UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 91—PART 9

NOVEMBER 29, 1945, TO DECEMBER 21, 1945
(PAGES 11157 TO 12550)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. E. J. Flanagan, founder and director of Boys Town, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

We are this day in the presence of Almighty God, our Lord and Creator, and, with humble and contrite hearts, recognize our entire dependence upon Him.

Dear Lord, help us to pay proper homage and reverence to Thee. We thank Thee for all the graces and blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us as individuals and as a body representative of a great nation. We know it is only through Thee, dear Lord, that we can worthily observe the duties and responsibilities that are expected of us as a properly constituted body to insure peace and tranquillity to our Nation and restore order out of chaos in this postwar era.

There are many perplexing problems, dear Lord, that are disturbing our national and world peace. These come from conflicting powers, with sufficient influence that they are capable of upsetting the much-bewildered minds of our people. There are many selfish interests at the bottom of those disturbing factors.

Dear Lord, if our Nation is to continue to be great and to maintain its leadership among the distressed and wearied nations of this war-torn world, it must eliminate selfishness and greed from its citizenry, and base its strength and virility on that great foundation of love—love for Thee, O Lord, and love for our fellow man, for Thy sake. With love and sacrifice, wounds will be healed, injustice rectified, human dignity upheld, and peace secured under the moral guidance of Thy Commandments.

May the God of love inspire this splendid body of the Senate and guide it in the solution of its many and important problems, that this great Nation may be blessed and become an outstanding example by dispensing Christian love and Christian justice to its people. True democracy, guided by such spiritual principles, is the only safe and sane solution for world peace and world security. All this we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, November 28, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

GREETINGS TO FATHER FLANAGAN AND BOYS FROM BOYS TOWN, NEBR.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I know that I speak the sentiments in the heart of every Member of the Senate this morning in extending a greeting to the man who has done such distinguished work for the boys of America. Monsignor Flanagan is well known to the people of this country, and his name has gone around the world. It so happens that the institution over which he presides is located at Omaha, Nebr., but it is not a State institution; it is a national institution, and it is the product of the life and love of a great man and a great American.

We also have with us Capt. P. J. Norton, the superintendent of the Boys Town school, and there are in the gallery members of the Boys Town football team. I am sure the Senate joins with me in welcoming Father Flanagan, Captain Norton, and the boys from Boys Town who are in our presence this morning.

I ask the senior Senator from Nebraska, who I think is as close to and as intimate with the distinguished monsignor as anyone in our State and in the Nation, if he will present Monsignor Flanagan, Captain Norton, and the boys, not only to Members of the Senate but to those in the gallery.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it has been my privilege on a previous occasion to welcome to the Senate Chamber a group of boys from Boys Town, Nebr., under the leadership of Monsignor Flanagan—Father Flanagan to me and to those who know him in Omaha and throughout the country. It is again a distinct pleasure and privilege to present them to the Members of the Senate of the United States. I will ask the boys who are in the gallery to rise. They represent not only the school itself but the school represents practically every State in the Union, for at Boys Town there are boys from almost every State as well as from countries abroad. Boys, will you please stand?

(The group of boys from Boys Town rose from their seats in the gallery.)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 28, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941;

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; and

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, UNITED STATES SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 100)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, United States Senate, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $15,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, UNITED STATES SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 101)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, United States, fiscal year 1946, amounting to $400,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 102)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice, fiscal year 1946,

amounting to $29,350 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—BUREAU OF THE BUDGET (S. Doc. No. 103)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Bureau of the Budget, fiscal year 1946, amounting to $61,800 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. Doc. No. 109)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions amounting to $176,660.86 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 104)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1946, amounting to $15,000, to remain available until June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 105)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1946, amounting to $2,000,000, together with an amendment to House Document 340, in the revised amount of $605,000, for the Foreign Quarantine Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 106)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting to $3,042,831.27, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 107)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, amounting to $158,482.52, and requiring an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 111)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $20,040.24, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO OR LOSSES OF PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 108)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant law, estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, amounting to $38,181.15 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 110)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $31.18 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 112)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of a judgment rendered against the Government by a United States District Court, amounting to $35,144.95, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 113)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay a claim for damages to privately owned property, amounting to $37.50 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 114)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department, amounting to $63,018.62 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION RELATING TO A JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 115)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered against the Government by the Court of Claims in favor of Alfred Oscar Schaffer, amounting to $4,171.10 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Willis F. Kern, professor of mathematics, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., praying for a revision of certain amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 69, to provide for the preparation and publication as an official document of railroad cost scales or tables and related information, and that he be notified of the date set for public hearing; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of State Universities, held in the State of Kansas, favoring the establishment of a joint committee of Congress to formulate sound principles of Federal and State relationship in educational administration for the guidance of Congress in the consideration of proposals for Federal participation in educational planning and support; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition from the Marion County organization, American Legion, Department of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 804) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1634, to establish a national natural resources policy; to create a Natural Resources Council, to provide for a natural resources inventory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for Mr. McFARLAND):

S. 1635. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provisions of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

APPROPRIATION FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 2, after the figure "1947" insert a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for the purchase of any agricultural commodity, or any commodity manufactured or processed in whole or in part from any agricultural commodity, unless such purchases are made directly by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and (except as are already in the possession of agencies of the Government and/or declared as surplus by the Government) unless such purchases are made after advertisement for proposals and competitive bidding."

ALUMINUM PLANTS DISPOSAL PROGRAM

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to his speech of November 23 regarding the aluminum plant disposal program, together with a telegram referred to him by Mr. MAGNUSON and his reply, as well as Senate bill 1612, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE WAR DEPARTMENT'S WEEKLY SUMMARY OF THE DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the War Department on November 26 released a weekly summary of the demobilization program, showing the re-

turn to civil life from the Army during the week of November 23, the total released from November 1 through November 23, the total released from VJ-day, September 2, through November 23, and the total released during the period May 12, 1945, through November 23, 1945. I ask unanimous consent to have the summary printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 26, 1945.

The War Department today gave the following weekly summary of the demobilization program:

Returns to civil life

Released during week ending Nov. 23, 1945	252,000
Total released Nov. 1 through 23, 1945	918,000
Total released VJ-day (Sept. 2, 1945) through Nov. 23, 1945	2,774,000
Total released during the period May 12 through Nov. 23, 1945	3,366,000

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—SUBSTITUTION OF A CONFEREE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, when the conferees on the reorganization bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, were named, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was designated as one of the conferees for the minority. The Senator from Michigan is unable to serve, and it is agreeable that the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be substituted for the Senator from Michigan. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be substituted for the Senator from Michigan as one of the conferees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 21, it is proposed to insert the following:

The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—

(a) vote to recommend what he may consider appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment under article 36, and preferably recommend reference to the International Court of Justice;

(b) in voting to recommend terms of settlement under article 37 or 38 vote only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable;

(c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures, if taken, will bring about a result in accord with international justice as well as international peace and security;

(d) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 (except by direction of the Congress) for measures against a nation unless such nation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the Security Council, except in cases in which such nation has made an aggressive attack on the territorial integrity of some other nation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am prompted to discuss——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Saltonstall
Brewster	Hoey	Shipstead
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Buck	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Tobey
Carville	McMahon	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Donnell	Mead	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Mitchell	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wheeler
Fulbright	Morse	Wherry
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Myers	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Young
Gurney	Overton	
Hart	Reed	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been excused to attend hearings on sustained yield timber units in Oregon and California lands.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is necessarily absent. He has been excused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss informally the pending amendment, proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and what I shall have to say I hope to narrow down largely to a discussion of the provisions of the United Nations Charter which cover the subject matter of the proposals made, rather than to state my views of the general policy. If I shall enter into the realm of the general policy, as one may in the heat of argument, it will not be because of my present intention, but will be the result of interrogations or some other cause outside of my intention.

Mr. President, I make the point that clauses (b), (c), and (d) render the proposed amendment unacceptable, because they are either in conflict with the Charter of the UNO, or because they are unnecessary in view of the terms of the Charter of UNO. There are different grounds of discussion of the several paragraphs. Paragraph (b) relates to a situation in which the matter at issue is still a dispute; it has not arrived at the condition of a threat to international peace and security, and has not arrived at the point where armed force can be considered at all. The paragraph reads as follows:

The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—

(b) in voting to recommend terms of settlement under article 37 or 38 vote only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable.

The other two paragraphs relate to an entirely different situation, for which provision is made in another chapter of the United Nations Organization Charter, namely, chapter 7. That condition is one where a threat to international peace exists or where it has gone beyond a threat by an act of aggression.

In the first case, considering paragraph (b), the jurisdiction of the Security Council is provided for and is limited, of course, to nothing but recommendations; and in arriving at judgment with respect to recommendations, the Security Council is controlled by the

Charter, which ought to control us now that it has become the law by treaty.

Chapter V, setting up the Security Council, article 24, paragraph 2, reads:

In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

That is a specific declaration. It is not a general statement. It is a capitalized reference to a certain chapter in the Charter of the UNO which is obligatory upon the representative of the United States to the Security Council. Now, if the purposes and principles to which the delegate or representative is bound by the Charter provide for exactly the same thing that is contained in paragraph (b) of the Senator's amendment, then paragraph (b) is certainly gratuitous and not necessary. In reading paragraph (b), there is in my mind a question whether it is exactly in the same terms and has the same significance as the Charter, because, as I interpret the proposal, it is rather vague in its terms. "Vote only for terms of settlement" relates not to action generally which would include voting against terms in certain events. And "terms of settlement which are just to both parties," which is a very broad term, difficult indeed of application generally.

The language of the Charter itself is more precise in its adaptation to a delegate's authority, a representative's power to exercise judgment on the ground and make a determination. Thus we find in the preamble of the Charter the following:

We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and—

Skipping to the third paragraph—

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; * * * hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

Chapter I provides in paragraph 1 of article 1 as follows:

The purposes of the United Nations are:

". To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace—

And this is the particular provision which I think is applicable—

and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator contends that article 1, paragraph 1, prescribes principles binding on the Security Council "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations." Of course it is fairly clear that those principles apply only to bringing about settlement by peaceful means. What strikes me about article 1, and the outstanding fact, is that while justice and international law are applied in bringing about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement, they are not applied apparently to the action under article 39, chapter VII, relating to the use of force. Does the Senator agree with that interpretation?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator from Ohio is exactly correct, and later I shall discuss article 39 and point out that the wording and the theory of the United Nations Charter is right in that direction, so that when the affair or condition remains in the realm of dispute only, then the scope of authority and jurisdiction of the Security Council is one thing, but when it reaches over into the realm of a threat to international security and peace or a breach, then it is much restricted and limited, and therefore that the proposal of the distinguished Senator and my friend in paragraphs (c) and (d) are in conflict with the Charter. I will come to a discussion of that later.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator's opinion, then, is that the phrase "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law" covers every possible recommendation under articles 37 and 38. Does the Senator from Vermont think that covers the recommendation of terms of settlement under articles 37 and 38, or does he feel that articles 37 and 38, being specific, prevail over the general terms? I should like to have the Senator's opinion on that question.

Mr. AUSTIN. My opinion is that the general rule of guidance about which we are talking covers every action under chapter VI, which includes articles 37 and 38 to which the distinguished Senator has referred.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I considered the question and it seemed to me that it was at least ambiguous. I agree that there might be such a compulsion, but it seemed to me that the two proposals I made cleared up the ambiguity at least and made it plain that the action taken was to be in accordance with the general purposes of the United Nations.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not in dispute with anyone about the desirability of the general policy of having these pacific methods applied according to the purposes and principles as they are stated in the Charter, which I think is a workable statement of them, whereas I believe that if it were narrowed down to voting "only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable," it would probably be unworkable in many cases.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator believe that the words "which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law" are different from the words in the Charter, "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law"?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I conceive that there is a difference. In other words, the Charter envisages the representative of each of the nations which are members of the Security Council exercising judgment under the principles of justice and international law, and acting accordingly in the recommendation. My claim is that if the purpose is different, if the proposal of amendment is outside and beyond the purpose stated in the Charter, then it is inadmissible for us to adopt it, because we are bound by the Charter, and the effect of this proposal would be the same as that of a proposal to make a reservation to a treaty. I cannot conceive of the Senate at any time undertaking to make a reservation to a treaty by a Senate resolution or by an amendment to a bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. May I suggest that since the vote in the Security Council is apparently entirely a matter of discretion, it seems to me that we can issue general instructions to our delegate as to when to vote for certain proposals, and when not to vote for them? I do not believe that such instructions should be in conflict with any provision in the Charter, but we certainly can impose additional rules for the guidance of the delegate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Provided they are not in conflict with the Charter, which says—and this is a mandate, as I view it, on the representative of the United States:

In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The principles are set forth very definitely on the point of keeping within the realm of the principles of justice and of international law.

As to the other two paragraphs, (c) and (d), of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio I believe that they reach into a field which was carefully considered for a long time, before the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were drafted, and before the Conference at San Francisco. The question arose whether we ought to invest the Security Council with the double capacity of acting as a court and enforcing its judgments by armed force. It was conceived that the primary duty of the Security Council under chapter VII should not be extensive, but that it should be limited to the sole objective of maintenance of international law, peace, and security. So it was stated in article 24 of chapter V of the final draft of the Charter which we adopted:

In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

That is, as to the United States, whatever the Security Council does under chapter VII relating to the application of the enforcement remedies under articles 41 and 42 is the act of the United States. This has been kept prominent throughout the final draft of the Charter, and we find in chapter VII that in order to have the power to act the Security Council must make a finding of fact.

That is a condition precedent to its action. It is not a finding based upon the merits of the question. I assume that it was considered at San Francisco, as it always was in the preparation of the Dumbarton Oaks draft, that expedition, or promptness, was the very essence of this matter under chapter VII, and that the speed with which the Security Council could apply the particular enforcement remedies must not be interfered with by a study of the merits of the question between two countries which have created the condition which must be studied with one objective, namely, Does this condition threaten to disturb the peace of the world?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Senator's position, and that is my criticism, in a way, of what we may be compelled to do under the Charter. Let us suppose a case in which the Indonesians establish their independence as an Indonesian republic, but become involved in a war with the British, who wish to take a naval base, and attack Singapore. It may be a minor attack. However, it is aggression. Thereupon, obviously we cannot do anything about Great Britain. The only way we can contribute to the peace and security of the world is to send the United Nations forces in against the Indonesians and wipe out their independence. That is the only step I can think of that would bring about the peace and security of the world, and that step is what I am seeking to prevent by my amendment.

Let us take another case. Suppose that the Finns and the Russians should become involved in a border dispute. I do not know what we could do for the peace and security of the world except to use the United Nations force against the Finns. That is what I am trying to prevent. I do not believe that the American people wish to become involved, no matter how necessary it may be for the peace and security of the world, against a nation which fundamentally is fighting a just war. That is the purpose of paragraph (c) of my amendment. It seems to me that we have the right under the Charter to exercise our own judgment as to whether or not we shall vote for force, and to prescribe the basis on which we shall do it. That is the argument for my amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I certainly understand that argument, because I have heard it many times before, by many distinguished Americans. It is not without foundation from their point of view. I believe, however, that those who conceived of this first step toward maintaining security and peace by the abolition of the use of warfare as a means of setting disputes and threats of aggression, those who had an ambition to take at least one step forward in this direction, found that it was absolutely necessary, in order to make it effective, to have it operate almost automatically, and that any effort at undertaking to inject into this particular function, which is the primary function of the Security Council, the business of passing on the merits of the question was sure to slow down the action and perhaps completely to nullify any effort of saying effectively to the rest of the world, "You have taken an obligation not to resort to war as a means of settling your disputes. You have set us up as the institution to see to it that you do not do it." Therefore, all the delay that can intervene between the threat and the action by the Security Council is that which is necessary in order to find the fact that a threat to the security and peace of the world exists on account of that situation.

I took up this point very thoroughly on the cross-examination of Dr. Pasvolsky, because I seemed to read into certain changes which had been made between the Dumbarton Oaks draft and the San Francisco draft an expansion of the authority of the Security Council, and I wished to make sure and to have in the record a statement of how those who were responsible for these changes interpreted them. So I asked Dr. Pasvolsky, as shown at page 274 of the hearings:

> It is true that you accomplished the combination of the authority to pass upon the merits of an issue and to enforce it by arms—that combination in the Security Council?

I did not receive the answer directly. I turn to page 276, where Dr. Pasvolsky took up the question after some collateral discussion in the nature of a historical statement. At the top of page 276 we find that Dr. Pasvolsky testified as follows:

> Now, there is a question which is involved here which is rather important, and that is whether or not this converts the Council into a court. The whole tenor of the Charter is that as far as possible all legal disputes, that is all justiciable disputes, all disputes which involve situations that can be settled by a court, should be settled by a court.

Pursuing it further, I read from page 278:

> Senator AUSTIN. Article 39 reads:
>
> "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."
>
> Mr PASVOLSKY. When the Council begins to make recommendations under article 39, that is another story.

Article 39, as will be seen, is the first article under chapter VII which relates to actions with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression, and that is what the two last paragraphs of the amendment of the distinguished Senator refer to.

I read further from the testimony of Dr. Pasvolsky, appearing on page 278 of the hearings:

> That is another kind of a recommendation, because that is a recommendation which occurs at a stage at which the Council has determined that there exists an actual threat to the peace or a breach of the peace. Even here, however, it is very important to bear in mind that in chapter V which relates to the powers and responsibilities of the Security Council it was stated that the Security Council shall in the performance of its duties be guided by and act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Organization.
>
> In the article on purposes and principles, article 2, it is stated that—
>
> "The Organization and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1, shall act in accordance with the following principles," that is, both the Organization and its members.

Now I call attention to the testimony appearing on page 279. In order to show further that the Charter itself limits the jurisdiction and power of the Security Council to action which will prevent the use of war as a means of settlement of disputes, and therefore that (c) and (d) of the amendment are in conflict with the Charter, I continue to read from the testimony of Dr. Pasvolsky. In my question on page 279 occurs the following:

> Can you say, then, that the use of military authority which is granted by chapter VII, is not intended by this treaty to be used to enforce in this indirect way, that is spoken of here on page 84, the recommendation of the Security Council, but is used only for the purpose of preventing hostilities?
>
> Mr. PASVOLSKY. I would say that; certainly.
>
> Senator AUSTIN. All right. Let us have the record rest there. That is where I thought it ought to be left. It is not my disposition in asking these questions to develop the fact that this expansion of the authority of the Security Council was intended to combine in the Security Council both the powers of judgment and the powers of execution of the judgment. I think that would be a grave mistake and a step backward instead of forward.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will yield in a moment. I wish to point out the language of the amendment in order to show what it would accomplish if it were to be put into effect. To my mind, it would be quite doubtful that it would accomplish much if it were adopted, because I believe that two of its paragraphs are in conflict with the Charter. I wish to show that the paragraphs run precisely counter to the Charter itself.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will yield in a moment. Let me read the language to which I have referred, and then I shall yield to the Senator from New Jersey, and later to the Senator from Ohio. The amendment reads in part as follows:

> The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—
>
> * * * * *
>
> (c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures, if taken, will bring about a result in accord with international justice as well as international peace and security;
>
> (d) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 for measures against a nation unless such nation has been given an opportunity to be heard before the Security Council, except in cases in which such nation has made an aggressive attack on the territorial integrity of some other nation.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I was about to suggest that we consider, for example, the case suggested by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with respect to Indonesians. As I read the Charter and interpret it, in the case of an attack on Singapore by India, the Security Council would move in and say, in effect, "You

cannot use aggressive methods." As I understand, the whole purpose of the Council is to prevent the use of aggressive power.

Mr. AUSTIN. I agree with the Senator. I can envisage the Security Council moving in against both sides merely for the purpose of arresting the use of war as a means of determining their issue.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the two cases which I cited, the Security Council could not move in against the British or the Russians because they would veto the use of force against themselves. So the only recourse would be against those who had become involved in war with them. It would be the only step the Council could take toward peace and security. Therefore, unless there were some restraint exercised by way of justice the Council would be compelled, it seems to me, to proceed in the manner suggested. I do not think our representative must vote in that way. The amendment would not increase the jurisdiction of the Security Council. It would rather tend to limit it, because we say that we will exercise our veto power in that kind of a case. Certainly we have a right to exercise our veto power if we wish to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. The amendment undertakes by statute to extend the Charter, which is a part of a treaty, so that the jurisdiction and the power of the Security Council will comprehend other questions than the simple question laid down in the Charter, namely, Does this situation threaten the peace and security of the world?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the amendment would affect the jurisdiction of the Security Council in any way, or that it could do so. It is merely an instruction to our delegate that he shall consider that situation when he decides whether or not he will veto the use of force. It does not affect in any way the jurisdiction of the Security Council.

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot imagine a Security Council, made up of members who are not committed to perform their duties under this Charter according to the terms of the Charter, holding in reservation some additional jurisdiction which is not comprehended by the Charter, but is being imposed through a single act of the legislature of merely one of the countries involved.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator question the right of the President to act on such a motive without any instructions?

Mr. AUSTIN. I certainly would question it. The sole duty of our representative, after the controversy gets beyond the stage of a dispute, as covered by chapter VI, and into the stage of a threat to peace or aggression, is to vote to put a stop to the use of warfare as a means of determining the issue.

Mr. TAFT. So if, in fact, the United States itself went to war it would be the duty of the United States representative on the Council to vote for the use of international force against the United States. That is the logical conclusion, is it not, to be reached from the Senator's statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. Unfortunately there is a veto provided which seems to be a stumbling block to every contemplation which we may have of the use of the United Nations effectively under chapter VII.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly.

Mr. AUSTIN. I recognize that fact, and have recognized it all the time; but we must conform our legislation, nevertheless, to the terms of the treaty.

Mr. TAFT. As I said at the time I voted for the United Nations Charter, if there had been no such veto provided I would have voted against it, because it is based on force and not on justice. If we remove the veto, it seems to me that we must substitute justice for peace and security as a guide for the United Nations. Otherwise, it seems to me that we have turned simply to a world of enforced rule.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I cannot agree with my friend on that point. We must consider the Charter in all its scope. Article 41 and rticle 42 have different scopes. There is a provision existing to implement the finest characteristic of the Charter, namely, the provision to settle disputes by pacific means. In the enforcement provision of that part of the Charter we find article 41, which reads as follows:

> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

We voted for that language of the Charter as well as for that part of chapter VII which relates to the condition of affairs which threaten resort to war as a means of determining disputes. With one exception, so far as I can see, we have provided for the greatest encouragement the world has ever received for the determination of controversies among nations by pacific measures. To my mind it is one of the most important parts of the Charter, and I voted not only for that provision but for the other chapter relative to the ultimate use of armed force, which is not to be used under the Charter unless this condition precedent is found, namely, that what started out to be merely a dispute has ripened into a threat of war. Then and then only can the enforcement action under article 42 be applied to the situation. And even then it is not to be applied with reference to who is right and who is wrong, but only as the most expeditious way of preventing the breach. The decision may go against two or more countries. It cannot be conceived of as being directed solely against only one country which is found to be an aggressor. Under the Charter, after having exhausted all these wonderful means of pacific settlement, if they have all failed and if the condition amounts to a threat to international peace and security, the Security Council must proceed in accordance with the provisions of chapter VII.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, if I may finish this thought, then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Article 42 provides:

> ARTICLE 42
>
> Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

That is the only purpose and the only condition.

> Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

In other words the enforcement articles, 41 and 42, are faithful to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter to which I have already alluded. I do not intend to go into the others, but only into those principles and purposes to which the proposed amendment of the Senator from Ohio applies, namely, that under the pacific method the principles of justice and of international law shall be applied to the determination.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator was discussing of course, the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] composed of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d), was he not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to ask the Senator a rather general question. Can he conceive of the American representative, under the direction and instruction of the President of the United States, or without it, going on the Security Council or the Assembly for that matter, bearing in mind the declaration of purposes of the United Nations as set forth in the very initial chapter of the Charter, from which, if the Senator will bear with me, I shall read:

> 1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of internation disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace?

That is a general declaration which permeates the entire Charter. Those are the purposes it has in mind and whatever is provided under the Charter must always refer back to that purpose.

Can the Senator conceive of a man going on the Council, in view of the obligations he assumes and in view of the whole tenor of the Charter, and failing to vote in accordance with appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment? Of course he is going to do that. What is the use of saying, "Go ahead and do what is right"? He is already going to do what is right, if he knows how. Yet paragraph (b) of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio provides:

> (b) in voting to recommend terms of settlement under article 37 or 38 vote only for terms of settlement which are just to both parties and in accordance with international law so far as it may be applicable.

Of course, that is already the obligation of the American representative, an obligation which is placed on him by the Charter.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio further provides:

(c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures, if taken, will bring about a result in accord with international justice, as well as international peace and security.

There is another obligation already imposed by the Charter.

With respect to paragraph (d) in the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, I wish to ask the Senator if it is not true that the Charter already provides that any member of the Organization may not only have a hearing before the Security Council, but may sit and participate in the discussions?

Mr. AUSTIN. As provided in article 44.

Mr. CONNALLY. And also in article 31, which reads:

ARTICLE 31

Any member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that member are specially affected.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to have the Senator also read article 44, because that takes in the other feature of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be glad to do so, but first I desire to read article 32:

ARTICLE 32

Any member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate—

It does not have to go with a petition and beg to be heard, but it is to be invited to participate—

without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a member of the United Nations.

I understand the Senator from Vermont desires that I read article 44?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Article 44 is as follows:

ARTICLE 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under article 43, invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

That particular provision of the Charter was proposed by Canada, as I recall, and was adopted by the San Francisco Conference. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his comments.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. As I understand the position of the Senator from Vermont, which is my own position, if a member of the United Nations should attempt to take any kind of aggressive action the Security Council could say, "You cannot do that." If there was a dispute, it might be left to the International Court, but the Security Council could say, "You cannot use force and you cannot debate the merits of the question, for it is not before us." I think that is the proper interpretation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. And I call attention to the further fact——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AUSTIN. As soon as I finish this sentence I shall be glad to yield.

The Security Council is not invested with authority to make a decree; nowhere in the Charter is it given judicial power to make a judgment. All it can do under the Charter is to make a recommendation and the question of whether a dispute shall be settled peacefully or shall ripen into a threat depends at that stage upon the self-discipline of the nations involved in the dispute. There is nothing more the Security Council can do about it than to make recommendations. If the nations are unwilling to act upon such recommendations, or on their own initiative, to close the matter peacefully, but start to make war, then it is necessary that we act quickly. That is the purpose of setting up this organization, that it should act quickly, that it not be delayed by being required to summon a nation, as provided in clause (d) of the amendment, and give it a chance to be heard. The chance to be heard is already given with respect to the pacific settlement of disputes, and it is also given if a nation were to be called upon to participate by the contribution of troops. It would then have a chance to be heard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the remarks of the senior Senator from Texas, because as I understand his position on this matter, it is diametrically opposed to that of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. The senior Senator from Texas says that the provisions of article 1, which uses the language "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law," must guide the delegate to the United Nations Council in determining whether to use force or not. Surely, he says, no man would disregard those principles. Whereas the Senator from Vermont says he must disregard those principles, he must act solely on principles of peace and security. Article 1 emphasizes the conclusion of the Senator from Vermont, which is essentially right unless we adopt the pending amendment, because the provision is, "and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes."

When it comes to force, however, under articles 41 and 42, there is no longer any direct or indirect injunction to do anything "in conformity with the principles of international law." I understand the position of the Senator from Vermont to be as I have stated, and it is diametrically opposite to that of the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I did not so understand the Senator from Texas. I thought he and I were following the same line of thought. This is certainly according to the record as made by Dr. Pasvolsky:

Can you say, then, that the use of military authority, which is granted by chapter VII, is not intended by this treaty to be used to enforce in this indirect way, that is spoken of here on page 84, the recommendation of the Security Council, but is used only for the purpose of preventing hostilities?

Mr. PASVOLSKY. I would say that; certainly.

That was my hope, and, as I have stated, it has been my hope for a long time. I endeavored from a remote distance, as this matter was being discussed in California, to make known to our representatives my views on that point. I feel so strongly that it is necessary to have this idea carried out, that that is the real, underlying reason why I discuss this question now.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator and I are in agreement as to what the treaty essentially provides. My attempt is to say that so far as our delegate is concerned, he shall in voting regard principles of international law and justice, and he shall not, because of some form of technical aggression and dispute, in which perhaps the fundamental rights are on the side of the aggressor, join in sending in an air force, to kill thousands of Indonesians, for example, who we think are essentially right, because they have been the aggressor, perhaps, in a dispute affecting Singapore, on the ground that that is the only way we can possibly contribute to international peace and security. I think that is contrary to the genius of the American people. I think they will violently protest against any such action on our part against a nation which we feel perhaps is fighting for its rights and for justice.

I feel very strongly that the argument submitted by the Senator from Vermont and his interpretation of the treaty enforce the necessity that we provide that our delegate, at least in deciding whether he shall exercise the veto power or not, shall pay some attention to principles of international law and justice. I think the Senator agrees that in the present situation, so far as the Charter is concerned, he may or he may not pay attention to international law and justice, but, so far as the Charter is concerned, he is instructed only to pay attention to international peace and security, and if that requires the erasing of a nation—as it might; and perhaps the world would be more peaceful if there were no Poles or no Germans in the

world—if the Council thinks it will contribute to international peace and security, the Council may order the erasure of that nation by atomic bombs. That is the genius of the treaty as I see it, and that is my great criticism of the Charter. I think we can gradually turn the Charter more and more to the rule of justice, if on any occasion when we have discretion we exercise our voting power in consonance with international law and justice.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are many things in the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Ohio which appeal to me strongly, for example, his statement that we should increase the interest of the world in the determination of controversies in the family of nations according to justice and principles of international law. With that I am in complete sympathy. If I had had my way in the matter, I might have so written certain parts of the Charter as to emphasize that point. But I certainly would not have utterly destroyed the primary power and purpose of the Security Council, which would be accomplished by adopting changes proposed by the Senator from Ohio. I would have put it where it belonged. In the first place, the broad powers of discussion and interchange of views in the General Assembly should be carried out, as the Charter says, on principles of justice and international law. In the second place, I think I would have implemented the Court more fully than it has been by the statute which is attached to the Charter. I am not making commitments now, but I will say that I have read with great interest an amendment drawn by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I fully agree with him, and I hope we might implement the peaceful means of settlement by saying that we at least are in full accord, and willing to go the whole way in that direction.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well; we are not very far apart on that. But when it comes to diminishing the efficiency of this organ, which is designed to prevent the use of armed force, I am not for it. I want to maintain the ability in that agency to act instantly upon the discovery and decision by the Security Council that a threat to the peace and security of the world exists. I do not want the decision interfered with by the necessary business of calling the parties in and inquiring into the nature of their dispute, finding out who is to blame, and then striking against only the one that is to blame. The assumption is that all the parties who resort to the use of war as a means of settling their disputes are offenders to the extent that will cause the Security Council to act forthwith. That is my position.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. CHARLES C. GOSSETT, Senator-designate from Idaho, and ask that they be read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise.

STATE OF IDAHO,
County of Ada, ss:

Whereas on the 10th day of November 1945 the Honorable John Thomas, senior United States Senator from Idaho, died in the city of Washington, D. C., thereby creating a vacancy in the Office of United States Senator for Idaho;

Now, therefore, I, Arnold Williams, Governor of the State of Idaho, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution of the United States of America, and the statutes of the State of Idaho, do hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES C. GOSSETT, of Boise, Idaho, to be United States Senator for the State of Idaho, with all of the rights and privileges, and the duties and responsibilities thereunto pertaining, until his successor is duly elected and qualified, according to law.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Idaho to be hereunto affixed this 17th day of November, A. D. 1945, and of the Independence of the United States, the one hundred and seventieth.

[SEAL] ARNOLD WILLIAMS,
Governor of Idaho.

Attest:
IRA H. MASTERS,
Secretary of the State of Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator-designate is present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath of office.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. GOSSETT, escorted by Mr. TAYLOR, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

GENERAL MACARTHUR'S COMMENDATION OF BILLY MITCHELL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the case of the martyrdom of Gen. Billy Mitchell is well known to the Members of this great body. So, too, is the fact that our country has been shockingly negligent in paying a last measure of tribute to his hallowed memory.

Three times I have introduced into the Senate a joint resolution to grant Billy the posthumous rank of major general. Three times the Senate has passed the resolution, and three times it has been shamelessly bottled up in the House of Representatives Military Affairs Committee.

It has recently been said that one of the reasons why that committee has failed to take favorable action is that its members do not want to cast any adverse reflections upon General MacArthur, who served on the court martial which cashiered Billy Mitchell.

According to my knowledge of the facts, this theory is "all wet," because General MacArthur voted consistently against the court-martial verdict. In order to confirm these facts, I recently wrote to General MacArthur, asking for his candid statement on the situation. The following gracious reply has just been received from General MacArthur's headquarters:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for the many kind and generous expressions contained in your letter which has just reached me.

I was one of Billy Mitchell's most intimate and devoted friends from the beginning to the end. Our families came from the same spot, Milwaukee, and enjoyed the most cordial intimacy for many decades. Your recollection of my part in his trial is entirely correct. It was fully known to him and he never ceased to express his gratitude for my attitude. It would be ridiculous for anyone to say that any posthumous honors that might be granted him would be embarrassing to me. He was a rare genius in his profession and contributed much to aviation history.

I know nothing of the discussion involved in your resolution, but do know that any part I played in his career should have no bearing whatsoever on the matter.

Out here we are making excellent progress. With renewed expressions of thanks and appreciation,

Very faithfully,
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

This response, I believe, removes any last barrier to the postponement of action on my resolution in the House Military Affairs Committee. I believe that the resolution should be immediately reported to the House floor, where, from all indications, it will be enacted virtually without dissent.

Let the rut-minded brass hats, who, behind the scenes, have so far successfully plotted to hold up the joint resolution, cease and desist their sinister activities. That they have done so thus far is one more proof to America that we cannot fall asleep at the switch and allow rut-minded military leaders to guide our destinies. It was they who in the last analysis had the primary responsibility for the defense of Pearl Harbor. It was they who, unalert, fell down on that job. It was they who will let us in for worse Pearl Harbors in this atomic age unless we can replace them with forward-looking pioneers in military offense and defense like Billy Mitchell.

His warnings of the dangers of Jap attack on Hawaii went unheeded. His pleas for adequate air striking power went ignored. He was crucified for his vision, his honesty, his boldness. Billy Mitchell does not need to have this tribute paid to him now, but America, for its own honor and its own present and future, needs to pay the tribute to him. It needs to remove the unjustified stain which it has allowed for so long to sully his brilliant record.

General MacArthur, great soldier-statesman that he is, has added his word once more to this righteous cause. Let me repeat what General MacArthur wrote:

> Your recollection of my part in his trial is entirely correct.

To what does General MacArthur refer? In my letter I called attention to the fact that there was one negative vote, and that it was reported that his was the negative vote. So he writes:

> Your recollection of my part in his trial is entirely correct. It was fully known to him and he never ceased to express his gratitude for my attitude.

Mr. President, Billy Mitchell said that battleships could be sunk with bombs,

and he went forth and demonstrated that they could be sunk with bombs. Then the record was forged. Billy Mitchell looked ahead and saw just what would take place at Pearl Harbor, and literally in words of his own pictured and set forth the happenings at Pearl Harbor. And he was crucified. General MacArthur, his friend, sat through his trial, on the court-martial board, and he said, "No," he should not be court-martialed. But all the other brass hats—because here was a leader, a man with vision and foresight, said "Yes," and they humiliated him. If they could have had a true understanding of Billy Mitchell's vision, and if they had followed his advice, Pearl Harbor would have been in reverse.

So, Mr. President, General MacArthur, great soldier-statesman that he is, has added his word once more to this righteous cause. Let the House take the final step to honor our prophet son, Billy Mitchell.

NATURAL RESOURCES POLICY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a natural resources policy for the United States.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1634) to establish a national natural resources policy, to create a Natural Resources Council, to provide for a natural resources inventory, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have just introduced a bill to establish a natural resources policy for the United States.

No one really knows how much we have depleted our natural resources in our war efforts.

Forced overproduction of minerals, beyond the needs of an orderly development program, was a war necessity. That overproduction has caused a serious depletion of ore from ore bodies which were known to exist, or which were blocked out, before the war.

I do not go as far as others have gone in painting the picture black. I do not agree that we have become a "have not" nation. But we do not know the facts. And we need to know the facts. We need to know what our natural resources are, where they are, and how they may best be used in the national interest.

A nation is a business. The United States is the biggest business in the world. For us to continue in business without knowing our potential assets is insane from an economic standpoint.

We have skimmed the cream off many of our known mineral deposits, and are now down to a large number of low-grade deposits, of fine producing potentialities, in almost every mineral category. These low-grade deposits include alumina, magnesite, molybdenum, iron ore deposits, low-grade copper and mercury deposits, and low-grade nickel—silicate of nickel—besides low-grade gold and silver deposits, and lead and zinc deposits. We also have numerous other metals and minerals, available in low-grade ores which with proper research could be made available, commercially, in spite of the type of thinking which argues that we should go outside the United States to acquire such rare metals and minerals.

We need a national inventory of our natural resources, and we need to keep that inventory up to date.

With respect to mineral resources, the inventory should not only show ore reserves on the present commercial basis, but should also show such reserves on a theoretical basis assuming the ability to work lower-grade ores than presently possible. Doing this would set up a clear goal to shoot at. It is not widely understood that the extent of ore reserves, with respect to any metal or mineral, depends upon the minimum grade of ore which can be worked.

With respect to minerals also, we need a continuing national program of exploration and laboratory work, to find the mineral deposits which are important to us, and to develop the technologies which will make those deposits liquid assets on our national balance sheet.

In the field of agricultural and forest resources, the national inventory should include far more than a tabulation of acreage cleared, acreage in forests, and so on. It should show the type and kind of soil. It should go further, and attempt to indicate, so far as possible, what may best be grown on the soil, and how the soil can be treated to make it more productive.

The inventory of forest resources should show the kind and quantity of timber available, and indicate the extent of the need for reforestation.

Reclamation involves more than putting water on the land; we need to know what the land can be made to grow.

Conservation involves, with respect to agricultural land, far more than crop rotation and contour tilling. We need a basic policy of stream control to best utilize rainfall and run-off.

We need to intensify and coordinate agricultural research. This is an important field and should not be lightly dismissed.

We need to do more and more intensive work in the development and adaptation of new crops. Much has been done along the line of developing new grasses and forage crops, and much has been done in improving the strain of various crops such as corn. Not nearly enough has been done to develop new cash crops. For instance, despite the vast potentialities of ramie as a crop in many of our southern States, it has been exploited hardly at all.

We need to develop new farm technologies in this country. We need more adequate and more widespread electrification of our farms. We need to develop better and cheaper farm machinery, which will permit a one-man farm to provide an adequate livelihood to the farmer.

In connection with all of this, as in connection with the inventorying of mineral resources, stress should be laid on fact-finding, rather than on Government planning. The Government should engage in, and encourage, research and development, and should attempt to provide or assemble the facts upon which intelligent planning can be based. But the planning itself should be left to private enterprise. What we need is not a blueprint for a new world, but a pyramid of facts, from the apex of which we may get a comprehensive view.

In the whole field of natural resources—particularly mineral resources—we must build up during years of peace adequate stockpiles above ground, and adequate resources below ground, so that never again will the United States have its safety jeopardized by the lack of critical or strategical materials.

The President of the United States has called our attention to the need for a natural resources program.

In his message to Congress on September 6, 1945, the President made pertinent reference to this problem. Let me read some excerpts from that message:

> During the war years we have expended our resources—both human and natural—without stint. We have thrown into the battle for freedom everything we had.
>
> The depletion of our natural resources is even more startling. We have torn from the earth copper, petroleum, iron ore, tungsten, and every other mineral required to fight a war without regard to our future supplies. We have taken what we needed. We were not able to, and we did not, take account of tomorrow.
>
> Although during this war this Nation has reached the apex of its power—a peak of greatness and might which the world had never seen—our national capital account has greatly suffered. We must proceed with all possible diligence not merely to restore these depleted resources to their prewar standards but to make them greater and richer than ever before.
>
> We must make a diligent effort to discover new deposits of the precious and indispensable minerals upon which our national life is founded.
>
> We must develop for the use of industry new technologies so that the vast deposits of low-grade ores that have not heretofore been considered usable may be put to work for the good of all of us.
>
> This is not only to provide men and women with work, it is to assure to the Nation the very basis of its life. It is to play the part of a good businessman who insists carefully on maintaining and rebuilding his plant and machinery.
>
> We know that by the investment of Federal funds we can, within the limits of our own Nation, provide for our citizens new frontiers. * * *
>
> Our irreplaceable wealth of minerals * * * is not composed of segments which can effectively be dealt with separately. Any program * * * must have as its unifying purpose the greatest possible contribution to the wealth of the Nation and to the wealth-producing capability of the Nation.
>
> It is necessary that we proceed as speedily as possible * * * to make an inventory of our national wealth and our basic resources. * * * An agency of this sort could provide us with consistent direction toward the goal of rehabilitation and improvement of our basic national resources.

The bill I have just introduced is intended to carry out those recommendations of the President. It is intended to provide the agency of which he speaks.

I will not at this time go into a detailed analysis of the bill. But I want

the Senate to know, in general, what the bill provides.

First, it contains a declaration that we need to know what our resources are, where they are, and how they are being depleted.

It contains a declaration that new technologies must be developed for working low-grade ores.

It contains a declaration that we should stock-pile man-hours as well as materials, by processing stock-piled materials to their most accessible and useful form.

Finally, it contains a declaration that the national interest, and not private or sectional advantage, must dictate our natural resources policy.

The bill sets forth a natural resources policy in specific terms. Important points in that policy include the following:

A national inventory of natural resources.

An annual accounting of the depletion of our natural resources, including estimates of foreseeable future depletion.

Annual estimates of future national requirements for critical or strategic materials.

Encouragement of private enterprise to develop natural resources and new technologies; and protection of the rights of individual discoverers of mineral deposits.

Government assistance in exploration for mineral deposits and development of new processes for production and recovery of metals and minerals.

A ban on sales abroad of critical or strategic materials of which we produce less than we need for our own use.

Establishment and maintenance of a stock pile including all critical or strategic materials in amounts sufficient to meet for at least 3 years our anticipated requirements for war production plus essential civilian production.

A requirement that stock-piled materials be not disposed of except by Executive order of the President for use in the interests of national defense or in the prosecution of a war.

The bill creates a Natural Resources Council. This Council would be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, one man with technical training and at least 15 years of outstanding experience in the mining industry, one man with technical training and at least 15 years of outstanding experience in agriculture, forestry, or soil conservation, and one member designated by the President for his executive and administrative ability.

The Council would be authorized to call upon any other department or agency of Government for information or services, with express provisions that in each field the Government agency now engaged therein and, therefore, possessing special knowledge and skill, shall be utilized.

The bill provides that all foreign patents held by the Alien Property Custodian and covering new or improved processes for production, recovery, processing, or utilization of natural resources, are to be studied with a view to claiming for the United States the right to use thereof, in America as a factor in peace negotiations.

The bill provides for a study of how we use metals and minerals to determine where and how those which we produce in abundance can be substituted for those of which we do not produce enough, so as to reduce the rate of depletion of the latter.

The bill establishes a continuing program of exploration for and development of domestic mineral deposits, and a continuing program of laboratory and demonstration tests, to develop and establish improved processes for production and recovery of metals and minerals, both programs to be administered by the Interior Department.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to accelerate and expand his functions relating to the appraisal and development of natural resources under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Department.

I do not claim that the bill I have introduced is the last word on this subject. I do say that we must have a national inventory of our natural resources as the basis for making intelligent decisions on financial and economic policies. I do say that we must have a fixed and defined national policy with respect to natural resources. I do say that Congress should fix and determine that policy.

The bill which I have introduced attempts to meet these problems.

This bill represents a great deal of work. Undoubtedly it is by no means perfect, but I believe it provides a sound foundation upon which the Congress can build. I hope it will be the subject of early hearings, and that every Member of the Senate will give it his careful attention.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, has the Senator modified his amendment by eliminating all except paragraph (c)?

Mr. TAFT. I thought I would do that after a quorum was present. However, I shall be glad to do it now.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator expects to do so when a quorum is present, no doubt that will be the best time.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is what I expect to do.

Mr. President, I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Hoey	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Stanfill
Buck	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarran	Taft
Byrd	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McMahon	Tobey
Connally	Maybank	Tunnell
Donnell	Mead	Tydings
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mitchell	Walsh
Fulbright	Morse	Wheeler
Gerry	Murdock	Wherry
Green	Myers	Willis
Guffey	O'Daniel	Young
Gurney	O'Mahoney	
Hart	Overton	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking therefrom clauses (a), (b), and (d). The amendment will then read:

> The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall—
>
> (c) refuse to vote under article 39, 41, or 42 for measures against a nation unless he is satisfied that such measures, if taken, will bring about a result in accord with international justice as well as international peace and security.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the single issue before the Senate is whether, in voting under articles 39, 41, and 42 of the Charter for economic sanctions and for the use of force against a nation, the American representative shall be bound solely by the theory that the action of the United Nations will produce international peace and security, no matter how unjust such action may be to the nation against whom the forces are used. Such power is probably the greatest legal power that any group of men have ever had. Five men, by their individual decision, may decree the death of a nation, the enslavement of millions of people, and the destruction of cities. They may do so merely because they think that to do so will bring about peace and security regardless of any principles of international justice which may be involved. In the interesting discussion of the Senator from Vermont who criticized this provision, he admitted that in the Charter, as written, there is no provision for the consideration of international right or justice in connection with the use of force.

I respectfully submit that the American representative at least should be guided, in addition to his interest in peace and security, by international justice, that American troops may not be sent against a small nation, perhaps, merely because the use of such force might bring about peace regardless of the fact that that nation had a just cause, with which the great bulk of the American people sympathized.

Certainly this is a limited request. It is merely that our representative shall exercise the veto power, which has been

emphasized as our power to bring the Charter into accord with what we actually desire it to be, if he feels that the use of force will bring about an unjust result. Certainly that is not an unreasonable instruction to be given to the American representative.

Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. The bill was drafted with great care by the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the majority members in consultation with the State Department. We went over all the probabilities and possibilities. The leading minority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are supporting the bill without amendment, and the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, according to my view, would not contribute to the workings of the Organization, nor would it in anywise change the attitude of our representative, because it is assumed he will vote with due care and with due regard to his obligations under the Charter. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], are necessarily absent.

The Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], are detained on public business.

The Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

I wish to announce the following general pairs: The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is necessarily absent. He has been excused. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been excused to attend hearings on sustained-yield timber units on Oregon and California lands.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], if present, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—18

Ball	Millikin	Taft
Brooks	Morse	Tobey
Buck	Revercomb	Wheeler
Bushfield	Robertson	Wherry
Donnell	Shipstead	Willis
Langer	Stanfill	Young

NAYS—41

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Barkley	Hart	Myers
Bilbo	Hayden	O'Daniel
Briggs	Hill	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hoey	Overton
Carville	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Eastland	Kilgore	Stewart
Ellender	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McKellar	Tunnell
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
Gerry	Maybank	Vandenberg
Green	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—37

Aiken	Glass	Murray
Andrews	Gossett	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bridges	Huffman	Taylor
Butler	Knowland	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	La Follette	Wagner
Capper	Lucas	White
Chavez	McClellan	Wiley
Cordon	McFarland	Wilson
Downey	Magnuson	
George	Moore	

So Mr. Taft's amendment as modified was rejected.

Mr. DONNELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the bill now open to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is now open to amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I offer the amendment which I sent to the desk last Monday, I think it was, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, providing for the numbers and.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in order to arrive at a correct understanding of the amendment just read by the clerk, it is advisable to read also the first sentence of section 6 of the bill as now pending. That sentence reads as follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter.

It will be observed that the amendment which has been read by the clerk strikes out beginning with line 8 down to and including line 11 and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, providing for the numbers and.

After which follows the remainder of the sentence, which I previously read.

The effect of the amendment as proposed is twofold: First, to strike out of section 6 of the bill the provision authorizing the President "to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council, which agreement or

agreements shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution"; and, second, to substitute for the provisions so stricken out a provision authorizing the President "to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The difference, Mr. President, between the bill and the amendment is, therefore, that (a) under the bill the agreement or agreements which the President is authorized to negotiate shall be subject to the approval of both Houses of Congress by act or joint resolution, and (b) under my amendment the agreement or agreements which the President is authorized to negotiate can be entered into only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

The bill, therefore, on the one hand makes the agreement or agreements with the Security Council subject to approval by both Houses of Congress. My amendment makes the said agreement or agreements subject to ratification under the processes set forth in section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States, namely, the processes prescribed by the Constitution for the ratification of treaties.

The basis of my amendment is twofold, namely, first, that the reason for authorizing the negotiation of such special agreement or agreements with the Security Council as is or are mentioned in section 6 of the bill is that the negotiation of such agreement or agreements is required by article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations, and, second, that the meaning of the language in said article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations is such as requires that such special agreement or agreements mentioned in section 6 of the bill now before the Senate as shall be concluded between the United States of America and the Security Council shall be subject to ratification under the processes prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the ratification of treaties.

Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations first provides as follows:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations next provides:

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

Article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations then requires as follows:

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

It will be observed, Mr. President, from section 6 of the bill, that the agreement or agreements, the negotiation of which is thereby authorized, are the agreement or agreements required by article 43 of the Charter to be negotiated and concluded. What is the requirement of article 43 of the Charter as to how the agreements therein mentioned are to be concluded? Let us again recall the last sentence of article 43. It reads:

They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Mr. President, as applied to the United States of America, what is—and I quote—"ratification in accordance with" its—and again quoting—"respective constitutional processes"? I submit first that the only respective constitutional processes of the United States of America governing ratification which are found anywhere in our Constitution are those processes which relate to the ratification of treaties, namely, those set forth in section 2 of article II of the Constitution, as follows:

He—

Meaning the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

True it is, Mr. President, that the term "ratification" is not used in this section of the Constitution; but it cannot be successfully denied that both in common and legal acceptation the processes described in that portion of the section which I have read are termed "ratification." In the article in 63 Corpus Juris on treaties, heading No. 4, on page 831, reads, "Negotiation and ratification." A portion of the body of the article under the heading in this encyclopedia of the law reads as follows:

After such agreement and signature it must be ratified by the respective governments, which in the United States is done by first referring it to the President, who determines whether or not he will submit it to the Senate for ratification; and if it is submitted by him it must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

In the article on treaties, in Fifty-two American Jurisprudence, page 811, the heading is "Ratification by Senate." A portion of the body of the article reads as follows:

It is an implied condition in negotiating with foreign powers that the treaties concluded by the executive government shall be subject to ratification in the manner prescribed by the fundamental laws of the state.

Continuing, the writer says:

In the United States, under its Constitution, treaties are made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. The Senate is not required to adopt or reject the proposed treaty as a whole, but may modify or amend the proposal.

In Charles Henry Butler's work on The Treaty-Making Power of the United States, section 465 is headed "Necessity of ratification by the Senate—Procedure in the Senate—Amendments." The next section, namely section 466, proceeds as follows:

After such ratification the treaty, according to the Constitution, becomes the supreme law of the land.

In that book Mr. Butler says, in section 465:

If a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations reports the treaty favorably it is still necessary for its advocates to obtain a two-thirds majority of the Senate in order to ratify it.

James Bryce, in his American Commonwealth, writing on the Senate as an executive and judicial body, as quoted in Mr. Butler's work, note 3 to paragraph 465, refers to the "necessity of ratification by the Senate in order to give effect to a treaty." The citation of Mr. Butler is in volume 2, page 379.

Curtis, in his Constitutional History of the United States, volume 1, pages 579 to 581, as cited in the note on page 329 of Mr. Butler's work, says:

The rule established by the Constitution, while it gives to every State an opportunity to be present and to vote, requires no positive quorum of the Senate for the ratification of a treaty. It simply demands that the treaty shall receive the assent of two-thirds of all the Members who may be present.

Bouvier's Law Dictionary, volume 3, paragraph 3313, says:

After treaties have been negotiated and signed they must be ratified by the proper authorities of each State.

In the case entitled *"14 Diamond Rings* v. *United States"* (183 U. S. 176, at p. 179) the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Chief Justice Fuller, twice refers in terms to ratification of a treaty. On page 183 Mr. Justice Brown, in a concurring opinion, speaks of the "power of the Senate" being "limited to a ratification of such terms as have already been agreed upon between the President, acting for the United States, and the commissioners of the other contracting power." Justice Brown further says:

The Senate has no right to ratify the treaty and introduce new terms into it which shall be obligatory upon the other power, although it may refuse its ratification or make such ratification conditional upon the adoption of amendments to the treaty.

Mr. President, from the citations of these various authorities and from our common knowledge of the acceptation of the term, it cannot be denied that both in common and legal acceptation the processes described in that portion of section 2 of article II of the Constitution which I have read are termed "ratification." So when article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations refers to ratification "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes," the Charter is referring to a well-understood and well-defined meaning of the term "ratification," namely, the provision, so far as the United States is concerned, which appears in section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States, that the President "shall have power, by and

with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The pending bill, to which the amendment I have offered applies, provides not for a ratification of the agreement or agreements by the Senate, with two-thirds of the Members present concurring, but provides for approval of the agreement or agreements with the Security Council by Congress, through appropriate act or joint resolution. I submit that there is no provision in the Constitution for ratification through an act of Congress or joint resolution of Congress, of any agreement made by the President; and when article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations refers to ratification, so far as the United States of America is concerned, in accordance with its constitutional processes, there is no provision in the Constitution to which those who have presented the bill can point which authorizes ratification through act of Congress or joint resolution in Congress. There are no "respective constitutional processes" in the United States of America for ratification of any agreement of any nature through act of Congress or joint resolution of Congress.

Mr. President, it is fundamental, I think, that no branch of the Government of the United States has any power which is not granted to it by the Constitution. Congress has no power which is not granted to it by the Constitution. The Senate has no power which is not granted to it by the Constitution. The House of Representatives has no power which is not granted to it by the Constitution. The Supreme Court of the United States, in *Dorr* v. *United States* (195 U. S. 138, at p. 140), says:

> It may be regarded as settled that the Constitution of the United States is the only source of power authorizing action by any branch of the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, when we examine section 6 of the bill as it is written, and find that the agreement or agreements with the Security Council are to be subject to the approval of the Congress by act or joint resolution, it is appropriate that we examine the Constitution to find whether or not this branch of the Government, the two Houses of Congress, has been granted power by the Constitution of the United States to approve any agreement which may be presented to Congress.

There is no power of approval of presidential agreements granted by the Constitution to Congress. The only power of approval granted by the Constitution of the United States is the power granted to the Senate, namely, to advise and consent to treaties. Therefore, when article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that the agreement or agreements "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes" so far as the United States is concerned, the only constitutional processes which could have been meant are those relating to the ratification of treaties, namely, the making of them by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. President, I am not taking the position that it would have been impossible to provide validly in the Charter that agreements should be subject to approval by both Houses of Congress. In my opinion the Charter could have provided that the agreements should become effective on the happening of any event whatsoever. The Charter could have provided, for illustration, that the agreements should become effective upon the termination of the Japanese war.

Let me say by way of illustration that the Charter could have provided that the agreement or agreements shall become effective, as to the United States, at such time as the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretary of State of the United States shall declare them to be effective.

However, Mr. President, merely because it would have been possible to provide in the Charter that agreements shall become effective at the moment they shall have been approved by both Houses of Congress does not mean that the Charter has so provided, nor does it mean that such procedure by both Houses of Congress constitutes as to the United States of America a constitutional process within the meaning of the Charter. There would be nothing either constitutional or unconstitutional in having Congress give such approval, any more than it would be constitutional or unconstitutional for all Members of Congress in joint session to recite together Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. But the fact is, first, that notwithstanding it would have been possible to have provided validly in the Charter that agreements shall be subject to approval by Congress, the Charter did not in fact specify that they should be approved by Congress or by any method other than the one which is contemplated by the Constitution; and, second, Mr. President, the Charter specifically requires ratification in accordance with—and I quote again from the Charter—"their respective constitutional processes"; and, third, the Constitution of the United States does not create any constitutional processes of ratification except the processes of ratification of treaties.

Mr. President, in the report submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to the pending bill, it is stated that—

> The precise details of the obligation—

Referring to the special agreement or agreements—

> is not a matter for treaty consideration but for legislative sanction by the Congress under its constitutional powers to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Mr. President, although Congress itself—and when I refer to the Congress, I mean both Houses of Congress—does have power under the Constitution to raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, and make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as stated in the committee report; nevertheless, those powers do not expressly or impliedly confer on Congress the authority to ratify treaties, even though those treaties require the raising or support of armies, the provision and maintenance of a navy, or the making of rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. The powers with respect to the raising and supporting of armies, provision, and maintenance of a navy, and the making of rules for them do not create in the two Houses of Congress a constitutional process of ratification, and the Constitution will be searched in vain for any provision which even remotely suggests that because Congress may raise and support armies or perform the other functions mentioned in the committee report, the Congress itself, meaning both Houses of Congress, has power to make treaties or to ratify treaties.

The power of ratification—and I quote again from the Charter of the United Nations—"in accordance with their respective processes" rests solely, under the Constitution of the United States, in this very body, the Senate of the Congress of the United States. There is a distinction, on the one hand, between the power of raising and supporting armies, providing and maintaining a navy, and making rules and regulations in that connection and, on the other hand, the ratification of treaties which call for the raising and supporting of armies, the providing and maintaining of a navy, and the making of appropriate rules and regulations.

Mr. President, to my mind it is clear and unmistakably true that by the use of the language in article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations that the agreement or agreements "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes," there is meant, insofar as the United States of America is concerned, ratification in accordance with article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, the section which relates to treaties.

But, Mr. President, I am not compelled to stand solely on my own judgment in connection with this matter. We have eminent authority, the authority of distinguished Senators whose judgment and first-hand knowledge of this situation have been recognized by the Senate, upon whom were conferred exalted honor and trust, and who attended the San Francisco Conference.

I say we have their understanding as to what was intended by the language of article 43 of the Charter, "ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

Mr. President, there has been printed, as we all realize, a large book entitled "The Charter of the United States—Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate," showing the proceedings on July 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 of this year before that great body, our Foreign Relations Committee, on the subject of the Charter of the United Nations. Anyone reading those proceedings is bound to come to the conclusion that the understanding of our representatives at San Francisco was clearly that article 43 of the Charter of

the United Nations, in requiring ratification by the United States in accordance with its constitutional processes, meant ratification by the Senate in the manner in which treaties are ratified.

I call attention first to the very significant comments made at page 7987 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. CONNALLY, speaking on July 24, 1945. The chairman of the committee was, of course, chairman of our delegation at the San Francisco Conference, and in his statement he is referring to the special agreements which are referred to in section 6 of this bill. The Senator from Texas said:

> In the Charter we agreed to make these agreements. We are under obligation to make some kind of an agreement with the Security Council. It is assumed that those agreements will be adhered to by us and by the Security Council. Dr. Dulles said that his conception of the language of the Charter was that when those agreements are made they should be ratified by the several countries according to their constitutional processes.

Then, Mr. President, I call particular attention to the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of our delegation at San Francisco. Continuing on the same page, in the same speech he said:

> My own individual view, which may not control, is that that means they should be ratified by the Senate.

Then he proceeded, as follows:

> There is another school of thought which may be correct. It takes the position that inasmuch as the agreements relate only to the furnishing of troops, it is not necessarily a matter which requires ratification by the Senate, but could be taken care of by a joint resolution or other legislation of the two Houses of Congress. I believe, on the whole, that whether we assent to an agreement by constitutional processes or not, it is a domestic question which we ourselves must settle, and that we must be satisfied that we are acting through constitutional processes either by a joint resolution of both Houses of Congress, or by ratification of the Senate. My own view is that, under our system of government, the term "constitutional processes" means ratification by the Senate.

So the Senator from Texas expressed himself before this great body in the debate upon the question of the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations.

I quote again from the same distinguished Senator, the chairman of our delegation at San Francisco. Speaking on the same day, July 24, 1945, he said the following which is to be found at page 7990 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

> The Senator from Kentucky probably misconstrued what I stated in the committee. I stated that the question as to what constitutional processes meant was a matter for our own decision.

Mr. President, let me call attenion to what the Senator from Texas then said:

> I merely expressed my own individual view that they meant ratification, as in the case of a treaty. So when the agreements come back to the Senate or to the Congress, or to the President, we can then decide whether constitutional processes means ratification by the Senate alone, or action by the two Houses by joint resolution. That is what I meant to say. I was not undertaking to foreclose the issue. I merely expressed my own view that it meant ratification.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As a matter of fact, the bill was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with the understanding that these treaties were to be ratified by two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. Is not that clear from the statements which were made both by Mr. Dulles in the committee and by the chairman on the floor of the Senate and by other Members of the Senate at the time?

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. In a moment I shall quote from Mr. Dulles and also from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and further from the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WHEELER. I was going to remark that if the committee, after reporting a measure to the Senate, takes one view on one day and another view on another day, what are we going to rely upon?

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his inquiry. I shall proceed to quote from the statements which were made at the hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee. I digress merely for the purpose of identifying Mr. Dulles, not that any Member of the Senate does not know him, but for the purpose of preserving the record. Mr. Dulles, to whom reference has already been made and to whom reference in the future will be made, was appropriately described by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as one of the chief official advisers to the United States delegation. Such designation occurred at page 640 of the hearings.

I now read the colloquy which occurred on page 646 of the hearings, and also reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8187.

> Mr. DULLES. It is clearly my view—

And I call attention to this language—

> and it was the view of the entire United States delegation, that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty.

Then said the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]:

> I should like to ask if that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

The Senator from Colorado was, of course, referring to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The Senator from Texas said:

> It is most certainly the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

Then a little later the following statement was made by the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Texas:

> Our constitutional process is for us here at home to decide. There is no question in my mind that that means that the agreements must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

Mr. President, this was not my language which I am reading, but the language of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I would say that the Senator speaks the language of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator, and I believe he is exactly correct.

The Senator from Texas continued as follows:

> I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the Conference to that effect.

So, Mr. President, we have heard something of what both the Senator from Texas and Mr. Dulles had to say. In a few moments I shall refer further and more specifically to the comments which were made by Mr. Dulles, one of the distinguished chief official advisers of the United States delegation.

Mr. President, this great body, the United States Senate, witnessed a spectacle which I shall never forget, and I assume no other Member of the Senate will ever forget, on that memorable day on which two Senators, one on the Democratic side of the aisle and the other on the Republican side of the aisle, stood stanchly and firmly, and pledged themselves to perform their duties as they saw them at the San Francisco Conference. I have referred to one of those men, distinguished as he is, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas. The other man, though he does not occupy the chairmanship of the committee because, perhaps, of the fact that he is not a member of the majority party, is a man of such distinction as to command attention throughout the world. I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG.

Mr. President, I quote the following language appearing at page 7991 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1944, by the distinguished Senator from Michigan:

> So far as my own interpretation is concerned, I think the record should be completed in respect to the constitutional point submitted by the able Senator from Montana—

There, reference was made to our distinguished friend [Mr. WHEELER], who rose a few moments ago. The Senator from Michigan continued:

> regarding the form in which the basic agreement for force, as contemplated in the Charter, shall be handled in the United States in behalf of the United States.

Continuing, the distinguished Senator from Michigan said:

> First, I wish to say that it never remotely occurred to me, either at San Francisco or since—

Listen to those words, Mr. President, "never remotely occurred to me at San

Francisco or since"—and those words were spoken on July 24—

that the language used in the Charter at this point did not refer to a treaty to be brought before the Senate of the United States for ratification precisely—

Said Mr. VANDENBERG—

as indicated by Mr. Dulles in this testimony, and as supported by the able Senator from Texas in his interpretation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I may say that it is apparent that the Senator from Michigan was talking about the instrument which is now before the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator from Michigan was referring to the implementation of the treaty.

Mr. DONNELL. Unquestionably he was talking about it. Of course, the instrument at that time had not been drawn.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. No.

Mr. DONNELL. But it was the implementation of the Charter to which the Senator was referring.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It was generally understood throughout the debate, until the last days of the debate, when a telegram was referred to, that action should be taken by a majority vote.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator refer to that matter?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall within a few moments. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution.

Mr. President, in continuing, the distinguished Senator from Michigan said, as reported on the same page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I can understand how there might be advanced a perfectly legitimate argument as to whether or not constitutional process at that time referred to a joint resolution of Congress or a treaty action by the Senate, although—

And I invite attention to the Senator's words—

it is the letter which I favor.

Mr. President, what was the latter? It was the treaty action of the Senate. Those are the very words of the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Then, Mr. President, I come to the testimony of Mr. John Foster Dulles, and at this point I shall undertake to refer to the matter which the distinguished Senator from Michigan mentioned a few moments ago.

At pages 645 and 646 of the hearings, page 8186 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, appears the following colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and Mr. Dulles:

Senator MILLIKIN. Thank you. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Dulles—

I digress here to interpolate that Mr. Dulles was testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee. He had been at San Francisco as one of the chief advisers of the United States delegation. I repeat:

Senator MILLIKIN. Thank you. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Dulles, I thought you said that the Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the special agreement having to do with our contribution of force and material.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that he was talking about the Senate, and so stated.

I thought you said—

Said the Senator from Colorado to Mr. Dulles—

that the Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the special agreement having to do with our contribution of force and material.

To that statement Mr. Dulles replied:

Yes, sir.

The Senator from Colorado then said:

Is that your opinion?

Mr. Dulles responded:

That is not only my opinion, but it is expressly stated in the Charter that the agreements are subject to ratification by the states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Then the Senator from Colorado, with his customary thoroughness, proceeded as follows:

Then it is your opinion that to comply with our constitutional processes, that separate agreement would have to come to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. DULLES. It is, and that was the view of the American delegation. I think there is no doubt whatever about it.

Then said the Senator from Colorado:

Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. And no disagreement of opinion on that?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. I take it that by ratification you mean ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct; by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Could there be anything clearer than that, Mr. President, as to the understanding of this distinguished lawyer and publicist and adviser to the delegation?

For the benefit of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who stepped out of the Chamber for a moment and has now returned, I shall read again the last question and answer. I may say that I am quoting the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who interrogated Mr. Dulles:

Senator MILLIKIN. I take it that by ratification you mean ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct; by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

There could not have been anything clearer, there could not have been any misunderstanding. According to the testimony I read but a few moments ago, the view which Mr. Dulles submitted in response to the earlier questions of the Senator from Colorado was the view of the American delegation. Mr. Dulles said, "I think there is no doubt whatever about it."

Then when the Senator from Colorado said, "Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?" Mr. Dulles responded, "No."

The Senator from Colorado then said: "And no disagreement of opinion on that?"

Mr. Dulles responded: "No."

Then the Senator from Colorado concluded as follows:

The reason why I asked the question is that you are, of course, aware of the fact that there is a large dispute as to what is the legitimate field for so-called executive agreements and treaties. You are definitely of the opinion that the special agreement referred to would have to be handled by supplemental treaty rather than by an executive agreement?

Mr. DULLES. I have no doubt whatever about that.

Mr. President, I call attention further, before coming to the episode to which the Senator from Minnesota referred as a telegram—I think he was referring to a telephone message—to pages 651 and 652 of the hearings, quoted on page 8029 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] took part in the interrogation of Mr. Dulles. This is what occurred. I read:

Senator GEORGE. And that would not bring us—if Congress should subsequently in an implementing statute insert any provisions restricting the use of the military force made available to the Security Council, that would not, in your judgment, bring us into collision with any affirmitive grant or any affirmative obligation that we have assumed under this treaty?

Mr. DULLES. No.

I wish to call attention particularly to the next sentence. Mr. Dulles said "No," then he said, speaking to the Senator from Georgia:

You speak of doing it by statute.

That is what the pending bill proposes to do, do it by bill or joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress, the effect being a statute. Mr. Dulles said:

No. You speak of doing it by statute.

Then Mr. Dulles proceeded in his testimony:

The procedure will be by treaty—agreements submitted to the Senate for ratification.

Could anything be clearer than this? Could there be any question as to the opinion of Mr. Dulles to the effect that the implementing agreements which are referred to in section 6 of the bill now pending are to be handled by the procedure of being submitted to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. President, let us take just one further glimpse at Mr. Dulles' view as of that date. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] participated likewise in the questioning, and for the purpose of having the record clear, I wish to call attention to the fact that this appears at page 653 of the hearings, page 8000 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I quote from the RECORD, where the Senator from Wisconsin is telling the Senate what occurred in the hearings:

Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to page 476, part 5, of the hearings.

I may interpolate to say that in the revised collection of the hearings there has been a renumbering of the pages, and that that page is now page 653 of the revised book which has been compiled.

I read again what the Senator from Wisconsin said:

Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to page 476, part 5, of the hearings. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]—

Who this afternoon, with appreciation and pleasure, I see present.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] asked a question of Mr. Dulles as follows:

I would like to have you refer to page 198 of the report to the President, article 43.

Then he cited section 1 of article 43, and Mr. Dulles replied.

This is the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] speaking:

In his reply, which I thought did not perhaps cover the exact point, he made a statement, and then I asked him as follows:

This is found at page 653 of the present printed record. I read:

Senator WILEY. Mr. Dulles, in connection with the questions just raised by Senator Austin, I want to ask you whether you interpret the terms "special agreement or agreements" to be synonymous with the word "treaty" as we understand it?

Mr. DULLES. I do.

Then the Senator from Wisconsin proceeded, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from which I have just quoted, after quoting what Mr. Dulles said, as follows:

In that connection, I wish to invite attention to the fact that paragraph 2 goes back, by relationship, to paragraph 1, by using the language "such agreement or agreements." I am sure that paragraph 3 carries out the same intent.

Paragraph 3 is the paragraph of article 43 which we find today contains the language "subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

The Senator from Wisconsin continued in his statement to the Senate, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the page I have indicated:

So it would seem that Mr. Dulles, and those who had something to do with writing this particular article, had definitely in mind that the language "special agreement or agreements" meant what we mean by the word "treaty."

The distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] made inquiry with respect to whether or not I would mention the incident of the telephone conversation—which he referred to as a telegram—and I shall refer to that at this point.

On page 8027 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 25, 1945, appears this language by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]:

Mr. President, inasmuch as this discussion very largely involves the interpretation of the distinguished Mr. Dulles' attitude, it occurred to me that it might be a unique recourse to find out what Mr. Dulles thinks by asking him. He has a habit of speaking very plainly for himself. So I have just talked with him on the telephone. I shall do the best I can to reflect his statement to me.

He called attention to the fact that the sole issue presented to him in the hearings was a choice between a treaty on the one hand and a Presidential Executive order on the other. In other words, it was a choice between Presidential power and congressional power. The questions submitted to him by the Senator from Colorado were constantly questions directed to "executory" agreements. I assume and he assumed that meant Executive agreements by the President, without consultation with Congress.

Then the Senator from Michigan proceeded, on July 25, 1945, immediately following the conversation over the telephone to which the Senator from Minnesota referred a few moments ago. This, mind you, was only a few minutes after the conversation. The Senator from Michigan said:

As I understand, it continues to be Mr. Dulles' attitude that the agreements contemplated should be made by treaty, but that he has never passed upon the question of whether there may not legitimately be an alternative choice between a treaty and a joint resolution by Congress; that the only thing upon which he has been undertaking to speak is the basic question as to whether or not this authority must rest in Congress, either by treaty or by joint resolution, rather than whether it may rest in the exclusive authority of the President of the United States. Mr. Dulles, as I understand him, is asserting the fundamental and controlling doctrine that this agreement between this Government and the Security Council governing the use of force cannot be made by exclusive Presidential authority through an Executive agreement. He has not dealt with a choice between the two alternative congressional methods which are available.

I call particular attention to the fact that in this statement by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, made only a few minutes after his conversation with Mr. Dulles, the Senator said:

As I understand, it continues to be Mr. Dulles' attitude that the agreements contemplated should be made by treaty.

Mr. President, I do not mean the slightest disrespect to Mr. Dulles. I have the highest regard for his opinion or I would not have quoted him here this afternoon as I have, but to my mind it is perfectly clear from the testimony which I have read that it was not an inadvertence, but a clear, intended conclusion which Mr. Dulles drew as to what should be done with these agreements after they had been negotiated by the President.

Mr. Dulles, in the hearings, submitted what was the view of the American delegation. The Senator from Colorado asked him:

Senator MILLIKIN. Then it is your opinion that to comply with our constitutional processes, that separate agreement would have to come to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. DULLES. It is, and that was the view of the American delegation. I think there is no doubt whatever about that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. And no disagreement of opinion on that?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. I take it that by ratification you mean ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct; by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Mr. President, the proposition would seem to be so clear as to require no further argument when we consider the statements of these men who attended the San Francisco Conference, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the distinguished lawyer, Mr. Dulles, who was there as one of the chief advisers to the delegation. It is not conceivable to conclude that these men did not give appropriate thought to the question as to what should be done with the implementing instruments, or agreements, when they came back. The conclusion of the distinguished Senator from Texas, who has again entered the Senate Chamber, was, as Senators will recall:

My own individual view, which may not control, is that that means they should be ratified by the Senate.

And again said he:

My own view is that under our system of government the term "constitutional processes" means ratification by the Senate.

And then Senators will recall he said:

There is no question in my mind that that means that the agreements must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

And then he said:

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the Conference as to that effect.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL) in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The distinguished Senator from Texas has stated on the floor of the Senate that in concurring to that instrument we acquired obligations and made commitments. I can think of no more important commitment that was made than that to ratify as a treaty the implementation agreement growing out of the former instrument. That cannot be disputed.

Mr. DONNELL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator, and I shall later go further into that point and somewhat amplify it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I compliment the Senator for having read the record. It would do the rest of us a great deal of good to follow his example.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator very much for his kind comment, and for his valuable contribution.

I now desire to refer again to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and this is later than the statement which he made which I read a few moments ago. It was on the same day, however, and a continuation of the same remarks which he gave. I quote from page 8028 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want this to be understood and heard with care. He said:

My position—

This was after his conversation with Mr. Dulles; it was after the lapse of all the time he had been in San Francisco, it was after the lapse of time which had intervened from his return until the time this discussion took place in the Senate. It was after the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee had taken place, consuming many days and running into seven-hundred-and-some-odd

pages. This is what the Senator from Michigan said, after reciting what Mr. Dulles had said over the telephone, and after reciting that "As I understand, it continues to be Mr. Dulles' attitude that the agreements contemplated should be made by treaty," then on the next page the distinguished Senator from Michigan says——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Michigan is not on the floor. I am trying to get in touch with him. Is what the Senator is now reading to be found in the hearings?

Mr. DONNELL. No; this was said on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the floor of the Senate?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not in the hearing before the committee.

Mr. DONNELL. No; on the floor of the Senate, and it will be found on page 8028 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator mind giving the date?

Mr. DONNELL. July 25, 1945.

Mr. CONNALLY. Last July?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. What was the occasion for it?

Mr. DONNELL. This was a portion of the debate on the United Nations Charter.

Mr. CONNALLY. During the debate in the Senate?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. I continue to read now what the distinguished Senator from Michigan said. I certainly have no desire to take advantage of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and I do not feel I am, because what I read appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not mean to imply that the Senator from Missouri was taking any advantage of the Senator from Michigan, but I thought the Senator from Michigan would be interested in what the Senator from Missouri is now saying. He is not available, however. I cannot immediately find him.

Mr. DONNELL. I should be glad to reread this after the Senator from Michigan returns, if he desires. To preserve the continuity of my argument I desire to quote from his remarks, but I want to be thoroughly fair with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan, whom I so greatly admire. He said on July 25, on the floor of the Senate in the debate relative to the ratification of the United Nations Charter:

My position—

This was after he talked with Mr. Dulles.

My position continues unequivocally to be that the action could not be taken by Presidential executive order, that it must be done by congressional consultation.

Then I call attention to this:

That my preference continues to be that it should be done by treaty.

Then he said:

But I concede a perfectly legitimate choice between the two methods of congressional expression, so long as we retain in Congress, by one of those two methods, the final power of decision.

Mr. President, a statement was made in the Senate on that same day, by one of our very distinguished Members, who is absent today because of illness—I refer to the very outstanding and distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], for whom I have the highest respect, and I know that my respect for him is shared by all his colleagues who are present this afternoon.

He participated in the debate on July 25, very modestly as he always participates in anything without giving undue vent to his own personality; in other words, with a modesty characteristic of the man. I shall not read all he said, because some of it is not germane to this question, but he said this:

The passage of legislation by the Congress—

This was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]—

The passage of legislation by the Congress is not, in my belief, a ratification as that term is correctly used in the law and in the Constitution.

A little further on he said—and I wish to call attention to it, for I think it is one of the most thoughtful observations made in the entire debate—

It may be that the Charter might have provided—

I am going to read that again, so that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who just entered the Senate Chamber, may hear it. This is what the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] said, speaking on July 25, 1945:

It may be that the Charter might have provided for approval by a joint resolution, or it might have recognized the Presidential authority to enter into negotiations and consummate agreements as distinguished from treaties.

I may interpolate by saying that, as I understand his position, it is identical with the position I took a few moments ago. This might have been done. It might have been stated in the Charter that the effectiveness of the Charter would occur when the Secretary of State, the President pro tempore, and the Speaker of the House should certify their approval of the document. So the Senator from Maine is speaking of what might have been. He said:

It may be that the Charter might have provided for approval by a joint resolution, or it might have recognized the Presidential authority to enter into negotiations and consummate agreements as distinguished from treaties.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator think that an Executive order of the President could with propriety arise out of an enactment of a treaty so indefinite in its provisions as the United Nations Charter joint resolution which we ratified here, without more definite power to the Executive by negotiation and ratification of a treaty such as is now before us?

Mr. DONNELL. I think I may answer the Senator that the very provisions of article 43 indicate clearly that further negotiation—because the word that is used is "negotiate"—must be had before these agreements can be formulated or entered into. I thoroughly agree with that view.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. May I ask another question? Was not the purpose of the treaty to give authority for negotiation?

Mr. DONNELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And the program was to be returned here to be ratified by the Senate in the form of a treaty.

Mr. DONNELL. My understanding, if I may answer the Senator, is that article 43 provided that the members of the United Nations undertake to make available to the Security Council on its call—and this is touching the Senator's point—in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed-forces facilities and assistance, and so forth.

Article 43 continues:

The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council.

I thoroughly agree with the position suggested by the Senator from Minnesota that further formulation is essential before the agreements can go into effect.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Those agreements involve the war power.

Mr. DONNELL. They certainly do; and I shall further advert to that subject in a few moments.

I am glad to see the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in the Chamber. If he would care to have me repeat my statements as to his previous observations, I shall be glad to do so. However, I believe that I have accurately quoted him in each instance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think I am familiar with the Senator's discussion. I shall be glad to have him proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. I was reading what the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] said on July 25, after the distinguished Senator from Michigan had spoken as I have indicated, and a few minutes after the Senator from Michigan had reported with respect to the telephone conversation with Mr. Dulles. If the Senate will bear with me, I shall repeat the last sentence or two so as to preserve the continuity of the statement of the Senator from Maine:

It may be that the Charter might have provided for approval by a joint resolution, or it might have recognized the Presidential authority to enter into negotiations and consummate agreements as distinguished from treaties.

The Senator from Maine continued:

In the present instance, however, we have the testimony of Mr. Dulles that the treaties were contemplated; we have the testimony of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that treaties were meant. I think this view is strengthened and confirmed and made certain by the very language of article 43 itself, which speaks of ratification by constitutional processes. "Ratification" is a

term applied to the approval of a treaty by the Senate of the United States.

It is my judgment, therefore, for whatever it may be worth, that not only does the testimony before the committee bespeak the truth that treaties are to come before us, but that the language of the instrument itself speaks in terms of a treaty, and not of an agreement or a joint resolution.

I may add for the purposes of the record that the distinguished Senator from Maine is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. While I do not know how many of the hearings he attended, I do recall that at one session at which I was present for a portion of the time, he was present and participated.

Mr. President, it is stated in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations that—

During the debate in the Senate on the Charter last July, there was considerable discussion as to whether the military agreements should be considered as treaties or whether they might be approved by the Congress through the joint-resolution procedure.

This further sentence occurs in the report:

The preponderant view was that the latter procedure was preferable, since the agreements would be entered into for the purpose of giving effect to the obligation assumed by this country under article 43 of the Charter to make available to the Security Council the armed force necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

It will be observed that the report states that the preponderant view was that there should be an approval by the Congress through the joint-resolution procedure. Mr. President, I have not undertaken to count the number of Senators who have expressed themselves upon this subject in this memorable debate. I know that there was a statement of opinion by at least one or more distinguished Senators—I am quite sure by more than one Senator—to the effect that procedure by Congress was permissible, as distinguished from procedure by the Senate. However, I undertake to say that I am not convinced by any manner of means that the preponderant opinion in the Senate in the debate of July of this year was to the effect that the procedure of having the agreements approved by Congress through the joint-resolution procedure should be followed. I undertake to say that the distinguished Senator from Texas was quoted on the floor of the Senate as favoring the treaty plan. I undertake to say that he was quoted as believing, with Mr. Dulles, that the treaty plan was contemplated. I undertake to say that the distinguished Senator from Michigan, for whose judgment I have such great esteem, stated, after he had talked with Mr. Dulles, first, that "As I understand, it continues to be Mr. Dulles' attitude that the agreements contemplated should be made by treaty." On the next page he said "My preference continues to be that it should be done by treaty."

Both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan were quoted. They were the two men selected by the President of the United States from the Senate to be present at the San Francisco Conference. Those two Senators faithfully followed and participated in the proceedings at the Golden Gate. I undertake to say that with their testimony and with the testimony of Mr. Dulles, so unqualified as it appears in the hearings, not merely that it was meant that the agreements should be ratified as treaties are ratified, but expressing in so many words his view that it should be done by a two-thirds majority of the Senate, I am unable to come to the conclusion that the preponderant view expressed in the Senate in the debate in July was in favor of the joint-resolution procedure.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations indicated, at almost the very outset of this debate, his hope that this amendment would not be pressed. I understand his points in support of the hope which he expressed to have been twofold. His first point was that the obligation to make the agreements was created by the Charter, and that that obligation has already received a two-thirds vote of the Senate. I agree with him to the effect that more than two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voted to ratify the Charter of the United Nations. However, I call attention to the fact that we ratified every word of it. Among those words is the provision that the obligation in article 43 to undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call, the armed forces, assistance, and so forth, is to be carried out "in accordance with a special agreement or agreements." Furthermore, article 43 distinctly provides that "the agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council."

So, Mr. President, I do not concur in the view that because of the fact that by a two-thirds vote of the Senate we adopted the Charter of the United Nations and ratified it, therefore we must throw into the wastebasket and discard further language contained in the very Charter which we adopted, namely, that these agreements shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota very clearly pointed out a few moments ago, by his penetrating and interesting questions, the fact that there are matters which are not settled by the Charter, and that as to those matters special agreements are necessary before they shall be determined. Mr. President, if questions are already settled, if the mere fact that we voted for the Charter amounts to a settlement of all the other questions, why do we have the provision requiring the negotiation of a special agreement or agreements?

The Charter not only provides for the special agreement or agreements, but it provides for the negotiation of such special agreement or agreements. As I understand, negotiation means a process of consideration by at least two sides, perhaps more. In fact, with the Security Council composed, as it is, of representatives of several nations, I take it that the negotiations incident to matters of vital importance covered by article 43 will be of tremendous moment to the people of the United States. So I say that not only does the Charter provide for special agreements, but it contemplates that such agreements shall not be mere matters of form, but that there shall be a negotiation which goes into the various questions involved in the agreements.

I shall briefly discuss for a few moments the importance attached to those agreements. Not only does the Charter provide for special agreements, not only does it provide for the negotiation of such special agreements, but it goes further and throws around those agreements a safeguard for the preservation of the rights of every signatory of the Charter of the United Nations. In my judgment the individual safeguard could not have been expressed in a more solemn, dignified, convincing, or important manner than it was, namely, that the special agreements shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

The mere fact that such agreements shall be made by the President does not mean that they shall go into effect. The mere fact that there has been a careful negotiation does not make the agreements go into effect. There is still retained for every signatory, including the United States of America, a string by which we and all the other nations may, if we desire, reject the agreements. We may reject them or we may confirm them. We may refuse to take them or we may accept them; and we shall do so, not by a mere formal expression, not by mere legislative action, but by ratification in accordance with the respective constitutional processes.

How could anything be made more solemn, more important, more deliberate, more clearly indicative of the fact that in order to learn how these agreements are to be ratified we must go to the Constitution of the United States, which after all is still in existence in this country? Go to the Constitution of the United States and find there what the processes are which are set forth and required for the term "ratification" as used in the Charter.

So, Mr. President, the point that the obligation to make the agreements was created by the Charter and has already received a two-thirds vote of the Senate—that being the first point made, as I understand, by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—to my mind is conclusively answered by the considerations to which I have referred.

The Senator from Texas made a second point, namely, that it is necessary to secure money to finance the troops and for the other expenditures contemplated by article 43 and by the agreements which shall be entered into pursuant to that article. His point is, therefore, that inasmuch as it is necessary to finance these various commitments, it is advisable to have the approval of the House of Representatives to any special agreement providing for troops and the various other facilities and assistance referred to in article 43. If it were sound to take that position because of the fact that the United Nations Charter has in contemplation the furnishing of troops and the

expenditure of funds, the time to have presented the argument that there should be action by the House of Representatives would have been when the question of approval of the United Nations Charter itself was under consideration, for the Charter itself, as we realize, contains the underlying obligations under which these expenditures are necessary. However, Mr. President, not a Member of the Senate would undertake for a moment to stand here and say that the Charter itself could have been ratified or approved by joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress. Our constitutional fathers laid down the method by which treaties shall be ratified. There are sound and convincing reasons for the requirement in that respect which is set forth in the Constitution. There are many other reasons. One is that inasmuch as the Senate is a deliberative body—as is also the House of Representatives—whose Members are elected for 6 years, they are less likely to be moved by passion or excitement or considerations of the moment than are the Members of the House of Representatives who are elected for a term of 2 years. I believe there are other reasons for the requirement in the Constitution of the United States that treaties shall be ratified by approval of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate.

But, Mr. President, in response to the argument based on the necessity of raising money and providing troops, let me say that the fact is that the Charter of the United Nations itself, by every fair intendment and construction of its language, provides which branch of the legislature shall approve, and that branch is the Senate, because the required process, as indicated, is by "ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

A great many Senators were in this Chamber on July 28 when the Charter of the United Nations was ratified by this body. I believe every Senator voted as he felt he should vote. As I recall, 91 Members of the Senate were in this Chamber at that time. I believe that every Senator who voted either for or against the adoption by the United States of that instrument is entitled to have the provisions of that instrument carried into effect. Certainly every Senator who voted for adoption of the Charter by the United States is entitled to have its provisions carried into effect, and not to have something else substituted for those of its provisions which are dealt with by the bill which is now pending.

Mr. President, in seeking to have carried into effect the provision of article 43 of the Charter that the agreements therein mentioned are subject to ratification in accordance with the constitutional processes of this Nation and the other participating nations, we are dealing with the method of ratification of agreements which are not of minor importance; but, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has indicated, they are of vast importance to this Nation and, I submit further, also of vast importance to the Security Council and to every other nation which has signed the Charter of the United Nations.

In this debate, reference has been made to the testimony of Dr. Leo Pasvolsky, special assistant to the Secretary of State. I had the pleasure of hearing him testify. I am not a member of the committee, but I had the pleasure of hearing a small portion of his testimony. I was impressed with his care, with his precision, and with the fact that the members of the committee obviously had the greatest confidence in him. Although I am not certain of this, it is my impression that he was at San Francisco during much, if not all, of the proceedings of the Conference. Let me call attention to his comments, which are to be found at pages 297 and 298 of the committee hearings, as to the importance of these special agreements, first, to the Security Council itself:

Senator MILLIKIN. Doctor, I should like to ask you, with respect to the special agreements provided for in article 43, if the United States reserved to itself the right to determine in advance, in each instance whether it will join in measures of force, to what extent will that violate the terms of this agreement?

Mr. PASVOLSKY. I do not quite understand, Senator. The article says [reading]:

"All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities."

That means within the limits set out in the special agreement.

Senator MILLIKIN. Would your answer, therefore, be that if the United States reserved to itself—let us say reserved to Congress—the right to decide in each instance, in advance whether or not it will contribute force to an expedition of force, that would violate the Charter?

Mr. PASVOLSKY. Senator, the purpose of this whole provision is—

I call the attention of the Senate especially to the purpose as stated by him—

to make it possible for the Security Council to know in advance what force it could rely upon in the performance of its duties.

Senator MILLIKIN. Let me put it to you in another way. The article calls for special agreements. Let us suppose that the United States withheld to itself the right to determine in advance whether or not it will contribute men or material by the mechanism of special agreements. Would that violate the Charter?

Mr. PASVOLSKY. The United States, under the terms of the agreement, would indicate what forces, what facilities, and what assistance it would be prepared to make available to the Security Council. Now, if the Security Council were not in a position to know that it could call upon any part of the forces that are pledged there or the assistance and facilities that are pledged there, when necessary, then, obviously, the purpose of the whole provision would be defeated. It is the purpose of this provision, by means of these agreements, to make it possible for the Council to know in advance what forces it would have at its disposal when necessary and, therefore, to make plans accordingly for the performance of its duties.

So, Mr. President, in answer to one of the inquiries of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I have pointed out the importance of the special agreements provided for in article 43, first, from the standpoint of the Security Council.

Now, I call attention to what is of equal importance to the people of the United States, namely, the purpose of this provision and its importance to our people. In this connection I call attention to the testimony of Dr. Pasvolsky, which is to be found at pages 295 and 296 of the hearings:

Under article 43, all members of the Organization undertake to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security by making available to the Security Council armed forces, facilities, and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Now, the amount and kind of armed forces, assistance, and facilities which each nation would provide would be governed by agreements concluded between it and the Security Council. Those agreements would be concluded after the Charter goes into effect—

I call especial attention to this testimony—

and, as far as each country is concerned, the agreement would be subject to ratification by its constitutional processes. So a country would know in advance how much it could be expected to supply on the call of the Council.

Then, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] said:

In other words, that is a matter to be worked out by the members belonging to the pact, and what each nation furnished in the way of military forces is a matter for agreement between that nation and the Security Council, and then ultimately that must be returned to the particular nation for ratification by its own government?

Mr. PASVOLSKY. Quite right. Now, as the Charter stands, once these agreements are concluded, the Council has a right to call upon the members to supply the facilities and assistance which each country has undertaken to provide.

So, Mr. President, I submit that what we are dealing with here in this implementing legislation is, as the Senator from Minnesota has so clearly pointed out, of tremendous importance both to the Security Council—which means, in other words, the members from all the other nations, as well as the member from the United States—and to the United States of America. Under the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council has no power whatsoever, in the absence of an agreement such as is to be entered into and such as is authorized by the pending bill, to order what shall be the numbers of forces, the types of forces, the location of forces, the degree of readiness, the nature of facilities, the rights of passage, or the nature of assistance. That in itself indicates the important nature of the agreements concerning which this debate now is had.

Mr. President, allow me to ask very emphatically, What are the subject matters to be embraced within this agreement or agreements? I invite attention to the language of article 43 which defines the subject matter of these agreements:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities—

This is, in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, the ones which

are embraced within this provision of the bill—

including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

So, Mr. President, the first thing that is to be covered by the agreements is the matter of the number of armed forces. Certainly the United States of America has every reason to be interested in the size of the forces which are to be required by the agreements which are to be entered into.

I wish to point out the fact that not only are forces to be contributed, but they are to be contributed for a specific purpose, namely, "to make them available to the Security Council," according to the language in article 43. What does that mean, Mr. President? Articles 39 and 42 of the Charter answer the question. Article 39 states as follows:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

This is big business, Mr. President. It is a subject of vital moment to the people of the world. Article 42 takes up the problem as to what the Security Council may do if it considers that measures provided in article 41, that is the pacific means, would be inadequate, or should prove to be inadequate. So article 42 provides:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.

The article continues:

Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

So, Mr. President, inasmuch as article 43 provides that these agreements shall have to do with making available to the Security Council all these forces, and so forth, I wish to point out that they are being made available for purposes which are of fundamentally vital importance to the welfare, peace, and security of the world.

There is another thing which, to my mind, makes the matter of the determination of the number of forces of tremendous importance to our country, and, for that matter, to every other country as well. There is to be brought about in these negotiations an apportionment, if you please, between Great Britain, Russia, the United States, France, and China. How many forces are to be contributed by this country? Are we to contribute as many as Russia, or half as many? How many forces are to be contributed by Great Britain, France, or China? The apportionment of the number of forces is vital and of immediate importance not only to our Nation but to every other member having representation on the Security Council.

The importance, Mr. President, of the agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, and in the pending bill, is further indicated by the fact that the agreement or agreements shall govern not only the number of forces, but—and I quote from section 43, paragraph 2, "types of forces." In other words, these agreements will govern whether the forces shall consist of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or all of them or any two of them. The agreement or agreements will not only determine the numbers of forces which are to be furnished to the Security Council, and their apportionment as between the various nations—which may be an extremely difficult problem to work out—but the agreements are to determine, through negotiation, the types of forces, whether Army, Navy, Air, or otherwise.

Mr. President, the agreements do not stop there.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. We are being told now that we have made an agreement by approving the charter and that we have bound ourselves to enact the pending implementing legislation. When we do so, thereby giving power to the President of the United States to make agreements, and he comes back to the Congress with an agreement providing that we must furnish certain numbers of men, or a large part of our Navy or Air Force, or anything else, to the Security Council, the same cry which we have already heard will be again raised to the effect that we have bound ourselves to approve whatever agreement the President makes.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the comment of the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. The other night, during a debate over the air, a distinglished member of the Foreign Relations Committee made the statement that what we had to do was to furnish to the Security Council a quota sufficient in size to permit the Council to have a large enough army or a large enough police force to go forth and defeat any nation in the world, no matter how large an army and navy it might have.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his comment. I think that by his keen and interesting questions the Senator from Montana has pointed out so clearly the importance of this subject matter that it requires no further comment from me except to say that to my mind the power residing in the Senate, or the power to approve or disapprove in accordance with the constitutional processes of this Government, should not be bartered away by mere considerations of expediency in order to give the House of Representatives some power because of the fact it will have to pass appropriation measures.

Mr. President, to my mind the very fact that these agreements will relate, as I have indicated, to purposes of vast importance, to the question of forces and the apportionment of forces, emphasizes the further fact that the Senate of the United States, including every Senator who voted—91 of us—and those who did not vote, had the right to insist that no provision in article 43 would be waived and that every safeguard thrown around this agreement would be maintained in full force and effect.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a moment ago I said that a member of the Foreign Relations Committee had participated in the debate which took place a few evenings ago over the air. I was mistaken. He was not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, we have been talking about commitments. We have been told that we entered into commitments, and that as a result of such commitments we must now enter into what amount to more important commitments. That is why I think the pending legislation is far more important than was the original Charter. Here is the statement of Mr. Pasvolsky, the man who did the legal interpreting for the committee, as shown on page 262 of the hearings on the Charter. Senator BARKLEY asked:

Was there any discussion as to the required number of members of the United Nations who would have to agree to this system?

Mr. Pasvolsky replied:

No; there was no discussion of that. All the details were left to the future for the simple reason that nothing could happen until such an agreement could be reached, and also the discussion of some of the details involved in such an agreement would have been an extremely difficult and complicated matter. There is no commitment here. There is only the duty of the Security Council to prepare plans.

I take it, Mr. President, that those plans are now before us for implementation by the Senate of the United States.

I continue reading from page 262 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. More than that, though, it was understood in all the discussions—and I participated in them; I was on this committee—that the authority of the Council extends only to the formulation of such plans. It is not a function of the Security Council to do more than to formulate plans and to submit them to the governments affected.

Plans have been submitted for the implementation of the Charter to be passed upon and ratified by the Senate. It has been pointed out that the word "ratification" refers to treaties and agreements and that the word "concurrence" refers to resolutions.

Mr. DONNELL. I invite attention further to the language along the same lines by the chairman of the committee as set forth on page 262, and following, of the hearings. After referring to the formulation of the plans as being a function of the Security Council, the chairman said:

If we do not want to accept them, all we have to do is to say no, and they are not effective at all. It is like the Disarmament Conference which was held in 1922. That was a general conference of the powers at which plans were formulated and submitted to the states for final approval. We held another one in Geneva under the League, but the participating nations did not agree and relatively little was done. Here each nation had the option of accepting the results or not, and if they did not accept them, they did not apply.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. So, Mr. President, I refer again to the importance of these

agreements. What do we undertake to do? I again quote: "To make available to the Security Council" armed forces.

That is to be limited by the provision in accordance with the special agreement or agreements.

What could be more important to the United States at this time than a determination as to what are to be the contents of these agreements, which, as I have indicated, are to affect this country, and, in order to bring about a condition of international peace and security, are to determine the number of forces, the apportionment of such forces among the various nations of the world that are in the Security Council, and the type of forces which are to be contributed by our country?

These agreements do not stop with what I have indicated. They go further. I wish to point out that obviously the next phrase to which I refer was a phrase that was deemed to be of no little importance by the nation which presented it. I quote from the report of Secretary Stettinius to the President of the United States at page 95, where he says with respect to this language:

Under another French proposal—

I call attention to the fact that it is French—

as modified by the new amendment, the special agreements—

That is, the ones embraced in the bill now pending—

the special agreements will provide for the degree of readiness of the armed forces committed and their general location, as well as for the numbers and types of forces and the nature of the facilities and assistance, as specified in the original text. These changes—

Said Mr. Stettinius, who was then Secretary of State—

These changes cannot but sharpen considerably the edge of the sword which will ultimately be placed in the hands of the Security Council.

Mr. President, if we refer to the Dumbarton Oaks provisions as they were originally phrased, we do not find any reference to this degree of readiness and general location of the forces being contemplated to be agreed upon, but the French obviously considered it of importance, and it was submitted by them and was agreed to, as I understand, with some amendments, nevertheless, agreed to in this language:

The agreement or agreements shall govern * * * the degree of readiness and general location.

I do not know exactly what those terms mean. Some other definition may be better than mine, but obviously the degree of readiness, how soon the forces can be made available, where they are to be sent, obligates this country to real, material obligations of tremendous importance.

The agreements do not stop with these provisions. Not only are they to govern the numbers and types of forces, not only are they designed to make forces available to the Security Council for the preservation of international peace and security, not only do the agreements refer to the types of forces, Army, Navy, or Air Forces, their degree of readiness and general location, but they go further and refer to the nature of the facilities and the assistance to be provided. I take it that facilities would include, airplanes, ships, firearms, right of passage across our Nation for troops of other nations. Yes, Mr. President, they may even include that dire weapon which has come into our lives within the last few months, the atomic bomb.

Finally, these agreements are to include, as I have indicated, the assistance to be provided, which obviously is a general clause designed to include everything in general which may not have been specifically mentioned.

I mention also that in article 45 there is reference to the matter of Air Force contingents. I quote this significant and self-explanatory sentence:

The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

So, Mr. President, answering the Senator from Minnesota, I agree with him as to the importance of the types of agreements which are embraced within the bill now pending, and which are specifically mentioned and described in section 6 of the bill, which is the one to which my amendment applies.

Mr. President, if I may recapitulate, in the first place, the reason for authorizing the negotiation of the special agreements mentioned in section 6 of the bill is that such negotiation is required by article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. Second, article 43 prescribes the method of ratification of such agreements to be "ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." Third, the only ratification in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States of America is the ratification prescribed for treaties, namely, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Then, Mr. President, that this is the correct view of the meaning of ratification in accordance with the constitutional processes of the United States of America is, as I have indicated, amply corroborated by eminent authorities. I shall trespass but a moment more upon the Senate's time. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Dulles, whose views appear in questions and answers, stated what I now quote:

Senator MILLIKIN. It is your opinion that to comply with our constitutional processes, that separate agreement would have to come to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. DULLES. It is, and that was the view of the American delegation. I think there is no doubt whatever about that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. And no disagreement of opinion on that?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. I take it that by ratification you mean ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty?

Mr. DULLES. That is correct; by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Then the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] spoke, and I have quoted him in full. I shall quote only a portion of what he said, although I think I have fairly and fully stated the various modifications which have been indicated by him. He used this language:

So far as my own interpretation is concerned, I think the record should be completed in respect to the constitutional point submitted by the able Senator from Montana regarding the form in which the basic agreement for force, as contemplated by the Charter, shall be handled in the United States in behalf of the United States.

First, I wish to say that it never remotely occurred to me either at San Francisco or since—

And this was just 4 days before the Charter was voted upon and ratified by the Senate by a vote of 89 to 2. The Senator said:

First, I wish to say that it never remotely occurred to me, either at San Francisco or since, that the language used in the Charter at this point did not refer to a treaty to be brought before the Senate of the United States for ratification, precisely as indicated by Mr. Dulles in his testimony, and as supported by the able Senator from Texas in his interpretation.

I wish to repeat, Mr. President, for I want to be perfectly fair to the Senator from Michigan, that I have fully indicated, I think, with thorough exactness, the further qualifications which he made and which I have tried to give. I shall not give them now because of their length.

Then the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is quoted at page 8187 of the RECORD, on that eventful day in the Senate; I read from the testimony:

Mr. DULLES. It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation, that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], said:

I should like to ask if that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas, said:

It is most certainly the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

Continuing, he said:

Our constitutional process is for us here at home to decide. There is no question in my mind that that means that the agreements must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

Finally he said:

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the Conference as to that effect.

Mr. President, I submit the meaning of the language in article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations clearly requires that any special agreement or agreements mentioned in section 6 of the pending bill as shall be concluded between the United States of America and the Security Council shall be subject to ratification under the processes prescribed by

the Constitution of the United States for the ratification of treaties.

Finally, every Member of the Senate of the United States, whether he voted for the Charter or voted against it, is entitled to have its provisions carried into effect, and not to have something substituted in their place.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have not heard all the discussion, and perhaps the Senator has already covered the point, but assuming that there is a doubt as to whether under the Constitution a two-thirds vote is required by the Senate, or whether an agreement can be made with the action of the Congress as a whole, and assuming that the committee has unanimously found that it is more practicable to have an agreement approved by the action of the Congress rather than ratified by the action of the Senate, is it not possible for one person or a group of persons to bring an action before the Supreme Court of the United States and have them decide this constitutional point once and for all, when the first action supplementing the agreement shall be taken?

Mr. DONNELL. In answer to the distinguished Senator, in the first place, it is extremely difficult for me to make the assumption to which he refers, that there is any doubt as to what ratification by the constitutional processes in this country means. I fear I am unable to answer his question with satisfaction either to him or to myself, because of my inability to make that assumption.

I make the further statement, however, Mr. President, that to my mind the mere matter of what is termed here practicability or expediency, whatever term may be used, should not be decisive; but I say furthermore that even from the standpoint of practicability—and I shall not base my argument on the ground of practicability—it is important, to my mind, that the provisions of the Charter be followed to the letter, and that we provide for ratification by the Senate according to the constitutional procedure.

With regard to the query whether a proceeding may be brought in the Supreme Court of the United States to determine this question, I would not undertake to answer the question without very careful study. There occurs to me immediately, of course, as it doubtless does to every lawyer in this body, the question whether or not the Supreme Court would take the position that a political issue was involved, and would refuse to decide it.

I frankly say to the Senator, however, that I cannot answer with any degree of assurance on my part the question as to whether a test case could be successfully brought.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the Senator's argument is that he is so clear that under the Constitution the agreements must be ratified by the Senate he cannot assume that the other method is constitutional, and that Congress should not adopt it.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. I fear the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was not in the Senate Chamber at the time I discussed this phase of the question. I discussed it only very briefly. I do not take the position that it would have been impossible to provide validly in the Charter that the agreements should be subject to approval by Congress. In my opinion the Charter could have provided that the agreements should become effective—it could have legally so provided—on the happening of any event whatsoever. The Charter could have provided that the agreements should become effective on the termination of the Japanese war. The Charter could have provided that the agreements should become effective as to the United States at such time as any three officials or a dozen officials might declare them to be effective. But the point I make is that article 43 of the Charter does not so provide. It does not provide that these instruments shall go into effect when the bell rings, or when three men vote, or when six men vote, or when the Congress votes. It provides that they "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes," and I am unable to make the assumption that ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes includes in the case of the United States approval by joint resolution or act of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The question would not be one of practicability. The question can only be resolved on the basis of law and the Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Minnesota, and I am very glad the Senator mentioned the point. I do not want to be understood, even remotely, as basing my argument on the matter of expediency or practicability. I used that expression because of the fact that I understood the Senator from Massachusetts made the point that the Foreign Relations Committee deems it more practical to handle the matter by the joint resolution or act of Congress plan. I desire to say to the Senator from Minnesota and to every other Senator and everyone else who may be interested, that I am not basing my argument remotely, directly or indirectly, on any considerations of expediency, but I did say that even if that were the plane on which the matter were determined, in my judgment the letter of the charter should be carried into effect.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to say, with all due respect to the Senator who said the joint-resolution method would be more practical—I am speaking ostensibly of the Foreign Relations Committee—that I am not aware that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has any authority to change the Constitution on the basis of practicability or any other consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Missouri concluded?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the pending amendment not later than 12:30 tomorrow.

Mr. DONNELL. I object.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall have to object.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does the Senator object?

Mr. WHEELER. There are very few Members present in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. My request was that the vote be taken not later than 12:30 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. WHEELER. I object.

Mr. DONNELL. I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, that I object. Perhaps the reporter did not hear my objection.

Mr. HILL. Perhaps no Senator desires to address himself to the pending amendment at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, why do we not have a vote on the amendment now?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that eight members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, four on the majority side and four on the minority side, have had to go to the State Department. They are members of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which was set up to keep liaison and contact with the State Department. The subcommittee, composed of eight members, has now gone to the State Department. It is therefore not desirable to have a vote on the amendment this afternoon, but it is hoped that we may have a vote on it early in tomorrow's session.

THROUGH TRAINS FROM COAST TO COAST

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of November 25. It is so seldom that I find myself in accord with anything the New York Herald Tribune says, either about domestic or international affairs, that I want to read this editorial because it pertains to the railroads, and it is a matter which I have discussed with railroad presidents and with members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and with others for some years. The editorial is entitled "Through Trains to the Coast":

Ever since that historic day in 1869 when, at Promontory, the Pacific Railroad, as the joint operations of the Central Pacific and Union Pacific were then known, came into being, the matter of through transcontinental train service has been a skeleton in the closet of American railroading. Often discussed in private but never aired in public, the subject of passenger service on regular schedule from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific States was too hot for the public even to be allowed to think about it. For 75 years, therefore, the traveling public has been the victim of a conspiracy to make it pay toll on its person and ransom on its convenience largely in Chicago but in a somewhat less flagrant manner in St. Louis and New Orleans. There never has been and is not now any slightest valid reason why

railroad patrons should be forced to stop over in Chicago for so much as 5 minutes, and the railroad schedules now in effect, generally speaking, require them there a matter of several hours, depending on the trains of their selection in either direction.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that a traveler who leaves Washington for the Northwest, on the Capital Limited or on the Pennsylvania, arrives in Chicago about 8:30 in the morning. He cannot get one of the good trains out of Chicago for the Northwest until 11 o'clock at night. At 11 o'clock at night three trains leave Chicago for the Northwest at identically the same hour on the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and the Milwaukee. A woman making the trip from Washington to the Northwest with three or five children is forced to stay in Chicago from 8:30 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night. She may be obliged to take rooms in a hotel for herself and children during the time she stays in Chicago. The same is true of businessmen. The result is that today travelers, instead of taking the trains, are resorting to airplane travel when they are in the slightest bit of a hurry. It seems to me that intelligent self-interest on the part of the railroads would cause them to put into effect a through service of pullman cars from coast to coast to accommodate travelers who go from coast to coast or from the Atlantic coast, let us say, to the Intermountain States.

I continue to read from the editorial:

Now, at least, the outer shell of this conspiracy, engineered by tradesmen, hotel keepers, and transport interests in Chicago, and tacitly abetted by the roads themselves, has been cracked. Two venturesome and, it may be said, forward-looking railroads, the Chesapeake & Ohio and the New York, Chicago & St. Louis (Nickel Plate) have advertised their willingness to cooperate with any western railroads or combination of them to establish through-car service from the Atlantic to the Pacific and thus make it unnecessary for passengers, if they are so inclined, to leave their staterooms between, say, New York and San Francisco. Chicago would not even be a water stop in the passenger's progress, since the western terminals of these lines are at Cincinnati and St. Louis, respectively, and through-car pullmans would be more nearly in a position to compete with plane service on one more count.

The merits of the proposal are apparent from every aspect. Its negative appeal would be the abolition of a long-standing and singularly bare-faced travel racket; the positive one would be a great inducement to the patronage of long-distance travel. On either count it is worthy of the cooperation of the western railroads to their fullest measure of capacity.

Mr. President, I regret that other railroads have not yet taken the same position in regard to through pullman travel from coast to coast as has been taken by the Chesapeake & Ohio and the New York, Chicago & St. Louis. I hope other railroads which operate trains from Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Washington will join in the plan suggested by the two railroads I have named. I believe the only two large centers where the general public is tied up for many hours when traveling across the country, are Chicago and St. Louis. There is no reason why pullman trains cannot be operated from Washington or New York through to St. Paul or to other large cities. There is no reason why the same policy as that suggested by the two railroads in question could not be adopted with respect to travel through Chicago and St. Louis. I think the editorial is so worthy that I have taken the liberty of reading it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George T. Cromwell to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, November 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for the terms expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointments):

William E. Lee, of Idaho.
William J. Patterson, of North Dakota.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia, for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Theodore W. Markham, Caspar, Calif., in place of J. W. Lilley, resigned.

Helen Cooper, Diablo, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Rena L. Post, Knightsen, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Peter Almos, Moffett Field, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Ferrell H. Lauraine, Oceanside, Calif., in place of C. A. Turner, resigned.

Effie M. Inks, Port Costa, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Irene S. Gooch, Temecula, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Roy Radcliffe Morris, Panama City, Fla., in place of C. E. Powell, resigned.

Gertrude G. Whitfield, Salerno, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

HAWAII

Antone Nobriga, Jr., Hanamaulu, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John E. Ventura, Kihei, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James L. S. Spalding, Pepeekeo, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

ILLINOIS

Betty B. Page, Lovejoy, Ill., in place of A. B. Dorsey, deceased.

Harold E. Young, Mounds, Ill., in place of H. E. Young. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

IOWA

Robert N. Culbertson, Blairsburg, Iowa, in place of H. B. Rutledge, resigned.

Hans A. Tvedte, Dolliver, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

KANSAS

Merlyn E. Beougher, Gove, Kans., in place of W. I. Hanna, transferred.

Bert S. Vaughn, Selden, Kans., in place of H. F. Sloan, resigned.

LOUISIANA

C. Mildred Smith, Houma, La., in place of C. A. Duplantis, resigned.

Barney N. Eubanks, Dry Prong, La., in place of A. T. Honeycutt, resigned.

MARYLAND

Margaret E. Mulford, Galena, Md., in place of A. T. Mulford, retired.

Elizabeth R. Woodland, Marion Station, Md., in place of A R. Woodland, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Frank J. Nackerman, St. James, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mina Cato, Ceresco, Mich., in place of Harry Keithan, transferred.

Fred B. Mohr, Sherwood, Mich., in place of L. G. Whitmore, transferred.

MISSOURI

Thomas W. Sincox, Washington, Mo., in place of J. H. Dickbrader, resigned.

MONTANA

Charles A. Berkner, Highwood, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Charles E. Opitz, Bertrand, Nebr., in place of C. R. Larson, transferred.

Frances N. Fauquier, Chapman, Nebr., in place of T. D. Volkman, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Katherine Stilwell, Blawenburg, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW MEXICO

Lambert R. Dannenfelser, Jemes, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NORTH CAROLINA

Nelda L. Spruill, Pinetown, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Woodie G. Ammons, Robbinsville, N. C., in place of O. L. Ammons, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gladys L. Hall, Deering, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

OHIO

Herbert D. Holshoe, Homerville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edwin S. Blakeslee, East Smithfield, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Evalyn M. Roberts, Morganza, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Pauline E. Stanislaus, Wallace, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TEXAS

Lucile R. Ryon, Seadrift, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Orine H. Palmer, Tornillo, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Minnie P. Chambers, Arvonia, Va., in place of W. A. Chambers, deceased.

H. Warren Conant, Chincoteague Island, Va., in place of N. M. Conant, resigned.

J. Walter Bailey, Woodstock, Va., in place of E. E. Sine, retired.

WASHINGTON

Lillian Brain, Thorp, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WEST VIRGINIA

Nannie V. Duncan, Crumpler, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ernestine Harris, Fenwick, W. Va., in place of E. E. Murphy, resigned.

Howard H. Altizer, Newhall, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William T. Moomau, Petersburg, W. Va., in place of I. G. Bowman, resigned.

Alma D. Gwinn, Shrewsbury, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Esther White, Stollings, W. Va., in place of B. S. Chambers, deceased.

Carlos V. H. Cook, Van, W. Va., in place of E. C. Berkeley, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

George T. Cromwell, to be a collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md.

POSTMASTERS

MAINE

Harry B. Harris, Canaan.
Marie C. Vachon, Sabattus.

MINNESOTA

Donald Krey Grant, Wyoming.

MISSISSIPPI

Nan H. Thomas, Benoit.
Roy Scott Barber, Lake Cormorant.
Jesse L. Pace, Pace.
Joseph A. Bishop, Sarepta.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, beneath Thy guiding hand in prayer and praise, we worship Thee. Though the light of Thy providences at times blinds the sight of men, yet there is a song that lives when all else fails. Somewhere in this boundless universe there is ample scope for all our endeavors, and all our holy impulses to love and to serve will find a glorious outlet in heavenly ministries.

Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. Whatever may be Thy will, enable us to serve Thee in all loyalty and gladness; help us to bring forth the fruits of the spirit, sowing the seeds of brotherhood for those who are too proud to hear or too sad to pray. Mercifully keep us from every act which would deprive others of the rights and blessings of freemen. When the harvest-time comes, may we hear Thy word:

Those who are called by My name shall humble themselves and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven and forgive their sins and heal their land.

In the blessed name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) entitled "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. MILLIKIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) entitled "An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers not to recognize Members to proceed for 1 minute this morning.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post, together with his reply.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by the service officer of the Vincent B. Costello Post, No. 15, of the American Legion.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article by a senior schoolboy on peacetime military training.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence on the subject Three Sides to a Labor Dispute.

DELAY IN RETURNING HIGH-POINT MEN FROM OVERSEAS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, many of the letters reaching me blame Congress for the delay in returning high-point men from overseas. The Congress has given the President, the Army, and the Navy everything needed and even everything requested in the way of authority and funds. If the President or the Army or the Navy need anything whatever additional for the purpose of getting these high-point servicemen and those with long service overseas back home, all they need to do is to name it. Indeed, I am constantly searching for suggestions along this line to make to the departments, and so are other Members.

Having all the authority and all of the money required, the responsibility for the actual execution of this job rests entirely on the President and the Army and the Navy. The President is still the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He emphasized this strongly during the summer and fall of 1944. It is as true now as it was then. Being the Commander in Chief, he should have carried out under his constitutional powers, long ago, this duty imposed upon him by the Congress.

As one Member of Congress, in justice to the thousands of men now stranded in far-off places, I feel this should unceasingly be called to the attention of the President and the Army and the

Navy, with the purpose of having them do the job at least as soon as possible in view of the previous bad planning and mismanagement and lack of interest.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

FURLOUGH FOR CERTAIN MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I have written today to the War Department's Chief of Staff Designate, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, asking that consideration be given to the granting of a minimum 7-day furlough or leave, plus traveling time, during the Christmas holidays to all fathers in the United States Army now stationed in this country. In my conviction that this is a plea to which the heart of all America will respond, may I ask that all Members who feel that this request represents the thinking in their districts combine their voices, too, in messages to this great general so that the plea may come from all the far reaches of our entire Nation. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that General Eisenhower is not only one of the greatest commanding generals in the history of the world, but also a man of deep, sympathetic, human understanding. I am sure that he has the capacity to find a way to answer America's hope that the greatest possible number of American families may be reunited in peace on the day on which we celebrate the birth of Him on whose principles and words the American family has become the firm foundation of a sound, secure America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 192]

Andrews, N. Y.	Barry	Bloom
Baldwin, Md.	Bennet, N. Y.	Boren
Barden	Bland	Bradley, Pa.
Brehm	Geelan	Poage
Campbell	Granger	Powell
Carlson	Hancock	Quinn, N. Y.
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Rains
Chapman	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Clements	Holifield	Reed, Ill.
Courtney	Holmes, Mass.	Roe, N. Y.
Cox	Hook	Rowan
Crosser	Jackson	Sadowski
Curley	Jones	Sheridan
Dawson	Keefe	Short
De Lacy	Keogh	Slaughter
Delaney, John J.	King	Somers, N. Y.
	Kirwan	Sparkman
Dingell	Lea	Taylor
Dirksen	Lewis	Vursell
Doughton, N. C.	Martin, Iowa	Weiss
Drewry	Morgan	White
Engle, Calif.	Murphy	Winter
Fernandez	Norton	Wolcott
Fulton	Patrick	
Gearhart	Pfeifer	

On this roll call 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a minute.

The SPFAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, inquiry has been made as to the program for tomorrow. I understand there has been a revision of the original announcement of the majority leader, and I would like to ask him what the situation is.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. After disposition of the pending bill, the next order of business will be the conference report on the so-called Boren bill. I announced heretofore that the Navy personnel bill will be taken up, and, of course, I also made reference to the Second War Powers Act, also the UNRRA matter. It is hoped that the Second War Powers Act may be brought up and disposed of tomorrow. After the report on the Boren bill has been disposed of, the Second War Powers Act will be the next bill to be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us anything about Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I cannot advise the gentleman at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it the plan of the leadership to complete consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill today? Are the Members expected to stay here very late?

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the inquiry?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Whether or not it is the plan of the leadership to finish the deficiency appropriation today.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is hoped that bill will be disposed of today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe there is any idea of running late if we do not finish it by 5 or 5:30?

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I have an answer to that question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I refer that question to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is hoped that the bill will be disposed of today. Of course, it all depends upon developments later on. I am unable to answer the question now except to say that it is hoped that bill will be disposed of today.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The question was brought up by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] whether or not the leadership plans to keep us in session late tonight in case it is necessary to finish the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question. That is a matter of conference later on. It is a practical question that has to be decided in accordance with the conditions that may exist later on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to ask the majority leader a question. The Rules Committee has reported a rule on H. R. 4717, a bill from the Veterans' Committee to establish a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration in order that the present Administrator may secure the necessary doctors to look after our disabled veterans in our hospitals. I want to know when it is proposed to have that measure taken up in the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is a bill that should be brought up as soon as possible, but there are other important measures that have to be acted on. There is the Second War Powers Act, there is a First War Powers Act, there is a Navy personnel bill having to do with the size of the Navy, which has a lot to do with the rapidity of discharge of men in the Navy, then there is the UNRRA matter, which is of vital importance.

Mr. RANKIN. I refer to "INRA," not UNRRA. I want to take care of our disabled veterans, which is more important from my viewpoint than wasting money all over the world through UNRRA.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not agree with the gentleman on that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4805, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the action of the House yesterday in rejecting the recommendation of the committee that the veterans' hospital items be deferred for further and more deliberate study is deeply significant. And the proposal incorporated in the amendment to be offered today to put all the civil-function items in the bill is even more significant. They mark the beginning of a policy at a critical time in the history of the country, the disastrous effects of which cannot be fully appraised within the lifetime of any man sitting on this floor today.

I trust the House appreciates the difficulties under which the members of the Committee on Appropriations labor. It is not a pleasant thing to deny funds which Members want in their congressional districts. It would be much easier to be good fellows instead of dissenters. It is always a struggle for us to go against the wishes of our colleagues importuning for appropriations, and within the committee itself we must always agonize with ourselves before we come out here with an agreement to economize and retrench. So when the committee finally reports a bill here on the floor which rejects appropriations that some Members want, we do so reluctantly and upon the most disinterested motives. Somebody must protect the Treasury of the United States. Who is going to do it? It will not be done on this floor. It can be done only in the committees. But when the committee comes in here, after a struggle with everybody who wants Government money, and a struggle with themselves, and against their desire to go along with the requests of colleagues for appropriations, then if you keep kicking the committee in the slats, they are going to get tired of that after a while. Then when we come out here and get consideration like that, what will be the answer? We only abuse. Members call us sharply on the phone. They come to our offices with bitter recriminations. They insult us in the course of debate here on the floor.

What is our offense? That we tried to save a little money for the United States Government. You can discourage a dog by giving him a kick in the slats every time he points the game. He loses heart after a while. And the members of the committee are getting a little discouraged. If there are any mistakes in the bills we have reported it is that they are too generous. If we have erred at all we have erred on the side of prodigality. There are 11 members on the subcommittee which reported this bill. They are among the oldest and most experienced Members of the House. They have served here for many years, both in the House and on the committee. Many of them sit in their offices past midnight every night in the week during hearings. And for the past 4 years hearings have been almost continuous. In all fairness, they should receive a little consideration. They should at least be protected from abuse and insult. They have nothing to gain by denying appropriations. They have tried to discharge a responsibility which someone must discharge.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is merely incidental. The disposition of these particular amendments is in itself comparatively unimportant. The alarming feature of the situation is that immediately following the war, when we should in the very nature of things adopt a policy of rigid retrenchment, when we should engage in a stern determination to pay our debts, and take every possible step to maintain the financial stability of the Government, running away from our responsibilities instead of paying our debts are dissipating our rapidly dwindling revenues in non-revenue-producing consumption. It is on a par with the man who buys a new automobile instead of paying the mortgage on his house. In both public and private finance such a policy leads inevitably to disaster.

Eighty-five million people in the United States have bought Government bonds. They paid 100 cents on the dollar for them. They made sacrifices to buy them and they must make sacrifices to hold them. It would be a tragedy if their faith in their Government was betrayed by a drop in the value of those bonds.

Every bank in the country—and especially the smaller local banks—are crammed with Government bonds. In the smaller banks, where inflation and depreciation would strike hardest, there are few other securities in the portfolios.

If Government bonds should drop just one point it would be catastrophic. But after the last war when we owed only one-tenth of what we owe now Government bonds dropped 16 points. If Government bonds start downward this time, as they did last time, we are on the brink of a precipice. And every vote to spend money in consumption, instead of using it to decrease the national indebtedness, is a vote to depreciate Government bonds.

The maintenance of Government bonds at par is not our only financial problem. We have more paper money in circulation than we have ever had before. The growth of money in circulation in the United States since 1939 is greater in percentage than the growth of money in circulation in France between 1914 and 1918. France had about 11,000,000,000 francs in circulation in 1914. By 1918 French circulation, chiefly Bank of France notes, had risen to approximately 30,000,000,000 francs, an increase of 233 percent. In the United States, money in circulation in 1939 stood at $7,000,000,000. It now stands at $26,000,000,000, an increase of 271 percent. And more unsupported greenbacks are being thrown into circulation every time a Government bond is brought in for redemption. Every dollar of revenue for the next several years should be applied to the barest national housekeeping expenses and the redemption of bonds and reduction of debt. No other course is financially sound.

Downstairs in the corridor at this minute several women's organizations are patriotically trying to sell bonds, and they are not making much progress. All over this country we are trying to float an $11,000,000,000 bond issue, and it is dragging worse than any issue we have yet floated.

This amendment to be offered here on the floor today is a proposition to spend that borrowed bond money before we get it. If this and similar amendments are agreed to, we will not have a dollar out of the $11,000,000,000 to pay on our national debt.

Banks and financiers from all over the country, the financiers of every other nation all over the world are watching us. And the thing they are taking into consideration is the same thing a bank takes into consideration when a man owes the bank a personal note—is there a will to pay? That is the determining consideration; is there a will to pay? Do we want to pay our debts? Do we want to pay this $300,000,00,000 we owe? The vote on the floor yesterday was a vote not to pay. Proponents of this amendment indicate by support of such amendments their lack of interest in decreasing the $300,000,000,000 we owe. We do not have the will to pay; we do not want to pay; we do not propose to pay, as long as we can vote the money for local purposes in such amounts as this. We voted to cut down taxes, and here we propose to vote to increase expenditures.

Another significant feature of this amendment is that it initiates programs of expenditure which in their ultimate development are vastly in excess of the money we spent for the same purpose before the war. Now that we have burned up in a world war of extermination all the wealth of the Nation we propose to expend in consumption more than we spent in prewar days of peace and plenty. It seems impossible to realize that with decreased resources and increased debts, there must be a corresponding decrease in consumption expenditures.

They tell us that there are 371 Members on the floor from States which will participate in this gravy train. I do not believe they will be influenced by such considerations. Nothing would establish this Congress and the Members of this House so securely in the affection and confidence of the people as a vote against pork expenditures in our own districts and for conservation of our national revenues for the discharge of national obligations. A vote for pork is a vote to depreciate every Government bond held by the people. A vote to reduce the national debt is a vote to establish the national credit on which we must depend for safety in time of war and prosperity in time of peace.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 10 minutes as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] did.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it must have been surprising to the members of the gallery, and it certainly was to the Members of the House, to listen to the

speech of the gentleman from Missouri a moment ago. Nobody questioned the integrity of the Committee on Appropriations on yesterday, but we do take the position that it is an appropriations committee and not a legislative committee.

But when a Member on this floor rises and says that Members "do not give a damn" about the Treasury of the United States, it is certainly shocking to say the least of it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. RICH. Do you not think we have been doing that; a good many of them have been doing that for the last 10 or 12 years.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so.

But I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that whatever else may be said about the Members of this House as a rule they all have regard for the integrity of the Treasury of the United States.

On yesterday the amendment that I offered was to provide the funds for the building of hospitals that we are going to have to have in order to take care of our disabled veterans.

That is not wasting money. It is money they all admit we are going to have to spend sooner or later. They why keep the hands of the Veterans' Administration tied for months while these men suffer and while the very physicians we need become disgusted and seek other fields. Why dilly-dally along and not let the Veterans' Administration know now that it is going to get whatever funds are necessary to provide the hospitals to take care of the maimed, the blind, the wounded, and the disabled victims of this war?

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] talks about inflation. Why does he not talk to the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency? They have a right to report legislation and Congress has a right to pass it to limit or prevent the further expansion of the currency. That expansion is being done through the Federal Reserve System. Congress is going to have to take back the power vested in it by the Constitution to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

I suggested the other day that we should take away from the Federal Reserve System the power to further expand the currency, decide at what point it should be stabilized for the next 5 or 10 years. Then when an attempt is made to reduce it below the danger point, as was done right after the last war, to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] referred, the Government should check it.

Certainly the bonds fell after the last war, because you had a gang of financial racketeers in charge of the Federal Reserve System who went out right in the midst of crop time and raised the rediscount rate, called loans, and contracted the currency below the danger point, drove the farmers to the poorhouse and businessmen into bankruptcy, and drove the country into the panic of 1921. They did the same thing in 1929 simply because Congress did not carry out this mandate of the Constitution to coin the money of this Nation and regulate the value thereof.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What difference does it make whether you coin dollars or let the Federal Reserve bank do it? As long as you continue this deficit spending, you are depreciating the currency.

Mr. RANKIN. I am getting to that. I do not think you are going to bankrupt this Government by taking care of a few disabled soldiers.

You Members who are voting for all these appropriations for foreign expenditures, this billion dollars for UNRRA, and then quarrel about a reasonable amount for the disabled veterans remind me of the old colored preacher down at home. He said, "I's gwine to preach to you today on the subject of straining at a g-nat and swallowing a camel." I am afraid you are straining at a "g-nat" and swallowing a camel.

We can pass a law stabilizing the currency at a given point, and then when they attempt to contract it below that point have the Treasury of the United States issue United States notes for the difference with a gold reserve behind it, and in that way you can stabilize the currency and maintain the prosperity of this country for fifty or a hundred years.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAY. A very brief statement with respect to a conversation I had with the Secretary of War this morning with respect to a trip which he had made to Battle Creek, where he told me about a young soldier from my section who had lost both legs and both arms, and, as evidence of the public feeling, in this case the people made up $80,000 for him.

Mr. RANKIN. We are going to provide hospitals for these veterans. We are not going to wait for somebody to decide whether or not the Veterans' Administration is going to take over some buildings in his district that may not be fit for a veterans hospital.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No, not just now.

I called attention the other day to the fact that in 1861 or 1862 a similar condition confronted the United States Government, and Abraham Lincoln issued $346,681,016 United States notes. These notes are in circulation today. They are legal tender. They are just as good as gold dollars. They are just as good as Federal Reserve notes. They are just as good as silver certificates. They are just as good as national-bank notes. That is what this Government is going to have to do or these Federal Reserve financiers will continue to expand the currency—those in control of the Federal Reserve System—just as long as it is to their interest to do so. If you want to cure that evil, let the Committee on Banking and Currency bring in a bill to check that practice and to restore to the Congress the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Then we can stave off any depression, we can stave off the panic which the gentleman from Missouri dreads.

Today we have $27,825,000,000 in circulation as against $5,698,000,000 at the close of the last war. With that amount of money in circulation, you are not going to be able to drive prices back down to the level of a few years ago. If you did, it would simply mean repudiation of all your bonds. If you drove us back to the price level of 10 years ago, it would probably mean ultimate repudiation of the national debt, which would be one of the greatest calamities, in my opinion, that could come to this Nation.

No; if you want to save this country, let us first take care of our own people, beginning with our disabled servicemen.

These flood-control projects and these power dams are necessary for the economic existence of the people in the areas affected. They are simply developing our own country.

Now, if you want to prevent run-away inflation and maintain the prosperity of the Nation and preserve the integrity of Government bonds, let the Committee on Banking and Currency bring in a bill to take away the power to continue the issuance of this money by the Federal Reserve System, and place it back where it belongs. Then we can stabilize the currency, meet all our obligations, and maintain prosperity for 50 or a hundred years.

We can take care of our disabled veterans. We can pay the national debt. We can maintain the highest level of prosperity the world has ever known, and take our country into a glorious future, as Henry Grady once said, "Holding high the torch and making light the way up which all other nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I just wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the table which appears on page 206 of the hearings showing the proposed cost of hospital beds, for medical and surgical beds the cost ranges from $6,000 per bed to $10,500 in comparable and nearly located communities, indicating a lack of attention to that subject when the thing was started up.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there is such a fine attentive crowd here today, and you seem to be so much interested in this question, and time is running so fast, as far as I am concerned, that I could not resist the opportunity to take advantage of the opportunity to just drop an observation

or two into the hopper for whatever they may be worth.

Mr. Chairman, I believe every Member of this House is interested in doing the right thing for the best interests of the country. I start with that premise. I believe that is almost always true. I am frank to say that sometimes in construing what is for the best interests of the country maybe the fact that we are advocates of a certain policy or are representatives of certain people or are interested at the time in a certain group, might color our judgment a little bit as to what is for the best interest. But I say that fundamentally the Members of this House want to do what is for the best interests of the country. Now, the Members of the Committee on Appropriations are also Members of the House and they are likewise interested in the national welfare.

I feel that the turn this bill has taken is unfortunate. I do not think it is a catastrophe, but I think it is unfortunate because I think on yesterday we assumed that somebody was trying to hurt somebody and that we had to go on a crusade to save the veterans. I am afraid we are going to crusade some more today. Well, I have been under this House steamroller many times. It will not be any new experience if I find myself under it again today. But let me make one or two observations about what is in this bill and what is not in it; and I preface my remarks by saying this, Mr. Chairman: We may try to laugh off or turn aside lightly the questions about the fiscal condition of this Nation, if you wish to do it, but, Mr. Chairman, it is not a theory, it is a condition. You cannot get away from that. We talk about the American way of life; the American way of life is not going to be very much good if we do not preserve the fiscal integrity of this Nation, and we cannot preserve it if sometime, somewhere, this Congress does not put on the brakes. We have got to reach a point somewhere in our deliberations where we will say: "I would like to have that, my constituents would like to have it; but we cannot have it because we have not got the money." It is just the same thing as one tells one's wife when she says she would like to have a new mink coat: "Yes, yes, darling, you would look beautiful coming down the street in it, but I have not got the money; you will have to await a more opportune time."

Look at the national debt. I will not elaborate on that; there it is, but look at it. Mr. Chairman, it is growing by leaps and bounds. It is a real potent threat to the peace and tranquillity of this Nation. Our great Secretary of the Treasury, our beloved former colleague in this House, the other day, according to the press, stated that if things went all right we would probably get a balenced Budget in 1947. That is optimistic. I wish I could share that optimism. You cannot get it the way we are spending money now.

What has the Appropriations Committee done in this bill? In the first place we have not done anything against the veterans. I have been chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee for a great many years.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], has been the intelligent, aggressive, and active minority member of that committee. Why, we have given the veterans everything they need to try to take care of them. But here is a condition that arose and here is the condition that confronted the Appropriations Committee on this bill.

General Hines, than whom there has been, or ever will be, no greater Administrator of veterans' affairs, who as such was chairman of the Hospitalization Board, told the Committee on Appropriations not once but time and time again that as we progressed in this war when we were building hospitals for the Army, Navy, Public Health Service, and the Veterans' Administration, they were placing those hospitals and building them with an eye toward using them for the veterans after the war, after the prosecution of the war was completed and it is possible to use those hospitals.

What has now developed? It has now developed before our committee that there were any number of perfectly adequate hospitals about to be declared surplus when some Members of this House say the veterans are in need of hospitalization and cannot get it. But evidently there has been a change of policy by the Veterans' Administration whereby many fine, splendidly equipped hospitals are about to be declared surplus and you have them going sometimes into an adjoining community and building a hospital. While the Appropriations Committee said that this will only entail a delay of 2 or 3 months because the Independent Offices Committee is right at the moment having hearings, we also stated "Leave this item out of the bill so the Independent Offices Committee, the regular committee, can inquire into this from the Veterans' Administration and the Army and Navy, and make a survey of these hospitals to see which of them can be used and which of them cannot be used." We certainly do not want to be so stupid as to go to building hospitals when we have hospitals that can be used. No member of that committee had the slightest intention then or now of denying any worthy veterans hospitalization if they needed it.

Now, there is another item you are going to hear something about today, which is in exactly the same situation. Nobody has refused to appropriate money for legitimate flood control. But in this amendment which is going to be offered today there is involved $128,000,000. There are many splendid projects that ought to be carried on to completion. There are some other projects that should not be started even that are in that amendment. So you are going to be faced with the proposition, in order to get a few worthy projects, of having to swallow many that ought not to be started at all, and one of them is the project represented by my beloved friend the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR. I refer to Bug Island, which is 90 percent power. It is not a flood-control project at all.

The Virginia Planning Commission has advocated public hearings on the project. Many of the people of North Carolina have asked to have hearings. The Army engineers have set December 5 on which to have public hearings on that project, and yet here today we are rushing in pell mell to begin the construction of a thirty-, forty-, or fifty-million-dollar power project when there still has to be public hearings. The Appropriations Committee said that while there are many very worthy projects in this amendment, there are some in there that ought to be further examined and we would like for the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to take this back and reexamine the whole situation. They are going to have hearings early in January. There is no great need right now for a public-works program. There is a scarcity of labor, so we are told. Some Members contend that if we start these projects around over the country, what little farm labor we can get now will immediately go to the public-works projects and you will not get the farm labor that we can get now. So we left it out of the bill, not turning down the merits of it. We are waiting simply for a more opportune time when a subcommittee can examine them more carefully and report back to the House in order that you may deliberate and legislate as we think more intelligently and more in keeping with the necessity of the times, which certainly calls for great caution in the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Mississippi and the remarks made by the gentleman from Virginia, I want to get down to specific cases on this veterans' hospital situation. However, any individual Member may have voted yesterday or may vote today, should there be a roll-call vote on it, I believe it should be understood that no vote either for or against the amendment that was adopted yesterday in the Committee of the Whole should be considered a vote against the welfare of the veteran.

I have served on the Independent Offices Subcommittee ever since I have been on the Committee on Appropriations under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who has spoken, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the ranking Republican member, and during that period of time I cannot remember a single instance when a project requested by the Veterans' Administration has been denied. It may be that in some instances the amount of funds or the rate of expenditure may have been modified or changed. The only time that I can remember where any major modification was made was in the amount for death claims 1 year because the other body believed that the amount proposed would not be needed in a given year, but there was no denial of the project.

In the estimates that were submitted by the Deficiency Subcommittee—and I am not on the Deficiency Subcommittee—I note that there was, as the gentleman from New York has called attention to a discrepancy of from $6,000 to $12,000 per bed in the amount requested. Let us get down to cases on that. For exam-

ple, New Haven, Conn. It is proposed to erect a 500-bed hospital. The amount requested was $4,060,000, or $8,000 per bed, whereas, in Clarksburg, W. Va., a general medical and surgical hospital was asked for that would cost $12,000 per bed. In Albany and Buffalo, N. Y., the figures work out to more than $10,000 per bed. It would only be sound sense if the Committee on Appropriations should find out why such a discrepancy exists in the requests that have been made.

Only yesterday a gentleman—a Member of this House—told me that in his district there is, on the very grounds of the Veterans' Administration facility, a 350-bed Army hospital, and yet the Veterans' Administration is requesting funds for a new hospital rather than consider the use of that, and that was something that was built there during the war with the idea that it would supplement the existing veterans' facility.

So the urgency of some of these projects should be looked at, and the amount of money requested for them should be looked at in order that the veterans' own rights may be protected. I was in World War I. I do not claim to be a veteran who suffered and bled or anything of that sort; but I do want to say that there is no Member of this House who is more anxious for the welfare of the veteran than I, and I am unwilling, by overappropriating in one particular, by paying more for something than we should, to impair our ability to do justice for all the veterans. That is what can be done if we appropriate for some hospital at the rate of $12,000 a bed, without knowing why it is done, and then only allow $6,000 in some other instance.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I happen to have discovered yesterday and today by investigation in the Veterans' Administration that there is a proposal to build a new hospital in Cincinnati, and at the same time there is a big housing plant and a fine hospital over at Fort Thomas that could be utilized, which has been abandoned by the War Department. What does the gentleman say with respect to building outright a new hospital when there is one available?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I say that such instances should be investigated and the facts developed by hearings. There was no opportunity for the Deficiency Subcommittee to do that. It should be done.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not a matter of fact that every one of those projects was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget acts upon the recommendations of the Veterans' Administration for those projects, and are not those Veterans' Administration recommendations based upon a full and fair investigation of the project?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I want to answer what the gentleman just said with respect to the Bureau of the Budget. If this Congress adopts a policy of letting the Bureau of the Budget appropriate for the Congress, the way downhill is directly ahead of us.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman prefers to take no position——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sorry, but I cannot yield further. The Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee has already begun hearings on the regular appropriation bill. The Deficiency Committee made no pretense of having hearings on these estimates for this new construction, preferring to refer it to the regular subcommittee which handles that. We are already in session holding hearings on these questions, and that will be the first appropriation bill reported in January. If this matter were left to the subcommittee handling these matters we would put in a clause making the funds for construction immediately available, as we have in prior years, and there would be no appreciable delay in construction.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It certainly sounds quicker to get something declared surplus property than to build it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And particularly when strikes are delaying the delivery of building materials. The gentlewoman's point is very much in order. It is quicker to declare property surplus than to build new and there are some permanent structures in the Army and Navy stations that can be used or at least that should be investigated, whatever we do about providing funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thought that on yesterday we closed debate on this amendment which the Committee on Appropriations is redebating here today. I thought we had come here today to read the balance of this bill. I did not know there was any rule providing for them to reopen the debate on the amendment that was adopted on yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole is proceeding in order. The gentlemen who have spoken have moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to my chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, who is a very able gentleman, as we all know. I do not think for one moment that he intended to impugn the motives of anyone who voted for those amendments yesterday when he said we did not give a damn about the Treasury of the United States. I voted for some of those amendments. I am willing for the record to speak for itself. When it comes to economy in government I am also willing for the record to speak for itself.

I served on three subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations. I served under the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], I served under the able gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and I served under the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. I am willing for those gentlemen to say whatever they think about my record on economy, and I think they will tell you that I believe in economy.

However, I do not think that the core of this subject has been discussed at all today. I think there is a move on to stop any amendments to this bill. I do not believe you will be able to stop amendments to this bill, and I will tell you why. I think ordinarily this deficiency bill would have passed right through the House in one afternoon, including all amendments. The chairman of my committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] told me the other day that the chairman of a committee is judged by the cuts that he makes in a bill. I think he is sincere in that, and I believe probably that is what happened in this deficiency appropriation bill. I think many cuts were made without proper consideration of the merits of the projects. I believe that is the reason amendments are being put on this bill.

If we are going to be judged by the cuts we make in the bill, I am one of the chairmen who will have to be judged. Incidentally, I have to take the place of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. No one can fill his shoes, but I will be chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriation Committee. What happened yesterday was that the Deficiency Committee turned back to my committee over $200,000,000. They did not say these funds are not needed, they said, "We send them back to your committee so you can decide whether to bring them in." If they are going to be judged by the cuts they make, I am going to be judged by the cuts I make. I think we all ought to take our responsibility. That is the crux of the happenings on this bill.

I have never seen a deficiency bill yet so attacked as this bill has been. I certainly believe it is because the Deficiency Committee did not give proper consideration to the merits of certain projects. We cannot put in all the projects that everybody wants. We put in some projects here which it would not hurt anybody to leave out for 2 or 3 years. We put in $25,000,000 for Federal roads. Of course, we need them and want them, but we refused to put in $24,500,000 for supplying temporary housing for the veterans. I cannot see the justification for such action. We may put in an amendment—I do not know—for flood-control projects. There may be something else more important, but I think if this committee had given proper consideration to the merits of certain projects, particularly those which

affect the veterans of this Nation, they would not be having the trouble they are having with this bill. When I went home last week, people came to me about public-works projects. I said to them, and I had to say to them, that we have a $350,000,000,000 debt. The Government of the United States has a public debt of $350,000,000,000. I told them, "I want to tell you that if we have Federal public-works projects, I want you to get what you are entitled to. But somebody has to take the responsibility for reducing this debt or the money that you have and the bonds that you have bought will be worth nothing." Therefore, I cannot vote for all sorts of public-works programs. That is my attitude. We must cut, but at the same time we must practice a sensible economy and not a false economy. When a project has merit, no matter what committee has jurisdiction over the project, we should give it the proper consideration. If the committee does not give it proper consideration, then the House has the right to act in their own right and I do not believe that the vote or the motives of any Member of this House should be impugned.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking the time of the Committee at this time, but in view of certain arguments which have been advanced in opposition to the amendment which will be offered with reference to rivers and harbors and flood control items, I feel that there are certain facts which ought to be pointed out at this time. The gentleman from Virginia, in attempting to justify the action of the Deficiency Subcommittee in acting as an appellate body and reviewing the findings of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, insisted that one particular project, that of Judge Kerr of North Carolina, in which I understand the gentleman from Virginia is also interested, known as the Bug Island project, ought to be eliminated from the bill. If that is correct, and I am not in position to say whether it is correct or not because I have given no study to the evidence relating to the Bug Island project, whose duty was it to eliminate it from the bill? Initially, it was the duty of the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which conducted hearings for 2 or 3 weeks and which made its findings on the basis of the evidence which it adduced. Secondarily, it was the duty of the Deficiency Subcommittee, on which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] serves as a member, if it desired to exercise supervisory jurisdiction over the findings of the Civil Functions Subcommittee. If there were any bugs in the Budget they should have eliminated them. How are members of the House to be governed in their vote on matters of this sort concerning which they have not heard the evidence otherwise than by following the conclusions reached, first by the Corps of Engineers of the Army; second, by the Bureau of the Budget; and, next, by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which had jurisdiction to consider the subject matter which in this instance was the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Now, if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], at this stage of the game feels that the Bug Island project ought to be eliminated from the amendment which is to be offered by the chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], he has a right to offer on the floor today an amendment to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] striking out the amount of money proposed for use on the Bug Island project. If there are other Members of the House who feel that there are other projects to be taken care of in that amendment which ought not be included, they have the same right to offer amendments with reference to their projects and accept the judgment of the House on the question of whether or not those projects should be included.

But, instead of that, what is proposed here? It is proposed to eliminate the entire river and harbor and flood-control program recommended by the President of the United States, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Certainly that is not the fair or equitable thing to do, and it is against that attempted exercise of arbitrary authority, that I do not believe ought to be vested in the Deficiency Subcommittee, that those of us who are trying to sustain the action of the Civil Functions Subcommittee are standing here today in protest.

Let me read to you an Associated Press item which appeared in the Washington Star of yesterday with reference to some things that this Government of ours is doing in an effort to aid flood control, not in the United States, but in China:

UNITED STATES ENGINEERS TO HELP CHINA PLAN LARGEST DAM ON YANGTZE

American engineers will aid China in working out plans to control the Yangtze River.

Secretary of the Interior Ickes announced today the signing of a contract between the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Resources Commission of China. It calls for Bureau engineers to prepare the designs and specifications for what may be the largest concrete dam ever built.

The Chinese Government will pay an estimated $500,000 to the Bureau for its technical assistance.

The contract carries no commitment for actual construction which Mr. Ickes said rests entirely with the Chinese Government and might require 25 years or more.

Key feature of the proposed development plan is a dam larger than Grand Coulee to be located in the gorge of the Yangtze near Ichang in the heart of China. It would back the river into a reservoir 250 miles long.

The plan also calls for the construction of numerous other dams, hundreds of miles of irrigation canals, the world's largest hydroelectric plant and other facilities.

Secretary Ickes said:

"The tremendous impact which development on the project would have on China's internal economy can be realized from the fact that a population exceeding that of the entire United States lives within a 300-mile radius of the Yangtze Gorge dam site near Ichang."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. That is what we are contributing to in China. Can we do that, can we spend the money of the American taxpayer for that purpose and at the same time eliminate here entirely the river and harbor and flood control program approved by all of the authorities of our Government dealing with a subject matter for the benefit of our own people?

They talk about economy and our national debt. The basis of our national debt was laid many years ago. For instance, the $4,880,000,000 public-works bill in 1933. I voted against it. I voted against $14,000,000,000 of appropriations made during the early days of this administration. Of course, the greater portion of our public debt today is the war debt, but those are the things which started the national debt to rise. In those days the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was urging bigger and better WPA appropriations. It is a late day for him to undertake now to raise the cry of economy when it is proposed to spend $121,000,000 for the protection of our people against the dangers of floods.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is an earnest advocate of economy.

Mr. RICH. What I was going to ask the gentleman was this: If we spend this money in this country for the things that are necessary, how are we going to spend the money that these foreign countries are asking us to spend for them—five billion here and four billion somewhere else, and so on?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is in as much position to guess about that proposition as I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. TABER. For the purpose of asking if the Chairman might be ready to close debate on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read if there is no one seeking recognition.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am seeking recognition. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few brief words about these hospitals we have been discussing. I believe it is wise economy to arrange to build these permanent buildings. I have had occasion to investigate many Army hospitals that have been referred to as available. A great many of them, the great majority of them are temporary hospitals. I saw this Government after the last world war embark on a program of using temporary Army hospitals, and I saw it continue over a period of years. I believe it was a tragic mistake. Some of those temporary buildings fell into disrepair and became unfit for hospital use. The program of the Veterans' Administration at one time after the First World War was a shame and a disgrace to this country. I do not want to see us make the same mistake after this war of using temporary frame buildings that were built for soldiers in time of war and not for sick men in time of peace.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer a suggestion to the committee, to the Veterans' Administration, and to the Congress generally: Some of these hospitals are located in southern climates. All of them are subject to heat in time of summer. I have before me resolutions of veterans' organizations, especially the American Legion, asking that air-conditioning equipment be placed in these hospitals. It seems to me this is a simple request, that in the construction of new hospitals and in the repair of old hospitals air-conditioning equipment be used. Mr. Chairman, this morning I talked with the Veterans' Administration about this and they told me that, to the extent they can obtain air-conditioning systems from the Army and Navy, they are going to use them; but there seems to be no organized program of giving these sick men the benefit of air conditioning. In this connection it must be remembered that many of them stay months and even years in hospitals, especially the TB cases, where patients are often bedridden for long periods of time. We have our own Chamber here air-conditioned, the hotels throughout the Nation are air-conditioned, the cafes and restaurants and other public places are air-conditioned. It does seem to me that where it is to the interest of public health, the health of these veterans, these hosptials be air-conditioned.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Is it not a fact that many of these temporary hospitals are not suitable for further use?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly; because they were only temporary affairs to begin with. The patients who have to stay in these hospitals in many parts of the country suffer in summertime from extreme heat. We should give them the same thing we demand for ourselves in the way of air-conditioning equipment. The veterans' hospital located at Alexandria, La., is a glaring example of a great hospital dedicated to TB cases which needs air conditioning badly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested listening to the debate this afternoon in reference to veterans' hospitals. I do not believe there is a man or woman on the floor of this House who would hesitate a minute to spend every dollar necessary to take care of the veterans; I believe everybody wants to do that. I am sure I do. I believe, however, that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in his remarks with reference to the subcommittee's deliberations to the effect that it was necessary for the Veterans' Bureau to determine just what hospitals should be built and the differences in cost of different types of hospital, that their construction would not be delayed, ought to be an answer to those Members who want to set themselves right with the veterans by talking so heatedly about the subject this afternoon.

I want to help the veterans but I want to do it in the right and sensible way. If you will leave the matter up to the Appropriations Committee for a short time it will only be a few months at the longest, probably only a month, until that committee will bring back a bill here which will satisfy everybody, the Veterans' Administration and those who are in need of hospital facilities. That only seems to be the sensible thing to do at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not likely that the veterans are more apt to be injured by this sort of procedure than if it were handled deliberately and carefully by the appropriate committee?

Mr. RICH. Absolutely correct is the gentleman from Ohio. The veterans themselves are the ones who eventually will take the place of the present Members of Congress who are here today. They are the ones who will have to run the Government. But we are getting the Government in such a condition that it is going to tax our best brains and the highest ingenuity of the most capable people in America from now on in order to get this country out of the hole you have gotten it in during the past 12 years. You have been getting the country in the hole so badly so far as the veterans whom we are supposed to take care of are concerned and the ones the people of the country are expecting us to look after, and they are the ones who will be injured, that it is a question whether we are going to be able to keep this country solvent. It is serious. You are going to be bogged down with the enormous debt we have. When you bog down and when you eliminate all the resources of this country, while at the same time you are expected to pay pensions to veterans, how are you going to do it? Where will you get the money? We have to be careful that we do not bankrupt this Nation.

I come to the point now I want to make in connection with the national debt, which is $265,000,000,000 at this time. It amuses me to see Members of Congress from that side of the aisle get up here and talk economy, it is really funny after they spent so freely for 10 years. They want to talk economy, yet they want to go on spending money, going deeper and deeper in the hole. There is not one of you who keeps on spending that is thinking of the best interest of our country as a whole. We hear too many selfish Members thinking of what they can get out of our Government for their districts. Selfish, I say.

An amendment will be offered here today in reference to flood-control projects. Now, flood-control projects do two things: Give employment to people and they are built for the purpose of stopping floods; but the greatest benefit that we can get from flood-control projects which we have made so much of in the last 4 or 5 years is to give employment when the people cannot get employment in other lines of business. Today we have a great demand for labor, there are a million jobs open, yet nobody to take them. Now we go ahead and pass this money for these flood-control projects when they can be deferred until next year when it is for the greatest interest of our country as a whole. We are only going to heap greater burdens upon the Treasury of the United States at this time and endanger our financial structure, which is in a deplorable and desperate condition.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is the gentleman in favor of trying to overcome the tremendous loss and destruction Pennsylvania has suffered, particularly Pittsburgh, as a result of floods?

Mr. RICH. I have had people call me from my district in reference to these flood-control projects and I told them that I thought it was the wise thing to wait for a year or so, if necessary, because we only have a big flood every 10 years up there. We had one several years ago and we may not get one for several years more. If we do it is just too bad. As for Pittsburgh and elsewhere we do not want them to have floods and I know they do not want you to bankrupt the Nation.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that the flood did not wait at Pittsburgh.

Mr. RICH. No, we cannot tell when the next floods will come and I do not know when the spenders will bankrupt the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Capital outlay, Sewer Division: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for construction of sewers and receiving basins, and so forth, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, $320,000.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFEE: Page 20, line 21, add a new section entitled "Motor Vehicle Parking Agency" and insert "For carrying out the act of Congress of 1942 creating a separate agency to handle exclusively the parking problem, $5,000."

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to trespass upon the time of the Committee on a matter of such relative unimportance in regard to the total amount sought to be obtained by this amendment.

This amendment is offered for the purpose of carrying out the act of Congress passed in 1942 creating a separate agency to handle only the public parking problem as distinguished from the traffic problem. This agency was set up in 1942 but because funds were appropriated for only 1 year and during the war nothing was accomplished because of the war, and following that first year, Congress eliminated the appropriations to continue that agency in existence during the war. This amendment would reactivate the agency which would immediately endeavor to find some solution to the terrible parking situation which prevails in Washington at this time.

This is an emergency problem which everyone recognizes today. This amendment is given the endorsement of the Washington Board of Trade, American Automobile Association, Keystone Automobile Association, Federated Improvement Associations of the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Bureau of the Budget, the Budget Office of the District of Columbia, President Truman, and all of the newspapers of the city of Washington, D. C. The money does not come out of the Federal Treasury; it comes out of the general fund of the District of Columbia. I appeal to the Committee at this time to approve the amendment. It was contained in the Budget which was submitted to the Deficiency Committee, but unfortunately was left out. The National Capital needs the funds in order to get going between now and June 30 when the subcommittee, of which I happen to be chairman, will be able to provide regular funds for the continuation of that agency. Everyone who is a resident of the city of Washington recognizes that the parking situation here is very chaotic, and that is due to the fact that with the lifting of rationing on gasoline and the improvement of the tire situation the number of cars coming into the National Capital is altogether too heavy for proper handling, and the facilities for parking inadequate. Everyone who goes down to visit Government departments is confronted with the constant impossibility of being able to park his car. This agency was created for the purpose of providing and suggesting ways and means of arranging for the parking of cars on the streets of the city of Washington or recommending off-street parking areas and structures. I ask the Committee to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am for economy; but I want to say to the Members of the House that I am not going to split hairs when it comes to projects relating to our soldiers, or where the money is going to be used for private projects for our people, and I will tell you why. I am sick and tired of shoveling the money of the taxpayers of this country into foreign ratholes. I do not propose to lend my vote to UNRRA, which is one of the most corrupt organizations ever set up by any international group. I call your attention to an article which appeared in the Washington Star just this noon:

SIX HUNDRED UNRRA EMPLOYEES PURGED FOR SELLING TO BLACK MARKET—DISMISSALS, SUSPENSIONS, AND ARRESTS IN THREE REICH ZONES FOLLOW TWO-MONTH PROBE

HERFORD, GERMANY, November 29.—The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has dismissed, suspended, or arrested more than 600 of its workers accused of diverting relief supplies into the black market, it was announced today.

Leo J. Margolin, of New York, chief of the UNRRA Information Bureau in Europe, said a majority of the workers involved were Americans and Britons employed in the French, American, and British occupation zones in Germany. The action followed a 2-month investigation.

Without specifying how many of the accused workers were from each zone, Mr. Margolin said:

"All were involved in black-market dealings—actually selling or being a party to selling at black-market prices foodstuffs and clothing earmarked for victims of war."

He explained that the accused workers would be replaced by demobilized American and British soldiers.

"Investigations will continue," Mr. Margolin said, "and before the first of the year Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick A. Morgan, chief of UNRRA operations in Germany and formerly assistant chief of staff for General Eisenhower, hopes to have UNRRA a spotless organization."

In a joint statement, General Morgan and Sir Raphael Cilento Brisbane, Australian director of UNRRA in the British zone, said:

"We are determined to ferret out from the ranks of honest, sincere UNRRA workers members of teams who put personal profit above their trust of aiding unfortunate victims of war under our care.

"There is nothing more low and despicable than stealing from these luckless people, and UNRRA intends to see that the personnel of the organization keeps faith with the 47 nations supporting UNRRA, with the armies which sponsor its work, with displaced persons in Germany, and with other displaced persons who are our charges."

Mr. Margolin said that in the last 5 weeks 13 UNRRA workers had been arrested and another had been sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment during investigations in the British zone by military police and UNRRA officials.

The convicted worker was Francis Schiff, a Czechoslovak national, who had been assigned to a relief team caring for displaced persons in the Bonn area. He was caught selling coffee to Germans.

That thing is going on and it has been running wild, yet I get telegrams asking me to vote for this corrupt institution, rotten from top to bottom. They are using it over there to help enslave the people that we liberated with the blood of our boys. It does not make sense to come in here and split hairs on something for our own people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] I think has adequately described the necessity for this small sum of $5,000 for the District of Columbia in an effort to solve its parking problem. There is little I can add to what he has said or that you individually do not know if you have tried to park downtown.

I think one important thing, however, is that this small sum of $5,000 will have no effect at all on inflation in this country, nor will it have any effect on the United States Treasury, because it is not coming out of the Federal appropriation in any manner whatsoever, but purely from the District of Columbia appropriation. As you know, the Federal Government gives a lump sum to the District of Columbia, so that is not affected in one way or the other.

The main thing in connection with this amendment is the fact that unless this $5,000 is made available at this particular time it will be impossible to employ the individual whose services are now available. Six months from now will be too late. This expert who is now available to the District of Columbia will not be able to give his services which are so terribly needed at a date 6 months hence.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. You are the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, are you not, and investigated this whole situation?

Mr. HÉBERT. We have given a great deal of time and study to parking conditions and parking problems here, and I believe this is absolutely necessary on the basis of the study that we have made. I again emphasize it is definitely an emergency and something that cannot be put off until 6 months from now. I hope the Committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there was no item in the estimates which was rejected with more unanimity than the proposition before the Committee. The gentleman says the reason the appropriation was discontinued back in 1942 and 1943 was because of the war. There must be some misapprehension on the subject. The congestion here in Washington during the war was greater than ever before. The reason the estimate was rejected by the committee was that there was no ascertainable reason for this activity. It was suggested in the committee that some Member of Congress had

gone downtown to a show some night and being unable to find a place to park his automobile, came up here the next morning and indignantly introduced a bill to appoint this commission. The committee could find no need for this provision. We have here a Department of Vehicles and Traffic, and a Director of Vehicles and Traffic. The District went to considerable trouble to select him. They went to Philadelphia to secure an especially competent man. He is an expert. He is as capable of solving any of these problems as well as anyone who could be employed under this amendment. The committee made no provision for this item after the first year it was authorized because it found no justification for appropriating for it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that if his knowledge of all the other items in this appropriation bill is as accurate as his statement now in connection with this particular amendment, it is little wonder that he is having so much trouble.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You said some Member of Congress went down to a show and could not find a parking place. You did not mean that, did you? Why put all that on Congress?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman knows a bill was introduced and there was absolutely no reason for introducing it unless somebody went downtown and could not find a parking space.

Mr. HÉBERT. I do not think that is a true statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not know anything about that, I gather, from what you are saying. Why slam that on us? Do you not want somebody elected?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is nothing for this man to do that Mr. Van Duzer cannot do. He is one of the most efficient and experienced experts that could be found in traffic matters when he was appointed a few years back. To appoint another man would be like putting a fifth wheel on a cart.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COFFEE) there were—ayes 17, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Supply and distribution of farm labor: The authority and funds provided by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, as amended and supplemented, are hereby continued through December 31, 1946, to assist in providing an adequate supply of agricultural labor for the production, harvesting, and preparation for markets of agricultural commodities essential to the orderly transition from war to peace and for carrying out the other purposes of said act, and, in addition to the amount hereby continued available, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $14,000,000 for such purposes, to be merged with the funds hereby continued available. Not less than $5,000,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner and for the purposes specified in section 2 of said act, and of the amount so apportioned, not more than $100,000 may be expended by the State agricultural extension services for the construction of labor-supply centers under the limitations of said section 2. In addition to the amounts heretofore made available for administrative expenses pursuant to section 3 (c) of said act, there is hereby made available, out of said funds, the sum of $562,023 for such purposes. Whenever labor recruited from outside the State of use is furnished hereunder to any agency, public or private, or individual, the Secretary may make such charges for furnishing such labor as he may determine to be practicable to help defray the cost of recruitment, transportation, housing, medical care, and supervision, and the receipts derived therefrom shall be credited to the funds hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of said act. Agricultural workers may be admitted into the United States to perform agricultural labor in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (g) of said act during the continuance of this program, notwithstanding any official determination of the cessation of hostilities in the present war: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law and subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, the State agricultural extension services of the several States are authorized until December 31, 1946, to sell or otherwise dispose of, at the fair market value, to local public agencies or to nonprofit associations of farmers for use in the housing of agricultural labor, camps, other facilities, and equipment which have been purchased from funds apportioned to such agricultural extension services in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, as amended, and the receipts derived therefrom shall be credited to the appropriation and shall be available to the State extension services for expenditure for the purposes of said act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order against the entire paragraph on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Compiling census reports, etc.: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Compiling census reports, etc.," including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, $3,250,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 25, line 3, strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$1,970,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that we may have an opportunity to find out whether or not the House is ready to save money where it is a pure waste and where we are embarking upon activities that do no good and where we are getting into something that means in the future a very large sum of money, I am offering this amendment to cut $1,280,000 out of this proposed appropriation for the Bureau of the Census.

The Bureau of the Census at the present time has $9,300,000 available to it for this year. It has 3,677 employees. If this entire sum of money is provided, it will increase the number of employees up to 7,775.

The particular items I have aimed at here are as follows:

Sample census of population, $420,000.
Quarterly expansion of the labor force, $600,000.
Consumer's income study, $260,000.

The sample census of population is utterly valueless. The population is in such a state of flux that if we take samples here and there all over the country, we would get nowhere and we would have no result that is of any value. If any businessman attempts to set up anything on that basis, he is going to lose.

Quarterly expansion of the labor forces is a new scheme to provide new jobs for these statisticians. And they are scattered all over the lot, all over the Federal Government. There is absolutely no sense to it. It is a brand new activity.

Then we have the consumers' income study. Here they propose to go into a town to find out what the people's income is—in these days when the soldiers are coming back and when we have all of this upset due to reconversion, at a time when such a study will be absolutely worthless and when it will do no good to anybody they propose to spend all this money. I have heard the protestations of the chairman of the committee and of various Members of the House. If they are sincere they will support this amendment.

It is absolutely necessary that we begin to economize somewhere and begin to do it on the things that are not needed. These items will double the force the Census Bureau will need in the days to come, and it will call for increasing annual appropriations for the Census Bureau from about $10,000,000 up to about $20,000,000.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we shall be able to get rid of a part of this proposed increase.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that the hearings disclose we have no less than 65 separate agencies collecting statistics at this time?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and the statistics situation in this country is absolutely impossible. No one accepts their statistics as official and there is such a jumble that it is almost impossible to get anywhere. I have not cut off the whole appropriation. I believe the whole estimate here, $3,250,000, is bad. I have just aimed at a part of it, that part about which there can be no question it is bad. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I noticed in the newspaper headlines of a few days ago that the President, who is not only the leader of the country but in particular is the leader of the majority party in power, is seeking to deflate bureaucracy; he thinks there are too many people on the Federal pay roll and that we should economize. He makes a rather feeble gesture, in my judgment, in the plan drawn by Mr. Allen. I think, however, he is headed in the right direction, and I am hoping that in particular the Members of his party will heed his voice today and not continue to mobilize, expand, and increase bureaucracy. I hope they will try to demobilize bureaucracy to the extent of a million-and-some-odd employees, as suggested by the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee.

There are some 65 agencies collecting statistics over this country. This typifies the absolute lack of cohesive effort and business ability on the part of the administration that this work has been so scattered in the last few years. Not only do you propose to continue annoying the people of this country as they have been in the past, but you propose an additional appropriation here that will encourage these 65 agencies taking the census over this country to continue to expend the people's money and to annoy them further. I was home recently, and the people out my way are looking with alarm at the some 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 people now on the Federal pay roll and hoping that we may do something about it, hoping that the Congress, now that the war is over, will help cut down this pay roll.

Certainly, the majority party and the majority leaders ought to be willing to cooperate right here with the minority party that wants to make at least a feeble gesture toward preventing the pay rollers from increasing, a feeble gesture toward economy in the interest of the taxpayers of this country. I sincerely hope that the Members of this House who have seen this foolishness go on year after year until it has got the people confused and disgusted with the wasting of their money will vote for economy on this particular item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I wonder if we realize just where we are traveling with respect to this matter of statistics. It is so overdone and overworked that it is utterly foolish and the Members of this House know it. Gathering and compiling statistics is a sort of mania in some of our departments.

We have more than 60 different agencies or branches of Government gathering statistics. You find them in the various bureaus of the Government. There are duplications and triplications of all kinds. These agencies do not seem to even try to prevent overlapping and duplications. Now, then, you are providing here an additional 4,000 employees to continue to gather and compile statistics. Here is one chance to hold down just a little bit in Government employment. Millions have already been appropriated this year for this purpose. How in the world are you going to reduce unnecessary activities if you support this sort of business.

You Members are just as familiar as I am with the material that comes to your desk from the Bureau of the Census. Of course, a great deal of it is important. But loads of it is of no real use or necessity. You do not even look at it.

A document came to our offices just recently estimating the number of persons in this country who would be married during the next year. It is a fair example of unnecessary information. This document estimates men and women may be married during the coming year in the United States; then it tells you what their ages are. If you think this sort of information is worth the money, and the taxpayers want it, then you do not agree with me.

It seems to me if we are ever going to begin cutting down expenses that we will have to begin cutting down our employment. Here is one little chance to do so. Let us try it out and see if we cannot agree to cut out something like $1,900,000 just for once. Here is a chance to do it. Let us do it by supporting the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, a minute ago the gentleman asked that a certain portion of the farm-labor supply program as indicated on page 22 be stricken from the bill on a point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph which I had stricken out on a point of order for the purpose of modifying the request in connection with that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that we wait until the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought the gentleman from California was going to speak on that subject, which is the reason I brought it up. I withdraw the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his fine cooperation. I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to what happened. I do not believe the Members realize the seriousness of the situation that confronts the American farmers at this particular time.

I want to thank the gentleman for his fine cooperation and I hope that we can return to the section by unanimous consent and make this correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 22, line 12, "Farm Labor Supply Program," which was stricken out on a point of order by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], for the purpose of offering a modified paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: Page 22, line 12, insert the following:

"FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

"Supply and distribution of farm labor: The authority and funds provided by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, as amended and supplemented, are hereby continued through December 31, 1946, to assist in providing an adequate supply of agricultural labor for the production, harvesting, and preparation for markets of agricultural commodities essential to the orderly transition from war to peace and for carrying out the other purposes of said act, and, in addition to the amount hereby continued available, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $14,000,000 for such purposes, to be merged with the funds hereby continued available. Not less than $5,000,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner and for the purposes specified in section 2 of said act, and of the amount so apportioned, not more than $100,000 may be expended by the State agricultural extension services for the construction of labor supply centers under the limitations of said section 2. In addition to the amounts heretofore made available for administrative expenses pursuant to section 3 (c) of said act, there is hereby made available, out of said funds, the sum of $562,023 for such purposes."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Departmental salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Departmental salaries and expenses," including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, $405,000, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for personal services is hereby increased from "$1,929,250" to "$2,304,250."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 26, strike out lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in a further attempt to eliminate departmental expansion which in my judgment is unjustified in this bill.

The Secretary of Commerce has pending before the Budget Bureau now an expansion program amounting to $192,-

000,000. This compares with an appropriation for this fiscal year of $79,000,000, this year's appropriation being 25 percent in excess of that for 1940, just before the war.

The appropriation of $405,000 in the paragraph which I am moving to strike from the bill is part of that expansion. If the amendment carries I shall also move to strike the following paragraph appropriating $47,000, which is also a part of the expansion.

The Department requested under this paragraph $675,000 for a personnel of 396 in addition to the $2,017,000 already appropriated for a personnel of 611. If the request were granted in full, the Department would have for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, departmental service, 1,007 people at a cost of $2,692,000, a personnel of 1,007 as compared with 608 just prior to World War II.

This amendment will eliminate $405,000 from this bill and throw the whole matter of expansion for consideration as one unit by the regular subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Department of Commerce.

Every division of this Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce will have a very substantial increase in personnel if this amendment is not adopted. Also, as I stated in general debate, there will be a brand-new set-up known as the Industrial Relations Division, because we are told there is nobody in the Department of Commerce equipped to talk to a labor-management conference, so we have to have a new set-up here duplicating the set-up we already have in the Labor Department.

I submit that no one can read the hearings on this particular request for expansion and form any intelligent opinion as to what the money is actually going to be expended for. It is one of the most unsatisfactory hearings I ever recall.

I hope sincerely the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the fight he is making for economy in this bill will lend his support to this amendment, and that the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Labor Department may not have enough money to carry on its program. I do not know, but I do know that it is using a part of what they have, improperly. Here is a letter that just came in, dated the 27th, from a manufacturer I know:

We are enclosing herewith a copy of a form letter received from the Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

We received a similar form letter some weeks ago out of Chicago. When receiving this letter from Chicago we simply penned on the bottom of it that there was no dispute of any kind or nature between our employees and ourselves. Furthermore, none of our men belong to their union.

We are still in the same position and we would think the Department of Labor and industries have enough trouble on their hands without trying to start more where there has always been peace and harmony between employees and employer.

The writer thought that this would be of interest to you and we are enclosing a copy of our letter to the Department relative to this matter. Several others have received the same thing and are in the same position as we are in the Twin Cities. We would like your reaction to this matter.

With kindest personal regards, we are,

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

"GENTLEMEN: You are advised that a notice of a labor dispute between the LaFayette Transfer & Storage Co. and the Central States Drivers Council of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters has been filed by said union pursuant to section 8 of the War Labor Disputes Act. This notice became effective October 25, 1945. Section 8 provides, among other things, that:

" 'On the thirtieth day after notice is given by the representative of the employees, unless such dispute has been settled, the National Labor Relations Board shall forthwith take a secret ballot of the employees in the plant, plants, bargaining unit, or bargaining units, as the case may be with respect to which the dispute is applicable on the question whether they will permit any such interruption of war production."

"I shall be grateful if you will acknowledge receipt of this letter.

"JOHN T. DALY,
"Docket Officer, Labor Department."

And here is the reply of the company:

Replying to your letter, will state that we see no reason why you wrote us a letter of this nature.

There has always been peace and harmony between our employees and our company and from inquiry, cannot find where anybody has made any complaint. Our drivers do not belong to the Central States Driver Council of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and why they should stick their nose in our business is a mystery to us.

We claim there has never been a dispute between the employees and the management of this company.

Very truly yours.

Now, just why the Labor Department should stick its nose into the business of a private employer and ask it to settle a dispute when there is no dispute and when none of their men belongs to the union involved, or is dissatisfied, is more than I can figure out, except on the theory that the Labor Department is still acting as the organizing agent of the teamsters union of the A. F. of L.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield. You tell me if you will.

Mr. HOOK. I was just wondering if that does not come about by virtue of the fact that the gentleman himself and others were responsible for the Smith-Connally Act going on the books.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We are responsible. I was, and I assume my share of the responsibility for the passage of that act. But I am not responsible for the misinterpretation and the maladministration and the use by the Government of that act which was devised to lessen labor disputes and to settle them, nor for the Department's efforts to create trouble, instigate strikes, and coerce employers.

Mr. HOOK. The Smith-Connally Act is responsible for that, and the gentleman is partly responsible for the Smith-Connally Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Nor am I responsible for the corrupt political alliance existing between certain labor leaders and the political generals of the administration. The Labor Department stirs up trouble instead of trying to settle or prevent it. Think of it—of the policy of writing a company that never had a dispute with its employees and telling them it is going to call an election unless the company settles a nonexistent dispute.

Now, the gentleman may like that kind of a procedure. I do not. I just tell you now for your information that the press has announced that General Motors has canceled its advertising program for the first 3 months of 1946. Where will the gentleman and Reuther and Thomas get the money to make up the pay checks that will be taken away from those workers? Did any of these labor agitators who are following the communistic procedure ever give anybody a job? What they do is to destroy jobs, not give jobs. The gentleman's argument is all the time in favor of those who are depriving honest workingmen of jobs and promoting the interest of some racketeers and some labor politicians.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be adopted. It saves $405,000 and it stops the addition of 280 employees. The activity involved is something like this. They get out booklets to help folks start in business. They want to help the veterans, for example, start in the shoe cobbling business. Among the important suggestions they made was that before a fellow starts in the shoe business he must get a lease on the property that he is going to occupy and then before he did anything else he must have his machinery installed. Then he must have the electricity turned on and then he must have the gas turned on. Then when he got through at night, he must lock the door. But it did not say anything about the cash register. I would like to have the veterans helped, but to get a bunch of professors to get up that kind of a book is a little too strong for me.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did it say anything about his knowing anything about the business before he started?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. It did offer the services of these professors to help the returning serviceman who wanted to open a bar or grill, to tell him where in the town it should be located.

Now, it is all right if they want to go into business, but can you imagine a professor over in the Department successfully advising anybody to do anything of that kind?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand it, we already have in the Veterans' Administration a bureau for rendering service to veterans, without going into the Department of Commerce and employing several thousand other individuals to go around and advise them with respect to entering business. As I understand it, the men who have these jobs are not trained themselves. They are just out of school, and they have these jobs to advise men as to what they should or should not do with respect to entering business.

Mr. TABER. Now, can you imagine the Government of the United States spending money for such stuff as that, and can you imagine it helping anybody?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the important provisions of the bill. American business finds itself today in a highly advantageous position. We have more, newer, and better-equipped factories than ever before. We have the largest supply of trained workers, skilled artisans, in the history of the country. In the production of war equipment we streamlined the delivery of raw materials and are now ready to channel them into nonwar production. We have the material, the factories, and the workmen. The only thing needed is the market.

At home, our markets have deteriorated because there were no goods to sell. Abroad, of course, all our markets virtually have been wiped out for more than 4 years.

This provision is put here in order to service American businesses, to assist in providing access for American goods to both foreign and domestic markets.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of this service. The committee, in passing on the estimate—and I was under the impression we were unanimous on it, but I guess we were not—the committee, in passing on this item, handled it with a stringency bordering on parsimony. Originally it was estimated to require about $750,000. But the Bureau of the Budget submitted a request for $675,000. The committee, over the protest of some that we were cutting it too low, reduced it from $675,000 to $405,000. We cut it to the minimum.

In this critical time in which American business finds itself—when we must have markets for our goods, both at home and abroad—the small amount recommended here is if anything unreasonably small. The amount we have allowed is the minimum, and I trust the Committee will reject the amendment.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the only people who request this additional appropriation were those in the Department of Commerce, and that it was not requested by the testimony from any businessmen. My understanding is that businessmen have been interfered with too much already.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Department submitted to us a pile of photostatic letters from businessmen, a foot high, letters from some of the most important business interests of the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, there is already $2,000,000 allowed for this sort of thing. Am I not right about that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly. This is the additional amount made necessary by reconversion. The original appropriation did not anticipate the close of the war.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you have already spent $2,000,000 to do this sort of thing. Am I not right about that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; all of it has not been spent, but it will be spent. But does the gentleman take the position that we ought not to do our utmost to provide markets for American industry? We must recognize our duty in this regard, and this is one of the indispensable factors in supplying markets for industry and jobs for labor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If this item is so important why not let the appropriate Appropriations Subcommittee handle it in regular order in place of bringing it in in a deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately there is not time to read them, but I have here in my hand letters from some of the most important business interests of the country insisting that we make adequate appropriations to carry out this work.

I trust the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 70, noes 59.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 72.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field office service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Field office service," including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, $47,000, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for personal services is hereby increased from "$395,000" to "$433,000."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no Jack MacNiders, no generals' sons in my district, but among the Joe Smiths and Bill Johnsons in the Paterson, N. J., area are many GI's whose medical schooling was interrupted by the war and are now anxiously awaiting the day when they will have points for discharge.

Every one of these boys is just as important to this democracy as the son of any general. Democracy is what they fought for, but democracy is what they are not getting if deals like this can be made for the sons of higher ups.

The MacNider case makes a mockery of the present point system for discharges and Congress knows it is not the only case.

The point system should be tossed out the window. It is time for Congress to take the ball and punch through a score for these boys who after winning the war now have to sit on the sidelines and see the good old rules of American fair play knocked into a cocked hat.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a ship not long ago sailed from Calcutta with several hundred Chinese students coming here to attend school, and our GI's almost went into a riot over it because they wanted to get back for an education. If the gentleman wants the name of the ship and the students I can furnish it.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is another reason why I am going to sign the gentleman's discharge petition for the early discharge of these GI's who have served so long.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 26, line 12, strike out the paragraph, lines 12 to 17, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, general fund, construction, $42,765,000: *Provided*, That all moneys hereafter received by the United States in connection with any irrigation project, including the incidental power features thereof, constructed by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation, and financed in whole or in part with moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allocated therefor by the Federal Government from the general fund, shall be covered into the general fund until the general fund has been reimbursed in full for allocations and appropriations made to such project from the general fund, except in cases where provision has been made by law or contract for the use of such revenues for the benefit of users of water from such project: *Provided further*, That the portion of appropriations or allocations invested in the power features of such projects shall be fully amortized and repaid within 50 years with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso commencing on page 30, line 15, and continuing on page 31 down to the end of line 6 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further on the point of order, I want to say that in my judgment the language of the whole paragraph is subject to a point of order, and that includes both provisos in the paragraph.

There are at least three different statutes modified by the language in the bill against which the point of order is made. First, it would have the effect of amending that portion of the act of May 9, 1938, concerning increase in the reclamation fund. In the second place, it would have the effect of amending sections 1, 2, and 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940. That is an act which I recall distinctly, because I had something to do with its enactment when it was reported out of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. And in one other respect the language objected to would have the effect of amending section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This language would distinctly modify existing provisions of law and would be therefore legislation on this appropriation bill, and that is the basis of the point of order.

It is sufficient to show, in supporting the point of order, that the language objected to is legislative in character, but I wish to go beyond that and state that it almost completely reverses the provisions of existing law, and would have a very adverse effect upon reclamation. This is far too important a matter for us to act upon without full and complete hearing before the appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. It is manifest that this item requires that funds received shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury until the general fund has been fully reimbursed for the amount that it has expended. In my opinion that is an order under the Holman rule. It saves money to the Treasury on the face of the document.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, and so holds. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely regret that my colleagues from Utah and Arizona found it necessary to raise a point of order against the second proviso in that paragraph. They served with me on the Committee on Irrigation back in 1939 when the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 was drafted. That merely coordinated a pattern for irrigation development which had begun in 1902. In the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Department of the Interior last spring, we were confronted with an opinion rendered by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior which, in fact, emasculated that section of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 which provided that allocable costs chargeable to power development must be repaid in full with 3 percent interest.

There is no justification for contending it was the intent of Congress in 1939 that there be no repayment of the principal investments on allocable costs to power development. As a member of this committee, I am a friend of reclamation development. I am hopeful that the House Irrigation Committee, of which the gentleman from Arizona is the chairman, will consider clarifying legislation before next spring so that our Interior Subcommittee will be enabled to make appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation in accordance with the provisions of the 1939 act. Otherwise, there will likely arise opposition to some of the projects.

I believe it is the consensus of the Members of this House that they do not propose to permit a Solicitor of the Interior Department to ignore and disregard completely the legislative enactments of this body. I know that technically this is a legislative provision, but when the chairman of that committee raises this point of order he also is implying an indictment of his committee for its failure to act upon a ruling made by the Interior Department Solicitor almost 1 year ago.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. This legislation would change the act of 1939. That is why we are opposed to it. We favor the existing law, but this is legislation that would change existing law.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That second proviso will not change the law. It merely reaffirms the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and that has a specific provision which affects the repayment of allocable costs chargeable to power development. The gentleman will find such a provision is necessary if we are to reinstate the original power repayment features of the act of 1939, and thus seek to nullify the ruling of the Solicitor of the Interior Department, which is not defensible. I was a member of the Irrigation Committee, as was the gentleman from Arizona, in 1939 when that act was drafted. I know the printed record will show it was not the intent of our committee or of the Congress, which approved that act, that the principal investment shall not be repaid, as has been ruled by the Solicitor of the Interior Department, and that the only requirement is the payment of interest upon the amount invested in the power construction. I contend this proviso is essential unless we are to concede the superiority of the Solicitor of the Interior Department.

My position on this question is in complete accord with the views expressed recently by the National Reclamation Association at its fourteenth annual convention at Denver, Colo. This group of delegates, representing 17 Western States, took cognizance of the situation created by the Solicitor's opinion, and adopted a resolution urging congressional action restating the original objectives of the 1939 act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert at this point this resolution for the guidance of Congress and particularly the House Committee on Irrigation:

Whereas the intent of the Reclamation Act of 1939, as indicated by its legislative history, as viewed by the reclamation interests of the West, and as interpreted by the Bureau of Reclamation for 5 years following the adoption of the act, was that costs chargeable to power, in addition to operation and maintenance costs, should be sufficient to return to the United States the power construction costs plus interest at 3 percent per annum on what is described in the act as "an appropriate share of the construction investment"; and

Whereas the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, under an opinion, given on September 29, 1944; held:

"That a proper interpretation of section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the Department's Appropriation Act of 1939 require that the minimum rate schedule be such as to produce revenues sufficient only to meet in addition to the return for operation and maintenance cost, an amount equal to 3 percent of the power-construction costs with the proviso that if total revenues thus produced are insufficient to repay all costs allocated to power to be repaid by power revenues, 'other fixed charges' must be included in the rate schedule to produce revenues sufficient to repay such costs;" and

Whereas although the Solicitor's interpretation of the 1939 Act provides for minimum power rate schedules only, it nevertheless lays a basis for fixing costs chargeable to power, and adjusting rates in accordance therewith, contrary to the accepted intent of the 1939 Act at the time of its adoption, with results and implications of vital concern to the reclamation programs and to the national interest; and

Whereas the application of the Solicitor's opinion particularly to a broad program of basin-wide development may have wide-reaching effects contrary to the intent of Congress and to the policies now and heretofore supported by this association, which have asserted the principle that power production should be incidental to reclamation and should return, in addition to its share of operation and maintenance costs, at least a sufficient amount to repay the power-construction investment, plus interest as provided in the act, and, where possible, aid in returning the cost of the irrigation features where the latter, if charged in full, would impose a burden beyond the ability of the water users to repay: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the policy in reclamation development which would be effectuated by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, above mentioned, should not be permitted to prevail; and be it further

Resolved, That this association hereby registers its belief in, and approval of, the intent of the law as originally interpreted, and directs its officers to seek the enactment by the Congress of legislation making such intent effective and rendering nugatory the opinion of the Solicitor referred to herein.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes. My understanding is that there is nothing at all before the Committee now. We have disposed of the matter covered by this

discussion. We have a heavy program ahead of us if we are not to run tomorrow on this bill. I trust gentlemen will extend their remarks unless there is some amendment pending before the Committee.

Mr. JONES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his request until after the chairman of the Legislative Committee, who has just now received recognition, has spoken? It may be that the matter will be clarified at that time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I withhold my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the second proviso in the portion of the bill which has been stricken out on a point of order would, if left in the bill, change basically the reclamation law, including the law of 1939. There is a provision in section 9 (c) of the act of 1939 for the repayment of costs on the power parts of the projects as well as the reclamation projects. The power projects carry a 3-percent rate of interest. The language here which has been ruled out would have all rates fixed and amortized so that they must be fully repaid in 50 years, whereas the original law provides for repayment in 40 years. Without discussing any merits of this proposed change, I want to say, it is a vital change offered without benefit of hearing by the proper legislative committee of the House.

It may be there are provisions in the stricken language that may have a proper purpose, but they would restrict and hamper future reclamation projects. For that reason I am glad to see that the point of order was sustained and the language stricken out on the point of order that the language is legislative in character.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman object to power features of reclamation projects being paid and fully amortized with an interest rate of 3 percent over a period of 50 years?

Mr. MURDOCK. On the face of it, that looks good. The present law provides that they should be amortized over a 40-year period with a rate of 3 percent interest.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman object to that, however? Does he object to the cost being repaid in 50 years?

Mr. MURDOCK. The 3 percent interest rate is the same, and the time element is increased. I am not objecting to that part of it. There are provisions contained in our existing law which this would change or take out. In addition to that, there are other fixed charges now under existing law that may be amortized which this provision leaves out. There are other conditions involved as well as other fixed charges. So that the Government, under this proposal would be deprived of a certain discretion which the existing law now gives it, but which discretion would be denied under the language just stricken from the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I do not yet have an answer to my question as to whether or not the gentleman wants these reclamation projects, that is, the power features thereof, amortized and repaid within 50 years at a 3 percent interest rate.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want the power costs amortized and repaid with interest—yes. That is what we now have in existing law. But there are times when we have to make some exceptions—certain equitable adjustments. Therefore, I do not care to have an ironclad provision here which specifies 50 years and which requires all rates to be charged accordingly, without any discretion for equitable adjustment. That is just exactly what I am afraid of.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly I can draw the inference that the gentleman approves of the ruling made by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior which emasculates that provision of the 1939 act?

Mr. MURDOCK. If change there should be, I favor any change in the reclamation law being made by the legislative committee having charge of such a matter. I do not want to see legislation written here by an Appropriations Committee without suitable hearings by the proper committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. But the gentleman does approve of the Solicitor changing legislation?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all. I approve of an act of Congress changing the law that needs changing and fixing the law. That is exactly what I am contending for now. We have the law on the statute books, a law considered by the Legislative Committee of this House and passed by the Congress. If we are going to change it, let us revise it in the same way we enacted it by legislative action and not by action of the Appropriations Committee and not by a solicitor or by anybody else. We are the lawmaking body. We are the policy-determining body. Let us do our work accordingly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thought we had an agreement that when the chairman of the Legislative Committee addressed the Committee we would then consider passing on to some substantive amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to omission in this bill, which I believe merits the further consideration of the committee. It is the appropriation of $500,000 for the extension of the power line by the Bureau of Reclamation from the Big Thompson project in Colorado to the cities of Sterling, Brush, and Holyoke, Colo.

This line will supply power to several rural electrification districts in the west end of Nebraska. The need for this power is very urgent. At the present time part of this area is buying power from the city of Holyoke, Colo. That city can furnish no more power and threatens to terminate the contract with the present power users. Only last night I received a telephone call from a representative of 400 farmers in that area of Nebraska. These 400 farmers have signed up for rural electrification, they have gone to the expense of wiring their homes, but no electricity is available. There are other farmers who have installed electrical equipment and are receiving electricity to light their homes, run their machinery, and pump water for their livestock and crops, and those farmers are threatened with the possibility of having their power completely cut off. The situation is very acute, and an emergency exists.

This item has been before the committee on several previous occasions. The first time it was presented the subcommittee stated in effect that they were having some problems to settle in reference to our general program of building transmission lines, particularly with the Central Valley project in California. That because of these problems they had decided not to build any transmission lines. However, we find that in this bill they appropriate money to begin the building of $6,000,000 worth of lines in connection with the Central Valley project, but leave out this very worthy, but much less expensive project that is so needed in an agricultural area.

A few months ago the Senate placed this item in a bill, but the House conferees rejected it. Certain of the conferees stated on the floor in defense of their action that they expected the REA to build this line. Upon investigation we find that the REA cannot build such a line. The hearings contained that information.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Senate will again insert this item in this bill. I sincerely hope that when they do, the conferees will accept this item, because it is greatly needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, a request of $500,000 for the construction of the Brush-Holyoke transmission line of the Colorado-Big Thompson project by the Bureau of Reclamation in the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1946—H. R. 4805—has been specifically disallowed by the Committee on Appropriations. The request was also disallowed by the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1946—H. R. 789, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. At that time the action of the conferees was taken because it was their opinion that this line should be constructed with funds loaned by the Rural Electrification Administration rather than with funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The need for this line has been fully presented in the hearings recently conducted by the committee. On July 14, 1945, the Rural Electrification Administration was asked by the Bureau of Reclamation whether it was in a position to finance construction of these facilities and REA Administrator Wickard on September 21, 1945, wrote that upon investigation it was found that the major use of the facilities would be to furnish electrical energy to the Colorado Public

Service Co. at Sterling, Colo., and the municipal system at Holyoke. It was also pointed out that the Highline Electric Association at Holyoke would need only a small fraction of the capacity of the transmission equipment which the Bureau of Reclamation proposed to build. Mr. Wickard advised that as a matter of policy and as a matter of legal powers REA would not be in a position to finance construction of the proposed work. The correspondence appears on pages 386–387 of part II of the hearings on the bill.

Since presentation of the supporting data, more evidence indicating that the transmission line should be constructed at the earliest possible date has come to my attention. The city of Brush, Colo., has expressed a desire to be supplied with low-cost power from the Bureau's system. However, in order to obtain dependable service the city needs some assurance that the Government's transmission system will be extended from Sterling to Sidney and Gering, Nebr., thus completing a loop affording an ample power supply from two sources. Construction of the above line would complete a part of the facilities. The city of Sidney, Nebr., has an immediate demand for additional power which can be met temporarily by service from an ordnance plant which has surplus generating capacity. It will, however, need additional power in the very near future and could be served from Sterling by appropriating funds for construction of the Brush-Sterling-Holyoke line. I am also advised that the Rural Electric Cooperative at Pine Bluffs, Wyo., is completing plans for approximately 2,000 miles of REA distribution lines in northeastern Colorado and southwestern Nebraska. It now has a line into Sidney and needs power to supply existing distribution as well as proposed lines. A large number of farms are being broken up into smaller units, making room for many more farm families, especially returning servicemen. I am advised that in this vicinity alone some 2,000 more families will be located and each will require additional power and facilities must be provided to serve these demands. The Brush-Sterling line will be a part of the system to supply energy to this area and must be constructed at the earliest possible date.

The Highline Electric Association at Holyoke, Colo., is now in a position to serve about 1,400 members and is desperately in need of power to meet its demands and to enable returning servicemen to develop farms and other enterprises in the area with modern electrical equipment. Everything possible must be done to supply these needs and alleviate the existing critical power shortage. It is estimated that some 12,000 people in northeastern Colorado would be directly benefited through the availability of low-cost power supplied through construction of this line.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, so that the issue will not be confused in replying to the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Committee having charge of reclamation projects, the language in this appropriation bill was inserted for the particular purpose of keeping the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior from repealing an act of Congress, the act of Congress which the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the chairman of the committee, who has just spoken, and the gentleman who made the point of order against the provision or the paragraph, helped to write in 1939. The 1939 Reclamation Act provided that the power features of reclamation projects should be amortized and repaid with interest at 3 percent. Apparently, the chairman of the Legislative Committee and the gentleman who made the point of order have not read the Interior Department Solicitor's opinion delivered nearly a year ago. The Solicitor determined that no interest had to be paid on the Columbia Basin project. The Bureau of Reclamation is following that illegal fiat opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. To this date, the Columbia Basin project is not paying 3 percent interest upon the power portion of the enormous investment of $180,000,000 in that project. Now, what can the Appropriations Committee do but rewrite into this appropriation bill the intent and the purpose which the chairman admits are in the 1939 reclamation law? The words stricken reassert—not legislate for Congress—but reassert the 1939 act which was repealed, not by Congress, but by the Interior Department. For one whole year the chairman of the Legislative Committee either has never been aware of it, or if he has been aware of the Interior Department repeal of the 1939 act, he has never called the committee together to consider that the 1939 act should be reasserted, enforced, or restated, nor has he rebuked the Solicitor or Interior Department.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Do I understand the gentleman is against taking this out of the bill?

Mr. JONES. I am for reasserting in the appropriation bill the actual basic law. It is not an issue of writing new legislation in the bill. The point at issue is that a portion of the appropriations or allocations invested in power features of such projects shall be fully amortized and paid within 50 years, with interest at 3 percent. That is the basic law. That is the part we are trying to save. That is the part we are trying to get the Interior Department to observe. Therefore, we want it to be done.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. As a member of this committee, I concur in the position taken by the gentleman. The Department should comply with the organic reclamation law and not depart therefrom because of some erroneous opinion. I hope that between now and next spring that matter will be remedied, either by the Legislative Committee or the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his observation, and I certainly appreciate his fair statement in regard to this problem.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say that unless the basic law is abided by and unless we in the House and in the Congress can change the decision of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and have the law of the land abided by, the Interior Department Subcommittee—and I am sure I speak for a majority of them—will very likely not give the appropriation or allow the appropriation we have been allowing for many of these projects, many of which are needed. Speaking for myself, as a member of that committee, if I have to take the severe means of helping deny appropriations in order to make the Interior Department live up to the law of the land, then I shall do it.

Mr. JONES. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to vote for any more reclamation appropriations as long as the Department of Interior distorts the law by curbstone legal opinions. I have been very liberal, as a minority member from one of the Eastern States, in voting for such appropriations, but I shall not vote for another one until the Department of the Interior observes the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount of Fort Peck project, Montana, $480,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: Page 31, line 21, strike out "$480,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call the attention of the House to certain features in regard to this item that have been deleted by the Appropriations Committee. You have seen fit in the past to install a generator at Fort Peck with a capacity of some 35,000 kilowatts. You have appropriated money for an additional generator of another 35,000 kilowatts capacity. In order that these generators may be put to some use it is necessary that we have certain transmission lines. These lines must be built or this investment will lie idle and will not be used. There is no conflict in this area between the local utilities and this power project. A contract has been drawn up that is satisfactory to all concerned.

I realize that this is a deficiency bill, but the Congress has made certain investments in this Fort Peck power project and the only way they can get any return out of it, the only way they can get any money out of it or return on

their investment is to build these transmission lines.

A great deal has been said this afternoon about rates. The present rates are merely tentative rates; we are in the course of negotiating a new schedule of rates for the use of this Fort Peck power. I have personally visited the Federal Power Commission, the Power Division of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and they have all agreed to rewrite that rate on a basis that not only will repay the investment of the Government in building the transmission lines, but will repay the original investment that was made, and that will in every way possible meet the wishes of the local people.

The committee report states that these lines should be built by the REA. It is not possible for the REA to build transmission lines that will serve this whole community.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This $2,000,000 additional which is needed to build the transmission line will be of assistance not only to northeastern Montana but down through southeastern and southcentral Montana and the western part of North Dakota as well. Is not that correct?

Mr. D'EWART. That is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This appropriation will be repaid within a reasonable time, and at the same time it will give material benefit to the people in these areas I have mentioned. This is an extremely meritorious project and I sincerely hope that the full amount will be restored so that the benefits desired by these folks will be given to them.

Mr. D'EWART. My colleague is exactly right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I hope the gentleman's splendid statement will be given the attention it deserves and that his arguments will be heeded.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. Is it not true that the committee's action virtually puts a cork in the bottle of energy created by this dam and power installation built by the taxpayers' money?

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct. In order to get the benefit of these generators which Congress has seen fit to provide and install it is necessary that we have these transmission lines.

I sincerely hope that this Committee will approve my amendment so that these transmission lines may be constructed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) there were—ayes 27, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Missouri River Basin (reimbursable): For the partial accomplishment of the works to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), $10,269,100, to remain available until expended.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the committee took out $2,035,000 of the appropriation for the construction and study of transmission lines. I am not criticizing the committee because I know it had a difficult job, but I have also discovered that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is not correct when he assumes that his committee is infallible. This because the ranking minority member successfully assailed the finding of the committee and offered an amendment that took out of the bill a sufficient amount to take care of these studies and transmission lines.

I also am sorry that many Members do not realize what these transmission lines are for. Here we are building a dam for flood control that, as a byproduct, produces electricity. We take money from the taxpayers to build the dam, that we bottle up the electrical energy and deny to the people the use of the very thing that their money creates.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very frank. It seems to me that is idiotic, even though it is done by an act of Congress.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman agree that the very program of the power companies today is to let the people build the dams provided they can get control of all the electricity at the dam after it is built?

Mr. LEMKE. That is correct. I want to say in this connection that North Dakota and the surrounding States, the nine Missouri River Basin States, are for this project. They have been criticizing very severely the Bureau of Reclamation for not building transmission lines when in fact the Congress has been responsible. It has refused to give the Bureau the money with which to do it. It is your responsibility. It is not the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation but the responsibility of the Members of Congress who have refused the Bureau these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of an amendment that will be offered later, and I am also in favor of all the amendments that will be or have been offered to remove the cork from the bottle in which the electrical energy is bottled up—the electrical energy that is created by building dams with the taxpayers' money.

I am in favor of this amendment, and all other amendments, that will remove the cork from the bottle in which electrical energy is bottled up—electrical energy created by building dams with the taxpayers' money. Why build dams if part of the purpose for which they are being built is not to be utilized? The Missouri River Basin project, as authorized by Congress, is a multiple-purpose project. As set forth in the Pick-Sloan plan, the project includes water conservation for irrigation and navigation. It includes power development for the Government and its various agencies, for municipalities, for the REA, for cooperatives, and other domestic purposes. It includes flood control.

I am sorry that the committee saw fit to eliminate the study and building of transmission lines. I have confidence in the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that it eliminated these items under misapprehension. I, therefore, ask that the committee withdraw its opposition to the restoration of these items. These transmission lines are like public roads. There must first be a study and survey and then construction. The electrical energy created by these dams cannot be used unless the roads are there. The transmission lines—the roads—must be there at the time or before the energy is produced.

Congress accepted the Pick-Sloan plan on December 22, 1944, when it passed Public Law 534 and adopted Senate Document 247. The complete development of the multiple-purpose, Pick-Sloan plan will add billions of new wealth to the Nation. Why not turn on the green light and go ahead?

In the past the Bureau of Reclamation has been unjustly censured because it did not distribute the electrical energy at Fort Peck to the REA, to municipalities, and to cooperatives. The people did not know that the Bureau had never been given funds with which to construct these transmission lines. They did not realize that during the war no material was available, and that that was the reason that Congress did not appropriate the necessary funds. But now that the war is over, it is the duty of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress to provide funds for the study and construction of transmission lines so as to carry out the multiple purposes of the Pick-Sloan plan.

Unless Congress furnishes the funds, no plan connected with the development of this basin will succeed. I hope that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee will not object and that this House will now restore the Budget's estimates for these appropriations. I cannot believe that this Congress is not fully awake to the need of the prompt development of the Missouri River Basin along the Pick-Sloan multiple-purpose plan. Let us consider this matter calmly. It is not a partisan issue; it is an American issue—an issue of twentieth-century progress. It is the demand of the nine Missouri River Basin States. It is the demand of the Nation.

The people of my State and of the entire Missouri River Basin are not going to like the first deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1946 unless it is amended to permit them to obtain the full benefits of the power plants we are building in the valley in connection with irrigation and reclamation projects.

The bill disallows $515,700 for power-market and transmission-lines studies by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri River Basin—studies without which the Government cannot intelligently build the lines which will assure an abundant flow of low-cost power from the people's own power plants. Such denial appears to be a move to force the Bureau of Reclamation to sell electric power to private utilities at the busbar—a principle which the utilities now wish

to establish in reversal of long-standing precedent.

The bill also disallows the $2,000,000 requested for the construction of transmission lines from the Port Peck power plant, except $480,000 for a line to Williston, for which $480,000 is allowed. In its report the Appropriations Committee specifically states that "funds for additional transmission lines and substations to supply Fort Peck power to private power companies, REA cooperatives, and for irrigation pumping" are disallowed, "it being the opinion that such lines and substations should be constructed by the agency which proposes to use the power."

I wish to call your attention to the fact that the North Dakota country which I represent is not thickly settled, and that if the construction of transmission lines, r any of which would be over long distances, is left to the private utilities and cooperatives of the area, that it will be many a long year before the people of my State, and surrounding States, are served adequately. Only the Federal Government can provide the initiative and finances to undertake an adequate distribution of power in this region—a distribution which will be like an injection of new life blood, and which will enable this area to grow and to absorb the large quantities of power that can be produced through the development of irrigation dams and flood-control dams.

Congress already has recognized this situation and given the people of the Missouri River Basin new hope. In the act authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to distribute and sell the power produced at the Fort Peck project, an act which became the law on May 18, 1938, the Congress declared:

In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electrical energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization thereof by limited groups, the Bureau is authorized and directed to provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto, as it finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Fort Peck project to existing and potential markets, and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Fort Peck project with either private or with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now and hereafter constructed.

Denial of such funds now that we are ready to proceed with a great developmental program for the Missouri River Basin not only would in effect nullify the promise Congress has given but it would be a destructive blow at the entire Missouri River Basin development. It would be a clear indication that the Congress does not intend an economical and coordinated development of the resources of this great area, for without the low-cost power distributed by the Federal Government there could not be low-cost irrigation water or low-cost energy for the development of industry. It would mean that the repayment for construction would be greatly impaired and delayed. It means that the Missouri River Basin development would be strangled at its birth.

Let me remind you once again of the obligations the Congress has undertaken. Only last December the principle of Federal distribution of surplus electric power was laid down in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 after considerable debate. This section reads:

Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under control of the War Department, and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects, shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. * * * Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives.

Can electric power generated at War Department and Bureau of Reclamation dams be distributed according to these principles of the Flood Control Act of 1944, if current is to be sold to private power monopolies at the busbar? Can the Secretary of the Interior function as you have ordered him, if you deny him funds to make power market studies and to construct transmission lines?

We cannot afford to pl. e such a handicap upon the development of any region within the United States, when encouraging a high level of economic activity is the only hope we have of avoiding a terrible postwar depression, when it is one of the few hopes of giving jobs to the men returning from battlefields of the war that has just ended. Congress must do all it can to encourage the development of industrial activity and agricultural prosperity, or assume a responsibility for which the people most certainly will hold it to account. This is a principle for which we must stand today, rather than to enact legislation which only serves special power utility interests.

If the implication is to be drawn that the committee is not in favor of the construction of Government transmission lines to serve the people from the people's own power plants, it has raised an issue that should be debated most fully on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Government now owns thousands of miles of such transmission lines, and the people of every area in which they have been built will testify as to their benefits.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the development of these power features is the one way we have to pay back the taxpayers money that is invested in the project?

Mr. LEMKE. That is absolutely true and I cannot understand why we always do things back end forward. I am satisfied we will again have to go over to the Senate and get these appropriations back into the bill. There we will have a sufficient opportunity to at least present the need for these appropriations. I am sure that the Committee on Appropriations of the House, when it discovers its error, when it discovers it is not infallible, will correct the error we are pointing out here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Committee to the situation that exists at this point. When the Flood Control Act was passed in 1944 there was authorized an expenditure of $200,000,000 in the Missouri River project for reclamation and $200,000,000 for flood control, making a total, as I recall, of $400,000,000.

There was recommended, Mr. Chairman, for flood control, on the Missouri River approximately the same amount as for reclamation. However, we have before us here today approximately $12,000,000 for reclamation. We have nothing for flood control. If we provide an appropriation for reclamation we ought to provide an adequate amount for flood control. So either we ought to take out this item entirely for reclamation or we should adopt the recommendation of the Civil Functions Committee of the War Department and add the necessary amount for flood control.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that we all ought to bear in mind in connection with flood-control projects that to a very large extend flood-control aspects and power aspects are incompatible. The power aspect requires a full dam. The flood-control project requires an empty dam. If we are not careful, we will develop projects for both flood control and power development which will be disastrous failures as flood-control projects.

Mr. NORRELL. You cannot build the top of a dam for power until you build the bottom for flood control.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I quite agree with the gentleman. Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 a coordinated program for the development and control of the Missouri River was worked out between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. We in the West feel appropriations should be made for each of these agencies. We want the reclamation program carried out as soon as possible so farms can be provided for the returning soldiers and provide jobs for them in the construction of these projects.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the gentleman that I do not believe the Committee on Appropriations has allowed one dollar of funds solely for unemployment purposes. These projects ought to go along together. They are coordinated, and if you are going to have one you ought to have the other at the same time.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Of course these appropriations are not work projects but they will provide work. They are very worthwhile projects. While the committee has made appropriations for reclamation they have failed to appropriate for flood control. In my opinion we should have both.

Mr. NORRELL. I wanted to call that to the attention of the House so that we may understand the situation.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said during this debate regarding our enormous national debt, and in the beginning I would like to say that I am, and have been, as concerned regarding the national debt as anyone anywhere in this country. This great concern has compelled me to vote against many very desirable and beneficial authorization bills. My record during my tenure of office will show that I have probably voted against as many authorization bills as any other Member of Congress. I am alarmed at the rate of expenditures of the Nation. I have been alarmed not only since becoming a Member of Congress but many years prior thereto.

I may have been criticized at times for voting against many worth-while measures too numerous here to itemize, but my negative vote was not because I did not concur in the program desired to be inaugurated, or the fact that I did not think that someone was entitled to an increase in salary, on the other hand I recognized that the increases were well deserving and that the projects were most beneficial, but I construed it my duty to vote against the measures because of the terrific debt that we have, due of course in a large measure to expenditures during the war. I challenge any Member of Congress to show where he has been any more economical than I have been. Probably at times I have gone to the extreme.

However, the question before us today is simply this, whether or not the Appropriations Committee should provide the House with an opportunity of voting on appropriation measures in accordance with authorization bills heretofore passed.

All of the criticism regarding the amendment providing appropriations for rivers, harbors, and flood-control projects have been with reference to the expenditure of the money. These criticisms should have been directed toward the authorization bills. Congress, in passing these authorization bills, said that the project should be constructed in a certain way as provided in the report of the Army engineers. Congress also said that there shall be provided a certain amount of money for the construction of these projects. Now the members of the Appropriations Committee are servants of the House of Representatives. These bills constitute directives, orders, or decrees to us. I have to admit that I have voted against many appropriation items. However, to that extent I have voted against doing what Congress directs us to do. And, I may say, I opposed many of the items in the rivers, harbors, and flood-control program as presented in the Snyder amendment. I am opposed to a large number of these projects. I am a great believer in the private enterprise system and do not desire to have the Government conduct its affairs in such way that it will eventually force any legitimate private enterprise out of business. I think the Government should regulate, not liquidate. If a firm is charging too much in rates, the Government should be able through its strong arm to regulate such enterprise and establish reasonable and fair rates. However, I am in favor of a large majority of these projects and after Congress has authorized these projects I see nothing the committee can do but to give this Congress an opportunity of saying whether or not it desires to make the necessary appropriation.

That is what the Civil Functions Subcommittee has tried to do. It is up to this House now as to whether or not it desires to make the necessary appropriation.

The Deficiency Subcommittee gave as its reason for deleting the items for rivers, harbors, and flood control, that they were not satisfied with the investigation which had been made regarding the projects. I quote part of their reasons as disclosed on page 5 of the report:

> The bill excludes provision for any of the foregoing items. The committee believes that a number of the undertakings should have further investigation.

Further on in this paragraph they say:

> Rather than propose a partial program, approval is withheld of the entire submission for reconsideration by the War Department Subcommittee early in January.

Therefore, the sole reason given by the Deficiency Subcommittee for deleting these items was not because they opposed any of the items but because they felt that further study should be made and that the program before us, together with additional projects approved by the War Department, all should be included in the projects to be submitted to the War Department Subcommittee in January.

Now, let us see what was necessary for these projects to be before us at this time.

First, there must be an investigation authorized. In order to secure the investigation, local communities investigate and become interested in the projects and take the same up with their Members of Congress or Senator. These Congressmen and Senators investigate to determine whether, in their judgment, the projects are desirable and necessary, and if so, they file resolutions in the House or Senate asking that an investigation be made by the Army engineers These resolutions are referred to the respective jurisdictional committees of the Senate and House, the Commerce Committee in the Senate and the Flood Control Committee in the House, where they are investigated further, and if approved they are submitted in the form of a bill to the Congress and when passed by Congress and approved by the President, formal investigation is authorized by law.

Let us see what further investigations are made. After the law is passed the projects are referred to the various district engineers having jurisdiction of the community in which the project is located. The district engineer conducts public hearings, permits everyone to testify, acquires all available data, determines the necessity and feasibility of the project and submits this information, his findings, and recommendations to the regional engineer. The regional engineer reviews the same, makes any additional investigation deemed necessary, and submits all information with his comments and recommendations to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors then issues a statement reviewing briefly the contents of the recommendations, sending copies of this review to every interested party. This information goes to the Members of Congress of the respective States, Federal officials or agencies who have indicated some degree of interest, State officials and agencies, governors, local governmental bodies such as State, county, and city officials, local organizations, utilities involved, business corporations, chambers of commerce, postmasters, newspapers, and all individuals who have at any time expressed any interest one way or the other, and to a multiplicity of other organizations and individuals and oftentimes conducts public hearings, receives and considers all evidence, data, and information of any character or description which any of the several organizations and individuals may desire to submit. They will hear any evidence or argument of any other person or organization to whom such notice may not have been sent.

After all have had opportunity of being heard, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors make their findings and recommendations to the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, where it is further reviewed and, if approved, is submitted to the Secretary of War for further review. Then the Secretary of War, if he is satisfied with the project, submits his recommendations to the Congress and it is referred to the House Flood Control Committee if a House resolution, or to the Senate committee if a Senate resolution, where the matter is given further consideration and study. The committee hears all witnesses either for or against the project, and after public hearings they reach a conclusion as to what should be done and make their recommendations to the House or Senate in the form of a bill. The bill is considered by the Congress and the construction of no project can be authorized unless it receives a majority vote of the Congress and the bill is signed by the President.

At this time you have a law authorizing the construction of the projects. Congress has expressed itself. The Appropriations Committee has received its orders, but the investigations do not stop here.

After the law is passed providing for the construction of a project, then it becomes the duty of the Chief of Engineers to submit to the Bureau of the

Budget estimates for construction costs. Further investigation is made by the Bureau of the Budget and if the Bureau of the Budget does not approve, it never reaches the Civil Functions Subcommittee. If the Budget does approve, then it must go to the President for his consideration, and if it is approved by the President it is then submitted to the House Appropriations Committee, where additional hearings are held. In the projects before us, the committee heard testimony of every witness insofar as I know, who made request to be heard. General Robins and other War Department officials testified. And, after hearings which are before you, and which contain 665 printed pages, and after the committee had deleted several millions of dollars from the estimates, the Civil Functions Subcommittee reported to the Deficiency Subcommittee appropriations for the projects embodied in the Snyder amendment. These projects have been reviewed many times by some of these officials. Appropriation bills have passed this Congress for practically all of these projects, but work was stopped because of the war.

This Congress, therefore, has approved many of these projects over and over and over. Have they been properly investigated? Do they need further study? If we are not going to repeal a multiplicity of these authorizations, I see nothing which further study could do, and yet I am opposed to a portion of this program. As previously stated, I voted against the authorization bills of some of them, and against many of the appropriation items in the committee, but they are here. Congress has authorized their construction, and I see nothing other than this that your Subcommittee on War Department Civil Functions could do than to make these items available so that if you meant what you said when you passed the authorization bills you can now pass the appropriation.

Any objection to the items involved here should have been made during the preliminary investigations, during the hearings of the congressional committees, or during the consideration on the floor. In view of the previous action in passing these authorization bills, I see nothing now that you can consistently do except to pass the Snyder amendment, and I expect to vote for it.

In conclusion I would like to repeat that I am more than alarmed over our national financial structure, and suggest that many of the authorization bills on the statutes should probably be repealed. It might be well that a survey be made to determine what additional projects have been authorized, and if, in the light of conditions at this time, it is believed that those projects should not be constructed, bills should be passed repealing the laws under which they were authorized. Notwithstanding my opposition to a portion of this bill carrying out the will of Congress, I see nothing I can do except to support the Snyder amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes of the Committee's time to commend the Committee on Appropriations, both the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Department of the Interior and the Deficiency Committee itself for the substantial sums placed in this deficiency bill for reclamation and irrigation. I likewise want to call to your attention the fact that there were additional sums of money allowed for investigational purposes, not as much, perhaps, as many of us think adequate, but nevertheless a recognition of these important moneys. These investigation moneys are used for preconstruction surveys, and it is through these preconstruction surveys that irrigation projects move from the feasible to the approved stage. There is coming before the Bureau of Reclamation before long some additional reports made out in the field concerning projects that will stand on their own merits. Among these is the Kennewick-Highland division of the Yakima project of the State of Washington, an outstanding project, one of the most meritorious irrigation projects in the United States. It is too bad that the Bureau's report was not in soon enough to place it before the Deficiency Appropriation Committee of the House for this appropriation bill.

I am urging the Bureau of Reclamation, through the use of these preconstruction survey moneys, to get their report in as soon as possible so as to make it feasible for this project to be eligible to go before the Bureau of the Budget for a request for funds for construction. There is no question but that this project should receive an excellent report and should be submitted by the Bureau to budget and then to regular appropriation. I do hope that the Bureau will do everything within its power to get this report in so that the project can go up for appropriation.

In closing my remarks, I commend the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, who are designated by the Deficiency Committee to go over these matters, likewise the Deficiency Committee of the House, for the substantial sums of moneys that were placed into the Irrigation and Reclamation program.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to compliment the action of the whole Committee on Appropriations and the Interior and Deficiency Subcommittees for the constructive action on western reclamation.

I am hopeful that a part of the funds here granted for general investigations will be used for studies looking toward the rapid consummation of the Greater Wenatchee irrigation project near the city of that name and the continuation of the Rathdrum Prairie project near Spokane.

Both of these can use waste summer power, provide a market for this waste power, and thereby further insure the Federal investments in the Columbia River.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I chose this time to speak for the reason that the paragraph to which we are addressing ourselves seems to be as close as this bill comes to flood control. Much has been said here on the floor today and yesterday and the day before in reference to economy, but when it comes to these emergency flood-control projects it seems to me we are very much in the position of a man the roof of whose house is leaking. He may look out in good weather and figure that it costs a good deal to repair that roof and he can postpone the work of repairing it and thereby save money; but when the rains come and the storms beat upon it, he knows he has been guilty of false economy and his damage has been greatly increased.

In striking out the recommendations of the Budget in reference to flood control, it is my humble opinion the committee has been guilty of false economy. In the year 1945, this country experienced its worst floods in history. Down in the Southwest especially where the floods are very bad, I refer to the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas. The Army engineers estimated the damages from floods for the entire country for that 1 year to be in excess of $102,000,000. More than 15,000,000 acres were inundated by the floodwaters.

If we could by building appropriate emergency flood-control projects save even a reasonable percentage of the flood damage for the year 1945 we would go a long way towards repaying ourselves for the expenditures we hope this Congress will make on flood control.

Some of these projects recommended by the Budget and having the support of the Army engineers as emergency projects are projects which were begun some time back and are now in varying stages of completion. There are undoubtedly other such projects, but I have in mind one that is 94 percent completed, yet we are told that that project must be reinvestigated and there must be a redetermination of the appropriation of that 6 percent additional money necessary to complete that project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my good friend from Oklahoma, who I am pleased to say, did the most unusual thing of declining a Federal judgeship to remain in Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As the gentleman will recall, there are 59 such projects that were not only investigated thoroughly but actually started but were stopped because of the war. The action of the committee, of which I am a member, without my consent or approval, eliminated those projects also. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his forceful and timely statement.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much.

With reference to that particular project which is 94 percent complete, had that project not been stopped because of the war it would have cost only $80,000 to complete it, but now because of the delay due to the war and because of the

further delay now due to the lack of appropriations, it will cost $190,000 to complete it. This fact shows the false economy of continually postponing the completion of projects already begun and substantially completed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, National Capital parks: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses, National Capital parks," including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, $70,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we can go a long ways toward underwriting national prosperity in this country by more fully developing the great natural resources of the West. I am sure that members of the Appropriations Committee of the House had that in mind in giving such favorable consideration to supplemental appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. The investment of such funds in irrigation and multiple-purpose projects will be returned many times over. It is an investment in jobs, farms, and business opportunities for thousands of our returning service men and for many others who will share in the benefits of such developments.

I am gratified that the committee has recommended such a substantial sum for the work of the Bureau of Reclamation. At the same time I am keenly disappointed at the action taken in slashing funds requested for general investigations from $3,000,000 to a half million dollars. I hope the House will restore this fund to the original amount. Otherwise the Bureau is going to be seriously hampered in carrying out the engineering and economic investigations on a good many projects.

One of the proposed projects which may be hit by this drastic reduction is located in eastern Oregon. The reduction will similarly affect other projects in many States of the West. Let me tell you something about the situation which confronts one of the communities in my district.

We have at The Dalles in eastern Oregon one of the finest fruit-growing districts in the United States. There are about 5,000 acres in orchards—some 4,000 acres in cherries, the rest in peaches, apricots, and other fruits. The individual holdings are small—averaging probably around 25 acres. The gross value of the cherry crop this year in the district amounted to about three and one-half million dollars.

It has taken years and years to develop these orchards. For some families it has been the work of a lifetime. Yet now, through no fault of their own, many of them face economic ruin, and the whole fruit-growing industry in the area is threatened. Because of the serious droughts of the past few years many of the trees are dying, and unless immediate action is taken to provide a supplemental water supply through irrigation, irreparable damage will be done.

Fortunately there is a way to provide the irrigation that will save these orchards and protect the community from economic disaster and losses that may run into millions of dollars. It can be done through pumping water from the Columbia River.

This is one of many projects on which the Bureau is prepared to undertake investigations to determine engineering and economic feasibility if sufficient funds for such studies are provided. I should explain that there is very little irrigation in the Dalles area at present. It has not been necessary. But now an emergency situation has developed because of drought conditions. The average annual rainfall has diminished gradually from about 16 inches to 6 inches. Some growers, in desperation, have sunk wells to a depth of 350 feet and installed their own sprinkler systems in efforts to save their orchards. This method is too costly, however, for most of them and is not a permanent solution to the problem, since underground water supplies are not adequate to provide for pumping from a large number of wells. Furthermore, the State engineer is reluctant to grant any more permits for wells serving irrigation purposes.

The people of Wasco County are counting on help from the Bureau of Reclamation to meet this problem and to help them save their orchards. Their hope is that a supplemental water supply can be pumped from the Columbia River, a few miles away, to provide for irrigation by a sprinkler system. Before that can be done the Bureau is required by law to make a thorough investigation to find out whether such a plan is feasible from an engineering standpoint, whether it is economically sound, how much it would cost, and whether the growers would be able to repay such costs. Many other factors would also have to be taken into consideration.

The point I wish to make is that this is just one of many worth-while projects on which the Bureau's hands may be tied because of insufficient funds to make the necessary investigations. Other Members of the House could cite projects in their States which would be affected similarly by the proposed $2,500,000 slash in the Bureau's general investigations appropriation. I hope that the House will not concur in that reduction by the committee and that we can restore this item to substantially the same amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, the work on the Columbia Basin project began in 1933. The project includes the Grand Coulee Dam which is a multiple-purpose structure serving flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power generation, irrigation, and minor related benefits; the power plants at the toe of Grand Coulee Dam; and the irrigation system to water more than a million acres of land between Ephrata and Pasco, Wash. The dam has been completed. It is as much a part of the irrigation project as it is a part of the power project, or a part of the flood-control project, or a part of the navigation project; in other words, it is an integral part of the multiple-purpose Columbia Basin project.

The left powerhouse was completed and the right powerhouse was virtually completed before the war. The generators and turbines for six of the main units in the left powerhouse were installed. Other generators are yet to be manufactured and placed. The power serves to increase the energy available in the Northwest. During the war it made possible a contribution of about one-third of the Nation's light metal supply. The revenues from the power repaid the allocations of cost made to power and about three-fourths of the allocations of cost made to irrigation, and the power is essential to the pumping of water from Lake Roosevelt, created by Grand Coulee Dam in the Columbia River, to the Grand Coulee itself from which the irrigation canals lead to the lands.

The irrigation phase of the project is represented in Grand Coulee Dam, a part of the power plant and output, the pumping plant which was constructed as a part of Grand Coulee Dam, tunnels leading from the pumping plant up into the Grand Coulee, engineering plans and specifications that have been completed for dams in the Grand Coulee and the parts of the canal systems, which are already completed and by work yet to be done, including the construction of dams in the Grand Coulee and the main canal and lateral systems.

In other words, work on the irrigation phase of the Columbia Basin project was begun in 1933. The project is a multiple-purpose project, and the authorization of one phase of the project is identical with that of other phases. There is no secondary position either in authorization or in time given to irrigation. Every year since 1933 some new facility designed to serve only the irrigation project has been constructed or begun. The fact that the major part of the expenditures remaining yet to be made on the Columbia Basin project is chargeable to irrigation does not in any way constitute a separation of irrigation from the other benefits of the project or mean that work on the irrigation project has not already been started. It simply has not been completed as rapidly as work on other phases of the project.

The Clerk read as follows:

Traveling expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Traveling expenses", including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1946, $35,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, according to all reports only a miracle can save the labor-management conference from abysmal failure. Every participant in that conference on both sides had one patriotic duty to his country—to reach agreement and thus at least narrow the area of conflict between labor and management. The only way that could have been done was if both sides yielded on some points and if neither side insisted on having its own way completely. Apparently in disregard of the general public welfare

no one has been willing to yield at all. Both management and labor will be clamoring at the doors of Congress demanding that we do this, that and the other thing that one side or the other wants done. But when it came to doing an unselfish patriotic act themselves it appears that up to date at least there has been little willingness on anyone's part to budge from their own extreme position though very great issues hang in the balance.

I warn both management and labor that their failure to agree together places responsibility squarely upon the Government to protect the interest of the whole people. I am fearful as to what such action might be. Serious mistakes like the Smith-Connally act must not be repeated, but in the face of continuous industrial conflict some action will be taken by Congress. That is almost certain. I most earnestly hope it will be wise, fair and two-sided action. The price of freedom from governmental control is for management and labor to get along at least reasonably well.

There is one measure that ought to be taken immediately—because it is so clearly right that no one can fairly oppose it. Here it is: In connection with every important labor dispute the Secretary of Labor should promptly appoint a group of impartial citizens to determine and publish the full facts bearing on the dispute. I understand that a few people on the labor side and a good many on the management side are opposed to this because they say the facts are none of the public's business. In heaven's name then what is the public's business? America is bigger than all of management and all of labor put together and that point had best be made clear right now. And the best way perhaps of all to make it clear is to say that we the people have a right to know all the truth and we are going to know it and to base our judgment as to who is right and who is wrong on those facts. For this the force of public opinion could intelligently be brought to bear and it is earnestly to be hoped we might not have to go further than that.

In fact I am today introducing a resolution for this purpose. And the main reason I am doing it is because this is the direction in which the greatest single force for good in American life is pointing. That force is religion. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews alike have urged this action in the name of their churches. Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the messages to the labor-management conference from the National Catholic Welfare Conference and from the Federal Council of Churches and from the Synagogue Council of America; I also include the text of my resolution:

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 18, 1945.—The following letter was sent today to the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, and to Judge Walter P. Stacy, chairman, Labor-Management Conference:

"The Department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to make a suggestion to the Department of Labor of the United States and to the labor-management conference.

"The suggestion grows out of two facts that hinder the settlement of labor disputes. One is the danger that if strikes of great magnitude occur, laws enforcing compulsory arbitrary may ensue. That would be tragic. Voluntary arbitration is good, but compulsory arbitration is a long leap down the totalitarian road and is no help toward the proper settlement of disputes on either side. It will, in fact, not be accepted so long as the working people and the employers are Americans and believe in their dignity as sons of God.

"The other fact is that methods of conciliation and voluntary arbitration often lack that thorough knowledge of the facts underlying the disputes which normally is necessary for a just agreement or a just decision.

"Our proposal is a modest one but one of far-reaching importance. It is that a method of fact finding be set up to reinforce conciliation, arbitration, collective bargaining and the attitude of the public toward any important labor dispute; that the fact finding be in the hands of a board representative of neither side of the dispute but representative of, as far as possible, impartial members of the public; that the President of the United States or the Secretary of Labor appoint them; that as many boards, national, regional, or local, be set up as are required to aid in the settlement of major disputes; that these fact-finding bodies be instructed to report quickly; and that they receive statements from both sides in the dispute and from other competent witnesses, and have available all the pertinent knowledge which the Federal or State Governments possess. These boards would make the facts known. They would make no decision as to the dispute. They would present the facts to fortify the right side in a dispute.

"Threats of major strikes now loom. Other strikes seem to be in the offing. Others will occur after this present period ends. We recommend this fact-finding procedure both for current disputes and for the future. The facts will furnish ground for just agreements in collective bargaining and just decisions in arbitration.

"We consider this proposal both as a way to help settle current disputes and as a permanent policy of the American Government and the governments of the States. We do not contemplate this procedure except in important cases.

"The usefulness of these boards depends upon their being established early in a dispute and upon the speed of their action. Delayed statements of fact would be calamitous.

"We think that there are enough honest and capable persons in our country to man these boards in the interest of the general good.

"Sincerely yours,

"KARL J. ALTER,
"Chairman, Social Action Department, N. C. W. C., Bishop of Toledo."

NOVEMBER 20, 1945.

Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM,
Labor-Management Conference,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Desire to urge that Conciliation Service be extended and its representatives become residents of localities rather than sent in for special cases, and for each local office an advisory board be appointed with representatives of civic and religious groups who could advise and assist in conciliation of cases of potential conflict in early stages long before develop as strikes. Also urge that in case of strikes a citizens' fact-finding board be appointed by the President of the United States to determine all pertinent facts, including wages, profits, and prices, and make them known to the public.

RABBI AHRON OPHER,
Assistant to the President, Synagogue Council of America.
JAMES MYERS,
Industrial Secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Whereas the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the Synagogue Council of America, representing the forces of religion in America have officially urged the employment of fact-finding bodies as an instrument in the orderly settlement of industrial disputes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that as a means of resolving conflicts between labor and management and thus serving the general welfare of all the people, the Secretary of Labor shall adopt the policy of establishing impartial fact-finding bodies for the purpose of determining all pertinent facts bearing upon such conflicts as a means of providing a basis for their settlement in a manner fair and just to both parties and in accordance with the general public interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD at a point immediately following the remarks made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Post office stationery, equipment and supplies: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Post office stationery, equipment, and supplies", including the objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1946, $3,600: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount available for the pay of employees in the District of Columbia in connection with the shipment of supplies is increased from "$63,900" to "$67,400."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the very able statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] with regard to the labor-management conference. It is rather unfortunate that labor and management cannot get together and settle their own differences. I do not believe, however, we should superimpose upon either labor or management any Government compulsory arbitration, because just as soon as we do that it will pyramid and pyramid until such time as we have heaped upon this Nation something other than democracy, and that is socialism. I am opposed to socialism, communism, or any other kind of "ism." I believe in real, honest-to-goodness democracy. Compulsory arbitration means the end of collective bargaining.

When the gentleman states that he wants to set up a fact-finding body to determine the facts as to labor and management I am wondering how in the world we are going to be able to get to the real facts unless the books of both are open to public scrutiny to such a point that they may be able actually to have the facts whereby they will be able

to make a just decision. It cannot be done by just looking into a crystal ball.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think, of course, that would have to be done if all the facts in the case are going to be developed.

I should like to point out to the gentleman that the point I was trying to make was that I am not in favor of Government controls in this field any more than the gentleman or anybody else. I am against them. But what I did say was that the public interest was paramount. I believe that must be recognized by everybody, and I do criticize the attitude of any person who says that the facts are none of the public's business. I think the facts are definitely the public's business. I think they should be brought out and presented in all these cases as one of the means of enabling the public to base its judgment.

Mr. HOOK. That is a fact. The further facts are these:

In the dispute between General Motors and the United Automobile Workers of America, the latter has requested time and time again voluntary arbitration, but the head of General Motors says, "You cannot look at our books, you cannot go into anything that is curs; the prices of our products and profits we make are no business of the public or no business of anyone but our organization." In other words, they have taken a "public be damned" attitude.

The United Automobile Workers have offered to appoint one public member, a man not connected with labor, if General Motors will pick one man as a public member not connected with their organization and that those two pick a third man, and not go completely into the books of the company but get just enough facts as will enable them to come to a just decision without looking into a crystal ball.

If General Motors is allowed an increase in prices, I know the union would not agree to an increase in a wage scale based on an increase in prices, because we would have a spiral of inflation in this country that would destroy the Nation. The unions say, "We do not want an increase in wages if there must be an increase in prices." That is the issue. General Motors for inflation, the unions against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasant day when I find myself in agreement on at least one point with the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]. I agree with the gentleman from California that the profits of General Motors are of concern to the public; I agree that the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury officials in getting up a tax program and for the purpose of collecting a tax have the right to go into the books of General Motors, or any other corporation, but I do not go so far as to agree with the gentleman from California that it is the business or the right of Walter Reuther or the UAW-CIO to look into those books and based upon what they find, formulate demands for wages or fix the prices at which the products of the company shall be sold.

In days gone by when wage increases were asked corporations have opened their books to Government agencies and it was found that some could not afford to pay the wages demanded by the employees, nevertheless the companies were forced to pay not less than the minimum wage fixed by statute and at times ordered to grant some of the demands, even though the order might mean the wiping out of jobs on which those men depended for their livelihood.

So the answer is: The public has the right to know, for the purpose of taxation, for the purpose of drafting tax laws, what corporations, including General Motors, are making, but it is not the business of a private individual or of a private organization to ride herd on what any individual or corporation in this country makes.

I am happy to agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], if he is correct in his statement, if I interpret his statement correctly; that is that the Government should not interfere on either side in these disputes. That is good news to me because since 1937 the Government of the United States, right on down to the present time, has been interfering in favor of certain labor politicians, in many an industrial dispute. I call as witnesses John L. Lewis, William Green, Philip Murray. They have stated that the Government has stuck its nose unjustifiably into union business and has misconstrued and maladministered the National Labor Relations law. I am happy to hear the gentleman from Michigan say that the Government should keep its nose out of business and out of labor disputes. I am inclined to believe, however, that the thing which caused the gentleman to voice these sentiments is the fact that the UAW-CIO has discovered that it has bit off more than it can chew, it has a bull by the tail and cannot handle the situation. Perhaps the gentleman fears that a justified aroused public sentiment—a people determined to have speedy reconversion might force the Government—if it acts at all—to insist that the interests and property of the owners of industrial plants be protected, that the public be safeguarded.

Apparently the General Motors strike is getting more men out of employment than was expected. The UAW-CIO has not been able to pick off General Motors first and then going on to Ford and Chrysler to play off two auto companies against the third. It has thousands of employees on strike or out of jobs now, and if this vote in Little Steel is acted upon it will have three or four hundred thousand more men out of jobs, and neither UAW. CIO. or PAC or any one or all of those wrecking crews or their sponsors is ready to supply a single job to any of those unemployed workers.

Just within the last 10 minutes there came to my desk a letter from a veteran with 5 years' service. He came home. He obtained a job in an electrical plant where the wage was $1.65 an hour. He was qualified for the job. He was told he would have to belong to the union before he could go to work. He went to the union. He made application for a union card. What did they tell him? They said, "Well, we can't give you a union card; you will have to serve an apprenticeship." Five years abroad in the service of his country did not count on the score card of the union. He could not meet the union requirements. So because he could not qualify under the union rules and regulations some man who stayed here in safety could hold down the good job and he who had served abroad in the combat area is denied the opportunity to work.

Is that equal justice under law?

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, foreign service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Representation allowances, foreign service", $23,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas:

Page 38, strike out all of lines 23 to 25 inclusive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes out the item of $23,000 in this bill for additional representation that is allowed as so-called representation allowances to be spent by our representatives abroad. About 3 years ago this Congress allowed $100,000 for this item. Then representatives of the State Department asked for and were allowed $250,000. Last year it was increased to the huge sum of $585,000. The item is called "representation." It is nearly all spent for whisky and other kinds of high-power liquor. I don't think anyone on the floor of this House will defend it on the ground it is used for other purposes. It is understood and agreed and admitted that it practically all goes to buy liquor. The taxpayers of this country are charged with the bill and it is handed over to our representatives abroad to provide liquor to entertain foreigners of other countries. I tried to reduce the $585,000 but did not secure enough support to get it done.

Now, it appears that right at the latter part of the year the fund has run short, so they are asking this Congress to replenish the fund with an additional $23,000. I hardly thought they would think of doing it. The last minute they come here in a deficiency bill and ask for $23,000 more. It seems to me that that is just about the last straw. It ought to

be observed that in addition to salaries, living quarters, traveling expenses, and so forth, our foreign representatives are provided with miscellaneous allowances and contingent expenses as indicated in this bill.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished Member from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Does the gentleman not think it is a bad idea to have these deficiency bills anyhow? They should have known that $500,000 or $600,000 was all the money we were going to give them and they should not then come in and ask for this additional $23,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agreed with my friend that it comes with pretty poor grace to ask for the additional $23,000 in a deficiency bill when they have already had $585,000 this year. I tried to get this House to cut the appropriation at the time it was considered this year. I thought the membership might at least agree on reducing it $200,000, but I did not get enough support to do it. So your Government and mine, is charged with $585,000 for this year, and evidently the money has been spent. At least they are asking for more. This is not just a question of so-called dry or wet; it is a question of principle if you are going to allow more than $600,000 of the people's money to be expended in this manner. Incidentally, $600,000 would buy a lot of food for hungry, starving people. To me the thing does not make sense.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, it does seem to me we Americans fall to a rather low ebb when we deem it necessary to spend $600 000 a year for our representatives to spend on liquor to entertain these foreigners in order to get along with them. I trust this House to agree with me and cut out this item of $23,000. It does not belong here, and I do not believe the committee itself will see fit to resist striking out this item. It is the amount itself compared with the entire appropriation is comparatively small but the principle of the thing is not good.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How many years have we done this?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know exactly, but it has increased from $100,000 to $600,000 in 4 years. It jumped about $300,000 in the last 2 years.

Mr. DONDERO. This is a good place to stop.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is time to stop. It should have been stopped long ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think if they had bought good California wine instead of whisky they would have had plenty of money to go around.

Mr. Chairman, the sum of $600,000 would pay for almost a half million bushels of wheat. It could be made into millions of loaves of bread. If you would put $600,000 worth of food in the hands of the Red Cross and let it be distributed among people in those countries who are starving and suffering from lack of food, you would come a lot nearer to cementing friendship and bringing about better understanding with these people than by buying liquor for foreign representatives. You could alleviate human suffering if you spend it for food. It will be wasted if you spend it for the purpose intended in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 69, noes 68.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The proviso contained in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, under the head "Rivers and harbors and flood control", reading "*Provided further*, That any appropriation for civil functions under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1946 shall be available for contracting in such manner as the Secretary of War may determine to be in the public interest without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or section 3 of the River and Harbor Act of August 11, 1888", is hereby repealed.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: On page 43, after line 2, insert the following:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Rivers and Harbors,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $25,516,000, to remain available until expended.

"FLOOD CONTROL

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, general', including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $81,759,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for constructing the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir beyond dimensions which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet or for constructing dikes or levees which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries', including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriations Act, 1946, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is merely to put back in the bill at this point the projects and the amounts of money sent up by the Bureau of the Budget for the projects that you will find in the hearings. In other words, it is putting back the money for all the rivers and harbors projects which were asked for by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and by the committee headed by the gentleman from Texas who held hearings on the projects. Then, Congress authorized these projects.

It also puts back all the harbor projects for flood control that were sent up here by the President, by the Bureau of the Budget, and which were referred to the Speaker, and then in turn to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in turn, referred them to me and my committee to hold hearings on them, which we did. We are putting those back in. We are also putting back the flood-control projects which the President asked for and the Bureau of the Budget recommended. They were sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and then, in turn, to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who, in turn, referred them to our subcommittee. We held hearings on them.

Above all, it puts back the rivers and harbors projects which the gentleman from Texas and his committee held extensive hearings on and found that they were economically feasible and justifiable. They were brought before the Congress, and Congress said: "You are right." In other words, the Congress said, "You are right on all these projects." And this amendment puts them all back in.

I am glad to present this statement which the able clerk of my committee, Mr. Lambert, has prepared for the benefit of the Committee of the Whole showing what my committee recommended in the four prewar years and the amount we are here recommending.

The statement is as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

FISCAL YEAR 1938

Hearings contained 95 pages, 87 of which were included in testimony presented by representatives of the War Department, and 8 pages by representatives of the Department of Agriculture making explanation of preliminary examinations and surveys of watersheds.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended for this year	$131,510,500
The subcommitted recommended	181,416,300
The Congress approved	181,616,300

FISCAL YEAR 1939

Hearings contained 246 pages, 93 of which were used for testimony of the War Department representatives, and 153 pages being used by others, mostly Members of Congress.

The Budget estimate	$183,821,800
The subcommittee recommended	Same
The Congress approved	Same

FISCAL YEAR 1940

Hearings contained 463 pages, 72 of which were used for testimony of representatives of the War Department, the remaining 391 by representatives of other departments, local organizations, and Members of Congress.

The Budget estimate	$277,800,000
The subcommittee recommended	Same
The Congress approved	Same

FISCAL YEAR 1941

Hearings contained 220 pages, 52 of which were used for testimony of representatives of the War Department, the remaining 168 by representatives of local organizations and Members of Congress.

The Budget estimate	$172,973,505.00
The subcommittee recommended	170,921,510.00
The Congress approved	176,017,660.00
And in the first supplemental the Congress approved	13,283,148.67
And in the first deficiency the Congress approved	1,500,000.00
Total approved by Congress	190,800,808.67

PRESENT DEFICIENCY BILL

Hearings contain 209 pages, 80 of which were used for testimony of representatives of the War Department, the remaining 129 by others, including representatives of organizations from Missouri, California, North Dakota, Louisiana, Arkansas, and perhaps other places, and a number of Members of Congress.

Amount recommended by Budget Bureau for this deficiency	$128,475,000
The subcommittee recommended	122,275,000

The Deficiency Subcommittee cut out this recommendation by the Civil Functions Subcommittee.

Hearings held by Deficiency Subcommittee contained 10 pages.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have leave to extend their remarks on this amendment at this point in the RECORD, so that anyone who wants to extend his remarks at this point as a part of this debate will be allowed to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that every Member has a right to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point as a part of this debate, I would like to see if we cannot get through as soon as possible this afternoon. I wonder if it would be agreeable to everybody concerned if we held the debate down to 1 hour. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER and Mr. MASON objected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour and a half.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour and a half.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EBERHARTER) there were—ayes 81, noes 62.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. EBERHARTER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 131; noes 37.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Sixty Members have indicated a desire to be heard on this amendment. That will give 1½ minutes to each speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that every one who wants to speak on this flood control item be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and that he be not required to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. That request has already been granted.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California, [Mr. DOYLE.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that time has already been fixed.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, may I yield my minute and a half to the gentleman from North Carolina?

The CHAIRMAN. Time has been allotted. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not more time to discuss this important amendment. I shall direct my attention to the justification for including the Bugg Island Reservoir, in Virginia and North Carolina, and the Philpott Reservation in Virginia. The two projects have been approved for the purpose of flood control in the Roanoke River and its tributaries. On many occasions and before various committees of Congress these projects have been approved and the construction of dams at the two locations mentioned has been authorized by Congress and an appropriation of the sum of $36,140,000, the estimated cost, recommended by act of Congress. The Roanoke Basin flood-control measure has long been a subject of importance to those who owned and occupied farms and property in this vast basin which extends from the mountains of Virginia to the Atlantic Ocean, many resolutions have been offered in respect to the hazard of floods in the course of this great river and its tributaries from the mountains to the sea; the records disclose that the proposed flood-control projects have always been a matter of legislative importance and have received favorable consideration. The Civil Function Committee of the Subcommittee on War Appropriation, of which I am a member, has carefully considered the justification of the appropriation which appears in the amendment under consideration, and traced the various legislative acts and investigations, and reported this amendment pending to the Deficiency Committee which, without justification and no investigation, struck the items out of this bill which had been approved by the proper committee which had full jurisdiction of the matter. The total number of items approved by my committee were 165 of which only 13 carried a power production feature; the work on these projects, some of which had begun, was discontinued for the war period.

Now is the opportune time of all times to begin the construction of these property-conserving features and accomplish what should have been done many, many years ago. The destruction of property and crops in the basin of the Roanoke River when it enters the coastal-plains area of North Carolina is most disastrous, and it is conservatively estimated that floods in this area alone has caused the loss of more than 20,000,000 of property, not considering the irreparable damage done to the fertile lands within the last 40 years. I insist that the production of electricity is an incidental feature of the dams referred to. The law required the engineers who made surveys of the area involved to report the feasibility of power production. This they did as required by law. What I am most interested in is the protection of the landowners along the watershed of the Roanoke River and its tributaries. I have personal knowledge of the destruction wrought by the floods in the Roanoke Basin; and when other areas of this country are protected by flood-control legislation, I am convinced that my State, North Carolina, and Virginia, which two States pour $500,000,000 annually into the Treasury of the United States, are entitled through this Government to the protection and consideration accorded other States in this Nation. Not an item should be stricken from the proposed amendment. Now is the time to begin the proposed dams and conserve the property which has so long been neglected.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am, Mr. Chairman, in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in speaking against this appropriation I want it distinctly understood that I am not opposed to flood control.

First. I have consistently supported the flood-control program during the 11 years that I served in this House, 9 of them as a member of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which has had charge of the flood-control appropriation bills. I gave this support despite the fact that I have no flood-control projects in my

district and I believe only one extremely small one in my State.

Second. I am not opposed to developing power from flood-control dams, if by doing so we are not passing the cost of producing power from the users of that power to the taxpayers of the Nation.

Third. I believe that in view of the tremendous national debt; in view of the further fact that we are confronted with the responsibility of meeting the interest and amortization cost on that debt, the care of 16,000,000 veterans of 3 wars, and other national financial responsibilities, it will require twenty-five to twenty-seven billion dollars a year tax levy to balance our Budget annually.

Fourth. That Budget has not been balanced for 15 years and that debt will undoubtedly, before the war costs are adjusted, reach a total of $300,000,000,000. If we keep on deficit financing, the time is not far distant when neither taxation nor bond selling will raise the money to pay the appropriations made by Congress. To continue to force banks, trust companies, and life insurance companies to buy these bonds, as we are now doing, constitutes a policy of confiscating the savings of the people which they have entrusted to their life insurance companies, trust companies and banks. This policy can only result in the collapse of the financial system of this country. In it lies the real threat to our system of Government.

It must be obvious to every right thinking American that this deficit financing cannot continue. To balance the budget we must have a definite financial policy which will set aside a definite amount for a definite purpose including flood control and use that money as wisely as we can. Log-rolling and pork barrel methods should be a thing of the past. The American people must be educated that Congress has no magic wand with which they can strike a magic rock called the United States Treasury and that a stream of gold will rush forth.

The amount appropriated for each purpose under that policy should if possible not exceed the amount expended for that purpose before the war, taking into consideration the increased cost of the work done. For instance we spent an average of approximately $80,000,000 a year for flood control during the 5 prewar years from 1938 to 1942, inclusive. The testimony is that there has been a 25 to 30 percent increase in construction costs since the war. The amount we should expend for flood control should not exceed the $80,000,000 a year, plus twenty to twenty-five million dollars for increased cost of construction.

I am ready and willing to support this kind of a program with a further qualification that we should take care of the flood-control projects first, giving special consideration to the small projects which can be completed with less than one or two million dollars. These are, as a rule, real flood-control projects and we can prevent more flood-control damage per dollar expended on these small projects than we can in the larger projects which may be 40 or 50 percent power. This is the program that I stand ready and willing to support.

WHAT WAS OUR PREWAR FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM?

Let us see how much money we have expended for flood control during the five prewar years of our flood-control program. On page 798 of part one of the hearings on the first deficiency appropriation bill now before this House, in response to my request Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Acting Chief of Engineers of the War Department, gave the following statement:

Funds spent for flood control, general, during the 5-year period preceding the war

Fiscal year	*Amount*
1938	$25,062,798
1939	55,151,452
1940	131,033,556
1941	96,506,047
1942	102,645,653

This totals approximately $400,000,000 for the 5-year period of approximately $80,000,000 a year.

THIS IS THE BEGINNING OF A 6-YEAR $2,100,000,000 FLOOD-CONTROL PROGRAM

The program proposed by General Robins, of which this bill is a part, will aggregate according to his testimony $350,000,000 a year for the next 6 years or nearly 4½ times the average amount appropriated during the 5-year period preceding the war.

This bill is the beginning of a $2,100,000,000 6-year flood control program as against $400,000,000 for the last 5 years. I am wondering just how long this sort of a thing can go on. It will not be long before we have added the straw that breaks the financial camel's back.

On page 798 of the hearings you will find the following testimony:

Mr. ENGEL. How much do you propose to spend during this 6-year program?

General ROBINS. We propose to spend in the neighborhood of $350,000,000 a year for 6 years.

It is this program which I am opposing on the floor of this House.

WHAT DOES THE BUDGET AND WAR DEPARTMENT PROPOSE?

Now let us examine the program presented to our committee. The proposal to our committee is for 118 construction projects. Fifty-eight of these projects were started before the war.

Total prewar cost	$560,564,000
Recommended by Budget for 1946	43,746,100
Recommended for 1947 Budget	66,385,400

These projects were interrupted during construction by the war. I stated in the committee and I state now that these projects should be reinstated at once and completed in the regular course of construction. In addition to these 58 projects there are 60 new projects not previously presented to Congress for funds. The total prewar cost of these 60 projects was estimated at $452,966,600. This bill contains $41,412,000 to commence these projects. The War Department states that they will have in the 1947 Budget $59,529,400 on this item. Summarizing, we find the following total projects aggregating $1,013,530,600, included in the War Department recommendations as set forth in the President's message.

General Robins further testified that there will now be a 25- to 30-percent increase in prewar construction-cost estimates. This means that 60 new projects will cost in the neighborhood of $600,000,000 instead of $452,000,000. There will be similar increases in the cost of other projects which estimates were made prior to the war.

Total recommended for the 1946 Budget	$85,158,100
Total amount required for the 1947 Budget	103,275,500

This is approximately $23,000,000 more for 1947 than the average amount appropriated for flood control during the 5 years preceding the war. It is true that six projects were cut out by the committee because Members of Congress objected to these projects. However, there were other Members of Congress who were just as strong for these projects as were Members who objected to it and it is reasonable to assume that these projects will be reconsidered and probably adopted.

PROGRAM CLEVERLY DRAFTED

This program was very cleverly drafted. It was drafted in such a way as to make it most difficult for the majority Members of this House to vote against it. The 118 projects were placed in 31 States. These 31 States have 371 Members in Congress, I am including a statement compiled by myself from the records giving the name of each State, the number of representatives that State has in Congress, the number of projects in that State, the total cost of the project and the amount recommended by the Budget for each State:

TABLE B

State	Number of representatives in Congress	Number of projects	Total cost of projects	Amount recommended by Budget for State
Arkansas	7	9	$102,084,300	$8,200,800
California	23	4	73,300,000	5,335,500
Colorado	4	1	14,800,000	500,000
Connecticut	5	4	9,928,000	2,649,500
Georgia	10	1	57,400,000	3,000,000
Illinois	26	7	5,500,000	1,353,000
Indiana	11	2	1,993,900	100,000
Iowa	8	5	3,235,500	1,667,800
Kansas	6	4	38,968,000	4,500,000
Kentucky	9	4	79,646,000	7,000,000
Louisiana	8	4	7,291,000	1,758,000
Massachusetts	14	6	18,199,000	1,397,000
Michigan	17	1	250,000	241,000
Minnesota	9	1	794,500	30,900
Mississippi	7	1	200,000	15,000
New Hampshire	2	4	10,318,700	834,100
New York	45	12	19,284,900	5,661,700
Missouri	13	3	40,599,600	2,047,000
North Dakota	2	1	130,000,000	2,000,000
South Carolina	6	1	35,300,000	1,000,000
North Carolina	9	1	30,900,000	1,000,000
Virginia	12			
Ohio	22	4	55,128,000	4,000,000
Oklahoma	8	3	51,780,000	5,000,000
Oregon	4	4	34,264,000	3,073,500
Nebraska	4	2	3,816,000	564,000
Pennsylvania	33	12	70,781,900	7,460,800
South Dakota	2	3	2,123,000	709,800
Texas	21	3	78,316,700	4,651,100
Tennessee	10	2	34,400,000	4,000,000
West Virginia	6	3	30,050,000	4,000,000
Washington	6	4	15,231,400	1,216,500

Let us examine this table. The first State is Arkansas. Arkansas has nine projects aggregating $102,084,300 and the amount recommended by the Budget for 1946 is $8,200,800. Arkansas has seven Members in Congress. These Members are going to find it extremely difficult to vote against these projects.

The next State is California. California has four projects, the total prewar cost of which was estimated at $75,300,000 and the amount recommended by the Budget for 1946 is $5,335,000. The Members of Congress from California are going to find it very difficult to vote against these projects.

Georgia has one project. The aggregate prewar cost was estimated at $57,400,000 and the amount recommended by the Budget for 1946 is $3,000,000. I can understand readily why the Members from Georgia are fighting hard to pass this program. This is true of practically every one of the 31 States. The War Department and Budget Bureau have sent down here a program which I believe has been framed in such a way as to insure its passage. It is very difficult for Members of Congress from the States in which these projects are located to oppose them. The Budget and War Department are saying to Congress in effect, "Here is the pork barrel, help yourself. There is the log pile, get busy with your logrolling."

I have seen this happen before in this House. I know this bill is going to pass. Several years ago in passing a flood-control bill this House authorized among other projects several million dollars for flood control in Rock Creek which flows through Rock Creek Park. It got so raw that the Senate stopped it. There are many good projects in this bill. I am not accusing anyone of logrolling or pork-barrel tactics. However, there is a lot of pork in this bill. And the argument that we should pass the bill in spite of this fact does not appeal to me. When anybody spits in my soup, I refuse to drink it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and I ask recognition.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the technical motion to strike out the enacting clause of course entitles its proponent to 5 minutes and its opponent to 5 minutes, but if the gentleman from Virginia is recognized the entire 10 minutes will be consumed in argument against the amendment which is now pending, while other members of the committee are limited to a minute and a half each. At least half of that 10 minutes, 5 minutes, ought to be given to the proponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot anticipate what the gentleman's argument will be. Besides, the gentleman from Virginia has said he is opposed to the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TARVER. He is opposed to the motion and also to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if you will get the adding machine and add up all the people who are going to be recognized, you will find that at least an hour and I expect an hour and 10 minutes of that hour and a half of 1-minute speeches will be used by the proponents of this amendment, so my friend does not have very much of a case there. But I am opposed to the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman moves to have the committee rise and strike out the enacting clause. I am opposed to that. I am for this bill. I am not only for the bill but I am for the bill as the committee reported it without any amendments, so I do not know how, technically or theoretically, I could better qualify for recognition.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman mean the amendments already put in the bill by the committee?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There are no amendments in the bill brought out by the committee. I am going to vote for the bill as the committee makes it today.

Mr. EBERHARTER. With the amendments already in it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes. Whatever this committee puts in the bill, I will vote for the bill. I believe in making a fight here and, if you lose your fight, voting for what the bill then is. Legislation passed by this Congress is a composite of the ultimate judgment of the Members. If you put flood control in here I will vote for it, but I do not think you ought to put it in, and I will tell you in 2 or 3 minutes why.

Now let us come back for just a minute to what has happened. Various reclamation projects are in this bill. They are there because the Subcommittee on the Interior Department Appropriations brought in a report showing that they had given careful, detailed thought, and study to each of those items. They had cut many of them. They had eliminated many of them and had changed some. We went over them item by item. Now, when the deficiency subcommittee reached the flood-control projects, gentlemen, right out of the box, and my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who offered this motion, brought it up, the Buggs Island business came up. It indicated we were going to get into a row on it. One member of the committee said, "Well, let us leave that out." Another member, my good friend, said, "If you are going to leave that out, leave them all out, and let the committee put it back." We said, "All right," and that is what was done. Nobody has passed on the merits of these things. But in order to vote for a few meritorious projects you have to swallow a lot of them that are not meritorious and this Buggs Island project is at the head of the list.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the gentleman understand that the Congress of the United States has approved this and authorized an appropriation for it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. May I say to my distinguished friend if this House appropriates all of the money that has been authorized by Congress, then God help us—that is all. There are thousands of authorizations that are never appropriated by the Congress, and the reason you have, first, an authorization, and then an appropriation, is because you want two examinations of the subject.

Mr. KERR. Does not the gentleman admit that years ago the Congress of this Nation approved the Buggs Island project and put in an appropriation of $56,000,000 to build it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But no work has ever been done on it. This estimate of $30,000,000 is an estimate 4 or 5 years old. It will be at least twice that much. The gentleman will see if he will turn to page 11049 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that this item of $5,000,000 for power is the initial cost of putting in the generators and not the ultimate cost of the power and does not include the ultimate cost of the dam dedicated to power purposes. The Buggs Island project is a power project and not a flood-control project in any sense of the word. Let me tell you that the citizens of North Carolina are protesting against this. Vance County, N. C., represented by the distinguished gentleman, Mr. COOLEY, who will speak to you for a minute and a half very shortly, are petitioning Congress to do nothing about this. They say it will flood thousands of acres of valuable land and inundate many communities. They want a hearing on it. The engineers have set December 5 to have a hearing on it. The planning commission of the State of Virginia has asked that nothing be done about it until they have a hearing. That is just one of these projects that you are asked to swallow in order to vote for a few meritorious flood-control projects. If this amendment is turned down, what is the result? The Civil Functions Committee of the Committee on Appropriations is going into session early in January. They are going to go over all of these projects. They will bring back a carefully considered bill and you can choose and vote for those that you want and leave out the ones that you do not want. All that we are asking you to do, all that the Appropriations Committee is asking you to do in this hour when we are scraping the bottom of the barrel of our finances and when we are in dire distress, is that we proceed with caution. There is no need today for a public works program. There is no need today for more power in this particular community. Maybe there is a need in some parts of the country. I am for power where it is incident to flood control or river and harbor development. I am for that. But this is a straight-out power project and it inaugurates a new policy of the United States. All our committee is asking you to do is to proceed with caution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the enacting clause stricken.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Deficiency Subcommittee

did not go into this matter more thoroughly and take out the items in the bill which they considered bad and leave in the items which they considered good instead of kicking out of the bill every item good and bad alike.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, there is a terrible flood condition along the Missouri River. There is an item in this bill for $236,000 to straighten the Nishnabotna River above Hamburg, Iowa, to the Missouri River. If that is not completed before the 1946 spring floods come, then many thousands of acres of the finest land in the world will lie fallow again next year, as has been the case for the past several years; also, the town of Hamburg is flooded each year, and has been for several years, causing a great deal of property damage and even the loss of human life; also, unless the money to repair and strengthen levees along the river is made available now, that much-needed work will not be done in time to save hundreds of thousands of acres of land from floods this coming spring, as has been the case for the past several years.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot within the very brief space of time at my disposal discuss the pending amendment, nor will my time permit even a discussion of the Buggs Island Reservoir on the Roanoke River. I do, however, desire to call attention to a resolution which was adopted on November 24, 1945 by the Board of County Commissioners of Vance County, N. C., which is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution by the Board of Commissioners of Vance County, N. C., adopted at a meeting held on November 24, 1945

Whereas the United States Government is contemplating the erection of a multipurpose dam on Roanoke River, in Mecklenburg County, Va., known as the Buggs Island Dam now proposed to be built 135 feet in height and to flood the area on the river above the dam to an elevation 320 feet above mean sea level; and

Whereas from information available the water impounded by said dam will flood and render useless approximately 22,000 acres of valuable farm and woodland in Vance County, N. C., the taxable value of which is approximately half a million dollars, thereby causing a considerable loss in tax revenue to the county each year for the support and maintenance of county government; and

Whereas due to the fact that Vance is a small county in area, being about 20 by 16 miles, the loss of approximately 22,000 acres of land will cause a great reduction in the value of crops raised annually in the county and affect its economic life and cause many of our most substantial citizens to give up their homes and property and go elsewhere to live; and

Whereas we are of the opinion that the proposed high multipurpose dam will in no way benefit the landowners living in the area affected in Vance County sufficiently to offset the injuries which will be sustained to the economic life of the county; and

Whereas, on the contrary, it is our desire if possible without too serious damage to our own economic life to cooperate in a program of flood control for the Roanoke River valley which will afford effective relief to the residents of the valley whose property is from time to time subjected to great loss by the occasional extreme floods in Roanoke River; and

Whereas we are advised and believe that at relatively small cost the Government of the United States can, by the erection of a series of single-purpose dry-reservoir flood-control dams on Roanoke River, at Buggs Island and elsewhere up the river, provide effective relief from flood conditions in the Roanoke River valley.

Now, therefore, in consideration of the foregoing and in pursuance of what we believe to be a proper good-neighbor policy, the Vance County Board of Commissioners this day in meeting assembled, does hereby respectfully request the United States Government not to erect the multipurpose high dam at the Buggs Island site on Roanoke River, but instead, we recommend that the Government of the United States do erect single-purpose dry-reservoir flood-control dams on Roanoke River at Buggs Island and at other desirable sites which will provide flood-control relief for the citizens of the Roanoke River valley without permanently inundating and rendering useless the valuable lands along the Roanoke River as would be the case if the present high multipurpose dam should be constructed at Buggs Island as proposed.

I also desire to call attention to a letter written to me on November 3, 1945, by Hon. Henry T. Powell, mayor of Henderson, the county seat of Vance County, which is as follows:

CITY OF HENDERSON,
Henderson, N. C., November 3, 1945.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: I realize that the proposed dam at Buggs Island in the Roanoke River is still in the discussion stage. But if this dam is built it will cover about one-sixth of Vance County with water and will cause a large number of our citizens to be uprooted. I believe that 90 percent of the people in this county who understand how much land will be covered with water oppose the proposed dam.

It is my hope and the hope of the city council that it will be possible to make the army engineers make public just what they propose to do, how high they propose to build the dam, and just how much, and what land they will put under water, so that we may fully understand the matter.

And before the bill actually reaches the floors of Congress the people of Vance County, who will take most of the ill results of the dam would also appreciate an opportunity to be heard by the committee considering the bill.

Very truly yours,
HENRY T. POWELL, *Mayor.*

I have also just received the following letter, dated November 28, 1945, from Mayor Powell:

HENDERSON, N. C., *November 28, 1945.*

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAROLD: I received your wire that Judge Kerr was introducing an amendment to the appropriation bill to include the Bug Island project in the bill, after it had been removed by the committee. I thank you for this information.

I am writing Judge Kerr, even though he does not represent our district, expressing the feelings of the people of Vance County, as evidenced in two resolutions, one by the county commissioners, the other by the city council, opposing the project as long as the dam is at its present height.

The Carolina Power & Light Co. does own the land to erect a dam 262 feet above mean sea level. We would not oppose here the erection of any dam up to that height, but the proposed dam would be 320 feet above mean sea level and would flood from 22,000 to 25,000 acres of land in Vance County and would cover highways so that another 20,000 acres would be cut off from Henderson. We feel that some plan could and should be worked out to give those who desire it flood control without ruining Vance County. We are now attempting to get an agreement with the people of the lower Roanoke Basin on the lower dam so we can present a united front to the Army engineers and Congress.

Very truly yours,
HENRY T. POWELL, *Mayor.*

I am very definitely in favor of adequate flood control on the Roanoke River and for many years my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, and I have advocated and urged that adequate flood control on the Roanoke River be provided. I want it clearly understood that I am not opposed to the Buggs Island Reservoir merely because of the hydroelectric power features involved. I am opposed to actions being taken upon the project at this time for the reason that the people in the affected area have not been given an opportunity to be heard. I call attention to the fact that a public hearing has been scheduled and will be held in the South Hill High School, South Hill, Va., at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, December 5, 1945. I have notified many interested parties of the scheduled hearing and have suggested that they attend the meeting for the purpose of obtaining full information regarding the project and to the further end that they may express freely their own views concerning the potential effects of the project upon the economic life of the community. It seems rather strange that the public hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, December 5, and we are called upon to appropriate the money even before the meeting is held and those whom I represent in the affected area are given an opportunity to express their views concerning the matter. I, therefore, urge that action on the Buggs Island Reservoir be delayed pending the hearing which is scheduled for next week. I do this in the hope that at the public hearing some satisfactory flood-control program may be agreed upon. Certainly those citizens whose homes and farms will be flooded should be accorded an opportunity to be heard.

I am not taking the position that the Buggs Island Reservoir should not be built as is now contemplated, but I do insist that very careful consideration should be given to the suggestions which no doubt will be made by officials of Vance County and other citizens living in the affected area and if a better plan and program can be agreed upon, that plan and program should be adopted rather than the project now contemplated.

I urge that the pending amendment be defeated to the end that further consideration may be given to all of the important projects involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Snyder amendment. It is absolutely unfair and discriminatory to eliminate the appropriations for flood-control projects which have already been authorized by the Congress. To do so simply means that the Appropriations Committee can at any time and at will override the express desires of the membership of this House. Adequate flood control is essential if we are to preserve our natural resources for posterity. Time and tide wait for no man. The Committee on Appropriations in its report on this bill says that it is reluctant to recommend the appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects without further inquiry into the merits of the proposals. It wants to submit the matter for reconsideration by the War Department subcommittee next January. This is "fiddling while Rome burns"; and, furthermore, there is no definite assurance that the proposals will be favorably acted upon at the later date suggested. The time for action is now.

I am particularly interested in the projects relating to the improvement of the Missouri River Basin. A comprehensive program for flood control in this basin has been already reviewed, discussed, and approved by this House. Millions of acres of fertile farm land are involved in this food basket of the world. With particular reference to that part of the Missouri River which touches part of my congressional district, this amendment will restore appropriations for dikes, revetments, and dredging between Kenslers Bend, Nebr., and the Combination Bridge at Sioux City, Iowa. Funds are required for initial construction of dykes and revetment to protect agricultural lands and the McCook Lake area in South Dakota. In the vicinity of McCook Lake the threat of the Missouri River to leave its normal channel and cut through McCook Lake is very real. If this happens, it will cause extensive loss of farm lands, buildings, and roads, and possible damage to the Sioux City power plant, which would be critical. In fact, the Army engineers' report on the Missouri River flood-control project has designated Sioux City as a critical area, and for that reason alone it is most essential that the lives and property of the people in this large center of population be protected. We cannot afford to wait until disaster strikes. I earnestly urge that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have not time to speak of the projects in this amendment affecting flood control. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], chairman of the Flood Control Committee, can represent those items.

There are 23 river and harbor projects in this amendment. There is not a project in it that is within 600 miles of where I live; consequently, I cannot be accused of having any personal interest.

I piloted every one of these items through Congress, in bills reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Since I have been in Congress I have put through more river and harbor bills and voted for more river and harbor bills than any other man living. I know that every one of these items is thoroughly worthy. These projects have had the most thorough consideration in the world, and no member of the Appropriations Committee will offer any opposition to them in the next appropriation bill; consequently there is nothing affecting economy in it. If you do not do it now you are going to do it next summer anyhow; and if you put it off you will lose 6 months' time assembling the work and getting it started.

The river and harbor funds are needed to continue projects which have been delayed due to the war. These projects are important. They are Nation-wide—Northeast, Southeast, the Gulf, the Mississippi system, the inland waterways, the Great Lakes, and the Pacific.

Waterway traffic has increased steadily before and during the war. For instance, the combined waterway traffic exclusive of the Great Lakes and the ocean in 1927 amounted to 9,000,000,000 ton-miles, whereas in 1944 it had risen to over 30,000,000,000 ton-miles. For the Great Lakes it has increased from 85,000,000,000 ton-miles to 115,000,000,000 ton-miles. This increased traffic is made possible only due to waterways improvement. Traffic follows improved waterways. The river and harbor work setup for the funds now deleted is essential and should not be delayed until funds are made available next summer.

The new river and harbor act has projects encompassing and traversing the Nation. Planning for this work should be continued. Engineer districts and divisions operate on the funds that are made available by appropriations from Congress. This planning cannot go ahead; and vital projects will not be started on time without funds being made available now. Engineer Department employees have recently begun to lay aside their uniforms to resume their prewar duties. Many more are in the act of returning and still others will return. Without funds these jobs must be vacated.

The projects now deleted from the deficiency bill have been presented in minute detail by the Chief of Engineers to the Bureau of the Budget. They have been passed by it. They have been sent to Congress with the approval of the President as part of his program for necessary work and improvement. They have been defended prior to this year before my committee and have been found essential and economically justified in each case. They are river and harbor navigation projects necessary for the increased traffic carried by the waterways.

The list of the river and harbor projects embraced in this amendment are as follows:

Name of project	Deficiency requirement	Work to be done
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.	$75,000	Channel regulating works to stabilize 15-foot channel and reduce maintenance cost.
Hudson River, N. Y.	515,000	Dredging and rock removal in 14-foot channel between Albany and Waterford, N. Y., for the safety and convenience of navigation.
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway	2,000,000	Resumption of work to provide 14-foot channel depth between locks.
Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia, Pa., to the sea	743,700	Deepening from Philadelphia Navy Yard to Philadelphia-Camden Bridge from 35 to 37 feet. Desired by Navy.
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.	645,000	Bank-protection work to stabilize channel and protect existing project.
Potomac River, north side of Washington Channel, D. C.	413,000	Construction of pier 4 necessary to relieve congestion in the Washington Channel.
James River Va.	652,000	Removal of rock and overburden necessary for the convenience and safety of existing navigation.
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	185,000	Widening between jetties. This work necessary for the safety and convenience of navigation due to encroachments made by the Navy during the war.
Pearl River, Miss. and La.	1,573,500	Resumption of construction work on lock stopped by war necessity; to protect works already started.
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.	3,439,500	To complete lock No. 2 on the upper Mississippi and other work left unfinished.
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont.	1,185,000	Miscellaneous features to complete work to protect investment of $114,000,000.
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	2,700,000	Partial replacement of lock No. 2 which has passed its economic usefulness.
Keweenaw Waterway Mich.	548,000	Modification of breakwater for safety and convenience of navigation. This has been the scene of a number of serious accidents.
Racine Harbor, Wis.	72,300	Removal of outer shoals and dredging of basin for safety and convenience of navigation.
Lorain Harbor, Ohio	131,000	Deepening outer barbor to prevent groundings.
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	967,000	Removal of dangerous rock shoals.
Oswego Harbor, N. Y.	571,000	Dredging of channel to facilitate navigation by deeper draft vessels.
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.	7,100,000	Completion of construction of breakwaters to provide anchorage for Navy Department and for protection of existing harbor facilities. Very essential.

Name of project	Deficiency requirement	Work to be done
Suisun Channel, Calif.	$160,000	Completion of 18-foot channel.
Sacramento River, Calif.	390,000	Completion of 9-foot channel, essential due to construction of Shasta Dam.
San Joaquin River, Calif.	150,000	Completion of 9-foot channel to Stockton.
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to mouth of Snake River, Oreg. and Wash.	100,000	Minor dredging and removal of dangerous rocks for the safety and convenience of navigation.
Inland waterway from Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (Chesapeake City bridge).	1,200,000	Substructure to replace bridge destroyed by accident. Temporary ferry service very expensive, estimated to cost in the postwar period $400,000 a year.
Total	25,516,000	

All these projects were thoroughly considered by the engineers for many weeks, and in some instances for many months. No other items in this bill have had such thorough investigation and study by the most competent authorities in our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

FLOOD CONTROL IS IMPORTANT

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1946 which we are now debating comes to the house from the committee with the entire flood-control proposal deleted. We now are proposing to restore these funds in order that very necessary flood-control work can be done immediately or before the floods which are sure to come destroy thousands of acres of valuable farm land. The committee has refused to allow funds for the flood-control work on the Missouri River between Kenselers Bend in Nebraska and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa. It has refused the funds for the work at Schuyler, Nebr. It has refused funds needed for flood-control work at Omaha, Council Bluffs and other parts of Nebraska. I am familiar with the serious flood conditions all along the Missouri River. These floodwaters can and must be controlled. The flood-control projects which we seek to restore in this amendment include those in my district which I have mentioned. The Committee should know that the surveys for this work have been completed. The flood-control work proposed was studied and approved by the Corps of Army Engineers. These projects were approved by the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives; and they were approved by the Bureau of the Budget after a very careful study. Hearings of several weeks were held by the House Committee on Civil Functions for the War Department and this committee practically unanimously approved these projects. The Deficiency Committee deleted all of them. I am told by reliable members of the committee that the projects which I am supporting are considered most meritorious and should be provided for in this deficiency bill. I agree with these committee members that the projects I am supporting should be taken care of immediately because they represent an emergency. Thousands of acres of valuable farm land all along the Missouri River in the Third District of Nebraska have been destroyed by floods. Thousands of acres of more valuable farm land will be destroyed by future floods unless flood-control work is launched upon immediately. Farm land which will produce food for hungry people will disappear unless we now implement the authority for this work with the emergency funds we seek in this amendment. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to vote favorably on the amendment to provide the flood-control work on the Missouri River at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, a little earlier in the day I was interested in the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] when he said we have burned up the resources of this Nation in the war. Let me remind you that for many years we have been washing away the resources of this Nation by the awful floods which have poured down the great rivers of this country. When you talk about economy, and oppose flood control, you are being penny-wise and pound-poor, because those of us who live on the streams and in these valleys know the devastating consequences of these floods from year to year.

As has been said, the Mississippi Valley is the bread basket of this Nation. You can never have full production in that valley unless you control the floods on the Missouri and other rivers that pour into the mighty Mississippi. I was interested in the remark of the gentleman from Virginia, a member of the committee, who admitted that fifty-some-odd of these projects have already been started. There is one in my district, the Clearwater Dam and Reservoir, which was authorized by this Congress. We appropriated money to begin it and we have spent about $4,000,000. It is nearly half completed now. We stopped work on it because of the war. Why in the name of common sense did not this committee put these projects in this bill if they wanted to do the fair thing to the people of this country? I ask them to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I cannot be accused of having any personal interest in the passage of this amendment because it will not provide for any improvement in my district or at any place within close proximity of my district. However, I have consistently supported flood relief programs because I know the value of them to the people who have had the benefit of such improvements.

The Ohio River—for about 175 miles—is the southern boundry of the district which I have the honor to represent. We who live in the Ohio Valley know of the ravages of floods. We know that the great floods of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers cannot be controlled altogether by locks and dams in these main stems. The floods are in some cases largely controlled by dams and flood protection works at the head waters of the large streams. One of the most important flood control projects in the whole country is the Muskingum Valley project in Ohio.

I think it would be very unfortunate if this bill should be passed without any appropriations whatever for flood control. For many years flood control has been a consistent policy with our Government without regard to politics. Flood control has been under the direction of the Army engineers which is an organization that stands high in the estimation of the people of the country because of the efficienty and honesty and fairness with which it carries on its work. Any break in the continuity of the construction of these improvements would be very disorganizing to this great organization. And besides it would be very unfair to millions of people in the country who live in these flooded areas and who have been encouraged to depend upon this program of flood control.

If there are any projects included in this amendment that are not now urgent or that might not be meritorious it is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee did not screen out this class of projects. I know that there are many deserving projects included in this amendment. I know there are some on which the Government spent millions of dollars and which are well along to completion. For instance, there is the Blue Stone Dam, located on New River in West Virginia. That dam is a gigantic project and has been under construction for years. It is well along to completion. As it stands today, it is of no value whatever. With the additional work necessary it will impound a large body of water. It will impound enough water so as to practically guarantee the city of Charleston, W. Va., and its contingent territory from any serious inundation. In the Charleston area is located probably the largest chemical industry in the Nation. For 40 miles up and down the Kanawha River in the Charleston area are located gigantic plants that have cost hundreds of millions of dollars

in their construction and that supply employment for thousands of people. The Kanawha River, about 30 miles down from the city of Charleston, empties into the Ohio River. It is estimated that if and when the floods come from the Blue Stone territory enough water would be impounded by this dam to take six feet off of the flood crest of the Ohio River. Thus if this is true, this dam might contribute greatly to the relief of all of the cities on the Ohio River even as far down as Cincinnati.

When I said that this bill carries no project for any place in the district which I have the honor to represent, I must not forget to say that some of these projects will affect our territory. All up and down the Ohio Valley are many fine stretches of fertile and valuable land. There are also located in this valley many great mills and factories that are seriously damaged by heavy floods.

I am proud that my home city of Ironton is safely protected against these floods. This city is the first city in the United States to have completed sufficient flood-wall protection under the legislation passed after the flood of 1937. I am sorry that more cities have not been able to avail themselves of the provisions of that law. Some cities cannot afford to meet the financial requirements. The city of Ironton, although a small city of about 20,000, issued bonds to the extent of about $750,000 with which to furnish rights-of-way and incur other expenses as required by the law. The Federal Government then came forward with about $4,000,000 as its portion of this construction. We have had several floods in the Ohio River since 1937 and on three or four occasions this flood wall has more than paid for itself by protecting the property and business of the citizens of that city.

An argument has been made that we should not pass this amendment because it contains some projects that are not meritorious. These projects can all be screened out when the legislation goes to the Senate or into conference. It is uneconomical, unwise, and unfair to withhold the money necessary to complete many of these very necessary and deserving projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have a personal interest in the passage of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I would be indifferent to the interest of my constituents if I did not favor it. A levy and flood wall was authorized by the Congress for Newport, Ky., in 1937 with an authorized appropriation of $2,250,000. This authorization was approved by the Army engineers, the Budget, and by the President of the United States.

Three times an appropriation has been made for this purpose which was subsequently withdrawn because of war conditions. Under the Flood Control Act the city of Newport was required to furnish the lands, easements, and rights-of-way for the flood protective works. The people of the city of Newport voted for a bond issue of $350,000 in 1941 and the city has purchased the land necessary for the construction of the flood wall. It has torn down buildings, it has fulfilled its contract. Everything is in readiness. The land that was purchased now consists of rubble and weeds and the people of Newport look upon it as a monument to a contract which has not been fulfilled by their Government.

There is more than national economy involved in this matter, there is the faith and credit of our National Government. The city in purchasing the land has taken it off of the tax roll and has sustained a great loss in revenue by reason of that fact.

We need this improvement immediately. We are entitled to it to guard the homes of the people of Newport and their property against the uncontrolled, unpredictable, and treacherous waters of the Ohio River.

In 1937 about half of the city of Newport in the basin was inundated and that may occur again.

As an extension of my remarks I wish to enclose the following telegram I received from Mr. J. B. Morlidge, city manager of the city of Newport, Ky.:

NEWPORT, KY., *November 28, 1945.*

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
United States Congressman,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following brief history of Newport's flood protection program may be of some assistance to you in presenting an amendment to the pending deficiency appropriation bill tomorrow which will include the sum of $500,000 for Newport.

The following brief history of Newport's flood protection efforts leads to the inescapable conclusion that Newport's project should and ought to be given immediate priority and preference with reference to the immediate beginning of construction. To attain this end an appropriation of $500,000 will be necessary in the deficiency appropriation bill now pending before the House of Representatives.

After the severe flood in 1937 the United States engineers began their preliminary surveys to determine the feasibility of flood protection for Newport. The results of these surveys indicated that such protection works were definitely feasible and that this community, one-third of the basin area of which was ravaged by flood water, needed protection as badly as did Portsmouth, Ironton, Paducah, Lawrenceburg and other materially affected river communities.

Newport, bounded by the Ohio and Licking Rivers on two sides and by contiguous municipalities on the other two sides, cannot expand territorially from the inundated area. Newport's flood condition must be fought from the river banks.

In 1938 a $350,000 bond issue was placed before Newport's voters to pay for our share of the project. It failed to get the necessary two-thirds majority. In 1939 again the bond issue failed. But in 1940 the voters, after a hotly contested campaign finally approved the issuance of the bonds.

Early in 1941 Newport sold $350,000 of flood protection bonds at the instance of the War Department through the United States engineers (interest 2 and 2¼ percent). Newport was also ordered by the United States Government to proceed immediately to obtain the necessary rights of way. This was an enormous task, requiring the acquisition of more than 160 parcels of privately owned property. The General Assembly of Kentucky was prevailed upon by Newport to enact special emergency legislation permitting the quick acquisition of the necessary land by eminent domain. Finally, by July 1, 1942, all necessary rights of way for the levee section had been acquired and the United States Government was prepared to advertise for bids for the construction of said levee section.

In the meantime, however, after the Pearl Harbor incident on December 7, 1941, the President of the United States issued a sweeping order revoking all appropriations for civil projects. Newport's appropriation was thus lost. But in early 1942 the city prepared evidence proving clearly that Newport's flood project had a material and direct bearing on the war effort. By reason thereof Newport's flood protection appropriation was reinstated. However, thereafter, war conditions became more stringent and, on July 15, 1942, Newport's appropriation was again withdrawn because prosecution of the war was deemed more vital and important.

The people of Newport bowed to the inevitable and patiently waited the end of the war. Nothing could be done in relation to the Newport project even though the land had been acquired and all structures thereon razed. This area which covers the entire water front of the community has been a rubble covered with weeds since 1942. It is in that state today.

Newport has been paying the principal and interest on its bonds since their issuance. The cost of the aforesaid land acquisition has been in excess of $225,000. Such acquisitions removed a quarter of a million dollars from Newport's tax duplicate. There has been the attendant loss of taxes since 1942.

After VJ-day, in August 1945, there was prepared a deficiency appropriation bill for submission to the Congress of the United States. At the recommendation of the United States engineers, the War Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and of the President of the United States, an appropriation of $500,000 for Newport was included therein. Such deficiency appropriation would permit the actual beginning of construction sometime in 1946.

On November 26, 1945, Newport was informed that the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives had recommended that Newport's appropriation, among others, be stricken from this deficiency bill.

This is the third time that Newport's appropriation has been withdrawn and the flood work impeded.

The records of the United States engineers show that $167,000 has already been expended by the United States Government for preliminary plans, surveys, and other work pertaining to this Newport project. Newport has actually expended some $225,000 of its bond issue and the balance now lies in the official depository where it has been since 1941. Newport has duly adopted its resolution of cooperation as provided by the Flood Control Act of 1936, as amended. The contract between the United States Government and the city of Newport has already been partially executed on both sides.

By reason of these past and existing facts the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in revoking Newport's appropriation cannot satisfactorily be explained to the people of northern Kentucky. To them such action constitutes a gross breach of faith on the part of their Government.

If the appropriation is not made in the deficiency bill now pending, Newport's project cannot possibly begin before the summer of 1947 or possibly as late as 1948. There seems to be no excuse for such unreasonable delay in the progress of such a comparatively minor project.

Heretofore the people and officials of Newport have always dealt with various Federal agencies in complete good faith. When the war stopped our project for a 3-year period our people were patient, but under existing

conditions they are patient no longer, and we believe, with ample cause.

It should be explained further that during the years of the war our community has worked diligently to create a substantial postwar program. This was done at the instance of the United States Government. The postwar program plans are completed but each and every one of them is predicated upon flood protection for Newport. The major points in this postwar program involve Federal participation. They are: Antipollution, pursuant at the Ohio River antipollution pact (Federal aid through the Barkley-Spence bill), redevelopment of blighted flood-ravaged areas (Federal aid through proposed Wagner-Ellender bill) and planning and zoning in conjunction with the master planning division for the greater Cincinnati metropolitan area.

It may be clearly seen that the entire program for progress in this community is being jeopardized by the failure of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to permit the immediate prosecution of Newport's flood-protection program which has been pending since 1937.

J. B. MORLIDGE.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Insert "For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the sum of $2,500,000 to be expended in carrying out the Fort Gibson Dam and reservoir project on the Grand River, Okla., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 107, Seventy-sixth Congress, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, Public Law 227, Seventy-seventh Congress; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the sum of $1,000,000 to be expended in carrying out the Hulah reservoir project on Carey River tributary of Verdigris River, Okla., and Kans., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 308, Seventy-fourth Congress, as authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, Public, No. 738, Seventy-fourth Congress."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is this offered as a substitute for the entire bill?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. No. It is an amendment to the Snyder amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read. I never heard of a flood-control act of 1933. There is no such thing, and I do not know what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. It was passed by Congress.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I introduced two bills on September 10, 1945, to care for these two projects which have heretofore been authorized by Congress, and I shall not take up the time now on account of the limited time allotted to me other than to say that I want to insert as a part of my remarks a telegram from Gov. Robert S. Kerr of the State of Oklahoma in support of these offered amendments, and one from N. R. Graham, who has perhaps more knowledge in reference to flood control than any other person in the State of Oklahoma except the United States Corps of Engineers themselves, and also a letter from the United States engineers addressed to me under date of October 31, 1945, in which was inclosed a letter from the Bureau of the Budget to the Secretary. I ask unanimous consent that they be included in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Permission will have to be obtained in the House.

The matter referred to follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *November 28, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Restoration of flood-control projects to deficiency bill now before your House is of utmost importance to Oklahoma. Work has long since been started at Canton and Fort Gibson and construction should be resumed at once. Bartlesville and surrounding area flooded numerous times. Hulah project authorized and approved would stop this flood damage and should be started at earliest possible date. Also urgent necessity for Wister project. I know you are tremendously busy but for and on behalf of Oklahoma I will be very grateful for your assistance in behalf of these measures.

ROBERT S. KERR.

TULSA, OKLA., *November 28, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Best interests your district was struck vital blow when Appropriations Committee eliminated flood-control funds. You have several levee projects in bill. If Tulsa district office has no funds they cannot plan Hulah and other projects. Why strike flood control and leave irrigation appropriation in bill?

N. R. GRAHAM.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, October 31, 1945.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: In response to your recent request I am pleased to furnish information regarding the present status of appropriation estimates for funds for the Hulah and Markham Ferry reservoir projects in Oklahoma.

The Department submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for transmission to Congress a supplemental appropriation estimate for funds for the resumption of its civil works construction program which included amounts for the initiation of work on the Hulah and Markham Ferry reservoirs. That supplemental appropriation estimate as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and as transmitted to Congress by the President on October 16, 1945, did not, however, include funds for those two reservoirs. In a letter dated October 16, 1945, the Bureau of the Budget furnished the Department information concerning the basis of its recommendations on this supplemental estimate. A copy of that letter is enclosed herewith for your information.

The Markham Ferry reservoir project provides for the construction of a concrete gravity type dam and earth fill embankment structure, including powerhouse structure and generating equipment. The original project document (H. Doc. No. 107, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) indicated a cost estimate of $14,294,000. The present estimate, based on provision for greater power capacity and improved engineering design, is $19,295,000. The project will be operated as a unit of the three-reservoir system—includes Pensacola and Fort Gibson—for flood control and power storage on the Grand (Neosho) River, and as a part of the comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin. The Markham Ferry reservoir cannot be separated or eliminated from the system without materially reducing the effectiveness of the flood control and hydroelectric power operations of the system and the benefits from the Pensacola and Fort Gibson reservoirs cannot be fully realized without the Markham Ferry reservoir operated as an integral unit of the system.

The Hulah Reservoir project provides for construction of an earth-fill dam and reservoir to provide flood protection to the agricultural lands immediately downstream from the dam site in the Caney and Verdigris River Valleys, and to a portion of the business and residential districts in Bartlesville, with incidental benefits to the Arkansas and lower Mississippi Rivers. The project was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, at an estimated cost of $2,343,000 (H. Doc. No. 308, 74th Cong., 1st sess.). Detailed investigations and development of revised design criteria indicated the need for a higher dam and greater spillway capacity than originally contemplated. The ratio of benefits to costs on the basis of the old estimate is 1.0:1. Based on revised cost estimate of $6,400,000, the ratio of benefits to costs is 1.17:1. The project will be operated as a unit of the comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River. The Hulah Reservoir project has been previously considered by the Appropriations Committees of Congress and funds were appropriated for initiation of construction of that project in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act approved June 24, 1940. Because of difficulties in obtaining an agreement with regard to the value of mineral rights in the reservoir area, no construction on the project was started at that time and the funds then available were withdrawn and applied to other approved features of the authorized flood-control program. No further appropriations have been made available since that time for construction of the project.

Both of these reservoir projects have been authorized by Congress and the Department has prepared the plans for the projects with funds appropriated for that purpose by Congress. The Department is fully prepared to initiate construction of these projects as soon as funds for that purpose are provided by Congress.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS M. ROBINS,
Major General,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

[Enclosure: Letter from Bureau of the Budget, October 16, 1945.]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, October 16, 1945.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The supplemental estimates of appropriation contained in your letter dated September 12, 1945, have been analyzed for conformance with the principles outlined in my letter to you dated August 25, 1945. I have recommended, and the President has transmitted to Congress, supplemental estimates for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1946 in the total amount of $128,475,000. Copies of these two letters are enclosed for your information and reference.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding of Bureau of the Budget action on these supplemental estimates and that War Department witnesses testifying before the Appropriations Committees of Congress, may have full knowledge thereof, I am furnishing the basis for my recommendations.

I believe that the amounts requested under the rivers and harbors appropriation conform with the principles set forth in my policy letter and the entire amount requested has been recommended. There are, however, several projects proposed to be initiated under the flood control, general, appropriation, on which the estimated present-day costs are appreciably greater than those appearing in the project documents and on which no further justification has been submitted, either to the Executive Office or to the Congress, indicating corresponding changes in benefits. I believe that work at this time should be limited principally to those projects which will show adequate economic return or which have been proven of sufficient social benefit to warrant accomplishment under unfavorable economic showing. It seems to me that it would be especially inadvisable to initiate work on these projects until an adequate opportunity has been provided for a thorough review in the light of present conditions. Projects falling into such a category are as follows:

Project	Project document estimate [1]	Present estimated cost	Percent of increase	Amount requested in supplemental estimate
Tully Reservoir, Mass	$573,800	$759,000	32	$659,000
Hoosick Falls, N. Y	137,000	432,500	215	395,500
Ithaca, N. Y	108,500	300,000	177	264,000
Hords Creek Reservoir, Tex	460,000	1,667,000	262	300,000
Cold Brook Reservoir, S. Dak	395,000	829,000	110	400,000
Mouth of Sangamon River, Ill	122,400	460,000	227	382,300
Bell drainage district, Illinois	31,100	43,100	39	41,800
East of Chandlerville, Ill	128,000	326,100	155	320,300
Pudding River, Oreg	62,000	86,000	39	83,000
Pilot Rock, Oreg	34,000	53,500	57	50,500
Cherry Creek Reservoir, Colo	10,500,000	13,940,000	33	2,000,000
Markham Ferry Reservoir, Okla	14,204,000	19,295,000	35	2,000,000
Harlan County Reservoir, Nebr	20,078,000	31,000,000	54	1,000,000
Hulah Reservoir, Okla	2,343,000	6,400,000	173	1,000,000
San Gabriel River, Calif	2,086,000	2,645,500	27	700,000
Total				9,597,400

[1] These figures were supplied by the Office, Chief of Engineers.

I have not included any of the above amounts in my recommendations. In the case of the Harlan County Reservoir, Nebraska, however, it is noted in your justification that an additional $300,000 is needed for completion of plans and specifications. It is considered that such advance planning should be continued and an allowance of that amount is included in my estimate.

I also note that your estimate contemplates the initiation of construction on certain projects in the Central Valley of California, authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act. In letter to you dated June 2, 1945, the President granted qualified approval for advance planning of the Central Valley projects and requested that the comprehensive reports now being prepared by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation be accelerated and submitted to him through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth any differences in plans and policy between the recommendations of the War and the Interior Departments. He also requested the Secretary of the Interior to take similar action. It is understood that these reports are nearing completion and will be available for submission to the President in the near future. In view of his request and the present status of these reports, I consider it improper to submit any estimates of appropriation for initiation of construction of these projects, in advance of a decision by him as to the course to be followed on these works. However, I have included funds for completion of planning of the Central Valley projects, indicated in your justification.

In accordance with agreement reached between representatives of the Corps of Engineers and my staff, the item of $100,000 requested for planning of the Mount Morris Reservoir, New York, has been deleted since the necessary funds for this feature of work have been included in the construction list.

I have recommended the appropriation of the entire amount of $15,000,000 requested under the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. "Others we can save, but ourselves we cannot save."

Mr. Chairman, I have just heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] state that 31 States were interested in the amendment under consideration. Well, I happen to come from a State where the waters of 32 States find their way to the Gulf of Mexico through the State of Louisiana, and I am sorry that there are not really 32 States interested in the appropriation under discussion, as any flood-control project in any of these 32 States would keep this water from continuously and perennially coming down on our State and causing floods which result in millions of dollars of damage.

I am further interested in this legislation as a matter of fact because I am a member of both the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and the Committee on Flood Control which authorized these projects.

I have consistently called attention of this Congress to the billions of dollars spent by the United States in foreign countries, and I have said time and again that I think it is time for this Congress to do something for the protection and welfare of our own people.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote excerpts from an Associated Press dispatch in last night's Washington Evening Star as an illustration of my contentions:

American engineers will aid China in working out plans to control the Yangtze River.

Key feature of the proposed development plan is a dam larger than Grand Coulee to be located in the gorge of the Yangtze near Ichang in the heart of China. It would back the river into a revervoir 250 miles long.

The plan also calls for the construction of numerous other dams, hundreds of miles of irrigation canals, the world's largest hydroelectric plant, and other facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that General Pick, of the Corps of Engineers, just returned from overseas, where he built the Ledo Road, said at a dinner night before last in St. Louis, that it would be most unfortunate if the appropriation for flood control and rivers and harbors were omitted from the present deficiency bill under consideration. I am told, that General Pick stated that it would retard flood-control work for at least a year, and in view of the fact that for nearly 5 years our flood control and rivers and harbors projects had been practically abandoned that the additional delay would mean a great loss, not only in time, but in further damage to our system of flood control, and on many projects which had been left uncompleted.

Mr. Chairman, I am further informed that the Corps of Engineers are now ready and anxious to proceed with the projects authorized in the appropriations under this bill, as I am certain that they realize the necessity and importance of undertaking this work on these projects at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Chairman, I further understand that some of the reasons advanced for striking out the appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors from the bill under consideration was that some of the members of the committee were of the opinion that further hearings should be had on some of these projects.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is unfair, and a reflection on the Committees on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors, as I can assure you that long, lengthy, weary, and exhaustive hearings have been held on all of these projects authorized, and I know that the committees which considered these projects would not have approved the same if they had not considered the same of the utmost emergence.

It will be recalled that President Truman, in a special message to the Congress, urged that this legislation be authorized, and I am greatly disappointed in the action of the committee in striking out these appropriations for this urgent and important work. The Budget Bureau after a careful examination of all of the projects listed under the authorization approved the appropriation for the flood control and rivers and harbors.

I may say further, that I am convinced that the Senate will never consent to the elimination of the appropriations for flood control and rivers and harbors in the legislation under consideration, and it is my opinion that, if these items are not restored in the bill under consideration, the bill will not only indefinitely be delayed, but that there is danger that the bill will not be considered by a conference committee, or if considered, long and exhaustive hearings will be held.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that this country will benefit many times over the amount of the funds that are expended on these projects.

I can only say to my colleagues that I think it is long past time for us to think about doing something for our own country, and at least spend some of the crumbs of the billions of dollars appropriated here to the benefit and for the protection and welfare of our own citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that upon further consideration the Members of this House will vote in favor of the amendments proposed to reinstate the appropriations in this bill which have been omitted by the Appropriations Committee, and that the bill will be restored to its original provisions, and passed almost unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, when I entered the Chamber yesterday I came in with a firm resolution that I would stand by the Committee on Appropriations in its effort to reduce expenditures in the bill they reported out and now before us for consideration. I yielded only in one instance, but I do not propose to yield any more. If we are going to reduce, let us reduce Federal expenditures. There is no other way. I am one who believes there is a limit to the credit of the United States. I am opposed to the Snyder amendment to increase the bill by nearly $130,000,000 for flood-control and river and harbor projects. That does not mean I am opposed to the river and harbor projects. They had my support in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors when such projects were under consideration. It does mean that this construction should be deferred until a later time. It was my understanding that this work was to be laid aside until 6 months after the war. The end of the war has not been officially closed.

I call attention to a rather unpleasant fact. If you examine the bank statements of banks in the United States today, you will find that from 60 percent to two-thirds of their entire savings and commercial deposits, or the footings of the bank, are invested in Government paper. This paper consists of certificates of indebtedness or United States bonds. If their face value should drop as little as 5 points, it might wipe out the capital and surplus of every bank in the country, which would close the banks or cripple them badly. Therefore I think it is our duty to preserve the credit of the Nation and a strong economic structure, so that our returning veterans will come back to the same kind of a country they left when they went away to fight the Nation's battles.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I believe that if all of the members of the Appropriations Committee had known the kind of floods we have in Arkansas they would have found a standard for distinguishing between meritorious and the other type of projects. You simply cannot temporize with the kind of flood we had in 1927, for example, the worst in 100 years, and then again in 1943, the first year I had the privilege of being a Member of this body, when one-tenth of every acre in the Arkansas Valley was utterly destroyed.

I told my farmers when they asked about the completion of these projects, the first one authorized in 1936 and the others in later legislation, that when the war was over these projects would be completed. One dam is three-fourths complete, 73 percent, to be exact. I think we ought to make good in these commitments we have made. We cannot break faith with the people we told we would take care of, if the war was fought to a successful finish and that when the materials were made available, we would make it possible for them to have protection against the floods. We must not break faith with our farmers who have carried their part of the load.

It is not Arkansas water that has done the destruction. We are not complaining either that the waters from other States have come upon us, because you have given every evidence in the past that you are nationally minded in this matter and we are only asking that previous commitments be carried out and protection given to those of us who happen to live along the channels of these national streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] illustrates the confusion that is prevalent on what the Snyder amendment covers. Actually, the pending amendment, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] embraces $2,000,000 for the Fort Gibson Reservoir, which is one of the two projects for which the gentleman from Oklahoma offered an additional amendment. It does not include the Hulah project, for which there was no Budget estimate. The gentleman was entitled to be confused because nothing has been said here as to what the pending amendment does cover.

The pending amendment embraces all the projects that were listed on page 11049 of Tuesday's RECORD, which is a copy of the list submitted by the engineers with Bureau of Budget approval as shown in part 2 of the printed hearings on pages 4 to 7, except four, and the four are these:

Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo., $1,000,000.

Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga., $200,000.

Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa., $3,000,000.

Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif., $2,000,000.

A total of $6,200,000 below Budget estimates.

In other words, the funds proposed that are now pending embrace all of the projects that appear in those lists except the four I have mentioned.

Personally, I shall vote for the amendment. I was a member of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings on the items that were referred to the subcommittee on appropriations for the civil functions of the War Department, and which recommended them to the Deficiency Subcommittee. We could have had more extended hearings had there been any demand for them.

I can assure the Members of the House, however, that if these items should be referred back to us we would give them careful consideration in the hearings which start the 8th of January, and speaking for myself, I would favor making immediately available the funds for whatever items are then recommended.

Since the schedule calls for reporting the civil functions appropriation bill to the House and passing it before the end of January, and passage in the other body in February, the funds should be available for contracting before March 1 whichever way the House decides to act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, before we vote on the amendment that is before the Committee I think we ought to have a clear understanding of what it would do to our economy program.

I have a good deal of sympathy with the position that there must be no economy when it comes to taking care of the disabled veterans, and I would like to point out that there is no reason why those who voted for the veterans' amendment yesterday should catch the amendment itch and vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania today. This is an entirely different proposition. If we are sincerely for economy, here is a chance to register our attitude in a way the country will understand and appreciate.

If we want to get an inkling of what the blanket flood-control program proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania would cost, let us turn to page 798 of the hearings before our Deficiencies Subcommittee and take note of a colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and Gen. Thomas M. Robins, the Acting Chief of Engineers:

Mr. ENGEL. You spoke of a 6-year program. How much do you propose to spend during this 6-year program?

General ROBINS. On flood control generally?

Mr. ENGEL. On flood control and power on the ones that you say are multipurpose projects?

General ROBINS. We propose to spend in the neighborhood of $350,000,000 a year for 6 years.

In other words, the cost of the 6-year program as estimated by General Robins would be $2,100,000,000. I call the attention of Members to the fact that there are many States of this Union where, according to the latest census of national wealth, the total wealth of the State, including all property, personal and real, is less than the estimated cost of this 6-year flood-control program. And I call attention to the fact that General Robins' estimate falls far short of giving the real cost of this expensive and expanding flood-control activity. The allotments to date on old projects total $339,857,600, and on new projects $9,339,100.

Fifty-nine projects have been started and I can conceive of some justification for continuing appropriations for them, although there has been submitted no evidence of deterioration or harm likely to result to these projects in the short time before appropriations can be processed through the regular subcommittee. But the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania goes much farther. It includes 60 brand-new projects for

which appropriations amounting to $41,412,900 are included. In this new work 13 new dams are provided for. Dams are costly and there should at least be consideration as to whether there will be a demand for all of the power that will be generated or whether the prudent course would be to put in penstocks at present and then await investigation as to the need of constructing complete power facilities.

These and other pertinent facts prompt the inquiry, "What is the sensible thing to do?" The War Department subcommittee will begin work on the civil-functions bill on January 7. I submit that the wise thing to do is to defeat the amendment and send all of these projects back to the subcommittee to be further screened. Some of them undoubtedly are sound and in the public interest, and I intend to vote for them at the proper time.

I have the highest respect and admiration for the gentleman from North Carolina, and I think I would support his North Carolina proposition all the way through if it were separated from this over-all program, but I am not willing to swallow a camel to get at a gnat.

On the opening day of the debate on this bill and again today the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, sounded an economy note that will give hope and inspiration to the American people. His speech charted a course which this Nation must follow if it is to escape financial disaster. The program he outlined would give faith and encouragement to business and start the Nation on the road to economic recovery and stability. Let us not, I pray you, negative everything he so wisely said and throw a monkey wrench into the machinery of revival and rehabilitation by adopting amendments like this which commit us to projects en bloc without the most careful examination and screening. With a debt of $300,000,000,000 and our national finances in such precarious shape as they are now, we cannot be sure when we embark on such colossal spending projects whether we shall ever be able to finish them, and the best plan is to be slow in starting them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, if this House continues to authorize unnecessary expenditures such as are embraced in this amendment, no Budget balance will be achieved in 1947 or in 1957. What will be achieved, and that not in the too distant future, is galloping, irresistible inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am very strongly in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. I have been in this House for 15 years. The first thing I heard when I came to Congress was a demand to balance the Budget, but I have never seen a balanced Budget yet. We have a bill here that is more unbalanced than the Budget itself. They have done what they should have done, that is, provided $77,000,000 to apply to the dry lands of the far West where the people have no water. That is right. But they forgot the fact that in every State in the Union except the dry areas, floods are a constant and dangerous menace to all of the people who live in those areas. I say if we are going to balance the Budget, let us balance the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and, of course, I have passed on all of these measures that have come from the committee. I am very strongly in favor of the Snyder amendment. This is not a boondoggling bill. It is not a bill to provide jobs. It is not a bill for leaf raking. This is a bill to provide for the ordinary affairs of our Government and the country in peacetime. Many of these projects have been held up during the war. Some of them have been held up for 4 or 5 years. If we are going to go forward with an economy in our country so that we may in the postwar period be in a normal condition and carry forward the projects which are necessary for the welfare of our country, we should at this time approve this measure. It is quite true that a number of them are in my own State of Oregon. The great Columbia River, which is the second largest river in the United States, and the Willamette River which runs into it are subject to floods. A run of a severe flood would cost those communities in lost produce and farm lands and buildings, as well as loss of life, more than the entire amount that this bill carries for these projects. I do hope that every single Member will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the burden of the argument presented in opposition to the pending amendment to restore the flood-control items unexpectedly eliminated by the committee is first that Members of this body should follow the Committee on Appropriations, and second, that a vote against the amendment is in the interest of economy. Answering these oft-repeated alleged arguments, let me remind Members of this House that in supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman who held the hearings on the projects in question, Members are supporting the committee that held the hearings on the estimates, heard the witnesses and secured the factual information as shown by more than 200 pages of printed hearings. Bear in mind also that members of the Deficiency Committee who suddenly decided to eliminate all of the 119 approved flood-control projects, held no hearings concerning the projects in question. So the plea to follow the committee falls flat. It all depends on which committee one desires to follow. Personally, as a member of the Deficiency Committee, I have a very definite feeling that it is far safer, more logical, and in the interest of orderly procedure, to follow the regular committee having jurisdiction over all flood-control projects, the committee that conducted the hearings, than one that arbitrarily decided, over my protest, to kick out of the bill the 119 projects, all of which were heretofore authorized by Congress, merely because some objection was raised to one or two of them.

Now about the economy argument. My record for economy over a period of nearly two decades in this House speaks for itself. As chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, I have with the cooperation of every member of my committee, scrutinized carefully every item in the annual supply bill for the Interior Department. For doing so I have been bitterly criticized by some high-powered bureaucrats. But to say that it is in the interest of economy to refuse to finish 59 important flood-control projects, on which there has been expended in excess of $300,000,000, that were stopped in the midst of construction because of the war, could not by any stretch of the imagination be in the interest of economy. On the other hand, such a course, if followed, would be the rankest kind of wasteful extravagance.

When the vote comes today or tomorrow on the pending amendment, bear in mind that every project that was approved by the civil functions bill has been approved by the Army Engineers, the Committee on Flood Control, and authorized by the Congress. Each of them were approved by the President and certified as being urgently needed by the Director of the Budget. Remember also that the taxpayers have an investment considerably in excess of $300,000,000 in these projects, that when completed will save millions of dollars annually now being laid waste by devastating floods. I again predict that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN] is recognized.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this matter at length but time does not permit.

I feel we must appropriate the funds for the completion of these necessary flood-control projects today. To refuse to do so will be like going out into a rainstorm fully dressed except for our shoes. These projects were completely studied and analyzed years ago by engineering and civil experts before they were presented to Congress. They were scrutinized by the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the War Department engineers before they were authorized by Congress. They are as necessary today as they were the day that Congress authorized them. The war interrupted their completion, but the war did not stop floods.

There can be no assurance of real flood protection until every safeguard has been taken. That may take years. The work must now be resumed and continued without cessation until every section of the country which is subject to flood victimizing is amply protected.

Many individual projects have been completed with the exception of the installation of the final safeguards, such as pumping plants. That is the case at Hartford, Conn., where a comprehensive system of dikes was built. All that awaits the completion of the project are the installation of pumping plants. The cost involved is $285,000. Over $11,000,000 has been spent on the dikes by the city and the Federal Government. For the first time since the real development of the city started, when back in 1850 the city was first seriously submerged by floodwaters, Hartford feels reasonably secure from flood disaster. In 1927 the city was again laid low. Again in 1936 and again in 1938. In addition to the dikes, a conduit through the center of the city was constructed. Eight hundred thousand acres of land that never before could be used for constructive purposes has been reclaimed. That section is ideal for the establishment of new industries, for new residential areas, or both. Vast areas of homes for the lower-income people of the city could be built there. And yet, until the pumping plants are installed, there is always the threat of flood trouble because the final measure of protection, the measure to seal flood protection, has not been taken. The cost of installing these pumping plants which are required to absorb damage from internal drainage represents about 2½ percent of the total cost. They can be installed right now, regardless of weather conditions.

This is one small example of magnificent work uncompleted because all of a sudden we adopt a niggardly attitude and start pinching pennies. I agree heartily that we must reduce expenditures, but there is no economy in being penny-wise and pound-foolish, and to destroy important work because we refuse to see the forest on account of the tree in front of us, is folly of the worst order.

While I cite the situation in my own town, I recognize that the same situation exists elsewhere, and even if our flood-control system had been completed, I certainly would support whatever appropriations are required to continue and complete now the flood-control projects which had been interrupted by the war. I take exception to my committee's viewpoint that these projects should be held in abeyance for further study. They have been studied and have been recommended and have been authorized by the Congress. To wait until the next regular appropriation bill is before us to decide again on their merits may cause us to be guilty of negligence should the floods this coming spring wreak disaster that these improvements could avoid. Even so, it will take time to get them under way after the money is available.

In New England we were very lucky last year because the weather was on our side. There was considerable scare as the heavy snows started to melt, but fortunately a warm day was followed by a cold day and the turbulent accumulation of the melting snows was retarded. But we held our breath until the scare was over. That scare may well come this spring again.

Although I feel a strong personal interest in this $285,000 item for the pumping plants at Hartford, because I was largely instrumental in securing the authorization and appropriation for the dike program and naturally cannot feel at rest until the project is entirely completed, I am no less interested in the completion of the comprehensive reservoir project for all of New England. The small towns along the tributaries of the Connecticut River will not be protected until these projects have been built. I feel, moreover, that our situation is duplicated in every section of the country which has a flood threat. It is up to the Members of this Congress to see to it that the domestic peace and security of the Nation is no longer threatened by floods. The Nation is waiting for that assurance by definite action by Congress without any ifs, ands, buts, or delays.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the procedure which has been adopted in the consideration of this amendment, involving more than $120,000,000, is such that those who desire to be heard have been limited to such a very short time. This is not the proper manner in which to approach an item involving more than $120,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. At least the amendment should be dignified with an open, free, and fair discussion. To assume that the Members can get even a general idea of what they are considering in the brief time allotted is asinine. Every Member who has addressed himself to this measure, with the exception of three, has favored the amendment. Why? They favor it because their particular districts are participating in the appropriation, while admitting that many of the projects are unsound and should at least have further study. It was admitted by one of the gentlemen who spoke, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that some of these projects are not sound, but, nevertheless, in order to put the project over for his particular district he will support the amendment. Many of you know in your own hearts that some of these projects just do not meet the test.

It is my opinion that the Appropriations Committee has acted wisely in deferring the appropriation for rivers and harbors and flood control. The committee report candidly states that many of the projects require further study. That study can be made in the regular way and at the proper time by the War Department Subcommittee in January which is only a few weeks hence. This is in reality not a deficiency matter. An urgency does not exist. Why all of the demand for hasty action? No harm could come from deferring these items to the proper time for further consideration and study.

This amendment carries an appropriation to start construction on many rivers and harbors and flood-control projects throughout the country. While I am not fully informed of the merits or demerits of each, I am conversant with the proposed flood control works known as the Enid and New Grenada Reservoirs of the Yazoo Basin. The benefits to be derived therefrom are by the War Department engineers admittedly so limited that they constitute an economic failure. If this be true, and the engineers so say, then certainly an appropriation therefor should at least be deferred for further study as the committee report recommends.

Sound Government principles demand that no appropriation should be made for a flood-control project when it is candidly admitted by the War Department engineers that the project is economically unsound. I believe in a fair, adequate, and economically sound flood-control program. But to be such, the benefits from construction of the works should far exceed the damages which the construction causes.

In November 1941, the War Department engineers estimated the cost of the Enid project at $9,897,000, and in November 1943, their cost estimate of the Grenada project was $17,300,000. In view of the considerable increase in real-estate values, labor and material costs, and so forth, undoubtedly these estimates are low at this time.

In a letter of January 29, 1943, Maj. Gen. E. Reybold, Chief of Engineers, informed me that the tentative design of the New Grenada Reservoir pool will extend 35 to 40 miles up the valley above the dam, depending upon the amount of water stored at any particular time. It is also our information that 18 miles of railroad track, 30 miles of highway, and 75 miles of utilities in this area will have to be relocated.

The engineers made a study of the Yazoo Basin project and reported its findings to the Congress on December 12, 1935, Committee on Flood Control Document No. 1, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session. In that report they stated:

> While the estimates presented in the report, based upon the saving in property, do not establish complete justification of the reservoir project, the loss and suffering occasioned by the recurring floods throughout the region establish substantial additional justification from a humanitarian standpoint. Moreover, the project is particularly well adapted to public-work relief.

The Congress directed that they should go back and make a further study, and after so doing, they reported on August 14, 1941, in House Document 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, as follows:

> In a report dated February 12, 1935, and printed as House Committee on Flood Control Document No. 1, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, the Chief of Engineers advised the Congress that while the project for protection of the Yazoo Basin against headwater floods failed to show dollar returns sufficient to establish its complete economic justification, the loss and suffering occasioned by recurring floods appeared to establish substantial additional justification from the humanitarian standpoint.

It is of notable interest that in both reports the engineers in substance say that these projects are economically unsound—to use their exact words—they failed "to show dollar returns sufficient to establish complete economic justification." They justify the works only from a "humanitarian standpoint" due to recurring floods.

An act which alleviates the suffering of one group and causes it to be cast

upon another is not a humane act. So to eliminate flood waters upon one, and by the same act permanently cast them upon another, bears no semblance of humaneness. This would be the case if the reservoirs are constructed.

The engineers have estimated that the conservation pool of the Enid Dam would flood 6,100 acres, the flood pool 28,000 acres, the surcharge pool 41,000 acres; and that the conservation pool of the New Grenada Dam would flood 9,800 acres, the flood pool 64,000 acres, and the surcharge pool 72,400 acres. Many acres bordering the pools will also be taken, the exact quantity being unknown. All of these lands are located in Calhoun, Grenada, and Yalobusha Counties, and all are highly productive. We are also informed that other acreage of fertile lands lying below the dam sites will be condemned for the construction of levees and drainage ditches.

With present highly inflated land values, it will be almost impossible for the hundreds of people who will be driven from their homes and fertile low-land farms to purchase farming sites equivalent to those from which they are to be forcibly removed. The villages, communities, and farms which lie within the reservoir areas will be completely destroyed; schools and churches will be torn down; the dead will have to be reinterred; and the people of these areas will be compelled to search for new homes, new farms, new schools, new churches, and new neighbor associations—in fact, a new life. It will completely disrupt a now happy and successful people, some of whom are in the evening shadows of life. If the reservoirs are to be constructed for humanitarian purposes, are not the people residing within the affected areas entitled to the same humane treatment at the hands of their Government?

Revenues derived from real estate taxes almost wholly support our county governments and their various district subdivisions. Removal of the thousands of acres of land from the tax rolls would have a most disastrous effect on the tax structure of Calhoun, Grenada, and Yalobusha Counties.

May I again call to your attention that the engineers have on two occasions, after thorough study and consideration, reported these projects to be economically unsound. To my knowledge their opinions remain unchanged. If the Government is to afford the same reasonable and fair treatment to the people residing within these reservoir areas as it does to its other citizens, then the reservoirs cannot by even the slightest imagination be justified from a humanitarian standpoint.

So, Mr. Chairman, at least so far as these projects are concerned, I feel that the Appropriations Committee has acted most wisely in deferring the appropriation. There is no real urgency. Why all of this haste?

I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Snyder amendment. I am speaking primarily from the standpoint of the Missouri River projects, of which I have personal knowledge.

It is obviously impossible for any Member of this House to know all there is to know about all of the proposed projects. If we did not vote on them today but voted on them after another committee had reported on them, we would not know anything more about those projects then than we know now, when they are so far away from us. We have to believe somebody's judgment, and if we can rely upon the judgment of the United States Army engineers and the Flood Control Committee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]—and I think we can—then I believe we are justified in voting for this appropriation for these projects today so that work may be promptly begun.

From the standpoint of economy, may I point out that next week or the week after you will be called upon to vote $1,350,000,000 funds to UNRRA. The $350,000,000 part above the billion alone is over four times as much as the figure involved here in doing something for the United States to strengthen the country which is being called upon to strengthen the world.

I believe it is good economy and sound business to do something to preserve the resources and productivity of the United States if we are going to be able to do what we would like to do, relieve suffering and distress and economic chaos in other portions of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I was surprised to hear the words of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from North Carolina with respect to the Bug Island project on the Roanoke River, which traverses the State of Virginia and the State of North Carolina.

The State of North Carolina has been long-suffering with respect to floods on this river and has never asked the Federal Government for much assistance. In 1940 in my congressional district there were over 200,000 acres of rich farm land flooded; there was something in the neighborhood of $6,000,000 lost to agriculture.

In 1935 a comprehensive report was made on this Bug Island project. It was approved. It was shown at that time that power interests had selected this site. That is when the electric angle came in. Prior to that time the possibility of flood control on the Roanoke River in this locality was also recognized.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will prevail, for it will be a blessing not only to this area of which I speak, but to other areas throughout the country.

There have been lengthy hearings and investigations for flood control on the Roanoke River which have shown the merit of the project both for flood control and power development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to say that most of these projects are approved by the Rivers and Harbors Committee. Many of them are about half completed. Work was stopped when the war broke out.

The entire cost of these improvements is no more than the cost of the Pentagon Building. Some of these erstwhile apostles of economy asked us to vote for that monstrosity now overflowing with military bureaucrats. Only God knows what they are doing there, and what shabby arguments will be advanced to justify continued occupancy.

Year after year I have offered amendments to appropriation bills to cut down unnecessary spending, only to be flattened out by the Appropriations Committee's steamroller. As a matter of record, when the initial appropriation for the Pentagon Building was up for consideration on the floor of the House, I am proud to say that mine was the only vote in this body cast against the expenditure. The cost was represented originally as $38,000,000, but skyrocketed to more than twice that figure, excluding extras. And believe me, there were plenty of extras. Not only is it a white elephant, but the inconvenience of going to and from the place, and the taxicab costs, add insult to injury.

The very same people who have the impudence to assail a modest expenditure for vitally needed veterans' housing and urgent hospitalization, as well as essential flood-control projects, were the outstanding champions of the Pentagon fiasco.

We need to economize—horizontal cuts all along the line are in order. But it would be a tragic mistake to use the knife here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, deplore the action of the committee in limiting debate on this amendment.

I am opposed to the amendment. We are considering today an appropriation act from the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. If I understand it correctly, the appropriations considered should be made only if they are of an emergency nature and the urgency should be such as to require the immediate passage of such appropriation. With regard to flood control, I am sure from the amount of interest evidenced here that there are many projects throughout the United States which have considerable merit. Whether or not, however, such projects should come up in a deficiency bill is another question. Certainly it is my judgment that appropriations for such projects should come

up in the regular order after full and adequate hearings at which those opposed to such construction would have ample opportunity to be heard and the interested citizens in the communities affected should have sufficient time to make their showing so that they might be able to change the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers. Throughout the years the Corps of Engineers of the War Department has become accustomed to opposition from those adversely affected by flood-control projects and much time is required to get any concessions from the Corps of Engineers with reference to making the projects work as little harm as possible. I am not familiar with the over-all situation, but there are two projects which are included in the funds requested under the present amendment with which I am thoroughly familiar. These projects are in the upper Yazoo Basin and are known as the Enid Reservoir and the New Grenada Reservoir. From the information which I have had from the people affected, they have had no real opportunity to present their objections. I, together with others similarly interested, went before the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations and raised the objections to the present plan for flood control in that area. The Deficiency Subcommittee saw fit not to make the appropriation at this time, as has the Appropriations Committee.

It is my belief that if the appropriation is carried over until the next year and heard in the regular way this would give further time to work out some of the inequities and injustices which would be perpetrated on Yalobusha, Lafayette, Grenada, and Calhoun Counties in my State under the present plan. Since objections were made before the Deficiencies Committee on Flood Control; a bill has been passed which I introduced continuously for several years, giving a jury trial to the property owners affected. This they have been denied under the present law. In my judgment the law which has heretofore prevented even the right to a jury trial in fixing compensation for land taken worked a hardship on people in the area where two other dams were built. I have had numerous citizens from that area who feel that the War Department can meet the needs of the upper Yazoo Basin without following the plans now had for the Enid and Grenada Reservoirs. There is much evidence that in this section real local consent has not been had. With reference to these matters I would like to discuss with you some of the provisions of the present law which would indicate that real consent has not been given and that these two projects have not received the same general treatment insofar as authorization is concerned as has been given to the rest of the country.

The act of Congress which laid down the rule to be followed by the Federal Government in flood-control work is the act of June 15, 1936—section 702–a–g, title 33, United States Code 1940, followed by another act having direct application to flood-control work in the Yazoo headwaters, act 1936, June 15, section 701, title 33, page 2965, United States Code, 1940. These statutes by express terms provide for local consent, cooperation, and contribution, plainly setting out a plan of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and their local subdivisions, under which the local community directly interested would contribute, consent, and cooperate in the construction, by providing easements, rights-of-way, and other essential elements of the work, and as a part of this general scheme of consent, contribution, and cooperation, those interested prepared and had passed by the Mississippi Legislature a State law under which this agreement could and would be reached. The Mississippi Legislature at its session next after the passage of the Federal Flood Control Act in June 1936, at the regular session of 1938, passed chapter 314, Laws of Mississippi, 1938, being section 4767, Code of Mississippi, 1942, title being "Counties, Agreement With the United States." This State law is almost an exact duplicate of the Federal law as to consent, contribution, and cooperation, making one general plan.

Thus it is easily seen that both the Federal Government and the State government contemplated that there should be, by expressed agreement, consent, contribution, and cooperation on the part of both and that on the part of the State such consent should be by county government of "any county through which any river or other stream may run or any part of which any river or other stream may touch or border, on which the United States of America has authorized flood control improvements, to give satisfactory assurance to the United States of America."

Under this plan the local community interested or affected would show its consent to and desire for the contemplated flood-control work by complying with these respective Federal and State laws, and by failure so to do could show its opposition and make such opposition effective.

But despite this general plan, without any action on the part of the interested State, under section 702a 12 (g), page 626, supplement United States Code 1940, additional construction for flood-control work on the Red River in Louisiana and on the Yazoo River in Mississippi may be made without these restrictions and limitations being applied, thus picking out these two and these two only, from the general plan for the entire Mississippi Valley, thus seeking to thrust upon the citizens of those two sections only unsought and undesired flood-control work.

My idea is that under our democratic system of government and our American system of government, the continuance of which was sought to be justified by millions of our best boys and girls on the far-flung battlefields of the world, the general plan for all flood-control work should have been followed in the entire area and no exception made as to any that the general plan should apply to the Red and the Yazoo areas as well as to other equally interested areas.

Surely there can be found no emergency, no pressing danger or crying need for this work, which has remained undone for more than a hundred years, which sets this work ahead of or which shows a construction entirely at more pressing need for Federal cost, than all the other flood-control work in the United States. By this action, they make this construction more pressing that the levees on the Mississippi, than the work on the St. Francis, on the White; is the demand more urgent than the work on the Pecos, or on the Sacramento, to mention just a few of the many?

Why require the Mississippi River levee boards on both sides from St. Louis to and below New Orleans to consent, contribute, and cooperate and exempt these two projects, and these only? Of course, it is made to appear that the exception made with regard to this area is to help the area financing the projects entirely with Federal funds. Actually it takes away all chance of local interests to object to such construction because local consent and cooperation is not required.

The lack of consent, contribution, and cooperation on the part of the governing agencies of the counties covered under the State law lead me to the belief that the great majority of the people of the counties most affected do not desire this appropriation at this time, certainly not in a deficiency bill without adequate hearings.

The money sought under the appropriation is to be spent, insofar as Yazoo headwater works are concerned, on the erection of Enid and Grenada Reservoirs. The Enid project is on the Yocona River, which runs through, touches, or borders on Lafayette, Yalobusha, Panola, Quitman, and Tallahatchie Counties. The Grenada project is on the Schuna and Yalobusha Rivers, which run through, touch, or border on Calhoun, Grenada, Yalobusha, Carroll, and Leflore Counties and almost borders on Tallahatchie County. The counties of Yalobusha, Panola, Lafayette, and Tallahatchie are within my congressional district. As their Representative in the Congress, I must, insofar as I can, consistent with my convictions, reflect the expressed or unexpressed will of the citizenship of the communities, especially in matters where the path has been so clearly marked.

There can be no escape from the conclusion that until the consent, contribution, and cooperation of these interested communities has been expressed through their governing bodies in the manner provided by the law of the State, I, as the chosen spokesman of the section, directly interested, must act in accordance with them.

I have asked the War Department to present me with this evidence of consent, contribution, and cooperation on the parts of Lafayette, Panola, Yalobusha, and Tallahatchie Counties so that I may know that this agreement has been reached under the State law. This they have not done. It is my belief that they have no consent, though, of course, they claim the War Department "has assurances satisfactory to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers."

We are in the midst of change, of uncertainty and unsettled conditions. Many of our boys were called away from their jobs, their homes, and their work. In our engineering and construction forces many have been trained and have

become skilled in work along the line of these planned projects and when they return home they should be given an opportunity to take part in these projects and to share in the money expended on the work. We should not hasten these projects and employ entirely men who have been here at home enjoying the high wage of wartime but should take care to see that the returning boy has his share. It will be more than a year before this can be done. A new Congress will have been elected before the returned serviceman will be back with us and before he may intelligently go into the work he will choose for his life's work. If we hasten with immediate work of public construction we will grab it for the men who have been back at home enjoying high wages and thus deprive the returning serviceman of his proper share in public work, so this is an additional reason for no haste in these particular projects.

No plan of equitable compensation has yet been reached for the acquisition of lands, flowage rights, and easements from the landowner, whose homes, whose farms, and whose lifetime communities will be taken. Under existing law these lands, easements, and properties are taken by a court action under which the landowner is deprived of a jury trial. The very fundamental right of the citizen, secured to him since the days of Magna Carta is denied these people, who will be driven from their homes. I am glad to note that the bill providing for jury trial in such cases, which I introduced, has passed the House and Senate, though it has not yet become the law.

In many instances great areas of lands will be taken and will disappear from the tax rolls of the local communities, so that the burden of taxation is heaped on the remaining part of the tax community. Under present law it is sought to partially compensate for this loss by giving 25 percent of the rentals from the flood lands to the roads and schools of the tax community. But a pitiable sum is realized from this course and only one-fourth of this is to take the place of the tax lost to the community for work done for the benefit of other sections.

I have introduced and have sought to have passed an act of the Congress under which a jury trial would be given to persons whose lands, property, and rights are taken for this proposed flood-relief work. I have introduced and seek the passage of an act of the Congress seeking to give to the communities whose lands are taken the entire receipts from rentals and profits on the lands and property taken in all such projects. Certainly no less could be done in equity for the people and their communities. No action should be taken until such provisions are written into the law.

With regard to projects which would be constructed if the pending amendment is adopted, the present plans are not the only ones which the War Department itself has said will do the job.

At first the War Department recommended a plan for the control of floods on the Yazoo River which would have reduced to a very great extent the number of acres that would have been flooded. This plan provided for:

First. Levees on the Yazoo in the lower part of the basin.

Second. Channel improvement on the Yazoo and Yalobusha Rivers and Schuna River if found necessary.

Third. Use of the natural depression, or basin, south of Greenwood, Miss., to be used in case of excessive floods. This natural depression, or basin, south of Greenwood, Miss., might require a small levee around the same.

This plan was offered by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department to the people to be affected in a public meeting at Grenada, Miss. Then without further report to the people and counties affected the present plan which provides for taking approximately 72,000 acres of land for the New Grenada Dam and approximately 41,000 acres for the Enid Dam off the tax rolls or Yalobusha, Grenada, and Calhoun Counties was put through without notice to the people of those counties and now the War Department wants to start construction without any consent from those counties. This was done quite some time before I came to this body. Since I have been a Member here I have requested a report from the War Department and from the Mississippi River Commission as to why the original plan could not have met the needs. I have asked for a comparison of the two plans. Though these requests were made some months ago, I have had no detailed report but only a general response. Yet, supposedly a comparison should have been made before any change was made. In other words, the information should have been immediately available.

I am advised that the present plan calls for the removal of approximately 3,000 persons from their homes, which certainly means as much to them as the property to be benefited could possibly mean to the owners of it. Certainly this project should not go through until every means has been exhausted to take care of the problem without this ruinous effect on so many of the good citizens of those counties and on the counties themselves. Certainly not under legislation such as the section 702, page 626, of United States Supplement, 1940, which takes away from the local authorities the right to pass on whether or not they want this flood-control work, the only such legislation to be found on the statute books of the Nation.

I certainly believe that in any plan whereby the waters of the Yazoo headwaters may be controlled and kept off the areas along its flow, should be a fair and equitable one, giving relief to the one section with fair treatment of and compensation of the section burdened with the impounded waters, and a plan in which the folks above the dam have equal right of participation in the plan with those below the dam.

To this end the headwaters of the Yazoo River should be placed in position as all other flood-control plans in that there should be no exception as to it as to local consent, contribution, and cooperation, in the general flood-control act.

Any such work should not begin until the returning serviceman has ample opportunity to participate in it and he should be given the right to enter into the engineering, construction, and operation of these projects.

The right of trial by jury should be given in the Federal Court to any person whose land and property is taken for the project.

The entire proceeds of rentals and profits of and from the lands, easements, and property taken in the tax communities should be paid over to these taxing units for roads and schools.

As I see it this is but fair, but right, and until some plan of construction of floodway control work on the headwaters of the Yazoo River can be reached, no justification can be found for any representative of these nonconsenting communities voting for an appropriation for this work.

It is my belief if those interested in the plan would seek to ascertain the desires of those opposed a comprehensive plan could be worked out under which the problem could be met without the ruinous effects of the present plan and therefore I feel that this amendment should be defeated and construction held up. A further study of the problem should be made and any action then taken should deal fairly with all concerned. Do not ruin the counties in one section and their citizens for the benefit and improvement of the property of others.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, the money made available through Federal action for flood control is money well spent. This country is wasting its soil by ravaging floods. We need only to look at China to appreciate what has happened there over a period of a thousand years to know that their soil has been wasted and millions of people have died there in the course of a few years from starvation.

This country should keep its soil in good shape and we cannot do it if we let the floods wash it down the rivers year after year.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. If I did not think it was sound economy to vote for this amendment I would not do it. The amendment carries money for a project in my district to take care of a river through the ravages of which we lost 110 lives in 1935 and in which the Federal Government has spent thousands and thousands of dollars in drought relief that has not returned a penny.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Snyder amendment. Of course, I thought, because of my name, I might get some extra time, but I have been assured by my colleagues that there is nothing personal in this matter of flood control.

Seriously, I would like to say that there are two projects in the Luzerne County, Pa., area, included in the Snyder amendment, that are literally necessary to be included and should be in the deficiency bill because there has been $10,500,000 spent thus far on them. This is actually a deficiency bill.

I may point out that all the power of the Appropriations Committee and the prayers of King Canute cannot prevent the rampaging Susquehanna River coming down from upper New York State.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in my remarks a history of the bills of the Appropriations Subcommittee and the number of months it takes for one of these laws to become effective after it passes this House in the period of the last 8 or 10 years, to refute any argument made by the committee that this matter should be delayed until January of next year. This résumé is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Calendar showing action on War Department civil functions bills for the past several years:

1937:	
Reported to House	June 11
Passed House	June 15
Through conference	July 15
Approved	July 19
1938:	
Reported to House	Apr. 18
Passed House	Apr. 21
Through conference	June 2
Approved	June 11
1939:	
Reported to House	May 10
Passed House	May 15
Through conference	June 20
Approved	June 28
1940:	
Reported to House	Feb. 27
Passed House	Feb. 27
Through conference	June 18
Approved	June 24
1941:	
Reported to House	Mar. 26
Passed House	Mar. 27
Through conference	May 15
Approved	May 23
1942:	
Reported to House	Mar. 6
Passed House	Mar. 11
Through conference	Apr. 23
Approved	Apr. 28
1943:	
Reported to House	Mar. 31
Passed House	Apr. 1
Through conference	May 27
Approved	June 2
1944:	
Reported to House	Feb. 15
Passed House	Feb. 16
Through conference	June 21
Approved	June 26
1945:	
Reported to House	Feb. 12
Passed House	Feb. 13
Through conference	Mar. 21
Approved	Mar. 31

The point has been made that hearings on the civil functions bill will start on January 7, or in slightly over a month. It is here pointed out that even though hearings are started early there is no assurance that the regular bill will be enacted into law earlier than June and then the funds provided will not be available until July 1, while in the present deficiency bill the funds would be available immediately on approval, or more than 6 months before funds could be expected from the regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1947. The above tabulation shows how the civil functions bills have fared in recent Congresses.

I regret that the time allotted to me on this debate prevents me from having a longer period of time at this moment, so that I might point out in greater detail the magnitude of the flood-control problem in my congressional district; sufficient to discuss at this time is this particular bill. I will be content that there is included in the Snyder amendment the $135,000 for the Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township, Luzerne County, Pa., project and $400,000 for the Plymouth Borough, Luzerne County, Pa., project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment to restore the appropriation for war-deferred river and harbor and flood-control projects, which was dropped from the bill, be approved because I am primarily interested in furnishing adequate protection to those communities which have and will again suffer irreparable damage to life and property unless adequate protective measures are afforded.

I am particularly interested, of course, in flood control on the Susquehanna River at Sunbury, Pa., and right now I want to point out that there is absolutely no power project connected with this flood-control program—it is a purely protective measure. I was given this reassurance as late as this afternoon by the office of the War Department's Chief of Engineers.

Since May 10, 1939, up until the present time, flood-control funds have been recommended for Sunbury by the War Department Chief of Engineers in two different administrations, the program at various times has had the approval of the Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control, and War Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, an authorization bill for $1,900,000 was approved by the House on May 18, 1939, and on October 16 last the President in his message asking additional funds in the sum of $87,000,000 for flood control approved the plans of the War Department including the $500,000 to initiate construction work at Sunbury.

The city of Sunbury and its citizens suffered over $3,000,000 in damages in the flood of 1936. On March 29, 1940, Sunbury again suffered more than $100,000 in flood damage and at that time I personally witnessed the fear and anxiety of the men, women, and children of that community. They had scarcely recovered from the 1936 flood.

In 1940 it was only by the grace of God and the herculean and noble work of the citizens of the Sunbury area that the river banks did not crumble.

Located at the confluence of the two great branches of the Susquehanna River, Sunbury is particularly vulnerable to the flood peril.

In 1940 conditions were such that I finally appealed to the Work Projects Administration for some relief and was successful in securing some Federal funds to help relieve the situation temporarily. Since, the War Department has allotted $96,000 in connection with the preliminary work done at Sunbury.

Such intolerable conditions must not be permitted to continue and it is action now that is needed—not later. We have waited too long.

In May of 1940 persistent efforts to get the legislation out on the floor failed because of the threat of a Presidential veto because of the preparedness program—but the flood threat still remains.

We spend billions of dollars in lend-lease and relief abroad. Certainly the citizens of this country who pay the taxes through their sweat and blood to maintain our Federal Government, and to help other nations, are entitled to the protection of their lives and properties at home.

As I previously stated the amount requested in this aprropriation for Sunbury is only $500,000.

Aside from the fact that we must be ever mindful of the life and property of our citizens, we must be cognizant of the fact that jobs must be furnished in the postwar era. What postwar employment project would be more meritorious than to afford employment to men on a job where they would be working to safeguard the lives and properties of their own families and their fellow-Americans?

I hope and pray you will adopt this amendment. Let me again remind you that many of the projects listed are not connected with any power schemes but are purely protective projects—projects to save the lives and property of our American citizens and taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, some Members have offered the argument here that they are going to vote against the pending amendment because there are some projects in it they do not approve of. That is absolutely absurd, because the engineers do not have to go forward with any project whatever if there are local controversies that need to be ironed out. The engineers will certainly see that that is done before they go forward. So there is no use to argue that the amendment is bad because some projects may not be desirable. It is discouraging when a Member takes this floor and says in effect that flood control is not necessary when we in Louisiana have been literally washed away many times. In 1945 we had one of the worst floods in history. It absolutely ruined a great section of our alluvial valley on the Red River. We need action. We need action now. A great many of the projects that we are anxious to see constructed were not even included by the engineers in their report this time. They were not included by the Bureau of the Budget. We hope to get them later. But let us pass this amendment now, because it is necessary.

It is true, as stated, that the amendment covers only a small number of projects comparatively. But it is a starter. Other projects, I am assured by the Corps of Engineers, will receive consideration later—I hope in the next regular appropriation bill next year. Perhaps every State has projects which the Corps of Engineers did not include in the list in the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. His amendment, as

I understand it, embodies only those projects which the engineers listed and which were approved by the Bureau of the Budget and also by the subcommittee. I have worthy projects, and perhaps nearly every Member here has worthy projects, not in this amendment, but it will give the engineers the green light on some projects and we will include others as fast as possible.

For four long years during the war we have had no flood control. During that time we have had floods, bad floods, and, as I stated, Louisiana experienced a very bad flood on Red River. The very fact that we have not had these important flood protective works for 4 years makes it all the more important to make a start now. It is good economy to save our fine river lands which are subjected to these floods. It is good business to start now when we are doing all possible to get jobs for returning veterans.

It is regrettable that the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to cut out all money for flood control and river and harbor works in this bill. The passage of the pending amendment to put back into the bill the list approved by the engineers and the Bureau of the Budget is very necessary. I wish the list included more. The list is too small. That is the only objection I have to the amendment. But this list is a beginning. I strongly support the amendment, as it will enable us to start some work, and we shall, of course, urge the inclusion of other projects in the regular appropriation bill coming up early next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to go on record at this point in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The money which will be appropriated under this amendment will in many instances complete work in the Connecticut Valley which is practically finished at this time, yet because of the failure to expend a few thousand dollars it is in a precarious position. It will result in the completion of the work in six out of seven cities or towns for which authorization has already been given for local protective works, and those include the capital of Connecticut, Hartford, and large industrial cities like Holyoke, Chicopee, and Springfield, Mass. I therefore feel that this amendment is well worth while and should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the Subcommittee on War Department Civil Functions for its consideration as to one project in my own district which, had it been authorized, would have deprived some 10,000 people of their homes and flooded an area of 3,700 fertile acres. This project, the Whittier-Narrows Dam, is not included in the amendment, and I am very grateful indeed to the author of the amendment that it is not. It would have inundated one of the most fertile areas in our whole section of California, an area where there have been a large number of homes built by our people in recent years, an area which is all fertile farm land. It would have provided for the construction of a dam which, from the best advice we can get from the people who have lived in that section through the years, could not be made a safe structure, for the reason that the underground structure in that region is not such as would support a big dam of that sort. I could speak for a considerable length of time about this project. I merely wanted to say that I appreciate very much the careful consideration given to it by the subcommittee, the fact that they did not include it, and the fact that it is not included in the amendment now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is rather clear that the only point involved in this discussion is the matter of time. I am in favor of this amendment because it involves doing things and doing them now. These projects have been authorized by Congress. They have been investigated, surveyed, and approved by the Army engineers. They have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The number of projects in the Northwest States, at least, merit consideration. It seems to me it is a question of whether these things are approved by this Congress now and started now or delayed 6 to 8 months longer. I am sure the same projects will ultimately be constructed, and it seems to me that we should be in preparation at this minute to take care of employment on these projects which have been so thoroughly investigated, and to take care of this employment, and to do it immediately. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in and in favor of the Snyder amendment. Someone has said that most of these projects are meritorious. I take the position that they are all meritorious because by our own act we authorized every one of them. Not only that but the local people practically unanimously advocated them. The Board of Army Engineers made a thorough study and investigation of all of them. Then the Committee on Flood Control and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors held hearings and had before them the Army engineers and invited everybody for or against the projects to appear before approving the projects. Then this Congress authorized all the projects in the Snyder amendment.

I take the position that it is none of the business of the Committee on Appropriations as to the merits of these projects because Congress has placed its stamp of approval on each and every one of them.

I also take the position that the Committee on Appropriations has the right to go into the feasibility of supplying the money at this particular time and determining how much money should be advanced according to the relative merits of the projects. The Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee, and has no right to legislate on any matter. The legislative committee is Congress who has authorized all these projects to be developed. We cannot take back something that we solemnly promised the people of this country, that is that these projects are good and will be developed in accordance with the merits of each one.

All of these projects mean something. Many of them will save our land, and in the long run mean more taxes for the Government. Many of them with power will pay for themselves in 25 or 30 years, and the Government will have a going concern that will bring dividends back. None of them is useless.

Many years ago some of our leaders now who are talking about economy advocated billions of dollars, and succeeded in getting through Congress laws to give employment for people to rake leaves and do other things which meant nothing stable for the Government. All of these projects are useful projects, many of them self-sustaining, and later on will bring dividends in to the Government, and the others will not only protect lives of people in floods, but will enrich the lands in many areas of the country, and finally the Government will reap more benefit in taxes from this class.

Let us carry out the contract that Congress has made in authorizing these projects which are necessary, some of which have begun and are not yet completed, and in many others the planning has been almost completed with forces on the ground for completion without money. In many of these projects where the planning is not completed it will take a year to complete same. Certainly this type of project should be in readiness within the next few months so as to give jobs to our returning servicemen and others not employed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the one big point—if not the only point—in reference to the adoption of this amendment is the question of timing. If the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is adopted, this bill will go to the Senate almost immediately. It should be completed and become a law before Christmas. Work can immediately begin on the emergency projects contained in this amendment, and some of them may even be completed before the next floods.

A large part of my life has been spent living behind the levees. I have lived to witness the thaws of the snow in the mountains and in the Northern States. I have lived to see the waters accumulate from the little streams into big rivers and to send rushing flood torrents upon our people. The thaws and consequently the resulting floods come in the late spring and are the destructive floods which many of us in the lower Mississippi Valley dread so much. If the amendment is not incorporated now in this bill or if the money for these projects is postponed until the regular appropriation bill is passed in the late spring, we know the money will not be available until the midpoint of next year.

This will mean work cannot be begun on the emergency projects prior to the next great floods which may inundate many sections of the lower Mississippi River Valley. The same is the case with other sections of the country. It is, therefore, vitally important that speed be used in the appropriation of funds for these emergency projects.

In my own area of Louisiana there is an item for levee work on Red River. During this current year we experienced the worst floods of all recorded flood history. More water attempted to descend Red River than at any similar time, and as a consequence our levees broke and millions of acres of farm lands were inundated. It is imperative that work be begun in the near future on this project of repairing the levees if we are to remove the present hazards of additional floods.

Then there is the Bodcaw Bayou project which carries with it an appropriation of $1,000,000 to carry on the work. Bodcaw Bayou often floods two and three times each year and causes distress and heavy property loss throughout the length of a very fertile valley. By beginning this work at once the hazard of this flood will be eliminated sooner and much money will be saved our people and likewise our Government.

The Wallace Lake project in Caddo Parish, La., according to Army engineers, is 94 percent complete. By presently appropriating $190,000 this work may be completed. This project was recommended in the 1936 Flood Control Act, and construction was begun immediately before the war started. Although it was suspended during the war, the Department of Agriculture recommended it be completed as a part of the emergency war-food program. The survey showed that millions of dollars in farm products sorely needed at the present time by the world will be saved by the completion of the last 6 percent of the Wallace Lake Dam and Reservoir project. It therefore seems folly in my mind to continue to put off the completion of work well begun and in fact almost completed. It is certainly economy to complete this project as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly interested in this amendment. In the 1945 floods, causing over $102,000,000 in damages, were suffered by our people and almost 16,000,000 acres of land were inundated. I have always supported the great program of flood control which will add wealth to our country and give safety to our people. I hope this amendment is adopted by an overwhelming vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Flood Control I realize the great importance of many of the projects included in this amendment. I believe that enough money should be made available that we can proceed in order to save millions of dollars worth of property that each year is being destroyed. In my own congressional district this year in one city alone three to four millions of dollars of damage was suffered.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], who offered this amendment, and his committee, on the fine cooperation they gave me when I appeared before them to explain in detail why I thought we should have this money at this time, so that the Corps of Army Engineers could construct the dams and reservoirs that are so badly needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope this debate will do one thing; that is, direct public attention to the importance and necessity of giving adequate consideration to the preliminary legislative consideration of these projects. I opposed several of the projects when they were pending on the floor of the House. The Congress approved the projects and authorized them to be constructed. In other words, you ordered your Committee on Appropriations to provide the necessary funds. Those of you who opposed the legislation when it was pending on the floor of the House certainly are consistent now in opposing the appropriation.

May I say that I am willing to place my record for economy beside that of any Members of this Congress. I stand for economy. I have voted for eeconomy. But you have authorized your Committee on Appropriations to provide the necessary appropriations, and that is exactly what you have here now. Gentlemen, I see nothing we can do but to pass the pending appropriation bill with the Synder amendment. I am in favor of the Snyder amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the adoption of the Snyder amendment. I believe it would be a very fine action by this committee and the Congress if the Snyder amendment were adopted. However, it is my intention when the parliamentary situation permits to offer an amendment which will add one more project to those contained in the Snyder amendment. I cannot claim sole credit for the authorship of this amendment which I intend to offer. Joining with me are my colleagues, the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLEY, Mr. CORBETT, and Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the project which I ask this committee to add is a project which has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and has been rated as a No. 1 project by the United States engineers. It is No. 1 in priority. It has the approval of the Water, Power, and Resources Board of Pennsylvania, an official State agency. When it is completed, it will reduce the flood waters 4½ feet, not only in the city of Pittsburgh, but in many other cities down the Ohio River. It will save in damages as much as $20,000,000 in 1 year if we were to have another flood as we did in 1936. It has been approved by every agency and by every committee that has studied it with the exception of a single individual who has objected to it. Nobody from any section of the country appeared in opposition to this particular project. I ask that the members of this committee add one more project to the Snyder amendment. I hope I have the support of the members of the committee for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I arise in opposition to the amendment to the Snyder amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. At the outset I want it to be clearly understood that I am not against flood control, but, on the contrary, I strongly favor flood control, as I have favored it in the past. I am particularly interested in the control of floods in the upper Ohio Valley and western Pennsylvania, but I also believe some consideration should be given to the people living in these areas, whose homes, factories, investments, and so forth, would be inundated if a flood dam the size of the proposed Conemaugh River Reservoir is constructed. If this, the Eberharter, amendment is adopted, it will mean that the Army engineers are authorized to construct a huge reservoir near Tunnelton, Pa. The backwater from this dam would extend for some 17 miles on the Conemaugh River and 12.7 miles on the Blacklick Creek, covering 6,820 acres of land and impounding a gross capacity of 274,000 acre-feet at an estimated cost of $30,457,000.

Mr Chairman, my interest in defeating this amendment is in behalf of the people of Indiana County, Pa., whose homes are in the area vastly affected by the building of this dam. I have been reliably informed that Blairsville, a town of more than 5,000 people would be most seriously injured. One-third of the town would be inundated, and the loss to it has been estimated to be more than a million dollars. In addition to the destruction of Blairsville, the construction of the Conemaugh Reservoir would completely wipe out the villages of Bairdstown, Cokeville, Tunnelton, and Livermore—all situated in the area covered by this contemplated dam. It would also destroy thousands of acres of the finest fertile land, now used for farming. A very reliable experienced mining engineer has assured us that 70,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, one of Pennsylvania's greatest resources, which is now drift mined, will be left unavailable for this kind of mining. Hundreds of men would be thrown out of employment in the community where the proposed dam is to be placed. Blairsville can ill afford to have additional unemployment thrust upon them.

In lieu of the proposed Conemaugh River Reservoir, there is advocated a sewill do the same as a huge dam would do to prevent floods and at the same time keep intact the communities in Indiana of dams such as we advocate—and, incidentally, we are reliably advised on this—will do the same as a huge dam would do to prevent floods and at the same time keep intact the communities in Indiana County, Pa. I believe I am fair in suggesting a series of dams to protect the

properties and the livelihood of so many people whom I represent. Mr. Chairman, this project was considered by the subcommittee on civil functions of the Appropriations Committee at the time of their recent hearings and the committee recommended that the project be carried over without prejudice for further study. I ask the committee to defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], proposes to offer is a very meritorious one. It refers to the Conemaugh River Dam. The Conemaugh River flows into the Kiskiminetas River. Both rivers border my home county. The Kiskiminetas River flows into the Allegheny, which borders on the western part of my county and flows past my county into Pittsburgh. The northern borders of my county have been ruined repeatedly by the flood waters of the Conemaugh and Kiskiminetas Rivers, as has the land along the Allegheny. Many homes have been lost and much damage has been done. Manufacturing plants and mines have been ruined. Many people have perished in the past as a result of floods from these rivers. Those who have homes along the shores of these rivers live in constant apprehension of what may happen to them from year to year. They can look only to the Federal Government flood-control program for security. I have the assurance of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], that in the event of the failure of the Eberharter amendment, he will see that it is introduced before his committee for consideration on January 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I think I have the easiest proposition of any Member of this House to support, in my support of the Snyder amendment. I say that, because I am asking your unanimous support of the $7,100,000 item in the river and harbor section of this bill, to go to further completion of the great Federal breakwater in the sea waterway and harbor of my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

On November 27, on page 11067 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will appear my remarks on this same important subject. This is not a new project for the Congress has already expended more than $23,000,000 upon it, out of an appropriation of $31,000,000 and the work was only temporarily discontinued on account of this recent World War. This sum of $7,100,000 is estimated by the United States engineers as necessary to complete three sections partially constructed, when discontinued on account of the war.

When I was home briefly this summer, I was amazed and inspired by the marvelous development and improvements made in the short period from January to July in the shore naval installations. Commodore Heim and his fellow officers and everybody on land and sea were very gracious and cooperative in showing me, as Congressman of the Eighteenth District, around. They all unanimously expressed hope that the breakwater could be completed at an early date. They explained the many practical and necessary reasons why.

Naturally Congress and the Navy would never have commenced building this necessary breakwater across the harbor of my home city, if years ago it had not then already determined upon this very harbor and port as one of the major naval havens of our continent. And, gentlemen, that is just what it has now become.

Just the other day, that distinguished naval officer, Commodore S. F. Heim, commandant of the United States naval shipyards at Long Beach, and which great naval installations this breakwater also shields, announced that these yards of the Navy were the major ones in southern California, and that a minimum of 7,000 workers in peacetime would be employed. Also, he anounced that the industry and needs at the world-famous Roosevelt naval base at Long Beach would be stepped up instead of slackened by the end of the war.

Recently in the Long Beach Harbor, under the shelter of this very breakwater which we now ask money to complete as needed now for naval and commercial shipping, Admiral William F. Halsey, commander of the Third United States Fleet, yielded command thereof to Rear Adm. Harold F. Kingman. Admiral Halsey thus completed 45 years of distinguished service in this great Navy. Long Beach is Navy-minded; it welcomes sincerely and hospitably the officers and men of the fleet and their families. It has always done so and the public buildings, parks, recreational facilities, are freely used by Navy whenever desired. For over 20 years the city of Long Beach and the recreation commission have maintained an admission-free club for the enlisted men and that club is one of the finest in the Nation. A great new Navy hospital is there situated, serving a real need. The Navy installations ashore total hundreds of millions of dollars; the fleet ships riding at anchor behind this breakwater value even more millions; it is the home base for them; it is a commenced and absolutely necessary project of national and international significance and moment; the Navy asks it; the President has approved it; the Army engineers are ready to finish it. So—let us do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment to restore to the bill H. R. 4805 the $25,516,000 for rivers and harbors because we need these funds to provide work projects for returning veterans as well as for the development of many of our river and harbor developments which have been held up during the war. In Los Angeles County the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor badly needs a 13,000-foot outer breakwater which has been held up during the war. Without these funds this breakwater could not be built. This great harbor is a great natural asset for the postwar development of world trade.

I also favor the restoration of funds for badly needed flood-control projects. We in California need flood-control aid perhaps more than any other part of the Nation, especially in southern California which is increasing in population so rapidly that much of the land which must be used for homes not now protected by flood control must be protected or later flooded out at great loss of life and property.

I urge the Members of the House to support this amendment because these funds are needed now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with and in favor of the Snyder amendment. It may be true, as has been stated by some of the Members, that there are many projects included in this amendment that should not be there. While that may be true, the majority of the projects should be there. They are projects that have already been authorized. They have been carefully examined heretofore, and appropriations have been made for them. Some of them are partially completed.

There is a project in West Virginia, Bluestone Canyon, a flood-control project, that is now one-third completed. The expenditure of four or five million dollars has been made there by the Federal Government. Work was suspended at the beginning of the war. The contractors are now there ready to commence work. Their organization is there. Everything is ready for the work to begin. It should not be suspended. This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, every bill that is brought in here is based either on humanitarianism or economy. It is strange to me that in the name of humanitarianism we are asked to appropriate billions, yes, billions of dollars to clothe and feed foreigners who do not even say "thank you" but who are resentful because they do not get more; yet you do not want to vote a few million dollars to a group of drowning Americans down in the flooded parts of this country. We should go ahead with these flood-control projects. Last year in my State, Louisiana, because of a flood in the late cold spring we lost 400,000 bales of cotton, worth $50,000,000. Taking into consideration the fact that the first 24 cents of every dollar you earn above your exemptions is taken by the Federal income tax, you lost right there $12,000,000 more than the amount we asked for down in Louisiana. The problem is very serious, and the State Legislature of Louisiana at a special session within the last 60 days has made an appropriation of $5,000,000 for matching funds to go along with this. We cannot have another flood next spring; we must do this work now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

The Chair hears no response. The Chair will say for the information of the House, and especially the gentleman from Missouri, that 12 names now remain on the list. So there will be no misunderstanding, I will read the names of those who have not been called or who have not responded. There have been a number who did not respond when their names were called. That leaves on the list now on the Chair's desk the following names: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGLE of California, WHITTINGTON, TRIMBLE, BARRETT, PETERSON of Florida, WOODRUM of Virginia, RANKIN, HARE, BAILEY, TARVER, SABATH, and THOM.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are three more to be called tonight, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] is recognized.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I relinquish my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] is recognized.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in the pro forma discussion, probably I should say the ad libbing, that took place on this proposal before it reached the floor in the form of an amendment, I noticed the charge made repeatedly that only those Congressmen favored this amendment who had projects directly concerned. I think that was a grossly unfair charge. I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and asked to have included a project on one of the major tributaries of the great Kanawha River. The Committee saw fit to leave my project out. Despite that fact, and despite the fact that I have seven other projects in my district on which not a single dollar of Federal money has ever been appropriated, I am still for flood control and for the Snyder amendment.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. I trust that this House restores the flood-control program to its rightful place in the bill which we are trying to pass, which will thereby make this Congress the servant of all the people.

The rivers belong to all the people of this country, and as good neighbors, those of us who are not jeopardized in life and property by continuous floods, desire to lend our aid to those of us who are. The damage caused by one flood far exceeds the total cost of all these projects.

To refuse to go along with the Army engineers in this program, under what occurs to me to be an erroneous conception of economy, borders on a policy of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. Our people do not object to the use of their money when it is used for them, and when they get value received. We hear constantly from this floor that the people resent wasteful spending. Well, I agree with that and shall not knowingly support such legislation. But here we have legislation proposed solely for the public good, and proposed at a time when our returning servicemen can share in the work of building. It is a certain way to avoid the so-called wasteful spending.

Another thing in this legislation which commends it is that in many of these projects for flood control there is also a power-development feature. I personally think this is a very wise and sensible provision because it enables the people, the taxpayers, to even be repaid the money spent in the building of the dams for flood control and, at the same time, secure cheaper power at home. I know there is objection to this on the ground that it is an infringement upon private enterprise. My belief is that it aids private enterprise instead. In my district there is located Norfork Dam, constructed under this program. The dominant power company in my State buys the power generated there at rates which permit it to sell to its own customers and to the Rural Electrification Administration at a rate cheaper than they could otherwise do. This contract with the local power company is under the watchful eye of the representatives of the whole people. Under its terms the total cost of the project will have been repaid, with interest, to the people of this country within a few years. It is a self-liquidating project. Private enterprise could not build these flood-control dams. Their cost must be borne by the public. To make them power projects, when feasible, is only common, everyday horse sense and good business. I do not share the anxiety of those who fear the power development phase of these projects. I think they are scared far worse than they are hurt, and that instead of hampering free enterprise the inclusion of power development makes more certain the continuous growth and development of the free-enterprise system.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest Tuesday to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as he presented this bill to the Congress. I was particularly impressed by his well-expressed deep concern lest the Nation find itself in danger by the overexpenditure of funds. I think his remarks could well be interpreted to lead toward the principle of balancing the budget. If I thought that were to be the policy of this administration, I should be somewhat reluctant to take the well of the House today to speak on the question of including the deleted items for flood control and rivers and harbors in this bill.

I share with the chairman grave concern, and have for many years about our unbalanced budget, and more particularly the fact that there seems to be little attempt to balance it.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that if this administration and this Congress is to attempt a policy of balancing the budget they will need to go back and review some legislation already passed. Most certainly this Congress and its leadership must make a definite commitment to the Nation now, that many of the pending bills which will require enormous sums of money shall not be passed.

I believe there are now pending before this House bills providing Federal sums to different programs amounting to total expenditures of over $3,000,000,000 annually. There are also pending bills requiring lump-sum appropriations of over $38,000,000,000.

All of us know that it will not be the policy to curtail Federal programs, and all of us know that the budget will not be balanced in the immediate future.

As a general policy it has always seemed to me the better part of wisdom to follow the Committee on Appropriations in its recommendations, after they have heard all the evidence submitted to them in the hearings. I am surprised to find that the Committee on Appropriations has deleted all of the items for flood control which were submitted to the Congress by the President.

The President's budget recommendations amount to approximately $25,000,000 for river and harbor work, and $87,000,000 for flood control. Surely if the Nation is to concern itself with a Public Works program, these items are of necessity in that category. By and large these items have been approved by the Committee on Flood Control, the chairman of which is the Hon. William Whittington. It cannot be denied that this distinguished gentlemen is a student thoroughly familiar with the problem of flood control, and surely his record is one of sanity and conservatism. The same may be said for the distinguished chairman of Rivers and Harbors.

There are some things about this bill which seems to me should receive the consideration of this body today. Why, for instance, are all items of flood control and rivers and harbors stricken from the bill, and so many other items left in?

This deficiency appropriation is merely a question of carrying out a program already approved by the Government through an expression of this Congress.

I hold in my hand a telegram from the Governor of my State of North Dakota, which I represent at large, which reads as follows:

> Do not know reason for deleting flood control appropriation. Urge reinstatement reasonably soon. Garrison Dam plans ready for starting preliminary construction work in early spring.

To delete this item from this appropriation bill does not mean a saving, because its construction has already been authorized and preliminary plans made. It simply means that the work on the Missouri River and its tributaries authorized by this Congress will be set back several months. The same will apply to other authorized works in every other section of the Nation.

In the north country the question of flood control and irrigation and reclamation are closely tied together. Only by joint action can the great development already planned have its beginning.

I am naturally primarily concerned with the development of the Missouri River and its tributaries as was authorized by the Seventy-eighth Congress. I see in this legislation the bringing to the country of great new opportunities. I see

with the completion of irrigation of reclamation supplemented by flood control that never again will this Congress be called upon to make the extensive appropriation for relief measures in drought periods that it made in the early thirties.

I am equally concerned with those people who occupy land down the streams of the river who are constantly confronted with devastation from excessive floods. Surely, it is within the power of the Nation and surely it is right to expect the Nation to exercise its right of power in the common interest of these people.

We are told that these items can be included in the next appropriation bill. By these remarks we are justified in the belief that they regard them as sound and worthy; then why should they be deleted from this particular measure unless it is the intention of this Congress to set about the task of balancing the budget, and I question whether that is the issue involved here.

It must not be overlooked that a number of the reclamation projects included in the pending bill provide for the development of power. The cost of some of these projects will run into many millions of dollars, sometimes in excess of the cost of the flood-control projects.

If there is power to be developed in the West, and I have no argument about that, I know of no reason why it should not be developed in the Northwest. It is my personal belief that the items deleted from this bill should be restored on the floor today. The people living in the areas affected should not be held in suspense. They should be able to definitely look forward to a fuller and brighter life as a result of a well-planned program of irrigation and reclamation and flood control. Both of these programs are vital to the growth of the United States of America. It is the duty of this Congress to intelligently set the machinery at work to do the important job ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I am definitely for this amendment.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the elimination from this bill of all appropriations for civil construction work by the War Department is to my mind not only a grave error but it is a disaster affecting the entire country. It means a practical abandonment on the part of this Government of plans of great magnitude, not only for the future development of the country as a whole, but for the security of the lives and property of millions of our people.

I have a deep interest in the restoration to this bill of the items for flood control, and I favor the pending amendment. My interest arises not alone from the concern I naturally have for the security and welfare of our people as a whole, but in a greater measure it stems from the concern that I have for the people of a large and prosperous area of my native State of West Virginia. Among the items eliminated from the bill under consideration is one for continuance of construction in West Virginia of what is known as the Bluestone Dam across New River, a tributary of the great Kanawha. This project has a most interesting history and I regret that the lack of time precludes me from relating to you the complete story. May I however give you but a brief sketch?

On September 12, 1935, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who at that time had been for a little over 2½ years President of the United States, issued an Executive order approving plans theretofore made by the War Department for construction of a flood-control dam across New River in West Virginia and directed the Secretary of War, through the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, to proceed with the work of construction. To this undertaking was given the name of the Bluestone Reservoir project, and by his Executive order the President allocated $1,000,000 out of funds made available by the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 for immediate use in construction of the work. Eight hundred thousand dollars of this sum was allocated for the acquisition by purchase or condemnation of necessary land and rights-of-way.

I personally know that the President at that time had given intensive study to the plans of the War Department for this dam, and to the great need of the protection it would afford to the people living in the great Kanawha and Ohio River Valleys. He then knew that this dam was the key dam in a system of four projects planned for protection from floodwaters of the great Kanawha and the area drained by New River and its tributaries. Of the four dams planned for this area one was to be located on Elk River above the capital at Charleston; one on Gauley River, a river which by its junction with the New River at Gauley Bridge, W. Va., forms the great Kanawha; the third on Greenbrier River, a tributary of New River; and the fourth and most important being the Bluestone Dam, the one covered by the Executive order. The President knew of the disastrous floods that were almost of yearly occurrence in the valley of the Kanawha and in the Ohio Valley below the point of junction of the Kanawha with the Ohio River. He knew also that the construction of the Bluestone Dam would, of itself, be a tremendous factor in the control of the floods. This dam is the only one of the four I have mentioned that is involved in the questions before us.

Following the issuance of the President's Executive order the Government of the United States started proceedings to acquire the necessary lands for construction of the project. These proceedings were enjoined at the instance of the West Virginia Power Co., a subsidiary of the Appalachian Power Co., which, in turn, was a subsidiary of the American Gas & Electric Co. These companies at that time owned the site of the dam. This injunction delayed the work of construction for many months. It was afterwards dissolved by the United States circuit court of appeals. But it is unnecessary to here give a history of this litigation. Suffice it to say that it was finally cleared and the Government proceeded with the work of construction.

This Congress supplemented the sum originally allocated by the President by additional appropriations, and work on this dam proceeded rapidly until the beginning of World War II. With our declaration of war, the work on this project, like that on other public works of similar character, was suspended for the duration. Any unexpended balance of appropriations formerly made for this work was, as in other like projects, diverted to other uses under authority given by this Congress. Therefore there are today no funds available to continue the work on this project, and there will be none available until a further appropriation is made. A further appropriation of $3,000,000 was recommended to the Appropriations Committee by the War Department and was also recommended by the President of the United States. It is this amount that we want to see restored to the bill before us.

Today Bluestone Dam is practically one-third completed. The work already done has cost this Government several millions of dollars. The exact amount I am unable to state, but whatever it is, it will be a total loss unless funds for completion of the work are made available. The contractors on this job have their equipment upon the ground. They have the necessary materials at hand; they have or can secure on brief notice all the labor required. They have the organization and the facilities for proceeding with the work of construction at once. Is there any reason that can be justified why this committee should refuse to let this work proceed?

This is not a project but recently planned. It is a project one-third completed. It has had years of consideration by the War Department and by committees of Congress. Surveys were authorized by Congress in January 1927. The project was recommended by the engineers of the United States Army after complete investigation. It was approved by the Missisippi River Commission in 1934, and by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in January 1935. The latter board recommended its construction at a cost of $12,942,000. It was recommended by the Secretary of War on January 29, 1935. It was approved by the President as evidenced by his Executive order on September 12, 1935. It has been fully approved by the Committee on Flood Control after full and extensive hearings. It has been repeatedly approved by action of Congress.

Convincing evidence of the necessity of this project, of its value for flood control and of the protection and security it will afford to the people of a vast section of a great State has repeatedly been stressed before various committees of this body as well as to officials of the Government. Why, then, at this time, when our country is presumably entering upon a new era of progress and development, should a great work of this character, now one-third completed, be allowed to lapse, and what has already been accomplished be left to nature's destructive elements, for no apparent reason except a false conception of economy? I, for one, cannot understand the action of the Appropriations Committee in deleting these items from the pending bill. Their action has certainly not been explained in their report. It has not

been justified on the floor of this House. It cannot be justified by either reason or common sense.

Let us here and now correct the error made by the Committee on Appropriations by adopting the pending amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] proposes that all of those rivers and harbors projects, and the allocations for flood control, set forth and recorded on pages 4 and 5, of part II of the hearings, be incorporated in this deficiency bill. May I say that there is one flood-control project enumerated in that list which is located in the district which I have the honor and distinction to represent, and I refer especially to the item allocated for Muncie, Ind., in the sum of $70,000. May I enumerate the situation which obtains with respect to that flood-control proposal for the city of Muncie, Ind., and the reasons of its importance at this time. The city of Muncie has a population of some 70,000 people; it is one of the outstanding cities in our State, and it has been named the typical American city by some of our outstanding citizens. The river which passes through that city passes very near the business district in that city, and through the thickly populated residential sections thereof. The banks along the river are low, and during the flood season this river overflows the banks and much water comes into the business district, as well as in the residential sections, of that city. Property loss and damage has been great. Much distress has resulted from the flood waters from that river. The imminent need of aid for flood control at Muncie, Ind., is great. It is my hope that this flood-control aid may be incorporated in this measure. However, if this amendment should be rejected by the House it is my hope that in the future hearings, by the proper subcommittee, that this great need may be carefully investigated, and that this aid for flood control will be extended to the good people of the city of Muncie, Ind. The need for this relief is so imperative that it should not be delayed, and I hope this allocation of the sum of $70,000 may be extended to this city, and community, at a very early date. It is my hope that the proposed amendment may pass and this relief granted at an early date.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I had expected to speak at some length on this amendment. I had especially hoped to do so in view of the fact that I am a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles appropriations for flood-control and river-and-harbor work. By reason of my assignment I am quite familiar with the amendment now pending, and I had hoped to make some comments with respect to it. Unfortunately the limitation of time is such that it is impossible to present to the House the facts of the situation as I see them, and I shall not undertake to proceed further.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Snyder amendment will be adopted without change or without amendment.

The Snyder amendment provides for the flood-control and river and harbor appropriations as recommended by the President of the United States through the Director of the Budget and as approved by the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Civil Functions of the War Department.

Members of the House will not be deterred by those who advocate no provision for flood control or rivers and harbors in one breath and support in the pending bill approximately $77,000,000 for reclamation. Nor will Members of the House be deterred by those who object to an individual project because power will be developed when the bill under consideration provides for power development in the reclamation projects. Amendments have been suggested. Members of the House are on safe ground when they follow the Budget and when they follow the subcommittee. It is unwise on the floor to insert amendments, as there would be discrimination. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] has offered an amendment to provide for the Fort Gibson Reservoir and the Hulah Reservoir. As the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] pointed out, the Fort Gibson Reservoir is embraced in the pending Snyder amendment. I trust the gentleman from Oklahoma will withdraw his amendment.

It has been the policy to follow the Director of the Budget. In the circumstances, the safe course to pursue is to vote down any amendments that have not been approved by the Budget and that have not been approved by the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of reporting flood-control and river and harbor bills. The debate discloses that all members of the subcommittee save one supported the reporting of the exact language of the Snyder amendment. We followed this committee in appropriations for the prosecution of the war. We voted for multiplied billions. I think we are safe in following the President of the United States, the Director of the Budget, and this committee in asking that a total of approximately $120,000,000 be restored for flood-control and river and harbor work in practically all of the States of the Union when the pending bill carries $77,000,000 for reclamation in substantially one-fourth of the States of the Union.

This is especially true when the appropriation for national flood control alone for the fiscal year 1943 was $129,226,700, which was not expended because of directive L-41 of the War Production Board about October 1943. It is not unfair to now ask that a total of $120,000,000 be provided, when more than $129,000,000 in national flood-control works alone were discontinued for the duration.

Much has been said about costs. We can only appropriate the amounts authorized. The total unappropriated authorization for national or general flood control is $1,080,000,000. The pending amendment carries only $81,000,000 for national flood control and $15,000,000 for the Mississippi River and tributaries. The program contemplates the expenditure of the authorizations over a period of years.

In all fairness, I believe that the Snyder amendment should be adopted without change.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, on October 24 I appeared before the subcommittee considering the pending bill and recommended that all of the appropriations for flood-control projects in New Hampshire requested by the Corps of Engineers should be approved, with the exception of an item of $30,000 for advanced planning on the Bennington project. I made objection to this item, due to the fact that it had not been approved by the Governor of New Hampshire pursuant to a request of the engineers. It is my understanding that no money will be spent, regardless of the appropriation and the adoption of the pending amendment, unless the approval of the people of New Hampshire is first obtained.

There are four items recommended by the engineers with which I am in full approval: An item of $60,600 for final completion of the Franklin Falls Dam; $195,000 for the construction of levees, a concrete wall, and a pumping station at Nashua; $521,500 for the construction of the Mountain Brook Reservoir in Hillsboro County; and $17,000 for the completion of the Surry Mountain Dam. Funds ought to be made available for all of the foregoing projects in connection with the comprehensive flood-control program for the Merrimack River Basin, as heretofore authorized by the Congress.

There are, in addition, two requests for advanced planning—one of $8,000 for use at West Peterborough, and the other of $7,000 for Nashua, both of which are recommended. Until approval is granted by the State for the construction of the Bennington Reservoir, no money should be spent for this project.

There are several other proposed flood-control dams being considered for construction in New Hampshire for which funds are not requested in the pending bill. It is understood that the Corps of Engineers will not expend any funds on these projects until approval of the people of New Hampshire is first obtained. Hearings with respect to the construction of these projects have been held in New Hampshire, pursuant to State law. Appropriate recommendations concerning the construction will be made by the State water resources board in due time and the position of the people will then formally be made known by the governor. The Corps of Engineers will be governed by such recommendations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] to H. R. 4805, the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The Appropriations Committee reported this bill without any appropriation whatsoever for flood control and other related projects. There may be some of these projects that are unnecessary, not feasible from an economic standpoint; however, there are a great many projects that are feasible and sound economically. Some of these have already been started and considerable sums of money spent on them. Among

these feasible and economically sound proposals that have not, through the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House, been included in this bill is one in my own congressional district. I refer to the Wolf Creek Dam project.

This project was authorized under the 1938 Flood Control Act of Congress. The first appropriation was made by Congress for the Wolf Creek Dam project in 1941. All work on this project was finally stopped under orders from the Government in 1943 because of the lack of materials and manpower. This dam was being built under contract. As the Government stopped all the contracts without any fault on the part of the contractors it was necessary for the Government to take over all the equipment of the contractors, and the Government now owns this equipment.

The Government has already invested approximately $8,000,000 on this project to provide money necessary to carry on the construction of this project for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The Army engineers of the War Department that has this construction in charge, after careful investigation recommended to the President and the Bureau of the Budget that $4,000,000 would be necessary and the Bureau of the Budget approved this sum and urged that it be included in this deficiency bill but as heretofore pointed out the Appropriations Committee cut this sum out, and the money for many other projects that were under construction, as well as some that had not been started.

This is one of the large flood-control projects. The foundation for this project with part of the embankment has already been completed. This foundation is 5,700 feet long and nearly 2,000 feet wide at the base and it affects 63,000 acres of land; and title to thousands of acres of these lands has already been acquired by the Government. They have also cleared off around the foundation 2 or 3 square miles.

It will require 3 or 4 years to complete this project. This will mean that it will provide employment for approximately 3,000 workers on the dam for a period of 3 or 4 years, and it will provide employment for approximately 4,500 additional workers outside of the construction, and in industry, furnishing materials, equipment, and so forth, for the dam.

This dam is to be approximately 200 feet high, and of course it will serve as flood control and provide navigation and power if necessary. This dam affects materially a large part of the entire Cumberland River Basin from the Mississippi, Ohio, and Cumberland Rivers up to and including Burnside, Ky.

It will be a wonderful recreational center. The area covered will have a circumference of between 50 and 60 miles. The people of many counties in the west end of my congressional district strongly favor the completion of this project. Millions of our young men are returning from the service. They will need employment. This will provide jobs for 7,500 workers for at least 3 or 4 years and in view of the lack of transportation facilities it will greatly benefit the people in the lower end of my district and those who have made a careful study of the subject believe that it will cause many industries to be established in that section and a great many other activities will be encouraged and developed. This will furnish employment for the people in that section and markets for the farmers.

HEAVY LOSS

If this project is abandoned now the taxpayers will lose all that has been invested in this project. The people in that section believed that this dam would be built and have sold their lands and properties to the Government, the titles to which are now held by the Government. Many of the owners have moved away from these lands acquired by the Government. Highways have been changed. Schools and churches have been reestablished elsewhere.

It can be seen at once how this operation has greatly changed the section of country that is involved in this project and how the people have rearranged their lives in view of its construction.

In view of what our Government owes, if this was a new proposal, I doubt if I could get the consent of my mind to support it, but inasmuch as the project has gone as far as it has, it seems to me that it would be unwise to hold it in abeyance. There is no proposal here to repeal the act of 1938 authorizing this and some other projects. If this project does not go forward now, there would be a large section, involving many counties in the west end of my district that would be disorganized for some years to come.

After having given this matter careful study from all angles, I urge support for the Kerr amendment proposing an appropriation of $4,000,000 to carry on this construction to the end of this fiscal year.

I am not unmindful of the fact that we are giving away billions of dollars to people in other lands and this administration is proposing to lend billions of dollars to help construct flood control and power dams in China and other countries of Europe and Asia, and are spending large sums in the development of industrial plants, providing business opportunities, as well as jobs for the people in other lands.

In view of this and other considerations, I feel that I am justified in urging the appropriation for $4,000,000, as approved by the engineers of the War Department and the Bureau of the Budget, to continue work on Wolf Creek Dam through the present fiscal year.

CENTRAL VALLEY STATEMENT

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for its action in providing $780,000 to begin the construction of the transmission lines that are necessary to the proper functioning of the Central Valley project for the benefit of the people of California. In providing the line from Oroville to Sacramento, the committee has furnished the project with the first step to assure that Shasta and Keswick power will be made available to the municipalities, irrigation pumps, and industries in the bay area.

In providing funds for this line the committee has recognized the soundness of providing public outlets for the public power produced at Federal projects. To be sure I am disappointed that the three lines included in the Budget estimate were cut to one. These three lines will be essential to the proper functioning of the project system. They are the necessary three legs to the stool. Even the irrigation pumps cannot be dependent upon one line only, but this first line is an earnest of good faith to the people of California. It will reassure the municipalities and the farmers that we intend to carry out the purposes of the great Central Valley project in a businesslike fashion and that we do not intend to be stampeded into a policy of building dams without power outlets that will benefit the people.

The committee is to be congratulated for giving the people of California that reassurance.

COERCION AND INTIMIDATION BLOCK RECONVERSION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the CIO owes its existence to the policy of coercion and intimidation followed by the last administration. It owes its continued existence to the present administration.

As long ago as 1924, John L. Lewis, who was then speaking for the A. F. of L., charged, and his charge was substantiated by reliable evidence, that the Communists were seeking control of the American labor movement—see Senate Document No. 14, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session. They have acquired a high degree of power in some unions.

Later, Lewis went with the CIO. It contributed some $770,000 to the campaign fund of Candidate Roosevelt and, in return, in its organizing campaigns, which Lewis either did not see fit to or could not confine to legitimate organizing activities, the CIO received the aid of President Roosevelt's administration, and adopted and used communistic tactics of defying the law, resorting to violence, creating civil strife.

The Senate Civil Liberties Committee aided and abetted the CIO organizers in their campaign of fraud, deception, and lawlessness by not preventing those organizers from carrying on their cars a placard which read, "'United States Senate Car, La Follette Civil Liberties Committee, Investigators."

When the thugs and the goon squads from other States moved into Michigan in January of 1937, they expelled peaceful workers from their places of employment; by force took possession of factories; wantonly damaged and destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of private property; took over cities and, by force and show of force, prevented policemen, sheriffs, and their deputies, from maintaining law and order.

Under Lewis and his lieutenants, the CIO defied the orders of the courts of Michigan; destroyed the right of the citizen to go about his lawful business, and brought about civil strife.

The then Governor of Michigan, Frank Murphy, now sitting on the United States Supreme Court bench—who had been brought back from the Philippines by the President to run as a candidate for Governor in Michigan—then in almost daily communication with President Roosevelt, in violation of his duty as Governor, called out the armed forces of the State, not, as one might suppose,

to protect the citizen, enforce the law—but, believe it or not, and the record shows it—to protect assaulters, destroyers of property, men who were committing not only misdemeanors but felonies—called them out and maintained them, armed, in a Michigan city, to prevent—and they did prevent—police, sheriffs, and outraged citizens from expelling the thugs and the goon squads from Michigan factories.

The foregoing is not a statement of opinions or conclusions. It is a statement of facts.

In return for the support given it by those in high authority, the CIO, in industrial centers and elsewhere where it could, gave its political support to the administration, and in some instances was the deciding factor in the election of local peace officers, of some Congressmen.

Later, the National Labor Relations Board, by misconstruction and by maladministration of the National Labor Relations Act, played into the hands of the CIO on many occasions when jurisdictional fights arose between the CIO and the A. F. of L.

In a few instances, its decisions favored the A. F. of L. and, when they did, Phil Murray, head of the CIO, charged it with bias and prejudice, while John L. Lewis, who had in the meantime severed his connection with the CIO and headed the United Mine Workers; and William Green, head of the A. F. of L., charged that the National Labor Relations Board was the tool of the CIO. In the records of the National Labor Relations Board there is evidence to support all of these charges.

Not as apparent, but just as widespread, are the administration present attempts to coerce management, employers; compel industry to meet at least a portion of the present demands of the CIO. An illustration of the Labor Department's attempt to cause a labor dispute—coerce an employer, force employees to join a designated union—was given the House earlier today.

The CIO today is attempting to establish here in America the communistic theory of government. The CIO and its spokesmen have long been demanding a full share in management; at the same time, refusing to accept any degree of responsibility.

It insists that, when industry makes a profit, it share in that profit. It vehemently refuses to accept any portion of a loss when a loss occurs, because, it says, any loss is the fault of management due to mismanagement.

It insists that it should have access to the company books, on the theory that it is entitled to a share in the profits. But, when the books show a loss, it refuses to take any reduction in wages; insists that its members shall be paid the minimum wage, even though the factory be forced to close its doors.

While demanding that industry throw open its books and insisting that the union officials have a voice in the distribution of the company's gross income, it refuses to let management or industry have any part in the management of union business.

To put it bluntly, the CIO today is following a policy of "Heads I win, tails, you lose," forgetting that, if it were permitted to follow that policy long enough, it would shortly have had and spent all of the coins, and there would be none left to continue the jobs upon which its members are dependent.

The National Labor Relations Act provides that, when a labor dispute arises, the employer shall negotiate with the employees' representatives in an effort to obtain a settlement.

Do not forget that, while the National Labor Relations Act imposes many duties upon employers, upon management; prevents any effort by management, through free speech, to disclose to employees the aims and purposes of the union or its organizers; provides for many penalties which can be imposed upon employers, it in no instance requires the union or its representatives to do anything; imposes no prohibitions or penalties upon the union or its members.

The present administration, in a more refined and in a less apparent way, is following the same policy of coercion and intimidation followed by the previous administration.

The press of the last few days and the morning press tell us that Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and Conciliator Warren are now demanding that management come to Washington and reopen negotiations with Walter Reuther and other UAW-CIO representatives.

What is collective bargaining? Presumably it is an attempt, where there is an honest dispute and a prospect of agreement, of arriving at a compromise.

The New Deal Supreme Court faltered and stopped when it was asked to hold that, under the National Labor Relations Act, an employer was compelled to meet the demands of labor negotiators. Whatever may have been its inclinations, it was apparent to even a rabid New Dealer that such a decision would be met by effective action of a Congress prodded by irresistible public sentiment.

The National Labor Relations Board has held, and in that conclusion has been upheld by the courts—although the law itself gives it no such authority, that employers must bargain in good faith.

This holding has opened the door to the further theory that the Board, being empowered to require the employer to bargain in good faith, may also hold that he is not bargaining in good faith unless he meets at least a portion of the demands of the union. A statement of that proposition shows its injustice.

In the sit-down strikes in Michigan, which ran from the last day of December 1936 to the 11th day of June 1937, management was compelled to sit in conference with union representatives for days at a time, sometimes not even recessing for meals.

Then, finally, when public sentiment was so aroused that it was apparent that, at least in one Michigan city, vigilantes would by force and with the use of firearms oust the goon squads from other States which had taken possession of her factories, Governor Murphy presented a letter, so he said, to John L. Lewis, telling him that the factories must be vacated. Then the strike was settled.

The same sort of a policy is now being attempted by Secretary Schwellenbach and his representative.

The UAW-CIO, through its spokesman, Walter Reuther—who, by the way, while a healthy young man, with a wage-earning wife, was deferred on the ground of dependency and remained during the war safely here in America, as the representative of the UAW-CIO—now demands that General Motors throw open its books to his inspection, apparently upon the assumption that he has the right not only to secure a fair wage for the members of his union, but to determine how the dollars received by General Motors from the sale of its products should be distributed as between stockholders, management, company needs for continuing the business, and the workers. The union also claims the right to limit the price at which motorcars should be sold.

Management replies that it cannot and that it will not meet the 30-percent demand. It offered a compromise, which was rejected by UAW-CIO, which again repeated its statement that it would not settle for less. What, then, is there to negotiate?

Is management, which has problems of reconversion on its hands, to be called down to Washington and to be detained here until it has been intimidated into meeting the demands of the administration's political ally?

General Motors has said that, inasmuch as Reuther insists upon his demands, as it cannot and it will not grant them, further negotiation is futile, and thus it would appear to the average citizen.

To enforce its demands, UAW-CIO has thrown picket lines around the company plants. Picketing is legal. Intimidation and coercion by a picket line is not.

By means of picket lines, UAW-CIO is attempting to force management to either mail or take paychecks to workers who customarily are paid within the plant. The press of November 23 carried the information that Ernest J. Moran, assistant regional director of the UAW-CIO, said strikers want to be paid on the sidewalk, did not wish to enter the plant.

The day before, Moran said that:

> We have struck and now we must dig in for a long stay. The only way we are going to win this strike is to maintain a fast and rigid picket line. We have people who have joined us in sympathy and we cannot let them down.

What did Moran mean by "a fast and rigid picket line"?

The press further gave us the information that union leaders announced that foremen and supervisors will be permitted to enter only on agreement not to do strikers' work.

From yesterday's press, we learn that:

> Pickets at the Saginaw Steering Gear Division of GM blockaded a group of supervisory employees in the plant for nearly 16 hours in a dispute over payment for work done before the start of the strike.

Also that:

> About 100 supervisory workers were forced to remain inside the GM steering division plant at Saginaw, Mich., when pickets blockaded it yesterday. Union leaders convinced

the pickets they should let the office workers out at 11:40 p. m., eastern standard time.

UAW-CIO Local No. 174 in Detroit, claiming a membership of 40,000, through its representatives, by a picket line prevented, according to the press, clerical employees from entering the Turnstedt offices. Mr. Lyons of the union explained the union's action in this way:

It helps the union because it is costly for the company to pay them—you might call it pressure. Then we don't know who all these people are, whether they're going in to try to break the strike or not. So we keep them out as part of the maintenance of an effective picket line.

The press tells us that, in reply to the UAW-CIO demand, apparently backed by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and Conciliator Warren, that the company reopen wage negotiations, the company said:

Unless you are prepared to modify your unreasonable wage demand, abandon your attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our past profits, assumed future profits and our selling prices, and are now prepared to discuss wage adjustments on their merits, we do not think that anything can be gained by further discussions.

General Motors' statement assailed what it termed union refusal to permit many salaried employees to enter its plants throughout the country.

When your union uses force and threats of force to interfere with free entrance at our plants, * * * you are creating a situation of lawlessness.

A fair settlement of the strike cannot be negotiated while such a situation exists.

The press tells us the union answered as follows:

This strike is the result, as reports in the press and radio make clear, of General Motors' refusal over a period of 97 days to bargain collectively in good faith, to permit Government conciliation and to arbitrate the issue.

Now the corporation has refused to negotiate at all on our wage demands since negotiations without discussing the company's ability to pay are not negotiations. We are notifying the National Labor Board of this further violation by General Motors of the National Labor Relations Act.

Then Anderson of the company declared:

We engaged in collective bargaining with your union in meetings covering a period of weeks. It was clear to us from the very beginning that you were determined to have a strike in General Motors.

You now have that strike—your so-called labor blockade—which you planned for many months.

Today, we have this situation: Hundreds of thousands of employees now out of work; other hundreds of thousands will be deprived of their jobs unless the motor industry renews operations; the whole reconversion program held up and delayed.

The union, according to the statements of the press—and there is no reason to doubt their accuracy—now prevents company employees and management itself from going into the factory, in violation of section 17 of act No. 176 of the Public Acts of Michigan for the year 1939, which reads as follows:

SEC. 17. It shall be unlawful for any employee or other person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force, or attempt to force any person to become or remain a member of a labor organization, or for any employee or person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force or attempt to force any person to refrain from engaging in employment. Violation of this section shall be a misdemeanor and punishable as such.

The union demands that the company produce its books. It asks for a straight 30 percent increase in wages, although the United States News of November 30, 1945, publishes facts and figures which show that the average wage throughout the United States, as measured by the purchasing power of the dollar—let me repeat, in purchasing power—is some $290 more today than it was in 1929. The article supporting this statement is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A."

The union demands that it have a part in management; the right to limit the price at which motorcars shall be sold.

The company has said that it will not, because it cannot, meet these demands, and the Labor Department of the Federal Government now calls upon management to come to Washington and negotiate on these demands of the union.

Does Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and the man whom he sent to Michigan as the Government's conciliator, supposedly impartial—a former president of Michigan CIO—intend to insist that management recede from its position that it cannot be required to open its books to UAW-CIO?

Is Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach demanding that management recede from its position that profits are not to be considered when fixing wages? Does he demand that the company recede from its position that the laws of the State of Michigan relating to punishing misdemeanors be enforced? Does he demand that the company recede from its position that its officers, its clerical workers—yes, and its employees who want to work—should not be kept from going through the company gates by force and violence?

If he does not, let him tell us just what he expects management to do. Just come to Washington, sit here and talk until, tired out, physically exhausted, it turns over its business to an organization which in some instances is shot through and through by communistic theories and agitators?

While paying lip service to free enterprise in its support of H. R. 2202 and S. 380, the so-called full employment bills, this administration effectively and vigorously is supporting a policy which will destroy private enterprise, throw more workers out of their jobs, and it is time the people knew the facts.

EXHIBIT A

[From the United States News of November 30, 1945]

Standards of living for this country's employed workers outside of farms have been rising steadily since 1933. As the Pictogram shows, by 1939 these standards topped the boom year of 1929, and now are higher than ever before.

The figures in the Pictogram represent the actual buying power of the average jobholder—the goods and services he could buy and the savings he could make after taking cost of living and Federal taxes into account. The figures include all wage and salary workers and all persons who receive income from their own business or profession.

In 1929, the average income of the working United States citizen, adjusted for taxes and living costs, was $1,331. Actual dollar earnings in that year were $1,640, but living costs, as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, were higher than they were in either 1933 or 1939. Cost of living in 1929 was 23 percent higher than the average in 1939, thereby reducing "real income" to $1,331 on the average.

In 1933, the real income of the average United States nonfarm worker had dropped to $1,256. The average dollar income in that depression year was lower than that—$1,168—but the cost of living in that year was only 93 percent of the 1939 average.

In 1939, recovery had carried real income of the employed population to an average of $1,435 per worker. That corresponds to the actual dollar earnings of that year, since this year is taken as the base year for measuring cost of living. Thus, on the eve of war, American workers on the whole had succeeded in raising living standards by approximately 14 percent above the depression low.

In 1945, when war ended, the real income per worker was averaging $1,603 a year, 27 percent above 1933 and almost 12 percent above 1939. War brought sharply higher taxes, the first time an income of this size was taxed, and sharply higher living costs (28.9 percent above prewar), but dollar earnings more than kept pace with this rise. Actual dollar earnings of workers this year was averaging $2,346 a year when Japan surrendered. Rising living standards also are reflected in the number of United States citizens who are able to find jobs. In 1929, for example, the working population off farms was 36,177,000 persons. By 1933, the number of nonfarm workers had dropped to 28,081,000, but 6 years after again approached the 1929 figure at 35,759,000. In 1945, civilian employment reached its highest point with 44,470,000 persons at work.

Total employment, as well as average income, thus is a measure of United States progress.

"Real" income of average United States worker [1]

	Annually
1929	$1,331
1933	1,256
1939	1,435
1945	1,603

[1] Nonfarm wages, salaries, and payments to management after Federal taxes and adjusted for cost-of-living changes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4805, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all those who have spoken on the bill today may have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REDUCING CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, tomorrow afternoon, the rules of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if we are able to reach a full agreement on that and it is not a controversial matter and it can be brought in here within a reasonable time, or if it can be brought in here within a reasonable time anyway, I would not object; but I would have to object unless there were coupled with that request certain restrictions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of the conditions indicated by the gentleman from New York are entirely satisfactory and included as a part of the request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair has no idea how long this bill that has been under consideration today will take tomorrow. It may take 30 minutes or 4 or 5 hours. The Chair is going to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] to call up a conference report first. How long that will take, the Chair does not know. If that is disposed of and there is time left, the Chair will consider these other things that might come across his desk and will recognize Members on those matters.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri if it is planned to call up the conference report before we finish the pending bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will handle that part of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The first business, provided it is agreeable to the majority and minority leaders, will be disposition of the pending bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And thereafter the conference report on the Boren bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understood the Speaker the other day, we were to dispose of this bill first.

Mr. McCORMACK. I stated that immediately after this bill, and the Speaker has just stated it the same way, and the Speaker's statement is strictly in accordance with what I said, the next order of business will be the conference report on the Boren bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am glad to have that statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made today the text of a statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Federal Council of Churches.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made today letters written to him by the city of Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include addresses by Mr. Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, upon the subject of the economic future of the West. I am advised by the Public Printer that they will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost $242, but I ask that they be printed notwithstanding that.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address entitled "The Future of Italy," by Col. Charles Loletti.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I asked and was given permission the other day to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost $138.80 but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two wires he received today relative to the matter of veterans' hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Col. Howard B. Brown, acting director of hospitalization service, delivered before the American Hospital Association at Chicago. The delegates later passed a resolution to assist the Veterans' Administration in this regard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE DISCHARGE OF CERTAIN MIDSHIPMEN FROM THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs: VINSON, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and COLE of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a telegram from Gov. Robert S. Kerr, a telegram from N. R. Graham, a letter from the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, and a letter from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a serviceman in the Philippines.

Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a resolution adopted by the National Reclamation Association.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a letter from the Secretary of War, and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of strikes, and include extracts from a local paper.

Mr. PACE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him on yesterday before the Cotton Textile Institute.

FOREIGN POLICY STUDY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that a comprehensive study of the foreign policy of the United States should be made by a select committee of the House of Representatives. After traveling in 30 countries last summer and after spending 3 weeks in London as a delegate of the United States to the recent United Nations Educational and Cultural Conference, I am more thoroughly convinced than ever that there ought to be a searching investigation of our policies and the manner in which our policies are conducted in all sections of the world. The recent resignation of Ambassador Hurley and the points made in his statement which was in the press only yesterday are most significant as evidence to substantiate my position.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for a study of our foreign policy by a select committee of this House. It shall be the duty of this committee to conduct a comprehensive study of all phases, both political and economic, of the foreign policy of the United States and to conduct an investigation of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States. This study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to, first, the

formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States; second, the improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States; third, methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and, fourth, the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will act immediately upon this important matter. Only by a searching study of our foreign relations and of the department of government charged with the execution of our foreign policy can we hope to remedy the present chaotic conditions in the field of foreign affairs.

BANKERS' SPLENDID ACTIVITIES IN WAR FINANCING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], is recognized for 40 minutes.

NEW DEAL POLICIES

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today there is much for which Americans can and should be grateful. But I believe that we are headed for grave future troubles which could be averted if Congress would only stop voting the treacherous New Deal policies, foreign and domestic.

A sponsor of the New Deal foreign policy was recently awarded the Nobel peace prize, of all things. But it seemed apparent way back in 1943 when the policy was christened in vodka at the Moscow Conference that this policy, completely violating Jeffersonian principles, could only lead to a world communistic superstate and continual war. Lately the welkin has rung with lamentations for poor Poland, poor Yugoslavia, poor Greece, and other lost tribes victimized by the policy. There is public discussion of whether or not the United States should fight Russia. A picture magazine, picked up at random, shows bathing beauties being polled upon the question.

The United States began subsidizing Russia in the early thirties with the gold-buying program. Russia would not be much of a menace today if she had not been given everything she asked unconditionally, or if Congress had not supported and financed that New Deal policy. Congress must not continue to promote war and misery abroad and at home through financing the building up of Russia or any other foreign government violating the Atlantic Charter. War is not the way out.

War against Russia could not relieve us of the fear of having our cities destroyed by atomic bombs in the future, perhaps by some small country. Destroying Russia would not destroy communism. Win or lose, another deadly war is likely to sink the United States into a communistic system as complete as Russia's and no doubt the Communists count on that.

There will always be Communists, regardless of what they call themselves, as long as communism continues to be a lucrative political racket. A nation can even fall into communism without realizing it—the way our Nation has been doing. The communistic state consists of a privileged caste supported by slaves of the government. Communism is what you get when the government continually tries to buy the support of part of the people by giving them special privileges at the expense of the rest of the people.

Even before the recent war the United States had blithely voted itself more communistic programs than taxpayers could afford to pay for and still keep their private property. Every additional deficit spending orgy creates more money, depreciates the value of the dollar, makes the standard of living more expensive. Already there is so much depreciation of the currency through deficit spending, accompanied by communistic production controls, that the standard of living grows rapidly more and more expensive. All we hear nowadays is strikes, strikes, strikes. Congress is thinking of outlawing strikes, but wilfully continues to vote more deficit spending, which is a fundamental cause of strikes. Congress deficit spends to buy more communism at home, then deficit spends to buy more communism in Russia, Britain, and other foreign countries. If you really want to destroy communism the place to do it is right here in Congress.

The New Deal foreign policy has made the United States the arsenal for both sides in a growing war for power between the Russian and British Empires. It seemed that anybody with any sense of caution would know better than to vote for the monstrous Bretton Woods bill which donated billions of dollars both to Russia and Britain. But perhaps you were stampeded. All the leaders of pressure groups favored it. They always favor every major New Deal measure. Your political leaders tell you that you cannot afford to alienate them. But do not you think the average American is beginning to see through the racket?

Certainly the people do not seem to stay sold long on New Deal programs these days. Look at the pet New Deal measures passed lately. Look at the glamorously advertised San Francisco Charter. It was impossible to find any political leader with the temerity to oppose it publicly. But within a few weeks it was as dead as the Atlantic Charter which it buried. True, the proponents are trying to use the necessity of securing universal atomic bomb restriction agreements as an excuse for frightening the American people into an all-powerful world superstate. But surely it will not take Americans long to see through that one too, since it is worse. What would the American people get but slavery out of a world government sure to be either a dictatorship run by imperialistic governments or a democracy run by the people—in a world in which the overwhelming majority of the people would not understand the value of traditional American principles of government even if you explained it to them?

Look at the other pet New Deal measures voted lately, the Bretton Woods bill, the slave-labor bill, the nurse-draft bill, and so forth. They were ardently supported by all your House leaders. But the blunder of voting for them was apparent even before they could be rushed back from the Senate.

Look at the New Deal measures you are asked to pass before Christmas: the full employment bill, the conscription bill, the UNRRA appropriation, and the bill giving an international bureaucrat power enough to take the United States to war. What a Christmas present for the American people. The kindest thing you could do for the new President is bury this already putrefied New Deal program, instead of hanging it around his neck like a dead albatross. Not that he has not asked for it.

The full employment bill is a Communist trap. Earl Browder, erstwhile Communist leader, let the cat out of the bag in his book called Teheran, only to be liquidated for talking too much. In that book Mr. Browder told Communists that, for the present, Communists would endorse private enterprise, saying they were giving private enterprise a chance to create full employment. Come the next depression—come it surely would with the United States deficit financing to the extent of billions of dollars to foreign governments as he advocated—Communists would then be in a perfect position to say that private enterprise had had its chance, had failed, and now "let somebody do the job of creating full employment who knows how."

The principal clause in the full employment bill, the clause guaranteeing the right to work, is lifted bodily from the constitution of the Russian Soviet Union. That clause was the snare from which the Russian Government construed the authority to force every Russian to do slave labor for the government or else be sent to starve in Siberia. Your political leaders tell you that you cannot afford to risk having it said next campaign that you voted against full employment. But nonsense, every Member of Congress can truthfully say he votes for relief work. Certainly you cannot afford to vote your country into this Communist trap. It is cunningly devised to indict and convict individual enterprise and private property in advance and ensnare free American workers into slave labor.

The communistic conscription bill comes from a War Department which, like our State Department, needs a bit of shaking up. During the war Britain enjoyed a veto on promotions of some of our ablest officers. Fellow travelers were given key positions. Some of our ablest military men, though gagged by military discipline and thus prevented from speaking publicly, say privately that the proposed conscription bill will give the United States a mere false sense of security, like France before World War II. They say that what the United

States really needs for adequate defense is:

First. A program to convert the scientific and industrial genius peculiar to America into striking power. This must be a continuous process and is rather expensive but would save money in the long run in that we would not invest heavily in obsolete equipment.

Second. Military intelligence of the critical areas throughout the world so that we may know what to strike with atomic bombs.

Third. A small, highly trained air army; that is, an army which could be loaded air transport and sent anywhere in the world rapidly.

They say that what we should be doing about conscription is using our influence to induce all nations to abandon it. The above-described program, it should be added, does not exclude use of ROTC, Organized Reserves, and National Guard.

They say of the proposed conscription army that it will not give us military security but will cause us to believe that we have it and nothing is worse than a false sense of security. They insist that the fact that Japan has just surrendered, disarmed, and demobilized 7,000,000 soldiers is a classic example that manpower in no way constitutes security.

This is only common sense. You know ahead of time that you will probably break your promise and keep draftees longer than a year the way you did before. Some of you argue that the American people would not favor this really adequate defense program because of the expense, but surely the average American does not want to buy the United States a false sense of security, a "broomstick" army. Moreover, the program described above would be cheaper. Some of you insist that you need this conscription army to enforce American wishes at the peace table. But waving the broomstick got us nowhere with Japan—except to Pearl Harbor—and the Russians are no deafer, nor blinder than the Japanese. Anyway you do not need an army to stop current aggression. All you really need is enough backbone to stop voting any aid whatsoever to violators of the Atlantic Charter.

Your leaders tell you that you cannot vote against UNRRA and risk seeming hard-hearted, that you need a record as a humanitarian. Well, wait until your constituents find out that the European governments who are distributing the UNRRA aid are the same governments who are causing the misery and starvation. And that aid you vote is sold by them to finance causing more misery and starvation. Maybe your constituents will call that screwy. But they will hardly call it humanitarian.

UNRRA is now a principal weapon in the struggle for power likely to precipitate a war which may destroy the last remnants of civilization. A vote for UNRRA is a vote to condemn to death by starvation, this very winter, multitudes of innocent anticommunistic Europeans. Because voting for UNRRA you put it out of your power to give our American surplus supplies to a good American organization, like the one used after the last war, composed of hard-boiled veterans, which could be organized almost overnight and which, like last time, would feed all hungry Europeans, giving innocent anticommunists a chance to live. Surely it is not "humanitarian" to vote to feed people knowing that with the same vote you are nourishing a war for the United States to fight in which those same Europeans are likely to be killed, like turkeys, fattened for a macabre feast.

Of course it is politically ticklish to vote against anything, even war, if it is labeled "peace." But the leaders who proclaim the loudest that the organization set up at San Francisco is a "peace" organization are the same old war "mongrels" who talked "keeping out of war" while demonstrating that they simply don't know how to get along with foreign governments except by either bribing them or going to war against them. And don't think your constitutents will not notice that; surely they are not stupid. It is only a matter of time until Americans discover, perhaps from sad experience, that by voting American armies to the "UNO" peace organization you will, in effect, have voted the United States into more war. It does seem that the best way to keep fences mended would be to stop straddling fences all the time. How can you say you favored bringing the boys home as soon as possible while you are still voting the schizophrenic New Deal foreign policy creating the increasing wars and revolutions now keeping our soldiers abroad—and making it likely that more multitudes of America's finest and fittest will be buried abroad?

Today the American people are beginning to learn that it is communism, voted by Congress, which is weakening our country at home. They will soon learn that what they are getting abroad is not peace but war and mass murder which Congress could prevent, if Congress would only stop voting for it. Surely it is only a matter of time until you stop voting for the New Deal policies, foreign and domestic. Why not stop in time to avert the disastrous consequences?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE LOUISIANA SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, a critical situation exists among the raw-sugar processors of Louisiana because of the stupidity and indifference of the Office of Price Administration in failing to provide long-needed relief. There is absolutely no reason or excuse for the attitude the OPA has exhibited in this matter.

The Louisiana sugar industry has done a grand job during the war. For the 3-year period preceding World War II Louisiana's sugar production averaged 329,000 tons, with restrictions on acreage and the establishment of quotas under the Sugar Act. For the three war years, this production has averaged over 400,000 tons and the crop now being harvested is estimated at approximately 450,000 tons.

You would think that any Federal bureau, including the OPA, would recognize what this industry has done to help the Government with its problem of providing enough sugar for the American consumer.

Sugar was the first food to have a price ceiling placed on it in 1941, and from January 1942 to this day there has been no change in the level of the price of raw sugar. Everyone knows that production costs have increased, but the OPA has never recognized the need of the raw-sugar industry to have its income brought up to meet these costs. My people in Louisiana who process raw sugar have been the forgotten men of the industry.

Last year the situation reached a crisis because the majority of the raw-sugar men lost money.. Proof of this was submitted to the OPA through a survey made by Louisiana State University. Then the OPA made its own investigation and the period for submitting data to them was closed on October 5, 1945. OPA has all of the facts, but still no decision has been made. In the meantime the harvesting of the 1945 sugar crop has been in progress for about 30 days and there remain less than 60 days before most of the sugar factories will have completed the harvest. The industry has pleaded for a quick decision by OPA. The processor sent a committee to Washington in September to explain the absolute need for relief and they were encouraged to believe that the Government would act promptly. With other members of the Louisiana delegation I accompanied the committee to see Secretary of Agriculture Anderson. It did not require much time to convince Secretary Anderson of the justice of our claims because he had already made a study and he agreed that the facts justified doing something. We pointed out to him that the 15 cents per 100 pounds of raw sugar offered raw-sugar processors in the form of a support price would not solve the problem. Incidentally, this support price on the 1945 crop is the first offer that has ever been made to the processors. The offer itself is an admission on the part of the Government that relief is needed.

Nobody wants inflation in the United States. Some controls are necessary. I think the average citizen is willing to accept that fact. It is not necessary, however, that such controls be so inflexible that officials refuse to apply the regulations in such a manner as to give all citizens the equal protection of the la...

When the Honorable Marvin Jones, of Texas, was War Food Administrator some help was given sugarcane growers who could not come out even under the price of sugar. The country badly needed the sugar because of a shortage, and the policy of providing incentives for the growers was continued by Secretary Anderson. I wish to point out that the only market the growers have for their crop is the plantation factory. In Louisiana there are 66 factories engaged in processing sugarcane into sugar and most of them make a raw sugar. These processors have received no incentive or price support from the Government during the war despite the fact that their costs have advanced as much as the costs of the growers and refiners.

Not until this year, since Secretary Anderson took office, has there even been an offer of any incentive for the processors and then only a small incentive. It is an offer which does not meet the need. Secretary Anderson has admitted that the amount is not enough, but it is all he has been able to get approved—OPA blocks him and refuses to agree to his recommendations, and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion Director, John Snyder, backs OPA.

I consider it very regrettable that the Secretary of Agriculture has not been granted the authority he needs to carry out his progressive policies. He is hampered by the OPA and the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The Louisiana processors of raw sugar lost money last year. They are going to lose money again this year. These facts are unquestioned. It is Bowles' and Snyder's responsibility to allow an increase in cost so as to absorb these losses. That is what the law says. Yet they follow the course, which if allowed to continue will unquestionably cause the Louisiana processors of raw sugar great financial losses and possibly bankruptcy in many cases. I am wondering whether the President recognizes that while possibly inflation is being stopped somewhat, small business as illustrated in this case is being ruined.

Let me explain more fully the squeeze in which the raw sugar processors of Louisiana find themselves. Regulations of the Department of Agriculture require that raw sugar produced from the 1945 crop be marketed and delivered prior to January 31, 1946. This means that the processor cannot wait for a better market, but has to accept the market price during the season in which he must deliver the raw sugar. On the other hand he must base the pay for the sugarcane he grinds on the average price of raw sugar during a marketing season established by the Department of Agriculture as beginning October 12, 1945, and ending January 31, 1946. It follows that he must sell his product at the average seasonal price, otherwise he cannot afford to pay for his sugarcane at the average season price. Here it is more than a month since the season started and all this time the OPA has done nothing about the price advance that is positively justified by the information furnished the OPA before October 5.

Congress has been told by Administrator Chester Bowles and other witnesses for the OPA that the OPA is not opposed to profits. Mr. Bowles and his subordinates continue to claim that their policy is to permit any industry to make as much profit currently as their books show they made during a base period from 1936 to 1939, inclusive. They have repeated that statement many times. The raw sugar producers have shown absolutely, by facts and figures, that instead of making a profit in 1944 they lost money. Yet here they are in the middle of the season's operations and they cannot get any answer or any action from the OPA.

I have tried to find out something from the OPA and have received letters from Mr. Bowles telling me an investigation is being made but has not been concluded. I also received letters from Mr. John Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, in which he takes the position that admitting losses in 1944, the conditions were unusual and temporary, so that no relief is needed now because the 1945 season is likely to be normal. That would be a ridiculous statement if it was not so tragic. In the first place it violates the promises and statements of the OPA Administrator to Congress because it constitutes a refusal to accept figures that prove there are no profits comparable to the base period profits. On the contrary, the last operations show losses. Secondly, figures show that the average recovery of sugar per ton of sugarcane during the first month of the present grinding season in Louisiana was approximately 153 pounds, which is 14.3 pounds less than the average recovery 1939 through 1943. This means that the results of the first month of grinding do not justify any supposition that Louisiana might expect a better season this year than in 1944. With the weather hazards increasing as the season progresses there is no one capable of prophesying what the final return on the 1945 crop will be until harvesting is completed. A severe freeze could change the prospects completely and cause losses even greater than those experienced in 1944.

Men in such responsible positions as the OPA Administrator and the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion are required to exercise judgment and render decisions which cannot always be correct. We know that and they should know it. In realizing that fact they should also appreciate the great responsibility they have to so administer the laws of the Nation that the highest degree of equality and uniformity is observed for the protection of all citizens. I am afraid that the bugaboo of inflation has warped the judgment of such highly placed officials as the OPA Administrator and the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and they have become so imbued with the idea they have a great mission to perform that they fail to see that justice and fair play are rendered.

The best proof of whether a business is profitable is the willingness of the businessman to continue to operate. The losses incurred by the raw sugar producers have been so great for several years, and the prospect of the 1945 harvest under the OPA ceiling has been so discouraging, that two processing plants in Louisiana have had to close down. They could not continue to lose money. The OPA is directly responsible for that condition and they know it. Yet it means no difference to them, as they continue to ignore the facts and the pleas from Louisiana. I have just received a letter from a third factory owner who has advertised his factory for sale on account of the conditions which prevent him from making a profit.

One of the factories which heretofore made raw sugar is now producing molasses because it cannot continue to make raw sugar and to make profits. Four other factories, also previously engaged in making raw sugar, confronted with continued operational losses in raw sugar production, leased their factories to a Philadelphia concern which is now processing sirup. The OPA and the Department of Agriculture didn't like this, because of course, they desired the manufactured product to be raw sugar instead of syrup; so, they went into the Federal court in Philadelphia last Monday and secured a temporary restraining order prohibiting them from continuing this operation. Yet, what these agencies fail to realize is that it is their arbitrary and unjust policy which forced these Louisiana factories to enter into this arrangement. One cannot expect business people to continue manufacturing raw sugar under these circumstances.

You will certainly agree it is most regrettable that a Government agency like the OPA is willing to disregard such conditions at a time when the people of the United States need sugar so badly and rationing has reached the point where some industrial users cannot continue in business. How are we ever going to get jobs for all of the unemployed, which men like Chester Bowles and John Snyder talk about, when they are deliberately closing down factories and reducing the number of jobs?

We read in the papers that subsidies to food processors are going to be removed. These announcements suggest that it will be necessary to permit some price increases to make up for the abandoned subsidies. I have been told that it is the intention to raise the price of sugar in 1946. That delay would be the last straw of maladministration and an utter disregard of public duty. As I have told you, the Government regulations require the raw-sugar producers to deliver their product to the refineries before January 31. That means that they can only get the price for their product that is permitted during the period of harvesting but no longer than January 31. With the entire crop marketed, at the direction of the Government, there will be no possibility of these producers obtaining the benefit of the price increase now contemplated by the Government. Not only are they denied, by the OPA, the application of OPA's announced policy of maintaining profits, but are further denied the opportunity of participating in the price increase being talked about openly for 1946.

The Louisiana producers cannot defer the marketing of their sugar in anticipation of a better price. Because of the present subsidy policy and allocation contract they are forced to dispose of their sugar virtually upon manufacture. And remember, also, that Louisiana is the only sugar-producing area which processes its entire crop before the end of the year. All other areas market their crop after the first of the year except Florida where operations will begin in December. An increased price after the 1st of January and after the Louisiana producers have marketed their product is not going to help them. It looks as if they are going to be the victims of discrimination as well as victims of the OPA's procrastination.

How can men like Chester Bowles and John Snyder expect these producers to have confidence in the OPA when their

rights are trampled on in utter disregard of announced Government policies? Is it any wonder that there are protests and criticism against continuing the OPA when the men who administer the law disregard their own announced policies? At best, price control is an emergency measure in a democracy like the United States. Men who are given the responsibility of applying emergency measures should have judgment enough to be democratic enough to be ever mindful of the rights of the small businessman. In this case they have not only ignored the small businessman; they have gone further. When the proof they themselves required has been submitted, their answer is an admission that losses have occurred but better times are around the corner this season.

If the Louisiana processors are to be relieved of this financial loss it must be done now. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture, in anticipation of an increased price of sugar, and knowing that the Louisiana processors cannot benefit from this increase, because when the increase is allowed their sugar would have been marketed, should authorize an additional subsidy of 25 cents per hundred pounds of raw sugar, with a recapture clause to protect the subsidy paid in the event the price of sugar should increase during the life of this proposed additional subsidy.

I wonder if the Members of the House recall the speech made by former Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace many years ago in Louisiana, when he said in effect that the Louisiana sugar industry was inefficient and should be liquidated. Certainly the great record Louisiana's sugar industry made during the war should dispute this statement—but I sometimes wonder whether or not the Henry Wallace philosophy and plans are not now being put into effect by the actions of the OPA and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion—at any event, they are securing the results which he contemplated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HORAN, for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damages to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 30, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, November 30, 1945, in room 1304, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek; with amendment (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4857. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 4858. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to stimulate private home building in the low-priced field and facilitate home ownership for low-income groups, by providing for mortgage insurance on rental housing which the tenant has an option to purchase without making lump-sum down payment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 431. A resolution with respect to foreign policy of the United States as it relates to the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:

H. Res. 432. A resolution creating a select committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 433. A resolution to provide for a study and investigation of all phases of the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 434. A resolution to provide for payment of expenses of the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 433; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 435. A resolution to provide for the appointment of fact-finding bodies in connection with industrial disputes; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Angelica Balabanoff; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Materials Handling Machinery Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4861. A bill granting a pension to James Thomas Lanpher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Newcomb, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 4863. A bill to establish the date of acceptance of a commission as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Naval Reserve, by William Leon de Carbonel to be June 1, 1941, and the date of reporting for active duty to be December 9, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Willie Crockett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 4865. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Klein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world filled with sights that sadden and problems that perplex, may our hearts be strengthened by the realization that ours is also a time of splendor, bright with promise as we stand at the portals of tomorrow. May the crashing of outworn things that are falling to earth not hide from our eyes the glory of a new era struggling to birth.

We give thanks with humble yet kindling hearts that we are summoned to live and give in such a time. If this weary flesh of ours hemmed by foes should fear or falter, keep us firm and steadfast as we put on the whole armor of faith and hope and love. May we play our part as Thy faithful servants in history's crowning hour. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, November 29, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the

Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4350) to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on November 29, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1208. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports (list No. 1) reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 6 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by his immediate predecessor; (list No. 2) the cases of 1,257 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and (list No. 3) the cases of 190 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by him, under the authority vested in the Attorney General by the said statute, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to be absent from the Senate either a part or all of this afternoon, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to be excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska is excused.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Reed
Ball	Hart	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Huffman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Connally	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gossett	O'Mahoney	Young
Green	Overton	
Guffey	Radcliffe	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is necessarily absent. He has been excused.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, assuming that the Senate will recess over until Monday when it completes its business today, I ask unanimous consent that a report may be filed from the Committee on Commerce during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

A resolution adopted by local union No. 227, Textile Workers Union of America (CIO), Lawrence, Mass., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1349) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the Emmet Associates of The Clan-na-Gael, Lynn, Mass., relating to the Ireland Partition Act passed by the British Parliament in 1920; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Newport, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation to merge the Army and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Middlesex County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Newton Centre, Mass., requesting that the ruling by the War Department that American soldiers captured and made prisoners of war while in action are not entitled to battle participation stars, be changed so that they may be accorded the same honors as their comrades in arms; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the War Service Committee, Massachusetts Dental Society, Worcester, Mass., favoring the release of more dentists from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Association of Real Estate Boards, Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to delay the construction of new public and institutional buildings until homes are made available for the returning members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by 5 North Dakota residents in favor of universal conscription. Also a petition signed by 27 North Dakota citizens who are opposed to universal military conscription. The petition was circulated by Mr. Gust Swanke, who has three sons at the present time in the service. Also a petition signed by 35 citizens of North Dakota in opposition to universal military training. The petition was circulated by Mr. Frank Witty, whose daughter has just been discharged from the WAVES. Also a petition signed by 31 North Dakota citizens from the vicinity of Drayton, N. Dak. Another petition circulated by Mrs. Emma Poline, signed by 16 citizens of North Dakota, all opposed to universal military training. Another petition signed by 22 North Dakota citizens. Still another petition signed by 12 North Dakota citizens all opposed to universal military training. Another petition signed by 25 citizens of North Dakota, the petition having been circulated by Leo E. Walz, of Zap, N. Dak. Another petition in opposition to universal military training signed by eight residents of Solen, N. Dak. Another petition signed by 29 citizens of North Dakota in opposition to universal military training, circulated by Mr. T. A. Bangen, of Sanish, N. Dak. Another petition signed by 19 citizens of North Dakota, circulated by Mrs. Walter Bohlen, of Braddock, N. Dak. Another peti-

tion circulated by Mr. Ursus Hoffmann, of Zap, N. Dak., signed by 14 citizens of North Dakota, in opposition to universal military training.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

One petition received as follows:
"To the Senate of the United States:
"We, the undersigned, hereby favor universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

One petition received as follows:
"To the Senate of the United States:
"We, the undersigned, are hereby opposed to universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

One petition and letter as follows:
"To the Senate of the United States:
"We, the undersigned, hereby favor universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

"Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:
"I received your petitions and went into town to see what the opinion was in the community and here are the results. I presented both petitions to everyone that signed and here are the results.
"I have 3 boys in the Army, one has been in for 9 years, and has enlisted again for 3 years more, O. K. he is a master sergeant now and he likes Army life so they made a soldier of him, but I think you can't make a soldier of anyone that doesn't want Army life.
"So I am against conscription, if you have it, you can't call this a free country any more and my boys fought to have this free country, so let us keep it that way.
"Yours truly,
"GUST SWANKE."

Ten petitions received as follows:
"To the Senate of the United States:
"We, the undersigned, are hereby opposed to universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress."

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 194, merely providing for a continuation of an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department, which was authorized by Senate Resolution 35, adopted by the Senate on February 26, 1945, the original resolution (S. Res. 35) having been offered by the two Senators from Florida [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ANDREWS]. This resolution (S. Res. 194) asks for no additional appropriation. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by the Senate Resolution 35, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to February 26, 1945, as extended by Senate Resolution 112, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to May 8, 1945 (relating to an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Post Office Department), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 161, reported by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] from the Committee on Interstate Commerce on July 28, 1945. The resolution provides for an investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation. I do not think there will be any objection to its consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, may the resolution be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation including transportation by means of aircraft, railroads, inland waterways, busses and trucks, and pipe lines with a view to determining (1) the interrelation of these agencies of transport; (2) the postwar character and adequacy of the services furnished in interstate and foreign commerce by these agencies of transport; (3) the developments and improvements that may be expected in foreign and interstate commerce; (4) such legislation to be recommended as will result in a consistent public policy fair to all competing agencies of transportation, to the using and investing public, and to labor; and generally to consider and to make recommendations to the Congress to the end that the Nation's commerce will be transported with the greatest possible degree of economy, safety, and dispatch.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures within the limits of S. Res. 9, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1945, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and to expend not more than $5,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate in such investigation.

SEC. 4. The committee shall, from time to time, in its discretion, make such report or reports to the Senate as it deems desirable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I notice that the resolution proposes an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Committee of all forms of transportation, including aircraft. I have no personal feeling on the subject, but I did not know whether members of the Commerce Committee were advised regarding the matter, and whether it should be taken up in the absence of the chairman of that committee.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to examine the resolution. I ask that it go to the calendar, or its consideration be deferred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine object to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Maine would not object. The resolution merely provides for an investigation and study to be made of the whole problem. It is a subject of very much interest to the committee and to everyone engaged in the transportation industry. A study has been made by a special committee appointed by the President some time ago. The proposal contained in the resolution is that a study be made to see what should be done generally with the whole transportation system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to speak to what the Senator from Montana just said. I certainly am in general sympathy with the idea of an integrated study. There are, as the Senator from Montana and other Senators know, certain jurisdictional questions concerning which there has been considerable discussion with respect to aircraft and other matters. I should like an opportunity at least to look at the resolution and have an opportunity for the chairman of the Commerce Committee to consider it, although I am not prepared to indicate that I shall have any serious objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that objection has been made to the resolution, and therefore it goes to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It automatically goes to the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

A bill and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1636. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday in December of each year as Disabled American Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — AMENDMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

The amendment submitted by Mr. WHERRY is as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) That such country shall supply to accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement and in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country for the purpose of obtaining information as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished such country."

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MAYFLOWER COMPACT DAY ADDRESS BY MAURICE H. THATCHER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Mayflower Compact, delivered by Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, governor of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, on November 22, 1945; which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AFFECTING CHINA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, for some time those who have observed the antics of our Department of State have been disturbed seriously as to just what our officials have in mind. On the one hand, they have been working for a strong United Nations Organization; yet, on the other hand, they have been in favor of keeping strong American forces in China, and have agitated for universal, compulsory military training at home.

These policies are contradictory of each other. If the State Department believes that we can unite with other nations to prevent war, then why is it necessary to conscript millions of American boys each year and to keep tens of thousands stationed in China?

In reference to our men in China, I should like to pose a few questions to the Senate and to the administration:

Why are our men being kept in China, long after the Japs have been crushed, and, apparently, the war they went out to fight has ended?

Are not the oft-maligned Russians withdrawing their troops according to their treaty with the Chinese Nationalist Government?

Why are goods and materials of war being flown by American pilots over the "hump" to supply the Nationalist Government, and why are American lives being sacrificed in this endeavor, according to newspaper accounts?

What possible stake has the average American in the outcome of China's civil war?

Who are we to use force for one side or another in a controversy 8,000 miles from our continental limits to resolve an internal quarrel of another nation, in the face of our oft-repeated statements that this Nation has no interest in the internal problems of other nations?

Mr. President, like all other Senators, I am receiving many letters from distressed mothers and fathers who have sons in China and in the Far East who want to know why their sons are being kept there. These parents cannot understand—as you and I cannot understand—our devious diplomacy in the Far East, but they do know that they want their sons back home and out of the armed services. If the security of the United States is involved in this outcome of civil war in China, the matter should be laid before the Congress, and authority should be sought for whatever action is decided to be necessary.

The statements of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, our late Ambassador to China, certainly do nothing to dispel our doubts about the efficiency of our foreign service. Many intelligent persons are wondering if the Department of State is not trying to use the Army both in Europe and in Asia to cover up its own serious blunders.

Let me quote a portion of General Hurley's statement:

The hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in Washington during the late war is chargeable to the weakness of our foreign service. If our foreign service had been capable of understanding and a sympathetic effectuation of our announced war aims, it would not have failed so completely to couple our logistical strength with our foreign policy to obtain commitments to the principles for which we claimed to be fighting from the nations to which we gave the strength of our productivity and manpower.

It seems to me that our Department of State has a lot of explaining—and housecleaning—to do in the coming months.

The questions which I have raised here are referred to the congressional committees which have announced their intention of investigating this situation. I am hopeful that our position in China will be fully clarified when the President makes his announced statement on the subject.

Mr. President, I have not noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement which was made by General Hurley, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 28, 1945]

I am grateful to both the President and the Secretary of State for the support they have given me and for their kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

In one capacity or another, I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war.

During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the Southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China.

Of all of the assignments, China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, President Truman, and Secretary Byrnes.

ASTONISHING DISCREPANCY SEEN

In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instance, we began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal.

Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism.

Inasmuch as I am in agreement with the President and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy, I think I owe it to them as well as to the country, to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war.

I will confine my remarks in this statement to Asia, although I wish to assure both the President and the Secretary of State that I shall be at their service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations.

I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese Army.

DIRECTED TO KEEP CHINA IN WAR

I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the Government and to keep the Chinese Army in the war. From both a strategical and diplomatic viewpoint, the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American military establishments and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government.

It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished. While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State, it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department.

The professional foreign-service men sided with the Chinese Communist armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same pro-

fessionals openly advised the Communist armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Despite these handicaps, we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department.

"CAREER MEN" HELD "RELIEVED UP"

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia.

In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist armed party and at times with the Imperialist bloc against American policy. This is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars. There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism.

I am opposed to both. I still favor democracy and free enterprise.

Our announced policy in the First World War was to make the world safe for democracy. That slogan was elaborated for the Second World War by a definite statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration.

FAILED TO ESTABLISH PRINCIPLES

We won both wars, but in both instances we failed to establish the principles for which we alleged we were fighting. America's foreign policy officials have always been divided against themselves. Consequently, we have always been a prey to the nations that give lip service to our ideals and principles in order to obtain our material support. The war that is now in the making is not even intended to defend or establish democratic ideals. Instead of putting our weight behind the Charter of the United Nations, we have been definitely supporting the imperialistic bloc. At the same time a considerable section of our State Department is endeavoring to support communism generally, as well as specifically, in China.

The hydra-headed direction and confusion of our foreign policy in Washington during the late war is chargeable to the weakness of our Foreign Service. If our Foreign Service had been capable of understanding and a sympathetic effectuation of our announced war aims, it would not have failed so completely to couple our logistical strength with our foreign policy to obtain commitments to the principles for which we claimed to be fighting from the nations to which we gave the strength of our productivity and manpower.

A democracy must live on its intelligence and its integrity and its courage. To the people of the democracy should be given all the facts to enable them to form correct opinions. The discrepancy between American foreign policy as announced in the Atlantic Charter and the Iran Declaration and in the President's recent Navy Day address, and as carried into effect, may be attributed in large measure to the secrecy which has shrouded the actions of the State Department. All too frequently information concerning its conduct leaks out to the public in distorted, garbled, or partial form. The result is that the American people have too little basic information to judge the extent to which their State Department correctly interprets and administers the foreign policies of the Nation.

During the war we had to maintain secrecy to prevent giving aid to the enemy. I grant that sometimes during the war we had to be expedient. Now we should endeavor to be right. I raise this issue because I am firmly convinced that at this particular juncture in our history an informed public opinion would do much to give intelligent direction and implementation to our international objectives.

CALLS FOR FULL PUBLICITY

With special reference to China and the other nations where I have served in the last 4 years, the blessings of factual publicity would be manifold. Now that the war is over, I am willing that all my reports be made public, together with the reports made by those officials in the foreign service who have differed with the promulgated American policy.

Our true position in China is misunderstood abroad because of this confusion of policy within our own Government. This situation suggests the need for a complete reorganization of our policy-making machinery, beginning at the lower official levels. No international policy can succeed without loyal and intelligent implementation.

Because of the confusion in our own international policy, America has been excluded economically from every part of the world controlled by colonial imperialism and Communist imperialism. America's economic strength has been used all over the world to defeat American policies and interests. This is chargeable to a weak American foreign service.

I wish to absolve from this general indictment some of our career men. Some of them are very admirable and well-equipped public servants who have fought in the State Department and in other countries against overwhelming odds to advance American ideals and interests.

America's economic and diplomatic policies should be coordinated. America's strength should not be allied with any predatory ideology.

America should support the amendment or revision of the San Francisco United Nations Charter to make it democratic.

Our strength should be used to uphold the decisions of the United Nations rather than to support conflicting ideologies or war-making power blocs.

PROGRESS OF ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that the Members of the Senate would be interested today in hearing a report upon the progress of enlistments in the Army. As is well known, the Congress in September passed the voluntary-enlistment bill. I have received a report from the War Department of the progress of enlistments, and I give the figures to the Senate. In September there were 12,000 enlistments. In October there were 65,000 enlistments in the Army. From November 1 to November 14 enlistments in the Army alone numbered 81,094. In other words, the average daily enlistments in the Army at this time exceed 5,700 a day. With that average, Mr. President, we know that volunteers are now entering the Army at a rate of 175,000 a month.

I wish further to say to the Senate that there are now pending in committee two joint resolutions. One is Senate Joint Resolution 116, which calls for the immediate stopping of the induction of men with a child or children, and also creating that as a ground for release immediately from the armed services. Up to this time neither the Army nor the Navy has recognized that status as a ground for discharge. That joint resolution is the first order of business on the calendar of the Military Affairs Committee when it meets next Tuesday.

There is another joint resolution pending before the Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Joint Resolution 117, which calls for the immediate suspension of the draft. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that at the time of the fall of Japan, when actual fighting ended, the President of the United States said that 50,000 inductees each month under Selective Service were sufficient to fill the needs of replacements in the armed services without interfering with the return home of servicemen who had had war service. So, based upon the formula set forth by the President of the need for only 50,000 men a month, we now know that with volunteering proceeding at the rate of more than 175,000 a month, we can put an end to the draft and suspend its operation of induction without interfering in any way with the return home of the men who have seen service. The return of war-service veterans and their discharge is still the first consideration from my viewpoint, and it should be the first consideration of the armed services and of the Government to see that those men are returned home as promptly as can be. From the reports I am receiving, particularly from the Pacific area, that is not being carried out as rapidly as should be done.

I call these figures to the attention of the Senate so that it may be known that the voluntary enlistment law is a success, and that men are volunteering for service.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me to ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if the conclusion from what has happened is that with safety without affecting the return of soldiers from abroad, further drafting under the Selective Service Act, could now be ended?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Undoubtedly so, because if replacements of 50,000 a month are sufficient, and if only 51,000 a month have been taken for both the Army and the Navy, then I say that enlistments of 175,000 a month would certainly justify ending the draft. It is

just a matter of figures and clear logic that the draft can be ended at this time without interference with the return home of the men who have had war service.

Mr. TAFT. I would only say that it seems to me we could do nothing more important than to prevent the taking of boys from their homes, if it is not necessary to do so, and in my judgment there can be nothing more important for the Military Affairs Committee or for the Senate to consider than the termination of the Selective Service Act at this time so far as drafting is concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I am glad to have his comment on that subject, but there is going on today under selective service, something even worse than the taking of young men in this country. The Army today is drafting into the service men who have children and families to support and is sending some of those me. broad as replacements.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not know whether the Senator was a Member of the Senate at the time when Congress lowered the draft age to 18 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was not a Member of the Senate at that time.

Mr. WILLIS. The argument for that proposal was that younger men were needed in the critical emergency which was facing the country. Now that the emergency has passed should not the younger men be released from service so that they may pursue their courses of education and make plans for their life work?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that the first consideration is the return home of men who have seen service on foreign shores. That is still the first question which should be considered. And, secondly, the return home of men who have dependents, who should be returned to their families and again take up their normal lives toward the support of those to whom they owe that duty. I think that when these men are no longer needed for enforced service, when we are receiving volunteers to send to serve in the armed forces, the time has come under our American idea of living to stop impressed service.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Did I understand the Senator from West Virginia to say that the figures reported by him did not include any reenlistments in the Navy?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The figures I have given are for the Army alone. I have asked to be furnished the figures for the Navy today, but they have not come to me as yet.

Mr. GEORGE. Is there a separate enlistment for the Navy now in progress?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; there is a separate enlistment. I will say to the Senator that in the middle of the month of October enlistments in the Navy were proceeding at the rate of 500 a day. I have not the figures as of the present date, but I have asked for them and expect to receive those figures later today.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me see if I understand the Senator's statement. Up until the 15th of November, 81,000 men had been enlisted from November 1 to November 15.

Mr. REVERCOMB. From November 1 to November 15, 81,094 had enlisted.

Mr. GEORGE. In the Army alone.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the Army alone; and prior to that time, in the month of October, 65,000 enlisted. In September 12,000 enlisted. The Senator will remember that the bill was passed in the month of September. In all, 158,094 have enlisted in the Army.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will press his resolution before the Military Affairs Committee. I do not believe that we have any moral right to keep the men who have been drafted into the Army for more than 6 months after the end of the war—and I believe that means the actual end of hostilities—unless the discharge of the men brought in under the draft would disorganize the Army.

The Senator is quite right in his statement that immediately after the surrender of Japan, the President published a statement to the country to the effect that it would be necessary to have for the military forces only about 50,000 men a month. If the Army alone is receiving more than that number each half-month, we ought to provide for the discharge of the men who were brought into the Army under the draft to fight the war into which we were plunged on December 7, 1941.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very grateful for the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia. He has expressed my view exactly on this subject. I will say to him that not only are men coming in at a greater rate than 50,000 a month, the figure stated by the President as the number needed for replacements, but, as shown by the figures given by me today and furnished by the War Department, they are volunteering at a rate of more than three times the number stated to be required by the President. I feel that the time has come when we may justly end the draft without interfering with the return home of those who ought to be returned promptly.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe that when those boys are returned we might also return labor borrowed from Mexico, Jamaica, and other countries. I believe it is necessary at the present time to keep these young men in the United States to help produce the things which we need—clothing, machinery, and products of all kinds. By drafting experienced help we are retarding the day of recovery.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to have the remarks of the Senator.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

The PRESIDING OFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, providing for the numbers and.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the names of Mr. AIKEN and Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to be heard further on this matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the roll call has started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that there has been no response.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I speak?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what was the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair was that there had been no response. Therefore the Senator from Missouri can be recognized to speak on the pending question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understood the rule to be that when the calling of the roll began that ended the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that that is not the case when no response has been made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. I subside.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would it embarrass the Senator if I were to ask him about how much time he expects to take?

Mr. DONNELL. I expect to speak rather extendedly. It is difficult to say to the Senator how long I shall take, but I expect to speak quite extendedly on the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator speak, in general, on the same matters which he discussed yesterday, or has he some new material?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall speak generally along the lines which I discussed yesterday, but I desire to amplify that discussion to a considerable extent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator rather fully developed his argument yesterday.

Mr. DONNELL. I did, but I expect to discuss the question further today.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senate was engaged in debate upon an amendment which I offered with respect to section 6 of the bill now under consideration. The amendment which I propose

differs from the bill itself in a very important respect. Under the terms of the bill the agreement or agreements which the President is authorized to negotiate would be subject to the approval of both Houses of Congress by either an act or joint resolution. On the other hand, under my amendment the agreement or agreements which the President is authorized to negotiate could be entered into only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

It will be observed that the amendment proposed by me goes not to the point of imposing restrictions, but rather to the point of how there shall be registered the ratification of the supplemental agreement or agreements referred to in section 6 of the bill.

Comparatively few Senators were in the Chamber yesterday during a considerable portion of the discussion which ensued. Today I observed in the Washington Post the following comment:

> Galleries, overflowing during the Charter debate 4 months ago, were only partly filled and during most of the debate fewer than a dozen Senators sat at their desks. Senators complained privately of a "lack of public interest" in the most important step by this Nation since the Charter was ratified.

Mr. President, I concur in the view of the writer of this article, Mr. Robert C. Albright, in characterizing the legislation now pending as the most important step by this Nation with relation to the Charter since the ratification of that document. I am not so sure, however, that private complaints of Senators as to a lack of public interest are as well founded as would be a complaint by Senators who were present, as well as those who were not present, at the lack of attendance by Senators themselves in the Chamber yesterday.

The public is expecting the Senate, upon which devolves important duties under the Charter of the United Nations, to devote intelligent, courageous, and diligent attention to the problems which are presented by that Charter. To my mind Members of the Senate who failed to be present yesterday and gave basis to the statement which appears in the Washington Post could now render a distinguished public service by giving further careful and intent consideration to the question of how the supplemental agreement or agreements contemplated both by article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations and by the bill now pending should be effected.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the next paragraph appearing in the Washington Post of this morning, reading as follows:

> Advocates of more restrictions may register their peak load on an amendment by Senator FORREST C. DONNELL, Republican, Missouri, requiring Senate ratification of the forthcoming agreement with the Security Council on military quotas to be used to keep the peace.

Mr. President, in my opinion, if the writer of this article had in his mind the idea that the amendment which I had offered was an amendment constituting a restriction or restrictions, he did not properly comprehend the purpose of the amendment. My amendment is not a restriction upon either the Security Council or the President or anyone or any nation. The amendment which I have offered and which I argued yesterday merely undertakes, as I comprehend the situation, to carry into effect the positive, direct, mandatory provisions of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. There is no effort or intent in this amendment to present or offer restrictions of any kind, nature, or description. But I take it that every Member of the Senate who voted upon the Charter on the 28th day of July of this year, and every Member of the Senate who was unavoidably absent on that occasion, has a right to expect that every provision of the Charter itself will be carried into effect. To my mind, section 6 of the bill which provides for approval of the agreement or agreements by joint resolution or act of the two Houses of Congress does not follow the Charter of the United Nations; specifically and explicitly, it does not follow the third section of article 43 of the Charter.

Mr. President, let me again read that section of article 43. It refers to the agreement or agreements; and that reference goes back to the earlier portions of article 43 which call to the attention of the reader the fact that the obligations or undertakings of the members of the United Nations to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security are to make available to the Security Council, on its call—not solely on its call, but also in accordance with a special agreement or agreements—armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

So, Mr. President, when article 43 refers to the agreement or agreements, both in section 2 and in section 3, the reference is to the special agreement or agreements referred to in the opening sentence and section of article 43.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that section 3 of article 43 reads as follows:

> The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council.

Then the section proceeds as follows:

> They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members—

Then follows this language—

> and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

The amendment which I have submitted goes to the question of compliance with the mandatory provision of section 3 of article 43, which I have read, namely, that "the agreement or agreements shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." Mr. President, it should be noted that the provision is not that the agreement or agreements may be subject, ought to be subject, or should be subject to ratification, but the section provides that the agreement or agreements shall be subject to ratification in the way specified.

So, Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that my amendment is not one which is in the nature of a restriction, but is designed to carry out the purpose, the intent, the express language, and, as I see it, the legal meaning of that section of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. President, as I indicated yesterday, my amendment has a two-fold basis. In the first place, the agreements which are mentioned in section 6 of the bill now pending are those which article 43 of the Charter requires to be negotiated. So when we come to the question of the negotiation and the question of the ratification of these agreements, we are to look to the terms of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations in order to ascertain what are the requirements of that article with respect to how the ratification itself shall be effected. The Charter is clear, explicit, and definite, as I see it, in prescribing how ratification is to be achieved.

Mr. President, article 43, to my mind, reads clearly and convincingly to the effect which I indicated yesterday. In that article the language of the mandatory provisions respecting ratification of the agreements is susceptible of no ambiguity, as I see it, but is clear, definitive and decisive as to the meaning of the framers of the Charter and as to the meaning of the Senate of the United States when it ratified the Charter on the 28th of July 1945.

What does section 3 of article 43 comprehend and require? I have already referred to the fact that it specifies that the various agreements shall be concluded between the Security Council and also that they "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." So the question arises, What is meant by "ratification in accordance with their respective constitutional processes," as to the United States of America? One will search in vain the Constitution of the United States, from its opening word to its closing word, to find any constitutional process made up of approval by either joint resolution or act of the Congress. The term "ratification," it will be recalled, is the commonly used and legally used term which describes the processes for advice and consent to the making of a treaty. Yesterday I referred to numerous authorities among law writers. At this time I wish to refer to another authority. I now refer, not alone to Corpus Juris, not alone to American jurisprudence, not alone to Charles Henry Butler, not alone to James Bryce in his American Commonwealth, not alone to Mr. Curtis in his Constitutional History of the United States, not alone to Bouvier's law dictionary which indicates in clear and unmistakable language that the term "ratification," as used in the United States, refers to the process by which treaties receive the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States; but, in addition to those particular authorities, I refer particularly to the fact that the highest judicial authority of the United States Government, the Supreme Court of the United

States, in the case entitled *"Fourteen Diamond Rings* v. *United States"* (183 U. S. 176), at page 179, specifically states what is meant by the process of ratification.

In a concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Brown in support of the position taken by the court—the opinion, by the way, was delivered by Chief Justice Fuller—there is a reference by Mr. Justice Brown to the power of the Senate being limited to ratification. I invite attention to the word "ratification" as applied to such terms as have already been agreed upon between the President in acting for the United States, and the commissioners of the other contracting power. A sentence from Mr. Justice Brown's concurring opinion is significant in its repeated use of either the verb or the noun in reference to the word "ratification." He said:

> The Senate has no right—
>
> To what?—
>
> to ratify the treaty and introduce new terms into it which shall be obligatory upon the other power, although it may refuse its ratification or make such ratification conditional upon the adoption of amendments to the treaty.

And so, Mr. President, obviously the Supreme Court of the United States, and the law writers to whom I have referred, understand that by the processes used by the Senate in advising and consenting to a treaty there is meant identically that which you and I, sir, term "ratification." A few moments ago I said, in substance, that the only constitutional processes of the United States of America governing ratification are those processes which relate to the ratification of treaties.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. MORSE, who briefly addressed the Senate. His remarks appear at the conclusion of Mr. DONNELL'S speech, where, by request of Mr. MORSE, they were ordered to be printed.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it is a very fundamental principle of the constitutional Government of the United States that the Federal Government itself possesses only such powers as are either expressly or by necessary implication conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States. It is equally true, Mr. President, that when we come to the specific branches of the Government of the United States, namely, the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch, each branch must look to the Constitution of the United States and to nowhere else for the authority which it possesses. No branch of the Government has any power which has not been granted to it by the Constitution.

From the earliest days of the history of our Government, when Washington, in his Farewell Address, urged constant adherence to the separation of powers, and pointed out the evil which would result from one branch of the Government undertaking to usurp the powers of another, it has been settled in this country that no branch of the Federal Government possesses any power which cannot be found either expressly or by necessary implication within the four corners of the Constitution of the United States.

Today we have before us a provision of the United Nations Charter making it mandatory that these agreements shall be subject to ratification in accordance with what? In accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the respective signatories. So, in order to ascertain what are the respective constitutional processes we must search the Constitution. In the bill before the Senate as it now pends we find that its framers, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, have answered the question as to what are the constitutional processes of the Government of the United States, by taking the view that the constitutional process surrounding the approval of an agreement resides in the two Houses of Congress through an appropriate bill or joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to express my agreement with the views of the Senator. If we propose in effect to delegate to the House of Representatives one-half of our right to approve treaties, in this respect, it seems to me that we will be bound, for all practical purposes of which I can think, in connection with any further supplemental agreement involving the United Nations Charter. Almost all future international agreements may be in connection with the United Nations Charter, and may require ratification by a majority vote of both Houses. In other words, it seems to me that the Senate of the United States, practically all of its members being absent throughout the entire debate on this bill, is now proposing to surrender its power, which was given to it by the Constitution, to deal with questions of foreign relations. Unless the Senator's amendment is adopted we are, for all practical purposes, surrendering that power which has been given to us under the Constitution.

I may say that the bill contains other provisions by which the Senate, in the absence of nearly all Members of the Senate, is proposing to delegate powers given to the Senate under the Constitution. Under section 3 of the bill, it is proposed to delegate to the President all power to vote in the Security Council or to veto action which may be taken by the Security Council. It is proposed to surrender any power Congress has with regard, therefore, to the use of armed forces because the President may vote for the use of armed forces. For practical purposes, it is proposed to surrender, it seems to me, the power that Congress ought to have to declare war, because, in my judgment, certainly we are giving the President the power to declare war. Certain of his actions may involve the use of police power, but other acts he is authorized to take under the provisions of section 3 may well result in war. So we are proposing to delegate to the President the power to declare war.

Again, under section 5, we are giving the President probably wider power over the economic life and foreign trade of the United States than any President has had since the Embargo Act; in fact, I think broader powers, because, referring to section 5, the Senator will find that the President may make orders, rules, and regulations as he desires, providing for the investigation, regulation, or prohibition, in whole or in part, of "economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication."

That means he may, by Executive order, go into any home in the United States and investigate business affairs and all correspondence and all relations that any person in the United States may have with any citizen of the Nation against whom economics sanctions are invoked. He may prohibit them, and he may put people in jail on the basis of the violation of his economic orders or his rules and regulations. I think that goes much further even than the Embargo Act in the early days of the Nation, and it is an indefinite power, for, so far as I can see, it goes on forever.

I propose to offer an amendment providing that after 90 days his order shall be only for the emergency, and that all power thereafter shall be vested in the Congress, and the Congress may, therefore, make the laws and determine whether they shall be fair or whether they shall be arbitrary.

Incidentally, it is also true that executive regulations are made with less consideration for the citizen and with less consideration for due process of law than in the case of a statute enacted by the Congress.

So in those important respects all the power over foreign relations which, in effect, we are not delegating to the President we are now proposing under the theory that we can have Executive agreements approved by the Congress, to delegate to the House of Representatives. And this entire self-abnegation of the Senate, this surrender of constitutional powers and duties given to the Senate is being made by the Senate, as I say, with practically no Members present to consider the constitutional questions involved, or the facts on the basis of which the Senate is asked practically to reduce itself to insignificance in foreign relations.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Chavez	Hart
Ball	Connally	Hayden
Barkley	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Bilbo	Downey	Hill
Brewster	Eastland	Hoey
Briggs	Ellender	Huffman
Brooks	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Bushfield	George	Kilgore
Butler	Gerry	Lucas
Byrd	Gossett	McCarran
Capehart	Green	McClellan
Capper	Guffey	McKellar
Carville	Gurney	McMahon

Magnuson	Reed	Thomas, Utah
Maybank	Revercomb	Tobey
Mead	Robertson	Tunnell
Millikin	Russell	Tydings
Mitchell	Saltonstall	Vandenberg
Moore	Shipstead	Wagner
Morse	Smith	Walsh
Murdock	Stanfill	Wheeler
O'Daniel	Stewart	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Taft	Willis
Overton	Taylor	Wilson
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio was commenting along the line that not only in the case of section 6 of the pending bill is there an abdication by the Senate of certain of its duties and responsibilities, but that elsewhere in the bill similar tendencies exist and that dangerous precedents will be established by the abdication in the instant case.

I call attention, Mr. President, to the fact that in two other instances which have already been called to the attention of the Senate in the course of its consideration of this bill, is there, in my judgment, a similar dangerous tendency. I refer in the first place to section 2, paragraph (d), in which it is provided that:

> The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine: *Provided*—

Mr. President, here is the portion of the section to which I call special attention—

> *Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations if—

And I call attention to this significant "if"—

> if the person so appointed is not at the time of such appointment a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives of the United States or an officer of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The persons who are referred to in the opening of paragraph (d) under the category of "such other persons as he"—the President—"may deem necessary to represent the United States" are the persons other than those who attend the General Assembly and the Security Council. But the other persons who are referred to in paragraph (d) are by no means persons of inferior or unimportant capacities. I refer particularly in the first instance to the members of the Economic and Social Council. The Economic and Social Council is referred to in article 62 of the Charter of the United Nations in this language, which indicates the importance of membership on the Economic and Social Council:

> The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General Assembly, to the members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

Mr. President, I digress to emphasize the importance of international economic questions and of international social questions, cultural, educational, health, and related matters. All matters such as we have considered in connection with the Bretton Woods agreements would come under the category—or would have had they not been already settled—of international economic matters. And who is there to say that an economic situation which requires an investment of $8,000,000,000, as I recall the figure, is not an economic substantial matter of tremendous importance to the United States and to every person within it?

And then the international social questions. Who is there to say that the social questions between nations are not of tremendous and outstanding importance to every citizen of this and every other nation of the world? And the cultural matters, and the educational matters, and the health matters. Who is there to say that these are not matters requiring as appointees of this Government upon the Council having to do therewith of representatives of the highest type of ability, integrity, and intelligence?

But, Mr. President, the duties of the Economic and Social Council do not end with the tremendously important ones to which I have already made reference.

Paragraph 2 of article 62 of the Charter says of the Economic and Social Council:

> It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

Mr. President, is there any more important task, any more important subject, before the world today than the matter of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all? These are among the topics which are committed by the Charter of the United Nations to the Economic and Social Council.

Then, Mr. President, the Charter goes on with respect to this Council and says:

> It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.

Who is there to deny the importance of a power to prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly constituted of representatives of the peace-loving nations of the world with respect to any or all the matters which have been previously by article 62 committed to the Economic and Social Council?

Mr. President, the Economic and Social Council has implementation in the fourth section of article 62 of the Charter of the United Nations. That section reads:

> It—

That is to say, the Economic and Social Council—

> may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence.

So I submit that when we are dealing in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill with the appointment of persons to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations we are dealing with fundamental matters requiring the utmost care in the selection of persons who shall constitute our representatives thereon.

I pass to the other Council mentioned in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the pending bill, the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. We all remember, from the newspaper accounts and from information which we may have otherwise obtained, the extremely important services rendered at San Francisco in the preparation of the Trusteeship Council provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. It was considered among the outstanding achievements of that great Conference at the Golden Gate.

What are the functions and powers of the Trusteeship Council? Article 87 of the Charter of the United Nations has to do with that subject. It says:

> The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may—
>
> (a) consider reports submitted by the administering authority;
>
> (b) accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;
>
> (c) provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and
>
> (d) take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

The Trusteeship Council has to do with matters of vast importance. Who is there to deny the importance of a trusteeship, which by the very name indicates the trust which is reposed in the members of the Council which exercises such powers?

Article 88 of the Charter provides as follows:

> The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the administering authority for each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such questionnaire.

The two Councils to whose functions I have referred are among the outstanding organs of the United Nations Organization created by the Charter. Yet what do we find in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill with respect to the appointment of persons to represent the United States on those two Councils? It is recognized by the provisions of subdivision (d) that the individuals who are so appointed are officers of the United States; else there would be no requirement set forth in the bill that the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of such persons.

The point to which I refer in connection with the matter suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio resides in the fact that subdivision (d) makes a very notable series of exceptions with respect to the persons who shall

require the advice and consent of the Senate in order that their appointments to represent the United States on these two Councils may be made effective. What are those exceptions?

One is that if the individual is a Member of the Senate of the United States at the time of his appointment the advice and consent of the Senate shall not be required. I remember that not so long ago there sat in the rear row on this side of the aisle the distinguished former junior Senator from the State of Ohio, Mr. Burton. He was elevated to a position of trust, that of membership upon the Supreme Court of the United States. His ability and qualifications were recognized by the President of the United States, notwithstanding their difference in political views. Did the fact that that distinguished citizen was then a Member of the Senate of the United States relieve the Senate from its obligation to inquire into his qualifications and to give or to refuse to give its advice and consent to his appointment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I understand that there is quite a sentiment on his side of the aisle against voting today on any amendments. I assume that the Senator is acting in harmony with that view. I was wondering if the Senator would agree to vote on his amendment not later than 1 o'clock on Monday next, so that we might agree to take a recess at this time in order to accommodate the large group of Senators who do not wish to vote today?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas in making the suggestion. However, I am compelled to decline the suggestion, for three reasons:

The first is the fact that this amendment, striking as it does at the very foundation question, as I see it, of the duties and responsibilities of the United States Senate, striking, as it does, a blow against abdication by the Senate not only of its powers but of its duties and responsibilities, is of such surpassing importance that, in my judgment, it would be both unwise and improper for me to undertake to give such consent.

In the second place, Mr. President, I respectfully decline to give my consent because of the fact that I do not believe that I have the power to consent on behalf of any other Member on this side.

There is a third reason which to my mind should induce my declination to give consent. It is a very fundamental reason. As I see it, unless the Senate of the United States shall adopt cloture, as it has the power to do under its established rules, there should be unlimited debate. Every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle should have the right to unlimited debate on matters of public interest and importance.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator, but I respectfully decline to enter into the agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to put myself on record in favor of the Senator's observation that this must at all times be kept an open forum, with unlimited debate.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. His statement is to be expected from his very consistent attitude, which has been manifested in numerous instances in the past on the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Am I to understand that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Missouri oppose cloture, and will in the future vote against cloture?

Mr. DONNELL. No. There is no such understanding to be gained from the remarks of either the Senator from Oregon or myself. I can speak for myself, and I am sure the Senator from Oregon will amply corroborate my statement.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I pause for a moment and yield to the Senator from Oregon, who has risen.

Mr. MORSE. As I have stated on several previous occasions, I will always sign a cloture petition whenever I am satisfied that a filibuster is being conducted and that discussion is not on the merits of any issue. But I will not agree to limitation of debate except by way of cloture.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to observe that I share the Senator's views. I believe in full and ample debate on the floor of the Senate. I am merely wondering whether Senators who profess to adhere to that doctrine are ready to vote for cloture whenever it suits their purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the fact is that both the Senator from Oregon and I signed a petition for cloture in this very body during the current session of the Congress of the United States.

A few moments ago I referred to the functions of these two councils and to the fact that the pending bill exempts Members of the Senate from the provision that the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States on either of the councils. I pointed out that in the case of the nomination of former Senator Burton of Ohio to membership on the Supreme Court, the Senate, of course, as a result of its intimate, personal knowledge of the nominee, acted quickly and promptly with respect to the confirmation of his appointment. But there was no failure on the part of the Senate to recognize its duty, as imposed on it by the Constitution, either to give or not to give its advice and consent. Yet we find that the pending bill follows the recent tendency of abdication of the power of the Senate, by providing for the exemption of appointments of Members of the Senate from the requirement that appointments to either of these two councils shall be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, subsection (d) of section 2 of the pending bill goes further. Not only does it exempt Members of the Senate who at the time of appointment were in office, as to whom there possibly might be the contention that because of the Senate's knowledge of them, there should not be the same stringency of requirement as in the case of someone who was not known by the Senate, but it makes other exemptions. I digress to interpolate carefully and with the utmost fervency that even in the case of the appointment of Members of the Senate, I believe it is wise for the Senate to be vested not only with the power but the duty of either advising and consenting or refusing to advise and consent to their appointment to offices of importance, just the same as in the case of the appointment of any other person.

Mr. President, I was about to point out that subdivision (d) of section 2 of the pending bill exempts the appointments of Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to these councils from the requirement to receive the advice and consent of the Senate for the language reads that—

> The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations * * *: *Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations if the person so appointed is not at the time of such appointment * * * a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

I do not know why this particular exemption as to the nominations of Members of the House of Representatives was included in the bill. I do know that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made a statement—I cannot quote it from memory with absolute accuracy, but I can state its general effect—that the House of Representatives would not be willing to have its Members subjected to the requirement of having their nominations receive the advice and consent of the Senate. Since when, Mr. President, have the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress become superior to the general requirements of the Constitution of the United States? Since when has it happened that membership in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States should free the Members of that body from the same obligations to which every other citizen of the United States, including the Members of the Senate, are subject, namely, that they shall subject themselves to the scrutiny of the Senate if they are nominated by the President to be members of the councils whose functions I have outlined and briefly described this afternoon.

Article 2, section 2 of the Constitution, in referring to the power of the President, provides that—

> He shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

The same section of the Constitution further provides:

> But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

Mr. President, who is there to say that members of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations of the earth or members of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations are inferior officers whose nominations should not receive the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On that point allow me to suggest to the Senator that the delegates to these subordinate organizations would not be serving in permanent positions. Such positions will not be offices in the strict sense of the term.

Mr. DONNELL. Then, let me ask the Senator why it is that the bill requires the advice and consent of the Senate for all appointments to the two Councils, except in the case of the excepted persons. Does not that recognize that those positions are important offices?

Mr. CONNALLY. The advice and consent of the Senate is required in connection with the nomination of our representative on the Security Council, because the Security Council is a permanent, going concern. The consent of the Senate is also required in connection with the nomination of his assistant, the one who will take his place in his absence. But I suggest to the Senator that, although I personally have no objection to having the Senate confirm such nominations, nevertheless today the President sends delegates to a number of international conferences without consulting the Senate or the House of Representatives or anyone else.

For instance, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has just returned from serving on a conference in London. The distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been a delegate to the International Labor Office. They did not give up their positions as Senators. They simply performed those additional functions.

For that matter, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the senior Senator from Texas were appointed as representatives of the United States at the United Nations Conference. Our appointments were not confirmed. No one ever suggested that they should be confirmed.

Furthermore, the consideration which caused the exception of the requirement in the case of Members of the House of Representatives or Members of the Senate was the thought that for the Senate to pass upon the nominations of Members of the House of Representatives and to reject or ratify their nominations in the case of temporary assignments would not contribute to the cordial relationship between the two Houses of Congress. As the Senator is bound to know, if he does not already know, the House of Representatives is a body coequal to the Senate, and the House of Representatives has a great deal of pride as to its functions, its privileges, and its prerogatives. The House of Representatives is jealous of any infringement upon its rights, either by the Senate or by anyone else.

Personally, I should not have any objection to having the Senate confirm the appointments of delegates to such commissions or boards, but I think that would be wholly unnecessary. Such appointments are not to be permanent positions. The persons receiving such appointments will not give up their regular employment, but they will merely serve temporarily in such positions.

For instance, in Mexico City at the Food and Agriculture Conference, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Texas attended, by designation of the President. We were not delegates, we had no voting powers; but we were consultants there.

That sort of thing happens from time to time. No one has thus far stated seriously, so far as I know, that such temporary assignments, made to carry out the President's wishes, should be subject to the requirement of confirmation by the Senate.

I say to the Senator further that in all these matters such delegates are simply the agents and representatives of the President of the United States, who, under the Constitution, is responsible for our international relations. It is to facilitate the performance of that function and to aid him in it that we propose that these appointees may serve in such capacities at any moment, at any time, whenever the President sees fit to have them do so.

I may point out that at the present time there is pending an agreement between the United States and Great Britain to appoint a commission to go to Palestine to investigate the Jewish problem in Palestine, and so forth and so on. I do not think anyone would contend that those delegates or commissioners should be forced to have their appointments or nominations confirmed by the Senate of the United States before they assume their duties.

I am not trying to argue with the Senator. I do not want to get into any controversy with him because the audience is small. [Laughter.] But I make these suggestions to him so that he can understand something of the motives of the committee in approving the proposed legislation in its present form.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his observations, but I do not find in the bill or in the Charter a basis for many of the observations which the Senator has made. In the first place, with all respect to the distinguished Senator, I may say that his multitudinous duties perhaps prevent him from examining with utmost care all details of legislation such as the pending bill. I find in subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill not that the individuals selected for these positions are representatives of the President of the United States but that they are appointed by the President—"to represent the United States."

The people of the United States, 130,000,000 of them, are the principals for whom these representatives on the two councils are to act. They are not the personal representatives, with all due deference to the distinguished Senator from Texas, merely of the President of the United States.

I invite further attention to the fact that the Senator's argument, as I understood it, is to the effect that there need not be any requirement of confirmation of appointments of members to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. I assert that the Senator has failed to read the bill, or has overlooked portions of it, because there is a distinct provision as follows:

> That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States—
>
> Not the President—
>
> in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

In other words, Mr. President, this is not an instance of there being no provision in the bill requiring the advice and consent of the Senate upon appointment. What I am objecting to and pointing out as being along the line of the dangerous tendency suggested by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is that this provision, which makes it mandatory that the advice and consent of the Senate be first had in order to enable a person to represent the United States in either one of the councils to which I have referred, contains a sinister and serious exception to the rule. I shall discuss that matter a little later in greater detail.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has indicated that the appointments on these councils are merely temporary appointments. I assume that they are not permanent in the sense that they will last until the millennium, but I observe that the appointments of members on the Economic and Social Council are governed by subdivision 2 of article 61 of the United Nations Charter, which reads:

> Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, six members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of 3 years.

So, Mr. President, it is not a mere temporary journey, such as the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has recently taken to London, that is contemplated. It is not a journey to San Francisco to attend a conference there, even though the one which was held was of tremendous importance and short duration. The appointees on the Economic and Social Council serve for a term of 3 years. At the first election, 18 members shall be chosen; 6 of them for a term expiring at the end of 1 year and 6 others at the end of 2 years. This, of course, is obviously for the purpose of staggering the terms so that they will not all expire at one time.

Mr. President, although I have hastily examined the Charter with respect to membership on the Trusteeship Council, I do not find at the moment a definite statement with regard to the length of the term of membership on that Council. I do find, however, that the United Nations is authorized to establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent agreements. I assume, Mr. President, that under that broad—I should say extremely broad—authority the United Nations would have the power, authority, and jurisdiction to specify any reasonable length of term of office for the members of the Trusteeship Council under the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the distinguished Senator found anything in the Charter which requires that the representatives on the General Assembly shall be only temporary appointees?

Mr. DONNELL. I have not found anything to that effect. I have not given that point particular attention, and I would respectfully request the Senator from Colorado to enlighten the Senate with regard to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I say that there is nothing in the Charter on that point, and I shall argue it when we reach consideration of some amendments which I shall propose.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his helpful and enlightening comment.

Mr. President, I have referred to the importance of membership on the Economic and Social Council and on the Trusteeship Council. Before passing from the subject of the Trusteeship Council I wish to comment further with reference to the basic objectives of the trusteeship system which has to do directly with the question of the importance of membership upon the Trusteeship Council. I quote from article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations:

> The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the purposes of the United Nations laid down in article 1 of the present Charter, shall be—

And I read them deliberately—

> (a) to further international peace and security;
>
> (b) to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;
>
> (c) to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and
>
> (d) to insure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80.

Mr. President, who is the Member of the United States Senate who would stand on this floor and undertake to depreciate the importance of membership upon the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations? What Member would liken it to some small or temporary body which meets, for example, for 3 or 4 weeks in London to consider a matter about which the meeting would have no greater authority than to make recommendations? Who is there to say that the furthering of international peace and security, which is the first basic objective of the trusteeship system, is not itself fundamentally important and deserving of the highest type of individuals to administer the attainment of such basic objective? Who is there, Mr. President, who would deny that the promotion of the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self-government or independence, as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples, and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement, is not an objective which is basic and fundamental, and one which entitles the people of this country—yes, and the people of the territories under the trusteeship system—to be assured of the selection of the highest possible type of individuals?

Who is there, Mr. President, who would undertake to say that the further basic objective of the trusteeship system set forth in subdivision (c) of article 76, namely, the encouragement of "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion," and the encouragement of the "recognition of the interdependence of the people of the world," is not of such a basic nature as to entitle both the United States, for whom these men would be agents—not the President of the United States as the principal—not only to entitle the people of the United States but the people of the trusteeship territories, and all the peoples of the world, to the choice of the highest type of individuals?

Who is there who would deny that the insuring of "equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals, and equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80." is not a fundamental, basic objective which entitles the people of the world, as well as the people of our Nation, to the selection of individuals who shall have passed the careful scrutiny of the Senate?

Mr. President, these are some of the purposes of these councils. These are some of the tendencies which are set forth in the pending bill, namely, because of some considerations of temporary expediency, some considerations of keeping the House of Representatives pleased with the attitude of this body, some considerations of what is deemed a practicality, certain persons, as indicated, are exempted from the obligation to submit themselves to the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another fact in connection with subdivision (d). The duties imposed upon the Economic and Social Council and upon the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization, obviously require men of experience; and when I say "men" I use the term in its generic sense. There may be women of experience likewise who would be qualified, and personally I hope that the freedom from distinction with respect to sex may receive an exemplification from time to time in the appointments upon these and other bodies and organs of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. President, I make the point, however, that although the highest skill and integrity and ability are required to carry out the functions of these two Councils, there is no guaranty whatsoever that merely because an individual is a member of the Senate or House of Representatives he or she is qualified to serve upon one of these Councils.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am dredging up what I am afraid is rather stale memory, but this whole subject of appointing members of the Congress to special missions developed in connection with President McKinley's establishment of the commission that dealt with the peace with Spain. There was much debate at the time on the propriety of putting members of a legislative body on a commission of that kind. Moreover, I think we can find a precedent showing that such names have been submitted to the Senate for confirmation.

It is only because of the outstanding distinction of the men who recently have represented us from the Senate on these conferences that many of us have been somewhat acquiescent in the practice. I think the Senator is entirely correct when he makes the point that that practice may well be subject to close scrutiny.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the comment of the Senator from Colorado. I wish to say to the Senate that I am pleased to know that the Senator from Colorado has had the courage to prepare and present to the Senate an amendment which will remove, as I understand, these exemptions from obligation on the part of individuals to submit themselves to the advice and consent of the Senate. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator is entirely correct. I hope to discuss the subject on Monday.

I wonder if at this time the Senator will yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hart	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wheeler
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Gossett	O'Daniel	Young
Green	O'Mahoney	
Guffey	Overton	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. ROBERTSON who addressed the Senate on embarkation problems in the Atlantic and the Pacific. His remarks appear following Mr. DONNELL'S speech.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was referring a little while ago to the importance of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations as to which paragraph (d) of section 2 of the pending bill makes numerous exceptions respecting the persons whose appointments are required to receive the advice and consent of the Senate.

I desire to supplement my previous observations by referring first to the fact that the Charter of the United Nations, in article 86, recognizes the fact that specific qualifications are required for membership on the Trusteeship Council, in the following language:

> Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

As we know, the membership in the Trusteeship Council consists of Members of the United Nations, and it is contemplated, as indicated by section 2 of article 86, that the members shall appoint specially qualified persons to represent them on that Council. Yet we find these exemptions applying to the general rule laid down by subdivision (d) as to the requirement for advice and consent of the Senate. The trusteeship system which is to be administered under the United Nations Charter shall apply, according to article 77 of the Charter, to territories which may be placed in the following categories by means of trusteeship agreements:

> (a) territories now held under mandate;
> (b) territories which may be detached from enemy States as a result of the Second World War; and
> (c) territories voluntarily placed under the system by States responsible for their administration.

It is further provided in subdivision 2 of article 77 that it will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system, and upon what terms.

Mr. President, can it be doubted that any person representing the United States in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, applicable, as it is, to the various categories of territories, must necessarily be a man or a woman of the highest integrity, intelligence, and special qualifications contemplated by article 86 of the Charter of the United Nations? Yet, as I have indicated, subdivision (d) of section 2 of the bill undertakes to exempt from the requirement for securing the advice and consent of the Senate, first, Members of the Senate; second, Members of the House of Representatives.

I now come to a third category which is exempted. This is a category the number of which is legion. I cannot say the number. I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has rendered such outstanding service to the Nation in connection with economy, could answer the question much more accurately than I can.

There is exempted by the provisions of subdivision (d) of section 2 every officer of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. How many officers of the United States are there? Every postmaster who comes under the provisions under which the Senate advises and consents is an officer of the United States. I say nothing in depreciation of any postmaster in the United States, but to my mind, to say that merely because a man is a postmaster under the jurisdiction of the advice and consent section of the Constitution of the United States so far as his appointment as postmaster is concerned, he shall thereafter be exempted from the necessity of receiving the advice and consent of the Senate with respect to his appointment on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, or appointment on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, is absurd and clearly nonunderstandable.

(At this point Mr. DONNELL yielded to Mr. BREWSTER, who addressed the Senate on the subject of British military policy in Palestine. His remarks appear following Mr. DONNELL'S speech.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was referring to the fact that paragraph (d) of section 2 exempts from the provision that the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for appointments to either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, to represent the United States, not only Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, but also officers of the United States "who shall have been appointed by and with the consent of the Senate." I pointed out that this exemption applies clearly to postmasters—I do not know how many postmasters there are; the number may run into thousands—who have been appointed with the consent of the Senate and who, under this provision of the bill, if, perchance, any of them should be appointed on these Councils, would be exempted from any obligation to have their appointments submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. With all due deference to the Postal Department and to the postmasters, I submit—and I do so just as seriously as I do in the case of Members of the Senate and in the case of Members of the House of Representatives—there is no assurance that merely because a man is the holder of a position as postmaster in this country, he is qualified to represent the United States on the Economic and Social Council or on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Mr. President, possibly the exemption does not even stop with civil officers. I am not certain what a court would hold as to the meaning of the word "officer." In the State in which the Senator, who is now temporarily occupying the Chair, and I reside, which we will agree is undoubtedly the best place in the United States in which to live, there is a controversy as to whether the term "officer" includes military as well as civil officers. I am not undertaking to pass upon that question today, but I do call attention to the fact that there is at least an opportunity for the contention, and possibly the successful contention, that by the exemption of "an officer of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the consent of the Senate," the intent is to include not only civil officers but the great list of military officers who from day to day are appointed with the consent of the Senate of the United States.

So Mr. President, we have this section at which the amendment to be presented by the Senator from Colorado so aptly strikes. As I have said, the section undertakes to exempt vast numbers of civil officers, certainly, and possibly vast numbers of others who may be included under it, from the requirement of having their appointments receive the advice and consent of the Senate. But, Mr. President, the vice of the section is not simply its exemption of such numbers of persons from the requirement. The real underlying vice of the section, as I see it, is twofold: First, it amounts to a clear abdication by the Senate of the United States of a responsibility which to my mind it should carry upon its shoulders in the case of appointments to both these great councils, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. In the second place, this section, by exempting such great numbers of persons, makes it easily possible for individuals who have no capacity for service on these councils to be appointed without having the Senate of the United States have the power, even remotely, to object successfully as to either their appointment or their qualifications.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to express my admiration and my appreciation of the superb argument the Senator has made relative to the advise and consent provisions of the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the compliment given me by the Senator from Colorado, and it is doubly appreciated because of the knowledge of the Members of this body of his ability and integrity.

Mr. President, I have already referred to various functions of the Trusteeship Council. In addition, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that article 81 of the Charter of the United States provides as follows:

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

Then, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that article 82 provides—

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area of areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under article 43.

In other words, here we are to make agreements under article 43. Article 82 provides that—

There may be designated, * * * a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under article 43—

I digress to emphasize the importance which, by Article 82, is attached to the special agreement or agreements made under Article 43. In a little while I shall have more to say with respect to the importance of those agreements; but obviously the Charter of the United Nations here recognizes that although the trusteeship council has the tremendous powers to which I have adverted—administering not merely matters of sordid monetary value, but matters which go to the following extent—

(a) to further international peace and security;

(b) to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development toward self government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;

(c) to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

(d) to insure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of article 80.

Notwithstanding all those powers of such vast extent which are reposed in the trusteeship administration, and thus are reposed in the Trusteeship Council mentioned in subsection (d) of section 2 of the bill, nevertheless the Trusteeship Council has no power to question any special agreement or agreements which shall be made under article 43.

So, Mr. President, I assert that article 82 is of outstanding significance in emphasizing the importance of the agreements which we are considering, and concerning which we are attempting to determine whether the advice and consent of the Senate, or an act or resolution of the two Houses of Congress, shall govern in determining the question of entering into such agreements.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has undoubtedly occurred to the distinguished Senator that it is more than passing strange that many of those Members of the Senate who are most fervent in their speeches on the subject of human rights, and of equality of races seem totally indifferent in this debate to the point which the Senator has been expounding. They seem to be totally indifferent to the fact that the bill, in its present form, might permit the selection of any political stumble-bum for appointment to the council which will have crucial controls and influence over vast areas of the earth and of the freedoms of the people living there.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his splendid contribution to this discussion.

Mr. President, the very mention of the words "strategic area or areas" is in itself indicative of the importance of a trusteeship administration, and of the importance of the Trusteeship Council. The word "strategic area or areas" have dire significance to every Member of the United States Senate, and indicate something of the tremendous power of a military nature—and a civil nature as well—which attaches to the administration of those territories.

Mr. President, I invite attention of the Members of the Senate to a fact which they should not overlook. Again I may say that I lament the fact that so few Members of the Senate are present. To my mind the matter which we are discussing today is a profound and important one, and deserves the presence in this Chamber of every Member of the United States Senate unless his presence is prevented by unavoidable illness, accident, or some other cause over which he has no control.

I was about to refer to article 83 of the Charter of the United Nations. In going further into the question of the importance of the Security Council, article 83 states:

All function of the United Nations—

I am not talking about the Trusteeship Council, but the Security Council—

All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

Then Mr. President, it is provided in subdivision 3 of article 83:

The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

Mr. President, is there a Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives, and is there a member of the Post Office Department of our Nation who would undertake to say that in view of the fact that vast powers and responsibilities are vested in the members of the Trusteeship Council, appointments of members to the Council should not receive the advice and consent of the Senate merely because the person appointed happens to be a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, a postmaster, or a member of any of the great military bureaus and commissions of our Nation whose officers are listed in the book which I have in my hand, some of those persons being, perhaps, officers of the Army? Is there a man or a woman who would undertake to say that merely because a person holds one of the positions to which I have referred, his nomination should be exempt from the advice and consent of the Senate if appointed as a member of the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has made it very clear that he does not disparage our postmasters, or anyone else who has been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A postmaster, no matter how experienced he might be, might not be qualified to sit as a member in the Economic and Social Council, or in the Trusteeship Council. And, conversely, a member of either Council might possess superb qualifications for that job and yet might make a very inefficient postmaster.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think the observation of the Senator from Colorado is filled with wisdom, and I am very pleased that he has emphasized much better than I can the point which I am making. I have tried to make it clear that I am not disparaging postmasters. I see sitting on my left a distinguished member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. MCKELLAR] is the chairman of that committee. I undertake to say that the administration of the postal affairs of our Nation has given numerous examples of fine public service in every corner and section of our Nation. However, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado has indicated, the mere fact that a man is a postmaster in any city, town, or village, regardless of its size or its nature, is not conclusive evidence of the fact that he possesses special qualifications, as embraced in the words "specially qualified" in article 86 of the Charter, to serve on the Trusteeship Council. The mere fact that he is serving in the office to which he received his appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate, does not necessarily indicate that he possesses qualifications to serve as a member on the Trusteeship Council. Nor does the fact that we Members of the Senate are sitting in our seats as the result of having been selected by our constituents, necessarily establish, by any manner or means, that any one

of us is able to take part in the technical work which it will be necessary for members of either Council to perform.

Mr. President, I believe there are numerous Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as postmasters, and officers of the Army and Navy, who are qualified to serve on these Councils. But just as it is necessary for a person who has been nominated to serve on the Federal bench to receive the advice and consent of the Senate before his appointment becomes effective, I undertake to say that the qualifications of each appointee, whether he be a Senator, a Representative, a postmaster, a general, a colonel, or whoever he may be, to serve as a member of these important councils, should first be established to the satisfaction of the Senate of the United States.

In referring a little further to the matter of the Trusteeship Council, article 84 of the Charter of the United Nations states in part:

> It shall be the duty of the administering authority to insure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security.

I now invite the attention of the Senate to the following very significant language bearing on the importance of the trusteeship administration and of the Trusteeship Council itself:

> To this end the administering authority—

As I understand, that is the administering authority under the international trusteeship system—

> may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations toward the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

Mr. President, there sits within this body numerous Members who have served as governors of their States. I see three of them on my left. There are others who sit upon the other side of the aisle. Yesterday we saw sworn in as a Member of this body a former governor of one of the far western States. A while ago there was present the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts who has headed the Governors' Conference of the United States. I refer to the Junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I am sure that all the Members to whom I have referred, who have been governors of their respective States, would join me in pointing out the possibilities of the commitment of error, the possibilities of the creation of strife, and the possibilities of bloodshed and loss of life as the result of improper administration of local defense. I may say, incidentally, that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], who graces the chair at this moment, has served as an acting Governor of the State of Missouri, and I am sure he would join me in my statement. Every governor of this country will concur in the statement that the control and administration of the military affairs of a State, those affairs having to do with law, order, and local defense, if need be, carry within themselves the necessity for exercising a cool head, the necessity for decisiveness, and the requirement of ability and knowledge of the situation at hand. But, Mr. President, to say that any man, merely because he has received a commission of some kind as an officer of the United States, or merely because he has been elected a Member to the House of Representatives or to the United States Senate, is qualified to handle matters involved in foreign countries, under strange and diverse conditions, embracing questions of local defense and maintenance of law and order within trust territories, and is qualified to act as a member of the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council without being first passed upon and thoroughly considered by the Senate of the United States, is to my mind a doctrine of profoundly bad public policy.

Mr. President, it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper without seeing spread across it in headlines references to difficulties taking place in one section or another of the world. A moment ago I picked up a copy of the Washington Post and observed such headlines as the following:

> Chiang troops assured safe Mukden entry. Nationalists halt 90 miles from Manchurian city.

In the next column appears the following heading:

> Tito proclaims new republic; King wrathful. Peter charges people never had chance to vote on monarchy.

I find in the adjoining column this heading:

> Issue warning against troop movements as disorders spread.

Mr. President, the administration of the affairs of local defense and the maintenance of law and order within any one of these trust territories has within itself the germs of possible war in the world at any time. To say that any man, merely because he is a Member of the Senate, merely because he is a Member of the House, merely because he is an officer, postmaster, member of the Aviation Board, or whatever it may be listed in this book, or because he is an officer, perhaps, of the Army—I am not sure of the legal status of Army officers, as I have indicated—to say that those men should be exempt from consideration by the Senate is to my mind unwise and unsound.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will withhold the suggestion a moment, may I ask the Senator from Missouri whether, if the Senate should recess at this time, he would continue very long on Monday in concluding his speech?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not able to state how long it will require me to conclude my remarks. I feel that this subject matter is of such profound importance that it is unwise even to estimate the time that will be required for the proper presentation of the arguments. To my mind the fact that Senators are not in attendance even today, after a lengthy address yesterday upon the subject matter of the bill and the pending amendment, is itself a strong argument why further presentation should be made on Monday. Of course, I shall endeavor to confine myself within reasonable limits, but I do not desire even inferentially to obligate myself as to the length or nonlength of time which will be required.

Mr. HILL. Am I to understand from what the distinguished Senator has said that even if he concludes today, it is his present intention to address the Senate again on Monday on this subject?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not certain as to that. I have not even estimated the length of time which will be required to complete my remarks. I cannot make a statement as to the length of time that will be required.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator desire to proceed this afternoon?

Mr. DONNELL. It will meet my entire approval for the Senate to recess at this time until Monday. In fact, I think it will be advisable to do so. I shall not urge it, and I am willing to continue speaking this afternoon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I apprehend very soon it will be impossible to get a quorum, and therefore it would be a good thing to go over until Monday.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that if he will yield to me at this time I shall move a recess until Monday, when the Senator may have a larger audience of Senators present. I appeal to the Senator that he endeavor over the week end to make his speech as compact as possible so that we may vote as soon as we can reasonably do so on next Monday.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the courtesy of my distinguished friend from Alabama, for whom, as he knows, I have great admiration. I am perfectly willing to suspend my remarks at this time if the motion is to be made by the Senator from Alabama, with the understanding that at the opening of the Senate on Monday I shall have the floor.

Mr. HILL. I think there will be no difficulty in the Senator's getting the floor on Monday.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

NECESSITY FOR UNRRA APPROPRIATIONS

(During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL's speech:)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield for not more than 2 or 3 minutes in order that I may introduce some material into the RECORD upon a subject which, while it bears indirectly upon the subject matter of the discussion, I think is of great importance to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed in the RECORD at the close of the speech of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning entitled "Speed For UNRRA". I think it is very important that the Senate reconsider the action which it took the other day when objection was raised to immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 266, providing appropriations for UNRRA.

As we sit here today, discussing and debating the implementation of the United Nations Organization, millions of people in many parts of the world are hungry, homeless, sick and cold. I think it is impossible to build up the good will and mutual confidence among the peoples of the world which are so essential if the United Nations Organization is to function effectively in the pacific settlement of international disputes, unless this great nation of ours lives up to the high principles of humanitarianism and Christian morality upon which UNRRA relief is based.

The Christian teachings as to our moral obligations as individuals in relation to other individuals who are suffering from want are equally applicable when applied to the moral relationships which should exist between nations of peoples. Thus as a nation, aware of the great suffering so prevalent this winter among the peoples of less fortunate nations who are suffering from the devastating effects of the scourge of war we might well heed the great moral teachings inherent in the Biblical words:

For I was hungry, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.

I am convinced that more lasting foundations for international cooperation and an effective United Nations Organization would be built if we would take time out from our debate over the language we should adopt in implementing the United Nations Organization and proceed to vote to provide, through the machinery of UNRRA, for food, clothing, shelter, and medicine to the destitute peoples of the war-torn world.

Mr. President, as I look at the many empty seats in the Senate I take note of the fact that many Senators are at lunch. It is pretty well recognized as a psychological law that it is difficult for persons who are well fed, well clothed, surrounded with the comforts of life, and who are far removed from the scenes of starvation and deprivation in other parts of the world, to appreciate fully the deplorable hardships which are being suffered by less fortunate peoples.

So, Mr. President, in addition to the editorial to which I have referred, and which I have asked to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, I would like to have the RECORD show as a matter of historical interest how well fed we in the Senate are as we delay action on the UNRRA appropriations bill—a bill which offers many of our fellowmen their only hope of living through the winter. Hence I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the luncheon menu in the Senate Restaurant for today. It speaks more eloquently than I can of how well fed are the Members of the Senate. I trust that before the day is over Senators will take sufficient time to give unanimous consent to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266 so as to provide immediate funds for use of UNRRA in order that we may stop the death ride of at least one of the four horsemen of the Apocalypse throughout the world—famine.

There being no objection, the editorial and the luncheon menu were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

SPEED FOR UNRRA

Every observer reporting on the economic situation in Europe attests to the desperate need for UNRRA's aid. Winter is already aggravating the terrible effects of shortages in food and clothing and shelter. If there should be any break in the stream of relief which UNRRA is supplying, the toll among children, among the aged, the ill, the undernourished, and even among the hardiest fighters for freedom in the liberated lands, would be an appalling one—an indelible reproach to all of us who escaped suffering and turned our backs upon those who endured it in a common cause.

The truth is that the stream of UNRRA's relief is very seriously threatened. It seems nearly certain now that the organization will receive the long-delayed $550,000,000 pledged to it a year ago as part of the initial American contribution. But this sum will be entirely exhausted by the end of this year. UNRRA's resources must be refreshed by another contribution from all the nations which escaped the ravages of invasion. The United States, wealthiest among these, is asked to contribute again an amount equal to about 1 percent of our national income, $1,350,000,000. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has already recommended the authorization of this amount. It must still be acted upon, however, by the House as a whole and by the Senate. And once the authorization has been adopted, an appropriation measure must pass both Chambers.

The trouble is that Congress plans to recess in just 3 weeks' time. If it is to furnish UNRRA the money needed before its Members go home, it will have to act with resolute dispatch. There is no time left for politicking, no time for the broaching of irrelevant amendments attaching strings to UNRRA's use of the American contribution. If the money is not made available by the end of the year, UNRRA will simply be unable to buy the supplies needed for shipment to Europe and Asia. If there is an interruption in the flow of these supplies, the price will inevitably be paid in human life.

It takes about 2 months to translate an order for supplies into actual delivery of relief to the needy. In the case of goods which have to be manufactured or processed, the lag between order and delivery may run anywhere from 2 months to 8. And UNRRA cannot order without money. This is the grim, inescapable situation. Congress has 3 weeks' time in which to answer the voices of Europe's children and of their mothers and of the men toward whom we look to build democracy upon the ruins of war. These will be but quiet voices. Perhaps they will not be heard in Congress above those that clamor for special conditions and delay. But unanswered, their echoes will haunt all our nights and days for many a year.

UNITED STATES SENATE RESTAURANT, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1945

LUNCHEON MENU

Appetizers: Clam cocktail, 30 cents; shrimp cocktail, 50 cents; Lynnhaven cocktail, 35 cents; celery and olives, 35 cents; leopard melon, 20 cents; pineapple juice, 15 cents; fruit cup, 25 cents.

Soups: Senate Restaurant bean, cup, 10 cents; bowl, 15 cents; Boston clam chowder, cup, 10 cents; bowl, 15 cents; oyster stew, 40 cents; in cream, 60 cents.

SIXTY-CENT LUNCHEON

Fried fillet of sole, tartare sauce; parsley potatoes, green salad; or boiled frankfurters and sauerkraut, parsley potatoes, assorted breads.

Choice of apple cobbler, frozen custard, or ice cream; tea or coffee.

(1) One-half roasted stuffed squab chicken, candied sweetpotatoes, old-fashioned turnip greens, $1.

(2) Sea food en casserole, steamed rice, green salad, 90 cents.

(3) Baked eastern salmon, hearts of lettuce salad, parsley potatoes, 70 cents.

Desserts: Fresh apple pie, 15 cents; cup custard, 15 cents; cup cakes, 10 cents; apricot pie, 15 cents; layer cake, 15 cents; ice cream or sherbet, 15 cents; blue cheese, 25 cents; Camembert cheese, 25 cents; Liederkranz cheese, 25 cents.

Beverages: Coffee, 5 cents; tea, 10 cents; Coca-Cola, 10 cents; milk or buttermilk, 5 cents; 7-Up, 10 cents.

No substitution on the above.

SHIPPING AND PERSONNEL PROBLEMS IN THE EMBARKATION CAMPS IN EUROPE AN THE PACIFIC—ABSENCE FROM THE SENATE

(During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL'S speech:)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on the 9th day of November, I submitted a resolution (S. 138) calling for an investigation of the shipping and personnel problems that have developed in the embarkation camps in Europe and in the Pacific and requesting that this investigating committee have on its personnel a number of enlisted GI's.

Since that date, under the guidance of the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], a number of meetings have been held with officers of the Army and the Navy, including General Paul, head of the personnel of the War Department, and Admiral Denfeld, Chief of Bureau of Navy Personnel.

When I submitted the resolution, I stated that the apparent difficulties were between Washington and the Pacific and between Washington and the Atlantic. I still think this is the case, as the Army and Navy officials in Washington have been most cooperative in their endeavor to do all they can to facilitate the return of soldiers and any investigation that we are conducting to that end.

This morning I attended a meeting with the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee at which were present members of the Army and Navy shipping branches and of the War Shipping Administration. I found these men particularly alert to the problems of the transportation of personnel from Europe and from the Pacific. They advised the chairman and myself that they were virtually "over the hump" in the matter of returning personnel from the Atlantic, and during the month of December will complete the lifting of available military personnel from Europe. They advised

further that at the present time shipment of available personnel has been completed from the Mediterranean theater. During the month of December they anticipate transferring 31 ships with a carrying capacity of 76,420 troops from the Atlantic to the Pacific—and, in fact, this has already started—so that during the month of December there will be a sufficient number of ships in the Pacific to lift all available men. Senators will note that I use the words "available men." Availability of these men is based upon reports of the area commanders in the Pacific, and does not necessarily mean the number of men who are eligible for discharge. The Shipping Administration is basing its efforts on the number of men reported as available by the area commanders.

I think, now that we are approaching the position where there is availability of ships, the number of men in the Pacific should be made available for the maximum amount of shipping that can be employed in returning them to the United States. I intend to ask that reconsideration be given by the area commanders to the number of ships available. In other words, until such time as the high-point score of the majority of the men overseas is equivalent to the high-point score of those being discharged in the United States, I feel there should be no relaxation in the effort to make available every ship for the transportation of personnel home. At the present time there are in the Pacific 515 ships with a carrying capacity of 829,283. This will be augmented in late December and early January by the 31 ships from the Atlantic with a capacity of 76,480. A few Navy combatant ships will be retired so that the total lift capacity in the Pacific will be only slightly larger than it is today.

I have been informed that the shipping situation on the island of Okinawa has materially improved since the 15th of November and that today it is nearly equal to the number of men available and released for transportation by the area commanders.

Mr. President, an opportunity has been presented me to visit Europe and speak directly with representatives of enlisted GI's from various embarkation camps and centers in France next week. As a member of the Senate Aviation Committee, I have been asked to be a guest of the TWA in their preview flight of the air liner *Constellation*, inaugurating their domestic flight from Washington to Paris. The air liner will be christened by Madam Bonet, wife of the French Ambassador, at 2 p. m., Monday next, and the plane will leave for Paris at 2:30. The acting chairman of the Senate Aviation Committee has nominated me to represent that committee on this flight. At my suggestion and with the approval of the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, the War Department in Washington has been kind enough to send dispatches to Europe requesting that enlisted GI's in the various embarkation camps select representatives totaling about 25 to meet me next Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon in Paris. In addition, the War Department is making arrangements for me to visit as many camps as I can during my brief stay there. I expect to utilize this opportunity to get the enlisted man's point of view of the demobilization.

I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

BRITISH MILITARY POLICY IN PALESTINE

(During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL'S speech:)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of introducing something into the RECORD and making a brief statement with relation thereto?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask permission to make certain insertions in the RECORD, and in connection therewith to make a statement dealing with the subject of Palestine, which is now a matter of large concern. I visited Palestine 2 years ago as a member of the senatorial committee, and also discussed the matter in London. During the past summer I saw the conditions in Europe which are bringing about such earnest consideration of Palestinian problems.

If in this brief statement there seems to be something which indicates that I am indulging in the American pastime of twisting the British Lion's tail, let me say only that my comments upon British policy can be supported by citations of such eminent authority as Winston Churchill and Hon. Herbert Morrison, the present leader of the House of Commons under the Labor government, who have used very much more caustic phraseology than I do in characterizing the obtuseness of the British Colonial and Foreign Office in dealing with the situation in Palestine, an obtuseness which seems to be somewhat contagious so far as our own State Department is concerned. I trust that a clarification of public thinking on this matter by more complete reports may conduce to a solution which will not only solve the very pressing problem of Palestine, but, as I conceive it, serve the long-range interests of American foreign policy as well.

It is well known that about 50,000 British troops have been concentrated recently in Palestine. The impression which British official circles are trying to create is that the only reason for the presence of these troops is the fear of Arab or Jewish disorders in the country. It is proper, therefore, to point out that the British Government has been concerned about a place which could be used as a British military base in the Middle East. The Egyptians have come to resent bitterly the continued presence of British garrisons, and the British Government has realized for some time that in all probability it will be obliged to remove its troops from Egypt. An attempt was made to develop Syria as an alternative British military base, and British Government circles hoped that with the elimination of France from Syria, the local government would enter into a special treaty with Great Britain permitting the use of that country as a British military base. The British hopes in this respect seem to have been not justified. After getting rid of the French with British assistance, the Syrians and Lebanese turned around—with possibly some discreet diplomatic assistance from the United States—and made it plain that they did not wish to give Britain any privileged status in their countries.

In the circumstances, the British Government has apparently decided that Palestine is the only country on the east coast of the Mediterranean where they would be able to maintain in permanence large military forces. This they perhaps consider essential to their military interests, as was indicated by Hon. Herbert Morrison in the British House of Commons some years ago in discussing the very problem of Palestine, and as was indicated by Winston Churchill when he, too, was a critic of that government—perhaps as essential as we consider bases in the Pacific, if not more so. As a result, about 50,000 troops have been concentrated in Palestine, largely from Syria and Egypt.

It may be a matter of relative indifference to the Jews whether Britain wishes to use its special position in Palestine in order to station there a large number of British troops for imperial reasons. But what is most unfortunate is the apparent attempt of the British to mislead public opinion, both in Great Britain and in this country, as to their reasons for having those troops in Palestine, and to put on the Jews the blame for a purely, or primarily, imperial policy. By now, the families of British soldiers stationed in Palestine have been led to believe that the Zionist issue is what prevents their sons and brothers from being demobilized and returned to their homes. They have been led to believe that the presence of British troops in Palestine is necessary either in order to defend the Jews from Arab onslaughts, or in order to prevent illegal activities and violence on the part of the Jews, and that therefore it is the Jews who stand in the way of the reunion of English soldiers with their families. The situation has led to a great deal of resentment on the part of the English public, and is bound to lead to greater resentment and to an increase of anti-Semitism.

Herbert Morrison in the House of Commons, before he was its leader, stated that negligible numbers of troops would be required in order to preserve order in Palestine, at a time when there was as much ground for concern as exists at the present time. In private conversations with many, there has been an intimation by British officials that the main reason why the British cannot agree to the opening of Palestine to the Jews, or even to the admission of the 100,000 refugees requested by President Truman, is that such a policy would lead to large-scale Arab attacks against Jews, which would have to be repelled by British troops, at the cost of lives. This argument is especially used by British propagandists in this country, who add that if the United States urges Great Britain to embark on this course the United States must share the risk by sending large numbers of American troops to Palestine.

As I have already indicated, both Winston Churchill and Herbert Morrison have indicated that the fear of widespread Arab violence over Palestine is absolutely imaginary; but assuming for a moment that such a danger exists, it is proper to point out that a logical solution might be the stationing of neither British nor American troops in Palestine, but the recall to Palestine of more than 30,000 Palestinian Jews who are now serving in various formations of the British Army outside their country. If any soldiers should risk their lives because of a policy of which Jews would be the direct beneficiaries, it is grossly unfair that British or American soldiers should be asked to bear these risks. It is only fair that the Jewish soldiers from Palestine should do so. Such a solution was, in fact, suggested by Herbert Morrison himself in discussion in the British House of Commons. The British Government, however, has refused to return to Palestine these Jewish formations. It seems evident that the argument of widespread Arab violence is not believed by the British Government, but is merely being used as an excuse for not undertaking a course which they do not wish to undertake as a matter of policy.

Another interesting point may be made. While British representatives in London and in Washington spread the impression, through newspaper articles and otherwise, that they are anxious to have American soldiers participate in the occupation of Palestine, and even create the impression that the American Government has been asked to participate but has refused, there is what is apparently reliable information to the effect that no such request, either formal or informal, has been made by an official British representative of any official American representative. On the contrary, fully aware that sharing the responsibility for a territory means sharing control and authority over the territory, the British Government has carefully refrained from making any such suggestion to the Government of the United States, rumors and newspaper reports emanating from British sources to the contrary notwithstanding. Thus the British are able to saddle the American Government with the seeming responsibility for failing to cooperate with the British Government, whereas in fact the British Government has no desire whatsoever to seek or welcome such cooperation.

The joint Anglo-American Commission is intended apparently to saddle the United States with a share in the moral responsibility for a British policy in Palestine, but there is no desire to allow the United States an effective voice in deciding Palestine's future. It is understood that there is a desire or aim on the part of Great Britain to obtain from the United Nations Organization a trusteeship over Palestine and to have it declare Palestine a British security zone under the United Nations Charter. If such an arrangement were to come about, Great Britain would be as free, if not more free, to pursue its own policies in Palestine as it was in its capacity as a mandatory of the League of Nations. The power which Great Britain exercises in Palestine at the present time derives in no way from the Balfour declaration, but simply and solely from the mandate given to it by the League of Nations and by the treaty made with the United States Government, under which Britain obligated herself to carry out the specific provisions of the Balfour declaration. Certainly the trusteeship or the mandatory or the treaty of the United States can not be modified by any authority less than that which bestowed the obligation or authority. The obligations of Great Britain and the United States to carry out the terms of the agreement can not be modified by the President of the United States or by any other authority less than that which created the obligations, which was the action of the United States Government, through its constitutional authorities, the President, the Senate, and, as a matter of fact, in that instance the whole Congress of the United States.

Meanwhile there are serious reports which it seems to me should be most informative to the American people and to the Congress of the United States at this time as it is considering the resolution regarding Palestine. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three or four press reports which, so far as I know, have not been widely brought to the attention of the American people. They emanate from apparently reliable sources, and they refer to conditions prevailing in both Palestine and Tripoli, where recent Jewish riots have created increasing concern.

There being no objection, the press reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM TRIPOLI

Seemingly reliable information from Tripoli, by way of Egypt, indicates that the British commanding officer in Tripoli, Brigadier General Temple, and his deputy, Colonel Merter, played the strangest possible part during the recent Tripoli disorders, a part which makes it impossible to absolve the British authorities from serious responsibility in connection with these disorders.

Until recently, Arabs in Tripoli did not dare do harm to Jews. Even under some of the worst days of Axis domination in north Africa, when German forces were in control of the situation, the Arab population was aware of the serious view which the authorities would have taken of any mob violence against the non-Moslem parts of the population. Accordingly, Jews and various European groups were left unmolested.

Any desire that may have existed among certain elements of the Arabs as an aftermath of the Nazi occupation to molest the Jews was rapidly dispelled by the arrival of British forces, among whom Jewish formations from Palestine were very noticeable. The Arabs gained the impression that the Jews were respected allies of the British, and this was sufficient to nip in the bud any temptation to engage in anti-Jewish activities.

Apparently recently, however, various Arab elements in Tripoli gained the impression, through their frequent contacts with General Temple, Colonel Merter, and other British officers in Tripoli, that, with the cessation of hostilities in Europe, the alliance between the British and the Jews was over; that the British no longer needed the cooperation of Jewish manpower from Palestine; and that, therefore, the British were no longer interested in the treatment of Jews in Tripoli.

As a result of this impression, coupled with agitation by emissaries of the Pan-Arab League, whose identity and presence in Tripoli were well-known to British authorities, a pogrom was organized in the Jewish quarters in Tripoli on Sunday, November 4. The organizers of the pogrom spread the word that the British authorities would not interfere. Indeed, the Jewish quarter in Tripoli was attacked and 40 Jews were murdered on that day. And the military authorities did not interfere. No curfew was declared in the city, and no exceptional measures were taken either to arrest the known ring leaders or to prevent the recurrence of disturbances.

This attitude of the British authorities was considered a clear encouragement by the organizers of the disorders. On Monday, November 5, they once more broke into the Jewish quarter of the city and several dozen Jews were again slaughtered. And again no effective measures were taken by the British authorities to prevent the recurrence or further spread of the disorders.

On the third day, when word of the peculiar attitude of the British authorities spread throughout the country, similar disorders took place in various villages, and looting of Jewish property extended throughout western Tripolitania. In those places where there were no Jews, and to some extent in Tripoli as well, the mob attacked Italians and other Europeans. It was only on that day that Brigadier Temple ordered a curfew in certain parts of the town. Significantly enough, he curfewed only the center of the city, sending patrols to the Christian and European quarters. Native and Jewish quarters remained unpatrolled, thereby making it possible for mobs from the native quarter to continue assaulting the Jewish quarter. The slaughter and looting of Jews continued unabated.

It is understood that Brigadier Temple is trying to justify his attitude on the grounds that he did not have sufficient police forces to patrol effectively the entire city. It should be stated, therefore, that he had full authority to use troops as well as police for the purpose of ensuring public order, and that, had he done so, he would have had all the manpower he needed. It should also be noted that in the disposal of the police forces he and his subordinate officers chose to leave undefended that section of the city and of its population which were threatened most.

On the same day the commanding general performed another act which throws a clear light on his attitude toward the disorders. He demanded that the heads of the Arab community express their regret for the disorders in writing. This they promptly did, and the pogroms continued. No other steps were taken by the British authorities to deal with the ringleaders of the disorders.

On the other hand, the Jewish rabbis were gathered by the British commanding general and severely chided for the anti-Jewish disorders. The British authorities demanded that they, the leaders of the attacked community, repudiate the disorders, thereby giving to outside observers the impression that the disorders were not a one-sided, unprovoked attack upon the Jews, but a two-sided conflict for which the Jews bore an important part of the responsibility.

It appears from the attitude of the British authorities in Tripoli that their conduct at the time of the disorders is connected with a threefold objective of British policy in that community:

(a) The British try to impress the local Arab population with the fact that they take the Arab side as much as possible in every controversy. This is done in order to get the local Arab population to favor British trusteeship over Tripolitania.

(b) The British authorities in Tripoli seemingly proceeded on the theory that a show of anti-Jewish violence would not be unwelcome to the British Government, as

evidence that the Arab-speaking world is very bitter about Jewish claims to Palestine. In order that this impression should percolate to the outside world, it was essential that the anti-Jewish disorders should not be stopped on the first day, but should be permitted to last for some time. As long as the Jews alone were the victims of the Arab mob the British, therefore, adopted a policy of noninterference. But when the mob started getting out of hand and looting the property of various European groups, the British stepped in and prevented further spread of the disorders.

(c) By calling upon the heads of both the Moslem and the Jewish communities to repudiate the disorders, the British authorities managed to maneuver themselves into their favorite position of trying to be the fair and impartial judge between two opposing groups, an impression which they thought to convey, through newspapers correspondents and otherwise, to the outside world.

[From the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 26, 1945]

BRITISH TROOPS ARREST JEWISH LEADERS IN BELSEN CAMP FOR PROTEST ON PALESTINE POLICY

PARIS, November 25.—Leaders of the Central Jewish Committee in Bergen-Belsen, in the British zone in Germany, have been arrested for protesting against the new British policy on Palestine, it was revealed in a report received here today from the committee.

The blue-white Zionist flag was mishandled by British military policemen and thrown onto a heap of garbage, the report said, and a crowd of Jews, including many women, which gathered when a police car arrived to take away those arrested, were beaten by British military police with rubber truncheons.

The arrests were made on November 16, when the protest against the Bevin statement was to have been submitted to the British authorities in Belsen during the distribution of Red Cross parcels scheduled to take place on that day. However, the German administrator of the camp, G. Grande, notified the military police of the plan and later appeared with British M. P.'s whom he asked to arrest Marian Lipke, the president of the Jewish committee.

As soon as they arrived the military police immediately removed banners bearing inscriptions in English reading: "Open the Gates of Palestine," which had been erected by the displaced Jews. Then, acting on the advice of the German administrator, they arrested not only the president of the Jewish committee, but a number of other leaders of the committee and several of its personnel. They then took the blue-white flag from the office of the committee and threw it into a pile of garbage 60 feet from the office.

JEWISH CAMP OFFICE RAIDED—TYPEWRITERS AND CORRESPONDENCE SEIZED

Meanwhile, many of the thousands of Jews who are still in the Belsen camp gathered together and voiced their protest against the German administrator. The military police then let loose with their rubber truncheons, striking at random at men and women.

Several hours later British troops, led by Grande, returned to the camp and arrested another member of the Jewish committee, two young chalutzim and three Jewish girls, without explanation. They later returned, for a third time, and searched the office of the committee, seizing several typewriters, correspondence files, and accounting ledgers.

No information concerning those arrested can be obtained, except it is known that during their interrogation at the headquarters of the military police one was struck twice by a German policeman in the presence of a British officer.

[From the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 11, 1945]

PALESTINE GOVERNMENT CHARGED WITH ARMING ARABS AND INCITING THEM TO ATTACK JEWS

JERUSALEM, November 9.—The serious accusation that the Palestine Government has been arming Arabs and inciting them to attack Jews, made by the secret radio of the Jewish resistance movement, has finally been brought into the open.

In the last few months there have been many reliable reports of such activity on the part of the Palestine Government, but those who were aware of them, and had investigated, were reluctant to aggravate the situation by writing an exposé. Actually the story has not appeared in the Palestine newspapers, and the Government therefore sees no reason to deny the charges. And, of course, the people who have the evidence cannot risk coming out into the open.

One authenticated instance of the administration's efforts to create trouble between the Arabs and the Jews involves Abdulla Khalil el Shoikh, commander of a Hebron gang which played a prominent role in the disturbances of 1936. Abdulla Khalil had been hiding since 1936, but last year the Palestine authorities let it be known that they had no objection to his returning to Hebron, which he did.

At the same time, he received magnanimous assistance from the authorities in the way of agricultural machinery and livestock. Two months ago he was approached by a Palestine Government agent and reminded of his obligations. At this time, the former Hebron gang leader was asked to organize the Arabs in that area into an armed force for the purpose of "resistance to Jewish aggression." Assurances were also given him that all the financial aid and the firearms and other equipment necessary would be forthcoming.

ARAB VILLAGERS RELUCTANT TO ENGAGE IN RIOTS: FEAR CONSEQUENCES

It is reported reliably that Abdulla Khalil el Sheikh at first was not too anxious to assume that task. But finally he was convinced, and he is now organizing and training Arabs with modern weapons. Five weeks ago a deputy inspector of the Palestine police visited Kilonia, which is near Hotza, a Jewish community not far from Jerusalem, and gathering all the Arab villagers together he told them that, according to trustworthy information, the Jews were preparing to attack the Arabs. He advised the Arabs to arm and not to await an attack but to go after the Jews themselves. The deputy inspector indicated that all the necessary arms were available. The villagers, however, did not stir, refusing to take the inspector seriously.

For the time being, the disinclination of the Arab villagers to become aroused and incited offers the most serious handicap to the plans of Palestine government officials, whose only solution to the Palestine problem apparently is to set Arabs and Jews against one another. The inability of these officials to guarantee to the Arabs that no legal action would ever be taken against them, in the event of disorders, also holds backs the Arabs.

Psychological warfare is also being used by the same Palestine government officials. This correspondent has seen leaflets, typographically excellent and in Arabic, which call upon the Arabs to be prepared to rise without delay. "The Jews are arming themselves to the teeth," one such leaflet says. "The Jews plan to conquer Palestine and neighboring countries," states another.

A whispering campaign also reveals that experienced manipulators are operating in Palestine among the Arabs, just as the Allies did against Germany, and vice versa. The most persistent of these rumors deal with King ibn-Saud—whispers about the size of the forces that ibn-Saud, ruler of Saudi-Arabia, has ostensibly promised to send to the aid of the Palestine Arabs; and these whispers make the rounds of the Arab villages with well-organized regularity.

This line is necessary to arouse Palestine Arabs, who are still reluctant to fall in with the anti-Jewish schemes of mysterious visitors who say they are from the government. When the Arabs in Nablus showed absolute apathy toward the Jewish danger, stories of ibn-Saud's horizon-filling hordes, who were reportedly poised on their horses ready to dash in on a holy crusade, immediately started to be spread among the villages in that area.

The Jewish underground radio, in discussing similar incidents and tactics, charges that the Palestine government is trying to arrange outrages and attacks, with Arabs set against Jews and Jews against Arabs, so that when the "two peoples of Palestine fight, the British will enter the fray and prevail over both sides, punish both sides, and appear to be playing the role of impartial judge."

[From Jewish Telegraphic Agency Bulletin of November 29, 1945]

FOURTEEN JEWS KILLED, ONE HUNDRED WOUNDED IN PALESTINE WITHIN FORTNIGHT; BRITISH SUFFER NO CASUALTIES

JERUSALEM, November 28.—It is now possible to discern both in the British and the Jewish behavior a distinct pattern since the statement November 23 by Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin on Palestine in the House of Commons.

In less than 2 weeks, 14 Jews have been killed by the British, including 2 women and a boy under 16, while nearly 100 people have been shot, including an 8-year-old. All this violent suppression has been accompanied by the classic excuse that shots from the crowds provoked a reply. Yet despite the reputation for deadly and accurate assaults built up by the terrorists, not a single British soldier or policeman has been seriously hurt in the clashes with the public.

On the other hand, the Jewish activities indicate a plan of attacks upon specific targets where minimal forces can be engaged as, for example, in the selection of such meaningful targets as the government offices at Tel Aviv—in protest against the Bevin pronouncement—and the attacks on the coastal stations this week in retaliation for the capture of a schooner carrying immigrants without entry permits.

Aside from such sharply limited attacks, which are definitely to be classified as carried out by resistance forces organized in quasi military cadres, the Jewish answer to the British is obviously taking the form of passive mass resistance. The Tel Aviv demonstrators last week did not reply as an organized mass to the attacks by British troops, while the tactics of passive resistance were most obviously demonstrated by the events yesterday which were exactly paralleled in two separate areas.

In both cases, thousands of Jews with no arms and with nothing in their hands, attempted to stream into the collective farms which had been surrounded by troops, simply to demonstrate their solidarity. Although the British communique today declares that a horseman led the colonists toward Givat Chayim and that other Jews opened fire from the flanks of the soldiers, there is not a single instance of a casualty among the troops as evidence of any firing.

THREE HUNDRED JEWISH SOLDIERS REPORTED SEPARATED FROM BRITISH DIVISION SENT TO PALESTINE

Witnessing events at Givat Haim where British troops fired at Jews, and witnessing also the picking off by rifle fire in the Tel

Aviv streets of people who could have been dispersed by the simplest means—such as the use of streams of water—convinced this correspondent that the armed forces here, while they are acting with the utmost restraint, are, nevertheless, firing unnecessarily. Perhaps these troops were overtrained in the expectancy of a general armed uprising.

The report is current here that 300 Jewish soldiers of the Sixth Airborne Division were separated from that detachment before the outfit entered Palestine. The main body of troops are also said to have been politically briefed along lines that the Jews, having now been given a homeland, want to establish a state by force. It is noteworthy that violent antagonism toward the Jews has been expressed by nearly all the soldiers with whom this correspondent has talked.

JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE, IN CABLE TO BYRNES, ACCUSES BRITISH OF INTRODUCING REGIME OF TERROR IN PALESTINE WITH VIEW TO INTIMIDATING JEWS

NEW YORK.—The British administration of Palestine was accused of "introducing a regime of terror with a view to intimidating the Jews of Palestine into submission to the white-paper policy and the cessation of Jewish immigration" in a cable sent to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes from Jerusalem by the Jewish Agency for Palestine. This was announced today by the American Zionist Emergency Council, which received a copy of the Jewish agency's cable this morning.

The cable discloses that 6 Jews were killed and 50 others, many of them children, were wounded by British troops and police in Tel Aviv last week, "although not a single shot was fired by Jews." The cable also charges British forces with forcibly entering three peaceful Jewish agricultural settlements, wantonly beating hundreds of men and women, killing four persons and wounding many others "without any reason or provocation."

The message requests Mr. Byrnes to "bring the above information and our solemn protest to the notice of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

The text of the Jewish agency's cable to Secretary of States Byrnes follows:

"British troops and police forcibly entered three peaceful Jewish labor agricultural settlements, wantonly beat hundreds of men and women; shot and killed four persons; wounded many others without any reason or provocation, and although settlers and numerous friends from neighborhood who assembled there were entirely unarmed. Forces also smashed furniture and damaged huts. This comes after shooting in Tel Aviv last week of 6 Jews dead and wounding 50 others, many of them children under 10, although not single shot fired by Jews. Impression growing mandatory government is introducing regime of terror with view intimidating Jews of Palestine into submission to white-paper policy and cessation Jewish immigration. Respectfully request bring above information and our solemn protest to notice United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"JEWISH AGENCY FOR PALESTINE."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

Harry A. Zinn, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., to fill an existing vacancy.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, December 3, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 30 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Floyd S. Daft to be senior scientist, effective date of oath of office.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Clark Kittrell, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27; 33 U. S. C. 642), vice Col. Malcolm Elliott, relieved.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of October 1943.

Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1944.

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of November 1944.

Vice Adm. Jesse B. Oldendorf, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1944.

Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of December 1944.

Vice Adm. Frederick C. Sherman, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 13th day of July 1945.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord God, shouldst Thou lead us into paths unknown, we would do Thy will with hearts sincere; we would live up to the capacities of our highest natures and become the true friend of man. Bearing the image of our Holy Creator, O keep us free from wanderings in the spiritual world, from the chains of a false tradition, and from the masks which disfigure the reality of true manhood and womanhood.

Forsaking old fears and prejudices, let us measure ourselves by Thy law of moral integrity, of uprightness and honesty of purpose; these alone will stand in the face of relentless attack. On the great sea of life, the Christ is on the headlands to help and serve struggling men. As we hear the matchless melody of the upper world and sense the rare beauty of the measure of human life, let men lift up their souls in praise.

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully. He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of his salvation.

Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1862) entitled "An act relating to rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that Mr. SMITH be appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) entitled "An act to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," vice Mr. FERGUSON, excused.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Journal of November 27 and an editorial appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of November 28 in eulogy of the gentleman from Georgia, Representative ROBERT RAMSPECK.

REVISION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the consideration of the appropriation bill the gentleman from Missouri and I engaged in a colloquy over a certain item in that bill, during which he made inaccurate statements, with which I took issue. Upon reading the RECORD today you will find the entire colloquy has been deleted. As far as this House and the public is concerned, it just did not happen.

I recognize the gentleman from Missouri as being a colossus of parliamentary maneuver and procedure. He wrote the book. I also recognize the fact that the gentleman from Missouri in this instance has adroitly and again in typical manner clothed himself with the mantle of

parliamentary protection. But I want to say here and now that I am going to watch, and watch very eagerly, to see whether or not that colloquy is put back in the Appendix of the RECORD where it is supposed to be put, because I serve notice on him and on anybody else that I do not need anybody to take my remarks out of the RECORD, nor do I need anybody to correct them. I think this practice of deleting another Member's remarks without his consent or permission is something which should be stopped immediately. Let the gentleman from Missouri dare attempt to cross out a single letter or strike a single word from what I have just said. I put him on guard against any such transgression of my privileged field. He may have the power of knowledge of all the rules, regulations, circumventions, short cuts, curves, and manipulations of parliamentary conduct, but he does not have the power to stay my own voice and my own expression. That power belongs to me, and me alone, and I intend to keep it without his aid or assistance.

Perhaps the incident is unimportant, but the principle involved is of the utmost importance. The RECORD should reflect only what takes place on this floor and not what some Member would like for it to reflect in his favor.

Yes; let us keep the RECORD straight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two editorials, one from the Manchester Union entitled "Hurley's Resignation," and the other from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "The Muddle."

TRANSPORTATION HOME FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KUNKEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR VETERANS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if the veterans are to continue to receive the preferential treatment that a grateful Nation is very anxious to continue to accord them, they have to be careful they do not become dupes of unscrupulous and vicious people. I say this because my attention has been called to one of the worst rackets I have ever heard of, namely, dealers in heavy equipment are giving veterans a few dollars to exercise the preference the Congress gave them under the surplus-property law to obtain this equipment. After they get it, they turn it over to the dealer who makes an unconscionable profit on it. It seems to me our veterans ought to be very careful lest public sentiment turn against them if they permit themselves to become the tools of racketeers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIBSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be postponed until Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION HOME OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, a serviceman in Calcutta, India, wrote to me and wanted to know why the education of 50 Indian so-called students, between the ages of 22 to 45, coming to America on the steamship *Torrens*, was more important than the return home of 50 eligible GI Joes who were homesick and would like to see their families and complete their educations in their homeland. So, 50 return tickets to the United States were not honored by our War Department and responsible officials assigned to the duty of returning those men.

I do not want any more explanations from departments, bureaus, and officials that we are doing everything possible to get the serviceman home. I want to know why tourists have priority to travel from India now on a troopship to the United States and why 50 GI Joes were left in India with a canceled return ticket, and who gave orders to have those 50 United States citizens replaced with 50 Indian so-called students. I want to know why 50 GI Joes were suddenly classified as less important than 50 Indian students, and who considered them such. I want the War Department and responsible officials to use every available shipping space for the return of our soldiers and I want it done now and continued until the job is finished.

FAVORITISM IN THE DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include three short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WHO RUNS THE GOVERNMENT?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of H. R. 2827 and the directives of the Selective Service Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an item from the Sylvian Bee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I had a special order, but the hour was so late that I deferred using it. I ask unanimous consent for the same special order, to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FAVORITISM IN THE DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have sent to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of the Members of this House who have defended the basic soundness of the point system for discharging men from the armed services, but I have repeatedly said that the point system should be carried out impartially as originally planned, and should be free of glaring exceptions which have recently been made.

I have today sent a letter to General Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps, in which I asked three questions which I wish to raise on the floor of this House: First, why should young McNider be shown such favoritism? Second, are sons of prominent military officers in a class by themselves? Third, does a recommendation from General MacArthur supersede all other regulations, and place an individual in a privileged class?

I hope we will soon have the answer to those questions.

The complete text of my letter is as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1945.

Gen. A. A. VANDEGRIFT,
Commandant,
United States Marine Corps,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL VANDEGRIFT: I wish to emphatically protest the release of Pfc Jack MacNider from the Marine Corps.

Every Member of Congress has had requests for release of boys from service so they might continue their education. All of the services have repeatedly stated that such action would disrupt the point system and be unfair to thousands of men with high points who should be released first.

I have been one of those Members of Congress who have defended the point system as basically fair to our valiant men and women who served their country so well in this war. But I do not believe we can honestly defend the point system when such rank favoritism is shown in the MacNider case.

You know better than I that there are thousands upon thousands of high-point men in the Pacific sweating it out, waiting impatiently for ships and planes to bring them home. Many of them are men with families who have not seen their children for several years.

Why should young MacNider be shown such favoritism? Are sons of prominent military officers in a class by themselves? Does a recommendation from General MacArthur supersede all other regulations and place an individual in a privileged class?

The Marine Corps' action in this instance certainly is not helpful to the morale of those still in service, or their relatives. It breaks down the faith of the people in their Government.

I sincerely trust there will not be a repetition of this grossly unfair action.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Member of Congress.

RELEASE OF PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part of my remarks three telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, students from foreign nations can apparently get transportation to the United States to enter our educational institutions. Why not be just to our own boys?

Why ignore the future public needs for physicians and dentists by depriving our boys now in the service of an opportunity to obtain an education, especially those who aspire to enter these essential and honorable professions?

Under leave to extend, I am including three telegrams:

TUCSON, ARIZ., *November 29, 1945.*

The Honorable DANIEL ALDEN REED,
Republican Representative from the State of New York,
House of Representatives:

Congratulations on stand you have taken with reference to immediate release of medical and premedical students from the armed forces. It is no fault of the council of education of the American Medical and American Dental Associations that at least a limited number of these boys have not continued their studies during the entire war. If we are to preserve the health of the Nation after winning a great struggle it is most essential that we continue to educate scientists, physicians, and dentists immediately.

Dr. PAUL H. BENNETT,
Past President Arizona State Dental Association, President Arizona State Board of Dental Examiners.

CHICAGO, ILL., *November 29, 1945.*

Hon. DANIEL ALDEN REED,
House Office Building:

Congratulations on your criticism of discharge of Pvt. Jack MacNider, just another case of favoritism to the privileged class: I wish you success in your demand for immediate release of all medical students. My son has completed his premedical studies but was not permitted to enter medical school last month. Although classified for limited service only, he is now loafing at the naval research laboratories, Washington, D. C.

FRANK L. FRABLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 29, 1945.*

Representative REED of New York,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Noticed story about General MacNider's son and your demand that all medical students be released from service, I consider any such release rank favoritism. My son is a marine in Japan and has more than 50 points, then why should he not be released. He has not finished his college education.

Mrs. FREDERICK WITT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration.

THE ARMY-NAVY FOOTBALL GAME

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF STRIKES ON VETERANS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MICHENER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PURCHASE OF INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL FROM CUBA

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the current purchasing of sugar from Cuba, and of which I am not complaining, it has been reported that our Government contemplates purchasing blackstrap molasses at a very high price and that consideration is also being given to purchasing Cuban industrial alcohol.

I have written the Secretary of Agriculture urging that our Government refrain from entering into competition with private enterprise for these commodities. Private business should have that opportunity.

We have tremendous stock piles of alcohol and most ample capacity for industrial alcohol manufacturing in our own country.

We now have millions of bushels of soft corn in the Midwest that can be converted into alcohol. This soft corn will not keep in cribs come springtime, even heated or moldy corn will still make industrial alcohol.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily News of yesterday.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make today in Committee of the Whole and include excerpts.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include correspondence and an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he is going to make today in the Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts and certain statistics on the power question.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Farm Journal.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very informative letter received from the Civil Service Commission, together with his reply thereto.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief letter received from Brig. Gen. Miles Reber relative to displaced persons in Europe of Polish blood.

WITHHELD COLLOQUY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] called your attention to his remarks having been expunged from the RECORD, without his permission, by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. On Tuesday, November 27, I had the same experience.

On page 11045 of the RECORD there should have appeared a colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri and myself. Without asking my permission he deleted from the RECORD the colloquy and the remarks I made. I think that is an unfortunate practice and I trust it will not happen again.

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to adress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement furnished by Mrs. Mabel Boardman of the American Red Cross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM TODAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], if he can give us any idea on what day next week the bill for establishing a Medical Corps in the Veterans' Administration, H. R. 4717, I believe it is, will be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to advise the gentleman now because the program has not as yet been made up. In all frankness, I will advise the gentleman that I doubt very much whether we will be able to bring that bill up next week.

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot understand why not. It is an emergency matter. It is very vitally necessary that the bill be passed as quickly as possible.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. RANKIN. Because we are unable to get the doctors that we need in these veterans' hospitals. The doctors who are coming home from the Army are becoming discouraged and going into other fields of practice, and the sooner we pass this measure the sooner the Veterans' Administration will be able to supply adequate and efficient doctors for our veterans' hospitals. I hope the gentleman will reconsider this proposition. There is not any legislation coming before this House next week, or at any time, that is of more importance than this bill for a Medical Corps for the Veterans' Administration, and I hope that he will reconsider and give us an oportunity to bring it up early in the week and pass it without delay.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nobody more interested in the veteran than I. The gentleman from Mississippi has not a monopoly of the interest of the veterans. Nobody is more interested in the welfare of the veteran than I am, and all the Members of the House have an interest in them. I announced last week that I would try to get the bill up this week. We did not expect that the pending bill would take as long as it has. In the meanwhile the Committee on Rules reported a rule on the First and Second War Powers Acts, and even if the gentleman disagrees with my judgment—and I respect his views in disagreement—I think it important that those measures be taken up immediately.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman's statement a while ago about my not having a monopoly was not altogether courteous. I do not profess to have a monopoly, but I am charged with a responsibility and I expect to carry it out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I, too, am charged with a responsibility, and I expect to carry it out, and I have the courage to carry it out.

Mr. RANKIN. How about taking it up tomorrow then? I will take it up tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made a unanimous-consent request. The gentleman can object to my unanimous-consent request if he wants to, and I shall announce now that if we meet tomorrow, in view of the situation that exists, there will be no legislative program.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Then in advance you announce you will not take it up tomorrow. Then what is the use for me to object and have the House meet?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am telling the gentleman frankly that there are a lot of other Members interested in the situation. If the gentleman wants to object, that is his privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. I will not object under those conditions, but I want to tell you now that this House is going to be in session every day next week and every day from now on until this legislation is passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I want to state this, that as quick as possible the bill that the gentleman has referred to will be taken up. There has been no delay in trying to bring it up, but I consider that the First and Second War Powers Acts are of paramount importance, and I think the taking up of UNRRA is of paramount importance. The gentleman disagrees with that, and I respect his views in disagreement.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I do.

Mr. McCORMACK. As soon as possible after those matters are disposed of, the bill the gentleman refers to will be taken up, and I assure the gentleman it will be taken up without delay.

Mr. RANKIN. I think we should investigate UNRRA first.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. Without objection a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 193]

Anderson, Calif.	Drewry	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Fernandez	O'Konski
Barden	Gearhart	Patman
Barry	Gerlach	Pfeifer
Bell	Gillie	Poage
Bennet, N. Y.	Granger	Quinn, N. Y.
Bloom	Hart	Rayfiel
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Brehm	Henry	Rich
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Robinson, Utah
Campbell	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Carlson	Huber	Sabath
Celler	Jackson	Sadowski
Chapman	Johnson, Okla.	Sheridan
Courtney	Keefe	Slaughter
Crosser	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Curley	Keogh	Snyder
Daughton, Va.	King	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	Kinzer	Starkey
Delaney, John J.	LaFollette	Stevenson
	Lewis	Weiss
Dickstein	Luce	Winter
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Dirksen	Morgan	Wood
Doughton, N. C.	Murphy	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4805, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], on which there are 20 minutes' debate remaining.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand it, after the 20 minutes' debate there will be a vote on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has that permission.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, none of the flood-control projects in this amendment will be located in the State of Wyoming, but we are interested in this legislation because

we furnish the water that causes the damage. Every major stream in the West has its headwaters in Wyoming. Twelve million acre-feet of water leaves our State each year. A good deal of that water finds its way to the Pacific Ocean, but most of it flows eventually into the Atlantic. We furnish about 5,000,000 acre-feet of water each year to the Missouri River Basin, and every spring that river roars down and destroys millions of dollars' worth of property and kills many people. Our State is primarily interested in reclamation. We had our differences with the Army engineers, whose main concern is flood control. Last year the Congress made a division of the responsibilities between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers on the Missouri River. The Bureau of Reclamation handles irrigation projects and the Army engineers handle the flood-control projects. We now have a well rounded out program. Both of those agencies are experienced and in their respective fields each does a mighty good job. Each needs about the same amount of money. The work of one supplements the other. If we do not pass the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we are going to open the door to those people who believe in "authority legislation" and who want to superimpose over the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers a new superorganization. We are opposed to the Missouri River authority, and I hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted by all means.

The contention that we ought not to spend this money on these projects now because of the financial condition of the Treasury is not sound. The very ones who are opposed to spending this money now for this improvement are ready to spend money abroad with which for other nations to do the same thing.

Only about one-third of these projects will produce any power. One Member objects to one project because he says it is 90 percent power. My objection to the amendment is that it does not have more projects that will develop the water power of this Nation, the greatest wealth we have on this continent outside of the soil from which we live.

I entered this fight for the development of the water power of this Nation many, many years ago. At that time we were using only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. The power interests told us then that we had more power than we needed. They are telling us that now. Last year we used about 250,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and we do not have as much as we need. We will need more and more as time goes on. I predict that within less than 15 years from the date of the close of this World War II the American people will be using half a trillion kilowatt-hours a year, and long before the turn of the century it will take a trillion kilowatt-hours a year to meet their demands. I hope the amendment is adopted. Let us develop the water power of the Nation and supply it to the people at rates they can afford to pay.

Let us supply it to every farm home in America at those rates, and make this the rightest and brightest country on earth in which to live.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I had an opportunity to express myself on the amendment that is now before us and which has been debated at great length. I refer to the amendment to H. R. 4805 introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. On yesterday through inadvertence my remarks showed in the RECORD that the amendment had been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

In view of some of the statements that have been made since I expressed myself in support of this amendment, I desire again to reiterate my support of this amendment to the rivers and harbors flood control, and so forth, provision of the first deficiency appropriations bill.

The Army engineers of the War Department and the Bureau of the Budget had approved $25,516,000 for rivers and harbors projects for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and $81,759,000 for flood control generally for numerous flood-control projects throughout the United States and also $15,000,000 for flood control of the Mississippi River and tributaries for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. This amendment would add approximately $125,000,000 for rivers and harbors and for flood control generally and for special flood control of the Mississippi and its tributaries.

The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, made up of 11 members, Republican and Democrat, who made a thorough investigation of this whole subject and all of these projects by a vote of 10 to 1 reported these items favorably to the full Appropriations Committee; but the full Appropriations Committee cut out all of these sums for rivers and harbors and flood control on the theory, as I understand, that further investigation and screening should be made to eliminate such projects and the majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee felt should not be included in the bill.

This amendment restores those items that were stricken from the bill by the full Appropriations Committee.

We are unable to say if there are any items in the bill that should not be there. As I understand it the opponents of this amendment have pointed out only one project of the great number of projects that in their opinion should not be included. It must be admitted that the overwhelming majority of these projects are feasible and economically sound, and the construction of them would be helpful to the country as a whole.

As I recall there are approximately 380 of these projects. We might add here that each and every one of these projects have been heretofore approved by the engineers of the War Department and by the Congress itself. This bill does not create any new projects; it merely appropriates this sum of money to be used in developing and carrying out the declaration and wishes of the Congress, heretofore expressed. It is passing strange that the Appropriations Committee did authorize the appropriation of approximately $70,000,000 for reclamation projects throughout the country but denied funds in this bill for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and these hundreds of flood-control projects. We cannot understand this discrimination.

Among these projects that had been approved by the Congress itself, by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, and by the Bureau of the Budget is Wolf Dam on the Cumberland River and for which approximately $8,000,000 has been already appropriated and expended.

CUMBERLAND RIVER PROJECT, WOLF CREEK DAM

After being approved by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, the Congress in 1938 established the Wolf Creek Dam project on the upper Cumberland River. Congress made the first appropriation for this improvement in 1941, and as pointed out in my remarks yesterday, this improvement was carried on until 1943. The foundation 5,700 feet long, and nearly 2,000 feet wide at the base, together with a lot of other work had been done. It was stopped because of the war and the scarcity of necessary materials, as well as workmen to carry on the construction. The Government has acquired thousands of acres of land and has made other constructions and developments on this project costing approximately $8,000,000 to this date.

The Corps of Engineers of the War Department, and the Bureau of the Budget, and the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee recommended and urged an appropriation of an additional $4,000,000 to carry forward Wolf Creek Dam to June 30, 1945.

Early in the 1920's the people in several counties in my congressional district and in adjoining Tennessee congressional districts became very active to secure the improvement of the Cumberland River. Many meetings were held and at some of these meetings there were as many as 2,000 delegates from the various counties in Kentucky and Tennessee strongly urging this improvement and development and this project was formally dedicated by the people of Kentucky and Tennessee in that section about the year 1941. That section of Kentucky and Tennessee was cut off in a way from railroad transportation as well as sufficient highways. The people were bottled up as it were and the development and progress of that section was greatly hindered because of the lack of transportation and destructive floods.

This project can be used for power purposes. That section has a great deal of raw materials in the way of timber, coal, oil, and agricultural commodities. There is a great deal of suitable labor accessible. It is believed by the people generally of that section, and I share in that belief that this will bring many industries that will provide jobs for the people and a market for their raw materials. Much of the land has been sold and titles transferred to the Governmen and the people have for several years planned their economy in that section owing to the ac-

tion of Congress with a view that this project would be completed and if it is not completed it would greatly disorganize and disrupt the people and their activities in that section of Kentucky and Tennessee.

Believing that this project will be helpful to the people of Kentucky and Tennessee in the way that we have set out above and in providing flood control and transportation on the Cumberland River, I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] and have this item and others cut out by the Appropriations Committee restored to the bill. Unfortunately, we are in this position. We must vote for the whole bill or against meritorious projects, like the Wolf Creek Dam project on the Cumberland River. It is hoped that if there are any projects that are not feasible or economically unsound that those projects will be screened out when the Senate takes the bill up and will have ample opportunity to make further careful investigation, but I wish to reiterate that the engineers of the War Department and the Congress have heretofore declared that the projects for which these appropriations are sought have been found to be feasible and sound economically, and that these findings have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that had all of the facts connected with these projects and approved them by a vote of 10 to 1. Perhaps the full committee of the Appropriations Committee did not have the opportunity to know all of the facts as did the subcommittee or as did the engigineers of the War Department, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Congress when it disapproved these projects. No one of the opposition made any claim that the Wolf Creek project was not feasible or unsound.

I trust that this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment had been offered a few short weeks ago in this House it would have been overwhelmingly defeated.

It would have been defeated because every Member of this House knew we were in a fight to win the war and that local consideration must be subordinated to the national interest. No brand-new $2,000,000,000 program for Federal public works scattered all over this country, some of it good, some of it bad, some of it for essential flood control, much of it for nonessential power, would have had the slightest chance of being adopted.

Today we are still in a fight, a fight to win the peace and to preserve the solvency of this country of ours. If that fight is to be won, unjustifiable expenditure must be eliminated.

I do not believe the adoption of this program as a whole, the good and the bad, can be justified at this time in this bill. I think the program demands further study and further screening. In order to obtain that further action, it is essential that this amendment be defeated and that the matter be referred back to the regular committee. Thereafter any urgent projects can be taken care of promptly by special resolution from that committee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have already been heard twice by the Committee of the Whole with reference to this subject matter. When I secured the allocation of an additional minute and a half I anticipated that, perhaps, in the further course of the debate some arguments of an ostensibly logical nature calculated to appeal to fair-minded Members of the House desiring to act in the best interests of the country as a whole might be advanced against the amendment, to which it would be possible for me to reply. No such argument has been advanced. I feel that I can contribute best to the happy conclusion of the pending controversy, which I confidently anticipate will be a vote for the amendment in a few minutes, by yielding back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, for many years Wister Dam Reservoir has been authorized by the Government, and $1,000,000 is included in the Snyder amendment for starting the construction of this flood-control project. I am enthusiastically for this amendment. I feel that with the Members of Congress I have talked with, and I have tried to talk with most of them, that it will be but little doubt of its adoption.

This section of the State has been neglected for flood control except for the Red River Dam in another State, all down through the years. This will be the first money authorized in this section, where erosion from high waters has sanded and destroyed the most fertile lands of the Southwest. Farming has become unprofitable and will continue so until the onrushing waters of such tributaries as the Poteau River are harnessed at the headwaters.

Mr. Chairman, this will be a bright day for the people of Oklahoma, particularly to those in the mountains I love so well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to again point out the fact that this is the beginning of a $2,100,000,000 flood-control program—a 6-year program of $350,000,000 a year. On page 798 of part 1 of these hearings I asked General Robins this question:

> How much do you propose to spend on this 6-year program?

General Robins answered as follows:

> We proposed to spend in the neighborhood of $350,000,000 a year for 6 years.

That amounts to $2,100,000,000.

I have heard argument after argument made that we should vote for these good projects despite the fact that there are some bad ones included in the total number. I cannot go along with that proposition. Not a Member on the floor of this House has ever come to me in the 9 years that I have been on this subcommittee but has received friendly treatment and I have cooperated with him on anything that he came to me about if I could do so. I have supported flood-control item after flood-control item without there being one project in my State or district. But I cannot go along with this. I cannot vote for this flood-control amendment on the argument that because we are giving money to China or because we have UNRRA or because of what we are spending abroad, as some seem to think, we ought to spend more on flood control. This bill ought to go back to the committee. Our subcommittee is meeting on January 8. We can then screen out the bad projects and take up these smaller projects and others which are entitled to consideration and which are not in this bill. This program commits us to an expenditure of $103,000,000 for 1945 on old projects before we can put in one new one. The $350,000,000 a year is four and a half times the average spent over the last 5 years. The average over the last 5 years was $80,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment now before us has been under discussion for the past 3 days. Therefore, for the benefit of those who may read the RECORD it may be appropriate to restate the purpose of the amendment and the circumstances under which it is brought to the House for consideration. It has been a policy of the Government for a great many years to assist in the development of navigation in our rivers and harbors, and to control floods in navigable rivers, to preserve properties and to prevent the loss of lives of people living near such streams. A number of projects had been approved and were under construction or development when the war began, and appropriations for their completion were discontinued during the war. In the meantime, other projects were considered, surveys made, and hearings conducted before the River and Harbors Committee, as well as the Flood Control Committee. The justifications in a number of cases were sufficient to warrant favorable consideration by these committees. Quite a number of projects were favorably reported to the Congress and many of them approved and appropriations authorized, but appropriations for their construction were delayed. Following the cessation of hostilies about 125 of these projects were submitted by the President to the Bureau of the Budget and estimates to complete some and to make plans for beginning others were submitted to the Congress for consideration. The proposals were referred to the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for attention. The subcommittee in turn referred the estimates to the committee known as the Civil Functions Committee, also of the Appropriations Committee. This latter committee conducted hearings for a few weeks and submitted its

report back to the deficiency subcommittee, recommending that appropriations totaling approximately $121,000,000 be made for 119 projects. The deficiency subcommittee decided not to include any of the proposals in the bill and the amendment now before us is for the purpose of inserting these various items in the bill and having the estimates approved.

Forty-five or fifty speeches discussing the matter have already been made, some in favor and some opposed to the amendment. It was my privilege to discuss the proposal at some length in general debate last Tuesday. Since then, several speeches have been made in opposition to the amendment. I have listened to all of them with a great deal of interest and concern. Those opposed to the amendment allege: (a) "There are some projects in the amendment without merit"; (b) "that to make the appropriation would greatly endanger our national economy"; and (c) "that some of the projects are solely for the purpose of generating electric power."

It will be observed that most of those opposing the amendment are among the ablest debaters of the Congress and practically all of them say, "There are a number of projects included in the amendment that are wholly without merit." Yet, it will be observed that not one of the speakers so far has endeavored or undertaken to name the projects to which they refer as being without merit, with the exception of one and that has been referred to as the Bug Island Dam on the Roanoke River and the defect or demerit referred to is that it is largely a power project. Further than this, not a single opponent to this amendment has pointed out a single project he considers as being without merit. I know, you know, and every other Member here knows, that if there were a project in this amendment without merit these able debaters would necessarily have to know the defect in the proposal and before they could make a convincing argument it would be necessary to name the proposal that is without merit. It is no argument to rise and proclaim to the House there is one project, two projects, or many projects in the list without merit, unless the person making the statement is able to state specifically the defect or the demerit to which he refers.

In other words, it is not a very convincing argument simply to say, "There are some projects listed in this amendment that are not meritorious," unless you are prepared and willing to state specifically to what project or projects you refer. This is particularly significant when we all know there is not a project included in this amendment that was not first thoroughly surveyed by Army engineers and recommended by them as being a project worthy of the consideration of the Congress. That is, it is a project they consider will be worth more to the people than the estimated cost. We know further that before either of the committees to which I have referred would consider any of the projects eliminated a full and complete report from the investigating agency of the Government would have to be submitted to such committee. We know further that before the committee would take action it would conduct hearings, where the testimony and justifications would be recorded and published for the benefit of the Congress and the public. We know further that every project referred to herein was submitted to the Congress, to the House of Representatives, where every Member was charged with the duty and responsibility of familiarizing himself with the justifications before casting his vote for or against it, and we also know that every one of these projects had been voted on and approved, not only by this body, but by the Senate at the other end of the Capitol and by the President of the United States. Now it seems to me that if any of these projects had been without merit the defects would have been detected before or when the Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation for any such project, and I insist that before any Member of the Congress should undertake to say that any one of these projects is not meritorious he should be able and willing to show the Congress where the defect or defects lie.

I can appreciate the next argument, which is to the effect that we have an enormous public debt, and we should use every effort to avoid unnecessary appropriations, because, as the chairman of the committee has said, and wisely said, this country must be prepared to pay the interest on the bonds that have been sold and redeem them when they come due. I subscribe to this idea, and I think my record here in the Congress will prove it, but I am not unmindful that there is such a thing as false economy. There are times when we may be "penny wise and pound foolish," and the bill now under consideration may well illustrate the idea. It carries a deficiency appropriation of $1,131,000,000 in round numbers. Of this amount, approximately $928,000,000 is for veterans' insurance, which is an obligation that must be met, but there remains in the bill approximately $400,000,000 to be used, as I pointed out a few days ago, largely for paying salaries and administrative expenses in various governmental agencies that may not be of as much importance or value to the economy of this country as the construction of the various projects carried in this amendment. In other words, the items now in the bill to which I have made reference will add little or nothing to the Treasury of the United States, where there must be funds to pay the interest and principal on our indebtedness, but if these projects are constructed they will be wealth-producing activities or agencies; they will increase the wealth of the Nation and will thereby be contributing to our national economy and adding something to the Treasury to be used in paying the interest on our national debt and possibly some of the principal. That is, from the standpoint of national economy, I think it would be much better, wiser, and more businesslike if we were to deduct $121,000,000 from the $400,000,000 referred to and eliminate the items for salaries, administrative expenses, and so forth, which will add little or nothing to our national economy, and substitute this amount to be used in the completion or the construction of the projects named in this amendment. If this country is to pay its debts and the Congress is going to devise ways and means by which they are to be paid, we should be inaugurating programs that will increase wealth, enlarge our national economy, and add to the income of our Treasury. It is not sufficient to spend money, but it is highly important that in the spending someone, somewhere, should be creating wealth and thereby contributing to the economy of the Nation.

The next argument is that some of these projects contain provisions for the creation of electric power. My information is there are 13 of the 125 projects referred to provide for the production of power incidental to flood control and navigation, but I find in every case I have studied that where power is provided for it is shown that there is not a surplus of power but on the contrary, there is a demand for power on the part of the people who live in those communities. It must follow, therefore, that if these projects are completed and there is a demand for additional power some of it will necessarily lend itself to the establishment of new industries and new enterprises that will be engaged in creating additional wealth and, to that extent, be contributing something to our national economy.

Some may say that I am particularly interested in the matter for the reason that one of the projects referred to touches my district. I plead guilty to the charge. I have been interested in such a project now for nearly 20 years and the project that touches my district has been surveyed, analyzed, studied, and investigated by practically every agency in the Government and it has received the enthusiastic support of everyone. Thorough investigation has been made into the justifications. So far, the Army engineers have insisted, the construction of the Clarks Hill Dam will practically eliminate the possibility of floods for 200 miles on the Savannah River. They have said it will contribute to the national economy by the increase of navigation for a distance of 200 miles on that river from Augusta to Savannah, Ga. They have said this for the last 6 or 8 years and no one has been able to deny or refute their statements or conclusions. The Federal Power Commission has said there is a pronounced scarcity of electric power in that section and that every kilowatt to be generated by that project can be used without competing with any existing power system. No one has appeared before any committee of the Congress or any agency of the Government undertaking to deny or refute these conclusions. If the project is completed, I not only look for dozens of new enterprises and industries, but I look for hundreds of them to be established in that area and I look for them to thrive within a radius of 50 to 75 miles from where this dam is to be constructed. I look for these enterprises and industries to make a substantial contribution to the wealth of the Nation and add substantially to the Treasury of the United States, where funds are to be used in making payments on our national debt. Mr. Chairman, this country must increase or enlarge its wealth-producing activities if we expect

to be prepared to meet our obligations when they become due. Therefore, it shall be my purpose to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a deficiency bill is supposed to take care of emergency items. Here comes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] with an amendment that puts into action about two or three million dollars of emergency items and $126,000,000 of items that will take a long time and a large development. The hearings upon those things are very meager and they are very unsatisfactory. They involve an enormous number of projects which require the flooding of acres and acres of productive land. I am receiving letters from all over the country on that subject, saying that the engineers have not yet given them a hearing on the subject.

There are items like this Buggs Island deal, where the folks involved say there is $100,000,000 of flood damage, and the engineers say there is $207,000 a year annual benefit from getting rid of floods.

We have that same picture with reference to every one of these great big items. Outside of that two or three million dollars that is involved, there is not a single thing that is of an emergency character. We should not at this time, with meager hearings, with a lack of proper consideration of the items, only 80 pages of hearings all together by the engineers, vote $128,000,000 for projects of all kinds and descriptions, almost all of them of a permanent and nonemergency character, without the slightest bit of justification.

Let it go back to the committee. Let them allow those things that really should be allowed as an emergency, but not the others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, advocating reclamation and grateful for the support of the sponsors of reclamation for flood control, I am on solid ground when I maintain that the arbitrary action of the Committee on Appropriations in including in the pending bill some $77,000,000 for reclamation, with power development in many of the projects, and the denial of one thin dime for flood control and rivers and harbors is an inexcusable blunder and should be promptly corrected.

The pleas for economy and further investigation by the opponents are without merit. The denial in December and substantially promised approval in January is not economy. Moreover, Members will not be misled. They know that civil function bills have not been approved on the average for the past 9 years until June 1. They recall that national flood control appropriations were discontinued by directive L-41 by the War Production Board in October 1943. Members were assured that appropriations would be made following the war. A delay of 6 months means the loss of lives, the loss of property, and delay means human hardships.

The plea for further investigation falls of its own weight. All flood-control projects are thoroughly studied and investigated by the Corps of Engineers. They must be authorized by Congress before they are eligible. The pending projects have been recommended by the President, the Director of the Budget, and the subcommittee that has always reported flood control and river and harbor appropriations. Advocacy of further investigation is by opponents of projects that have already been fully investigated and approved. No one denies with respect to any of the projects, and particularly with respect to the projects that provide for the development of power in connection with flood control and navigation that the benefits will not exceed the costs. No one asserts that the power developments will not be self-liquidating. Mention was made of a hearing in connection with one of the projects. There is nothing unusual about the hearing. The Corps of Engineers generally, when requested, after appropriations are made, arrange hearings to advise interested persons as to details.

The severe criticism of Members for following the Budget recommendations of the President and the subcommittee in charge are not only most unfortunate, but indefensible.

We believe in fairness; we oppose discrimination. The arguments of the opponents are fallacious. They favor the bill with provisions for initiating reclamation projects; they are condemned by their own acts. The appropriations are available until expended. It will take years to complete some of these projects. Projects that were discontinued should be renewed. Other worthy projects should be initiated. There is no reason why reclamation projects should be initiated and flood control projects delayed.

Whether it was so intended or not, the action of the Appropriations Committee flouted the expressed will of the people of the United States who have spoken in no uncertain terms for national flood control, as well as the established policy of Congress. The Committee on Appropriations is the servant and not the master of the House.

I call upon the membership to correct one of the greatest mistakes ever made by the Committee on Appropriations by restoring to the pending bill the Budget recommendations as approved by the subcommittee on civil functions for flood control and rivers and harbors, and thus provide for the resumption and initiation of worthy flood control and river and harbor improvements.

Under leave granted, I intend to say that formerly flood control was confined largely to levee protection. In response to the national demand, reservoirs are being constructed to detain the floods where they originated. A national flood-control policy was first adopted in 1936. It has been expanded and liberalized in the succeeding years.

Reservoirs require the flooding of lands. In all of the States, lands may be condemned by utility companies for power developments. If lands can be condemned for such purposes, it is unreasonable that they should not be condemned to protect people and property from overflows. Where the lands are cultivatable or arable, the same situation obtains in practically all of the States. Land owners object to their property being condemned to protect downstream areas. All water developments, whether canals, levees, diversions, floodways, or dams, require that the property of some be condemned for the general good and for the general welfare. In all flood control the yardstick is the same. Owners are compensated for the value of their property taken.

It is to be regretted that some Members are confused with respect to the local contributions and with respect to the applicable laws.

Members should be reassured when they recall that no projects are embraced in the pending bill and no projects are authorized unless the Chief of Engineers reports that the benefits will exceed the costs. Confusion arises from the fact that prior to the adoption of the national policy, the requirements for Government participation were formerly more rigid. Annual and successive floods, with the expanding population, have resulted in the liberalization of views respecting benefits. The general welfare is being more carefully considered.

All flood-control projects have been carefully studied and all alternatives have been explored. No project is authorized in the pending bill unless the chief of engineers reports that the benefits exceed the costs and unless Congress has previously authorized the projects. In the district that I represent, projects have been authorized along the Yazoo-Tallahatchie-Coldwater River system and about half of them have been completed. They will protect 1,500,000 acres of valuable and productive land. The same laws that govern the operation of these projects obtain with respect to all other similar projects in the United States. All other alternatives have been explored before the final project is adopted. Every other method has been investigated and discarded.

In all flood-control projects, whether along the Mississippi River, the Sacramento, or any other river, the local interests are required to furnish the rights-of-way for levees and flood walls, and in all flood-control projects since 1938 the Government pays for the flowage rights for reservoirs. The yardstick for local contribution in all projects is the same. The same law is applicable to all projects.

I know that valuable lands are acquired for building dams for the generation of power, but power is essential to progress. The remedy is to compensate. If lands can be condemned for the development of power, I repeat to emphasize that it is more important to the general welfare that they be condemned to protect the lives and property of the people of the country. If there are valuable lands in the district of any Member, the Member should keep in mind that there are no more valuable or important valleys between the two oceans than the valley of the Tennessee River, yet for the development of power primarily the entire Tennessee Valley has been converted into reservoirs.

I have advocated legislation to protect and to safeguard the rights of land owners. I have insisted that the State laws for condemnation should be applicable to condemnation in the Federal courts. I have insisted and promoted from the beginning of reservoirs for flood control, that the rentals from lands in the reservoir sites be utilized in reimbursing the school and road districts for taxes lost.

Sponsoring and advocating flood control to protect the lives and property of the people that I represent, I have urged comparable protection for all of the people of the United States. I have insisted upon a sound policy. I have urged that all projects be sound and in the future, as in the past, I will continue to insist that citizens whose property is acquired for flood control and river and harbor improvements be compensated as provided for all public improvements, whether they be highways, drainage ditches, canals, levees, floodways, or reservoirs.

I have advocated and supported through the year sound-flood control projects in which the benefits exceed the costs with the same local contribution applicable to all projects, where required. So that all parts of our common country are accorded the same treatment and consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is not an unreasonable request when a responsible committee of the House asks the House and the Committee of the Whole to give it a little more time that it may do a job well as it ought to be done. Now, let me say this to you, and I make no exception, there is not a committee of the House of Representatives that has had the load to carry in the last 4 or 5 years that the Committee on Appropriations of the House has had. During the war it was appropriating and trying to sift out billions of dollars to be appropriated. As soon as the war was over we had to start on the rescission program. Our deficiency subcommittee has been in session every day almost—Saturdays, Saturday afternoons, holidays, and every other time—working diligently to try to carry out its mission.

What happened? We have not discriminated against anybody, we have not turned down any flood control, but here we had on a deficiency bill sent to us by the engineers, a power program. It is not a flood-control program. Analyze it, do not take my word for it. It is a power program. And if you pass it and it goes into law, it gives the Federal Government in power-operated plants more potential kilowatts than you already have in all of them that are in existence today. How do we do it? It got sandwiched in there, sugar-coated around a lot of very meritorious flood-control programs that ought to be carried.

What do we ask you to do? We ask you, because we did not have time to go into it in a deficiency bill, we asked you to lay that aside in order that the regular committee of the House, when it meets in January, may go through it and bring back a well-considered program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time has expired.

The vote will come first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. In the first place I wish to explain that the first paragraph is covered by the Snyder amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER to the amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: Strike out the figures "$81,759,000' and insert in lieu thereof "$84,759,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, most of us, if not all here in the House, are intensely interested in economy and retrenchment and cutting down the drain on the Treasury. We have already made considerable headway in that respect. However, there are certain activities of the Government which must be carried on in the postwar period if we are to maintain our economy, keep our workers employed, and keep up the national income on the basis that will permit the collection of sufficient taxes to maintain the Government and keep it out of bankruptcy. One of the activities which is important in such a program is the development of our natural resources so that they may be made to produce and add to our national income. Either the Flood Control Committee or the Rivers and Harbors Committee has carefully considered every one of the projects included in the Snyder amendment. After exhaustive hearings and favorable reports by the Corps of Army Engineers, the projects were approved. They will not only provide employment during the process of construction for many of our returned veterans and workers released from war industries, but will add to the total of production in the postwar years. This, of course, will increase the national income and will help to keep our country on an even keel economically. The Congress has approved immense appropriations from the Federal Treasury in the way of lend-lease, UNRRA, and other expenditures overseas and it is time now when the war has ended to look after our own household and make provision for the employment of our folks here at home.

The hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill set forth on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7, volume II, the projects covered by the Snyder amendment, including also the few projects that have been eliminated. These projects fall in several groups, the first group covering "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works—supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946, new work." The second group covers "Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946." The third group covers "Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946."

The following is a list of the projects which were reported to the Appropriations Committee:

TABLE I.—*Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works—supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946, new work*

Project	*Amount*
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn	$75,000
Hudson River, N. Y	515,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway	2,000,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea	743,700
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	645,000
Potomac River water front, District of Columbia	413,000
James River, Va	652,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C	185,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La	1,573,500
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn	3,439,500
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont	1,185,000
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va	2,700,000
Keweenaw waterway, Mich	548,000
Racine Harbor, Wis	72,300
Lorain Harbor, Ohio	131,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y	967,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	571,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif	7,100,000
Suisun Canal, Calif	160,000
Sacramento River, Calif	390,000
San Joaquin River, Calif	150,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Celilo Falls to Snake River	100,000
Total new work	24,316,000
MAINTENANCE	
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	1,200,000
Total	25,516,000

TABLE II.—*Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946*

Project	*Amount*
Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H	$60,600
Mountain Brook Reservoir, N. H	521,500
Nashua, N. H	195,000
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn	1,500,000
Norwich, Conn	632,000
Union Village Reservoir, Vt	1,000,000
Surry Mountain Reservoir, N. H	17,000
Knightville Reservoir, Mass	14,000
Hartford, Conn	285,000
Winsted, Conn	132,500
Springfield, Mass. (Mill River)	42,000
West Springfield, Mass. (Agawam)	338,000
Riverdale, Mass	403,000
Chicopee, Mass	170,000
Holyoke, Mass	500,000
Syracuse, N. Y	500,000
East Sidney Reservoir, N. Y	700,000
Whitney Point, N. Y	243,000
Elmira, N. Y	1,000,000
Lisle, N. Y	240,500
Bath, N. Y	295,500
Addison, N. Y	331,100
Almond Reservoir, N. Y	1,000,000
Canisteo, N. Y	250,700
Almond, N. Y	30,500
Sunbury, Pa	500,000
Williamsport, Pa	1,000,000
Wilkes-Barre, Hanover Township, Pa	135,000

TABLE II.—*Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946*—Con.

Project	*Amount*
Plymouth, Pa	$400,000
York, Pa	218,200
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	1,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	1,000,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga	3,000,000
Homochitto River, Miss	15,000
Wallace Lake Reservoir, La	193,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Terre Noire Creek, Ark	100,300
Bayou Bodeau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, La	65,000
Bayou Bodeau Reservoir, La	1,000,000
Shreveport, La	500,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark	500,000
Memphis, Tenn	1,000,000
Buffalo Bayou, Tex	1,500,000
Columbus, Tex	212,300
John Martin Reservoir, Ark	500,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark	198,500
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo	1,000,000
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark	3,000,000
Fort Smith, Ark	853,600
Little Rock, Ark	548,400
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	1,500,000
Canton Reservoir, Okla	2,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla	2,000,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Wister Reservoir, Okla	1,000,000
Hutchinson, Kans	500,000
Union Township drainage district levee, Missouri	47,000
Green Bay levee and drainage district No. 2, Iowa	49,300
Dry Run, Iowa	382,500
Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, S. Dak. and Minn	45,800
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir, Minn	30,900
Kansas City, Mo. and Kans	2,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo	1,000,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak	2,000,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa	500,000
Omaha, Nebr	500,000
Hamburg, Iowa	236,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	500,000
Schuyler, Nebr	64,000
Hot Springs, S. Dak	154,000
Cotton Wood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak	510,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky	4,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	1,500,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn	3,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga	200,000
Brevoort Levee, Ind	30,000
Muncie, Ind	70,000
Harrisburg, Ill	24,500
Golconda, Ill	29,200
Brookport, Ill	28,500
Mounds and Mound City, Ill	500,000
Newport, Ky	500,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio	1,500,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va	3,000,000
Massillon, Ohio	500,000
Parkersburg, W. Va	500,000
Dewey Reservoir, Ky	1,000,000
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Tionesta Reservoir, Pa	277,600
Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa	360,000
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa	494,000
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa	573,000
Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa	3,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa	3,000,000
Punxsutawney, Pa	500,000
Elkins, W. Va	500,000
Coal Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	500,900
Kelly Lake drainage and levee district, Illinois	97,900
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and levee district, Illinois	$172,900
Sebewaing, Mich	241,800
Lancaster, N. Y	570,400
Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y	500,000
Santa Fe Reservoir, Calif	900,500
Los Angeles River, Calif	2,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif	2,000,000
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion, California	435,000
McKensie River, Oreg	62,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg	11,500
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg	2,000,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg	1,000,000
Mill Creek, Wash	125,600
Mud Mountain Reservoir, Wash	257,000
Tacoma, Wash	700,000
Yakima, Wash	134,000
Snagging	500,000
Round-off	−100
Total	85,159,000

TABLE III.—*Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946*

Project	*Amount*
Bennington Reservoir, N. H	$30,000
Nashua, N. H	7,000
West Peterboro, N. H	8,000
North Andover and Lawrence, Mass	9,000
North Plymouth Reservoir, N. Y	100,000
Genegentalet Reservoir, N. Y	60,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va	150,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La	150,000
Big and Little Sunflower Rivers, etc	150,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff, Mo	15,000
Black River, Poplar Bluff, Mo., to Knobel, Ark	10,000
Creede, Colo	5,000
Louisville, Ky	100,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek Levee, Ind	8,000
Indianapolis Warfleigh section, Indiana	8,000
Bald Hill Reservoir, N. Dak	35,000
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers, Minn	30,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Ind, Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif Folsom Reservoir, Calif Table Mountain Reservoir, Iron Canyon site, California Terminus Reservoir, Calif Isabella Reservoir, Calif	600,000
Harlan County Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Nebr	300,000
Panther Mountain Reservoir, N. Y	50,000
Cahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	200,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak	100,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans	200,000
Success Reservoir, Calif	50,000
New Melones Reservoir, Calif	125,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg	100,000
Quartz Creek Reservoir, Oreg	150,000
Recreational investigations and plans	50,000
Total	2,800,000

Mr. Chairman, these projects have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Corps of Army Engineers, and, I understand, have the approval of the President. It is important and urgent that they be given the green light so that construction work may be begun without further delay. Many of them have been held up owing to the war emergency. To eliminate them from this bill does not mean that the Government is thereby saving the amount allocated to the projects but merely that they are postponed to a later day. The whole program of reconversion will be materially aided if the appropriations are made now and the projects cleared for early construction. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Snyder amendment will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, anyone who is a sincere advocate of flood control should favor the prompt completion of the Conemaugh River Reservoir. Here is a project which has been authorized since 1937 and which has the enthusiastic approval of the Army engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and all the Pennsylvania State agencies which considered it.

This reservoir alone would often mean the difference between floods and no floods along much of the Ohio, Allegheny, and Conemaugh Rivers. It would lower the flood crest in the Pittsburgh area by almost 4½ feet. Six other dams have been completed along the tributaries to the Ohio River and all six have only lowered the flood crest by about 5½ feet. It is estimated that 1,375,000 persons in the immediate vicinity would benefit from the completion of this flood-control project. And let me emphasize that the Conemaugh Reservoir is strictly a flood-control project. No power facilities are even contemplated.

Based on a flood crest of 45 feet, which is less than the record flood of 1936, this dam would effect a reduction of over $20,000,000 in direct damage.

We are assured that the funds for the Conemaugh Reservoir will be included in the next flood-control bill which may be passed some time next year. In the light of that assurance I am puzzled as to why the funds should not be voted now. Since this project is necessary and desirable, why wait 6 or 8 months to start it? Six or eight months may very likely be the difference between one more disastrous flood or no flood at all.

We are asked to believe by the committee that while this dam should be built some time again that we should wait until more millions of dollars of property have been washed away and more lives have been lost before we should start work.

Obviously if this dam should be built it should be started now, not some time later after the horror, inconvenience, and destruction of another flood has compelled action. It will not cost a cent less next year than now, and if it saves lives, suffering, and millions of dollars soon after completion it will have been found to have been a mighty good idea to have started it at once. Nature will not wait even if the committee does request delay for further study.

In a few moments we will vote to amend the Snyder amendment by adding the Conemaugh Reservoir to the list of the projects to be appropriated for. I hope all of you will see fit to support this move, because the Conemaugh project is as meritorious as any flood-control project that ever passed this House. It is the key to flood control in the whole Pittsburgh area.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania which would restore to the Deficiency Appropriation bill now under consideration the amounts of money requested by the Army engineers and approved by the Bureau of the Budget for flood-control work throughout the United States. I think it is especially unfortunate that at a time when we are worried about finding jobs for the returning servicemen we are not making available the money to initiate those projects which have already been considered of sufficient national importance to warrant the approval and the authorization of the Congress. All of these projects have been previously authorized by the flood-control bill of 1944. I am particularly interested in a dam at Iron Canyon on the Sacramento River in California. This dam will protect thousands of acres of land in the fertile Sacramento Valley from disastrous floods. The money requested by the engineers and approved by the Budget is for the purpose of completing the surveys and for the further purpose of studying the problem of salvaging the salmon in the Sacramento River when the Iron Canyon Dam is built. This is a vital matter not only to the district I represent, but to all of northern California and also the fishing industry of the State, Certainly this type of work should not be put off and is appropriately a part of a deficiency appropriation bill. These are all worthy and necessary projects and the matter of timing is of vital importance. We have to get the preliminaries out of the way on these necessary public-works projects in order to be prepared to move swiftly when the full impact of postwar unemployment hits us. I hope the amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be adopted and I intend to support it.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I am for economy in the use of Federal funds and have always been. But I do not believe in practicing any economy in which we endanger the lives of our citizens and permit their property to be jeopardized.

In my home State of Louisiana we know as well or better than other sections of the Nation what floods mean. We have experienced many of them, and these disasters have brought death and destruction. Progress has been made in the flood-control fight, but much remains to be done. Vital work has been delayed by the war. Now that the war is over, this work should be and must be expedited. Unless it is, we are certain to have more floods, with all the tragedy they create.

The funds eliminated from the deficiency report by the Appropriations Committee include those for projects upon which the people of Louisiana and other States are depending for the safety of their lives and for their economic welfare. They are entitled to these funds from every angle. It must be remembered that the waters from a great part of the United States sweep down on Louisiana. It is the obligation of the Federal Government to help control these waters and the waters that invade other States, and I do not see how Congress can conscientiously refuse to grant the necessary appropriation for this purpose. Certainly we are pledged to protect the lives and the property and the rights of all of the people of this great country.

Flood control is a good investment, one of the best. I realize that we have a huge national debt and that we must begin to reduce Federal expenditures. But flood control is not the place to start reducing. I do not intend to vote for appropriations that I consider unnecessary to the general good of the Nation. Of course, we in Congress differ from time to time on the necessity of certain expenditures. Naturally, we are influenced to some extent by our primary interests in our respective home areas. That is only human and reasonable. But fundamentally we are all trying to do the best for the people of the country as a whole. Therefore, I do not see how we can justify the elimination of flood-control funds from this deficiency measure. Certainly the fair-minded and thinking citizens throughout the United States will appreciate the necessity for these projects. Millions of them are looking to us for the relief these projects will afford.

We have just emerged from a war of unparalleled horror and destruction. We appropriated billions upon billions of dollars to win that war—money which was necessary to preserve our Nation and our Government and the American way of life. We also voted that money for the cause of humanity, to help oppressed nations and restore to them the rights which had been taken away by a ruthless foe. We did not seek war, but when it was forced upon us we stood ready to pledge all the resources of this great land to save ourselves and to help others who were stricken through no fault of their own.

The war with Germany and the war with Japan have been won, but the war against floods continues. And it must be continued until every American citizen is protected against flood waters to the greatest extent that is humanly possible.

I am not familiar with details of all of the projects involved in the appropriation under consideration. But I do know quite well the necessity of those pertaining to Louisiana and to my congressional district. I feel sure no Member of the House would question my sincerity as to the needs in my area and I have no right or intention of questioning the sincerity of other Members with respect to the needs in their own sections. Let us be fair to ourselves and to our people.

Now is the time to proceed with these flood-control projects, not only because of their importance to the safety and progress of the Nation, but also because of the great volume of employment they will offer at the very time we are concerned over the problem of creating enough jobs for returning war veterans and other citizens during the reconversion period.

Surely we must economize in every practical way. The people expect us to be vigilant in the use of public funds. But they also expect, and have a right to expect that we will spend their money for their own good. I know of no better way we can help so many in such an essential manner as we can by completing the flood-control program. I trust that Congress will do its full duty in making this possible.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to stand for economy and a balanced Federal Budget during this, my first term in the Congress. There, however, is such a thing as false economy.

Among the items of the deficiency appropriation bill eliminated by the committee is an appropriation of $1,200,000 to restore the bridge over the Delaware-Chesapeake Canal at Chesapeake City.

During the war this canal was used most extensively by the Government with ships carrying war supplies. Over 3 years ago, one of these ships hit and destroyed the Government bridge over the canal at Chesapeake City. The Government instituted a ferry service which is very unsatisfactory to the general public, and which cost the Government $285,000 a year in round numbers to operate. This money is just wasted and will be wasted as long as the ferry is operated, and until the bridge is restored, so that the Government has already spent almost as much in ferry service as a new bridge would cost. This bridge is also on the new proposed dual highway, which will eventually run from Elkton to Easton to Cambridge to Salisbury to Ocean City, and be connected with the dual highway from Baltimore to Philadelphia at Elkton.

I sincerely trust that the House will vote to restore this item and the other items which are recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the War Engineers, and which I am sure are equally meritorious with the Chesapeake City Bridge, with which situation I am completely familiar.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that I agree most heartily with the efforts of the Appropriations Committee to cut appropriations in the interest of the economy, I am constrained to support the pending amendment to restore the miscellaneous group of river and harbor projects and flood-control projects to this deficiency appropriation bill.

We are confronted with much the same problem that we had yesterday, when I joined the majority of the members of the committee in voting for a present appropriation of $158,500,000 for veterans' hospitals. There surely is no question but what these veterans' hospitals will have to be built, and will have to be appropriated for; and there is, at the same time, no question but what these rivers and harbors and flood-control projects will have to be eventually built and paid for. The only real question is whether we do it now, or do it in January, or some later time. These items are vital for our domestic economy. I have no fear of appropriating money if it is appropriated for sound purposes, and in the aid of our national economy. The thing we must guard against is making wasteful appropriations.

We must cut, save, and economize wherever possible; but it does not make sense to talk about billions for foreign relief and foreign loans, and withhold

millions for the construction of needed and worth-while projects here at home.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, on October 1, 1945, the United States Army engineers announced that they were ready to start work this fall on a number of flood-control projects, all of which have been authorized by Congress. They were selected because of "urgent need, readiness for starting operations, and for geographical reasons, in order that the work may be scattered throughout the United States to as great an extent as possible."

Among the projects listed as ready for construction in the fall of 1945 is one at Syracuse, N. Y., estimated to cost the Government $2,210,000.

In compliance with Public Law 497, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved April 10, 1936, the Army engineers made preliminary examinations of Onondaga Creek, which runs through the city of Syracuse, with a view to the control of its floods.

On January 11, 1940, the Chief of Engineers submitted his report to the Secretary of War, for transmission to Congress, on the Syracuse project and others in the Oswego River watershed. It is contained in House Document 846, Seventy-sixth Congress. The report stated that "flood hazards seriously affect the economic life and future development of the region and that adequate control measures are urgently needed."

Quoting further from the report:

Syracuse, the largest city in the Oswego watershed, is situated at the southern end of Onondaga Lake. The city is the principal commercial and industrial center in this part of the State. Onondaga Creek, which drains 108 square miles, flows northward through the center of the city. The watershed consists of steep, wooded hillsides, cut by small flashy streams, and a broad, flat valley, which makes excellent farm land. The reservation of the Onondaga Indian Nation is located in this watershed.

In the city, the creek winds through the business district. The channel is confined by many large buildings and a total of 40 bridges, many having limited clearances. The channel of the creek has been paved for about 5 miles above its mouth but has a capacity of only approximately 6,000 cubic feet per second. Above the city, the creek meanders across the valley bottom. In this reach it has a capacity of but 1,000 cubic feet per second, which is frequently exceeded.

The largest flood occurred in March 1920 and had a peak discharge of 6,000 cubic feet per second. Flood flows larger than the improved channel capacity would result in the inundation of numerous commercial, industrial, and residential buildings and would have a widespread effect on industrial production. The largest probable flood on Onondaga Creek would affect real estate valued at more than $100,000,000. The estimated damages for the 1920 flood were $500,000 direct and $1,000,000 indirect.

The possibility of the existing channel capacity being exceeded is great, the flood menace is serious, and the need is urgent for relief measures to prevent a disaster in the future. In view of the small existing channel and the threat to lives and social security of the people of this community, the Board concludes that the project is justified and that the United States is warranted in undertaking it, provided local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way including all utility and bridge changes; (b) hold and save the United States free from claims for damages due to the construction works; and (c) maintain and operate the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War.

Public Law 228 of the Seventy-seventh Congress authorized the Syracuse flood control project with many others.

The Army engineers have completed plans for the improvement and Governor Dewey, of New York, has made available the funds required for local contribution. It remains only for Congress to appropriate the funds authorized by an act of Congress which became a law on August 18, 1941.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, it has been a settled policy of Government to make appropriations to control floods and prevent the tremendous loss and destruction they cause. No project is authorized unless approved and found to be a profitable investment by that most efficient of Government agencies, the Army engineers, and by our able Committee on Flood Control.

The program was interrupted by the World War when men and materials were conscripted for the war effort. The war is over and the program should be resumed and spread over a period of years to provide a flow of employment, to conserve our rich natural resources of farm land which is being washed to the sea, and to protect life and property, both in our rural and urban areas.

Many will assail the amendment before us as a "pork barrel" measure. I trust the Army engineers and the Committee on Flood Control to see that there is no pork in this particular barrel and I know I cannot obtain any funds for the Syracuse project without voting for others. I have lived all my life in the city of Syracuse. I know the damage and distress the people of the city, the Onondaga Indians, and the farmers south of the city have suffered from the perennial floods of Onondaga Creek. That is why I am voting for this amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to passing the Snyder amendment, which calls for an additional expenditure of over $2,000,000,000 during the next 6 years.

A great number of projects in this flood-control amendment are meritorious, but unfortunately a number of the projects included therein are without merit, and their purpose is merely to bring pork-barrel expenditures into certain areas of the country.

After the first of the year the committee can hold hearings and extend plenty of time to the proper consideration of a flood-control bill which will be practical and necessary for the different areas of the country benefited thereby.

I will heartily support and vote for all flood-control projects of merit which the committee will submit for the consideration of the Congress next year when due consideration can be given to the practicality and necessity of the various projects.

I propose to vote against the Snyder amendment.

Two amendments to the present deficiency appropriation bill should be adopted.

The Lanham amendment calling for an additional twenty-four million five hundred thousand to relieve the housing shortage for the returning veteran is vitally necessary.

I represent an industrial area into which thousands of war workers have moved during the last 5 years. When I was home 2 weeks ago, I met a great number of married war veterans, some of whom have families, who cannot find a house in which to live. As demobilization progresses during the coming months, this number of homeless war veterans will increase greatly in my district and will, no doubt, run into the millions when you consider the Nation as a whole.

I understand that there are over a million and a half married men now in the military service, and an equal number of single veterans will be married during the coming year. This will add a total of 3,000,000 homeless families to the already great number who cannot find dwellings.

I sympathize with the Appropriations Committee in every effort it is making toward economy, but reducing an appropriation which would deny thousands of our war heroes an opportunity to enjoy a peacetime home is false economy, and will break the morale of our returning servicemen and further cripple peacetime reconversion.

Another amendment to this bill which should be adopted unanimously is to increase the appropriations to provide sufficient hospitals to properly take care of our wounded and disabled veterans.

I have conferred with General Hines on several occasions before he resigned from the Veterans' Administration, and also with Gen. Omar Bradley, regarding the critical hospital situation in the industrial Calumet region and other parts of northern Indiana. Last spring, General Hines recommended to the Board of Hospitalization the erection of a veterans' hospital in the northern Indiana area. During the past year I have had a great number of complaints where our disabled veterans have been denied hospital space at Hines Hospital in Chicago, because of the fact that this facility is overtaxed in serving the city of Chicago and adjacent territory in the State of Illinois.

The Veterans' Administration officials have made a careful survey of this area and other parts of the Nation, and have already established their plans for expansion of their veterans' hospital program. This survey was made with the desire and knowledge that our Government must take care of its war heroes who have been physically incapacitated and are entitled to the best of hospital and medical care from a grateful Nation.

I believe this Congress has no alternative but to appropriate every dollar which is needed to carry out this sacred duty to the war veterans of World War II and World War I.

I voted for both of these amendments in the Committee of the Whole, and I hope that if a record vote is taken on these amendments before the final passage of this bill these amendments will be retained and adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment to include flood-control projects will be adopted. All these have been approved by Congress after exhaustive hearings before the Flood Control Committees of both Houses.

Floods are like fires. We hope they never will come but when they do so, they come without warning. The only kind of insurance or protection against floods is some type of flood protection. A flood control dam is like an army or a navy. We hope we will never need it but when we do we need it desperately.

In the list of proposed projects is one from my district, the Third District of California. That is the Folsom Dam. This project is on the American River and would protect Sacramento, the capital of California. Sacramento is located at the junction of the American and Sacramento Rivers. In times passed the city has been flooded. If a flood should come concurrently on these rivers the water would rush over the levees of the American and severely damage the city. The testimony was that some parts of the city might be 10 feet under water. The Folsom Dam would safeguard both the lives and the property of Sacramento and remove the annually threatening menace of a devastating flood.

Another project in my district is on the Littlejohn Creek. That project is not in the present amendment. It is called the Farmington Dam project. In the past the Littlejohn Creek and the Calaveras River have caused severe damage to property in Stockton and to surrounding farm lands. This project would remove this menace, which has resulted in so much property damage in the past.

These projects and many others like them should be built now as we never know when nature will go on a rampage and damage our people and their property.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I would not reply or disagree with the distinguished gentleman from my own State, the Honorable FREDERICK C. SMITH. No one has ever impugned the motives of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio with respect to his integrity and his charitable actions. Before entering Congress, as mayor of his city he not only declined to accept the salary of mayor but reached into his own pocket in order that his city might be taken out of the red and put into the black. He has always voted to save the financial resources of this Nation. No man in the House of Representatives has ever had more courage in directing the opinions of the Members of this House to the dangers of appropriations and appropriations and appropriations than has Dr. SMITH. However, I am impelled to disagree with his remarks in this debate, especially in reference to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER.

This is not "pork barrel" legislation. For over 3 years I have been working in behalf of the distressed sufferers as a result of the floods which occurred along Lake Erie, and I refer specifically to the Howard Farms-Reno disaster. I did not offer a definite amendment today in regard to the Howard Farms disaster inasmuch as assurance had been given me by not only the Army engineers, to whom I wish to express gratitude, and I further wish to express gratitude to the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi. May I refer to the debates and remarks of Mr. WHITTINGTON and myself on page 4231 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1944. I wish to concur with the gentleman of Ohio today, the dean of our delegation, the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, as to the integrity, industry, and uprightness of the Army engineers and express special appreciation for the thorough work of Colonel Goethals and the engineers under him. I wish to state here and now that the relief which is to be furnished the sufferers of the floods on the shore of Lake Erie can in no way be termed "pork barrel" and they are receiving no "bacon." What is to be done for the sufferers on the shores of Lake Erie is something long since overdue. Lakes may flood as well as rivers, contrary to the opinion of some of the officials in our Government. We of northern Ohio are never selfish and shall not endeavor to prevent the sufferers of any other portion of our great country from getting aid. The prevention of flood is not extravagance; it is economy. Had this House listened to our appeals in the first place in regard to the Howard Farms-Reno disaster, thousands of dollars would have been saved. I hate to quote maxims, but sometimes we need not so much be informed as to be reminded and in prevention of floods: "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan) there were—ayes 137, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. STEFAN Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that allow the offering of amendments?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It just waives the reading of the bill. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here we are again at the political trough—"pork" to the tune of $2,100,000,000 in the name of flood control.

As usual, the pork is so temptingly distributed and in such tremendous quantities throughout the congressional districts as to make it most difficult to successfully combat. The framers of the bill saw to it that a majority of Congressmen could, by supporting the measure, carry home some prime bacon for their districts—$2,100,000,000 worth in all.

In all likelihood many of the constituents who will receive the bacon will be made enough happier to give their support to the reelection of the Congressmen concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, ere long, at the rate the Congress has been going, the American people in general, along with those who are more directly concerned with the political pork that is involved in this bill in the name of flood control, will be confronted with another kind of flood. That one will make the Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri, Tennessee River Valley, and all the other river valley floods that have occurred in the past look like tiny innocent summer freshets.

Most of you know what that is. Surely most Congressmen cannot deny that we are haunted with a premonition that the unconscionable spending that we so recklessly continue to indulge in is causing an inundation of debt and monetary corruption that threatens to submerge completely what vestiges still remain of constitutional government and human liberty in this country.

Should this greatest and most terrible of all floods overtake us, it would be but natural for those who were responsible for the catastrophe to have their scapegoats. That might give us some consolation. But, Mr. Chairman, it will not in the least help any Congressman to save what property he possesses or to keep his children and their posterity from becoming slaves of the state, as now prevails in Russia and the other countries which suffered this fate.

Are we so naive as to believe that we can go through this wild and dissolute spending until bankruptcy overtakes the Nation and still somehow be able to save our property and values from the same fate that these have always suffered under similar circumstances, namely, confiscation by the state?

Do not believe it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my 15 years as a Member of this House, this is my first time to appear for the purpose of responding to the remarks of one of my colleagues. When the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who has just addressed the committee, opened his speech he was reading from a manuscript, which indicated it had been prepared in advance. I would not have appeared here at this time had there not been so many references to so many Members of this House as "pork gatherers," and so forth, as the gentleman made in his remarks, that I regard as entirely unworthy of a Member of this House. I am a poor man myself, and I buy and pay for all the pork that I eat. But I have read in a book somewhere where the most upright man who ever walked upon the face of the earth, when the Pharisees were accusing a lone woman of adultery, stooped down and wrote in the dust, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone," and the cowardly accusers fled.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman challenge the gentleman from Ohio to

tell the House one authorization bill embodied in the Snyder amendment that the gentleman from Ohio voted against?

Mr. MAY. I do not think I should challenge him to do that, because he has made a challenge that he ought to withdraw and strike from the RECORD. What I would like to say is this: I have stood for economy since I have been in this House, but if we had followed the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio and others who think like he does we would never have built the Panama Canal, we would never have constructed the great Boulder Dam, we would never have won the great war through which we have just passed. There are many lasting, valuable improvements all over this country that would not today be in existence.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. And we never would have had the WPA.

Mr. MAY. That is right. But we never would have had a great many other things that we should have had. But here is a widespread flood-control program that has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, recommended by the Corps of Engineers, recommended and endorsed by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of a single vote, and yet men who support that committee and its views are charged by the gentleman from Ohio with infidelity and pork gathering on the floor of the House at this time. I do not know how the gentleman from Ohio feels about what he has just said, but if and when the time ever comes that I shall do such a thing, I will resign and go home.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, why should I ask for this time? I am taking it because I should probably feel a little guilty. I voted for the Snyder amendment. But my record seems to have been in the years past rather consistent for economy. I did talk much the last 10 years against the great spending program. Picture these two Democratic leaders pleading today for economy. I cannot recognize them in that role. Why, they spread so much money over the country in the last 10 years that one great Democratic Senator declared that they bought two elections. Now certainly we should practice economy, and I might possibly question my vote. I thought yesterday I would support the Committee on Appropriations in full measure. However I voted for the amendment. My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], whom I expected to follow, told me that it shows my versatility. I accept the pleasant rebuke. I realize what it means to puff against the wind when I was pleading for economy. Yesterday I listened to most of the speeches, and I was somewhat amused, and after reading the RECORD carefully, I finally decided I could and should vote the much-discussed so-called flood-control amendment. There is not a bit of "pork" in it for my district, I can say to my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]. He knows how greatly I appreciate his thoughtful consideration of financial matters, and that I often sympathize and agree with him, but he rather needled me on that vote. There was no "bacon" in it for me, so I feel I can speak freely. Those leaders told us to worry about the debt. Why, I have worried about it for a long time. Seemingly more debt we have the more prosperous we are. Every other nation seems to think so.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is that the only authority the gentleman has to state his position on that?

Mr. GIFFORD. Well, on this currency question, one good old Democrat once said on the floor here, "We Democrats never could understand the currency question, and sometimes we think you damn Republicans do not understand it." Surely we do not understand the currency question. Having been on the Committee on Banking and Currency for so long and having listened to so many experts, I find that even those experts do not know much of anything about money. It is a psychological situation, is it not? As long as you have confidence in our printed pledges, all may be well.

Somebody said here yesterday something about what would happen if bonds went down 5 points. Why, it seems that they cannot go down. You legislated their redemption at par value. The bonds would seem to be protected at full value in printed money. They will be taken up by the Federal Reserve banks at par. The printed money used to redeem them may not be regarded as being too safe and might hasten inflation. I tell my banks, "Do not worry about the bonds. You can receive par value and return the dollars to your depositors."

Why are people not buying bonds quite so fast as they formerly were, as was claimed yesterday? Day before yesterday a lady said to me, "I will not buy any more bonds. I see such awful waste by the military and Federal agencies."

Is it not a safe investment? We buy the bonds, do we not, knowing they are perfectly safe because we tax ourselves to pay ourselves for them. Is that not wonderful finance? But it is not fully understood. So many people think they will escape and the other fellow will pay the tax. They will not escape. There is no other way to pay the debt except to tax ourselves to pay ourselves. But the recent doctrine is, "What of it? Do we not owe it to ourselves?" Of course, there are other ways of wiping out a public debt, as taught us by many other nations. We have already used the devaluation process.

I felt I wanted to support you, Mr. MANSFIELD, for the hard work you have done. You are careful to make no unsound recommendation in river and harbor matters. I have so often appeared before your committee. The committee seems to have turned you down flatly. I do not like it. Again I do not get any bacon in this legislation. After these many years I confess I cannot claim too much knowledge of the effect of printed money or the currency question. I know I do not know, and that is more than a lot of people know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, so many have evidenced an interest in H. R. 4779 introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, that I think it best to make this statement.

The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will begin hearings on this bill on Friday, December 7, at 10 a. m.

If the bill is to accomplish its purpose as announced by its author, of safeguarding the interests of the stockholders and junior security holders of railroads in reorganization, it must have prompt action. Several pending reorganizations are in that critical stage where to delay would be to deny action and would render it impossible for the Congress to aid any of the thousands of small investors whose savings were invested in good faith in such securities.

It would be a grave national calamity for railroad credit to be killed. Your Committee on the Judiciary has done its best to safeguard railroad credit by seeking to protect the investing public who have heretofore been the purchasers of stocks and junior securities. Those who are wise enough to take no chances and are therefore the holders of senior securities, secured by gilt-edged mortgages, are already adequately protected.

We are distressed that thousands of those who are not adequately protected should be wiped out without giving them a run for their money. So, if there be any way to ascertain the facts and to demonstrate, by the testimony of those experts who are in a position to know, how the structure of legitimate railroad credit may be protected and maintained, this desirable result should be accomplished without delay.

The committee, of course, has given no study to this new bill, very recently introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] but we hope that full and fair hearings on his bill may result in sound legislation for the common good of all those interested in American railroads.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commitee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations

to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Snyder amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Rankin amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 17, after line 8, add a new paragraph to read as follows:

"For construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities for fiscal year 1946, $158,320,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNYDER: On page 43, after line 2, insert the following:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Rivers and Harbors,' including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $25,516,000, to remain available until expended.

"FLOOD CONTROL

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, general', including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $81,759,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for constructing the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir beyond dimensions which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet or for constructing dikes or levees which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam.

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for 'Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries', including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriations Act, 1946, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 168, noes 53.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The count discloses that 221 Members are present; a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some statements and letters concerning the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Smith Times-Record.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LAND-GRANT RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by section 1 of this Act shall take effect October 1, 1946: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation specifically contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract of carriage or shipment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

E. C. JOHNSON,
BURTON K. WHEELER,
E. H. MOORE,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made two amendments to the bill as it passed the House.

Amendment No. 1: Section 2 of the House bill provided that the amendment to existing law made by section 1 of the bill should take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of the bill. The amendment of the Senate struck out this section and substituted the following:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect October 1, 1945: *Provided, however*, That any travel or transportation contracted for prior to such effective date shall be paid for at the rate, fare, or charge in effect at the time of entering into such contract."

The substitute amendment agreed to in conference is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the words "section 1 of" are inserted before the words "this Act", and clarifying changes have been made in the proviso without changing its intended meaning.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment of the Senate added a new section 4 to the bill, providing for making funds available for expenditure, for the benefit of veterans, in establishing family-type farms. The Senate has receded on this amendment.

LYLE H. BOREN,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
CARROLL REECE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before the House is on the bill generally known as the land-grant bill. This bill passed the House twice by overwhelming votes, on one occasion by 236 to 16 and another time by an even larger majority. When the conferees met to consider the Senate version of the bill we found they had put in amendments which a great many Members of the House felt, regardless of their merits, were not properly a part of this question and we brought the conference report back to the House with the result that the House rejected it. Today, however, we have brought in a conference report making the bill identical with the bill that has twice passed the House by overwhelming vote.

I want the membership clearly to understand that the conference report here before us makes the bill identical with the one they have overwhelmingly approved twice with the one exception that whereas the effective date of the act under the House bill was 90 days from the enactment of the bill, the conferees made the effective date October 1, 1946. So the only difference between the House version of the bill and what we have before us at the present time is the extension of the effective date of the act.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Do I understand correctly that the bill incorporates the amendment I offered and which the gentleman accepted?

Mr. BOREN. It does; it still carries the gentleman's provision. As I say, the only change at all is the striking out of the 90 days' clause and inserting in lieu thereof October 1, 1940.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House the effect of this change of effective date agreed upon by the conferees?

Mr. BOREN. There was a feeling on the part of many in the House and Senate that railroad traffic was so abnormal in wartime that the 90-day effective date might be more costly to the Government and result in unusual benefit to certain railroads. Therefore, we moved the date ahead so there could be no question but what the period of inflated wartime travel and use would be over, plus a reasonable time for readjustment and reorganization.

I wish to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on May 23, 1944, this bill in its present form passed the House by a vote of 236 to 16. Again, on May 4, 1945, the present bill was adopted after extended debate by a vote of something like 5 to 1. Your conferees have brought back to you the bill in exactly the form it was when it left the House, with this one exception of the effective date. We felt, after the last action of the House on the matter, that that was our responsibility, and we were successful in doing it. The conference report is unanimous. The bill originally came from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with a unanimous vote, with one exception, last spring. I see no need for further discussion at this time unless there are questions or points at issue; I see no reason to rehash all the arguments that have already been presented to you.

I realize, of course, there are a few Members who are opposed to the bill, and who have consistently been opposed to the bill. I propose shortly to recognize my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, who I know wants to speak in opposition to this bill. There are some Members, as I say, who have constantly opposed the principle of the bill, as indicated by the fact that there were 16 votes against it. I am absolutely certain that any Member of this House who sat on the committee and studied this subject, as was evidenced by the vote of 25 to 1 on the reporting of the bill from the committee, will approve this bill all the way through.

I find no fault with my good friend from St. Louis and others who, I know, have taken a constant position of opposition to this subject; but I feel that any Member who has made a close study of this matter and has had contact with it and who understands all the effects involved in this bill would get a clear and fair comprehension of it and approve the bill, as has been indicated by the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. As a matter of fact, the only issue before us now is whether or not we are in favor of making the change that has been suggested? The merits and demerits of the bill have already been decided by both the House and Senate?

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman from Texas has well stated the issue. There is one question before the House today and that is whether or not you are going to reaffirm the position that the House has already taken. There is only one issue involved and that is whether you would rather have it as the House passed it, that is, go into effect in 90 days or go into effect on next October 1.

We felt this was a reasonable concession to make to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate.

I am asking the House to approve a conference report on H. R. 694, this being a bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940. Under this section of the 1940 act, which the bill now before the House undertakes to amend, the Government pays on all of its civilian freight the usual commercial rates. It is provided, however, in the 1940 act that the land-grant railroads, so-called, shall give the Government half rates on military and naval traffic moving for military and naval and not for civilian use. The bill now before the House amends the 1940 act by providing that the Government shall pay, on and after October 1, 1946, full commercial rates on all of the freight owned by the Government, whether it be military or civilian.

I should like to remind the House that the bill deals with the so-called land-grant railroads and railroads that, by reason of equalization agreements, have agreed to meet the land-grant rates. Back in the fifties and sixties, in order to encourage the construction of railroads into the unsettled western territory and to a certain degree into southern territory, the Government granted to certain railroads about 130,000,000 acres of public land, worth, at the time, according to Mr. Eastman, 97 cents an acre. It was provided in the various acts granting these lands that Government-owned freight should be moved free of tolls. The Supreme Court of the United States and the Court of Claims, as the result of a lengthy litigation, decided that the proper construction of these clauses of the granting acts was that the Government freight should move at half price. Following these decisions of the Courts, Congress, at various times, passed laws which fixed the rate to be paid by the Government on land-grant roads at 50 percent of the commercial rate.

There are approximately 230,000 miles of railroad in the United States. Of this amount, about 14,000 miles are so-called land-grant roads, meaning thereby railroads which were granted lands in aid of construction. Most of this mileage is west of the Mississippi River, although a considerable amount lies in southern territory, south of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi. Many railroads that compete directly with so-called land-grant roads have entered into equalization agreements, under which the non-land-grant roads agree to meet the rates of the land-grant roads applicable on Government traffic. However, in all of that section of the country north of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi, where there is very little land-grant mileage, the railroads do not grant special land-grant rates on Government traffic.

For a long time, the shippers of the country have been urging the repeal of these land-grant statutes. The reason why shippers object is because of the inequalities and discriminations that result from the application of the rates. Obviously, a shipper located on a land-grant line or an equalization line selling its manufactured product to the Government has a tremendous advantage over a shipper not so located as to be able to take advantage of the land-grant rates. Furthermore, to calculate the exact rate applicable in every case is a very complicated process and shippers are often perplexed to know just what the rates really are, whether paid by themselves or paid by their competitors. By reason of the injustice and inequalities resulting from the application of these rates, the shippers of the country, with practical unanimity, have long urged Congress to repeal the land-grant statutes. The National Industrial Traffic League, which represents the most important shippers of the country, and the shippers' advisory boards, Nation-wide in scope, are unanimous in their request for the repeal of these statutes.

The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners is in favor of the repeal. The Interstate Commerce Commission has many times pointed out to Congress how difficult it is to regulate the rates of the railroads intelligently, as long as these special rates are in effect. The Office of Defense Transportation is of the same opinion. All of the railroad labor unions have urged Congress to relieve the situation by repealing these statutes.

The matter has been before Congress many times and hearings have been held both in the House and Senate at which all interests have been heard at length. I remind the House that in the Seventy-eighth Congress, on May 23, 1944, a bill almost identical with the one now under consideration passed the House by a vote of 236 to 16. That was H. R. 4184 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and came before the House as the result of a report by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which report was unanimous or nearly so. Again in the present Congress, on May 4, 1945, the present bill was adopted, after extended debate, by a vote of 176 to 40. As the bill passed the House, it provided that the repeal should be effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of the act.

When the bill reached the Senate, it was referred to the appropriate committee, namely the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and that committee, on July 28, 1945, reported the bill favorably, with an amendment which made the act effective 90 days after the date of the cessation of hostilities in the war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the two Houses, whichever was the earlier.

The bill came before the Senate on October 2, 1945, and was extensively debated for several days. Ultimately, the Senate amended the bill by making the effective date of the repeal October 1, 1946.

The Senate also adopted an amendment, commonly referred to as the McFarland amendment, which proposed to create a veterans' fund amounting to $68,272,770 to be used for assisting eligible veterans in certain States to establish themselves upon farm lands and to be used in part of reclamation and irrigation projects in those named States.

By reason of the amendments adopted by the Senate, it was necessary to send the bill to conference. Conferees were appointed and a conference report brought to the House and considered by this body on October 29. In the first conference report, the Senate amendments were adopted, these being the one fixing the effective date as October 1, 1946, and the other the McFarland amendment. Otherwise, the bill remained practically unchanged. The conference report was debated in the House on October 29, and the House voted on a roll call, by a vote of 167 to 114, not to approve the conference report.

Thereupon, the House asked for a further conference, to which the Senate agreed. The second conference report is the one now before the House. It has already been adopted by the Senate. This report eliminates the McFarland amendment entirely and provides that the repeal shall be effective on October 1, 1946. It is this report which I am asking the House to approve.

I should like to emphasize certain features of the bill. In paragraph (a) of the amended section 321, it is expressly provided that section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act is not in any way repealed, amended, or affected. Under this section 22, which has been used a great deal during the war period and, in fact, prior thereto, the railroads are permitted to make special rates for the handling of Government property, without reference to the commercial rates. The hearings on this bill, which have been numerous and voluminous, indicate that under this section 22, which will remain in the law, hundreds of special rates have been made for the Government, when emergencies made such action necessary.

Another feature of the law which should be mentioned is that the repeal does not take effect until October 1, 1946. By that time obviously, practically all of the Government transportation having to do with war will have been completed. The problem of returning the soldiers to their homes will certainly be finished before that time. The movement of war material incident to reconversion and the transition from war to peace will end well before October 1, 1946. It cannot be said, therefore, that the war effort will in any way be hampered or handicapped by the repeal of these special rates.

Something has been said from time to time to the effect that if this bill becomes a law, the railroads will profit, at the expense of the Government, in an amount estimated to be $200,000,000 a year. But this figure was an estimate based on the movement of men and materials when the war effort was at the maximum. It should be remembered that by the Transportation Act of 1940 the railroads were relieved from the obligation to make special rates on civilian goods. From and after October 1, 1946, the movement of military and naval material and of troops of the United States will be comparatively small.

The testimony on this bill shows that prior to 1939, when we began our preparation for war, the Government deductions never amounted to more than $7,000,000 a year. This was at a time, too, when under the law deductions were allowed on civilian goods. The Board of Investigation and Research estimated that from the beginning of the history of land-grant deductions up to and including December 31, 1937, the deductions amounted to about $56,000,000. It appeared, therefore, that in normal times $56,000,000 represented the deductions in a period of approximately 50 years.

No one can say with certainty just how much these deductions would amount to, limited as they are to military and naval traffic, but it is safe to say, upon the most conservative estimate, that they would not amount to more than $5,000,000 a year, from and after October 1, 1946, a date when the experts in the Army and Navy estimate that the war movement will be completed.

To summarize the situation: We have a bill here which has twice been overwhelmingly passed by the House and passed by the Senate without a roll call. The railroads did receive 130,000,000 acres of land, worth at the time of the grant about $126,000,000. By reason of the extensive shipment of war material in the late war, they have repaid, according to the record, probably $1,000,000,000 to the Government. The shippers of the country are unanimously in favor of the repeal, as are all the regulating agencies, Federal and State. The present act provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall take into consideration in fixing rates any benefit which the railroads receive from this bill. No measure has ever been before Congress which has been more extensively debated or more generally approved by the country.

It has been said that this is a railroad bill. As a matter of fact, it is a shippers' bill. Undoubtedly the railroads favor the repeal of these rates. It will mean something to them in the way of increased revenues.

The principal advantage to the railroads, however, is in removing the uncertainty as to the traffic to which the rates apply. Under the 1940 act, land-grant rates apply only to military and naval property moving for military and naval use. Controversies have sprung up all over the country as to the proper classification of particular shipments. Suits are pending in the courts to determine whether lend-lease material is or is not subject to land-grant rates. There is a case now pending in the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fourth Circuit which involves the question of whether fertilizer being shipped to Great Britain during the war is entitled to land-grant rates or, in other words, whether this fertilizer is military or naval property. It is contended by the Government that all lend-lease shipments, being in a broad general sense in aid of the war effort, fall within the description of military property. Numerous controversies of this kind exist and the railroads would naturally like to have the question put at rest.

The chief demand for this repeal comes, however, from shippers who have been perplexed and bothered for many years as to the application of these rates and have been greatly annoyed at the discriminations that result from the fact that one manufacturer has an advantage over another by reason of his fortuitous location upon a land-grant line. In making bids for Government traffic, those who are not located on land-grant lines are at a distinct disadvantage.

The talk about the railroads receiving a benefit of $200,000,000 a year utterly ignores the fact that the repeal does not become effective until October 1, 1946.

The best authorities in the Government believe that the movement of war material and troops will be over before that time. Under the 1940 act, land-grant rates are not applicable to civilian goods. The movement of war material and troops after October 1, 1946, will be only such as normally takes place in time of peace. Experience indicates that very likely the Government deductions would amount to no more than $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 a year.

We should not lose sight of the fact that the regulating authorities, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the State commissions, all unanimously and enthusiastically advocate the repeal of these land grants. The Interstate Commerce Commission has pointed out that it cannot properly regulate rates in land-grant territory as long as these abnormal Government rates are in effect.

There is no reason why the Government should have any preference in the shipment of ordinary freight. Particularly is there no reason why one section of the country should be given these special rates which are denied in another section of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this legislation before the gentleman from Oklahoma was ever a Member of this House. I have opposed it from the outset ever since it was first suggested.

It is true this bill passed the House on two occasions; unfortunately, I was unable to be here at that time. It is likewise true, however, it has been defeated on several occasions.

This House voted down a conference report on this bill just a few weeks ago. The gentleman from Oklahoma admitted a minute ago that abnormal times existed during the period of a war. That is the best argument that can be made for voting down the pending conference report.

The proponents say the only issue is whether or not the House wants to stand by the action it has previously taken.

The fact that the House made a mistake before does not by any means warrant the House in making another mistake.

Here is the issue confronting the House now: It is whether or not you are going to make the taxpayers of this country pay three or four hundred million dollars a year more than they have been paying to move our armed forces and military property over land-grant roads, and in fact other roads, that have made an agreement with the Government to carry its soldiers and military property at land-grant rates. Fighting has stopped but millions of those in our armed forces must be brought home as well as military material.

Mr. Speaker, many, many years ago the Government gave 130,000,000 acres of land away and it gave that land away for the purpose of building railroads. In return for that concession, it was agreed that the railroads would carry our soldiers and Government property free of charge. Remember that phrase "free of charge." That was the agreement that was made for the 130,000,000 acres that the Government gave away and, may I say, that 130,000,000 acres of ground covered a larger area than some of our States.

In later years the railroads told the courts that the agreement they made was that the railroads would be available to the Government to carry its soldiers and property insisting the railroads did not agree to do it, but said the right-of-way would be available for the Government to do it. The railroads won their case. So, rather than go into the railroad business, the Government made an agreement with the railroads that they should carry our soldiers, sailors, and our military property at 50 percent of the commercial rate. That has been going on for years. The railroads come in now and want us to abrogate that agreement. They want the Government to pay 100-percent commercial rates for moving our armed forces and our property. Can anyone say that so far as the movement of our troops and our military property are concerned that this war is over? We have millions of men in Europe and Pacific area waiting to come back home. There is no telling how many millions of tons of property we have which must be brought back home.

Now there is another feature to this. This does not only apply to land-grant roads. Other railroads not land-grant roads went before the Interstate Commerce Commission and secured permission from the Commission to apply to the Government to carry its troops and property on a 50-percent basis or on a land-grant rate. That is known as the equalization rate. That is in effect on non-land-grant roads today. Remember that. The minute that you repeal the land-grant rates then the agreements of the other carriers, non-land-grant roads, with the Government are canceled. So you not only lose the benefit of the land-grant rates from the land-grant roads, but you lose the benefits that are coming to this Government from roads that are not land-grant roads. They want the business. It is profitable at the land-grant rate or they would not have applied for it.

I want to say that my basis for the figure that I gave a few minutes ago is the statement made before the subcommittee on War Department Appropriations by the Chief of Transportation Division of the War Department. "You repeal the land-grant rates and then we will want $225,000,000 more to carry our soldiers and our property." I defy anybody to deny that statement.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. However, the gentleman will state, as a part of the record, that that was during the peak of war transportation when the War Department gave that estimate.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true, but I maintain the war is not over as far as the movement of our armed forces and property is concerned. It will not be over until our boys and our property are brought home. That $225,000,000, I will remind you, applies only to the War Department. How much more will the Navy and the Maritime Commission need?

There is another matter that enters into this, that you want to give a little thought to, and that is that the railroads have taken the position that they do not have to apply land-grant rates to the shipment of lend-lease products. That case is in the courts, and if the railroads win that case they are going to receive hundreds of millions of dollars more in freight rates for all the land-lease shipments they handled at land-grant rates.

Now look at this question this way. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved. It is going to mean that forevermore we are going to be required to pay the full commercial rate. What do the railroads offer the Government in return for the Congress abrogating that solemn agreement that was made? Do they agree to reduce the rates so that the shippers will get the benefit? Absolutely no. Do they agree to increase the wages of the railroad employees, including those white-collared workers in the offices that have never been treated right by the railroads? Absolutely no. They offer nothing. Every dollar will go into the treasury of the railroads.

You heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], yesterday and you heard the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], tell you about the financial condition of this country. Do we want today to place another burden of hundreds of millions of dollars on the people of this country? That is just exactly what you are going to do today if you approve this conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that the bonds of the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., the greatest beneficiary of this public-land grant, are way below par, and that the company never paid a dividend until the war came on? The gentleman talks about all the money pouring into the hands of the barons.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the Northern Pacific were properly handled those bonds would not be below par. The gentleman well knows how the railroad barons milked the Northern Pacific.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman. He has been very kind.

This is no little matter but one that deserves real consideration on the part of the Members of this House.

We have been petitioned by the railroads and we have been petitioned by the railroad lobbyists to support this bill, but there is another type of people in this country, the ones who elected you and me to office, the masses of the people, who are not organized, who are going to have to pay this bill, who feel that we as their representatives are going to protect their interests in this House. They are the ones I am going to vote for today, I repeat the ones that will have to pay this bill if you agree to this conference report.

You were fighting here a few hours ago on less than $100,000,000, but here you are voting to put on the taxpayers a burden of several hundred million dollars, and forevermore make this Government pay the full commercial rate for the handling of its troops and its military properties. What are the railroads going to do in the future for the 130,000,000 acres of land they received? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman referred to the fact that this would involve hundreds of millions of dollars a year for the Government. I call his attention to the fact that the Board of Investigation and Research, having studied this problem, reported that the total amount saved to the Government from 1928 to 1940, 12 years, was $85,000,000, which is $7,000,000 per year and not the hundreds of millions of dollars about which the gentleman is talking.

Mr. COCHRAN. I put a letter in the RECORD from the Comptroller General the other day that shows exactly what the Government has been paying to the land-grant roads and to those roads that are charging the equalization rates. Among other statements he said, We paid the railroads over $5,000,000,000 in freight in 1 year during the period of this war.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman knows these boys are going to be back by next October; I hope so.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know that. I wish I did know. Nor does the gentleman from Indiana know they are going to be back here by next October but I hope and pray they will be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been fully thrashed out by the House. I have no feeling that there is a necessity that we should rehash the matter. I simply want to call the attention of the House again to the fact that the railroads have returned to the Government in the form of reduced rates over $1,000,000,000. The original total valuation of all the land given to the railroads was less than $130,000,000.

The great outstanding purpose of the Government land grants was to develop the central, western, and southwestern sections of the country by making them accessible. That purpose was accomplished. Reduced rates to Government was not of any great consequence when the grants were made. In my judgment, the just claims of the Government have been more than repaid.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. By no stretch of the imagination could it have been contemplated at the time these land-grant rate transactions were made that the Government would go into the wholesale business of developing hydroelectric projects all over the country and that the railroads would be called upon to haul cement and other supplies and materials across the United States to build that kind of plants.

Mr. LEA. The gentleman's statement is absolutely true. There were very few cases in which the original grant required the railroad to give free transportation. This 50-percent concession to the Government was made by the Congress and not in the original grant. The original grant provided for the use of the roadbed by the Government on the assumption that the Government would run its own trains. The Government has not done that. This 50-percent provision originated in lieu of the original concessions by an act of Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. As I see the situation, it is not a question of whether or not the Government is making money out of this proposition. It is a question as to whether or not it is right.

Mr. LEA. Yes; that is the question. We cannot afford to refuse to satisfy our just obligations because it costs us something to do it. That is no argument. It would be a pitiful time for the Congress if a question like this cannot be considered on its merits. It is easy to demagog on questions like this, but here the question is one of distinguishing between what is just and what is unjust. This legislation is fair and right.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the committee, did not mean to indicate that anyone who opposes this bill is demogoging. I think somebody has to speak for the sort of ordinary folks that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], spoke about, because the other side of this matter has been very well presented here in Congress through the lobbying efforts in the interest of the great railroad systems of this country. I think we get down to the simple proposition of whether the House desires to pass upon this as a matter of finality. If you approve this conference report today, you permit the land-grant railroads to back out of the agreement which they solemnly made many years ago to carry free of charge the Government freight which was shipped by the railroads. In 1940, the railroads asked and the Congress agreed to cut that down to 50 percent. Since 1942, I think this bill has bobbed up here in Congress about three times. In 1942, it was overwhelmingly defeated. As the gentleman from Oklahoma says, it has been passed on a couple of occasions.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman does not mean that the 50-percent rate has been in effect only since 1940?

Mr. O'HARA. That is what I mean.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, no, it has been in effect a long time before that.

Mr. O'HARA. I think you will find it was not authorized by the Congress until 1940.

In any event, after getting out of 50 percent of their agreement it was not very long until they were asking to back out of 100 percent of their agreement.

Now, for the benefit of the gentlemen who are so sure that all the boys are going to be home by October 1, 1946, may I read something that has a bearing on this question. This apparently comes from the publicity department of the great Pennsylvania Railroad. It is from the Washington Star of last night. The article says:

"Military movements on the Pennsylvania Railroad are heavier now than at any previous time," C. R. Mathews, Jr., traffic manager, said today. "In the week ending November 10, military travel on the railroads reached an all-time high of 169,687 persons."

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] made an appeal to the great liberal element on my right, to the Members on his side of the aisle, in behalf of the common people. I would like to speak to my conservative friends on the left. They have been talking a great deal during the last few weeks on the matter of cutting down appropriations and cutting down expenses. Where is the logic if we pass a law which gives to the railroads of this country billions of dollars within the next few years? If we should get into another war, I do not know how many billions it will cost this country to transport Government property.

I appreciate the fact that many Members think this is not of such great moment, but I think if we are going to speak in terms of billions of dollars—and I claim that is what it is going to cost the Government, and that means the taxpayers—I will state frankly to you, you are not going to have them home under the terms of this bill by October 1, 1946.

I will admit this amendment is an improvement on the bill which the House passed, but I certainly do not admit that under this amendment the great Government traffic is going to be dispensed with by October 1, 1946.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Can the gentleman from Minnesota tell me whether or not the financial condition of the railroads today warrant any such measure as this? If not, how can any of us be justified in voting for this measure which will cost our Treasury so many millions of dollars?

Mr. O'HARA. I know that I placed in the RECORD during the general debate upon this bill when it was before the House a statement showing the net earnings of the Class I railroads of the country. That statement showed that they had net earnings of several billion dollars, after taxes were paid, at that particular time. I do not recall the exact figure.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman recall that before the war one-third of the railroad mileage was in receivership, and another one-third was insolvent?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman will be able to get time to discuss this matter. He is very much in favor of the bill, and I am sure he can get all the time he wants. Some of the railroads were in receivership. If we would look into the banking end of the railroads and some of the watered stock of some of the railroads, we would be doing the country a great deal more good than by passing this type of legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as to the railroads in receivership, the courts of the United States were looking into the matter about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. O'HARA. They had better do a little better job than has been done.

Mr. HALLECK. To my mind, the gentleman's answer is begging the question.

Mr. O'HARA. I am glad the gentleman brought this matter up, because I had overlooked it. In this morning's Post I noticed an item of news which shows what we are facing. The Investment Bankers' Association held a convention in Chicago. The only news item that came out of that convention is this, and I will insert the entire article in the RECORD, but this was the nub of the matter:

The evidence is convincing that a freight-rate increase is an absolute necessity if adequate railroad earning power is to be maintained.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. No. The gentleman can get some time. I would like to speak a little on this matter myself. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I do not want the gentleman to take up all of my time.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. No. I would uike to finish my statement, and then I will yield to both of my distinguished friends.

I want to say to the membership, Mr. Speaker, that we are facing the proposition of giving to the railroads of the country out of the taxpayers' pockets, if you please, billions of dollars, that is only for the benefit of the railroads. The shippers and passengers who travel on these railroads can get no consideration in the way of benefits in freight or passenger-rate benefits, which we are giving the railroads under this bill. Then to have the investment bankers come in shouting for increase in rates makes one ask: Just where are the people of the country reaping any benefit from this type of legislation? Is this a case of the special pleader and the special interest getting consideration and the people of the country not getting the benefit they should have?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlement yield?

Mr. O'HARA. With the gentleman's permission, I should like first to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I merely wanted to ask my friend: Is it not true that there is only one thing to be decided, whether or not you want this to take effect 90 days after the passage of the act or on October 1, 1946? That is all there is to it.

Mr. O'HARA. No, no; I may say to the gentleman that is not the question. The question is whether we vote this up or down. I want to see this report defeated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If it is voted down that would be the question would it not?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I insert at this point the two newspaper items to which I referred:

[From the Washington Evening Star of November 27, 1945]

MOVEMENT OF MILITARY ON PENNSY SETS RECORD

Military movements on the Pennsylvania Railroad are heavier now than at any previous time, C. H. Mathews, Jr., passenger traffic manager, said today.

In the week ended November 10 military travel on the railroad reached an all-time high of 169,687 persons.

Half the railroad's coaches are constantly in military service, he said, traveling great distances beyond the Pennsylvania's own territory. Approximately 65 percent of all pullmans in operation are assigned exclusively to military use, he added.

Military travel figures, Mr. Mathews said, have been climbing since August, contrary to popular conception of the situation.

[From the Washington Post of November 29, 1945]

IBA HOLDS RAISE IN RAIL FREIGHT RATES ESSENTIAL

CHICAGO, November 28.—The Investment Bankers Association went on record today in favor of freight-rate increases to maintain "adequate railroad earning power."

"The evidence is convincing that a freight rate increase is an absolute necessity if adequate railroad earning power is to be maintained. The only uncertainty is the size of the required increase," declared a committee report adopted by the association's thirty-fourth annual convention.

The report, signed by Fairman B. Dick, New York, chairman of the IBA railroad securities committee, said specific recommendations as to the size of a rate rise "are impossible without more definite knowledge as to future labor and materials costs."

Charles S. Garland, Baltimore, was elected president at the closing session. Vice Presidents named were Hazen S. Arnold, Toledo, Ohio; Julien H. Collins, Chicago, Hal H. Dewar, San Antonio, Tex.; Edward Hopkinson, Jr., Philadelphia, and Lee M. Limbert, New York.

C. B. Merrill of Cleveland was elected to the board of governors.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Oklahoma said a few minutes ago, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce considered this question, had extended hearings and came to a conclusion supported by 25 to 1 that this legislation should be favorably considered by the House. The Committee so reported.

A great deal has been said about the common man in connection with this legislation. Let us see who is supporting this proposal. Not only the railroads, but the shippers' organization, and the railroad labor organization. These two organizations certainly represent the people. Every interest connected with the transportation industry, both carriers and labor, is in favor of the enactment of this legislation. I believe it is unfortunate, if I may be pardoned for saying so, that after 3 years of consideration, the results of which are being presented to the Membership of the House, for the House to fail to adopt the conference report.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to inquire if this bill is not in the interest of the average shipper of the country?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Undoubtedly it is in the interest of the average shipper; and let me state further that the Interstate Commerce Commission approved this legislation. Former Director of Defense Transportation Joseph Eastman approved the legislation. The present Director of Defense Transportation, J. M. Johnson approves this legislation. Every advised agency and person almost without exception save for the representatives of the War Department approves this legislation.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Is it not true that everyone connected with rate making wants this legislation so they can have an equalized approach to the problem?

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Without exception they are in favor of it, and for one reason only: Because it is sound legislation in the interest of the country as well as the transportation system itself.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, seemingly the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota have one great complaint relative to this legislation, and that is that on two different occasions the House has failed to agree with their viewpoint. This legislation has been enacted twice before by the House of Representatives by an almost unanimous vote. If I remember correctly, on one roll call there were but 16 votes cast against this legislation, and but 17 on the other occasion.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman also say that the House has defeated the legislation on two occasions?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has not defeated the legislation at any time since I have been here.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation simply corrects an injustice. Up to this time the railroads have paid back many more millions of dollars in reduced freight rates than the property received from the Government was worth under any possible appraisal. For many years we have been compelling the shippers of your district and my district to pay higher rates than they should for civilian freight in order that Government freight could be hauled at rates far below the actual cost of such transportation to the railroad companies.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In North Dakota the Government allowed the Indians 10 cents an acre for a big tract of land. The railroad was given every other section and when the railroad went through, it made the Government's land worth $1.50 an acre.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly the railroads have given much more to the Nation, both in transportation and in building up and developing the country, than they have ever received in the value of land granted to them.

This bill simply corrects an inequity. It has been reported with but a single vote in opposition by the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on two different occasions. It has been enacted and approved by this House on two different occasions. The only question left before us now is whether or not we shall adopt this conference report with the Senate amendment which extends the effective date to October 1 next, rather than 90 days after enactment as provided in the original House bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I cannot understand the position of those in opposition to this bill who appear to be, no doubt sincerely, interested in the shippers of the country, because every dollar that the Government takes away from the railroads in reduced freight rates means a greater transportation cost to the shippers of the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, the laws of the land provide that the rates charged by the railroads must be fixed on a basis that will permit their operation at a fair and reasonable profit. Whenever any particular class of freight is being hauled at less than cost it is necessary the rates on other freight must be fixed sufficiently high to give the railroads the guaranteed return that the law provides.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman know that the railroads today still retain property that they do not need for their right of way, from which they are taking coal, copper, and oil? Are they willing to give that land back to the Government?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I know that there are railroads that still retain some of the property originally granted to them. I also know, and so does the gentleman from Missouri, that many of the railroads that have been giving these special rate reductions to the Government have never received a bit of Government land, or have never benefited in any way from such land grants.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will admit it, he knows the reason they have not got a dime is because of the way the railroad barons handled the property.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well for the House to consider again for the moment the exact facts. When a shipment of merchandise by the Government leaves New York and goes to some place, for illustration, either in Florida, or in Texas, or in Missouri, or anywhere else, it will go by the most direct route. However, the people who figure the rates in the War Department and in the Navy Department will find a route which has the maximum amount of land-grant road in it and figure the rate over a very circuitous route in order to take advantage of a bit of land-grant discount. The freight is not shipped over the circuitous route. It is shipped over the direct route where there may be no land-grant road traversed. The net discount is computed, which may be 1 percent, 9 percent, or whatever percent it takes, from the straight line route to figure the Government rate. Then each of the railroads participating in this shipment through their connecting lines take a proportionate reduction in the rate, whether or not there is any land grant on the road. The land-grant roads do not alone pay this bill. All the railroads and all the shippers in the United States pay this bill. The average reduction in freight rates for the Government in all bills of lading is something like 7 percent. In the Transportation Act of 1940 there was inserted a paragraph which provides that the Government may negotiate a rate with the railroads at a discount. That discount has not been set. There has been no negotiations, because the land-grant rates are still in effect. When the land-grant rates are repealed the Government will immediately negotiate with the railroads for a common discount on all Government shipments, and consequently the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri that the Government will lose money if this bill is passed is utterly fantastic. It is not true in any sense whatsoever.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to have the gentleman show me where in the act of 1940 there is anything that makes it mandatory that the railroads reduce the Government rates.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no mandatory provision at all. It is a negotiated discount, and it is then up to the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve that rate discount.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very intently to the arguments that have been made by the opponents of this conference report. I have failed to see any argument made that has not previously been made to this House. The effect, of those arguments, or more properly speaking their lack of effectiveness, in the past is evidenced by the fact that on one occasion there were only 16 Members in the House who agreed with those arguments, and at another time only 17 Members.

I do want to take some exception to the inference that has been drawn that the passage of this legislation is against the public interest. I cannot conceive how anyone who has given this matter any study whatsoever could come to any such conclusion, and when any Member of this House rises and bases his opposition against the adoption of this conference report upon the ground that he is seeking to protect the interests of the people, he is arguing contrary to the established facts in the case.

Furthermore, it would seem from the making of such an argument that those individuals consider themselves the only ones who are interested in the welfare of the people. When this House passed this legislation by a vote of 273 to 16, does the gentleman mean to imply that all of those Members who voted for the adoption of the legislation and many of whom have rendered outstanding service in protecting the public interest and have always been champions of the welfare of the people suddenly changed and voted against the interests of the people?

Examine the conference report and you will see the names of the individuals who signed that report, both on the part of the Senate and the House. The names that are there set forth are those of Members who have time after time, on many occasions, stood foremost in the fight for the people of the country and for the protection of their welfare. It is inconceivable to me that individuals of the kind and character who have signed this conference report would be so totally oblivious of the best interest of the people as those who have spoken against the conference report would have us believe.

This bill in fact is to protect the interest of the general public. Why should the Government be given the privilege of using our railroads at a rate far below what the other shippers and individuals of the Nation are required to pay? Is it not plain to any thoughtful mind that as long as the Government enjoys this privilege that the deficit must be made up by the others who use the railroads? And in conclusion, may I call to your attention that the only issue before the House today is whether this conference report shall be adopted. The merits of the bill have been discussed and debated on two previous occasions and it has won the approval of the House and the Senate. Today the only question before the House is whether the provision in the House bill fixing the effective date of the act as 90 days after its enactment shall prevail, or whether the provision shall be changed so that the bill will be effective on October 1 of next year. That is the only issue before the House.

Therefore, it seems to me that all this argument this afternoon by opponents of the conference report is extraneous to the real issue. The merits of the bill have been fought out on several occasions by this House and in two instances received the approval of the House by overwhelming majorities. I do not think the gentleman from Missouri has any better record in the House for standing for what is for the best interest of the people than I have. I am just as conscientiously in favor of this bill as being one that is in the general interest as is the gentleman who has sought in his argument to make it appear to the contrary.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman says the only issue here is whether the bill shall go into effect in 90 days or on October 1, 1946. If the House will vote down this conference report as it did a few weeks ago and continue to vote it down, the legislation will never go into effect.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The reason that prompted action in the House 2 weeks ago to vote down the conference report then presented does not exist today. This report is a new one that does not contain the features to which the House objected. Therefore those reasons no longer exist. They have been eliminated by the conferees. The bill is now in the same condition as when the House ap-

proved it by an overwhelming majority except as to the date when it shall become effective. Therefore, the only issue that remains is that which I have stated. I urge the House to approve the conference report now before it.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, by undertaking to speak on this matter I do not want thereby to indicate there is any question in my mind as to whether or not this conference report is going to be adopted, because I am sure it will be adopted. However, there has been a time or two when for some reason or other apparently our better judgment has not prevailed.

We have been talking about this matter of land-grant rates a long time. As far as I am concerned, I hope this will be the end of it. I understand the gentleman from Missouri has been in opposition to it for a long time, and I yield to him that sincerity of conviction that I hope he yields to me.

Mr. COCHRAN. I certainly do.

Mr. HALLECK. I can say the same for the gentleman from Minnesota. I would not say that anyone spoke on this except from conviction, but this happens to be one of those things where certain alleged arguments against it can be presented and, if one does not take the trouble to think about it pretty carefully, he may be inadvisedly persuaded by them. I am quite sure if he will take the trouble to look into the merits of the proposition, if he will look back of the first words that may be said about it, and if he will look for the real public interest, he cannot do anything but support it.

It is true that lands were given to the railroads, and subsequently the Government was afforded a 50-percent decrease in freight rates. I think it might well be argued, however, that those lands were given to the railroads as a contribution to the efforts to develop the great empire that is this country, that the development of the empire is all that the Government expected for those lands. But it has been pointed out that more than that, the Government in reduced rates has already received much more than the value of those lands that were granted.

Now, what is this thing all about? The railroads operate under rates fixed by the Government, by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The theory of such regulation is that rates are revised downward in the public interest. The theory is that rates shall be fixed at a point at which they shall pay operating costs and yield to the owners of the roads a fair return on their investment. That means that the railroads must obtain revenue from some place to carry on their operations. If the Government freight moves at 50 percent, who makes it up? Why, the shippers and the consumers of the country make it up. They must pay added rates in order to increase the revenue to the railroads to overcome the 50-percent reduction.

The gentleman from Missouri made an astounding statement here, if I understood him correctly. He said that the Government rate of 50 percent is a profitable one for the railroads. Why, bless your hearts, if that statement were true, then the rate that you and I pay is twice too high. If the statement he made is true, then the Interstate Commerce Commission is doing a mighty poor job in not reducing freight rates. Now bear that in mind.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I made the statement that the land-grant railroad rate must be satisfactory because the other roads which were land-grant railroads came to the Interstate Commerce Commission and secured permission to take Government freight and personnel at the same rate that the land-grant railroads were taking it. If they lose money, why are they so anxious for the business?

Mr. HALLECK. That does not answer my assertion at all and it does not in any way explain or strengthen the statement that the gentleman from Missouri made to the House. The competitive situation in railroad operations is known to all of us. They seek to get traffic wherever they can. And, secondly, it cannot be disputed, if the 50-percent rate is enough to afford a railroad an opportunity to make money, then the Interstate Commerce Commission has our rate twice too high.

Let me point out just one thing further. One-third of the railroads were in receivership before the war. Another third were running in the red before the war. Two-thirds of our railroads were running in the red. Many of them were right in the areas where these land-grant rates apply. The statement has been made that from Chicago comes the suggestion that rates will have to be increased. I say to the gentleman from Missouri, Do you want the Government to continue to have a 50-percent rate when the private shippers of the country are confronted with an increase in their rates? Let all of the taxpayers pay the fair bill in moving the freight of the United States Government.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'HARA) there were—ayes 159, noes 44.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who spoke on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk two privileged resolutions and ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 436

Resolved, That ROY CLIPPINGER, of Illinois, be and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Roads, the Committee on War Claims, and the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 437

Resolved, That FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr., of New Jersey, be and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and the Committee on the Census of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF DECEMBER 3

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to find out, if we can, the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to advise the membership that there is another conference report we are waiting to act on this afternoon, the conference report on the rescission bill. It is not quite ready, but when it is reported we intend to bring it up this afternoon, unless something unforeseen develops. Possibly some Members may be recognized under special orders in the meanwhile.

The program for next week will be as follows:

Monday and Tuesday: On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. If the conference report on the rescission bill is not acted upon today it will be brought up on Monday. The following bills will be in order on Monday and Tuesday—I am bracketing them into 2 days: The Second War Powers Act, the First War Powers Act, the Navy personnel bill.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: For these days I am bracketing three bills. If a rule is reported out in time—and I hope it is—the UNRRA bill, H. R. 4649, will be called up Wednesday and be the continuing order of business until disposed of.

Thereafter the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration,

to which the gentleman from Mississippi referred this morning and which I intended to bring up as soon as possible anyway, will be in order.

Thereafter the Bulwinkle bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, will be called up.

That is the program for next week. Conference reports may, of course, be brought in at any time they are ready for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

PROBLEMS FACING THE RETURNING VETERAN

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, the serviceman has many problems facing him in his return to civilan life. Congress, through the GI bill of rights and other veterans' legislation, has to a great extent anticipated and provided for the answers to most of these problems—in some cases giving interim relief until such time as he becomes reestablished. However, no veteran can begin to resume his civilian pursuits until he can find a place to live, and in this hunt he finds himself up against the most severe housing shortage in the memory of man. The wives of most of these men were either physically or financially unable to take care of the houses they were occupying at the time of induction into the service, and were forced to move their families and either double up with other servicemen's families or go back to their parents, either of which was an emergency makeshift.

With the present shortage of building materials, it is expected that new houses will be well under 500,000 in the next year, which, together with the present housing situation, will leave about a million veterans and their families homeless at the end of the year.

I recently attended a meeting at the veterans' service center at Silver Spring, Md., which was called for the purpose of arriving at ways and means of finding homes for local veterans. The facts brought out at that meeting were unbelievable and appalling, but I shall not burden you with the details, which I am sure are typical of conditions throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done, and quickly, to alleviate this situation. We cannot have our veterans who have done such a splendid job, and for whom we have been waving flags and sounding cymbals, walking the streets, or at best living in overcrowded houses with other families.

There have been several suggested remedies, none of which completely meet the situation, but would contribute to the solution.

As many of the public and private houses recently constructed were earmarked to or preempted for war workers, the veteran is practically blocked from this source. Lack of availability of materials is handicapping construction, and many of the homes that are being built are beyond the purchase reach of the veteran.

The situation will not be materially aided until a department on veterans' housing is set up under the National Housing Authority, with its efforts directed exclusively to the veterans' housing problems. Many needs could be met, including priorities for houses to be built, sold, and rented to veterans—building materials earmarked for veterans. The important thing at the moment is to have some agency charged with the responsibility of the veterans' housing problems, with the time and facilities to devote its entire activities to this end.

MACARTHUR AND THE REDS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is a conservative estimate to say that the United States was 95 percent responsible for victory against Japan.

While American vessels kept the breath of life in Britons and Russians during the European war, while American know-how on the battle line and on the production line brought victory out of certain defeat, Britain made only token efforts to help us in the Far East and the Soviet Union contributed no effort whatsoever.

It was not Britain who made immortal the battlefields of Buna and Lae. The daily bombing attacks on Rabaul were not merely a British "milk run." No British force landed in the Solomons and fought through the bloody Guadalcanal campaign. No proud British Fleet sent its carrier-borne planes against the so-called impregnable enemy base at Truk.

Where were the Soviet commandos? They did not undertake over half-a-hundred successful triphibious operations in the Philippines alone. They took no Saipan, no Iwo Jima, no Okinawa. The vaunted Russian Navy was bottled up in the Black Sea or icebound in the Baltic when our Navy was sinking the pride of the Japanese Navy from Midway through the Battle of Leyte Gulf and into Japan's own Inland Sea.

Yet, when the tumult and the shouting has died, when the war has been won—by the United States—then, Stalin signified his intention of moving in so that he and a socialized Britain can run Japan. There is no secret diplomacy in Stalin's position. There is no need for it. The time for secret diplomacy has passed. Stalin's open desire is to communize Japan.

What, then, is Britain's position in this unholy alliance? Britain wants to trade what America has won by expending the lives of American youth and the wealth of the American taxpayer to the Russians. For what? For what Britain fears she will lose and which she is impotent to protect—her subject empire in the Far East, the oil-rich British-dominated lands of the Middle East, and the Mediterranean lifeline to her middle eastern dependencies and far eastern possessions.

America—and America's fighting leader in the Far East—won the war the hard way. The phrase "too little and too late" might have been coined about Gen. Douglas MacArthur's tag end of men and material furnished him to fight a major war. It was a national scandal, in an era replete with national scandals, that General MacArthur was denied the necessities for waging war, as many people persistently believe, because some people thought that—if the great commander was furnished with men and guns and ships and tanks—MacArthur would win and that would make him a political threat.

In the midst of a neglect which might well have been a deliberate betrayal, MacArthur proved his unimpeachable military genius. He fought an uphill battle—from Bataan to Port Moresby, from Port Moresby to Lingayan Gulf, from Manila to Okinawa, and to Japan's inland sea itself. Never has MacArthur failed to give quick credit to his combat team. His praise has gone to the Air Forces, to the Navy, to the Filipino guerrillas, to the men who brought badly needed replacements, and to the men and women who planned, managed, and worked in building the vital weapons of war. And MacArthur was a leader as well as a team player. There is no doubt about the innate leadership of the man who headed one of the most brilliant military campaigns in all history, and who is—this very minute—displaying that same unerring judgment which has always marked his leadership in an administrative capacity in governing defeated Japan.

But scarcely had the ink dried on the momentous surrender document signed aboard the U. S. S. *Missouri*, when the acclimated Communists and socialized snipers in continental United States—following Moscow's party line—began a smear campaign against America's hero of the Far East. They have howled, and they continue to howl, that Stalin ought to have the real voice of authority concerning the governing of Japan, after going along for a brief and easy ride in an 8-day war. Editors who clamored about American "imperialism" while Russia was still a member of a mutual protection pact with Hitler, went all-out to blacken the name of the very man to whom they owed, in great part, their very freedom of expression. But these Communists of every shade from dark red to pale pink, have blunted their editorial pens against the hard common sense of true American thinking. The American people are growing increasingly aware of General MacArthur's value to them in peace as well as war.

Meanwhile, the British monetary delegation is in Washington today seeking a five- or six-billion-dollar gift to be paid to them out of the United States Treasury, gleaned from the war bonds and taxes on American citizens, so that Britain can bring about the reconstruction of her socialized industries to compete on the world markets with American private enterprise. But the British are not too busy, nor are they too financially em-

barrassed that, even while they are making this outrageous demand, they could forego the opportunity to scream for an important role in governing Japan, whose armed might they did so little to defeat. To paraphrase Churchill concerning the American relationship with the British in the Far East: "Never did such a large country owe so little to a small country for doing nothing."

But, at least, American newsmen and American military observers have been permitted on British soil. That has never been the case with Russia. Even in the days of shuttle bombing, American airmen who flew from Italy to Russia and bombed the satellite bases in between, were virtual prisoners on the narrow airstrips upon which Stalin permitted them to land. American newsmen in Moscow are never out of sight of the Russian equivalent of the gestapo. One may count on the fingers of both hands the number of accredited American correspondents allowed in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany. Where Soviet puppet governments exist in unilaterally controlled territory, freedom of the press most certainly does not exist. In fact, in all instances, the Soviet Union has shown complete contempt for the mythical four freedoms to which Stalin once subscribed.

Reports of so-called food riots, thefts, obstructionism, and downright opposition to American control in Japan have a familiar ring. They are definitely in the Communist pattern of starting with petty annoyances and culminating in an incident. Nor, on the record of past performances, can it be expected that the Communists want only a partial control of Japan. In the words of the popular song, they want all, or nothing at all. And we know that they will not be satisfied with nothing at all. They have never sought modest control: they seek absolute control.

If Japan could be communized, it is as certain that China would soon follow into the insatiable maw of communism. Already, according to a November 24 dispatch from Frederick Kuh in London, British authorities are of the opinion that Russia has Manchuria in the bag. With the possibilities of expanding southward, the aspirations of Stalin to become a twentieth century Genghis Khan become apparent. By indoctrinating training and equipping the Asiatic hordes, Stalin could well be planning to overrun the world. It would take all our people, all our know-how, all our courage, all our scientific research in the field of the atomic bomb, and in other fields, to stave off this greatest of all man-masses.

We have no assurances of Soviet good faith in international affairs. Soviet arrogance wrecked the recent London Conference of Foreign Ministers. Soviet demands nearly brought an end to the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. Nor is it wise to forget that Soviet Russia showed no concern for the peoples of other European countries—except to absorb them—while Hitler was undertaking his earlier aggression. In fact, Stalin participated in the dismemberment of Poland in 1939. He did not fight for humanity or for the ideals of humanity. Stalin fought only when his own dictatorship, Russia, was attacked by his fellow dictator. Russians did not enter upon an offensive outside their own country until well into 1944.

A final factor must be taken in consideration before making any such irresponsible move as that of giving up the battle-won American control over Japan. By giving in to Soviet pressure and submitting to their demands that we give them a place of equality on a control commission, General MacArthur would lose face before the Japanese people, and any effort for him to exercise his authority would be met by passive disobedience. The authority of the United States as an administrative factor in Japan would be at an end. We would have lost all the ground we have gained in the Far East, both during the war and after the war—for, when a nation loses face before an oriental people that nation can never regain it.

Here is a clear-cut decision to be made. Will we forfeit the fruits of victory? Or will we retain them? Will we level our Pacific defenses? Or will we make those defenses stronger? The cleavage is even simpler than that: Which man is America to follow in its dealings with the Far East—Stalin or MacArthur? As for me, my decision is made. I stand for keeping the fruits of our victory. I urge the maintenance of the front line of American Pacific defenses in Japan itself. I choose MacArthur.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

JAMES F. SCANLON

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress, and especially the Committee on Appropriations, will lose the services of one of its most valuable employees when James F. Scanlon, administrative assistant to the Committee on Appropriations because of long and faithful service becomes eligible for retirement and will exercise that right.

Jim, or Uncle Jim, as he is affectionately known on Capitol Hill, came to Washington many years ago and was employed by the House of Representatives. By the time I became a Member of the Congress, Jim was almost as much a fixture of the Committee on Appropriations as the paintings on the walls and the famous chandeliers that hang from the ceilings of the committee room. And when I became a Member of the committee, I soon learned why he was so valuable.

Early in his service he realized that an important part of the history of this Nation would be written in the proceedings and policies of the Appropriations Committee; and proceeded to keep accurate records of hearings held by the committees and of the preservation of same. In addition to his normal functions he undertook this most difficult and important task of perfecting and preserving the records of the Committee on Appropriations in a manner seldom equaled. Today the records of this important committee are most complete and in demand as reference material, not only of current proceedings but of those of past Congresses which serve as an accurate portrayal of the policies that have been followed through some of the most hectic years of the Nation's existence. There is not a day passes that many of us do not have occasion to refer to records accurately prepared and preserved as a result of the foresight and industry of Jim Scanlon.

As the Committee on Appropriations grew in importance with the growth and progress of the Nation, Uncle Jim grew in stature. He always was competent, industrious, and courteous. His personality was always such that he secured cooperation. We found it a pleasure to work with him. His faults through the years, if he had any, have become virtues, and it is my sincerest wish that he may enjoy these virtues and the well-earned retirement for many, many years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations who has been closely associated with Jim Scanlon for more than a decade, I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania in expressing appreciation for the excellent services rendered by this faithful and efficient employee of the House who is about to retire. I have found him to be courteous and dependable at all times and under all circumstances. I am certain that the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that of every member of the Appropriations Committee. Jim Scanlon will be missed by every member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that I speak the sentiment of every member of our committee when I join in wishing Mr. Scanlon good health, happiness, and godspeed.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to read a statement by Herbert H. Lehman, Director General of UNRRA, in regard to an erroneous press report:

> It is unfortunate indeed that UNRRA, at this critical time, should have to defend itself against an erroneous press report from Europe which, it must be said in credit to the press association which carried it, was immediately corrected.

The original dispatch, for which there was no foundation in fact, said that UNRRA had "dismissed, suspended, or arrested more than 600 of its workers accused of diverting relief supplies into the black market." The dispatch said further that "a majority of the workers involved were Americans and Britons."

I have investigated the matter thoroughly. The facts are these:

General Morgan, chief of our operations in Germany, is now completing a reorganization. Over the last few months the services of 600 UNRRA workers have been terminated for various reasons, including incompetency, illness, lack of adaptability, and other causes. These workers were chiefly European nationals, employed on the scene of operations, and not Americans and Britons.

The unfortunate news dispatch, through some misunderstanding, linked this reorganization with the UNRRA announcement that one UNRRA worker of Czech nationality was imprisoned for theft and sale to the black market of coffee intended for displaced persons, and that 13 other workers were suspended as the result of an UNRRA investigation into charges of black-market operations.

For several months a tightening-up process in UNRRA operations has been under way. This has been done under my direction. UNRRA officials in this country have been in constant touch with every move. I have assured congressional committees that we have been replacing employees who have been found to be unsuitable with stronger personnel, now that the war is over and better-trained and more experienced workers are available to us.

In line with this policy, Lt. Gen. Sir Humfrey Gale, former administrative officer to General Eisenhower, has been appointed my personal representative in charge of the European regional office in London; and Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan, former deputy chief of staff under General Eisenhower, has been made director of the UNRRA displaced persons operation in Germany.

I wish to reiterate here a statement I have made many times, and which was also made by Lieutenant General Morgan from Herford, Germany:

"UNRRA officials are doing everything in their power to ferret out any incompetence and dishonesty in the ranks. The overwhelming majority of the UNRRA workers are honest, sincere, and loyal, and dedicated to the care of the displaced persons who are innocent victims of the war."

I believe that the steps we have been taking and are taking to weed out unsuitable personnel and to stamp out black-market operations and theft so far as possible are evidence of the increasing effectiveness of UNRRA operations.

AUTHORIZING POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ADJUST CERTAIN CLAIMS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4127, an act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 3, line 16, strike out "this limitation shall not apply" and insert "the limitation shall be 2 years as."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. BURCH. The Senate amendment simply limits the time in which they shall file claim to 2 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that the only change?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING POSTMASTERS IN ALASKA TO ADMINISTER OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 304, an act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 14 insert:

"Each certificate of oath, affirmation, or acknowledgment executed by a postmaster within the Territory of Alaska under the authority of this act shall be signed by the postmaster, with a designation of his title as such postmaster, shall have affixed thereto the cancellation stamp of the post office, and shall state the name of the post office and the date on which such oath or affirmation is administered or such acknowledgment is taken. Postmasters shall keep a memorandum of all deeds and other instruments of writing acknowledged before them and relating to the title to or transfer of property, which memorandum shall be transmitted to their successors in the office of postmaster and which shall be subject to public inspection."

With the following amendment:

Before the Senate amendment, insert the following: "And that section 2 of said act approved August 5, 1939, is amended to read as follows."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is pretty broad authority to bestow on a postmaster. Will the gentleman explain the reason for it?

Mr. BURCH. In Alaska, on account of the sparseness of the settlements and the people, it is very difficult to reach the proper officers in order to have acknowledgements made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This applies only to Alaska?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in with an amendment.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POST OFFICES SERVING MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 697 an act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, after "stations," insert "or at civilian plants devoted to war production."

Page 2, line 1, after "stations," insert "or civilian plants."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. BURCH. Under existing law, postal employees who are stationed at Army stations or any other Government stations of that kind away from their regular places of business are allowed a per diem of only $2.50 for maintenance. This increases the per diem to not to exceed $4.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has the approval of the Department and all the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a unanimous report of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. BURCH. It is a unanimous report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials by H. B. Snyder appearing in the Gary Post-Tribune, of Gary, Ind.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter and some newspaper clippings.

HOUSE PERIODICAL PRESS GALLERY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I

offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 438, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $2,700 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of a superintendent of the House Periodical Press Gallery, who shall be designated by the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This merely gives facilities to the House Periodical Press Gallery?

Mr. COCHRAN. They already have the facilities, but there is nobody up in the room to look after the place.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This just gives them what the other services have?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right, but not quite as much help.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is this only for weekly publications?

Mr. COCHRAN. Weekly and monthly publications. They are not in the press gallery upstairs; they have a private gallery.

Mr. STEFAN. This provides service for the weekly and monthly publications?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRIKES ON MOTOR TRANSPORTATION LINES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

THIS GANGSTERISM MUST GO!

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, tragedy struck out our way, the other day, and I take this time to speak of it because it concerns America.

Two men who were not members of a drivers' union on strike, attempting to move some perishable goods for the Buckingham Transportation Co. were set upon, beaten, kicked, and trampled by eight men, later identified by them as fellow employees of the company. Today the trucks of the company are moving under escort of the State patrol.

The Governor, M. Q. Sharpe, I understand, has said that there will be no violation of law like that permitted in South Dakota while he has a State patrol or guard at his command. But that is not the angle of the matter I wish to bring to your attention.

The point to which I call your attention is the fact that this gangster incident was apparently incited by the International Committee of the Drivers' Union in Chicago, which is technically and actually beyond the reach of South Dakota law.

The drivers in South Dakota did not go on strike when the Midwest strike began. On November 15 they were called upon by the international agent in Chicago to strike, although a vote on the matter had never been taken. Some 10 days later, on a demand by the company for a formal action on the matter, they did so vote.

Perishable goods had been forwarded to the Buckingham Co., which it attempted to move. While the two nonunion employees were in a lunch room getting coffee along the road at night, their truck was tampered with so that it would not start when they came out. As they stood on the fenders, raising the hood to check what was wrong, they were attacked by men coming from the dark side of the truck, held, beaten, knocked to the ground, and otherwise pummeled until nearly unconscious.

Whether the attackers were drunk I do not know, but, drunk or sober, their acts were not rational or normal. As identified by the victims, they had been respected, trusted, long-time employees of the company. People in the community who have written me about the incident say they do not believe these men proposed the attack and are at a loss to understand it, save by incitement of the international committee in Chicago which ordered the strike and which has done its best to inflame the men in this local a thousand miles away.

Now, it was a tragedy that the two men should have been beaten in this brutal way. One of them may have suffered a permanent injury to an eye. But it is an even greater tragedy for America, in my opinion, that eight normally rational and respected men should have been incited to such an inhuman piece of gangsterism. It has no place in America.

It is all very well to say, "We cannot control what men do." It is all very well to say, "We must not consider labor legislation now; we must give the President's management and employee conference a chance to work out a plan for voluntary arbitration of industrial disputes"; but I want to say without qualification that such action or lack of action will not and does not satisfy the rank and file of the American people.

Nor do I believe that the United States can leave to management and labor the answer to all questions involved in labor disputes. Sometimes one, and sometimes the other is at fault. Sometimes one, and sometimes the other, refuses to negotiate or arbitrate. There must be a court or tribunal to which either one can appeal.

And above and beyond that, Mr. Speaker, there must be a place where a third party, the public, can appeal, in all disputes involving health, safety, and a high degree of public welfare.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of the Congress to provide a labor tribunal to which either party can appeal in a contested interpretation of a labor contract, and to which the public can appeal in any work stoppage affecting public health or safety and high public interest.

There must be positive provisions of law to give such a court the strength and dignity necessary to permit it to do the needed job. It must have power to enforce contracts, to punish wildcat strikes on the one hand, or irresponsible lock-outs on the other.

I recognize that under the Constitution we cannot have involuntary servitude in America and we do not want it. But this Nation has gone a long way to set up social security for the workers and protection of property for the employers. Surely, the Nation has the power to stop or deny benefits which it has created when the conduct of the recipients is such as to jeopardize the ability of the Nation to continue them.

No work stoppage should be permitted, by whatever party proposed, which endangers the health and safety of the Nation or the lives of its citizens under penalty of forfeiture of the benefits which the Nation has established. And no work stoppage should be permitted in the field of public health and safety without due notice to the public and a submission of the issues at stake to a properly constituted tribunal.

Mr. Speaker, nothing less than this will satisfy the awakening conscience and indignation of the country. The Nation which has fought for peace abroad demands peace at home.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, amidst all of the bungling of food administration by the Federal Government throughout the war, none has been more confused than the administration-made chaotic conditions concerning sugar.

The rationing of meat and other commodities, finally lifted on November 23, 1945, should have been lifted months before. But sugar still remains a rationed food, and probably will remain on the rationing list for many months to come simply because those in authority who presume to be experts, mismanaged procurement of adequate sugar supplies. Even at this late date final agreement with Cuban producers, the principal source of our supply, has not been reached, although negotiations have been going on sporadically for five or more months, and the crop itself was planted last May and June.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee which, I am glad to point out, has been correct in its analysis of every phase of our food problems since its creation 2½ years ago, has made a very careful study of our potential 1946 sugar supply. In this study we have found that there will be a very substantial increase in the amount of sugar available for civilian use in 1946. If this unofficial committee, composed of Members of Congress, who have a vast number of other congressional duties to perform, can ascertain the facts in matters

of this kind, why is it that the governmental agencies directly responsible under the law to handle these problems, cannot or do not ascertain the facts, make decisions and promulgate the necessary regulations, allocations, and information so that the American people can know just what they are facing?

As I shall point out in a detailed analysis, there will be available for civilian domestic consumption in 1946 some 6,500,000 short tons of sugar, as compared with approximately 5,000,000 tons allocated in the year 1945. This means that a very substantial increase can be made in 1946 over the amounts allocated to civilian and commercial usage in 1945.

Industry is entitled to know and to be advised by the Government at the earliest possible moment so that it can plan accordingly. This has not been the practice of the administration during recent years. American industry has not survived and grown under the American system through utter stupidity and luck, but because it has been able to gage and plan its course. Those responsible in the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration should recognize this fact and stop their everlasting procrastination in reaching decisions or in making false promises. They should immediately make known to industry what the allocations will be for the first quarter of 1946 and certainly not later than December 1 or December 10.

The domestic sugar-beet and sugarcane crops that will be used for 1946 consumption are almost completely harvested. The harvest of the Cuban sugar crop, planted months ago, will begin about January 15, while the Puerto Rico crop, planted about the same time, will come to its harvest around the 1st of February. Industry and trade already knows what the probable harvest from these primary sources will be. The Department of Agriculture should act so that the industrial users and the civilian consumers of the country will know the facts and be able to plan.

One of the largest commercial users of sugar is the baking industry. In 1944 all commercial users were allocated 80 percent of their 1941 consumption. In 1945 the bakers were cut to 65 percent, and all others except pharmaceutical manufacturers were reduced to 50 percent of their 1941 consumption. The baking industry will have an increased demand for their products in 1946 with the return of many of our servicemen and women to civilian life, while military requirements of sugar will be decreased proportionately. Thus with increased supplies, it becomes more necessary that early announcement be made of the substantially increased allocations that are possible.

A few weeks ago a report came to this country that 1,600,000 short tons of sugar had been found in Java. According to the report we have received, this information was delivered to the Secretary of Agriculture late in the day and he immediately called in newspaper reporters without checking with his sugar experts or his own public relations office, to rush into print with the story that all of our sugar problems would be solved by this discovery. We are informed further that officials of the United States Army have made an investigation in Java, and they have found that there is raw sugar in Java equivalent to 1,400,000 tons, 1,000,000 tons of which is in bags and 400,000 tons of which is in bulk. This sugar is distributed in different parts of Java where civil war is going on. Some of it is at ports where lighters will have to be used to load it onto ships, if ships can be made available. Bags will have to be imported from India in which to place the bulk sugar. From the best information available, and notwithstanding the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, it would appear that not one single pound of that Javanese sugar will become available for American use in 1946. If it does become available, then the following carefully prepared estimate of sugar supplies should be increased by that amount.

The following table is a composite tabulation of information from at least three different sources within the sugar industry of availability of sugar in 1946:

Sugar supply, 1946

Stock:	*Short tons*
Carry-over, Dec. 31, 1945	900,000
Cuba	4,650,000
Puerto Rico	1,050,000
Hawaii	900,000
Domestic:	
Beet	1,500,000
Cane	550,000
Miscellaneous	50,000
Total	9,600,000
Less:	
Local consumption: Cuba and Puerto Rico	300,000
South America	150,000
United Kingdom and Canada	600,000
Total	1,050,000
Available to United States	8,550,000
Military requirements	350,000
Foreign relief	250,000
Total	600,000
Net available	7,950,000
Carry-over, Dec. 31, 1946	1,450,000
Net available to United States civilians in 1946	6,500,000

It will be noted in the foregoing table that in addition to eliminating any sugar from Java, it is contemplated that there will be no sugar available from the Philippine Islands; at least one trade source estimates that we may secure 150,000 tons from the Philippine Islands. If we do, it should be added to this table. It is also probable that the amount of sugar for foreign relief can be slightly reduced from the 250,000 tons stated in this table. There is a surplus of sugar in Czechoslovakia which can be used for relief purposes in Yugoslavia and Greece.

Just as the Office of Price Administration regulations were responsible for and created black markets in other commodities, the mismanagement of the problems related to sugar production and distribution are responsible for a kindred situation. At least two large companies, one preparing sirup for commercial users and the other a soft-drink beverage corporation, are reliably reported to have devised methods for evading the restrictions on sugar consumption made necessary by poor administration. One of these companies is reported to have leased four of the largest sugar mills in Louisiana, and is offering a sirup to commercial users at a price of $1.50 to $2 a gallon, which contains the equivalent of about 8 or 9 pounds of sugar. These mills will be able to process sugarcane equavalent to some 15,000 tons of refined sugar.

Mr. Speaker, by way of emphasis, I repeat, there is every indication that after making allowances of an increase of 500,000 or more tons of sugar for carry-over from one season to the other, there will be available for civilian domestic consumption at least 1,500,000 more tons than was available in 1945. The Secretary of Agriculture should take steps now to make allocations for the first quarter of 1946 for commercial use and home consumption substantially greater than were made for the first quarter of 1945. It is recognized that much of this sugar will not be available until the quarter is half over. But if the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration are more interested in the welfare of the American people than in the maintenance of governmental bureaucracy regimenting them into un-American patterns, the people will be promptly informed of sugar allotments for 1946, and industry will be able to plan accordingly.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says about the taking over of certain sugar factories in this country by certain industries. For instance, I had a rumor—it might be a rumor or it might not be—less than an hour ago to the effect there is some sort of order about to come out from Chester Bowles' office or some other office, which if it is announced will indicate that one of these great concerns is going to be given preference that no other concern of the kind in the country will be given. I hate to ask the gentleman about a rumor, but since he is the outstanding sugar man in the House I thought perhaps he might know something about it.

Mr. JONKMAN. I have heard such a rumor myself. We are trying to verify it at the present time, we are checking up and will probably have some information a little later.

DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1064) to authorize discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude.

PROVIDE FOR NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a committee report on House Joint Resolution 278, to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess until 3:45 p. m.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess until 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the so-called rescission bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if this conference report on the rescission bill can be made the first order of business on Monday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have previously announced that if the conference report on the so-called rescission bill is not acted on today, it will be the first order of business on Monday after the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if it will be possible to make this the first order of business on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the rescission bill may precede the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday.

The SPEAKER. It is not necessary to obtain unanimous consent for that. The Chair can recognize the gentleman to call up the conference report before the call of the Consent Calendar and will do so.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I shall ask recognition to call up the conference report immediately after the reading of the Journal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Admiral Denfeld regarding the moral situation in Tokyo.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution of inquiry requesting the Secretary of State to report to the House full information regarding the sabotage of our foreign policy in China and full information regarding the resignation of Gen. Patrick Hurley as ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, in case the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs does not call General Hurley, I have asked Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to allow our House Foreign Affairs Committee members to sit in on their Senate hearings on Wednesday.

Several days ago I asked on the House floor that the Speaker of the House invite General Hurley to appear before the Members to tell about conditions in China which led to his resignation. Congress, the press, and the people of the country should be given full information.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for Saturday and Monday, on account of official business.

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 3, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, December 4, 1945, in room 245, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

846. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, a copy of a bill passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

847. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

848. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Salvatore Carbone; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4857. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4769. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing compensation for the employment of a superintendent of the House Periodical Press Gallery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4844. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of the alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area; with amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BELL: Committee on Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 278. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 4867. A bill to authorize the establishment of an additional coinage mint of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4868. A bill to increase the salary of the President to $100,000 per annum, to exempt such salary from Federal income taxes, and to increase the President's expense

allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4869. A bill relating to acquisition of rights-of-way for levee construction on the north bank of the Arkansas River from Pine Bluff, Ark., to the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con Res. 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Revenue Act of 1945", as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 439. Resolution requesting the Federal Security Administrator to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the drugs known as barbiturates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 440. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the drugs known as barbiturates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 441. Resolution creating a select committee to study the feasibility of establishing and operating floating, world-traveling universities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 442. Resolution to provide for expenses for the investigation authorized by H. Res. 441; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 443. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to give information regarding the resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley and the sabotage of our foreign policy in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1361. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the National Headquarters, Twenty-ninth Division Association, Inc., endorsing and recommending universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1362. By Mr. COFFEE: Petition of Joseph Sweat and 40,000 other citizens, for the passage of House Resolution 100 which is urging on behalf of the United States House of Representatives a diplomatic break with Franco (Fascist) Spain, and extension of lend-lease to the guerrilla armies of the Spanish Republic underground; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1363. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the ministers of the Beaver Federated Churches of Beaver, Pa., opposing compulsory peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1364. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Board of Aldermen of the City of Newport, in opposition to the merger of the Army and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of our pilgrim years, the day returns and brings us the round of its concerns and duties. As in Thy sight we serve in posts of high public office, make us solemnly conscious that our thoughts, our attitudes, our words, and our acts are not our own but go out from this Chamber, set as a light on a hill, to influence and to mold the whole structure of human relationships around the world. Help us in all things to be masters of ourselves that we may be the servants of others.

In these times of tension and strain, preserve us from minding and magnifying little slights and stings, or giving them. Keep us calm in temper, clear walk humbly with Thee our God. In gratitude, meanness, or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable us, we pray Thee, to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 30, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On November 30, 1945:

S. 1459. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

On December 3, 1945:

S. 1097. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 1215. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost in the disaster to the steamship *Maasdam* on June 26, 1941; and

S. 1494. An act to exempt Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 304) to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 697) relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 694) to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary of the Senate has received the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 3, 1945.*

LESLIE BIFFLE,
Secretary, United States Senate,
United States Capitol:

Am in Chicago attending Cooperative Milk Convention. Please request Senator MCKELLAR to have me excused for next 3 days.

ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator, Oklahoma.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and he is excused.

GREETING TO THE QUIZ KIDS

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Idaho for a purpose which the Chair thinks the Senator from Texas will approve?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will always yield upon any suggestion from the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have always prided myself that I endeavor to be a good sport at all times and love even my enemies and give them due credit. Last night the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and myself had a joust with the Quiz Kids, and they defeated us. Nevertheless, in the bigness of my heart, I want to call attention to the fact that the Quiz Kids are in the gallery at this moment, and I will ask them to rise so that we may see those who are smarter than at least one Senator.

(The Quiz Kids rose from their seats in the gallery.)

IMPLEMENTATION OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—PLEA FOR EXPEDITION OF CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 1580

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the pending amendment has been before the Senate for a number of days. The necessity for passing the bill now under consideration is imperative. The preparatory commission of the United Nations Organization is now in session in London, preparing for the meeting of the Assembly of the Organization in January. All over the globe there are many disturbing questions in the international field. Because of the importance and urgency of this matter, I am very hopeful that we may make some progress along the line of voting upon the pending amendment.

The Senator from Texas has no disposition to prevent fair and full discussion, but the pending amendment has been discussed by its author for about 3 days, and I think that every Senator who wants to understand it has had an opportunity to do so. The attendance has been meager, I will admit, but that is not the fault of the Members who are in charge of the bill. They cannot compel Senators to be present, and if present they cannot compel them to listen, and if they do listen they cannot be compelled legislatively to react.

Mr. President, this plea is addressed to both sides of the aisle; it is addressed to Senators for the bill and those who are against the bill. I beg that there be no manifestation of obstructive tactics, simply for delay, for road blocking in the way of the advancing forces who favor the early implementation of this organization.

It is not having a good effect on foreign countries for it to appear that the United States is hesitating, stopping, and worrying about whether it will enter this Organization or not. We are supposed to be at least one of the great leaders in this movement for international peace and harmony and the settlement of disputes and the adjusting of difficulties through peaceful means. So I make a sincere appeal to all Senators to let us proceed with all due haste—not necessarily haste, but all due progress, because we want to understand these matters. The amendments to the bill have been on the desks of Senators for many days, and I think that they are not so complicated or abstruse but they are readily understandable by all Members of the Senate. I appeal to Senators not to indulge in the temptation of delay and obstruction, but that we proceed to vote on the amendments which are pending.

CITATIONS TO FIRST LT. JAMES H. WILSON AND SECOND LT. GEORGE A. WILSON

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, for some time I have been attempting to obtain the record of two citations which I desired to call to the attention of the Senate. I have received them only this morning.

My colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], along with many other Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, has children in the armed forces. My colleague has three very fine boys in the service, whom I have known for many years, who have distinguished themselves in the service of their country in Europe in this war, especially in the invasion of Germany and the military activities there. Two of these boys have received citations, and I should like to read into the RECORD the citations of these two lads. The first is a citation of First Lieutenant—now Captain—James H. Wilson, and it read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, XII CORPS,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY GENERAL ORDER

An Air Medal is awarded to James H. Wilson, O1183796, first lieutenant, Field Artillery, Four Hundred and Tenth Field Artillery Group, who, while serving with the Army of the United States, distinguished himself by meritorious achievement while participating in aerial flight over France during the period September 15 to October 13, 1944. While serving as air observer, Lieutenant Wilson distinguished himself by outstanding service in flying 42 sorties near or over enemy lines for the purpose of conducting fire missions against enemy installations. The meritorious achievement of Lieutenant Wilson in the outstanding performance of his missions during the period mentioned measurably contributed to the success of the operations.

I may say that in the cold language of this citation the description is not quite adequate. Lieutenant Wilson, now captain, flew in a cub scouting plane at low altitude, and flew 42 missions in less than 32 days, as I recall the number. Three of the reconnaissance planes were shot down, and he contributed very greatly to the success of our arms at that time in the sector where he was active.

The second citation is of one of the other sons of my colleague. It is a citation in connection with the award of a Bronze Star Medal to Second Lt. George A. Wilson, and reads as follows:

EIGHTY-THIRD INFANTRY DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL.

CITATION AWARD OF BRONZE STAR MEDAL

Second Lt. George A. Wilson, O1019378, Infantry (AF), Seven Hundred and Thirty-sixth Tank Battalion, United States Army:

For distinguishing himself by heroic achievement in connection with military operations against an enemy of the United States on April 14, 1945, in Germany. In the Harz Mountains, just south of Wernigerode, four infantrymen were pinned down in a ditch by enemy small arms, machine gun, and Panzerfaust fire. They signaled Lieutenant Wilson, who, upon seeing their plight, went forward in his tank through a hail of small arms, machine gun, and Panzerfaust fire, and covered the four men in distress with fire from the tank until it was possible for them to move into such a position whereby they could defend themselves. Lieutenant Wilson's heroic devotion to duty and his disregard for his own personal safety brings the highest credit upon himself and the military service. Entered military service from Iowa.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE, TOGETHER WITH MINORITY VIEWS, SUBMITTED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of November 30, 1945,

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 326) to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation, submitted on December 1, 1945, an interim report (No. 805) thereon.

Mr. BILBO (for Mr. BAILEY) submitted on December 1, 1945, views of the minority of the Committee on Commerce on the bill (S. 326) to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation, which were ordered to be printed as part II of Report No. 805.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS RELATING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION FOR THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions relating to an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ORDINANCE PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of municipal council bill No. 54, an ordinance to impose certain excise taxes in the municipality of St. Croix, and for other purposes, passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Library.

FINANCIAL RECORD OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY INDUSTRY

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Commission's newly issued report entitled "The Finance Record of the Electric Utility Industry" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON LICENSURE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, RELATING TO HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT

A letter from the President of the Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the activities of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred, as indicated:

The petition of Robert Edward Edmondson, of Grass Valley, Calif., praying redress of his grievances, succor, and relief (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Gary, Ind., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Several petitions of citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation requesting the President and

Secretary of State to devote their efforts to the restoration of a free Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED IRRIGATION PROJECT IN NEBRASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriation reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Grand Island (Nebr.) Rotary Club, at its regular weekly meeting at Grand Island, Nebr., on Monday, November 12, 1945, relating to a proposed irrigation project in the central part of the State of Nebraska.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Grand Island and its entire trade territory is fundamentally and principally an agricultural area and particularly adapted to irrigation and the specialized farming most advantageously conducted under irrigation on account of the type of soil and terrain; and

Whereas the Mid-State Public Power and Irrigation District has been created and organized, having determined that there is a large acreage within its borders located in Buffalo, Hall, and Merrick Counties, it being determined by the plans and specifications of said district that this acreage may be provided with irrigation by constructing said irrigation district which will result in specialized farming, providing an increase in agricultural products for this area and the State of Nebraska, providing increased wealth for the entire State of Nebraska, providing employment both in the construction of the project and in the business of farming, as well as related businesses and industries; and

Whereas the construction of this facility would afford recreation facilities and wildlife conservation, both of which are greatly needed in this area and in which the peoples of this area are vitally interested; and

Whereas the construction of the district will provide increased power for this area in particular and the entire State in general, adding to the wealth of the State directly and indirectly and the inducement to business and industrial development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grand Island Rotary Club endorse the Mid-State Public Power and Irrigation District and request the counsel, advice, and assistance of the Honorable Dwight Griswold, Governor of the State of Nebraska, the Nebraska Legislature, the Nebraska Congressmen, and the Nebraska Senators, and urge that they use their efforts and influence in assisting the Mid-State Public Power and Irrigation District in securing approval of the project, financing for its construction and the ultimate completion of said project. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight Griswold, Governor of the State of Nebraska, the Nebraska State Legislature, the Congressmen from Nebraska, and the Senators from Nebraska.

GRAND ISLAND ROTARY CLUB,
HERBERT F. MAYER,
President.

Attest:

R. L. WOLCOTT,
Secretary.

PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Emory Lindquist, secretary, Kansas Council of Church-Related Colleges, Lindsborg, Kans., together with resolutions adopted by members of the Kansas Council of the Church-Related Colleges, at Winfield, Kans., on October 27, 1945, in which they protest against the enactment of peacetime compulsory military training. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and resolutions, and that they be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHANY COLLEGE,
Lindsborg, Kans., November 27, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As secretary of the Kansas Council of Church-Related Colleges, I am transmitting to you at this time a series of resolutions by this group. These statements represent the best judgment of the members on compulsory military training in peacetime with regard to comprehensive issues associated with national defense and American leadership in the world community.

The opposition to compulsory military training in peacetime is based upon the factors listed which seem worthy of serious consideration.

We shall appreciate the attention which you may give to these resolutions on this vital subject.

Sincerely yours,
EMORY LINDQUIST,
Secretary, Kansas Council of Church-Related Colleges.

Be it resolved by the members of the Kansas Council of Church-Related Colleges, assembled in regular session at Winfield, Kans., on this 27th day of October 1945, as follows:

That we, the presidents of the church-related colleges of the State of Kansas express ourselves as unequivocally opposed to the proposition of compulsory military training in time of peace in the United States of America, as undemocratic, un-American, wasteful of manpower, and all but prohibitive from the standpoint of expense. What we need is intelligent and sympathetic understanding that makes for good will. We must bridge the gap between our moral lag and our scientific and technological advance. Fears and hatreds must be disarmed before there is peace and this is not done by competitive armaments which anticipate war even among our allies; but it therefore further

Resolved:

1. That we petition the Congress to declare the war officially at an end as of September 2, 1945, as we believe it is vastly more important for the future security of our country to play fair with the men and women who enlisted for the duration plus 6 months than it is to guard against some unforeseen immediate need of national defense by keeping men and women in the armed forces against their will and their definite understanding as to contract.

2. That we express ourselves as favorable to the maintenance of adequate or reasonable forces of international police and national defense on a voluntary basis but that the methods of such training be thoroughly revised and brought into conformity with the demands for defense in our modern world.

3. That we favor the proposal of Representative JOSEPH MARTIN for international abolition of conscription in peacetime and that adequate provision be made for the promotion of that objective among the nations.

4. That we favor immediate and continued consideration by Congress of plans for instituting increased constructive measures of peaceful cooperation with other nations through the Department of State and the decreasing as rapidly as possible of provision for and expense involved in our present methods of preparation for war; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Senate and the House Committees on Military Affairs, to the two Senators and the various Representatives from the State of Kansas.

ANDREW B. MARTIN,
President (President of Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.)
EMORY LINDQUIST,
Secretary (President of Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kans.)
W. W. PETERS,
Committee Member (President of McPherson College, McPherson, Kans.)
NELSON P. HORN,
Committee Member (President of Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.)

TRIBUTE TO BERNARD M. BARUCH—LETTER FROM ROLLAND E. FRIEDMAN, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Rolland E. Friedman, of Indianapolis, Ind., paying a well-deserved tribute to Bernard M. Baruch, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *November 26, 1945.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Few if any men in the history of our country have been and are respected and held in such reverence as is Bernard M. Baruch. When, we the people, need reassurance, encouragement, and the facts, he is called upon to do the job, and, in his answer, we take heart—for we believe him as we do no other man.

His great service to this country is immeasurable and without thought of personal reward.

I have talked to thousands of people in all walks of life and almost to the man—Democrat and Republican alike—they feel his great work should be rewarded with the highest decoration it is in the power of our country to give him. Don't you?

There is nothing personal in this for I do not even know Mr. Baruch.

Yours very truly,
ROLLAND E. FRIEDMAN.

TRANSCRIPTS OF GENERAL MOTORS AND UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS-CIO AT NEGOTIATING MEETING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to inform the members of the Senate that the verbatim transcripts of the negotiating meeting of General Motors Corp. and the United Automobile Workers-CIO have been filed with the Senate Education and Labor Committee and are available for inspection in the committee room in the Capitol.

This is the record which is being studied by a group of distinguished leaders of American opinion at a conference being held in Detroit, December 4 and 5. It is made available to the Members of the Senate and House as part of the open-door policy followed by the union in its wage negotiations with the General Motors Corp.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a brief letter from Walter P. Reuther, vice president and director of the General Motors department, UAW-CIO, transmitting the verbatim transcript of the negotiations and certain related documents.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW-CIO),
Washington, D. C., December 3, 1945.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Education and Labor Committee,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Transmitted herewith is a set of the verbatim transcripts of General Motors Corp.-UAW-CIO negotiating meetings from October 19 through November 26, together with certain related documents listed below.

Since August 18 the union has sought to follow an open-door policy in our wage negotiations with General Motors. Pursuant thereto, we have asked a group of distinguished citizens to meet in Detroit December 4 and 5 to examine the verbatim record of our attempts to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the wage dispute on the basis of the arithmetic of the case.

Some of those invited have replied that they were unable to come, but suggested that the transcript be made available in Washington. We hope you will put these documents on file in the office of your committee, where they may be inspected by Members of the Senate and House and also correspondents and commentators interested in the case.

Because of the cost, we can make only one transcript available at this time.

The documents transmitted:

Transcript of meeting of October 19.
Transcript of meeting of October 23 (a. m.).
Transcript of meeting of October 23 (p. m.).
Transcript of meeting of October 24.
Transcript of meeting of October 26.
Transcript of meeting of November 7.
Transcript of meeting of November 9.
Transcript of meeting of November 16.
Economic brief, Purchasing Power for Prosperity, presented by UAW-CIO, October 19–26.
General Motors reply brief, November 7.
UAW-CIO First Supplemental Brief, November 9.
General Motors Second Reply, November 15.
UAW-CIO Second Supplemental Brief, November 17.
The Calendar of General Motors Refusal to Bargain Collectively in Good Faith, November 19.
UAW-CIO Proposal of Arbitration, November 19.
UAW-CIO Statement Announcing Strike in General Motors Plants, November 20.
General Motors Rejection of Arbitration, November 23.
UAW-CIO Statement Commenting on General Motors Refusals, November 24.

Your cooperation in promoting the widest possible understanding of the issues in the pending wage dispute between our union and the General Motors Corporation will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER P. REUTHER,
Vice President,
Director, General Motors Department.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 806) thereon.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of November 1945 from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia government	$3,970

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

NOVEMBER 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Comdr. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	317 Lynn Drive, Chevy Chase, Md	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$3,000
Lt. Comdr. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2745 29th St. NW, Washington, D. C	do	3,150
Lt. W. R. Borsdorff, U. S. Naval Reserve.	1630 Rhode Island Ave. NW, Washington, D. C	do	2,520
Loretto F. Jochman, yeoman second class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	3445 Oakwood Terrace, NW, Washington, D. C	do	1,152
Eleanor W. St. Clair, yeoman second class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	1,152
J. Huxman, seaman first class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	WAVE Quarters D, Washington, D. C	do	742
C. Wilson, seaman first class, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	742

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matters.

DAVID I. WALSH.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

NOVEMEER 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (T), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Rd., Trenton, N. J.	do	1,739
Yeoman (1st cl.) John M. Flannery, U. S. Naval Reserve.	17 Livingston St., Binghamton, N. Y.	do	1,436

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

DECEMEER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	$4,300
Charles Bragman	Arlington Village Apartments, Arlington, Va.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	6,440
Betty Brimberg	5331 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Farm Security Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture	2,100
Olive F. Caldbeck	237 Mississippi Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,329
Groff Conklin	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	U. S. Public Health Service	6,230
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	4,600
Patricia Daines	2000 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	2,100
Richard P. Daniels	1743 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	1,704
Marion L. Dillon	3659 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	4,309
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,090
Bernard Leroy	Persimmon Tree Rd., Bethesda, Md.	do	7,509
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	7,175
Joseph McMurray	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, 14th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	5,180
Love Morgan	1607 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	2,650
Dolores Raschella	3028 Wisconsin Ave. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Authority, 1201 Connecticut Ave. NW.	2,320
Milton Rossoff	2712 29th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Labor, Department of Agriculture	4,509
Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2007 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	
Capt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Rd. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Department, Pentagon Bldg.	

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY,
November 29, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 318, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Surplus Property Subcommittee (S. Res. 129) of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and adddress of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Surplus Property Subcommittee.

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$7,240
Mabel Graham	1474 Columbia Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,329
Hilda Hamilton	705 18th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	2,890

SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

NOVEMBER 30, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944 (see attached memorandum):

Memorandum to Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

From Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Chairman of the Subcommittee Investigating the Administration and Use of Public Lands.

The following persons are detailed from the Department of Agriculture to assist with the work of the above-mentioned subcommittee:

E. S. Haskell, senior administrative officer, Forest Service, CAF-2; basic salary, $5,000 per annum.

Elizabeth Heckman, clerk, CAF-5; basic salary, $2,000 per annum.

CARL A. HATCH, *Chairman,*
By W. H. MCMAINS, *Clerk.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1637. A bill for the relief of Herbert C. Rockwell; and

S. 1638. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Carbone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1639. A bill to amend the Transportation Act of 1940 so as to establish a National Air Policy Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1640. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. MOORE introduced the following bills, which were referred as indicated, and appear under a separate heading:)

S. 1641. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 1642. A bill to provide for the election of labor-organization officials and for other purposes; and

S. 1643. A bill declaring certain contracts and practices relating to employment unlawful, prescribing penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1644. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1645. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1646. A bill to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing law against unlawful restraints and monop-

olies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; and

S. 1647. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (relating to the granting of injunctions in cases involving labor disputes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1648. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1649. A bill to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS:

S. 1650. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1651. A bill to authorize the establishment of an additional coinage mint of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1652. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing ethnological researches on the American Indians," approved April 10, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

PROPOSED LABOR POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a series of eight bills to effectuate what I believe to be a wholesome and reasonable labor policy of the United States. In my opinion, the proposed legislation will place industry and labor on equal terms for the purposes of collective bargaining, the settlement of labor-management disputes, bring about more harmonious labor-industry relations, reduce strikes, and work stoppages, promote production, speed reconversion to a peacetime economy, and minimize our fast developing inflationary trend.

The proposed bills and amendments are as follows:

First. An amendment to the National Labor Relations Act to require collective bargaining to be conducted by the proper employee unit in each plant, shop, or other establishment, but in no case larger than the employee group of any separate plant, shop, or other establishment, in order that the employees directly affected may negotiate with respect to their own wages, hours, and working conditions. Industry-wide bargaining develops monopoly and disregards local conditions or the desires and benefits of local groups. The amendment would require the courts to weight the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the findings of fact of the Board and would deny the benefits of the act to any labor organization striking or threatening to strike in violation of its contract, and further provides that nothing in the act shall prohibit the prosecution of any cause of action in any court of competent jurisdiction for the recovery of damages by any person injured as a result of strikes or other violation of a labor contract.

Second. An amendment to the anti-racketeering law of June 18, 1935, to provide that unions, labor organizations, or any official or member thereof, shall be subject to the same restraints against interference with trade and commerce by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation as any other person or individual.

Third. An amendment of the Social Security Act providing for the withholding of unemployment compensation to which Federal contributions have been made in any case where the employee is unemployed as a result of a strike, unless such unemployment is the direct and unavoidable result of the strike and such unemployed person is not a member of the labor organization engaged in a strike and the employer shall certify such fact to the State agency administering the unemployment compensation.

Fourth. An amendment to section 6 of the Clayton Act to make labor organizations, their officers, representatives, or members subject to the same antitrust laws as other corporations and individuals.

Fifth. An amendment to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 to make political committees or other organizations affiliated directly or indirectly with any labor organization subject to the provisions of the act.

Sixth. A bill to repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act, thus restoring to the courts equity jurisdiction to grant injunctions in aid of equitable relief in labor disputes.

Seventh. A bill to require labor organizations to conduct annual elections of their officers and bargaining representatives and to conduct annual audits of their financial affairs and make the same public.

Eighth. A bill declaring it unlawful for management and labor to enter into contracts providing for a closed shop or a union shop, or providing for the check-off of union dues or assessments, unless pursuant to the separately given consent in writing of each employee affected. This bill is in line with a long-standing labor policy of the United States as reflected in the various railway labor acts.

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. MOORE were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as follows:

S. 1641. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act;

S. 1642. A bill to provide for the election of labor organization officials, and for other purposes; and

S. 1643. A bill declaring certain contracts and practices relating to employment unlawful, prescribing penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1644. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1645. A bill to amend subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1646. A bill to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing law against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; and

S. 1647. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932 (relating to the granting of injunctions in cases involving labor disputes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1648. A bill to amend the Federal Corcupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. WHERRY to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, viz: On page 2, line 2, after "1947", insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing that such country shall supply to accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement and in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country for the purpose of obtaining information as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished such country."

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

Mr. MITCHELL submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MITCHELL to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, viz: Under the heading "Department of the Interior" and after all other matters under such heading insert the following:

"BUREAU OF MINES

"Construction and equipment of a Pacific Northwest electrochemical laboratory: To cover the construction and equipment of an electrochemical laboratory in the Pacific Northwest to study and conduct research in the application of electrical energy to the production and processing of chemicals, and to develop new processes for the use of electrical energy in the production and processing of chemicals in such region with a view to the more complete utilization of the natural resources of such region, for the fiscal year 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs; professional and scientific books and publications; traveling expenses; purchase of land; construction and equipment of a building or buildings to house the electrochemical laboratory; engagement by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of architects or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building or buildings; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept lands, buildings, or other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this laboratory."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MITCHELL to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, viz: Under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation, reclamation fund, special fund" and after the matter reading "Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, $1,650,000," insert the following:

"Kennewick division, Washington, $1,000,000;

"Greater Wenatchee pumping project, Washington, $1,400,000";

Under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation, reclamation fund, special fund", strike out the matter reading "Total, from the reclamation fund, $20,442,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Total, from the reclamation fund, $22,842,000."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ ON RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL INTOLERANCE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a conference called by the Chicago Council Against Religious and Racial Intolerance, at Chicago, Ill., on December 1, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COST ABSORPTION POLICY—LETTERS OF JAMES G. PATTON AND CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters addressed to him respectively by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; and Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, relative to the policy of cost absorption at manufacturer and distributive levels, which appear in the Appendix.]

STOPPAGE OF WORK ON SHIPS TO BE USED FOR DEMOBILIZATION

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Have the Ships—Speed our GI's Home," delivered by Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, on Tuesday, November 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE BY THE NAVY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Annapolis Shadow," from the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

COURTS-MARTIAL REVIEW—EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Courts-Martial Review," from the San Francisco Chronicle of November 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO TRIALS IN GERMANY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS PRESS-SCIMITAR

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Trials in Germany," published in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 1, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DESTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY ON PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator from North Dakota withhold the suggestion for a moment? The Senator from Montana was on his feet, and I should like to yield to him.

Mr. LANGER. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a very eminent physician of my own city, Virginia City, Mont., writes me a letter and encloses a newspaper clipping which is headed, "Yanks wrecking equipment, Australian radio says."

I may say that this is a United Press story. The article reads:

YANKS WRECKING EQUIPMENT, AUSTRALIAN RADIO SAYS

SAN FRANCISCO, November 26.—The United States Army is burning and destroying $3,250,000 worth of equipment, including canned foods, radios, medical equipment, and typewriters, in the Finschhaven area of New Guinea, and similar destruction is taking place on islands north of Australia, Melbourne radio reported Monday.

Quoting a correspondent of the Melbourne Herald, the broadcast said that "American Army men are burning and bulldozing in the earth everything they cannot sell or get rid of on the spot."

Melbourne said that radio transmitters, receivers, jeep motors, generators, hospital gear, vehicles, and typewriters are being tossed into the sea or plowed underground. "Huge quantities" of food also are being destroyed, said a broadcast, heard by United Press.

"Appalled by the thoroughness with which Americans are carrying out the order (to destroy), Australians have been intercepting full trucks and persuading drivers to transfer loads to them," Melbourne said. "Many drivers equally keen to avoid wanton waste are handing over tinned turkeys and vegetables and other delicacies.

"Australians too are getting rich hauls from salvage dumps awaiting disposal by fire or bulldozer."

Mr. President, I received also another clipping on this subject, from another gentleman. The doctor who enclosed the clipping writes me:

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am enclosing a clipping from the Montana Standard of November 27, 1945. My wife heard the same thing over the radio a few days ago and if the conditions are true it makes my heart sick. My war taxes are hard enough to pay as I haven't been benefitted by any war work, etc. If the Army can't bring the stuff home give it to someone who can use it but don't destroy food equipment, etc., just for some fool reason. It doesn't make me feel like buying bonds or trying to pay taxes either. I know it isn't your fault, but I want to protest this asinine waste.

Mr. President, I have received reports of destruction of food and other materials by the Army, not only on this occasion, in this particular place, but in other places. We hear talk about voting money for UNRRA to feed the starving people of Europe and of Asia and other places, and I am in favor of that. I think we must do it, and do it just as soon as possible. However, I would much prefer that it be distributed by the United States alone, so that the United States may get the credit of the good will that comes from it, rather than to turn it over to an organization.

How can we ask people to approve our voting money for these things, however, when the Army is destroying food which should go to the starving people of the Orient? How can we approve appropriations and bond issues when the Army is destroying supplies, dumping them in the ocean, or plowing them under? It is one of the most outrageous and sinful things I have heard of in a long time, and if the report be true, the practice should be stopped, and should be stopped immediately.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me inquire if the Senator from Montana asked the War Department whether this report is true or not?

Mr. WHEELER. I have not asked the War Department whether it is true. I have been reading from a United Press dispatch. I said "if it be true." I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Senator think the War Department is entitled to an opportunity to deny or confirm it before it is given out with the sanction of the word of a United States Senator

as prominent and distinguished as the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WHEELER. I am not any more prominent or distinguished than the Senator from Texas. The United Press has sent this report all over the world. What I am saying is that if it is true, the practice should be stopped.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that. The Senator read a letter, the writer of which was impressed by the United Press report. I am not criticizing the United Press, but the press services are subject to check up, just as is everyone else. Now, the Senator seemingly approves the report. I do not mean he has done so in so many words, but to many untutored minds it will occur that "Senator WHEELER on the floor of the Senate charged this."

I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and have no brief for the War Department, but it occurs to me that before this charge is so widely publicized, Secretary Patterson, for instance, should have an opportunity of saying it is not true or that it is true. If it be true, then the Senator certainly has a jumping off place for his attack.

Mr. WHEELER. I presume I should have consulted the Senator before I made my statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. WHEELER. I probably should have consulted the Senator before I made the statement; but I am reading an article from the United Press, not only an article that was sent to Montana for the daily newspapers, but it was quoted in San Francisco, and was quoted by the United Press all over the world. It was sent out on November 26, and if the War Department wanted an opportunity to deny it, they have had the opportunity, and so far as I know it has not been denied, and it was published several days ago. If it is not true, then they should deny it. Not only in this particular instance have these reports been sent to me, but I have received them on a number of other occasions. As I have said, if the reports are true, they indicate an outrageous, asinine, and sinful policy.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, with reference to the matter brought up by the Senator from Montana, I wish to call attention to dispatches last week from Europe to the effect that approximately 600 employees of UNRRA had been discharged for peddling supplies in the black market. I have never seen that report denied by the UNRRA organization, and there was nothing indicating that these persons were to be prosecuted. I think we should have some information about the matter. If these employees were merely discharged without prosecution for dealing in the black market while on the pay roll of UNRRA, it seems to me the UNRRA should give us some explanation of it.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know anything about the particular statement the Senator has referred to, but if it be true that employees are selling supplies in the black market, of course they should be prosecuted and sent to the penitentiary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to reassure the Senator from Montana that the Senator from Texas is not arrogating to himself any authority with regard to this matter, so that the sneer of the Senator that he should have consulted the Senator from Texas was wholly beside the point. I do not regard it as necessary for the Senator from Montana to consult me about any matter, because he does not do so. If he did, and followed the consultation, matters might be different in the Senate Chamber. I merely desire to let the Senator know that I was not indifferent or impervious to his rather venomous thrust at the Senator from Texas.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas thinks that there was any venomous thrust at him, I will withdraw the statement, because it was not intended in that way at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF SICK AND HUNGRY PEOPLE IN EUROPE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SHIPSTEAD

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement on the question of European relief which I broadcast from Station WINX on November 18, during a discussion of the question of relief. This is a part of the broadcast.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

According to the latest dispatches from Europe to the New York Times, "Europe faces one of its bleakest winters since the chaos of the Thirty Years' War. More than 20,000,000 homeless and desperate persons are now milling east and west, north and south across the continent.

"Germans, Poles, and Czechs pour into the devastated Reich to escape the slavery of the Russians in the occupied section of Germany. Hungarians trudge into the Pannonian plain. Hundreds and hundreds of thousands of former Nazi slaves crowd into freight cars and trucks and rusty ships on uncertain voyages to their uneasy homes. The Apocalyptic Horsemen are once again trampling Europe whose vital energies alone have saved it time and again from their deadly hoof-prints."

Tuberculosis is rife, the very young and the very old especially are beginning to die as the autumn leaves fall. From other undisputed sources, too numerous to quote, we learn from ten to twelve million or more people are expected to die from hunger, disease, and cold unless sufficient food, clothing, and fuel are furnished and honestly distributed. The terrible situation is aggravated by widespread black-market transactions in the most needed necessities of life. Starvation is reported to be widespread in Greece because of hunger and inflation. Ideological and racial conflicts have started in Africa, the Near, Middle, and Far East. Apparently these are fostered by some of the great powers.

According to the New York Times "the freedom for which so many nations fought is far from evident. Dictatorship succeeds dictatorship. In great areas faith has disappeared but nothing new arises to fill the vacuum." This is in small part the systematic and realistic diagnosis of the economic and political disease spreading amongst the hungry, sick, desperate, and disillusioned human beings throughout Europe and Asia.

What can we do? Winter will soon be upon Europe. It seems to me every resource and energy, public and private, must be adequately financed, quickly, efficiently and honestly, I said honestly collected, and honestly distributed without political discrimination to the sick and hungry people. We must bring food, medicine, clothing, so far as lies in our power, in the hope that whatever relief we can give may serve as a quarantine against the spread of these calamities, otherwise the entire Europe and Asia may be engulfed in a revolutionary convulsion that may spread throughout the world.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hart	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Butler	Knowland	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Donnell	Magnuson	Wagner
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Gossett	Murray	Young
Green	O'Daniel	
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SETTLEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

All who think seriously about the problem of reconversion—of changing our economy from war to peace—realize that the transition is a difficult and dangerous task. There are some who would have the Government during the reconversion period continue telling our citizens what to do, as was so often necessary when the very life of our Nation was at stake during the period of world conflict.

That, however, is not the policy of the Government. The policy is to remove wartime controls as rapidly as possible and to return the free management of business to those concerned with it.

It was for the express purpose of getting away as soon as possible from some of the wartime powers and controls that the recent National Labor-Management Conference was called in Washington. Instead of retaining in the Federal Government the power over wages and labor agreements and industrial relations which a global war had made necessary, the top leaders of management and labor were invited to recommend a program under which labor relations would be turned back into the hands of those involved.

It was decided that full responsibility for reaching agreement on such a program would be left with the representatives of labor and management. Accordingly the conference was made up of leaders of labor and management only. Government representatives participated only as observers, without vote. The agenda and the entire program were worked out by the leaders themselves.

In opening the conference I said:

> I want to make it clear that this is your conference—a management-labor conference—and not a Government conference. You have not been chosen by me or by any Government official. You have been selected by the leading labor and industrial organizations in the United States. There has been no interference by government in that selection. * * *
>
> The time has come for labor and management to handle their own affairs in the traditional American, democratic way. I hope that I can give up the President's wartime powers as soon as possible, so that management and labor can again have the full and undivided responsibility for providing the production that we must have to safeguard our domestic economy and our leadership in international affairs.

I am sure that it was the hope of the American people that out of this conference would come some recommendation for insuring industrial peace where collective bargaining and conciliation have broken down.

The conference is now closed. The very fact that the top leaders of labor and management have met and worked together for more than 3 weeks is itself some progress.

Some agreements on a few general principles were also reached. For example, agreement on the principles of collective bargaining, and recommendations on the detailed procedure to be used; agreement on strengthening and enlarging governmental conciliation services; recognition of the necessity of eliminating discrimination in employment; agreement on settling by voluntary arbitration grievances under labor contracts and disputes concerning their interpretation—these are all valuable.

But on the all-important question of how to avoid work stoppages when these expedients have failed the conference arrived at no accord. Failing in that, the conference was unable to attain the objective most necessary to successful reconversion.

If industrial strife continues, the quick reconversion which has been planned, and which is now proceeding on schedule or even ahead of schedule on many fronts, will fail. In that event, we shall face a period of low production, low consumption, and widespread unemployment, instead of the high production, high employment, good markets, and good wages that are within our grasp.

The history of labor relations has proven that nearly all labor disputes can and should be settled by sincere and honest collective bargaining. The vast majority of those disputes which are not adjusted by collective bargaining are settled through Government conciliation. For example, during the month of October last, 354 strikes were settled by the Conciliation Service, and 1,282 labor controversies were adjusted before any work stoppages occurred.

The American people commend the many instances where management and labor have settled their problems peacefully. Many of these were in critical industries where work stoppages would have gained great prominence in the newspapers and over our radios. But when industrial disputes were settled little notice was taken of them by press or radio.

We know, however, that there are always some disputes that cannot be settled this way.

Industrial strife in some key industries means not only loss of a great amount of wages and purchasing power; but it may have ramifications throughout the country affecting the whole reconversion process. In such industries, when labor and management cannot compose their differences, the public through the Federad Government has a duty to speak and to act. In the last analysis, labor, management, and the public have the same interest.

The reconversion effort is now going well. The people have a right to expect it to succeed. Specific obstacles that stand in its way must not be allowed to defeat that expectation.

Good labor relations are just as important now as they were during the war. They should be based on justice, and not on tests of strength. Any industrial dispute which depends for settlement upon the respective strength of the parties results in loss to everyone; it causes loss of wages to the worker and his family, loss of dividends to the stockholders and owners of the industry, loss of goods to the public.

I regret that labor and management have not been able to agree on machinery that would provide a solution for existing strikes in some of the major industries and for the strikes which are threatened. Strikes already in effect may possibly cripple our reconversion program. Negotiations have broken down in other industries, and stoppages are threatened.

The American people have been patient. They have waited long in the hope that those leaders in labor and management whose business it was to handle this problem would be able to do so in agreement. The Federal Government declined time and again to make any suggestions to the conference as to proper machinery. All that the Government did was to point out the objective which the American people expected it to attain.

Now that the conference has adjourned without any recommendation on the subject, it becomes the duty of the Government to act on its own initiative. Therefore, I now sugggest to the Congress that well-reasoned and workable legislation be passed at the earliest possible moment to provide adequate means for settling industrial disputes and avoiding industrial strife.

I recommend that for the settlement of industrial disputes in important Nation-wide industries there be adopted the principles underlying the Railway Labor Act. The general pattern of that act is not applicable to small industries or to small local disputes in large industries. But it would be effective, as well as fair, in such widespread industries, for example, as steel, automobile, aviation, mining, oil, utilities, and communications. I do not intend to make this list exclusive. Nor do I think that local inconsequential strikes even within these industries should be included. The objective should be to cover by legislation only such stoppages of work as the Secretary of Labor would certify to the President as vitally affecting the national public interest.

In industrial disputes in such industries, where collective bargaining has broken down, and where the Conciliation Service of the Federal Government has been unable to bring the parties to agreement, and where the Secretary of Labor has been unable to induce the parties voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration, I recommend the following procedure:

Upon certification by the Secretary of Labor to the effect that a dispute continues despite his efforts, and that a stoppage of work in the affected industry would vitally affect the public interest, the President, or his duly authorized agent, should be empowered to appoint, within 5 days thereafter, a fact-finding board similar to the emergency board provided for under the Railway Labor Act.

I recommend that during these 5 days after the Secretary of Labor has made the above certificate it be unlawful to call a strike or lock-out, or to make any change in rates of pay, hours, or working conditions, or in the established practices in effect prior to the time the dispute arose.

The Board should be composed of three or more outstanding citizens and should be directed to make a thorough investigation of all the facts which it deems relevant in the controversy. In its investigation it should have full power to subpena individuals and records and should be authorized to call upon any Government agency for information or assistance. It should make its report within 20 days, unless the date is extended by agreement of the parties with the approval of the President. The report should include a finding of the facts and such recommendations as the Board deems appropriate.

While the Fact Finding Board is deliberating and for 5 days thereafter, it should be made unlawful to call a strike or lock-out, or to make any change in rates of pay, hours, working conditions, or established practices, except by agreement.

The parties would not be legally bound to accept the findings or follow the recommendations of the Fact Finding Board, but the general public would know all the facts. The result, I am sure, would be that in most cases both sides would accept the recommendations, as they have in most of the railway labor disputes.

I believe that the procedure should be used sparingly and only when the national public interest requires it.

The legislation should pay particular attention to the needs of seasonal industries so that the so-called cooling-off periods can be arranged in those industries in a manner which will not subject labor to an undue disadvantage.

There are other subjects which were on the agenda of the Labor-Management Conference on which no agreement was reached. The most immediate, the most pressing, however, is this one of machinery. I hope that the Congress will act upon this matter as quickly as possible—and certainly before its Christmas recess.

In order to avoid any delay in the settlement of the most important existing strikes, I am appointing such a fact-finding board for the present stoppage in the dispute between General Motors Corp. and the United Automobile Workers. While this board will not have the statutory powers which I hope the Congress will soon authorize, I am sure that the American people will expect the employer and the employees to cooperate with the board as fully as if appropriate legislation had already been passed.

In the meantime, I am asking both parties to the dispute to display the same kind of patriotism as they displayed during the war. I am asking all the workers to return to work immediately, and I am asking the employers to proceed energetically with full production. I make this appeal on behalf of the American people to their fellow citizens who are now responsible for this major obstacle holding up our reconversion program.

In connection with the threatened strike involving the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steel Workers, I am appointing a similar board. The public will expect full cooperation with the board by both sides. I am making the same appeal to the United Steel Workers to remain at work pending the report of the Board's findings and recommendations.

I hope that the Congress will approve the steps which I am now taking. They are being taken in the interest of accelerating our production, promoting our reconversion program, and pushing forward to a higher standard of living.

This is an immediate program which is fair to both sides. I hope that the Congress, naturally disappointed at the failure of labor and management to agree upon a solution for the prevention of industrial disputes, will not adopt repressive or coercive measures against either side. A free American labor and a free American private enterprise are essential to our free democratic system. Legislation which would stifle full freedom of collective bargaining on either side would be a backward step which the American people would not tolerate.

I am sure that the Congress will give its calm and careful consideration to this matter so essential to the progress of American life.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 3, 1945.*

THE MIDWESTERN TRUCK STRIKE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to comment for myself, personally, that I think the President's message calling on the Congress to enact legislation dealing with the field of labor disputes and the prevention of stoppages of production is the most hopeful word I have heard on this particular front for a long time, and I hope we can proceed expeditiously to consider legislation to carry out the President's recommendations.

A group of Senators from seven Midwest States had a beautiful example this morning of the need for such legislation. Since November 15 there has been an over-the-road truck strike in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. We have appealed to the Department of Labor and to the President to try to get the strikers back to work and to arrange some kind of settlement, but our attempt has been unsuccessful. The Secretary of Labor tried to get the employers and the teamsters' union first to agree to the appointment of a fact-finding commission; and when the union would not agree to that, he tried to get them to meet together in Chicago. The union would not even attend a meeting.

Finally this group of 14 Senators, particularly those from the affected States, on Friday afternoon sent identical telegrams to the head of the truck operators and also to Dan Tobin, president of the International Teamsters Union, inviting them to a hearing this morning in a committee room in the Senate Office Building, so that the public at least would know what the strike is about. Unfortunately, the teamsters' union did not even consider it worth while to have a representative appear at the meeting. A representative of the operators was there. His testimony was that the strike was called on November 15 without even any pretense of collective bargaining on the part of the union.

The union has negotiated a contract for over-the-road drivers with what is called the Central States Trucking Association, covering 13 States, dominated by the States east of the Mississippi, where conditions are vastly different from those in the Western States. The trucks in the East average 25 miles an hour, whereas the trucks in our section of the country average 35 miles an hour in over-the-road operation. In the Western States the legal loads permitted by the States are much less. These seven States have been fighting since 1938 to obtain in their contracts some differentiation based on their differences in operating costs. Over-the-road truckers are paid on a mileage basis, and naturally in our States they cover much more mileage than is the case in the Eastern States.

Nevertheless, the union negotiated this contract with the Central States Trucking Association, without having the operators from the Midwest even sit in the conference. Then they turned that contract over to them, and said, "You sign it, or else." The operators repeatedly tried to obtain a meeting with the union but they were turned down every time.

Five thousand truck drivers are on strike, and in turn their strike has tied up shipments and has thrown approximately 60,000 persons out of work. So far the union has refused even to meet with the employers. In the case to which I have just referred, the union has refused to accept the invitation of 14 Senators from the seven States to sit down with us and tell us what are the issues in the case.

So I think one of the recommendations of the Management-Labor Conference, namely, pledging their adherence to the principle of collective bargaining, also needs implementation by legislation. Today there is an obligation in law for the employer to bargain collectively, but no such obligation in law rests on the representatives of employees, and all to often today, as in the case I have just been discussing, the union makes no pretense even to bargain collectively.

Mr. REED and Mr. McCARRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. I had promised to yield to the Senator from Nevada, but if the Senator from Kansas wishes to speak briefly on the matter just referred to, I yield to him at this time, if that meets with the approval of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Minnesota has said. This morning the Senators from the seven States which the Senator from Minnesota has named met and discussed the entire strike tie-up which the Senator from Minnesota has described. It is most important in the Prairie States, because in many cases branch-line railroad lines have been discontinued and the rails removed, and in

States where that has occurred there are hundreds of communities which depend entirely upon truck transportation for their daily business.

It is a coincidence that at the conference which was held this morning we decided to request the President of the United States to appoint a fact-finding body, because a strike which spreads over seven States and paralyzes business in hundreds of communities is certainly of sufficient public interest and importance to warrant the taking of such action. We were fully aware that under the present law the President has no authority to appoint fact-finding bodies except in the case of disputes occurring under the Railway Labor Act. So it is a timely thing that the President has sent to the Congress the message which was read a moment ago, and I certainly hope the Congress will move promptly to enact legislation along the line of that mentioned by the President.

I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator from Nevada will consent to my doing so, I yield briefly to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word in connection with the matter now under discussion. It was shown conclusively that the situation to which reference has been made is a critical one in the Midwestern States. It has gone so far that freight previously handled by trucks is now being diverted to the railroads in such quantities that they cannot handle it. That makes the situation critical even for towns which have railroad connections. Of course, there are many towns without railroad connections. The railroads have had to place embargoes on freight. Many communities are not receiving any in-shipments or making any out-shipments of any kind, and there is a complete tie-up of transportation.

Therefore, I urgently request that this trucking strike be handled by the President, just as he has stated he would handle the strike in the case of General Motors and in the case of other industries, as reported in his message which we have received this morning. I urgently request that the President and the Secretary of Labor take notice of the truck strike and appoint a fact-finding board for the Midwest truck-operating territory.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join with the other Senators who have made statements relative to the truck strike situation in the Midwestern States. My State of Nebraska is, of course, one of the States involved. I did not know that the President's message which was read just a few moments ago was coming to the Senate today, and I imagine other Senators were not aware of it. I feel that the suggestion of the appointment of a fact-finding committee is a very hopeful sign.

I should like to bring an additional thought to the attention of all Senators from the Middle West, namely, that in some of the States, for example, Nebraska, during the war the rails and ties on many branch-line railroads have been taken up, and many communities have come to depend completely upon truck transportation.

It has now been nearly 10 days since at least one of the parties to the truck strike has refused to enter into a contract under the collective bargaining theory or even to negotiate one. This morning there was held the meeting to which reference has been made. The unions did not even send a representative there to discuss whether they would negotiate. So I think the President's suggestion is a wholesome one and is in line with the suggestion made at the meeting of the midwestern Senators.

In this connection, I feel it should be stated that today more than 200 towns are not being served by rail transportation but are entirely dependent upon truck transportation for the hauling of the food they need. Regardless of whether a fact-finding committee is appointed, it seems to me the Government should step in and see that the freight is hauled, irrespective of whether the parties to the truck strike get together, because it is becoming impossible for communities which depend primarily upon truck transportation to obtain food and other necessities of life.

I hope remedial legislation will be enacted; but in the meantime something must be done to get food to the communities in the Midwestern States which depend primarily upon trucks for the transportation of their food.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as one of the Senators who participated in the meeting which was held this morning, I wish to say, in view of the fact that 14 Senators had invited representatives of the unions to appear at the meeting and present their case, that I thought it was very ill-advised on their part, to say the least, for them not to appear.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say that I concur heartily in what other midwestern Senators have said today respecting the tension resulting from the truck strike in the Middle West. The midwestern Senators and Members of the House from that area have been vitally interested in this matter for a good many weeks, have held meetings, and have attempted to bring about a solution of the arbitrary and unwarranted situation that exists. I am very much encouraged by the message which the President sent to Congress today. I hope it will bear some fruit in bringing order out of the inexcusable chaos which apparently exists in certain sections of the country in the industrial field.

Mr. DONNELL subsequently said: Mr. President, before entering upon a discussion of my amendment which is now pending, and action upon which is the pending order of business, I desire to state very briefly my entire concurrence with the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and by other Senators today with respect to the message from the President of the United States, and also with respect to the situation in which the Midwestern States find themselves due to the existing strike on the part of workers for common carriers.

I take it that the President has very properly recognized the fact that there exists not merely the interest of the parties themselves but also the predominant interest of the public. Particularly, Mr. President, is this true in the matter of common carriers. It is true of common carriers of trade and merchandise. It is true of common carriers of individuals. The public, in my opinion, has the right to require that the work of common carriers shall not be interfered with by those who will refuse to negotiate the questions at issue.

So, Mr. President, without taking more time, I desire to emphasize what has been said as to the importance and urgency of the situation existing in the Midwestern States and to express the very earnest hope that negotiations may be very readily entered upon with respect to a solution of the pending problem.

CREATION OF ALL-AMERICAN FLAG LINE IN INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on three previous occasions I have brought to the attention of the Senate proposed legislation having as its purpose the creation of the All-American Flag Line as a community company to represent the United States in the field of international air transportation.

The first occasion was on March 20, 1944, during the Seventy-eighth Congress, when I introduced a bill which was given the number S. 1790. Title 5 of that bill contained the provisions respecting the All-American Flag Line. The remainder of the bill was concerned with reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and reconstitution of a separate Air Safety Board.

On May 25, 1944, in order to present the All-American Flag Line bill as a separate issue, I reintroduced title 5 of S. 1790 as a separate bill, which was given the number S. 1950. At the same time I reintroduced the remainder of Senate bill 1790 under the number S. 1949.

Shortly after the beginning of the present session of the Congress, or on January 15, 1945, I again introduced the All-American Flag Line bill, and it was given the number S. 326. I also reintroduced my bill for reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and it received the number S. 1 in the present Congress.

Senate bill 326, the All-American Flag Line bill, was the subject of lengthy hearings before the Senate Committee on Commerce. Subsequent to those hearings, the bill came to a vote in committee. On the occasion of that vote, the committee divided evenly, 10 to 10, for and against reporting the bill favorably to the Senate. Accordingly, Senate bill 326 is still pending before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

When I shall have concluded my remarks today I shall send to the desk for appropriate reference a new bill to create an All-American Flag Line to represent the United States in the field of international air transportation.

I say a new bill, because the amendment to Senate bill 326, in the nature of a substitute, which I now propose to submit, has been completely redrafted. I think this proposed substitute is in many ways better legislation than the present language of Senate bill 326.

I do not wish to convey the impression that this proposed substitute retreats in any way from the principle embodied in S. 326, and in my earlier bills to establish the All-American Flag Line. That is not true. This proposed substitute for S. 326 will create a federally chartered private corporation, to be known as the All-American Flag Line. It will effect a pooling of all the resources of the air transport industry of this country, to forge a new agency able to make the commerce of the United States first in the air all over the world.

Like the present language of S. 326, this proposed substitute will put back of the All-American Flag Line not only the full strength of the unity of all factions of the air-transport industry of the United States which are concerned with foreign air transportation, but also all available facilities of the Government of the United States, to enable it to carry out the purpose for which it is being created. While the policy of the proposed substitute is the same as the policy embodied in the present language of S. 326, the approach is considerably different. Also, the mechanics of the proposed substitute are different, and are set forth much more fully than in the text of S. 326, as originally introduced.

I do not propose at this time to argue the question of what should be the policy of the United States with regard to international air transportation. My views on that question have been fully recorded, and everything I have said in that connection with respect to S. 326 and my earlier bills on the same subject, is equally applicable to the bill I am now about to introduce. I believe the Members of the Senate know my deep conviction that the policy embodied in this bill is the only policy which will preserve to this country its present leadership in world aviation.

I know that certain Senators who have shared my views in that respect have nevertheless been dubious about supporting the bill S. 326 in the form in which I first introduced it, because they were not satisfied with its detailed provisions. I sincerely hope that all my colleagues will take the time to read and study the proposed substitute which I shall introduce today.

I do not intend to analyze this substitute bill in detail at this time. I think the proper time and place for such an analysis will be at the opening of hearings on the proposed substitute. However, I do desire to outline the provisions of this new measure in a general way, so that Senators may understand what I have attempted to do.

In redrafting this bill I had before me the hearings on S. 326, and the many statements, both official and unofficial, and both public and private, concerning that legislation, which had been made to me or to the committee, or which had come to my attention in the public press.

I had three major objectives in connection with the redraft of S. 326. One of these objectives was to make adequate provision for bringing railroads and steamship lines into the picture. The second objective was to devise and to write into specific language, a method for setting up the All-American Flag Line which would be fair to all concerned, which would be certain in the attainment of its purpose, yet which would allow sufficient flexibility to be entirely workable. The third objective was to take account of all existing statutes bearing upon the subject of international air transportation, or which otherwise might be affected by the provisions of this bill, and to provide for necessary amendments, so as to do a complete and workmanlike job, with no loose ends.

I believe all three of those major objectives have been accomplished in this proposed substitute. I do not pretend to claim that this new draft is perfect, but I am convinced it is a much better vehicle for the policy of creating an All-American Flag Line than was the original draft of S. 326.

Briefly, this proposed substitute directs the Civil Aeronautics Board to initiate preliminary studies and investigations, and to enter into subsequent negotiations, looking toward the creation of an All-American Flag Line; and, upon completion of such studies, investigations, and negotiations, to approve or prescribe a plan for the formation of the All-American Flag Line; and finally, to formulate and prepare a charter for the All-American Flag Line.

The new draft authorizes and invites United States air carriers, holding certificates for international air transportation, to submit to the Civil Aeronautics Board their own plans for creation of a community company. It provides for full public hearings on such plans, and it authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board to exercise a free hand in approving or disapproving the plans so submitted, in combining or altering such plans, or in finally formulating its own plan.

The new bill requires that the plan which is finally approved shall provide for acquisition by the All-American Flag Line of all the assets of all international air carriers on the date the plan goes into effect, and all real estate and ground equipment, owned by domestic air carriers, which is located outside the continental United States and used in international air transportation on the date the plan becomes effective, together with any stock, notes, or other securities or evidence of indebtedness of any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics in a foreign country, which are owned by any United States air carrier or any person controlling such an air carrier.

This new bill provides that the All-American Flag Line shall have three special series of common stock, to be known as carrier shares, each series of carrier shares to constitute 20 percent of the proposed initial common-stock capitalization of the Flag Line. These three series of carrier shares are to be made available by subscription, respectively, to: First, all domestic air carriers; second, all class I carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, exclusive of terminal and switching companies, and carriers not citizens of the United States; and third, to common carriers by water in foreign commerce, or in commerce between the continental United States and a Territory or possession of the United States.

The new bill, which, as I have said, I propose to offer as a substitute for S. 326, provides that securities or stocks of the All-American Flag Line shall be issued only with the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and that such stock or securities shall not be acquired or held by any common carrier by air, rail, or water, or by any person controlling or controlled by any such carrier, without the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is specifically provided that no such stock or securities shall be owned or held by any citizen or subject of any foreign government. The maximum amount of common stock of the All-American Flag Line which any one person, partnership, association, or corporation is authorized to buy, or own or control, directly or indirectly, is limited to 2 percent of the total amount of such common stock issued and outstanding.

I shall not go into detail at this time concerning further technical provisions of this measure. It contains provisions substantially similar in form to those found in the original draft of S. 326, placing the full weight of the Government of the United States behind the All-American Flag Line. It contains provisions requiring the All-American Flag Line to make any reasonable extension of its service required by the public convenience and necessity, or for the maintenance of cooperative relationships between the United States and any foreign country, or for the performance of any treaty obligation of the United States, or otherwise to further national policy. It contains provisions for fixing reasonable rates, fares and charges for foreign air transportation. It contains provisions requiring the All-American Flag Line to enter into traffic arrangements with domestic carriers, both for the purpose of assuring the domestic carriers fair and equitable treatment with respect to the routing of through traffic, and for the purpose of enabling the All-American Flag Line to compete effectively with foreign companies through utilizing the selling offices and organizations of the domestic carriers.

The proposed amendment contains a provision that in time of war, the United States Government may take over the possession, or may direct the operation, of the properties of the All-American Flag Line, during the war emergency, under fair terms and conditions.

One other provision of the proposed amendment will be of great interest to many Senators. This provision requires that the plan finally approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, for creation of the All-American Flag Line, shall assure the continued employment of all citizens

of the United States employed in international air transportation by United States air carriers, and the reemployment of any citizens formerly so employed, who left their jobs to enter the armed services of the United States. The measure also provides that for a period of 5 years after the end of the war, any United States citizen who was engaged during the war in the operation of transport aircraft of the military or naval forces, either as a member of those forces or as an employee of a contractor, shall have a preferential employment status with the All-American Flag Line for any position for which he is qualified. This provision applies to both flight personnel and ground personnel.

Mr. President, in my remarks I have not given a detailed analysis of this proposed amendment. I have only hit the high spots. Let me say again that I hope every Senator will take the time to read this bill and to study it. This is one of the most important subjects before the Congress today. It deserves the careful attention of all of us.

I have stated I did not propose at this time to argue the question of what should be the policy of the United States with regard to international air transportation. I do not believe it is unduly argumentative to say that developments in recent months have clearly indicated the truth of the prediction and the warning which I have reiterated time and again in this chamber and in committee. I refer to the prediction and the warning that if this Nation relies upon a number of competing air carriers to carry the American flag in international air commerce, foreign nations will play those carriers one against the other to the ultimate detriment not only of our American flag carriers but of the national interest of the United States. If we persist in such a policy, we shall find ourselves in a very short time either squarely behind the "eight-ball" of international power politics, or unwilling participants in a "shotgun wedding" with foreign cartels.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that this amendment may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks; and I now send the amendment to the desk for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN to the bill (S. 326) to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation, was received, referred to the Committee on Commerce, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCARRAN to the bill (S. 326) to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Congress hereby declares that the national interest of the United States requires preservation of its present leadership in the field of air commerce and air transportation, as essential alike to the maintenance of its position in the family of nations, to its national security, and to its avowed mission of peace, friendship, and commerce with all governments and with all peoples; and that this objective can best be achieved by and through complete coordination and integration of the international air transportation of the United States, under private ownership and management but with careful regulation and close supervision by the appropriate Government agency. The Congress further declares that the interests of the commerce of the United States, the national defense, and the postal service require that, for the purpose of avoiding destructive rivalries between American companies abroad and of presenting a united American front against the competition of foreign countries, the international air transportation of the United States should be consolidated into a single community company to be formed under a plan approved or prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board and which shall operate as a public utility in the national interest under regulation by the Board.

"DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this title, unless the context otherwise requires—

"(1) The term 'consolidation or merger' includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease or in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities or otherwise.

"(2) The term 'domestic air carrier' means any United States air carrier, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from common carrier business is derived from domestic air transportation.

"(3) The term 'international air carrier' means any United States air carrier, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from common carrier business is derived from international air transportation.

"(4) The term 'consolidated carrier' means an international air carrier which acquires or operates properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger pursuant to this act.

"(5) The term 'domestic air transportation' means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce, between points within the continental United States, between a point in the continental United States and a point in Canada or in Mexico, between points within the same Territory or possessions of the United States, or between a point in Puerto Rico and a point in the Virgin Islands.

"(6) The term 'international air transportation' means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce, between any point in the continental United States and any point outside the continental United States (except a point in Canada or in Mexico), or between any point in any Territory or possession of the United States and any point outside such Territory or possession (except between a point in Puerto Rico and a point in the Virgin Islands).

"(7) The term 'continental United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia.

"(8) The term 'Board' means the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"BOARD TO PREPARE AND FILE COMMUNITY COMPANY CHARTER

"SEC. 3. The Civil Aeronautics Board (hereinafter called the Board) is authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward, as expeditiously as possible, preliminary studies and investigations and subsequent negotiations looking toward formation of a community company in accordance with the provisions of section 4; to approve or prescribe a plan for the formation of such community company; to formulate and prepare a charter for such community company, to be known as and styled the All-American Flag Line; and to file such charter with the Secretary of State.

"PLANS FOR CONSOLIDATION OR MERGER

"SEC. 4. (a) In the performance of its duties under section 3 the Board may arrange such conferences and hold such hearings as it deems necessary. Within 3 months from the date of enactment of this section or such longer period, not exceeding 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, as the Board may determine, one or more international air carriers may file with the Board a proposed plan for the formation of a community company by consolidation or merger, or otherwise. Upon the filing of any such plan the Board shall transmit to the President a copy thereof, and shall order a public hearing to be held with respect thereto, and shall give reasonable notice of such hearing in writing and an opportunity to be heard to any person whose properties are affected by the said plan and to such other persons as the Board may deem advisable. At the discretion of the Board joint hearings may be had on all such plans so filed and upon any such plan tentatively proposed by the Board, a copy of which shall have been transmitted to the President, and notice of which shall have been given as aforesaid. If no such plan is filed by an international air carrier within the period above specified, the Board shall as soon as practicable thereafter issue a proposed plan for formation of a community company by consolidation or merger or otherwise, and shall transmit a copy thereof to the President, and shall order a public hearing to be held with respect thereto, and shall give reasonable notice of such hearing and an opportunity to be heard as foresaid.

"(b) Any proposed plan filed by one or more international air carriers or proposed or issued by the Board under subsection (a) of this section for the formation of a community company by consolidation or merger shall include the following provisions and may include such other provisions as shall be appropriate:

"(1) A statement of the properties to be acquired by the consolidated carrier which is to constitute the community company. Among the properties to be so acquired there shall be included:

"(i) All of the assets, or all of the outstanding stock, of all international air carriers existing on the effective date of the plan;

"(ii) All real property and ground equipment owned by domestic air carriers which is located outside the continental United States and is used by such air carriers in international air transportation on the effective date of the plan; and

"(iii) Any stock, notes, or other securities or evidences of indebtedness of any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics in a foreign country, which are owned by any United States air carrier or person controlling or controlled by such an air carrier on the effective date of the plan, except that the plan need not provide for the acquisition by the consolidated carrier of any such stock, notes, or other securities or evidences of indebtedness acquired by an air carrier or person controlling or controlled by an air carrier after October 25, 1945.

"(2) A statement of the terms and conditions of such acquisition.

"(3) A statement as to the proposed initial capitalization of the community company.

"(4) The form of charter of the community company and the form of bylaws of the community company.

"(5) Provisions for the offer for subscription, in such proportions within each class

as may be fair and equitable, respectively (a) to all domestic air carriers, (b) to all class I carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act (other than terminal and switching companies and carriers which are not citizens of the United States as defined in this act), and (c) to all citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water in foreign commerce or in commerce between the continental United States and a Territory or possession of the United States, as defined in the Shipping Act, 1916, of three special series of common stock (hereinafter referred to as "carrier shares") of the community company. Each of said series of carrier shares to be so offered shall constitute 20 percent of the proposed initial common-stock capitalization of the community company. The plan shall contain appropriate restrictions as to the transferability of carrier shares and provision for representation of the holders of each of the special series of carrier shares upon the board of directors of the community company: *Provided*, That the total number of directors provided to represent each of said special series of carrier shares shall approximate the proportionate amount of common stock of the community company represented by such series.

"(6) Fair and equitable provisions to assure the continued employment of all citizens of the United States who are employed by international air carriers, or who are employed by domestic air carriers engaged in international air transportation and whose duties have related primarily to such transportation, and the reemployment of employees of the same categories who since August 27, 1940, have left their positions for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, which provisions shall confer benefits at least as extensive as those provided in respect of the consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers by subsection (f) of section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the act of March 6, 1943, and which shall apply to all flight personnel of the character above described without regard to the restriction imposed by subdivision (11) of said subsection (f).

"(7) An agreement that for a period of 2 years after the effective date of this act, any citizen of the United States who has been engaged at any time since December 7, 1941, in the operation of transport aircraft of the military or naval forces of the United States outside the continental United States, whether as a member of said military or naval forces or as an employee of a contractor for said military or naval forces, and whether as a flight employee or as a ground employee, shall have a preferential hiring and employment status over any other person for any position for which he is qualified by training and experience, subject only to the obligations of the community company, as set forth in subparagraph (6).

"(8) An agreement that the community company will assume and perform the terms and conditions of any and all collective bargaining agreements in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and working conditions which shall be in effect as an obligation of any international air carrier at the time the Board, pursuant to section 3 and subsection (c) of section 4, approves or prescribes a plan for the formation of the community company.

"(9) An agreement that if any individual or organization shall have been certified by the National Mediation Board, prior to the time the Board approves or prescribes a plan for the formation of the community company, as the representative of any craft or class of employees of an international carrier, and if such certification shall still be in effect at such time, the community company will recognize and treat with such individual or organization as the representative of such employees until such time as another representative for such employees is certified by the National Mediation Board.

"(10) An agreement that the community company will make any reasonable extension of its services which the Board, on the recommendation of the policy committee referred to in section 9 and with the approval of the President, shall find to be required by the public convenience and necessity or for the maintenance of cooperative relationships between the United States and any foreign country or for the performance of any treaty obligation of the United States or otherwise to further national policy, and as to which the Board shall find that the expense involved will not impair the ability of the community company to perform its duty to the public under its existing certificate or certificates: *Provided*, That the community company shall be entitled to reasonable compensation for the services it is so required to perform.

"(11) An agreement that the rates, fares, and charges of the community company for foreign air transportation shall not be higher than reasonable maximum rates, fares, or charges, nor lower than reasonable minimum rates, fares, or charges, which may be determined by the Board.

"(12) An agreement that the community company will enter into traffic arrangements with domestic carriers, in such form or forms as may be approved or prescribed by the Board, in order to assure to domestic carriers fair and equitable treatment with respect to the routing of through traffic between points outside the continental United States served by the community company and points within the continental United States served by more than one domestic carrier, and, and also to enable the community company to compete effectively with foreign companies which have a preferential position with domestic connections in their respective countries, by utilizing the selling offices and organizations of the domestic carriers or otherwise.

"(13) An agreement that the community company will enter into agency agreements with citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water, in such form or forms as may be approved or prescribed by the Board for the solicitation by such water carriers through their selling offices and organizations abroad of air traffic for the community company.

"(14) An agreement that, in time of war, the United States, acting by such agency or agencies as the President may determine, may take over the possession or may direct the operation of the properties of the community company during such emergency, under such terms nad conditions as will afford just compensation to the commmunity company.

"(c) After the hearing provided for in subsection (a), the Board shall issue a report and order in which it shall prescribe or approve a plan (which may be different from any plan proposed) for the formation of a community company, upon finding that such plan will in its opinion meet the requirements of subsection (b) of this section, is fair and equitable, and will be compatible with the public interest. Such order shall become effective 60 days after the date of its issuance except that the Board may, upon petition for good cause shown, filed within 60 days of such date, stay the effectiveness of such order and may thereafter (upon further hearings if the Board shall deem necessary) modify such order by issuing a supplemental report and order. In the event of such modification such order, as modified, shall become effective on the date of such modification.

"EFFECT OF PRESCRIPTION OR APPROVAL OF PLAN

"SEC. 5. (a) Upon the prescription or approval of a plan by the Board, any law or laws which would otherwise make unlawful any transaction provided for in such plan carrier participating in or resulting from any shall not apply with respect thereto, and any transaction provided for in such plan shall have full power to carry such transaction into effect without securing approval otherwise than as specified in this section.

"(b) The plan prescribed or approved by the Board shall be carried out by the parties thereto within such reasonable period as the Board may determine.

"(c) If the plan prescribed or approved by the Board is not carried out within the period fixed by the Board, as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Board may apply to a court, as provided in section 1007 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to enforce compliance with such plan. In any such proceeding the court, as a court of equity, may to such extent as it deems necessary for purposes of enforcing compliance with such plan take exclusive jurisdiction and possession of the company or companies or the assets thereof which are subject to such plan, wherever located, and the court shall have jurisdiction in any such proceeding to appoint a trustee, and the court may constitute and appoint the Board as sole trustee to hold or administer under the direction of the court the assets so possessed. In any such proceeding the trustee shall dispose of such assets in accordance with the plan approved by the Board.

"(d) The provisions of section 5 of title I of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of any securities provided to be initially issued in the plan prescribed or approved by the Board, which securities and transactions shall for the purposes of such Securities Act be treated as if they were specifically mentioned in sections 3 and 4 of such Securities Act.

"(e) The provisions of sections 1801 and 1802 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to the issuance, transfer, or exchange of securities of the community company or the making or delivery of conveyances in connection with the acquisitions by the community company of the property, stock, or assets provided for in the plan prescribed or approved by the Board.

"AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 112 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss upon certain exchanges) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(11) Gain or loss not recognized on consolidation or merger of international air carriers: No gain or loss shall be recognized if property of a corporation is transferred in pursuance of a plan of consolidation or merger prescribed or approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under the All-American Flag Line Act of 1945, to another corporation organized or made use of to effectuate such a plan of consolidation or merger, in exchange solely for stock or securities in such other corporation.'

"(b) Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(m) Exchanges by security holders in connection with consolidation or merger of international air carriers: No gain or loss shall be recognized upon an exchange consisting of the relinquishment or extinguishment of stock or securities in a corporation, pursuant to a plan of consolidation or merger prescribed or approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under the All-American Flag Line Act of 1945, in consideration of the acquisition solely of stock or securities in a corporation organized or made use of to effectuate such a plan of consolidation or merger.'

"(c) Section 113 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to basis of property) is amended by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

"'(23) Property acquired pursuant to plan of consolidation or merger of air carriers:

If the property was acquired by a corporation organized or made use of to effectuate a plan of consolidation or merger prescribed or approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under the All-American Flag Line Act of 1945, the basis in the hands of the acquiring corporation shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the corporation whose property was so acquired, increased in the amount of gain recognized to the corporation whose property was so acquired.'

"ALL-AMERICAN FLAG LINE—DATE FOR FILING CHARTER

"SEC. 7. The charter for the community company to be known as and styled the All-American Flag Line shall be filed with the Secretary of State, as provided in section 3, not later than July 1, 1946: *Provided*, That if the Board shall certify that additional time is required for the performance of its duties under this act preliminary to the filing of such charter, the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by Executive order may extend the time limit herein provided for filing such charter, but no single extension of such time limit shall be for more than 90 days.

"ALL-AMERICAN FLAG LINE INCORPORATED

"SEC. 8. (a) Effective upon the filing of the charter for a community company with the Secretary of State by the Board, pursuant to section 3 and in conformity with all other provisions of this act, such community company is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'The All-American Flag Line' (hereinafter called the line) which shall have succession until dissolved by act of Congress.

"(b) The charter for the line shall be in compliance with the provisions of this section and in conformity with the provisions of the plan prescribed or approved by the Board pursuant to section 4.

"(c) In connection with the formation of the line the Civil Aeronautics Board may act as trustee for the line to do and perform all things and acts necessary or convenient to proper effectuation of the purposes of this act.

"(d) The purpose of the line shall be to operate as an air carrier in international air transportation and to provide transportation by air throughout the world, under the United States flag, for persons, property, and mail, to the full extent that such transportation is required in the national interest of the United States or for the public convenience of its citizens.

"(e) The line shall have all corporate powers necessary or desirable to effectuate fully the purposes of this act.

"(f) The line shall have its principal office in the District of Columbia, but may establish branch offices or agencies in any city or cities of the United States or of any foreign country, under rules and regulations prescribed by its board of directors.

"(g) Securities or stock of the line shall be issued only with the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and such stock or securities shall not be acquired or held by any common carrier by air, rail, or water or by any person controlling or controlled by any such carrier, without the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or by any citizen or subject of any foreign government.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, association or corporation to buy, acquire, hold, own or control, directly or indirectly, more than 2 percent of the common stock of the line issued and outstanding.

"(i) No person, partnership, association or corporation entitled to acquire carrier shares of the line pursuant to subdivision (5) of subsection (b) of section 4 shall acquire, directly or indirectly, any other voting stock of the line, except stock acquired by such person, partnership, association or corporation, as a result of the initial issue of stock of the line, for property acquired by it or stock distributed as a dividend on stock so initially issued or acquired pursuant to rights appertaining to stock which shall have been so initially issued or shall have been distributed as a dividend thereon.

"(j) Obligations of the line other than stock may be purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board, with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise obligated: *Provided*, That the total amount of such obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury at any time shall not exceed 25 percent of the total amount of such obligations then oustanding.

"POLICY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 9. Before transmitting any order relating to the line to the President pursuant to section 801 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and before requiring any extension of the services of the line as provided in subdivision (8) of subsection (b) of section 4 of this act, the Board shall consult with a Policy Committee composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce, and on which the Board shall be represented by its chairman. The Policy Committee shall also advise the Board generally in regard to the interests of the United States in international air transportation and the affairs of the line.

"RELATIONSHIP OF DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTTION

"SEC. 10. (a) From and after the date of approval of this act and pending the formation of a community company as provided herein, no certificate of public convenience and necessity to engage in international air transportation shall be issued by the Board except to an international air carrier.

"(b) All certificates of public convenience and necessity to engage in international air transportation which shall be issued to the line (other than certificates acquired by it as a result of the consolidation or merger provided for in the plan prescribed or approved by the Board pursuant to section 4) shall terminate on a date 7 years from the date of incorporation of the line: *Provided*, That any such certificate may be extended on application duly made pursuant to section 401 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. During said 7-year period no certificate of public convenience and necessity to engage in international air transportation shall be issued except to the line.

"(c) The line shall not engage in domestic air transportation, except that it (1) may engage in air transportation between points within Alaska, between points in the Canal Zone, and between a point in Puerto Rico and a point in the Virgin Islands, to such extent and on such terms and conditions as the Board may from time to time determine; (2) may engage in air transportation between the continental United States and Canada on through flights to or from more remote points, unless the Board shall from time to time otherwise determine; and (3) may engage in air transportation between the continental United States and Mexico. The line shall not hold or acquire, directly or indirectly, any interest in a domestic air carrier.

"(d) From and after the date of approval of this act, and for 7 years after the date of incorporation of the line, no domestic air carrier or person controlling or controlled by such an air carrier shall acquire, directly or indirectly, any interest in any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics in a foreign country, and, except as specified in section 4, no domestic air carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any international air carrier and no international air carrier shall effect a consolidation or merger with any domestic air carrier.

"GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 11. (a) In furtherance of its purposes pursuant to this act the line, with the approval of the Board, is authorized to call upon any department or agency of the United States Government, other than the Department of State, for such cooperation or assistance, other than direct financial assistance, as such department or agency may render, consistent with existing law and public policy.

"(b) The Secretary of State may negotiate agreements with foreign governments in the name of the United States for the benefit of the line. In furtherance of negotiations approved by the policy committee, between the line and foreign governments or foreign nationals, the Secretary of State shall, at the request of the Board, make available any and all services and facilities of the State Department.

"SECRETARY OF STATE; NEGOTIATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

"SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of State shall advise the Board of, and consult with the Board concerning, the negotiation of any agreements with foreign governments directly affecting or in connection with air navigation or air commerce.

"(b) No agreement with any foreign government restricting the right of the United States or its nationals to engage in air transport operations, or generally granting to any foreign government or its nationals or to any air line representing any foreign government or operating under a foreign flag any right or rights to engage in foreign air commerce or foreign air transportation other than as a foreign air carrier in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, or respecting the formation of or the participation of the United States in any international organization for regulation or control of international aviation or any phases thereof, shall be made or entered into by or on behalf of the Government of the United States except by treaty.

"FOREIGN MILITARY AIRCRAFT

"SEC. 13. Aircraft, a part or adjunct of the armed forces of any foreign nation, shall not be operated in the United States including the Panama Canal Zone in interstate or overseas air commerce, nor otherwise except in accordance with an authorization granted by the Secretary of State.

"EXTENSIONS OF SERVICE; BOARD MAY REQUIRE

"SEC. 14. The Board, upon its own motion pursuant to a recommendation of the policy committee, or upon certification by the Secretary of State that such action is necessary in the public interest (1) for the maintenance of cooperative relationships between the United States and any foreign country, or (2) in furtherance of national policy, or (3) for the performance of any obligation of the United States imposed by treaty, may by order require the line to make any extensions of its existing service, or to establish and provide any new service, in international air transportation: *Provided*, That if the Board pursuant to this section requires the line so to extend its service or to provide new service, it shall issue its order making such requirement only under such conditions as will guarantee the line against unreasonable loss in the performance of the service it is so required to perform. Within the limits of available appropriations made by the Congress therefor, the Board is authorized and directed, when necessary for compliance with the provisions of this section, to make direct payments to the line which, together with all other revenue of the line, will enable it most effectively to promote the public interest. Such payments shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the Board may prescribe, having regard for the provisions of this section.

"ADMINISTRATION OF ACT; CONSIDERATIONS FOR BOARD

"SEC.15. In the exercise of its powers and duties under this act and under the Civil

Aeronautics Act of 1938, the Board shall give due consideration to the necessity for (1) meeting the competition of air carriers operating under foreign flags; (2) forging an international air transportation system which will serve the foreign policy of the United States in peace and in war; (3) meeting the demands of the commerce of the United States for international air transportation; (4) insuring uniformity of policy in all operations in air transportation under the American flag; (5) preservation and advancement of American economic, technical, and labor standards; (6) avoidance of duplication of subsidies, and minimization of all subsidies, so far as possible; (7) standardization of procedures on a world-wide basis, from the standpoint of national defense, in all operations in international air transportation under the American flag.

"VALIDITY

"SEC. 16. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE; SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 17. (a) This act shall become effective upon enactment.

"(b) This act may be cited as the All-American Flag Line Act of 1945."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Senator from Missouri for his patience and tolerance in permitting me to present this matter at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Nevada it was a pleasure, and I am confident the Senator will give careful consideration to the measure he has proposed.

PROPOSED LOAN BY THE UNITED STATES TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, it appears that a loan of substantial size by the United States Government to the British Government is about to be concluded. Previously, I have made certain suggestions concerning the conditions of the proposed loan. Under date of November 30, I wrote the Assistant Secretary of State, the Honorable W. L. Clayton, who is in charge of the negotiations on behalf of this Government, a letter which is self-explanatory, and which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD. When I have received Mr. Clayton's reaction to the proposals made, I shall be glad to inform the Senate by reading his reply into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1945.

HON. W. L. CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary of State
for Economic Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLAYTON: It is my understanding that negotiations between the United States and the British Government for financial assistance by this country are to be concluded in the near future, which will result in a loan to the British of three and one-half or four billion dollars.

I have heretofore called your attention to certain discriminatory policies of the British Government concerning the importation of materials and equipment into the sterling area by American companies for their own use although no dollar exchange is involved. I sincerely trust that the conditions under which the loan is to be made are such as to remove this impediment to the legitimate activities of American nationals in the British Empire.

My attention has recently been called to another situation of which you are undoubtedly aware, but I am nevertheless taking the liberty of discussing the matter with you and making certain suggestions with respect to the proposed loan. First, I desire to make it clear that I am not opposing any loan to the British Government which is necessary for the economic well-being of both countries and which is made on terms and conditions that are fair and reasonable. It would, however, be improper to further burden our country financially by making a greater loan to the British than their economic necessity demands or on conditions that would not represent fair and reasonable business terms. Such a loan would not be helpful to either the British or the United States.

In July 1941 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorized a loan to the British Government in the sum of $425,000,000, of which $390,000,000 has been disbursed. The present principal balance is in the sum of $253,265,760, against which the RFC now holds in reserve from accumulated income $10,340,702, making an actual net balance as of the present time of $242,925,058. At the time the loan was negotiated there were deposited with the RFC as security for the loan listed common and preferred stocks of 83 representative American companies having a market value at that time of $205,000,000; unlisted securities consisting of common and preferred stocks and first and second mortgage bonds of 68 companies, in which the British ownership is substantial or controlling, in the sum of $115,000,000; the capital stock of British-owned United States insurance companies having an approximate net worth of $180,000,000 as of December 31, 1940; and assignment of earnings of the United States branches of 41 British insurance companies. The total securities deposited with RFC at the time of the loan, therefore, had a net market value of $500,000,000. The market value of the listed securities of the American companies as of the present time is in excess of $350,000,000. A market analyst advised me that the unlisted securities have a reasonable market value of $215,000,000. The net worth of the capital stock of the British-owned United States insurance companies held as security, is estimated as of this date to be approximately $210,000,000, making a total appreciated value of the securities held by the RFC at this time of approximately $775,000,000. It is, therefore, plain that if the RFC loan were liquidated at this time the British would have a dollar equity of over half a billion dollars.

Market conditions in this country at this time are such that it would not be unfair or unreasonable to request the British to liquidate their loan by the sale of the securities now held by RFC. Although the shares of stock represent a very substantial ownership in the respective American companies, I believe that in most cases the listed shares could be sold on the current market without depressing the market price of the stock of the companies affected. As to the unlisted stocks and the capital stock of the insurance companies affected, I am confident that these securities could and would be willingly absorbed by American investors. In any case, where a listed security was in such quantity that a liquidation of the stock on the market would result in adverse market reactions, I feel reasonably sure that such transactions could be readily placed with American banking houses. The American stock market is high. A better time probably could not be found to liquidate this loan than at present.

There are two fundamentally economic reasons why liquidation of the RFC loan should be made part of the conditions of the United States-British loan now being negotiated.

First, the British loan is being made for the express purpose of affording the British Empire exchange in American dollars. It is grossly unfair to the American people to burden them with an additional financial obligation of three and one-half or four billion dollars for this purpose when the British Government has a dollar equity in this country of over half a billion dollars. It is entirely proper that if the British are now in need of three-and-one-half-billion-dollar exchange in this country, the amount should be reduced by the half-billion dollars which represent the equity of the British in the RFC loan. If it is good business for the United States to bank the British loan, good-business principle demands that the British first use their dollar assets in this country to mitigate the amount of the loan and thus relieve to whatever extent possible our already financially overburdened Treasury.

Second, the liquidation of the RFC loan at this time would operate to return the shares held by the British Government in American industrial concerns to American investors. It is unhealthy economically and contrary to our philosophy of free enterprise for any government to be interested directly in a financial way in American enterprise. Stocks owned by the British and pledged to RFC represent 83 of our largest industries, including oil, gas, automobile manufacturing, chemicals, steel, utilities, radio, textiles, shoes and clothing, electrical equipment, tobacco, sugar, telephone and telegraph, locomotive, newspapers, banking and financial corporations. As an example of the British Government ownership, I call attention to the following interests:

	Shares
General Motors Corp. (common)	434,000
Radio Corp. of America (common)	177,000
Amerada Petroleum Corp. (common)	133,000
Chrysler Corp. (common)	36,000
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey (capital)	198,000
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana (capital)	315,000
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. (capital)	130,000
American Telephone & Telegraph (capital)	70,000
United States Steel (cumulative preferred)	21,000

Few representative American industrial corporations are not represented in this list of British Government ownership.

The RFC loan was negotiated as a war loan at a time when the British were desperately in need of dollar exchange in this country. There is no possibility that the securities involved will be returned to their original individual owners. Liquidation of the loan at this time would have the very desirable effect of converting this large equity into badly needed dollar credit for the British, remove this substantial British Government interest in American private industry, and relieve the United States of a financial burden of more than a half billion dollars.

I urge upon you the efficacy of this action.

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, providing for the numbers and.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senate was engaged in the consideration of the pending amendment. I shall endeavor this afternoon to make my remarks in regard to that amendment as brief as reasonably possible. I was pleased to hear the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] emphasize the importance of the pending legislation, for I take it that all of us who believe in the principles of the Charter of the United Nations are desirous of seeing that that great organization and its various organs shall be promptly implemented so that its work toward the preservation of international peace and security, and toward the great ideals of justice, and the other principles recited in the Charter, may be readily entered upon and carried, we hope, to successful fruition.

But, Mr. President, while I thoroughly concur with the expression made earlier today by the Senator from Texas, I also think that it is of highest importance that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States should be careful to see that in this implementing legislation there shall be closely, accurately, and precisely followed the obligations into which we entered in that great instrument, the Charter, and that we shall see to it that no substitution shall occur with respect to the contents of that instrument.

Mr. President, it has been suggested in more than one utterance that the amendment now pending may be in the nature of a restriction. I tried on Friday last to disabuse the minds of any who might be under that impression. To my mind, the amendment which I have offered is not only not a restriction but it closely and immediately follows the mandatory requirement of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. Instead of restricting the President or Congress or the Senate or any group of nations, the amendment which I propose does nothing more than that which I have repeatedly indicated, namely, to carry into effect the mandatory requirements of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The amendment is very simple. For the provision of the pending bill which requires that the special agreement or agreements which may be negotiated under article 43 shall be referred back for approved to the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, the amendment simply substitutes the provision that the President is authorized to negotiate the special agreement or agreements and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to enter into such agreement or agreements, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

The basis of this amendment is not a desire to impose restrictions. It is not a desire to impose reservations of one kind or another. The purpose of the amendment is to carry out the exact language, as I see it, of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. And what is that language? The language, as I have mentioned more than once, is that the agreement or agreements "shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject"—I emphasize this because it is the important part of the discussion in hand—"shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

The Charter does not say that it shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with a process that may not be unconstitutional. It does not say that the ratification shall be had by some means not embraced within the Constitution. The Charter says that it shall be subject to ratification in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the signatory states. To my mind this is not a mere statement of a negative fact, but it is a statement of an affirmative fact, that every such agreement shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with the procedure prescribed in its constitution itself and set out as the constitutional process of ratification.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, the nations have different methods or processes for ratification, and each country must decide for itself how an agreement is to be ratified according to its own constitutional processes.

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But in this country mainly the constitutional process is ratification by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct. It is not only mainly the constitutional process but is the only process under the Constitution of the United States. The Senator is quite right in pointing out that in this country our Constitution looks forward with the view that the process of ratification is confined to action by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, it is suggested in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations that under the view that the procedure by joint resolution or act of Congress is preferable:

The precise details of the obligation—such as the exact amount of the forces to be contributed and the places where they are to be stationed—is not a matter for treaty consideration but for legislative sanction by the Congress under its constitutional powers to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

The references made in the report of the committee are to article I, section 8, paragraphs 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution. Those provisions read substantially as set forth in the report of the committee, namely, that the Congress "shall have power to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." But, Mr. President, can it be successfully contended for a moment that the power to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces authorizes the two Houses of Congress to enter into a treaty or to ratify or confirm a treaty simply because the subject matter of the treaty embraces one or more of those subjects? The only reference in the Constitution of the United States to the process which law writers, as well as persons who are not lawyers, have constantly referred to as "ratification" is that which is contained in section 2 of article II, under the language:

He—

Meaning the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. When we take into consideration the fact that we are writing a blank check for the Preparatory Commission to deal with these matters involving the war power, it is not only necessary and important to follow constitutional provisions, but particularly in a case of this kind, when we are giving practically carte blanche to the Preparatory Commission to prepare an instrument to be submitted to us. We do not know what it will contain. It seems to me that we are taking a great deal of risk not only by avoiding constitutional processes, but by giving a blank check and having an instrument come back here to be ratified by a majority.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I think he has very

clearly pointed out the tremendous importance to the country of the proper decision with respect to this particular amendment, and the fact that we are not here quibbling over mere words. We are not here quibbling over what should be in this instrument.

The fact is that when the Charter of the United Nations was approved by this body on the 28th day of July 1945, it was approved with the provision in it that these agreements, important and profound as they are, "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." The article might have concluded with the words "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states," leaving it open as to whether it should be done in accordance with constitutional processes or in accordance with some expression of the legislative body. But the writers of this instrument, carefully and properly so, expressly provided not merely that the agreements shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states but that such ratification shall be in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Is there a person who can say today that ratification in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of this Nation does not mean ratification by the Senate, with two-thirds of the Senators present concurring?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Responding to the Senator's challenge to the body of the Senate, as to whether anyone is prepared to rise and support such a contention, I wish merely to say to the Senator that I shall do so as soon as he has concluded.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be pleased, as I am sure the Senate will be, to hear from the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, a moment ago I was referring to the fact that ratification in accordance with the respective constitutional processes is not authorized under the section of the Constitution which refers to the power of Congress to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Those are legislative matters which are delegated to Congress by the Constitution of the United States. But, Mr. President, the power to make treaties is not a legislative function. It is clear that the operation of making a treaty is executive in its nature. The very fact that the Senate of the United States, before it enters into the consideration of a treaty, resolves itself out of legislative session and into executive session indicates very significantly the nature of the work which the Senate is doing when it engages in the study and ratification of a treaty. There is an executive power. The President makes treaties. He makes them by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The process by which the advice and consent of the Senate is given is uniformly termed ratification by students, law writers, encyclopedias, and, as I have previously indicated, by the Supreme Court itself.

So, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that in advocating this amendment I am not advocating throwing restrictions around the President or around Congress. I am merely advocating, as I see it, the carrying into effect of the clear, plain mandate of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations. As I shall show in a few moments, it is not alone my opinion on which I rely.

It has been suggested that it is entirely constitutional for the two Houses of Congress to perform this act of ratification. I am not taking the position that it would have been impossible to provide validly in the Charter that the agreements shall be subject to approval by the Congress. I think it would have been entirely possible, as I have previously indicated, to provide that the agreements shall go into effect upon the happening of any event, whether that event be the ringing of a bell, the proclamation by some official, or any other act or incident. In my judgment, the Charter could have provided, as I have indicated, that the agreements shall become effective on the happening of any event whatsoever.

But, Mr. President, in the first place, that is not what the Charter did. I quote at this point from the observations of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. WHITE, who I am pleased to say, is again in attendance upon the sessions of the Senate. On July 25 of this year the minority leader stated, as appears from page 8028 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> The passage of legislation by the Congress is not, in my belief, a ratification as that term is correctly used in the law and in the Constitution.

The Senator from Maine further stated:

> It may be that the Charter might have provided for approval by a joint resolution, or it might have recognized the Presidential authority to enter into negotiations and consummate agreements as distinguished from treaties. In the present instance, however, we have the testimony of Mr. Dulles that treaties were contemplated; we have the testimony of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that treaties were meant. I think this view is strengthened and confirmed and made certain by the very language of article 43 itself, which speaks of ratification by constitutional processes. "Ratification" is a term applied to the approval of a treaty by the Senate of the United States.
>
> It is my judgment, therefore, for whatever it may be worth, that not only does the testimony before the committee bespeak the truth that treaties are to come before us, but that the language of the instrument itself speaks in terms of a treaty, and not of an agreement or a joint resolution.

Mr. President, the understanding of our representatives at the San Francisco Conference was clearly to the effect which I have indicated. There can be no possible question, from the reading both of the testimony and of the debate, participated in as it was by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who rose a few moments ago, that the understanding of our representatives at San Francisco was clearly that article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations, in requiring ratification by the United States in accordance with its respective constitutional processes, meant ratification by the Senate in the manner in which treaties are ratified.

Mr. President, I see upon the floor today the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Again I call attention, as I did a few days ago, to certain testimony given before the Foreign Relations Committee in which the Senator from Texas participated. I shall read certain of the testimony of Mr. Dulles. Mr. Dulles, as the record so amply and appropriately shows, was one of the chief advisers of the United States delegation at San Francisco. He is an international lawyer of high standing, high ability, and high integrity. I shall read certain portions of his testimony and request Senators to observe the comments made with respect to it by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I now read from the testimony:

> Mr. DULLES. It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation—

I repeat that statement by way of emphasis:

> It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation, that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty.

Then the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who sits here this afternoon, said:

> I should like to ask if that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

The chairman of the committee is the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who then said:

> It is most certainly the opinion of the chairman of the committee. * * * Our constitutional process is for us here at home to decide. There is no question in my mind that that means that the agreements must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.
>
> I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the conference as to that effect.

Then, Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan made a statement. The other day when I was quoting his remarks he was called from the floor of the Senate for a few moments. I referred to his observations before the Senate on the 24th of July of this year, during the debate upon the floor of the Senate, when he said:

> So far as my own interpretation is concerned, I think the record should be completed in respect to the constitutional point submitted by the able Senator from Montana regarding the form in which the basic agreement for force, as contemplated by the Charter, shall be handled in the United States in behalf of the United States.

The the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan continued, as follows:

First, I wish to say that it never remotely occurred to me, either at San Francisco or since—

Mr. President, I pause at the word "since," for they had been back from San Francisco for some weeks when that debate occurred, and that was only 4 days before the Charter of the United Nations was adopted by the Senate—

I wish to say that it never remotely occurred to me, either at San Francisco or since, that the language used in the Charter at this point did not refer to a treaty to be brought before the Senate of the United States for ratification, precisely as indicated by Mr. Dulles in his testimony, and as supported by the able Senator from Texas in his interpretation.

Then the Senator from Michigan continued, as follows:

I can understand how there might be advanced a perfectly legitimate argument as to whether or not constitutional process at that point referred to a joint resolution of Congress or a treaty action by the Senate, although it is the latter—

That is to say, Mr. President, the treaty action by the Senate—

which I prefer.

Thus, the Senator from Michigan expressed himself 4 days before the Senate voted on the momentous United Nations Charter.

Next, Mr. President, I refer to the telephone conversation which the Senator from Michigan had with Mr. Dulles. The Senator from Michigan very properly came before the Senate on July 25 and reported as follows—and I read only the portion of his statement which I think is particularly important, although I am quite willing to read all of it:

As I understand, it continues to be Mr. Dulles' attitude—

Mind you, Mr. President, this was only a few minutes after the telephone conversation had concluded, as I understand, and I think I understand correctly from what is stated in the earlier portion of the Senator's statement—

that the agreements contemplated should be made by treaty, but that he has never passed upon the question of whether there may not legitimately be an alternative choice between a treaty and a joint resolution by Congress; that the only thing upon which he has been undertaking to speak is the basic question as to whether or not this authority must rest in Congress, either by treaty or by joint resolution, rather than whether it may rest in the exclusive authority of the President of the United States.

Mr. Dulles, as I understand him, is asserting the fundamental and controlling doctrine that this agreement between this Government and the Security Council governing the use of force cannot be made by exclusive Presidential authority through an executive agreement. He has not dealt with a choice between the two alternative congressional methods which are available.

A little later on in the statement of the Senator from Michigan we find that he said this, as shown on the next page of the RECORD—and let me point out that this statement was made on July 25, 3 days before the Senate voted to adopt the Charter of the United Nations, and several weeks, as I recall, after the return of the delegation from San Francisco:

My position continues unequivocally to be that the action could not be taken by Presidential executive order, that it must be done by congressional consultation; that my preference continues to be that it should be done by treaty. But I concede a perfectly legitimate choice between the two methods of congressional expression, so long as we retain in Congress, by one of those two methods, the final power of decision.

Mr. President, I have indicated the views of both the distinguished senior Senator from Texas and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan immediately preceding the time when the Charter of the United Nations was approved by the Senate. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Michigan indicated that in his mind there was an alternative choice which could be made; but to my mind, Mr. President, there can be no alternative choice if the language of article 43 of the Charter of the United Nations is to be followed. If the Charter had meant to leave it to legislative action, it would have so provided. But it does not so provide. It provides that it shall be left to ratification in accordance with the respective constitutional processes of the signatory States.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, who will address the Senate shortly, I am sure will give us valuable information and I know his views are entitled to great respect. But to my mind there is an impossibility involved in the position that ratification in accordance with the constitutional processes of this Nation consists or may consist of legislative action by the two Houses of the Congress. As I have previously indicated, it would have been entirely possible for the framers of the Charter to have made the going into effect of these agreements dependent upon the happening of any event—whether the ringing of a bell or the standing of a Member of the Senate upon the floor of the Senate; but that is not what the Charter provides. It provides that the ratification shall be in accordance with the constitutional processes of the signatory States. The "constitutional processes" there referred to certainly mean something more than a mere negation of unconstitutionality. To my mind there is no provision in the Constitution which directly or indirectly says that the constitutional process of ratification in the United States consists of a legislative act, either a joint resolution or a bill passed by Congress.

Mr. President, the power given to Congress to raise and support armies and navies, and to provide regulations with reference to them, has never been held to include an authorization on the part of Congress to negotiate treaties. It has certainly never been held to include executive acts on the part of Congress which treaty making, in accordance with constitutional processes, involves.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator now feel willing to answer the question which I asked him a few days ago? I know he does not agree with what I have said. I should like to ask him this question: If there is a legitimate difference of opinion with reference to the constitutionality of the method employed by Congress, after the passage by Congress of the legislation which is now being discussed cannot the Supreme Court of the United States at one time or another decide the constitutional question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I answered the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts a few days ago, I do not feel that I am competent to answer the question at the present time. In order to answer a question of the kind which has been propounded by the Senator from Massachusetts, I think it would be necessary to make a careful study and analysis of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in determining what are and what are not political questions with reference to which the Court has repeatedly declined to rule.

To my mind, and I say so very humbly, because the Supreme Court and not a mere Member of the Senate, is the chief judicial authority of our country—if at some time the Supreme Court would decide the question, I feel that it would be advisable, under circumstances which made it important to determine the question, to have the question submitted. Again I say that I am not able, and do not, either directly or indirectly, express an opinion today as to whether or not the Supreme Court would assume jurisdiction of such a case.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one further question along this line?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. From what the Senator has said, I assume without any doubt that if he were today a member of the Supreme Court he would say that the Congress is being asked to pass legislation of an unconstitutional nature.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I see it, the question before the Senate is not primarily one of a constitutional nature at all. The question is, What is the meaning of the language of article 43 that ratification shall be "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes"? I think we have before us the question of determining the meaning of that language. It may mean that the two Houses of Congress would be permitted to act by way of ratification. But to my mind the question is not whether a provision that ratification should be by both Houses of Congress would have been constitutional; the question is, What has been done? It has been specifically stated that the ratification shall be "in accordance with the irrespective constitutional processses." To my mind there can be no argument as to the correctness of the proposition that the ratification must be by action of the Senate of the United States.

Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire further to interrogate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, the Senator from Missouri takes the position that if Congress passes Senate bill 1580 in its present form, it will not be implementing the United Nations Charter as we consented to it last July.

Mr. DONNELL. That is exactly my position, and I am sure the Senator realizes the implication of the question and the answer. In other words, after careful study, deliberation, and voting, we subscribed last summer to every word in the Charter. Whether it would have been better to leave the matter to the two Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of State, or to the Presiding Officer of the Senate, is not the question. The question today is, What was meant when we said by our vote on the 28th of last July that the agreement or agreements "shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes?"

Does the Senator from Massachusetts desire further to interrogate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I again desire to refer to what was said by Mr. Dulles. Mr. Dulles has been quoted with reference to a telephone conversation which indicated that he had not had in mind the difference between the two methods of approval, namely, one, by the Senate, and the other, by the House of Representatives. Without reflecting in the slightest on Mr. Dulles, it is with the utmost difficulty that I can bring myself into a frame of mind to realize how it would have been possible for a great lawyer, a man of the experience and standing of Mr. Dulles, to have gone to San Francisco in company with other men and there, day after day, participated in the sessions of the various committees or conferences being held, and not have asked what was the meaning of the words "ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." To my mind he should have explored that question from one side to the other.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that any man, lawyer, or layman, bearing in mind the vital importance of these agreements, and the fact that they embrace the various subjects which I have indicated, namely, the number of forces to be contributed, their relative location, and so forth—could have attended the sessions at San Francisco without considering carefully whether or not the ratification by constitutional processes meant ratification by the Senate, or meant some type of approval of a legislative nature by the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I come to what Mr. Dulles testified in his testimony before the committee. I wish to relate what transpired. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was interrogating. What I am about to read appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 28, 1945, the very day on which the Senate voted on the Charter. It was quoted in extenso only four pages from the place at which is recorded the final vote on the subject. What did the Senator from Colorado and Mr. Dulles have to say at the hearing? Senator MILLIKIN said:

> Thank you. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Dulles, I thought you said that the Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the special agreements having to do with our contribution of force and material.
>
> Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. Is that your opinion?
>
> Mr. DULLES. That is not only my opinion, but it is expressly stated in the Charter that the agreements are subject to ratification by the states in accordance with their constitutional processes.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. Then it is your opinion that to comply with our constitutional processes, that separate agreement would have to come to the Senate for ratification?
>
> Mr. DULLES. It is, and that was the view of the American delegation. I think there is no doubt whatever about it.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?
>
> Mr. DULLES. No.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. And no disagreement of opinion of that?
>
> Mr. DULLES. No.

I call the attention of the Senate especially to the next question and answer, for to my mind they are clearly indicative of the thought which Mr. Dulles had in his mind at the time he was in San Francisco, not when he was called up hastily over the telephone 2 weeks later, but at the time when he was at San Francisco. I do not mean that the Senator from Colorado was in San Francisco. He was questioning here in the Senate Office Building. Mr. Dulles having previously referred to no disagreement of opinion on the proposition about which I have just read, the Senator from Colorado asked this question:

> I take it that by ratification you mean ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty?
>
> Mr. DULLES. That is correct; by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Mr. President, can there be any doubt as to the meaning in his mind? He did not say it could be done by the Congress. He said that by ratification he meant ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty, "by a two-thirds vote of the Senate."

Then the Senator from Colorado proceeded:

> The reason why I asked the question is that you are, of course—

Mr. President, I should really like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator makes reference to me.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas was here all day Thursday, all day Friday, and has been here all day today listening to the Senator. I think I understand the Senator's point, because he has made it two or three times. I apologize if he thinks I am not listening, but he said he would use only 30 minutes today, and he has used some 2 hours.

Mr. DONNELL. Just a moment, Mr. President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not all of that, but he gave some of the time away to other Senators very freely. I apologize to the Senator, and assure him I have my ear turned toward him now.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, to my mind this matter is not one to be treated lightly. To my mind, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate is interested in every word that has to do with the matter of ratification of this treaty or the implementation of the treaty, and even if the matter were mentioned on last Thursday and on last Friday, I submit that it is of sufficient importance to stand repetition again on Monday, in the same language, in the same forum in which the other expressions occurred.

Mr. President, with respect to the matter of the hour and 30 minutes, I watch the clocks, and while I did not take down with my pencil a memorandum, I think anyone who was present will recall very distinctly that in addition to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] various other Senators spoke, with my consent; and I have no doubt the Senator from Texas would have extended the same courtesy to them just as I did. It was approximately 25 minutes after 1, as I recall, when I started to speak upon the subject matter to which I am addressing myself, namely, the amendment I have proposed. It is now 5 minutes after 2, which, as I figure it, is 40 minutes after I started.

Mr. President, I return again to what was said by Mr. Dulles to the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado said:

> The reason why I asked the question is that you are, of course, aware of the fact that there is a large dispute as to what is the legitimate field for so-called executive agreements and treaties. You are definitely of the opinion that the special agreement referred to would have to be handled by supplemental treaty rather than by an executive agreement?
>
> Mr. DULLES. I have no doubt whatever about that.

Then, Mr. President, a little later the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations entered into the discussion again. Mr. Dulles said:

> It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation, that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty.

That was Mr. Dulles speaking. Then the Senator from Colorado very properly——

Mr. President, I understand there is a rule that if Senators desire to converse the cloakroom is provided for that purpose. Am I correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator continues to make reference to the Senator from Texas. The person to whom I was speaking was the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations, about a very important matter having to do with a hearing. I tried to make it brief. I did not interfere with the Senator.

Mr. President, under the rules I can take the Senator from Missouri from the floor any time I desire, because he has spoken seven or eight times during the same legislative day on the same subject; but I have not done it, and do not expect to do it. I am trying to be courteous to the Senator. I have some rights on this floor as well as the Senator from Missouri. I do not understand he has control of everything that may transpire on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I understand also that Senators who desire to converse, as I have heard repeatedly stated from the Chair in the Senate, are

afforded the privileges of the cloakroom. I apologize to the Senator from Texas if I was interrupting a conversation which should not have been interrupted. I have observed the gentleman on his left and he have been conversing, not merely the man who came to his desk a few minutes ago.

I return to what Mr. Dulles said and what the Senator from Texas said:

Mr. DULLES. It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation—

Which included the distinguished Senator from Texas—

that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty—

Then the Senator from Colorado turned to the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, and said:

I should like to ask if that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

The chairman, the distinguished Senator from Texas, said:

It is most certainly the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

The last language Mr. Dulles had used was that it was to be "submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty." Then the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas, proceeded:

Our constitutional process is for us here at home to decide. There is no question in my mind—

I call attention to this again—

There is no question in my mind that that means that the agreements must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

Then he concluded:

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the Conference to that effect.

Mr. President, my amendment speaks for itself, namely, that instead of adopting a method which is not a constitutional process we shall adopt a method which is the constitutional process, and the only one provided. My amendment is not a matter of restriction of power, it is a matter of carrying into effect the solemn obligation into which the United States Senate entered last summer when it ratified the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter explicitly recites that the ratification shall be in accordance with the constitutional processes of the respective signatory states.

The mere fact that Congress has it within its power to raise armies and support navies, and make rules and regulations for the Army and the Navy, does not even inferentially indicate that Congress has the power to make agreements with other nations or other groups of nations. There is no power resting in Congress, as a constitutional process, so to do.

True it is, as I have indicated, and as the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, indicated last summer, that it would have been entirely possible for the Charter to have provided that Congress should perform this function. It would have been entirely possible, there would have been nothing constitutional or unconstitutional about it; it would have been just the same as if the Charter had said that the agreement should go into effect upon the conclusion of the war with Japan. Again I wish to quote the distinguished minority leader, who has now returned, and who was not in the Chamber when I previously quoted him, and I think his statement was so clear that I shall close with his remarks. He said:

The passage of legislation by the Congress is not, in my belief, a ratification as that term is correctly used in the law and in the Constitution.

It may be that the Charter might have provided for approval by a joint resolution, or it might have recognized the Presidential authority to enter into negotiations and consummate agreements as distinguished from treaties.

In the present instance, however, we have the testimony of Mr. Dulles that the treaties were contemplated; we have the testimony of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that treaties were meant. I think this view is strengthened and confirmed and made certain by the very language of article 43 itself, which speaks of ratification by constitutional processes.

Continuing, the Senator from Maine said:

"Ratification" is a term applied to the approval of a treaty by the Senate of the United States.

It is my judgment, therefore—

Said the Senator from Maine, speaking near the conclusion of the debate on the United Nations Charter last July—

It is my judgment, therefore, for whatever it may be worth, that not only does the testimony before the committee bespeak the truth that treaties are to come before us, but that the language of the instrument itself speaks in terms of a treaty, and not of an agreement or a joint resolution.

Mr. President, I close with the observation that every Member of the Senate is entitled to have the action on the pending bill carry into effect the promises made in the Charter, and not to have something else substituted therefor.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall respond very briefly to the argument of the able Senator from Missouri. First, I want to commend him for his scrupulous fidelity to what he believes to be his constitutional obligation. I have the greatest respect in the world for any Senator who insists upon implementing his constitutional oath to the last possible degree to which he can emphasize that fidelity.

The difference fundamentally between the able Senator from Missouri and myself at the moment is that the action pending before the Senate, namely, a proposal that this ultimate agreement shall be ratified by the joint action of the two Houses of Congress, is, in my opinion, strictly a constitutional process.

Mr. President, it seems to me that certainly throughout my experience in the Senate, and particularly in the Foreign Relations Committee, we have repeatedly implemented treaties by agreements in the fashion which is here proposed, and, while I may be mistaken, I have never known the process to have been challenged in any court in the land as an unconstitutional process. Therefore, it seems to me that the choice pending before the Senate today, as presented by the unanimous recommendation of the Foreign Relations Committee, does not involve in any degree a violation of constitutional process as required by the language of the United Nations Charter in respect to this particular decision. That being the case, Mr. President, it seems to me that the problem is tremendously simplified. We are not determining whether or not this is a constitutional process. It is a constitutional process. We are simply determining which constitutional process we shall choose for this particular obligation in implementing the treaty which we previously ratified in the fashion recommended by the Senator from Missouri.

The able Senator from Missouri has repeatedly quoted from the RECORD in respect to my position upon this question, and in each instance he has quoted me with absolute accuracy. Indeed, it seems to me that the RECORD completely bears out the position which I take today. I content myself with referring to his quotation at page 11173 of the RECORD in which he referred to my observations on the floor of the Senate on July 25 when the ratification of the Charter itself was pending. I am correctly quoted as follows by the Senator from Missouri:

My position continues unequivocally to be that the action—

Referring to the ultimate action upon these agreements, upon the contract with respect to force—

My position continues unequivocally to be that the action could not be taken by Presidential Executive order, that it must be done by congressional consultation.

I interrupt the quotation at that point to say, Mr. President, that it is well for the Senate to remember that as the question arose in the first instance it was not a question between exclusive Senate ratification of a treaty on the one hand or joint congressional action through a joint or concurrent resolution. That was not the question that arose in the first instance. The question that arose in the first instance was: Can this contract for force be made by the President of the United States himself alone by an executive agreement, or must it come in some form back to the representatives of the people for their approval? That is the fundamental question which was under consideration when all these assertions were made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], by the Senator from Michigan, and even by Mr. Dulles, in the first instance. I said then, I say now, and the Senator from Texas would say now, that unequivocally this contract with the Security Council cannot be made by Presidential Executive order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. If there were nothing in the Charter about how the agreements should be ratified, if it were perfectly blank on that point, and we had made the treaty and the Senate had ratified it by two-thirds majority, could not the President, being the President and Commander in Chief of the Army, make use of military forces, except for the fact that we are putting a provision in the bill as to how these agreements shall be ratified?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, that is my position.

I continue the quotation. Then the Senator from Missouri called attention to the fact that I said:

My preference continues to be that it should be done by treaty—

Mr. President, that was my purpose at that time. I must say that I was asserting it primarily in opposition to the idea that this power could ever be exercised by the President himself alone through an executive order, but I do not want to try to evade the responsibility for whatever I may have said at that time. I meant at that time that I preferred it should be done by treaty. But let me call attention particularly to the next sentence which the able Senator from Missouri quoted from my observations at that time—and this is very important, it is fundamental, and it describes the issue which is presented to the Senate this afternoon—

but I concede a perfectly legitimate choice between the two methods of congressional expression, so long as we retain in Congress by one of those two methods, the final power of decision.

I said that on July 25, as quoted by the able Senator from Missouri. I say it now. I would say it at any time. So far as I am concerned, the important thing is to establish beyond peradventure, beyond any possibility of violation of the bond, that this contract for force cannot be written by the familiar practice of Presidential executive orders by which we have been chiefly governed during the past 12 years.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not have the RECORD before me, but I remember the debate at the time, from which the able Senator from Missouri has been quoting; and notwithstanding the fact that the senior Senator from Michigan, after he had expressed his preference at that time, did indicate that there is a perfectly legitimate choice, is it not still true that in that debate, when the Senate was being urged to ratify the United Nations Charter as a treaty, all the leaders advocating its adoption, namely, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], Mr. Dulles, and the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], then indicated that his preference was for action to be taken in the form of a treaty?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. BROOKS. Now will the Senator tell us what has happened to cause the change in unanimous opinion since the leaders received such an overwhelming majority vote on the charter, with the understanding certainly that every one of us believed that all four leaders at the time we considered the charter were for ratifying agreements as treaties?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am coming to the answer just as soon as I can reach it. I think the Senator from Illinois is entitled to present that interrogatory, and if he will be patient with me not longer than 5 minutes I shall reach it.

The first thing I want to establish, Mr. President, beyond any question of a doubt, is that the original question involved was not a question as between Senate ratification of a treaty or House and Senate passage of a joint resolution or adoption of a concurrent resolution. The fundamental question was: Shall this be done by Presidential executive order without consultation of Congress by any method, or shall it be done by treaty? The answer to that was: It must be done by treaty. That had to be the answer. That is the answer today.

But, Mr. President, another question arises, and it was made perfectly plain, so far as I am concerned in my testimony in the various speeches to which the able Senator from Illinois refers, that the subordinate question immediately is: Can there not be a choice between the two different constitutional processes? And the answer then was, "Yes." And the answer to that now is, "Yes."

It is true, precisely as the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] has indicated, and as the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has told us at least once in the last 3 days, that there was a general unanimity of recommendation at that time that the choice between two processes should be a choice by treaty action. So far as I am concerned I would be perfectly willing to support treaty action today. I think it is of very little consequence whether it be by treaty action or by joint action of the two Houses.

What is the difference? Let us consider it for a moment. The difference is that, on the one hand, if we are to rely exclusively upon the treaty process, we depend upon 64 Senators to defend the welfare and interest of the Government of the United States and its people. If we rely upon the process contemplated in the pending bill, we rely upon 266 Members of the House and Senate. Mr. President, since, so far as I am concerned, no constitutional question is involved and it is purely a question of decision as to the relative desirability of one process over the other, I shall have to agree, regardless of my original preference for the treaty system, that the welfare of America is just as safe in the hands of 266 Members of the House and Senate as it is in the hands of 64 Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is war declared by the Senate, or by joint action of the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has raised a thoroughly pertinent point. I was coming to it in a moment. The question we are debating here is tied up with our great effort to prevent war. It is tied up with the hope of mankind that through the instrumentality of the United Nations Organization we can look forward to peace and security without the necessity of going to war.

If we go to war, a majority of the House and Senate puts us into war. Yet the argument here is that a majority of the House and Senate cannot be trusted to keep the peace. Obviously, the Senator from Colorado is perfectly correct in his approach to that question.

Many other reasons have been advanced why the House ought to have a partnership relation to a decision of this nature. The Senator from Missouri has referred to some of them. The House has equal responsibility with the Senate in respect of raising armies and supporting and sustaining them. The House has primary jurisdiction over the taxation necessities involved in supporting and sustaining armies and navies, and in maintaining national defense.

These are some of the reasons why a majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee came to the conclusion that, being free to choose either of these methods so far as the Constitution is concerned, it was preferable to rely upon joint action by both Houses, so that the decision could have the broadest possible reflection of American public opinion behind it. I yield to the opinion of the majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I support its opinion this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, because I think the reasons adduced are powerful and conclusive in the aftermath of the months which we have given to the survey of this issue.

So, Mr. President, we come down simply to this, so far as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is concerned: It has presented a unanimous report—unanimous, at least, so far as those who participated in the meetings are concerned. The committee has recommended a constitutional process for implementing the San Francisco Charter. In my view, the committee had a right to choose, under the Constitution, between the treaty method and the joint resolution method. It chose the joint resolution method. It chose to place the decision respecting quotas, which must come back to us in the form of a contract between our Government and the Security Council of the United Nations Organization, in the hands of the total Congress of the United States. It chose to place the ratification of that contract in the hands of both Houses of Congress, inasmuch as the total Congress of the United States must deal with all the consequences which are involved either if we have a war or if we succeeded in preventing one. I believe that the action of the committee was logical, in spite of my predelictions in favor of scrupulously defending the Senate's treaty prerogatives. I have defended those prerogatives just as actively as has anyone else, and I shall continue to do so. I am not in favor of the movement

which would strike down the Senate's exclusive prerogatives in respect to treaties, and which would make a general practice of submitting all original treaties to both Houses of Congress for their approval. But this is a different question. This is a supplementary agreement implementing a treaty which has been ratified by two-thirds of the Senate—yea, by a vote of 89 to 2. This is an agreement to supplement and implement a treaty, precisely the same kind of an agreement which has repeatedly been embraced heretofore as an agency for this purpose. And, Mr. President, in view of the fact that it comes to the Senate with the united support of the Foreign Relations Committee, is fully within the confines of the Constitution of the United States, and errs, if it errs at all, only in that it broadens the voice of America when it accepts this contract in respect to a quota for armies, I submit that the amendment offered by the able Senator from Missouri should not be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am in complete agreement with the reasoning of the Senator; but I should like to observe that his very persuasive arguments in favor of the joint resolution method are likewise persuasive for the abolition of the two-thirds rule altogether.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will forgive me, I think there is no advantage to be gained by pursuing a general debate on that subject at this late hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not intend to pursue it. I merely wished to compliment the Senator for his very persuasive presentation of the fundamental, basic reason why both Houses should participate not only in this particular instance but in all instances.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator forces me to say that I do not think there is any direct analogy whatever between the two situations, and that there is a totally different assessment to be made against the original act, the original commitment of the Government of the United States to a basic treaty obligation, as compared with a supplemental action. I think there is an infinitely different degree of responsibility involved at that point than there is in a supplemental action which merely ratifies an agreement implementing a treaty obligation already ratified by two-thirds of the Senate of the United States; but I do not care to pursue the debate in that direction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nor do I.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can see where it would offer no advantage in the present instance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not intend to have the Senator pursue the debate in that direction.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distingushed Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] for forcefully and constantly drawing attention to the important decision which we are about to make, and for bringing the record up to date as to the method by which the United Nations Charter was adopted and the change of view which has taken place among those who led the fight for so nearly unanimous a ratification at the time.

I do not agree that it requires both Houses of Congress to put us into war. It is the handling of our troops before either House of Congress ever has an opportunity to vote on the question that gets us into war. We declare war after something has been done with our troops and our military might which makes a declaration of war inevitable and inescapable.

We are now considering how we are to set up the agreement by which troops are to be assigned. When once assigned, we shall have to follow them to their death if we ever reach the stage where war is inevitable.

In the first instance, I do not believe that ratification should be by both Houses of Congress. I voted for the Charter with the understanding that the leaders all agreed as they did agree—that the agreement should be finally ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

I shall vote for the pending amendment, and I hope that it will prevail.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the situation. I speak extemporaneously concerning it.

When the United Nations Charter was before the Senate last July I indicated somewhat briefly my views as to what was to be done, and what must be done fully to implement the obligations we assumed under the Charter.

Mr. President, what is all this debate about? We are talking about the processes provided in article 43 of the San Francisco Charter. Article 43 provides that upon the initiation of the Security Council there shall be negotiated between the member states and the Security Council an agreement or agreements to be ratified by the member states through their constitutional processes.

There are three views which might be taken of the situation, three courses which might be followed. Some might say that these obligations could be assumed by the President, by virtue of the powers which inhere in the presidential office. I reject that contention altogether.

I think it is true that if the Charter itself, in article 43, did not provide otherwise, there would have been a choice before us as to how we should consummate and make vital the agreements referred to in article 43. It might have been done, as argued so eloquently by the Senator from Michigan, by joint resolution approved by both Houses of Congress and finally approved by the President of the United States.

Or it might have been done by the negotiation and ratification of a treaty, a treaty being just as much the law of the land when finally negotiated and finally ratified by the Senate as a joint resolution.

Mr. President, at San Francisco there was that choice as to which course should be prescribed for those of us in this country to follow. It was, I think, the unanimous view of all who served at that conference—it was the view of Mr. Dulles, who was the adviser of the American delegation at the Conference; it was the view of members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including the chairman of the committee—that it should be done by treaty, not by joint resolution. I assume they came to that conclusion because the very language of the article which we are proposing to implement and which they drafted called in loud terms which could not be denied for the negotiation and the ratification of an agreement in the nature of a treaty by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, let us consider what negotiation is. Negotiation is a term applied almost universally, if not exclusively, to the drafting of treaties. It has no reference whatsoever to the formulation of legislation or the presentation of legislation to the Congress of the United States. The article referred to calls for the negotiation of a treaty—to be ratified how, and to be effectuated how? Not by joint action of the two Houses of the Congress, but an agreement in the nature of a treaty to be ratified by constitutional process. We cannot miss the importance of that word "ratified" because it is the word in the law and in the Constitution peculiarly and particularly applicable to a treaty and to the final disposition of a treaty.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator show me the word "ratify" in the Constitution?

Mr. WHITE. I believe it is not in the Constitution; but the process prescribed by the Constitution is generally referred to by the word "ratify"; and, under the Constitution, when an instrument in the nature of a treaty comes before the Senate it is supposed to be handled by ratification of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understood the Senator to say that the word "ratification" is in the Constitution.

Mr. WHITE. I did not mean that this word is in the Constitution, but the process is recognized in the Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator realize that in the debate it has been stated repeatedly that the Supreme Court of the United States has said the process must be that of ratification?

Mr. WHITE. The language of the Supreme Court refers to ratification by the Senate of the United States as a function of the Senate, not as a joint function of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator indicate any place in the Constitution where there is any suggestion of an executive agreement approved by both Houses of Congress?

Mr. WHITE. I think there is none.

Mr. President, I was about to say that not only was it the understanding of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, not only was it the understanding of our delegation at San Francisco, not only was it the understanding

of the Senate, repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate, that a treaty was in contemplation, but the very language of the instrument which we are proposing to effectuate, to make vital, speaks in terms of a treaty "initiated" by the Council and "negotiated" and "ratified" by the constitutional processes of the states which are parties to the instrument.

Mr. President, I hate to vote against the action of the committee. I do not believe I was present when the resolution was adopted. If I was, I missed entirely the provisions of article 5 to which the Donnell amendment applies. I think I was away at the time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. But, Mr. President, in the situation which confronts us I cannot bring myself to believe that this is an instrument which the President of the United States may execute and may bring into full fruition. Although other language might have been drafted, so as to permit action by way of a joint resolution, I cannot believe that article 43 has in contemplation the adoption of a joint resolution by the Congress. It seems to me that it speaks in definite terms of a treaty, and to the exclusion of any other possible action by the Senate of the United States. Therefore, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. AIKEN and Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as thus far no Senator has responded to his name, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is in order, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hart	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Reed
Briggs	Hill	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Russell
Buck	Huffman	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Willis
Gossett	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murdock	Young
Guffey	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in understanding that a vote of "yea" will be in favor of the amendment I have offered, and a vote of "nay" will be in opposition to the amendment I have offered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VANDENBERG (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S name was called). The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is detained because of illness. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and will vote. I vote "nay."

I announce that if the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on official business at Government departments.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER.]

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been excused. He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained in committee meetings.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—14

Brooks	Langer	Wheeler
Buck	Moore	Wherry
Capehart	Reed	White
Capper	Shipstead	Willis
Donnell	Taft	

NAYS—57

Austin	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hart	Murdock
Barkley	Hayden	Murray
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Briggs	Hill	Overton
Byrd	Hoey	Radcliffe
Carville	Huffman	Revercomb
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Downey	Knowland	Smith
Eastland	Lucas	Taylor
Ellender	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McKellar	Tunnell
Fulbright	McMahon	Tydings
George	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gerry	Maybank	Wagner
Gossett	Mead	Walsh
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Guffey	Mitchell	Young

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Glass	Pepper
Andrews	Hatch	Robertson
Bailey	Hawkes	Stanfill
Bankhead	Kilgore	Stewart
Brewster	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	McCarran	Tobey
Bushfield	McFarland	Wiley
Butler	Myers	
Cordon	O'Daniel	

So Mr. DONNELL'S amendment was rejected.

APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266, known as the UNRRA appropriation bill. On my motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is the motion of the Senator from Oregon in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I very much hope that the Senate will not agree to such a motion at this time. We are progressing very satisfactorily with the pending bill. We will finish consideration of it within a short time, and then we can take up the UNRRA appropriation measure. I am not at all hostile to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the motion of the Senator from Oregon prevails and the UNRRA appropriation measure is taken up, after it has been disposed of, will it be necessary again to move to proceed to the consideration of the pending bill, or will it come up automatically?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the motion of the Senator from Oregon is agreed to, consideration of the pending bill would be set aside and the bill would be returned to the calendar. If the Senate wished to consider it further, it would have to be taken up anew.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the progress which we are making on the pending legislation and the probability that the joint resolution appropriating money for the UNRRA will be immediately taken up following the disposal of the pending bill, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in expressing the hope that the motion of the Senator from Oregon will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senater from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on the motion, merely to say that, in my opinion, the Senate of the United States should take the very short period of time it will require to pass House Joint Resolution 266. I feel that there is a great moral obligation resting on the shoulders of the Senate not to delay further supplying the necessary food and clothing and shelter to the millions of people around this globe who this hour are suffering, are facing a winter which is going to result in the death of large numbers of people unless we proceed to pass the necessary appropriations provided for in the UNRRA bill. We cannot justify a day's delay in fulfilling this humanitarian obligation. We already have delayed much too long.

I think it is perfectly clear that within a very few hours the Senate can pass this UNRRA appropriation bill, and then we can go back, under the unanimous consent of the Senate, to the immediate consideration of the United Nations Organization bill, S. 1580. I feel that the passage of the UNRRA appropriation bill would have a tremendous effect in creating good will toward the United States all around the globe.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MORSE. I shall not yield for a moment. I regret that it has been reported to me that some Senators on the other side of the aisle charge that there is a group of us in the United States Senate who are responsible for not having House Joint Resolution 266 passed before this because of the fact that there has been a prolonged discussion of the United Nations Organization bill. I believe that the Senate discussion of that bill of the past few days has been one of the great historic constitutional debates of this session of Congress. I think that one who believes as the Senator from Missouri believes in regard to the constitutionality of that bill should have ample opportunity to present the great legal and constitutional argument which he has made. I regret that there is a thought on the part of some, as stated to the press by a Democratic leader, that there is a filibuster being conducted by the Senator from Missouri. I have read the RECORD very carefully, and, in my opinion, there was not one word in the remarks spoken in the issue by the Senator from Missouri that was subject to the interpretation that he was doing anything else but debating on the merits of the bill. The attack upon him by a Democratic leader is unjustified.

I regret that the implication is being made in some quarters that Republican Senators on this side of the aisle are responsible for not having the UNRRA bill passed by now. I now give to the Senate of the United States and to the Democratic Party on the other side of the aisle the full opportunity to proceed to pass the UNRRA bill this afternoon.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the majority leader whether it might not be possible to reach an agreement, if consideration of the pending bill shall continue, as I now understand it certainly will, to take up the UNRRA bill tomorrow, at perhaps 12:30 o'clock, with the understanding that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and if consideration of the UNRRA bill shall not be completed within half an hour or an hour, we recur to the standing order of business. I had hoped we might get through with the pending bill today but I have heard of two Senators who are to speak for quite a while.

I feel some obligation, because a few days ago, when the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asked for the consideration of the UNRRA bill at about 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon, I thought it should not be proceeded with without notice to the Senate, I though there should be a quorum called, and I am quite sure that a quorum could have been obtained if there had been a call at that time. But the Senator felt that there might be some doubt about it, so he preferred not to proceed with the bill rather than to call for a quorum. I think the Senator from Texas was willing at that time to have the pending bill set aside for half an hour or an hour, or some specified time, if the UNRRA bill could have been taken up and passed.

I wish to ask the distinguished majority leader whether he does not think such an agreement might be reached, for the consideration of the UNRRA bill at the hour of 12:30 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I am engaged in an entirely different enterprise, at the moment, from that which seems to be engaging the attention of the Senate, but the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is in charge of the pending bill, and I certainly would not consent to any arrangement which would not meet with his approval.

I do not know how long the consideration of the pending bill will take. I had hoped it might be disposed of today. I do not know how long the so-called UNRRA bill will take. I have a fear that it may take more than the 30 minutes suggested by the Senator from Ohio. Whatever is agreeable to the Senator from Texas, who is in charge of the pending bill, I will say to the Senator from Texas, and the Senator from Ohio, would be agreeable to me, but I would not associate myself with any effort to displace the pending bill in order to take up the other bill unless it were entirely agreeable to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to be agreeable to Senators. I am not disposed to hinder the UNRRA bill, but I do not regard it as so highly important that we must take it up now. The money will not be available for some time. I am informed that the debate on the UNRRA bill will take several hours. My source of information is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, which considered and reported the bill. Why should we now, when we are near the end of the debate, interrupt the consideration of the pending bill, which is of the highest importance not only to ourselves, but to the other nations of the world, who are witnessing the proceedings of the Senate in connection with it. I assure Senators that as soon as we finish with the pending bill, so far as I am personally concerned, I shall be perfectly willing to have the UNRRA bill considered. The authorization for the appropriation came from our committee originally, and we will have another authorization a little later from the committee relating to UNRRA.

It looks to me as if the appropriation could wait a reasonable time, until we get through with the pending bill. I hope Senators will not vote to lay the pending bill aside.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator from Oregon will permit me, I might say that I had an informal understanding with the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that following the disposition of the unfinished business, the UNRRA bill would be taken up. I do not mind confessing that the consideration of the pending bill has taken a little longer than I had anticipated. We always understand those things in the Senate, and we cannot ever be certain how long or how short a time will be consumed in the consideration of any measure.

I think the chances are we may dispose of the pending bill this afternoon, certainly tomorrow, and I doubt whether any great harm will come from a 24-hour delay in the consideration of the UNRRA bill.

Furthermore, I might say that I doubt very seriously whether the UNRRA bill

can be disposed of in 30 minutes or an hour. There are matters which may or may not be pertinent to the question of UNRRA which will be debated. We all understand that. It may take an entire day to dispose of the bill in order that Senators may express their views with reference to it.

If we may make all possible speed consistent with the proper consideration of the pending bill, I think we can reach the UNRRA bill tomorrow, at least. Unless it is agreeable to the Senator from Texas, I would not suggest that the pending bill be laid aside at this time in order to take up the other bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I attended the sessions of the Committee on Appropriations which had before it the bill relating to additional funds for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and there was considerable debate in the committee. There was a decided difference of opinion, and I have not any doubt at all that the same difference of opinion will be expressed on the floor of the Senate. I doubt very much that the bill can be disposed of in less than 2 or 3 hours. Perhaps it will take longer than that.

I wish to say that I believe exactly as the Senator from Oregon does about the importance of promptly enacting the appropriation measure for UNRRA; but as a practical matter it cannot be done instantly. If the Senator believes as I do, he will vote for the bill as reported from the committee. The amendments which have been proposed, in my judgment, properly belong on the authorizing bill which is to follow in a very short time. In other words, we establish a policy with respect to UNRRA in the legislation which the Senator from Texas has mentioned, and I think it is the function of the Committee on Appropriations to carry out that policy. If the policy is to be changed, it should not be by riders or amendments to the appropriation measure about to be considered, but upon an additional legislative proposal which the Senate will consider very soon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to vote for Senate bill 1580, but I think one of the best ways to implement the United Nations Organization would be to proceed without any further delay to pass House Joint Resolution 266. The starving peoples of Europe and Asia cannot eat our words. They need the food which UNRRA cannot give to them because we have failed to pass House Joint Resolution 266. Therefore, I call for a vote on my motion, which the Chair has ruled is in order, and I ask for the yeas and nays. I wish to remind the Senate that shrunken bellies of millions of people throughout the world are a challenge to our good faith to keep the trust of the San Francisco Charter.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Oregon has said with reference to the debates which have occurred up to this time in reference to the pending bill. I shall not vote to take up the UNRRA bill and displace the pending bill, because I think we should proceed with the pending bill and finish its consideration; although I am wholeheartedly in favor of the UNRRA measure.

In connection with criticism of the fact that there has been some discussion relating to the constitutionality of the pending bill, let me say that Mr. James G. Rogers, who is one of the greatest international lawyers in this country, has recently written a book upon the subject. He is in favor of the pending legislation, yet he agrees it presents a very close constitutional question, and one of the most important constitutional questions that has been presented to the Senate for some time. He says he hopes the matter will be discussed at length in the Senate, so that every man, woman, and child throughout the country will understand the questions which are being voted upon.

Other great international lawyers have taken the opposite view.

Mr. President, Senators should not consider lightly the question which is now before the Senate of the United States, which is a serious constitutional question, whether this country shall depart from what has heretofore been our national policy respecting foreign relations. The Senate is discussing and passing upon important constitutional questions when, as a matter of fact, only a handful of Members of the Senate have been on the Senate floor to listen to the discussion.

We hear talk about the Senate of the United States and, indeed, the whole Congress, lowering itself in the estimation of the people of the country. I deplore the attacks which have been made upon the Senate of the United States and upon the Congress of the United States. I deplore the fact that certain Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives have gone about the country denouncing the Congress. I have no use for anyone who befouls his own nest; but I do say, Mr. President, that when there are pending before the Congress questions of such great moment as the one now before the Senate, they should be given most careful consideration by every Member of the Senate. In my judgment it is most unfortunate that more Senators have not been on the floor and have not been able to listen to the debates which have been had in connection with the pending measure.

I call attention to the fact, Mr. President, that the things the Senator from Missouri has advocated, and for which he has argued, are the very things that John Foster Dulles said he took for granted would have to be submitted to the Senate of the United States. Not only that, but the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] took the same position, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], also a delegate to the San Francisco Conference, took exactly the same position before the committee. As a matter of fact, only one member of the Foreign Relations Committee raised his voice in protest when the matter was before the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to engage in any controversy with the Senator from Montana, but I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and served for a short time as chairman of that committee. On the floor of the Senate I took definite issue with the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Michigan and by the distinguished Senator from Texas in the first instance. I do not know that the Senator from Texas finally adhered to his then view. I also took definite issue with Mr. Dulles. And the Senator will find in the record that I took occasion then to express myself as being satisfied that if we then ratified the Charter itself it would not be necessary to have an additional treaty submitted to the Senate merely fixing the quota of troops that would be made available. I took that position for the simple reason that it seemed to me wholly unnecessary to have one treaty in order to authorize another treaty. But I took it for another reason, which seems to me to be fundamental. The United Nations Organization is the mere agency created by sovereign nations. The United States Government contracts treaty relations with sovereign powers, with other nations, and not with their agency. That is my position. I want to keep it straight. It is in the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Georgia for correcting me with reference to that matter. But certainly I know of no other member of the Foreign Relations Committee who was present when John Foster Dulles made his statement in which he took another view.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to engage the Senator in controversy about that matter and I do not recall exactly whether I interrogated Mr. Dulles before the committee on that phase of his testimony, but if I did not in the committee, I did in the Senate take the same position as that taken by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that by the enactment of the Charter which we were then considering we did not bind ourselves in the Senate to consider hereafter or thereafter legislation implementing that agreement at San Francisco by a two-thirds majority, or that we should even be required to consider that any subsequent agreement would have to be regarded as a treaty rather than as legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I want to say that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and myself, a member of the committee, all took the same position on the floor in the debate that the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Kentucky took.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I recall very distinctly that the Senator from

Illinois took that position on the floor of the Senate, and that the Senator from Alabama took that position on the floor of the Senate. But I am speaking of when Mr. Dulles made his statement before the committee. I have read the testimony very carefully, and I find that the chairman of the committee, who was a delegate to the San Francisco Conference, and Mr. Dulles, who was our legal adviser, and the Senator from Michigan, who was a delegate to the San Francisco Conference, all took the opposite view at that particular time, and the two Senators in question took that view on the floor of the Senate.

Frankly I do not think it makes a great deal of difference from the technical standpoint as to whether or not the agreements must be passed upon by both Houses of Congress, or ratified by a two-thirds majority of the Senate. I am not particularly interested in that question. But I do say that all leading authorities on international law have stated that in their judgment it is a very close question, and likewise that the question of giving the power to the President of the United States to send a delegate with the right to vote to send a portion of our Army, however small it may be, to put down aggression anywhere in the world, is a very close question of constitutional law.

Mr. President, I have offered an amendment dealing with that subject, and I intend on the floor of the Senate tomorrow to quote from some of the leading authorities upon that subject. I am perfectly aware that most Members of the Senate of the United States will vote against such an amendment. Nevertheless, I want my own record to be clear. I want to go on record to show my position with reference to the lack of constitutional authority for giving the President that power.

Mr. President, I do not intend to filibuster on the bill in the slightest degree. I think it is regrettable that anyone should say that because a Senator wants to discuss a constitutional question on the Senate floor for a day and a half or 2 days he was indulging in a filibuster, and to try to create such an impression throughout the United States. After all there is no great hurry for the passage of this bill today or tomorrow or the next day. When the Bretton Woods agreements were under consideration we were told that they must be acted upon without delay. We were told that all the countries of the world were waiting breathlessly to see what the United States of America would do to the Bretton Woods agreements. We were told we had to pass that legislation immediately, and that if we did not do so possibly the world would go to pieces. We did pass the legislation. What other nations have joined us in the Bretton Woods agreements? Has England, our great ally, joined us? Has Russia, another great peace-loving nation, joined us in the Bretton Woods agreements? If they have not done so, what other nations have joined? We listened to the overwhelming propaganda respecting the Bretton Woods agreements. We were urged by newspaper columnists and radio commentators to pass the legislation. They presented the urgent necessity for immediate passage. They wanted hardly any discussion on the floor of the Senate. Mr. President, it has come to the point now where we are a nation controlled by propaganda. As I said at the outset, a delay of a day or 2 days is not going to jeopardize the pending legislation. The Congress will pass it in a short time. I simply rose to correct the idea that there was any filibuster in the Senate simply because a few Senators had the temerity to raise a constitutional question respecting the pending bill.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I hope that, regardless of what determination we may make with respect to the pending bill, we will move to expedite the legislative program. I had intended to speak on the question of UNRRA for the last several days, but in the hope of expediting the passage of the pending bill I have refrained from taking any time of the Senate. However, Mr. President, I want to say that the Senate could meet earlier than it has been meeting and could remain in session longer and in that way expedite consideration of the pending bill.

I want to point out that the situation in the Old World is very serious, in fact it is tragic. People are depending upon us for UNRRA relief. We are the only nation which has not paid its full complement toward the initial UNRRA appropriation. People who are depending upon the balance of our originally pledged contribution are dying by the thousands. The pipe line is empty, and no supplies are being put into it.

Mr. President, this is a serious situation. Unless this appropriation for UNRRA is provided at a very early date it will not be possible to place orders in this country. Therefore no shipments will be made, and not only will there be prolonged suffering but all the good we have thus far accomplished will be of little or no avail. If we could file orders now, if we had the money now, shipments could be inaugurated. The pipe line would not remain empty for long, and relief would be forthcoming before it was too late.

The money which we appropriate will be used in great measure to buy surplus property, commodities, and food now being held by the military. Practically all the money will be spent in this country. It will be spent in a good cause. So I hope, in view of the tragedy of the situation, that we will make a decision here and now to expedite the consideration of legislation, even if it requires earlier sessions, and even if we are required to remain here after 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I remind the Senate that we left here at 3 o'clock last Friday afternoon.

Mr. President, there is pending a legislative program of vast importance. With that realization, and with the hope of being able to spend some time at home during the holidays, I trust that we will seriously consider the situation which confronts us and begin early and work late until we enact the program of pending legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr MORSE. I wonder if the Senator from New York is aware of the fact that the reason given—at least in the press—for the Senate taking a recess at 3 o'clock Friday afternoon, and certainly the reason given in the cloakrooms, was that we could not obtain a quorum if one had been called for.

Mr. MEAD. I do not know what the reason was, but I hope that, regardless of what action we take on this vote, we will make it our business to enact the pending bill as speedily as possible, and then do likewise with the UNRRA appropriation bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before a vote is taken on the pending motion, I should like to say a few words.

The UNRRA appropriation bill, in which I am tremendously interested, and in which I have manifested an interest from the very beginning, is the next order of business, so far as I know. I have conferred with the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator who is now presiding [Mr. McKELLAR] and also with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in whose committee UNRRA originated. The UNRRA appropriation bill is the next order of business. I do not know how long a time will be required to dispose of it. I hope it may be disposed of speedily. I hope that the pending bill may be disposed of today. Whether that is possible, I am not in a position to predict. I am sure that the Senate is perfectly willing to spend as many hours as may be necessary in session considering this legislation. While it is true that on Friday the Senate took a recess at 3 o'clock, on the day before it remaincd in session until after 6. So Friday's early recess was not necessarily a criterion of Senatorial industry.

I hope that the motion to set aside the unfinished business will not be agreed to. I can assure the Senate that immediately upon the conclusion of consideration of the pending bill the UNRRA appropriation bill will be taken up for consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am in complete harmony with the views expressed by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky. A program has been agreed to more or less definitely. It contemplated, first, the consideration and disposition of the bill which is now before the Senate. I understand that it then contemplated that the UNRRA appropriation bill would be taken up. When there has been such a general understanding, it seems to me that to set aside the unfinished business would be unwise in the extreme, and would not make for haste in the consideration of either piece of legislation, but would tend rather to confusion, and perhaps some discord. I fear that the net result would be harmful to both pieces of legislation rather than beneficial to either. So I express the hope

that the motion to lay aside the unfinished business and proceed with the UNRRA measure will not prevail.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in expressing the hope that the UNRRA legislation may be taken up at this time, and also the hope that the distinguished leader on the other side of the aisle will see his way clear to join in this motion.

I speak as one on this side of the aisle who is supporting the Committee on Foreign Relations in its report to the Senate, and opposing any amendment to the pending bill. I speak as one on this side of the aisle who is supporting the UNRRA legislation as it comes from the committee handling that measure.

As one who has had some personal experience overseas, and has made some personal observation of the critical situation facing the nations of Europe and the stark hunger, famine, and disease which are now prevalent overseas, it seems to me that a delay of 2 or 3 days, or even a day, is far more critical when human life is confronted with hunger and disease. It seems to me that if my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle would join with us at this time we could put the UNRRA legislation through and get it behind us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and allow my vote to stand. I am informed that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote as I have voted.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained at a conference being held at the White House.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

I wish to announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been excused. He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained in committee meetings.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—21

Brooks	Fulbright	Shipstead
Buck	Hickenlooper	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfill
Butler	Mead	Wagner
Capehart	Moore	Willis
Chavez	Morse	Wilson
Ellender	Revercomb	Young

NAYS—53

Austin	Gurney	Murray
Ball	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hill	Radcliffe
Briggs	Hoey	Reed
Byrd	Huffman	Russell
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Connally	Langer	Taylor
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Magnuson	Walsh
Gerry	Maybank	Wheeler
Gossett	Millikin	Wherry
Green	Mitchell	White
Guffey	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Hatch	Pepper
Andrews	Hawkes	Robertson
Bailey	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bilbo	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Lucas	Tobey
Bridges	McFarland	Wiley
Cordon	Myers	
Glass	O'Daniel	

So Mr. MORSE's motion was rejected.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for consideration of the report. Its consideration will take but a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the report? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the report be agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate to us just what is the agreement which has been reached by the conferees?

Mr. WALSH. The House conferees receded from the position which the House originally took, and the bill as reported by the conferees is as the Senate passed it.

Mr. WHITE. And the conference report is agreed to by the Senate conferees, I assume.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What was the difference between the Senate and the House in connection with this matter?

Mr. WALSH. The Senate sought to include provision for the request of the Senator from Louisiana that the Director of the Office of Budget and Reports be among the officers dealt with by the bill and be given the same treatment as that given the other chiefs of bureaus.

Mr. HILL. The House did not agree to the amendment and the conferees did not agree to it; is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. No; in the conference the position of the Senate was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. The conferees agreed to the position of the Senate regarding the matter; did they?

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 20, 24, 25, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,884,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,912,558"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$587,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$440,794,164"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission (national defense), $465,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$666,040,849"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Emergency rubber project, $1,649,790, and the balance remaining shall be used to liquidate such project, including the elimination of the remaining plantations, the rehabilitation and return of leased lands to the owners and the disposal of other property according to law, and for the continuation of the production, breeding, and disease phases of guayule research on indicator plots and experimental areas until June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That any balances remaining shall be available until December 31, 1946, for completing the liquidation of the emergency rubber project."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Division of Geography, $13,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"War Relocation Authority: Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, Department of the Interior, $2,500,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 2 and 3 of the second paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "one hundred and twentieth" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundredth"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$54,107,572"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$2,945,503,585" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$3,919,838,479"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$541,018,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,514,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,675,684,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$11,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$2,575,225,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,248,510,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,359,367,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$800,374,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$14,370,159,964"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "further"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32 and 39.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee state the changes in the bill?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The conferees have agreed on everything except two items relating to the Air Corps of the Army. There is still a difference, and I will ask for an additional conference on those two items.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the

House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4407, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 3, 1945.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert "$11,799,313,000"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment insert "$30,263,923,923."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 32 and 39; ask for a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTERS IN ALASKA TO ADMINISTER OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to an amendment of the House to House bill 304, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
November 30, 1945.

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 304) to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, with an amendment, as follows: Before line 1 of the said Senate engrossed amendment insert: "And that section 2 of said act approved August 5, 1939, is amended to read as follows."

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have proposed amendments intended to improve the bill in the following ways:

First, to eliminate the provisions which would give diplomatic rank and status to our representative and deputy representative to the Security Council.

Second, to establish continuous office for full-time salaried representatives appointed to the General Assembly by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as distinguished from the present theory of the bill which would establish an intermittent office to be filled by representatives appointed by the President without the consent of the Senate, who shall serve without salary and who shall be specially selected and appointed to each session of the Assembly.

Third, to require the advice and consent of the Senate to the appointment of all representatives, except the President and the Secretary of State, to all organs and agencies of the United Nations, regardless of whether such representatives are Members of the Congress or are officers of the United States who shall have been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to unrelated positions. The bill as it now stands provides that only the representative and his deputy to the Security Council and the representatives to the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that the appointment of representatives to the Economic and Social Council may be exempted from such consent if the appointees are Members of Congress or if they hold some other Federal job to which they have been appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Fourth, to preserve the theory of the bill that the President or, at the discretion of the President, the Secretary of State may represent the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations, and to make it clear that the Secretary of State, if so acting, would not have to receive the preliminary consent of the Senate, and to authorize the President to make special temporary appointments of persons to specially designated meetings or sessions of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

Fifth, to require, in addition to the special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures and on the participation therein of the representatives of the United States, as now provided in the bill, that Congress shall also receive special current reports from the President on matters being dealt with by the Council which in the judgment of the President may lead to decisions to take enforcement measures, and on the President's instructions to our representative on the Council regarding such preliminary matters and the decisions which may result therefrom.

Mr. President, I shall first discuss two amendments intended to eliminate diplomatic rank and status and undefined extraneous duties for our representative and our deputy representative to the Security Council, as now provided in sections 2 (a) and (b) of the bill. Since the two amendments relate to the same subject matter and since the decision on either of them would probably control decision on the other, I ask unanimous consent that both amendments may be considered as consolidated into one. I refer to the amendment now on the desks of Senators, reading as follows——

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment stated from the desk?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to identify the two amendments and then have them stated.

On pages 1 and 2, strike out all of section 2 (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, who shall receive annual compensation of $20,000 and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President.

The other related amendment is on page 2, lines 9, 10, and 11, to strike out "who shall have the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary"; and on page 2, line 11, insert the word "who" before the word "shall."

Mr. President, I ask that the two amendments be consolidated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On pages 1 and 2, it is proposed to strike out all of section 2 (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, who shall receive annual compensation of $20,000 and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President.

On page 2, lines 9, 10, and 11 it is proposed to strike out "who shall have the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary."

On page 2, line 11, it is proposed to insert the word "who" before the word "shall."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the two amendments be considered as having been consolidated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I inquire what was the Senators's motion?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have pointed out to the Senate that I have two amendments which would eliminate diplomatic status of our representative to the Security Council and his deputy. Inasmuch as both amendments relate to the same subject, I have suggested that they be considered as having been consolidated so that I will not have to argue in support of each one separately.

Mr. HILL. I suggest, Mr. President, that the Senator merely ask that the amendments be considered as one, without making any formal motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered as one, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I to understand that the question which will presently be submitted to the Senate by my able friend is confined exclusively to the definition of the status of our representatives on the Security Council?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It does not confine itself exclusively to the definition, but to the subject matter of diplomatic status, title, and immunities of our representative to the Security Council and his delegate. That is the single sharp issue involved in the present discussion.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, does the Senator, at some place in his amendment, take care of the subject of immunity?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will be taken care of directly.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, from hearing the amendment read, it does not seem to be the same as the printed form, a copy of which is on my desk. Has additional language been added to the amendment with reference to salaries, or is there a new copy of the amendment which does not include the salary of $20,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The printed form of the amendment should show the following: "On pages 1 and 2, strike out all of section 2 (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following: Section 2 (a)," and so forth.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I may say that in the copy which has just been handed to me I find the amendment to which the Senator has referred. I had not seen it before.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Have I made it clear?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I may emphasize that under the consolidated amendments all the features of sections 2 (a) and 2 (b) of the bill remain the same except for the elimination of the provisions relating to diplomatic rank and status, and extra undefined duties of our representative to the Security Council.

As to section 2 (a) of the bill, which provides that our representative to the Security Council "shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations Organization as the President may from time to time direct":

Is it not clear that our representative to the Security Council will have enough to do in attending to the business of that agency without having to assume undefined additional duties? This grant of additional and possible overlord authority and responsibility to our representative on the Security Council, in relation to the other organs and agencies of the organization, has, I submit, an inescapable tendency to exalt that representative over our representatives to the General Assembly. Indeed, it could be used so as to allow the representative on the Security Council to direct and to control the actions of our representatives to the Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and all the specialized organs and agencies of the United Nations.

It, of course, might be advisable to have someone on the ground to check on how the instructions of the President are being carried out, and to perform other chores which would not disturb the proper relationships between our various representatives. If so, it certainly is not necessary that we make this glancing approach to the subject. It would be an easy thing in this bill, or in other legislation, to authorize the President, if he does not already have the authority, to appoint someone to perform that specific job.

Moreover, we will be called upon to give our advice and consent to the appointment of our representative on the Security Council, and we shall perform our duty by considering his qualifications for that particular office, the nature of which is defined in the Charter. We cannot weigh his qualifications for unpredictible and anonymous duties.

The granting of diplomatic rank and status to our representative on the Security Council, and to his deputy, is not supported by the arguments which have been made in behalf of the provision. While querying the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] at the beginning of the debate as to the purpose of this provision, I was informed by him that it is to assure that our representative and deputy representative on the Security Council shall follow the instructions of the President.

Section 3 of the bill provides in the most unequivocal manner that all our representatives who are provided for in section 2 of the bill—I say all of them, and that includes our representative and his deputy on the Security Council—"shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. That particular section of the bill has disturbed me somewhat. I do not know what other way may be provided by which instructions could be given to our representatives. But it seems to me that, so far as the law is concerned, the language which the Senator has read makes our representatives but little more than errand boys for the President and for the State Department. I have some doubt as to whether, under those circumstances our Government will be able to obtain representatives of the proper caliber to serve on the various agencies to which reference has been made if we are to build the United Nations Organization for peace through service to the people of the world. I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Colorado on that point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, as to what our representative on the Security Council shall do, I do not see any escape from transmitting our will through instructions of the President. It has been held by the Supreme Court that the President is the sole organ of communication between this and other nations. Therefore I have been unable to figure out any way by which communication may be conducted than the way which has been provided. For example, it would be utterly impracticable—and I think it would be wrong—for the Congress itself to short-circuit the President by corresponding and giving instructions direct to our representatives in the United Nations Organization. It seems to me that the basic question there is whether the language which I have read means a complete delegation of all our constitutional powers to the President, so far as those powers relate to subject matters involved in the Charter, or whether we retain as to those subjects over which we have reserved jurisdiction the right to funnel our own will through the President as an intermediary. At the beginning of the debate I asked some questions with regard to that subject, and both the distinguished senior Senator from Texas and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan said in effect that as to any reserved powers of Congress under the Constitution, we could funnel those powers through the President.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that under the present set-up, and the concept underlying the San Francisco Charter, there is no alternative, perhaps, but to make all our representatives completely subject to instructions of the President. But it seems to me that the necessity for that arrangement emphasizes the character of this organization as having very much the appearance of a council of ambassadors similar to previous ones, instead of the appearance of an embryo parliament of the world in which representatives of the people may discuss freely and fully issues which threaten the peace of the world. Obviously, if all the representatives to the General Assembly are to be under strict instructions from their various chief executives, the possibility of full and free discussion in that Assembly is very greatly limited.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that undoubtedly the provision of the bill has that tendency. Candor requires me to say that I have tried to figure out how we could draw a line between where these men may act independently and where they must act in obedience to the instructions of the President, and I have been unable to find that line.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator that it is difficult, for I, too, made a little effort to do that. I believe, however, that in actual practice the President and the Secretary of State will be guided to a considerable extent by the reports from our representatives on these various organs, so it is not exactly a one-way street that reaches back into Washington without somebody, knowing what is going on in the headquarters of the Assembly, instructing our delegate what to do.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The amendment which I am now discussing drives directly at the point whether we shall turn this organization into a diplomatic convention, and it is my theory, of course, that we should not. That is one of the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. BALL. I shall support the Senator's amendment. I think the further we can get away from the concept of a council or assembly of ambassadors of foreign rulers here, there, and every-

where, the nearer we will come to an effective organization to keep the peace.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from his fine contribution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator consider that the provisions in the bill for annual reports and current reports are inclined to keep the Congress as much in touch with the executive as any other governmental branch? In other words, so far as determination of policy goes, whether it be internal or external, Congress has the primary charge of that matter. If at any time there arises from the reports which are made to the Congress by the President, coming from overseas, something which Congress deems leads it to take action, the Congress may, if it desires to do so, change or amend its policy, and the Executive, if the policy is in conformity with the Constitution, would be obliged to carry it out. Is not that the condition that is left by the bill with respect to the Government of the United States?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree entirely that the provision to which the Senator has referred is designed to give information to Congress, presumably so that it can protect its own powers and interest in specific situations as they may arise. An amendment which I shall discuss later is based on the theory that that provision does not go far enough in several very important respects. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in assuming that possibly the Senator from Colorado shares the view I expressed a few days ago in my speech on the jurisdiction of the World Court, that we should at least hope for that era in which the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization will develop into what we might very well call the legislative branch of the world organization, and that the men selected to represent us on that organization, or that branch of the organization, should be men of the highest caliber, who can look forward to service there on a full-time rather than on a part-time basis?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Frankness requires me to say that I think there is perhaps a difference of opinion between the distinguished Senator and myself as to the time within which we can reach the situation to which he refers. But if we can evolute to that sort of a situation, I should certainly be heartily in favor of it.

Mr. MORSE. So long as our objective is a common one, I shall be glad to join with the Senator in doing everything we can to shorten the time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will say also that I have an amendment which is designed to correct what I consider to be a serious down-grading of the Assembly. In fact, several of my amendments have that intent. Under my view, we will be saved, if we are to be saved, by the Assembly. Once the Council ever commences a full-scale war, the organization, in my opinion, will be finished, because it will thereby confess the failure of its intended purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Carrying that a little further, against whom would the Council operate? Under the veto power it can operate only against nations which are so small and so unimportant that they cannot attract a powerful patron. So that the function of the Security Council at the present time is confined to possible actions against very small nations of that unimportant nature.

Mr. MORSE. I am in complete agreement with the Senator's position on the veto. In my judgment, there is no hope of the elimination of power politics and balance-of-power diplomacy so long as the veto power can be exercised by any of the great powers of the world. We are either going to have rules of reason apply to all, and be equally applicable to all, or we are going to resort again, when some great power does not like a contemplated decision of the United Nations Organization, to the jungle law of force. I hope that in the very near future the Government of the United States will take a very definite stand that we are ready to have applied to us, and we believe every other great power should have applied to it, a uniformity of rule, without the reservation of a veto.

Along that line I found it impellant on me to make the plea I did make for the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. I hope the Senate in the not too far distant future—and I speak in terms of days—will proceed with a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations to take up the question of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should be interested if the Senator would develop a little further what he had in mind when he said that if the United Nations Organization ever used force, or had a war, it would mean the end of the Organization. What did the Senator mean by that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the first place, under the present nature of the Charter, the great powers have the veto right. It is inconceivable that a great power would not veto a proposed aggression against itself having the size of a war, or having any size. It is equally inconceivable from my standpoint that a great power would not use its veto if one of its important satellite nations were being considered as the object of coercive action. What is left? As I said a while ago, a group of nations so unimportant that they cannot attract a powerful patron, and against those nations nothing is required but very meager policing force.

The basic theory, so far as the Council is concerned, is that the important nations that have the power of veto must hang together and attend to the enforcement job contemplated by the Charter. It seems obvious to me that if they do not hang together they will be in war with each other, and in a war on such a scale as would result it cannot be argued that the Council will have retained its effectiveness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator think that the abolition of the veto power, at least in the area dealing with armament, which is the exercise of power through arms, would be an improvement?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I could not agree to the abolition of the veto power at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, let us leave out time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I can foresee that we may evolute after experience with each other, after, through that experience, learning that we really mean that we want peace when we say we want it—and that might take a long course of years—I can see that we may evolute to that point, and then I would favor the abolition of the veto power.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is really what I have in mind. Then we should try to get some idea of where we are moving, and where we should move in order for this organization to be effective. The Senator agrees that is at least where we should aim to move?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Under circumstances of there being no veto power, and agreement having been reached upon the regulations concerning armament, if then there were a nation which was recalcitrant, we will say, and a war resulted, would the Senator consider that to be the end of this organization?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think associated with that time we would have a world union which would abolish separate armies and this would enable the centralized military force of the world union to act against any recalcitrant part of the whole. I believe the problem then would be different.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then it would not necessarily mean the end of the organization?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Not at that time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That would be the normal functioning of an organization.

Mr. MILLIKIN. To make it clearer, my remarks apply to the way the organization is at this time, and, under my viewpoint, as it will continue to be for some time to come.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I quite agree concerning the veto power. I do not quite see how there can be a legal war, so to speak, authorized by the organization against any nation which really counts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will not the Senator agree that that necessarily limits the use of coercive measures to very small and very unimportant nations? And, digressing from the instant subject, that may put the thought in our minds that our delegation of authority to this Organization to use armed forces need not be more than of modest size, because it should not take enormous military concentrations to whip one of these small and relatively unimportant nations.

Mr. President, I have pointed out that section 3 of the bill in the clearest possible language states that our representatives to the Organization shall follow the instructions of the President. My point being that since it is clearly provided that that shall be the case, there is

no point in giving diplomatic status and immunities and privileges to our representative to the Council to secure the same result.

It is respectively suggested that nothing can add to the clarity of this provision, and certainly nothing is added by a masked approach which does not mention the subject aimed at and which carries with it many irrelevant implications.

The provision is not extended to our representatives to the other agencies and organs of the Organization. If the assigned reason for the provision, to wit, that it will make it additionally clear that our representative to the Security Council shall act under the instructions of the President, are sound, then the provision throws an unexplained and ominous suspicion of disobedience on our future representative to that particular agency and causes one to wonder why it is unlikely that the unknown future representatives to the Assembly and other agencies and organs of the Organization will be less recalcitrant. Surely, if it is important that our representative on the Security Council shall have this additional and oblique admonition to follow the President's instructions, it is also important that our representatives on the other organs and agencies of the Organization shall in the same curious way be made to feel the duty of obedience.

Furthermore, the charter itself grants to our representatives to the Organization the privileges and immunities necessary for the independent exercise of their functions. I read article 105:

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes.

2. Representatives of the members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article.

Or may propose conventions to the members of the United Nations for this purpose.

I quote an excerpt from the report by the executive committee to the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations dated October 27, 1945:

Under its terms of reference, Committee 10 undertook to make studies and prepare recommendations concerning the location of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations, and now submits its findings to the executive committee.

AGREEMENT WITH HOST STATE

1. Any agreement entered into by the Organization with the host state—

That is, the state where the seat of the Organization will be located—

should provide that the United Nations, its principal and subsidiary organs and the specialized agencies should enjoy all necessary guaranties and facilities provided by articles 104 and 105 of the Charter for the free exercise, in all circumstances, of their functions, diplomatic immunities and privileges, including inviolability of buildings and property owned or occupied by the United Nations or its organs, satisfactory visa facilities, exemption from immigration regulations for the members of the staff, experts and permanent and temporary foreign delegations connected with the United Nations. (Agreements made with states on whose territory the headquarters of any of the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations or of specialized agencies are located should include similar provisions.)

The Secretary of State in his report to the President of June 26, 1945, on the San Francisco Conference closes his remarks on the subject as follows—page 160:

So far as the United States is concerned, legislation will be needed to enable the officials of the United States—

To do what?

to afford all of the appropriate privileges and immunities due the Organization and its officials under this provision. Such legislation would deal with such exemption from various tax burdens and other requirements as is commonly granted to representatives of foreign governments. The enactment of legislation and its application to such persons would not be for the purpose of conferring a favor upon any individuals. It would rather be for the purpose of assuring to the Organization the possibility that its work could be carried on without interference or interruption. The according of such privileges and immunities is merely one aspect of cooperating with the Organization itself.

So, from article 105 and from the report of the preparatory commission the remarks of the Secretary of State on the subject, we may conclude that the Organization itself, by appropriate conventions with the host country and other nations, will see to it that the representatives from this and all other member nations will be afforded the privileges and immunities necessary for carrying on their official business and that the whole subject is premature and that we had better wait to see what the Organization wants its members to do in the way of privileges and immunities.

Let me emphasize that domestically we can do what we want to do as to privileges and immunities for our own representatives or for any favored category of them without giving them diplomatic rank and status.

Then I suggest that we are setting a very harmful precedent. It follows from the fact that we are a powerful and leading nation; that if we vest our representative to the Council with diplomatic rank and status, that every other member country, whether or not it can afford it, will consider that it, too, must do the same, and it will not be long before all the representatives to the Council, their deputies, and all the representatives to the Assembly, and all the representatives of all the member countries on the other organs and agencies of the United Nations, numbering into the hundreds, will also be given diplomatic rank and status.

There would be so many ambassadors that they would not be able to sit down to work or to eat because they would never be able to agree on their places at the tables. Foster, in his book on the practice of diplomacy, gives an amusing account of the early day precedence difficulties at diplomatic conventions and of foreign courts. He states:

A large part of the deliberations of the great congresses of European nations up to and even including the early part of the last century was taken up in setting the question of precedence among the envoys or delegates. This was notably so at the Conference of Westphalia. At the Congress of Ryswick a warm debate occurred over the demand of the ambassadors of the Emperor of Germany that a particular space should be set apart for their carriages, and that this should be the post of honor. A fierce quarrel occurred over the allotment of rooms. In the conference room a single table had been provided, but no agreement could be reached as to the order of seating, and so in that room they all stood; and another room was provided in which there was no table, and the envoys sat in a circle. At the Diet of Regensberg the precedence of the ambassadors was decided by an arithmetical rule by which each had precedence over the rest twice in 10 days. At Utrecht a round table was used, but this lost its accommodating qualities when it was discovered that the place of honor was opposite the door of entrance, and that every place of honor has a right and a left. At this congress a quarrel for precedence took place between the footmen of the several ambassadors, in the account of which, occupying 30 pages in the History of the Congress, it is recorded that it "threatened to retard the peace of Christendom." Addison gives an amusing account in the Spectator of a discussion over it which he heard in one of the coffee houses in London, the result of which he sums up in these words: "All I could learn at last from these honest gentlemen was that the matter in debate was too high a nature for such heads as theirs, or mine, to comprehend." Macaulay, in his History of England, describes in his best vein the proceedings of the Congress of Ryswick, which well illustrates these idle controversies.

The contest of envoys to these international congresses of the past has been not more animated and absurd than that of the envoys to the several courts of Europe. Many amusing and some tragic incidents have been narrated respecting the latter, from which I give the following instances: It is related that the Spanish Ambassador to England in 1661, in order to secure a place in the royal procession next to the King and before his French colleague, attacked the latter's coach in the streets of London, hamstrung his horses and killed his men, thus vindicating his country's greatness.

When the plenipotentiaries of France and Austria met to settle the conditions of marriage between Louis XIV and Marie Theresa, in order to preserve the full dignity of their nations, they stepped together, with the right foot, side by side, into a council chamber hung in corresponding halves with their respective colors, and sat down at the same instant precisely opposite each other at a square table, on two mathematically equivalent armchairs. Such events as these in statecraft led Voltaire to remark that armchairs, backed chairs, and stools were "important subjects of politics, and illustrious subjects of quarrels" in those days.

A story is told of two newly arrived envoys from Italy and Germany who, being unable to agree as to which should first present his credentials to the King of France, stipulated that whoever reached Versailles soonest on the day of their reception should take precedence of the other. The Prussian went the night before the audience and sat on a bench before the palace until dawn. The Italian arriving early in the morning saw the Prussian there before him and slipped surreptitiously through the door of the king's bedroom and commenced his speech of audience. The Prussian rushed after him, pulled him back by the skirts, and commenced his harangue. The memoirs of diplomatists and the histories of Europe are full of the extreme and absurd contentions of envoys, but the foregoing are sufficient to illustrate their extreme and other farcical pretentions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the Senator imagine that future historians, in looking upon our deliberations over the United Nations Organization, with its power of veto which renders the whole thing futile, may chronicle them in somewhat the same manner as the events to which he has referred were chronicled?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is difficult for us to see the humor of the day in which we live.

It takes a great deal of money beyond that which is paid in salary for an ambassador to maintain his position abroad. Surely we do not intend to exclude a poor man who can meet all qualifications except the possession of a huge private fortune from representing his country on the Council. In passing, I point out that the bill as now drawn does not provide any salary for our representatives to the Assembly, and the same objection is applicable there.

I feel quite sure that it was never intended that the Organization should be a diplomatic convention or a mere adjunct to traditional diplomacy. I suggest that if the Organization has any chance to succeed it will be because it is a hard-working body, free of ostentation and diplomatic frills, and characterized by democratic simplicity consistent with its basic theory of the equal sovereignty of all its members and its professed regard for the poor and humble of all the world.

The Organization was created because diplomacy has failed to keep the peace. It remains to be seen whether the Organization will be more successful, but we cannot hope that it will be more successful if it is to ape the system which did not succeed.

A short 5 months have worked a startling and chilling recession in the hopes of the world for the success of the Charter. The revelations, one on top of the other, that secret diplomacy in which we have participated has gone a long way in chaining the world to special spheres of influence and power politics have quenched the fervors of many of the most zealous promoters of the United Nations.

Confronted as we are with the task of reasserting and reestablishing the primacy of the opposing ideals and actions proclaimed by the Charter and to which we have pledged ourselves, what are we doing about it? How do we intend to hold and reverse the mounting forces of repudiation?

We set the tone of what we propose to do by making our representative to the Security Council an envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary and by making his deputy an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary we offer rank and status and immunity and privileges and diplomatic titles.

Confronted with the challenge of a despairing and frightened world, we take our shining hope of June and at the beginning of its first winter we deposit it as a foundling on the doorstep of diplomacy.

Envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary! Envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary! That, my fellow Senators, in the language of Father Divine is the way to "tangibilate the intangible."

Mr. President, I suggest that we might as well have a vote now on this amendment if there are no further remarks.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the exchange between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] if the Senator from Colorado has concluded his remarks. I do not wish to interrupt him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The thing that was said in the exchange between the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Arkansas goes so desperately to the heart and core of the question whether or not the United Nations can succeed, or whether there is any chance to chart peace in this present unhappy world, that I wish to make reference to it based upon a current exhibit in the news. I think this phase of the matter is even more important than the United Nations Organization itself, if that could be possible. I wish to read a dispatch from London this morning:

RULE OF JAPS, NOT ATOM, IRKS RUSSIA—BEVIN

LONDON.—Britain's Labor Cabinet has concluded that American control of Japan, rather than the atomic energy secrecy, is responsible for Russia's recent cooling toward the western powers.

This is the substance of a statement that Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin made to the external affairs committee of the parliamentary labor party this week.

PRESS SUPPORTS BELIEF

Bevin refrained from elaborating on this significant comment despite the effort of Labor Members of Commons to draw him out.

It was presumably on the basis of reports from Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, British Ambassador to Moscow, that Bevin reached his verdict.

The Soviet press and radio have been assuming an attitude toward American action in Japan which appears to support Bevin's findings.

Russian comment has been stressing the survival of Japanese industrialists in position of authority, continued existence of a nucleus of Japan's police and military forces.

Alleged United States failure to encourage the weak progressive forces in Japan, combined with Russia's exclusion from a share in shaping Japan's destiny, evidently has been stimulating Soviet fear that Japan is to be prepared as a potential outpost against Russia.

Mr President, it is the latter and final sentence which I emphasize.

Here again we collide, as we have collided all this year, with Soviet fear in respect to ultimate resurgence of Axis aggression upon them. Here again we confront precisely that same fear.

I wish to refer to a speech which I made on the floor of the Senate on January 10, 1945. I shall read one paragraph of it. Mr. President, I am as strongly convinced today as I was then that there is collateral action which should be taken between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States in behalf of world peace which is indispensable to the sort of great-power relationship which is necessary not only for the effective functioning of the United Nations Organization but which is equally necessary for any sort of effective partnership between America and the Soviets and Great Britain which will be mutually effective in behalf of peace, security, and understanding.

On January 10, nearly a year ago, before the United Nations Organization had been formed, when I was discussing this matter I referred to the fact that at that time Russia was constantly expressing her fear of a resurgent Germany. She seemed to wish to have more effective protection against a resurgent Axis than she could see in sight at the time. I then said what I am about to quote; and in the light of the dispatch from London which I have just read, I submit that it is as true today as it was at that time, it has constantly remained true in the interim, and I fear it will continue to be true until something of this nature is done.

I quote:

I propose that we meet this problem conclusively and at once—

Namely, the problem of giving the Soviets an assurance against Axis resurgence which should be so complete that this reason never again could be urged against total and sympathetic cooperation not only in the United Nations Organization but also among the great powers—

I propose that we meet this problem conclusively and at once. There is no reason to wait. America has this same self-interest in permanently, conclusively, and effectively disarming Germany and Japan. It is simply unthinkable that America, or any other member of the United Nations, would allow this Axis calamity to reproduce itself again. Whether we Americans do or do not agree upon all the powers that shall reside in all ultimate international council to call upon us for joint military action in behalf of collective security, surely we can agree that we do not even want an instant's hesitation or doubt about our military cooperation in the peremptory use of force, if needed, to keep Germany and Japan demilitarized. Such a crisis would be the lengthened shadow of the present war. It would be a direct epilog to the present war. It should be handled as this present war is handled. There should be no more need to refer any such action back to Congress than that Congress should expect to pass upon battle plans today. The Commander in Chief should have instant power to act, and he should act. I know of no reason why a hard-and-fast treaty between the major Allies should not be signed today to achieve this dependable end. We need not await the determination of our other post-war relationships. This problem—this menace—stands apart by itself. Regardless of what our later decision may be in respect to the power that shall be delegated to the President to join our military force with others in a new peace league—no matter what limitations may commend themselves to our ultimate judgments in this regard, I am sure we can agree that there should be no limitations when it comes to keeping the Axis out of piracy for keeps. I respectfully urge that we meet this problem now. From it stem many of today's confusions, doubts, and frustrations. I think we should immediately put it behind us by conclusive action. Having done, so, most of the reasons given for controversial unilateral and bilateral actions by our allies will have disappeared; and then we shall be able, at least, to judge accurately whether we have found and cured the real hazard to our relationships. We shall have closed ranks. We shall have returned infinitely closer to basic unity.

Mr. President, I submit that at that time it was perfectly clear that if we could have a treaty between the three major powers which would permanently create an alliance against the resurgence of the Axis—nothing else, just that, the resurgence of the Axis—which then and now seems to be either the reason for Russia's difficulties with us or at least the excuse, if we could have done it then, that would have cleared the track. I very much doubt that we shall clear the track until we do do it. It seems to me that if an engagement of that character were written between the three major powers, within the four corners of the United Nations Organization, it would complete a guaranty against Axis resurgence which would prevent the misunderstandings which are plaguing our international relationships today, if it be in fact true that the fear of this resurgence is to blame for our difficulties.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Russell
Bankhead	Hoey	Shipstead
Barkley	Huffman	Smith
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wheeler
Gerry	Mitchell	Wherry
Gossett	Moore	White
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Murray	Willis
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Hart	Radcliffe	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not consume the time of the Senate by making an extended argument against the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. I hope, however, that the Senate will reject the amendment.

The diplomatic character of our representative would be quite appropriate, and a great help to him in the way of privileges a diplomat has regarding passage through a country, the question of precedence, and matters of that kind. Furthermore, the President might wish to utilize this representative to perform a diplomatic mission in an adjoining country, or something of that nature. It will do not harm whatever to invest our representative with this character, and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], which I transfer to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I vote "nay." I am informed that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico would vote as I have voted.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are detained at a conference being held at the White House.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained because of attendance at important committee meetings.

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business, as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. The Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been excused. He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—17

Ball	Moore	Wheeler
Donnell	Revercomb	Wherry
Fulbright	Shipstead	Willis
Hickenlooper	Smith	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Taft	Young
Millikin	Tydings	

NAYS—46

Austin	Gurney	Murray
Bankhead	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hoey	Russell
Briggs	Huffman	Stanfill
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McCarran	Tunnell
Eastland	McClellan	Vandenberg
Ellender	McKellar	Wagner
Ferguson	McMahon	Walsh
Gerry	Magnuson	White
Gossett	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Mitchell	
Guffey	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—33

Aiken	Chavez	Mead
Andrews	Cordon	Morse
Bailey	George	Myers
Brewster	Glass	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hatch	Overton
Brooks	Hawkes	Pepper
Buck	Hayden	Reed
Bushfield	Kilgore	Robertson
Butler	La Follette	Saltonstall
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	McFarland	Tobey

So Mr. MILLIKIN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I call up an amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 16 to 20, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint not to exceed five representatives of the United States to the Assembly of the United Nations who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President, who shall receive such salaries not to exceed $12,000 each per annum as the President shall determine, and one of whom shall be designated as the senior representative.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the Committee on Foreign Relations agreed to an amendment dealing with that subject, and wonder if it would not be satisfactory to the Senator from Colorado. It is contemplated that there shall be not more than five representatives appointed to the Assembly. To the Security Council there will be only one. Therefore it is rather unreasonable to expect that each of the five temporary representatives would receive the same compensation that is paid to the one representative on the Security Council who gives all his time to that position. Representatives to the Assembly may serve for only a few

weeks or months. The amendment agreed to by the committee is in line 20, on page 2, as follows:

Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of appointment as the President may specify.

In other words, representatives to the Assembly would receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 a year for such period of time as they actually serve.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I regret that I cannot accept the amendment for the reason that my basic theory is that it should be a continuous office, and that those who are appointed to the Assembly should be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have a rather lengthy argument which I am now approaching. I wonder if it would be more feasible to proceed with it the first thing tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there is a larger attendance in the Senate now than the Senator will have at the reconvening of the Senate tomorrow. If the Senator wants a large audience he had better continue now. When the Senate reconvenes tomorrow the Senator will not have so large an audience as he now has.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have rarely had so large an audience during the course of this debate. If I had any assurance that Members would remain I should be glad to continue.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator makes as good an argument and presentation of his case as he usually does Members should stay under the spell of his remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We will see, Mr. President, how we come out.

Section 2 of the bill provides in paragraph (c):

(c) The President may appoint from time to time to attend a designated session or designated sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States, one of whom shall be designated as the senior representative.

It seems to me that the provision represents a very serious down-grading of the importance of the Assembly. Note, please, that the President may make appointments "from time to time to attend a designated session or designated sessions of the General Assembly."

The provision goes on the theory that each Assembly is a sort of an original creation, with an original set of problems unconnected with preceeding history which can best be solved by a succession of specially selected delegations having only temporary tenure, serving without salaries and appointed without the advice and consent of the Senate to meet the expediencies of the moment.

First, I respectfully affirm that nothing of the kind is required by the Charter and there is no claim to the contrary in this debate.

I do not deny that under the Charter we are permitted to give vagrant attention to our duties in the Assembly. I argue that we do not have to do it and that it would be a very unwise thing if we were to do it.

The amendment which I have proposed would make permanent and continuous the office and the duties and would make the tenure of regular, constantly serving representatives, appointed with the consent of the Senate, subject only to the pleasure of the President.

Whether we shall regard the office as discontinuous to be filled from time to time by temporary and newly appointed representatives or whether we should view the office as continuous regardless of whether or not the Assembly is in actual session, and as deserving the continuous attention of our representatives who shall possess continuous tenure, limited only by the pleasure of the President, depends in the main, I suggest, on the functions and purposes of that body.

The distinguished senior Senator from Texas, chairman of our Committee on Foreign Relations, and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan returned last June hot from the San Francisco Conference and with noble and moving eloquence spoke to us of what had been accomplished and of the transcendent importance of the Assembly.

The distinguished senior Senator from Texas said, among other things:

The international organization which the Charter establishes will include a General Assembly of all member nations, in which the smallest and the weakest state will have equal power and authority with the mightiest and strongest. The Assembly will constitute a democratic forum in which freedom of debate is practically unlimited and in which all of the matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to any of its organs may receive the scrutiny and the discussion of the member states. It will form a world forum for the discussion of matters whatever their origin that may relate to international peace and security. Here will be hammered out on the anvil of debate the problems that may confront the Organization throughout its career. Here will be formed a mighty public opinion which shall exert a tremendous influence upon the solution of all questions that relate to international peace and security. Here may be formulated recommendations to the Security Council and to the member states.

The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan said:

The Charter tells the General Assembly that it is empowered—and I beg of you, Senators, to listen to these words, Here is the heart and core of humanity's hope for tomorrow. The General Assembly is empowered—to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situations regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare of friendly relations among nations, and of situations resulting from a violation of the purposes and principles set forth in this Charter.

Mr. President, this can be a new emancipation proclamation for the world. You may tell me that it is calculated to "keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the heart." I reply that I know of no better hope. I reply that it certainly will be broken if you insist upon denying it a chance or if you cripple it at birth.

In the report of June 26, 1945, of the Secretary of State to the President on the result of the San Francisco Conference, the following appears at page 65:

From the foregoing description it is clear that the General Asembly occupies a central position in the Organization. Although it cannot invade the functions which have been specifically asigned in security matters to the Security Council, it will nevertheless wield great authority and influence throughout all parts of the Organization and will affect the development of basic policies of the entire Organization.

Unlike the functions of the Security Council, which are primarily political and in case of need may be repressive in character, the functions of the General Assembly will be concerned with the promotion of constructive solutions, of international problems in the widest range of human relationships, economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian. The General Assembly, therefore, may well come to be regarded by all nations as the forum in which their interests can be effectively represented and promoted.

In the same report, at page 63, the Secretary of State declares:

The role of the General Assembly in the maintenance of peace and security can be summarized as follows:

1. The right to consider the general principles of cooperation, in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments;

2. The right to make recommendations to the members or to the Security Council on such principles;

3. The right to discuss any questions pertaining to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member of the Organization, by the Security Council or, in certain cases, by a nonmember;

4. The right to make recommendations to the members or to the Security Council with regard to any such questions;

5. The responsibility to refer questions on which action is necessary to the Security Council either before or after discussion or recommendation;

6. The right to call attention of the Security Council to situations likely to endanger international peace and security;

7. The obligation not to engage in making recommendations while the Security Council is dealing with a dispute unless the Security Council so requests;

8. The right, subject to the judgment of the Security Council, to be notified of any matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and to receive notification when the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters;

9. The responsibility to cooperate with the Security Council, upon its request, in steps to preserve or restore peace. Such measures would include the suspension of members against which enforcement action is being taken, the expulsion of members, which persistently violate the principles contained in the Charter, and the enlistment of full support for either nonmilitary or military enforcement measures;

10. The right to receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council.

Examination of the Charter confirms the correctness of the views expressed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Secretary of State.

Article 60 provides that the responsibility for the discharge of the functions of specialized agencies having to do with economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be vested in the General Assembly.

Article 61 provides that the Economic and Social Council shall consist of 18 members of the United Nations, elected

by the General Assembly. Article 85 provides that the functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly, and that the Trusteeship Council, operating under the authority of the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions.

Article 93 provides that a state which is not a member of the United Nations may become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on conditions to be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Article 97 provides that the Secretary-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council and that he shall be the chief administrative officer of the organization.

Earlier in my remarks I suggested that our decision should turn on whether the functions and purposes of the Assembly will be served efficiently by the intermittent attention of temporary and changing delegations to each session of the Assembly or whether these functions and purposes require the continuous attention of representatives who, by the nature of their tenure, are in position to meet the requirement.

These functions and purposes are now freshly before us. Shall we give nothing more than fitful attention to that agency of the organization which has responsibility for the admission and expulsion of members, for amendments to the Charter, which has supervision over the Economic and Social Council, has responsibility for the election of members to that Council, which will have much to do with the Trusteeship Council, which will select the vitally important Secretariat and members to the International Court of Justice?

Shall we give nothing more than spasmodic effort to a branch of the organization which is charged with arousing and focusing a mighty and controlling public opinion upon the solution of all questions relating to international peace and security?

Shall we make nothing more than a haphazard contribution to an assembly which is charged with promotion of solutions to problems arising from the widest range of human relationships, economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian, which will have the most significant and possibly determinative responsibility for peace or war, which has been described as the heart and core of humanity's hope for tomorrow, as occupying a central position in the organization, as being the emancipation proclamation of the world, as being the anvil on which will be hammered out the policies that will keep the world in peace?

I affirm that our responsibilities are continuous. If I am right in this, why, then, give those responsibilities merely periodic attention?

Will starving people start eating because the Assembly is in recess? Will racial irritations cease because the Assembly is in recess? Will exploiters of the labor of under-privileged peoples of the world store their shackles and knouts and stay their brutal oppressions until the Assembly again reconvenes? Will an ailing world economy defer its illness while the Assembly is in recess? Will plotters against the peace of the world halt their deadly preparations because the representatives of the member nations are not at the seat of the organization? Who can answer in the affirmative?

It is interesting to note what the Charter says as to the meetings of the Assembly and what our Constitution says as to the meetings of our own Congress.

Article 20 of the Charter provides that "the General Assembly shall meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require."

Our own Constitution provides in article I, section 4, that Congress shall assemble at least once in every year. Special sessions are also contemplated by the provisions that the President may on extraordinary occasions convene both Houses or either of them.

Has anyone in the whole history of this Nation, except in a frivolous sense, suggested that because our Congress is not necessarily in continuous session it would be an improvement on our system if the terms of the Members of Congress were automatically to end every time there is a recess and that a new set of Members should be sent here every time a new problem arises?

Here at home we realize that our National Government and its problems are continuous and require the continuous attention of the Members of Congress whether or not the Congress is in actual session. I believe that many of the Members of the Senate will testify that their official duties multiply when they are at home on so-called vacations when the Congress is in recess.

Here at home we realize that as a rule Members of the House and Senate acquire increasing efficiency and influence the longer they continue to serve. It is impossible to point to anything in the Charter or in the inherent nature of the organization set up by it that makes it necessary, expedient, or wise to reverse our own lessons of experience in this matter.

But it might be argued that on rare extraordinary occasions it might be advisable to have special representation temporarily appointed. At the opening session of the Assembly, for example, we might wish to be represented by some of the delegates who took outstanding parts in the making of the organization at San Francisco. Such special temporary representation on rare and special occasions could be arranged under Presidential regulations without interference with the regular appointees. A related amendment which I have proposed provides for this.

Can it be denied that a full-time representative to the Assembly would have opportunity to gain valuable experience and contacts and to increase his usefulness and influence with the lengthening of his tenure? If that would not occur, then every Member of Congress who has been elected to more than one term of office has swindled his constituency with false representations.

We should not blind ourselves to possibilities which also have been suggested by experience. What I am now about to say has no reference to the administration in power or to any particular past administration. We all know from studying our history that political, personal, and social pressures too often induce the appointment of unqualified men to positions of great responsibility. The present provisions of the bill authorizing ambulatory office and tenure would not tend to discourage such appointments. We should be very careful not to do anything here that would make it easier for the appointment to the Assembly, which has been described as the last and best hope of the world, of peripatetic amateurs, diplomatic dilettantes, and politically deserving incompetents.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hickenlooper	Russell
Ball	Hill	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hoey	Smith
Barkley	Huffman	Stanfill
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McCarran	Tunnell
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Walsh
Ferguson	Maybank	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
Gerry	Mitchell	White
Gossett	Moore	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Young
Hart	Radcliffe	
Hayden	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two in support of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Colorado. I am extremely sorry that the prediction of the Senator from Texas that Senators would remain in the Chamber and listen to the magnificent presentation of the Senator from Colorado has not been borne out. It seems to me that he has proved conclusively, by a simple recital of the duties of the men who will make up the Assembly under the Charter, that membership in the Assembly is and should be a full-time job. The Assembly may not only discuss and debate any situation pertaining to the peace of the world, make recommendations to the Security Council and receive and consider reports from the Security Council, but it may also set up the Trusteeship Council, which I think is tremendously important so far as keeping peace in the world is concerned. It will also set up the Economic and Social Council.

If President Truman was quoted correctly in his press conference, one of the first duties of the Assembly will be to

establish a commission to study the entire problem of international control which has been made necessary by the development and use of the atomic bomb.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that the United States would want a type and caliber of individual to serve on our delegation, or several such individuals, who could serve for full time on the atomic-bomb commission. No question is more vitally important, so far as the peace of the world is concerned, than is the question of how we shall handle atomic energy, and what kind of machinery we can agree on for its control in order to prevent a third world war with atomic weapons which, I believe all of us are convinced, would mean the end of civilization.

I agree completely with the Senator from Colorado that we cannot expect our representatives to the Assembly to go new and untrained to each conference and possibly wield the influence which they should wield if the Asssembly is to do the job we expect it to do, and really become a town meeting of the world, as the Senator from Michigan has described it. All Members of the Senate have had the experience of coming to the Senate as freshman Senators. We all know that it requires from a few months to a year to familiarize ourselves with the procedures of the Senate, and become effective as United States Senators. I believe that exactly the same situation will prevail with regard to representation in the Assembly. If we send to the Assembly a new delegation each year, or every 6 months, or whenever the meetings are held, obviously those representatives will be merely a facade for full-time employees of the State Department who will actually be our representatives in the Assembly. Our representatives under any other circumstances could not possibly familiarize themselves with the task at hand in time to be truly effective.

Mr. President, I know that all of us were deeply moved last July by the eloquent statement of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] when he expressed the hope that the General Assembly of the United Nations would be the embryo from which would develop a parliament of the nations. I believe that if we refuse to give our representatives in the Assembly a status commensurate with the tasks which they will face, and at least the dignity of full-time appointment confirmed by the Senate, we will be taking a step away from the proper course and in the opposite direction. We will be underlining the fact that we regard the United Nations Organization as merely another conference or council of diplomats, instead of one having the importance of a limited form of world government which may eventually solve the tremendous problems facing the world.

For the reasons which I have stated, Mr. President, I hope the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Colorado will be agreed to.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire merely to say that it will be my intention to support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

If we are going to allow the United Nations to depend solely upon the work of the Security Council, we shall be playing international power politics. If we hope to make it a democratic organization which will work for world peace, we should undertake to make the Assembly a body in which the little people of the world may have a voice. It seems to me that if the United States of America is to carry the moral influence in the world which it ought to carry, and which it must carry, and if we are to eliminate the scourge of war, we must do everything which lies within our power to make the Assembly a workable organization I can think of nothing which would tend more to weaken our influence in the Assembly than for us to indicate that we regard it only as a small matter, or a small organization to which temporary appointment of representatives may be made. But, if, on the contrary, we adopt the principle upon which the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is based and determine by our votes here that we shall send important envoys who will represent the President, and will do so with the confirmation of the United States Senate, then we shall say to the little peoples and to the small nations of the world, "We are participating with our full power in the one Assembly to which you are admitted. We are ranging ourselves on your side for the maintenance of peace and the preservation of your individual interests."

Mr. President, I think it would be a great mistake for the Senate to reject this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to echo the sentiments which have been expressed by the previous speakers. I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Certainly, the appointments to which reference has been made are sufficiently important to warrant our having full time representatives on the job. I do not think their salaries should be on a pro rated basis. Even if the Assembly is in session only a week, our representatives on it should be paid for the entire year, and should devote their energies and their work during all that period to measures to effectuate permanent peace in the world. I know that the Assembly will be in session longer than a year, or at least several months, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the committee favors an amendment which it will offer at the proper time fixing the compensation of the representatives on the Assembly at the rate of $12,000 a year, payable for such a period as the President may designate. The President may designate some of them to remain on the Assembly for a whole year. But, Mr. President, one of the purposes of allowing the President to appoint the delegates to the Assembly from nonprofessional people—I mean nonprofessional job holders—is to scatter the appointments of representatives among prominent persons of the United States, such as Representatives, Senators, and others. If five men, for example, are chosen and made permanent job holders they may perhaps become like other bureaucrats. We want to popularize this organization by tying into it, and allowing to have contact with it, leaders of public opinion in all fields in the United States. We do not need to send the same representatives each time a meeting of the Assembly is held. If we wish to send the same two, for example, for a year or 2 years, it would be all right to do so. But we want to send new blood; we want to send new representatives and give them an opportunity to study the questions with which they will be confronted. Public men in the Senate are already properly advised. On the Security Council, we will have a permanent representative and also a permanent assistant. We will have another group of executives on all the different commissions.

The only thing involved in the amendment is the question of salary. Talk about representing the little man. The delegates would be more apt to represent the little man and the little people when their personnel is subject to change and new groups are appointed rather than to have the same professional jobholders continue indefinitely to hold these positions.

We do not want someone who is hunting a job. We want someone who will accept the office at a sacrifice, perhaps, in order to serve this organization, who will be willing to act because of the honor involved and the opportunity for service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not also true that as particular and special problems arise, men with special training and qualifications will be chosen?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. That is a very cogent point and a very important one. If a particular and special problem should arise, we would want to select someone who knew more about that subject than anyone else. The professional job holders who would beseech the President by all sorts of political pressure to appoint them to these political jobs could not be utilized. It is the same as it is now with our committee, where we have before us each morning scientists, experts, not automobile mechanics or doorkeepers in the public buildings.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to ask the Senator from Maine a question. When he speaks of the experts who could be or should be appointed, does he have in mind the ones whom former Ambassador Hurley to China had in mind? Is that the type the Senator has in mind?

Mr. WHITE. I do not understand the significance of the question the Senator asks. I merely suggested that I thought there was definite advantage, when special problems arose, in having complete freedom of selection and appointment on the part of the President, so that men best qualified to deal with problems might be members of the Assembly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And when the Senator from Maine said the best qualified, I was

wondering whether he had in mind those whom former Ambassador Hurley had in mind.

Mr. WHITE. I do not know about that. I have in mind a man who by all standards would be best qualified to deal with a particular problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I have read aright the amendment which the Senator from Colorado has offered, none of the arguments the Senator from Texas has announced has any relation to it whatsoever. The expression "job holder" rolls very easily off the tongue of the eloquent Senator from Texas. He wants no long-term officer representing the President. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado places no limitation upon the power of the President to select. However, it requires confirmation by the Senate. It provides, if I understand it correctly—unless it has been changed—that these persons shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Therefore he may change them when he pleases. What the amendment would do would be to send these representatives to the Assembly of the United Nations Organization with the confirmation of the Senate, therefore with the added prestige that they would go into the Assembly clothed with the power of speaking both for the Executive and the Senate. I think it is a very worth-while thing to do.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his very cogent and complete argument in which he pointed out very graphically that the Senator from Texas did not know what he was talking about, when he said the argument of the Senator from Texas had nothing at all to do with the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has said that the amendment would preclude sending specially qualified men.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I did not say that. I said it was desirable if possible to send specially trained men, that the group we had in the Assembly at a given time might not be suited for the next conference. I was answering the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understood the Senator to say, in effect, that there is a disadvantage in the amendment which I propose because the President could not send specially trained men to meet special occasions. In that connection I would like to invite attention to the fact that I shall offer an amendment later on providing as follows:

> Nothing contained in this section—
>
> Referring to section 2—
>
> shall preclude the President, or the Secretary of State at the discretion of the President, and without the advice and consent of the Senate—
>
> That is to take care of these special instances—
>
> or any other person or persons appointed by the President for the purpose, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from representing the United States at any designated meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations Organization.

In other words, I have tried, first to make this a regular, continuous office; and, second, to meet the theory of the bill, that there may be special occasions when a special representative shall be appointed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would that be in addition to the five?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That would be in addition to the five. They would be set to one side by Presidential regulation, just as under the present theory of the bill we would set aside the representative to the Council if the President wanted to take his place, or if the Secretary of State wanted to take his place.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. Mr. President, just a further word. It is pointed out that one of the virtues of the amendment is that it requires Senate confirmation. The President now sends delegates to all international conferences without consulting the Senate or the House of Representatives or any other body. It is contemplated that the President will now and then send Senators or Representatives. We particularly omitted provision for confirmation, not because we minded it, but we thought that a member of the House of Representatives appointed by the President would probably resent the idea that he had to be confirmed by the Senate, that it would be only a temporary office, and if we make these permanent offices for a year, we will probably deprive the Senate or the House of having any representative there, because no Senator or Representative will want to give up his position as a Member of Congress to be a delegate to the Assembly.

It is said the President can remove them at his will. Of course, he can remove officers anywhere by dismissing them. But after the President had appointed five men to permanent jobs, drawing $10,000 or $12,000 a year, we all know how difficult it would be to replace them. We all know what pressure would be brought. Do not humiliate my good friend the Senator from Colorado, or the Senator from Wyoming, or a Senator from some other State, do not humiliate him by removing him and putting someone else in his place. The Senator is conscious of that, is he not?

I hope, Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, that the Senate will not adopt the amendment. The committee has authorized me to offer this amendment at the proper time:

> Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of time as the President may specify.

If he works 6 months, he receives $6,000. If he works 12 months, he receives $12,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan came on this floor some time ago with the United Nations Charter, I thought they had afforded our country, and perhaps the world, the remaining opportunity to avert another great world war. Since I have listened to this debate, to the remarks of the Senator from Colorado and those of the Senator from Texas, I have been greatly disillusioned. I find this great body on which mankind is going to pin so much hope and expectation, is not to be the type of organization which I had thought it would be. Frankly, the arguments of the Senator from Texas on all the other points of this bill have been very impressive, but in this instance I cannot conceive of any logic in anything he has said except to belittle the standing and the stature of the men who will represent this country on what I think is the last hope of the world to avoid world calamity. Certainly the individuals who serve on this organization ought not to be changed around in 6 months or a year. Obviously it takes a great deal of time to accumulate information about things that are happening all over the world from persons who come from different sections of the earth. Obviously it takes time to build up acquaintances and to have a degree of confidence in one's fellow workers so that persuasion and argument, both in the Assembly and out of it, can take the place of armed conflict.

I do not want to see the Security Council ever called into session, if possible, and the only way we can avoid it being called into session is for the Assembly to work out the problems and make it unnecessary for the Security Council to be called upon to act. Why? Because when the Security Council is called into session its members have in effect the power to commit the world to war, and then it will be difficult for the best men in this world to sit in the Assembly and try there to iron out the differences which may beset mankind.

I do not want Senators and Representatives appointed to the Assembly for a short period of time, except under extreme circumstances, where they would be available. I want to see the best men this country can produce sit on the Assembly, men of vision, men of caliber, men of patience, men of judicial outlook, men of tolerance, men of understanding, because the problems of this world, now that the war is over, are not growing less, but are becoming more complicated and more numerous.

It is true that we have a new element with which to deal in this situation—the atomic bomb. For some years we shall have time to work out perhaps a plan which will offer the faint hope—and that is all it will be in its initial stages at least—that we can, somehow or other, solve our differences without resort to this deadly weapon. And the men who will help to work out that solution will be our representatives and those of other countries who sit in the Assembly.

With all deference to my colleague, the Senator from Texas, who has rendered yeoman service in the building of the United Nations Organization, I do not believe he is helping to improve his own fine handiwork by opposing what I consider to be one of the best amendments to be offered to this bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I was impressed by what the Senator said, that he would not want to be appointed as a Senator to this important body, the United Nations Organization.

Mr. TYDINGS. Unless there was some particular function I could perform, because of a particular committee chairmanship, for instance, or some work for the moment which it was believed might contribute to the effectiveness of the organization.

Mr. WILLIS. But if in the judgment of the President it were considered that the Senator from Maryland should be appointed as a representative to the United Nations Organization, would he not prefer to have his appointment confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, Mr. President, and I would not want to go as a representative, and I do not believe my friend the Senator from Texas or the distinguished Senator from Michigan would want to go on a mission of great international magnitude, for that would be the only reason for a Senator going, unless he had the approval of his President and unless he had the approval of his colleagues.

Mr. WILLIS. I heartily agree with the Senator, and I believe the argument of the Senator from Texas on this proposal is utterly baseless.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to suggest that in view of the lateness of the hour and the possibility of further discussion, we might suspend now until tomorrow, the yeas and nays having already been ordered.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Texas indicates a willingness to recess now.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said earlier in the day that I would not insist on holding the Senate in session after 6 o'clock. I made that statement to several Senators, so I want to live up to that statement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Sometime ago I requested that the argument on this amendment go over until tomorrow. The distinguished Senator from Texas insisted that the Senate proceed and if possible come to a vote tonight. Since that occurred argument has been had, and a suggestion has been made of the absence of a quorum, and a quorum was found to be present. In view of that fact, and since the yeas and nays have been ordered, it occurs to me that we should proceed to vote on the amendment now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the comment of the Senator from Texas, I think the Senate ought to pass on whether it wants to recess now or whether to go ahead.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not going to be the cause of any friction. If the Senate wants to go ahead and vote it is all right with me. Earlier today I suggested that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow instead of 12, but I withdrew that suggestion after it was decided that the Senate continue in session until 6 o'clock today. The suggestion was made that we continue in session until 6 o'clock, and I agreed. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will not confirm my statement?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Before yielding, I might confirm the statement of the Senator from Texas that he suggested that we meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow instead of 12, but after we decided to go ahead and hold a session until 6, the Senator from Texas withdrew that suggestion and suggested that we meet at 12, the regular hour, and that is the program now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is exactly what the distinguished Senator from Texas stated, except that we would stay until at least 6 o'clock. We could stay as much longer as we wanted to, but if we stayed until 6, then we would meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock. It was because of the fact that we have kept a good attendance of Members in the Senate all afternoon. I want to do what the distinguished Senator desires, but inasmuch as many Senators are present and ready to vote I should very much like to get the amendment out of the way.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are many Senators present. There is a good attendance, considering the average during the day. That does not mean, however, that other Senators who might wish to vote on this amendment are not away, and may have gone home. They may be here or yonder. I think the Senator from Texas had in mind that some Senators are not present because of the statement with respect to 6 o'clock. However, it is entirely for the Senate to decide. If it wants to vote now in the absence of Senators who may be away for one reason or another, the Senate has a right to do so, of course. I myself have no preference about the matter.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kentucky came to the Senate Chamber I urged that the whole matter go over until tomorrow, and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas said "No"; he favored going ahead, and that when we finished this amendment—I do not take issue with him on the session running until 6 o'clock, but he did not mention 6 o'clock to me—we would then recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that the Senator from Texas suggested to the Senator from Colorado that he had a better audience now than he would have tomorrow.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the attendance now has confirmed that prophecy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the Senator was correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The suggestion was made that the Senate continue. That applied to the argument of the Senator from Colorado. I do not know whether the question of a vote on the amendment was involved. The Senator from Colorado however, as he always deserves, has had a very attentive audience in the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] is detained at a conference being held at the White House.

I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. The Senator from

Oregon, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been excused. He is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—27

Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Briggs	Langer	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Taylor
Chavez	Millikin	Tydings
Donnell	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
Fulbright	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gurney	Revercomb	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Shipstead	Young

NAYS—31

Bankhead	Hayden	Mitchell
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hoey	Overton
Connally	Huffman	Stewart
Downey	Knowland	Tunnell
Eastland	Lucas	Vandenberg
Ellender	McClellan	Wagner
Gerry	McKellar	Walsh
Gossett	McMahon	White
Green	Magnuson	
Guffey	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—38

Aiken	Cordon	Myers
Andrews	George	Pepper
Austin	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hart	Reed
Brewster	Hatch	Robertson
Bridges	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Mead	Tobey
Capper	Morse	Wheeler
Carville	Murray	

So Mr. MILLIKIN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a fleet admiral of the United States Navy;

Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of October 1943;

Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 23d day of September 1944;

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of November 1944;

Vice Adm. Jesse B. Oldendorf, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1944;

Vice Adm. Daniel E. Barbey, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 9th day of December 1944; and

Vice Adm. Frederick C. Sherman, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 13th day of July 1945.

By Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Frank Olson, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, vice Frank E. Dekay, term expired.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz, of Puerto Rico, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Martin Travieso, elevated;

Shackelford Miller, Jr., of Kentucky, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, vice Elwood Hamilton, deceased; and

James E. Mulcahy, of New York, to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

Mr. Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

NOMINATION OF HARRY A. ZINN TO BE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the executive calendar. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to consider the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry A. Zinn, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 4, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 3 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Meredith Weatherby, of Texas, to be a foreign-service officer of class 7, a secretary in the diplomatic service, and a consul of the United States of America.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

James M. Smith for appointment as Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $6,230 per annum.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Charles F. Rouse, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina, vice James O. Carr, resigned.

Adrian W. Maher, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, vice Robert P. Butler, term expired.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 3 (legislative day of October 29), 1945.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry A. Zinn to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 48, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Nathaniel Sonntag, O. F. M. Cap., J. C. B., St. Anthony Friary, Marathon, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal Father, whose dominion extends over all peoples and nations, we beseech Thee to have a continual regard for these, our United States. Thou hast always shown us Thy favor. We are surrounded, more than any other people, with a bountiful fullness of earthly blessings. For all these things we give Thee our daily thanks.

We pray Thee, Heavenly Father, to have a particular providence over our proceedings and deliberations. We are charged by our people to guard the liberty they so valiantly defended, to quicken the life they so recently ennobled, to promote the peace they so decisively restored. We ask that Thou illumine our minds so that by sharing in Thy guidance we may allow the light of Thy divine wisdom to shine forth in wise and prudent legislation. May we suppress all that is harmful and injurious; may we establish an open field for enterprise, industry, and business; may we foster useful knowledge, sobriety, and national happiness; may we perpetuate the blessings of peace and security, of justice and equal liberty. May all of us be blessed by this knowledge and sanctified by its observance. To Thy greater honor and glory. Amen. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 30, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed

the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On November 20, 1945:

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of G. H. Moore and Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore; and

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of the estate of Donald Rhone.

On November 21, 1945:

H. R. 391. An act to amend section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

On November 24, 1945:

H. R. 1591. An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy, and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, from among the sons of persons who have been or shall hereafter be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor;

H. R. 1868. An act authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during the present war, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2525. An act to include stepparents, parents by adoption, and any persons who have stood in loco parentis among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes.

On November 30, 1945:

H. R. 601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Driggers and her minor children;

H. R. 843. An act for the relief of Francis A. Hanley;

H. R. 1902. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928;

H. R. 2027. An act for the relief of the estate of Alexandar McLean, deceased;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Florence Zimmerman;

H. R. 2310. An act for the relief of James A. Brady;

H. R. 2620. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Allen;

H. R. 2874. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to authorize any corporation formed under authority of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of such code to specify in its bylaws that a less number than a majority of its trustees may constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the corporation;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3225. An act for the relief of Rolla Duncan;

H. R. 3686. An act relating to the sale, in the District of Columbia, of certain small rockfish;

H. R. 3867. An act to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia with respect to the making and publishing of annual reports by trust companies;

H. R. 3873. An act to provide for the opening of a road within the boundaries of the District of Columbia Training School property in Anne Arundel County, Md.; and

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution providing for the continuance of the tax-exempt status of certain property in the District of Columbia when used and occupied by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States of America or by the American Red Cross.

On December 3, 1945:

H. R. 744. An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Sybil Georgette Townsend;

H. R. 875. An act for the relief of Nannie Bass;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of John August Johnson;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Carl Lewis;

H. R. 1316. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Lee Brown, deceased;

H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of O. M. Minatree;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Candler Cobb;

H. R. 1956. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lannon;

H. R. 1960. An act for the relief of the estate of Alfred Lewis Cosson, deceased, and others;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Florentine H. Keeler, Harold S. Keeler, and Genevieve M. Keeler;

H. R. 2029. An act for the relief of Wesley J. Stewart;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of John J. Gall;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of the estate of Franz Tillman, deceased;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Clifford E. Craig;

H. R. 2191. An act for the relief of Cleo E. Baker;

H. R. 2290. An act for the relief of Mary Galipeau;

H. R. 2300. An act for the relief of the estate of John R. Blackmore and Louise D. Blackmore;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Arlethia Rosser;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz;

H. R. 2481. An act for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased;

H. R. 2512. An act for the relief of Helen Alton and Edwin Alton;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly;

H. R. 2642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson;

H. R. 2686. An act for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood;

H. R. 2810. An act for the relief of Mrs. Stuart B. Riley;

H. R. 2836. An act for the relief of Angelo Gianquitti and George Gianquitti;

H. R. 2886. An act for the relief of the estate of Harper Theodore Duke, Jr.;

H. R. 3011. An act for the relief of John Hames;

H. R. 3135. An act for the relief of Mrs. Addie S. Lewis;

H. R. 3198. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sue Flippin Bratton, a minor;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of Stanley J. Lilly;

H. R. 3302. An act for the relief of Christian H. Kreusler;

H. R. 3790. An act for the relief of Genevieve Lund;

H. R. 3868. An act to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the District of Columbia without the payment of any fees for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 3979. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 4018. An act for the relief of Robert A. Hudson;

H. R. 4350. An act to amend section 3646 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the issuance of checks in replacement of lost, stolen, destroyed, mutilated, or defaced checks of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4411. An act to adjust the pay and allowances of the members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and for other purposes.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION RESCISSION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 26.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 20, 24, 25, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,884,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$180,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,912,558"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$587,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$47,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$440,794,164"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission (national defense), $465,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$666,040,849"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Emergency rubber project, $1,649,790, and the balance remaining shall be used to liquidate such project, including the elimination of the remaining plantations, the rehabilitation and return of leased lands to the owners and the disposal of other property according to law, and for the continuation of the production, breeding, and disease phases of guayule research on indicator plots and experimental areas until June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That any balances remaining shall be available until December 31, 1946, for completing the liquidation of the emergency rubber project."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Division of Geography, $13,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"War Relocation Authority: Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, Department of the Interior, $2,500,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 2 and 3 of the second paragraph of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "one hundred and twentieth" and insert in lieu thereof "one hundredth"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$54,107,572"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$2,945,503,585"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$3,919,338,479"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$541,018,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreeemnt to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,514,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,675,684,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$11,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$2,575,225,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,248,510,540"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,359,367,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$800,374,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$14,370,159,964"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "further"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32 and 39.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, relating to the Foreign Economic Administration: Rescind $3,884,400, instead of $5,226,461, as proposed by the House, and $3,437,042, as proposed by the Senate, and adjust amount limitations accordingly.

Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to salaries and expenses, Office of War Information: Rescind $6,912,558, instead of $10,662,558, as proposed by the House, and $5,662,558, as proposed by the Senate, and adjust amount limitations accordingly.

Nos. 10, 11, and 12, relating to salaries and expenses, Office of Strategic Services: Rescind $9,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $11,500,000, as proposed by the House and adjust amount limitations accordingly, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 13: Corrects a total.

No. 14, relating to the Federal Communications Commission: Rescinds $465,000, instead of $930,000, as proposed by the House, and no rescission, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 15: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the additional appropriation of $30,000,000 proposed by the House for grants to States for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service facilities operated in conjunction therewith.

No. 16: Corrects a total.

No. 17: Retains the House provision pertaining to the emergency rubber project, Department of Agriculture, instead of the Senate provision, amended, however, to continue the appropriation available until December 31, 1946, for completing the liquidation of the project.

Nos. 18 and 19, relating to the Department of the Interior: Rescind $13,000 for salaries and expenses, Division of Geography, instead of $20,000, as proposed by the House, and no rescission, as proposed by the Senate; and rescind $2,500,000 for salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and no rescission, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 20, relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation: Rescinds $1,240,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,480,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 21, relating to the United States Employment Service: Accepts the Senate provision for returning to the States the employment services which were loaned to the Federal Government at the beginning of 1942, pursuant to the request of the President, but provides for an outside return date of 100 days after the enactment of the bill, instead of 120 days, as the Senate amendment proposed.

Nos. 22 and 23: Correct totals.

No. 24, relating to access roads, Public Roads Administration: Rescinds $2,576,845, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,076,845, as proposed by the House.

No. 25, relating to the Alien Property Custodian: Makes no rescission, as proposed by the Senate, instead of rescinding $500,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 26 to 31, and 33 to 39, inclusive, relating to the Military Establishment: Provides for rescissions as follows, either as proposed by the House or Senate or in lieu of such proposals:

Contingencies of the Army, $12,829,151;
Welfare of enlisted men, $5,000,000;
Regular supplies of the Army, $541,018,000;
Horses, draft and pack animals, $1,514,000;
Signal service of the Army, $1,675,684,000;

Medical and Hospital Department, Army, $267,539,000;

Engineers service, Army, $2,306,763,000; and subhead engineer service, $2,011,648,000;

Ordnance service and supplies, Army, $8,100,000,000;

Army of the Philippines, $200,000,000, and the Senate proposal with regard to service of the military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines in the service of the armed forces of the United States.

Also include provision proposed by the Senate that, before any permanent fields are determined upon or permanent buildings erected thereon, the Air Corps shall submit to Congress a list of such fields and the justification therefor.

Nos. 40 to 61, inclusive, relating to the Naval Establishment: Provide for rescissions as follows, either as proposed by the House or Senate or in lieu of such proposals:

Miscellaneous expenses, Navy, 1946, $11,900,000;

Instruction, Navy, 1946, $6,000,000;

Naval Reserve, 1946, $38,262,000;

Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, 1946, $2,575,225,500;

Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, 1944, $69,247,269;

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1946, $5,000,000;

Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks (contractual authorization), $1,248,510,540; that the $400,000,000 rescission of the appropriation shall not act to reduce further the contractual authority; and that $6,000,000 of funds available for advance bases shall be available toward reconstruction of the civilian economy of Guam. It was agreed by the conference committee that $6,000,000 of the restored amount of contractual authorization should be used for construction of hospital at Beaufort, S. C.

Aviation, Navy, 1946, $1,359,367,660; and subhead for new construction, $128,116,900; subhead for maintenance, $800,374,950; subhead for experiments and development, $148,256,500;

Pay, Marine Corps, 1944, $40,521,480;

General expenses, Marine Corps, 1946, $307,750,000;

Increase and replacement of naval vessels, emergency construction: $24,100,000 made available for construction of 5 advanced-type combatant vessels and 17 minor craft.

Provide for issuance of uniforms to enlisted men, as proposed by the Senate, extending somewhat the scope of the provision proposed by the House.

Provide that personnel of the Naval Reserve, not qualified for sea duty, shall, upon their application, be placed on inactive duty if surplus to requirements.

Provide for movement of household effects of civilian and naval personnel on duty at locations outside the continental limits of the United States, or in Alaska.

No. 62, relating to flying personnel of the Army and Navy: Conditions flight pay upon certain specific orders; requires annual reports to Congress on certain flying personnel and authorized flight pay; and calls for submission to Congress on or before January 3, 1946, of a joint recommendation by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for revision of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, including but not restricted to recommendations with respect to increases authorized for flying pay, parachute pay, glider pay, submarine pay, and similar special pay and allowances.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendments reported in disagreement are as follows:

No. 32, relating to the rescission proposed as to Air Corps, Army, 1942–46.

No. 39, relating to a total.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we herewith submit the conference report on the rescission bill.

This conference report marks the successful consummation of a long and laborious program. When war was declared the Congress pledged the resources of the Nation to its victorious prosecution and conclusion. The Committee on Appropriations, in compliance with that pledge, has from that day to this reported to the House every estimate submitted by the various departments engaged in the war program calculated to support the armed forces and always with the most favorable recommendation warranted by the progress of the war. At the same time we adopted a policy of preparing to reclaim any appropriations or grants of contractual authority which might remain unexpended and unused in any intervals of activity and at the conclusion of the war.

In order to facilitate that policy we included in deficiency bills provisions directing the Bureau of the Budget to maintain a constant study and report periodically on the status of provisions, authorizations and expenditures.

Under this provision we have twice before reported bills reclaiming something in excess of $4,000,000,000. With this bill we have reclaimed an additional $52,000,000,000—a total of more than $56,000,000,000—the price of an empire—in comparison with which the spoils of the Montezumas and the Incas, the reparations exacted by the victors from the vanquished in all the wars in history, sink into insignificance.

But as large as it is, it is only a part of what we expect eventually to reclaim. When conditions have further settled and we are in position to secure a more accurate report on the situation we expect to bring in a final bill or bills to complete the salvage of every dollar available for reclamation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first step in the initiation of a rigid policy of economy which should guide the Congress in husbanding the resources and revenues of the Nation preparatory to reduction of the national debt. Much depends on the savings—and especially on the development of an attitude of economy and a visible evidence of our determination to balance the budget and meet the huge obligations of the Nation at the earliest date possible.

It is a matter of gratification to the committee to be able to submit to the House this first evidence of a trend toward retrenchment which we trust will continue with increasing emphasis through the years immediately ahead of us.

Specifically, the bill as passed by the House proposes rescissions of obligational availability—cash, contractual authority, and corporate funds, in the aggregate amount of $52,653,713,879.

Of that amount the Senate proposed restoration of $1,409,033,666, and this conference report, with one amendment not disposed of—we bring in a complete agreement on everything except one item—this conference report, with that one item not disposed of, reduces the restorations proposed by the Senate, or, in other words, reduces the lessened amount of rescissions proposed by the Senate by $56,131,708.

In its present form, therefore, the bill proposes rescissions aggregating $51,300,811,921, which is $1,352,901,958 less than proposed by the House, and $56,131,708 more than proposed by the Senate.

Since one amendment—No. 32—remains to be disposed of, these figures are subject to adjustment, up or down, according to the disposition made of such amendment.

The changes effected by the Senate are quite numerous.

In title I, which applies to all agencies other than the Military and Naval Establishments, restorations were made in amounts ranging from $20,000 to $5,000,000, aggregating in all $16,479,419.

In title II, embracing the Military Establishment, restorations were proposed aggregating $1,151,072,571, the principal amounts pertaining to the Air Corps and the Ordnance Department.

In title III, applying to the Naval Establishment, the net amount of restorations proposed was $241,481,676, the principal amounts applying to ordnance, aeronautics, and pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel.

The amount restored of the Senate reductions, by titles, is as follows:

Title I	$4,675,358
Title II	25,906,000
Title III (net)	25,550,350
Total	56,131,708

The title III amount, pertaining to Navy, is a net amount. The Senate increased the rescission proposed by the House of Navy contractual authorization for public works by $53,630,540. The conferees agreed to restore $35,000,000 of that further reduction proposed by the Senate, which is needed for berthing facilities for ships to be in an inactive status, and for hospital construction at Beaufort, S. C., for serving naval and Marine Corps personnel in the Charleston-Parris Island area.

The Army and Navy made strong representations to the Senate as to the severeness of the House recissions in certain items, and we have gone along pretty much with the Senate restorations.

Under the law, the status of all national defense funds again will be presented for review early in January, and there will be opportunity then to make further rescissions if the facts are such as to warrant them.

There are one or two legislative propositions to which attention should be called.

In lieu of the so-called Dirksen amendment, returning the United States Employment Service back to the States, which contemplated such return within 30 days after the enactment of this bill, we bring back for approval the Senate substitute, amended to provide for the accomplishment of the return within 100 days after the enactment of this bill, instead of 120 days, as proposed by the Senate. The provision provides for the mechanics incident to retransfer, and for the retention, to the extent reasonable and practicable, of Federal employees who have been identified with the activity while federally administered. The provision was drafted by the legislative counsel's office and is understood to be generally satisfactory to State officials.

Another provision deals with Filipinos who have engaged with American forces since the start of the war. It is essential that there be some law on the subject for the guidance of the armed services and the Veterans' Administration. The Senate provision, in which concurrence is proposed, confines beneficiaries to members of the organized military forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while serving in the armed forces of the United States under Presidential order, and limits the benefits to those authorized by the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, under contracts heretofore entered into, and laws administered by the Veterans' Administration providing for the payment of pensions on account of service-connected disability or death, and further provides that such pensions shall be paid at the rate of a Philippine peso for each dollar authorized to be paid under the laws providing for such pensions.

While on this subject, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senate has proposed to make an additional amount of $200,000,000 available for the army of the Philippines, to be transferred from the appropriation "Ordnance service and supplies, Army." I mention this specifically because the amount, which is a part of amendment No. 38, is neither a rescission nor an appropriation. It is a transfer of surplus ordnance funds.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Missouri about the item that is in disagreement.

Mr. TABER. I will yield to the gentleman.

The gentleman wanted to know what the item in disagreement is?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. This is an item with reference to the Air Corps, but the items in disagreement do not relate to Air Corps operations. They relate to the item of "pay of the Army," and the amount of transfers that will have to be made in the situation, to the item "Pay of the Army."

Mr. RANKIN. How much is involved in the item in disagreement?

Mr. TABER. There is a difference between the House and the Senate of approximately $850,000,000. The amendment that will be offered here by the committee as a compromise figure will be in between; that is, as I understand it, it will add $486,000,000 to the Senate rescission.

Mr. RANKIN. On what page of the bill H. R. 4407 is that to be found?

Mr. TABER. Page 25, amendment 32. Really, the effect of that amendment is going to be that there will be no cut below the budget on the Air Corps and that they really, the way we figure it, will have more money to operate with than the Budget allowed them, because with the rate of discharge that is being accomplished and the program that is ahead that has been announced by the Army, there should be an average of at least 500,000 fewer officers and men in the Army than was figured when the Budget estimates were prepared on the basis of about $2,500 apiece average for pay and allowances. This would mean that we could reduce that transfer by $1,250,000,000. This is on a lower basis than that, and in my opinion there is absolutely no possibility of the Army Air Corps not having as much money as the Budget allowed.

There is also under consideration involved in this an additional $200,000,000 which the Air Corps tells the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] will be available this year on account of renegotiation and cancellation of contracts, information with reference to which was not available at the time they were up before us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First of all, I should like to ask the gentleman about the effect of the conference report on the funds for the air forces for research and development.

Mr. TABER. The conference report itself does not touch the Air Corps at all, it is in the amendment which is in disagreement. But if the amendment that is proposed by the committee is adopted, having in mind that picture of the transfers which I have described, there will be more money available to the Air Corps than the Budget indicated there would be at the time the Budget was submitted here.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the action of the House on the original Rescission bill the money for the Air Forces proposed $115,000,000 for research and development. My understanding is that for the fiscal year 1946 in the regular appropriation bill the Air Forces asked for $160,000,000 for research and development.

However, when the Air Forces were called upon to make up a program for research and development under the rescission program they proposed a request for $245,000,000. The reason was that they had expected the manufacturers to provide research and development along with the procurement program; but with the stoppage of the war and the stoppage of procurement, that will fall on the Air Forces. What I am interested in knowing is whether or not the amendment that is proposed will allow the Air Forces more than the $150,000,000 for research and development?

Mr. TABER. It will allow them a great deal more than that. It will allow them surplus funds, according to my figures, of at least $200,000,000 beyond what the Budget called for without any allocation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that an over-all figure for the Air Forces?

Mr. TABER. The over-all figure for the Air Forces, according to my figures, will be more than the Budget allowed. Let me say to the gentleman that there was estimated a transfer of Air Corps funds of $4,700,000,000 to the item, "Pay of the Army." According to my figures that item will be $1,250,000,000 less than that, which builds up your Air Corps funds very substantially. The rescission that I understand will be proposed involves $11,799,000,000. That is the proposed amendment.

If you take the $10,434,000,000 which the Budget suggested giving back to the Army and add the $1,250,000,000 which unquestionably they will have on hand in addition, that they will have to transfer in smaller amounts to the pay of the Army, and adding that to the $10,434,000,000 you will get $11,684,000,000, which is $195,000,000 more money than the Budget originally figured they would get.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. An increase of that much over-all for the air forces?

Mr. TABER. Above what the Budget estimates called for. So they have a lot of money to play with in the figure that the House is proposing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One further question. In achieving these figures, I understand that the committee contemplates the War Department will receive some kick-backs, so to speak, in unexpended funds by the termination of contracts by the time the year is closed?

Mr. TABER. The Air Corps story is that the additional saving resulting from renegotiation and cancellation of contracts, in addition to what they had figured at the time the Budget estimate was made up, will be $500,000,000. Of that they figure, according to my understanding, that they will be able to realize $200,000,000 in the current fiscal year and therefore we used that $200,000,000 rather than the $500,000,000 figure in making the estimate that we would present to the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that point brought out, because I think the question about that $200,000,000 or $500,000,000 that would be coming back through renegotiation or cancellation of contracts rested upon when it would be available, whether it would come at the end of the year or whether a portion would come during the year, so that it might be used.

Mr. TABER. Their estimate, as I got it, was that $200,000,000 of it, at least, would be available in 1946, and that is the figure we have operated on.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. With reference to amendment 21, the so-called Dirksen amendment regarding State employment offices, as I understand the only

change in that amendment is that the House recedes on the Senate amendment with the exception that it provides that the employment offices shall be turned back to the States in 100 days rather than 120 days.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words then we are going to take Federal money and turn it over to the States to use as they please, probably for political purposes, to run the employment offices; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. COCHRAN. What is it?

Mr. TABER. That is not correct, because all of this money to run the employment offices comes out of the three-tenths of 1 percent—I think it has been scaled down a little bit—which is collected out of the employers for unemployment insurance administration. We have never approached the figure that the collected tax amounts to so that that money comes out of that specific fund and it does not come out of the Treasury of the United States at all. It was understood when this act was passed that it should be State administration. The 100 days, to my mind, is a very bad thing, because it delays reconversion that much and because it prevents the proper operation of the employment offices so that the law can be observed instead of being abused.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is quite correct. More than $625,000,000 has been collected on the administrative side that has never been used, as a matter of fact, nor turned back to the States for administrative purposes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois this question: Will the Federal Government have anything whatever to say in reference to the type of employees that will be employed in the employment offices or is it going to be referred to the governors and the officials of the States entirely, and whether those employees that are now under Civil Service working in these offices will be subject to release if the State authorities so desire?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The qualifying agencies are set up as they always were, and the employees are fully protected in that transition period in the language that the Senate inserted in the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about after the States take them over?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are a great many—I think, 47 percent—that were State employees in the first instance that will be taken back; consequently, they will absorb as well as some of the returning war veterans, so that for all practical purposes it will offer no problem that I can see, nor anybody else.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am rather disturbed about whether or not you are going to make State political offices out of this employment service at a time such as this.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman will see, if he examines the Senate language, that no such thing is contemplated for one thing, and every man has been made fully protected by this amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. In answer to the gentleman's question, the employees were not so well protected in the bill as passed by the House. They are protected in a much more secure manner now by reason of certain amendments that were put in by the Senate—not as far as some of us would like to see them protected, but, nevertheless, they are more securely protected than they were before.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, the only way you can defeat this is by voting down the entire conference report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that manifestly we operate under far more restrictive rules here, and the only thing you could put in the bill was a limitation. You could place in it no affirmative legislation. That was our difficulty, and that has been cured by the Senate.

Mr. RABAUT. This 30-day provision affected all of the 19,000 employees in the service. At least 40 percent of the employees, according to the rules of many States, would have lost their jobs under the action which was taken recently in the House, at a time when the load is 8 times as high as it was a year ago. Of course, that is really a great shock to the returning veterans and to the great number of people that are out of employment at the present time. As I said, it has been corrected in the Senate, but it has not been corrected to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. In order that the record may be complete as to the appropriation for research and development, there was in this bill as it left the House for research and development for the Navy $191,754,000. There was in the bill as it left the House for the Army $193,518,500—a total for research and development for the Army and Navy of $385,272,500. In addition, the War Department has $600,000,000 for the continuance of the development of the atomic bomb, and $26,000,000 for NACA, which of course is in part for research and development of airplanes. As the bill left the House there was over $1,000,000,000 in it for research and development, including the development of the atomic bomb. That sum in my judgment is adequate, even though the conference report apparently provides for additional sums.

Mr. TABER. I just want to say this, and then I will yield to anyone or yield the floor. The conference report represents a complete agreement with the exception of amendment No. 32. There were compromises of different items. There is also in disagreement amendment No. 39, which is a total that will have to be adjusted after amendment No. 32 is disposed of.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to question the gentleman about amendment No. 32. I understand that in the House bill the amount proposed to be turned back was $12,166,313,000. The Senate reduced that to $11,313,313,000, which left a difference of $853,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the difference between the House and the Senate as to this amendment on which the conferees have differed.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that mean there will be $853,000,000 more for use by the Air Force during the fiscal year 1946 if the Senate provision is sustained?

Mr. TABER. It probably does. It also means that there would be a large amount of money available which could be transferred to pay of the Army and used to delay the discharge of the boys who ought to be discharged. That is the thing that is involved here. Two things are involved here; in other words, the way the Budget was sent down here it showed a proposed transfer out of the Air Force appropriation to pay of the Army of $4,700,000,000. Most of the cut in the Air Force appropriation which the Committee on Appropriations made here was on account of pay of the Army and the accelerated programs of discharge. It was set up with the idea of encouraging those programs insofar as it might be done.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is what I am trying to get at: This leaves us then with $853,000,000 for the Air Force for the fiscal year 1946, if it is not changed?

Mr. TABER. No, the Air Force does not need any such sum as that. For instance, if we gave them every dollar that the Budget allowed after we reduced the amount of transfer that will be necessary for pay of the Army by the figures that are available to us with reference to the reduced number of personnel that will be in the Army, we would be able to add to the Budget estimate of rescission which was $10,434,000,000, $1,250,000,000, which would make a total rescission all by itself of $11,684,000,000. On top of that, there is not any question but what there is going to be $200,000,000 surplus funds in the Air Corps this fiscal year due to the cancellation of contracts and renegotiation which they did not have in shape to present when they came up before us to start with.

Mr. RANKIN. What disturbs me is this. Why leave money in this item not to be used for the Air Force but to be shifted for some other purpose?

Mr. TABER. Because without any action in the nature of a transfer, the item pay of the Army would otherwise be short. They have the authority in the appropriation act that was passed to make that transfer. Therefore, the way we have to operate is to reduce the amount available for the Air Force, because the Air Force has that surplus fund that the budget of the Army has set up to

transfer the pay of the Army. It is complicated, I will agree with the gentleman. I do not like that way of doing it.

Mr. RANKIN. It is complicated. The way it looks to an individual who is not familiar with all of the ramifications of this procedure is that you are unloading on the Air Corps, and it leaves the impression on the country and on the Congress, and if I may say it makes the impression on me, that you are charging up to the Air Corps $853,000,000 for the year 1946 at a time when untold thousands of planes are being destroyed. It leaves the impression that the Air Corps is spending more money than is justified when, as a matter of fact, according to your statement, it is being spent by some other division of the War Department.

Mr. TABER. Here is the picture, and it has been the picture for a long time. The estimates for the Air Force have been too high.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The Air Corps has had in the past 5 years over $26,000,000,000 more than they could obligate or spend. That is a billion dollars more than the total national debt after World War I. Last year they had $12,000,000,000 more than they could obligate. Some other branches of the service which have not been able to obtain funds from Congress obtained such funds by transfer from the Air Corps under the transfer clause placed into the appropriation bill, which clause I opposed.

Mr. TABER. May I suggest, if the gentleman from Mississippi is agreeable, that we get rid of this conference report if we can and then take up the other amendment which is in disagreement. Then we can stick to that and we will not have anything else involved.

Mr. RANKIN. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. TABER. I think then we would be better off.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The difficulty which the gentleman from Mississippi has pointed out is one which members of the committee themselves have had when these estimates have been considered, but it grows out of a situation prevailing, particularly because of the war, and also because of the War Department's bookkeeping that made it easier for them to transfer funds within the War Department rather than to let them revert at the end of the fiscal year. That matter has been discussed in the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department. It has been my contention that as soon as we get through with the war we should adopt the policy of having the funds revert at the end of the fiscal year instead of allowing them to be transferred within the Department.

Mr. TABER. I must yield back the balance of the time to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, there are several Members who would like to speak briefly on the conference report.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support this conference report. I have been strongly in favor of the legislation with which it deals. We all surely favor any and all legislation that will reclaim to the depleted Treasury more than $50,000,000,000.

However, there is one matter that has been overlooked in the preparing and perfecting of this legislation and this conference report that will be of interest to practically every Member of the House. That is the matter of the retirement benefits of those State employees who were loaned to the Government on January 2, 1942, and who will be transferred back to the States by reason of this legislation.

For instance, in the State of Ohio, we have about 900 employees who were loaned by the State to the Federal Government at the request of the President. If these persons transferred their employment status from the State to the Federal service they should have been entitled to all the retirement benefits that come to Federal employees. Let us take as an example a man who earned $2,000 when he was employed by the State. If he were making $2,000, he paid, let us say, $100 into the retirement fund. The State would pay in another $100. That would be $200 left there for his retirement benefit.

When he transferred to the status of a Federal employee the State would not pay any more. The Federal Government would then assume the responsibility of maintaining this man's retirement protection, but under the Federal law, as I understand it, an employee cannot be entitled to this benefit unless he is employed by the Federal Government for 5 years or more. This man having only been employed from January 2, 1942, he would not have been employed for 5 years and consequently would not be entitled to Federal retirement benefits. However, while this man was employed by the Government, the Government took out of his wages the amount provided by the Federal law and put it into the Federal retirement fund. The Government would also put into the fund the amount which the Government is required to do. Suppose the Government took out $100 per year from the wages of this employee and put in $100 of its own money, the employee would not be financially injured. But since the Government will not pay retirement in case of less than 5 years of employment, you can see that this would not be satisfactory. But the Government will refund to the employee the amount that it collected from him but it will not thereby supply the man with the retirement to which he is entitled. This man will lose the benefit of retirement for 4 years. Although he will be refunded the money taken from his pay, he will lose 4 years of retirement benefit. This creates a confusion and is not just and fair to these employees. This confusion is increased in cases where employees have died or left the service. Now, that matter will have to be taken care of sometime. A serious injustice has been done, and I know this Congress will be fair. We cannot do it very well in this conference report. It is not a matter that should be taken up in that way. I am calling attention to that now because I expect, upon the record made here today, that sometime we will build up some legislation to take care of this situation.

I have a telegram from Ralph W. Emmons, the State representative of the State employees of Ohio who were transferred from the service of the State of Ohio to the service of the Federal Government.

I wish to extend my remarks by inserting that telegram in the RECORD. I think this telegram will represent the position of the employees of all of the other States, especially those who have the same kind of retirement system.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I would say, in answer to the gentleman's statement, that the matter was brought up in conference and we recognized the situation. It is one of the reasons why I maintained the terrific hurry about this whole matter on the floor of the House was wrong. Now we are beginning to see some of the places where it was wrong, and this is one of them. An injustice is being done.

Mr. JENKINS. I am glad the gentleman recognized this matter that I have tried to present to the House. It is a fair claim and I feel that Congress, which is always fair, in time will rectify this failure to deal justly. I think it will appeal to everybody, because this oversight will never be corrected until some legislation is passed.

The illustration which I have given may not be accurate as to the amount of deduction for retirement, but I hope it creates an accurate picture. The telegram to which I have referred I think will clarify the situation. Its sender is one of the best posted men in the country on retirement and civil-service matters.

The telegram is as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, *December 2, 1945.*

HON. THOMAS JENKINS,
Member of Congress,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

By Executive order of the President effective January 2, 1942, the employees of the Ohio Employment Service were drafted into the service of the Federal Government. Practically all these employees had many years service credit in the Ohio retirement system. Policy statement issued by the Federal Government at the time of draft assured employees that the retirement credit would be fully protected. Immediately following the State retirement board declined to accept employees' contribution, as the employees were no longer in State service. Drafted employees were required to contribute to the Federal retirement system and have continued to do since January 1942. It is now declared if the Employment Service is returned to the State within 5 years since date of loan that the employees will not be entitled to Federal retirement privileges although the amount of their contribution less $50 tontine fees will be refunded. Unless corrected by act of Congress the drafted employees would unjustly lose retirement privilege in both the Federal and

State system. Two collective methods are suggested: First. That Congress authorize the Federal agency having jurisdiction to pay from appropriation granted to that agency the same amount that the State would have matched the employees' contributions had the service remained with the State since January 1942. That authorization would restore the employees to the State retirement system but possibly with the loss of service credit for the period since January 1942.

Second. That the concerned employees be granted five or more years service credit in the Federal retirement system benefits payable when the employee reaches the retirement age and subject to the involuntary-termination-of-service provision of the Federal retirement system. The salaries of the employees prior to January 1, 1942, were paid in part by the Federal Government and since that item in full. For that reason it is the contention of the employees that they have been the Federal employees since 1939 and should be entitled to service credits for the entire period plus the amount that they have paid as contributing members of the Federal system. The Federal Government is obligated to meet their policy statement in some satisfactory manner, and no reason can be assigned why the employee should be penalized by the loss of their retirement privileges earned after years of public service.

RALPH W. EMMONS.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] such time as he may desire.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, when this bill to rescind some of our war appropriations was before the House, it may be recalled that I called attention to what I regarded as an excessive cut in the funds allowed for continuing the research and development program of the Army Air Forces. The figures as I cited them at the time showed an allowance of 115 million where the Air Forces has proposed $245,000,000. It was true that the Air Forces in the original requests for fiscal 1946 asked for only 165 million for research and development and the cut to 115 million was approximately the 25 percent reduction applied generally by the Bureau of the Budget.

It was my contention, however, that the committee and possibly the Budget Bureau were unaware of the reason why the percentage cut applied to other programs was not a proper one for the research funds of the Air Forces.

When fiscal 1946 estimates were proposed, the Air Forces counted on getting a great deal of research and development done by contracting companies in connection with procurement of planes and aircraft matériel. This was particularly in the fields of radar, jet propulsion, rocket bombs, and applications of atomic power.

With the end of the war, and the cancellation of many of those procurement contracts, naturally the research and experimentation would not be accomplished. Consequently, the Air Forces would have that work to do themselves, if it was done at all.

Prudent administration of the Air Forces dictated that the research and development should go on at this time, particularly if we were to examine and determine the values in items and plans captured in the surrender of Germany and Japan.

That was why I called attention to the situation when the bill was before the House. Now, I am very glad to see that the situation has been improved by the conferees' proposal. As explained by the gentleman from New York in response to my interrogations a very substantial amount of funds recaptured through renegotiation and termination of contracts has been made available to the Air Forces which will let them pursue their research program and particularly to study and explore the possibilities of German and Japanese machines and plans that were captured with enemy surrender.

In connection with this recognition of the importance of scientific research, I deem it appropriate to call attention to the retirement from Government service, a few days ago, of one of the Nation's most distinguished and most helpful men of science, the head of the National Bureau of Standards, Dr. Lyman J. Briggs.

THE SERVICE OF DR. LYMAN J. BRIGGS

Mr. Speaker, few scientists have had careers so valuable to the United States both in its civilian functions and its military activities as Dr. Lyman J. Briggs. He has completed 49 years of service in the technical work of the Government.

During the last 12 of those years, while still carrying on active scientific research, he was the highly successful administrator of one of the Government's most important scientific organizations, the National Bureau of Standards. Under his wise and understanding administration, 2,000 scientists and technicians sought the solutions to a variety of intricate and difficult problems in physics, chemistry, engineering, and mathematics.

Dr. Briggs made significant contributions to the successful prosecution of both World Wars.

During the first, when science had not been given the major assignment that later fell to it, he was one of a relatively small group of scientists who worked tirelessly at fundamental problems whose answers might prove of practical value to the armed services. He was authorized by President Woodrow Wilson to carry on special researches for the Navy.

One of the fruits of this work was the development of a stable zenith instrument which greatly facilitated accuracy in firing the Navy's big guns. Through other researches he worked out a new method of measuring the acceleration of gravity at sea.

In the period between the wars, Dr. Briggs made important contributions to aeronautics.

With Dr. Paul R. Heyl, he invented the earth inductor compass, an instrument which overcame many perplexing difficulties in airplane navigation. For this service, Dr. Briggs and his associate inventor received the Magellan medal from the American Philosophical Society.

During this period Dr. Briggs, with associate physicists, devoted a great deal of time to experiments on models in the wind tunnels at the Bureau of Standards. This work involved pioneer measurements of air flow around airfoils at very high speeds, up to and exceeding the speed of sound. These studies later proved of great value in the design of aircraft propeller blades.

At the approach of World War II Dr. Briggs received a secret assignment which turned out to be of utmost importance.

He was selected by President Roosevelt in 1939 to be chairman of the original Uranium Committee to study the possibilities of using atomic energy in warfare. He was closely identified with all the early work which later led to production of the atomic bomb, and personally conducted much of the initial research.

Under his direction during the war period, 90 percent of the personnel of the Bureau of Standards was engaged in war work much of which played a vital part in furthering victory.

An indefatigable worker, Dr. Briggs has extended his scientific interests outside the sphere of his official duties.

For more than 8 years he has been chairman of the research committee of the National Geographic Society and has helped to formulate research programs for the expeditions which the society has sent to all parts of the world.

He took an especially active part in the stratosphere expeditions of 1934 and 1935, serving as chairman of the special advisory committee for the flights. In those ascents the society and the United States Army Air Forces cooperated in sending aloft from the Black Hills of South Dakota the balloons *Explorer I* and *Explorer II*, the latter to the world altitude record of 72,395 feet.

Both balloons were equipped with a large assortment of scientific instruments many of which Dr. Briggs helped to design. From these researches came results that led to improved airplane performance during World War II.

Since 1933 Dr. Briggs has been a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and in 1942 was elected vice chairman. He has been a member of the Aerodynamics Subcommittee for 23 years and more recently has been active on the Aircraft Materials and Aircraft Structures Subcommittees. He became Chairman of the Federal Specifications Board in 1932, of the Federal Fire Council in 1933, and of the National Conference on Weights and Measures in 1935.

Dr. Briggs was born May 7, 1874, on a farm north of Battle Creek, Mich. He entered Michigan State College at the age of 15. He received the degree bachelor of science from that institution in 1893, and 2 years later was graduated master of science in physics from the University of Michigan. In the fall of 1895 he entered Johns Hopkins University to continue his studies in physics; and, following the discovery of X-rays by Roentgen in that same year, Briggs conducted the first X-ray studies at Johns Hopkins.

In 1896 Dr. Briggs began his career in the Government's scientific work as a physicist in the Bureau of Soils of the Department of Agriculture. During his early years in the Department of Agriculture, Dr. Briggs originated the centrifugal method of classifying soils—moisture equivalent—now widely used in soil laboratories throughout the world.

In 1901 he received the degree doctor of philosophy from Johns Hopkins.

In 1906 Dr. Briggs organized the biophysical laboratory in the Bureau of Plant Industry. From that time until 1917 when he began investigations for the Navy at the Bureau of Standards he carried on extensive basic studies of the influence of environmental factors on the water requirements of plants. In the course of this work methods were developed for determining the "wilting coefficient" of a soil, which has found wide application in establishing the amount of water in a soil that is available for plant growth.

Dr. Briggs has been honored by many educational and scientific institutions. He has received the honorary degrees: Doctor of science from Michigan State College, George Washington University, Georgetown University, and Columbia University; doctor of engineering from the South Dakota School of Mines; and doctor of laws from the University of Michigan.

He is a life trustee of the National Geographic Society, a director of the American Standards Association, and has served as president of the American Physical Society, Washington Academy of Sciences, Philosophical Society of Washington, Cosmos Club, and Federal Club. He is a fellow of the National Academy of Sciences and a member of the American Philosophical Society, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences, Physical Society of England, and Newcomen Society of England.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that any man completes 49 years in the service of the Government—49 years of distinguished technical service. And because the funds allowed in this conference report for the research and development program of the Government are a signal recognition of the importance we now attach to work of this sort, I have thought it proper to speak of the great contribution to the practical scientific knowledge of the Nation made by the retiring head of the National Bureau of Standards, Dr. Lyman J. Briggs.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make mention of the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the States.

There is not much we can do about it in the House except to vote down this conference report, but I feel we can reiterate our protests and expose the meaning of this transfer in the hope that the President will veto this bill. I hope that this Congress will learn that this practice of putting on legislative riders to appropriation bills and then going to the Rules Committee and getting a rule waiving points of order to what ordinarily would be out of order, that that practice, particularly when it is employed against the interests of the working people of this country, must be stopped.

The significance of the transfer of the USES is very obvious. There is no question of efficiency involved, for the record of the United States Employment Service speaks for itself. It is part of a wage-cutting drive that is taking place throughout this country. Let us see what is going to happen as a result of this transfer. A person who is unemployed, who had been working, let us say, at a dollar an hour refuses a position at 50 or 60 cents an hour, which is now being offered. He will be certified as being eligible for unemployment compensation. That is the policy of the United States Government. We go back to the States with the employment service and we will subject every unemployed worker in most of the State to the following practice: The person is offered a job at 60 cents an hour after he has been working at a dollar an hour; he refuses that kind of work. If he does so, he will not be certified as eligible for unemployment compensation. He will be faced with the proposition either of accepting a low-scale job, a low-standard job, or starve. That is the purpose behind this transfer of the USES to the States. Some people are in favor of cutting wages. I wish they would stand up here and say so; I wish they would declare themselves in favor of this transfer because they favor wage cuts. Instead, they will talk about efficiency as the reason for the transfer.

Labor today is subjected to industrial warfare. Industrial warfare has been declared on labor. It has been declared on labor by automobile and steel. This is just another antilabor maneuver in the warfare against labor.

Furthermore, let use look at this unemployment proposition. Since when has unemployment been a State problem? Employment and unemployment is a problem which crosses State lines. It has always been recognized since the exit of Herbert Hoover as a national problem. It was only during the Hoover administration that it was considered purely a local and State problem; and we know what catastrophe that caused in this country. Now we are doing the same thing, we revert to the Hoover philosophy on the question of unemployment. Give return of the USES to the States and it will be used as a wage-cutting drive. It is part of the vicious drive which has been launched against labor in this country. You cannot get away from it.

I do hope that the President vetoes this bill so that the Committee on Appropriations will come out with a genuine appropriation bill and not seek to legislate against labor by means of a rider that would have been out of order except that it was made in order by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has brought before the House a report which gives the membership no opportunity to express itself upon the question of accepting or rejecting the Senate amendments relative to the continuation of the guayule project. I realize how difficult it is for a conference committee to work out a report which will enable the House to pass on each and every item of disagreement. I have no desire to criticize the conferees, nor have I any desire to delay action on this conference report. At the same time I am convinced that we should avoid the tragic mistake of unreasonable or unnecessary destruction of the substantial amount of natural rubber now growing in the California fields. The pressing need for natural rubber still exists. Were it not for our existing price controls, there is no doubt but what natural rubber would bring a higher price today than after the last war. We have, at present prices, approximately $5,000,000 worth of natural rubber in California. If we will allow this rubber to mature and to harvest it in an orderly manner, we will have several times that amount of rubber. All that those of us who have worked on this guayule program ask is that our investment be liquidated in an orderly manner and over a sufficient period of time to avoid unnecessary loss and that experimental and research work be continued.

The report as it comes before you now provides for an additional 6 months for liquidation of the guayule project. Those of us who have been charged with the responsibility of some special study of the guayule project feel that even the additional 6 months—that is the entire calendar year 1946—will be too short a period in which to liquidate all of the guayule now in the fields of California.

Much of that guayule has not matured; much of it needs from 2 to 2½ and some even 3 years to reach a state when it is proper to cut and mill it.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to join the gentleman's position in reference to that guayule project. The policy of the Congress in that respect reminds me of a boy who will plant a grain of corn and go out the next morning and pull it up before it has any possible chance to grow, and throw it away.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We do not feel there has been time enough to complete this work. We now have approximately $5,000,000 worth of guayule in the field. If we leave it for 2 or 3 years we will have possibly two or three times that amount, and under no circumstances can we justify the abandonment of the experimental and research program. Until we have reached a point where natural rubber is not necessary, we shall need to study and encourage the production of guayule in the United States. We believe that private enterprise should be encouraged to take over the properties in California and that we should establish a price program which would keep private growers in the picture.

When the regular agricultural appropriation bill comes up next spring we hope to have an opportunity to discuss this matter fully and freely and to make what we hope will be a more sound and satisfactory decision on the program both as to guayule in the field and as to the milling and research programs. My

colleague, Mr. PHILLIPS, of California, will present a resolution which the Committee on Agriculture has just passed.

I hope that the Members of the House and especially the members of the Appropriations Committee will give us a full opportunity to present the case for guayule next spring.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Guayule Rubber Committee, I heartily endorse the statements made by Mr. POAGE, and trust that you may give your attention to the recommendations of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ANTON JOHNSON; also the recommendations of the gentlemen from California [Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. PHILLIPS], which are in accord with the viewpoint expressed by Mr. POAGE.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the liquidation of the guayule rubber project, but I would like to see it done in a little more orderly manner and not in a destructive way by throwing away a lot of money. I think the point was well made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama when he referred to the planting of a seed of corn. To me, it is like planting a nice orchard and when it begins to come into bearing to say, "It has cost us too much," and you plow it up and destroy it. This situation is entirely comparable.

I hope that the Appropriations Committee will net this subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture come before us at some future time and bring this matter up in an orderly manner. We have growing around $5,000,000 worth of rubber in the fields today. There are 30,000 acres of it out there. It has cost a lot of money; there is no question about that, but I am sure that guayule is going to be grown in this country by private capital and private enterprise. It is being done down in Mexico, where millions of acres have been planted, domesticated, and cultivated. We are going to compete with the world in rubber. So we are notifying the Appropriations Committee that we would like a chance in the early part of next year to appear before the committee and see this thing carried through a cycle of, say, four to four and a half years or so; then we will know and the Government will know what it costs to produce guayule rubber.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the only reason for me taking a few minutes about this program that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] have talked about is to say that in my district we have the Agricultural College of the University of California. We would like to formulate some way to salvage this rubber project so that these guayule plants can be brought to maturity.

Our college has experimented with rubber in a very small way for about 10 or 15 years and this will give them an opportunity to experiment with it in a much larger way. Also we believe that if we have a little more time we can salvage this project, that it will not result in such a great financial loss.

As I see it, we should find some way, if possible, to develop our own rubber. We are now looking to the outside world to furnish us rubber. It will be remembered that at one time we found ourselves in a very bad state because we could not produce rubber ourselves. The carrying out of this program in accordance with the plan that the Agricultural Committee will develop later on will, in my opinion, give opportunity to determine conclusively whether or not we can develop and furnish our own rubber in this country.

I hope, my colleagues, that the University of California Agricultural College may, by being given a wider range in its experimentation with these guayule plants, play an important part in determining conclusively that we can or cannot develop our rubber in this manner. If given this chance and the experiments can be widely carried on as to climate, soil, water conditions, and so forth, from the planting of the shrubs until their maturity, this will give the answer. We have in the agricultural college the men that can do this. Give them a chance and they will give the answer, which will be of tremendous benefit to our country.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, following the three gentlemen who have just preceded me, I present to the Congress a resolution just adopted by the House Committee on Agriculture, which I desire to read:

The managers for the House and the Senate on the so-called rescission bill (the conference report on which is now before this House) having changed the wording of that section which refers to the liquidation of the program of producing natural rubber through guayule and other plants;

And the subcommittee on rubber projects of the House Committee on Agriculture having had this problem constantly before it for more than a year, and having met this morning to consider this immediate problem of the conference report, and having recommended to the full committee, the House committee has approved the following resolution:

Resolved, That the House Committee on Agriculture is disturbed by the possible loss of rubber and money to the Government and urges on the Department of Agriculture and the Forestry Service (as the agency directly handling this liquidation) the most careful and thoughtful efforts to conserve this asset and to dispose of the plants in such a way as to get the most rubber from them and transfer the plants and the properties into private hands, particularly into the hands of a number of farmers who may carry on this protective national program; and be it

Resolved further, That the House Committee on Agriculture take this matter up immediately after the first of the year, with the thought of making definite recommendations to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations regarding the liquidation and the future handling of that part of the rubber program which involves the production of natural rubber from guayule and other plants.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I listened a moment ago with a great deal of interest to the observations made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], that the transfer of the United States Employment Services to the States, where it properly belongs, and where Congress placed it in 1936, is, in his judgment, just another effort at wage cutting and an antilabor move.

Nothing could be further from the fact. That is, of course, the opinion of the gentleman from New York. It reminds me of a little quip of Abraham Lincoln long ago when he asked someone, "If you call a sheep's tail a leg, how many legs will the sheep have?" Somebody said, "Five." "No," he said, "just calling a sheep's tail a leg does not make it a leg."

The opinion of the gentleman from New York does not make this a wage-cutting endeavor whatever. This operation has been integrated with the unemployment compensation function ever since 1936. There was a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government when the States surrendered those offices to the Federal Government in response to a telegram by the late President of the United States, that they be returned and be returned forthwith. If I had my way, of course, we would stand on a 30-day provision similar to that adopted in this House a number of weeks ago. The Senate, in its wisdom, undertook to make it 120 days, and the compromise gives an outside date of 100 days, so that they must be returned as quickly as practicable but not later than 100 days. It will be one of the most constructive efforts that this House ever made toward the reconversion program in the country.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this bill are, generally speaking, quite laudable. However, I find myself in a position that I cannot support it because of the provision which returns the United States employment services to the States within 100 days.

It was realized at the time the Federal Government took over this service that the States could not handle it; and why? Because there was a very serious situation with respect to placing employees in the right jobs. Within the next 6 months this country is going to go through one of the most critical periods in its history with respect to the replacing of veterans and displaced war workers in employment. Just at the time when we need an integrated service you are going to throw this thing back to the States, and it will result in inefficiency and confusion.

There is also a very grave question whether or not the States have in their budgets at the present time any money with which to support the employment services. I think the proposal a serious mistake. I honestly believe the governors of the States who asked that this service be returned did not intend that it be returned immediately. All they wanted to do was protect themselves

from having it remain permanently in the Federal Government. The only thing I ask is that the return of control to the States be postponed until the end of 1946. That will be the wise and the sensible thing to do. I am afraid we are going to regret the turning back of this service to the States on such short notice, mainly because it will result in hardship, inefficiency, and confusion. I believe the President would be justified in vetoing this bill for those reasons.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report of the conferees of the two Houses on H. R. 4407, the so-called supplemental surplus appropriation recision bill of 1946. From time to time we have heard criticism that the Congress perhaps did not provide ample funds to carry on the war. The war is now over, and the Army and Navy Establishments, after setting aside forty-four billions for the use of the Army and Navy for the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, proposes to turn back into the Treasury approximately $53,000,000,000. In other words, after the Army and Navy have turned back approximately $53,000,000,000 that had been appropriated during this war, they still have a nest egg left of approximately $44,000,000,000 to carry them through to the end of this fiscal year June 30, 1946, and this nest egg is a very tidy sum itself. It is more than twice the cost of World War I up to the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918.

Congress in H. R. 4407, and in this conference report that we have before us for adoption today, has canceled appropriations and authorizations for these $53,000,000,000, and these billions cannot be expended. This clearly shows that Congress not only provided all the money that the Army and Navy required, but when the war was over they had a balance of appropriations and authorizations of fifty-three billions, plus forty-four billions, amounting to almost one hundred billions, and no one can say that Congress was not providing all the money that was necessary to conduct and win the war, and nearly $100,000,000,000 besides. It seems that if there could be any criticism it is that Congress was too liberal. Of course, Congress could not know just how much money would be required. We had to depend upon the President, the Commander in Chief, and those in charge of our armed forces.

I see in some articles and here statements in some speeches that it is necessary to buy bonds now in order to bring our boys home. These statements are inaccurate. The Army, Navy, Air Forces, and Marine Corps have at their disposal $44,000,000,000 to take care of our armed forces and to bring them home. We have and shall continue to urge that demobilization be expedited. Millions of these boys have been away from home a long, long time. They have faced great dangers and endured great hardships and many of their families have made great sacrifices, and have won undying glory on land, see, and air. They should be taken off the Government pay roll and placed on the pay rolls of industry, agriculture and commerce, taking care of their own business, renew their education and normal lives again, and in that way help themselves, their families, and our country and save billions of dollars to the American taxpayers. This is very important as we are now facing a national debt of $300,000,000,000, with a real threat of inflation and financial disaster to our country.

Of course, it gives me pleasure to vote for this conference report that cancels approximately $53,000,000,000 of appropriations and authorizations that have heretofore been made but not expended. These $53,000,000,000 are not turned in alone by the Army and Navy but by the hundreds of other governmental agencies. The Army and Navy did turn in approximately $46,000,000,000 of this sum. This report should in my opinion be adopted by unanimous vote by the House and Senate.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 86, noes 10.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 262, nays 61, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—262

Abernethy	Byrne, N. Y.	Fallon
Adams	Byrnes, Wis.	Fellows
Allen, Ill.	Camp	Fenton
Allen, La.	Canfield	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
Anderson, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Fogarty
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Folger
Andrews, Ala.	Chiperfield	Forand
Andrews, N. Y.	Church	Fuller
Angell	Clason	Fulton
Arends	Clevenger	Gardner
Arnold	Clippinger	Gary
Baldwin, Md.	Cochran	Gavin
Barden	Cole, Kans.	Gibson
Barrett, Wyo.	Cole, Mo.	Gifford
Bates, Ky.	Cole, N. Y.	Gillespie
Bates, Mass.	Colmer	Goodwin
Beckworth	Combs	Gossett
Bell	Cooley	Graham
Bennet, N. Y.	Cooper	Granger
Bennett, Mo.	Corbett	Grant, Ala.
Bishop	Cox	Grant, Ind.
Blackney	Cravens	Gross
Bland	Crawford	Gwinn, N. Y.
Bolton	Cunningham	Gwynne, Iowa
Bonner	D'Alesandro	Hale
Boren	Davis	Hall, Leonard W.
Boykin	D'Ewart	Halleck
Brooks	Dirksen	Hancock
Brown, Ga.	Dolliver	Hare
Brown, Ohio	Domengeaux	Harless, Ariz.
Brumbaugh	Dondero	Harness, Ind.
Bryson	Durham	Harris
Buck	Dworshak	Hartley
Buffett	Earthman	Hedrick
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Hendricks
Bunker	Ellis	Henry
Burch	Ellsworth	Herter
Burgin	Elsaesser	Heselton
Butler	Elston	Hess
Byrd	Engel, Mich.	Hill
Byron	Ervin	Hinshaw
Camp	Fallon	Hobbs
Canfield	Fellows	Hoeven
Case, N. J.	Fenton	Hoffman
Case, S. Dak.	Fisher	Holmes, Wash.
Chenoweth	Flannagan	Hope
Chiperfield	Fogarty	Hull
Church	Folger	Jarman
Clason	Forand	Jenkins
Clevenger	Fuller	Jennings
Clippinger	Fulton	Jensen
Cochran	Gardner	Johnson, Calif.
Cole, Kans.	Gary	Johnson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Gavin	Johnson, Ind.
Cole, N. Y.	Gibson	Johnson, Luther A.
Colmer	Gifford	Johnson, Okla.
Combs	Gillespie	Jones
Cooley	Goodwin	Jonkman
Cooper	Gossett	Kean
Corbett	Graham	Kearney
Cox	Granger	Kerr
Cravens	Grant, Ala.	Kilburn
Crawford	Grant, Ind.	Kilday
Cunningham	Gross	Kinzer
D'Alesandro	Gwinn, N. Y.	Kirwan
Davis	Gwynne, Iowa	Kunkel
D'Ewart	Hale	Landis
Dirksen	Hall, Leonard W.	Lanham
Dolliver	Halleck	Latham
Domengeaux	Hancock	LeCompte
Dondero	Hare	LeFevre
Durham	Harless, Ariz.	Lemke
Dworshak	Harness, Ind.	Lyle
Earthman	Harris	McConnell
Eaton	Hartley	McCowen
Ellis	Hedrick	McDonough
Ellsworth	Hendricks	McGehee
Elsaesser	Henry	McGregor
Elston	Herter	McKenzie
Engel, Mich.	Heselton	McMillen, Ill.
Ervin	Hess	Maloney
Fallon	Hill	Manasco
Fellows	Hinshaw	Mansfield, Tex.
Fenton	Hobbs	Martin, Iowa
Fisher	Hoeven	Martin, Mass.
Flannagan	Hoffman	Mason
Fogarty	Holmes, Wash.	Mathews
Folger	Hope	Michener
Forand	Hull	Miller, Nebr.
Fuller	Jarman	Mills
Fulton	Jenkins	Monroney
Gardner	Jennings	Morrison
Gary	Jensen	Mundt
Gavin	Johnson, Calif.	Murdock
Gibson	Johnson, Ill.	Murray, Wis.
Gifford	Johnson, Ind.	Norrell
Gillespie	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Hara
Goodwin	Johnson, Okla.	O'Konski
Gossett	Jones	O'Neal
Graham	Jonkman	Pace
Granger	Kean	Peterson, Ga.
Grant, Ala.	Kearney	Phillips
Grant, Ind.	Kerr	Pickett
Gross	Kilburn	Pittenger
Gwinn, N. Y.	Kilday	Ploeser
Gwynne, Iowa	Kinzer	Plumley
Hale	Kirwan	Poage
Hall, Leonard W.	Kunkel	Price, Fla.
Halleck	Landis	Priest
Hancock	Lanham	Rabaut
Hare	Latham	Ramey
Harless, Ariz.	LeCompte	Randolph
Harness, Ind.	LeFevre	Rankin
Harris	Lemke	Reece, Tenn.
Hartley	Lyle	Reed, Ill.
Hedrick	McConnell	Reed, N. Y.
Hendricks	McCowen	Rees, Kans.
Henry	McDonough	Richards
Herter	McGehee	Riley
Heselton	McGregor	Rivers
Hess	McKenzie	Rizley
Hill	McMillen, Ill.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Hinshaw	Maloney	Robertson, Va.
Hobbs	Manasco	Robinson, Utah
Hoeven	Mansfield, Tex.	Robsion, Ky.
Hoffman	Martin, Iowa	Rockwell
Holmes, Wash.	Martin, Mass.	Rodgers, Pa.
Hope	Mason	Roe, Md.
Hull	Mathews	Rogers, Fla.
Jarman	Michener	Rogers, Mass.
Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.	Russell
Jennings	Mills	Schwabe, Mo.
Jensen	Monroney	Schwabe, Okla.
Johnson, Calif.	Morrison	Scrivner
Johnson, Ill.	Mundt	Sharp
Johnson, Ind.	Murdock	Sheppard
Johnson, Luther A.	Murray, Wis.	Short
Johnson, Okla.	Norrell	Sikes
Jones	O'Hara	Simpson, Ill.
Jonkman	O'Konski	Smith, Maine
Kean	O'Neal	Smith, Ohio
Kearney	Pace	Smith, Wis.
Kerr	Peterson, Ga.	Sparkman
Kilburn	Phillips	Springer
Kilday	Pickett	Stefan
Kinzer	Pittenger	Stewart
Kirwan	Ploeser	Stigler
Kunkel	Plumley	Stockman
Landis	Poage	Sullivan
Lanham	Price, Fla.	Sumners, Tex.
Latham	Priest	Sundstrom
LeCompte	Rabaut	Taber
LeFevre	Ramey	Talle
Lemke	Randolph	Tarver
Lyle	Rankin	Taylor
McConnell	Reece, Tenn.	Thomas, N. J.
McCowen	Reed, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
McDonough	Reed, N. Y.	Thomason
McGehee	Rees, Kans.	Tibbott
McGregor	Richards	Towe
McKenzie	Riley	Traynor
McMillen, Ill.	Rivers	Trimble
Maloney	Rizley	Vinson
Manasco	Robertson, N. Dak.	Vursell
Mansfield, Tex.	Robertson, Va.	Wasielewski
Martin, Iowa	Robinson, Utah	Weaver
Martin, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.	West
Mason	Rockwell	White
Mathews	Rodgers, Pa.	Whitten
Michener	Roe, Md.	Whittington
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Fla.	Wickersham
Mills	Rogers, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Monroney	Russell	Wilson
Morrison	Schwabe, Mo.	Winstead
Mundt	Schwabe, Okla.	Wolverton, N. J.
Murdock	Scrivner	Woodruff, Mich.
Murray, Wis.	Sharp	Woodrum, Va.
Norrell	Sheppard	Worley
O'Hara	Short	Zimmerman
O'Konski	Sikes	
O'Neal	Simpson, Ill.	
Pace	Smith, Maine	
Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Ohio	
Phillips	Smith, Wis.	
Pickett	Sparkman	
Pittenger	Springer	
Ploeser	Stefan	
Plumley	Stewart	
Poage	Stigler	
Price, Fla.	Stockman	
Priest	Sullivan	
Rabaut	Sumners, Tex.	
Ramey	Sundstrom	
Randolph	Taber	
Rankin	Talle	
Reece, Tenn.	Tarver	
Reed, Ill.	Taylor	
Reed, N. Y.	Thomas, N. J.	
Rees, Kans.	Thomas, Tex.	
Richards	Thomason	
Riley	Tibbott	
Rivers	Towe	
Rizley	Traynor	
Robertson, N. Dak.	Trimble	
Robertson, Va.	Vinson	
Robinson, Utah	Vursell	
Robsion, Ky.	Wasielewski	
Rockwell	Weaver	
Rodgers, Pa.	West	
Roe, Md.	White	
Rogers, Fla.	Whitten	
Rogers, Mass.	Whittington	
Russell	Wickersham	
Schwabe, Mo.	Wigglesworth	
Schwabe, Okla.	Wilson	
Scrivner	Winstead	
Sharp	Wolverton, N. J.	
Sheppard	Woodruff, Mich.	
Short	Woodrum, Va.	
Sikes	Worley	
Simpson, Ill.	Zimmerman	
Smith, Maine		
Smith, Ohio		
Smith, Wis.		
Sparkman		
Springer		
Stefan		
Stewart		
Stigler		
Stockman		
Sullivan		
Sumners, Tex.		
Sundstrom		
Taber		
Talle		
Tarver		
Taylor		
Thomas, N. J.		
Thomas, Tex.		
Thomason		
Tibbott		
Towe		
Traynor		
Trimble		
Vinson		
Vursell		
Wasielewski		
Weaver		
West		
White		
Whitten		
Whittington		
Wickersham		
Wigglesworth		
Wilson		
Winstead		
Wolverton, N. J.		
Woodruff, Mich.		
Woodrum, Va.		
Worley		
Zimmerman		

NAYS—61

Bailey	Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.
Biemiller	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Bloom	Gregory	Outland
Bradley, Pa.	Havenner	Patman
Carnahan	Hoch	Patrick
Celler	Holifield	Patterson
Chapman	Huber	Price, Ill.
Chelf	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rayfiel
Clements	Kee	Resa
Coffee	Kefauver	Rogers, N. Y.
Delaney, James J.	Kelley, Pa.	Rowan
Douglas, Ill.	Kopplemann	Ryter
Doyle	LaFollette	Sabath
Eberharter	Lesinski	Sadowski
Feighan	Link	Savage
Flood	Madden	Somers, N. Y.
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Spence
Geelan	May	Starkey
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	Tolan
Gore	Neely	Voorhis, Calif.
		Welch

NOT VOTING—109

Auchincloss	Gerlach	McGlinchey
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gillette	McMillan, S. C.
Barrett, Pa.	Gillie	Mahon
Barry	Granahan	Mansfield, Mont.
Beall	Griffiths	Merrow
Bender	Hagen	Morgan
Bradley, Mich.	Hall Edwin Arthur	Murphy
Brehm	Hand	Murray, Tenn.
Buckley	Hart	Norton
Campbell	Hays	O'Toole
Cannon, Fla.	Healy	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.	Hébert	Pfeifer
Carlson	Heffernan	Philbin
Clark	Holmes, Mass.	Powell
Courtney	Hook	Quinn, N. Y.
Crosser	Horan	Rabin
Curley	Howell	Rains
Curtis	Izac	Rampeck
Daughton, Va.	Jackson	Rich
Dawson	Judd	Roe, N. Y.
De Lacy	Keefe	Rooney
Delaney, John J.	Kelly, Ill.	Sasscer
Dickstein	Keogh	Shafer
Dingell	King	Sheridan
Doughton, N. C.	Knutson	Simpson, Pa.
Douglas, Calif.	Lane	Slaughter
Drewry	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lea	Snyder
Engle, Calif.	Lewis	Stevenson
Fernandez	Luce	Sumner, Ill.
Gamble	Ludlow	Talbot
Gathings	Lynch	Thom
Gearhart	McCormack	Torrens

Vorys, Ohio	Weiss	Wood
Wadsworth	Winter	Woodhouse
Walter	Wolcott	
Weichel	Wolfenden, Pa.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shafer for, with Mrs. Woodhouse against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. De Lacy, against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. McGlinchey against.

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Granahan against.

Mr. Lewis for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Vorys of Ohio for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mrs. Douglas of California against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. King with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Ramspeck with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Wolcott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: On page 25, line 10, strike out "$12,166,313,000" and insert "$11,313,313,000."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'NEAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 32 and concur in the same with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the amount inserted by said amendment insert '$11,799,313,000.' "

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

I am somewhat disturbed over what developed here this morning. While $853,000,000 were credited to the Air Force, most of that amount seems to have been shifted to other accounts which indicates to me that a great deal of the expenditure in the War Department is being charged up to the Air Force that ought to be charged to some other branch of the Department.

I am in favor of an independent Air Force and have been for many years. I believe it is the only way to keep our Air Force up to date and keep it from being imposed upon, if not suppressed, by other branches of the service.

I was here in 1921 when Gen. Billy Mitchell gave his famous demonstration off Hampton Roads by sinking the *Ostfriesland*, the largest German battleship captured in the First World War. It took less than 20 minutes and only 3 shots from an airplane to accomplish that destruction. He begged Congress then to build up a modern air force, and was court-martialed for his pains. Yet 20 years later we found ourselves without an adequate air force when Pearl Harbor was attacked.

I saw the brass hats destroy Billy Mitchell and send him to his grave a broken-hearted hero when, if they had followed his advice, that was backed up by the most glorious examples of his services in the First World War, he would not only not have been court-martialed but we would have had an air force capable of protecting Pearl Harbor in Hawaii as well as the whole United States and of preventing the Japanese from invading the Philippine Islands.

You may say what you please, our defense in the years to come will depend largely upon two things, upon our Air Force and the atomic bomb. I for one am not in favor of peddling the secrets of the manufacture, or the know-how, as President Truman says, of making the atomic bomb to every country in the world that is now manifesting a lack of interest in universal peace.

If some of them had it now, there is no telling the destruction they would visit upon the helpless peoples of the world.

By maintaining the strongest air force on earth, keeping it right up to the minute, and keeping the atomic bombs we now have and the machinery ready to make more, we cannot only lead the world in the ways of peace but we can say to every other nation on earth, "We are going to expect you to keep the peace." That will do more than all this mollycoddling of a group of wild-eyed internationalists running about all over the world, crawling around on their bellies, and asking some dictator what the taxpayers of America can do for them. Let us look out for America first, if you please. Our men and our materials won this war. If it had not been for America, it would have been hopelessly lost. Now, let us not throw the peace away. Let us maintain the strongest air force on earth, and in order to do that take it out from under every other branch of the service and make it an independent agency, even if we have to consolidate the Army and Navy in order to do it.

Then let us keep the secrets of the know-how of making the atomic bomb to ourselves, so far as its manufacture is concerned. Not another nation on earth can make the machinery with which to make the machinery to manufacture those bombs within 5 years.

We are not expecting to use it for the destruction of other peoples. The American people want peace, but we are not going to have peace as long as we continue to pander to every war-making element in the world and try to appease them at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States and at the expense of the blood and tears of the American people.

We have a bunch running around here now attacking Chiang Kai-shek and backing up the Chinese Communists that were making war on Chiang Kai-shek during the time we were at war with Japan and Chiang Kai-shek was fighting on our side. In that way they cost the lives of thousands of American boys on Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and the other islands of the Southwest Pacific.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39, page 29, line 10, strike out "$30,903,090,564," and insert "$29,752,017,993."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'NEAL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 39 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the amount inserted by said amendment, insert '$30,263,923,923'."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely relates to the total and makes it correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RETIREMENT PAY FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying bill and papers referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1512 providing that retired enlisted men who have been, or may be, retired with credit for 30 years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps and who served beyond the continental limits of the United States between 1898 and 1912, such service having been computed under previous laws as double time toward retirement, shall be entitled to receive the maximum retired pay now provided for the grade in which retired.

While enlisted men who performed certain foreign service between 1898 and

1912 may count such service double in computing length of service for retirement, they do not receive double credit for such service for longevity pay purposes. H. R. 1512 would, in effect, grant double credit in computing longevity pay for the foreign service which was counted double in determining their right to retirement.

Enlisted men who enlisted subsequent to August 24, 1912, may not count such foreign service as double for any purpose. Thus those who performed such service prior to 1912 and retired with less than 30 years of actual service have already received a substantial benefit. I am unable to see any reason for granting further benefits to those included within the particular group covered by this bill, who have already received more favorable treatment with respect to retirement benefits than other service personnel who could retire only after 30 years' actual service.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 3, 1945.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

All who think seriously about the problem of reconversion—of changing our economy from war to peace—realize that the transition is a difficult and dangerous task. There are some who would have the Government, during the reconversion period, continue telling our citizens what to do, as was so often necessary when the very life of our Nation was at stake during the period of world conflict.

That, however, is not the policy of the Government. The policy is to remove wartime controls as rapidly as possible, and to return the free management of business to those concerned with it.

It was for the express purpose of getting away as soon as possible from some of the wartime powers and controls that the recent National Labor-Management Conference was called in Washington. Instead of retaining in the Federal Government the power over wages and labor agreements and industrial relations which a global war had made necessary, the top leaders of management and labor were invited to recommend a program under which labor relations would be turned back into the hands of those involved.

It was decided that full responsibility for reaching agreement on such a program would be left with the representatives of labor and management. Accordingly, the conference was made up of leaders of labor and management only. Government representatives participated only as observers, without vote. The agenda and the entire program were worked out by the leaders themselves.

In opening the conference I said:

I want to make it clear that this is your conference—a management-labor conference—and not a Government conference. You have not been chosen by me or by any Government official. You have been selected by the leading labor and industrial organizations in the United States. There has been no interference by Government in that selection. * * *

The time has come for labor and management to handle their own affairs in the traditional American, democratic way. I hope that I can give up the President's wartime powers as soon as possible, so that management and labor can again have the full and undivided responsibility for providing the production that we must have to safeguard our domestic economy and our leadership in international affairs.

I am sure that it was the hope of the American people that out of this conference would come some recommendation for insuring industrial peace where collective bargaining and conciliation have broken down.

The conference is now closed. The very fact that the top leaders of labor and management have met and worked together for more than 3 weeks is itself some progress.

Some agreements on a few general principles were also reached. For example, agreement on the principles of collective bargaining, and recommendations on the detailed procedure to be used; agreement on strengthening and enlarging governmental conciliation services; recognition of the necessity of eliminating discrimination in employment; agreement on settling by voluntary arbitration grievances under labor contracts and disputes concerning their interpretation—these are all valuable.

But on the all-important question of how to avoid work stoppages when these expedients have failed, the conference arrived at no accord. Failing in that, the conference was unable to attain the objective most necessary to successful reconversion.

If industrial strife continues, the quick reconversion which has been planned, and which is now proceeding on schedule or even ahead of schedule on many fronts, will fail. In that event, we shall face a period of low production, low consumption, and widespread unemployment—instead of the high production, high employment, good markets and good wages that are within our grasp.

The history of labor relations has proven that nearly all labor disputes can and should be settled by sincere and honest collective bargaining. The vast majority of those disputes which are not adjusted by collective bargaining are settled through Government conciliation. For example during the month of October last, 354 strikes were settled by the Conciliation Service, and 1,282 labor controversies were adjusted before any work stoppages occurred.

The American people commend the many instances where management and labor have settled their problems peacefully. Many of these were in critical industries where work stoppages would have gained great prominence in the newspapers and over our radios. But when industrial disputes were settled, little notice was taken of them by press or radio.

We know, however, that there are always some disputes that cannot be settled this way.

Industrial strife in some key industries means not only loss of a great amount of wages and purchasing power; but it may have ramifications throughout the country affecting the whole reconversion process. In such industries, when labor and management cannot compose their differences the public, through the Federal Government, has a duty to speak and to act. In the last analysis, labor, management, and the public have the same interest.

The reconversion effort is now going well. The people have a right to expect it to succeed. Specific obstacles that stand in its way must not be allowed to defeat that expectation.

Good labor relations are just as important now as they were during the war. They should be based on justice, and not on tests of strength. Any industrial dispute which depends for settlement upon the respective strength of the parties results in loss to everyone; it causes loss of wages to the worker and his family, loss of dividends to the stockholders and owners of the industry, loss of goods to the public.

I regret that labor and management have not been able to agree on machinery that would provide a solution for existing strikes in some of the major industries and for the strikes which are threatened. Strikes already in effect may possibly cripple our reconversion program. Negotiations have broken down in other industries, and stoppages are threatened.

The American people have been patient. They have waited long in the hope that those leaders in labor and management whose business it was to handle this problem would be able to do so in agreement. The Federal Government declined time and again to make any suggestions to the conference as to proper machinery. All that the Government did was to point out the objective which the American people expected it to attain.

Now that the conference has adjourned without any recommendation on the subject, it becomes the duty of the Government to act on its own initiative. Therefore, I now suggest to the Congress that well-reasoned and workable legislation be passed at the earliest possible moment to provide adequate means for settling industrial disputes and avoiding industrial strife.

I recommend that for the settlement of industrial disputes in important Nation-wide industries there be adopted the principles underlying the Railway Labor Act. The general pattern of that act is not applicable to small industries or to small local disputes in large industries. But it would be effective, as well as fair, in such widespread industries, for example, as steel, automobile, aviation, mining, oil, utilities, and communications. I do not intend to make this list exclusive. Nor do I think that local inconsequential strikes even within these industries should be included. The objective should be to cover by legislation only such stoppages of work as the Secretary of Labor would certify to the President as vitally affecting the national public interest.

In industrial disputes in such industries, where collective bargaining has

broken down, and where the Conciliation Service of the Federal Government has been unable to bring the parties to agreement, and where the Secretary of Labor has been unable to induce the parties voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration, I recommend the following procedure:

Upon certification by the Secretary of Labor to the effect that a dispute continues despite his efforts, and that a stoppage of work in the affected industry would vitally affect the public interest, the President, or his duly authorized agent, should be empowered to appoint, within 5 days thereafter, a Fact Finding Board similar to the Emergency Board provided for under the Railway Labor Act.

I recommend that during these 5 days after the Secretary of Labor has made the above certificate, it be unlawful to call a strike or lock-out, or to make any change in rates of pay, hours, or working conditions, or in the established practices in effect prior to the time the dispute arose.

The Board should be composed of three or more outstanding citizens, and should be directed to make a thorough investigation of all the facts which it deems relevant in the controversy. In its investigation it should have full power to subpena individuals and records, and should be authorized to call upon any Government agency for information or assistance. It should make its report within 20 days, unless the date is extended by agreement of the parties with the approval of the President. The report should include a finding of the facts and such recommendations as the Board deems appropriate.

While the Fact Finding Board is deliberating and for 5 days thereafter it should be made unlawful to call a strike or lock-out, or to make any change in rates of pay, hours, working conditions, or established practices, except by agreement.

The parties would not be legally bound to accept the findings or follow the recommendations of the Fact Finding Board, but the general public would know all the facts. The result, I am sure, would be that in most cases, both sides would accept the recommendations, as they have in most of the railway-labor disputes.

I believe that the procedure should be used sparingly and only when the national public interest requires it.

The legislation should pay particular attention to the needs of seasonal industries, so that the so-called cooling-off periods can be arranged in those industries in a manner which will not subject labor to an undue disadvantage.

There are other subjects which were on the agenda of the Labor-Management Conference on which no agreement was reached. The most immediate, the most pressing, however, is this one of machinery.

I hope that the Congress will act upon this matter as quickly as possible—and certainly before its Christmas recess.

In order to avoid any delay in the settlement of the most important existing strikes, I am appointing such a Fact Finding Board for the present stoppage in the dispute between General Motors Corp. and the United Automobile Workers. While this Board will not have the statutory powers which I hope the Congress will soon authorize, I am sure that the American people will expect the employer and the employees to cooperate with the Board as fully as if appropriate legislation had already been passed.

In the meantime, I am asking both parties to the dispute to display the same kind of patriotism as they displayed during the war. I am asking all the workers to return to work immediately, and I am asking the employers to proceed energetically with full production. I make this appeal on behalf of the American people to their fellow citizens who are now responsible for this major obstacle holding up our reconversion program.

In connection with the threatened strike involving the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steel Workers, I am appointing a similar Board. The public will expect full cooperation with the board by both sides. I am making the same appeal to the United Steel Workers to remain at work pending the report of the Board's findings and recommendations.

I hope that the Congress will approve the steps which I am now taking. They are being taken in the interest of accelerating our production, promoting our reconversion program, and pushing forward to a higher standard of living.

This is an immediate program which is fair to both sides. I hope that the Congress, naturally disappointed at the failure of labor and management to agree upon a solution for the prevention of industrial disputes, will not adopt repressive or coercive measures against either side. A free American labor and a free American private enterprise are essential to our free democratic system. Legislation which would stifle full freedom of collective bargaining on either side would be a backward step which the American people would not tolerate.

I am sure that the Congress will give its calm and careful consideration to this matter so essential to the progress of American life.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 3, 1945.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include remarks on cutting of veterans' red tape, together with two letters received on the subject, and in the other to include an excerpt from an article appearing in the Michigan Catholic.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] has a special order tomorrow to address the House for 30 minutes. She advises me she will use but 15 minutes of that time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one, comments on veterans by the national commander of the American Legion, and in the other to extend his remarks on the subject of housing, and to include a letter from the city of Southgate, Calif.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Rev. C. H. Rutherford entitled "False Teaching Shown Cause of Atrocities."

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence passing between him and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials appearing

in the Washington Post and New York Times.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the city of Gary council.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a soldier.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter to the Governor of Hawaii.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted by the Wayne County, Iowa, Farm Bureau.

Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a speech by Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, Minn., delivered in the village of Detroit, Mich.; in one to include excerpts from the testimony of Adolph Gustavus Berle before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House in 1941; and in the other to include excerpts from the minutes of a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in November.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances, and in one to include a communication from Lawrence A. Kimpton, secretary of the faculties of the University of Chicago; in another a letter; in another an editorial; and in the fourth a statement.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE PRIVILEGE OF RETIREMENT TO CERTAIN JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 565) to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MORE EFFICIENT DENTAL CARE FOR NAVY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 715) to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4412) to authorize the head of the postgrade school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 1493, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy is authorized, upon due accreditation from time to time by the appropriate professional authority of the applicable curriculum of such school leading to masters or doctors degrees in engineering or related fields, to confer such degree or degrees on qualified graduates of such school.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4412) was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES TO MEMBERS OF THE NAVAL FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4450) to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation to their homes, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 524) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and other possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would withhold his objection for just a moment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HANCOCK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. I object, Mr. Speaker.

REPATRIATION OF PERSONS BURIED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3936) to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill has an entirely worth-while objective and one with which, I am sure, there can be no disagreement. However, it is a subject in which there is general interest, and many questions arise in the minds of the Members. In addition to that, it has

been estimated the cost of the measure will be in the neighborhood of $200,000,000. Consequently that makes it a bill which it would seem inadvisable to pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING OPERATIONS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON TO PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4683) to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have whoever is handling the bill explain it. It seems to me to have far-reaching importance.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency at the request of the Export-Import Bank. In the continuation of the authority of the Export-Import Bank which was passed last July, inadvertently the Philippines were omitted from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Were the Philippines included in the prior law?

Mr. SPENCE. No. After the bill had been passed, the Export-Import Bank discovered that the Philippine Islands were not incorporated in the bill. A concurrent resolution was passed by the Senate authorizing the enrolling clerk to insert the Philippine Islands in the bill. It was messaged to the House during the closing days of the session and there was doubt as to whether a quorum could be obtained. Therefore, the matter was not pressed. The Export-Import Bank is very anxious to have the authority to have its operations include the Philippine Islands.

Mr. PLOESER. Did the Committee on Banking and Currency act unanimously in this matter?

Mr. SPENCE. The committee reported the bill unanimously. The Export-Import Bank has the authority to stimulate exports and imports between the United States, its Territories and insular possessions, and foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to state that H. R. 4683, to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands, was introduced to permit the Export-Import Bank to stimulate imports and exports between the United States and the Philippine Islands which, under the terms of the Export-Import Bank Act, it does not have authority to do at the present time.

While the present status of the Philippine Islands is that of an insular possession, it has been promised its independence by the United States not later than July 4, 1946.

This bill was introduced in order that the Export-Import Bank might immediately extend its operations to the Philippine Islands without waiting until its status became that of a foreign country. I am sure it would not meet with the disapproval of the Congress or the people of the United States that the Export-Import Bank may be enabled to render assistance to the Philippine Islands. The islands are large producers of sugar, coconuts, copra, and vegetable oils, all of which are in great demand by the American people; and in return we may be enabled to sell them machinery and materials that are so greatly needed for the reestablishment of the economy of the islands and the reconstruction of their destroyed industries and homes. Certainly we should be glad to give our faithful ally who has suffered so much an opportunity to reestablish itself through means which if widely used will not cost us anything but will be a very great advantage to both countries.

I herewith insert a list of credits authorized by the Export-Import Bank which will indicate the character of its operations:

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Statement of loans and commitments, Oct. 31, 1945

Country and borrower	Loan No.	Commodity	Authorized		Cancellations and expirations	Balance not yet disbursed		Amount disbursed	Amount repaid	Amount outstanding
			Date	Amount		Amount	Expiry date			
LATIN AMERICA										
Argentina: Past operations.[1]	------	------	------	$93,480,000.00	$93,090,000.00	------	------	$390,000.00	$390,000.00	------
Bolivia:										
Republic of Bolivia	314	Materials, equipment, and services.	Mar. 1, 1942	15,500,000.00	------	$15,500,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946	------	------	------
Bolivian Development Corp	315									
Total	------	------	------	15,500,000.00	------	15,500,000.00	------	------	------	------
Past operations	------	------	------	2,178,004.50	48,250.58	------	------	2,129,753.92	2,129,753.92	------
Total	------	------	------	17,678,004.50	48,250.58	15,500,000.00	------	2,129,753.92	2,129,753.92	------
Brazil:										
American-Brazilian Corp., New York.	233	Tropical products	June 12, 1939	1,117,049.28	------	------	------	1,117,049.28	974,069.09	$142,980.19
Sorocabana Ry. (Electrical Export Corp.)[2]	258	Electrical equipment.	Apr. 3, 1940	4,340,000.00	80,604.38	223,590.23	Dec. 31, 1945	4,035,805.39	1,274,464.87	2,761,340.52
Rio Grande do Sul Ry. (Inland Steel Co.)	259	Steel rails	---do---	1,575,000.00	959,395.80	------	------	615,604.20	543,180.16	72,424.04
Companhia Siderurgica Nacional.	269	Steel-mill equipment.	June 19, 1940	45,000,000.00	------	6,408,906.80	Dec. 31, 1946	38,591,093.20	------	38,591,093.20
Banco do Brasil, Central Rys. (U. S. Steel Export Co.)	272	Railway equipment.	Aug. 22, 1940	712,500.00	214,907.65	------	------	497,592.35	435,842.62	61,749.73
Republic of Brazil, Banco do Brazil (Amsinck, Sonne Corp.)	274	Road building and other equipment.	---do---	575,000.00	380,564.60	------	------	194,435.40	172,831.49	21,603.91
Republic of Brazil	293	United States machinery and equipment.	Mar. 18, 1941	1,220,000.00	------	------	------	1,220,000.00	1,067,500.00	152,500.00
Republic of Brazil, Companhia Iale do Rio Doce.	310	Railway and mining equipment.	Mar. 3, 1942	14,000,000.00	------	82,163.47	Dec. 31, 1946	13,917,836.53	------	13,917,836.53
Banco do Brasil	349	Dollar exchange	Jan. 11, 1944	10,000,000.00	------	10,000,000.00	---do---	------	------	------
Republic of Brazil, Companhia Vale do Rio Doce.	358	Railway equipment.	Jan. 27, 1945	5,000,000.00	------	2,357,880.40	---do---	2,642,119.60	------	2,642,119.60
Central Rys. of Brazil (Electrical Export Corp.)	359	Electrical equipment.	Feb. 12, 1945	4,500,000.00	------	4,500,000.00	---do---	------	------	------
Paulista Ry. Co. (Pullman Standard Car Export Corp.).	364	Rolling stock	Apr. 12, 1945	2,500,000.00	------	2,500,000.00	------	------	------	------
Lloyd Brasileiro	376	Cargo steamers	Sept. 11, 1945	38,000,000.00	------	38,000,000.00	------	------	------	------
Total	------	------	------	128,539,549.28	1,635,472.43	64,072,540.90	------	62,831,535.95	4,467,888.23	58,363,647.72
Past operations	------	------	------	108,485,838.36	73,295,896.63	------	------	35,189,941.73	35,189,941.73	------
Total	------	------	------	237,025,387.64	74,931,369.06	64,072,540.90		98,021,477.68	39,657,829.96	58,363,647.72

[1] The line designated "Past operations" shows the total of commitments which were canceled or expired without being utilized and the total of previous loans which have been repaid in full.

[2] Name in parentheses is, in each case, that of the United States firm to which the credit was extended for the purpose of financing exports to the foreign purchaser indicated.

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Statement of loans and commitments, Oct. 31, 1945—Continued

Country and borrower	Loan No.	Commodity	Authorized		Cancellations and expirations	Balance not yet disbursed		Amount disbursed	Amount repaid	Amount outstanding
			Date	Amount		Amount	Expiry date			
LATIN AMERICA—con.										
Chile:										
Fomento Corp	245a	Industrial products and machinery.	Sept. 27, 1939	$15,751,260.24				$15,751,260.24	$5,036,260.24	$10,715,000.00
Do	245b	United States agricultural and industrial products.	July 1, 1941	4,248,739.76				4,248,739.76	3,123,740.83	1,124,998.93
Do	245c	Industrial products and machinery.	Dec. 30, 1944	8,000,000.00		$6,000,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946	2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00
Chilean State Rys	313	Railway equipment.	Mar. 6, 1942	5,000,000.00		4,288,501.97	do	711,498.03		711,498.03
Ingenieria Electrica, S. A. C.	355	Dollar exchange	Dec. 30, 1944	250,000.00		250,000.00	do			
Chilean State Rys. (Baldwin Locomotive Works).	372	Locomotives	July 13, 1945	1,200,000.00		1,200,000.00	do			
Chilean State Rys. (Electrical Export Corp.).	373	Electrical equipment.	do	2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00	do			
Fomento Corp	374	Steel mill	Sept 11, 1945	28,000,000.00		28,000,000.00				
Do	375	Electrical equipment.	do	5,000,000.00		5,000,000.00				
Total				69,450,000.00		46,738,501.97		22,711,498.03	8,160,001.07	14,551,496.96
Past operations				9,156,007.84	$6,688,678.30			2,467,329.54	2,467,329.54	
Total				78,606,007.84	6,688,678.30	46,738,501.97		25,178,827.57	10,627,330.61	14,551,496.96
Colombia:										
Republic of Colombia	296	Materials, equipment and services.	May 1, 1941	20,000,000.00		4,816,056.30	Dec. 31, 1946	15,183,943.70	2,235,280.00	12,948,663.70
Republic of Colombia, Caja de Credito Agrario Indus. y Minero.	346	do	July 1, 1943	10,000,000.00		9,945,000.00	do	55,000.00		55,000.00
Empresa de Energia Electrica (Westinghouse Manufacturing Co. et al.).	351	Materials and equipment.	Mar. 29, 1944	3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00	do			
Republic of Colombia, Consejo de Ferrocarriles Nacionales.	352	Railway equipment.	June 28, 1944	2,000,000.00		307,062.34	do	1,692,937.66		1,692,937.66
Ferrocarril de Antioquia (Baldwin Locomotive Works).	356	do	Dec. 30, 1944	202,800.00		202,800.00	do			
Total				35,702,800.00		18,770,918.64		16,931,881.36	2,235,280.00	14,696,601.36
Past operations				11,022,856.00	841,470.52			10,181,385.48	10,181,385.48	
Total				46,725,656.00	841,470.52	18,770,918.64		27,113,266.84	12,416,665.48	14,696,601.36
Costa Rica:										
Republic of Costa Rica	275	Construction material and services.	Sept. 23, 1940	5,000,000.00		50,000.00	Jan. 21, 1947	4,950,000.00		4,950,000.00
Do	330	do	Apr. 23, 1942	2,000,000.00				2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00
Total				7,000,000.00		50,000.00		6,950,000.00		6,950,000.00
Past operations				1,723,000.00	1,448,392.71			274,607.29	274,607.29	
Total				8,723,000.00	1,448,392.71	50,000.00		7,224,607.29	274,607.29	6,950,000.00
Cuba:										
Republic of Cuba	294	Materials, equipment and services.	May 1, 1941	25,000,000.00		14,835,000.00	June 30, 1946	10,165,000.00	4,574,375.00	5,590,625.00
Past operations				65,366,535.31	26,888,061.95			38,478,473.36	38,478,473.36	
Total				90,366,535.31	26,888,061.95	14,835,000.00		48,643,473.36	43,052,848.36	5,590,625.00
Dominican Republic:										
Dominican Republic	266	Construction material, equipment, and services.	June 7, 1940	3,000,000.00				3,000,000.00	466,848.87	2,533,151.13
Past operations				300,000.00	16,067.58			283,932.42	283,932.42	
Total				3,300,000.00	16,067.58			3,283,932.42	750,781.29	2,533,151.13
Ecuador:										
Republic of Ecuador	262	United States agricultural and industrial products.	May 7, 1940	1,480,000.00		84,289.79	Dec. 31, 1946	1,395,710.21	544,635.63	851,074.58
Republic of Ecuador, Corporacion Ecuatoriana de Fomento.	316	Materials, equipment, and services.	Mar. 6, 1942	5,000,000.00		245,000.00	June 30, 1946	4,755,000.00	10,000.00	4,745,000.00
Republic of Ecuador, Quito and Guayaquil water supply system.	328	do	Apr. 22, 1942	8,000,000.00		8,000,000.00				
Republic of Ecuador	343	do	Dec. 18, 1942	1,200,000.00		1,200,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946			
Do	371	United States services.	July 13, 1945	1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00				
Total				16,680,000.00		10,529,289.79		6,150,710.21	554,635.63	5,596,074.58
Past operations				105,000.00	75,000.00			30,000.00	30,000.00	
Total				16,785,000.00	75,000.00	10,529,289.79		6,180,710.21	584,635.63	5,596,074.58
El Salvador: Republic of El Salvador.	303	Construction materials, equipment, and services.	Dec. 10, 1941	1,726,000.00		826,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945	900,000.00	44,639.46	855,360.54

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Statement of loans and commitments, Oct. 31, 1945—Continued

Country and borrower	Loan No.	Commodity	Authorized		Cancellations and expirations	Balance not yet disbursed		Amount disbursed	Amount repaid	Amount outstanding
			Date	Amount		Amount	Expiry date			
LATIN AMERICA—con.										
Haiti:										
Republic of Haiti (J. G. White Engineering Corp.)	201	Construction material.	June 18, 1938	$5,500,000.00				$5,500,000.00	$2,030,000.00	$3,470,000.00
Republic of Haiti-Societe Haitiano Americaine de Developpement Agricole.	295	Development of rubberandother Tropical products.	May 1, 1941	5,000,000.00		$260,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946	4,640,000.00		4,640,000.00
La Plantation Dauphin	267	United States equipment, materials, and services.	May 16, 1945	100,000.00		100,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945			
Total				10,600,000.00		460,000.00		10,140,000.00	2,030,000.00	8,110,000.00
Past operations				2,750,000.00	$2,570,000.00			180,000.00	180,000.00	
Total				13,350,000.00	2,570,000.00	460,000.00		10,320,000.00	2,210,000.00	8,110,000.00
Honduras: Republic of Honduras.	312	Materials and equipment.	Mar. 6, 1942	2,700,000.00		1,805,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945	895,000.00	180,000.00	715,000.00
Jamaica: Past operations				25,000.00	25,000.00					
Mexico:										
United States of Mexico	300	Highway construction, equipment, and services.	Aug. 12, 1941	40,000,000.00		30,000,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946	10,000,000.00	4,098,569.27	5,901,430.73
Altos Hornos de Mexico	323	Steel mill equipment.	Apr. 10, 1942	8,000,000.00		8,000,000.00	do			
Fred Leighton	338	Mexican handicraft.	May 18, 1942	529,726.56		12,535.17	Dec. 31, 1945	517,191.39	429,726.56	87,464.83
Petroleos Mexicanos	350	Gasoline refinery equipment.	Jan. 31, 1944	10,000,000.00		2,800,000.00	do	7,200,000.00		7,200,000.00
Nacional Financiera, S. A., Mexican National Rys.	362	Railway equipment.	Mar. 21, 1945	15,000,000.00		15,000,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946			
Cia. Fundidora de F. y A. Monterrey (United Engineering & Foundry Co. et al.).	366	Steel mill equipment.	May 16, 1945	800,000.00		800,000.00				
Nacional Financiera, S. A.	379	Electrical equipment, materials, and supplies.	Mar. 21, 1945	20,000,000.00		20,000,000.00				
Total				94,329,726.56		76,612,535.17		17,717,191.39	4,528,295.83	13,188,895.56
Past operations				2,432,600.00	1,383,308.80			1,049,291.20	1,049,291.20	
Total				96,762,326.56	1,383,308.80	76,612,535.17		18,766,482.59	5,577,587.03	13,188,895.56
Nicaragua:										
Republic of Nicaragua	227a	Equipment and services.	May 17, 1939	2,000,000.00				2,000,000.00	1,004,000.00	996,000.00
Do	291	Construction material, equipment, and services.	Mar. 3, 1941	2,000,000.00				2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00
Total				4,000,000.00				4,000,000.00	1,004,000.00	2,996,000.00
Past operations				1,235,000.00	585,000.00			650,000.00	650,000.00	
Total				5,235,000.00	585,000.00			4,650,000.00	1,654,000.00	2,996,000.00
Panama: Past operations				4,500,000.00	2,012,296.12			2,487,703.88	2,487,703.88	
Paraguay:										
Republic of Paraguay	228a	Construction material, equipment, and services.	June 1, 1939	3,400,000.00	400,000.00			3,000,000.00	518,000.00	2,482,000.00
Do	337	Materials, equipment, and services.	May 18, 1942	3,000,000.00		535,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946	2,465,000.00		2,465,000.00
Total				6,400,000.00	400,000.00	535,000.00		5,465,000.00	518,000.00	4,947,000.00
Past operations				1,400,000.00	1,200,000.00			200,000.00	200,000.00	
Total				7,800,000.00	1,600,000.00	535,000.00		5,665,000.00	718,000.00	4,947,000.00
Peru:										
Banco Central de Reserva del Peru.	329	United States agricultural and industrial products.	Apr. 22, 1942	25,000,000.00		25,000,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945			
Cia. Peruana del Santa (Westinghouse Electric International Co.).	368	Electrical equipment.	June 12, 1945	350,000.00		350,000.00				
Total				25,350,000.00		25,350,000.00				
Past operations				12,000,000.00	12,000,000.00					
Total				37,350,000.00	12,000,000.00	25,350,000.00				

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Statement of loans and commitments, Oct. 31, 1945—Continued

Country and borrower	Loan No.	Commodity	Authorized		Cancellations and expirations	Balance not yet disbursed		Amount disbursed	Amount repaid	Amount outstanding
			Date	Amount		Amount	Expiry date			
LATIN AMERICA—continued										
Puerto Rico: Puerto Rico Fiber Corp.	317	Machinery and equipment.	Mar. 6, 1942	$450,000.00				$450,000.00	$27,500.00	$422,500.00
Uruguay:										
Republic of Uruguay	331	Materials, equipment, and services.	Apr. 22, 1942	12,000,000.00		$6,511,698.00	Dec. 31, 1946	5,488,302.00		5,488,302.00
R. Hoe & Co., Inc	333	Printing press	do	85,000.00	$6,125.00			78,875.00	9,403.88	69,471.12
Republica Oriental del Uruguay.	345	Materials, equipment, and services.	Feb. 2, 1943	20,000,000.00		17,705,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946	2,295,000.00		2,295,000.00
Total				32,085,000.00	6,125.00	24,216,698.00		7,862,177.00	9,403.88	7,852,773.12
Past operations				11,500,000.00	11,500,000.00					
Total				43,585,000.00	11,506,125.00	24,216,698.00		7,862,177.00	9,403.88	7,852,773.12
Venezuela:										
Banco Agricola y Pecuario.	286	United States agricultural and industrial products.	Dec. 9, 1940	3,000,000.00	500,000.00			2,500,000.00	1,566,666.51	933,333.49
Banco Obrero	302	Construction material and equipment.	Oct. 27, 1941	6,000,000.00	4,001,500.00			1,998,500.00	185,000.00	1,813,500.00
Total				9,000,000.00	4,501,500.00			4,498,500.00	1,751,666.51	2,746,833.49
Past operations				32,951,000.00	32,305,421.65			645,578.35	645,578.35	
Total				41,951,000.00	36,806,921.65			5,144,078.35	2,397,244.86	2,746,833.49
Virgin Islands: Virgin Islands Co.	348	Agricultural products.	Aug. 10, 1943	250,000.00		250,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946			
MISCELLANEOUS LATIN AMERICA										
Special bank export credit lines.[1]	306		Jan. 12, 1942	50,000,000.00		46,399,493.45	Dec. 31, 1945	3,600,506.55	3,582,437.38	18,069.17
NORTH AMERICA										
Canada: Past operations				59,265,000.00	21,850,000.00			37,415,000.00	37,415,000.00	
AFRICA										
Ethiopa: The Ethiopian Empire.	353	United States products and service.	Aug. 7, 1944	500,000.00				500,000.00	400,000.00	100,000.00
Portuguese West Africa: Chas. B. McDaniels, Jr.	319	Materials and equipment.	Mar. 6, 1942	300,000.00		235,000.00	Jan. 21, 1947	65,000.00		65,000.00
ASIA										
Arabia: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.	363	United States materials, equipment, and services.	Apr. 12, 1945	5,000,000.00		5,000,000.00				
China:										
Universal Trading Corp.	254	United States agricultural and industrial products.	Mar. 7, 1940	20,000,000.00		2,500,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945	17,500,000.00	4,900,000.00	12,600,000.00
Central Bank of China	276	do	Oct. 17, 1940	25,000,000.00				25,000,000.00	12,536,115.00	12,463,885.00
Do	283	do	Nov. 30, 1940	50,000,000.00		9,797,704.09	Dec. 31, 1945	40,202,295.91	13,647,743.04	26,554,552.87
Yungli Chemical Industries, Ltd.	360	Machinery, equipment, and services.	Mar. 21, 1945	16,000,000.00		16,000,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946			
Total				111,000,000.00		28,297,704.09		82,702,295.91	31,083,858.04	51,618,437.87
Past operations				43,943,329.99	4,526,800.00			39,416,529.99	39,416,529.99	
Total				154,943,329.99	4,526,800.00	28,297,704.09		122,118,825.90	70,500,388.03	51,618,437.87
India: Past operations				16,000,000.00	16,000,000.00					
Iran: Past operations				1,130,000.00	667,570.61			462,429.39	462,429.39	
Iraq: Past operations				100,000.00	100,000.00					
Philippine Islands: Past operations				25,600,000.00	25,600,000.00					
AUSTRALIA										
Past operations				1,400,000.00	1,400,000.00					
EUROPE										
Czechoslovakia: Past operations				1,741,917.60	947,473.97			794,443.63	794,443.63	
Denmark:										
Kingdom of Denmark	370	United States agricultural and industrial products.	July 13, 1945	20,000,000.00		16,100,000.00	Dec. 31, 1948	3,900,000.00		3,900,000.00
Past operations				10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00					
Total				30,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	16,100,000.00		3,900,000.00		3,900,000.00
Finland:										
Finnish-American Trading Corp.	250	United States agricultural and industrial products.	Dec. 13, 1939	10,000,000.00		231,715.40	Dec. 31, 1946	9,768,284.60	2,341,424.61	23,869,905.32
Do	251	do	Mar. 1, 1940	25,000,000.00		8,556,954.67	do	16,443,045.33		
Total				35,000,000.00		8,788,670.07		26,211,329.93	2,341,424.61	23,869,905.32

[1] Special credit lines established in favor of banking institutions in countries of the Western Hemisphere to facilitate opening of letters of credit to finance exports from the United States.

Export-Import Bank of Wash ington—Statement of loans and commitments, Oct. 31, 1945—Continued

Country and borrower	Loan No.	Commodity	Authorized		Cancellations and expirations	Balance not yet disbursed		Amount disbursed	Amount repaid	Amount outstanding
			Date	Amount		Amount	Expiry date			
EUROPE—continued										
Germany: Past operations				$3,011,309.75	$3,006,750.75			$4,559.00	$4,559.00	
Hungary: Past operations				2,375,000.00	2,375,000.00					
Iceland: Past operations				1,000,000.00	410,000.00			590,000.00	590,000.00	
Italy: Past operations				16,917,385.58	3,541,120.90			13,376,264.68	13,376,264.68	
Latvia: Past operations				1,903,000.00	1,892,217.97			10,782.03	10,782.03	
Netherlands:										
Kingdom of the Netherlands.	380	United States agricultural and manufacturing products.	Sept. 11, 1945	50,000,000.00		$43,700,000.00	June 30, 1946	6,300,000.00		$6,300,000.00
Do	381	United States products and services.	do	50,000,000.00		50,000,000.00				
Total				100,000,000.00		93,700,000.00		6,300,000.00		6,300,000.00
Norway:										
Store Norske Spitsbergen Kulkompani, A/S Norway.	354	Mining equipment and machinery.	Oct. 25, 1944	750,000.00		750,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946			
Kingdom of Norway	369	United States agricultural and industrial products.	July 13, 1945	50,000,000.00		50,000,000.00				
Total				50,750,000.00		50,750,000.00				
Past operations				10,000,000.00	9,773,388.00			226,612.00	226,612.00	
Total				60,750,000.00	9,773,388.00	50,750,000.00		226,612.00	226,612.00	
Poland:										
National Economic Bank.	212	Cotton and copper.	Nov. 3, 1938	6,000,000.00	2,655,508.67			3,344,491.33	47,043.11	3,297,448.22
Polish cotton mills	141	Cotton	Oct. 21, 1936	166,742.52				166,742.52	163,250.56	3,491.96
Total				6,166,742.52	2,655,508.67			3,511,233.85	210,293.67	3,300,940.18
Past operations				6,740,000.00	6,703,822.27			36,177.73	36,177.73	
Total				12,906,742.52	9,359,330.94			3,547,411.58	246,471.40	3,300,940.18
Portugal. Past operations				5,500,000.00	4,229,134.35			1,270,865.65	1,270,865.65	
Rumania: Past operations				50,000.00	50,000.00					
Spain: Past operations				15,072,871.78	1,391,797.89			13,681,073.89	13,681,073.89	
Sweden: Past operations				15,000,000.00	10,889,000.00			4,111,000.00	4,111,000.00	
Turkey:										
Turkish State Airways (Westinghouse Electric International Corp.).	378	Airport equipment.	Sept. 11, 1945	3,060,000.00		3,060,000.00	Dec. 31, 1946			
Past operations				10,267,860.00	10,267,860.00					
Total				13,327,860.00	10,267,860.00	3,060,000.00				
Yugoslavia: Past operations.				517,667.00	517,667.00					
Europe: Special cotton credit.	387	Cotton	Oct. 8, 1945	100,000,000.00		100,000,000.00				
VARIOUS COUNTRIES										
TACA-Airways Agency, Inc.	361	Aircraft, engines and accessories.	Mar. 21, 1945	1,000,000.00		911,440.00	Dec. 31, 1946	88,560.00	1,000.00	87,560.00
Pan American Airways, Inc., et al.	365	United States materials, equipment, and services.	May 16, 1945	25,000,000.00		25,000,000.00				
International Standard Electric Corp.	377	Communication equipment.	Sept. 11, 1945	5,000,000.00		5,000,000.00				
Total				31,000,000.00		30,911,440.00		88,560.00	1,000.00	87,560.00
Past operations				46,478,400.00	27,102,518.11			19,375,881.89	19,375,881.89	
Total				77,478,400.00	27,102,518.11	30,911,440.00		19,464,441.89	19,376,881.89	87,560.00
Special exporter-importer credits:[4]	187		Mar. 1, 1938							
Anglo-American Trading Corp.		Poultry, game, and lard.		176,836.17		20,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945	156,836.17	156,836.17	
The Atlas International Co.		Merchandise		62,655.27		7,267.09	do	55,388.18	52,655.27	2,732.91
L. A. Cordovez C		Flour and manufacturing products.		97,574.13		12,500.00	do	85,074.13	85,074.13	
Defiance Spark Plug Corp.		Merchandise		66,113.96		10,000.00	do	56,113.96	56,113.96	
Enequist Chemical Co.		Chemicals		292,001.23		15,787.28	do	276,213.95	272,001.23	4,212.72
Home Plan Corp.		Merchandise		23,840.05				23,840.05	22,622.01	1,218.04
H. R. Jacoby		do		10,000.00		10,000.00	Dec. 31, 1945			
Walter Malowan, Inc.		Manufactured products.		320,360.58		17,130.81	do	303,229.77	300,360.58	2,869.19
Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.		Merchandise		217,079.31		4,071.56	do	213,007.75	197,079.31	15,928.44
Packard Chemical Co.		Packaged foods		156,218.89		10,000.00	do	146,218.89	146,218.89	
S. C. Prado		Merchandise		97,491.00		10,000.00	do	87,491.00	87,491.00	
S. Ronnie, Inc.		Paper supplies		103,278.06		11,615.16	do	91,662.90	88,278.06	3,384.84
Universal Products Co., Inc.		Rubber, rayon silk garments.		371,660.00		11,718.00	do	359,942.00	351,660.00	8,282.00

[4] The firms listed have been granted credit lines ranging from $2,000 revolving, covering miscellaneous shipments to and from various countries. Funds are provided and details handled by commercial banks. Advances under these credits are repayable in 90 days or less. Total available for such lines—$1,000,000, revolving.

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Statement of loans and commitments, Oct. 31, 1945—Continued

Country and borrower	Loan No.	Commodity	Authorized		Cancellations and expirations	Balance not yet disbursed		Amount disbursed	Amount repaid	Amount outstanding
			Date	Amount		Amount	Expiry date			
VARIOUS COUNTRIES—con.										
Special exporter-importer Credits—Con.										
Wise & Constable, Inc.		Merchandise		$246,751.16		$15,963.93	Dec. 31, 1945	$230,787.23	$226,751.16	$4,036.07
Unallotted				802,500.00		802,500.00				
Total				3,044,359.81		958,553.83		2,085,805.98	2,043,141.77	42,664.21
Past operations				93,001.62				93,001.62	93,001.62	
Total				3,137,361.43		958,553.83		2,178,807.60	2,136,143.39	42,664.21
Grand total				1,658,301,763.50	$438,413,572.76	$684,752,345.91		535,135,844.83	295,717,308.62	239,418,536.21

GENERAL SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES (INCLUDING SECOND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.) [5] FROM FEB. 12, 1934 THROUGH OCT. 31, 1945

Total commitments	$1,658,301,763.50	Total outstanding loans	$239,418,536.21
Total cancellations and expirations	438,413,572.76	Balance of commitments not yet disbursed	684,752,345.91
Total disbursements	535,135,844.83	Total of outstanding loans and balance of commitments not yet disbursed	924,170,882.12
Total repayments	295,717,308.62		

[5] Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., was incorporated Mar. 12, 1934, and dissolved June 30, 1936, all of its active commitments being assumed by Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (Public Law 173, 79th Cong., approved July 31, 1945) is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word "country" the following: "(or the Philippine Islands)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4652) to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual- and sick-leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LOCAL FIRST-CLASS MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2647) to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a change of policy. In accordance with the agreement made here, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the Export-Import Bank and include certain statistics.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

AMENDING THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 426 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H. R. 4780, to amend the Second War Powers Act 1942, as amended. It is an open rule and it provides for 2 hours of general debate.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule was granted by unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules.

All this bill aims to do is to eliminate certain powers from the present existing law and also the act of 1917. In view of the fact that the chairman and the gentlemen representing the Committee on the Judiciary, and I feel that we should finish this bill today, there being 2 hours' general debate, I will not take much time on the rule, as I feel it should receive the unanimous support of the House.

Furthermore, the bill will be thoroughly explained by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who prepared the report. I presume each and every Member has had a copy of the report. At least it is available. The report explains the need for this legislation to restrict and to reduce the time with respect to the power heretofore granted during the war.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Do you extend the life of the Office of Price Administration in this Second War Powers Act?

Mr. SABATH. No. There is nothing about the Office of Price Administration in this bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. How about this draft act that is still going on? Do we extend that?

Mr. SABATH. No. In fact, if anything, this bill reduces the time in connection with most matters.

Mr. PITTENGER. Can the gentleman tell us when there will be something that declares the war at an end, so that the duration of the war will be at an end and so that we can get back to a peacetime basis?

Mr. SABATH. I presume that will be done as soon as the President can see his way clear to do so or feels that it is the proper time to do so, or when the Congress acts. Under the law, we also have the right to state when the war is over. In view of conditions, I do not think we are ready to vote on that important matter, because, although the fighting is over, there are still a great many things to be done before we can take the position about which the gentleman has inquired.

Mr. PITTENGER. This is the Second War Powers Act?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. How long does it extend it?

Mr. SABATH. It really does not extend it. It reduces it. For instance, it repeals the power and authority that was originally given in the 1917 act. Then, title XI of the Second War Powers Act is amended, and it provides that on and after January 1, 1946, the authority granted by this title shall be exercised

only for the benefit of the personnel of the armed forces of the United States stationed abroad. All of the other powers have been taken away.

The same thing applies to title XII. Whereas it would have been in force up to December 1946, it will go out of existence December 31, 1945. So we reduce the time in this bill and amend it so as to take away certain powers that were originally granted.

As I said, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the gentleman representing that committee who prepared the report will more thoroughly explain the bill than I possibly can, because I was not present at the hearing and the only information I have obtained was from the short statement made by the gentlemen who appeared asking for the rule and what I could gather hurriedly from the report of the committee.

With this I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, my colleague [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. It does require explanation. The Committee on the Judiciary is prepared to make that explanation. A very splendid report giving the law as it now is and the changes proposed by this bill is embodied in the committee report. I know of no serious opposition to this bill.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I notice this report carries a reference to OPA. I asked the gentleman from Illinois about that. He was under the impression that the OPA was not involved. I am against the OPA. They cannot do a good job on anything, and I want to know if they are included in this bill of limitation and repeal.

Mr. MICHENER. No; the OPA law is not directly amended. OPA gets its rationing and priority powers from the Second War Powers Act through Executive order. It gets its price-fixing powers directly from the OPA law.

This bill does not amend the OPA law.

Mr PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Is is not true that the very limited extension in here makes the Second War Powers Act expire concurrently with the price-control law?

Mr. MICHENER. I believe that is true, and I believe that is a wise coincidence. I might say that the Judiciary Committee went through the whole Second War Powers Act very carefully, section by section, and paragraph by paragraph. It heard the War Department, the Navy Department, and all the departments and agencies affected by the Second War Powers Act and the bill is brought to the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary recommending this legislation. When that committee reports a bill unanimously that is rather unusual, and there can hardly be any controversy about the merits. This amendment provides for all revocation of war powers granted in the act consistent with reconversion necessities.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4780, with Mr. TARVER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has for its purpose the extension of some of the powers contained in the Second War Powers Act.

Most of the agencies of the Government, if not all of them, suggested an extension of 1 year, but the Committee on the Judiciary, after going into the matter thoroughly, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] just stated, arrived at the conclusion that an extension of 6 months would probably be adequate. If at the expiration of 6 months, or when it begins to come close to the end of that time, it is found necessary that a further extension be granted, the Committee on the Judiciary would be disposed to extend it, of course.

This matter was very carefully gone into by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] was chairman. Probably it would be more helpful if I should at this time yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] 10 minutes to explain the details of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice in the hearings there is a title "Termination of Hostilities" and "Extension of the War Powers Act of 1942." As I understand it, this bill has nothing to do with termination of hostilities?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has before his committee several resolutions that would terminate hostilities?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell us when these bills might be placed before the House?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot advise the gentleman at this time.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. If this measure were not adopted what would the status of hostilities be? Would they be terminated?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. They would not.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the Congress should pass a bill terminating hostilities, that would automatically release the men under draft 6 months after the date that we would determine to be the end of hostilities; is that correct?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I believe that is about right. They would be released, but that would not bring them back here. At least one of these extensions has in purpose to aid in the return of our troops and in their transportation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It seems to me quite important that Congress take some action soon to declare hostilities at an end. After the last world war it took nearly 3 years before we got around to that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I believe it would confuse in the consideration of this bill if we went further into the question as to when hostilities should end.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Part of what the gentleman is talking about comes under the draft law. This does not deal with that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I just indicated that I thought the territory being covered is a little wide; that we should hold our discussion to this bill, and if the gentleman will excuse me, I would rather not yield further for discussion beyond the consideration of this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand this bill it merely extends the War Powers Act for another 6 months.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Not all of them.

Mr. STEFAN. It extends the act until June 30, with some exceptions.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; parts of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This bill extends the War Powers Act another 6 months with the exception of some items that the committee has taken out and which were included in the original act.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to consume the 10 minutes. I will be glad to yield to anyone who has a question to ask.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know the gentleman has held some very extensive hearings on this bill, and that various governmental agencies were before his committee.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I presume most of the agencies appearing before his committee were anxious to continue every War Powers Act that they had.

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; just the contrary. The five major agencies which have had powers in abundance under these war powers acts, as you will see by reading the report of our committee on the Second War Powers Act, have done just the reverse. I would say that 90 percent of controls exercised under the war powers conferred by the Second War Powers Act have been abandoned, and the personnel that had been working on them has likewise been released. For instance, take the ODT. Every one of their powers has been fully surrendered and every employee has been released. That kind of record is one that we take pleasure in calling attention to in our report. We have referred specifically to the record of all five of the major agencies. I think what the gentleman has in mind is the large number of war powers acts that would be terminated by a declaration of the end of hostilities. We are working on that as hard as we know how. I have in my brief case here for the first time what we believe to be the complete list of all the war powers acts that Congress has passed. There are something over 400. Our committee is engaged in briefing those war powers acts to see what the effect would be upon each of them were we to declare hostilities terminated. I think it is a fair statement, and I want to put it as bluntly and with as brutal frankness as I may—I think it is a fair statement that the policy of the administration, the policy of those who are exercising these war powers, and the policy of the House is unanimous that every single one of them that can possibly with safety be canceled should be canceled at the earliest possible moment. Of course, hostilities should be terminated as speedily as possible.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am very happy to hear that statement and to know that the agencies are eager to get out of the business of regulating the American people. It seems to me that one thing that touches most vitally the American people is the ending of hostilities so that the boys who have been drafted into the service during the wartime may be discharged, because they were taken for the period of hostilities and 6 months thereafter. If Congress or the President fails to declare hostilities at an end, they can be kept in service under a subterfuge because Congress or the administration has failed to declare hostilities at an end. Some of the boys are getting very bitter indeed about that particular phase of the draft. They say, "Yes, we went into the war; we wanted to defend our country, but it was with the understanding that it was for the duration plus 6 months." If Congress now fails to declare hostilities at an end, these boys may be kept in the service 2 or 3 years longer than they perhaps should be. I hope the gentleman's committee will soon give particular attention to that one phase, if no other phase, of the War Powers Act.

Mr. HOBBS. We are doing exactly that. There is not a single member of our whole committee or the subcommittee that is not just as eager about it as the distinguished gentleman himself, who introduced one of the resolutions we have before our committee. I say again, however, that as patriotic American citizens, with the conflagration we fondly hoped was put out, flaring up again in a half dozen different places, we cannot afford to run the risk of doing anything that would leave us undefended and helpless in the face of an enemy.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On the very point about which our friend is concerned, and we are all concerned about it; that is, bringing our boys home. If the entire Second Emergency Powers Act were repealed it would delay bringing these boys home.

Mr. HOBBS. That is certainly true, sir.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There are certain laws that apply in peacetime that limit the number of persons that may be carried on a ship and impose certain requirements as to the equipment of the ships, and if these laws are applied several hundred fewer men could be carried on each ship. That is one of the things about which we are concerned.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is exactly correct, and I thank him for his contribution. Two of the powers we are extending for 6 months will expedite greatly the speed with which the boys are returned home and increase the number who can be returned.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana, a distinguished member of our subcommittee and of the full committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the resolutions which are pending before our subcommittee and which have been mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], are still being considered by us. However, it is a very ponderous subject. As to the matter of the inspection, to which reference has just been made, the requirements as to the rigid inspections and as to the number of passengers to be carried on these ships would have been violated had we not had the provisions in the second War Powers Act, and those requirements are still lifted so that we can get the boys back home and do it at the earliest possible moment. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOBBS. That certainly is correct. I thank the gentleman, and appreciate not only his contribution to this debate, but also the splendid contribution he has made to the hearings on the pending bill and that which he constantly makes in the work of our committee.

This is a unanimous report, not only of the subcommittee which held hearings for 6 weeks, usually having two sessions a day, but also it is a unanimous report of the full committee. We have repealed one of the titles of the Second War Powers Act entirely. We have cut down four others, and we have recommended for the consideration of appropriate legislative committees the matters that were in two or three others. We have cut down the length of extension so as to synchronize with the ending of the fiscal year 1946, on June 30. So it is believed that the unanimous report will commend itself to you. We invite your attention to the report. We believe it answers every conceivable question that can be raised. If not, we will be happy to try to elucidate further.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to make this point clear. I feel certain portions of the Second War Powers Act are needed to get the boys home. But there is certainly nothing that this Congress can do to raise the morale of our soldiers as much as declaring hostilities at an end so that they will feel that the termination of their services to the United States might see some daylight so that they could get home eventually. Many of them are in this country, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. That is certainly true. But neither they nor we wish such a declaration made prematurely, nor unless it be wise in view of its legal consequences.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay tribute to the splendid work the members of our subcommittee did on this bill, as well as on the resolutions declaring hostilities terminated. The subcommittee was happy to have several members of the full Committee on the Judiciary join in their sessions and participate most helpfully in the study of the problems involved. Also we were delighted to have submitted to us by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. FRANCIS WALTER, a distinguished member of our full committee, and also of the Colmer committee, the report of the latter committee. This was of great value to us in our studies.

AMENDING THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942, AS AMENDED

Mr. HOBBS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, after consideration, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The bill would amend the Second War Powers Act, as amended, in five respects.

1. It amends title II to eliminate the power to seize real property.

2. It repeals title IX dealing with free postage for members of the armed forces.

3. It adds a new section to title XI, which reads as follows:

"On and after January 1, 1946, the authority granted by this title shall be exercised only for the benefit of personnel of the armed forces of the United States stationed abroad."

4. It amends title XII by substituting the date "December 31, 1945" for the date "December 31, 1946" as the date upon which

the Treasury is to return to the minting of 5-cent pieces of the prewar metallic content.

5. It extends for 6 months titles I through V, VII, XI, and XIV of the act.

GENERAL STATEMENT

By the grace and guidance of Almighty God, the brilliance and devotion of our civilian and martial leadership and the heroism of the men and women who composed the team of the United Nations, the Axis Powers have been brought to unconditional surrender, yet neither the war nor the peace has been won. Our victory then is neither final nor complete. We still have before us and our allies years of service in foreign lands, requiring the solution of problems at least as difficult as were those of war.

The conflagration that so recently blanketed the globe, still flares in spots. We have learned that no place is too remote to be a menace. Nor can it be doubted that fire spreads. Military and naval might, even including atomic bombs, do not quench the fire of war so potently as the milk of human kindness. No civilized nation, much less one that is Christian, can allow even surrendered enemies to starve or freeze when we have enough and to spare. That would not even be good business, were we so base as to be governed by no higher motive. Even more incumbent on us is it to share with our allies in the liberated countries; and, of course, we must not fail to provide adequately for our own forces of occupation. This job cannot be done until the last man or woman so engaged shall have been brought safely home and be happily rehabilitated into our peacetime economy.

During our preparation for adequate national defense, and while the shooting part of the war was on, the Congress of necessity had to grant extraordinary powers for such purposes and for the fulfillment of the inevitable aftermath. These were loosely called war powers.

Now that we have won back much of our safety and peace, it is the determination of Congress to recapture those powers as speedily as may be wise, for the people, so that they may be again exercised in accordance with the slower but more desirable processes of democracy.

The study of the situation by your committee has revealed that the Presidents and the agencies of Government that have been exercising these war powers agree with the thought of the Congress as shown by their records. The following synopsis not only shows such agreement, but also discloses no reason to doubt that they will continue to diminish their personnel and surrender their powers as rapidly as possible with safety. A survey of the five chief agencies exercising controls under title III of the Second War Powers Act indicates that they have reduced their outstanding controls and administrative personnel as follows:

REDUCTION IN CONTROLS EXERCISED UNDER TITLE III OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, AND OF PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN ADMINISTRATION OF THESE CONTROLS

War Production Board-Civilian Production Administration: At its peak prior to VE-day, this agency had outstanding slightly over 700 basic orders and schedules. Approximately 200 of these were lifted shortly after VE-day, and as of November 1 the number had been reduced to 73.

Personnel has been reduced from a peak of about 23,000 in February 1943 to less than 11,000 at the end of August, less than 4,000 on November 3, and it is planned to reach a figure of 400 by June 30, 1946.

Office of Defense Transportation: On VJ-day this agency had outstanding slightly over 2,950 orders under title III of the Second War Powers Act. By December 1, 1945, all of these orders will have been revoked, and this agency will no longer exercise controls under this act. The reduction in personnel engaged on title III administration has been as follows: June 1, 1944 (peak), 3,897; VJ-day, 2,333; November 1, 1945, 54; December 1, 1945 (estimated), 0.

Department of Agriculture: On August 1, 1945, this agency had outstanding 94 general food orders, and on April 1, 1945, 194 suborders. These two dates are chosen because they are the dates on which the greatest number of general and suborders, respectively, were in existence. As of November 14, 1945, there were outstanding 56 basic orders and 173 suborders. Of these 173, however, 144 were suspended. That is to say, they are temporarily inoperative and the Department of Agriculture believes that probably they will not be made operative again.

Personnel engaged in administering these orders has been reduced from 1,000 at the end of the fiscal year to 550 as of November 14, 1945.

Solid Fuels Administration: This agency had outstanding 13 general orders prior to VJ-day. Of these 13 only 6 remain today and of these 6, 1 has been confined to operations east of the Mississippi River. It is believed that all controls will be lifted at the end of the coal year, March 31.

Personnel engaged in title III activities has been reduced from 700 employees prior to VJ-day to 650 at the present time, and will continue to decrease to 50 at the end of the coal year. These 50 will be engaged in clean-up work.

Office of Price Administration: On VJ-day this agency had 16 major rationing programs in effect on a national basis. This number has been reduced to two.

Paid employees (as opposed to volunteers) actually engaged in administering the rationing programs have decreased from 27,055 on August 15, 1945, to 8,952 on October 31, 1945. This figure includes field offices and local boards. Actually the reduction has been greater since these figures do not include reductions in overhead employees indirectly concerned with rationing. Proportionately heavy reductions have been made in this category, as well.

The committee has concluded that extension of certain titles of the Second War Powers Act for a period of 6 months is essential in order to assure an orderly liquidation of much of our wartime economy and to aid reconversion. The necessity results basically from the fact that our armed forces and industry are still deployed for war and from the continuance of a number of basic shortages which threaten to cripple industry and to cause inconvenience or even suffering to consumers. A brief recapitulation of the various titles of the Second War Powers Act follows and of the action which the committee believes should be taken with respect to each.

Title I—Emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission over motor and water carriers

Under this title, the War Shipping Administration operates certain coastwise lines which should be maintained until the return of vessels to their former owners can be accomplished so as to restore normal peacetime traffic. In addition, the Army and Navy are authorized under this title to operate certain bus lines serving camps and emergency facilities where otherwise no such transportation would be available. Pending further demobilization of the armed services and return of vessels to their owners, the authority of this title appears necessary.

Title II—Acquisition and disposition of property

This title permits the seizure by the Government of real property prior to condemnation proceedings and to some extent facilitates disposal. Because of the drastic nature of the seizure powers, the committee recommends that these provisions of the title be permitted to lapse. A continuation of the disposal features is necessary because of the extensive temporary real-estate holdings of the Army and Navy.

Title III—Priorities powers

This title establishes the powers under which the War Production Board-Civilian Production Administration, Office of Price Administration, Department of Agriculture, Office of Defense Transportation, Solid Fuels Administration, and certain other agencies have allocated and rationed materials and facilities. The powers were used up to the capitulation of Japan for a twofold purpose—to assure simultaneously the production of a maximum quantity of war materials in a minimum of time, and of materials necessary to support the basic civilian economy. Since that date there has been a change of emphasis in the exercise of these powers by the departments in the belief that Congress intended the defense program to include an orderly reconversion to a peacetime economy. During the next few months there will necessarily be a further change of emphasis in the exercise of these powers, with an increasing use for reconversion purposes as distinguished from the primary military purposes. While both priorities and allocations will be granted where necessary to assure support of our Army and Navy, the primary task will be the liquidation of our war effort and the hastening of reconversion and restoring the flow of materials to peacetime channels.

The exercise of these powers after the end of this year will be necessary in order to accomplish the following broad program:

(1) Allocation and conservation of scarce materials: During the next few months there will be extremely severe shortages of certain essential industrial materials. Tin is an excellent example. Until the supply becomes considerably greater, which will not be for some time in the future, it will be absolutely necessary for the Civilian Production Administration to prevent the use of tin in any application where there is a reasonably satisfactory substitute and to divide the available supply equitably among the competing claimants. Unless the Civilian Production Administration can require conservation of tin, our stocks will be dissipated within a very few months, largely because of wasteful uses. Unless the supply can be allocated among essential users, it is possible that a few companies will obtain much more than their fair share, thereby depriving other companies of this necessary material. Our resources of certain other materials, such as lead, rubber, and antimony, must similarly be husbanded carefully and distributed fairly if we are to avoid crippling reconversion.

(2) Breaking of bottlenecks: In numerous instances plants reconverting from wartime to peacetime production are hindered by inability to obtain one or more essential tools and other components. By careful use of the priorities powers the CPA has been able to break many such bottlenecks, making possible the operation of plants which would otherwise be closed. The power is also used for breaking bottlenecks which threaten industries as a whole by increasing the production of some minor but indispensable components. For instance, production of certain construction materials, lack of which seriously threatens the building program, has been greatly increased through a comparatively minor use of the priorities powers. Unless these powers can be exercised during the coming months, the Nation will be faced with plants unable to operate for the lack of minor items of equipment, and with industries operating at a fraction of their capacity for lack of component materials.

(3) Inventory controls: A large number of basic materials are presently in sufficient supply to permit removal of all restrictions on their use and distribution, but the balance between supply and demand remains precarious. There is a very serious threat that

speculative buying and inventory hoarding will disturb this balance, as actually happened following World War I. In order to prevent any such occurrence the CPA prohibits accumulation of inventories of these materials beyond current industrial needs. Continuation of this type of restriction is essential if we are to avoid danger of crippling artificial shortages.

(4) Rationing: There will be continuing shortages of sugar, probably until the domestic sugar-beet harvest in the fall of 1946. On November 24, 1945, meats, fats, and oils were lifted from rationing. Although fats and oils and some cuts of meat are expected to remain in short supply for a time, this most recent release of rationing is an indication of the policy of the administration.

(5) Low-end programs: When the supply of certain basic materials is short there is a tendency to use these materials only for the fabrication of comparatively high-priced articles, since these high-priced articles generally provide a larger margin of profit. This situation is particularly acute in the textile industry, where garment manufacturers have tended to concentrate on production of high-cost garments. This results not only in decreasing the total quantity of clothing available (since by and large the more expensive garments consume greater quantities of textiles), but in increasing very seriously the cost of living by forcing consumers to purchase the more expensive items. The CPA and the OPA working together have initiated programs under which priorities are granted to producers of low-cost clothing, with a result that a fair share of the available textiles are channeled into this field. Termination of this power would seriously intensify the present severe shortage of such items as low-cost shirts and underwear.

(6) Foreign programs: The United States has entered into a number of commitments to supply foreign nations with materials which they desperately need. Export of certain of these materials is essential if labor in foreign areas, such as Malaya, is to be induced to produce materials, such as tin, which we ourselves require. Other exports are necessary to prevent widespread disaster and loss of life in liberated areas. Unless we can allocate certain materials, notably foods and textiles, for export we will be unable to meet these commitments.

The committee has considered the possibility of rewriting this title so as to restrict its exercise to specific materials and has concluded that this is impractical. In the first place, it is impossible to state definitely exactly which materials will be in short supply during the next half year to require some form of action. It was believed this summer, for instance, that all controls over coal distribution could be dispensed with before the end of the year, but the coal strike necessitated a revision of this point of view and it appears probable that controls will be required until next spring.

Title IV—Purchase by Federal Reserve banks of Government obligations

This title permits sale of Government obligations to the Federal Reserve System up to $5,000,000,000. This affords the Treasury an opportunity for short-term financing at emergency periods and should be continued during the immediate future when considerable financial fluctuations are threatened, pending consideration by the Congress whether some permanent legislation along these lines is warranted. The committee respectfully recommends that the appropriate legislative committees should give study to permanent legislation of this character.

Title V—Waiver of navigation and inspection laws

Under this title certain of the manning and equipment restrictions placed on the operation of American vessels are waived. This is absolutely essential if transportation is to be made available to bring back our troops from overseas. As an example, over 200 Liberty ships are now carrying from 784 to 1,943 persons per trip, but without the authority of title V the maximum of 68 persons, including the crew of 56, could be transported. Should this title lapse, return of overseas personnel would be most seriously delayed.

Title VI—Power to requisition

This title has already been extended to June 30, 1946 (Public Law 102, 79th Cong., approved June 30, 1945), and no further extension is contemplated at this time.

Title VII—Political activity

This title exempts from the provisions of the Hatch Act part-time employees who serve without compensation or with only nominal compensation. It affects primarily members of local price and rationing boards and selective service boards. The OPA and the Selective Service System make every effort to assure themselves that members of these boards do not presume upon this exemption, but so long as personnel of these boards continue to donate their services to the United States it appears appropriate to continue it in force.

Title VIII—Protection of war industries and protection of resources subject to hazards of forest fires

This title has already lapsed and should not be renewed.

Title IX—Free postage for soldiers, sailors, and marines

This title should be repealed since the free postage privilege has now been extended to members of the armed services by section 10 of Public Law No. 190 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 6, 1945.

Title X—Naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war

No termination date of this title appears in the act and accordingly no action is required.

Title XI—Acceptance of conditional gifts to further the war program

This title could be permitted to lapse at this time were it not that under its authority the French Government contributes francs which are paid out to American military personnel in France to help them to meet the unfavorable rate of exchange. In order to permit continuation of this program an amendment is suggested which would confine the operation of this title to gifts made for the benefit of members of the armed services.

Title XII—Coinage of 5-cent pieces

Under this title the Treasury is permitted to coin 5-cent pieces made one-half of copper and one-half of silver until December 31, 1946. Since nickel is now available it seems desirable to return to the peacetime basis at the end of this year. An amendment to this effect is suggested in the bill. No expiration date is expressed in the act or the title and its repeal would be unwise since the redemption provisions must be exercised after December 31, 1945.

Title XIII—Inspection and audit of war contractors

No expiration date is expressed in the act and no action is necessary.

Title XIV—Utilization of vital war information

This title makes possible the collection and dissemination of various statistical data within the Government. On the basis of this information the conversion from peace to war was accomplished and the availability of this information appears equally necessary for planning reconversion from war to peace. The title should, therefore, be extended to aid in the administration of the powers conferred by title III. The committee respectfully recommends that the appropriate legislative committees should give study to permanent legislation of this character.

Title XV—Time limit and short title

The proposed amendments to the title merely extend certain of the previous titles for 6 months, in accordance with comments made above in regard to these specific titles.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some confusion as to what this bill does. It does not refer to or fix any date for the termination of the war. It has nothing to do whatever with the Price Control Act. It is confined simply to an extension or a modification or repeal of the 15 titles that are contained in the Second War Powers Act which was passed March 1942. We were a little bit too optimistic at that time and by its terms the Second War Powers Act expired on December 31, 1944. We hoped that the war would be over by that time but it was necessary to extend it to December 31, 1945. The question before us now is, how many of those 15 titles shall be allowed to lapse, repealed, or continued, and for how long. As the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Texas have both explained, the first extension was from 1944 to 1945. The question now is how far beyond December 31, 1945, we shall extend certain powers. There were some differences of opinion in the committee as to the time of the extension and one or two other minor disagreements. It is quite unusual, but nevertheless it is a fact that we come before you with a united committee. There is no disagreement among us whatever. Very full hearings were held.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There were quite a number of members of our committee who wanted to extend it to December 31, 1946.

Mr. HANCOCK. But we have reached an agreement, as I just said. We are here now with a united front.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And others wanted to limit it to 6 months, to June 30, 1946.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is what we agreed upon.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think that was quite a victory under all the circumstances.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, at least we come here all friends and we are all rowing in the same direction. To give you some idea of the completeness of these hearings, representatives appeared before us from the Department of Justice, the Director of War Mobilization, the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, the Navy Department, the War Department, the War Production Board, the Solid Fuels Administrator, the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the War Shipping Administrator, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

If anyone really wishes to get into the details of the different titles that are involved in this bill, I would respectfully suggest that he look at these hearings. I heard the testimony and have read the

hearings. I should be glad to try to answer questions.

I do not believe any more complete hearings have been taken before our committee in recent years. The report itself explains every title. It is clear and concise. If you will take the time to read that, I am sure you will understand all that is involved. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], just pointed out, there was quite a difference of opinion among us as to whether certain titles should be extended until December 31, 1946, or June 30, 1946.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is only on those powers that we did extend. Many of them have been eliminated.

Mr. HANCOCK. Naturally, if we did not extend them, there is no extension date. That goes without saying. I am confining my remarks to title III. The most unpopular, the most controversial, and the most important part of the whole act.

It so happens that the OPA has a termination date of June 30, 1946. That is provided in the bill under which price control was first established and its extension. That legislation originated in the Banking and Currency Committee. Price control is very closely related to rationing and priority orders and allocation orders. The two subjects can scarcely be separated. We felt it would be wise for Congress to consider the continuance of price control and rationing beyond June 30, 1946 at the same time and to determine at that time whether such controls are still necessary. We hope not.

The accomplishments of the various rationing agencies in curtailing their activities have been amazing. I think everyone on the committee was astounded to learn the progress they have already made during recent months in releasing their controls, and in reducing their personnel. It indicates to me that most, if not all, of the men charged with the thankless task of administering the war control agencies are sincerely trying to restore normal economic conditions in America as speedily and as painlessly as possible.

Let me give you a few figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

On VE-day the War Production Board, now called Civilian Production Administration, had outstanding over 700 basic orders. Two hundred were lifted shortly after VE-day, and as of November 1, the number has been reduced to 73, a reduction from 700 in a few short months.

The peak of the personnel in this agency was 23,000 in February 1943. The number was reduced to less than 4,000 on November 3 of this year, and it is planned to reach a figure of 400 by June 30, 1946. That is a reduction in employees from 23,000 to 400. That is a major operation.

The Office of Defense Transportation at its peak had 2,950 orders outstanding. By December 1, all of those orders had been rescinded, and the bureau personnel reduced from 3,897 to nothing.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Were those employees taken off the Federal Government pay roll or were they simply transferred to other agencies?

Mr. HANCOCK. We inquired about that and we were assured by the Director of War Mobilization that practically all of them had returned to private industry.

I am giving you these facts to illustrate how rapidly this gigantic bureaucratic Government of ours is being demobilized, and to what an amazing degree. It gives some idea of what can be accomplished in the next 6 months.

The Solid Fuels Administration had 13 outstanding general orders on VJ-day. Only six remain today. At the peak they had 700 employees, and at the end of the coal year, which Mr. Potter tells us will be April 1, 1946, they will have but 50 employees left, and they will be engaged in clean-up work.

From that record it is shown that a long period of extension is not necessary. A far better job of demobilization is being done than could possibly have been anticipated. For that reason, and other reasons, we all agreed finally, after some discussion, that June 30, 1946, was the right date to terminate the emergency powers granted under the Second War Powers Act.

We all dislike restraints, restrictions and controls of all kinds; that is human nature, certainly the nature of Americans; but if we do not continue these rationing powers, these powers of allocation, these powers of priority, we are pretty likely to find ourselves in the disastrous times of 1919 and 1920 when there was so much speculative buying and inventory hoarding. You remember at that time—some of you who are as old as I am—that there was much speculative buying and inventory hoarding of critical materials. Prices went skyrocketing. An artificial as well as a genuine shortage resulted. The bubble burst and there was widespread collapse and bankruptcy. We have learned something from that experience; we have learned that in the matter of scarce and critical materials reasonable control must be exercised until there is a normal supply to meet the demand, or an approximation thereof. It would be inviting disaster if we suddenly canceled the war control powers which are contained in title III of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I congratulate the gentleman upon the intelligent statement he is making. In that connection, I remember the 1919–20 period and what happened to the country then because we had no price control. But I am reminded this morning that since they took the price limit off of oranges, grapefruit, and lemons, the price rose from $2 to $3 a crate. This just shows what may happen with other food or fruit if we should discontinue price control. I think it would be unfortunate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

That is particularly true, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, where the supply is below the demand and where there are no restraints and controls. Sometimes they are removed prematurely. It can lead to a dangerous condition. We learned something from the First World War and we are trying to apply that knowledge now as effectively and as intelligently as we can with the least disturbance to our economic system and the least delay in reconversion.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken more time than I intended to but this is a very important bill and should receive the consideration and the support of every Member of this House.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. This would insure the possibility of keeping building material for home construction rather than for the construction of cinema theaters.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is correct; in other words, the rationing authorities, for example, would allocate lumber for flooring in a house rather than for the construction of bowling alleys, and would also allocate tin for necessary alloys and for the making of tin cans rather than for the making of toys and cheap jewelry. These are two typical examples indicating the necessity for priority orders and allocations.

If there are still shortages in farm or manufactured products whose distribution needs to be controlled 6 months from now we can continue the authority given the President and his designees by title III as to those specific articles. We think—perhaps I should say we hope—that the number of such articles will be very few.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, embraced 15 different important titles. In these 15 titles the President was granted extraordinary powers. This act gave to the President most unusual powers over the manpower and the entire resources and the activities of the American people. It is doubtful whether the head of any nation had greater powers during this war than the President of the United States. He had control of 140,000,000 Americans and almost unlimited billions of resources.

These were granted to the President solely and only for the purpose of expediting the winning of the war. While the war is not yet legally over, and it can only end through a proclamation of the President or by a resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress, yet Germany, Japan, and their satellite governments have been overwhelmingly defeated. The President could at any time he desires declare the war at an end and the

administration, with its majority in both Houses of Congress, could pass a resolution declaring the war at an end. But they have not chosen to take either course.

This bill repeals many of those war powers, amends some of them, and extends others to June 30, 1946.

This bill does not go as far as I should like for it to go; but I am very happy to join in the efforts to relieve the American people as much as we can of the burdens and inconveniences of these war powers.

The OPA comes under the Price Control Act. That legislation is handled by the Banking and Currency Committee. It is not included in this bill, although the OPA has removed price ceilings from a great many of the products and only a few remain, such as sugar. The OPA Act itself comes to an end on June 30, 1946, and it can only be continued after that date by an act of Congress.

Under the present temper of Congress it is not likely that it will be continued unless a very important national emergency should arise between now and the date of its expiration.

The second war-powers bill before us deals largely with priorities and allocations and, as pointed out above, much of the power relating to priorities and allocations is repealed by this bill or greatly modified. In fairness I might say that there is still a necessity for some control for allocations and priorities in tin, rubber, and some other very important commodities, especially at this period of converting from war production to peacetime production and the scarcity of certain commodities.

Under this bill the War Production Board-Civilian Production Administration will go out of business. The Office of Defense Administration is continued in a modified form. It will greatly aid and expedite the return home of our servicemen; but the manifold agencies under the second war-powers bill are being either eliminated or greatly reduced and they are on their way out and practically all of them will be out by June 30, 1946.

Our navigation and inspection laws will continue, as it is absolutely essential that transportation be made available to bring back our troops from overseas.

This measure repeals the right of the War Department and other defense agencies to take over lands and any interest therein and other property for the Government almost without notice to the owners. This is one of the many powers most irksome to the people and about which we have had many complaints. I think it is generally the purpose of our Judiciary Committee and of the Congress to wipe out all of these war powers at the earliest date possible so that our country may get back to normal living and normal conditions.

Thousands of the directives and regulations under these war powers have been canceled and set aside, and with the passage of this bill many others will be eliminated and we hope before June 30, 1946, that all of them, with very rare exceptions, will have no validity or authority.

As these measures give the American people very substantial relief from these extraordinary emergency powers and will restore a great deal of freedom and liberty to the people, I trust that this bill may receive the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the principal effect upon our economy that the enactment of this bill will have is the power to allocate materials. Now that there are shortages in many materials it is essential that those items that are scarce be so channeled into the proper hands as to cause as little suffering as possible.

The Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee gave considerable thought to this question and as a result of the studies made by that committee a very important report has been made. This report was not acted on by the committee; however, it comes as the result of studies made by the committee and by its staff, and I shall include it as a part of my remarks:

EXTENSION OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

(By Edwin B. George, staff consultant, House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning)

The economic consequences of the war will run on a considerable distance beyond the termination of hostilities and means must be found to cope with them. Among the means at present available is the Second War Powers Act. Most of the titles of this act, however, expire on December 31, 1945. Two questions are raised by its approaching expiration: (1) Are the problems left by the war of a kind justifying continued Government control over industrial operations as now permitted by this act, and (2) are its terms sufficiently well adapted to post-hostility purposes to justify a limited extension?

The Second War Powers Act has 14 titles, under the authority of which many Government agencies have since March 1942 performed wartime duties. A list of these titles, together with a summary of their contents and the recommendations of the Director of OWMR concerning them, is appended hereto. The most important provisions are those of title III, authorizing the preferred distribution, rationing and allocation of materials. It is with title III that the present analysis is concerned.

Despite sometimes lively disagreement in both Government and business circles over the wisdom of rapid decontrol, the Civilian Production Administration now has outstanding less than 75 orders and schedules of the 650 regulations issued by the War Production Board. The elaborate controlled materials plan has gone, as have AA ratings. Remaining orders are being constantly scrutinized by the Administration with the apparently clear intention of dispensing with them successively as opportunity permits. An opportunity for this purpose is regarded as occurring whenever near-term supply prospects are in the general neighborhood of probable demand or wherever the product is not so important to standards of living and industrial operations that a shortage would be injurious.

The Executive order of October 4 which established the Civilian Production Administration set forth six general purposes:

1. Expand the production of materials which are in short supply.

2. Limit the manufacture of products for which materials or facilities are insufficient.

3. Control the accumulation of inventories so as to avoid speculative hoarding and unbalanced distribution which would curtail total production.

4. Grant priority assistance to break bottlenecks which would impede the reconversion process.

5. Facilitate the fulfillment of relief and other essential export programs.

6. Allocate scarce materials and facilities necessary for the production of low-priced items essential to the continued success of the stabilization program of the Federal Government.

Beyond these purposes, it may be added, the CPA accepts responsibility for insuring the availability of supplies needed by our occupation forces overseas and by servicemen pending demobilization.

The House Judiciary Committee has already heard testimony by Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and by Mr. John D. Small, Administrator of the Civilian Production Administration, concerning the problems with which they expect to deal. The facts touching these problems are not regarded as being in dispute in any important respect. The issue is whether they can be most suitably dealt with under authority of the Second War Powers Act. The basic considerations are outlined below:

I. ARE GOVERNMENTAL CONTROLS STILL JUSTIFIED?—SOME SHORTAGES PERSIST

A half dozen or so materials are in obviously short supply and may remain so for a considerable time. In any list are tin, rubber, lead, hard cordage fibers, and burlap. Cotton broadwoven goods will give difficulty for several months. Castings and even some forms of steel have been borderline in the past and under the push of a sudden and violent demand might swing back into the trouble area. In recent weeks motor backlogs have risen rather than declined. Lumber may not be easy for some time. Other materials, such as hides and coal, while in nearly adequate domestic supply, cannot remain completely unaffected by the acute deficits obtaining internationally. Molasses, antimony, quinine, quinidine, and rosin are short for causes that cannot be easily overcome. There are still quite a number of industrial commodities for which orders may not for sometime be accepted with pleased assurances of prompt delivery. None of this is to gainsay, of course, that supplies of many materials and components are or soon will be in a position to meet any likely demands made upon them.

Briefly, in some areas the American supply outlook is mixed and unstable, while a few international shortages ranging from critical to desperate constitute at least an arguable claim to assistance from our stocks. The bulk of materials and components are already in satisfactory position to withstand any pressures but that of a strong inflationary boom, but a number are still in precarious balance, while a few must still be handled with the greatest care.

The administration lists its duties with respect to these short commodities, as follows:

1. Expansion of materials in short supply

Administrators are agreed that for most of the problems in their respective jurisdictions the cure is production. As during the war and similarly in the public interest now, the CPA and companion agencies can often employ available resources more effectively by controlling their use. Thus power shovels and dredges have been diverted into tin mining, and the delivery of heavy dredges is being speeded up. Without equipment as well as manpower the shortages in building materials, such as bricks, cast-iron soil pipes, clay sewer pipe, and structural clay tile, will linger, and without these materials the vital construction program will be delayed. Trucks and tiles multiply the output of lumber in laggard areas. The quick availability of coal-mining machinery, tractors, and shovels means more steel, manufactured gas, and home fuel. The completion of new plants for new drugs will still hold down the

war toll, and the scratching of surrender pens did not somehow lessen the value of soldiers' lives.

The war has not yet released its hold on us. These shortages are the fault of the war and competition cannot yet be discriminating enough to single out the bad spots for special attention.

2. Selective use of scarce materials

There mere existence of shortages does not confer license on the Government to plan in any general way what use should be made of available supplies. Sometime, however, the effect of shortages on the public interest is so direct as to take on some of the attributes of a public emergency as in the case of public health and natural disasters. Tin, for example, has become very important to the maintenance of the national food supply. Neither the public nor industry would expect the Government to carry freedom to the point of allowing this critical material to go into artificial jewelry rather than food preservation. Throughout the war the WPB has greatly reduced tin consumption by limiting the thickness of coatings and encouraging the development of economic methods of coating, such as electroplating and bonderizing. By means of these economies the country came through the war with a surprisingly small amount of trouble. The end of hostilities, however, did not replenish our tin stocks, and even with careful husbanding the present stock pile of about 30,000 tons (not including concentrates) will hardly last beyond 1946. Similarly, some of the industrial uses for lead are much more closely affected by the public interest than others. Serious dependence on foreign supplies of lead is a new experience for this country, but the shortage that developed during the war raised difficult problems for manufacturers of storage batteries, ethyl gasoline, paint, cable covering, chemicals, collapsible tubes, bearings, terne plate, free-turning brass, etc. Supply and demand forecasts are not yet too firm, but it is at least possible that in the face of an unrestricted demand the shortage would exceed 150,000 tons. Stocks are now at the unusually low figure of well under 100,000 tons and must be used sparingly. Our crude rubber deficit is well known and its dangers understood. Actual and potential production of synthetic rubber is now at a high level but for some types of goods, such as surgical equipment and heavy truck and bus tires, crude rubber or a moderate admixture of it is indispensable. To throw crude rubber on the open market could have disastrous consequences. Burlap likewise is in far-from-ample supply, and in conjunction with cotton bagging must be channeled into the food-producing industries in preference to some of the industrial products ordinarily using this material but for which satisfactory substitutes are available. These are examples, but most of the shortages previously cited can raise comparable problems.

3. Inventory control

The country is not likely to forget the near orgy of inventory speculation that followed the last war. The danger of repetition can be overstressed, for it is not likely that industry will have forgotten it either. Nevertheless, it is natural and proper for industry and purchasing agents to think in terms of margins of safety, and in the case of some materials the shortages are so acute as to require even working stocks to be held below normal levels if the best use possible is to be made of available supplies. Industry has had to work on this basis during the war and in many respects the situation has not changed. The number of materials subject to manufacturing inventory limitations has already been scaled down, and can be expected to decline further as a result of the semimonthly reviews to which the entire list is being currently subjected. Distributors' inventories are sensitive to the same needs and temptations as in the case of manufacturers and must therefore also be watched until free markets are again possible.

4. Bottleneck breaking

This is one of the few purposes for which priorities are still used. The question is, as usual, one of relative values. Where a particular industry is both crucial to quick recovery and is paralyzed by lack of a small amount of materials or a few pieces of equipment, a reasonable amount of assistance to it is obviously in the public interest. Producers of the short materials and equipment are already working at top speed to bring supplies back to adequate levels, and neither price nor competition can accelerate the process to any appreciable extent. In the meantime, greater total production and employment can be achieved through the channeling of a small amount of scarce materials to a few critical spots. Governmental interference of this type obviously does not harmonize with our normal and preferred methods of determining patterns of production and distribution, but it was not through the workings of free enterprise that the shortages occurred in the first place and it is not yet possible for free enterprise to supply quick remedies. The War Production Board and now the Civilian Production Administration has used this power sparingly, and there is hardly any restorative medicine in its cut-down cabinet that it prescribes for business with more reluctance. Its claims to this effect seem to be confirmed by the kinds of use it has made of its authority.

The assignment of a CC rating to a small quantity of wooden floor blocks permitted an automobile axle plant to keep its own strategic product moving to a number of assembly plants employing tens of thousands of men. At this stage of reconversion it is still not uncommon for strategic production or transportation facilities to have all the material, equipment, and manpower necessary to large-scale operation except in a few small respects. Obviously more public value can be gotten out of the use of a small amount of scarce material at those points than if it were floated into the general distribution stream. The administration states that in the use of this power veterans are given special consideration, and while there is no statistical evidence as to the scale on which preference to veterans is being given, it has been able to verify examples. The use of priority assistance to avoid break-down in public utilities and food processing plants is in keeping with public policies of long standing.

The concept is a dangerous one and even good examples of use can be merely disarming. The great weakness in the use of this kind of administrative authority is in the lack of clear boundaries of essentiality. Sympathy can take the place of judgment and judgment has to function without the benefit of all pertinent facts. There will always be more borderline than urgent cases and those coming to the Administrator's attention may actually be duplicated a score of times in the complex industry without his knowledge. As supplies improve, judgment becomes progressively difficult even though applications decline.

The safeguard is that the Administration seems to be as concerned over the propriety of these measures as is the country. In the abstract the case for a moderate use of priority powers in the aid of carefully selected civilian activities under conditions very closely resembling those of wartime because they were born of the war seems to be sound. In practice it can also be sound as long as the war connection remains the principal criterion.

5. Assistance to the production of low-priced goods

This problem has haunted the administration throughout the war and is still far from solved. It is particularly acute in the textile fields but has been troublesome in furniture and potential at many points. The war has exerted a powerful pressure toward upgrading because high margins of profits are usually earned on the higher-priced lines. The problem has been aggravated by price control because of the reluctance or inability, depending on the circumstances, of OPA to set prices capable of inducing large-scale production of low-end goods. The use made of the authority conferred by the Second War Powers Act in this connection is to channel fabrics and other pertinent materials to the manufacturers of these products. Where basic materials are short, production patterns of end products are not likely to correspond of their own accord with the patterns of public need. The shortages in basic materials were caused both by heavy diversion to military programs and by labor shortages. The military drain has now fallen to a trickle, but in the case of textiles, at least, the production of fabrics continues to lag. Both the problem and the chosen remedies for it, however, have been and remain highly controversial.

Irrespective of solutions adopted in that area, the general situation is still so unsettled as to preclude an abrupt decision by the Civilian Production Administration to withdraw its assistance. Hope has been held out for some time that the natural recuperative forces released by the war's ending would provide their own cure, but it has not yet happened and it is not yet safe to expect immediate recovery.

Particularly because of the low-end problem, if the Congress decides to extend either the Second War Powers Act or a more guarded substitute, it is highly important that it should do so at the earliest possible moment. Business has to plan a considerable distance ahead, and for administrative actions to be of practical benefit they must likewise be taken far in advance of the actual appearance of goods on the market. There will be a heavy demand from veterans for men's cheap suits. Infants' wear and cotton garments generally are still badly needed. The manufacturers of such goods must be assured now of an adequate supply of materials. The implementation of such programs can scarcely be accomplished in less than 45 days. Applications must be assembled from producers, papers processed, and orders placed. Uncertainty over continued CPA participation in this effort could conceivably be worse than a wrong step in either direction. Producers could be misled into marking time during precious days when they might at least be preparing to produce something.

6. Regulation of exports and imports

Many agreements will probably be made and revised before stable economic relations between America and the rest of the world are restored. In the meantime artificialities carrying over from the war present international problems that are not self-resolving. The scarcity of materials badly needed by all countries is conspicuous among them. Up to now most of the influential countries have been proceeding on the assumption that none of them would be helped by an immediate return to completely free markets. America's long-range policy in matters of this kind is still to be decided, but abrupt termination of all existing arrangements may not be the most desirable way of deciding it. American participation therein is now to a considerable extent, although not exclusively, implemented by the Second War Powers Act. Up to now those powers have been used both to protect American markets and to assist certain foreign purchasers in the American market.

Demand for many kinds of American goods has been as avid abroad as at home. In some countries large reserves of dollar exchange have been built up, in others the need for materials and merchandise has been so great as to make the depletion of such reserves a

secondary consideration. While as discussed below, Congress and the administration have been willing to render planned and limited assistance to other nations, they could not afford in the face of continued home stringencies to open up all of our markets to all comers. A few commodities, indeed, are still being rationed at home, although the number is now small and is declining. Even where rationing has been discontinued, however, other domestic controls have had to be retained. The Civilian Production Administration and the Office of International Trade Operations of the Commerce Department are therefore still permitting the export of some goods only under export licenses and on a showing of critical need.

On the other hand some export trade is actively implemented both in self-interest and in fulfillment of our obligations to mitigate chaos abroad.

Workers in the countries from which we traditionally obtain essential imports have long been discontented. Our cash payments to them in return for such services have been liberal but have added little to the real welfare of the people receiving them. The money has to a considerable extent accumulated unspent for lack of goods whereon to spend it. This lack has been particularly aggravating in standard trade goods areas, where payment for labor is to a considerable extent made in kind. All during the war the workers in many supply countries have been waiting patiently for textiles, household utensils, bicycles, and tools. These and not money are the ultimate currency for tin, crude rubber, Manila fiber, fats and oils, quinine and quinidine. In the present distorted markets, however, the exchange will not happen of itself. Some of these markets hold out poor long-term prospects for the particular goods desired, and American producers of them canont be expected of their own accord to fill such orders at the expense of home customers. Additionally, exports of equipment sometimes have to be facilitated to maintain the necessary flow of supplies to our overseas troops.

As in the case of bottleneck-breaking in the industrial market the completion of these transactions does not always require the use of authority. The existence of the priority power is sometimes important as an emblem of public policy as well as in actual use, and producers and exporters will frequently honor simple requests that designated orders be filled.

The Department of State and the Civilian Production Administration, among other agencies, have testified on a number of occasions concerning the continued need for controls wherewith to implement our foreign relief commitments. The views of the Department of State may be of particular importance to the Congress at this time as those of a permanent part of the Government in contrast with the short life intended in any event for the Civilian Production Administration. That department has consistently advocated the termination, at as early a date as possible, of powers created expressly for war purposes. It feels, however, that with respect to the present state of international economic relations an indiscriminate and overhasty relaxation could have embarrassing consequences. It advises that certain commitments made under existing law are still to be discharged, and that the continuance in force of certain economic and trade controls is necessary for that purpose. Among them are the allocation mechanisms set up under title III of the Second War Powers Act. The Department has, therefore, recommended a 12-month extension for that title. In a letter to Representative SAM HOBBS, chairman of Subcommittee 4 of the House Judiciary Committee, the Department listed a number of commodities which it expected to remain in short supply in liberated areas and which it regarded as essential to restoration of normal economic conditions. The commodities listed were fats and oils, meat, sugar, hides and leather, textiles, coal, lumber, phosphates, agricultural machinery, textile machinery, and transportation equipment. These commodities would be purchased in agreed upon quantities by UNRRA. By reason of their importance UNRRA might encounter grave difficulties in procuring them without priority assistance, allocations, or set-aside orders. Procurement by UNRRA might not be impossible in the absence of these controls, but the fear is that it could only be effected through payment of premium prices that would greatly reduce the real purchasing power of the funds available to that agency. For that same reason it might increase the volume of requests from foreign governments for dollar loans.

The use of priority powers on exports as a means of inducing imports has already been mentioned. It is noteworthy in the same connection that our part in formulating and implementing international allocations of short materials is also performed under authority of the Second War Powers Act. The arguments against abrupt abandonments of these agreements, while the damage done by the war to supply sources and supply lines is still unmended, are strong. It is worth noting at this point, however, that the State Department, which has taken a strong stand for the early removal of wartime restraints over international trade, sems to be convinced that these particular arrangements should be kept in force for the time being.

There are other laws under which international arrangements for equitable distribution of short materials might be implemented, but their application is not so direct. The National Defense Act, expiring June 30, 1946, also contained authority for export control, although in the main its provisions were carried over into the Second War Powers Act. Exports are also controlled under the Export License Control Act, expiring June 30, 1946. That act, however, was essentially protective in nature, being designed and used to prevent undiscriminating drains on limited American supplies. The First War Powers Act granted authority for import control in the form of an amendment to the old Trading with the Enemy Act.

The Second War Powers Act, however, contributes prominently and distinctively in two respects: (1) Without the priority and allocation power it would be impossible to make equitable distribution of our arbitrarily limited imports among importers and users, and (2) without the priority and allocation power export shipments could not be directed on a basis of analyzed needs or in fulfillment of commitments, or with reciprocal intent.

II. ARE THE PROVISIONS OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT SUITABLE TO POST-HOSTILITY PURPOSES?

While questions can properly be raised as to the need for extension of wartime type controls, it is overshadowed by a further question as to the form in which any necessary future power should be conveyed. There is no doubt that the Second War Powers Statute as presently written was drafted primarily for the purpose of assuring speedy production of munitions of war while maintaining a basic civilian economy. The emphasis is military; the word "reconversion" appears nowhere; and the criteria are generally set forth in terms of "national defense." Then why should it be used for reconversion? Why not draft a new statute? In fact the Congress has quite a number of choices available to it. After deciding what it wants to do in the immediate postwar period, the Congress has the option of either renewing the present law in the belief that the powers conveyed in it cover both war and transitional contingencies, or of modifying the present law to make sure that it does, or of passing two new laws at the expiration of the present one on December 31, 1945, or of incorporating any necessary residue of the present law in some other law for which a longer life is assured. It sems appropriate, however, to limit consideration to the choices of writing a definitive new law or of extending the statute as it now stands.

There appear to be two chief arguments in favor of drafting substitute legislation. These arguments, and the countervailing considerations, may be summed up as follows:

(a) The powers granted by the Second War Powers Act are broader than necessary to accomplish the programs contemplated by the CPA and the other Government agencies who will exercise such powers. It can be argued that the rapid reduction in the number of really scarce materials, and to some extent the narrowing of the objectives to be achieved, should make it possible to draft legislation which would be limited more closely to the field in which the powers might be exercised, and to set more definite criteria for their use. In support of this argument is the fact that the WPB and its successor, CPA, have been able to reduce the number of controls exercised from somewhere in the neighborhood of 700 to approximately 70. The OPA has similarly reduced its rationing programs to 2 out of an original 13, with possible further reductions in the near future. The very fact that so many controls have been given up would seem to indicate that permission to exercise the remaining controls could be covered in more restrictive language. Moreover, it is most undesirable, if unnecessary, to delegate powers as broad as those contained in the Second War Powers Act to the executive agencies because of the danger that these powers may be exercised for purposes other than the somewhat narrow field for which they are intended.

As against these arguments there would seem to be two possible answers. Both the OWMR and the CPA have attempted to write legislation which would be more restrictive and which would establish more definite criteria. The difficulty of drafting such legislation is two-fold. In the first place, the number of materials which are in scarce supply and must be controlled is rapidly diminishing but a substantial number remains; and it is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy what materials—especially when we consider components and semifabricated items—may be in short supply at some later date and may thus threaten to become bottlenecks in the whole reconversion program. Among the examples previously given, it could hardly have been predicted that clutches or 50-cycle electric motors would for a time become major impediments to the restoration of tin production. And if perchance a new law permitted corrective action only in the case of scarcities, doubt might be created as to whether capital equipment for urgent or preferred purposes could be scheduled. Requests range from raw materials, to capital equipment, to parts, to components, to products, and rise and fall in volume on any of them. Therefore, any attempt to limit controls to specified types of materials becomes almost impossible.

Secondly, the types of controls exercised by the CPA and other agencies must of necessity be so diverse as to defy careful definition. The type of control will depend on the type of material involved; the structure of the producing industry; the structure of the industry requiring the material from the manufacturer; the degree of scarcity of the material; its essentiality; and to some extent upon the type of control to which the industry has become accustomed. This diversity is increased by the various ends to be accomplished. These may be summed up as allocation and conservation of scarce critical materials; prevention of inventory hoarding; rationing of consumer goods; breaking of bottlenecks; meeting of foreign commitments; and aid to low-end programs. Each of these purposes must be approached in a different manner.

It is still true that the use of words connoting good and wholesome purposes does not of itself guarantee cautious administration. As proof it can be riddled. Whenever scarce materials or components are "diverted" to "urgent" needs, they are taken away from the satisfaction of other needs, blindly. The test of urgency may be noise. With the best of intentions CPA will be merely assisting with problems it can see at the expense of those that it cannot see, and not much of industry can be seen in good perspective at any one time. Even where visibility is good, the decision to use Government powers has to rest on personal judgments and personal ideas of value. An industry with which an adjuster is familiar may make a better case to him than one that he has never considered very important, or a worse case than one that can deceive him on details. He will be subject to pressures. Economic and social evaluations must enter into most of his decisions, and the effect of a broad charter would be to delegate to a bureau matters on which the Congress itself has difficulty in agreeing. Do pressing reconversion needs include relocation of industry, or the strengthening of small or regional enterprise or of ethical competitors, or the preferment of mass production and big employing industries, or the relief of distressed areas? Most of these are arguable purposes but they are hardly to be handled as incidents to a rapidly shrinking war function. With respect to export preference, at what point is the urgency of relief in low-standard countries to be balanced against the maintenance of our own standards? Is reconversion best helped by holding inventories to merely normal ratios or by cutting them back to a hand-to-mouth small-purchase basis? On the eve of a return to free enterprise, is it still proper on even a moderate scale to dictate patterns of civilian production on the ground that Government bureaus regard some goods as more important than others? Does the Congress wish to leave all these decisions to the administration or to try writing its own specifications?

These questions are valid but they may be also self-defeating. There is hardly any limit to the number that could be raised and sound specifications could not very well be written for them all in the short time available. Also their application is shallow. A war agency will be trying to close up the most noticeable remaining industrial wounds by touching many points briefly within a few months. Congress and the public at large have been kept completely informed of actions taken. Industry understands what is being done. Any suspicious deviation from advertised purposes would bring quick protests. Almost everyone concerned will be operating in a familiar medium, and detailed new criteria at this stage might raise more questions than answers, and prove inappropriate as well for the solution of problems now unforeseen. In any event, the danger of too extensive use of the delegated powers is largely negated by the history of the WPB and of the CPA in their use of the powers granted. There appears to be no question but that they are making every effort to give up every remaining control at the earliest possible moment—so much so in fact that there has been considerable criticism of the speed with which certain controls have been liquidated.

(b) It can be further argued that assuming the difficulty of drafting a more restrictive statute, it would still be wise to redraft the Second War Powers Act so as to relate it more specifically to reconversion. The present law gave trouble during the closing phase of active hostilities. Reconversion problems were plainly becoming paramount and the law was not designed with them in mind. It said in effect that shortages upon which action was premised should result from the fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States. Obviously, this phrase can be construed narrowly or broadly. If the war is over, national defense is not the primary consideration. Nevertheless, some current production will continue for future defense; and quite aside from mincing distinctions of this sort there is the important fact that if it were not for the efforts made over the past few years for the national defense but few if any shortages would exist.

The strategic allocation clause then goes on to authorize the President to allocate as he may deem necessary in the public interest and to promote the national defense. Here two criteria are present. Is the public interest to be construed as ancillary to the promotion of national defense or as an independent consideration? The presence of both tests might reflect merely a congressional fear that extreme measures might be taken in the name of national defense that were still not acceptable from an over-all viewpoint, or it might authorize measures going beyond a strict construction of national defense if in the administrator's judgment larger public interests would be thereby served.

There is always the final question of course as to whether the courts would regard the kind of things now being done by the CPA and companion agencies as coming within the purview of a war powers act. On this point Attorney General Clark recently quoted a Supreme Court decision which said the war power "carries with it inherently the power * * * to remedy the evils which have arisen from its [the conflict's] rise and progress." He has furthermore advised the OWMR that the various agencies exercising powers under title III would be quite justified in continuing to exercise these powers to aid reconversion if the act were extended in its present form.

Nevertheless it would not be exceedingly difficult to draft a new statute which granted approximately the same powers very definitely for the purpose of aiding reconversion. Even so simple an amendment as the insertion at appropriate points of the words "and considered essential for orderly reconversion" might be adequate.

This argument is sound as far as it goes, and were the priority and allocation powers to be a permanent part of our legislation it would doubtless be preferable to have the statute redrafted. However, this argument does not take into effect the problem of timing and the extremely transitory nature of the extension. It seems probable that a new statute would be more difficult to enact and to administer than a simple extension of the present statute, which is familiar both to government and to industry. During a comparatively brief period, the administration wishes to exercise approximately the same types of control although in rapidly decreasing numbers for precisely the same reasons—i. e., to make the most effective use of materials in time of scarcity. As a practical matter the task of enacting and administrating new legislation to cover this brief period might not warrant the difficulties involved.

In view of the disproportion between complications and available time the Congress may be satisfied to let the issue be primarily one of confidence. There are hazards of course. Overzealous or officious administration could abuse a carry-over of broad power. Administrative sense of timing could become confused and powers intended for careful use in emergencies be applied to the making of economic rearrangements that seemed more satisfactory to the administration. This is a risk, but any grant of authority that would leave reasonable scope for the fulfillment of congressional intentions could be abused by a determined administrator. The size and complexity of the economy have not been reduced by the ending of hostilities. National purposes have changed, but during this transitional period they can still be obstructed by difficulties carrying over from the war. Due to the scale and depth of the war dislocations small surprises can still happen. Speed in completing adjustment is very important both to the country generally and to the potentially unemployed in particular.

The actual number of critical cases needing accelerated production, or bottleneck-breaking, or special preference on materials, is now few. The WPB-CPA continuity is an agency that has been criticized more since VJ-day for withdrawing help than for giving it. It seems to take a good deal of pride in bringing buyers and sellers together at critical points on a voluntary basis rather than by command. Any decision of the Congress to let broad powers continue in force in preference to writing more specific ones—which for long-term use would be desirable—must rest principally on confidence that they will not be abused. The present custodians of the particular powers under consideration here have shown an actual distate for using them, which goes somewhat beyond failure to abuse, and therefore would seem to justify the Congress in choosing the simplest available solution. If, therefore, the Congress feels that the danger of misuse is slight, a fairly wide grant of power may be the quickest way of ending the need for any grant at all. A general charter always has the merit of facilitating prompt and direct action, and the issue in this case is whether the good record of the responsible war agencies since VE- and VJ-days is sufficient warranty against its use for purposes that the Congress would not approve or had had no opportunity to study.

The simpler course, however, may require more substantial checks. Administrations change, and even an originally cautious administration may through continued exposure to problems become so sensitive to them as to take well-meant liberties with its mandate. On the record it may perhaps be assumed that the powers extended will be sparingly used. A requirement might be included, however, that those who exercise the powers for the President should submit a general report on past and prospective actions to the Judiciary Committee once every 2 months.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF TITLES, SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Title I. Emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission of motor and water carriers: This title relates especially to enforced pooling of equipment, services, and facilities. The Office of Defense Transportation states the continuance of this title is unnecessary, insofar as land transport is concerned, but the War Shipping Administration has some special problems which they will explain and which may require extension of section 103 of this title.

Title II. Acquisition and disposal of property: This title enables the military to enter into immediate possession of real property with condemnation proceedings following later, and to some extent facilitates its disposition and use. The Army, especially the Corps of Engineers, and the Navy request continuation of this title.

Title III. Priorities powers: This title establishes the priorities, rationing, and allocation powers exercised by numerous Government agencies, including the War Production Board, the armed services, Office of Price Administration, Office of Defense Transportation, Agriculture, State, etc. Continuation is essential.

Title IV. Purchase by Federal Reserve banks of Government obligations: This title in effect gives the Treasury the right to borrow up to $5,000,000,000 on short notice from the Federal Reserve System.

The Treasury considers it necessary to retain this power for the time being to tide it over possible emergencies.

Title V. Waiver of navigation and inspection laws: This title permits the operation of ships under less restrictive rules as to equipment and manning than would otherwise be the case. During demobilization continuation of this power is sought, especially by the Navy, to insure maximum use of available shipping.

Title VI. Power to requisition: This power has been extended until June 30, 1946, when continued need for it will probably have passed. No extension is therefore necessary at this time.

Title VII. Political activity: This title exempts employees serving part time and without compensation, or with only nominal compensation, from restrictions prohiting participation in political activity. Due to continued existence of such organizations as price and rationing boards and selective-service boards, this title should be continued for a year.

Title VIII. Protection of war industries and protection of resources subject to hazards of forest fires: This title has already expired. No extension is necessary.

Title IX. Free postage for soldiers, sailors, and marines: The provisions of this title have been incorporated in the act to stimulate voluntary enlistments and this title is thus no longer necessary. No extension is necessary.

Title X. Naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war: This title is permanent in nature and no extension is required.

Title XI. Acceptance of conditional gifts to further the war program: Under this title contributions of the French Government in francs to American soldiers in France, necessitated by unfavorable exchange, are handled by the United States Government. For this reason only, extension of this title is desired by the Army.

Title XII. Coinage of 5-cent pieces: This title is permanent in nature and no action is necessary.

Title XIII. Inspection and audit of war contractors: This title is permanent in nature and no extension is necessary.

Title XIV. Utilization of war information: This title permits Census to make information available to Government agencies which would otherwise be confidential. Availability of this information is necessary in planning an orderly reconversion as it was in mobilizing the country for war, and this title should, therefore, be extended.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this measure which comes before the Committee at this particular time arose following the introduction of several resolutions relating to the fixing of a date for the termination of the war. When those resolutions were presented to the subcommittee our duty became such that it was necessary to examine into the war powers which had been given by this Congress under both the First and Second War Powers Acts. This measure now before the committee is the result of that investigation which was held first by Subcommittee 4 of the Judiciary Committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is chairman, and upon which subcommittee I happened to have been a member. After long hearings and very careful consideration we have brought this bill before the House for its consideration and determination.

May I briefly explain some of the titles of the second war powers bill. There are 14 of these titles.

Title I deals with emergency powers relating to motor and water carriers. It was essential that that particular title be continued because we still have boys in the service; we still have transportation from the city of Washington to the Pentagon Building to get the workers in the War Department to and from their work; we have the question of getting the men to and from the Marine base at Quantico, down the Potomac River, so it was necessary that title I be continued for the present.

Title II of the Second War Powers Act relates to the acquisition and disposal of property. That power was extended to the War Department and to the Navy Department. It was highly essential during the period of the war that when they sought to acquire real estate or personal property that it be done quickly, and the Second War Powers Act was passed and this particular title was passed in order to give to them the right and the power to act quickly in acquiring property. So far as the acquisition of property is concerned, that time has passed. Consequently, so far as the acquisition of property is concerned that is eliminated entirely from this act. But the disposal of property which was acquired still remains in the act and is a part of the law, because it is now necessary that they dispose of the property which was acquired for the purpose of the war.

Under title III, priorities in allocations, to which reference has been made by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] it was found necessary to extend that title insofar as a very few items were concerned. Sugar, for instance, is now rather scarce, and it is necessary that there be some right of allocation and priorities so far as sugar is concerned. Tin is another.

At the time we held the hearings rubber was another item, but recently I have discovered in the press that they claim rationing, so far as rubber is concerned, will be lifted about the first of the year. The other is textiles. I had an instance just recently in which a boy who had been discharged from the Army sought to get a civilian suit of clothes. He went to his home town. He was unable to obtain a suit of clothes through the clothing merchants in his own home community, and he boarded the train and came to Washington in an effort to buy a civilian suit of clothes, which indicates how close and how tight textiles are at this particular time. So it was extended insofar as those items are concerned for the period of 6 months, the period this act is extended for those items which remain in the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman how long it is proposed to extend this right to issue priorities and allocations?

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank my colleague for asking that question. It is proposed to extend this right for 6 months, up to June 30, 1946, and no further.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do I understand it is the consensus of opinion that that will be the dead line then?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the consensus of the opinion of the committee, to extend it for 6 months and no further. Of course, if we should find at the end of 6 months that it is absolutely necessary for the protection of the public to have some further or limited extension regarding critical materials, or supplies, then that could be met as we face that issue. But at this time I can see no good reason for any extension after June 30, 1946.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. We not only agreed as a committee that June 30, 1946, should be the date of the conclusion of these powers, but I think we also agreed that the record of the hearings did not justify any later date; is that not true?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. That was the sense of the committee and that was the vote of the committee at the time we passed on it. I may say further to my distinguished friend from Maine that this was a unanimous vote, not only by the subcommittee, presided over by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], but also by the full Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There cannot be any extension beyond June 30, 1946, except by an act of Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It was the united opinion, as I understood it, of our committee that the OPA could not hope for an extension beyond its expiration date. This was included with the idea that June 30, 1946, would be the end.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that the OPA expires on June 30, 1946. It was thought that all question of allocations and priorities should expire at that same time. That was the sense of the committee and this was expressed by its vote.

If I may proceed further, I mentioned just a little while ago the waiver of the inspection laws with respect to navigation. We have all these boys located on foreign soil and we must get them back home at the earliest possible moment. This waiver of navigation inspection laws was made for the purpose of loading these boys onto ships and getting them to foreign soil quickly in order that they might participate in this war and that we might win this war. Now, the boys are on those foreign shores and we want to get them back. If these strict and rigid inspection

laws were enforced, we could not get the boys back as rapidly as we would be able to do otherwise. Because we have lifted these rigid inspection laws we load these ships to a greater capacity than they could otherwise be loaded under the rigid inspection laws in force.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, there is nothing in this bill that authorizes either the War Department or the Navy Department or any other agency of the Government to put men on these ships in such numbers as to endanger their lives.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The only thing with respect to the waiver of the rigid inspection laws is that if the ship should happen to be overloaded to a very small extent there would be no violation. They want to get the boys back as rapidly as possible, but they are not taking any chance of overloading the ships to the point where there is any danger.

Under this presentation today there are eight of these titles that are amended or extended in a limited manner, five that expire or are repealed, and one that is entirely eliminated. It is the sense of our committee, and I believe it to be the sense of the House, that we want to eliminate these war powers as rapidly as possible and get back to the normal procedure and progress in this country. I think that meets with the thought of each and every Member of the House. Each and everyone of these war powers which were granted by Congress under both the First and the Second War Powers Acts, it is our sense, and I believe it to be the sense of the entire membership, should be eliminated as rapidly as possible so that we may proceed in a normal manner in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill, which is presented after careful consideration, will receive the unanimous vote of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the discharge from the marines of Pvt. Jack MacNider, 18-year-old son of Gen. Hanford MacNider. Not knowing the circumstances, I am not in any position to make comment on the discharge.

However, in the interest of fair play, I would like to invite attention to the military record of the MacNider family.

Hanford MacNider served with the Iowa National Guard in 1916 on the Mexican border. He entered World War I as a second lieutenant and was promoted to a lieutenant colonel and was adjutant of the famous Second Division. He was wounded twice and was twice awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. As soon as this Congress declared war on Japan Hanford MacNider came to Washington, asking only for immediate service at the front. Within a very short time he was in the Pacific area, where he spent 4 years. He was promoted to brigadier general and was wounded by a hand grenade while at the front, the sight of one eye being seriously affected. In World War II he was also twice awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

In the period between the two wars Hanford MacNider served as Iowa State commander and later as national commander of the American Legion. He was also Assistant Secretary of War and Minister to Canada.

Each of the three young sons of Hanford MacNider volunteered in this war, and at least two of them enlisted on their seventeenth birthday.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the abrogation of all these war powers which were of necessity granted to the Chief Executive in order to effectively wage this war is a consummation devoutly to be wished. We are getting rid of some of them. We all hope to see the day when we can eliminate them all. Speaking of the apparent discriminations and acts of favoritism by which the boys of some men close to the seats of the mighty have been brought home while other men have been kept overseas for 2 or 3 years, I received a letter yesterday from a good woman in my district whose husband has been across 3 years. She said, "I could remain silent; I could take it until this last blow." She sent me a newspaper clipping which told of the unmarried son of a general who had been brought home and who had not been over there nearly as long as her husband had. People just cannot understand these things.

I just want to say, in passing, if we have any doubt as to whether Gen. Patrick J. Hurley was correct in his diagnosis of the kind of people that have been hamstringing him and double crossing him and sabotaging the effort of this country to maintain the only real government that China has, if we ever had any doubt about whether he was right in what he said, we have overwhelming, indisputable proof of the fact that he was right by the abuse and the source of the abuse that has been heaped upon him since he exposed these worthies last week. Nobody could have any doubt about it.

Forgetting and ignoring General Hurley's great services to his country as a soldier and diplomat in the First World War, and as a special representative of former President Roosevelt in the Asiatic area in this war, in the performance of which mission he narrowly missed death on more than one occasion, his detractors are undertaking to flyspeck him and whistle him down the wind. They call him a cowboy diplomat. Well, he was a cowboy when a young man—and it is my opinion that 90 percent of the decent people of this country will say to Pat Hurley, "Ride 'em, Cowboy; ride 'em."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the proposed bill amending the Second War Powers Act of 1942. I wish to commend the committee for the careful study it has given this matter. I desire to confine my remarks to title III of the original war powers bill which deals with priorities powers.

I am happy to note that the committee has fixed the termination of this section for June 30, 1946. This means that the power of the Government to allocate materials and to ration scarce articles will expire on that date. I believe the committee has very wisely set this date and in so doing is now serving notice on the departments and agencies engaged in rationing and allocating that they can now make their plans to quit business at the close of next June.

The American people have been asking for some time just when these war programs would end. There has been considerable speculation as to just how long they would be continued. In some quarters we hear the rumor that some of these agencies would like to perpetuate themselves, and not long ago Mr. Bowles, OPA Administrator, told a congressional committee that it would be impossible to end price control next year.

It is reassuring to know that the Committee on the Judiciary has taken a different attitude, and is now informing the House that after careful consideration it is of the opinion that these controls can be removed next year. The Price Control Act expires on June 30, which is the same date fixed for the end of the rationing and allocation authority. I think it is well that the committee decided that both should be abolished at the same time.

By the passage of this bill today the House is announcing that on June 30, 1946, we will return to the American way of doing business in this country. I am sure that everyone believing in free enterprise will rejoice that the end of the wartime controls is only a little more than 6 months away.

While on this subject of rationing, I wish to call attention just briefly to the sugar situation. It has been announced on this floor within the past few days that the supply of sugar for 1946 will be about 1,500,000 tons greater than in 1945. Our sugar-beet crop was increased this year, there will be more cane sugar produced in this country, and we can expect increased imports from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and certainly some amount from the Philippines. In view of this favorable outlook surely the Department of Agriculture should now announce a new rationing program for the next 6 months, so that increased amounts may be made available for domestic and industrial use.

I have received several appeals from bakeries within the past few days who state they cannot continue in business on the present allocation of sugar they are receiving. Already many of these bakeries in my district are closing. I wish to quote from a wire received just last week from the chamber of commerce at La Junta, Colo.:

A. N. Phillips, operating the only two bakeries in La Junta, forced to close today account Denver Office Industrial Users, OPA, refusal to consider troop-train demands for

bakery goods upsetting civilian requirements for bakery sugar. Local operator and honest citizens striving to supply demand seriously impeded by asinine rulings. Ernestly seek your assistance to help tide us over this emergency.

I took this matter up with the OPA in both Washington and Denver, but was advised nothing could be done until December 15. In the meantime these two bakeries are closed, as are many others. There is a suspicion that there is more sugar available than is being announced, and surely now is the time for these allocations to be revised and adjusted. I know of some bakeries who close 2 days each week because they do not have sufficient sugar. The situation is truly desperate.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is refreshing to have this legislation here today and to know that we now see the end of these wartime controls. I again congratulate the chairman and every member of the committee. I feel this is the greatest step we have yet taken in our reconversion program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) title II of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following section:

"SEC. 202. The authority to acquire property, or any use thereof or interest therein, granted by section 2 of such act of July 2, 1917, shall not be exercised after the date upon which this section becomes effective."

(b) Title IX of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is hereby repealed.

(c) Title XI of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following section:

"SEC. 1107. On and after January 1, 1946, the authority granted by this title shall be exercised only for the benefit of personnel of the armed forces of the United States stationed abroad."

(d) Title XII of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended by substituting the date "December 31, 1945" for the date "December 31, 1946" wherever the later date appears in such title.

(e) Section 1501 of title XV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1501. Titles I to V, inclusive, and titles VII, XI, and XIV of this act, and the amendments to existing law made by any such title, shall remain in force only until June 30, 1946, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate, and after such amendments cease to be in force any provision of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted; but court proceedings brought under any such title shall not abate by reason of the termination hereunder of such title."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I have just heard read the message which came from the President of the United States this morning. I would be remiss in my duty to the people I represent if I did not now make comment thereon.

It is my considered judgment that this message constitutes one of the most serious blows against the interests of the working people, at a time which can properly be described as the most critical period for labor in this country.

The message makes certain recommendations. One of the recommendations that has been made restricts labor from exercising its fundamental right, the right not to work, which is the only factor that labor has at its disposal in order to establish equality in bargaining. If the President's recommendation is accepted, this right will be seriously circumscribed.

If the President's recommendations were adopted it would mean that in the basic industries of this country labor would be placed at a tremendous disadvantage. We must bear in mind that in bargaining, labor is powerless unless it is in a position free and untrammeled to refuse to work at time when it believes it necessary to refuse to work. To cut that right down, to restrict it, means in effect depriving labor of the right to strike. The right to strike in and of itself is meaningless unless labor has the right to say when it can strike. If we take from labor the right to decide when it can strike we are virtually taking away from labor the right to strike in that we thereby destroy the effectiveness of striking. Take the right to strike away from labor by destroying the effectiveness of this right and labor is no longer free in these United States. Thus labor is placed on an unequal basis in bargaining with industry.

When I use the word "unfair" in connection with the President's recommendations, it is an understatement; these recommendations are most damaging to labor at this time.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman agrees that one of the greatest needs of the country today and for the next 9 to 12 months if we are to prevent inflation is production.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Correct.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman has been interested I believe, as I and many others have been, in preventing inflation. The President has stated to the Congress, and all of us I am sure realize and did several days ago that the Management-Labor Conference has failed to produce any agreement. The President has made these recommendations.

Personally, I feel that his message was very constructive and that if we have legislation within the next few days to put those recommendations into effect we can at least stave off inflation that will be as ruinous to labor as to everybody else. I wonder if the gentleman has any alternative suggestion in view of the failure of the Management-Labor Conference?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; definitely. First of all let me answer the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York may proceed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In answer to the gentleman from Tennessee, let me say that any inflationary condition is not going to be produced by labor in asking for a 30-percent increase. As the gentleman knows, with the doing away with overtime and time and a half pay the take-home pay of labor has been reduced by 30 percent, while at the same time the gentleman himself, being a student of prices and price control, must admit that prices have increased. Therefore, labor's demand for an increase is not inflationary. So you cannot get away from that proposition.

As to the exercise of the right to strike, labor does not want to strike, workingmen do not want to strike. It means loss of pay to them, it means hardships to their families. If anybody in this House feels that the average worker or organized labor wants to strike just for the fun of it, I want to assure him that that is not so at all. But when you have organizations like GM or Steel which take a position that they are not going to give any increase, and take the position they are not going to negotiate, what else would you want labor to do? Would you want labor to submit, to commit suicide, to have the take-home pay of American workers cut down to the bone?

You ask, What solution is there? Of course, there is a solution; and I was very disappointed that the President did not recommend that solution, which is to enforce the National Labor Relations Act and compel organizations like GM and Steel to enter into collective bargaining. Certainly, no one can quarrel with that. That is the law. Why not enforce it?

But with the President's recommendation, what happens? Here you have GM and Steel that have declared ruthless warfare on labor. There is not a word of condemnation of them in this message. What is wrong? This message favors them. Not only does it call for this repressive legislation—and that is what it does—not only does it call for legislation that will give tremendous advantage to industry against labor, but in the existing GM situation the President asks for what the company has been requesting; that is, to have the men return to work when their staying away from work is the only power they have to enforce collective bargaining. Strategically, it is an advantage to GM for the President to ask the workers to return to work at this time when GM has repeatedly refused to enter into a realistic discussion of the merits of the dispute by opening its books.

Mr. Chairman, we find industry bloated with profits. We find it is the beneficiary of tax legislation which has benefited it to a tremendous extent. We

find labor's income being cut down daily. Labor expected that in this dangerous period it would receive from the President that aid which labor has justly earned. Instead, we do not even get neutrality. We get a proposal which is anti-labor in character, a proposal which would deprive labor of its only weapon with which it can enforce collective bargaining, a proposal which is one-sided, on the side of industry, despite the fact that it has been industry's greed which has held up the reconversion program.

These are facts that have to be faced. We will have to face them within the next week or so. Let us face them in fairness and justice to the men who toil, to the men whose take-home pay has been cut to the extent that the average housewife of the American worker can no longer meet her budget. Now, no one can any longer dodge this issue. Let us face it squarely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in his criticism of the President's message suggesting needed legislation affecting industrial disputes just read to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is in error on two fundamental propositions, as a matter of fact, on three. In the first place the message of the President does not ask the employes to forego the right to strike. There is no such statement in the message which I hold in my hand. Perhaps the gentleman referred to the statement that strikes and lock-outs be postponed.

The President asks that strikes and lock-outs be postponed for 30 days. Certainly there is nothing unreasonable in asking the postponement of a strike which vitally affects the public interest; especially true is it when we are engaged in an attempt to bring about reconversion, prevent unemployment.

In the second place, the gentleman says that the take-home wage has been reduced. The purchasing power of the take-home wage has not been reduced. It is $290 more than it was in 1929, and all you need to do is look at the figures and read the articles appearing in last week's United States News.

There you will find a comparison of the purchasing power of the take-home wage of the average American worker. The statement shows that, in 1929, the average income of the working United States citizen, adjusted for taxes and living costs, would purchase $1,331 worth of the things that make up the average living.

In 1933, he received an income which would purchase but $1,256 worth of food, merchandise and other things which went into the cost of living. In 1939, the average income, figured on the same basis, was $1,435, while in 1945, it was $1,603—a 27 percent increase above the purchasing value of the average income of the worker in 1933, and of almost 12 percent above that which the average worker could purchase in 1939.

Again the gentleman said: "Why not bargain?" He said that General Motors has refused to bargain. I am sorry; but the gentleman is again in error. General Motors has not refused to bargain. The only thing that it refused to do was to discuss the right of the employees to have access to the company's books. Under no American theory is the right of an employee to inspect an employers books the subject of investigation under collective bargaining. The UAW-CIO asked General Motors to negotiate—and think of this—the question of the unlawfulness of a picket line engaged in lawlessness and violence. The press throughout the country, and eye-witnesses on the spot, show that the pickets are acting in violation of a criminal statute of the State of Michigan. I know of no reason why that right should be negotiated, but General Motors said it was willing to discuss it.

Saturday, Wilson, of General Motors, proposed to Thomas and to Reuther, representatives of the UAW-CIO, that the strikers go back to work in the parts plants supplying not General Motors—oh, no—supplying Chrysler and Ford, and Thomas, the president of the UAW-CIO, advised the workers to do it. Reuther, who is negotiating for the UAW-CIO, said that it was a most generous offer. He appeared surprised that General Motors could be so generous—it was a turning of the other cheek—and he advocated the opening of the plants at Flint. What happened? The UAW-CIO council, representing some forty or sixty thousand workers of the Flint local, said, "No; we will not open those plants. We will not even enable the competitors"—think of it—"the competitors of General Motors to make automobiles." And yet these gentlemen talk about the refusal of General Motors to negotiate. The only fault I can find with the President's message is that it does not go quite far enough. It does not suggest that when this Congress passes legislation, as it will be forced to do by public sentiment, that the Congress of the United States require the unions and the members of the unions to assume and exercise a degree of responsibility equal to the power which has been given them. Why not make them responsible for the damage they do? Why not make them comply with the contracts that they make when they enter into and complete their negotiations?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman from Michigan explain what information General Motors' books would disclose over and beyond that which is revealed by the annual statement to its stockholders?

Mr. HOFFMAN. None at all. Of course, wages are not fixed by the fact that a company makes or does not make a profit. If the company sustains a loss, under the American way of doing business, the company must pay at least a minimum wage, even though it sustains a loss which in the end may put it out of business.

And why negotiate unless the bargaining representatives of the union have authority to bind the union and its members?

BARGAINING COLLECTIVELY FOR WHOM?

UAW-CIO, through Thomas and Reuther, has been insisting that the Government force General Motors to come to Washington to bargain collectively and settle the dispute over its demand that the selling price of automobiles be held at the 1942 level; that the company open its books to inspection and that a 30 percent wage increase be granted.

The company expressed its willingness to negotiate the wage issue, but refused to either open its books or concede UAW-CIO's right to fix the prices of its products. The result was a deadlock.

Then came UAW-CIO's demand that the Government compel General Motors to again negotiate. This was followed by General Motors' reply that the parties should first negotiate the question of illegal picketing and the imprisoning of company clerical employees in the plant.

Still later, Wilson, president of General Motors, suggested to Thomas, president of UAW-CIO, that all General Motors' plants making parts and accessories for General Motors' competitors, including Ford and Chrysler, be reopened and supply those competitors, so they could continue business.

Reuther characterized the offer as very generous, advocated its acceptance, but said that it must be passed upon by the local unions in the parts plants.

This morning's press carries the information that the CIO Industrial Union Council at Flint, where 42,000 General Motors' employees are on strike, rejected the plan, refused to make the parts necessary to enable other companies to turn out automobiles, even though there is no strike against those companies.

According to the press, the Flint union said the plan could, and I quote, "only lead to possible rioting and bloodshed."

Can it be possible that the union Council meant that, if the workers, the employees, went back to work in a plant owned by General Motors, even though the purpose was only to keep other union members working in Ford and Chrysler, it would cause rioting and the beating up of its own members?

The Flint union further said in a telegram to Thomas, the UAW-CIO president, that—

> Our plant is shut down 100 percent and we intend to keep it down 100 percent until our just demands are won.

Can it be possible that the law-enforcing authorities of Michigan will permit the use of violence by these pickets, who are acting in violation of a Michigan statute and of a request by their own international union officers that employees be permitted to operate these factories?

Does not the foregoing demonstrate the difficulty of bargaining collectively under the present National Labor Relations Act?

Apparently, Thomas and Reuther have been authorized by the UAW-CIO to negotiate with General Motors, but when a suggestion agreeable to them comes from General Motors, the local at Flint turns it down.

Should there not be some provision of law which makes binding upon unions and the members of the unions any agreement entered into by their legally authorized bargaining representatives?

Why a contract if it is not to be kept by the union and by its members? Why a contract if a violation of it does not make the violators responsible for the injury and damage growing out of the violation?

The following are press accounts of the later developments in the UAW-CIO-GM dispute:

GM PLAN ACCEPTED BY CIO—AGREE TO TURN OUT PARTS FOR FIRM'S RIVALS—UNION STANDS PAT ON WAGE DEMAND

DETROIT, MICH., December 1.—Striking CIO United Automobile workers agreed today to relax their strike against General Motors Corporation to permit production of parts for competitors of the giant automotive concern.

A General Motors spokesman said the action might result in partial resumption of work in nearly half the corporation's plants.

The unprecedented agreement to permit some of the striking UAW-CIO members to produce car parts needed by GM rivals came from R. J. Thomas, union president, in response to a proposal yesterday by General Motors President C. E. Wilson.

CALLS OFFER GENEROUS

In a letter Thomas told Wilson the offer was "generous" and came as a "welcome surprise," but he expressed belief there are "only one or two items on which GM production is an essential part of the picture for other manufacturers."

"I shall, of course, accept the offer," Thomas wrote.

His letter gave no indication, however, of any retreat from the union's wage demands which Wilson has assailed as "unreasonable."

Discussing the possibility that strikers returning to work on parts output might be asked to contribute portions of their pay to the union strike funds, a spokesman at international UAW-CIO headquarters said such a decision would be left to the local unions involved. He expressed belief some locals would take such action.

Noting that automobile industry policy is "to have at least two suppliers and preferably more for each part or component," Thomas said he would seek to ascertain the dependence of other manufacturers on GM production, and the size of present stock piles.

FORTY THOUSAND PARTS WORKERS

After that, the Thomas letter said, the international union will "lay the facts before the various GM local unions which may be involved." Thomas said he would communicate again with Wilson "as soon as the necessary data has been collected and analyzed."

Principal General Motors parts plants, a corporation spokesman said, employed more than 40,000 of the 175,000 workers now on strike in more than 70 factories. How many of these would be affected by any partial resumption of production, he said, was impossible to estimate at present. Approximately 50 percent of GM plants make parts in varying quantity.

The AC spark-plug plant at Flint, Mich., produces, in addition to plugs, fuel pumps which the spokesman said were used by about 90 percent of the motor-car industry. It employs nearly 10,000 workers.

Other large parts producers in GM include the Delco-Ray and guide lamp units at Anderson, Ind., producing generators, starters, and head lamps; the malleable plant making camshafts at Saginaw, Mich.; the New Departure unit at Bristol, Conn., producing bearings; two Hyatt roller-bearing plants in New Jersey, and the Harrison Radiator division at Lockport, N. Y.

FIRST SIGN OF BREAK

The Wilson-Thomas agreement was the first indication of a break in the shut-down that spread through the Nation's GM plants when the UAW-CIO struck November 21 to enforce demands for a 30-percent wage increase within the corporation's present price structure.

Production of parts for competing manufacturers would coincide with the union's strike strategy of keeping other producers going while shutting down GM operations. On the other hand, return of some strikers to jobs might result in individual situations where pickets would watch their fellow unionists reentering struck plants.

Wilson, who made the parts production offer to the union last night, expressed belief it was "very unfair" for General Motors to be singled out for a "labor blockade," and added, "nevertheless, it has always been our principle to take care of our customers if there was any possible way to do it."

UNION'S CHIEF WON'T ORDER ANY WORKERS BACK TO JOBS—LOCALS MUST DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES ON REOPENING GM PARTS PLANTS, THOMAS SAYS

DETROIT, December 2.—Faced with a membership rebellion against an agreement with General Motors for manufacture of parts at eight plants while the main GM strike remains in progress, President R. J. Thomas, of the United Automobile Workers, said tonight he had no intention of arbitrarily ordering the men back to work.

The CIO's industrial union council at Flint, Mich., where 42,000 GM employees are on strike, denounced the agreement to permit parts manufacture.

The Flint union council condemned the plan as "morale destroying" and said it could "only lead to possible rioting and bloodshed." This ruled out any chance of work being restored at the key AC spark-plug plant, providing fuel pumps for several car companies outside the General Motors system.

ANOTHER LOCAL TO MARK TIME

"Our plant (AC) is shut down 100 percent, and we intend to keep it down 100 percent until our just demands are won," said a telegram to Thomas.

At the same time, workers at the Harrison Radiator Co. plant, Lockport, N. Y., decided to stay on strike until the situation has been clarified.

The agreement, proposed by President C. E. Wilson, of GM, to permit production of key supplies for other automobile manufacturers, had been tentatively accepted by Thomas.

However, rebellion flared among the strikers themselves against this development, leading Thomas to state tonight that the international union has "no intention of arbitrarily and immediately ordering strikers back to work in the General Motors parts plants."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I do it for this purpose: We are considering now, and are close to a vote on the Second War Powers Act. This discussion is getting entirely away from the bill. There have been two speeches made now with reference to the President's message. I regard it as what I think is my right, and probably my duty, to make objection to a discussion that gets us entirely away from the provisions of the bill. I hope the gentlemen who have something further to say with regard to the President's message will defer that discussion until we can get through with the business at hand. In addition to that, we have another bill, a very important bill, the First War Powers Act, which is pending, and I understand it has been arranged to give the Committee an opportunity to present that bill.

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this bill do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TARVER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 426, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an extract from a report.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the report of the staff of the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] entitled "There Is Work To Be Done" appearing in the December issue of the Young Democrat, the official organ of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include articles from newspapers and letters.

AMENDING THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 428 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4571) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the discussion which was taking place on the floor of the House a while ago was cut off. I think it is only fair that there be some discussion on this matter. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia very much indeed. I wanted very much to speak at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan, because I found myself in disagreement with both of them to a considerable extent.

On last Thursday I addressed the House and pointed out that in my judgment the Labor-Management Conference could be saved only by a miracle. I said that the hope of management and labor both lay in their ability to mutually agree on at least certain fundamentals, and that in the absence of a sufficient will on the part of both parties to bring that about the responsibility for the protection of the public interest inevitably passed to the Government and would have to be exercised.

I said I was fearful that in an attempt to exercise that power, mistakes would be made by Congress as they have been in the past. But I said I believed that the temper of the American people today was such as to insist upon a feeling of reasonable security with regard to the orderly settlement of industrial controversies in the Nation and that I was fearful, that unless some constructive measure was taken, there would begin a spread abroad in the country a general attitude which I described as dangerous. This is an attitude insisting upon a greater and greater exercise of governmental power, which in turn can lead to a demand for a strong man in the Government who might be able then to straighten all these things out by means of force. Such a philosophy is, above all things, to be avoided. So I appealed at that time for the setting up of fact-finding bodies, and I quoted from the National Catholic Welfare Conference and from the Federal Council of Churches and from the corresponding organization among the Jewish churches, recommendations made to the Labor-Management Conference, in order that the business and interest of the public might be served at the point where it needs to be served, namely, at that point where the facts with regard to these disputes are to be determined and found out and laid before the Nation. Therefore, it is no wonder that I feel that the message of the President, coming as it did on the very heels of the substantial failure of the Labor-Management Conference was a message well-timed, and I believe, on the whole, well-taken. I was glad to hear it read today.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I call the gentleman's attention to the CIO news of this morning, which has a picture of some strikers and the legend "UAW-CIO President R. J. Thomas said the strikers' spirit all over the United States is the highest he has seen." I want to point out that the mail from my district does not indicate that the spirit of the people who want to buy automobiles is correspondingly high. I wonder if that is not the gentleman's view.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think there is deep disturbance in the minds of many people. They are not people who are hostile to labor or management. They are simply citizens of the country. I would heartily agree, and I would want to preface what I have to say further by saying that wage increases are called for. It is not true, as the gentleman from Michigan contended, that take-home pay has not been cut. It has been cut. Wage increases are necessary if the standards of living and buying power of our people are not to suffer. The question is what the amount of this wage increase ought to be and what it can be. That is where all the difficulty arises, of course. I hold no brief for an employer company that refuses to sit down and talk things over with the workers. I have felt frankly that some of the employers, including General Motors, have been guilty, or negligent at least, in this respect. Sometimes labor has been the same way. I would like to point out that the thing most to be desired by anybody really anxious to find a solution to this problem is that the facts should be presented and presented fairly and justly. I see no reason why the books of the company should not be known about. I believe they ought to be gone into among other things with regard to these controversies by such bodies as the President has proposed.

I believe the President's proposal is an attempt to constructively deal with this problem. I think some other proposals that are before us are not in that category. For example, it seems to me the proposal coming from the Committee on Military Affairs at the present time would be disastrous if enacted, because I think it would accomplish exactly the opposite purpose that it is calculated to accomplish. Under its provisions contracts with a no-strike clause just would not be signed at all, I believe.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is not that proposal one to socialize labor without socializing capital, that is, the proposal to pass this antilabor legislation and put it under the control of the courts?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The trouble with the Arends amendment is that it proposes a penalty against labor without a finding as to who caused the work stoppages that might have taken place; without any finding as to whether it might have been the fault of the employer that it took place.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Virginia very much.

Certainly no one, least of all myself, will defend the breaking of a contract. The problem, however, is to find a fair and just way of preventing it. Any measure seeking to protect the validity of contracts and the punishment of anybody for violation of contracts, certainly should work in even-handed fashion, both with regard to employer and worker. Certainly there should be required a finding of fact by an impartial body as to whose fault has caused a strike to take place or any other contract violation for that matter. But the Arends amendment does not contain any such provision. I agree no contract should be able to be violated with impunity, but a better answer than the Arends amendment will have to be found if we are to accomplish anything. The suggestion of the President with regard to this all-important question is a fundamental one, and to my mind, is fair and just. I do not agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said in criticism of it. That proposal should be taken up in earnest by the Congress. There are problems and difficulties in the way but the President is right that constructive action is demanded and that it must not be coercive or punitive against either side but calculated instead to further encourage and protect collective bargaining. I would earnestly hope that some of the other legislation that is being pressed will not be passed, and that we can attack the problem along the lines of the President's suggestion. Certain it is that labor does not want to strike, as the gentleman from New York said. Certain it is also that management does not want stoppages. But it also has turned out to be true that on both sides there has been a stubbornness, an unwillingness in some instances to yield, an unwillingness to place the public's interest in the paramount position where it should be placed. I believe the suggestions of the President in his message today are altogether proper and that this should be the No. 1 thing on the program in this field.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. After reading the message carefully, if the determination or recommendation of the fact-finding body is made, neither party need accept it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is quite true.

Mr. GIFFORD. Then, of what value is this?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The value is that you place the case before

the American people, and, ultimately, the most powerful factor in any of these controversies is the factor of public opinion.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have already heard from my people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it entirely appropriate, in the light of the President's message on labor legislation, that we should discuss the questions there raised, particularly as several speeches have already been made on the subject.

For my part, I think the President's action in sending a message to Congress asking for legislation on this subject was a courageous act, and that it will meet with the approval of 90 percent of the American people. I want to congratulate him upon having done so.

I might remind this House, however, that just 4 years ago today, on December 3, 1941, this House passed an act which contained the very things that the President now, after 4 years, is asking for. It was modeled on the Railway Labor Act—that is, the mediation provisions of it. If you want to carry out the President's message, all you need do is go back to the bill that the House passed in December 1941, and take the mediation provisions out of that bill, and such other provisions as the House may desire, and your legislation is already drafted and has been previously approved by this House.

The thing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and those who entertain similar sentiments seem to overlook is that there are some superior and paramount rights in the American people on this subject of the stoppages of production of essential goods to keep them clothed, keep them warm, and keep them traveling. The gentleman takes the position that nothing must be done unless it meets with the approval of organized labor, irrespective of how much it may adversely affect the public interest of a vast majority of the people of this country.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time. I heard the gentleman call this proposal of the President antilabor.

Anybody who has read the President's message will know that what he recommends is a duplication of the Railway Labor Act, the magna carta of railway labor, the first great step ever taken in this country for the protection of labor, the act of Congress which is so much in the hearts of railway labor that they do not want any amendments to it, the act which has been held for 25 years as a successful piece of legislation in the interest of organized labor. And the gentleman from New York stands here and accuses the President of the United States of proposing antilabor legislation when all he proposes is that we parallel the Railway Labor Act so far as it will conform to the situation with respect to industrial labor.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I decline to yield at this time.

We all know that there is wrong on both sides, we know that there are abuses in industry and we know that there are abuses in labor. I think we ought to approach the subject with a view of trying to work out something that as nearly as possible is commensurate with the rights of labor and commensurate with the rights of industry, but commensurate also with the paramount rights of the American people to have the production of the things that are essential to their comfort, to their welfare, and to the very economic existence of this Nation. I have therefore, since receiving the President's message, introduced a resolution to set up a joint committee of the two Houses that will consider this message, consider and confer with organized labor and with organized industry and try and report to their respective Houses some legislation that may have some chance of getting through. You gentlemen of the House know what has been our experience with legislation—because in the past we have approved it in this body only to have it killed in the Senate. I believe a joint committee of both Houses, which will approach this subject seriously and earnestly and with a desire to be fair to both sides, may arrive at a conclusion and arrive at it quickly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from California, I believe, was mistaken in his facts when he said that General Motors had been arbitrary in refusing to consider any proposition. As I understand it, General Motors said: "We can give you certain wage increases and we will give you certain wage increases." But when labor sits down and says: "We must have 30 percent and we will not take anything else," I do not see what there was for General Motors to talk about.

Some criticism has been made about the proposal that labor should conform to the contracts it makes.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will not yield at this time. Excuse me, please.

Industry has to conform to its contracts. Your Government, under the National Labor Relations Act, required industry to bargain. Requires industry to do it as matter of law, and when they have bargained your Government compels industry to sign a written contract; and every dollar's worth of machinery, every dollar in the bank, every asset of that corporation stands behind that contract. Why should not something stand behind the other party to that contract, organized labor? When somebody will answer that question intelligently, I will be glad to listen to him. Why, why should not a labor union be equally responsible for its contract?

I have on my desk, taking the automotive industry, where the crisis is today, I have on my desk an analysis of strikes that took place in 3 months this summer in the automotive industry and strikes that were in violation of contracts not to strike. Have you any idea how many strikes there were? I do not remember the exact figure, but in 3 months there were over 400 strikes in the automotive industry and in violation of contracts. Can anybody see any sense in that from the standpoint of Government, labor, industry, or the American people? If you do I would like to hear from you.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to say to the gentleman, in answer to his question, that I would say this has to be an even proposition on both sides of the question with regard to these contracts, and I think it most important that a determination of the cause of such an action should be made by some impartial body, otherwise you will put into the employers hand an absolute power to provoke a strike, in which event there is automatically assessed against the worker or his organization a certain penalty which does not seem to me to be equitable.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It seems to me that the gentleman proceeds on the premise that the responsibility for these industrial disputes is to be placed at the doorstep of labor. The gentleman entirely neglects the responsibility on the part of industry for having provoked these industrial disputes. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have listened to that bunk for a long time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let me ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I can answer but one question at a time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is the gentleman in favor of the President's proposal?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I have declined to yield to the gentleman further.

I have listened to that bunk a thousand times, that whenever there is a strike it never is the fault of labor, that industry always provokes it. I followed right closely and with grave apprehension the newspaper accounts leading up to General Motors strike. There was not anything there that looked like General Motors was promoting a strike. It looked to me like Reuther was promoting the strike against the wishes of the president of his own union, and apparently against the wishes of more than a majority of his workers, because only about 70,000 workers voted for a strike, while there are 350,000 employees. It does not look, in that instance at least, like industry had provoked the strike.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Will the gentleman tell us how many voted against the strike as compared with the 70,000 who voted for it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know; but I do know that a very small minority of the workers voted for a strike.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a striking thing in most labor disputes, and I have been through four of them, that the real issues in dispute are very narrow, and if you can narrow them down to the real facts in dispute you have a basis for compromise?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is true, and I think the proposal suggested by the President, that is, mediation of these matters, will go a long way toward settling strikes. I repeat again that the proposal of the President is that we should do everything to narrow these things down by mediation and through voluntary arbitration, if possible. Nobody can make the charge that that is antilabor legislation because it is the very pattern under which the Railway Labor Act has worked so satisfactorily for the last two decades, and we have had no strikes on the railroads.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In this vote to strike in the motor plants only about 20 percent of the workers actually voted. Of course, of those 20 percent, 80 percent or more voted to strike.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think about 25 percent voted, but only 19 percent voted to strike. There were 79 percent who apparently were opposed to striking.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the gentleman see any difference in the breaching of a contract between industry and labor and the breaching of any other contract? If industry breaches the contract, it is responsible, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from California has never answered the question whether he approves of labor breaking its contract.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think the gentleman from California was called on to answer the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. He did not answer it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not approve of anyone breaking a contract.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why does not the gentleman say so, then, and not be one-sided about it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did say so in a speech I made the other day, and I will say it now or any other time the gentleman wants me to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to hear the gentleman say so now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this debate on the majority side attacking and defending the President's labor message which was read to us a few minutes ago is most interesting. It is especially interesting because some of those who have for the last few years defended all President's messages in all kind of weather and under all kinds of circumstances today are condemning the President's labor policy in very strong terms, even accusing him of being unfair to labor. If this tempo continues, he may possibly be called a labor baiter.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to enter into this Democratic quarrel. It does seem strange to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] assailing a New Deal President and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] defending him. Surely there is a place for the minority in this body just as there is in the British Parliament, and as one of "His Majesty's most loyal opposition," I am not going to discuss his message until I have at least read it carefully. On two occasions in the last 10 days I have addressed the House, urging the President to come out courageously, stating his position on the present strike situation. I am glad for his message. I hope it suggests the solution. The country now awaits the next step, which is implementing legislation introduced and supported by the majority leadership. Talk without action is of no avail.

Mr. Speaker, may we now get to the business of the day? There has not been a word said in debate so far about the business now before the House, which is an amendment to the First War Powers Act. It has the unanimous approval of the committee reporting it. I think it is advisable in every sense of the word. I do not believe there will be any opposition. However, so far as the rule is concerned, we have no further requests for time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for calling attention to what is before us, which is the consideration of a rule that will make an important bill in order, which I feel should pass. It comes before us with a unanimous report, and consequently I shall not take up any time on the rule, feeling that it should be adopted.

But, in view of what has been said, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], let me say that I have been a friend of labor during all my years of service here. I have implicit confidence that the President is also interested in the cause of labor, but at the same time he is interested in the welfare of the Nation, and because he is interested in the entire Nation he is also interested in labor as well as industry. He is striving to bring about an adjustment of differences that exist between labor on the one hand and industry on the other.

The gentleman from Virginia would place the responsibility for strikes on organized labor. He dislikes to hear that industry is responsible at times for refusing to meet with labor and to adjust any differences in their just claims. Personally I regret that the gentleman from New York has placed an unfriendly construction on the message of the President. I do not know whether there is anything in the message that would be detrimental to labor. I did not have an opportunity to read it, but, knowing the President as well as I do, I know that he does not possibly intend to recommend any action that may be unfriendly to the cause of organized labor; that his main interest is in the welfare of the Nation, in the interest of all the people, which, as I have stated, is bound to be in the interest of organized labor as well.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It is not a question of the gentleman's intent and it is not a question of bad faith; nothing like that is involved. What is involved here is a specific recommendation that has been made to Congress. I think it should be judged on its merits; that is all.

Mr. SABATH. What are the recommendations? I have not read the message.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The message is not a long one. I am sure the gentleman will have an opportunity to read it. I also have every confidence in the belief that when the gentleman does read the message he will agree with my interpretation of it because he has always stood by labor.

Mr. SABATH. My record for labor needs no defense. I appreciate that the gentleman from New York does not question my sincerity and friendship for labor, and surely I do not question his, but is it not possible that he has judged a little too harshly and has not made allowance for the fervent hope and aim of the President to eliminate strife between industry and labor, and to compel industry as well as labor to amicably adjust any differences to the best interest of the country. I would not defend the President today, for I do not think he needs any defense at my hands or the hands of anyone else, because I know so well that he is friendly to labor and that no act of his can be properly construed as unfriendly. He may advocate a conference or an organization that will bring about the elimination of strikes, but that is bound to be in the interest of labor, as the gentleman himself states. I do not know to what extent we can, but I hope we will bring about the establishment of an organization and procedure that will result in the elimination of strikes, because they affect both labor and industry.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that industry more so than labor is responsible for the strikes, the reason being that many manufacturers have derived such large profits in 1945 that they welcome and look for an "out" in not continuing to produce because to do so would increase their income and the payment of larger taxes. I charge that they are deliberately withholding production until 1946 when they will not be subject to the payment of excess-profits taxes. They have actually instigated and are responsible for many of the walk-outs and strikes which should be properly designated as "lock-outs" against labor. Yes, I know personally and, if need be, I can name several manufacturers who admitted and boasted to

me of their action in this respect, who have stated to me: "Why should we make more money so that we will be obliged to pay larger taxes. This will give us an opportunity to bring some of the laborites to their senses." Meaning thereby to force them to accept a lower wage.

May I say that the President's message should satisfy the gentlemen who have endeavored to force through such unfair antilabor legislation as the May-Smith bill and the Hobbs bill and that opportunity to bring about the enactment of sane legislation on this matter of such vital importance to the welfare of our country should be afforded.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4571) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4571, with Mr. COFFEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary, and it has the approval of the Treasury Department, the War Department, the State Department, and the Department of Justice, also the office of Alien Property Custodian.

In a word, it seeks to empower the Alien Property Custodian to return property to friendly aliens, primarily aliens of such countries as Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Greece, the Netherlands, Norway, and Poland.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. If a German citizen should have been interned in a place like Bermuda and had some property that was taken over by the Alien Property Custodian, could he get it back?

Mr. CELLER. This bill does not primarily concern the property of nationals of Germany, Japan, Italy, Hungary, or Rumania; that is, those countries which declared war against the United States. In fact, I doubt if there was any case of a German residing in Bermuda whose property was taken. There may have been. I do not know. The only Germans, in general, whose property was taken were those of, and in, Germany or in occupied territory, in addition to property of Germans interned in this country.

Mr. BECKWORTH. But you are not sure of that?

Mr. CELLER. I am quite sure about it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. You are quite sure about it? If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask this further question. Not long ago I wrote a letter to the Alien Property Custodian. The letter was written on November 13, 1945. I asked him if a German citizen could recover property under this bill. Here is what he said:

> The only German citizens who would benefit under the bill would be those continuously resident in and loyal to the United States since before Pearl Harbor, in the event any of their property had been mistakenly vested.

Mr. CELLER. If a German national or Japanese national was interned in this country, he must have been interned because he was guilty of subversive activities or was guilty of something that would be akin to aiding the enemy. Therefore, the Alien Property Custodian, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, had the right to seize the internee's property. If that internee, with the consent of the War Department, can prove that he is purged of all of his sins, as it were, then the Alien Property Custodian would have the right in the interest of the United States, after satisfying the many formalities, to return that property to that German national or that internee.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is my point. Actually, he could get it back. The German citizen could get the property back.

Mr. CELLER. That is, the internee in this country, if he purged himself and it was in the interests of the United States to return the property.

Mr. BECKWORTH. If he is in this country?

Mr. CELLER. That is right. But the internee, because of his sins, would not be one likely to get his property back because, first, the War Department I am sure would not consent nor would the Alien Property Custodian consent.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to read just a little more of this letter because it is right on that same point:

> Citizens of Austria——

You remember we were at war with Austria.

Mr. CELLER. No; the citizens of Austria were deemed nonhostile.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We were once at war with them; Hitler had taken them over. We were at war with them, were we not?

Mr. CELLER. You see, you must understand that an alien of a friendly nation might become under the Trading With the Enemy Act definitions one whose properties could be seized by the Alien Property Custodian for protective purposes. For example, we seized, or rather the Alien Property Custodian seized the property of Dutch nationals and French nationals and Polish nationals, though we were not at war with those countries of which they were nationals. But we seized the properties of such nationals in order that the properties would be kept from Axis control.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right.

Mr. CELLER. They were seized for what we called protective purposes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I would like to finish reading from this letter:

> Citizens of Austria, Norway, France, Luxemburg, or Denmark may also benefit under the bill only if the return of their property would be in the interest of the United States under the provision noted.

Therefore, they could get the property back.

Mr. CELLER. They could get the property back if they were nationals of Austria.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is my point.

Mr. CELLER. That is so because Austria was not a country with which we were at war except, you might say, technically, because after the anschluss Austria became technically a part of Germany.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is my point.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say with reference to the Austrian question, in relation to alien property, that when there was a registration of aliens it was recognized it would be wrong to classify as a German a person of Austrian birth who was in the United States. I took the matter up and they were permitted to register as Austrians. I took the matter up also with the selective-service officials because I felt it was unfair to have those people subjected to being classified as Germans when their country to all practical purposes had been overrun. I felt they should be classified as Austrians. That was permitted, as I remember, both in the case of registration of aliens and also in the operation of the Selective Service Act. Is my recollection correct?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the first place, I would like to ask the gentleman whether this legislation has any effect at all upon the question of the return of property to people who were either German citizens or who were acting as agents for German companies.

Mr. CELLER. No. If they were German nationals, primarily this bill does not permit the return of property to those German nationals or to corporations that were originally formed in Germany. As I mentioned a moment ago, there are cases where Germans in this country had their property seized. On one or two occasions they were seized by mistake. They were enemy aliens in this country. Where the property was seized and there was no mistake, and they have indicated that they were innocent of all enemy taint, and it is to the national interest to return that property, then the Alien Property Custodian would have the discretionary power to return that property.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What about the case of an individual who was found to be holding on behalf of a huge German corporation in this country a considerable block of stock in a company operating in the United States, and judged to be a subsidiary of that German corporation? Will this bill return to that American that property?

Mr. CELLER. Well, I will ask the gentleman, Would that be in the national

interest to return that stock to the American?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think so.

Mr. CELLER. I doubt it very much. Furthermore, one of the requirements is that the claimant would have to prove he is the owner and the actual owner is not hiding behind him.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not propose to vote for a piece of legislation unless I am sure that will not happen.

Mr. CELLER. I am sure the Alien Property Custodian would have to decide that it is contrary to the interests of the United States to return such property. Remember this, that before the Alien Property Custodian can return any property there must be publication in the official Federal Register. There must be an opportunity for all persons to be heard and to object.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman will recall that after World War I the Alien Property Custodian vested the property of the American Bosch Corp., but in World War II that same corporation had to have its property vested on the ground that it was German-controlled. So that the vesting that took place in World War I was utterly ineffective. I do not want us to make the same mistake again and permit that German control to be established. What should be done is that this property ought to be sold to American companies and the owners compensated by the proceeds of that sale, but the property ought not to go back in cases where we know, as this clipping indicates, that those companies were companies which financed Hitler and financed his war.

Mr. CELLER. If that is the case, the Alien Property Custodian, in whom we must have some confidence, would not dare return that property to such individuals. If you will read the bill carefully, there are numerous safeguards to preclude anything like that happening.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CELLER. I yield myself five additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. But with reference to the Alien Property Custodian trying to do what is right, that is conceded. He will do his best, but the great fear I have about this legislation is simply this: These trials are going on in Germany and they are going on in Japan. It is impossible today to determine who is going to show up guilty tomorrow. A person who may appear to be innocent at present may in 5 or 6 years from now prove to be anything but innocent.

Mr. CELLER. There is no possible chance of any property being returned to any German national in Germany. As for Germans outside Germany and occupied Europe and the United States, no case has arisen. No property has been seized. That is my understanding. This bill does not empower the Alien Property Custodian to return the properties of enemy aliens. That is the Japs, Rumanians, Hungarians, Germans, Bulgarians, and Italians, because they were enemy aliens, except in the few instances that I have mentioned.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Where they were in this country or in Bermuda?

Mr. CELLER. Not in Bermuda. I do not believe there are any such cases concerning Bermuda. However, there may be some isolated cases I do not know of. If their property was seized and they were Germans in this country, then the property was seized because they were guilty of evil and subversive activities. They have to go a long way to show they are innocent before they can get any of the property back.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does not the gentleman feel it will probably be a good while before we can determine just who is guilty and who is not guilty?

Mr. CELLER. We must rely on someone. In this bill the responsibility rests with the President or the gentlemen he may designate. I think we must give full faith and credit to the people that the President will appoint; that he will appoint or has appointed honest and competent men. I think he has appointed a competent and honest man in Mr. Markham, who is the present Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. We probably had competent men at the end of the First World War, but by 1928 we had returned some 80 percent of the property we had taken over from the Germans.

Mr. CELLER. When this bill was fashioned we tried to profit by the mistakes we made the last time, and I want to get this over so you will understand it: This bill concerns itself primarily with the return of property to friendly aliens, not to hostile aliens; and those foreign governments, like Belgium, Holland, Sweden, and Norway are demanding that the property of their nationals which we seized be returned to them. They have a perfect right to demand that, and the State Department is being importuned daily to return that property. If it were the other way around the gentleman certainly would want to see to it that property that was taken away from him where he was perfectly innocent, was restored to him, and that is what we are trying to do primarily.

As to your observation that 80 percent of the property of Germans was returned after the last war, be advised that Congress specifically required the return of 80 percent.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As I said a moment ago, I believe the real fault with the legislation lies in that it is premature because it is impossible now to determine who is guilty and who is innocent. As for me, if the gentleman will indulge me just one moment further, I want to say I am opposed to this legislation. I believe that before we inaugurate a policy such as we inaugurated at the close of the First World War we ought to make a diligent study. I am opposed to this legislation, and I shall have to vote against it today.

Mr. CELLER. I think it has been diligently studied. We have had several weeks of hearings. The hearings are available. The committee would have been glad to hear any suggestions the gentleman cared to make. All departments concerned approve—the War, State, Justice, and Treasury Departments, as well as the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to say in that connection that I note also that one of the same men who wrote letters in 1926 urging the return of that German property likewise wrote letters this time. I have read the hearings. As a matter of fact, the whole thing came up very rapidly in my opinion.

Mr. CELLER. The committee would have welcomed any suggestions the gentleman might have submitted. This matter has been pending for months.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I have read the hearings. I certainly am not for the legislation today. I am certainly not in favor of any German or Japanese citizen—not even one—getting any property back until the claims of every American citizen have been fully satisfied.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. The purpose of this legislation is for the restoration of property to friendly persons rather than enemies, and that would be known enemies. What is the point of distinction as set out in the law so we can be free of any apprehension? I want to support the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Under the present Trading with the Enemy Act and the First War Powers Act no power is vested in the Alien Property Custodian to divest himself of property that he seizes. We seized the property of friendly aliens to protect it, to prevent its getting into the hands of the Axis Powers. Now no longer is there any reason for holding that property. The Alien Property Custodian therefore asks us to give him the power to return that property to these friendly aliens.

Mr. PATRICK. How can we know who is a friendly alien and who is not?

Mr. CELLER. I named them; there is a list in the hearings.

Mr. PATRICK. I know it; but that is only a nomination. I do not understand how you can tell in practice whether they will run true or not.

Mr. CELLER. For example, a Belgian whose property was taken certainly has a right to have himself declared a friendly alien unless something to the contrary appears. The same holds for a Dutchman, a Pole, a Greek, a Chinese, a Frenchman, and so forth. You could not call them enemy aliens. They fought and bled on our side. The Alien Property Custodian examines very carefully into claims of all friendly nationals, like

the Belgians, or the Hollanders, or the Frenchmen who want their property back. If a claimant shows that he has not been guilty of any taint, that he has conducted himself properly, the property may be returned to him. In most instances the governments of those nationals make the claim to the State Department and the State Department and the representatives of the State Department have testified that these governments are importuning us daily to return the property of the nationals. We must recognize the plea of those governments.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I have an actual case, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I know a German refugee family that has taken out its first citizenship papers. They have inherited great works of art, including paintings, as a matter of fact a whole museum, which they would like to have returned to them and which they in turn want to present to the United States or to some public library or place that would be prepared for keeping them.

Mr. CELLER. How long have they been in this country?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. For several years.

Mr. CELLER. The question is whether they came in before December 7, 1941. That is a date which is very important in the consideration of these facts. Many factors in addition will have to be weighed before the property is returned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, it is important to bear in mind the fact that the legislation under consideration has to do with only one situation. The things that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] talked about are not considered at all. Existing law meets the situation that he discussed.

This amendment has to do only with the property of people who were technically alien enemies. When a country is overrun by an aggressor nation, then that country after it has been invaded becomes technically an enemy country. So that when the Germans went into Holland, Belgium, France, and all the other countries that they overran, those governments at that moment became alien enemies and the property of the nationals of those countries thus overrun became subject to confiscation by our Enemy Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the committee that we have at the head of the Alien Property Custodian organization one of the finest men available. I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Markham, in his integrity, honesty, and ability.

I do not think we need be in the least bit concerned with the possibility of a recurrence of those things that caused most of us to hold our noses at the end of the last war. Somebody has to have authority.

Bear in mind this fact that when a national of a country that was overrun claims property on the ground that he is a friendly alien, the burden of proof is on him. He has to prove that he was a friendly alien, and unless he convinces the Administrator that he was a friendly alien then his property is not returned to him.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman can see where our apprehension arises. That is true, but now whenever he does come forward with that information and produces a reasonable measure of assurance, regardless of the ability and integrity and sincerity of Mr. Markham, if it involves a matter that is difficult for him to lay hold of further facts about the petitioner, he will be lost; is not that right? Is not that what we had after the last World War?

Mr. WALTER. No; I do not think so. I do not think it is possible for this property to get back into the wrong hands under this law because the burden of proof, as I said before, is on the claimant. He must establish the fact that he did not even consort with the enemy. The burden is on him to prove that he was friendly even to the extent of being opposed to Hitlerism and the things that we have been fighting against. I certainly see no reason why these people through force of circumstances have been discriminated against should not have their property returned to them promptly.

Mr. PATRICK. I think that satisfies most of us.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is made necessary by reason of the fact that certain properties and moneys, royalties and matters of that character have been collected by the Alien Property Custodian. This bill would authorize the President or such person as he should designate to restore property which has been vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian during World War II, to persons who were never hostile to the United States of America. This bill provides on page 2 in paragraph 1 the requirements that are placed upon those persons who seek to recover property. In the first place, the person must file a notice of his claim for the return of the property. He must then show that he was the owner of the property or that he had an interest in the property immediately prior to the time it vested in the Alien Property Custodian. He must also show that as such owner of the property or the legal representative or successor in interest, that such persons were not the government or connected with the government with which the United States of America had at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war.

In other words, they must show that they were never hostile to the United States of America, in addition to all of the other matters which I have mentioned.

This property which has been claimed by the Alien Property Custodian amounts to a very considerable sum. Most of it is royalties on patents, royalties on copyrights, patent applications, and inventions. That has amounted to a tremendous sum. That is shown in the report on pages 12 and 13, which is now before the committee. The total amount is something like $2,227,447. The Alien Property Custodian had a right, under existing law, to seize the property, but there is no law up to the present moment which authorizes him to return that property to any of these owners.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In addition to these royalties, and so forth, there is a great deal of other property.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is other property. The only matter set out in the report is royalties and inventions, patents and patent applications, and those matters. That is set out rather fully, but it also includes other property, all other property which was seized, which comes under the provisions of this act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There are 11,201 patients.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And some of them are very valuable.

Mr. SPRINGER. Also, there are 1,239 patent applications pending, which have not yet been finally determined or acted upon. There were 246 inventions of various kind and character, which were received and are now held by the Alien Property Custodian.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to try to get myself straightened out on this legislation, if possible. I would like to ask what the effect of this legislation would be in the following case, where the Alien Property Custodian has vested certain property held in the name of a Swiss bank, on the ground that that Swiss bank actually is a cloak for German holdings, and for real German ownership over a company which had a subsidiary operating in the United States. Would this legislation make it possible for such property to be returned to that Swiss bank under those circumstances?

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman mean by the question to indicate that the Swiss bank was the absolute owner of the property?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It claimed to be, but there is a serious question as to whether it was.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from California that anyone who makes application to the Alien Property Custodian for the return of property must file a notice of his claim therefor. Then he must prove,

in accordance with the rules and regulations laid down by the President, that he was the owner of the property, or had an interest therein, immediately prior to the time it vested in the Alien Property Custodian. That proof must be absolute and positive.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. There is language in the bill which provides that if that Swiss bank was used as a cloak to hide the machinations of any Nazi group, that property would not be returned to that Swiss bank. There is specific language in the act.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was just coming to that point. If the Swiss bank was used as a cloak for an alien enemy and the alien enemy was actually the owner of the property, they would have no right to recover under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, recent developments in Iran are disturbing to every American who believes in the philosophy of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter or who is giving serious thought to the development of a pattern of foreign policies which will protect the security of the United States and help perpetuate the peace of the world. These events in Iran also call for candid speaking and the widest possible understanding of all the factors involved and of our American attitude abroad.

It is in Iran, today, more than any place else in the world that interests of the United States and Russia seem to be clashing sharply rather than operating cooperatively in the manner which is so essential to the peace of the world and to a mutual understanding between the Governments of Moscow and Washington. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that not all of the fault lies on one side in the present controversy between Russia and the United States concerning Iran and it is in this connection that I propose to speak today.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, a few words of background might be appropriate. As a war measure, troops from the United States, England, and Russia joined in occupying various sections of Iran—formerly known as Persia—during the war as a measure considered essential to the adequate defense of the important lifelines running from the Persian Gulf to the Russian Army. This seems to have been a wise military move. I have nothing but the highest praise for the officers and men of all the armies of the United Nations who established, patrolled, and operated this very significant life line. Unquestionably, the great quantities of war supplies and equipment which were made available to the Russian Army over this life line contributed greatly to the success of the Red armies on the eastern front. Praise is also due to the Iranian Government for the cooperative attitude which it displayed throughout the war and the gracious manner in which it subjected itself to the exigencies of war.

With the war over, the Iranian Government naturally and logically desires to reestablish its peacetime economy and to have the occupying armies evacuated. In conformity with this desire and in cooperation with our gallant ally, Iran, the so-called Tripartite Agreement was signed between Russia, England, and Iran whereby Russia and England agreed to remove their occupying forces from Iran not later than March 2, 1946. The United States indicated both a willingness and a desire to evacuate its troops well ahead of March 2, 1946, so the Iranian public officials have been looking forward to an opportunity to exercise complete sovereignty and to maintain the independence and territorial integrities of Iran without outside assistance or coercion after March 2 of 1946.

However, as is well known, military disturbances and outright fighting has broken out in the northern provinces of Iran which is the area that has been occupied by the troops of Russia. Clashes have also taken place between the gendarmery of Iran, the Regular Army of Iran, and soldiers of the Red Army. There is a vigorous desire on the part of the officials of Iran, consequently, that Russian soldiers evacuate their country earlier than agreed upon by the Tripartite Agreement in order that the gendarmery and the armies of Iran can enter the northern provinces and restore order.

Consequently, under date of November 26, 1945, our State Department released to the press a note it had sent to the Government of Russia reviewing the history of the situation of Iran and proposing that the complete evacuation of Iran be completed by troops of the United Nations by January 1, 1946, instead of by March 2, 1946. The text of the American note to Russia reads in part:

> The Government of the United States has already reduced its forces in Iran during the present year from a maximum strength of approximately 28,000 to less than 6,000. There are no American combat troops in Iran. Those who remain are engaged in activities exclusively of a service nature connected with the liquidation and disposal of military supplies and the operation of certain important communication connected with demobilization. While the immediate withdrawal of these troops will cause considerable inconvenience to this Government, nevertheless instructions are being issued to the American military authorities in Iran to take immediate steps to effect the complete withdrawal of all American forces from Iran by January 1, 1946. This Government proposes that the British and Soviet Governments issue similar instructions to their commanders and that arrangements be made immediately for the complete withdrawal of all foreign troops from Iran by January 1, 1946. Immediate steps to effect such withdrawal would dispel any doubt regarding the intentions of the three Governments to carry out the assurances given by them. In making this suggestion the Government of the United States is aware that no undertaking has been given that these troops are to be removed from Iran before March 2, 1946. On the other hand, now that hostilities have ceased, it sees no compelling reason for them to remain until that date. It is of the opinion that immediate steps to effect withdrawal by January 1 not only would obviate possible misunderstandings but would also be a fitting recognition of the notable contributions which Iran, a member in good standing of the United Nations, has made to the common war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I find no fault with the State Department note of November 26 although it is impossible to ignore the strange coincidence that the last time the United States sent a note having at least some of the implications of an ultimatum was also on November 26 and I refer to the note which Secretary Hull sent on November 26, 1941, to Japan.

My reason for taking the floor today, Mr. Chairman, however is to point out that in my opinion the State Department of the United States does not enter the court of world public opinion with clean hands. I am sure that this is recognized by the officials of the Kremlin in Moscow and since the full facts of the situation are known to Russia, I see no reason why they should not be made available to the American public and, more particularly, to the Members of the Senate and the House. The State Department note of November 26 does not tell the whole story and it does not go the full route in its agreement to withdaw American military forces from Iran. Let me proceed to supply the missing details.

When the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, and I were in Teheran, Iran, last September, we made a rather extensive study of political and economic conditions in that country and of the activities of a rather unusual American military mission which was operating in Iran. Here are the facts which were brought to our attention. At the request of our State Department, our War Department has assigned two small missions of about 20 officers and men each in the following manner. One mission, under Maj. Gen. Clarence S. Ridley, has been engaged for the past 3 years in reorganizing the supply and administrative sections of the Iranian army.

A second mission headed by Col. H. Norman Schwarzkopf has been reorganizing the gendarmery on modern lines. Colonel Schwarzkopf, who has also been in Iran 3 years, has the position of commander of the gendarmery. Mr. Chairman, that last sentence will bear repitition: Colonel Schwarzkopf has the position of commander of the gendarmery. He is not there simply as an adviser or a counsellor or an observer but he is vested with full administrative authority and is in effect the chief and commander of the gendarmery. This gendarmery as of last September consisted of a headquarters and 15 regiments, totaling 20,000 men and 1,000 officers, distributed over approximately 600,000 square miles and available for concentrated use at any trouble point. The functions of the gendarmery parallel those of the state police in the United States and in addition include quasi military action. Mr. Chairman, insofar as the activities of General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf, together with their respective missions, operated during the war to provide increased security for the vital Persion Gulf supply lines to Russia, I have nothing but commendation to offer for its operation. The important point, however, is that the war is over and that missions are continuing up to

the present moment and insofar as any public declaration of policies are concerned there is no disposition on the part of the State Department to withdraw these missions even now.

It was developed in the conference which the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and I, together with representatives of our State Department and our War Department, held in Teheran that the salaries of General Ridley and of Colonel Schwarzkopf, together with their associates, are paid by the American Government through the War Department in the same manner in which ordinary officers and men of the American Army are paid. Consequently, since their salaries are paid by American taxpayers through the War Department appropriations bill and since they are on the pay roll of the War Department, they function as American citizens under order of the War Department and the Chief of Staff and their supreme commanding officer is the Commander in Chief of the United States Army, President Harry S. Truman of the United States.

STATE DEPARTMENT NOTE OF NOVEMBER 26 IS INCOMPLETE

Thus, in the troubled situation existing in Iran, we find America in the anomalous position of suggesting to two of our great allies that they withdraw all their troops and completely evacuate Iran while at the same time, we have regular officers of the United States Army, regularly being paid from American funds, operating under the command of our high military officers in Washington, actually serving as the commanding officers of the gendarmery of Iran. Careful reading of the note which Secretary of State Byrnes sent to Moscow under date of November 26 fails to reveal any indication that we expect to withdraw these particular missions from Iran either on January 1, 1946, on March 2, 1946, or any other predictable date.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am regretfully compelled to inform the House that all of the existing evidence runs quite to the contrary. When we were in Teheran we discovered and I confirmed this fact by a telephone call to the War Department this morning, that contracts have recently been signed with the Iranian Government providing for the continuation of these two military missions in Teheran with the continued exercise of their present controls, for an additional 2 years. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I said earlier in my remarks that the American State Department does not enter the court of world public opinion with clean hands in sending its note of November 26 urging the complete evacuation of Iran by Russian and British troops while it proposes to continue Colonel Schwarzkopf in command of the Iranian gendarmery for another 2 years under a contract already signed with the Iranian Government.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, this particular matter has been one that has given me considerable anxiety. When the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I were in Teheran, we were given a very full report of the conditions actually existing in the northern provinces then, and now, under Russian military occupation. Let me cite one or two instances. The Russians protested the right of the gendarmes to make an arrest ordered by the Iranian Central Government, and released the man whom the Iranian gendarmes had arrested.

At another point, Russian soldiers beat up and shot an Iranian gendarme driver, and the Russian major ordered the gendarme forces out of the city. Throughout their occupation, the Russian military has refused to permit the Iranian gendarmery to reinforce their staffs and forces or to move troops from one location to another without specific authority from the Russians.

At one point a funeral attended by many Iranians was used as an excuse to forbid public gatherings and to declare martial law.

Such actions as these—and the ones I have cited are but examples of a widespread policy—certainly should be protested vigorously. But if our State Department is planning to protest Russia's actions there, our skirts must be very clean.

Therefore, would it not seem to be advisable if, in the study of this legislation to be made at the other end of the Capitol, these matters be explored in detail.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly hope so and that is one of the reasons why I am bringing it up at this time.

It is true, of course, Mr. Chairman, that General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf hold their important positions in the Iranian Army and the Iranian gendarmery at the request of the Iranian Government, but it is also true that these contracts contain a cancellation clause providing that our American officers may be withdrawn from their assignments in Iran in the event that Congress fails to continue the war powers provisions under which the Secretary of State was able to assign American officers in this unusual manner to exercise the important controls in a foreign country, even in time of peace, and while serving on the pay roll of the American War Department. It is quite a different thing, Mr. Chairman, to have Americans in charge of foreign armed forces in peacetime from what it is to have our officers in charge of foreign armed forces during the days of actual conflict. I am sure Congress never intended that these powers should be projected beyond the days of actual hostilities. The war on the eastern front has long been over. The war with Japan has been over for several months. And yet our State Department enters into a 2-year contract with the Iranian Government to perpetuate the existing arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, I can see that this request on the part of the Iranian Government is smart from their standpoint. By putting American officers in actual command of their gendarmery, they certainly compel the continuance of active American influence in their country. Naturally, the government of Iran is eager to have itself protected by the strong arm of the United States Army. I deny however, Mr. Chairman, that an equal amount of sagacity was demonstrated by the State Department of the United States when it entered into a contract of this type. It is certainly a commitment which should have been submitted to Congress for ratification insofar as its continuance into the peacetime era is concerned and not one which should have been made by executive action since its ramifications are very wide and very serious.

I doubt that 1 man in 50 among the Members of Congress or that one citizen in a thousand among the taxpayers of the United States realizes that today General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf, together with their respective staffs, hold these administrative military positions in Iran and especially that Colonel Schwarzkopf is considered the commander in chief of the gendarmery of Iran. I think many will be surprised to learn that American Army officers on the pay roll of the War Department are assigned by the State Department for such purposes in these times. In my mind, this is backing up a long way from the pious phrases once enunciated in the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the State Department now has in mind the preparation of legislation which would extend authority to assign officers of the War Department to foreign governments in peacetime for precisely the purposes now being fulfilled by General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf. If the State Department deems this to be wise American policy, it is proper that it should submit such legislation to Congress. If it is to be American policy to have little satellite foreign armies and interior police squadrons scattered about the world under the command of American Army officers operating on the pay roll of the War Department and being financed by the taxpayers of the United States, that, sir, is certainly something to be decided by Congress. It is not something to be authorized arbitrarily by the State Department in time of peace. It is a policy which at best has very far-reaching repercussions.

In protesting this condition last September to Ambassador Wallace Murray, the American Ambassador at Teheran, in protesting it to members of the State Department and the War Department in Washington, and in a letter of protest to President Truman dated October 25, I called attention to the following contingencies.

First. Is it not easily conceivable that even though the United States and England withdraw their troops from Iran that the Russians might use as an entirely valid reason for their reluctance in withdrawing their occupation troops from the northern provinces of Iran, the fact that the United States is maintaining Army officers under pay of the United States War Department in actual command of the gendarmery of Iran? Apparently, Russia is today demonstrating just such reluctance and since Russia is well aware of the positions General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf occupy in Iran, it is reasonable to suppose that this is one reason for Russia's reluctance to

withdraw from Iran. In all events, since the Russians know about these conditions, it seems to me no more than right and proper that the Members of Congress and the citizens of the United States should also be informed about all of the factors involved in the situation inasmuch as the State Department's note of November 26 fails to write in the complete details.

Second. The second contingency I suggested in my protest was concerning the possible attitude of our State Department and of Congress if the conditions were reversed. If Russia were to assign officers under her employment to one or more of the Republics in South America or to Mexico, for example, with similar administrative authorities in those republics, it seems to me that this country would look with considerable disfavor and suspicion upon Russia if she were to enter into such contracts with the Republics of South America and that it would also tend to lessen our friendship for any individual South American country entering into such a contract. Here in the Western Hemisphere, in our general area of influence, among our South American neighbors, I do not believe any South American Republic would enter into such a contract, but if such development did occur and Russian officers under the direction of Russian high military command and on its pay roll were placed in charge of armed and uniformed units on this side of the ocean, I am confident that the people of America would resent and resist such a situation.

RUSSO-AMERICAN POLICIES MUST BE RECIPROCAL

Mr. Chairman, I have been insisting for a long time that our foreign policy toward Russia must be a reciprocal affair and must operate with equal clarity, emphasis, and equity on both sides of the sea. Certainly Russia is as much justified in resenting and resisting a condition wherein American Army officers directly attached to our War Department are in charge of the Iranian gendarmery as we would be if the situation were reversed.

Mr. Chairman, with actual fighting now taking place in Iran, it seems to me that the American Congress and American citizens are entitled to know just what activities are being engaged upon by the missions headed by General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf, and, in my opinion, sir, their contracts with the Iranian Government should be summarily canceled until Congress has had an opportunity to pass specifically upon their necessity and wisdom.

To show the serious possibilities and implications of the prevailing situation, permit me to quote from the address of Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin as delivered in the House of Commons on November 23. Here, in part, is what Mr. Bevin had to say about conditions in Iran, which he referred to by its better known name of Persia:

> Reference was made yesterday by the right honorable gentleman to the recent events in Persia. According to my information, the facts are as follows: A political group in the Province of Azerbaijan, in northwest Persia, which has been carrying on agitation for autonomy, had resorted to violence against the Persian Government and forcibly seized the railway station in the town of Mianeh. It attacked and overcame the Persian troops and gendarmes stationed at Sarab, a town some 70 miles east of Tabriz. It is also reported to have taken over the town of Maragheh. Telegraphic communications between Tabriz, the capital of the province, and Teheran was cut several days ago. In view of the situation which had arisen, the Persian Government wished to send a force composed of two battalions of troops and one battalion of gendarmery to that province to restore their authority—which seemed to me quite a reasonable thing to do. Since there are Soviet troops in northwest Persia under the Anglo-Soviet-Persian Treaty, the Persian Government informed the Soviet Embassy of its intention and expressed the hope that no obstacle would be placed in the way of the despatch of that force. It appears, however, that when the Persian force had almost reached the town of Kazvin on its way it was stopped by the Soviet troops. It would appear that the Persian Government's desire to send forces to restore order in part of their territory is perfectly legitimate under the treaty, and it is to be hoped they will be able to proceed freely with their plans. The question is presumably being taken up by the Persian Government with the Soviet Government.

It will be observed, Mr. Chairman, that Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin says:

> In view of the situation which had arisen the Persian Government wished to send a force composed of two battalions of troops and one battalion of gendarmery to that province to restore their authority—which seemed to me quite a reasonable thing to do.

And he further states:

> It appears, however, that when the Persian force had almost reached the town of Kazvin on its way, it was stopped by the Soviet troops.

In view of the position which Col. H. Norman Schwarzkopf holds as commander of the gendarmery and as an officer of the American Army on the pay roll of the American War Department, one wonders a bit where this places the United States with relationship to its great and friendly ally, Russia.

I shall not pursue this matter further today, Mr. Chairman, except to point out that all of the foregoing is one additional reason why there should be more candor and less secrecy in connection with the activities of the State Department of the United States of America. Over on the other side of the Hill, the Pearl Harbor investigating committee is now examining into secret activities of the State Department prior to Pearl Harbor. It was hoped that at least one result of this investigation would be to develop a policy whereby the people of America would be increasingly taken into the confidence of their State Department. It is my hope that my remarks today will further tend to discourage secret commitments secretly arrived at. It is also my hope that it will bring out in the open the important decision as to whether in peacetime we are to adopt the policy of placing American Army officers who remain on the pay roll and are under the command of our War Department as commanders of foreign military forces.

I would like to respectfully recommend, however, Mr. Chairman, the situation in Iran together with the general international picture seems to indicate that a meeting of the Big Two should be arranged in the very near future so that a workable and mutually satisfactory relationship can be agreed upon between the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America. I suggest that President Truman take the necessary steps to arrange for a meeting with Marshal Stalin at the earliest mutually convenient date. I suggest a meeting of the Big Two rather than the Big Three at this time, sir, simply because it is primarily between Russia and the United States that a workable, mutually satisfactory understanding must be achieved if world security and world peace are to be obtained.

The Iranian situation is only one of many points which could be considered in such a conference. There is also the matter of the veto provisions of the United Nations Charter. There is the necessity of revamping the military control systems for Germany and Austria. There is the problem of America's interest in the Balkans and in Poland, and there is the problem of Russia's interest in the Mediterranean area and in Japan. There is the necessity of developing a pattern of treatment for the visiting nationals of each country which will provide that the same courtesies and freedoms are extended Americans in Russia that Russia expects us to extend to Russians in America. There is the important matter of urging Russia to become a part of the United Nations Educational Security and Cultural Organization, which recently completed its meeting in London and which for some reason was not attended by the delegates from Russia. There are all these and many other problems, Mr. Chairman, which I believe can best be reconciled by a meeting of the Big Two.

I am certain that the officials and the citizens of Great Britain would not look with suspicion on a meeting which was limited to the leaders of the Big Two. Certainly the United States would not agree to any program or policy which would be injurious to the interests of Great Britain. Nor do I believe that the leaders of Russia would propose such policies or programs. However, it is always easier for two men to strike up an agreement than it is for three. It is understandable that Marshal Stalin up to now may feel a little bit on the outside at these conferences since the other two members of the Big Three speak English, which he does not understand. He may feel at times as though he is being subjected to the treatment which in a colloquialism is defined as being accorded by "two brothers to a stranger." I am sure that England and the United States have not at any time in any way teamed up in opposition to Russia, but certainly a meeting limited to the Big Two would entirely eliminate any such possibility and even the smallest possible hint of a suspicion to that end. Moreover, as the two largest and strongest powers in the world, it is only logical that there be a meeting of the Big Two. The sooner such a meeting is called, in my opinion, the more quickly the world can begin readjusting itself to the problems of peace and the sooner we shall be able to resolve the numerous differences which now seem to be holding nations apart.

OUR ADJECTIVES AND OUR ACTIONS SHOULD BE IN HARMONY

Mr. Chairman, the time is here, and, in fact, it is abundantly here, when we should develop an American foreign policy in which our adjectives and our actions are in harmony. One great stride in that direction can be achieved at a conference of the Big Two in which an honest, firm, albeit amiable, effort could be made to develop an understanding with Russia whereby both countries could begin to practice toward each other the principles and policies which both countries so proudly preach.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to quote one section of the letter which the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and I sent to President Harry S. Truman under date of October 25. This letter followed a conference which we had with the President in his office in the White House and was sent him at his request in order to provide him with a memorandum of the recommendations which we made. The section quoted was section 3 of our letter and deals only with the situation in Iran:

Our committee found a situation in Iran which it considers disturbing: American Army officers in that country have recently been assigned by the War Department to Iran under a new 2-year contract whereby while drawing their salaries from the United States Government, they are actually to direct the troop movements and activities of the uniformed interior police corps of that country. We doubt the wisdom and the "neighborliness" of this policy. We do not believe that our Government could look with favor upon a situation, for example, wherein Mexico might similarly contract with Russian Army officers in the pay of the Soviet Government to direct, train, and deploy its troops and uniformed interior police. If we could not approve such a policy in our hemisphere should it be projected by Russia, we do not believe that the Russians—without securing retaliatory advantages of one type or another—can look with favor upon our projecting such a program on her southern borders. If our military personnel is to serve in such a capacity in Iran or elsewhere, we believe they should do so in the pay of the foreign government and as detached and disconnected elements of our War Department personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter which I have today sent to Secretary of State Byrnes. The letter of Mr. Byrnes reads as follows:

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

Secretary of State JAMES F. BYRNES,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRNES: This letter is a communication of inquiry concerning State Department policies and plans in Iran which I am discussing in full detail on the floor of the House today. You will find my remarks in tomorrow morning's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and they will supplement the data included in this letter to you.

Like all Americans, I am very much distressed and disturbed over the reports coming out of Iran. My personal concern is aggravated because of the presence and position of certain American officers now under contract to the Government of Iran but on the pay roll and consequently under the authority of the United States Government. I refer to Maj. Gen. Clarence S. Ridley and Col. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, and their respective military attachments with whose operations and activities I am sure you are conversant.

It is my belief that under prevailing conditions in Iran, the assignments authorized for General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf are apt to involve us in untoward international complications. My reasons for this you will see set forth in the speech referred to in the initial paragraph of this letter.

In order that I may have your point of view which, with your permission, I shall be happy to accord the same publicity given to my remarks and include on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would appreciate your writing me in response to the following questions:

1. I was informed by the War Department this morning that General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf are presently in Iran continuing the same functions for which they have been contracted by the Iranian Government. Have you any evidence to indicate that this information is inaccurate?

2. I was informed in Teheran and again by the War Department this morning that a new 2-year contract has been entered into between the United States and the Government of Iran which would project the functions of General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf into the peacetime era subject only to the exercise of possible cancellation clauses should Congress rescind the war powers granted the President prior to that date. I am also informed that this contract was at the instigation of our State Department rather than the War Department. Is it correct that the State Department was the instigator in this instance insofar as action by the American Government is concerned?

3. Is it the plan of the State Department to ask Congress to grant it peacetime authority to make arrangements similar to those now existing under contract with the Iranian Government to make available American Army officers under the pay and direction of the War Department, to train, reorganize, and administer army troops and uniformed police forces abroad? If so, what are your reasons for believing that this will contribute to a feeling of good neighborliness around the world and have you counseled with the other members of the Big Five to determine whether they approve of such policy in countries adjacent to them?

4. Would it be in accord with the attitude of the State Department of the United States, as presently administered, to look with favor upon other nations entering similar contracts to direct and deploy the armies and interior policy of neighboring countries in this hemisphere should such arrangements eventuate?

5. It would appear to me that the following procedure might much better meet the needs of countries requiring or desiring outside military leadership in the reorganization of their armies than the policy you are pursuing in Iran. Either (1) the members of the Big Five might agree to put in joint military missions to give smaller countries the counsel and military leadership they require, or (2) if it seems desirable to use American personnel exclusively where they have been invited by foreign governments I would suggest that only such American military personnel be authorized by such foreign service as no longer are on the pay roll of the United States and are no longer on reserve or active duty in any of our military establishments. If employed abroad at all, they should be completely detached from our military establishments and serve under the direction in the uniform, and on the pay roll of such governments as desire their services. I shall be happy to have your reaction to the foregoing suggestion.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me make it crystal clear that I favor the complete and prompt evacuation of Iran by all of the occupying troops of the United Nations. That includes the British in the southern Provinces, the Russians in the northern Provinces, and the Amercans from the central zone and from their administrative posts in the Iranian Army and in the gendarmery. The Iranians are courageous and capable people, they belong to the United Nations, and they are entitled to the full and free exercise of their independence and sovereignty. Russia has no legitimate territorial claims or prior rights in Iran.

Certainly I hold no brief for Russia insofar as she has refused to permit the Iranian Government to send reinforcements to her troops in the northern Provinces, which are an integral part of Iran. Surely one of the prime rights of a sovereign nation is to utilize its troops in an effort to put down civil rebellion. However, Mr. Chairman, I insist that this job of putting down civil rebellion is an Iranian responsibility, not an American assignment.

Our American officers in the Iranian Army and gendarmery should not be permitted to associate themselves with this civil strife and more especially so if it should involve clashes between the fighters of Iran and the troops of Russia. Manifestly, at the minimum, such a procedure should not be permitted or authorized without the knowledge and consent of Congress. Mr. Chairman, shooting is closely akin to war and we play with a very dangerous explosive when we permit American Army officers on the pay roll of our War Department to be contracted to the shooting units of foreign governments, in either an advisory or an administrative capacity. This is more especially true when one of these officers is referred to as the commander of the Iranian gendarmery under conditions such as prevail in Iran today.

We defeat our own purposes and actually render a disservice to Iran in an emergency of this type, Mr. Chairman, unless we go the full route and assure Russia of our determination to withdraw our administrative officers from their posts with the Iranian troops as well as agreeing to withdraw our own troops from Iran provided England and Russia do likewise. By permitting American Army officers to work in administrative posts with the Iranian forces at this crucial juncture, we give Russia a valid and logical excuse for maintaining her military people in the northern Provinces. Let us come entirely clean, Mr. Chairman. Let us tell Russia we will go the full route and withdraw not only our troops by January 2 but General Ridley and Colonel Schwarzkopf and their staffs as well provided Russia will completely evacuate the northern Provinces. We may be a little tardy in making this offer, sir, but better late than never.

If the internal security of Iran requires outside military leadership in the organization and administration of its militia and its Army, let that outside military leadership be jointly supplied by British, American, and Russian military advisers but all three countries should withdraw their armies from Iran and permit that gallant little country to work out its own

destiny without outside coercion or intimidation. An offer of this type to Russia will show our complete good faith and it will require Russia to make a reply which should clearly indicate her plans and policies with regard to Iran.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to provoke a little discussion in order that I and any others in my situation may a little better understand the implications of this bill. I call attention to the language on page 2 providing that certain properties held by the Alien Property Custodian may be returned under certain conditions to certain people.

Subsection (1) on page 2 in part reads:

That the person who has filed a notice of claim for return was the owner of such property or interest immediately prior to its vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian, or is the legal representative of such owner.

Subsection (2) reads:

That such owner, and legal representative or successor in interest, if any, are not—

(A) the government of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war.

That much is easily understandable, but subsection (B) reads:

Or a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation.

I have wondered why that did not read this way:

A corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation—

That is, an enemy nation—

or any person a citizen thereof on the date indicated here.

Instead of saying that, it reads here:

Provided, That any property or interest or proceeds which, but for the provisions of this subdivision (B), might be returned under this section to any such corporation or association, may be returned to the owner or owners of all the stock of such corporation.

The question arises in my mind if it would not be possible under that proviso that while you could not retransfer this property to a corporation or association of an enemy nation, you have made it possible for the stockholder in that enemy corporation to require the return of his beneficial interest in that property.

Now, I realize that in the reading of the balance of this section as follows:

And if such ownership was by one or more citizens of the United States or by one or more corporations organized under the laws of the United States or any State or Territory thereof or the District of Columbia.

That would seem to indicate, in my mind which might be too suspicious, that somewhere in the United States there are stockholders of the I. G. Farben Co. or in some other company organized and originally operated by an enemy nation and that we are leaving by this proviso the danger that notwithstanding this ownership, whether it be bona fide or only claimed, the power within these stockholders to demand under the terms of this bill that this beneficial interest with all that the ownership of stock carries with it, should be returned by the Alien Property Custodian without any further ado.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the proposed amendment only deals with the property of friendly aliens? The I. G. Farben Co. was located in Germany.

Mr. FOLGER. I do not so read the bill. I think the result of it is to deal with property of an alien or an enemy nation.

It says if such owner and legal representative or successor in interest are not "the government of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, or "B" a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation. Which nation? It means an enemy nation. But the stockholders can come along and demand notwithstanding that the stock in this corporation organized under this enemy country shall be returned.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may understand his position?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Do I understand the gentleman's position to be that if an American citizen or a friendly alien should happen to have been caught with the ownership of stock in a foreign corporation that he ought not to be able to get it?

Mr. FOLGER. No; I will say to the gentleman I do not take that position. But what I am trying to bring to the attention of the commitee is the danger with respect to a situation along the lines which the gentleman from California spoke about with respect to the Swiss Bank or some other institutions professing to be, and so far as outside appearances are concerned, the owner of stock in a corporation organized in Germany before December 7, 1941. How are you going to find out whether that ownership is bona fide or is just on the books of the company in view of some things we have heard during this war about intermingling of stocks and interest in the I. G. Farben Co. and some other companies of this country?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am not at all as familiar with this bill as the gentlemen of the subcommittee who are responsible for bringing it to the full committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), is hereby amended by adding at the end of title III thereof the following:

"SEC. 304. The Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"SEC. 32. (a) The President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, may return any property or interest vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian (other than any property or interest acquired by the United States prior to December 18, 1941), or the net proceeds thereof, whenever the President or such officer or agency shall determine—

"'(1) that the person who has filed a notice of claim for return, in such form as the President or such officer or agency may prescribe, was the owner of such property or interest immediately prior to its vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian, or is the legal representative (whether or not appointed by a court in the United States), or successor in interest by inheritance, devise, bequest, or operation of law, of such owner; and

"'(2) that such owner, and legal representative or successor in interest, if any, are not—

"'(A) the government of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war; or

"'(B) a corporation or association organized under the laws of such nation: *Provided*, That any property or interest or proceeds which, but for the provisions of this subdivision (B), might be returned under this section to any such corporation or association, may be returned to the owner or owners of all the stock of such corporation or of all the proprietary and beneficial interest in such association, if their ownership of such stock or proprietary and beneficial interest existed immediately prior to vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian and continuously thereafter to the date of such return (without regard to purported divestments or limitations of such ownership by any government referred to in subdivision (A) hereof) and if such ownership was by one or more citizens of the United States or by one or more corporations organized under the laws of the United States or any State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That such owner or owners shall succeed to those obligations, limited in aggregate amount to the value of such property or interest or proceeds, which are lawfully assertible against the corporation or association by persons not ineligible to receive a return under this section; or

"'(C) an individual voluntarily resident at any time since December 7, 1941, within the territory of such nation, other than a citizen of the United States or a diplomatic or consular officer of a nation with which the United States has not at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war; or

"'(D) an individual who was at any time after December 7, 1941, a citizen or subject of a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, and who on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the date of the enactment of this section, was present (other than in the service of the United States) in the territory of such nation or in any territory occupied by the military or naval forces thereof or engaged in any business in any such territory; or

"'(E) a foreign corporation or association which at any time after December 7, 1941, was controlled or 50 percent or more of the stock of which was owned by any person or persons ineligible to receive a return under subdivisions (A), (B), (C), or (D) hereof: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subdivision (E), return may be made to a corporation or association so controlled or owned, if such corporation or association was organized under the laws of a nation any of whose territory was occupied by the military or naval forces of any nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war, and if such control or ownership arose after March 1, 1938, as an incident to such occupation and was terminated prior to the enactment of this section; and

"'(3) that the property or interest claimed, or the net proceeds of which are claimed, was not at any time after September 1, 1939, held

or used, by or with the assent of the person who was the owner thereof immediately prior to vesting in or transfer to the Alien Property Custodian, pursuant to any arrangement to conceal any property or interest within the United States of any person ineligible to receive a return under subsection (a) (2) hereof;

"'(4) that the Alien Property Custodian has no actual or potential liability under the Renegotiation Act or the act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013; 35 U. S. C. 89–96), in respect of the property or interest or proceeds to be returned and that the claimant and his predecessor in interest, if any, have no actual or potential liability of any kind under the Renegotiation Act or the said act of October 31, 1942; or in the alternative that the claimant has provided security or undertakings adequate to assure satisfaction of all such liabilities or that property or interest or proceeds to be retained by the Alien Property Custodian are adequate thereof; and

"'(5) that such return is in the interest of the United States.

"'(b) Notwithstanding the limitation prescribed in the Renegotiation Act upon the time within which petitions may be filed in The Tax Court of the United States, any person to whom any property or interest or proceeds are returned hereunder shall, for a period of 90 days (not counting Sunday or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the last day) following return, have the right to file such a petition for a redetermination in respect of any final order of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board determining excessive profits, made against the Alien Property Custodian, or of any determination, not embodied in an agreement, of excessive profits, so made by or on behalf of a Secretary.

"'(c) Any person to whom any invention, whether patented or unpatented, or any right or interest therein is returned hereunder shall be bound by any notice or order issued or agreement made pursuant to the act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013; 35 U. S. C. 89–96), in respect of such invention or right or interest, and such person to whom a licensor's interest is returned shall have all rights assertable by a licensor pursuant to section 2 of the said act.

"'(d) Except as otherwise provided herein, and except to the extent that the President or such officer or agency as he may designate may otherwise determine, any person to whom return is made hereunder shall have all rights, privileges, and obligations in respect to the property or interest returned or the proceeds of which are returned which would have existed if the property or interest had not vested in the Alien Property Custodian, but no cause of action shall accrue to such person in respect of any deduction or retention of any part of the property or interest or proceeds by the Alien Property Custodian for the purpose of paying taxes, costs, or expenses in connection with such property or interest or proceeds. Any notice to the Alien Property Custodian in respect of any property or interest or proceeds shall constitute notice to the person to whom such property or interest or proceeds is returned and such person shall succeed to all burdens and obligations in respect of such property or interest or proceeds which accrued during the time of retention by the Alien Property Custodian, but the period during which the property or interest or proceeds returned were vested in the Alien Property Custodian shall not be included for the purpose of determining the application of any statute of limitations to the assertion of any rights by such person in respect of such property or interest or proceeds.

"'(e) No return hereunder shall bar the prosecution of any suit at law or in equity against a person to whom return has been made, to establish any right, title, or interest, which may exist or which may have existed at the time of vesting, in or to the property or interest returned, but no such suit may be prosecuted by any person ineligible to receive a return under subsection (a) (2) hereof. With respect to any such suit, the period during which the property or interest or proceeds returned were vested in the Alien Property Custodian shall not be included for the purpose of determining the application of any statute of limitations.

"'(f) At least 30 days before making any return to any person other than a resident of the United States or a corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or any State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, the President or such officer or agency as he may designate shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of intention to make such return, specifying therein the person to whom return is to be made and the place where the property or interest or proceeds to be returned are located. Publication of a notice of intention to return shall confer no right of action upon any person to compel the return of any such property or interest or proceeds, and such notice of intention to return may be revoked by appropriate notice in the Federal Register. After publication of such notice of intention and prior to revocation thereof, the property or interest or proceeds specified shall be subject to attachment at the suit of any citizen or resident of the United States or any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or any State, Territory, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, in the same manner as property of the person to whom return is to be made: *Provided*, That notice of any writ of attachment which may issue prior to return shall be served upon the Alien Property Custodian. Any such attachment proceeding shall be subject to the provisions of law relating to limitation of actions applicable to actions at law in the jurisdiction in which such proceeding is brought, but the period during which the property or interest or proceeds were vested in the Alien Property Custodian shall not be included for the purpose of determining the period of limitation. No officer of any court shall take actual possession, without the consent of the Alien Property Custodian, of any property or interest or proceeds so attached, and publication of a notice of revocation of intention to return shall invalidate any attachment with respect to the specified property or interest or proceeds, but if there is no such revocation, the President or such officer or agency as he may designate shall accord full effect to any such attachment in returning any such property or interest or proceeds.

"'(g) Without limitation by or upon any other existing provision of law with respect to the payment of expenses by the Alien Property Custodian, the Custodian may retain or recover from any property or interest or proceeds returned pursuant to this section or section 9 (a) of this act an amount not exceeding that expended or incurred by him for the conservation, preservation, or maintenance of such property or interest or proceeds, or other property or interest or proceeds returned to the same person.'

"SEC. 2. Section 20 of the Trading With the Enemy Act is hereby amended to read as follows: 'No property or interest or proceeds shall be returned under this Act, nor shall any payment be made or judgment awarded in respect of any property or interest vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian unless a schedule of the fees to be paid to all agents, attorneys at law or in fact, or representatives, for services in connection with such return or payment or judgment, has been furnished to, and approved in accordance with this section by, the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, or the court, as the case may be. In the case of any return of, or the making of any payment in respect of, any such property or interest or proceedings (other than pursuant to an order of a court), the President or such officer or agency as he may designate may make such modifications, if any, as are appropriate, and shall approve such schedule only upon determining that the individual fees do not exceed fair compensation for the services rendered and that the aggregate of the fees does not exceed 10 percent of the value of such property or interest or proceeds or of such payment. Any person aggrieved by the determination of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate may petition the district court of the United States for the district in which he resides to review the determination, and shall name the person or agency making the determination a party defendant. The court hearing such petition for review, or a court awarding any judgment in respect of any such property or interest or proceeds, as the case may be, may make such modifications, if any, as are appropriate, and shall approve such schedule only upon determining that the individual fees do not exceed fair compensation for the services rendered, and shall approve an aggregate of fees in excess of 10 percent of the value of such property or interest or proceeds only upon a finding that there exist special circumstances of unusual hardship which require the payment of such excess. Any person accepting any fee in excess of an amount approved hereunder, or retaining for more than 30 days any portion of a fee, accepted prior to approval hereunder, in excess of the fee as approved, shall be guilty of a violation of this act'."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 10, at the end of line 7 add double quotation marks.

Page 10, line 9, strike out "'SEC." and insert "SEC."

Page 10, line 10, strike out "'No property or" and insert "'SEC. 20. No property or."

Page 11, line 24, omit the single quotation mark following "act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COFFEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4571) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, pursuant to House Resolution 428, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and insert an editorial regarding an integrated job bill which she introduced.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her

remarks in the RECORD and include an article regarding the abuses of barbiturates.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. FEIGHAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Boston Daily Globe.

Mr. RANDOLPH (at the request of Mr. KOPPLEMANN) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before the war the idea of "production for use" rather than "production for profit" had caught the popular fancy of several radical groups in the United States. Essentially a Communist doctrine, this extreme socialistic theory, which is completely alien to our democratic point of view, found support among Communists, Socialists, and their fellow-travelers, because it represented the first step toward the destruction of free enterprise and our form of government. Now that the war is over these groups again are launching their insidious program.

I have the honor of representing the people of the Fourth Kansas Congressional District in the House of Representatives. I rebel at the thought of converting that great agricultural region or any part of the rich Middle Western farm belt into a mass of collectivistic farms, devoid of individualism and dedicated to the communistic plan of "production for use."

Our great ally, the Soviet Republic, is the best-known exponent of the Communist philosophy in the world, yet today Russian agriculture is far from convincing proof that "production for use" would be successful in this country.

I have examined a mass of comparative statistics which represent a cold analysis of the relative positions of the United States and Russia with respect to farm crops, crop yield per acre, use of farm machinery, farm, family income, taxation, farm housing and living conditions, etc. The facts demonstrate clearly the superiority of our Nation upon all scores.

Discounting the larger agricultural area in Russia, our "production for profit" system of agriculture in the United States has resulted in greater efficiency, more yield per acre, greater use of scientific farm methods, better individual farm family housing, lower taxation, and greater leisure for the farmer and his family.

To my mind, the most important single factor which statistics can never measure, is the high sense of dignity and personal pride which comes to the American farmer as a result of his ownership of the soil he tills, the livestock he raises, and the crops he harvests. This personal freedom and sense of ownership can never be known to the Russian farmer peasant.

Perhaps, in lifting Russia from beneath the iron heel of the church and the nobility, the revolutionary leaders believed that a state-controlled communism should be the first step toward total democracy and individual freedom. On this side of the world, however, we and our forefathers have fought for over 150 years to preserve a freedom and a free enterprise society which must never be sacrificed for vague and untried theories.

Within the next decade the American farmer, and indeed his city brother, will have a choice to make. This is the choice of whether we as a nation shall proceed further toward a nationally controlled and dominated communistic way of life or whether we shall remain free. In making that choice let no one be deceived by the meaning of catch words or phrases for, in the truest sense, Communism is wholly reactionary—a step backwards—while on the other hand democracy is dynamic and progressive.

TRANSPORTATION HOME OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, many Members have spoken about the desirability of getting the troops back home, transportation, and so on. I think the discussion has resulted in some real action. I notice where the Maritime Union is on strike against the companies which have been continuing their ships in the hauling of freight instead of the hauling of troops. It looks like the House should commend those people for this action and really bringing to the attention of the Nation why the troops are not being transported home. Personally, I congratulate those people on the unselfish action which they are taking for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GILLETTE (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for December 3, on account of official business.

To Mr. TALBOT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), until December 7, on account of official business.

To Mr. SASSCER (at the request of Mr. D'ALESANDRO), for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. EATON), for Monday and Tuesday, December 3 and 4, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, was amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic;

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 4, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in executive session, on Tuesday, December 4, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the committee room 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10: 30 a. m. on Tuesday, December 4, 1945, in room 245, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 4719.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, December 5, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of hearings on H. R. 2764, the freight forwarders bill, to hear opposition.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will have an executive meeting on Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

849. A letter from the national adjutant and paymaster, Marine Corps League, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal period of August 1944 to September 30, 1945, of the Marine Corps League; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

850. A letter from the chairman, the National Archives, transmitting the annual report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Library.

851. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Herbert C. Rockwell; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1329. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1330. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1331. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3787. A bill for the relief of Natale Piavallo, also known as Natale Kiecieck, with amendment (Rept. No. 1328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 4870. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming, to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Bear River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4871. A bill to provide for the appointment of three additional Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4872. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4873. A bill to create an agricultural credit agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4874. A bill to provide gold star emblems to mothers and fathers of men who lost their lives in the armed services of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4875. A bill to provide for the investigation and mediation of labor disputes, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

H. J. Res. 280. Joint resolution creating a joint select committee to study and recommend legislation concerning labor disputes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4876. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John W. Jones; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4877. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John R. Andresen; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4878. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John Akers a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4879. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Leslie Warrior; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4880. A bill for the relief of J. N. Kilgore; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Alice C. Knox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 4882. A bill for the relief of Alfred Abboud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4883. A bill for the relief of Eric Goffe M. Loffe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4884. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4885. A bill for the relief of Ernst V. Brender; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4886. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Carbone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 4887. A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4888. A bill for the relief of Gustav F. Doscher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4889. A bill for the relief of Jordan B. Gross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4890. A bill for the relief of Helen C. Coffey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 4891. A bill granting a pension to Mary O. Shaw Lyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4892. A bill with respect to national service life insurance in the case of the late William E. Dennis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1365. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Monacatootha Post, No. 580, of the American Legion, Monaca, Pa., opposing S. 1203 and H. R. 3522; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1366. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the pastors and keymen of the Lutheran Center Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to aid to the occupied countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1367. Also, petition of Local 248, United Federal Workers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their call for the summary abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

1368. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 150 Austrian military internees, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their scheduled surrender to Russia for forced labor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1369. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. G. Wells and various citizens of Riverside, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of H. R. 2229, H. R. 2230, S. 690, and S. 809; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou hast given unto all of us a life of high vocation. May Thy spirit interpret for us its sacred meaning and reveal its glorious opportunities. Help us to sense the sanctity of even the most commonplace duty.

We pray that the chosen representatives of our beloved country may be in-

spired to come to the sacrament of public service with clear minds and courageous hearts. May they be richly endowed with wisdom as they seek to mediate the blessings of the more abundant life to suffering and struggling humanity.

Grant that the unity of spirit, which was forged in the heat of battle by freedom-loving nations, may be strengthened and sustained in the continuing tasks of peace. May all the nations of the earth live and go forward as a commonwealth of free people, united by those bonds of friendship and good will which nothing can break and which shall match our common need.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, December 3, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4571. An act to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; and

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] may be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for a week, or possibly 10 days, while he is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is excused.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] be assigned to the following committees: Commerce, Mines and Mining, and Privileges and Elections; and

That the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] be assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 117)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting additional estimates of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $227,000, for the fiscal year 1946, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Massachusetts, like every other State, has a serious housing problem, particularly as it is related to returning veterans. I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter I have received from Philip Nichols, former chairman of the Massachusetts State Housing Board, a gentleman who has studied this subject for a great many years and is an authority on the problems of housing.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
STATE BOARD OF HOUSING,
Boston, December 1, 1945.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I acknowledge receipt of your telegram of November 29 in regard to the housing situation in Massachusetts and the possibilities of relief through Federal action, and I have talked with Mr. McBride as requested. I find that his views as to the existing situation and to the possible remedies are much the same as mine.

The situation is one that has given me great concern in the past 2 months and on which I have devoted much time and thought in seeking a remedy. There is no doubt that there is an acute shortage of housing in many cities and towns in Massachusetts. Families of men who have remained in civilian life were already hard put to it by the middle of this year to find either single residence or apartments for rental. Vacant houses or apartments were indeed almost impossible to find. When to this population already suffering from shortage and overcrowding some 600,000 returning veterans are added, of whom from 80,000 to 100,000 are or will be seeking homes, the seriousness of the situation can well be imagined. In some cities and towns the local officials have been driven nearly frantic by the tales of distress due to inability to obtain shelter brought to them daily. This distress they have no means of alleviating under existing laws.

All of the public-housing projects are full and have waiting lists of qualified applicants longer than the entire capacity of the projects. We are told of private apartment houses with waiting lists of over a thousand families. Apparently the only way in which a homeless family can house itself is by buying a dwelling at an inflated figure and evicting the occupant. This method is beyond the means of most families, and in any event, it does not help to solve the over-all problem. What can be done to relieve this situation is a most difficult problem.

The problem is divided into two parts: (1) To provide permanent housing, (2) to provide temporary shelter while the permanent housing is being brought into existence.

The deficiency in housing was, of course, primarly due to the lack of building during the depression, and the cutting off of all private construction during the war. I feel confident that the deficiency so far as it relates to permanent housing will eventually be overcome by private enterprise and the economic law of supply and demand. Considerable time must, however, elapse before the building of private houses can even start, and it may well take 10 years before the building industry fully catches up with the deficiency.

At present there is plenty of available land, builders and contractors are anxious to get started, and the treasuries of savings banks, cooperative banks and insurance companies are overloaded with uninvested funds seeking an outlet. The only thing lacking is building materials. Almost everything required for building a dwelling house is almost impossible to obtain, and it is reported that, as to some materials at least, the production is starting very slowly.

As all restrictions and price limitations have already been removed, it is hard to see what more can be done by the Federal Government to quicken the supply of building materials. It has been suggested that priorities in favor of materials for home-building be established by the Government. If such building material is being or is likely to be diverted for other purposes not equally as essential as home building, the establishment of such priorities would tend to speed up the start of dwelling house construction. If there is any large amount of surplus war material that could be used for dwelling construction it should be released.

On the whole, however, I think that private enterprise can be counted on to make up the deficiency in permanent housing as rapidly as the supply of materials permits, at least in providing homes for families able to pay economic prices and economic rents. For the lowest income groups the need of the federally subsidized public housing is more urgent than ever. Provision for continuing these activities is of course contained in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

There are of course possibilities of eventually expediting and encouraging private building suggested by some of the other provisions of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, but this does not seem to me the occasion for discussing them, as they involve new and perhaps debatable long term economic policies and what is needed now is immediate production of building materials.

With respect to temporary housing required to carry over the homeless veterans who have no relatives with whom they can double up, the situation is just as difficult. However, I do not believe that the erection of new temporary housing such as was provided near some of the manufacturing plants engaged in war industries is the solution. Such housing is very expensive—about $4,000 per dwelling unit—the materials are lacking, and if obtained would aggravate the shortage of materials for permanent housing and postpone for several years the completion of the permanent housing needed to make up the housing deficiency.

I think that we must make the best use of what we have, first by setting up home information centers, and also making surveys of all available housing in each city or town, remodelling or rehabilitating existing residential property and if necessary large, vacant buildings of other types; also providing locations for or supplying portable and prefabricated houses, huts, cabins and trailers. Even vessels may have to be used in some cases.

At the last session of the legislature a resolve was adopted requiring the State board of housing to submit recommendations in regard to providing housing for veterans, with a draft of proposed legislation. This report has to be filed not later than December 6 and I have nearly completed a report, and a bill containing a grant of authority to cities and towns to act as outlined in the previous paragraph. With this effort under State authority the Federal Government might cooperate in one or more of the following forms:

(1) By releasing to all public bodies needing them such temporary war housing as is no longer required for its original use, at a nominal charge. This help is now being given

some extent, but some of the temporary war housing is being destroyed or sold for private purposes.

(2) By devoting all of the permanent war housing to housing for veterans and converting it when no longer needed by the veterans to low-rent housing for low-income families generally.

(3) By cooperating as far as possible with local officials in the use of all available locations, buildings and materials, owned or controlled by the Federal Government, including surplus war material, for providing shelter for veterans and their families.

(4) By using all suitable shipping when no longer needed, to provide shelter for veterans in cities bordering on the sea and on navigable waters. If the crisis becomes more acute, the Liberty ships now unused and tied up and other freighters might be converted so as to house many veterans and their families.

I feel that the consequences of allowing the soldiers and sailors to return to their own home cities and towns, to be received as heroes and then to find no place to live will be serious and that everything that can be done should be done to avoid such a situation, even if we temporarily have to swallow some of our ideas about the expenditure of public funds for private use, city planning, and zoning and other conceptions of public policy which must be lived up to in normal times.

I am very glad if I can be of any use in this difficult situation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP NICHOLS.

PERMANENT FAIR-EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a telegram I have received from the Kansas District Woman's Missionary Society, in which they favor immediate action on permanent fair-employment practice legislation.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *November 30, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We urge immediate and effective permanent fair-employment legislation to protect rights of all men to gainful employment and willing to work without regard to color, race, creed, or previous condition of servitude. Please exert your every effort to this end and know that we pray a just and loving God of us all will lead your steps aright.

KANSAS DISTRICT WOMAN'S MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
MRS. GEORGIA WALKER, *Chairman.*
MRS. ORA CARTER, *Member.*
REV. R. C. D. TEUEL, Jr.
MRS. ROSA BASS.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution recently adopted by the Kansas Savings and Loan League, protesting against the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, S. 1592, to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Kansas Savings and Loan League, acknowledging that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and realizing that there are abroad in the land today certain influences and destructive philosophies which, if allowed to spread unrestrained, would undermine and damage, if not entirely destroy, those traditional ideals of individual thrift and private home ownership to which we have been so long committed, do hereby

Resolve, That we voice our disapproval and opposition to the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill (S. 1592) providing for an all-powerful permanent National Housing Administration, with extensive and permanent powers over the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration which will include influence and appointments, control of appropriations, reports, regulations, and authority for mingling and further consolidation. That the provisions of the bill will give the public housing group a dominance in the Federal Government that is illogical, unfair, and unnecessary, if this country is basically and honestly interested in private enterprise and home ownership.

That we, as thoughtful citizens of the State of Kansas and of the United States of America, publicly proclaim and restate our sincere belief in the fundamental social, patriotic, and economic values of private financing, private building, and private ownership of homes as opposed to the publicly sponsored or socialized housing concept.

That the leaders of our Government and Members of Congress should realize that the public housers are using the housing shortage that has resulted from the war as an excuse to stifle private enterprise by introducing legislation that is public housing done up in the impressive wrappings of a "private enterprise program."

That we, closely associated with the individual home owner and taxpayer, and conscious of his problems and requirements, are fully convinced that private enterprise has been, now is, and will be, ready, willing, and able to adequately meet the housing needs of our citizens—that Federal encroachment in the housing field is unreasonable and unnecessary and can lead only to paternalistic tendencies in the individual citizen's character and independence of thought that we, as Americans, must certainly deplore and discourage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3603. A bill to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 807).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1590. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites; without amendment (Rept. No. 809);

S. 1605. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 810);

S. 1631. A bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 811);

H. R. 2553. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 812); and

H. R. 2556. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 813).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1653. A bill to amend section 3 of the Social Security Act so as to provide for computation of amounts of grants to States for old-age assistance on the basis of the financial resources of the several States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1654. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CARVILLE:

S. 1655. A bill to amend section 2288 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bill 1656, prohibiting labor organizations from making contracts or engaging in combinations or conspiracies in restraint of commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1657. A bill to amend Public Law 779 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "An act to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved December 1, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1658. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1659. A bill relating to appointments in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 4571. An act to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SEATS FOR DISABLED VETERANS AT THE ARMY-NAVY GAME

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to say something today about a resolution which I shall offer. I know of the important business now before the Senate, and I do not wish to interrupt its consideration for more than a moment. So I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas there is conducted an annual contest in football between the respective teams representing the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, commonly known as the Army-Navy game; and

Whereas such contest typifies and expresses the spirit of friendly rivalry between the two services and all members of these services regardless of rank or commission; and

Whereas the athletic associations of both Academies have the authority to allocate and block out seats for such contest and make suitable provisions for members of the armed forces, disabled, and otherwise, to obtain seats for such game before general sale; and

Whereas at the recent contest played in Philadelphia December 1, 1945, no apparent effort was made by such associations to allocate seats for disabled veterans able to attend such contests, although other groups of citizens were allocated seats: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate direct its standing Committee on Military Affairs to ascertain the methods used by the associations in allocating seats to disabled veterans and in giving such veterans opportunity to obtain such seats to the end that in future Army-Navy contests proper allocation and opportunity be given to all disabled veterans to attend the contest.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Washington will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NEW ENGLAND AND THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT — ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject New England and the St. Lawrence Project, delivered by Senator AIKEN before the Boston City Club, November 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE AMERICAN SLAV CONGRESS, DETROIT, MICH.

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the annual convention of the American Slav Congress at Detroit, Mich., December 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

HIROHITO'S STATUS — EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hirohito's Status," published in the Washington Star of December 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DELAWARE DAY (1944) ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL at a joint meeting of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs of Dover, Del., on December 7, 1944, in celebration of the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the State of Delaware, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENGLAND—ENEMY OF LIBERTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "England—Enemy of Liberty," delivered by him at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, N. Y., on November 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business. They have been excused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD EUROPE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee of the House of Representatives recently spent a number of weeks on the European Continent in an investigation and examination at first hand of conditions there, and in a study of our permanent policies toward the defeated German nation. The committee several days ago filed a report on conditions in Europe, and made certain recommendations. This report was very critical of our policies toward Germany, and made recommendations for a sane economic reconstruction of that unhappy nation.

I recently read in a communistic newspaper that the American people are the least informed about current world conditions of the people of any civilized nation. I agree entirely with this conclusion. There appears to be a conspiracy of silence to conceal from our people the true picture of conditions in Europe, to secrete from us the facts regarding conditions on the Continent and information as to our policies toward the German people. In spite of this suppression the American people are becoming suspicious of conditions across the Rhine, and suspect the motives behind every source of information or alleged information that sees the light through the barrage of propaganda which is being used to blind us. Are the real facts witheld because our policies are so cruel that the American people would not endorse them?

A number of weeks ago Mr. Hoover and a committee of experts appointed for the purpose submitted to General Clay a report on German industry, in which were given figures on the industrial production necessary to leave to that country an industrial output sufficient to feed and clothe its population. This report was at wide variance with the policies and plans of our own Government. In fact, I am informed it took issue with the proposals of our Government, and showed that our policies would cause grave hardship, starvation, and human suffering abroad. The report was immediately marked "Secret," and was not released and has not been released to the American people.

Mr. President, at first the State Department refused to furnish me a copy of the report, stating that the Members of the American Congress had no right to the information therein contained, but on yesterday, through the intercession of a high official of the State Department, the report was given to me, with the understanding and the promise received from me first, that the information therein would not be made available to the people of this country.

At a time when the war is over, why there should be secrets from the American people is more than I can comprehend. If our policies could withstand the sunlight of publicity, if they were just and humane, I am confident that the Government would desire that the full facts be given to our people.

On last Thursday it was announced that certain German industries were available for reparations and that they would be shipped out of Germany. The particular industries included were not announced. This information is also evidently marked "Secret."

What have we to hide, Mr. President? Why should these facts be withheld from the people of the United States? There cannot possibly be any valid reason for secrecy. Are we following a policy of vindictive hatred, a policy which would not be endorsed by the American people as a whole if they knew true conditions?

Mr. President, I should be less than honest if I did not state frankly that the picture is so much worse, so much more confused, than the American people suspect, that I do not know of any source that is capable of producing the complete factual account of the true situation into which our policies have taken the American people. The truth is that the nations of central, southern, and eastern Europe are adrift on a flood of anarchy and chaos.

Mr. President, the whole American people are responsible for the policies of our Government. Eventually, we will reap the reward or pay the price for these policies. Our policies, therefore, should certainly be subject to the most searching scrutiny. Our people are most certainly entitled to know fully what their Government is doing abroad.

Mr. President, last summer, with a group of my colleagues of the Senate, I visited Europe and at first-hand saw conditions in western, central, and southern Germany.

We discovered that in the Reich most of the houses in all of the cities have been destroyed. Millions are homeless. Millions more are dead. Most of the factories are in ruins. Practically all the bridges are blown up. The railroads and transportation system are wrecked. The misery and human suffering are terrible to contemplate. No nation in modern history has suffered such catastrophe as Germany endures today.

We were unable to go into eastern Germany because of the policies of the Russian Government, but from authentic reports received, both in person and through the press, conditions there, due to the policies of the Soviet Government and the conduct of the Soviet armies, are horrible beyond human comprehension. In fact, by eyewitness accounts, loot, pillage, pestilence, rape, wholesale murder, and human suffering form one of the most terrible chapters in human history. Words are incapable of adequately picturing conditions there. The virtue of womanhood and the value of human life are civilized man's most sacred possessions, yet they are the very cheapest thing in Russian-occupied Germany today.

Mr. President, I agree entirely with the recommendations in the Colmer report. There is more intelligence in the conclusions of this committee than in anything I have read regarding our policies toward this late enemy state. I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate. In the name of decency, in the name of civilization, for the sake of our own future welfare, and for the future of world peace there must be a complete review and revision of our policies for the reconstruction of the German Nation and the rehabilitation of the German people.

Mr. President, there is a minority school of thought in this country headed by Mr. Morgenthau and Mr. Bernard Bernstein and by certain high officials of this Government which has held and still holds that Germany should be deindustrialized, her heavy industry for peace as well as war destroyed or removed, and that she be reduced to an agricultural state with a population consisting largely of subsistence farmers. The proponents of this plan advocate allowing her only enough industry to serve her most limited, essential consumer needs. She would not be permitted an industrial production large enough to enable her to export large amounts of peacetime industrial products which would enable her in return to buy foods, agricultural raw materials, and industrial imports necessary if Germany is to have a standard of living comparable with other civilized nations. In fact, under this program it would even be necessary, as advocated and admitted by Mr. Morgenthau, for the German people even to export food to pay for the fertilizer which is so essential to the productivity of the soils of Germany. It is admitted that under the Morgenthau dispensation the standard of living of the German people would thus be very low, and that Germany as an industrial nation would be a thing of the past.

Mr. President, in support of his plan, Mr. Morgenthau has written a book attempting to prove that Germany, stripped of her best agricultural lands in the east, stripped of Austria, the Sudeten and the Saar—and that program today has largely been carried out—and in addition stripped of her industry, can still survive as an agricultural nation. This program, as I shall show in a few moments, represents the policy adopted by the American Government.

What are the facts?

Prewar Germany had 79,000,000 people and 225,000 square miles of land, including Austria and the Sudeten area. Stripped of East Prussia, Silesia, the Sudeten, Austria, and the Saar, Germany's area is reduced about one-third, or to about 150,000 square miles. The area of Texas is 267,000 square miles. Mr. Morgenthau, therefore, wants what remains of Germany's 79,000,000 people to subsist on an area 40 percent smaller than the State of Texas.

In 1940 the United States census revealed that the size of the average American farm was 174 acres. Under Mr. Morgenthau's plan the average German farm would be 6 acres. Yet, Mr. Morgenthau says on page 54 of his book that Germany could even export enough food crops to pay for her fertilizer requirements.

I notice from the newspapers that Mr. Morgenthau states that the recent Potsdam agreements, which promulgated our permanent German policies are based upon his proposals.

The New York Times, on October 18, in commenting on this fact states:

> This means that the policy toward Germany determined upon at that conference was in the main an American plan and must, therefore, also be primarily an American responsibility.

How is it that the Morgenthau plan manages to find its way into an official declaration of America's intentions toward the German people? The fact is, I am informed, that the directive issued to General Eisenhower, which Mr. Morgenthau demanded be released after having been kept secret for months, was Mr. Morgenthau's brain child, and that it did not represent the views of the Central European Division of the State Department, and further that the directive did not represent either the Department's long months of preparation or its own convictions in the matter. I am informed further that this plan was fathered and born in the Treasury Department, and the responsibility for its consequences must be laid at that door.

Mr. President, the American people have not the slightest idea of what Mr. Morgenthau's proposal and our policies for Germany mean in terms of its economic or social or religious implications. It is not to the interest of America that oriental, atheistic philosophies prevail in the heart of Europe, the cradle of western civilization; and yet, if these policies are pursued this will be the result, to the grave detriment of America.

Under our policies the exports of Germany are to be limited to merely 2,000,000,000 reichsmarks per year against 12,000,000,000 reichsmarks in normal times, and even this amount did not afford prosperous conditions to the German people. In other words, German exports are to be reduced to one-sixth of normal. Much of the industry of Germany was destroyed in the war. Sixty percent of the remaining heavy industry is to be removed. The plan is to deindustrialize Germany and destroy most of her peacetime industry as well as all war industry.

Of course, there is no argument regarding the elimination of Germany's war industry. We are all agreed on that. We are all agreed, too, that she must be kept disarmed. But why blur the easily defined distinction between peacetime industry and war industry? By eliminating specific war industries, preventing the stock-piling of certain raw materials, and by supervising German industry, there will be no possibility whatever of Germany rearming. The basic issues here have nothing whatever to do with German rearmament. To deindustrialize Germany is not necessary to render Germany powerless again to wage war.

We are concerned, instead, with the great issue of humanitarianism, of our responsibility as a civilized, Christian people in the face of profound misery, suffering, and impending starvation abroad. We are concerned with the great question of the effect present policies will have upon our own economy and on the future peace of the world.

Mr. President, western Germany, the part now occupied by the United States, Britain, and France, is the industrial heart of Europe. In the prewar years the whole of Germany produced only 80 percent of its food supply, and western Germany, the large industrial area, produced nothing like its essential food requirements. Normally the American area produced 75 percent of the food required to give each person 1,500 calories per day. Mr. President, 1,500 calories a

day is a starvation diet, which will do irreparable damage to the human body. The French area produced 45 percent, and the British area less than that. Of course, production today, due to war dislocations and lack of fertilizer, is only a fraction of that.

For centuries the lands in Germany east of the Oder-Neisse Rivers have been inhabited by 9,000,000 people of German culture, tongue, and blood. In Czechoslovakia, two to three million more reside in the Sudeten areas. In the Potsdam agreement these areas were given to Poland and Czechoslovakia, with the understanding that their populations would be uprooted from their homes by the Russians, Poles, and Czechs. As a result, their lands, implements, tools, food, and even most of their clothing, were confiscated, and the men have been enslaved and taken off to Russia. By the way, Mr. President, this is the first time in the Christian era that the doctrine of slavery has been adopted as applied to the white race. The women and little children, defenseless and helpless, were driven, starving, at the beginning of winter, into the other zones of Germany. Many of them died of starvation and pestilence. Many were cruelly murdered by their oppressors, made to wander aimlessly, stripped of everything they owned, while their children died like flies, without food or medicine. The suffering of these people forms one of the most cruel chapters in history. We agreed to this. We did it, as was said—and I quote from the Potsdam agreement—"to restore true justice and peace." This agreement was made to settle the disputes which were dividing the United Nations. It was made to compensate Poland for her territory which was forcibly seized by Russia. We agreed to this transfer of populations, we are a party to and must assume part of the responsibility for the destitution and suffering of these people, and there is certainly a moral and legal obligation upon us to prevent those who now live from starving. There is an obligation upon us to assist them in starting anew.

The only surplus food-producing areas in Germany were in the east, areas which because of our agreements have been taken from her. Today she is left with a production of less than 50 percent of her necessary food requirements. Even with a very low diet she must import a vast amount of food. Today the Russians refuse to make food grown in the east available to the people of Germany outside the Russian zone, and very little, if any, to the people who remain in that zone—a fact which greatly increases the relief load which American taxpayers must bear and which we will be willing to bear because we are a civilized and Christian people.

The Russian area, in addition to containing the most fertile and productive agricultural area in the country, contained the second largest industrial area. This eastern industrial region has been looted by the Russian armies. Factories and industrial equipment of all kinds have been removed to Russia. Food, grain, herds, livestock, and farm machinery have been seized and shipped off to the Soviet Union. The country has been devastated. Thousands of people have been murdered, thousands of women violated, and conditions horrible beyond civilized human comprehension prevail.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks sundry newspaper clippings which deal with conditions in the areas of Germany occupied by the Russian Army.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From PM, New York, N. Y., of October 3, 1945]

UNITED STATES DOCTORS IN BERLIN FEAR DEADLY WINTER—SAY MOST GERMANS UNDER 10 AND OVER 60 WILL BE KILLED OFF

(By Edd Johnson)

BERLIN, October 3.—Germans are going to die like flies this winter—so say the United States public-health officers here.

The Germans are undernourished and flea bitten. A typhus epidemic is inevitable, they say. They predict that German children under 10 years of age will virtually be eliminated by diphtheria and that tuberculosis will kill thousands under 10. Diarrhea now afflicts almost all new-born German children.

The infant mortality rate in Berlin is 16 times as high today as it was in 1943. A German Red Cross official predicts an infant mortality rate of 80 to 90 percent during the coming winter.

There is going to be a definite age-group elimination of the German population. Most children under 10 and people over 60 cannot be expected to survive the coming winter, they say.

The inevitable influenza epidemic will fill the gutters with German dead—and I am still quoting the public-health officers with whom I have had rather close associations in the past few days.

These public-health officers have no statistics with which to back their predictions. The AMG denazification program has made it impossible to obtain hard facts. All efficient medical-statistical personnel have been denazified and fired.

Nonetheless the public-health officers are talking as reported above. If they are correct in those predictions, then those predictions are the most important news that could come out of Germany today.

For it would again mean that our occupation has brought depopulation to the groups who are the principal hope of a new democratic Germany—the very young and the very old.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 16, 1945]

GIRL DESCRIBES RAPE OF DANZIG BY RED SOLDIERS

(By Hal Foust)

STOCKHOLM, October 15.—The rape of Danzig—literally the violation of its women and young girls by the Russians—was described here tonight by two sisters, 15 and 17 years old, with their 20-year-old brother, their parents, and their uncle contributing details of barbarism they said was not ended. They were a Swiss family which recently escaped from the Polish Corridor and are en route to their homeland.

The younger girl, with the nonchalance of a high-school student reporting a football game, told of brutal sex attacks upon her classmates, of sex murders by Soviet soldiers in an air-raid shelter, and of the almost flippant attitude toward such crimes under Russian rule.

ASSERT ASSAULTS COMMON

"It is so commonplace in Danzig now that a girl's screams attract little attention," the mother added as if to explain her daughter's failure to blush.

"There were a couple of hundred of us, mostly women and children, in a shelter when Russian soldiers came in," the child related. "They took my 14-year-old chum because she was blond and pretty. She cried and shrieked. The mothers protested and the Russians pointed their guns at the crowd and told them to shut up.

"Her father, a German, interceded. 'Better go with them, darling,' he said, 'before they kill all of us.'

"She went. About 4 hours later she came back. She walked into the shelter and fainted in front of all of us. She was dead.

CHOSE ONE AT A TIME

"We spent much time in the shelters in those first weeks of Russian occupation because they were about the only roofs left in Danzig. Soldiers finding us there barred the exit and used the shelter office for vergewaltigungen (translated 'forced down').

"We could hear screams as the soldiers took turns with the victim. They would come in and take out one girl at a time. One day another school chum, a 15-year-old, was taken into the office about a dozen times and I could hear her crying. The last time she was thrown into the shelter unconscious."

The mother told us of an 18-year-old girl living with them who was repeatedly ravaged by the Russians who forced their way into their house in the daytime as well as at night.

HID IN FEATHER BEDS

The father made haste to add that his own daughters, after early narrow escapes, were confined to their home and were successfully hidden in feather beds during repeated searches by soldiers hunting women, liquor, and incidental loot.

Another rape story involved the wife of an American engineer who had been employed in Stettin at the outbreak of the war. She was assaulted in her home which flew the Stars and Stripes over the front door. They said she recently left for America via Berlin, an invalid.

[From the New York Daily News of October 8, 1945]

GERMAN REFUGEES BARE HORRORS OF DEATH FLIGHT

(By Donald Mackenzie)

BERLIN, October 7.—In the windswept courtyard of the Stettiner Bahnhof, a cohort of German refugees, part of 12,000,000 to 19,000,000 dispossessed in East Prussia and Silesia, sat huddled in groups under a driving rain and told the story of their miserable pilgrimage, during which more than 25 percent died by the roadside and the remainder were so starved they scarcely had strength to walk.

Filthy, emaciated, and carrying their few remaining possessions wrapped in bits of cloth, they shrank away crouching when one approached them in the railway terminal, expecting to be beaten or robbed or worse. That is what they have become accustomed to expect.

RED ATROCITIES CHARGED

A nurse from Stettin, a young, good-looking blond, told how her father had been stabbed to death by Russian soldiers who, after raping her mother and sister, tried to break into her own room. She escaped and hid under a haystack with four other women for 4 days, she said, then remained on in the city working for the Poles who had taken over a portion of the city, until she had bartered everything she owned for food.

She said that in Stettin and all other cities in East Prussia food rations for the remaining Germans were a twentieth of the rations in Berlin.

On the train to Berlin she was pillaged once by Russian troops and twice by Poles who, she said, were far more savage than

the Russians. Women who resisted were shot dead, she said, and on one occasion she saw a Polish guard take an infant by the legs and crush its skull against a post because the child cried while the guard was raping its mother.

The nurse said it was pathetic to see in the midst of starvation ripened crops standing in the field with nobody to harvest them.

An old peasant from Silesia said shooting and fights between Russians and Poles were daily events, with officers smacking each other's faces and having duels with hand grenades. An old man said that when his party reached Kustrin a typhoid epidemic broke out in the train and all who were sick were pushed out on the platform, where they lay day and night until they died.

GANTLET OF ROBBERY

But first these victims were robbed of everything they had, even their shoes. Infants were robbed of their swaddling clothes so that they froze to death. All the healthy girls and women, even those 65 years of age, were raped in the train and then robbed, the peasant said.

Another woman with whiplash bruises across her face said that as the party with which she marched to the railroad from Upper Silesia was passing through Sagan, Polish civilians lined both sides of the road and the refugees were systematically robbed and beaten as they walked by.

They were stripped naked in streets and their bodies were gone over by jeering Poles. Many men and women continued to march barefoot in shirts and pants.

By the time they reached Cottbus, 90 percent of them had died.

This informant said one of the most galling things to the starving pilgrims to see was Polish stores and delicatessens crammed with luxury foods which the Poles bought freely at exorbitant prices with money obtained by looting German homes of furniture and selling it.

She concluded that she thought she was pregnant. She had been raped 30 times on the journey to Berlin.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of October 2, 1945]

STARVING BERLIN'S DAY OF RECKONING IS TERRIBLE ONE

(By Donald MacKenzie)

BERLIN, October 1.—Children of this city are dying like flies from undernourishment. Typhoid is rampant and the shadow of approaching death is plain on the gaunt faces of adults who are slowly starving because most of them are living on a ration that supplies scarcely half the minimum necessary to support life.

MORE SUFFERING AHEAD

But worse is still to come. Winter, it is universally admitted here, will intensify hardships a hundredfold. There will be no coal nor any other heating fuels for city dwellers in Germany this winter. Even if the mines were producing there is no transportation to distribute coal. Tens of thousands will freeze to death before Christmas.

Today we drove through the rubble that once was Berlin. Over an area bigger than Manhattan and the Bronx, including the Tiergarten, Unter den Linden and the whole of what formerly was select west Berlin, there is not one habitable building. Of the 15 percent of the city not wholly destroyed, most of the still habitable buildings have been taken over by American, British, and Russian occupation missions.

More than 3,000,000 Berlin residents, most of them women, live in the remainder.

CITY WAS LOOTED

The city was systematically looted in May, and blankets, pillows, bed linen, cooking utensils, and all food was carried off.

Shoes are so scarce and shabby that tens of thousands will go barefooted within a few weeks. In their present underfed condition, following years of undernourishment and privation, their mass extermination is as certain as though they were in the infamous Auschwitz or Belsen concentration camps.

American, British, and Russian evictions were governed strictly by military dictates. We took the best homes left standing and gave the German occupants a few minutes to pack one suitcase and get out to find what accommodations they could.

SEARCH GARBAGE CANS

Great streams of discharged German soldiers and displaced persons gush into Berlin every day but they are not permitted to remain, even though their families are here. The authorities refuse to issue them ration cards so that they are compelled to carry their miseries elsewhere.

Today we saw long lines of women with bags ransacking garbage cans in search of scraps of food, cigarette butts or bits of rag. It is impossible adequately to convey the scene in words. It was pouring with a rain that has been steady for 16 hours. The women all were drenched.

Every so often we passed funeral processions. The coffins were bundled along on wheelbarrows. They had no lids and the rain beat in on the corpses. Coffins are scarce in Berlin, so they are used only to convey the bodies to the burial plots. The dead are then tipped into the graves and the coffins resold.

COMMON GRAVE USED

The poor who can't afford coffins carry their dead to the crematorium and dump them before the gates. The overworked crematorium cannot handle all of the bodies, so some of those that are unidentified are carted off to a common grave outside the city.

As a final touch to the picture of Berlin's plight, the sewers are seeping into the drinking-water supplies so that it is dangerous to drink unchlorinated water. That is well enough for the victors who have plenty of drugs. The Germans have none and do not even ask for drugs for hospitals.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 5, 1945]

REDS TERRORIZE CONQUERED WITH RAPE AND DEATH

(By B. J. Kospoth)

LONDON, August 4.—As our long line of British Army lorries (trucks) carrying American, British, and French liberated prisoners of war from the Russian to the main Anglo-American zone of Germany rolled through the main street of Brahlstorf, the last Russian-occupied town, a pretty blond girl darted from the crowd of Germans watching us and made a dash for our truck.

Clinging with both hands to the tailboard, she made a desperate effort to climb in. But we were driving too fast and the board was too high. After being dragged several hundred yards she had to let go and fell on the cobblestone street.

IN STATE OF TERROR

That scene was a dramatic illustration of the state of terror in which women in Russian-occupied eastern Germany were living. All these women, Germans, Polish, Jewish, and even Russian girls "freed" from Nazi slave camps were dominated by one desperate desire—to escape from the Red zone.

Before I describe what happened to the women of Pomerania when the Russians came I want to put it on record that I have no wish to vilify the Red army, whose brilliant military exploits already are a matter of history. I shall relate only facts which came within range of my personal observation.

I know the Russian high command issued orders to restrain Red soldiers and I have seen local Russian commanders run considerable personal risk trying to protect women against the lust of undisciplined drunken troops.

ORDERS RARELY ENFORCED

But I also know that the high command's orders frequently were not enforced and rarely obeyed.

In the district around our internment camp—the territory comprising the towns of Schlawe, Lauenburg, and Buckow and hundreds of larger villages—Red soldiers during the first weeks of their occupation raped every woman and girl between the ages of 12 and 60. That sounds exaggerated but it is the simple truth.

The only exceptions were girls who managed to remain in hiding in the woods or who had the presence of mind to feign illness—typhoid, diphtheria, or some other infectious disease. Flushed with victory—and often with wine found in the cellars of rich Pomeranian land owners—the Reds searched every house for women, cowing them with pistols or tommy guns, and carried them into their tanks or trucks.

PROTECTORS MURDERED

Husbands and fathers who attempted to protect their womenfolk were shot down and girls offering extreme resistance were murdered.

Some weeks after the invasion, Red "political commissions" began a tour of the countryside ostensibly in search of members of the Nazi Party. In every village the women were told to report for examination of papers to these commissions which looked them over and detained those with sex appeal. The youngest and prettiest were taken by the officers and the rest left to the mercy of the privates.

This reign of terror lasted as long as I was with the Reds in Pomerania. Several girls whom I had known during my captivity committed suicide. Others died after having been raped by 10 soldiers in succession.

HIDING FROM REDS

In an isolated farmhouse where my French comrade and myself spent 3 months after joining the Reds, there were eight young girls from neighboring villages hiding from the Reds. One was always on watch and whenever the Russians were seen approaching they scampered off into a nearby woods and hid in the dense underbrush. This sometimes happened several times daily and the girls never had a quiet moment but while we were there the Reds never discovered them.

All of these girls already had been raped and three of them—one a little girl of 13—were pregnant.

Inevitably the Red occupation is having a disastrous effect on the morality of the inhabitants and the existing conditions of anarchy will exert an evil influence for years. Many women have been infected with venereal diseases and now a very few youthful girls have joined the Reds for pleasure and food and are helping them spot their compatriots.

QUEER CODE OF HONOR

Whenever possible, girls attach themselves to liberated Anglo-American or French prisoners of war for protection against the Russians. Curiously, the Reds seemed to have a special code of honor in this respect—they will take an Allied prisoner's watch but won't touch his girl.

On the road to the Prenzlau crossing of the Oder River we met three young Pomeranian Jewish girls who begged us to take them with us. They were highly respectable and had succeeded in escaping the Russians, but they were in mortal fear of them. Every night when we were sleeping in ruined houses or haylofts Red soldiers would awaken us while making their customary rounds in search of women but when they saw our uniforms they would merely grunt "harasho"

(all right) and go away without molesting the girls.

GOT GIRLS TO SAFETY

We eventually got the girls safely across the line of demarkation to Lueneburg.

When the Red army starts a big offensive its commanders hold out prospects of unrestricted rape and pillage as encouragement to the troops, but later they try to stem the tide of lust—not on grounds of humanity but because it threatens to undermine discipline.

Squadrons of Cossacks, used by the Reds, as they were by the czar, as mounted police, periodically surrounded villages in Pomerania and searched all the houses for deserters and stragglers who had remained behind with women. The Cossacks mercilessly drove the soldiers off to jail with their "nagaikas"—Cossack whips—but they kept the women for their own pleasure.

Mr. EASTLAND. From an area recognized as possessing one of the high points of world civilization in the twentieth century, most of the male population has been enslaved and shipped off to work camps in the Soviet Union. Today this area needs our help even more than western Germany.

Mr. President, we are face to face with stark reality. When we adopt the program which is cut out for Germany, we sentence millions of people to starvation and death. We limit them to land which will not grow the food to feed their populations. We strip their industry, prevent them from manufacturing, and thus deprive them of the ability to earn a livelihood. We attempt to keep them permanently at starvation levels. We are not punishing the guilty. Innocent, helpless little children and defenseless women are doomed to die by the policies of the American Government—people who have violated neither the laws of God nor man. The American people are not bloodthirsty. Our people, if they know the facts, would not be guilty of cruel, inhuman injustice. Under what theory should we make the children pay for the sins of their elders? Yet we are doing so. There is a 50-percent infant mortality in Berlin today. I am informed the infant mortality in Russian-occupied Austria is 100 percent. Throughout this winter the rate in Berlin and the rest of Germany will greatly increase.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to make a brief comment. The Senator says that we are not punishing the children of the fathers who are guilty, but that we are punishing the children of the fathers and mothers who are not guilty at all.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree with the Senator 100 percent. Recently I heard a very distinguished man answer this question. The question was put to one of the greatest men in the United States, "Do you think the German people as a whole should be exterminated in order to make peace in the world?" His answer was a wonderful one. He said: "I do not believe that any people as a whole should be exterminated, because there are good and bad people in every nation." He called attention to the fact that in Germany 1,800,000 non-Jews had resisted Hitler to the point where they had been executed, or put into prison camps, and enslaved. He said: "I wish to God that I felt there were 4,000,000 people in the United States whose population is twice Germany's who would resist dictatorship to the point where they might be executed or be put into prison camps."

The Senator is speaking on a subject which is very interesting to me. Unless we cure the difficulty there will be a historical record which we shall always be ashamed to look at.

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe that future generations will condemn the American people if our present policies are not changed. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. As I shall show in a moment, those policies, if pursued, will also gravely damage the American economy and curtail the future prosperity of this country.

Mr. HAWKES. And damage, as well, our character.

Mr. EASTLAND. Even communistic periodicals are admitting that from ten to fifteen million Germans will die of starvation this winter. Mr. President, the Morgenthau plan for these unhappy people, on which our present policies are based, is sadistic. We are abandoning the principles of Christian civilization, for not since the days of Nero have Christians been treated so cruelly. This plan promises a prolonged era of pitiless hunger, a program of central European chaos and disorder, to be ultimately presided over by the ghouls of revolution, starvation, and atheism, and resulting in the cremation of Christianity in Europe.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Senator think about the children and the people of Greece, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe that the children of Greece, Czechoslovakia, and other areas should be fed. We are feeding them and preventing starvation in those areas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. According to reports which I have seen recently, we are not doing a thorough job in those areas. It is estimated that enormous numbers of deaths are occurring in those countries.

Mr. EASTLAND. The American Congress should by all means appropriate the money to prevent starvation in those areas. We have set up the organization. We put up 85 percent of the money, and we have given the organization every dime it said was necessary to prevent starvation in those countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. On the floor of the Senate yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and I believe one other Senator, made the statement that the pipe line is empty, and that we are very far behind today.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill has passed the House of Representatives; it has been approved by the Senate committee, and it is next on the calendar. It will be passed by the Senate as soon as the bill presently under consideration is out of the way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is one trouble in the practical situation. Winter is upon us and the bill has not as yet been passed. But I understand UNRRA has purchased the goods.

Mr. EASTLAND. It has the money and it has purchased the goods, and it will continue to buy them so long as the money is available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If we assume that ample supplies are available, then I join the Senator in his feeling about the children of Germany. But does not the Senator think that a slight difference exists between our attitude toward the people of Germany and our attitude toward the people of Greece and other countries?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not see the point in that question, because we have ample supplies of food with which to feed the people in all such areas. So there is no use quibbling about who are the people to whom we owe the greatest duty. We owe a duty to our allies, of course; but we should prevent starvation in all those areas if we can do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, let me say that it seems to me it is rather a harsh condemnation to say that the United States has brought this condition upon Germany. I think there is some duty which we owe to humanity, of course; but we did not create those conditions.

Mr. EASTLAND. I said before, and I repeat, that the permanent policies which we have adopted for the control of Germany after this war will cause the starvation of millions of Germans, because Germany is the most densely populated country in Europe, and she is not organized on the basis of an agricultural economy. The Germans do not have sufficient agricultural resources to feed all their people, but the functioning of Germany on the basis of an agricultural economy is exactly what we are attempting to enforce.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My only point is that the conditions in Germany were not created by us.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, they were not. Everyone knows who created the conditions. Of course, the Germans started the war.

But the question is whether we are civilized people and whether we are going to relieve conditions there. I understand that the Senator agreed with me on that ground.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agreed on that ground, but I question the availability of sufficient food to feed everyone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Our own Secretary of Agriculture states that we have sufficient food to do that. Our diet has increased during the war, but we are the only people of whom that may be said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true. But the question is whether we have sufficient food with which to feed all those people.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have appropriated every dime that UNRRA has said was necessary.

Mr. FULBRICHT. Then I have been misinformed about that.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We still owe a balance of $550,000,000 on the commitment we made last year.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator even mean to infer that there is the least doubt that that appropriation will be made?

Mr. MEAD. That is not the question. The Senator said we have given UNRRA every cent they have asked for.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have given them every cent they have asked for.

Mr. MEAD. They have asked for $550,000,000 more, but we have not as yet given it to them.

Mr. EASTLAND. But as they have requested $550,000,000 more, a bill appropriating that sum of money has passed the House of Representatives, has been approved by the Senate committee, and will be passed by the Senate within the next few days.

Mr. MEAD. We pledged $550,000,000 nearly a year ago. We are the only country which has not furnished the full amount of its pledge. The UNRRA needs that money now. The pipe line is empty.

Mr. EASTLAND. Are they not getting it now? Is there any opposition to that bill? As I understand the Senator, he is talking about a measure which is about to be passed by the Congress. Is it the Senator's point that we should have passed the bill sooner? Is that it?

Mr. MEAD. The point is that the Senator from Mississippi said we have given UNRRA every cent they have asked for, whereas so far as I am concerned we have not given them $550,000,000 which they asked for months ago. That amount is still pending.

Mr. EASTLAND. They came before the Senate committee 2 weeks ago. Mr. Lehman appeared there and I was present when he testified. The bill has already passed the House of Representatives and has been favorably reported by the Senate committee, and, in my judgment, it will be passed by the Senate this week.

Mr. MEAD. As I understand the matter, Governor Lehman has made a statement, which, I think, appeared in the New York Times of today, to the effect that the situation in Europe is serious and the pipe line is running low.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, that is true.

Mr. MEAD. We have pledged the money.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and we will give it to them in the next few days.

Mr. MEAD. I certainly hope so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I certainly think the Senator from New York has misstated the situation when he has inferred that any pipe lines are empty because the Congress of the United States has not made the appropriation effective. Of course, that is entirely contrary to the facts. As the Senator from Mississippi has said, the appropriation will be made this week. There is no empty pipe line because of failure on our part to pass the appropriation bill 2 or 3 days ago.

Mr. MEAD. The information I received, let me say, if my colleague from Mississippi will yield further to me, is that the pipe line is running low; that unless they receive this appropriation, they cannot contract for goods for which they do not have the money; and that if the goods are not applied for now, there will be a time when the pipe line will run low.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator has just said is exactly true. They asked that the money be made available by the 31st day of this month.

Mr. MEAD. They have been trying to obtain the money for some time.

Mr. EASTLAND. They have been eager to have us pass the bill. But they have asked that the money be made available by the 31st of this month.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Let me inquire whether I correctly understand that when Governor Lehman appeared before the Senator's committee he said that the failure to appropriate the money sooner had interfered in any way with obtaining the supplies or placing them in the hands of the people who need them; or did he say that the appropriation should be made this year?

Mr. EASTLAND. As I remember his statement, he said that the appropriation should be made available by December 31.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question, if he will further yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Before I ask this question, let me say that my understanding of the statement which Governor Lehman made at a meeting which I attended with him is that if the money was appropriated by December 31, the supplies would keep right on flowing.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to ask this question, because apparently there is some misunderstanding on the subject: Does the Senator know what people UNRRA will feed in Germany? Will UNRRA feed displaced persons only, or will it feed the German people about whom the Senator from Mississippi has been talking?

Mr. EASTLAND. UNRRA will feed the displaced persons. Under UNRRA's charter, it cannot feed German nationals.

Mr. HAWKES. Then I understand that the continuation of UNRRA will not solve the problem which the Senator from Mississippi has been discussing in his speech; is that true?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask a question in order to obtain information. Does the Senator know whether UNRRA will acquire some of the property which is surplus?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know nothing about that. UNRRA is beyond the purview of the speech I am now making. UNRRA does not feed all the people who I think should be fed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought perhaps the Senator knew that as a matter of information. I notice there are very large surpluses, and no doubt they would help in the very situation which the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sorry that I cannot tell the Senator about that.

Mr. President, as Mr. Michael Foot so aptly quoted in the British Parliament:

> We speak of the Potsdam agreement. For the women and little children, the principal sufferers from our policy, there is for their protection an older law than any ever promulgated at Potsdam: "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Thank God that law protects the children of Germany as it does the children of all mankind.

Mr. President, surely there cannot now be any question in the minds of the American people that terrible conditions exist in Germany, that a great tragedy is in the making, and that a catastrophe which threatens western civilization itself has been set in motion by these proposals. An overwhelming support of this charge is to be found in the recent warnings given by General Eisenhower, the Colmer Committee of the House, the Byron Price report, the economic advisers to Gen. Lucius Clay, by Mr. Churchill, Mr. Bevin, Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson, General Montgomery, and a host of others who are compiling, without any relation to each other, a list of terrible indictments of the consequences of these policies. To be more specific, Mr. President, there is involved in the present predicament of Germany the whole question of the relation between the eastern and western civilizations. Germany has served both as a neutralizing agent and as a barrier between the Oriental hordes and a western civilization 2,000 years old, and for the first time in history we find in Czechoslovakia savage, barbarian Mongolian hordes stalking the streets of western civilization as its conquerors, and threatening not to stop at Vienna and Berlin but to push on to enguif the very civilization from which we ourselves have stemmed. Our treatment of Germany will decide this question of whether Germany is going to clamor for an anschluss to Moscow, or is to be reincorporated into our own civilization and culture, and the time has come for the American people to be told what it would mean if Germany, the most highly industrialized country in Europe, were to be incorporated into a totalitarian tyranny, masked under the guise of a modern democracy but manipulated by a vicious and sadistic minority of totalitarian Communists who for 30 years or more have preached openly throughout the world the doctrine that there is nothing left in western civilization worth preserving, and who have been and are the greatest persecutors of the Christian church since the Mohammedan invasion of Spain. Is it not significant, Mr. President, that there is not the slightest mention of this prospect in any of the writings of Mr. Morgenthau in any information which comes to the American people from the stricken continent?

Communism is the only beneficiary of starvation and vast human suffering. If

we permit wide starvation in Germany, if we attempt to destroy the German people, hold down their standard of living to low subsistence levels, and destroy their culture and self-respect as a people, Germany will be driven into the arms of communism. Mr. President, the western powers cannot permit the German Reich to become a satellite of Russia. The Communists know that a hungry, chaotic Germany will and must embrace communism, and that a Soviet Germany will lead to the Sovietizing of the smaller nations of western Europe and the collapse of democracy outside Britain and the United States. Whether we like it or not, Germany is the keystone of the structure, and Germany and western Europe must, by all means, be kept within the folds of democratic, freedom-loving Christian society which follow the private-enterprise system. No matter whether we have atomic bombs or not, we are not strong enough to stand against a world organized against us. I shudder to think what a union of Russia and Germany under the banner of communism would mean to the peace of the world. Why, Mr. President, that would be the most powerful combination in the world, a combination fraught with grave danger to world peace. The American people must realize that Russia is a predatory, aggressor nation, and that today she follows the same fateful road of conquest and aggression with which Adolf Hitler set the world on fire.

What the people of America want more than anything else is a just and permanent peace. This is the only kind of peace, Mr. President, that America will give her blood and treasure to defend and preserve. We desire a world system based upon freedom from want and freedom from fear. We want equality of opportunity and justice. We want a world in which nations and peoples shall be independent, and in which mankind shall be free from control and aggression at the hands of larger states. We made war upon tyranny. We destroyed the tyranny of the Nazis and the Fascists. We cannot permit American or Russian tyranny to take its place. The abolition of tyranny has been the great ideal under which America has labored, fought, and poured out her precious blood and treasure in order to win the victory. It is the inalienable right of every nation and of every people, Mr. President, whether friend or foe, to follow the pursuit of happiness and to build commerce and prosperity in the paths of peace. Shall the blood, the labor, the treasure, and the sacrifices of the American people all have been in vain? By holding down the standard of living of the German people to starvation levels, by depriving them at bayonet point of the opportunity to prosper, rebuild their economy, and reconstruct their civilization, we build up reservoirs of hate and create a festering sore in the very heart of Europe, a sore which once again can and, in my judgment, will poison the world with the scourge of war.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think that perhaps when we were previously discussing this matter we had two separate bills in mind. I had in mind the emergency appropriation bill which is on the calendar.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the bill which I had in mind.

Mr. MEAD. Very well. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to read into the RECORD a portion of an article appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I favor the appropriation for UNRRA. However, that subject is not germane to what I am now discussing. The appropriation for UNRRA will undoubtedly be made. I may say frankly, however, that I do not wish to go into that subject at this time. I am just as strongly in favor of the appropriation for UNRRA as is the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator will allow me to do so, I should like to say that Governor Lehman has said:

> Congressional sanction for the additional American contribution must be had before the end of the year so that supplies can be ordered for shipments beginning in February.

The bill which covers that matter is not even in the Senate at this time. It is still in the House of Representatives, and unless we act upon it before Christmas the authorizations which will be necessary in order to keep the pipe line in operation will not be made.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will join with the distinguished Senator from New York in anything which he may wish to do to expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the cooperation of my distinguished colleague. I merely wanted to emphasize the fact that we not only should pass the appropriation bill which is now on the calendar but we should expedite the passage of the authorization bill and see to it that it is passed before the holidays have arrived. As I understand, that bill is now pending in the House of Representatives and has not as yet reached the Senate. I believe, of course, that a separate bill could be introduced in the Senate and referred to our Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. EASTLAND. The money about which I am talking would be used to feed more than displaced persons. I want people all over the continent of Europe to be protected and saved from starvation. I think that the appropriation of the necessary funds would be very good business and a very good investment for the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it should be made plain in connection with the suggestions of the Senator from New York that this Congress is not guilty of withholding funds from UNRRA which in any way has had the effect of diminishing or reducing supplies in the pipe line to which the Senator has referred. This Congress does not deserve that kind of an indictment, and it is for that reason that I object to the implication contained in the remarks of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not believe that there has been any trial, indictment, or decision of guilt made in accordance with the statement of the Senator from Colorado. I merely say that Governor Lehman said that he is in charge of this responsibility, and that unless we expedite the appropriation which has been requested, UNRRA will break down. That is the purport of the article to which I have referred as it appears in the New York Times. What I read was a statement made by Mr. Lehman at the White House.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the history of this world shows any one thing, it is that no peace which is founded upon injustice and vengeance is an enduring peace.

As the British Prime Minister, Hon. Clement Attlee, told the Congress a few days ago, "We cannot have prosperity at home with hell abroad." The United States cannot alone be prosperous when the people in great areas of the earth are unemployed and in poverty. As I have said, Germany is the industrial heart of Europe. European countries are dependent upon German industry. European industry is dependent upon German machine tools for repairs and replacements. Destroy Germany as an industrial nation and we retard the whole European recovery. In fact, there can be no permanent European recovery without German recovery. With Germany deindustrialized so that she produces only a limited domestic consumer supply of peacetime industrial products, the producers of the United States are deprived of one of their greatest foreign markets. In fact, there can be no sound, permanent peacetime prosperity in the United States until the economy of Europe is put upon a sound permanent basis.

Mr. President, what will be the effect of our present policies toward Germany upon the economy and future prosperity of the United States? If these policies prevail and the producers of the United States lose their German market, what will be the result upon our own economy? I think, Mr. President, no one will deny that the present program is aimed at depriving us in the United States of that market.

Next to the United Kingdom, Germany and our other defeated enemy, Japan, have traditionally been the most important export markets for the farmers of the United States. Next to the United Kingdom and Canada, they are the greatest export markets for both American farmers and American industry. As agricultural export markets they have ranked second and third; as general export markets for all American products they have ranked third and fourth. These two former enemy states normally take huge quantities of cotton, wheat, tobacco, lard, pork, corn, flour, fruits and other products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at

this point a table giving the statistics of our exports in former years to Germany.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States: Exports to Germany, specified commodities, 1920–39

Calendar year	Cotton, excluding linters		Tobacco, unmanufactured, value	Lard, including neutral, value	Total pork,[1] value	Corn, including meal, value
	Quantity	Value				
	500-lb. bales	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of dol.*
1920	742,718	110,308	4,806	28,823	18,736	1,667
1921	1,505,686	110,153	5,589	35,790	9,502	10,405
1922	1,231,008	128,272	4,611	26,356	6,670	21,954
1923	1,014,818	148,311	5,836	46,590	12,211	4,765
1924	1,578,844	220,050	7,487	41,667	6,211	683
1925	1,939,557	245,885	8,176	33,916	2,505	213
1926	2,090,802	173,251	5,498	31,712	1,531	477
1927	2,528,110	226,048	5,949	25,232	1,109	277
1928	2,141,660	217,891	5,551	24,169	922	2,823
1929	1,738,583	169,457	3,493	27,264	1,299	3,704
1930	1,736,751	123,077	4,063	12,945	548	3
1931	1,435,149	64,380	2,777	11,982	198	70
1932	1,846,812	67,624	2,061	9,482	41	113
1933	1,746,814	77,107	1,720	7,223	157	7
1934	782,112	44,948	1,986	1,550	80	49
1935	624,706	38,453	2,357	183	5	0
1936	722,763	45,306	1,357	1,066	6	0
1937	854,143	50,243	1,435	264	3	103
1938	343,119	16,875	1,365	140	71	9,581
1939	183,409	9,046	1,211	28	15	0

[1] Includes bacon, sides, hams and shoulders, pork, canned, fresh, pickled and salted.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States.

Wheat and flour: United States exports to Germany, quantity and value, 1920–39

Calendar year	Wheat		Wheat flour		Wheat including flour, in terms of grain	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
	Thous. of bu.	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of bbl.*	*Thous. of dol.*	*Thous. of bu.*	*Thous. of dol.*
1920	8,246	22,511	1,078	11,856	13,311	34,367
1921	36,931	61,103	1,726	11,859	45,043	73,052
1922	10,084	12,656	1,497	7,909	17,121	20,565
1923	2,386	2,781	1,247	6,288	8,246	9,069
1924	7,150	10,218	1,861	10,750	15,899	20,963
1925	2,504	4,302	1,085	8,574	7,606	12,876
1926	6,877	10,473	657	4,554	9,967	15,027
1927	5,472	7,843	656	4,369	8,554	12,212
1928	2,117	2,775	341	2,060	3,718	4,835
1929	3,754	4,778	409	2,360	5,678	7,138
1930	2,431	2,722	368	2,060	4,163	4,782
1931	2,821	1,659	173	533	3,633	2,192
1932	1,743	982	58	164	2,017	1,146
1933	0	0	23	70	107	70
1934	19	19	18	72	104	91
1935	11	10	19	78	99	88
1936	0	0	17	80	82	80
1937	669	751	17	98	747	849
1938 [1]	3,215	2,635	4	14	3,232	2,649
1939	378	154	1	3	382	157

[1] Trade data for Germany include Austria beginning May 6, 1938; Sudeten area as far as ascertainable beginning Nov. 10 1938; Czechoslovak Provinces occupied by Germany, beginning Mar. 18 or 19, 1939; and Memel beginning Mar. 25, 1939.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Statistical and Historical Research. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, during the 1920's Germany took more than two million bales of American cotton per annum. If the American farmer is permanently to lose this market, as he most surely will if the present plans are carried out, then American agriculture will not and cannot be prosperous. Surpluses will pile up. The purchasing power of the American farmer will be cut, and through his reduced purchasing power our entire economy will suffer. It will simply mean a continuance of acreage reductions, subsidies from the Treasury and regimentation for American agriculture. This is a terrible price, Mr. President, which the American farmer must pay if we continue the policies generated by Mr. Morgenthau's hatred of the German people. I do not desire to see the American people punished and impoverished, as they certainly will be if the present course is continued.

We hear a great deal about the importance of our trade with the 10 South American nations. South American trade is important, yet our trade with Germany—one nation—is traditionally greater than our trade with the whole continent of South America.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing our exports to Germany and to South American countries for a number of years. The table shows that in the 1920's we exported approximately 20 percent more to Germany alone than to all the South American countries combined.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States exports to Germany and South America compared

[In thousands of dollars]

	To Germany	To all South America
1921	372,380	273,325
1922	316,114	226,075
1923	316,837	269,318
1924	440,418	314,252
1925	470,344	402,606
1926	364,162	443,507
1927	481,681	438,159
1928	467,260	480,815
1929	410,449	539,310
1930	278,269	337,509
1931	166,050	158,691
1932	133,417	96,589
1933	140,024	114,048
1934	198,738	161,701
1935	91,981	174,341
1936	101,956	204,222
1937	126,343	318,354
1938	107,130	299,714
1939	46,475	329,127
1940	156	435,584
Total for 13 years (1921–33)	4,362,656	4,094,203

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as an illustration of the impractical policies of our Government toward the German people, permit me to give an illustration. We have in America a great surplus of cotton. A surplus which is large enough to affect the whole economy of America, both in industry and agriculture. Germany, on the other hand, has a textile output which is far from adequate, but a textile industry which was largely undamaged during the war. There are millions of destitute, ragged people on the European Continent, millions whom America's own textile industry cannot clothe.

What happened? The cotton interests of the United States and the German textile industry reached an agreement whereby cotton would be consigned to the Port of Bremen, spun in German mills and enough of the product sold in central and southeastern Europe to pay us for the cotton. From 25 to 30 percent of the proceeds thus derived would be used to pay us for the cotton, and the remainder of the goods would be distributed or sold as our own military government desired. I am informed that that agreement was approved by our military government, but the State Department refused to make the cotton available. The reason which was assigned was that there is a shortage of coal in Germany, and yet they permit some rayon manufacture, although it takes seven times as much coal to manufacture textiles from rayon as it does from cotton, and cellulose, which is the basis of rayon, is an explosive which can be used in rearmament. When the matter was pressed the real reason came out, and this was that the textile industry of Germany might be given to Russia as reparations. In fact there is the authority so to do.

Now Russia refuses to purchase the American product, and in eastern and southern European countries the Red Army which occupies those countries by force of arms prevents the textile mills from spinning American cotton.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article on the Russian cotton policy which appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, December 2.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. EASTLAND. So, Mr. President, the textile industry of Germany, not a war industry, not a part of a rearmament program, can and might be given to Russia, and 13,000,000 Americans, dependent for a livelihood on the cotton industry will be or could be deprived of what is traditionally their second largest export market.

Yesterday I was informed by the State Department that some cotton will be available to German industry and to Japan, but the point I am getting at is that under our policies the cotton textile industry among others is liable for reparations to Russia and that such a policy will hurt our country.

Mr. President, the whole procedure to make effective our German policies is wrong. The program for the deindustrialization of Germany, for the removal or destruction of peacetime German industries is not submitted as it should be to the American Congress or to the United States Senate. The agreements are made. The policies are promulgated in secret by the executive branch of the Government. They are carried out in secret by the Army and employees of the State Department; men who are responsible to no one; men who know nothing about their impact upon our country or its people. This proceeding is not legal until submitted to the United States Senate in the form of a treaty and ratified by this body.

State Department employees and Army officers can give to Russia as reparations any German industry they desire. They are responsible to no one; the matter is handled in secret; the people who are affected in the United States,

as the cotton grower is vitally affected in the matter of the German textile industry, are not permitted the opportunity to protest. They are given absolutely no chance to present their side, and show how the actions of these employees will affect the American economy and destroy the prosperity of certain segments of our population. To give this matter some vestige of legality, the program of deindustrialization should be submitted, as the terms of a treaty are, to the Senate of the United States for ratification, so that the public will of the people of this country could be expressed through their elected representatives.

The will of the American people is thus circumvented. Our people are not afforded the opportunity to protect themselves. When the Senate or the Congress has the opportunity to ratify the peace treaties or act upon these matters the destruction of German industry and of the German people will be complete. We will be faced with a fait accompli. Mr. President, these matters involve the very highest governmental policy. Their impact upon the economy of this country will be terrific. They will have very great influence upon future world peace and prosperity. This whole matter should be submitted to the American people for ratification through their chosen representatives in the legal and constitutional way.

Mr. President, under pressure from Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Bernstein, Mr. White, and others, we are following a cold, calculated, selfish policy to destroy the German people, but in injuring them a great wrong is also being committed upon our own citizens—in other words, by following a vindictive policy of hate toward Germany we are injuring and dislocating American economy and curtailing the well-being and prosperity of our own citizens.

Mr. President, there are other reasons why our basic program toward Germany must be changed. If we hold down the standard of living of the German people as planned, if we deprive them of the right to earn a living and to prosper, as planned, if we permit starvation, want, pestilence, and sorrow, as is now planned, then we must keep in Germany a large army of occupation to control the German people at gun point for many years, and, in addition, we must certainly have compulsory military training in this country. General McNarney forecasts a 10-year occupation for Germany. The mothers and fathers of America must realize that our policies will prevent the return of their sons for a long period of time. The solution is to permit Germany to rehabilitate herself along the lines of peace and to take her place as a decent, self-respecting nation.

There is another consideration, Mr. President: Who has been more heartless or cruel than the Japanese? The death march of Bataan was one of the most cruel episodes in human history. Now, why do we force much harder peace terms upon the people of Germany than we do upon Japan? Why is there a difference? What powerful influences are there in the United States that demand the destruction of the German people? Who are they, and what are their motives? We are not deindustrializing Japan. We are not shipping out her industry to lower permanently her standard of living. We are not destroying any of Japan's peacetime industry, not permitting her male citizens to become slaves, yet she devastated large areas of the earth. Why do we give Japan a much easier peace than Germany? If our occupation of Germany and our policies toward Germany contained half as much intelligence as we have shown in the occupation of Japan, we would be rewarded with much better conditions in Europe.

There is a middle ground between a sadistic peace and a soft peace, and that is to follow an intelligent program which will reconstruct the German Nation along peaceful lines, a program which would permit them to find contentment in prosperity, and which at the same time would constitute a program that would make our own citizens happy and prosperous.

Mr. President, if we do not act immediately there will be no road left of any kind that will lead to peace. I am duty bound to reemphasize the terribly critical situation which exists in Germany at this moment, and which is getting worse by the hour. There is a desperate food shortage. Eighty-five percent of the houses in the German cities have been destroyed. There are no medicines. The hospital facilities are woefully inadequate, as are clothing, bedding, and fuel. Millions—again I say millions—of helpless innocent men, women, and children are starving to death. The authorities tell us there will be a definite age group elimination in the German population by spring unless we harness our full resources and energies to save them. That means, Mr. President, most of the children under 10 years of age and the elderly people over 60 are doomed to die by spring. In the American zone we are following a policy of supplying a starvation diet of 1,500 calories of food per person per day. We could easily supply more and save human life. This, Mr. President, is in our own zone and is our own immediate and inescapable responsibility. We permit German children to starve and at the same time we release 750,000 bushels of corn to the distillers from which to make whisky. Conditions in the British zone are better, but conditions in the French and Russian zones are much worse, if that could be possible. The Russians are refusing to feed their captured populations except for political purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to read an article written by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Evening Star yesterday. As everyone knows, Miss Thompson was one of the leading anti-Nazi columnists in this country, and I think everyone will admit that she has as good sources of information regarding conditions on the continent of Europe as any other columnist in the United States.

First, let us see who her authorities are. She says:

> Military officers whose positions do not permit them to come before the public communicate with journalists, and tell of frightful conditions.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I have received the same information from friends in the military services who were stationed in Germany. Listen to this:

> One reports: In 6 months large parts of Germany will be shelterless Buchenwalds of starved corpses. Trains and trucks coming from the east with refugees from the Polish and Czech territories are arriving with corpses among the barely living, many of them children. These are often tossed out of trains and trucks upon the roads.

Listen to this, Mr. President:

> In Berlin, in August, out of 2,866 children born 1,148 died—and it was summer, and food more plentiful than now. The current issue of the British Nineteenth Century and After in an article entitled "Orderly and Humane," draws the most horrifying picture since the opening of the concentration camps.
>
> From Vienna, a reliable source reports that in the Russian zone no one has had food except dried peas, bread, and a little oil, in 6 months. Infant mortality is approaching 100 percent; slight ailments result in death from lack of resistance. Tuberculosis and rickets are becoming universal.

Miss Thompson goes further—and let me say that I agree with these statements 1,000 percent:

> This war was fought by the West in the name of Christian civilization, the "four freedoms," and the dignity of man against those who were perpetrating crimes against humanity. But policies which must inevitably have resulted in the postwar extermination of tens of thousands of children are also crimes against humanity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column written by Dorothy Thompson, published in the Washington Star of December 3, 1945, be printed in the full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, our policy toward Germany that has brought this misery upon them is the direct result of the barbarous doctrine of collective guilt. The people of America can never permit such policies to be followed through to their horrible conclusion. The Christian concepts of justice are anchored to the principle of individual responsibility. The German leaders who plunged a world into war are now on trial in Nuernberg. The American people cannot demand the punishment of slow starvation. They cannot sentence to death women and children for the crimes of the leaders of the German State. Why, the principle that an entire people are responsible for the acts of their leaders has not been recognized nor permitted in the Christian era. Such a doctrine was even repudiated in the Dark Ages. We hold in our hands, Mr. President, the fate of the German children. We must feel for them in their agony. We must give to them the same treatment that we would ask for our own children.

What then must be done? The American people must demand, first, that the United States repudiate the doctrine of collective guilt.

Second, the United States Government, with the wholehearted support of the American people, must demand an increase over the starvation rations of the German people. There is not one moment to lose. I believe that President Truman should order the Army to in-

crease the daily rations in the American zone and to use its entire influence to encourage the same increase in the other zones. I want to commend the Army for opening the channels of relief in Germany to the many high-minded, humanitarian private relief agencies that have always done so much to express the basic ideals and concerns of the American people. This Government ought to do everything in its power to provide adequate shipping facilities to transport these private donations of food and clothing. But I am convinced, Mr. President, that the situation is so grave that a separate American relief machine ought to be set up in an attempt to do everything in our power to avert this threatened catastrophe.

Third, I believe the time has come to implement the provisions of the Potsdam Agreement that call for the reuniting of the four separate zones of Germany under a central, non-Nazi, civilian administration. This is the only way we can hope to enable the German people to help themselves in this hour of crisis. I believe that once this has been done and once this Government has begun to function under an inter-Allied control commission, our troops—and it would not require many of them—could be used for police purposes only and the German people could be given the opportunity to salvage something from the wrecks of their lives.

Fourth, I am absolutely convinced that we must put an end now to scorched-earth policies in times of peace which, under the slogan "Reparations in Kind," have stripped every country in Europe of the industrial equipment necessary to maintain even a minimum standard of living. I believe that wise statesmanship would demand that rather than strip Germany of what small percentage of her peacetime industrial equipment she still possesses intact we could set those industries in motion to producing the machinery and the technical equipment which could be used to meet any reparations formula that has been agreed upon.

In other words, Mr. President, instead of shipping out of Germany peacetime industry as reparations, why do we not force the Germans to manufacture the machinery and equipment as reparations for other nations, and thereby save their standard of living, give them the ability to live and prosper, and increase the industrial production of all the countries of the earth, which would be good business and which would bring about better conditions for us all?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether he would carry that over and include the rehabilitation of Germany in the heavy-industry line.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me see if I understand the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the Senator's remarks, he would have Germany rehabilitated so that she could produce reparations and pay reparations out of what she could produce through her own industry.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I said; yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator include heavy industry in his statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; to the extent that heavy industry is needed to produce peacetime consumer goods.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How does the distinguished Senator then square his statement with the situation of the world having been dragged into war twice in our generation if he would permit Germany to have all the necessary requirements by which he could plunge the world into a third world war?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from California was not present when I spoke of that matter. I went into that subject in great detail. I said it is not necessary to strip Germany of heavy industry in order to prevent her from waging war in the future. I said she should not be permitted to manufacture armament, she should not be permitted to manufacture airplanes, and what is more crucial, she should not be permitted to stock-pile strategic materials. That alone would prevent her from waging war. Furthermore, through an adequate intelligence unit, such as we already have there, we must continually supervise and control the production of German industry, and when that is done there is absolutely no danger of her going to war.

What I said, Mr. President, was that instead of shipping out her peacetime industry and giving it as reparations to other countries which have been ravaged and devastated by the Germans, let us force the Germans with their industrial equipment to construct other factories which would go to the devastated countries. Such a policy has been recommended, I understand, by some very able American citizens who are fully conversant with all the conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have had an example in this country of a tremendous peaceful potential turned into a war potential second to none in the history of the world. But we had the foundation on which to build. In other words, we did not need a great armament industry to make this Nation the greatest armament producer the world has ever seen. I, for one, am not willing to allow Germany to have the potential to go to war a second or a third time.

Mr. EASTLAND. But regardless of whether that industry is shipped out or not, if German industry is not supervised and controlled and the Germans are not prevented from stock piling strategic materials, they can wage war. That, then, is the crux of the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator from Mississippi is that I am not willing to shed tears here for German heavy industry when I have seen in other nations of Europe, such as France, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Holland, places from which the Germans have shipped factories to their own country. That material was transported to Germany, as undoubtedly much was transported from Russia. So, I think there is ample justification for taking some of that German heavy industry and returning it to the countries from which it was stolen.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, in those cases where Germany stole industry Germany should repay it. I do not conceive that the Senator would for 1 minute think that anyone would rise on the floor of the Senate of the United States and advocate the leaving of stolen property in Germany. Of course, Germany should repay it. Of course, it should be removed from Germany. But the point I am making is that instead of depriving Germany of the industrial production to replace devastation in other countries, instead of shipping out her own industry, I would force her to rebuild industries for France, Luxembourg, Russia, and other countries. When it becomes apparent that as a result of our policies they cannot feed themselves our people will demand that new industries be created both to relieve us of the relief load and to create markets for our products. In the end Germany will be reindustrialized by us and at our expense. I think that is a reasonable conclusion to draw as to what we will do in the future. This simply means that the American people as a result of the Morgenthau-Bernstein proposals will be paying the reparations of German industry which now are going to Russia.

Mr. President, nothing that I have said can or should be construed as a criticism of President Truman, Secretary Byrnes, or Mr. Dean Acheson. They inherited an impossible situation, a situation which was over 2 years in the making in the heat of war. These policies, however, have not worked out, cannot and should not work out. Relief must be given.

Mr. President, it is my earnest conviction that only by the policies which I have recommended or by similar policies can we create anything that remotely resembles the kind of a peace in Europe that the American people are going to be willing to pour out their treasure and their blood to maintain through the United Nations Organization in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from an article entitled "Common Sense About the Peace," written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in the Progressive of October 15, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMON SENSE ABOUT THE PEACE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

If the political realities of Potsdam are a travesty on the professed war aims of the United Nations, the economic provisions of the Potsdam agreement are a complete repudiation of the fourth point of the Atlantic Charter:

"They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

Such vital branches of German peacetime industry as metals, chemicals, shipbuilding, machine building are sentenced either to complete destruction or to a system of foreign control so rigid as to make normal efficient production impossible. At a time when all Europe needs all the machinery, equipment and manufactured goods it can

get from any source, the most productive industrial system in Europe, insofar as it has survived obliteration bombing, is to be very largely wiped out of existence.

The contradictions of the Potsdam economic program are so numerous and flagrant that one might well suspect a purpose not to disarm but to destroy the most productive industrial mechanism in Europe, and thereby increase and prolong the distress in that stricken continent indefinitely. American responsibility to help feed and clothe the cold and hungry peoples of Europe is often stressed. But the territorial and economic decisions of Potsdam have wrought more harm than the most generous contributions to UNRRA can repair.

One of the most glaring of these contradictions is the simultaneous declaration that "primary emphasis shall be given to the development of agriculture" in the German economy and the decision to give one-fourth of Germany's arable land to Poland. Another contradiction is the thrusting of millions of destitute refugees into the shrunken remainder of Germany and the decision to eliminate or greatly reduce the industries which might conceivably give these people employment.

Perhaps the most hopeless contradiction lies in the announcement of a desire to assist the growth of democracy in Germany while at the same time the "peacemakers" do everything in their power to make living conditions there utterly insupportable. There may be differences of opinion about the precise meaning of the word democracy. But all experience shows that no system worthy of the name has maintained itself very long when economic conditions have become not only dark but hopeless.

Some of the glib talk about transforming Germany into an agrarian country would convey the impression that there are vast open spaces waiting for new hands to till. Germany is one of the most densely populated countries in Europe and the population per square mile will be even larger because the eastern regions which have been taken away are more agricultural than the highly industrial Ruhr and Rhineland.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of December 2, 1945]

RUSSIAN MOVE SEEN FOR TEXTILE LEAD—BID SEEN IN EASTERN EUROPE AND PLAN TO CROWD UNITED STATES OUT OF MARKET AS COTTON SUPPLIER

(By Herbert Koshetz)

Although full reestablishment of the cotton textile industry in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Greece, and Iran is hampered by scarcity of labor, there is a clearly defined trend of Russian dominance in this industrial field which eventually will eliminate the United States as a supplier of cotton staple to those markets, it was asserted last week by textile men just returned from these areas.

Russia not only will control the industry in the countries named, but she will become the world's number one grower of cotton staple in the next 5 years, they predicted, and might step ahead of the United States as the largest producer of cotton goods.

The Soviet Union's tactics in Czechoslovakia reveals the pattern which will bring textile production in eastern Europe under her dominance, textile men said. In that country Russia has discouraged the purchase of any American cotton by private manufacturers, they reported, and aside from staple supplied by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration she is supplying all the raw material for use in Czech mills.

Moreover, it was asserted, she is selling the cotton on a dollar basis at the high United States price, and taking back the major portion of production on a ruble basis.

The resulting squeeze leaves little or no profit to the individual manufacturer, and if he survives at all it will be merely as a part of the program of nationalization of industry that is gradually taking hold in that country as well as in other Balkan and eastern European countries, according to the textile men.

Although the Export-Import Bank could provide the necessary financing for Czech mills to purchase American cotton, the textile men said that the Government has discouraged the use of dollar exchange for purchase of any staple except that coming from Russia.

Russia has contracted with mills in Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other nearby countries for cotton textile production, similar to the procedure in Czechoslovakia, textile men said. In all instances, the staple to be used will be Russian and the weavers will not be allowed to cast around for customers other than Russia, it was indicated.

The mill owners' problems are complicated by inability to obtain labor and a shortage of coal for electric power. Recent reopening of two mills in Czechoslovakia normally employing several thousand workers brought less than 100 workers, it was reported.

From sources in this country, it was learned that Russia plans to expand her growing of cotton staple to perhaps three times her present harvest. For 1945, production in the central Asia republic of Uzbekistan, will total 1,000,000 metric tons. As this area supplies 68 percent of the total cotton production, it is estimated that Russia will produce a cotton crop of more than 6,000,000 bales. Reconversion of areas now devoted to grain and implementation of the latest methods for growing and picking will aid in bringing up the cotton production figure to a total well over that of the United States.

On the basis of 3,000,000 spindles destroyed in the war, estimated to be approximately one-ninth of her total, it is believed that Russia still has over 20,000,000 spindles in operation. During the war, 20 new textile mills were constructed in the east and since the end of the war 480 enterprises, including 129 clothing mills and 29 knitting mills, were restored in the Ukraine, and 112 in other parts of Russia. A substantial part of Russian cotton will go into "durable cord," for tires, it was indicated.

EXHIBIT B

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

In April I attended the enthronement of the Archbishop of Canterbury. At the climax of the impressive ritual a feminine voice rang startling through the arched nave. It came from an unassuming-looking little woman who cried, "In the name of Jesus Christ, stop this performance. While you parade in your costly robes the children of Europe are starving."

I smiled at this characteristic outburst of English nonconformist spirit. But 7 months later it is no smiling matter. The children of Europe are starving. Six years of war, indescribable destruction, and the lunatic Potsdam policies which have added to the disintegration inherited from the collapse of the Nazi regime have done their work. Germany, and with it Europe, is skidding into the abyss.

The facts are at last being revealed through what has amounted to a conspiracy of silence here. The British press has long been more outspoken and critical. Weeks ago a committee from both parties of the House of Commons issued an appeal to the long-deprived British people to cut down their rations to release food for German children.

The Economic Advisory Commission sent to Berlin to assist General Eisenhower was utterly frustrated by attempting to advise on the implementation of Potsdam in a country which had lost a quarter of its arable land by unilateral action of the Russians and Poles, who were driving the population, along with the German-speaking Czechs, into the truncated Reich. General Eisenhower now tells us that the normal population of the American zone has increased 24 percent. Eighty-five percent of the food crop in the area east of the Oder and Neisse—the normal German grain and potato source—has gone unharvested.

In the Russian zone, which together with the Polish comprises half of Germany, 50 percent of the crop is lost. The stripping of industries in the east and the demolition of others in the west and south have added to the break-down. Efforts to bring up coal have partly succeeded, but lack of transportation piles it at pit heads. Mills that should be turning out plows, rails, locomotives, machinery for all Europe are idle. Only 5 to 7 percent of industry is operating.

Mr. Byron Price points out that French opposition to a unified German economic policy is a root cause for the chaos, and that unless we find some way of instilling hope into the German people we can expect general break-down under uncontrollable conditions.

Military officers whose positions do not permit them to come before the public, communicate with journalists, and tell of frightful conditions, especially in the East. One reports: In 6 months large parts of Germany will be shelterless Buchenwalds of starved corpses. Trains and trucks coming from the east with refugees from the Polish and Czech territories are arriving with corpses among the barely living, many of them children. These are often tossed out of trains and trucks upon the roads.

In Berlin, in August, out of 2,866 children born 1,148 died—and it was summer, and food more plentiful than now. The current issue of the British "Nineteenth Century and After," in an article entitled "Orderly and Humane," draws the most horrifying picture since the opening of the concentration camps.

From Vienna, a reliable source reports that in the Russian zone no one has had food except dried peas, bread, and a little oil, in 6 months. Infant mortality is approaching 100 percent; slight ailments result in death from lack of resistance. Tuberculosis and rickets are becoming universal.

This war was fought by the West in the name of Christian civilization, the "four freedoms," and the dignity of man against those who were perpetrating crimes against humanity. But policies which must inevitably have resulted in the postwar extermination of tens of thousands of children are also "crimes against humanity."

UNRRA has no help for former enemy states. Are the children of these states enemies, too, and does anyone believe that those who survive the present egregiously compounded horrors will grow up to love democracy, or learn that war does not pay—or only that defeat does not pay? Will they believe in "Christian" civilization or grow up to despise it as a false face put upon hypocrisy and greed? Will they believe in anything except that nihilism which was the mood out of which nazism was bred?

And does any one think that chaos, famine, freezing, and disease can be confined within any frontiers in compact Europe?

America must send food for all children wherever they may be, even if we have to ration ourselves. The United States, in addition to UNRRA, must set up its own services, under men who can be trusted not to play power games with the staff of life, but give to the starving in Allied and enemy lands—children first. The world's richest country, the only one which has increased its diet during war years, will, if we do not cease our callous indifference, become the most unloved nation among the children of men.

And if ever that happens, the atomic bomb will not save us.

ADMINISTRATION AND USE OF THE PUBLIC LANDS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, which was authorized by Senate Resolution 241 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and extended by Senate Resolution 139 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to conduct a full and complete investigation of the administration and use of the public lands, I ask unanimous consent to submit a third partial report (No. 808) thereon, which I ask may be printed with an illustration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be received and printed with an illustration.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the report which I have just submitted to the Senate deals with public-land withdrawals within the State of Utah, and matters intimately related thereto. Although concerned primarily with the people in Utah, these withdrawals raise certain fundamental questions which are causing consternation in other public-land States.

The first of the withdrawal orders, which I wish to speak about, covered nearly 3 millions of acres. The order was hastily drawn, in entire secrecy, and it never had any substantial basis or justification whatever. It served no useful or legitimate purpose. It was finally vacated only because these facts were brought to light by the investigations and hearings of my subcommittee. Immediately after these facts were made known, the order was superseded by a withdrawal smaller in area, but with much more drastic terms, and correspondingly more far-reaching and objectionable effects.

This second withdrawal order, as drawn, was issued under doubtful legal authority.

The third so-called withdrawal order, covering nearly 2 millions of acres, was prepared and promulgated under an alleged authority, which, in my judgment, has not the remotest basis in law. It was based on one of the most flagrantly distorted departmental interpretations of a statute that has ever come to my attention. Yet, after 12 years, the land withdrawal still stands to plague an important industry in eastern Utah and to prevent the development of some of the richest resources in that State.

Over the years, a large number of similar withdrawals have been made in many States, under the same alleged but nonexistent authority. The distorted departmental interpretation to which I referred has therefore had the effect of nullifying three of the acts of the Congress.

Mr. President, I make mention of these three withdrawals because, although important in themselves, they are but examples of the manner in which the Department of the Interior has misused and exceeded its withdrawal powers. The citizens of the public-land States are strenuously demanding that abuses of the withdrawal authority be curbed, and so far as possible corrected by legislative action. It is high time that Congress take steps to regain at least a large part of the withdrawal power which, by acquiescence of the Congress has been acquired by the executive branch. Those powers should be drastically curtailed and redefined by legislation.

The first of these withdrawals was effected July 23, 1943, by Public Land Order 130. It withdrew from settlement, location, sale, and entry approximately 3,000,000 acres of public land in eastern Utah, without prior notice of any kind. The order aroused immediate and violent protests on the part of officials and citizens of the State of Utah, and this committee was asked to investigate the withdrawal and all of its implications. Public hearings were held in Salt Lake City in November 1943, and again in May 1945. A hearing was also held in Washington, D. C., in January 1945.

This withdrawal was considered important in Utah, not only because it involved a large area of highly mineralized public land, but also because the citizens of Utah were fearful that it would be but the forerunner of further large withdrawals of beautiful scenic lands in the southern part of the State. They were apprehensive that additional large areas would be removed from beneficial uses by placing them in national parks and monuments, thus seriously retarding the development of the irrigation and hydroelectric power resources of the State and the industries dependent thereon.

This withdrawal of July 1943 covered virtually all of the Paradox Basin, in eastern Utah, an area long known to be underlain by thick beds of saline minerals. Since 1920 many exploratory wells had been drilled in the area, most of them in a search for oil and gas. Such drillings disclosed the presence of rich deposits of the salts of potassium and magnesium, in the form of carnallite and sylvite.

In 1942, prior to the issuance of this withdrawal, the Defense Plant Corporation drilled a well in the area to explore the possibilities of magnesium ores to supply the Government magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., as well as elsewhere. The drilling operations were under the supervision of the Bureau of Mines, and the report issued by that Bureau described what appeared to be fabulous findings of both magnesium and potash. The Bureau reported that: "The possibilities are tremendous." The disclosure of these findings in the Defense Plant Corporation well intensified the already widespread interest in Utah in these mineral resources and their further exploration and development. However, the findings also had much to do with the issuance of the withdrawal order.

Because of the complete secrecy with which the withdrawal order was issued, its scope and limitations were little understood in Utah until brought out in the hearings by this committee. The order was signed by an Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and was purportedly issued pursuant to authority contained in the Withdrawal Act of 1910. It, therefore, did not affect the locating or mining of metalliferous minerals. Neither did it, by its terms, affect the nonmetalliferous minerals designated in the mineral leasing laws. It is highly significant, however, that from the time the withdrawal order became effective not a single prospecting permit or lease in the area has been approved by the Department, in spite of the fact that several hundreds of applications were on file.

The withdrawal order did not affect the grazing privileges on the public lands, but it completely stopped all settlement, and exchanges, and all development for irrigation and power purposes.

This committee was told that the withdrawal order was issued because the Department had informaton that a large number of placer mining claims were being located for the so-called worthless nonmetalliferous minerals not subject to the leasing laws, as a subterfuge to obtain the valuable deposits of potash and magnesium. However, when the county records were examined, subsequent to the first hearing by this committee, it was found that only a negligible number of such locations had been made. All of these were filed many months prior to the withdrawal, and in any event, even these few mining claims would have been declared invalid by the Department in the course of its regular procedure.

It is clear, therefore, that there never was any actual serious basis in fact for the issuance of the withdrawal order. The committee emphatically condemns the habitual practice of the Department of the Interior in making ill-advised and needless public land withdrawals. The committee strenuously objects to any withdrawal which is not supportable by a preponderance of fact, and even more so to withdrawals which are predicated on rumor, as in this case. Such withdrawals seriously hamper the orderly development of resources, communities, and industries, in addition to affording constant consternation and confusion to the citizens of public land States.

On January 4, 1945, just 6 days before the committee resumed its hearings in Washington, D. C., the 3,000,000-acre withdrawal of July 1943 was lifted. In its place there was substituted an air-tight withdrawal of approximately 200,000 acres. This second withdrawal consists of seven detached areas, all within the boundaries of the preceding 3,000,000-acre withdrawal. The lines are so drawn as to include all of the public lands in the State of Utah in which there are known or suspected deposits of potash and magnesium. The terms of this withdrawal are so drafted that such essential mineral resources are successfully removed from any further exploration, or any development whatever, by any person or agency except the Department of the Interior itself, with its own personnel and appropriated funds.

This second withdrawal, unlike the first, was not issued pursuant to the general withdrawal act of 1910, nor is it based upon any other authority specifically delegated to the executive branch by the Congress. Instead, it is based upon the so-called broad powers of the President, which are derived from the

long-continued acquiescence, or silence, on the part of the Congress in the exercise of such authority assumed by the Executive. The withdrawal could not have been made under the act of 1910, for in that event the mining laws with respect to the metalliferous minerals would have applied. As a matter of fact, the only purpose specified in the order was that the public lands therein described were "withdrawn and reserved for classification." "Classification of lands" is one of the specific purposes named in the act of 1910. Moreover, the Attorney General informed the Secretary of the Interior in 1941 that "when lands are withdrawn temporarily for a purpose coming within the 1910 act these lands are subject to the terms of that act, and accordingly said mining laws apply." Furthermore, the Department officials informed this committee that the withdrawal was "prompted" by proposed legislation pending before the Congress. In other words, the withdrawal was made "in aid of legislation," and for "classification of lands," which are the terms regularly used by the Department to describe the purposes of withdrawals under the act of 1910.

The second withdrawal is therefore, at best, but a subterfuge so frequently indulged in by the Department of the Interior.

For more than 20 years, various private citizens and companies operating in Utah have prospected the public lands in question. They are the ones who have made the discoveries of the rich mineral resources therein. Many of these citizens have spent years of effort, and have made heavy expenditures, in accordance with and reliance on the mining and mineral leasing laws. For more than 2 years they have stood ready and anxious to proceed with further exploration and development of these minerals, delayed only by the necessary approval of the Department. The Department has stalled them along, while it tried to decide upon a potash policy. Now, by this withdrawal order, the Department has blithely brushed aside the efforts, the expenditures, the equities of these citizens, and has decided that only the Department itself shall proceed with future exploration and development of these resources. Such a policy has been established notwithstanding the equities and interests of Utah citizens who stand ready and willing at all times to continue exploration and development.

The Department of the Interior told the committee that the 200,000-acre withdrawal was prompted by proposed legislation pending before the Congress. The proposed legislation referred to is S. 882 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. This bill contains a most ambitious and far-reaching scheme. If enacted, S. 882 would declare, as the policy of the Congress, that the reserves of potash and phosphates in the public lands "shall be held by the Government as a public trust in perpetuity primarily for the purposes" named in the bill. It may be well to note that substantially all of the known potash reserves in this country, and a high proportion of the phosphate deposits, lie in the public lands. It may be equally well to emphasize that such lands are by the terms of S. 882 expressly reserved to the United States Government "in perpetuity."

It cannot be doubted that this bill would put the Government directly in the business of mining, processing and distributing fertilizers, on a large scale. The Department of the Interior and the Tennessee Valley Authority would be directed to construct and operate large plants for the manufacture of concentrated fertilizers and all of the chemical byproducts thereof. The Department and the Authority would acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, or otherwise, plant sites and additional reserves of raw materials for the mining and production of concentrated fertilizers.

The bill would set up a vast system of test-demonstration farms throughout the country, with a minimum of 75 farms per county. This would mean a minimum of about 200,000 farms. Fifty percent of the output of the Government owned and operated plants would be used to supply all of the fertilizer used on the test-demonstration farms and in other fertilizer programs provided for in the bill. The other 50 percent of the fertilizers and the chemical byproducts would be disposed of through commercial channels, preferably through farmers' cooperatives. Such fertilizers would be furnished to the farmers free of cost, or at prices to be determined by those in charge of the program.

The bill would establish a network of National, State, and county fertilizer committees, with wide powers and many enumerated functions, to carry out the numerous purposes outlined in the proposed legislation. The purposes of the bill would be further implemented by a huge additional Government personnel, by grants to the States and to cooperating agencies; all at public expense, through annual appropriations by the Congress.

My committee was told that the Department of the Interior would continue its air-tight public-land withdrawals at least until the Congress should enact or defeat this proposed legislation defining a "national fertilizer policy." In view of the Department's record with respect to the many hundreds of public-land withdrawals made "in aid of legislation," this committee has much concern and grave misgivings as to when the Department might decide that this proposed legislation had been defeated. The committee finds that it is a rare thing for the Department ever to vacate a public-land withdrawal once it is made "in aid of legislation."

There is nothing whatever in the language of this withdrawal order to indicate that the withdrawal was intended to be other than permanent. But whether this proposed legislation should be enacted or defeated, the Department of the Interior proposes to do the future exploring of these mineral resources, with its own funds and personnel, at public risk and expense. The Department has adopted this policy in complete disregard of the interests and efforts of the citizens who have patiently, at heavy expense and in good faith, carried that work forward to the present time, and who are anxiously waiting to proceed with it.

Exploratory work is both costly and hazardous. The development following exploration calls for large expenditures for plants and equipment. The same system of private enterprise that has brought about the discoveries, possessed of the technical know-how and the financial means, should be permitted to proceed in the economic development of these resources. Private enterprise would provide added and much-needed employment in the State of Utah. The public interest in these lands would be served by the royalties paid into the Government Treasury and by the conservation measures provided in the leasing laws and regulations. It is not a proper function of the Interior Department to hold these resources out of use until, under some Utopian, hair-brained scheme, it can build up, within itself, another large bureaucratic machine, with all the inefficiencies and the abuses of power necessarily entailed.

I strenuously object to any policy, on the part of the present Secretary of the Interior, of withholding natural resources in the Western States, when so great a proportion of the lands are owned by the Federal Government. I am opposed to this insatiable reaching out, grasping for bureaucratic control and power. The Interior Department is strangling the orderly and much-needed development of the resources of the public-land States, as well as the individual initiative of its citizens. In this opposition I am sure that I am joined by the other Senators representing these Western States.

The Potash Leasing Act was passed February 7, 1927. A number of prospecting permits and leases have been issued thereunder. In 1934 the further issuance of potash permits and leases was suspended by Order 914, because the new domestic industry was then facing strong foreign competition and was operating at much below its capacity. But the advent of the war years shut off imports and greatly enlarged the demand for potash. That demand is expected to continue in the postwar period. A considerable increase in the producing capacity of the industry was called for. On June 9, 1943, the suspension order was revoked by Order No. 1829, which set up four provisions under which permits and leases might be approved.

These provisions were couched in ambiguous terms, and set up conditions which could not be met by any applicants other than the four producing companies already operating in this closely held industry. Whether so intended or not, the provisions of this order were so written and have been so administered that they effectively precluded any competitors from entering the potash-producing field. During all the time that this order remained in effect, not one potash prospecting permit or lease was approved by the Department, although there were several hundreds of applications on file. The bulk of the applications were for public lands within this withdrawn area in Utah.

I now come to a special, human phase of this withdrawal episode. It reflects no credit upon the Department of the Interior. In 1919, prior to the passage of

the Mineral Leasing Act, a group of 15 citizens located oil and gas placer claims for 2,880 acres of public land near Crescent Junction, Utah. They formed two companies and drilled their first well in 1920. Over the succeeding years they drilled, or had drilled, through operating agreements to which they were parties, 10 additional exploratory wells. While drilling for oil and gas, they made the first discoveries in the region as early as 1924 that disclosed the existence of the rich deposits of potash and magnesium.

This group has remained in possession of the placer claims over a period of 25 years. They are in possession today. They have kept one or more men on the properties at all times, and have performed assessment work on the claims many times in excess of the requirements under the mining laws. They have spent more than $700,000 in this work. They have complied with the laws and the rules and regulations in every respect.

Early in their experience, the Department of the Interior approved conflicting prospecting permits and leases, overlying and overlapping the placer claims. These permits and leases were filed by prospectors and speculators who apparently performed no work and made no expenditures on the lands, other than the payment of the filing fees. Yet these permits and leases were renewed by the Department, some of them for as long as 18 years. The conflicting permits and leases allowed by the Department have at all stages seriously hampered the placer claimants in their efforts to further drill and develop their claims. When they sought additional outside capital and assistance to perform the expensive drilling operations, these conflicting permits and leases constituted a cloud on the record and created doubts in the minds of those from whom they were seeking financial assistance as to whether the Interior Department would ultimately validate the claims and issue patents thereto. The claimants repeatedly protested the overlying permits and leases, but to no avail.

In October 1941, the Department initiated contest proceedings against the placer claims of one of the two companies of these claimants, based on a field examiner's report made in 1929. Without ever bringing the contest to a hearing, or giving the claimants an opportunity to present their facts and arguments, the Department arbitrarily declared all but one of the claims in question to be invalid, on the grounds of lack of discovery and lack of diligence leading to discovery. A patent was issued for one of the claims. On it the Defense Plant Corporation drilled the Government exploratory well in 1942, under an operating agreement which included the placer claimants as parties thereto.

Immediately after the patent was issued for the one claim and the other claims were declared invalid, the Department ordered three separate additional investigations by three of its own field examiners. In each instance the examiners found in favor of the claimants. It was the opinion of the Department's field investigators that the claimants had been in continuous possession of the claims; they had been diligent; they had made sufficient discoveries; and that the Government could not substantiate its charges in the contest proceedings. In the face of these findings, the Department never took to a hearing the contest which it itself had initiated. Instead, immediately after the reports by the three field examiners were filed with the Department, Secretary Ickes transmitted two amazing, incomprehensible documents to the Defense Plant Corporation, whose drilling operations on the lands of the claimants were by that time nearing completion.

In these documents, a letter by Secretary Ickes and a 30-page memorandum signed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, the Department decided every issue in advance, adversely to the claimants. It was declared that the claimants had no color of right to any but the one patented claim and that they were trespassers against the United States. It was even declared "that the lands embraced within the claims are nonmineral in character," a statement that on its face was utterly absurd. Secretary Ickes went so far as to suggest to the Defense Plant Corporation that charges of fraud be brought against the claimants. That suggestion was completely repudiated by the President of the Corporation. The degree of animus, bias, and hostility that permeate those two documents is beyond comprehension. It cannot be doubted that Secretary Ickes had personal knowledge of these things, for he had given orders in his Department that all matters pertaining to the Defense Plant Corporation should be reviewed by him personally.

All of these charges were fully answered and refuted by the evidence presented before my committee. I cannot but condemn in the strongest possible terms such ex parte proceeding; such predetermination of issues without a hearing. To put it mildly, they are wholly unworthy of any Government official or agency.

Some time earlier these claimants took the precautions to have applications for potash permits and oil and gas leases filed by individuals in behalf of their two companies. Theirs were then the first applications. In view of their earlier experience with the Department, they took this step as protection against any clouding of their titles that might result in the Department records.

Shortly after the Department declared the placer claims to be invalid, a demand was made upon the claimants that they relinquish their rights to these claims within 30 days or their applications for leases would be canceled. The Department said that their placer claims and their applications for leases were inconsistent, and they must give up one or the other. The claimants were then about to become parties to an interest in an operating agreement with a large potash company to drill four additional deep exploratory wells on the lands within their claims. Faced with what they considered a choice between a hopeless contest with the Department for their placer claims and the probable loss of any chance to obtain permits and leases, they consented to relinquish the placer rights. This was done on advice of counsel, and with reservations. The reservations, however, were not recognized by the Department. The oil and gas leases were issued to the claimants, but the potash permits were denied.

The claimants felt that when they relinquished the placer rights it was "with a gun at their heads." The Department contends that when it made the demand upon the claimants for relinquishment "it was not intended as pressure." It appears to this committee that the Department did resort to pressure and coercion of the strongest and most effective kind. We believe that the Department went much too far when it demanded that the claimants make a choice without even a hearing as to the validity of the placer claims. We believe that citizens have a right to present the other side in any controversy with the Department in the protection of their interests.

My committee feels that a serious injustice was done to these placer claimants by the arbitrary and unwarranted actions of the Interior Department. Since it seems clear that they cannot look to the Department for any redress, it is recommended that a private bill be enacted directing that patents for additional placer claims be issued to the claimants.

I now come to the third public land withdrawal dealt with in this report by the committee. In 1933 some 1,800,000 acres of public lands within the limits of the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation in eastern Utah were withdrawn from all forms of entry under the public-land laws, and placed under the administration of the Indian Service. The withdrawal order, so-called, consisted only of a letter of recommendation by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, carrying an endorsement of approval by the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior. It was given no publicity, nor even posted in or near the area withdrawn. The Register of the General Land Office at Salt Lake City was never able to obtain a copy of the order.

This withdrawal was made under alleged authority continued in the proviso in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927. The language of this proviso is wholly negative; and the proviso itself has no relation to anything else in the act. But the Department of the Interior, by a flagrantly distorted interpretation, decided that the proviso is an affirmative grant of power to the Secretary to make "temporary" withdrawals of public lands for the use and occupation of Indians. This interpretation has for many years been widely used by the Department to make many withdrawals, in many States, involving many millions of acres of public lands. Most of the withdrawals, including this one in Utah, are designated as "in aid of legislation." But the withdrawals are allowed to stand indefinitely; for many years after the proposed legislation has been rejected by the Congress.

In New Mexico such withdrawals were made 14 years ago, on a vast scale. For much of that area no proposed legislation has ever been presented to Congress, because the Department knew that

it would be futile to do so. On a part of the withdrawal the legislation proposed by the Department has been repeatedly and definitely rejected by the Congress. Notwithstanding the decisive expression of Congress, I have yet to learn of a single instance in which this type of withdrawal has ever been vacated.

By this procedure the Department has arrogated to itself powers which the Congress has never conferred upon it. The Department has gone further and, by allowing these withdrawals to stand indefinitely after the alleged or legitimate purposes have been served, has in effect created new Indian reservations or additions to Indian reservations. This is in direct violation of three separate acts of Congress—those of 1918, 1919, and 1927. In these acts the Congress has specifically reserved to itself all powers to create Indian reservations or addition to Indian reservations or to change the boundaries of such reservations. The Congress should put an end to this illegal practice on the part of the Department of the Interior by repealing the proviso in section 4 of the act of March 3, 1927. Moreover, the withdrawals made under the alleged but nonexistent authority of this proviso should be vacated forthwith.

The abuse of the privilege of making "temporary" withdrawals of public lands is by no means confined to withdrawals for Indian purposes. Such withdrawals have been made in great numbers, for many purposes, in the interest of various Government agencies, most of which are in the Department of the Interior. I am informed that "temporary" withdrawals made as early as 1862 still remain in full force and effect.

The power of the executive branch to make public-land withdrawals must be delegated by the Congress. The language of both the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court is very clear on that point. It is a favorite practice in the Department of the Interior to refer to the so-called inherent power of the President to make public-land withdrawals. But no such inherent power exists in the executive branch. The Supreme Court has in effect said that the President, as agent of the Congress, has acquired certain powers to make withdrawals because of long-continued acquiescence by the Congress in unauthorized withdrawals. However, if this be true, it cannot be doubted that the Congress can put an end to such unauthorized withdrawals by the simple expedient of eliminating this assumed inherent power.

The time has come when the Congress should redefine the authority of the Executive to make public-land withdrawals. This should be done either by further amendment of the General Withdrawal Act of 1910 or by the enactment of a new law which would codify the authority now embodied in hundreds of separate acts. The Congress should by affirmative legislation provide that (1) prior to the issuance of a withdrawal order there shall be a public hearing or hearings in the State or States affected, and (2) that temporary withdrawals shall be limited to periods of 2 years, unless approved by the Congress, with provision for a limited number of renewals, under strictly prescribed conditions.

My committee renews its recommendation that all existing withdrawals be carefully reexamined with a view to rescinding or modifying those which cannot be justified on the record.

LABOR CONDITIONS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few minutes the general labor situation which exists in the United States at this time. We are witnessing today a demonstration of the power of organized labor to stop the wheels of industry throughout this Nation. We see the whole plan of reconversion of our industries to peacetime production stopped, and hundreds of thousands of people are out of employment.

This is to my mind the logical result of the type of legislation which has been enacted by Congress during the past 10 or 12 years and the logical result of the type of administration which the Government has provided under the legislation enacted. During recent years, prior to our entrance into the war, it became popular to pass labor legislation, such as the National Labor Relations Act, which legislation has placed in the hands of organized labor absolute, unbridled power; but nowhere in the legislation has labor been made responsible for the exercise of that power.

I think that when the history of labor relations in this country is finally written, the National Labor Relations Act will go down in the history as the worst piece of labor legislation ever placed on the statute books. Any law which grants vast power to a particular group or class and does not at the same time make that group or that class responsible for the exercise of that power is bad legislation.

Under the provisions of this law the authority of management actually to manage and conduct its business affairs has been seriously undermined and in some instances almost totally impaired. Bad though this law has been, the administration of the law has been even worse. In this piece of legislation the leadership of organized labor has been given authority under which it has been able to build up a dictatorship of the labor racketeer.

Under this grant of power which came from Congress itself during the war period labor groups have extracted from every man who toiled a fee for the privilege of working. They have built up vast money chests, and today we witness a situation in which these powerful groups of organized labor not only believe that they are able to control and dominate the workmen of America but they look with scorn upon the opinion of the great rank and file of the American people and they defy the Government itself.

I think we face a situation in this Nation today in which it is inevitable that we must restrict the power which has been granted to organized labor in the National Labor Relations Act and in other legislation which has been enacted during recent years. If we do not restrict that power, then we most certainly must by law make these labor organizations responsible for the manner in which that power is used.

The conclusion which I have reached is not a conclusion which I have arrived at hurriedly. It was not necessary for me to wait to see the result which would come from the Government granting to labor organizations the power which it had granted, because I thought I knew what the result would be. I can say today that the predictions which I have made with reference to these matters are coming true every day.

When I first entered the United States Senate I fought to secure legislation which would tend to curb the power of powerful organized groups who were proving they had no respect for the rights of the public, the rights of the individual workman, or the power of Government itself; but it seems that the legislation which I proposed at that time was not popular in official Washington circles. It seems that the legislation which I then proposed was not regarded by Members of Congress as essential and necessary.

On the 15th day of February 1943, I again introduced legislation designed to improve this general labor situation, and in a speech which I made on the floor of the Senate on the 1st day of August of this year I pointed out what I regarded as an urgent need for some constructive legislation. In that speech I called attention to a published agreement which had been entered into by Mr. Eric Johnston as a representative of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. William Green on behalf of the A. F. of L., and Mr. Philip Murray on behalf of the CIO. I directed attention to the fact that the sum and substance of this agreement was that they wanted the labor affairs of this country thereafter to be conducted on a peaceful basis with free collective bargaining and without any legislative interference. Certainly I thought then and I think now that if, in this country, we are to have free collective bargaining and if it is to be free from legislative interference, then the proper beginning for such a procedure would be to repeal the National Labor Relations Act which has vested dictatorial power in organized labor throughout the United States.

Therefore, in an effort to test the sincerity of all who were parties to that agreement, I introduced at that time a bill which was simple in its provisions because it merely provided for the repeal of the National Labor Relations Act under which the dictatorship of organized labor has grown up in the United States.

I quote briefly from the speech which I made at that time—on August 1 of this year:

> I am not introducing this bill for the purpose of urging it to the exclusion of other worth while legislation. The thing I am interested in is sound legislation. I believe it will simply be impossible for a sound system of labor relations ever to be built in this country under the provisions of the existing National Labor Relations Act. I am willing to follow my colleagues, Senators HATCH, BURTON, and BALL, and try to improve the situation by making the responsibility of labor organizations coordinate with the power and authority which is granted, or I am willing to vote for a bill to simply repeal

the National Labor Relations Act and leave the matter of labor relations to be worked out strictly on a basis of collective bargaining between employer and employee.

But I should like to warn my colleagues in the Senate that the time is here now when we, as representatives of the people of this Nation, must take some constructive action to deal with the impending general labor situation in the United States. The issue is clear: The Government must either withdraw the authority of law which has created a labor dictatorship in America, it must repeal the National Labor Relations Act and leave the settlement of labor difficulties in the future to free collective bargaining between employer and employee, or it must follow the course which has been charted by my colleagues in Senate bill 1171 and establish in the law of the land the rights of labor, the rights of the employer, and set up machinery to make both employer and employee responsible under Government authority for the exercise of the power granted.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to proceed along either course, but I am firmly convinced that unless we face our responsibility to the Nation at this time and pass some constructive legislation, we shall face a chaotic condition in the postwar period where industry cannot operate, where jobs cannot be provided, and where chaos will reign supreme. We have fought and won one World War in the interest of sound democratic government; we are engaged in the second World War and will win it. It is to be hoped that the Congress of the United States will have enough foresight to act now to prevent a situation which is going to amount to practically a civil war on the domestic front, if something is not done to make those upon whom the Government has conferred vast power, responsible for the use of that power.

Mr. President, as I foresaw at that time, the labor situation in this Nation is getting worse, not better. We hear a great deal of conversation about conferences between management and labor participated in by the leaders of both management and labor and the Government itself. These conferences look to a better understanding between labor and management with the hope that strikes may be averted and differences in the future settled by more peaceful methods. Of course, all people in the United States would like to see such a situation developed, but the thing that many people overlook is the fact that if we are going to have collective bargaining, it must be bargaining in the real sense of the word; it must not be collective dictation on the part of labor or on the part of management; both labor and management should come before the law as equals.

It is in no sense a function of the Congress of the United States to put on the statute books such legislation as the National Labor Relations Act, which ties the hands of management, which prevents management from even talking freely with its employees, and then to say, "We want to see fair and equal collective bargaining." To my way of thinking, it is absolutely foolish to talk about or to hope for real collective bargaining on a fair and square basis between labor and management when we face the situation which the Nation faces today, wherein organized labor is absolutely free to go into a collective bargaining agreement and to execute a contract and then openly and flagrantly refuse to abide by the contract and leave no recourse whatever to business and industry to secure enforcement of a contract which they have honestly made.

When the United States Government undertakes, as it has done in the National Labor Relations Act, to tell the businessmen of this Nation that they must bargain collectively with organized labor, it then becomes the responsibility of the Government to say to organized labor that when, as a result of such collective bargaining, agreement is reached on a contract, the Government expects to see to it that labor lives up to the contract. If they do not live up to the contract, the rights of such union to act as a bargaining agent should be taken away from them. When any employer undertakes a contract with organized labor, that contract can be enforced in the civil courts of the land insofar as the employer is concerned, but it cannot be enforced insofar as the labor unions are concerned. Such a situation is not conducive to encouraging employers to enter into labor contracts.

When Mr. Thurman Arnold was Assistant Attorney General of this Nation, he gathered together and made available to the public a vast store of authentic information which proved beyond any question of doubt that labor unions were entering into conspiracies against the public in order to further their particular desires and their particular will. He gathered together evidence which proved that, not in a few isolated cases, but in many cases, these conspiracies against public interest actually existed and were in operation.

Facts gathered together by Mr. Arnold proved that the unions were responsible in many cases for actual limitation of production; that they often required men to be employed on the job when their services were of no value whatever; and furthermore, that in many instances the unions required work to be done by the most expensive methods of hand work, out on the job, when the work could have been done far more economically by utilizing other processes. Of course, all that simply means that the cost of the product to the customer is substantially increased because of these conspiracies entered into by the various labor unions throughout this Nation.

Facts were also developed to show that in New York City, force and violence were actually used to take trucks away from truck drivers who were seeking to deliver products into that city, and that employers were forced to pay union drivers who were members of the union local in New York, when their services were not needed, and, in fact, when they performed no service. Facts were developed in these cases to show that acts then performed by the union would have constituted highway robbery if performed by anyone other than by the unions.

But the Supreme Court of the United States told Mr. Arnold, when these cases were presented, that according to the law of the land unions could not be prosecuted for these conspiracies against the interest of the public. The decision of the Supreme Court made it clear that what would constitute an act of highway robbery when engaged in by others, could be performed with immunity by members of the Teamsters' Union.

It is absolutely foolish even to talk about working out any reasonable plan under which labor and management may settle their differences by the process of collective bargaining, so long as there remains in the law of this Nation authority definitely granted to labor unions to violate all laws which other citizens must abide by, and so long as they claim they are acting in the interest of their members.

What we need in this Nation is for Congress to have courage enough to put on the statute books not laws which are oppressive to labor, but laws which are fair to labor, and fair to the great rank and file of the public. I assert that there is no hope that anything but chaos will exist within the field of labor relations until the Congress of the United States has enough courage to face this issue and solve this problem.

If it is the decision of Congress that the National Labor Relations Act is to remain a part of the law of the land, which act places every restriction that can be written by law on the employer in the exercise of his rights as an employer, then certainly there should be additional legislation which would protect employees not only from coercion and threats of the employer, but would protect employee and protect the public interest against coercion and threats from organized labor. If it is the function of Government to protect employees against threats and against violence, it is also the function of the Government to protect those employees against threats and violence from all sources whatsoever.

If we are going to allow to remain on the statute books laws which will say that a mob may not form and take over the property of our citizens, then, if we want to be honest, we must say that such mob may not form under the guise and under the banner of a labor union and do those things which would be illegal for the mob to do under other circumstances.

No nation can command respect for its laws if those laws are written to control one class of citizens and at the same time to grant immunity to some other class of citizens. If we are going to have in the laws of this Nation a requirement which forces employers to enter into collective bargaining with labor unions, and if we are going to have on our statute books laws which force the employers to keep the contracts which they make as a result of such bargaining, it becomes imperative that the employer be assured that when such contracts are made the Government will see to it that they shall be enforced not only against the employer but also against labor unions.

If we are going to have laws in this Nation which provide that wherever business organizations enter into combinations and agreements which adversely affect the public interest, they shall be subject to prosecution under our antitrust laws, then, if we are going to be honest, we must also provide that these vast combinations of labor shall likewise be subject to prosecution and to civil penalties if they enter into combinations

and conspiracies against the public interest.

So long as the laws of this country make fish of one class of our citizens and fowl of another class, the laws will not have the respect of the public generally. If by law we are going to guarantee to the unions throughout this country the right of their members to strike without losing their status as employees and without losing their right to return to their jobs when the strike is over, we have an obligation to require that during the period of the strike they shall conduct themselves in an orderly manner, and that they shall not use force and violence and the threats of force and violence to achieve their objective.

With the situation as it stands today, under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act employees in an industry may go out on a strike, they may take over the property of the employer by force and violence, and they may apply force and violence to prevent employees who want to work from entering and returning to their jobs in order to work. But still the law says that when the strike is over the employer must take back the goon squads and reinstate them in their former positions.

Is it any wonder that under the operation of such laws violence is the rule rather than the exception? Is it any wonder that under the operation of such laws conditions have developed to such an extent in this country that the labor racketeer assumes himself to be the master of the employer, the employee and the public? How much longer will the Congress of the United States allow itself to be intimidated? How much longer will Congress refuse to act in behalf of the interest of the great rank and file of the American people? How much longer will Congress sit idly by and see the whole program of reconversion, which is for the purpose of providing jobs for our returning soldiers, junked while these labor racketeers exercise the power which Congress has conferred upon them to pose as the dictators of American industry, and arrogate unto themselves the sole right to say who may and who may not work to earn an honest living?

I hope the situation is now so bad that Congress will act before it becomes worse. I am now convinced that this Congress will not repeal the National Labor Relations Act. I am also convinced that this Congress has no intention of passing the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill which seeks to establish a comprehensive method of regulating labor relations, both from the standpoint of the employer and the employee. As I said in my speech on August 1, I would personally welcome the opportunity to vote for this bill, but somehow I have the feeling that the opportunity will never present itself.

Therefore, with the hope that under the conditions which exist today, the Congress will be willing to pass a bill which would at least correct some of the most flagrant inequities which now exist in our laws governing labor relations, I have drafted a bill which I intend to introduce. This bill is designed to do what I regard as the absolute minimum which can be done if we are to have a semblance of fairness or equity in the laws of the United States governing labor relations. This bill, if enacted into law, would accomplish the following objectives:

First. Under the provisions of the bill, if labor unions enter into conspiracies against the public interest they are made subject to prosecution on the same basis that business organizations are subject to prosecution under the antitrust laws.

Second. The bill seeks to encourage collective bargaining between the employer and the representatives of his employees by providing that so long as the employer does not in any sense resort to force or coercion he shall be free to discuss with his employees the merits and demerits of any proposed plan of unionization.

Third. This bill provides that if labor unions in any way use or encourage the use of force or violence in labor disputes, such unions shall lose their right to act as a bargaining agent for their members for a period of 12 months.

Fourth. The bill also provides that if labor unions enter into contracts and then fail to keep those contracts, they shall lose their right to act as a bargaining agent for a period of 12 months, and shall be subject to civil suit for their failure to keep contracts, just as employers are now subject to suit for violation of the contract.

Certainly no one can by any stretch of the imagination say that there is anything radical proposed in this bill. In other words, the bill is simply designed to provide that hereafter labor relations, labor negotiations and collective bargaining, shall be conducted by responsible parties on both sides of the bargaining table, and that each alike shall be subject to penalties for failure to conduct themselves in accordance with the law of the land.

We face in this Nation at this time a situation in which an unbridled labor monopoly, which has been built up under laws which the Congress has passed, is seeking to establish itself as the absolute dictators of the employees, of the public and of business as well. It is a situation which must be corrected if we are to make any progress in reconversion, and if we are to provide jobs for our returning soldiers. I hope that Congress will not longer delay action on this important matter.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill to which I have referred and ask that it be properly referred and given prompt consideration. I also ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1656) prohibiting labor organizations from making contracts or engaging in combinations or conspiracies in restraint of commerce, and for other purposes, introduction by Mr. O'DANIEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any labor organization or for the officers, representatives, or members thereof to enter into any contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of commerce. Any person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in the National Labor Relations Act shall be construed to prevent an employer from expressing his opinion concerning any matter affecting the relationship between him and his employees, or in any way to restrict or interfere with the right of an employer to express to his employees his opinion and preferences concerning any labor organization seeking to secure the right to represent such employees, provided such employer does not coerce or threaten to deprive his employees of any rights which they may have under the law.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the National Labor Relations Board finds that any labor organization, or any officer, or representative thereof, has in any way authorized, encouraged, or promoted the use of force or violence in connection with any labor dispute, it shall thereupon deny to such labor organization, for a period of 1 year, any rights, privileges, or benefits to which such labor organization would otherwise be entitled under the National Labor Relations Act.

(b) Whenever the National Labor Relations Board finds that any employee has used force or violence in connection with any labor dispute, it shall thereupon deny to such employee any rights, privileges, or benefits to which such employee would otherwise be entitled under the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 4. Any labor organization which authorizes, encourages, or promotes, a strike or other concerted stoppage of work affecting commerce, in violation of the provisions of a contract between such labor organization and an employer, shall be subject to suit in any court of competent jurisdiction for recovery of any damages sustained by such employer as a result of such strike or stoppage of work.

SEC. 5. As used in this act the terms employer, employee, representative, labor organization, commerce, affecting commerce, and labor dispute, shall have the same meaning as is given to those terms by section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 6. To the extent that the provisions of this act are in conflict with any other provision of law the provisions of this act shall govern.

NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN GENERAL MOTORS CORP. AND UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS UNION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish at this time to make a few remarks regarding the labor situation, not exactly along the lines followed in the previous speaker's remarks.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a bit of encouraging news in the field of relations with other sovereign states. In the New York Times of Friday, November 30, it was reported that C. E. Wilson, the president of the du Pont-controlled General Motors Corp., had announced his willingness to meet with the President of the United States to discuss the current wage dispute with the United Automobile Workers Union-CIO. This was confirmed in later dispatches from Detroit.

This is progress. Previously, General Motors management had refused to negotiate with the union, in flagrant violation of the National Labor Relations Act, and a week ago appeared to have severed diplomatic relations with the Government of the United States. It is indeed gratifying and reassuring to learn that President Wilson has now

expressed a willingness to meet with President Truman.

Public opinion and the weight of the Federal Government's feeling that the General Motors Corp. should resume negotiations with the union appear to have persuaded the corporation to yield some ground, to the extent that Vice President Harry W. Anderson has now agreed to come all the way from Detroit to Washington, not immediately, or last week when the union was here, but next Tuesday, not to resume negotiations with the union, as would be required if the corporation were obeying the Wagner Act, but to confer with United States Conciliation Commissioner Edgar Warren, who had previously been told that, if he wanted to talk to General Motors management, he could come to Detroit, the capital of the General Motors colonial empire.

In time, the Federal Government, backed by the force of American public opinion, may persuade General Motors management to come back into the United States of America, back into compliance with the Wagner Act, and to sit down with the union, in the presence of United States counciliators, to work out a settlement of the wage dispute which is currently paralyzing production of the largest corporation in the automotive industry. President Wilson, who is on a sit-down strike against collective bargaining, may be persuaded to go back to work.

Why is the General Motors management behaving in this arrogant, high-handed manner?

In my view, the answer may be stated in two parts. First, because the General Motors management is determined to keep a veil of secrecy over its operating methods, its whole financial position, so that neither labor nor customers can have a factual basis for demanding a fair share of the corporation's profits in the form of higher wages and lower prices. Both would, of course, be in line with national policy, which is committed to maintaining purchasing power, now threatened with a drop of $30,000,000,000 in 1946.

Second, and even more serious and sinister, there is the charge made by the union, and substantiated by the corporation's behavior toward both the union and Federal officials, that the General Motors Corp., a rich colony of the vast du Pont industrial empire, is considered by its management to be a sovereign industrial state, in relation to the Federal Government, its employees, and its customers and stockholders.

On the first point, today, far too many industrialists and businessmen, many of them with powerful political alliances, are determined to head the Nation the wrong way in the reconversion and postwar period. Instead of going forward to full employment, full production, full consumption, and stable prosperity year in and year out, they are determined to head the Nation back to the bad past, the past of chronic mass unemployment, of breadlines, of half-way mustard-plaster emergency legislation. Yes; they want to go even further back, back beyond the Wagner Act, back to the twenties, when union organizers were hunted with dogs, beaten, thrown in jail, framed and imprisoned, just for the crime of believing in the right of collective bargaining and of proposing to organize so that more and more could practice what so many preached.

It is easy to understand how a millionaire, say, for example, one of the Du Pont family, which controls and directs the policies of General Motors, should be perfectly sincere in thinking that Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO and director of the union's General Motors department, is a very fresh, inquisitive young man because in the course of negotiating wages he wants to get a peek at the General Motors Corporation's costs and profits.

Many perfectly sincere officers and controlling stockholders of big corporations seem to think that in the interest of public morality Mr. Reuther and the UAW-CIO, and A. F. of L. and rail labor unions, too, should be restrained, forcibly if need be, from insisting that in wage negotiations the employers should open their books and show their profits. It is their feeling, I am told, and I can believe it, that they look upon the whole procedure as a sort of economic strip-tease act that is bound to result in lowering the Nation's standard of morals.

I should be inclined to agree with that if they would agree to substitute the word "elevate" so that we could all get together on the statement that our moral standards would be elevated if all corporations made a practice of doing what thousands of employers have done for years, namely, talk costs, prices, profits, and future market expectations based on past experience and general business trends when they sit down to negotiate wages, hours, and working conditions with union representatives of their employees. We should all be better off and no one's morals would suffer, economically or otherwise, if that were done.

Actually, if disclosure of excessive profits resulting from too-high prices and too-low wages resulted in the payment of higher wages and the cutting of prices, the corporation might develop a better figure, feel a great deal better, be less afraid of the future, and behave in a much freer, more enterprising, and more competitive manner.

Mr. President, do not misunderstand me. I am not advocating the practice of economic nudism in our business and industrial system. I think corporations and the individual employer are entitled to as much privacy for their legitimate business secrets, know-how, and financial position as a laid-off worker has when he applies for unemployment insurance, or workmen's compensation, or when retired working people apply for old-age assistance. Yes; and more, because I think unemployed and aged workers suffer entirely too much snooping and prying and coercion by investigators and interviewers who are under the supervision of officials with bookkeeping minds.

I think a corporation, or the individual employer, should have about as much privacy, economically speaking, as a boy, aged 18, has when he goes before his Selective Service Board for examination. Maybe a little less, because, after all, the State gives the corporation certain privileges and immunities, such as the convenience of going bankrupt without the owners having to make good individually.

But let us not accuse the Du Ponts and the other multimillionaires and their highly paid hired men in the management of our great corporations of insincerity when they say in tones of great moral indignation: "We certainly are going to keep our profits covered—and we will not let even our own stockholders see them. As for the curiosity of labor—there ought to be a law."

Now, Mr. President, I turn to the second point, the basis, the assumptions on which General Motors management is refusing to negotiate with the union, is defying the national wage-price policy of increasing wages while holding prices, and is treating with the Secretary of Labor and his chief conciliator and with the President of the United States as if they, the General Motors management, were the rulers of one sovereign state and the President of the United States the head of another with whom General Motors management might choose to deal or not to deal, on terms to be dictated or negotiated by the corporation.

Let me read two paragraphs from the page 1 story in the New York Times of November 30:

> President Truman expressed belief today that General Motors Corp. and the United Auto Workers, CIO, should resume negotiations to seek a way out of the strike, which union officials said would not affect the rest of the motor car manufacturers unless there is a conspiracy in the industry.
>
> A few hours later C. E. Wilson, General Motors president, announced in Detroit that he would talk only with President Truman in Washington and that Harry W. Anderson, vice president of the corporation in charge of labor relations, would confer with union representatives in Detroit tomorrow on the question of illegal picketing.

Mr. President, I think the arrogance and presumption of that statement by Mr. Wilson needs no further comment.

General Motors' whole conduct in the course of these wage negotiations, before and after the strike, bears out and verifies the statements made in the Union's supplemental brief, presented in negotiations November 7, 1945. Because this is true, I want to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the conclusions set forth in the brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MOTORS' POSTWAR PLAN FOR LONGER HOURS, LOW WAGES, HIGH PRICES, MASS UNEMPLOYMENT, INFLATION, AND ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM

The most disturbing feature of General Motors' reply brief is its renewed proof of the corporation's determination to write and enforce for itself and all of American industry a policy of reckless and irresponsible economic imperialism within the United States of America and throughout the world.

Such a policy as the brief delineates would weaken and destroy economic and political democracy within the Nation; it would commit us as a Nation to international economic warfare leading inevitably to armed conflict.

We recognize that such a charge, introduced during a wage negotiation, requires substantiation. This we propose to give.

First, let it be understood that this whole question of interlocking national and international economic policy was first raised, not by the union, but by the corporation. We now address ourselves to the issue because it has been reopened by the corporation.

In its reply brief (pp. 7–9) the corporation incorporated the text of GM President C. E. Wilson's October 27 letter proposing an alliance with the union to persuade Congress to lengthen the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours by amending the Wage-Hour Act. (On p. 32 the corporation proposed a 48-hour week.) Although Mr. Wilson, in the October 19 press conference at which he unveiled the 45-hour workweek proposal, said it was not a proposal to the union, the brief now terms the October 27 letter "a counterproposal." Moreover, new emphasis is given the proposal—already characterized as "unthinkable" by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee—by the corporation's November 7 appeal to the union to give this proposal serious consideration (p. 11).

The corporation management obviously intends to continue its efforts to mobilize pressure on Congress (p. 7) to weaken the Wage-Hour Act after 7 years of successful and beneficial operation. It proposes to do so at a time when unemployment is rising toward an estimated peak of 8,000,000 early next year. It persists in the face of estimates that lengthening of the workweek would add at least 1,500,000 to the ranks of unemployed veterans and laid-off war workers. It does not deign to notice the practical alternative, proposed by the union and now recommended again, of attaining maximum production and efficiency by going on a three-shift 40-hour-week basis.

The corporation leaves us no choice but to attempt to follow its devious reasoning all over the economic map. We must piece together the corporation's assumptions, points of view, and half-revealed economic plan for the General Motors Corp., all American industry, and trade here and in the world's markets.

General Motors has asked for it—twice. Now it is going to get our answer, stated as flatly, dispassionately, and briefly as possible.

We hope some responsible persons among its officers and stockholders will approach our analysis with open minds and will review and reconsider a policy and plan which, in our opinion, spell ruin for the corporation, for genuine free enterprise, and for economic and political democracy.

Not because we love the corporation more, but because we like depression less, we are determined if it is humanly possible to save General Motors from committing hara kiri. We prefer to believe that American business and public opinion have enough good sense to restrain General Motors and its industrial allies from cutting their workers' take-home pay, soaking their customers, and stealing world markets with a dollar cheapened by inflation.

Let us examine the parts before we measure the scope of the corporation's postwar plan for an economy that, because of unemployment and shrinking purchasing power among wage earners, farmers, professional groups, and small businessmen, and oversaving by management and stockholders of big corporations such as General Motors, means chronic mass unemployment, scarcity in the midst of "overproduction" and want in the midst of "surpluses." (In the automobile industry this means a return within 3 years to the 3- or 4-day workweek, 6-month working year—for those who get jobs at all.)

1. General Motors' wage-price-profit policy, as stated in the reply brief, in the course of negotiations and in letters and Nationwide advertisements, is, as we have hitherto demonstrated:

"High" wages, but 23 percent less than enough to maintain GM workers take-home pay equal in purchasing power to 1944;

Prices as high as the traffic will bear;

"Reasonable profits," whatever is left after wages, materials, and parts costs, etc.;

Prices and profits, none of labor's business;

Profits and costs, nobody's business but the corporation's.

At the very outset the reply brief expresses alarm over the possibility that wage rates may be increased to maintain take-home pay, a proposal advocated by us and the Federal Government as a necessary first step toward achieving a postwar level of living 50 percent better than the American people have ever known. "The demand for higher wages has since become universal throughout all industry" (p. 1).

Parading the economic fallacy that higher wages automatically mean higher costs and higher prices (see pp. 32 and 33 of our brief for proof that they do not), the corporation's anxiety about general increases in all industrial wage rates is touching. It reminds us that General Motors, giant though it is, in terms of control, is a subsidiary of the Du Pont interests, which in turn tie in with other vast concentrations of economic power extending even beyond the Nation's borders. They well know the big profits of high-volume production.

The corporation s alarm and anxiety (pp. 2 and 3) was expressed earlier by GM President Wilson. In the course of his October 19 press conference he warned that other employers who grant wage-rate increases are not "playing the game." Considering GM's dominant position in American industry, particularly with respect to producers of materials and parts, Mr. Wilson's statement on this point is worth quoting again:

"I think the people that have stepped out and raised wages and salaries, instead of lowering prices, if they had the margin to do it, have not been quite playing the game if we are going to stabilize and hold the line" (p. 34, press conference transcript).

Judging by the corporation's offer to the union (p. 34) to raise wages along with prices, Mr. Wilson could not have been quite serious in the last part of his statement to the press.

What is "the game" General Motors is playing that it is suggesting other employers should play or run the risk of being marked down in GM's books? Is it a game that is in the interest of GM stockholders, workers, and consumers, or is it in the immediate, short-run interest of a small ring of insiders and management who, as we showed in our economic brief at page 46, have already achieved a managerial revolution by getting a rule whereby officers, directors, and their associates (holding 30 percent of the voting stock) may act for GM stockholders as a whole, all 400,000 of them? (In citing that rule we remarked that democracy among GM stockholders appears to have been abridged.)

2. In our considered opinion, a dark thread of consistency and intent runs through the GM statements on wages cited above, and from them to the fantastic attempt to justify a 45-hour normal work week as necessary in order to compete with longer work weeks in other countries. In its reply brief the corporation endorsed and quoted the Wilson letter of October 27:

"The workmen of other nations will work far more than 45 hours" (p. 8).

Supporting its proposal that the union join the corporation in pressuring Congress to extend the 45-hour work week, GM argued that during the period of postwar reconstruction "our country will be shipping food, materials, and machinery to other countries" (p. 8).

Nothing is said about General Motors, du Pont, United States Steel, and other large producers selling cars and other products abroad, except that "it is hoped that at the end of this postwar reconstruction period our relations with other countries will be on the basis of a two-way street, where we shall get back goods and services for those we supply" (p. 9).

A similar statement was made by Mr. Wilson in his October 19 press conference:

"Until this aftermath of this war is over, we ought to go back to about a 45- or 48-hour work week. That is what the rest of the world is going to do. That is the only way that we will produce the volume of materials and goods at a sufficiently low price to satisfy the people of our country. I doubt, personally, if that is going to happen. In my own memory I remember the 60-hour work week, 40 or 50 years ago. When I first ran a plant it was 50 hours" (p. 21, press conference transcript).

Here three points are notable:

(1) It is proposed to go back to 45 or 48 hours, at a time when our productive plant and methods permit efficient, economical three-shift, 40-hour-week operation, as General Motors production men well know.

(2) The rest of the world (where cities and productive plants have been destroyed and where acute manpower shortages exist) is going to work long hours, so should we.

(3) Mr. Wilson's nostalgia for the good old days of his youth, when a 60-hour week prevailed.

Mr. Wilson is an appealing homespun front for du Pont controls. (See p. 46 of UAW-CIO brief for members of GM bonus and salary committee.) But Mr. Wilson does not succeed in masking GM's intent, expressed in the reply brief, to get into the world markets quick and deep, during the period of reconstruction and on a competitive wage-cost-price profit basis that, using GM's own gargantuan measurement of reasonable profits, would require that wages be held down and hours lengthened.

One of the most effective known ways to hold down wages is to maintain a large pool of unemployed. Thus the 45-48 hour week ties in with the low-wage advice given to industry by Mr. Wilson in his press conference October 19.

3. The thread of consistency ties in the corporation's statements on prices. The reply brief seems to talk out of both sides of the corporation's mouth. On page 20, the corporation seems to plump for lower prices. Yet on page 34, when the corporation comes to make the final firm offer of an estimated 8- to 10-percent wage increase to the union, it proposes to take advantage of an assumed opportunity to use a wage increase as the screw with which to jack up prices. Page 34 is consistent with the corporation's attempts in statements, pamphlets (Danger on the Production Front) and advertisements to soften up OPA, other administrative agencies and Congress for a price increase and at the same time to plant in the public's mind the idea that labor's wage demands would be responsible, solely and in full, for whatever price increases occur.

No more disruptive strategy could be devised. Labor would lose in lower weekly wages, in longer hours, in lower-purchasing power as prices rose—and labor would be blamed by farmers, business and professional persons for a spiral of inflation to which labor would have become the first victim.

The net of the reply brief's statements on prices is inflation—runaway inflation. We have already rejected the wage-price offer. We again denounce it as pure economic poison.

4. Bringing together the corporation's statements on wages, hours, and prices, discussed above, the pattern is fairly obvious. General Motors is for holding down wages, lengthening hours and raising prices within the United States of America.

5. But, in view of past operations by big business in world markets, and reading again the strange concern and anxiety displayed by the corporation in its brief (pp. 7–11) by

General Motors' president in his letter (pp. 7–9) and his press conference (p. 21 of press conference transcript), regarding world markets and hours, wages and production in other countries during the period of reconstruction, it seems reasonable to conclude that:

General Motors and/or du Pont dominated management are thinking of producing American cars and other products on a low-wage, long-hour, inflated-dollar basis for easier competition on the world market.

This amounts to a program for American economic imperialism, using an inflated dollar—cheap in terms of other currencies, but dear in terms of purchasing power here at home—to fight for ever-larger shares of the world market.

America's production record shows that our hope of sharing in the world's peacetime markets on a healthy and stable basis lies, not in pulling down the income of wage earners and farmers toward the coolie-peasant level of other less industrialized nations, but in the establishment of a high wage, low price, full production, full employment and full consumption economy in which profits, while perhaps lower on a unit basis than du Pont's would wish, can be greater in volume and more stable than ever before.

If, as seems obvious, General Motors management is mixing dreams of economic imperialism—dumping American goods produced with sweated labor and sold for cheap dollars—with its postwar production plans, then the union will fight on that front, too. And we are confident that all of organized labor and the public will unite to oppose such a program for the degredation of the American standard of living.

Were we to embark upon a course of economic warfare such as is implicit in General Motors policy statements, the road to World War III would be a short road, soon traveled.

The world's hope of lasting peace is largely based on raising the standard of living—and the consuming power—of all peoples toward the American standard while at the same time continuing to raise our own.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Old Money-Maker Hate," published in Collier's Magazine of October 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD MONEY-MAKER HATE

Speaking of Collier's article, Walter Davenport ripped off one recently under the title "Savior From Texas." This one was about hate merchants in general, and a pair named Vance Muse and Lewis V. Ulrey in particular. Muse and Ulrey do business under the name of Christian American Association, Inc.

As you probably remember from the Davenport article, Muse and Ulrey sell hatred of labor unions as their principal stock in trade, and have a working arrangement with Senator W. LEE (Pass the Biscuits, Pappy) O'DANIEL of Texas to push an anti-labor-union constitutional amendment christened by them the God-Given-Right-to-Work amendment. But they also sell various side lines of hate, directed at colored people, Jews, etc., etc., and all dressed up in language disclaiming hatred of anybody or anything.

These hate peddlers of the Muse-Ulrey type probably are in for some boom times, what with the war over and a lot of tensions still unresolved among us, and the desire riding higher in many a bosom to punch some nose which one couldn't see one's way clear to punching while the war was on.

We don't advocate the hate merchants' suppression. That would be contrary to the Bill of Rights and would only drive them underground. But we do advocate their frequent unveiling by magazines, newspapers, radio commentators and so forth; and we do earnestly advise the hate merchants' prospective customers, before they buy a bale of hate, to stop and thing about where their money will go.

In the Muse-Ulrey Christian American case, a total of $67,873.49 was contributed to this organization for its campaign for the anti-union constitutional amendment in Arkansas. This money was whacked around for salaries to Muse and assistants, for lobbying expenses, for personal expenses not itemized, etc.

The hate merchants, in short, make money out of marketing hate. Hate is the commodity they sell, the thing they live by—a purely destructive emotion which makes no jobs, builds no houses, raises no crops, and settles almost no problems of any kind.

It's a strange way to make a living, when you come to think about it, and it's something of a commentary on human cussedness that so many hate merchants can make good livings out of hate, while dispensers of good will and generosity and tolerance so often have to give their wares away.

There's no law to keep you from buying hatred by contributing to one or more hate organizations. But you're just a sucker if you do it, and nobody but the hate peddler who gets your money will profit by it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in the light of all the events which have occurred since the San Francisco Conference, I doubt very seriously that the plan agreed upon at that Conference will serve any worth-while purpose, but it is desired by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, who are charged with the responsibility of conducting our foreign affairs. Therefore, Mr. President, I intend to vote for the pending measure, for that reason, and for that reason only.

Mr. MILLIKIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Carville	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Mitchell	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Gossett	Murray	Wilson
Green	Myers	Young
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, yesterday there was considerable interest in the matter of confirmation under the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. At this time I wish to offer a committee amendment which I think will meet the wishes of Senators who were not in agreement with the attitude of the committee yesterday, and will at the same time be in entire harmony with the action of the committee. If Senators will follow me, the amendment is on page 2, line 16, after the words "the President." It is proposed to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." That refers to the delegates to the Assembly and requires Senate confirmation.

In line 20, on page 2, at the end of the paragraph, it is proposed to insert, "Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of appointment as the President may specify." That simply means that the delegate to the Assembly may receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

On page 3, line 4, after the words "United Nations", it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 4, and down to and including line 8, and insert "or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization." The effect of that amendment is that any member of the Economic and Social Council, or any member of the Trusteeship Council, or the principal representative of the United States on any other commission or body that may be created shall be subject to confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas wish his amendments to be considered en bloc or separately?

Mr. CONNALLY. I offer them all as one amendment. The reason why I offer them all as one amendment is that they all relate to the same subject. If we do not adopt all of them, we shall not wish to adopt any of them.

Does the Senator from Colorado prefer that I leave the amendment pending?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I prefer that it be acted on now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, after the word "President", it is proposed to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

At the end of line 20 it is proposed to insert: "Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of appointment as the President may specify."

On page 3, line 4, after the words "United Nations," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of line 4, and down to and including line 8, and insert, "or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have section 2 (d) read as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read section 2 (d) as proposed to be amended.

The Chief Clerk read as follows.

(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine: *Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I merely wish to make this comment: I am very happy to join in urging the amendment which the able Senator from Texas has worked out in consultation today. My complaint against the Millikin amendment yesterday related solely to the fact that it undertook to make a full, round-the-clock job of representation on the General Assembly, and I know that in many instances, that would rob the General Assembly of the type of representation which we may wish upon it. On the other hand, I totally agree, and always have agreed, that the members of the General Assembly should be confirmed by the Senate, and that the chief representative of the United States upon the other instrumentalities should be confirmed. I believe that this is a very happy arrangement to settle the entire question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely wish to say that I have never had any objection to the confirmation of these representatives by the Senate. In fact, I have repeatedly voted for measures providing that all appointees receiving salaries of more than $5,000, or some such sum, should be confirmed by the Senate. I am strong for Senate confirmation. But when we were drafting this measure and considering it in the committee several Senators were apprehensive that the requirement that confirmation must be had in the case, for example, of a Member of the House of Representatives appointed to one of the periodical meetings, might result in the House feeling that we were infringing on its prerogatives and privileges. For that reason alone I consented to the provision originally carried in the bill. But it is entirely agreeable to me to require that all the delegates to the Assembly and the heads of any other important bureaus or organizations shall be confirmed by the Senate. The only possible trouble might be that at a meeting of the Assembly or the United Nations Council an agency might be established composed of certain members, and the Senate might not be in session and there might be a little delay. However, I am willing to take that hazard. I think the amendment ought to quiet the fears of all Senators who voted yesterday under the idea that some such provision was necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas on behalf of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I am much gratified with the amendment which the Senator from Texas has offered. It meets almost all the points which I made yesterday in connection with an amendment which we fought out, and it meets all the points of an amendment which I proposed to discuss today. I believe that the Senator and the committee have done a very constructive thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall read section 4 of the bill:

The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instruction, of the representative of the United States.

It will be noted that under the bill the President is not required to make current reports on matters which in his judgment may lead to decisions and that he need not make current reports of his instructions to our representative on the Security Council as to such preliminary matters.

I have an amendment intended to correct these deficiencies. The amendment is also broad enough to require that such current reports shall cover the actions of our representative to the Security Council whether or not they are pursuant to the instructions of the President.

Mr. President, I request that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On pages 3 and 4, it is proposed to strike out section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. The President shall make special current reports (a) on matters being dealt with by the Security Council and which in his judgment may lead to decisions to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, (b) on such decisions, (c) on the participation in such matters and decisions by the representative of the United States to the Council of the United Nations, and (d) on the President's instructions to said representative regarding such matters and decisions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, as will be observed, the proposed amendment would require special current reports not only on decisions of the Security Council and on the action of our representative as to such decisions, but also would require current reports from the President on situations being dealt with by the Security Council which—and please note this—in the judgment of the President may lead to decisions to take enforcement measures.

I emphasize the discretion which this proposed amendment leaves in the President because I would not want to require that he burden himself or the Congress with reporting irrelevant or unimportant details.

This part of the proposed amendment would put no more on the President than a duty of good faith. Nothing less should be acceptable. I have proposed this discretion for the President because it was suggested early in the debate that a blanket duty to report everything would not be practicable, and with this I agree.

The proposed amendment would also require that such current reports on matters preliminary to decisions shall include the President's instructions as to such preliminary matters.

The bill as now drawn requires a current report on the actions, under the instructions of the President, of our representative to the Security Council, on decisions to take enforcement measures, but not on instructions leading up to such decisions. The proposed amendment would broaden this provision so as to cover such actions on important preliminary matters and with respect to decisions whether or not taken under the President's instructions.

The proposed amendment raises the question whether Congress should content itself with news of a fait accompli.

The proposed amendment emphasizes the right of Congress to be informed on matters which may lead to its own action in its own reserved field. It emphasizes the right of the people of the United States to be informed on matters which may take their sons into war. It emphasizes the moral principle that the destiny of this Nation and the world shall not be decided in secret. It poses the question whether we mean it when we talk of open covenants openly arrived at.

Our history is not free of instances where the fate of nations has been decided in secret with the secret approval of our Chief Executive. Am I making an extravagant draft on imagination when I would provide against the possibility of repetitions?

While we are opening the Town Meeting of the World, let us not close our own Town Meeting, the Congress of the United States.

The proposition that in order to preserve peace and to protect the rights of the peoples of the world there must be no dark corners, there must be no censorship, there must be full exchange of information, has been so eloquently, effectively, and recently argued in this body that I shall not presume to add my lesser talents to further elaboration. All that was said in these matters as to foreign countries applies equally here at home.

Every reason that requires the lifting of the iron curtain between the nations of the world requires also that we do not lower the iron curtain between the executive and legislative branches of this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill makes provision for reports by the President to the Congress. I think Senators are aware of the fact that actually a good deal of the work to be done by the Secretary of State, particularly, will not be such that it can be made public currently, because to do so would interfere with the operations. However, there is no intent to keep from the public the action of the organization when and if it is desirable to make it known.

I think the President of the United States can be trusted to make such reports. He is directed to make certain reports, and in addition, he is given authority to make such additional reports as he may see fit to make.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I offer and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "on its call."

On page 5, line 17, beginning with the word "The", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> Nothing in such agreement or agreements shall authorize the President, and the President shall have no authority, to make available to the Security Council any armed forces to enable the Security Council to take action under article 42 of said charter, unless the Congress has by appropriate act or joint resolution authorized the President to make such forces available to enable such Council to take action in the specific case in which the Council proposes to take action.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it has been stated that the power we are granting to the President of the United States to appoint a delegate who shall have power to vote to send a police force to—as it is termed—"put down aggression" is not the power to send us to war. The question immediately arises: What is war? No dictionary or text helps us much. The word has many meanings. War is a contest of arms, a struggle of violence between nations—but, clearly, not every use of arms or every contest.

James Grafton Rogers in his recent work suggests, in speaking of war:

> Slowly the conception emerges. War must be declared because it reaches many people. A declaration is in part a summons to citizens. It also gives notice that many legal rights are changed. Treaties are canceled. Trading and even corresponding with enemies is no longer proper. Enemy persons and property are restrained. Contracts and debts suspended. Our ships at sea and our own property and citizens abroad have only the protection force can provide. Vast and autocratic control of people by the government is released by a declaration of war—the right to control prices, ration food and clothing, even to seize factories and to arrest our own people without the right to demand the charges against them or secure public trial.
>
> The Constitution says, therefore, in effect, "Our country shall not be committed formally to a trial of force with another nation, our people generally summoned to the effort, and all the legal consequences to people, rights, and property incurred until the House, Senate, and the President agree."

Mr. President, a noted columnist has stated, in criticizing a speech which I recently delivered on the floor of the Senate, that fortunately, as he said, my voice does not carry very much weight any more in the Senate. I agree with him that it does not carry very much weight with reference to the pending measure, and it has not carried very much weight on this floor with reference to our foreign policy. It seems to me that any person who is so blind that he cannot read the signposts along the road, and cannot interpret their meaning, overlooks public opinion in the United States of America. The time will very shortly arrive when it will not be my voice that will be heard in the Senate of the United States, and it will not be the voice of any other Senator. It will be the voice of the woman who sits knitting by the fireplace or the stove. It will be the voice of the boy who returns from the war with his arms and legs gone, and, perhaps, blind, deaf, and insane. It will be the voice of the worker in the factory, the people out in the "sticks" and in the little towns. It will be the voice of the small businessman such as the small merchant. It will not be the voice of some person in Washington who sits in his gilded cage and disseminates propaganda, nor the voice of the commentator over the radio. No, Mr. President, it will not be the voice of the high-salaried columnist who broadcasts propaganda, but it will be the voice of the common people of this country that will be heard, and that voice will be effective in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, my voice has not been effective, but if it had been effective there would not have been enacted some of the measures which were passed prior to the time we entered this great conflict, which today everyone concedes has left the world in the most chaotic condition it has ever known, and has saved for us not the "four freedoms," or even the freedom from fear, but has left in the world the greatest fear that has ever been experienced since the Dark Ages, and has brought about dictatorship, starvation, degredation, anarchy, and disease.

Mr. President, briefly as I can I wish to discuss the question of the wisdom of granting power to the President of the United States to authorize his appointed delegate to vote to send any part of our armed forces into foreign countries for the purpose of putting down aggression, or for the purpose of putting down what some may say is aggression, which may or may not affect the peace and security of the people of the United States, or their property. Aside from the constitutional question involved, is it the part of wisdom to grant such power to the President? I submit at the outset that we have never sent a delegate abroad clothed with authority to bind us to take action in connection with any international affairs, and we have never authorized any executive spokesman to use future powers, as distinguished from past powers, to order into action American armed forces.

Mr. President, Mr. James Grafton Rogers, one of our foremost authorities in this field, writes as follows in his book, World Policing and the Constitution:

> This new territory needs to be as thoroughly mapped and mooted as our grandfathers debated and explored the consequences of the admission of Missouri or Nebraska on the political equilibrium of the slave question, or as our fathers grew fiery in debate over imperialism when we wondered whether and, if so, how and with what consequences, we should undertake to own and rule the Philippine Islands. The writer happens to be one of those who would be glad to see this country enter an international organization of the type now discussed but he is not one who welcomes our doing it in a burst of thoughtless enthusiasm. He fears reaction, repentance and disillusion unless we have discussed thoroughly, indeed almost torn to shreds, the question of means and commitments involved.

Indeed, it must be acknowledged that this whole new field of international relations into which we are entering must be explored in terms of the constitutionality of the President's powers to participate.

Surely no one welcomes the thought of what might result from hasty, blind, or foolish action on our part. Yet, Mr. President, we have been told that we must hurry the passage of the pending bill because the world is waiting for it, regardless of whether or not the people of the United States understand to what they are being committed by the Congress of the United States, or understand the secrecy which has surrounded every move that has been made not only prior to but all during the war and since then. Even the international newspapers and commentators have criticized the secrecy which has been practiced with reference to our foreign relations.

Strangely enough, the report of the Foreign Relations Committee admits that in section 5 dealing with economic sanctions:

> The committee realizes that the powers proposed to be granted to the President under this section are very great.

But Mr. President, in support of the proposition contained in section 6 that the Congress shall authorize the President to use American armed forces without any further reference to the Congress, the committee states simply, that even any kind of an amendment to this proposition contained in section 6 would, in its opinion, "violate the spirit of the United States Constitution under which the President has well-established powers and obligations to use our armed forces without specific approval of Congress."

The Supreme Court has never made a decision on the subject. I challenge any Member of the Senate to find such a decision of the Supreme Court.

At best it is only in recent years, when liberalism in the United States has swung away from a determination to limit the powers of the executive to the present incomprehensible determination on its part to surrender all powers to the President, that this proposition affirming the President's right to use American troops without consent of Congress has been given any serious consideration whatever.

The report of the Foreign Relations Committee clearly reveals that its findings do not rest on any constitutional basis whatever, for the report concludes:

> In order that there may be no doubt about the availability of our armed forces, the committee believed it wise that the Congress should in this legislation confirm its view that the President has the power and obligation, in compliance with our undertaking under the Charter, to make the forces provided in the agreements available to the Security Council.

Mr. President, in the request of the Foreign Relations Committee that the Congress confirm its view that the President has the power to make our armed forces available to the Security Council, the Congress is merely being asked to delegate its own powers to the Executive. What does the Constitution have to say on this matter? What are the powers of the Congress as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution? I read:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes * * * to provide for the common defense * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin * * * to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations * * * to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water * * * to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years * * * to provide and maintain a navy * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces * * * to provide for calling forth the militia to repel invasions * * * to regulate generally the militia, and, finally, to pass laws to carry into effect the foregoing powers and all other powers vested in the Government.

Again I submit, Mr. President, that there is no mention in the Constitution of any power of Congress to delegate its authority to the President and for him in turn to authorize his appointee to an international organization to vote to put down aggression in foreign countries which may or may not directly or indirectly affect the interests of the United States.

What are the powers granted to the President in the Constitution? We read under article II:

> The Executive powers shall be vested in a President * * * the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States (and of the militia when in national service) * * * he shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls * * * and all other officers (although the Congress may exempt posts) * * * fill up all vacancies * * * during the recess of the Senate * * * he shall give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend measures and shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers * * * he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Mr. President, James Grafton Rogers says of the provisions of the Constitution which define the powers both of the Congress and of the President:

> Congress alone is to "declare war." There is in this connection no mention of the President. His veto or approval of a declaration is, of course, contemplated, as the requirement is made that "every vote" should have his concurrence. Although the history of England to that date and our own history since shows that war has scarcely ever been declared without executive request, and, indeed, that the declaration has been usually an inescapable consequence of executive steps, we do not find the President especially mentioned on this point. The phrase does not read "on recommendation of the President," nor that the "President with advice and consent of Congress may declare war." The omission is significant. There was to be no war unless Congress took the initiative.

If we say to the President of the United States, "You may send a police force, or a part of the Army and Navy, to put down aggression," is there any Member of the Congress who does not believe that thereby we commit the whole of our Army, the whole of our Navy, and the entire Nation immediately to war? In that situation lies a fait accompli. We might just as well, it seems to me, say to the President of the United States, "We delegate to you the power to send at any time the whole Army and the whole Navy." We are only fooling ourselves and fooling the people of the country when we say that we will give to the President power to put down aggression with a small force, and not at the same time delegate to him the full power to declare war at any time, or have our representative vote to declare war at any time when, in the wisdom of the Council, it is determined that a particular nation has become an aggressor.

Mr. President, who should determine when a nation has become an aggressor? As I pointed out the other day, the League of Nations was never able to define an aggressor. Not only that, but when the Japanese went into Manchuria and the League of Nations declared Japan to be guilty of aggression, it could not back up its decision because the British representative on the League of Nations stood on the floor and defended the position taken by Japan, and the Japanese representative said that the British representative had defended the Japanese position far better than he himself could have done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is undisputed that the war-making power is vested in the Congress. The proposal now before the Senate is to transfer the war-making power. Does the Senator think that can be done without a constitutional amendment?

Mr. WHEELER. I, myself, do not think so.

Mr. President, while the Constitution admittedly is no more specific in its delegation of power to either the Congress or the President than in the provisions to which I have already referred, there is more than ample evidence to prove what was in the minds of the framers of this document concerning the nature of the President's power to used armed forces without the consent of Congress which they were ready and willing to grant him. It is perfectly clear that the President was not to be empowered to declare war or to use American armed forces for war purposes without a specific and prior authorization by Congress.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, the treatment the question of war received at the constitutional convention. Mr. Rogers informs us "the business of declaring the country embarked on war was always treated by the convention during its sessions as a legislative function." The subject of war was not mentioned in Governor Randolph's Virginia Resolutions. It was not mentioned in various other first sketches, such as the Paterson suggestions or the Sherman papers. But, in an outline by Alexander Hamilton, the Senate was given sole authority to declare war and its advice and consent required for treaties. The President was to be Commander in Chief and to direct the war when commenced. On May 29, 1787, a draft was presented by Charles Pinckney, which set the style of the Constitution which was later adopted. This draft proposed a Congress of two Chambers, a House of Delegates and a Senate. The latter alone

was authorized to declare war, "to make treaties and appoint ambassadors."

Mr. President, the Articles of Confederation of 1777, themselves, provided that Congress alone, under the articles, could determine on peace or war. Article IX states:

The United States in Congress assembled shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace and war excepting in the cases mentioned in the sixth article.

And, Mr. President, the sixth article specifically states:

No State shall engage in any war without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled unless such State be actually invaded by enemies or shall have received certain advice of a resolution being formed by some nation of Indians to invade such State, and the danger is so imminent as not to admit of a delay till the United States in Congress assembled shall be consulted.

In chapter 69 of the Federalist, Alexander Hamilton defines what was clearly in the minds of the members of the Constitutional Convention regarding the nature of the powers they were willing to grant to the President insofar as war was concerned:

The President is to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect his authority will be nominally the same with that of the King of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It will amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first general and admiral of the Confederacy, while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all of which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature.

President Jefferson's attitude toward his own war powers was clearly evidenced in an incident in 1801 when he forbade our Navy to take offensive action against Tripoli, which had declared war upon us, because Congress itself had not declared war.

Mr. President, I do not see how there can be any mistaking of the mind of the framers of this Constitution concerning the President's war powers, and it is on this point that the claims of those who support the constitutionality of the provisions of this bill are wrong. I want to quote from the Collected Papers of John Bassett Moore, recognized by everyone as one of our outstanding authorities on international as well as constitutional law, who says:

I have occasionally heard the suggestion that there can be no objection to conferring on the President dictatorial powers as regards peace and war because, forsooth, he can, in the exercise of his constitutional power as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, or in the conduct of diplomatic intercourse, at any moment plunge the country into war.

That is the argument which is being used by many at the present time. Mr. Moore continues:

I utterly deny this. There is only one case in which the President is empowered to use the military forces for purposes of war without the express authority of Congress, and that is to repel invasion. The use of any of his powers so as to plunge the country into war would be a palpable violation of the Constitution and of his oath of office. The fact that such loose notions can be entertained in the United States of Executive prerogative should of itself be a solemn warning against the adoption of such legislation as that proposed, since it would remove the last doubt that Congress had abdicated its functions as the law-making power and set up an absolute dictatorship to be exercised when the country is at peace as well as when it is at war. It would be as sensible, by an act of five lines, to repeal all laws because all living men have the physical power to violate them.

What stronger language from a great authority could we find than the particular statement by Mr. Moore?

Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that the framers of the Constitution deliberately intended that the President should use neither his diplomatic nor treaty-making powers nor his position as Commander in Chief for any other purposes than to secure the defense of the realm by repelling attacks or invasion and for the protection of American lives and property.

But we have been told time and time again in recent years of the long list of incidents in which the President has so exercised his alleged constitutional authority for the purposes named as to warrant the recognition of his right to use American troops in the future without any further reference to Congress, and we are told that the recognition of such a right and the granting of such power is constitutional.

The President has never had the right to take America into war. This was the one specific possibility against which the framers of the Constitution so zealously guarded. There is no question that the President has the power to plunge America into war any time he chooses, but I submit, Mr. President, that the President of the United States has neither the moral nor the legal right so to act. I refuse to consent to give him the legal right to do something which at present he has neither the moral nor the legal right to do. If he does, as is claimed, have the moral and legal right now to plunge America into war at the slightest provocation, why is the Senate of the United States being asked to pass upon the constitutionality of these powers? If there is any real doubt in the minds of the proponents of this bill as to its constitutionality, is it not incumbent on them to ask for a constitutional amendment that will remove that doubt once and for all?

Mr. President, what proof can we derive from the instances of Presidential use of American troops without the consent of Congress which are cited from the past in support of this legislation? I hold in my hand a list of these instances that have been cited, and I challenge anyone in the Senate to prove that, with one or two exceptions, the President in using American armed forces without the consent of Congress has even remotely dreamed that he was deliberately engaging this country in war. The whole long list of these incidents proves conclusively that the Presidents of the United States, in using American armed forces without the consent of Congress, have recognized their moral and constitutional obligation to use those forces only for the protection of American lives and property, or for the defense of the realm, or where their use was specifically provided by treaty which afforded the United States the privilege of protecting its own citizenry and property on foreign soil.

Mr. President, since the American people have not had made clear to them the real distinction between the nature of the past use of American forces by the President, without the consent of Congress, and what is now being proposed in this present legislation, I believe it will be illuminating to cite the major instances in the past which are being used to justify this complete break with America's traditional domestic and foreign policies.

Anyone advocating the legislation now pending before us who would have the country believe that the long list of instances in which the President has used American armed forces without the consent of Congress constitutes a chapter in our history of which we can be passionately proud is misleading the American people. There are some few instances, instances at best where the use of this Presidential power has brought neither honor nor glory to this Nation.

Mr. President, three important military interventions and occupations in our history have been initiated under Presidential authority in Caribbean countries. These are the cases of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. All were the product of disorder and bloodshed, all were forced by the fear of intervention of European power, and not one constitutes anything of which the American people have reason to be either proud or grateful. We are informed by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], that the President has used American armed forces to enforce treaties without the consent of Congress. The Senator is technically correct; but, so far as I have been able to discover, from the list of such instances compiled by James Grafton Rogers, there is no relation whatsoever between what is being proposed by the pending legislation and the treaties to which the distinguished Senator referred. So far as I can determine, there are four major instances in which the President has used American troops to implement a treaty without the specific and prior consent of Congress.

First, there was the treaty with Colombia, ratified in 1848, 100 years ago; to implement that treaty American troops were sent to Colombia in 1856, 1860, 1868, 1873, 1885, 1895, 1901, 1902, and 1903. But I submit, Mr. President, the nature of the treaty itself is very enlightening. The treaty merely provided that the United States could send troops into Colombia, not for armed intervention, but for protective purposes only. In other words, the treaty itself provided that we could send troops to Colombia for the purpose of protecting American property and American citizens. I submit further that the last incident in 1903 resulted in the Panama Revolution and in the payment of $25,000,000 in reparation to Colombia by the United States Government. Would anyone cite this as a precedent he desires to see repeated?

The second instance is a treaty between the United States and Great Britain signed in 1862 which purported to suppress the slave traffic at sea by setting up courts and authorizing seizure and search of slave-bearing traffic But, Mr. President, there are no recorded instances where American troops were used to implement this treaty.

The third treaty was signed between Mexico and the United States in 1882 as a reciprocal agreement that permitted the pursuit of cattle thieves by either party into the territory of the other.

Mr. President, the fourth treaty is really a series of treaties with China dating all the way from 1858 to 1901, which were purely protective in character and which provided only for the protection of American lives and property of the pirate- and bandit-infested Chinese seaboard.

I believe there is one instance, namely, the Boxer uprising, of the President using American troops for the political purpose of preventing the domination of China by any other power, although such an admission has never been forthcoming from this Government.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. In the case of the Boxer uprising, were not the American troops used to protect the lives of our own nationals?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; yes.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the talk about treaties, political commitments, and military alliances—all of which come under the category of treaties—is somewhat misleading.

In the December 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, Mr. William Hart writes in his article on American internationalism that only three times in our history has America ever joined an alliance. He wrote:

> In the course of our history we have given three outstanding permanent commitments to foreign countries. The outcome of all three has been extremely embarrassing and distressing.
>
> (A) In 1788 we signed with France a treaty of alliance. It was the only alliance treaty that we ever signed. We promised to guarantee forever against all other powers the French possessions in America. In 1798, by a simple act of Congress, without French consent, we repealed and repudiated it.
>
> (B) In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by conquering it; and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary, we were the very first Government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by this proclaiming to the world that Korea, our "ally," had ceased to exist as an independent country.
>
> (C) In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to "guarantee" the "sovereignty" of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force and vigor in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces over the Isthmus. For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic indemnity of $25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

Mr. President, four conflicts at arms which amount to undeclared war have taken place in our history. The first was the naval war with France during the years 1798 to 1800. The second and third instances were the First and Second Barbary Wars. And the fourth, the Mexican hostilities 1914 to 1917, all of which were carried on by the President without the authorization of Congress. But I welcome any interpretation of these armed conflicts to prove that they constituted a use of American troops by the President of the United States without the prior authorization of Congress for any other purpose than that of protecting American lives and property or providing for the defense of the realm or our national security or for implementing treaties which were purely protective agreements we had reached with other countries and which by their very terms merely recognized our right to defend American life and property.

I earnestly solicit from my colleagues any intimation in the Constitution of the United States that could be distorted into proof that such action on the part of the President was ever intended to be legalized by the framers of that document. The truth of the matter is that all the talk about preventing war and about enforcing the peace is war talk and calls for war measures and war powers and acts of war. The fact that the forces supposedly would be limited by an agreement drawn up on paper does not refute my claim that even the initial use of our quota forces will constitute an act of war and such use will demand that each such act be immediately successful and backed by the full resources of our economic and military power. Where, Mr. President, does the Constitution provide that any President of the United States shall be empowered to direct the domestic and foreign relations of this Government toward the imposition of our will on any nation or group of nations without let or hindrance or advice or consent of Congress?

I quote again from Mr. Moore:

> It is evident that the United States has no more power to prevent other countries from going to war than other countries have had or now have to prevent the United States from going to war. We have had two civil wars, (1) that which resulted in the establishment of our national independence, and (2) that which resulted in the preservation of our Federal Union. We should not have relished being starved by foreign powers into the abandonment of either of those two wars. We have also had four formal foreign wars; and as we certainly should have resented and repelled, by all the means in our power, any attempt by other countries, by starvation or otherwise, to deprive us of our belligerent rights, such an attempt would necessarily have tended to extend the area of war rather than to diminish it. In saying this I believe that I speak for the great body of my fellow countrymen, past, present, and to come, and without regard to sex or to age.

I now quote from Professor Borchard of Yale, one of the great constitutional authorities in the United States and a leading authority on international law. In speaking of the present Charter and the Constitution he has this to say:

> A serious question of constitutional law is involved in the implementation of the San Francisco Charter by the United States. Assuming that the Potsdam agreement does not make the San Francisco Charter academic, the Charter provides in article 43 that all members of the United Nations shall "undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces * * * necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security."
>
> A question was raised during the Senate debate in July and since then, as to who can speak for the United States and whether these agreements with the Security Council would have to take the form of treaties, requiring the constitutional approval of two-thirds of the Senate, or whether the agreements must be made by Congress as a whole, voting by simple majority. Some opinion has also been expressed that the President alone could make such an agreement without Congress—at least so far as concerns the use of the limited quota. The President is supposed to have sent a cable from Potsdam announcing his intention to "submit" any and all agreements of this nature to a majority vote of both Houses.
>
> Before these questions can be intelligently discussed certain assumptions of fact must be made. Since it is agreed that no international police force has been established, each nation's quota, as agreed upon, must retain its own national identity in the combined forces. Thus the United States quota will operate under its own flag, its own officers, its own uniforms, be subject to American orders of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and engage the responsibility of the United States. When, then, it engages in any belligerent action against a proclaimed "aggressor"—all preliminary conditions for such action being assumed to have taken place—the United States is involved. If it bombs or shoots up that nation's inhabitants, it is hard to see how the conclusion can be avoided that this is an act of war and the United States is at war, even if the "aggressor" fails to resist. And if he does resist, it is hard to see how the number of troops engaged can be limited to a specific quota. The use of the limited quota commits the Nation. The imposition of the national will on a resisting nation is now involved, with all its consequences. The same is true of the application of sanctions, a hostile measure which can be equally harmful, if not so violent. To escape this conclusion by calling the imposition "peace enforcement" or any other pleasant name does not alter the fact that it is an act of war. This effort to assign to the armed action of the United States some name other than "act of war" or a "state of war" is the crux of the debate whether to give the President and his delegate the unreviewable power to dispose as he wishes of the limited quota, with report to Congress, whereas the employment of additional forces is admittedly an "act of war" requiring the consent of Congress. That the use of the limited quota, probably 5,000 at least in number, is the crucial test of United States committal to war is not universally appreciated.

Not only is it not universally appreciated over the country, but it does not seem to be universally appreciated here in this body.

It has been said that since the President can use the armed forces of the United States

for the protection of American citizens abroad, it follows that he can make these agreements or give his consent thereto without the consent of Congress or the Senate. His action in landing troops for the protection of American citizens, described by J. Reuben Clark, Jr., Ellsworth, Offutt, and others, is limited to small, backward, or weak countries, where the American citizens or his property is in immediate danger or where the intervention is assented to, where small forces are involved, and where the activity could not possibly lead to war. If the President even faintly suspects that intervention might lead to war, it is his duty, as President Wilson undertook in the Vera Cruz expedition of 1914 against Mexico, to obtain the consent of Congress for his proposed enterprise. Nor is the President here engaged in the administrative task of "executing the laws" or "carrying out" a treaty.

I appreciate that what these great writers on constitutional law and international law say will have no effect upon the vote which is to be taken in the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has referred several times to a very eminent authority, Hon. James Bassett Moore.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. As bearing upon his authority, was he not at one time a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. As I stated a moment ago, he is one of the most highly esteemed and outstanding lawyers. He is recognized by every lawyer in the United States, and by everyone who knows anything about his capacity, as the outstanding lawyer and authority of his time on international law. I have also quoted from Professor Borchard and from James Rogers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it the Senator's thought that the Congress has ever had much influence on whether or not the Nation went to war?

Mr. WHEELER. No; it is not. As a matter of fact, the Congress has never made war, and in my judgment has never been responsible for war. It has always been the acts of the diplomats that have led us into war. It is a step-by-step process.

We talk about putting down aggression. When is a nation an aggressor? It does not become an aggressor overnight. It becomes an aggressor step by step. No one has been able to define very clearly who is an aggressor, and when he becomes an aggressor, except in the case of an absolute act of aggression, when the aggressor actually moves in and takes over another country. However, the new technique used by Hitler, by Soviet Russia, and by other countries, has been to send their agents into a country in advance, in an attempt to undermine its government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the case of the Japanese attack, neither the Congress nor the President made the decision. It was made in Tokyo.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that case it was immaterial whether the Congress or the President, under the Constitution, had the power to make war.

Mr. WHEELER. When a country is attacked, everyone recognizes that as a matter of sovereignty it has the right to resist the attack. When the Tripoli pirates attacked us and Jefferson refused to retaliate without a declaration by Congress, it was Hamilton who criticized him and stated that he did not need an act of Congress when we were attacked, because when someone else attacked us, that fact, in and of itself, was an act of war and we had the right, as a matter of sovereignty, to resist it. I think it is perfectly plain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a practical matter, the Senator does not seriously believe, does he, that the right of Congress to make war will ever be very significant in modern warfare?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not. Not only is it not significant in modern times, but it never has been.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see why the Senator thinks it is necessary to argue that the war power must remain in Congress, when it has never been important.

Mr. WHEELER. It has always been important from a certain standpoint, and in this instance we are starting with an entirely new philosophy of international relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We hope it will be new.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator recognizes the fact that it is. In every one of the instances in the past in which such action has been taken it has been said that the action was in defense of treaties, or to implement treaties. Under many such treaties we have been allowed to intervene for the protection of American property; but we have never pursued a policy under which any President of the United States has sent troops into foreign countries to put down aggression in Europe or Asia. We have done it in the interest of protecting American sovereignty, American interests, American citizens, and American property. Now we are starting on an entirely new theory of international relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that the fact that the old policy has so obviously failed is a very good argument for attempting something new. We should not continue within the restraints of the old policy and expect another war in 15 or 20 years. That is no argument against trying something new.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand what the Senator says. The question was presented to me by one of the leading editorial writers of the country. He said to me, "I understand that you are opposed to giving the President the power to send a delegate who can vote to put this country into war without the consent of Congress."

I said, "That is correct."

He said, "You know, do you not, that any President can get us into war at any time he wishes to do so."

I replied, "That is correct. He has the power to do so, but he has no legal or moral right to do so, and I refuse to give the President of the United States the legal right to do that which he has no legal or moral right to do at the present time."

Particularly during the past few years, we have passed resolutions giving the President vast authority in advance. Such authority related largely to domestic issues. While it affected the economic life of the Nation in many instances, in this case we are dealing with something which seems to me of far greater importance. We are jeopardizing the lives of American men, and not merely their property. I cannot subscribe to that view without having the President of the United States come to the Congress and say, "Here is the situation which faces us." Whenever the President has sent a message to Congress asking for a declaration of war, the Congress of the United States has never at any time denied the request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator says that we are dealing with the power to jeopardize the lives of our citizens. The real purpose is to try to create such a situation that there will be no more war. That is the real purpose. It is to establish an effective system to prevent war.

Mr. WHEELER. That is where the Senator and I differ. I agree that the real purpose of the Charter is an attempt to get the nations around the table to talk things over, and prevent war in the future. I agree that that is a good purpose if it can be accomplished. I hope it can and will be accomplished. But when we go further and give to a few men authority to try to perpetuate the status quo before we know what the peace treaty is to be, I must object. The American people do not know what the peace treaty is to be. They do not know what is going to happen to the various countries of Europe. No one else knows what is going to happen to them. There are rumors and statements in the press; yet we are proposing to establish a so-called peace organization to maintain the status quo when we do not know what the peace plan is to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not the principal purpose of the Charter to maintain the status quo.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether it is the main purpose or not, the Senator and I know that that will be the effect of it. The Senator knows perfectly well that Russia will never give up what she has taken in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. She will never give up Poland and the other nations which she has taken over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that there is still room for some flexibility under this organization.

Mr. WHEELER. In my judgment, it is wishful thinking. I hope that I am mistaken.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope I am mistaken with reference to the good that may come from it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose India should revolt against England and the Security Council should say, "This is an act of aggression." I take it the Senator's view is that our boys would have to go over

there to help England put down the rebellion or aggression.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Or if the Chinese should say, "We want Hong Kong," and if England should then say, "You cannot have it," and should contend that the taking of Hong Kong by the Chinese was an act of aggression, our boys would have to go into China.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps in Java poor people will say, "We are sick and tired of working for 7 cents a day," and they will get together and do what our forefathers did here in the United States. Then if the Security Council should say that was an act of aggression, our boys would have to go into Java and fight there.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. The net result will be that one man—I understand that Mr. Stettinius has been picked for the job—can vote in the Security Council to send our boys to fight in foreign lands.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. President, Mr. Borchard further says:

> The Constitution provides that Congress alone, not the treaty-making power, has the power to declare war and make regulations governing the use of the armed forces of the United States.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Since the power to declare war, however perfunctory it may have become, is expressly reserved to Congress by the Constitution, I doubt whether a treaty to this effect would be valid. Moreover, it implies that the President would first make the agreement and then submit it to the Senate, a procedure he has stated he will not follow.
>
> There remains, therefore, only Congress which has power to bind the delegate, and it is believed, unless the form of this Government is to be changed, that this method must be followed. If not, the delegate or the President could vote the United States into war, without Congress, and that would be contrary to the Constitution. The delegate can perhaps vote in the negative without Congress, but it is believed hardly in the affirmative. A correct procedure—constitutional processes—must be followed. However Congress may be notified of an impending vote in the Security Council, it must act before the President is warranted in executing its instruction by communicating with the delegate. The delay is unavoidable. No agreement is necessary, but the limitations on size, occasion, and place of use of American forces must be strictly observed. If the President makes an agreement to this effect, tentative at best, he can no longer submit it to the House. He is compelled to make it a treaty, which does not suffice. At best, it requires implementation by Congress before it is constitutional. Considering the subject in the light of everything that has happened, it would seem that an act of Congress is necessary to reconcile the Charter with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, as I said at the outset, I appreciate that there is a certain trend toward hysteria when we refer to this peace organization; and if we try to speak of the Constitution or of changing the method of conferring war powers or of the giving dictatorial powers to the President of the United States, such comments will have no effect whatever on the vote which will be cast in the Senate.

In conclusion I wish to refer once more to aggression, by quoting further from Professor Borchard:

> In the second place, the whole conception of aggressor, in my opinion, is a delusion and a betrayer of reason in a world such as this. To assume to judge the morals of other nations as peoples strikes an unresponsive chord in the breasts of the judged. When the term, moreover, is identified with certain selected powers as constitutionally aggressive, it is likely to arouse uncontrollable resentments and to poison international relations.
>
> The attempt to hold down an impossible status quo and to defend it in the name of law and order makes a mockery both of law and of peace. To enforce the unhealthy status quo by hostile measures, whether called sanctions or by any other name, only adds irresponsibility to inexpediency. It enlists hostility, starvation, and possibly war on behalf of a condition that requires not perpetuation but change. Yet it is change which is pronounced illegal, after it is provoked and almost compelled by the maintenance of unnatural, precarious, and manifestly ephemeral conditions. This is the new morality to which Europe has unhappily retrogressed. It is hardly surprising that apprehension, uneasiness or hysteria marks the mental state of every people on the Continent.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, we now have before us the question of implementing our responsibility in the United Nations Organization.

I have three purposes in rising to speak briefly at this time. It is our primary obligation, as Senators, to be sure that we do nothing which transgresses the authority which has been vested in us. It is unfortunate that the people of the United States are little concerned with the mechanics of the Organization we propose to set up. It is a safe assertion that only a small percent of our people have read the Charter framed at San Francisco earlier this year. Too few of them know, or understand, the responsibilities which will rest upon our country in carrying out the terms of that Charter, with the pending legislation supplementing it.

The great body of the people have but one ambition and one longing. That is that we may do something that will avert a tragedy that will bring suffering vastly greater than any this country has ever known, and that conceivably could destroy civilization itself in our time. We, as citizens and as Senators, are possessed with the same longing, and we are determined to do all in our power to avert such a catastrophe.

Indeed, in the face of the hopes and aspirations of our people and the tremendous dangers which could lie ahead of us, we cannot afford to accept the responsibility of leaving undone anything which offers any reasonable hope of preventing war.

But—and I repeat for emphasis—while we strive to accomplish that common hope, we must also make certain the safety of our people. We have a charge to keep for the men and women who sent us here.

Therefore, the first point I wish to stress this afternoon is that we need to give some attention to the importance of the General Assembly in relation to the Charter and the pending legislation. In listening to the debate on this proposal I have come to the conclusion that too many persons have lost sight of what appears to me to be the greatest hope for peace contained in the United Nations Organization. We have neglected a proper appraisal of the power for peace which will be developed in the Assembly of the United Nations Organization. Too much emphasis has been placed on the hope of preserving peace through the Security Council of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. President, force is a vain thing for safety. It lasts only until overcome by superior force. Permanent peace will not come to the world because we are able to set up a police force larger than any of the police forces which will be maintained by the various nations. If we put our faith in this world organization only with the thought in mind of finding a formula by which to overcome evil force through superior power, we will hardly succeed. History reveals that permanent peace comes through understanding among peoples and nations, through confidence and trust, which are developed by association and negotiation. We find the instruments for the promotion of these most essential ingredients for peace in the General Assembly.

Take the case of the United States and Canada. For thousands of miles we have a common border, yet it is trite to point out that we have never fought the Canadians in modern history and that such a thought never enters the mind of any sane man, yet neither the United States nor Canada worries about the economic power of the other. No Canadian suggests that we need a common security council to protect each of us from the other. The peace we have—and this would be just as true if Canada were larger than the United States in physical and industrial power—has come through mutual understanding and a common striving to be peaceful.

The same thing can well take place between us and other nations, and among nations of the world generally.

To make peace, we should know what makes wars. Can anyone deny that ignorance among the people of a nation makes for war with other nations? The antidote, then, is more education—everywhere in the world. Can anyone deny that hunger makes for war? The antidote, then, is more agricultural production of needed food and fiber—everywhere in the world. Can anyone deny that a lack of understanding makes for war? The antidote, then, is more full and frank discussion by representatives of nations and more travel in other nations by all peoples.

Perhaps I can place special emphasis upon the effectiveness of the General Assembly in promoting and maintaining peace among peoples and nations, by quoting the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when he commented in Detroit last February 5 on the preliminary agreements reached at Dumbarton Oaks:

> The genius of Dumbarton Oaks in correct perspective, is not the use of military force at all. The genius of Dumbarton Oaks is the exact opposite. It is the substitution of justice for force. It is the substitution of

international law for piracy. It is the substitution of peace for war. Its genius lies in the organization of these pacific mechanisms which shall stop future frictions short of the necessity for force. Its genius lies in the mobilization of the vigilant moral and spiritual power of enlightened civilization against the dark and evil forces of recurrent savagery. If this power has been dormant and impotent, it is because it has lacked a vigorous world instrument for organized expression. In my deep conviction, Dumbarton Oaks, in proper form, can supply this tremendous instrument.

As we know, Dumbarton Oaks paved the way to San Francisco and the magnificent accomplishments attained there.

I want also to quote our former distinguished colleague, the present Associate Supreme Court Justice, Harold H. Burton, who made the following statement last June 12, on this floor, in reference to the San Francisco Charter:

> The great objective of the Charter of the United Nations * * * is to maintain peace and security, and its greatest contribution to that end consists of the several mechanisms established and extending from peaceful investigations to the use of economic or military force. None of these mechanisms would be available were it not for the Charter. They constitute an unanswerable reason for its ratification and against its rejection.

Continuing, our former colleague, Associate Justice Burton, declared:

> I wish to call special attention to the fact that there is a specific provision that any state, whether a member of the Organization or not, may bring to the attention of the General Assembly, or of the Security Council, any dispute, or any situation which may lead to international friction, or give rise to a dispute—an organized international forum open to the world. It is also provided that the parties to any dispute, the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security should obligate themselves—and they do so obligate themselves by their membership—first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, by mediation, by conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement, by resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or by other peaceful means of their own choice.

So we see, Mr. President, that the General Assembly is not a secondary function of the United Nations Organization, but the primary part of that great Organization. If the United Nations Organization is to succeed, we must not always be thinking of the means of force, but of the means of settling disputes by peaceful means wherever and whenever possible, and with a minimum of force when it is necessary to employ it at all.

In order to place the General Assembly on a level of importance with the Security Council, I supported the amendments offered by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] to require confirmation by the Senate of the President's appointees to represent the United States in the sessions of the General Assembly. I believed that through this method the joint responsibility of the Senate and of the Executive, in our representation both at the meetings of the Assembly and of the Security Council would be more firmly emphasized.

Mr. President, my second purpose in speaking at this juncture in this debate is to support the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. I have offered a similar amendment in briefer form, but I am willing to allow the matter to be determined by the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana. His amendment should be incorporated in Senate bill 1580 in order to unify the American people behind this venture into world cooperation. The amendment would reserve to the Congress of the United States the final decision with reference to committing our sons to any military expedition into a foreign land for the purpose of preserving peace. I have sent to the desk a similar amendment to the pending bill which would maintain this very elementary safeguard to the functioning of a free government. I withdraw the amendment until the Senate has voted on the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Most of the arguments which have been presented in public forums and by typewriter strategists against placing in the Congress the final vote on the use of American soldiers in enforcing a final Security Council decision have been specious and academic. It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] said with such vigor and force here last week—on November 28—that "wars from now on will start suddenly and will be lost quickly."

I certainly agree that the unleashing of atomic energy has made mandatory many changes in the world, and no change caused by this infernal invention is more plainly indicated than is the futility of an international army to preserve peace. If I seriously believed that any scientific discovery has made impossible the operation of a representative republican form of government, I would despair of the use of further mental energy to preserve our safety and permanence as a nation. The unleashing of atomic energy is of colossal import, but it does not mean that all of our long-tried rules of debate here in the Senate must be altered without consideration; it does not mean that our Constitution must overnight be rendered without effect over our present and future deliberations; it does not mean our inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and all the other gains man has made in his long struggle for freedom are now out of date. Many Americans have underestimated the significance of the unleashing of atomic energy, but many others have "atomic bomb jitters" with results in thinking which are just as fallacious.

The atomic bomb revolutionized the material world, but it did not bring a revolution in the realm of the spiritual. It did not repeal any moral laws. It did not, of itself, mean that every long-standing, tried and true rule of conduct in modern society was ipso facto outdated.

Therefore, Mr. President, let us not overlook the fact that we are debating here today whether or not to deliver more power into the hands of the executive branch of the Government—into the hands of one man, if you please. I have heard many of my colleagues say on many occasions that from now on we must think of decentralizing power instead of centralizing it. Now, I find it difficult to believe that the men who are supporting this proposal are the same men who spoke here so many times before, and advocated principle diametrically opposed to the idea of centralizing power.

Too many people in our Government, and too many citizens of our country, have been led to believe that in order to expedite action, it is necessary to place the power to send our soldiers into an expedition ordered by the United Nations Organization solely with the representative of the United States on the Security Council. In all the history of the wars in which this country has engaged, there was never a time when the Congress of the United States refused to grant quickly a declaration of war when this Nation was attacked, or when its safety was in jeopardy.

Let us just think back to about 4 years ago. When Japan attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, it did not take long debates, consultations, and deliberations to galvanize this Nation into one spirit. The very next day—the day after Pearl Harbor was attacked—this Congress voted overwhelmingly to go to war. Hitler could not have asked better cooperation of the Reichstag. Stalin certainly could not have obtained much quicker response from the Supreme Soviet. And it is doubtful if any President, meeting in secret session with his Cabinet, could move any more swiftly than did the people of the United States, acting through their Congress.

Mr. President, we hear a lot in this and in our companion body about "secret diplomacy." If we allow our delegate complete freedom of action on the Security Council, if we deliver this further power to the Executive, we are inviting more secrecy in our foreign affairs. We of the Senate will be by-passed in regards to important information which we and the people must know in order to arrive at intelligent decisions in the coming months and years.

I believe such a grant of power over the lives of American boys is unconstitutional and I believe that if such a proposal could be carried before it the Supreme Court would declare it unconstitutional. I believe that before next December the voters will learn what we are doing here, and I am confident that they will reject decisively the idea of the Senate and the Congress thus voting away their powers to any one person.

Personally, I cannot see how the effectiveness of combined military action would be in any way hindered by leaving the decision for the use of force to the Congress of the United States in each case. If we in Congress, who are representatives of the people, are kept informed by the Department of State of what is happening in the world, certainly we have the intelligence and the courage to vote for, or to reject, whatever proposals are made along this line from time to time. If the Congress cannot be persuaded, then it is a sure sign that the people cannot be persuaded—and if the people cannot be persuaded, then what is proposed certainly should not be done.

The whole tenor of the argument of the proponents of this legislation re-

flects, consciously or unconsciously, the belief that the people cannot understand the issues and that we must follow the fuehrer—or leadership—principle. Presumably, the delegate who would have the power to put us into war would be better informed and more intelligent than all the people of the United States, including the Senate and the House of Representatives. Therefore, according to the reasoning of the proponents, he could decide more impartially and more fairly and more justly when to use our armed forces. This is rank fascism, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, and I would reject it for that reason, if for none other.

If the decision to use armed forces were to be left with the Congress—where the Constitution provides that it should belong always—it would create a closer cooperation between the Executive and the Congress in the dangerous problems which arise in every age. And, I repeat, if this provision for congressional approval to send our boys to war is upheld, there will be much closer unity of the American people behind the United Nations Organization.

Mr. President, it is true that the President of the United States is charged with the responsibility of protecting the safety of the United States against an armed attack. It is true that the President can use the armed forces to protect the lives and property of our nationals abroad, and he should so use them.

Several Presidents have exercised their responsibilities along these lines as the occasions demanded, but there is no precedent for the President using our armed forces merely on an opinion of a threat which might lead to war. And there is certainly no precedent of record in which he turned over our armed forces to a superauthority to be used wherever and whenever that superauthority determined.

If I were a delegate to the United Nations Organization, I would not want to commit this Nation to an adventure which might eventually lead to the expenditure of billions of dollars and the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives, without the advice and approval of the Congress. The responsibility is too great for any one man. It is knowingly embraced only by dictators.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Suppose our delegate votes to put down an aggression in a dispute between Bulgaria and Rumania, let us say, or Rumania and Greece, or some of the other Balkan states, which have been fighting back and forth for many years, and the aggressor nation refuses to desist. Then we have committed this whole Nation to war. In my judgment, if such a thing should take place without the authority of the Congress of the United States, there would be such a revulsion of feeling among the American people that some would think an atomic bomb has hit them. The people of this country are not going to stand for such a thing. Anyone who thinks they are for such a philosophy, certainly, as I stated a moment ago, is blind to the signposts along the road.

Mr. WILLIS. I heartily concur in the Senator's observation. I wish to add that the only authority to prevent such a situation is the Senate, or the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that it has taken us approximately 5 days in the Senate to discuss the particular legislative proposal now pending? My recollection is that in 5 days Holland, a nation which had tried to maintain its neutrality, had tried to keep out of the war, and had successfully kept out of the last war, was completely overrun and dominated by Nazi Germany in the same period of time we have been discussing the pending bill.

Mr. WILLIS. In case of an imminent emergency, such as an act of aggression on the part of any nation, by which the safety of the United States was threatened, there would be no long debate. We who were present during the debate 4 years ago know that the commitment of this country to war to defend our lives and the shores of the country was accomplished in a matter of moments, not of days.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator from Indiana further yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I call attention to the fact also that there has never been any time when the President of the United States came before Congress and asked for a declaration of war that the Congress did not vote for it almost automatically.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator is correct historically.

Mr. WHEELER. What the Senator is talking about is whether in case of an attack, let us say, by Rumania or Bulgaria, or Yugoslavia, upon Italy, or upon Greece, our delegate should have power to vote us into the war. Of course, the American people should have a right to say whether they want to be committed to such a war or not. They have that right, and it should not be left to any one man to say this Nation is going to pledge the life blood of the boys of this country to put down an aggression by another country, when we do not know anything about the facts in the case.

It is said that we have to make some such provision because of the length of time involved, because there must be speed. That is no argument for violating the Constitution of the United States. It is no argument for committing this country to war in order to defend some other country, when our interests are not involved, and may never be involved.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana further yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the line the distinguished Senator from Montana has been discussing, the fact remains, however, that twice in this generation we have found that what goes on elsewhere is of concern to the United States. It is important to put out a fire when it first starts, and, therefore, it is important to us to see that an international fire is extinguished before it ultimately engulfs us.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator from Indiana will yield, of course, that policy would lead us to the position where we would become involved in every war anywhere in the world. In any dispute between any two nations this country would be involved. I cannot see that the American people want to become involved in every dispute between nations all over the world, because there is a possibility of our interests being affected.

This country did not get into the war just closed until we were attacked by Japan. Notwithstanding the fact that Holland had been attacked, that France had been attacked, that Czechoslovakia had been attacked, that Russia had been attacked, both the Republican candidate for President and the Democratic candidate for President went before the people of this country, knowing that they wanted to keep out of the war, and in order to get votes at the election promised the people over and over and over again that they would keep the country out of war. That was because they knew the sentiment in this country was for keeping out of the war.

Does the Senator think we should be involved today in the war between Iran and Russia? Russia is the aggressor. Should we become involved in all the small wars which are going on all over the world?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say, in answer to the Senator, that we must determine whether the world is to be governed by law or by force. What we are trying to do here is to set up a system of international law and order. If we are to have a system of international law and order, then it is of vital concern to the American people that any lawless gangster nation that is getting ready to start in shall be stopped as it starts, and not after it has gotten considerably underway.

Mr. WHEELER. If that is the philosophy we are following, then what we should do would be to stop Russia tomorrow, because Russia is an aggressor in Poland, she is an aggressor all around the Baltic and in the Balkans, and for that reason we should go to war with Russia tomorrow. I venture to say that no Member of the Senate will deny that Russia is an aggressor in those countries.

Similarly it is true, if we can believe the reports that come out of Manchuria, that Russia is an aggressor in Manchuria at the present time, and that her armies are fighting in north China against the Nationalist Government.

Mr. President, that is the situation which confronts us; so if we follow the philosophy of the Senator from California and the philosophy of others who are talking about law and justice, we should declare war, if we are to carry out their theory of government and their theory of American foreign policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I shall yield in a moment. I might say that the Senator from California is making the same mistake that has been made here so often, and persisted in; that is, he is overlooking the effectiveness of the General Assembly to

go along with the nations through periods of irritation and friction, and try to remove the causes of the friction. If we are kept informed as to what is going on through all the negotiations, the need for calling out our troops for war will become apparent quickly during the long period of the processes which have been set up to maintain peace through peaceful means.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to comment on the remarks of the Senator from Montana to the effect that we should declare war.

The theory of the remarks of the Senator from California is that if we establish the proposed organization and institute a system of law, the control provided for in such law should be exercised in all the places he has mentioned. I do not understand the Senator from California to say, nor have I said, that this Nation as an individual nation, outside of any such system, should undertake to attack any other nation. That is an entirely different theory than that applicable to this situation. No one has proposed—I do not think the Senator from California is proposing—that this Nation, acting individually and aside from any international system such as we hope will grow out of the United Nations, should undertake to police the world. I certainly have not said that, and that is a complete misconstruction of the theory that both of us, I think, have in mind. I think the Senator from Montana the other day, when he quoted from Thomas Jefferson, agreed that our ultimate purpose or objective was that we should establish some system of law.

Furthermore, and with regard to the Senator's remark about how quickly we acted in December 4 years ago, that action was utterly without significance. We were already committed to the war at Pearl Harbor, and to say that we acted quickly in that instance has no significance. The fact is, I think, that our hindsight should inform us that we should have acted about 2 years before that time, and that if we had done so, then likely the war either might have been stopped or its seriousness greatly reduced. During those 2 years we sat here and acted as if we were neutral and tried to pursue a neutrality policy, and, of course, that proved utterly fruitless and resulted in the worst and greatest war we ever had.

I think the fundamental assumption of the Senator from Montana that we have a choice, that we can stay in or out of a war, is the real crux of this matter. If we grant the Senator's fundamental assumption, then his argument follows, but if we cannot stay out of war, if we are actually a part of the world, then I think the argument of the Senator from Montana is absolutely meaningless, because we had no such choice, and I think we will have no such choice in the future.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Senators speak of having a world organization, and of world peace and law and order. The very Charter itself gives Russia a veto power so that if she wants to take over a part of China, or of any other country, she can veto any proposal to prevent her from doing so. The same is true with respect to Britain and the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator permit me to draw his attention to my remark made the other day that this Organization has its weaknesses, but we hope to develop it to the point where it shall be strong. I grant that it is not effective in the field to which the Senator referred, but, so far as I can see, this is the only way to proceed toward that goal.

Mr. WHEELER. A Senator said to me the other day that the reason he was going to vote for the bill was that he believed what it provided did not amount to anything. But after all it seems to me a principle is involved in this question. Senators should not vote for something merely because it does not amount to anything. We should consider the principle involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I did not say it did not amount to anything.

Mr. WHEELER. No.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to add to the discussion that we are here thinking of the minds of the Mrs. Smiths and the Mrs. Browns and the Mrs. Jones out in the far reaches of the country, and it is for us to determine whether they want us to continue to retain in the Congress the responsibility to send their boys to war, or to place the responsibility in the keeping of some one person.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is a very well established fact that we can have no peace which is not based upon justice. A few days ago the Senate voted down an amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] providing that this Organization should work for justice. How can we have peace without justice? The peace which came after the Civil War is still lingering because of the carpetbagging we carried on in the South. That is what we are doing in Europe. The proposal contained in the amendment that the peace shall be based upon justice, and that the United Nations Organization should strive to establish justice was voted down. It seems to me there is a contradiction here which spells tragedy.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The whole issue that is drawn out of the amendment under consideration, and which is being supported by the able Senator from Indiana, I take it, is whether when force is called upon, the representative of this Government in the United Nations Organization shall of his own decision do as he pleases, without reference to the Congress, or whether he shall report to the Congress what is about to take place and, if force is needed, that the question whether this country shall vote to use its armed force shall be determined by the Congress. That, I take it, is the exact issue upon this amendment?

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We agreed, to begin with, to the Connally resolution back in 1943, which was the first step in the acts of the Senate toward taking part in a world organization. Then later we agreed, by a very large vote, to join the United Nations and subscribe to its Charter.

The question now is as to the third step; that is, what powers shall the representative of this country have in representing us in the world organization? Shall Congress give up the power vested in it under the Constitution of our country, or if not under the Constitution, then certainly by what has been the way of our Government for many years, as the representatives of the people to say when we desire our armed forces to be used on an extensive scale?

Mr. President, I think the pending bill goes too far. I want to comply with the Charter and our obligations under the Charter in every respect, but I do not believe we are called upon to go so far as to say that the President may instruct our representative to use whatever forces are set aside under the agreement that is referred to and provided for in the bill, without taking the matter to Congress.

I listened with great earnestness and I was very much impressed on yesterday when the able senior Senator from Michigan was arguing the question whether agreements contemplated by this bill should be made and confirmed and ratified as a treaty, or whether they should be approved by legislative action of the Congress. I recall that he said he favored legislative action on the subject. One of the important reasons why he favored it, he said, was that instead of having 64 Senators decide upon the question of how many troops should be set aside to the United Nations Organization, he preferred to have a majority of the House and a majority of the Senate, 266 Members of the Congress, to pass on that subject, which would give a much better response from the people of the Nation.

Now I want to ask a question. I do not intend to take up much of the time of the Senate, and I shall stop in a moment; but I want to ask, If it is so important to have a majority of both the Senate and the House pass upon how many troops shall be set aside, is it not vastly more important for those bodies to pass upon when and how the troops shall be used?

Another question occurs to me, if the able Senator will indulge me, a question that is rather practical.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sure the Senator is rendering a helpful contribution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator, and I assure him that I shall not trespass upon his time more than a moment longer.

What are we going to do if Russia and Poland become involved in war? What are we going to do if a conflict arises between the Free State of Ireland and the British Isles. What is going to take place if in the future the people of India, believing in their hearts that as a result

of World War II freedom would be granted to people who wanted to rule themselves, should start a war against Great Britain? Are we going to leave the decision as to what we should do in those instances to one man, or are we going to leave it to the representatives of the people, as we have in the past?

Take for instance, an incident which happened within this very week, when the British warships shelled the Javanese and killed many of them. We do not know why. Britain has no right of domain over that island. What part are we going to take? Shall we leave that decision to one individual? I would not want to leave it to the President of the United States, whoever he might be, unless the interests of our country and the American people were jeopardized, and under such circumstances the President has the right under the Constitution to use our armed forces temporarily.

Mr. President, I think we are taking a very dangerous step. I think we are going too far under the pending bill when we take from our own people, through their representatives, the right to say when armed forces shall be used. We have never heretofore done such a thing. We have never taken so long a step. We know what has happened in many instances when American interests and American lives have been jeopardized, such as in the Venezuelan incidents, the Boxer Rebellion in China, when Americans were being set upon and killed, and the Vera Cruz incident, when our ships shelled the Mexicans. But never has the President for a moment thought that he had the power of extended use of troops in any number. Even when the Vera Cruz incident took place, Senators will recall that President Wilson, believing that he may have gone too far, came to the Congress and asked approval of his actions. I think we are going much too far, and far beyond our obligations under the Charter, when we vest in any man the right to order into battle the troops of America.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator. Of course I cannot answer quickly the questions which he raises, but he has opened our eyes to the far-reaching implications of our action today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I interject to say that it appears to me that we are turning over control of the war-making power to a foreign council upon which we have a representative, and we shall be in the minority. The Security Council will have control of it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I believe I have a somewhat different view of the obligations which we have assumed under the United Nations Charter than has the Senator from West Virginia. I do not believe that I agree with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana. It seems to me that the crucial point in this whole authority is section 3, where we give the President the right to vote for the use of armed forces, and to vote for the use of economic sanctions. Once that authority is given, it seems to me that, taken together with our general obligations under the treaty which we have approved, we are morally, and I believe should be legally, obligated to supply troops to carry out that vote.

My difficulty with the bill is the unlimited power in section 3 to the delegate to vote as he chooses, or rather as the President chooses, on any question which may impose upon us the obligation to use troops. I believe that Congress should at least lay down the rules as to when such a vote shall be taken. I am not at all sure that Congress should not reserve to itself the right to say when that vote shall be taken, because the vote is not a vote determined by law. It is not a vote determined by any principle. It is simply a vote based upon national policy, which may lead to war; and it seems to me that national policy leading to war is a concern of the Congress of the United States, and not solely of the President of the United States.

I have felt very strongly that the difficulty with the bill, as I see it, is with section 3. It may be that since the Senate has absolutely refused to limit that authority in any way, perhaps the only recourse we have is to try to limit section 5. I do not quite agree with the theory of the amendment because it seems to me that with the Charter before us, if the Security Council, with our representative on it, votes for the use of armed force, and commits us to that course—because under section 3 we are delegating to him authority to do that for us—then I think we are morally and legally obligated to send the forces provided for in the United Nations Charter.

Mr. WILLIS. Let me say in response to the remarks of the very able Senator from Ohio that we are in this situation: We are asked to vote a blank check on the most precious treasures we have in our country, the lives of our young men. We are asked to give a blank check to some person in the Security Council while we in the Congress of the United States are supposed to be the guardians of such treasures.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask the Senator to yield in order that I may reply to the Senator from Ohio. He states that he is in disagreement with me. I find that in his conclusion he is very much in agreement with me. It is a question of the power of the representative to vote for the use of troops. That is what I tried to make clear. I do not want one person, whoever he may be, to be endowed with the power to vote the use of troops as he shall determine in any instance. It might work out well if he always voted to put our troops in on the side of the strong power. But when a powerful country invades a small one, even though we know that the large country is the aggressor, and when a large country friendly to us sails its great ships up to an island and destroys people who are trying to establish self-government, are we going to leave it in the hands of one man to say that American troops should be used there, or whether they should be used at all? That is the danger. If we dare to use them in behalf of any other than the powerful nation, we shall have war; or such use of troops will be vetoed under the provisions of the Charter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that in such a case the large nation which sailed its navy to the shores of the small nation would veto the use of force against it, so we would be in the position of having nothing to say in the matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. This Organization may prove to be very much like the alliance which grew out of the Napoleonic wars, known in history as the Holy Alliance. The large powers of Europe allied themselves for the declared purpose of keeping peace. That alliance kept the strong nations together and made Europe safe for kings. It prevented uprisings. It kept the peace, but it kept the peace at the expense of suppression of the people of the various countries under their monarchs. When the alliance broke down, uprisings occurred throughout the whole of Europe. If this is to be an organization in which we join the big fellow, right or wrong—and we must join him when we are outvoted—we are taking a step which is not very appealing from the standpoint of justice and fairness. If we must decide against the small nation, whether we wish to do so or not, and that determination is to be placed in the hands of one individual, as this bill would do, I say that we are going unnecessarily far in subscribing to the Charter.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the third purpose which I had in rising to speak was to point out the fact that it seems to me that we are placing too much emphasis on the use of force and upon expediency, rather than the implements of safety which we have in our own hands. Speaking on this subject the other day, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] remarked that the only atoms the scientists have succeeded in splitting are the unstable atoms of one type of uranium and plutonium, which are scarce on the earth. He later declared, "The centuries have taken their toll and only the stable elements remain on the earth."

I should like to carry that thought over into the realm of government. The tempests of time and the storms of history have been able to split up the unstable governments of the world, but the centuries have taken their toll and only the stable type of governments remain.

Although our representative Government, based firmly in the hearts and minds of millions of persons, is young so far as recorded history is concerned, it is the oldest such government among all the great powers in the world today. Kings and dictators, princes and fuehrers, have come and gone, but the representative Government of the United States still stands. The atom bomb may change many things, but it will not—it cannot—change the principles on which we, as a free people, have built the richest, the most powerful, the finest,

and the freest government on the face of the earth.

For 40 years the war lords of Japan were driving the Japanese people to get ready for war.

For 20 years, under Mussolini, the Italian people prepared for war.

For 20 years, under Joseph Stalin, the Russian people prepared for the war Stalin knew was coming.

For 12 years Germany was driven under the lash and spur of Hitler and the Nazis to supreme efforts to get ready for a war which Hitler intended to wage against the civilization of the world.

In 3 years, under the American system of free government, with our free labor, our free agriculture, and our free society, we overcame the 40-year lead of Japan, the 20-year lead of Russia, and the 12-year lead of Germany, and not only held up our own end on a financial basis but we shipped billions of dollars' worth of supplies to our allies and poured millions of men and women into the struggle—all this without ever seriously impairing our living standards in America.

What marvelous power is responsible for this genius of the American people to accomplish these miracles?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I interrupt at this point because the Senator is so ably and eloquently paying tribute to what has been done in the way of contribution by this country in the case of the recent war, and in the case of rehabilitation and peace after the close of this war. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to a provision in the bill which, so far as I know, has not as yet been discussed. On page 6, in section 7 of the bill, we find the following language:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter.

There is a blanket authorization for the expenditure of money by this country without any budget, without a bill for it—a signed blank check, so to speak, authorizing money to be paid out, upon the direction of whom? Upon the direction of the United Nations.

Throughout this war we expended vast sums. We authorized the appropriation of money and then appropriated it to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the State Department. But we never used such language as is contained in the bill, without knowing what those agencies wanted, and without having them send to us requests for what they needed. No such blanket authorization was made even to our own agencies of Government.

We well know that the power to tax is the power to destroy. That has been too well proved through the years of history. This is not a tax measure, but it does authorize the expenditure of money, and authorize the appropriations of money, which in turn calls for taxation, without any requirement that there shall be submitted to Congress a demand, a budget, a request, or an estimate as to what may be needed—a blanket authorization without limit, if you please. We do not know what that may mean, nor do we have any idea of what part of the expenses will be apportioned against the United States. Yet this bill commits us to pay any such future levy that may be made upon us by the United Nations.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator for calling our attention to this very grave tax upon our economic solvency.

Mr. President, I again ask, What marvelous power is responsible for this genius of the American people to accomplish these miracles? That power was inherent in our American system of government, economy, and society. Such wonderful feats could not be and were not achieved under any other form of government. All that we have and all that we are today in the United States of America is due to our American system of free government, free enterprise, and free society. These are the things we must keep. We must not give them away to the control of any supergovernment, made up of representatives of governments who have never accomplished anything of like kind. Not only do we owe it to the people of America to preserve this power, but we owe it to the civilization of our day to see that it is not dissipated in an uncertain attempt to keep the peace of the world. We must always bear in mind that the maintenance of a strong, free America is the basis of our greatest contribution to world peace.

I will rest my case in this instance with the thoughtful men and women of America who want world cooperation, who desire everlasting peace, who have all the hopes and fears of which men are capable, but who still do not want to throw away the rights that were won for them and their children through long centuries as their ancestors gave their lives in fighting and defeating tyranny. Let us not put shackles on America.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have been somewhat astonished at the trend and drift of the debate on the pending measure. I distinctly remember the adoption of the United Nations Charter by the Senate and some of the provisions of that Charter. I was particularly interested in chapter I of the Charter, in which its purposes are stated. The first is—

> To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

So the first purpose, of course, is to settle, by peaceful means, disputes between nations.

Then, Mr. President, in article II of the Charter of the United Nations, I find the following language in paragraph numbered 2:

> All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

That is to say, we have certain obligations which we entered into at the time of adopting the Charter and becoming a member of the United Nations Organization. As I understand the Charter of the United Nations, our member of the Security Council will not determine whether force shall be used. The Security Council itself, of which our representative will be one of the members, will make that determination.

As I have understood the arguments which have been made today, they begin by stating that we shall take the benefit of this security organization and shall say to the other nations of the world, "We are going into it with you." Mr. President, we made some rather binding obligations at the time when we entered the Organization, as I understand., In chapter VII we find the following language:

> The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures.

The following are some of the things which may be done to enforce peace without the use of force:

> These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Mr. President, we may go that far without the use of force.

But in article 42 it is provided that we may go further. Article 42 reads as follows:

> Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

That is what we have obligated ourselves to do.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If what the Senator says is correct—and I take it that he means that the Security Council of the United Nations Organization can call upon the United States for an unlimited amount of land or naval forces, whatever it may choose to specify——

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not said so.

Mr. WHEELER. But it follows as a logical conclusion from what the Senator says——

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator from Montana voted for that very article of the Charter.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well; but I did not vote for it with the idea that the Security Council could call upon us for whatever number of land or naval forces the Council might want us to furnish.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not said that.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator's argument is that the Security Council could call upon us for any number of

troops which it wished to have us provide.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator is fairly good at determining what various matters mean, and when the Senator voted for the adoption of the Charter, his vote gave me considerable confidence in the Charter, for I knew he would be afraid of anything which was too strong.

Mr. WHEELER. But I am trying to point out that if the conclusions which the Senator from Delaware is attempting to draw——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have not had a chance to draw any conclusions as yet.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator said this is what we promised.

Mr. TUNNELL. Well, is it not what we promised? Did I not read provisions of the Charter to which the Senator from Montana subscribed?

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator from Delaware referred to what would be done by the pending bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not yet discussed the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator means that by the bill we would give the Security Council certain power. If the construction which the Senator and the leaders are placing on the pending bill is the correct one, then there would be nothing in the world to prevent us from saying, "We will give you these troops, but we want the Congress of the United States to pass upon the question, because under the Constitution of the United States it is the duty of Congress"——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Montana would permit me to tell what I think the bill means. The Senator is stating his understanding of what I think the bill means, although I have not as yet had a chance to say what I think it means.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the last thing I read, before I was interrupted, was the concluding sentence of article 42, which is as follows:

Such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Mr. President, we went further than that. In article 43 we said:

1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call—

Not when Congress gets through talking, not after several days of debate, not after atomic bombs have blown up the world, but on the call of the Security Council—

and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Mr. President, that is what we voted for.

In the second paragraph we voted for the following:

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces—

The numbers are covered in the agreements which we have agreed to make—

their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Now we are told that must be done by a treaty. I do not take that statement very seriously because I do not believe the Security Council is a sovereign power, as we understand the term. I think it is a combination of representatives of signatory nations. I do not think the agreements which are referred to at this point of the Charter are treaties in the sense of the treaties which are referred to in our Constitution.

Mr. President, we have gone thus far; we have agreed that we shall do this much.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator care to yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator overlooks one statement. I agree with much of what the Senator has said. But we never agreed that under any circumstances we would vote in the Security Council to use these forces; and unless we do vote in the Security Council to use the forces authorized in sections 41 and 42, they will be wholly ineffective and cannot be used.

Mr. TUNNELL. What does that prove?

Mr. TAFT. If we want to use force I think we may use it. But there is no obligation on us to use it, and there never was. The right of the President to grant unlimited power to our delegate to veto or not to veto is inconsistent with the Atlantic Charter itself. I think it is highly unjustified. I invite the Senator's attention to what I said at the time I voted for the ratification of the Charter. I said:

There is this consideration, however, in dealing with the power of our representative to authorize sanctions or force. If we assume certain definite obligations I am prepared to leave to the President the performance of those obligations. But the veto power given under article 27 makes every individual case a question of national policy and not of justice. There is no obligation of any kind on us to vote for sanctions or for force——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am willing to yield in order that the Senator may ask a question. I am not willing to yield in order that he may make speeches at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I am trying, if I may, to answer the Senator's contention.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am willing to yield in order that the Senator may ask questions, but I am not willing to yield in order that he may have an opportunity to make speeches at this time in answering any of my contentions.

Mr. TAFT. After all, Mr. President, the Senator's time is unlimited, and I hope he will be kind enough to allow me to finish what I started to say.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have control of whether or not I will yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is apparently afraid of legitimate argument.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not afraid of legitimate argument, nor any argument which the Senator from Ohio is capable of making. That is my position with reference to his comments.

Mr. President, here is the language of the Charter with reference to the promise which we have made to maintain a force:

All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements—

And so forth. We agree to keep that force on tap for the use of the Security Council. What is there in that language that does not imply that we are already obligated? If the English language means anything at all, we are already obligated. Are we going to say to the world, "Yes; we are a member of the United Nations, but if some difficulty arises we want the right to hold a session of Congress, which may last anywhere from 1 month to a year, and determine whether or not we will carry out our obligation"? That is what has been suggested. We would have the same right to declare war after the enactment of the kind of law which has been proposed as we have now. If such a law were enacted it would not give Congress any additional power to declare war. Our friends are arguing, "Let us go back to Congress." What is the use of passing this measure? We can go to Congress at any time and have war declared. If there is no virtue in the Security Council itself, or if it means nothing, why should we pass this bill?

Apparently it is thought that the other nations of the world may be deceived into believing that we are actually agreeing to something which we are not agreeing to at all. It is being said in effect, "We will join the Security Council, we will join the United Nations Organization, we will enter into an agreement, but when the time comes to perform our part of the contract or agreement we will tell you then whether we were in earnest at the time we entered into the agreement, or were trying to dupe the rest of the world." Mr. President, I ask, Did we mean what we said we meant when we entered into the agreement, or did we not mean it?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator realize that England, Russia, China, and France have reserved the right to veto any use of force, and that, after all, all we are trying to do is to reserve the same right with respect to the vote of our representative on the Security Council? Is it not a question of whether the right of veto shall reside in the President or in the Congress, or, to some extent, in the President under rules laid down by

Congress? Is not that the question that we must decide?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I do not understand what the Senator is talking about, because we have the right of veto. That right was reserved in the Charter. We have not been discussing that phase of the matter. The question is, Have we really entered into an organization with the idea of participating or not participating? If the Organization is a fake, let us get out of it. Let us say so. If, after each dispute that arises, we want to go back to Congress and determine whether the United States will "welsh" on what it has agreed to, or will provide the force it has said it will provide for the benefit of the Security Council, let us tell the world now. Let us not wait until after our country has joined the United Nations Organization, and after some necessity arises for the use of the United Nations Organization, and then say, "Well, I guess we will take the matter back to Congress and decide whether we will help or not."

Article 43 provides in part:

> All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call—

Not next year, not the year after, or 10 years from now, but on its call; not on the determination of Congress, not on the determination of any individual, but on the determination of the Security Council.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator would not object to the President of the United States advising our representative on the Security Council how he should vote with regard to a certain issue, would he?

Mr. TUNNELL. That is provided for in the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. The question I ask is, Why not let the Congress itself advise our representative on the Security Council?

Mr. TUNNELL. With reference to how he shall vote?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; with regard to a given issue as it arises.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is the Senator speaking with reference to our military force being used in war?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, that is correct; whether or not our representative on the Security Council should vote to use force.

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not understand the Senator's comments, if that is what he said, and I do not think the RECORD will bear him out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, that is certainly what I intended to say, and I believe the RECORD will bear me out. Let me say further that of course, if we are outvoted on the Council we are lost. But I am talking about what our representative should do. I think he should be instructed by the Congress.

Mr. TUNNELL. The arguments which I have heard this afternoon were on the question of how the force shall be used.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; and we should determine how our representative shall vote.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I suggested a moment ago, are we going to let the world think that we are a member of the United Nations Organization? Are we going to let the world think that we are entering into this agreement in good faith? Are we going to tell the world that we are going to keep forces on hand subject to the call of the United Nations? Are we going to say that when the time comes we will reserve the right to say, "We did not mean it at all; we were just playing with a little thing like the peace of the world"?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Under the pending bill, the only difference between the proposal I have made and the proposal which the Senator is suggesting is that I am saying that I think the Congress of the United States should have the right to say how our representative shall vote. The Senator from Delaware is saying that the question should be left to the determination of the President. If the Senator did not understand my argument this afternoon it was because of the fact that my use of the English language and the citation of the authorities did not make my position very clear.

Mr. TUNNELL. The Senator was very clear in his statements. I understood him perfectly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, assuming there was being discussed in the Security Council a proposal to use force, does the Senator think that Congress could pass a resolution directing the President not to vote for the use of our forces?

Mr. TUNNELL. I think it would probably require several months of unlimited debate in the Senate to find out what was the will of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking the Senator why he thinks Congress would have the power to direct our representative on the Council, or direct the President, not to vote for the use of forces.

Mr. TUNNELL. Oh, I think there is no question about Congress having the power. What I am trying to do is to argue for an organization which would have some effect on the peace of the world If the object is completely to destroy it, then adopt a provision that it is necessary to go back to Congress every time there is a desire to do something, and the world organization will be destroyed, so far as its usefulness is concerned.

Congress has passed on the United Nations Organization. I think the Congress will pass on the whole matter when it appropriates the money. I do not think Congress is being ignored, but what we have been hearing all afternoon was about a declaration of war. What we have agreed to do is to be prepared to keep on tap a force for the use of the Security Council, on its call, not on the call of the President, not on the call of the delegate to the Security Council, but a force that is to be kept for use on the call of the Security Council.

Mr. President, there is no question about the matter, either we favor an organization which will have some power back of it on its call, or we do not favor it. I favor it, and I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WILLIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Huffman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Byrd	Kilgore	Stewart
Capper	Knowland	Taft
Carville	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Lucas	Tunnell
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Wagner
Ellender	Magnuson	Walsh
Ferguson	Maybank	Wheeler
Fulbright	Mead	Wherry
Gerry	Millikin	White
Gossett	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Willis
Guffey	Murdock	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hart	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "on its call."

On page 5, line 17, beginning with the word "The", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 2, on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> Nothing in such agreement or agreements shall authorize the President, and the President shall have no authority, to make available to the Security Council any armed forces to enable the Security Council to take action under article 42 of said Charter, unless the Congress has by appropriate act of joint resolution authorized the President to make such forces available to enable such Council to take action in the specific case in which the Council proposes to take action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say one word before the vote is taken. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment. It is known as the Wheeler amendment, having been offered by the senior Senator from Montana. It provides that the President may not send any troops anywhere, at any time, unless there has been a prior specific authorization by the Congress. We are authorizing the President in the general bill to take action, and if the Wheeler amendment should be adopted there

would be no use having a Security Council. We might as well wipe out the Security Council. Adoption of the amendment would paralyze the activities of the Council.

Mr. President, the bill provides that agreements shall be brought back to the Senate and the House for discussion and action. The Congress can limit the troops and throw all sorts of safeguards around them.

I hope the Senate will not kill the bill by adopting this amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the amendment in nowise kills the Security Council or the purposes of the Organization. All in the world it does is to provide that before American troops may be used to put down aggression, when the Security Council may say aggression has occurred, the proposal must come back to the Congress of the United States and, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, Congress shall pass upon the question whether American boys are to be used to put down aggression or to place this country in war.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the cases in which the troops will be necessary are emergency cases, such as the invasion of the Rhineland by Mr. Hitler's forces. Under the plan proposed by the Senator from Montana, in the case of an emergency, when the action must be instantaneous or not at all, the President would have to say, "Well, we will talk about that. We are going to take the matter back to Congress"; and before Congress could ever act the invasion would take place, and then it would be too late to act.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, permit me to say a word. After all, it is the Senator from Texas who has renewed the debate. I am going to vote against the amendment so far as that is concerned, but the statement made by the Senator from Texas that the matter under consideration relates only to emergency cases, is not the fact. Under article 39, if the Security Council considers that there is a threat to the peace—there may be no invasion, there may be no aggression on the part of the Nation against whom troops are to be used—if the Council decides there is a threat to the peace, and it may or may not be an emergency, it may act. So far as I am concerned, I feel that the mistake is in authorizing unlimited power, under section 3, to our member on the Security Council to vote.

I propose to vote against the Wheeler amendment because if we adopt section 3 we shall have voted to give our delegate the power to do as he pleases, and once having done that we are morally and legally obligated. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment, but I think the objection that should be made is to the fact that we are laying down no rules, but under section 3 are giving our delegate unlimited power to act against any nation in any case where that one man thinks that the use of force against some nation will promote peace and security, if you please. Not justice, but merely peace and security. The power we give, I think, is the greatest power over life and death that has ever been given, but once we have given that power by adopting section 3, and once the individual, acting under the authority we have given him, has voted on behalf of the United States for the use of force I think we are morally and legally obligated to go through with it. I do not feel, however, that I can vote for the pending amendment.

Certainly the argument made by the Senator from Texas that this is merely an emergency matter, only to be used in such a case as when Hitler marched into the Rhineland—no; that is not the case. The power is given to do it in any case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas did not say anything of the sort.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and allow my vote to stand.

I am informed that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. Both of these Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—9

Brooks	Moore	Wheeler
Chavez	Revercomb	Wherry
Langer	Shipstead	Willis

NAYS—65

Austin	Hart	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler	Huffman	Smith
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Carville	Kilgore	Taft
Connally	Knowland	Taylor
Donnell	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lucas	Tunnell
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Wagner
Fulbright	Magnuson	Walsh
Gerry	Maybank	White
Gossett	Mead	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Guffey	Mitchell	Young
Gurney	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Cordon	O'Mahoney
Andrews	George	Pepper
Bailey	Glass	Reed
Brewster	Hatch	Robertson
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	McFarland	Tobey
Bushfield	Morse	
Capehart	Murray	

So Mr. WHEELER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to offer two amendments. I do not know whether the Senate wishes to proceed with them at this time or not. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to have the Senate complete consideration of the bill tomorrow? I believe these are the only amendments left.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we hope to finish consideration of the bill today.

Mr. TAFT. Then I shall be very glad to proceed.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall urge upon the Security Council immediate action

under article 26 looking to a limitation of armaments and of the use of weapons such as the atomic bomb, rockets, and poison gas, and effective amendments to the Charter to secure the enforcement of the undertakings of nations with respect thereto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, my objection to the bill is that it implements up to the hilt the use of force under the provisions of chapter VII, and does nothing whatever to set up the General Assembly, which is one of the great agencies for maintaining peace, and is stated to represent one of the great advantages of the Charter. The Senate has in effect made our representatives to the Assembly of inferior rank.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have read the amendment rather hastily. It reads, in part, as follows:

The representative of the United States on the Security Council shall urge upon the Security Council immediate action under article 26 looking to a limitation of armaments and of the use of weapons such as the atomic bomb, rockets, and poison gas.

That is a limitation on the use of atomic bombs, rockets, and poison gas. I think perhaps the Senator's intention was to eliminate them rather than limit their use. Am I mistaken in that respect?

Mr. TAFT. No; I think it could be a prohibition.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the amendment now reads, it is confined to a limitation of the use of atomic bombs and other weapons. I do not believe that a limitation on the use of atomic bombs would be very effective. I suppose what the Senator is looking to is a limitation of armaments and a prohibition of the use of such weapons.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be very glad to modify the amendment by striking out the word "use" and inserting the word "prohibition."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modification of the Senator's amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4 of the amendment it is proposed to strike out "use" and insert in lieu thereof "prohibition."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, no action whatever has been taken toward implementing the provisions for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. No suggestion has been made that we adhere to the International Court of Justice. The entire emphasis of the bill is on unlimited power to use force, a force which, under the veto power which is imposed, would be completely and wholly ineffective.

The effort of this amendment is to submit a proposal under article 26, indicating that while we are authorizing the use of force, we are also suggesting that the nations proceed to a limitation of armaments under article 26.

Of course, there is no use in limiting armaments if the only means of enforcing such limitation is the present provision of the Charter for the use of force, because any of the large powers could immediately veto the use of force. So if article 26 is to be in any way effective, there must also be effective amendments to the Charter to secure the enforcement of the undertakings of nations with respect thereto.

Article 26 provides for the submission of plans, to be submitted to the members of the United Nations, for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments. It seems to me that covers the prohibition of the use of various weapons. Those plans must necessarily involve an amendment to the Charter. There can be no plans for an effective limitation of armaments unless in some way the Charter is implemented to permit the United Nations to enforce the provisions regarding any violation of that particular limitation. As I have said, so long as the veto power exists, obviously such a limitation may not be effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator mean that in that particular instance the veto power should be abolished with regard to the agreement as to the limitation of armaments?

Mr. TAFT. That is my belief. My belief is that the only way we can effectively prevent the use of atomic bombs is to eliminate the veto power and to provide authority to limit the development of weapons which may destroy the world.

The amendment would provide only an instruction to our delegate to start the machinery in behalf of securing some kind of an effective limitation of armaments, instead of relying on the use of force, which, as the Charter is written, I say is wholly ineffective against the great nations of the world, who could be the only dangerous aggressors in the world. I suggest that we at least join in a move in the direction of peace and in the direction of limitation of a force which itself may destroy the world.

I cannot believe it would hurt the bill to adopt the amendment. I think it would enable us to say, "We are not only interested in force. We are not trying to rule the world with three or four other great nations. We are trying to achieve peace."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with that thought, but I did not understand the original amendment to mean that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am quite willing to submit the amendment to the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TAFT and Mr. WHERRY requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the name of Mr. AIKEN.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, is it in order for me to speak at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask two questions. First, let me say that I do not like the idea of confining the amendment to advice which we may have to offer to the Security Council, because in my judgment there will be a far greater possibility of effective evolution in behalf of arms limitation through the recommendations of the General Assembly in the first instance, than in the case of the Security Council in the first instance. I call attention to the fact that article 11, defining the functions of the General Assembly, says:

The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments,

Mr. President, my first complaint is that from my point of view, this amendment addresses itself to the wrong body in the United Nations Organization, so far as hopes are concerned, if it is to be addressed only to one, and that the dignity and importance of the General Assembly in respect to this particular problem, among all possible problems, should not be overlooked.

Secondly, I very seriously question whether we are now prepared to start to lay down any rules in respect to the control of atomic energy. We have just commenced an inquiry into that question and we have gone merely far enough to realize how utterly little we know about the possibilities of control or what is involved in control or whether control can be made effective.

So far as I am concerned, I have gone far enough to understand that I want a total prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes; but I have also gone far enough to understand that, except as we can develop a practical system of international inspection upon an over-all basis which is complete and adequate and utterly searching, I am not so sure that we in America are prepared to discuss, as yet, such a development.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not also a fact that until such a system is developed, it is also impractical really to limit arms?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is.

All I wish to say is that it is with the greatest reluctance that I disagree upon a subject of this nature with my distinguished friend the Senator from Ohio. I am totally sympathetic with the objective to which he addresses himself, but I seriously question whether in the pending bill at this moment we are yet ready to make our first statutory approach to the question of the control of atomic energy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as to the first question, let me say that article 26 reads as follows:

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

So far as the atomic bomb is concerned, I would just as lief offer the amendment, regardless of whether the atomic bomb had ever been invented. The other modes of warfare are sufficiently destructive so that we should undertake a limitation of armaments and we should undertake to prevent the use of rockets, poison gas, and other arms which also are capable of destroying entire nations.

It seems to me that the plan provided by the amendment is an approach. The Charter itself makes provision for the Security Council to start out now on a plan for the limitation of armaments. The plan is to be submitted to the members of the United Nations; the plan must come to us and to the other members. They may not be able to agree on any plan; but when we have assigned that function to the Security Council, I cannot understand why it should be suggested that they should not immediately proceed with it.

I think they may work out an approach to a solution of the atomic bomb problem which may be entirely acceptable. Of course, they may not. But it seems to me that the pending amendment provides the only way to start on a course which may preserve the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment would require a study of the method; would it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it requires such a study. They shall be responsible for formulating a plan and submitting it; that is all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word before the vote is taken. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment. The Charter already provides, as has been suggested by the Senator from Ohio, for the responsibility of the Security Council in regard to this matter. It must cooperate with the Military Staff Committee. Of course, the Military Staff Committee cannot be organized until the Charter is put into effect.

This is a matter which can receive the attention of the Congress if it desires to undertake to instruct the delegate of the United States at any time in regard to such a matter. I see no occasion for projecting this question into the Organization before it is organized.

Furthermore, the President and the Premiers of Great Britain and Canada have recently made a joint statement with regard to the atomic bomb. We do not know much about the atomic bomb. I happen to be a member of a committee which is seeking information with regard to it. Scientists and soldiers are not agreed upon it, nor are statesmen. It is a matter which will continue to receive a great deal of attention and study, and I think that the entire subject should be left to the Charter where it is stated that at an appropriate time studies and examinations will be made with reference to some plan of disarmament.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of what has been said, and in view of what we all know, does the Senator from Texas believe it is proper at this time to delegate to a member of the Security Council any powers whatsoever with respect to atomic energy? In other words, no one knows all about atomic energy, and at this time it would seem to me to be unwise for the Congress to grant power to a member of the Security Council to start fooling around with atomic energy and discussing it, when he knows little or nothing about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will not the Security Council, and will not our delegate, have as much authority to initiate something along this line without this amendment as they would have with it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely. The Charter specifically provides that they shall have jurisdiction.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think there is nothing wrong in what the Senator from Ohio wants to accomplish, but I certainly assume that the very fact we are setting up a Security Council and Assembly to settle these questions, embracing the whole compass of the matters set forth by the Senator from Ohio, together with bacteriological warfare, which is not mentioned and which can be more horrible, perhaps, than all the other methods of warfare put together, not including the atomic bomb, as well as many other forms of offensive and defensive warfare, will eventually be taken up and considered. While I am sympathetic with what the Senator wants to do, and I am in accord with him, it seems to me that the adoption of the amendment would be loading the bill down with a great many details.

Mr. CONNALLY. I certainly concur with the view of the Senator from Maryland.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I wish to announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business. Both of these Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business, as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—16

Ball	Hawkes	Taft
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Wheeler
Butler	Langer	Wherry
Byrd	Russell	Wilson
Donnell	Shipstead	
Fulbright	Smith	

NAYS—54

Austin	Hayden	Murdock
Bankhead	Hill	Myers
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Bilbo	Huffman	Radcliffe
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Carville	Kilgore	Stanfill
Chavez	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	La Follette	Taylor
Downey	Lucas	Tunnell
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McMahon	Wagner
Gossett	Magnuson	Walsh
Green	Maybank	White
Guffey	Mead	Wiley
Gurney	Millikin	Willis
Hart	Mitchell	Young

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Brewster	Hatch	Reed
Bridges	McCarran	Robertson
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Moore	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Morse	Tobey
Cordon	Murray	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

Any action taken by the President under this section shall cease to be effective after 3 months, but whenever the United States is called upon to act under article 41 of said Charter, the President shall promptly recommend to Congress appropriate legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under said article 41.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know this is the last amendment to be proposed to the bill. It deals with section 5, which has hardly been discussed. It is the section which implements the President's power to impose economic sanctions.

The President may issue rules and regulations which will have the force of law, and which, under paragraph (b), may subject a person to a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for 10 years.

The character of those regulations is not specified in detail. The words are very broad. The language is:

Through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

That certainly is a wide-open provision. The amendment provides that the President may take this action in an emergency, when the Council acts. In order that there may be no delay, he may continue to act, but his action will be good for only 90 days. Then he will have to come to Congress. He should come to the Congress immediately, as a matter of fact, and ask Congress to enact laws to carry out the obligations.

Under the provision I have read the President may impose any kind of censorship. He may go into anyone's home, he may investigate anything, he may have a person's books brought into court, he may examine all his correspondence, and, as I have said, he may impose censorship. It seems to me the language is sufficiently broad to enable him to regulate economic relations or any means of communication involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. I should say that under this provision the President's power could be stretched so that he could investigate and prohibit any action remotely related in any way to the country involved in the particular economic sanction.

Mr. President, I think this is a legislative matter. I think Congress should act. It seems to me probably the greatest delegation of regulatory power Congress has ever been asked to give the President. The distinguished Senator from Colorado pointed out that all the embargo acts in the early days of our history contained specific date limitations on the power of the President. Under the provision I am referring to the actions might go on for years, so far as any authority of Congress is concerned.

Mr. President, I have only to add that I do not think the amendment would interfere with the operation of the Charter in any way. Under my amendment the President would retain the emergency power to act, which, incidentally, may never extend beyond 90 days in any case. But if the power is to be permanent, Congress should enact a statute, it should impose the penalties, Congress should limit the President's power so that it may not be used at any time that may suit the whim of the administration in office at the time. It seems to me this is an amendment which Congress might well adopt to prevent some of the abuses which certainly may well arise under the power that is to be delegated in the section affected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that we may understand what the effect of the amendment would be, it might be advisable to read section 5 of the bill, on page 4, to which the proposal is offered as an amendment. I read:

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

The amendment proposes that any action taken by the President under the section I have just read shall cease to be effective after 3 months. No matter what the conditions are, no matter what the justification for an extension of the time may be, it must cease at the end of 3 months, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. The amendment reads:

Whenever the United States is called upon to act under article 41 of said Charter, the President shall promptly recommend to Congress appropriate legislation to carry out the obligations of the United States under said article 41.

As I understand, that instruction is not necessary as a part of the bill. I think we have the right to assume that any President, whoever he may be during the years in the future, will discharge his obligation by recommending to Congress any legislation he may deem necessary to carry out our obligations under article 41 of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose this amendment were adopted, and suppose the Parliaments of Great Britain and of France, and of all the other countries in the United Nations Organization, passed similar provisions restricting their members on the Security Council, and their Prime Ministers. What kind of action could we get if 30 or 40 or 51 parliaments had to debate a question before there could be any action?

Mr. BARKLEY. What would be done by this amendment, if it should be adopted, would be to tie the hands of the United States and the President of the United States, so that he would be required to annul within 3 months any action which might be taken under article 41 of the Charter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me suggest, too, that the economic sanctions under article 41 cannot be put into effect originally without the consent of the United States, because we are members of the Security Council.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In just a moment; but I shall yield first to the Senator from Illinois, as he asked me to yield.

This amendment will do two things if it shall be adopted. It will handicap the President. It will tie his hands and limit him. And, in response to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who presupposes that other nations might do the same, let me say that suppose none of them should do the same, then we would be out on a limb by ourselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have not studied the amendment, but as I listened to its reading by the Senator from Kentucky I reached the very definite conclusion that the amendment really would amend the Charter. If we adopt it it would represent an attempt to amend the Charter, and certainly affect the basic principles of the Charter.

Mr. BARKLEY. In effect it would amend the Charter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment would not amend the Charter in any way. The Charter imposes an obligation on the United States, once our representative on the Security Council has voted for economic sanctions, to impose economic sanctions. That is our obligation. But, as I understand the Senator, he says Congress is wholly incompetent to carry out the obligations of the United States, that Congress will not do it, that we cannot leave it to Congress because the Congress is an unreliable body, and Congress may not keep the promise of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. That is in effect the argument. There is nothing in the Charter that says these sanctions shall be imposed by the President or the Executive. As a matter of fact the Executive has never had any power of this kind, as contrasted with the use of the armed forces of the United States. The Executive has never assumed to have power to impose economic sanctions except under the express delegation of authority by the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Section 5 of the bill authorizes the President to do certain things, after investigation. The amend-

ment of the Senator from Ohio seeks to limit his power. Whether the Senator's amendment in effect amends the Charter may be an academic problem, but the Charter does not limit the United Nations with respect to the length of time during which sanctions may be in effect. This amendment, however, seeks to limit the time to 3 months. Whatever the President may do under section 5 of the bill would be limited to 3 months, and then he would be under the obligation to come to Congress. He will do that anyhow if he thinks it is necessary to do it. In two respects the amendment is a handicap against the United States by limiting the sanctions that may have to be imposed by the United Nations, or their effect, to 3 months, and then by assuming the President will not do his duty by coming to Congress, unless the Congress tells him by this amendment to do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if we adopt section 5 there is no duty imposed on the President to come to Congress. Congress then says, "You handle it. Handle it in any arbitrary way you please. Call anybody in you want to and examine him. You may send him to jail for 10 years." If we say that, then it will be our fault. If we should adopt the language as it now is, there would be no duty on the President to come to Congress.

My contention is that this is a function which ought to be performed by Congress. We should be the ones to carry out economic sanctions. I am willing that for 90 days the President may have such authority. That is a long enough period. But it seems to me that after 90 days the Congress should have the right to perform that function, and perform it wisely, and impose the restrictions in the mildest way and with the least damage to our Nation, and in a way that would inconvenience in the least manner the people of this country. Whereas the regulations otherwise authorized to be issued by the President may be absolutely arbitrary and far beyond what Congress may even today consider necessary or necessary in the future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CONNALLY demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN. I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], is necessarily absent on account of the serious illness of his mother. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED.] Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Both these Senators are necessarily absent, but would vote "yea" if present.

I wish to announce that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

All of these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—65

Austin	Guffey	Mitchell
Ball	Gurney	Murdock
Bankhead	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brooks	Hill	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Hoey	Smith
Butler	Huffman	Stanfill
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Carville	Kilgore	Tunnell
Chavez	Knowland	Tydings
Connally	La Follette	Vandenberg
Donnell	Lucas	Wagner
Downey	McClellan	Walsh
Eastland	McKellar	White
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Willis
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
Gossett	Mead	Young
Green	Millikin	

NAYS—7

Langer	Shipstead	Wherry
Moore	Taft	
Revercomb	Wheeler	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Pepper
Brewster	Hatch	Reed
Bridges	McCarran	Robertson
Buck	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Murray	Tobey

So the bill S. 1580 was passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 266, making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I make this motion in order that the bill may become the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask if it is the purpose to go forward with the joint resolution today?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of the UNRRA appropriation measure.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1947", to strike out:

Provided further, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities.

No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until (A) the President has received

from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

(2) That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in such country, to retain title to all motor transport equipment supplied by the Administration, and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

(B) That for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials, or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an additional amount fiscal year 1946, to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267), to be available for expenditure in the manner specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, $550,000,000: *Provided*, That no relief or rehabilitation supplies procured out of funds heretofore or herein appropriated shall be shipped to any country except in the Far East after December 31, 1946, and in the case of any country in the Far East after March 31, 1947.

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946.

CLAIM OF EASTERN CONTRACTING CO.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar on November 23 the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] objected to House bill 2518, Calendar No. 771. I have just talked with him, and he has withdrawn his objection. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2518) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask what the bill is?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a claims bill, unanimously reported from the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as assistant to the Chief of Engineers, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Brig. Gen. John Jennings Kingman.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Charles A. Donnelly, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, in place of Joachim O. Fernandez, resigned; and

Floyd S. Daft, to be senior scientist in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Shackelford Miller, Jr., to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Mulcahy to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF FRANK OLSON TO BE REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE, BLACKFOOT, IDAHO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Olson to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has any report to make on this nomination.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senator means. I have secured the endorsement of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that as a member of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I feel that I have an obligation to Members of the Senate.

As I understand, and as appeared from the evidence adduced in the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, this nominee was convicted of bootlegging in Idaho and served a term under a Federal sentence. He is now proposed for appointment to a position of honor and profit, and his nomination is before the Senate of the United States for confirmation. It was my understanding that the Senator from Idaho would report the record to the Senate at the time the nomination came before us. Therefore, I raised the question. I feel that under the circumstances, until the case is further aired, I should object.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, that was not the understanding which I had. The question was brought up in the committee, and the Senator from Iowa stated that he would not object to the appointment, but he suggested that I await the arrival of the junior Senator from Idaho and secure his endorsement. I did so. I did not understand what he meant. He stated that if the junior Senator from Idaho agreed it would be agreeable to him. That was my understanding.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the controversy which seems to have arisen over this nomination, can it not be passed over for the day?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will go over, and the clerk will state the remaining nominations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the statement which has been made by the Senator from Idaho, I feel that I should state my version of the affair.

This question arose in the committee, completely out of a blue sky so far as I was concerned. A record was produced showing that this man had been convicted and had served time. I stated in the committee meeting that because he was being endorsed by a member of the committee I would refrain from voting against him in the committee, but I asked that the record show that I refused to vote for him. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] joined me, and we both stated that we desired to wait until the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT] had arrived, and then we would ascertain whether both Senators approved the nomination after examining the record.

At no time did I state that I would not object to this man's appointment. I feel that there is a duty upon me as a member of the committee to inform the Senate with respect to information which came to the committee, and which I think might well be considered by Senators when they come to the question of confirming the nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 4 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Shackelford Miller, Jr., to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Jorge Luis Cordova Diaz to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James E. Mulcahy to be United States marshal for the southern district of New York.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE FLEET ADMIRAL

William F. Halsey, Jr., to be fleet admiral of the United States Navy.

TO BE VICE ADMIRALS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles A. Lockwood, Jr.
Charles H. McMorris
George D. Murray
Jesse B. Oldendorf
Daniel E. Barbey
Frederick C. Sherman

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mervyn H. Gallagher, Doheny Park.

HAWAII

Antone Nobriga, Jr., Hanamaulu.
John E. Ventura, Kihei.
James L. S. Spalding, Pepeekeo.

KANSAS

Ralph Ganson, Canton.
Merlyn E. Beougher, Gove.
Bert S. Vaughn, Selden.

WASHINGTON

Bette M. Robertson, Belfair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, above our drifting years, Thou art the soul of the universe, whose star of hope never dims in a nightless sky. In all our ways, help us to walk aright, that we may live and labor in peace with one another. No one among us is so gifted or ungifted but that the Christ can enrich him a thousandfold. Grant that our mental and heart powers may be unclogged by hidden motives or unclouded by deception that in us all graces may flower into blessed fullness.

O Spirit of the Most High, fan into a glowing flame the embers of unity and cooperation through our land, that the ugly wounds of vacillation and suspicion may be healed, releasing untold treasure, unspoken comfort, and unwrought deeds. O let the word become flesh and dwell in us, in factory and in office, throughout America, liberty's wonderland, with tolerance and justice for all men.

The Lord God be merciful and gracious to our President. Give him courage and the assurance of Thy wise guidance in all his decisions. In the name of our Redeemer we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) entitled "An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39 to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 304) entitled "An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1362) entitled "An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes."

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram from Msgr. Bernard Sinne, of the Archdiocese of Omaha, from which the following is taken:

> From December 9 to 16 the Catholics of the United States have a national drive for canned foodstuffs for Europe. * * * In the name of the priests and people, I appeal to you to help us obtain permission for sending foodstuffs into Germany. Please answer this wire at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone explain why the American people should be taxed billions for UNRRA, a political relief organization, yet when the Christian churches of America voluntarily seek to help their brethren in central Europe they will find our Government cold-bloodedly blocks their errand of mercy. I again urge the administration officials responsible for this inhuman situation to take down their barriers against church, private organization, and personal relief in central Europe.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, December 6, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short resolution adopted by the American Legion.

AMERICAN COMMUNISTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I see in big headlines, "Party line at the State Department." The Communist Party is now picketing the State Department with banners reading, "Hurley Out and Byrnes Must Go." Mr. Speaker, I want to say that is getting to be a pretty bad state of affairs when we let those Communists, who do not believe in our form of government, endeavoring to oust the Secretary of State because he does not want to aid and assist the Communist Party into power in America, thus overthrowing our form of government. It is a pretty tough job, and I think the President of the United States ought to use the "big stick" now, and I think the Congress ought to get after them and clean every hoodlum out of this country. I want to tell you that the Communists have no business here. If they do not like this country, let them go back to Russia. Let them go to some other country that they admire. It is about time that we cleaned them out. If there is anything or anybody I dislike, it is a traitor to America. They apply for citizenship to our country and then try to overthrow its Constitution and its liberty. Let us start now to clean them out, or they will clean us up.

America first, last, and all the time for me.

LATIN AMERICA GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal's good-neighbor policy in South America is collapsing just as has its home-economy plan. Instead of good will in these neighboring countries, we are building up, through our constant meddling, bitterness and suspicion, which could have dangerous consequences.

You cannot go around shaking a "big stick," bullying small nations, failing to consult other nations, and interfering in domestic policies, like Ambassador Adolf Berle has recently been doing in Brazil, without causing discord and ill will. We would resent any ambassador from a foreign country telling us who we should elect as President, and Brazil has a right to resent any interference on the part of Mr. Berle.

Brazil has been a good friend of the United States during the World War. Let us not sacrifice that friendship by meddling in foreign political internal affairs.

SIC PAUL T. STEWART

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REECE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Robert H. Wood, editor of the Aviation News.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the December Democratic Digest by Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BIEMILLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FRENCH INDOCHINA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that some eight American Victory ships were turned over to the British Government to redeploy British and French soldiers to French Indochina to maim civilians actively engaged in the independence movement there.

These ships should be used to bring our marines and GI's home from India and China forthwith.

This is the same brave British Government which fights its way into peaceful villages in Palestine, killing the innocent with American lend-lease machine guns, tanks, and planes—the same courageous British who used tear gas and V-bombs on civilians in Burma, Dutch territory. Remember, this is the same British who are asking us for a huge loan to bolster and further their imperialistic cunning and imperialistic cruelty in Asia and in the Levant.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances; in one to include a radio address delivered last Sunday at the special Elks memorial program at Lawrence, Mass.; and in the other to include a newspaper article taken from a periodical.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein petitions and letters from several church groups and also excerpts from a very brilliant speech delivered by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston.

OUR CHINESE POLICY

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therewith a letter from Secretary Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include a set of resolutions of the Farm Bureau of Wapello County, Iowa.

MORAL CONDITIONS IN JAPAN

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, within the last 2 or 3 weeks at least four Members of the House have extended in the RECORD a letter and a statement published in a number of newspapers and magazines by Chaplain Lawrence Lacour relative to the moral conditions prevailing in Japan and the attitude of the Navy in dealing with the problem. The situation is both revolting and nauseating almost beyond human comprehension. I am well acquainted with the Reverend Lawrence Lacour. He is a resident of Oskaloosa, Iowa, a man of unquestioned integrity and a devout Christian gentleman, imbued with patriotism. He went into the Navy to serve as chaplain in any way that would be useful. For many years as a distinguished clergyman he has held successful evangelical meetings

throughout the Middle West. His statement cannot be easily dismissed, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] have very properly called attention to the unspeakable conditions as described by the Reverend Lawrence, and have asked the Navy Department for an investigation.

If Chaplain Lecour's letter results in a thorough investigation and cleaning up of a bad situation he will richly deserve an award of the Legion of Merit.

THE PULPIT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are certain professional men of great influence, I speak particularly of clergymen, who in attacking our Congress, both branches thereof, because they are not satisfied with the speed with which Congress is operating, are doing a great disservice to the country. The Congress has managed the affairs of this Government for more than 150 years, as a result of which this Government is the hope of the world. Those who are offending most by lashing Congress are men who have come here from other countries, men who have been recently naturalized so that they can profess to speak as Americans.

Mr. RANKIN. And think as aliens.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I will accept that remark. They think as aliens. The way they have heaped abuse on this Congress is a national disgrace. Of course, they lend encouragement to all the feeble-minded who are Communists and everything but Americans. Many of these propogandists have come from a nation that has never failed, whenever the opportunity presented itself, to aid those who would weaken or destroy this Republic.

The Speaker. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, it was the hope of the American people that the management-labor conference would recommend a solution to insure industrial peace after collective bargaining and conciliation had failed. Since the conference has closed and has failed to give us a solution to this problem it is time for the House Labor Committee to hold hearings on this important problem. The President suggested that well-reasoned and workable legislation be passed at the earliest possible moment. Speaking as one of the Republicans on the Labor Committee, and I believe speaking for other Republicans on the committee, I want to say that I am ready and willing to get busy right away and do my part in solving this vital problem. We know the country is anxious to get started on a reconversion program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Tulsa Tribune of November 30, 1945.

Mr. BUFFETT (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of demobilization of the armed forces, and to include excerpts from a letter and a bulletin.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Julius Barnes before a club at Detroit, Mich. The manuscript is too long for printing without receiving permission under regulation No. 10 of the House. I am informed it will cost $208. I renew the request I made yesterday, notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an address he delivered before the Executive Club in Chicago.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution which would create a select committee for the purpose of investigating the operations under the Lend-Lease Act, particularly with reference to the transfer of ships, articles, materials, and equipment; also, the expenditure of funds under that particular statute.

On August 17, the President issued an Executive order terminating Lend-Lease operations, but apparently they are continuing unabated.

The President also stated that about $41,000,000,000 have been expended under this program, while in reality the Congress has appropriated a total of $66,000,000,000. In the rescission bill currently before the Congress, there is recaptured only about $1,500,000,000 from this fund. The Lend-Lease Act originally was claimed to have established the United States as the arsenal of democracy. Now, the Congress should have some concern lest Lend-Lease make the United States the arsenal of imperialism.

With conditions so chaotic throughout the world, Americans do not want lend-lease funds diverted to defeat the allied objectives in this war, as outlined in the Atlantic Charter. It is now time to have an accounting of the use of these funds, particularly when it is recognized that hostilities ended almost 4 months ago.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

BARBITURATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include as a part thereof a resolution and discussion by the American Pharmaceutical Association regarding the misuse of barbiturates.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Evening Star entitled "Mr. Hull's Views."

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star and in the other a statement made before the Military Affairs Committee by Mr. Donald Dushane.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Governor Thye, of Minnesota, to the Honorable Clinton Anderson.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next and 15 minutes on Friday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the respective days and special orders entered for those days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

REDS PICKETING THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes Representatives get some unexpected though ineffective help. In the Washington Post of this morning on the front page is a picture that should bring

a great deal of comfort and encouragement to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] and the ardent supporters of his criticism of General Wedemeyer and Patrick Hurley. This picture has above it the headline: "Red pickets want Byrnes out."

One of the placards reads: "Bring our Marines home."

We all know, of course, that the Maritime Union is shot through and through with communism and that it called a strike because it says we are not getting the soldiers out of China or out of the other countries fast enough. The Communists want the servicemen out of the way of Russia. That is all right with me, for I never cared overmuch about their being sent over there in the first place. I never wanted our country involved in this war. After we were in I did my best to support the war and never found fault with those who were fighting it.

On the other placard, as shown on the front page of the Post, there is the statement: "Hurley out. Byrnes must go, too."

It is not very often that a Congressman or a group of Congressmen in the conduct of a program are supported by a Red picket line here at the White House. Perhaps, or should I say no doubt, the gentleman and his associates have no connection with the individuals doing the picketing.

TREASON COMES TO WASHINGTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, treason has come to Washington.

When the representatives of the Communist Party, dedicated to the destruction of this Government, can march up and down in front of the State Department in open daylight bearing placards demanding the ousting of the Secretary of State because he does not bow to the militant will of their subversive leaders, then I say treason has come to Washington.

On yesterday Harold J. Laski, a Communist, from overseas, came to Washington and conferred with certain of his fellow travelers. He went to New York last night and made a speech in favor of abolishing American sovereignty, which means getting rid of the Government of the United States. That is the program of these traitors.

We see Members rise on this floor and denounce Chiang Kai-shek, and demand that we take away from him the weapons of war we gave him while he was fighting on our side against the savage Japs and helping to save the lives of American boys, while the Chinese Communists were driving the knife into his back and into the backs of his men, thereby costing the lives of thousands of American boys on the islands of the Southwest Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the American people woke up to what is going on, denounced treason in whatever garb it may be found, and drove it forever from American soil.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the House, and it has its inception in an experience I had in Chicago last week addressing a large group of farmers. One of them came to me and asked, "Where can I obtain a copy of an objective treatise on communism so that I can understand it?" I said, "In my judgment, I do not know whether you can find a simple, factual, objective, narrative treatise that will show the impact of this new ideology on our own form of enterprise or not."

It occurred to me as I studied over the matter that perhaps a joint committee ought to be created to select a number of objective writers to prepare a very simple treatise, and then have 25,000,000 copies printed at Federal expense, and send them into the libraries and into the school rooms and make them available for free distribution to every citizen in the land. That, in my judgment, will be the greatest antidote to the march of communism that I can think of.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

COMMUNISM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have an interesting fight taking place in the State Department. It is a fight to determine whether or not the Communists are going to run the Democrats out or the Democrats are going to run the Communists out. We Republicans are watching the outcome with interest.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 693) entitled "An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 693) for the relief of Saunders Memorial Hospital, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed the Senate appropriated the sum of $25,000 to Saunders Memorial Hospital as the result of losses sustained by such hospital for the failure of the United States Army Engineers Corps to carry out a contract to lease or purchase such hospital to the United States, for the duration of the present war and 6 months thereafter.

The House reduced the sum to $10,000, and at the conference the original sum of $25,000 was agreed upon as being the proper amount.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. J. D. WHITESIDE AND ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,259" and insert "$1,888."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$7,828.66" and insert "$4,596.16."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES LYNCH

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Sen-

ate amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, HOLMES of Washington, and PITTENGER.

ESTATE OF THOMAS McGARROLL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3390, an act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,926.50" and insert "$5,571.50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE BENHAM

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1457, an act for the relief of Josephine Benham, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, JENNINGS, and COMBS.

L. WILMOTH HODGES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 874, an act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree with the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. JENNINGS.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2335, an act for the relief of Albert E. Severns, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree with the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. HOOK, and Mr. PITTENGER.

I FAVOR AN HONEST AND REAL INVESTIGATION OF EVERY UN-AMERICAN AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] are, as usual, seeing ghosts under the bed. And following these two gentlemen, my good colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] suggested that a congressional committee be appointed to make a real investigation of what communism does or does not mean and distribute the findings to the number of 25,000,000 copies.

While I do not dispute that there is a relative threat from communism, we must remember that a more immediate danger exists from those Fascists, Bundists, and Nazi ideologists who labored for years before the war and throughout our participation in the conflict to destroy our democratic form of government.

Hitler and Goebbels poured millions of dollars into propaganda activities in this country to discourage our war effort, to divide our people, and to try to undermine our morale. Those diabolical experts in psychological warfare made the prediction that even if the Nazis lost the war there would be no victors, because their propaganda would be so well implanted that the Allied Nations would be divided among themselves and that each of the Allied Nations would be disrupted within itself.

I am willing to join the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in requesting that a congressional committee be appointed to make an investigation; but let it be authorized to investigate also the activities of these secret Fascist organizations, and especially the sources of the funds which finance the thousands of dollars' worth of seditious, un-American pamphlets, booklets, and other publications.

I will heartily join my colleague and give favorable consideration to such a resolution if the investigation is made inclusive of all foreign ideologies threatening American security. Let the American people have the truth, but the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

If we do that I am sure we will find that there exists a definite, deliberate, and well-financed campaign backed by reactionary forces in this country to try to discredit as communistic every liberal group, and every movement working for improvement of the lot of the average citizen, and every legislation measure designed to accomplish that end. I am confident that such an impartial investigation would find that behind this whole vicious campaign of smearing there are economic interests seeking to muzzle free speech, or to confuse public opinion by beclouding free discussion of vital public issues, in order to protect their own position of wealth and power.

I think the true picture will show that these miscreants, who dare not risk a public judgment founded upon a well-informed citizenry, employ the services of professional demagogs and rabble-rousers of the type of Gerald L. K. Smith, Joe Kamp, William Pelley, Joe McWilliams, and others like that sorry group of alleged seditionists still trying to evade justice in the courts. Speaking of national menaces, here are men and women who, in our Nation's most trying days, did their utmost to undermine the war efforts, to blast our confidence, besmirch America's motives, and spread disunity.

Today they are still rampant on the American political scene, spreading their poisons of racial and religious bigotry.

These Benedict Arnolds, quislings, bundists, silver shirters, and such nefarious villains, in seeking to distract attention from their own seditious activities, invariably turn upon our patriotic, liberty- and freedom-loving citizens, especially those of foreign extraction.

Even that great patriot and statesman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, did not escape the villainy and the denunciation of these rascals. Moreover, they were privileged to use a congressional committee—the Dies committee, just as they now appear to be using the Wood committee—as a shameful weapon against the Congress itself. Many good persons were unjustifiably accused, as was ultimately shown by indisputable evidence. We supported from taxes a weapon cast for our own destruction. How ambitious these scoundrels were. Their campaign ranged all the way from President Roosevelt to Shirley Temple.

This dastardly propaganda was so thorough in operation that it was supported not only by a few with great wealth, but by some large newspapers, tax and tariff beneficiaries, and radio commentators. Many honest, well-intentioned American men and women, constantly denied access to the truth, were misled and imposed upon.

Who, Mr. Speaker, benefited from this long campaign of vilification and representation? Whom did it profit to mislead and fool the American people?

They hide in the shadows of Hitler's great lies. The last thing they want is a thorough investigation. It would take years of painstaking search in the cracks of the woodwork of our Nation to ferret them out. Some already are in felon's cells. Would the Department of Justice and the State penitentiaries want to turn these wretched traitors loose upon helpless society before their terms have expired, even to give testimony?

I am a believer in the light. The truth will expose these recreants in their full infamy. It will enlarge the stature of those who have been unfortunate enough to suffer from the smears, the distortions, and the lies of those who fear the people.

We can see the benefits of the truth, and the whole truth, by watching the conduct of the Republican members of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. For months and years selfish and shameless people have tried to suggest that the great Franklin D. Roosevelt invited war with Japan, even encouraged

war with Hitler. Do not these charges run true to form—accusing one whose lips are forever sealed? By his death, by his memorable record of leadership, Franklin D. Roosevelt has discharged any debts which might have lain against his memory. Yet in a minute and painstaking search, cataloging every deficiency of every individual whose name might be turned up, these defamers of true greatness have tried to find some mud to sling; but they have not been able to present a scintilla of evidence to prove anything except that the late President did everything in his power to ward off the horrors of a war he knew and dreaded.

The great name of Roosevelt, farseeing statesman, pathfinder, trailblazer, fearless executive, lover of peace, will stand in Himalayan and resplendent stature for countless centuries and long after even the tombstones of his petty traducers shall have crumbled into meaningless dust.

The Pearl Harbor investigation daily unfolds the sad truth that the charges against our late President are inspired by hatred, jealousy, envy, malice, all with a view to providing political capital, and with a sinister underlying motif of racial and religious animosities unworthy even of those who bring the charges. What a motive, to smear the name of a truly great man for the sake of a political campaign.

While traducers indict and persecute the memory of our late President, they are giving Russia a little rest. When the hearings have been concluded, the wild dog pack will be in full tongue again to malign and libel Russia—Russia, where 15,000,000 men and women perished to beat back tyranny in freedom's darkest hour. Those lives were given, not only that Russia might survive, but that the world, as we knew it, might live by their death. Even now we can hear the wild dogs yapping here in this House as the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities insinuates that any organization in America having a kind word for our communistic ally is, per se, subversive.

I doubt that Russia needs defense; if she does, let me rest that defense on the testimony of a single witness, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower has very recently stated publicly:

> If the American people had a chance to study the Russians at close range, and vice versa, I am certain there would be a fine mutual understanding and respect between the two peoples. I rubbed elbows with Marshal Zhukov and others, and have the highest regard for them. I was always able to get along with them.
>
> What most people do not realize is that the Russians are a good deal like us. They enjoy life like us Americans, are full of fun, and have a fine sense of humor. I have no fear about future amicable relations between our own country and Soviet Russia. There will have to be some give and take in our relations, but eventually things will work out well.

Mr. Speaker, it has been well and truly said, "give the people light and they will find their own way."

I will gladly concur with my colleague in his proposal for an honest, all-inclusive investigation if every dark and fearsome force in America is brought under the searchlight. Let us investigate the Communist Party—yes; but let us investigate also the bundists, the klansmen, the shadowy figures who hide in the night and gnaw at our freedom.

Let us have such an investigation as our beloved majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] conducted a decade ago. Let us turn up all the stones in the cellar—not just the ones painted red or pink.

I would have this committee uncontrolled by any group. I would have it fearless and without preconceived notions; not the tool of one or two newspaper publishers or dyspeptic cynics in our own body, but the good weapon of our democracy against the forces that would enslave us without our knowing it.

I want the guilty unmasked and the guiltless absolved. I want the accused to have their day in court. I want no man unmolested because of his wealth or power. I hope that a committee such as our friend suggests may be created, subject to the conditions I have named; and I hope that it will courageously, thoroughly, and without fear or favor, bring forth the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

REVERE SUGAR REFINERY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1955) for the relief of the Revere Sugar Refinery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ADOLPHUS M. HOLMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1841) for the relief of Adolphus M. Holman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

TENDERING THANKS TO GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 243) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

TRANSIT INVESTMENT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1266) for the relief of the Transit Investment Corp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. McGREGOR objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DAVE TOPPER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2062, for the relief of Dave Topper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dave Topper, Toledo, Ohio, the sum of $6,926.48. Such sum represents the amount of an alleged loss sustained by the said Dave Topper in connection with the sale of 44 surplus motorcycles which he had purchased from the Treasury Department, Procurement Division, on November 9, 1944, under the name of Topper Sales Co., such loss resulting from the establishment by the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration on December 2, 1944, of a ceiling price upon used motorcycles.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,926.48" and insert "$2,014.88."

At the end of the bill, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUNGE CORP. AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2187) for the relief of the Bunge Corp., the Corporation Argentina de Productos de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal and Ore Corp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommended to the Comimttee on Claims.

JOSEPH E. BENNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph E. Bennett, doing business as Joseph E. Bennett Co., Boston, Mass., the sum of $41,705. The said Joseph E. Bennett Co. was the low bidder on a contract for the construction of certain

temporary buildings at the airport at Presque Isle, Maine, and was on September 1, 1941, awarded the contract (DAW 175–eng–22, dated September 5, 1941) for such construction. Through an error in the engineers office in Boston he was furnished with an unrevised and incorrect set of plans for the purpose of enabling him to estimate for his bid, and the sum directed to be paid to him represents (1) the additional cost of $39,129 which he incurred in completing the contract under the correct plans; (2) a profit of $1,956, or approximately 5 percent of such additional cost; and (3) the cost, in the amount of $620, of the performance bond with respect to the additional construction called for by the correct plans.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "the sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "$39,129, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained under contract (DAW 175–eng–22, dated September 5, 1941) in the construction of certain temporary buildings at the airport at Presque Isle, Maine, beginning in September 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARA M. FORTNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clara M. Fortner, of 220 West Magnolia Street, Auburn, Ala., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Frasier Fortner, who was killed by the collision of a United States Army plane with an Eastern Air Lines plane copiloted by him at the Thirty-sixth Street Airport, at Miami, Fla., on September 22, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO CONVEY CERTAIN PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1117) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever he shall determine that such property is no longer needed for exclusively public purposes the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss without consideration (1) all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the real property situated in Santa Barbara County, Calif., known as Casa Dorinda estate, which is described in a certain grant deed by which said property was conveyed to the United States, dated November 23, 1942, and recorded in the official land records of Santa Barbara County, Calif., at page 492, book 559, (2) all right, title, and interest in and to the appurtenant sewer line and easement mentioned in said deed, and (3) all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in any of those certain articles consisting of books, furniture, and household furnishings, tools, garden equipment, and other articles of personal property conveyed by deed of gift from Mildred B. Bliss and Robert Woods Bliss to the United States of America dated November 23, 1942, and which are more fully described in exhibit A thereof: *Provided*, That the conveyance of such property as herein authorized shall be upon the condition that the grantors shall release the Government from any and all claims with respect thereto and with respect to any personal property which may have been loaned to the Government in connection therewith: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall cause to be removed any improvements or alterations made to the premises at the Government's expense, if in his judgment the value thereof shall substantially exceed the cost of restoring the premises to their condition at the time of the Government's entry thereupon.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA M. RANEY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 684) for the relief of Ida M. Raney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ida M. Raney, of McCrory, Ark., the sum of $750, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her on January 22, 1944, when she was struck by a flying rock fragment thrown into the air by an explosion which occurred during a military demonstration at Camp Robinson, Ark., which she was witnessing as a guest of United States military personnel: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALAN SELLS AND THE ESTATE OF ALAN SELLS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 779) for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Mrs. Alan Sells, of Topeka, Kans., the sum of $7,745.35, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred while she was riding as a passenger in a United States Army vehicle near the Topeka Army Air Base, on February 1, 1944, and (2) to the estate of Alan Sells, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Alan Sells as a result of such accident, and for funeral expenses incurred by it in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. HANNON AND ELEANORE M. HANNON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $6,542.52, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for the destruction of their house and personal property in Coquille, Oreg., and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon as the result of the crash of a United States Navy airplane on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,542.52" and insert "$6,191.52."

Line 7, strike out "their" and insert "all."

Line 9, strike out "and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREGORY STELMAK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 998) for the relief of Gregory Stelmak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gregory Stelmak, of Hartford, Conn., the sum of $4,365.58, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while walking along Village Street, in Hartford, Conn., on October 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLIE B. ROUSE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1017) for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie B. Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $81.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident involving a United States Army reconnaissance car on Highway No. 41 near Tullahoma, Tenn., on August 12, 1944; to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $1,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as a result of said accident; and to pay to Mrs. Louette Rouse, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $50 for the benefit of her minor daughter, Rachel Rouse, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Rachel Rouse in said accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. D. WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of E. D. Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. D. Williams, of Glendora, Calif., the sum of $1,300, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army truck and a De Soto airflow sedan in which he was the driver, at the corner of Barranca and Cortez Streets near Glendora, Calif., on November 1, 1943: *Provided*, That no amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,300" and insert "$614.57."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROY S. COUNCILMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1250) for the relief of Roy S. Councilman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roy S. Councilman, Corona Del Mar, Calif., the sum of $894. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Roy S. Councilman against the United States for personal injuries sustained on August 8, 1944, when two United States Navy airplanes dived so close to a fishing boat on which the said Roy S. Councilman was fishing off San Mateo, Calif., that their backwash threw him from a bait box to the deck of the boat, causing him to injure both of his knees.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEONARD HUTCHINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of Leonard Hutchings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leonard Hutchings, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of an arm and other personal injuries he received in a collision with an Army vehicle near Liberty, Ariz., on the 24th day of April 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Line 6, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLYN LAMB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of said Carolyn Lamb, who died August 30, 1944, as the result of an accident caused by an Army truck operated by a member of the United States Army crashing into said Carolyn Lamb on August 28, 1944, said Carolyn Lamb being a resident of Lakeland, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "the legal guardian of Carolyn Lamb, the sum of $5,000" and insert "Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb, of Lakeland, Fla., the sum of $2,291.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb."

VIOLA THERIAQUE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1836) for the relief of Viola Theriaque.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Viola Theriaque, of Springfield, Hampden County, Mass., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States arising from personal injuries suffered when the car in which she was a passenger was struck by a Government motor vehicle operated in connection with the United States Army at Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass., on Main Street, Springfield, Mass., on July 31, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the sign "$", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 1, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "2,500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as the result of a collision between the car in which she was riding and a United States Army vehicle in Springfield, Mass., on July 31, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX HIRSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1848) for the relief of Max Hirsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against Mr. Max Hirsch, county Farm Security Administration supervisor, Anderson, Mo., in the sum of $289.65, together with interest thereon from date of loss of the public funds for which he is accountable and which were destroyed by fire, without his fault, on November 24, 1943.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS SUMNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Thomas Sumner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas Sumner, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries resulting from being struck by a Government-owned automobile operated by William B. Hancock, bearing United States Government license No. 14000, on August 12, 1942, at Salt Lake City, Utah.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,000."

Line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$2,000."

Line 7, after the word "injuries" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert ", medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of being struck by a United States Army truck in Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR, of Ohio, to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$750."

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY H. OVERALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2087) for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay from any funds not otherwise appropriated the sum of $1,280, to Mrs. Mary H. Overall, Murfreesboro, Tenn., for the loss of a barn and contents by fire caused by military personnel during the Tennessee maneuvers, and $1,500 to Thomas I. Baker, Murfreesboro, Tenn., for the loss of a Fordson tractor which was in the building at the time of the fire and damaged beyond repair.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, insert:

"Such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON SCHTIERNMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2171) for the relief of Solomon Schtiernman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Solomon Schtiernman the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when a United States Army plane crashed at the Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 7, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Schtiernman" and insert in lieu thereof "Schtierman."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Solomon Schtierman."

ARNOLD MECHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2289) for the relief of Arnold Mecham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arnold Mecham, of Nampa, Idaho, the sum of $2,120. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said Arnold Mecham against the United States on account of injuries sustained and resultant losses when the automobile he was driving was struck by an Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 30 near Boise, Idaho, on December 7, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the figure "1943:" insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRTIE PIKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2318) for the relief of Mrs. Mirtie Pike.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. Mirtie Pike, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, (2) the legally qualified representative of the estate of Mrs. Bernice Smotherman, deceased, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of said sums shall be in addition to any sums paid to Mrs. Mirtie Pike for medical and hospital expenses, and to the estate of Mrs. Bernice Smotherman, deceased, for funeral and burial expenses, and shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of (1) the personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Mirtie Pike, and (2) the death of the said Mrs. Bernice Smotherman. The said Mrs. Mirtie Pike was severely injured, and the said Mrs. Bernice Smotherman was instantly killed, on October 15, 1943, when they were struck by a United States Army truck, on Tennessee Highway No. 10, near Murfreesboro, in Rutherford County, Tenn.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the balance of page 1 and all of page 2, down to and including the word "Tennessee" in line 10, and insert "Mrs. Mertie Pike, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for pain and suffering and personal injuries sustained, and to pay to the estate of Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, deceased, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, as the result of the said Mrs. Mertie Pike and Mrs. Burnice Smotherman being struck by an Army vehicle on Tennessee State Highway No. 10, near Murfreesboro, Tenn., on October 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 11, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mertie Pike and the estate of Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, deceased."

ELSIE PETER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2393) for the relief of Elsie Peter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elsie Peter, the sum of $10,000, as compensation for and in full settlement of all claims for damages against the United States for injuries sustained by her and expenses incident thereto, as a result of her being struck and injured by a Government vehicle which was driven by an employee of the War Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of any services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Peter", strike out the balance of page 1, and insert "of Skokie, Ill., the sum of $5,730.74, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained and for medical, hospital, and dental expenses incurred and required as the result of her being struck by an Army truck in Skokie, Ill., on January 12, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. D. JONES AND ETHEL S. JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2661) for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones, of Lake Waccamaw, N. C., the sum of $8,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damage to real and personal property, to wit: Hotel building and fixtures, owned by them and caused by a United States Army plane on July 5, 1943, when it crashed into their building: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,500" and insert "$3,904.74."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE STILES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2837) for the relief of George Stiles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,107.34, to George Stiles, of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for damages sustained as the result of guests being evacuated from the Soda Springs Hotel, Nevada, Calif., on January 21, 1943, by an officer of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2963) for the relief of William Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of William Phillips, who is alleged to have sustained injuries from the explosion of dynamite while working for the Works Progress Administration in a rock quarry at Garland, Tex., on or about April 11, 1938, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he filed such claim with the United States Employees Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the words "as amended," insert "and as extended to employees engaged in emergency relief employment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KATIE SANDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropropriated, to Mrs. Katie Sanders, Stella, Mo., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Katie Sanders against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Walter Crave Sanders, who died on October 1, 1944, as the result of personal injuries sustained on September 27, 1944, when the truck which he was driving on the McNatt Mill Road in Camp Crowder, Mo., was in collision with a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL STANIK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3514) for the relief of Paul Stanik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Stanik, Carrollville, Wis., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul Stanik against the United States on account of injuries and partial permanent disability therefrom sustained by his minor daughter, Olga Stanik, on September 24, 1938, when she fell into an excavation on a project of the Works Progress Administration at the Otjen School, Carrollville, Wis.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out the name "Paul Stanik" and insert in lieu thereof "the legal guardian of Olga Stanik, a minor."

Line 6, after the figures "$2,500", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Olga Stanik, on September 22, 1938, when she fell into an excavation on a project of the Works Progress Administration at the Otjen School, Carrollville, Wis.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Olgo Stanik, a minor."

RAYMOND C. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3904) for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and dirtected to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raymond C. Campbell, Alexandria, Va., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such rum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Raymond C. Campbell against the United States on account of injuries sustained by him, on December 12, 1944, on United States Highway No. 1, about 2 miles south of Alexandria, Va., when he was struck by an ambulance in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwitstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK E. WILMOT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4240) for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank E. Wilmot, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $340.30. Such sum represents the cost of a resurvey by Frank E. Wilmot of section 32, township 11 north, range 7 west, San Bernardino meridian, California, made necessary when original survey data and plats made under his direction proved inaccurate, without fault of his own, because they had been based on certain corner monuments reestablished erroneously through the negligence of an employee of the Glendale, Calif., office of the United States General Land Office of the Department of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, after the figures "340.30" strike out ". Such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of."

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGNES J. ALBERRY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 865) for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Alberry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CHARLES BRYAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1122) for the relief of Charles Bryan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Bryan, of Lincoln, Nebr., the sum of $5,881.40, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while directing traffic, in Lincoln, Nebr., on August 24, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGINIA PACKARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 215) for the relief of Virginia Packard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Virginia Packard, 931 Gainsborough Drive, Pasadena, Calif., the sum of $80.33. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from Pasadena, Calif., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent

or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT 90, PRATT COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans., the sum of $2,444.40, in full satisfaction of all claims which said school district may have against the Government for the expense involving in removing and relocating the schoolhouse in said district at the request of the War Department, in order that the land previously occupied by such building might be used for an Army air base: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and th same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "involving" and insert in lieu thereof "involved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLADYS ELVIRA MAURER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 919) for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gladys Elvira Maurer, National City, Calif., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Gladys Elvira Maurer against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on April 18, 1942, in San Diego, Calif., when the automobile in which she was riding was in collision with an Army ambulance.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVEE DISTRICT NO. 10, YUBA COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 948) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment, respectively, upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which break occurred at a point where the Engineer Department of the War Department in 1934 and 1935 had removed an old unused pipe discovered through the levee near its base and then allegedly replaced that portion of the old, well-compacted original levee by new levee construction with new earth inadequately tamped and leaving a definitely weakened point in the levee, through negligent reconstruction undertaken without authority requested of, or granted by the trustees of levee district No. 10, which damages and losses, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Suits upon such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time of any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment shall be in the same manner as in cases in which such court has jurisdiction under the Judicial Code, as amended.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the word "persons" shall be interpreted to mean any person or persons, individual or individuals, copartnership, firm, or corporation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "person", strike out the bill down to "SEC. 3," page 3. Insert in lieu thereof "against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, in Yuba County, Calif., on the easterly side of the Feather River, when the said Feather River breached the district's river levee at a point about 3 miles from the south end of the district on December 11, 1937, which damage, if any, it is alleged could have been prevented by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence on the part of the Engineer Department of the War Department. In the determination of such claims the United States shall be held liable only to the extent to which a private person would be liable under such circumstances.

"SEC. 2. Suits upon which such claims, respectively, may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statutes of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claims, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment, shall be in the same manner as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph twentieth of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 41 (20))."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERTRUDE VERBARG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1073) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbarg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE IRVINE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1251) for the relief of the Irvine Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Irvine Co., Tustin, Calif., the sum of $2,900. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Irvine Co. against the United States for the destruction of a small house and several orange trees which resulted from the crash of a United States Navy airplane on December 14, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. J. W. McMURRAY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1477) for the relief of Mrs. J. W. McMurray, R. T. Lathan, G. B. Cooper, L. W. Pearson, and Billups Oil Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REV. NEAL DEWEESE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, Ralph Demert, and the estate of Lon Thurman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,000 to Rev. Neal Deweese; to pay the sum of $1,500 to Mrs. Minnie Deweese; to pay the sum of $1,500 to Raymond Deweese; to pay the sum of $1,000 to Ralph Demert; to pay the sum of $5,500 to the estate of Lon Thurman, all of Farmington, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and the death of Lon Thurman as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 21, near Pilot Knob, Mo., on July 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary, notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$8,000" and insert "$6,000."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$750."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "to pay the sum of $1,000 to Ralph Demert."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$5,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Pilot Knob" and insert "Ironton."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendments offered by Mr. SPRINGER:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$750" and insert "$500."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$500" and insert "$250."

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR PARKINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1918) for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eleanor Parkinson, of Mount Carmel, Ill., the sum of $5,000 for damages to her property, which was caused by the Wabash River overflowing, due to the Brevoort levee maintained by the United States Government in the State of Indiana: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,637.50 in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,637.50" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,200."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORVIS WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2167) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CHARLES ZUCKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2168) for the relief of Charles Zucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Zucker, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained when a United States Army plane crashed at the Montefiore Cemetery, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on December 4, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY C. WESTOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2270) for the relief of Harry C. Westover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of Harry C. Westover, collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California, in the sum of $2,160, representing the value of certain wine stamps erroneously issued to the Rubidoux Winery, Riverside, Calif., in the wrong denomination, affixed to barrels, and mutilated in accordance with provisions of the Internal Revenue Code prior to discovery of the error, no loss of tax having been incurred by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF KATHLEEN LAWTON McGUIRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2670) for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire, a minor child, of 941 Eighth Street, Boulder, Colo., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for injuries sustained as a result of being wounded by a bullet fired by Gino Morello, while a passenger on a train of the Denver & Fort Worth Railroad near Memphis, Tex., on May 7, 1944, the said Gino Morello being a military prisoner in the custody of military police at the time said shot was fired: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,657.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

B. H. SPANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2884) for the relief of B. H. Spann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to B. H. Spann, of Claxton, Ga., the sum of $5,000,

in full satisfaction of all claims of said B. H. Spann for damages for personal injuries sustained by him when struck by a vehicle of the United States Army near Reidsville, Ga., on May 19, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "claims", insert "against the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JANET McKILIP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2901) for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKilip.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Mrs. Janet McKilip, West Albany, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle at approximately stop 31½ in front of No. 1520 Central Avenue, town of Colonie, Albany County, N. Y., on April 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,438.52."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "McKilip" and insert "McKillip."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKillip."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOBBY MESSICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2974) for the relief of Bobby Messick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legally qualified representative of the estate of Bobby Messick, deceased, of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Bobby Messick who was instantly killed on September 18, 1943, when struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 41, 6 miles south of Murfreesboro, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE W. AND KIRBY MURRELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3012) for the relief of George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,437.60, to George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor, of Elizabeth, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses incident thereto, and as compensation for the death of their wife and mother, Mrs. Mamie Murrell, as the result of a collision with a United States Army vehicle about 5 miles south of Alexandria, La., on United States Highway No. 165, on June 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "George W. Murrell", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 7 to 11, inclusive, and on page 2, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", the sum of $2,045 to George W. Murrell as natural tutor of Kirby Murrell, a minor, and the sum of $5,407.95 to the estate of Mamie W. Murrell, deceased, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage and personal injuries sustained, for medical, hospital, burial, and dental expenses incurred and required, and for the death of Mamie W. Murrell, as a result of the collision of an Army vehicle with an automobile operated by George W. Murrell, near Alexandria, La., on June 4, 1944;."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY ELIZABETH MONTAGUE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Elizabeth Montague, New London, Conn., the sum of $52.74, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from New London, Conn., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by Members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM CLYDE McKINNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3454) for the relief of the legal guardian of William Clyde McKinney, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of William Clyde McKinney, a minor, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as the result of a collision with a Government truck on Frio City Road, San Antonio, Tex., on February 20, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,709.64."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "to", strike out "the legal guardian of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "a minor" and insert "of San Antonio, Tex."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Government" and insert "United States Army."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of William Clyde McKinney."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED C. LITER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3554) for the relief of Fred C. Liter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to Fred C. Liter, of Harrisonville, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle, on February 22, 1945, near Neosho, Mo.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,141.80."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Neosho" and insert "Harrisonville."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. MARTIN TURPANJIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3641) for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500, to M. Martin Turpanjian, of Allendale, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Liberty Road and Tenafly Road, Englewood, N. J., on February 13, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "$2,500" and insert "$1,186."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. TOM STEPHENSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3677) for the relief of J. Tom Stephenson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Tom Stephenson, Marianna, Fla., the sum of $152.40. Such sum represents the amount of fees earned by the said J. Tom Stephenson for services rendered as United States commissioner, Northern District of Florida, during the quarter ending October 31, 1943, and quarter ending January 31, 1944, but not paid because the account covering such services was not rendered within the time prescribed by law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the period, strike out the balance of the line to and including the word "Stephenson" on line 7 and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS JACQUELINE FRIEDRICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miss Jacqueline Friedrich, San Jacinto, Calif., the sum of $27.80. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Miss Jacqueline Friedrich against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from San Jacinto, Calif., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service Pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. FRANK JAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2769) for the relief of C. Frank James.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Frank James, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of his claim against the United States arising out of the death of his minor son, John Ronald James, resulting from an accident involving a United States Army truck on the Goldsboro-Kenly Highway, near Goldsboro, N. C., on Oct. 13, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,364."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE MERSMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3791) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Florence Mersman the sum of $3,833, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses, and losses sustained by her as a result of an Army truck striking the automobile in which she was riding at the intersection of Western Avenue and Marathon Street in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on April 16, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,833" and insert "$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM N. THERRIAULT AND MILLICENT THERRIAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3808) for the relief of the estate of William N. Thierriault and Millicent Therriault.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault, of Fall River, Mass., the sum of $11,425, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault, as the result of being struck by a United States Post Office vehicle on Union Street near Columbia Street in Fall River, Mass., on October 1, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA BARGER ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following-named persons the amount specified in the case of such person, in full satisfaction of his or her claim against the United States for the injury indicated in each case resulting from the explosions which occurred at the naval ammunition depot, Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944:

Ida Barger, for the loss of an eye and lacerations of the forehead, the sum of $6,113.34;

Hazel A. Beecher, for the loss of an eye, $7,351.41;

Etta Clark, for the loss of an eye and permanent facial scars, $5,000;

Jesse Ruth France, for the loss of an eye, $6,465.51;

John W. Nolan, for the loss of both eyes and partial paralysis of the right arm, resulting in total disability, the sum of $28,008.16;

Anna Palubicki, for the loss of vision of left eye, $3,812.05;

Frank J. Schrom, for the loss of vision of right eye, $6,971.55.

No part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ACCEPT BRITISH EMPIRE MEDALS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett, employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, be authorized to accept and wear British Empire medals, civilian division, tendered by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI, in recognition of their gallant services in rescuing four crew members from a crashed and burning Canadian bomber in September 1942, and that the Department of State is hereby authorized and permitted to deliver the above medals to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EVELYN MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2927) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Mrs. Evelyn Merritt, of route 1, New Augusta, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, property damage, and loss of earning sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which she was riding and a United States Army truck in Camp Shelby, Miss., on December 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

Line 8 strike out "medical and hospital expenses, property damage,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELI RICHMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2644) for the relief of Eli Richmond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eli Richmond, of Oakdale, La., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Eli Richmond against the United States for personal injuries, sustained as the result of a collision on January 26, 1944, on United States highway No. 165, near Kinder, La., involving the truck in which he was a passenger and a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,672."

Line 8, after "injuries", insert a comma and the following: "medical, hospital, nursing expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAMSAH OMAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 233) for the relief of Hamsah Omar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proceedings and orders requiring the deportation of Hamsah Omar, of Detroit, Mich., who entered the United States of America from Mexico at El Paso, Tex., on March 10, 1940, be canceled and set aside, and that said entry be considered a legal entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE MAUDRAME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2809) for the relief of Theodore Maudrame.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission into the United States for permanent residence of Theodore Maudrame as of December 9, 1924, the date on which he last entered the United States: *Provided*, That he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to inadmissibility because of racial ineligibility.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH MRAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Joseph Mrak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the immigration laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Joseph Mrak, of Johnstown, Pa., to remain permanently in the United States if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than quotas.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the adminis-

tration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest against Joseph Mrak, of Johnstown, Pa., heretofore issued on the grounds that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained and that he shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on October 20, 1939. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Yugoslavian quota for the first year that the said Yugoslavian quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERMAN TRAHN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of Herman Trahn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C. 303), Herman Trahn, of 65 Park Terrace East, New York, N. Y., may be permitted to become a naturalized citizen of the United States if he can otherwise meet all the requirements of existing law relating to naturalization.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, before "Herman", insert "and the provisions of Public Law 205, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 29, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALVADOR LORENZ FERNANDEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2546) for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Salvador Lorenz Fernandez, 117 West One Hundred and Sixteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., (file number 560019/657), who has resided continuously in the United States since 1925 and whose wife and six children are citizens and residents of the United States, and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants or orders are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act, or are based on the fact that such alien was not entitled to have been admitted to the United States, as a quota or nonquota immigrant, for permanent residence.

EDGAR KAIGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 207) for the relief of Edgar Kaigler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edgar Kaigler, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the sum of $5,213.79, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the death of Lela Morris, the mother of Edgar Kaigler, the said Lela Morris having been killed on September 10, 1943, when a United States Navy airplane, SBD-4, bureau number 10371, crashed into the home of Lela Morris, on 425 Maple Street, Daytona Beach, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,213.79" and insert "$2,713.79."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BESSIE S. EDMONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 873) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds, widow of the late Lt. Comdr. Samuel P. Edmonds, United States Coast Guard, retired, of Pass Christian, Miss., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the use of certain life-saving-equipment patents, which have been, and are now being, used by the United States Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilt of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

B. PENDINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1315) for the relief of B. Pendino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to B. Pendino the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injury to said B. Pendino, on November 1, 1943, as a result of negligence in the operation of an Army vehicle in the city of Tampa, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,641.92."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "for", strike out the bill down to the word ": *Provided*," and insert in lieu thereof "personal injuries and loss of wages sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck in Tampa, Fla., on November 1, 1943."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GORDON T. GORHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

To the estate of Gordon T. Gorham, deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Florence M. Gorham, deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Rita M. Robertson, deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of George J. Robertson, Jr., deceased, late of Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Edna May Hume, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of John William Hume, dedeceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Clarence S. Hume, Jr., deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Virginia Mae Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Edward Alfred Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Roberta Mae Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Rose M. Gerrish, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Virginia Warren, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Jennie C. Allen, deceased, late of Windham, Maine;

To the estate of Shirley M. Brown, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Hazel M. Little, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of Nancy Lee Little, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

To the estate of James McGuire, also known as James Little, deceased, late of South Portland, Maine;

the sum of $10,000 to each of the aforesaid estates respectively, in full satisfaction and settlement of all claims against the United States for the deaths and injuries of each of the aforestated decedents, caused by the crash of a United States Army bomber into and onto the dwellings occupied by the aforesaid persons on the date of July 11, 1944, at South Portland, Maine; and that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated—

To George J. Robertson, Sr., of Portland, Maine, $5,000 for personal injuries and loss of wages;

To guardian of John E. Gerrish, of Orono, Maine, $10,000 for personal injuries;

To guardian of Marian Rose Gerrish, of Orono, Maine, $10,000 for personal injuries;

To Jennie Bassett, of Pittsfield, Vt., $10,000 for personal injuries; and for expenses incurred as result of injuries, not including medical expenses;

To guardian of Vina J. Hannan, of South Portland, Maine, the sum of $25,000 for personal injuries, loss of wages, and hospital bills,

said sums to be in full satisfaction and settlement of all of their respective claims against the United States not otherwise claimed of or paid by the War Department under statutory claims resulting from and caused by the crash of a United States Army bomber into and onto the dwellings of aforesaid persons on the date of July 11, 1944, at South Portland, Maine: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 1, line 9, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 1, line 11, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 2, line 2, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."
Page 2, line 4, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 2, line 6, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."
Page 2, line 8, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $7,500."
Page 2, line 10, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 2, line 12, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 2, line 14, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $2,000."
Page 2, line 16, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."
Page 2, line 18, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 2, line 20, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $5,000."
Page 2, line 22, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $7,500."
Page 2, line 24, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $7,000."
Page 3, line 2, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."
Page 3, line 4, after the name "Maine", insert ", the sum of $1,500."
Page 3, line 5, strike out "the sum of $10,000", insert in lieu thereof "the sums."
Page 3, line 5, after the word "to", strike out "each of."
Page 3, line 15, strike out the figures "$5,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,000."
Page 3, line 17, strike out the figures "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."
Page 3, line 19, strike out the figures "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."
Page 3, line 20, strike out the figures "$10,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,000."
Page 4, line 1, strike out the figures "$25,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$7,500."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment:

On page 2, line 9, strike out the sum "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."
Page 2, line 23, strike out the sum "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."
Page 2, line 25, strike out the sum "$7,000" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment to the committee amendments was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 3, line 21, strike out the name "Rose" and insert in lieu thereof the name of "Anne."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN BUCHAN AND LAWRENCE GILLINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of John Buchan and to pay the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of Lawrence Gillingham, all of 337 Forty-fourth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., for personal injuries sustained by the minors when they were struck by an automobile driven by an employee of the United States Department of Justice, on January 27, 1942, at Fourth Avenue near Thirty-seventh Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,300."
Line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$1,034."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE V. SWEENEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2251) for the relief of Catherine V. Sweeney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Catherine V. Sweeney, of Utica, N. Y., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Catherine V. Sweeney against the United States on account of the serious and permanent personal injury sustained by her on October 1, 1943, in the town of Cicero, N. Y., when an automobile in which she was a passenger was struck by an Army truck of the Syracuse Army Air Base, bearing license No. 3152053 and operated by Pfc. Joseph J. George: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. F. DILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2596) for the relief of M. F. Diller.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CHARLIE POWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2724) for the relief of Charlie Powell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie Powell, Castalian Springs, Tenn., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on March 3, 1944, by Forest Eldon Powell, minor son of the said Charlie Powell, as a result of the explosion of a fuse for a tank mine which had been left near the school attended by the said Forest Eldon Powell by United States Army forces on maneuvers.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "Charlie" and insert "the legal guardian of Forest Eldon."
Line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,500."
Line 9, strike out "son of the said Charlie Powell."
Page 2, line 2, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Forest Eldon Powell."

R. H. SINDLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of R. H. Sindle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. H. Sindle, Gallatin, Tenn., the sum of $101.54. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said R. H. Sindle against the United States for the loss of, and damage to, certain personal property owned by him as the result of acts of depredation committed by members of the United States Army on March 22, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GISELLA SANTE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3124) for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Gisella Sante, South Bend, Ind., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Gisella Sante against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Ignace Sante, who died on March 30, 1945, as the result of injuries sustained on March 29, 1945, when he was struck by a United States mail truck in the driveway of his home in South Bend, Ind.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEONARD J. FOX AND MILFORD G. FOX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3158) for the relief of Leonard J. Fox and Milford G. Fox, a partnership, doing business as Fox Co.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MRS. LESLIE PRICE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3229) for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Leslie Price the sum of $1,557.50; to Philip C. Price, the sum of $1,309.50; to Annie Curry, the sum of $1,000; to James Curry, the sum of $1,150.20; all of Donovan, Ga.; and to Mrs. Louise Keyton, of Wrightsville, Ga., the sum of $1,090, in full settlement of all claims for personal injuries, medical expenses, property damage, and loss of earnings as the result of a collision of a car belonging to Mrs. Leslie Price and an Army vehicle on April 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures $1,557.50" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,007.50."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$1,307.50" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$807.50."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$1,000" and "$1,150.20", respectively, and insert "$567.19" and "$656.26", respectively.

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$1,090" and insert figures "$590."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. WAYNE E. MEISENHEIMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3285) for the relief of Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $177.50 to Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer, of Wingate ordnance depot, Gallup, N Mex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of travel expense from Aruba, Netherlands West Indies, to Miami, Fla., in November 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. H. BRUMFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3784) for the relief of C. H. Brumfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. H. Brumfield, Chicago, Ill., the sum of $25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said C. H. Brumfield against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained on August 31, 1943, when an automobile owned and driven by him was in collision with a United States Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 2, near Devils Lake, N. Dak. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,790."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries," insert "hospital and medical expenses, and loss of earnings."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EUNICE C. HARDAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3834) for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Eunice C. Hardage, widow of Newton G. Hardage, former rural mail carrier, at Dallas, Ga., whose death occurred on January 8, 1936, and her claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the United States Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, or within that time renews her claim heretofore filed which has been denied because of failure to comply with said provisions of said act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "death" insert "of pneumonia."

Page 1, line 11, after the figure "1936", insert "alleged to have been caused by exposure."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. R. STONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4116) for the relief of M. R. Stone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of M. R. Stone, of Huntington, W. Va., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said Act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been sustained in February or March 1938, while performing his duties at Huntington Veterans' Hospital, West Virginia: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "injury", strike out the words "and disability" and insert "to his hip and leg."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "act:", insert "*Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue hereunder prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN P. RADCLIFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Franklin P. Radcliffe, of Huntington, W. Va., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been sustained on or about March 19, 1938, while performing his duties as fireman at the United States Veterans' Hospital, West Virginia: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "disability", insert "caused from a hernia."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "Act", insert ": *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY DELGADO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Lucy Delgado.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,570 to Lucy Delgado, who was seriously injured on June 11, 1944, when a United States Army truck overturned on Insular Highway No. 25, between Cataño and Santurce, P. R. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Delgado", strike out all down to and including the word "accident" in line 11, and insert "and to pay the sum of $750 to Irma M. Delgado, both of Puerto Rico, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as the result of an accident which occurred on June 11, 1944, on Insular Highway No. 25 between Cataño and Santurce, P. R., and which involved a United States Army truck in which they were riding:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lucy Delgado and Irma M. Delgado."

IDA F. BRAUN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1782) for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MRS. LUCILLE SCARLETT AND CHARLES SCARLETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3698) for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Scarlett and Charles Scarlett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lucille Scarlett, Cookeville, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, and to Charles Scarlett, Cookeville, Tenn., the sum of $175. The payment of such sum of $5,000 shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Lucille Scarlett against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on October 18, 1943, when the automobile in which she was a passenger was in collision with a United States Army truck at the intersection of United States Highway No. 70–N, Scott Street, and Buffalo Valley Road in Cookeville, Tenn. The payment of such sum of $175 shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles Scarlett against the United States for damage to his automobile as the result of such collision: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONOLULU PLANTATION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2688) to provide compensation to Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, as compensation for damages sustained.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, having its principal properties and operations in the Territory of Hawaii, the sum of $3,250,000, as compensation for the damages to and the loss of property sustained by said company to its mill, water system, and other properties of its enterprise by reason of the expropriation by the United States of America of divers lands held under leases owned and operated by this company as an integral part of its enterprise, in full and complete satisfaction of all claims of said company against the United States of America: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection herewith, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims, notwithstanding any prior determination, statute, or decision, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, for damages to its real property, mill, water system, remaining leasehold, and other enterprise properties not expropriated by the United States Government, and located on the island of Oahu, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the depreciation in the market value thereof arising out of the expropriations by the United States of divers lands upon which said claimant held leases, in proceedings wherein said lands were condemned in the United States District Court in and for the Territory of Hawaii; and

designated as civil Nos. 416, 430, 434, 436, 442, 452, 514, 525, 529, 533, 535, 544, and 548.

"SEC. 2. The damage to be ascertained and adjudged shall be the difference in the fair market value of the fee lands, mill, and other enterprise properties of said claimant as the same existed in 1936, prior to the filing of the aforesaid condemnation suits, and as the same remained in 1945 after the severance and loss of the beneficial use of said leased lands of said claimant condemned and expropriated by the United States as aforesaid.

"SEC. 3. Any suit brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 1 year after the date of approval of this act; and from any decision or judgment rendered in any suit commenced under authority of this act, a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States may be applied for by either party thereto as provided by law in other cases. All testimony adduced before and all documents and evidence received by the subcommittee of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives shall be competent evidence of said damages and shall be received upon the record thereof made before said committee, as fully and to the same extent as though the witnesses were present and without further proof and certification."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Honolulu Plantation Co."

FRANTISEK JIRI BOVELEK OR GEORG BOVELEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4381) for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Frantisek Jiri Bovelek or Georg Bovelek, who arrived at the port of Boston on September 21, 1945, as a stowaway, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States notwithstanding the fact that he was found to be inadmissible on the sole grounds that he arrived as a stowaway and was without proper immigration documentation. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Czechoslovakian quota of the first year that the same Czechoslovakian quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Bovelek" and insert "Pavlik."

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "Bovelek" and insert "Pavlik."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik."

NATALE PIAVALLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3787) for the relief of Natale Piavallo, also known as Natale Kiecieck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Natale Piavallo, heretofore issued on the grounds that on July 11, 1945, admission to the United States had been illegally obtained, and thereupon Natale Kiecieck shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at Boston, Mass., on July 11, 1945.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the alien Bozic Kisic, also known as Natale Piavallo, and other names, at Boston, Massachusets, on July 11, 1945, on the Navy Transport *General T. H. Bliss*, notwithstanding the provisions of the immigration laws of the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of the appropriate nation when such quota number becomes available. Nothing in this act shall prevent the deportation of the said alien for any cause under the immigration laws arising subsequent to his admission for permanent residence on July 11, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR UNRRA

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 444, Rept. No. 1332), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, an amendment prohibiting the use of funds involved in the bill H. R. 4649 in countries that refuse free access to examination of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration operations by representatives of the United States press and radio. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INCREASE OF PERSONNEL IN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 393 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the comprehensive bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs by a unanimous vote. The House, and the country, too, are indeed fortunate that the Committee on Naval Affairs has such an able chairman who seems to be—not only seems to be but I believe is—one of the best posted men in the United States. The House, therefore, has always shown real confidence—and I know I have—in any legislation he reports. The gentleman from Georiga [Mr. VINSON] is present, and is ready to explain the need for the increase of Navy personnel. I presume we have a great many splendid vessels that the Navy cannot man because of the lack of personnel. That is the underlying reason for bringing this legislation before the House today. I know it is not intended as a threat to any other nation. I hope the people of this country, and people the world over will realize that it is not intended for the purpose of having the greatest Navy in the world, although we have it anyway, for purposes of war but that it will be used by our Nation for purposes of peace. I know the aim of the President, and the American people and its leaders, is to provide cooperation, harmony, and peace to the troubled world.

There have been those who have been trying to create the impression in the United States that we have a chip on our shoulder and are ready to fight. They are using every pretext for the purpose of creating this impression, which is unfortunate. These same men and organizations have precluded us from preparing in order to avoid the last World War. They are the same people who opposed preparedness; in fact, in my opinion, their activities were responsible for our

being forced into the recent war because they led Hitler and Japan to believe that we would not be in position to defend ourselves or to protect our democratic form of government.

The people of the world must recognize that our form of government is the best in the world. We have a great country and a great people and we do not desire to take advantage of any nation or peoples at any time. All we ask is that fair play and justice prevail.

I do not think there will be any opposition to this rule, which will be further explained by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I will conclude with the statement that the rule provides for 2 hours' general debate, it is an open rule and I hope that it will be adopted by unanimous vote and that the bill will also be adopted by unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is no explanation of the rule necessary further than the last sentence of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. This is an open rule. The bill will be read under the 5-minute rule. All germane amendments will be in order. There is no gag to it, there is no nauseation in connection with the rule. I know of no reason why we should not proceed at once to the consideration of the bill.

The only difference between this bill and the average bill is that the first section suggests a policy only. That section has no vitality. It bears about the same relation to the rest of the bill that the "whereas" clause has to a resolution which it precedes. Possibly the remainder of the bill implements the speech in the first section.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the chairman of Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say the first section of the bill was read to the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy at the other end of the Avenue, and he said it was the best language in the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not surprised at that. If the Army and Navy can get Congress to state a policy in a bill without binding provisions, but with authority to act, that is more satisfactory because it has more flexibility; therefore, I am not surprised to hear that the best part of the bill, so far as the Army and Navy are concerned, is the part which binds no one, where there is an opportunity to exercise discretion.

Mr. VINSON. I differ with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, because this is a fixed policy and the policy is binding and the policy is so positive that it is going to be followed literally by the department.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will see that that is done, as long as he is chairman. The uncertainty lies in the fact that the Congress changes, the heads of the departments change, the heads of the Army and Navy change, and unless there is language in the law which speaks specifically, the next administrator does not always interpret the law as it was intended to be interpreted, and as it can be interpreted if discretion is lodged in an administrative office. As usual, the persuasiveness of the gentleman from Georgia prevails.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4421, with Mr. WORLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on the floor of House Concurrent Resolution 80, the question was raised as to why that resolution which set forth the sense of Congress as to the number of ships for the postwar Navy did not also set forth the number of personnel to man the postwar Navy. H. R. 4421 is the answer to that question, as it blueprints the permanent authorized enlisted and officer strength of the Regular postwar Navy. It is a proposed statutory basis for meeting the postwar personnel requirements of the Navy.

To accomplish this objective, provision is made—

First. For an increase in the permanent authorized strength of the Regular Navy to 500,000 and of the Marine Corps to 100,000;

Second. For an increase in the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps from 5½ to 8 percent of the authorized enlisted strength; and

Third. For the appointment of officers in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps from the enlisted ranks and the temporary and Reserve officers.

Manning of the postwar Navy raises three basic questions: First, how many men does the Navy need? Second, what kind of men does the Navy need? And, third, how can the Navy get these men?

HOW MANY MEN DOES THE NAVY NEED?

The present authorized strength of the Regular Navy, as set by the act of April 22, 1941, Public Law 39, Seventy-seventh Congress, is 232,000. This strength must be more than doubled if the Navy is to be able to fulfill its function of national security and its proper participation in the global responsibility of this country to keep the peace. The Navy needs 500,000 enlisted men and 58,000 officers. The Marine Corps needs 100,000 enlisted men and 8,000 officers.

These totals are not mere guesses. They are based upon detailed analyses by the men of the fleet, the men who have to do the job, the men who know what the job requires.

These analyses have been prepared and set forth on pages 1367 to 1415 of the hearings of the Committee on Naval Affairs on the postwar Navy. They give the proposed personnel distribution ship-by-ship and station-by-station. They lay the cards of the Navy on the table face up.

I also call your attention to page 29 of the committee's report on House Concurrent Resolution 80, which gives total personnel requirement statistics according to types of ships and the three components of the postwar fleet.

For the fleet, the Navy will need 27,560 officers and 314,000 enlisted men. This need is on the basis of a ship complement of only 70 percent of wartime strength in the active fleet, as compared to 90 percent wartime complement of the pre-Pearl Harbor Fleet.

For the shore establishments, the Navy will need 23,934 officers and 151,000 enlisted men. Of these numbers, 4,047 officers and 43,890 enlisted men will be stationed outside of the continental United States; 19,887 officers and 107,110 enlisted men will be stationed in this country.

The training program will require 3,500 officers and 30,000 enlisted men. As this is the key to the desired quality of naval personnel, the training establishments must be adequately manned.

As between the floating Navy and the flying Navy, 22,000 line officers will be required to man the ships and 17,000 officers to man the planes. Naval aviation will also require 120,000 enlisted men.

WHAT KIND OF MEN DOES THE NAVY NEED?

What kind of men does the Navy need? The answer is not the obvious and easy one—the very best men—because we must know what constitutes the "very best."

The Navy needs not only men of the best capabilities but also men of the best attitudes. This means men who want to make the Navy a career.

Our great technical development has placed growing emphasis on mental capacity rather than physical prowess. It has increased the need for men with aptitudes to fight with machines rather than with their fists. It has resulted in greater mental demands upon the enlisted men of the Navy. And it has given the enlisted men a better chance to be commissioned as officers.

The increased ratio of officer strength from 5½ to 8 percent is due partly to the wide use in modern warfare of technical equipment which must be operated by personnel possessing higher skills, and partly to the development of aviation and the consequent demand for flying officers.

In other words, it is "brains" rather than "brawn" which will operate the postwar Navy.

HOW CAN THE NAVY GET THESE MEN?

In the first place, the Navy cannot get the necessary number of men unless the Congress passes this bill. But then the practical question arises.

Enlisted men can be obtained by either, first, voluntary enlistments or, second, the draft. The Navy prefers the recruiting by voluntary enlistment and has no desire to use the draft. At the present time the Navy recruiting program is proceeding most satisfactorily and enlistments are ahead of the schedule which calls for full strength of 500,000 by September 1, 1946.

This encouraging progress is being made because the Navy has adopted measures which make the naval service attractive. Security and opportunity for technical training and advancement have given the Navy definite career aspects.

However, such is not quite the case as to the meeting of requirements for naval officers. The Navy now has 12,000 Regular officers. It will need 28,000 Reserve officers to transfer to the Regular Navy. The present immediate need is 17,000 Reserve officers.

The long-term permanent staffing of the Regular Navy with officers will be through three principal sources: First, the Naval Academy; second, NROTC colleges; and third, promotion from the enlisted ranks.

It is of the utmost importance that the need for additional officers from sources other than the Naval Academy be clearly realized, and that every effort be made to convince those contemplating transfer from the Reserve to the Regular Navy that there will be equality of opportunity regardless of the source from which such persons entered the Regular Navy.

The required officer strength for the postwar Navy can be met only by the transfer of a sufficient number of Reserve and temporary officers to a permanent status in the Regular Navy.

The Navy and the Marine Corps at the present time have a supply of seasoned Reserve and temporary officers who are excellent material for appointment to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps. It is realized that everything possible must be accomplished toward preventing unfairness and partiality in the matter of promotions, positions, and assignments, including proportionate representation on selection boards and attendance at the Naval War College and other such institutions.

What is of interest to you and the public is that this bill assures a square deal for Reserve and temporary officers who go into the Regular service.

The committee has attempted, by everything humanly possible, to eliminate the possibility of discrimination and to make a career in the Regular Navy a proposition which will attract these men.

In deciding whether or not to transfer to the Regular Navy, these men have three things uppermost in their minds:

First. They want to go home to think it over—to discuss it with their wives or parents;

Second. They want a trial period during which time, if they decide that they do not want to stay in the Regular Navy after having transferred to it, they can resign from the Regular Navy; and

Third. They want concrete assurances of equal opportunities for advancement and assignments.

With respect to the first desire, the Navy has provided that the men will be given 6 months after release to inactive duty within which to make their application to transfer to the Regular Navy. This provides ample time to think it over and to talk it over with the folks.

With respect to the second desire, the Navy has provided that any reservist or temporary officer who transfers to the Regular Navy may offer his resignation which will be automatically accepted before January 1, 1947.

This bill attempts to satisfy the third desire for assurances of equal opportunities and treatment with the Regulars. You cannot legislate for promotions—but you can legislate for the basis of promotions. In the hearings on this bill the committee demanded and received assurances from the Navy Department that satisfaction of this third desire of those contemplating transfer to the Regular Navy would be guaranteed.

The key to this very matter, which asserts itself at the meetings of the selection board, is the education and training of the men being considered for selection to higher grades. In order that the Reserve and temporary officers who become Regulars can compete with the old Regulars, the committee has obtained the commitment of the Navy Department to give these men all the training that is necessary to put them on a par with the Regulars. In other words, so that the selection board could not justify its failure to promote the transferees because they had not had the training that the Regulars had.

H. R. 4421 makes the following additional provisions which I have not discussed:

First. Any higher temporary rank held by Reserve or temporary officers transferring to the Regular Navy or Marine Corps would be preserved in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps as long as temporary appointments are continued under existing law;

Second. The fixing of standards and qualifications for appointment to the several grades and ranks by regulations prescribed by the President;

Third. Each person appointed to officer rank, who had accrued leave to his credit, would be granted such leave subsequent to his appointment, without loss of pay or allowances; and

Fourth. The clarification of several existing laws relating to the authorized strength of the Navy, thus removing confusion resulting from the multiplicity of statutes on the same subject matter.

This bill is timely legislation. It will assure a well-planned and orderly transfer program. It is a recognition of the admirable performance of the temporary and Reserve officers during the war as well as the Nation's continued need for the services of these persons.

Mr. Chairman, this bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs after a great many days of hearings was reported to the House by direction of the committee by the distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. I yield the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] 30 minutes for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, this bill has two primary purposes. First it will authorize the personnel strength of the Regular Navy adequate to man the postwar Navy which we provided for under House Concurrent Resolution 80 which we passed a few weeks ago. Second, it will authorize appointments to commissioned rank in the Regular Navy in order to provide officers necessary to man that postwar fleet. As you know, at the present time we have the temporary officers, the Reserve officers, and the Regular officers. We propose in this bill to do away with the temporary officers and the Reserve officers, and have but one officer group, the line of the Regular Navy. Under existing law the size of the Navy is held to 232,000 men. Under this bill we provide for 500,000 men. The commitments that we have made I think are well known to the members of the committee. We have provided in our composition of the postwar Navy for the placing in reserve of all those ships that we do not need, and we have conscientiously gone through the list and figured out the number of ships which we must keep in use and which will require a postwar navy enlisted personnel of 500,000 men. The officers for the fleet have heretofore been based on 5½ percent of the enlisted strength, but owing to the fact that we need a great number of naval aviators and a great number of highly technical men to man radar fire control and the latest equipment, we have found it necessary to increase the proportionate strength to 8 percent, so we will require a strength of about 58,000 officers and 500,000 men. Incidentally, this is over and above the number required for the Marine Corps which is, as it formerly was, based on 20 percent of the strength of the Navy. That will mean 100,000 men in the Marine Corps. As I say, the 500,000 is the number required to man the postwar fleet at 70 percent of wartime complement in the active fleet, 20 to 30 percent of the wartime complement in the ready fleet, and with just sufficient personnel for the preservation of the ships of the reserve fleet.

We will require about 17,000 Reserve officers and temporary officers to be blended into the Regular Navy. This is the first time any such effort was made to have the officer personnel of the Navy supplied from other sources than the Naval Academy. I think it is worthy of note that the postwar Navy will be manned by almost 50 percent Reserve and temporary officers and 50 percent regulars. As a continuing program, it is our hope and intention that we shall be able to work out an educational program

whereby we shall have about 50 percent of the officer strength of the Navy supplied by the Naval Academy and 50 percent by the naval ROTC, and other sources.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that he intended that this bill provide for the medium through which the Navy will obtain eventually 50 percent of the regular officer personnel from the Academy and 50 percent from other sources?

Mr. IZAC. No; not in this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wanted to make sure that this bill does not cover that.

Mr. IZAC. This bill does not, but I want to point out that we will perhaps in the future never depart from that policy of approximately 50 percent Reserves, or those who were formerly Reserves and temporaries, and 50 percent regulars.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The bill that is pending does provide, however, that you will take 17,000 Reserve officers and temporary officers now in the service and put them into the Regular Navy?

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. You make them regular officers of the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. Of the line of the Navy.

Mr. SHORT. Would the gentleman take time to explain to the Members just how these officers are to be chosen and what rank they shall be given? What standard or criterion will be used in order to determine the rank?

Mr. IZAC. I will be very glad to do that, because that is the crux of this whole bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Before the gentleman makes his explanation to the gentleman from Missouri, may I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that under the law today no officer in the Naval Reserve can be transferred to the Regular Navy unless he first is a graduate of a Naval ROTC or the Navy V–12 program. Therefore, a large number of Reserve officers in the United States Navy today could not become members of the Regular Navy without legislation.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. It is also true, is it not, from the experience of the recent war that some of our best and most efficient officers were Reserve and temporary officers?

Mr. IZAC. I think the Reserves gave a very creditable performance in this war. While I think comparisons are odious, for we hate to say that this officer is as good as that one or is better than this one, I think, generally speaking, the Reserve officers did do an excellent job. While you had to have that leaven of Regulars in command posts and for training purposes, the young officers who came in from civil life did give an excellent accounting of themselves.

Mr. SHORT. But as the able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has stated, in order to get the required number of officers to man the 70 to 80 percent of the ships in our postwar period it will be necessary to enact this legislation.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I feel that the gentleman's knowledge of this bill is probably equal to that of anyone on the committee or in the House. I hope that when he gives the explanation the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has asked for he will go into detail with respect to the opportunities which are being afforded to warrant and chief warrant officers in the Regular Navy to retain permanent commissioned rank in the postwar Navy.

Mr. SHORT. That is what we want to know.

Mr. IZAC. I will go into the matter of the temporary officers, the enlisted men who have been graded up and given promotions, the warrant officers, and of course the V–5, the V–12, and the other young men who came in from civil life.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was quite interested to hear the gentleman speak concerning the commissioned personnel of the Navy who were either of the enlisted rank or of the chief petty officer rank who have been promoted temporarily during the period of the war. I am quite eager to have the gentleman, if he will, explain just what is going to happen to those individuals.

Mr. IZAC. I shall be glad to go into that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that 90 percent of the men on the ships in the Pacific were the Reserves? I was given those figures by the Navy Department in the past.

Mr. IZAC. The commissioned officers?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and the men also.

Mr. IZAC. I think it was about 87 percent or 90 percent of the officers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know how many of the Reserve officers want to stay in the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. There is no indication. I understand the opinion in the Navy Department is that most of the Reserve officers are waiting for the passage of this legislation before they determine whether they want to stay in the Navy and make it a career.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Referring to the gentleman's statement that in the future it is planned that half of the Regular officers of the Navy will come from the Academy and the other half from other sources, I hope the gentleman will emphasize that that is the present recommendation of the Navy Department and does not reflect the opinion of the committee.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct. It has been proposed by the Navy Department. In fact, there is a board which has been set up in the Navy Department on several occasions. The recommendations of the last board were to that effect, that we would have about half of our commissioned personnel from the Naval Academy and the other half from civil life, that is, from the colleges and ROTC.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I compliment the committee for bringing this bill out at this time, particularly in view of the provisions of the bill which is proposed for passage. I sincerely trust it will pass the House and the other branch of the Congress. My subcommittee is going to have an opportunity to consider appropriations for the Navy Department and we feel very grateful for having a chance to consider such legislation.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The Naval Affairs Committee has been working on this bill and several complementary bills ever since we came back in September, knowing that the men of the Navy and the officers of the Navy cannot make any decision until they know what they can expect through legislation. That is the reason we have tried so hard to bring this up as early as possible.

Mr. SHORT. Unless the legislation is quickly enacted, many of these very able officers who are now being discharged and leaving the naval service will go into private business or industry and they will be lost to the service of their country.

Mr. IZAC. That is right. But after the passage of this act, we provide for 6 months during which they may come back and retain the same rank that they held when they were placed on inactive duty.

Mr. SHORT. That is, the men who have already been discharged from the naval service?

Mr. IZAC. They will have 6 months.

Mr. SHORT. They will be given equal opportunity and the same consideration?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. They will be given the same consideration as the other Reserve and temporary officers who have stayed on?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is a very fair provision. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the other members of his committee.

Mr. IZAC. I am sure the gentleman will be glad to hear that when those men, whether they are now out or are still in the Navy, are placed in the lineal list of the Navy they go in exactly where they

stand today. Even though they go from the Reserves into the Regular Navy, they retain their same place on the lineal list and they do not suffer in loss of rank. Eventually, all may suffer, but if they do it will be Regulars as well as the Reservists. In other words, we are making one lineal list and one line of promotion in the Navy. Men who are now lieutenants, junior grade, commanders, or whatever they may be, take their place alongside of the Regulars of the same date of commission. The commissions, as everyone knows, have been temporary all during the war.

Mr. SHORT. Has your committee given credit on the basis of age or length of service?

Mr. IZAC. The rank that they attain, regardless of the age. However, when it comes time to make a decision in the case of temporary officers, such as warrants, who had a good many more years of service and were therefore older, they provided for 5 years beyond the normal period for those men to be eligible to be retained in the Regular Navy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. In response to the thought in the mind of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] the law now dealing with the question of age and credit, unless that is changed, will apply to all those who come in. In other words, an officer from the Reserves who transfers to the Regular Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander, if he is of a certain age he will be automatically kept in that rank, but there will also be the law of the age and credit which will apply to every officer who comes in. But the objective here is to try to keep as many in the present grade, when the transfer comes, as possible.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct, with the exception of the fact that the warrant officers do have the advantage of the 5 years.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In case of a Reserve officer who has not yet had recognition and yet has been doing important work, will an increase in rank be in order for him when he comes into the Regular Navy? Some officers have had hard luck. They have been doing very important work but have not received promotions. They have not been passed over, yet they have not received the recognition due them.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, I cannot say what is going to happen in the case of an individual officer, but I do not see how they can go down and pick up an officer who has not received a promotion at the same time his running mates did.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But I mean, through hard luck sometimes an officer does not go up, yet he has not been passed over by any selection board.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, we have had no promotions of that type during the war. Everything has been temporary promotions. While it is true it was by selection, and they do have panels sitting here in Washington to go over the records of the officers, they were supposed to pick up everybody except those who did not have a good record.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find there are a good many who have not, but who had good records.

Mr. IZAC. On the other hand, I do not know how we could correct that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman wants to correct all injustices, especially to the Reserve men who have gone into the service and given up fine positions in the outside world. It is pretty difficult sometimes to get back to them.

Mr. IZAC. But I still think we must adhere to some such plan as is incorporated in this bill where, if an officer is a lieutenant, he goes in as a lieutenant. He is not placed in a group of commanders. I do not think it would be fair.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman might just as well inform the Committee that, while we provide for transfer, we do not provide for promotions after the man is transferred. But we do give him equal opportunity by postgraduate work and by proportionate representation on the Selection Board as the Regular officer has. But he must meet the competition if he goes in after an opportunity has been given him to qualify.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What will happen to a warrant officer who has been holding a temporary commissioned rank, and whose age is such that he does not come within the provisions of that 5-year latitude that is accorded him over an officer who held a permanent regular commission? What will happen to such a man?

Mr. IZAC. My colleague will remember that when we raised that point in the Naval Affairs Committee, the committee took action, asking the Navy Department to bring in a bill specifically for the warrant officers because it was felt that we could not diverge more than 5 years from the regular plan of promotion in the Navy, since those officers then would be too old to do the duty that would be assigned to them; so in order to take care of all of those who were beyond the 5-year age limit we must have special legislation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman agrees with me that these officers certainly are entitled to some consideration to retain the rank in which they served so well during the war.

Mr. IZAC. Absolutely.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If they were fitted for those ranks during time of war which, after all, is the major test of any military organization, they certainly are competent to hold those ranks in peacetime.

Mr. IZAC. Yes; and therefore I hope that the Navy Department will bring to our committee a bill that will do justice to those men. So far no such bill has been introduced, I understand.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. We all realize, of course, that unless there is sufficient inducement to these Reserve and temporary officers, we simply will not get the officers. Let us take a concrete case. Take a civilian, perhaps a former banker or businessman, who has been given a commission as lieutenant commander during the recent war. In order to get him, if he is competent and capable, to enlist and become a Regular officer, although he may be several years older and has served only 3 or 4 years during the conflict that has just closed, what rank will he have in comparison to, say, a graduate of Annapolis or a Regular naval officer who might be 3 or 4 years his junior but who held the same rank. Which one of those, the Regular officer or the temporary officer, will stand the best chance for promotion in the future?

Mr. IZAC. I would say, of course, the Regular officer, because he has had probably 20 years' experience against the other man's 3 or 4.

Mr. SHORT. That is the point I want brought out.

Mr. IZAC. There is a provision that we will be fair when he comes up for promotion.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In order to clear up the point raised by the gentleman from Missouri, this is the policy that Congress has laid down, and I want to take time enough to read it:

That in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement in event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever against officers because of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, and that no preference shall be given officers by reason of the fact that they entered the Regular Navy from any particular source; and, among other things, that all commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, regardless of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, shall receive the same treatment with respect to opportunities for (1) promotion or advancement to all grades in the Navy, (2) holding any positions or assignments in the Navy including proportionate representation on selection boards, and (3) attending the Naval War College, postgraduate schools, or other schools, or otherwise receiving advanced or technical training.

In view of that language I believe the answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri is that the officer coming from the Reserves has equal opportunity with the officer from the Naval Academy for advancement, because that is the principle set forth in the policy that we wrote into the law.

Mr. IZAC. However, Mr. Chairman, the premise of the gentleman from Missouri was that he had had only 3 years of experience, let us say. Now it is true that in 3 years no one can expect to get the experience the other man got in 20; but we are going to endeavor to see that

the first officer is given the same opportunity as the second officer to have that postgraduate course which will fit him for the duty of his grade and rank. When that officer then comes up for selection or to pass his examination he will be just as well fitted as the Naval Academy man.

Mr. SHORT. I think that it is a fine statement of general policy which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has read, but I was concerned with whether or not any civilian who served 2 or 3 years in the Navy could become a Regular officer and have under him men who have spent 20 years in the Navy and who are graduates of the Naval Academy at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. IZAC. They are not likely to have such a situation because the only Reserve officers in the higher grades are those who have been in the Reserves for a good many years.

Mr. SHORT. I realize that you will have only a few cases. I think we should bring out here that we are facing the same problem in our Committee on Military Affairs, which is the only reason I am intruding into this debate. We might as well recognize it is almost an utter impossibility to write a hard and fixed rule without doing some of these men an injustice.

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, flag ranks have been given to some 33 reservists. Some of them have the rank of admiral and some of them have the rank of commodore. In a great many instances you will have regular graduates of the Naval Academy serving under some of these civilian commodores who justified their promotion during the war.

Mr. SHORT. We have many people in industry serving under young executives because of their outstanding, extraordinary ability.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to make it clear to the House the point I raised is an entirely different question from the one brought to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Missouri. I am speaking about the men who are chief boatswains, chief gunners in the line of the Navy, who had learned through practical experience the fundamental principles of navigation and the other operations of the Navy, whereas the graduates of Annapolis had acquired their knowledge through academic study. These gentlemen during the war were advanced to lieutenants and lieutenant commanders. They commanded destroyers and they are preeminently qualified to hold commissioned rank in the Navy in peacetime if they were qualified to go out as a commander of a destroyer or as the executive officer of a cruiser during the war; but because their age is more than 5 years above that of a graduate of Annapolis of similar rank, those men will have to go back to chief boatswains and chief gunners or whatever their rank might have been. It is not fair to them, and this bill does nothing to help them except to give them a latitude of 5 years. The gentleman agrees with me that the bill does not help them, although the Navy Department did promise us it would bring legislation before us. I want the House to know that those men are not being fairly treated, in my opinion.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Following the thoughts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, they will either have to revert back to their former rank or retire from the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is not quite fair.

Mr. IZAC. We have a saving clause in this bill to take care of temporary officers. Any officer has a revocable commission up to 7 years. Anytime within 7 years the President of the United States can dismiss him; therefore, there is not any more security for the Naval Academy man than there is for anybody else. But for the enlisted man and the warrant officer we have placed in this bill a saving clause which states in so many words that if they fail of selection in competition with Regulars they will be placed back in the same position they held before in their old warrant grade. I am going to offer an amendment so that this will apply to the chief petty officers as well.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to congratulate the distinguished author of this bill and the Committee on Naval Affairs for the fine job they have done in bringing this bill to the floor at the present time. I think the House owes them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As I understand this bill, it increases the Navy personnel by more than 100 percent; is that correct?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if we might have, for the purpose of the RECORD, a statement as to the necessity for that increase at this time.

Mr. IZAC. Yes. We have just passed by House Concurrent Resolution 80 a bill called a bill for the composition of the postwar Navy. It provides for a certain number of battleships, aircraft carriers, all combatant types, and that a certain number of them shall be manned at 70 to 80 percent of wartime complement, a certain amount in reserve, and a certain amount in ready reserve. Breaking that down, we have found that the very least we can man this postwar Navy with is 500,000 men and 58,000 officers, and that is the basis on which we worked when we drew up this bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have heard so many conflicting statements as to what will be the probable cost of this expanded Regular Navy. Would the gentleman mind stating what the estimated cost will be?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the distinguished chairman to answer that question.

Mr. VINSON. It was estimated in House Concurrent Resolution 80—and I call the gentleman's attention to the committee report which is the justification for the bill—that to maintain the postwar Navy in accordance with the Concurrent Resolution 80 which this bill implements, it would be $3,500,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, if you will just permit me for a moment I will try to explain exactly how we propose to blend the Reserve officers into the regular line of the Navy. There will be a screening board established in each naval district. Any naval reserve officer who feels that he wants to make the Navy a career can apply to the commandant of the district and ask for a hearing. His record is gone over by a board of officers. They question him. There is no mental examination but there is a physical examination. If, in the opinion of the board, the officer is qualified, they send his name to a board in the Bureau of Naval Personnel here in Washington. There these officers' records are again gone into and the Navy Department determines whether or not this particular officer is to be offered a commission. After—and this is what so many of the Reserve officers fear—after they have joined the Regular Navy and the period of temporary promotions is passed, and they are forced to compete for advancement or promotion with old-time regular officers, what assurance have they that they will be chosen? Let us say it is in the rank of commander. There are now 400 commanders; 200 of them Regulars and 200 former Reserves.

In the selection board appointed to select the officers for advancement, there will be 50 percent Regulars and 50 percent Reserves, so that the Reserve cannot be discriminated against; I mean that we try to eliminate all chance of discrimination and make it as fair as we can.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does this provision give the same consideration to the peacetime enlisted man who has risen to a commissioned grade, or does it only give consideration to the peacetime Reserve officer, the man who came in from civilian life?

Mr. IZAC. No; it gives it to every temporary officer and to every Reserve officer. As the gentleman knows, the temporary officer is the man who might have been a first-class petty officer or a chief petty officer and who was advanced to perhaps as high as lieutenant or lieutenant commander. Those men will retain the highest rank they held on active duty and will have their same place in the lineal list. If at some later date they

are unable to compete, if they fail of selection, and they do not have 7 years of commissioned service so that the President can discharge them without anything, I am going to offer an amendment that will protect them so that they can go back to chief petty officer.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Do I correctly understand that by July 1946 the Navy will be comprised entirely of Regulars; that all the Reserves, both enlisted and commissioned, will be out; and the Navy will in fact be the Regular Navy?

Mr. IZAC. No; I do not think it can be by that date, I am sorry to say.

Mr. STEFAN. When the chairman of the gentleman's committee was before us some time ago, I understood from him, when the question was propounded to him as to the discharges and the demobilization of the men, that eventually the Navy hoped to have all its enlisted men and all its commissioned force in the Regular service rather than having some in the Reserves.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. It is the gentleman's opinion that by July 1946 all will have been demobilized except those who have reenlisted or been recommissioned?

Mr. IZAC. I would say it depends on two things, first, this bill, and second, the fleet reserve bill, which is the incentive bill for the men of the Navy, and which we hope to pass within a couple of weeks.

Mr. STEFAN. Will this help speed up demobilization?

Mr. IZAC. Undoubtedly it will, because instead of these officers now asking, "Have I enough points and can I get home?" they will be saying, "Do I want to stay in the Regular Navy or do I want to get out?"

Mr. STEFAN. I understood from the chairman of the committee, Mr. VINSON, that by July 1946 every enlisted man and every commissioned officer would have to say whether or not he wanted to stay in the Regular Navy, and the rest would be demobilized.

Mr. IZAC. We passed the voluntary enlistment bill a few weeks ago, and the results in enlistments are very favorable, but at this date I would not be willing to venture a guess as to whether or not we would be down to our 500,000 permanent personnel; in fact, I know we could not by July 1946, because we will have to tie up a great many of the ships that are now bringing the men back from overseas, and that takes time.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman confirm the report that the Navy is securing sufficient volunteers to fill their ranks?

Mr. IZAC. I do not believe it is, but I venture to guess that it will as soon as we pass the fleet reserve bill and this bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I was interested in the date of July 1, 1946, which the gentleman from Nebraska used. I thought the Navy had stated that they expected to demobilize all the men who wanted to get out of the Navy by September 1, 1946.

Mr. IZAC. That is what they were aiming for. Whether they will be able to meet that or not depends in large measure on the number of ships we will be unable to tie up because of their being engaged in bringing the men back from across the seas.

Mr. KUNKEL. Where does this date of July 1 come in?

Mr. IZAC. I suppose because we have provided for a 6-month period in this bill during which time any of these reserve officers and temporary officers may apply for a commission in the permanent Navy.

Mr. KUNKEL. This bill really enables the Navy to carry out their demobilization program as announced, aiming at September 1, 1946, at that time having a Navy of 500,000 men and 58,000 officers. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. IZAC. That is exactly correct. That is exactly what we are aiming for.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to compliment the gentleman on the bill and on his clear exposition of it. We are going to have a Navy of 500,000 men and 58,000 officers, and it is planned to have about 50 percent of the officers from those having Naval Academy training and 50 percent from the temporary and Reserve officers. We know how we are going to get the officers from the Naval Academy, but how is it contemplated we are going to get the officers to fill the other 50 percent?

Mr. IZAC. All I can say to the gentleman is that the Navy Department board that has been studying this has suggested that we enroll a number of Naval ROTC colleges each with a sizable unit. From the graduates we would get about 50 percent of our officer personnel.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Therefore, we would get men who would have training comparable to that of the Naval Academy and college training?

Mr. IZAC. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Can the gentleman tell us approximately how many voluntary enlistments are being made each day since we passed the voluntary recruitment bill here a short time ago; that is, with reference to voluntary enlistments in the Navy?

Mr. IZAC. It was something like 2,000 a week, but I understand they are doing better now. I cannot give the gentleman any exact figures. I feel sure that with the passage of this legislation and the fleet reserve bill we will have all the men who are in the Navy today in a position to determine their own course of action: Do they want to make the Navy a career, or do they not? If they do, we have some excellent benefits in the fleet reserve bill as well as in this bill, and you can see in the case of this bill how we endeavor to abolish all discriminations, if there have been any in the past, and put everybody on the same footing in the Regular Navy.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What success has the Navy had thus far in interesting junior officers of the Naval Reserve in accepting commissions in the Regular Navy?

Mr. IZAC. The Navy has had very good success, but they are all waiting to see if this bill passes. I talked with the officer in charge a couple of days ago in the Navy Department. He assured me they were having a large number of inquiries—not applications, but inquiries.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman feel that the inducement provided in this bill will encourage these younger men to make application for Regular Navy commissions?

Mr. IZAC. I really do. It may not for the older officers with little service, I will say to the gentleman, because you can see that they may be up in the forties or fifties and they will probably say, "Well, we cannot hope to make a career of it at this late date." But I am sure it will encourage the younger men.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I understand that. I understand that this puts the Navy Reserve officers on the same basis as the men who graduate from Annapolis.

Mr. IZAC. Exactly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And they have the same opportunity. That will do more in recruiting these young junior officers than anything else.

Mr. IZAC. That is right. It does more than that. It states in this bill as a policy that they must be given a postgraduate course, a war-college course, promotions, and choice of duty on exactly the same basis as the Regular officers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And they have not had that in the past. I think that is a splendid program.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman from California might point out to the committee the advantages this bill gives to seamen who enlist in the Navy insofar as their opportunity to become officers is concerned.

Mr. IZAC. It used to be very limited, and now we make provision for that. Let us say a college man joins the Regular Navy. There is nothing to prevent his going right straight up to the commissioned ranks of the Navy whereas before there used to be a limitation as to the number.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Will there be carried after the name of those men who are not graduates of the Naval Academy the letters "USNR" instead of the letters "USN"?

Mr. IZAC. I assure the gentleman it will be "USN" for all of them.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs inform the House what the status of the Naval ROTC legislation is?

Mr. VINSON. It is contemplated in the very near future that we will lay before the House a complete educational program with reference to the Naval ROTC. We already have selected the 52 universities. Therefore, that matter is behind us. Now, we have to work out some details as to how those units will be brought into the Naval ROTC and how they will then go into the Navy, whether they will go directly or whether they will go through the Naval Academy. Within a short time that will be before the House.

Mr. STEFAN. I have received numerous letters from heads of universities and colleges and schools and they are tremendously interested.

Mr. VINSON. We know they are.

Mr. STEFAN. They are tremendously interested in the proposed Naval ROTC program. I assume other Members of the House have the same inquiries for information.

Mr. IZAC. The Committee on Naval Affairs is working on several of these bills. We are hoping within 2 months to have them all on the floor.

Mr. STEFAN. When can we expect legislation in the House seeking some authority to bring this about? Do you need any additional legislative authority?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. When do you suppose you will bring that legislation before the House?

Mr. VINSON. The Board has already made a report to the Navy Department. It has not yet been submitted to the committee. The committee has had a conference with the Board, and we are not very far apart on certain phases of the legislation. I would say at least by the middle of January or the 1st of February the Committee on Naval Affairs will be able to submit a complete educational program to the Congress. Involved in that is the question as to whether or not we shall expand the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman refer to 52 colleges?

Mr. VINSON. Fifty-two colleges.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do I understand a man who is today a seaman will have an opportunity to become an officer in the Regular Navy? I mean the Reserve seaman can become an officer through this bill?

Mr. IZAC. That is right. Of course, there will be no more Reserve seamen. They will be Regular Navy seamen. They will have the right to compete for commissions, regardless of numbers.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Having given the Reserve officers this opportunity, you have written an emancipation proclamation as far as the Navy is concerned.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring before you today a war story. I wish to tell it for the information of this body and for the RECORD, so that the history of World War II, as it was brought before the Congress, will not be found lacking, and so that the heroes of this story will long be remembered by our legislators and by this Nation.

The men of whom I speak are a group of officers, all of them volunteers, who served in the United States Navy. They ran and crawled up bloody assault beaches with the marines at Guadalcanal, Saipan, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, the Philippines. They were aboard our gallant fighting ships at Pearl Harbor, the Coral Sea, in all major naval engagements, and some of them, but not all, were at Tokyo Bay.

They are not tough—they were not trained to kill. They went into battle unarmed, although they fought a deadly enemy. Their battle stations were clearings in the midst of bitter battlegrounds, crowded compartments of Navy vessels, little offices where they shared the simple joys of the men, counseling them in their trouble, or in the sick bays and medical aid stations, comforting them in their pain.

These officers wore the Christian cross or the Jewish Tablet and Star of David. They serve God, and when war came, they decided they could serve Him best by serving their country as it defended His ideals. They are the men of the United States Navy Chaplain Corps.

When the President declared this Nation to be "in a state of emergency" on September 8, 1939, there were only 91 Navy chaplains in uniform, with 63 others standing by in the Naval Reserve. Faced with the prospect of a Navy which must be more than tripled in size, the Chief of Chaplains and the Bureau of Naval Personnel were confronted with the problem of challenging over 2,000 priests, rabbis, and ministers to give their services to the men who would comprise our wartime Navy. The case was presented to church bodies of every faith, to the clergymen themselves, and to their congregations. By August 1, 1943, over 1,300 clergymen had taken leave of their civilian parishes, had gone to the Navy procurement offices to offer their services to the chaplaincy. They were draft exempt, but they saw the challenge and knew that they were needed to keep the young men of this Nation aware of the comfort and strength of God as they went to war. By August 15, 1945, there were 2,811 Navy chaplains, or one to approximately 1,250 men.

Qualifications for the Navy Chaplain Corps were high. A candidate must have completed 4 years of college or university work, and have completed three additional years of theological work in an accredited institution. He must pass the rigid physical requirements set up for all naval officers, he must be a fully ordained clergyman in the church he represents and must be nominated and endorsed by the official authorities of his denomination. He must not have passed his forty-fifth birthday. During one of the most critical periods of the war, chaplains were appointed up to the age of 50, but it soon became necessary to again reduce the age limit to 45.

Chaplains were trained at the Naval Training Schools—Chaplains—first set up at the Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., and later moved to the College of William and Mary at Williamsburg. For 2 months these student chaplains, who were commissioned lieutenants and lieutenants, junior grade, were under the tutelage of chaplain veterans. They learned naval regulations, procedure, customs, and history. They were instructed in warfare duties, first aid, and counseling. They got toughening-up training, too. They worked out in the gymnasium, ran the obstacle course, and at the climax of the training dived through burning oil in the swimming pool, pushed ahead under water, came up with arms thrashing, finally made it into flame-free water and clambered out. For men who had just left school or pastorate, it was a rugged business. They learned to work closely with clergymen of other faiths. At the close of the course, some of the chaplains went aboard ships; and others to shore stations for periods of "field training."

Young candidates for the ministry were accepted in the Navy's V–12 program. They continued their seminary training in uniform, and upon graduation and ordination, were commissioned in the Chaplain Corps.

Navy chaplains were assigned to duty with the Marines, and the Coast Guard, as well as with the fleet. They went to training stations with the men, then into battle.

War was a wretched setting for the sacred ideals of religion, but through the smoke of battle and the ugliness of war, chaplains kept their mission clear. "I am most humble when I consider the great personal responsibility that is mine," said one Navy chaplain, "a responsibility that is every chaplain's, to preserve in these young people a supreme faith in their religious convictions, to help them find clear-cut and spiritually satisfying answers to disturbing questions which may crowd or jumble their thinking during these troubled times."

But there was more than that. Chaplains did not content themselves with regular Sunday services and office hours during which they were available for counseling. Army and Navy chaplains and chaplains of all faiths worked long hours together, planning their schedules so that every man in their area would have an opportunity to worship God according to his own faith. They exchanged pulpits and traveled from unit to unit bringing divine services to men stationed in isolated places. They traveled many miles over difficult terrain by outrigger canoe, by jeep, rowboat, and on foot to reach their men.

During battle, chaplains worked as assistants to medical parties, performed heroics large and small as they carried

out rescue work, brought men through fire and strafing to the aid stations where doctors could take over. And often the chaplain stayed—"Say a prayer for me, padre," or "what's that one about 'for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son'?" The strong, comforting voice of the chaplain would join with the wounded, "that whosoever believeth in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life."

A bluejacket wrote:

If you have ever seen a chaplain trying to comfort men who have had their eyes burned out, or whose skin is hanging in shreds, you understand that it is not an easy task. When the excitement of battle is over and the morphine wears off, the pain comes again to the wounded. Then the chaplain lives with the men, bathing them, helping to feed them—always ready, because a man may die at any time. I never figured out just when our chaplain slept. Maybe he didn't. But I remember him because he was weeping for the wounded. Several of the fellows remarked that it seemed strange for a man to cry—after all the danger is over. But when we saw our chaplain in the sick bay, caring for the broken bodies of the men he loved, I think a lot of us realized for the first time what it meant to be wholly consecrated to God's work.

Eleven Navy chaplains have been killed in action; three who had been detained by the enemy for nearly 3 years died aboard the Japanese prison ship which was torpedoed in Subic Bay last December. Stories of their courage and service to their comrades during their imprisonment have been brought back by men who were fellow prisoners. Two chaplains, declining to carry out Japanese orders to go with other chaplains to the hospital on Corregidor, chose instead to go to a concentration center where 15,000 Americans were being held. They found the men without benefit of shelter or sanitary facilities. They lived with them, and at the risk of their lives held religious services, worked on details searching for food, ministered to the sick, and in countless ways bolstered the morale of these men who were discouraged in defeat. One of the chaplains was severely beaten several times for interfering when Japanese guards were beating Americans.

Ninety-two chaplains have been decorated for heroism and outstanding service. Citations read like this:

When an armor-piercing bomb exploded in the vicinity of the after magazine, crushing or exploding 70 rounds of ammunition, killing 6 men and wounding 6 others, and starting fires in adjacent compartments, Chaplain ———, with complete disregard for his own safety, entered the smoke- and steam-filled engine room, assisted in removing the wounded, and administered last rites to the dying. His courageous action beyond the call of duty and in the face of grave danger is in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service.

Or—

During the period that he—

The chaplain—

was on these beaches, they were constantly bombed, strafed and shelled. On July 11, 1943, while digging a grave for the burial of a man who had been killed in action, Chaplain ——— was wounded. Despite his wound and with utmost fortitude, he continued to complete the grave and conducted the services for the deceased man. Upon returning to his ship he declined medical aid until those more seriously wounded were cared for.

And—

He—

The chaplain—

also, while under heavy enemy fire, walked about among the troops, encouraging and reassuring them. On the following day, while conducting burial services for the dead, he was selected as a target by a Japanese sniper, who fired five shots at him during the services. His heroic disregard for personal danger and his firm faith in God, which inspired the officers and men of the battalion, were in keeping with the highest traditions of the naval service.

With marines or naval construction battalions at advanced bases, chaplains had a hard time finding places of worship for their men. One chaplain built his own chapel, hewing logs for benches, dragging stones to build paths to the little sanctuary he set up in the jungle. Many altar appointments were fashioned by the men from shell cases, altars were ammunition boxes, religious paintings were made with ordinary house paint on coarse tent canvas.

In some places there were natives, eager to show their gratitude for the Christianity which had returned to their midst in the form of the Navy chaplains. These dark-skinned Christians could now worship their God for the first time since the Japanese had occupied their homes, and they turned out to construct chapels of nipa grass, palm fronds, and native lumber, which they spent long hours carving with religious designs.

When the Navy went into the Mediterranean, the countries of the Middle East were starving and impoverished. Navy chaplains organized help for them, gave parties for their children at Christmastime, and played Santa with gifts of clothes and good things to eat. Chaplains made friends for the Navy and for the United States wherever they went in the world.

Morale problems were always a particular concern of the chaplains. When men found time heavy on their hands, as they waited for their turn to go to battle, chaplains helped welfare officers to organize sports events, entertainment of all kinds. Bible classes were also held by chaplains, and they played an important part in life aboard many ships and in many units. Young men whose training for the ministry had been interrupted by war continued their studies with their chaplains. On small vessels, where there was no chaplain, a member of the crew or an officer was given materials to aid him in leading divine services on his ship. Chaplains gave generously of their time and effort to these ships when they were in port or near larger ships, helping the men organize a religious program with lay leaders.

The horror and awfulness of war were particularly difficult for the chaplains, who had dedicated themselves to the doctrines of love and the brotherhood of man. One young chaplain, just out of the training school at Williamsburg, wrote from Iwo Jima of his dangerous, heart-breaking task, that of assisting burial crews in the sorting and keeping of the personal effects of the marines who died there. He knows the last resting place of every man at whose rites he officiated.

Most jobs you can get used to—

He wrote—

but this one is different. Every man you bury is a fresh tragedy.

Since the signing of the surrender papers in Tokyo Bay, chaplains have found that in many ways their responsibilities have increased. Men anxious to get home present a perplexing morale problem, and chaplains have an active role in the Navy's civil readjustment program.

Chaplains, remembering the faces of their fighting-men congregations, recall the grips of their hands as they filed out of makeshift chapels. They will never forget their friends whom they prayed for and buried in some far-off corner of the world. One chaplain expressed the thoughts and prayers of all his comrades when he said at the dedication of the Fifth Marine Division cemetery on Iwo Jima:

We dedicate ourselves, first, to live together in peace the way our comrades fought and are buried in this war. Here lie men who loved America * * * with equal passion because they themselves or their own fathers escaped from oppression to her blessed shores. Here lie officers and men, Negroes and white, rich men and poor—together. Here are Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—together. Here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Among these men there is no discrimination, no prejudice, no hatred. Theirs is the highest and purest democracy."

We promise—

He continued—

by all that is sacred and holy, that your sons, the sons of millers and miners, the sons of farmers and workers, will inherit from your death the right to a living that is decent and secure * * * we shall remember how you looked when we place you reverently, lovingly, in the ground.

Navy chaplains have spoken this promise to men in a thousand ways, in a thousand places. They have talked long and reassuringly to men who found it difficult to reconcile the holy teachings of their homes to the unholy ways of war. We owe the chaplains a deep debt for the spiritual strength they have supplied to our men when physical endurance was exhausted. We are beholden to them for the many times they have brought into battle the only softness, the only reminders of Divinity and love which could be found in the rigid discipline, the rough ways of military life.

The powers of darkness which these chaplains sought out as their enemy were gallantly attacked by example; were beaten away with dogged perseverance and consecrated determination.

The Navy Chaplain Corps is spendidly organized, and has functioned brilliantly in helping to bring victory to this Nation. Many of the men who compose the corps are returning to civilian church life and are bringing home with them a faith immeasurably deepened by the experiences they have shared with other

veterans, a hope kindled and inspired by the men they saw die for our future. These clergymen veterans will continue to enrich the religious life, and therefore the social life, of our Nation. I propose that we salute them with the Navy's traditional "Well done!"

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is for the purpose of providing a satisfactory basis for meeting the postwar personnel requirements of the Navy Department. Only a short time ago, the Committee on Naval Affairs brought a bill into the House providing for the composition of the size of the fleet in the postwar Navy. That bill passed the House by unanimous vote and is now on the statute books.

The bill before us today is implementing the bill of a few weeks ago by providing the personnel that is to operate the so-called postwar fleet.

As the original composition bill provided, approximately 300 ships will be in the active fleet in the postwar days. We will also have a ready fleet of about 104 combat ships. We will have, also, in reserve approximately 681 ships. That 681 ships, which will be laid up in reserve, comprises about 60 percent of the total of 1,082 ships. We can all look back over a period of only a few years when the strength of the Navy was about 325 ships. That was only 5 years ago. The personnel total at that time was only about 160,000 officers and men. This bill provides for a postwar personnel force of 500,000 enlisted men and 50,000 officers. Forty thousand of the officers will be in the Regular Navy and 10,000 in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps, under the act of 1941, comprises about 20 percent of the total strength of the Navy.

This bill therefore provides for about 100,000 men in the Marine Corps.

The question has been asked from the floor of the House what the cost of the postwar Navy would be. In the bill we reported some 3 or 4 weeks ago, when we considered the composition of the postwar Navy, we gave the estimate of cost of the operation of the postwar fleet, and that includes personnel and all other cost, as approximately $3,525,000,000 annually, of which the active fleet would be $3,275,000,000. The ready fleet would cost approximately $170,000,000, and the Reserve, comprising 60 percent of the total number of ships that would be laid up in reserve, would be about $80,000,000, making the grand total $3,525,000,000. We can appreciate what a staggering amount this is, but we can also appreciate as the result of the sad experience we have had in the past how vital it is to our own security to have our first line of defense on the highest possible level of efficiency.

The question of the education of our officers is a matter which will be considered by the Naval Affairs Committee as time goes on. The Navy Department has already made a very thorough study of the educational program that will be necessary for the education and training of these officers who later shall be available in the service of the fleet. Those of us who have followed the affairs of our Navy down through the last decade can well appreciate the urgency of early action, and I know the Members of the House can appreciate it likewise. Early action on this bill is necessary so that those in authority in the Navy Department may lay their plans in the development of the postwar Navy and also plans to lay up the vessels of the so-called reserve fleets which are fast coming back from all the waters of the world.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. I have understood that if the universal military training program went through it would be possible to reduce the size of the peacetime Army. What would the gentleman say with reference to the effect of the passage of the universal military training bill upon the peacetime Navy program as outlined in this bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman asks the very same question I asked the Chief of Naval Personnel when he came before the Committee on Naval Affairs a couple of weeks ago, as to whether or not we could get by way of volunteers a sufficient number of men to compose the personnel of the so-called postwar Navy. His answer at that time was that he thought we could in his opinion get sufficient personnel through the volunteer system for the Regular Navy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, the Navy is now up with its monthly quota on voluntary enlistments.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In fact, we are running ahead.

Mr. VINSON. I understand they feel it is not necessary to have a universal military training program in order to enable the peacetime Navy to carry on in accordance with its program.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Insofar as the active service now is concerned, according to word I get from Admiral Denfeld, the volunteer system will provide sufficient personnel to operate the active Navy. But we also have in mind the question of whether or not the volunteers in the Reserves will be sufficient to operate the Reserve Navy. Only time alone will tell.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope the membership may give favorable consideration to this bill. The Naval Affairs Committee has given a great deal of time and attention and study to its many aspects, and we strongly recommend its passage by the House today.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I have the honor to be a member, has recently had before it H. R. 4421, a bill to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and for other purposes.

The purpose of this bill is to provide a statutory basis for meeting the postwar personnel requirements of the naval service. To accomplish this purpose, provision is made, first, for an increase in the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy to 500,000, and of the Regular Marine Corps to 100,000; second for an increase in the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of Navy and of the Marine Corps, from 5½ to 8 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy, with a resultant increase in the authorized number of commissioned officers of the several staff corps of the Navy; third, for the appointment to warrant and commissioned grades and ranks in the Regular Navy, of male officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps without permanent appointments therein, commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps with temporary appointments in higher grades and ranks, and any person who served in such capacity during World War II who shall have been subsequently discharged from such officer status under honorable conditions. The bill would also require that officers of the naval and Marine Corps Reserve receiving permanent appointments to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps under its provisions be given temporary appointments therein in such higher rank and with the same precedence as that held by them under temporary appointments in the Reserve.

At present, the authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy is fixed by the act of April 22, 1941, at 5½ percent of the authorized enlisted strength of the active Navy. The proposed bill would increase that number to 8 percent. The bill would provide for fixing standards and qualifications for appointment to the several grades and ranks for determination of the lineal positions of appointees, by regulations prescribed by the President, and for assignment of running mates to officers appointed to the staff corps. The bill also provides that each person appointed to officer rank pursuant to the authority of its terms, who had accrued leave to his credit, would be granted such leave subsequent to his appointment, without loss of pay or allowances.

The bill further provides:

That in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement in event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever against officers because of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, and that no preference shall be given officers by reason of the fact that they entered the Regular Navy from any particular source; and among other things that all commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, regardless of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, shall receive the same treatment with respect to opportunities for (1) promotion or advancement to

all grades in the Navy, (2) holding any positions or assignments in the Navy including proportionate representation on selective boards, and (3) attending the Naval War College, post-graduate schools, or other schools, or otherwise receiving advanced or technical training.

In my speech of October 29, at the time House Concurrent Resolution No. 80 was under consideration, I stated:

Every American citizen is proud of the magnificent showing made by our Navy in World War II. Our Navy demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt that it was the No. 1 Navy of the world, superior by far to the Navy of any other Nation. Since Pearl Harbor, in December of 1941, the Navy of the United States was increased in leaps and bounds until it became the largest, the most powerful and effective Navy that the world has ever known. It is interesting to note that on September 8, 1939, at the time of the declaration of the limited emergency by the President, the personnel strength of the Navy and Navy Reserve, active and inactive, was 23,596 officers and 152,181 men. By October 14, 1945, the Navy had expanded to 3,004,811 enlisted men and 323,755 officers. This great Navy, naturally, was the result of the tremendous efforts then being put forth by the Congress and the Navy Department to see that the United States was adequately prepared for naval warfare.

While it is definitely certain that the postwar Navy must be the largest peacetime Navy that our country has ever seen, yet it is equally definite that even the most ardent advocates of a large Navy would not contend that our postwar Navy should be equal in size and strength to our war Navy. Of course, that would be entirely prohibitive because of the tremendous cost incident thereto and for the further fact that it would be unnecessary to maintain such a vast Navy.

Various naval officers and naval experts testified that the postwar national security of our country would be attained by a Navy of 500,000 men and a Regular Marine Corps consisting of 100,000 men with 40,000 officers of the line of the Navy and 8,000 officers of the Marine Corps. A naval personnel of this size could maintain our post-war Navy consisting of, first, an active fleet of 297 major combatant ships and 1,375 ships of other types; second, a ready fleet of 104 major combatant ships and 2,209 ships of other types; and, third, a reserve fleet of 681 major combatant ships and 1,418 ships of other types; making a grand total in the active fleet, the ready fleet, and the reserve fleet of more than 6,000 ships.

The responsibilities resting upon the United States, as the result of World War II, is very apparent. No longer can the United States delude itself with the fact that the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans are natural boundaries of protection. It will be necessary for our country to maintain and protect many strategic islands and bases scattered throughout the world. We will do this, naturally, for our own protection; we will also do it in order to maintain our leadership and hold our proper place in the United Nations Organization. The United States Navy is fully cognizant of this fact and has proposed 27 postwar bases in the Pacific and 13 in the Atlantic—part of which will be for regular operation, part of them under a reduced status, and the balance designated as caretaker emergency.

H. R. 4421 comes before the Congress at the logical time, having followed the passage of House Concurrent Resolution No. 80. This bill is all the more important in view of the position that the United States finds itself in as the original father of constitutional government and the world's most intelligent leader in those efforts which will make world peace a possibility instead of a theory.

I am, therefore, heartily in favor of H. R. 4421 and sincerely hope that it will receive the unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California has outlined the salient features of H. R. 4421 in his customary clear-cut manner. He has covered the details. It is my desire to speak to you on the broad objectives and aspects of this bill.

H. R. 4421 is tailored to the proposed postwar Navy—to a Navy with enough personnel to man the ships, planes, and facilities called for by House Concurrent Resolution 80, which this House unanimously passed a few weeks ago.

The approach is twofold: First, an increase in the authorized personnel strength; and, second, the staffing of the Navy and Marine Corps with officers of the desired quality and in the desired quantity. Because of what I feel to be the more difficult of attainment, I will address my remarks for the greater part to the objective of getting the best officers in the required numbers for the Navy.

It is my view that we should be interested in getting the best men to be officers in the best Navy that we can have for the United States. This is an obligation of the Congress. It is an obligation which the Naval Affairs Committee believes that it has at least initially discharged in unanimously reporting out H. R. 4421. I say initially because the committee will have a continuing obligation to see that the Navy Department complies with the spirit, as well as the letter, of H. R. 4421, in actual practice, rather than lip service, if it is enacted.

The Navy needs 58,000 officers for its postwar establishment. It now has 12,000 Regular officers. It is obvious that the Naval Academy cannot provide the necessary number for this is an immediate need. The preponderant number of the 46,000 officers that must be added to the present 12,000 Regulars must come from the temporary and Reserve officers and the enlisted ranks. The principal procurement must come through the transfer of Reserve officers into the Regular Navy.

Until recently, less than 1 percent of the 265,000 Reserve officers expressed any interest in transferring to the Regular Navy. This is a serious condition whether it stems from alleged discrimination or not. When we realize that less than 1 percent of the Reserves who have been the backbone of the Navy during the war, to the extent that the wartime officer complement was 92 percent "civilians in uniform," and have had a taste of Navy life—that less than 1 percent of them wanted to go into the Navy, indicates that there is something seriously wrong with the system.

I do not blame this reluctance on the part of the Reserves solely on fear of discrimination. It is broader than past records of promotions and decorations. It is uncertainty in the selection of the Navy as a profession. And uncertainty is a far more foreboding and compelling mental factor to one subject to military orders. The answer is that so far the Navy has not been sufficiently attractive, whether it be pay, prestige, or security, to compete with civilian professions and occupations.

The principal attack of the Navy on this problem began with the appointment of a board headed by Rear Adm. L. T. DuBose composed of 7 or 8 Regular officers and 14 or 15 Reserve officers. This board made a study and inquiry of the problem over an extended period of time. It concluded this study and inquiry with a report recommending regulations for the transfer of Reserve officers into the Regular Navy.

H. R. 4421 is a result of that study. However, it is more liberal to the reservists than was the report of the DuBose board. In general, the Reserve officers are very much in favor of this legislation. They feel that the bill is a recognition of the past mistakes and evidence that the Regular Navy officers are making a sincere effort to avoid the discrimination that existed against Reserve officers who transferred to the Regular Navy after the First World War. Partial evidence of this is reflected in the encouraging increase in the number of Reserve officers indicating their desire to transfer to the Regular Navy since the introduction of this bill.

The greatest asset and advantage of the Regular officer is his specialized naval training. His knowledge in naval tactics and strategy are, and should be, eminently superior to that of the Reserve officer. This is fully respected by the Reserve officers but they also recognize their disadvantage in that respect when it comes to promotion and recognition—the necessary attributes of a career whether it be naval or civilian.

Both Regulars and Reserves possess the most important military requirement of leadership. It is no criticism of the Regulars to say that reservists as civilians have a better grasp of civilian psychology and enjoy superior ability in handling civilians. The importance of this is that the professional Regulars lead a civilian army and navy in time of war with very little training for such leadership.

Because officers must be leaders—because officers should possess both leadership and skill in naval tactics and strategy, in its hearings the committee demanded and received assurances from the Navy Department that Reserve transferees would receive all of the specialized training that is necessary to put them on an equal basis with the Regulars when going before the selection board. This was putting teeth into the provisions of the bill assuring against discrimination of the Reserves. It is hoped and expected that the training program of the future will permit a firm grasp of civilian psychology.

H. R. 4421 is not omnipotent. It is not a touchstone for the procurement of the desired Reserve officers in the needed numbers for the postwar Navy. It will not sell the Navy as a career as much as the deeds, the actions, and the attitudes of those in charge of the Navy will. It is human to judge a tree by the fruit it bears.

But H. R. 4421, if enacted into law, can be the seedling for that tree. As far as action by Congress is concerned, H. R. 4421 can be a most practical encouragement to the reservists to transfer to the Navy in Regular status. It has already stimulated transfers even before it reached the floor of the House.

It is of the utmost importance that the need for additional officers from sources other than the United States Naval Academy be clearly realized, and that every effort be made to convince those contemplating transfer from the Reserve to the Regular Navy that there will be equality of opportunity regardless of the source from which such persons entered the Regular Navy.

H. R. 4421 is a clear manifestation of that realization. Within the bounds of human limitations it goes as far as can be expected of legislation to assure career opportunities on an equal basis for all in the Navy. I urge its passage by the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman apparently feels that this bill was almost a necessity because the men did not want to go on with the Navy as a career and also because it was an intelligent thing to do because the Navy in peacetime is dependent upon its popularity.

Mr. COLE of New York. This bill was necessary for many reasons, principally that the law does not now permit a Reserve to become a Regular, and the need of the Navy was such that it was imperative that it have additional personnel above the existing supply of Regular officers, so we had to make available additional Regular officers from some source. It seemed the best source was from the Reserves already in the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Those who have already given their time and service.

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; and have proved themselves qualified to be Regular officers. This bill was intended to make it as appealing to the reservists to transfer to a Regular status as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman's great interest in building up the Navy in peace as well as in war.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am especially interested in seeing that these men who have done such fine work in wartime will be given favorable consideration for service with the Navy in peacetime.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. As I read this bill, a man who has been commissioned in the Marines during the war, but not in the regular Marines, in the rank of colonel and lieutenant colonel, and those who have had commissions as captains and commanders in the Navy, will be entitled to secure permanent commissions in the Marine Corps and in the Regular Navy by virtue of this bill if it becomes law.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is correct.

Mr. CLASON. To the extent that that is possible it will be in direct conflict with a bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs today under which apparently the highest commission a man can get will be a major, so that it would appear that a person who was serving in the air branch of the Navy or in the Marine Corps and gets one of these higher commissions will outrank a man who has been serving in the Army of the United States and later gets a lower commission in the Regular Army.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I am not familiar with the bill to which the gentleman refers. But as I understand this bill it provides for the transfer from the Reserve to a regular status in the same rank, even though it might be temporary, that was held by the reserve at the time he made the transfer. That does not mean, however, that after he becomes a regular that he will retain that higher rank. He will be put on the same basis as a regular who is now in the service with a higher temporary rank. It may be necessary for them all to be reduced in rank, but he will be treated the same as a regular.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no request for any additional time on this side.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to discuss the unauthorized wearing of honorable-discharge buttons provided for veterans from all branches of the armed services. This button that you see on my lapel is what is known as an honorable-discharge lapel button. Every man who has served in the armed forces of the United States and who is honorably discharged is entitled to wear it. I am not so entitled, and I wear it today merely to bring out the point I am trying to make. This is the first time and the last time I shall ever have one in my lapel.

I find, however, that these buttons are extremely easy to obtain. Through the help of some of my friends who have served in the various branches of the armed forces, I find that I can obtain service buttons without any trouble whatever. I have never been noted for sleight-of-hand or legerdemain, but I want you to notice that I can reach into my pockets and bring out honorable-discharge buttons from almost any source. Here, for instance, are five more to which I am not entitled.

Some time ago, Mr. Chairman, I wrote to the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, at the suggestion of some friends of mine, and suggested that one service button for men who have served in both World War I and World War II would be a good idea. I asked the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to give me their opinions. They wrote back expressing the opinion that because of the different type of discharge buttons that had been authorized after the last war the idea would not be a good one, so I abandoned it.

However, I developed some very interesting observations on the wearing of the honorable discharge service button provided for veterans of this war. I received several telephone calls from folks downtown who said, "Do you know that it is very easy to come down here to some of these haberdashery stores and walk in and obtain an honorable discharge service button? They are even shown on window display dummies."

I assume many Members of the House have noted in the various news periodicals of Washington advertisements stating that all you have to do is show your honorable discharge papers to receive another service button. I have no objection to any man in the service having as many of these buttons as he feels he is entitled to—one for every suit, one for the Monday suit and one for the Sunday suit—but any man who wears this button and who is not authorized to wear it certainly ought to be subjected to heavy penalties.

The strange part of it, Mr. Chairman, is that there are not any heavy penalties for the unauthorized wearing of this particular button. I wrote again to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in order to ascertain what penalties were imposed for the unauthorized wearing of discharge buttons. I received replies from both Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal, which I wish to quote. Secretary Patterson wrote me as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 12, 1945.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have read with interest your letter of October 24, concerning the issuance and wearing of the lapel button indicating honorable service in the Army, and penalties for the unauthorized wearing of this button, service ribbons, and other awards.

The statute which prohibits the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges is the act of February 24, 1923 (42 Stat. 1286), as amended by the act of April 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 347). The penalty provided for a violation of this act is a fine of not to exceed $250 or imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both such fine and imprisonment. The Department of Justice is charged with the enforcement of this law.

War Department regulations provide for the issue of honorable service lapel buttons to authorized personnel by designated officers at each Army installation. Our regulations also permit the sale of buttons to ex-military personnel by various commercial concerns engaging in the sale of insignia under a procedure established by the War Department.

Under this procedure lapel buttons, as well as service ribbons, etc., are manufactured and sold commercially by holders of certificates of authority issued by the War Department pursuant to the act first mentioned above. In order to preclude the possibility of these items falling into the hands of unauthorized persons, agreements entered into

prior to the issuance of a certificate of authority to sell insignia require the dealer to demand and receive proof of the eligibility of the purchaser to wear the insignia before the sale is made, and to keep a record of each sale made to include the date of sale, name, grade, and Army serial number of the purchaser, and name of the article sold.

I should like to point out that there is now pending before the Congress, H. R. 3842, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended. This bill specifically provides protection for the veterans' discharge button. The War Department now has under consideration H. R. 3842, and when its study is complete the Department will submit a report on this bill to the House Military Affairs Committee. I am confident that the chairman of this committee will make the report available to you when it is received.

Your interest in this matter and your consideration in bringing it to my attention are sincerely appreciated.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Here, let me call attention to that portion of Secretary Patterson's letter which deals with the sale of discharge buttons by commercial firms.

If these regulations were complied with, the unauthorized obtaining and wearing of a button of this kind would be much more difficult. Several of my friends who obtained these buttons for me were able to go downtown into the local haberdashery stores and simply present their discharge papers and receive the button. That is how I obtained the buttons I have here. I maintain that if it is that easy to obtain them, it will not be very long before somebody finds that out and it becomes a racket throughout the country. When any of us meet a man on the street wearing these particular emblems, we want to know that he is an honorably discharged serviceman and entitled by the laws and rules and regulations of the War and Navy Departments and other branches of the armed services to wear them. We do not want to find them on fakers and slackers.

Let me call your attention now to the communication from Secretary of the Navy Forrestal. It is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 5, 1945.

Hon. JACK ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I am pleased to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 24 October relative to the issuance of honorable-discharge buttons to discharged members of the armed services.

Early in 1944 it became evident that some token of service should be given to those persons who had served in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during the present war and who had been separated from those services under honorable conditions—something they could wear on their civilian clothing and which would readily identify them as having served in the armed forces. The matter was investigated and it was found that the War Department was giving persons who had performed military service a lapel button similar in design to the United States Army discharge button.

Inasmuch as the button was already in production for the Army, it was decided that the Navy Department should adopt it rather than originate a distinctive and different design of its own. Arrangements were, therefore, made to obtain a supply of these buttons from the War Department, and a recommendation was made to the Secretary of the Navy that he approve the issue of this button to all persons who had served honorably in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard during the war. The Secretary approved this recommendation on 2 September 1943 and instructions, as contained in the enclosure, were published to the service.

Due to the scarcity of metals at that time, the button was manufactured of a plastic material and gold plated, which was not entirely satisfactory from the standpoint of durability and appearance but which could not be helped then. It is understood that the button is now being manufactured with a metal base. The War Department's policy was to present an official button to each person upon separation from the Army and to authorize civilian insignia manufacturers to make the button in a more expensive form to be sold by civilian agencies to former military personnel who could prove that they were entitled to the button and wished to purchase it.

The Navy, on the other hand, decided to issue one button to each person as provided in the attached copy of instructions from the Bureau of Naval Personnel Manual, and not to authorize its sale or gift by civilian agencies. As more veterans left the service and the restrictions on precious metals were eased, the Navy Department received a constantly increasing amount of mail from civilian insignia manufacturers requesting permission to manufacture the button in various forms and from retail stores requesting permission to give or sell the button. Taking the above into consideration, together with the fact that the button originally presented was made of very inexpensive materials, and that there is no law which permits the Navy Department to control the manufacture and sale of these buttons, it was finally decided to permit retail stores to give or sell the button to personnel who were entitled to receive one if they had been officially authorized by the War Department to manufacture, give, or sell the button to Army personnel. Each company has been requested to give or sell the button only to persons who prove that they have already received an official button from the Government.

In addition to the honorable service lapel button covered in previous paragraphs, the Navy Department also issues two honorable discharge buttons—one for Regular Navy personnel and one for Naval Reserve personnel who are discharged upon completion of a normally contracted term of enlistment. These latter buttons are issued only by the Department, one button being given to each individual at the same time he is given his discharge certificate.

To the best of my knowledge there is no law which prohibits unauthorized persons from wearing the honorable service lapel button or any other distinctive device presented by the services to persons for wear on civilian clothing. Section 125 of the National Defense Act makes it unlawful for any person not an officer or enlisted man of the United States armed forces to wear the duly prescribed uniform of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or any distinctive part of such uniform or a uniform any part of which is similar to such uniforms, except that the National Guard and certain other specified organizations may do so under certain regulations. Inasmuch as the honorable service lapel button and the honorable discharge buttons are not items of uniform insignia, within the meaning of the act, their wear is not covered by this act and consequently it is entirely possible that a person could obtain an honorable service lapel button through misrepresentation and wear it if they wished to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Mr. Chairman, you will note from the last sentence in Secretary Forrestal's letter that it is entirely possible for any person to obtain and wear an honorable discharge button if he so desired. I maintain that this is wrong and that it is the duty and the responsibility of Congress to provide for heavy penalties to safeguard our veterans who should wear their discharge emblems proudly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am glad to hear the gentleman read both of those communications from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the penal statutes of the United States that apply only to the wearing, manufacturing, and issuance of discharge buttons, which statutes cover only World War I service. Some months ago, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and I introduced a bill making it unlawful to wear, manufacture, or issue discharge buttons with reference to World War No. II without authority and provided for a penalty in the sum of not more than $500 or imprisonment for 6 months, or both. But at the present time there are no laws on the statute books to prevent the issuance or wearing of the discharge button of World War II.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is entirely correct. I join him in hoping that some such legislation will pass. However, I should like to point out that I have introduced a similar piece of legislation, and have made the penalty a good deal stiffer. I want to be sure, as I said before, that when I meet a man on the street wearing that discharge button that he is an honorably discharged member of some branch of the armed services of the United States. I have today introduced a bill which will make the penalty a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. I sincerely trust that either the measure which the gentleman's colleague from New York and he have introduced, or my measure, will receive favorable consideration within the very near future.

Mr. KEARNEY. It does not make any difference so far as the authorship of the bill is concerned so long as there are laws on the statute books that cover the situation.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is exactly what we want, I am sure.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it will be necessary to consume the entire time, but I did want an opportunity to make a few remarks on this subject of the situation of the Reserves in the services. In doing so I do not detract for one moment from the credit due the Regulars for the job they have done in this war. The condition I want to discuss is, I think equally true of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

The declaration that is contained in this bill that is before us, while a very pious hope, is, to me, no assurance whatsoever that the mistakes of the past, the handicaps which a man who does not happen to be a graduate of Annapolis or West Point carries with him through his service in the Military or Naval Establishments, will be corrected. We say in this bill "that in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement, in the event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever," and so on, against such officers because of the fact that they may not have come from Annapolis.

Mr. Chairman, you can write the most perfect law in the world, but so long as you have the officer personnel of the Navy flowing out into the Regular service, part of them from Annapolis, and part of them not from Annapolis, it is inevitable that you will have the bias, the distinction, and the cleavage that we find in our services today.

To me, one of the most disturbing elements of this whole cleavage is the fact that so many of the officers of the Regular Navy have come before our committee and have denied that such a situation exists. So long as those people are not able to see and will not admit that that feeling has grown up in the service, there is no immediate hope that we will cure it. Certainly, you are not going to cure it by the mere enactment into law of a pious hope such as is contained in the preamble of the bill that is before us.

We have had before our committee for many weeks, in fact for many months, a bill proposing to grant authority to the Navy Department to take over a small site of 32 acres that now accommodates little St. John's College, an institution of learning that is older than the Naval Academy itself, but which had the misfortune of having its grounds adjoin the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Mr. Chairman, that matter has been before our committee for months and months, but up to this date a final vote has never been taken on the question of the acquisition of the site of St. John's campus. We have, by our failure to take action, regardless of the merits or demerits of the controversy, cast a cloud over that little institution of learning that must work irreparable harm and injury to the future of that little college. What is to be the situation of any prospective student who weighs in his mind the advisability of going to St. John's, not knowing whether next week or next month or next year the all-powerful Navy of Uncle Sam is going to take over that 32-acre site and put that institution out of business? All of that is tied up with the question that must be answered sooner or later, that is, Where are we going to train the 58,000 officers who will be required for Uncle Sam's postwar Navy, and for which provision is made in the pending bill? It is a question of how large Annapolis shall be and what shall be its part in the production of officers for Uncle Sam's Navy.

It was my understanding, and I hope I am correct, from the hearings we had on the pending bill, that this bill will not be used by the Navy Department as a means for procurement of officers in the postwar Navy, but rather that the question of where these officers shall be trained, and how, is to be the subject of future legislation. For the sake of the record may I ask my able chairman if that is correct?

Mr. VINSON. I understand the gentleman has stated the position exactly correct. The question of training is not involved in this bill at all. It merely relates to the question of transfer; and may I say that since the gentleman from Indiana has mentioned St. John's, of course, I am hoping that a full, complete educational program may be worked out in the very near future whereby a final decision can be reached by the Naval Affairs Committee in regard to St. John's and thus dispel any cloud that may be hanging over that institution at as early a date as possible.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for that statement because I hope there may be some final disposition of the long controversy that has been going on in our committee. I think it ought to be determined and determined soon.

I appreciate, too, for the sake of the record, the statement that the chairman has made about the future training for officers of the Navy. Many plans have been submitted by the Navy Department as to how we are going to train our officers. We have had almost every kind of report come back, the last of which in effect is this: We will use the 52 NROTC schools that we have in the colleges of the country. From these schools will come roughly one-half of the officers for Uncle Sam's Navy. The other half therefore are going to come from the Naval Academy at Annapolis. We will have a 50–50 division. We are going to be confronted with the same ills, the same problems we have been confronted with in the past; and I say again, Mr. Chairman, we may write the most perfect law in the world but as long as there is a division in the service as between those who come from the Navy's school and those who come from the outside it is inevitable that we are going to have this feeling that has grown up in the Navy, and the Army as well. I have on several occasions before our committee—and others before me—have made a suggestion that I think merits a lot of consideration and we are going to urge our case vigorously when the legislation reaches our committee and the floor, which the chairman has just told us will follow. It is expected that the requirements of the Navy in the postwar era will be some 3,000 or perhaps 4,000 new officers every year. That happens to be just about the present size of the Naval Academy. Why cannot we send all of Uncle Sam's prospective naval officers to the engineering schools of the country that have come into and are a part of the Naval ROTC program, have them turn out the 3,000 or 4,000 officers a year that the Navy is going to require, and then send all of them to the Naval Academy for a year's postgraduate work. They would then all go to the fleet on the same footing and we would have done away with this division in the ranks that we have and that we are going to continue to have so long as a part of our officers come from Annapolis and the rest come from the outside, and do not happen to belong to the Annapolis club that is on the inside and writes the rules and calls the plays.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should just like to say that I feel the same as does the gentleman from Indiana. Also may I point out that to send these prospective officers to existing colleges throughout the country for their training would cost $1,000 per man per year. To send them to Annapolis to acquire their naval training would cost $3,000 per man per year. So if the Navy's plan is adopted the one man who is trained in the outside educational system will cost the public $1,000 a year, and the other one, his counterpart, his balance wheel, who comes from the Naval Academy, will cost the public $3,000 a year. So we have not only the question of morale to consider in the problem of the procurement of regular officers, but we might also give some attention to the question of cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is very important to note that great difference in cost and it might be further pointed out in connection with what the gentleman, my very able leader on the committee, has just said: The experience of this war has certainly shown that the Reserve officers who had their training in civilian life, in the colleges and universities of the country, brought to the service an understanding and an ability to lead our civilian soldiers and sailors and a breadth of vision that can never possibly come from the sequestered life that you lead within the four walls of the Naval Academy.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Indiana as to his views, and there is another reason also. From the viewpoint of a democratic country it would be a whole lot happier situation if we had the men going to Annapolis, and let me say this would apply also to West Point as well, from the ROTC or from the training courses in the colleges of the country, taking a postgraduate course at Annapolis and West Point, than under the present system where there are so many allotted to the Congress, so many to the President, and so many to the War and Navy Departments. In my opinion it would work out a whole lot better and the boys would be a lot more democratic. If I got one thing out of this war it is that the big chasm between the commissioned officers and the enlisted men is too much and there is

going to be some very bad reaction in this country if we do not have the Army and Navy run upon a more democratic system than it has been in this war and prior thereto.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I say to the gentleman that I refer to his remarks with respect to training of naval officers. The gentleman has made a commendable suggestion, and one which I hope both the committee and the Navy Department will give consideration to.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. I always appreciate the gentleman's good judgment. I wish I had at hand at the present moment figures to give you in reference to the promotions in the officer grades in the Navy and in the Marine Corps and how they break down as between the Regulars and the reservists. Where, on the one hand, you have probably 98 percent of the personnel coming from the Reserves, you find the bulk of the promotions going to the Regulars. That same thing is true in the matter of decorations and awards.

I recall that in the total officer personnel of the Marine Corps the reservists outnumber the Regulars about 15 to 1; that is, there are 15 Reserve officers for every Regular officer. At the same time there were 81 general officers in the Marine Corps, of whom only 1 is a Reserve officer. There were 378 colonels, of whom 345 were Regulars and only 33 were Reserve officers.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman have any idea as to the figures on the promotions in the commissioned Reserve of men who have either graduated from Annapolis or who have attended the Naval Academy?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I regret I do not have such figures at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the very able member of the naval subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman and I were in the Pacific about a year ago, in the forward areas, and talked to many officers. I am sure he recalls a great many Reserve officers being rather down in the mouth about the promotion lists that came out in which they were almost entirely ignored in some grades. I observed, and I think the gentleman did, too, that it was tending to break down the morale right out in the fighting areas.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. There is not the slightest doubt about the truth of that statement and the effect it has on morale in the service.

I have said many times that the Navy Department has done itself great injury by sending a lot of our reservists back to civilian life, back to the jobs of being businessmen, Congressmen, mayors, local officials—yes; the taxpayers—to whom the Navy is going to have to look for its support in the postwar years, and sending them back with the bad feeling that has developed.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I say this: When the time comes that this matter of procurement and assignment of officers in the postwar Navy is before us the most important thing that we can do for the permanence of this Navy is to take the "R" out of "USNR" and all that it stands for.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say to the gentleman from Indiana that if his argument and his reasoning prevails, one of the greatest services has been done for the armed forces of America.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I hope we can succeed. I know that we can count on the able gentleman from Missouri to assist.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. For the information of those who might be interested in the treatment accorded reservists as against the regulars, as far as promotion and decoration is concerned, I would call their attention to a discussion on this subject and the tabulations that are contained in the hearings, which are available to the Members, on pages 1730 and 1780.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I cannot speak with the knowledge and the background and with the facts and figures that the members of this committee are able to command during this discussion. But if what the gentleman who just preceded me has said has any bearing on the future personnel of the Navy, if the sequestered and cloistered life of Annapolis is to be broken down and the differential between the Reserve officer and the trained officer at Annapolis is to be opened up so that there will be more democracy, it seems to me that in considering this question in the next bill to come before the House that there should be recommendations for expanding the educational facilities of the Naval Academy beyond that of the present Academy at Annapolis. It has been one of the particular things that I have been interested in just the short time I have been here, to advocate that such an academy be built on the west coast, so far as that is concerned, to remove any possibility of provincialism. I am not concerned about where it is built on the west coast, or whether it is built in some other location than within the borders of the State of California, although I must admit that I would prefer to have it in the State of California, and especially in southern California where the all-year-round climate is desirable for training facilities.

But there is more to this question than merely building an academy. The gentleman from Indiana indicated a very serious situation that exists between the Naval Reserve officers and the Regular officers educated in the Academy. Your bill and the report of the committee indicates that you went so far as to say there would be no discrimination. I do not think you can put that in a bill and have it mean that in so many words. You cannot legislate the attitude of one man against another; who may believe that he is superior because he was trained at Annapolis, over the man who comes in from a business office during a temporary situation like the war we just fought. One of my sons is a Reserve officer in the Navy. He has never complained about the situation, but I do know from what the gentleman from Indiana said that there is a division there that should be broken down. The expansion at Annapolis is also limited as indicated by the reports up to now. We cannot expand by the acquisition of St. John's College. Is there any reason why the west coast, with its all-year-round training on the sea, in the air, on land, and under the sea, for naval officers is not a desirable location for an academy? I would like to ask a question and be contradicted if anyone chooses to.

Is there any better location for the training of naval officers than on the Pacific coast? In setting up naval bases we consider the best geographic and strategic locations. The Roosevelt base built at Wilmington, Calif., was started before this war. It is one of the finest naval bases in the United States. We did not come here and ask for it, the Navy decided that is the best place for it, because they wanted a base for the fleet on the Pacific Ocean.

I am sure we from California do not have to ask you to put an academy on the coast. I think your judgment and wisdom will direct it to be placed there, when the time comes for such an extension of the Navy's educational facilities. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that when the bill comes before the House the committee in preparing it give consideration to the Pacific coast as a desirable location for the expansion of the Naval Academy.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I wonder what the gentleman might think of the Great Lakes as a suitable place.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the Great Lakes is very desirable and a very fine place for the training of naval officers. You have a great base up there now. You have trained a great number of men at the Great Lakes Training Station.

Mr. DONDERO. It is especially suitable in the summer months when we are at peace for the training of the men who take to the sea for their livelihood.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Unfortunately, it is confined to the summer months only. We can train men all the year round in California.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise more for the purpose of obtaining information. As I understand, the Navy program is to cost $3,500,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is what the postwar Navy, in accordance with Concurrent Resolution No. 80, submitted to the House the other day and unanimously passed by the House, is estimated to cost.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does that take into consideration the training program?

Mr. VINSON. That takes into consideration everything that relates to the postwar Navy, including the pay of the personnel of 500,000 referred to in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And all training programs?

Mr. VINSON. The whole thing—lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not have any definite figure on the Army, but I understand it is estimated that the cost of maintaining it in peacetime will be about $4,000,000,000.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand it is $4,200,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I made it a little bit low. I want to be conservative.

The interest on the Federal debt will be about $6,000,000,000. I just telephoned to General Bradley a few minutes ago and asked him for an estimate of the cost of the Veterans' Administration, and he gave me a figure of $3,600,000,000 for 1946, and said that would increase in the next several years.

We have a total here of $17,100,000,000 for these four items. Of course, I do not know what the remainder of the cost of the Government is going to be, but in accordance with the authorizations and appropriations that are being voted and the spending psychology that exists in the Congress, if we were to add to the above figure anywhere from $6,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, I do not believe we would be very far out of the way. This means we are going to have a cost running somewhere between $24,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000 annually.

I doubt the wisdom of legislating in this piecemeal fashion. The day is coming when this Congress will have to look to the matter of financing these costs. Do not misunderstand me; I voted for the Navy bill a few days ago. I want our armed forces to be fully adequate, but I believe this Congress is running into a danger. I question whether we are going to be able to finance the costs for which we are obligating ourselves.

The proper procedure would be to have a concrete estimate of the over-all cost of all the services and functions before definitely committing the Nation to any specified program. There could be nothing more unfortunate for the Navy itself than to discover in the future that we had committed ourselves for more than we were able to pay.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is not the question of the postwar Navy as provided in the bill we passed a few weeks ago together with the personnel bill today a flexible matter in which we can consider all phases of our financial structure in the days to come when the appropriations are made for them? But for the purpose of demobilization, we have to know now what we consider to be the needs of the postwar period. Certainly, this is no time for us to cuddle up and go to sleep as we did after 1922 as the result of the disarmament conference which certainly all will agree brought us much more expense during the intervening period than what this bill would entail.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe the gentleman wishes to infer that I take the attitude we should not be prepared. I have not indicated that at all. I merely made the statement that sooner or later this Congress will have to set itself to the task of finding the money to pay for these costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I gladly speak in support of H. R. 4421 as so ably authored by my distinguished colleague from my native State of California and as unanimously reported to this legislative body by our tireless and far-seeing Committee on Naval Affairs, under the leadership of its distinguished chairman, who has rendered such lasting and long service to the cause of the progress of our great Navy.

This bill is one of those for which I expect a unanimous vote of approval. This I say because a few weeks ago this Congress unanimously declared its policy for a postwar Navy under the terms of House Resolution 80. Having so declared our intention indelibly as to what we then knew to be a wise policy, we now begin implementing the purpose of that resolution. This bill before us today begins to put lifeblood into the policies already declared by us as reasonable and sound.

Having heard the clear and adequate reasoning of committee members in explanation of this bill, I feel their reasons given impel us to follow their unanimous lead and vote the bill as asked.

This bill, amongst other features, should be attractive to us all as Americans for the reason that it admittedly aims to help correct a condition which has needed correction for some years. It also looks forward and prepares the way up the trail toward the top of the hill where we will see our Navy even better and stronger in its democratic functioning than it now is.

It will make of 52 already designated American universities pretraining schools. This will make these benefits more available to more of our fine, ambitious, qualified youth. This is as it should be.

Hailing from Long Beach, Calif., as I do, I know you will understand—yes, expect me to remind you of the great naval installations there situate. And, within these last 30 days the Secretary of the Navy has designated these permanent facilities and installations as the Long Beach Navy Yard.

There rides at home anchor, and in the most beautiful and available harbor on the continent, the Third Fleet of the United States Navy. This harbor of Long Beach and all its more than 300,000 citizens cordially consider it a high privilege to have the Navy come and go and to count among its happy population, many thousands of Navy personnel.

This bill should have unanimous approval this day.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests on this side, and if the gentleman from New York does not have any requests for additional time, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The bill is as follows:)

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to remove any apprehension on the part of Naval Reserve officers regarding their opportunities for advancement in event of their transfer to the Regular Navy, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that in all matters relating to commissioned officers in the Regular Navy there shall be no discrimination whatsoever against officers because of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, and that no preference shall be given officers by reason of the fact that they entered the Regular Navy from any particular source; and, among other things, that all commissioned officers in the Regular Navy, regardless of the source from which they entered the Regular Navy, shall receive the same treatment with respect to opportunities for (1) promotion or advancement to all grades in the Navy, (2) holding any positions or assignments in the Navy including proportionate representation on selection boards, and (3) attending the Naval War College, postgraduate schools, or other schools, or otherwise receiving advanced or technical training.

SEC. 2. (a) The permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy shall hereafter be 500,000.

(b) Hereafter the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Marine Corps shall be 20 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 3. The number of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps provided for shall be construed to mean the daily average number of enlisted men in the naval service during the fiscal year.

SEC. 4. The permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall hereafter be equal to 8 percent of the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy.

SEC. 5. (a) The President may appoint male officers of the Naval Reserve and of the Marine Corps Reserve, officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps without permanent appointments therein, commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps with temporary appointments in higher grades and ranks, and any person who served on active duty in any such capacity during World War II and shall have been separated from such officer status under honorable conditions, to permanent warrant grades or, with the advice and consent of the

Senate, to permanent commissioned grades and ranks in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, respectively, but no such person shall be appointed to a grade or rank higher than the highest grade or rank in which he served on active duty. Appointments pursuant to this subsection to commissioned warrant and warrant grades shall be in such numbers as the President may determine, and to other grades and ranks in such numbers that, exclusive of commissioned warrant and warrant officers, the total number of officers of the line and of each of the Staff Corps of the Navy, and of the Marine Corps, will not exceed the authorized numbers of such officers.

(b) (1) Each appointee who is serving on active duty in a higher grade or rank than that in which appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall also be appointed for temporary service pursuant to, and subject to the limitations of, the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as now or hereafter amended, to such higher grade or rank and with the precedence held by him at the time of acceptance of permanent appointment; each appointee not serving on active duty in an officer grade or rank who is appointed under subsection (a) of this section to a grade or rank lower than the highest grade or rank held while on active duty in World War II other than by virtue of a temporary appointment which by its terms was of limited duration, may be similarly appointed to such higher rank or grade and with precedence determined in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (c) of this section.

(2) During such period as the Secretary of the Navy may determine, but not later than 6 months after June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present wars shall terminate, notwithstanding date of rank and lineal position assigned upon permanent appointment under subsection (a) of this section, (A) each officer who receives a permanent appointment in the same grade or rank in which he is then serving on active duty in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve shall retain the precedence held by him at the time of such appointment; (B) each person not serving on active duty in an officer grade or rank or serving on active duty in his permanent commissioned warrant or warrant grade who is appointed under subsection (a) of this section to the highest grade or rank held while on active duty in World War II other than by virtue of a temporary appointment which by its terms was of limited duration, shall have precedence determined in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (c) of this section.

(c) (1) Appointments under subsection (a) of this section shall be made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President for the administration of this section.

(2) Such regulations shall include, among other provisions, (A) provisions establishing standards and qualifications for appointment thereunder to the several grades and ranks and for the determination of the lineal position and precedence of appointees; and (B) provisions for the assignment of running mates to officers appointed thereunder to the Staff Corps of the Regular Navy.

(3) Such regulations may provide for (A) readjustment of the lineal position and precedence of persons heretofore or hereafter appointed under other provisions of law to commissioned grades or ranks in the Regular Navy subsequent to September 8, 1939, and in the Regular Marine Corps subsequent to June 30, 1939, and (B) reassignment of running mates to persons so appointed to commissioned grades or ranks in the Staff Corps of the Regular Navy.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (b) the authority granted by this section shall expire 6 months after June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall terminate or 2 years after the effective date of this act, whichever shall be the later.

SEC. 6. (a) The commission of any appointee under subsection (a) of section 5 may be revoked by the Secretary of the Navy until the latest date on which the commission of any officer (or in the case of officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy, an officer in his corps) senior in lineal position to that assigned such appointee pursuant to regulations established under subsection (c) of section 5 of this act is revocable.

(b) Each officer (other than officers appointed or reappointed pursuant to subsection (c)) whose commission is so revoked shall thereupon be discharged from the naval service without advanced pay or allowances.

(c) Each officer above the grade of commissioned warrant officer whose commission is so revoked and who (1) at the time of his appointment under subsection (a) of section 5, held permanent status as a commissioned warrant officer may be reappointed by the President to such permanent status without examination, with the lineal position and precedence to which his seniority would have entitled him had his service subsequent to reappointment under such subsection (a) been rendered in such permanent status, or (2) at the time of his appointment under such subsection (a) held permanent status as a warrant or petty officer may be appointed by the President without examination to the permanent commissioned warrant or warrant grade and with the same lineal position and precedence which he normally would have attained in due course had he not been appointed pursuant to such subsection (a).

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each officer of the Naval Reserve and of the Marine Corps Reserve and each officer of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps without permanent appointments therein, appointed to officer rank in the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps pursuant to this act, who at the time of such appointment had to his credit leave accrued but not taken, may, subsequent to appointment, be granted such leave without loss of pay or allowances.

SEC. 8. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and the provisions of this act shall be in effect in lieu thereof and such repeal shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts and parts of acts:

(a) That portion of the first sentence after the subheading: "International naval rendezvous and review;" in chapter 212, Twenty-seventh Statutes at Large, page 715, which appears at page 730 and which reads as follows: "; and the number of persons who may at one time be enlisted into the Navy of the United States, including seamen, ordinary seamen, landsmen, mechanics, firemen, and coal heavers, and including 1,500 apprentices and boys, hereby authorized to be enlisted annually, shall not exceed 9,000."

(b) That portion of the sentence after the heading "Pay of the Navy" in chapter 186, Twenty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 825, which appears at page 826 and which reads as follows: "and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enlist as many additional seamen as in his discretion he may deem necessary, not to exceed 1,000;".

(c) Section 2 of chapter 120, Twenty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 96, at page 97.

(d) That portion of the sentence after the heading "Pay of the Navy" in chapter 399, Twenty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 361, which appears at page 361 and which reads as follows: "and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enlist at any time after the passage of this act as many additional men as in his discretion he may deem necessary, not to exceed 1,000,".

(e) That proviso at the end of the first sentence after the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. Pay of the Navy:" in chapter 130, Thirty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 392, which appears at page 403 and which reads as follows: ": *Provided*, That hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps provided for shall be construed to mean the daily average number of enlisted men in the naval service during the fiscal year."

(f) The following portions of chapter 417, Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 556:

(1) That portion of the first sentence after the heading "Hospital Corps" in such chapter, which appears at page 572 and which reads as follows: "and shall be in addition thereto."

(2) That portion of the first sentence after the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. Pay of the Navy:" in such chapter, which appears at page 575 and which reads as follows: ", and the President is hereafter authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 87,000 men," and that portion of such sentence which reads as follows: ", and hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Navy shall be exclusive of those sentenced by court martial to discharge."

(3) That portion of the first sentence after the heading "Commissioned Personnel" in such chapter, which appears at page 576, as amended by the first section of chapter 402, Forty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 487, and which, so amended, reads as follows: "Hereafter the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be equal to 4¾ percent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the active list, exclusive of the Hospital Corps, prisoners undergoing sentence of discharge, enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, and the Flying Corps."

(4) That portion of the first sentence after the subheading "Pay of enlisted men, active list," in such chapter, which appears at page 612 and which reads as follows: "and hereafter the number of enlisted men of the Marine Corps shall be exclusive of those sentenced by court martial to discharge.".

(5) The third sentence after the subheading "Pay of enlisted men, active list:" in such chapter, which appears at page 612 and which reads as follows: "The President is authorized, when, in his judgment, it becomes necessary to place the country in a complete state of preparedness, to further increase the enlisted strength of the Marine Corps to 17,400: *And provided further*, That the distribution in the various grades shall be in the same proportion as that authorized at the time when the President avails himself of the authority herein granted,".

(g) The first and second sections of chapter 20, Fortieth Statutes at Large, page 84, as amended.

(h) That portion of the second sentence after the heading "Maintenance" in chapter 9, Forty-first Statutes at Large, page 131, which appears at page 137 and which reads as follows: "and the President is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment a sufficient national emergency exists, to increase the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy to 191,000 men."

(i) That portion of the fourth sentence after the heading "Marine Corps. Pay, Marine Corps;" in chapter 228, Forty-first Statutes at Large, page 812, which appears at page 830 and which reads as follows: "The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby permanently established at 27,400, distribution in the various grades to be made in the same proportion as provided under existing law: *Provided*, That."

(j) Section 2 and subsection (d) of section 15 of chapter 598, Fifty-second Statutes at Large, page 944, at pages 944 and 952, respectively.

(k) Chapter 74, Fifty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 145, as amended by chapter 1, Fifty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 3.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. IZAC: Page 7, line 9, after the word "warrant", strike out the word "or"; insert a comma, and after "grade" insert "or chief petty officer permanent grade."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WORLEY, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4421) to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 393, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF BUREAUS IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The Senate amendment provides that the terms "chief of bureau" and "assistant to chief of bureau" shall include the Director of Budget and Reports and the Assistant Director of Budget and Reports, respectively.

The conferees on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment so that the Director of Budget and Reports and the Assistant Director of Budget and Reports will receive the same consideration as a chief of bureau and an assistant to chief of bureau, respectively.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the conference report, when the bill was passed some weeks ago it only related to the chiefs of bureaus. There are some nine different bureaus in the Navy Department, including the Judge Advocate General's Office. The Senate amended it to make it applicable also to the Director of Budget and Reports, and Assistant Director of Budget and Reports, which was agreed to by the House conferees.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What rank would the Director of Budget and Reports have?

Mr. VINSON. The Director of Budget and Reports would be a vice admiral at the discretion of the President after 1 year's service as such. The Assistant Director of Budget and Reports would have the rank of a rear admiral. It carries that rank.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN BECAUSE OF UNSATISFACTORY CONDUCT OR APTITUDE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment insert the following: "or whenever it is determined by a unanimous decision of the Academic Board that any midshipman possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

In authorizing the discharge of midshipmen from the Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy the House amended the Senate bill by striking out the words "or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service". The conferees on the part of the House receded from the House amendment and accepted in lieu thereof a modification of the Senate version which requires unanimous decision of the Academic Board before a midshipman can be discharged for insufficient aptitude.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as the House will observe from the statement just read, when the bill was passed some weeks ago, the House struck out the words "or that any midshipman has demonstrated that he possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service."

When this bill was before the committee there was grave doubt in our minds as to whether any one person should be given the responsibility of determining whether or not a student lacked aptitude for becoming an officer. So we struck that out. In the conference it was suggested that oftentimes it develops in the Naval Academy that students do not have sufficient aptitude for becoming officers, and therefore, if the unanimous decision is reached by the academic board, then the student should be dropped. So the House conferees agreed to leave the aptitude provision in the bill provided it required the unanimous vote of the academic board that he should be dropped for insufficient aptitude. However, we want it distinctly understood that it must be done by the unanimous decision of the academic board before any student can be dropped for lack of aptitude. It might be that in my mind some student might not have sufficient aptitude. In the decision of someone else he might have. So it is such a debatable question that we were unwilling to confer that authority upon anyone unless it was by the unanimous voice of the academic board.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. MICHENER. That word "aptitude" is all-inclusive, and so comprehensive that it has caused literally days of debate in this Congress since I have been here.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. I have been told by members of various committees that in the olden days in certain departments aptitude was measured sometimes by social accomplishments.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; in the minds of some that might be true.

Mr. MICHENER. If in the mind of the admiral and those in charge a young man whom the chairman of the great Naval Affairs Committee sent to Annapolis, even though he should be A–1 in all the grades, yet according to the standards of the admirals he never would shine at a tea table or a cocktail party, he would be summarily dismissed from the institution without any right of appeal.

Mr. VINSON. No; no.

Mr. MICHENER. I know the gentleman does not want to see anything like that happen. I have tried in selecting my boys to select boys who had some of all the accomplishments.

Mr. VINSON. When you use the word "aptitude" you enter a large field. Therefore when it was before the House Committee and before the House we struck it out. But we have it safeguarded by saying that before any boy can be dropped from the Academy for lack of sufficient aptitude it must be by the unanimous vote of the academic board and not of the admirals.

Mr. MICHENER. I think that is good. I wish the gentleman would interpret the law and tell the House just what he could consider "aptitude" if he were to judge.

Mr. VINSON. Yes. What I have in mind and what in my judgment the individual officer should have in mind is something serious. One of the requirements of a naval officer, for instance, is leadership. If he fails in leadership then I would say he would fail in aptitude and therefore should not be educated at public expense and given a commission because he fails to possess the necessary qualifications that will enable him to lead other men.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that this does become the law, and it undoubtedly will, and another policy should be adopted by this academic board, I want the record to show, and I hope the gentleman whom I am now interrogating will join in the expression, that if there are cases that are questionable there is likely to be a congressional investigation as to the specific case.

Mr. VINSON. I grant the gentleman that. If I thought for one moment that after this bill becomes a law they would misinterpret what the Naval Affairs Committee thinks is a proper interpretation of "aptitude" there would promptly be an investigation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Further than that, is it not correct that if a student at Annapolis graduates and is commissioned in the Navy he can be summarily dismissed during a 7-year period of time for no reason?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include certain letters.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein a copy of a letter he had just addressed to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower concerning the priority of shipping.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain data.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a document sent to him by the War Department on the subject of Negroes in the armed forces.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a statement on behalf of H. R. 3940, amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act by the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an analysis of the President's labor message prepared by the legislative representative of the United Electrical Workers of America, CIO.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1493. An act to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, December 5, 1945.

Business to be considered: Resumption of hearings on H. R. 2764, the freight forwarders bill, to hear opposition.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will have an executive meeting on Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

852. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

853. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued report entitled "The Financial Record of the Electric Utility Industry"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 444. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4649, a bill to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 4893. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4894. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and to suspend all inductions thereunder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4895. A bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4896. A bill to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation, and for transportation of dependents and shipment of household effects, of members of the naval forces upon separation from active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4897. A bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to provide for operation of its provisions (except title 1) in time of peace as well as in time of war; to eliminate the provisions relating to Federal ballots; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4898. A bill relating to the unauthorized wearing of the discharge button awarded by the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4899. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE of New York:

H. R. 4900. A bill to clarify the terms "compensation" and "pension" under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4901. A bill to facilitate filing and settlement of claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4902. A bill to facilitate settlement of claims and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution to control and reduce world armaments and weapons designed for mass destruction of human life; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 455. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1205, current session, entitled "Economic Reconstruction in Europe," for the use of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate lend-lease operations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 4903. A bill for the relief of Capt. Richard Reynolds Shoaf; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 4904. A bill for the relief of Cleo D. Johnson and Jack B. Cherry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4905. A bill for the relief of Nina E. Schmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4906. A bill for the relief of Alice E. Pearce, Louise D. Tweed, and Mary Frances Hill; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1370. By Mr. RICH: Petition of residents of Lock Haven and Clinton County, Pa., urging immediate release from the military and naval service of all fathers, regardless of age, rank, length of service, or number of children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1371. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert Edward Edmondson for consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances, succor, and relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who amidst all the traffic of our busy ways leadest our steps to this noontide sanctuary of the spirit, take Thou the dimness of our souls away; open our hearts that, facing our tasks with Thee, we may be of a quiet mind. A quenchless desire cries out within us that only Thyself canst satisfy. Without Thee we can find no light, nor rest, nor strength. Like men who turn from dusty toil to crystal streams, like those who raise their eyes from foul and narrow city streets to the snow-clad whiteness of mountain peaks and to the steadfast calm of the friendly stars, so do we lift our gaze to the infinite sky of Thy mercy and to the beckoning hills of Thy help, as we link our hopes for all humankind to Thee who seest our little troubled hour as one to whom a thousand years are but as one day.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 4, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 4, 1945:

S. 1308. An act to amend article 6 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

On December 5, 1945:

S. 1364. An act to provide for the compromise and settlement by the Secretary of the Navy of certain claims for damage to property under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to provide for the execution of releases by the Secretary of the Navy upon payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE—AMENDMENT TO UNRRA BILL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the remainder of the session today. I have official business to take care of in committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska is excused.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I should like to make a statement regarding the consideration of the joint resolution appropriating additional funds for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I have an amendment which I intended to offer. In the event that consideration of the joint resolution has been concluded before I return to the floor, I should like to say to the Members of the Senate that I shall not offer the amendment, because I have been assured by my esteemed colleague from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and President pro tempore of the Senate, that the matter covered by the amendment will be discussed in conference and that the conferees will decide whether or not they will submit it to a vote of the Senate.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL PAY BILL

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of action on the UNRRA appropriation measure and the Philippine appropriation bill, Senate bill 1415, the Fed-

eral pay bill, shall become the unfinished business of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall feel constrained to object to any unanimous-consent agreement being entered into at this time. I think there ought to be at least a quorum call and a substantially larger membership upon the floor before any agreement is made as to the legislative program.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. I cheerfully accede.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Chair understand the Senator from Maine to make the point that there was not a quorum present?

Mr. WHITE. I objected to the unanimous-consent request and one of the reasons I assigned—there are other reasons—was that there is not a quorum now present.

PROPOSED PROVISION RELATING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 118)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation for the Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, as an amendment to House Document 364, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the New York Federation of Chiropractors, Inc., Unit No. 2, Brooklyn-Richmond district, favoring the entry of certain Jews into Palestine and the establishment of a commonwealth in the Holy Land, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 4, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1493) to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 50) to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 814) thereon.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of November 1945 from the chairman of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
December 1, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee.

SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or agency by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Bertram Gross	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	$8,750
Doris Phippen [1]	40 Plattsburg Court NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department	2,650
Eve Zidel	24-C Crescent Rd., Greenbelt, Md	Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,650

[1] Temporarily borrowed from Surplus Property Subcommittee (S. Res. 129).

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

DECEMBER 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Herman Edelsberg	2141 Suitland Terrace SE., Washington, D. C	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C	$7,175
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainesville St. SE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	7,175
F. Preston Forbes	502 Four Mile Rd., Alexandria, Va	Commerce Department, Washington, D. C	7,175
Scott K. Gray, Jr	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	5,390
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C	do	2,980
Lt. George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C	Navy Department, Washington, D. C	2,400
L. Evelyn Spicer	1708 Kilbourne Pl. NW., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	3,090
Fredk. W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave. NW., Washington, D. C	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	5,600
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C	2,320
Allen G. Thurman	9729 Bexhill Drive, Rock Creek Hills, Md	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C	7,175

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—VIEWS OF MR. LANGER (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 639)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file the individual views of myself as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on the bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the views will be received and printed.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill and joint resolution were introduced, and the bill was read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 1660. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. McKELLAR reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND PUBLIC HEALTH CENTERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such constuction, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STUDY AND SURVEY OF THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 199), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, as heretofore extended and supplemented, is hereby increased by $187,800.

DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD four letters from members of the military forces and one letter from the mother of a serviceman expressing resentment and indignation at the slow manner in which the men who are eligible for discharge are really being discharged. For obvious reasons I am withholding the names of those writing the letters.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

DEAR SIR: At present I'm stationed on the island of Leyte waiting my turn to return to the United States along with several thousand other soldiers, and due to the present difficulties in transportation I'm writing you, for I think it's time our Senators and Representatives look into this situation instead of taking high-ranking Army and Navy officials' word for smooth operation of the "magic carpet" which in my estimation is so much propaganda and "boloney" for civilian consumption. I'm wondering if you men in Washington know what's really going on, or are you listening to what the radio and newspapers are saying in favor of prompt and excellent movements of veteran troops.

As a slight example: I have been overseas only a short 17 months as a troop-carrier pilot, and in that time have flown 1,100 hours through every kind of bad weather that you can imagine, and in my Army career have accumulated 117 points under the adjusted service rating. So far they've helped none; however, according to the radio, I've been home a couple of months and am already out of the Army. On the radio last night it was announced that men with 70 points were being returned from this theater already, and I know what packs of lies are being released to the public in this respect. Thirty days ago, October 15, 1945, I finally succeeded in getting my orders to return to the United States, at that time there were 331 officers ahead of me. Today, 30 days later, only 79 officers and about 1,500 enlisted men have been shipped out. This is far from being satisfactory, and there is no improvement as time goes on. So I think it's about time you men in Washington with some power and authority start looking into this situation and try to get some action started to alleviate this situation.

About a week ago I got permission from a skipper of a small ship to ride back to the United States with him and went to get permission; however, it was strictly forbidden as unauthorized transportation. So far as I know the ship pulled out completely empty when a few men could have ridden home that way. The shipping space that is available certainly isn't being utilized, and a little here and there goes a long way in the end.

To top things off, Japanese prisoners are being sent out of this harbor on American ships back to their homeland while we sit around and wait. I can't give the exact number that have been shipped out, nor the ship numbers, but I know it's going on. For this I quote from Maptalk volume IV, No. 23, published by I and E Section, GHQ, AFWESPAC, October 31, 1945: "The United States Army forces in the western Pacific disclosed that, to save feeding costs, 13,800 Japanese prisoners of war in the Philippines would be repatriated by mid-January. Many in Liberty ships."

Senator, this isn't a joke to any of us, for God only knows how we want to get home to our families and children that we've not seen in such a long time. It would be nice to be home for Christmas once more, but apparently our Government doesn't give a damn if we sit over here and rot or not. There's nothing we can do over here, and only you men in Washington can help now, for patience and time is relieving nothing.

As long as I'm in the Army, I can say nothing, but the day after I'm discharged, if that day ever arrives, I'm going to turn over plenty of facts and figures to Texas newspapers so maybe they'll be published and let a few of our people see what really went on.

I'm sure that you've received several other letters similar to this in the past few months, and I'm hoping that some way, somehow you can help us that are trying to get home.

Sincerely yours.

NOVEMBER 12, 1945.

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: How long does one certain group of men have to tolerate the unfairness and even persecution of the Army bureaucracy? This group consists of unfortunate doctors of the Medical Corps stationed over here in the Pacific.

I and many others have adequate points for discharge as of September 2, but not quite enough to be the first on the lists. We wait our turn for orders. Finally our bracket is reached and what happens—AFWESPAC freezes all medical officers. So orders continue to come on officers with fewer points and we are as helpless as a prisoner of war. Even if there were a shortage of doctors over here, does this mean that we of this minority have to write ourselves off as unfortunates whom chance has dropped here? Why can't the misery be shared by all?

I formerly practiced medicine in Dallas, Tex. I'm married and have one child. I've been overseas 20 months and have 81 points with 3 combat stars to my credit.

The rumor is that even though we are eligible for discharge, we are going to be here several months yet, and of course the command is too great and too busy to tell us why we are frozen and for how long. No; the sadists lean back in their chairs and chuckle with joy at the rumors they know to be false because they enjoy seeing some lesser ranked individual going progressively insane over here.

Don't let anyone tell you, sir, there is a shortage of shipping either. We can find enough ships to take Japs home at the rate of 1,000 a day. We have enough ships to take Aussie women to the United States. We have enough ships to hold a huge pageant in all United States ports. We have enough ships to carry a few Chinese armies into a politically rotten China. We have so many ships that daily we can send them home with ballast—yes, empty.

Respectfully yours.

NOVEMBER 15, 1945.

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Senator from Texas, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We are concerned over the loss of prestige that the Army has suffered since VJ-day, due solely to the Army's failure to adhere to the publicized point system. We are equally concerned with the forced separation from our families.

Surely, the War Department must know that an embittered bloc of veterans will oppose any policy for future defense simply because there will be a lack of faith in the military, the persons responsible for the current redeployment confusion. Is it cause for astonishment that the American people are opposed to large appropriations for defense during peacetime?

Paradoxically, the men charged with our country's defense are most instrumental in guaranteeing a lack of armaments in the future years. Now, more than ever before, when the citizenry should be conscious of the need for preparedness, the present men in charge are laying the ground work for the same situation that existed in our country following the last war.

We declare it to be the responsibility of our elected Representatives to be cognizant of the above-mentioned facts and not fail their duty toward our children and children to be.

Of course, our basic complaint underlying this letter is our desire to return home, but these desires are intimately correlated with the argument we have presented.

The men who are signed below are all veterans of long duty in the Southwest Pacific and ask nothing more than a thoughtful perusal of our letter.

Sincerely yours.

GALVESTON, TEX., *November 19, 1945.*

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I don't know whether I'm out of order in writing you about this, but I trust I'm not. know you're probably swamped with just such letters, so I don't feel one more will bother you. I know I wouldn't write such a letter if I didn't feel that something was radically wrong with the discharge of soldiers who are not serving any useful purpose, now that the fighting is over, but it don't look any too bright the way talk is going round about a third world war.

My son is in Leyte, in the Philippines. He writes that his unit is absolutely idle, doing nothing at all; ships leave there empty, when they could be taking men back to the States. His unit has made a baseball diamond; they play rummy, have cock fights, and in general, they're getting pretty moody, with nothing to do; surely the Government shouldn't want to waste money on men who can't, through no fault of their own, make a return in work of some sort.

One major in this unit has made a still, and detaching a soldier to guard it. Even though a soldier may have a pass, he's not allowed to be away more than 6 hours, and yet the officers set the example of having drinking parties and dances. Don't they know that the soldier will be full of resentment against being in the Army?

Now I'm not asking that my son be sent back home and discharged, if he is needed. * * * I'm not asking that you do anything for him alone, but something should be done to help unnecessary men to get back into useful jobs, before they learn to detest the Army and all its implications. I'd like some advice that I can pass on to my son, who in turn can pass on to his buddies. They feel that they are now deserted and left to fiddle around, doing nothing.

Yours very truly.

KYUSHU, JAPAN, *November 13, 1945.*

DEAR SENATOR AND FRIEND: As a marine who came from Texas, if it is possible I would like a favor from you. All we can hear on the radio is thousands of men on strike. Isn't there something you can do about it. There are thousands of us marines here in Japan who would be glad to work for the wages they get now. We draw around $50 a month and have to be pleased with it.

What would have happened if we had set down 2 or 3 years ago? The people of the United States might have been working for the Japs at 30 cents a day.

It is my opinion and the opinion of a million other servicemen that have been over here for 2 years, to send the men that want to strike over here to occupy the country that our buddies and brothers died for and let us work for we feel like our Government can and will keep the wages at the right scale.

I also am one of thousands who has a child that is 17 months old that I haven't seen. I have over 50 points and want to go home, but till my job is done I won't be crying for someone has to stay here and straighten this country out, so we can live in peace in the future to come.

Sir, I just feel that you are the one that can do something—as a hundred thousand Texans put you in for our State and they can't be wrong. Maybe we just don't know what it's all about. It just doesn't make sense when we get the news that our ships are having to wait for repairs so they can carry us to our loved ones and to the "good ole" United States of America that we love. So, sir, our feelings should be known throughout the United States of America. May I thank you.

Yours truly.

ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR FROM MEXICO

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by His Excellency, Dr. Antonio Espinosa de Los Monteros, Ambassador from Mexico, at a dinner in his honor at the New York Board of Trade and the Mexican Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at the Hotel Plaza, New York, November 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THEY CALL IT PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "They Call It Peace," from the Chicago Tribune of December 3, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss;

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan; and

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2930) for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 693) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1862) relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. JENNINGS, and Mr. COMBS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. HOOK, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 233. An act for the relief of Hamsah Omar.

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of E. D. Williams;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 948. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of B. Pendino;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others.

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Leonard Hutchings;

H. R. 1615. An act for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1848. An act for the relief of Max Hirsch;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Thomas Sumner;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Dave Topper;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett;

H. R. 2168. An act for the relief of Charles Zucker;

H. R. 2171. An act for the relief of Solomon Schtierman;

H. R. 2251. An act for the relief of Catherine V. Sweeney;

H. R. 2270. An act for the relief of Harry C. Westover;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Arnold Mecham;

H. R. 2318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mertie Pike and the estate of Mrs. Burnice Smotherman, deceased;

H. R. 2393. An act for the relief of Elsie Peter;

H. R. 2546. An act for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2661. An act for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones;

H. R. 2670. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire;

H. R. 2688. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Honolulu Plantation Co.;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Forest Eldon Powell;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of R. H. Sindle;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of C. Frank James;

H. R. 2809. An act for the relief of Theodore Maudrame;

H. R. 2837. An act for the relief of George Stiles;

H. R. 2884. An act for the relief of B. H. Spann;

H. R. 2887. An act for the relief of Joseph Mrak;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKillip;

H. R. 2927. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt;

H. R. 2963. An act for the relief of William Phillips;

H. R. 2974. An act for the relief of the estate of Bobby Messick;

H. R. 3012. An act for the relief of George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3285. An act for the relief of Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer;

H. R. 3454. An act for the relief of William Clyde McKinney;

H. R. 3514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Olga Stanik, a minor;

H. R. 3554. An act for the relief of Fred C. Liter;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian;

H. R. 3677. An act for the relief of J. Tom Stephenson;

H. R. 3698. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Scarlett and Charles Scarlett;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3765. An act for the relief of Herman Trahn;

H. R. 3784. An act for the relief of C. H. Brumfield;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Natale Piavallo, also known as Natale Kiecieck;

H. R. 3791. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman;

H. R. 3808. An act for the relief of the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R 3904. An act for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Lucy Delgado and Irma M. Delgado;

H. R. 4269. An act for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom;

H. R. 4381. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Javlik; and

H. R. 4421. An act to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of E. D. Williams;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District, No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 948. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, northern division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1315. An act for the relief of B. Pendino;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Leonard Hutchings;

H. R. 1615. An act for the relief of the legal guardians of John Buchan and Lawrence Gillingham, minors;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1848. An act for the relief of Max Hirsch;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Thomas Sumner;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Eleanor Parkinson;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Dave Topper;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett;

H. R. 2168. An act for the relief of Charles Zucker;

H. R. 2171. An act for the relief of Solomon Schtierman;

H. R. 2251. An act for the relief of Catherine V. Sweeney;

H. R. 2270. An act for the relief of Harry C. Westover;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Arnold Mecham;

H. R. 2318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mertie Pike and the estate of Mrs. Burnice S. otherman, deceased;

H. R. 2393. An act for the relief of Elsie Peter;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2661. An act for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones;

H. R. 2670. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire;

H. R. 2688. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Honolulu Plantation Co.;

H. R. 2724. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Forest Eldon Powell;

H. R. 2728. An act for the relief of R. H. Sindle;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of C. Frank James;

H. R. 2837. An act for the relief of George Stiles;

H. R. 2884. An act for the relief of B. H. Spann;

H. R. 2887. An act for the relief of Joseph Mrak;

H. R. 2901. An act for the relief of Mrs. Janet McKillip;

H. R. 2927. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Merritt;

H. R. 2963. An act for the relief of William Phillips;

H. R. 2974. An act for the relief of the estate of Bobby Messick;

H. R. 3012. An act for the relief of George W. Murrell and Kirby Murrell, a minor;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3229. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leslie Price, Philip C. Price, Mrs. Louise Keyton, Annie Curry, and James Curry;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3285. An act for the relief of Capt. Wayne E. Meisenheimer;

H. R. 3454. An act for the relief of William Clyde McKinney;

H. R. 3514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Olga Stanik, a minor;

H. R. 3554. An act for the relief of Fred C. Liter;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian;

H. R. 3677. An act for the relief of J. Tom Stephenson;

H. R. 3698. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Scarlett and Charles Scarlett;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3791. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mersman;

H. R. 3808. An act for the relief of the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3904. An act for the relief of Raymond C. Campbell;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot;

H. R. 4249. An act for the relief of Lucy Delgado and Irma M. Delgado; and

H. R. 4269. An act for the relief of Ida Barger, Hazel A. Beecher, Etta Clark, Jesse Ruth France, John W. Nolan, Anna Palubicki, and Frank J. Schrom; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 233. An act for the relief of Hamsah Omar;

H. R. 2546. An act for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez;

H. R. 2809. An act for the relief of Theodore Maudrame;

H. R. 3765. An act for the relief of Herman Trahn;

H. R. 3784. An act for the relief of C. H. Brumfield;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Natale Piavallo, also known as Natale Kiecieck; and

H. R. 4381. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4421. An act to increase the permanent authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, to increase the permanent authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, and to authorize permanent appointments in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum present before we take up the bill, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bail	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Reed
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Huffman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Taylor
Capehart	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Carville	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Donnell	McMahon	Walsh
Downey	Magnuson	Wheeler
Eastland	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Gossett	Murray	
Green	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business. They have been excused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 2, after the figures "1947", to strike out the colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask Senators to listen to a statement in explanation of the joint resolution which will take but a few moments. In March 1944 Congress passed a bill authorizing an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for what is known as UNRRA. In June of that year we appropriated $800,000,000 in furtherance of that authorization. The pending measure simply appropriates the balance of the authorization, amounting to $550,000,000.

When this joint resolution was before the House the House placed in it a number of amendments, some of them apparently legislation and some of them not. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate has stricken out all those amendments and has confirmed the joint resolution simply to carrying out what America undertook to do when Congress passed the $1,350,000,000 authorization bill. The joint resolution as reported from the Senate committee contains no House amendments at all. For instance, I call attention to the principal amendment of the House, which is what is known as the publicity provision, intended to keep the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid furnished by UNRRA. The Senate committee thought that was a matter which ought to come up when the next UNRRA authorization bill is considered, and that such a provision should not be attached to the pending measure.

The appropriation carried in the pending joint resolution is a part of the authorization made last year. It is our duty to make good that authorization. Of course, there has been much criticism of UNRRA, but without regard to that, the United States Government has promised inferentially, at any rate, to appropriate $1,350,000,000 for relief purposes, and the joint resolution as reported by the Senate committee striking out all the amendments which the House placed in the bill, provides simply for the appropriation of the balance of $550,000,000 remaining after the prior appropriation. The Senate committee believes the promise made should be carried out, and the amount appropriated.

I call attention to one paragraph of the report of the committee:

> With respect to the so-called free-press provision—

And that was the most important provision the House placed in the bill by way of amendment—

> the Department of State called attention to the fact that officials of the Department were negotiating on matters of this kind all the time and feel that they have had some degree of success in achieving their objectives. It is their feeling that the proposed provision would hinder them in their efforts. Inasmuch as the peoples in those countries to whom relief is being given—and there are millions of them who are right on the starvation line—are not in position at this time to have very much influence with their central governments on the policies that those governments may adopt, it seemed to the committee that to deny those starving people succor unless the conditions laid down in this provision were met would only result in greater suffering to those we are trying to help. The committee, therefore, has recommended the deletion of the proposed language.

Mr. President, I have stated the purpose of the joint resolution. It is a very simple measure. As reported by the Senate committee, it provides simply for an appropriation of the $550,000,000 which Congress has not yet appropriated, but which has been authorized.

Mr. President, as I stated to the Senator from Nebraska the other day in reply to a question respecting the free-press provision, these matters of legislation can all be taken up when the UNRRA authorization measure, which is now before the House, comes up for action, but they ought not to be taken up now, and we ought to limit ourselves simply to the appropriation. I hope very earnestly that the Senate will adopt the recommendation of the Senate committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with what the chairman of the committee has said. I am sorry I was obliged to be out of the city when the measure came before the Senate committee. At that time I was attending the funeral of our deceased colleague, Senator Thomas of Idaho. I think the free-press provision quite properly should not be attached to this joint resolution. But I should like to ask a question. Did the committee make any inquiry, and has any assurance been given that UNRRA is checking to see that the money Congress appropriates goes where the American people think it ought to go?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly the question which was raised in the committee, and the evidence indicated that it was. Such questions will always be raised. So far as the $550,000,000 is concerned, as I see it, having authorized it, having led suffering people in distressed countries to think they would get it, we are duty bound to appropriate the money.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the Senator is completely right; but I shall think that I am correct in saying that the people of the United States are going to expect the Congress to insist pretty soon that the people of the world know that we are feeding them. What benefit can we get from the humanitarian joy of knowing that we are feeding people if they do not know that the American people are sending this money to them?

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator entirely; and when the bill for

the extension of UNRRA comes before the Senate I am willing to go to the very limit to find out whether the money is being properly spent, as the American people expect it to be spent. The American people are of the opinion that we are feeding people who are hungry, that we are clothing people who have no clothes, and that we are furnishing shoes to people who have no shoes. The American people believe that we are taking care of those actually in want in the various countries. But those questions should be raised in connection with the bill authorizing the extension of UNRRA, and not in connection with the pending measure. I hope the Senate will look at it in the same way.

If Senators will examine the printed hearings they will find that the committee considered the subject very carefully. I hope the Senate will pass the bill as it has been reported by the committee.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me say to the Senator that all the information I can obtain is to the effect that when UNRRA started it was a very haphazard organization. Many persons returning from overseas made very derogatory reports about it. Then we heard that its administration was improving. Now it is proposed to appropriate $550,000,000, but we have no assurance that the money will go to the people for whom it is intended, or that the people for whom it is intended will have the slightest idea that the American people are giving it. I believe that this should be the last appropriation for UNRRA without insisting that we know where the money goes, and that it goes where we think it goes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator 100 percent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. REED. I should like to talk with the Senator from Tennessee while he has the floor.

I am very glad to have the assurance of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that in future legislation extending the life of UNRRA, if such an extension is to be made, an effort will be made to insert a provision that the assistance shall go to countries in which the American press can have free access to the news as to what becomes of the money that we are sending abroad. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee that as the bill came to the Senate from the House legislation was written into it; but I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I am glad to have his assurance, if I correctly understand him, that in future legislation such important matters will be given proper consideration and properly taken care of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will go further than that. I will say to the Senator that we ought to know whether the needy in the various countries are actually receiving the help which the American people are expected to give them by the passage of this measure and the appropriation of this money.

Mr. REED. I join the Senator from Illinois in believing that it is important that the recipients know where the help is coming from.

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there anywhere, in the reports or elsewhere, any statement of where and how the $550,000,000 is to be used?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the way I understand the situation with respect to the $550,000,000——

Mr. TAFT. Let me ask, in the first place, whether there is any statement as to how the $550,000,000 is to be used. I have before me the fourth report, as of June 30, which seems to be the last report. I do not find in the hearings any comprehensive statement as to what the money is to be used for, what countries are to get it, and whether it is to be used for food or clothing for displaced persons, or for some other purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator understands that we passed an authorization act providing $1,350,000,000. We have heretofore appropriated $800,000,000, leaving $550,000,000 to be appropriated. Of the $550,000,000, 10 percent, or $55,000,000, will be in cash. In the first instance, 10 percent of the $800,000,000, or $80,000,000, was in cash, and $720,000,000 in credit. Under this appropriation of $550,000,000, there will be available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration $55,000,000 in cash, and a credit of $495,000,000, with which to purchase goods in the United States. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that we have practically committed ourselves, and that delay will interfere with obtaining goods on which the Administration has options in the United States. By the 1st of January there will not be $100,000,000 of this money left. So we know that the purchases are to be made in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that the Senator is quite correct in stating that, so far as this appropriation is concerned, we are obligated to make it, and I propose to vote for it. I am not concerned with the question as to whether we are bound to do it. What I am asking is whether there is available any information showing which nations are to receive the money, and whether they are to receive food, clothing, or agricultural implements. I notice in the June 30 report that $40,000,000 is a currency fund to finance purchases outside the United States. Do we know where those purchases are being made, and which countries are receiving the $40,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Tennessee has the figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me give the Senator the figures: Clothing, textiles, and footwear, $87,300,000; food, $235,000,000; agricultural rehabilitation supplies, $36,450,000; industrial rehabilitation supplies, $72,000,000; medical and sanitation supplies, $33,750,000; relief and rehabilitation services, $10,000,000; ocean transportation, $50,000,000; miscellaneous commodities and accessorial expenses, $25,000,000; making a total of approximately $550,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Those figures refer to the money which is about to be appropriated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Exactly.

Mr. TAFT. Is there a division of that money among the various countries which are to receive it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have before me the list of countries. I shall place it in the RECORD later.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I believe that the main part of the $550,000,000 for supplies will go to five countries in Europe, namely, Greece, Albania, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, chiefly to Greece, Albania, and Yugoslavia, where there has been a severe drought. The proportion of food and clothing, in relation to industrial and agricultural rehabilitation supplies, is going up. Industrial and agricultural rehabilitation supplies represented a much larger proportion of the first part of the program than they represent in the current program.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, this appropriation covers Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Albania.

Mr. BALL. And, to some extent, China.

Mr. TAFT. In effect, practically all of the $550,000,000 will go to those five countries; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Will any go to Italy?

Mr. BALL. There is a $100,000,000 program in Italy to take care of children and expectant mothers.

Mr. TAFT. But it provides for no food?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Arizona will yield to me——

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will show the Senator where it goes. It goes to Albania, Byelorussian S. S. R., which is bordering on Russia; China, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Poland, Ukrainian S. S. R.; Yugoslavia, and a very small amount—2.2 percent—to all other countries.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator putting in the RECORD a statement of the proportion or figures indicating the relative size of these programs?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was requested that such figures not be put in, because the amounts might change constantly, and it would be misleading if we published the proportions or the percentages.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator think we should at least have information regarding what the plans are for each country, so that we may at least have some idea where the money is going.

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as this measure is concerned, we do not have that information.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think we are committed to the amount under discussion, but I am interested in the fact that we shall soon have another request for funds for the UNRRA. We shall have a request for an authorization of $1,350,000,000, and it seems to me that when that request comes we should have a definite statement regarding whether these countries will or will not be disappointed in regard to what the plans are, so that we

may know what the plans are for distributing the second allotment of UNRRA funds, before we commit ourselves to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator 100 percent, and I shall join with him in doing everything possible to obtain the facts.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize what the acting chairman of the committee has said. I hold in my hand a copy of House bill 4649, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives, has been favorably reported from committee, and is on the calendar of the House. I also hold in my hand a copy of a rule adopted by the House of Representatives providing for the consideration of that measure in the House. The bill is under general debate in the House of Representatives today. It is expected that it will be voted upon tomorrow. The bill was reported from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and after it is passed by the House and comes to the Senate, it will be referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The whole policy regarding whether we are going to continue UNRRA can be debated in connection with the consideration of that measure.

The rule adopted by the House is perfectly wide open. The House can vote on the question whether the supplies can be sent into a country which does not permit our news correspondents to enter it; the House of Representatives can vote on anything in connection with consideration of the measure. It is a wide open matter, so it will be thoroughly debated in the House of Represenatives; and when the bill comes before the Senate for consideration, there will be the same privilege here.

For that reason, I wish to say that, so far as the pending measure is concerned, all we have to do is to wait about two days until the other measure comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives. There will be opportunity for hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and subsequently there will be opportunity for full debate when the measure comes before the Senate. Therefore, my plea is that the pending measure be not amended, because there is no necessity for doing so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the Senator placing in the RECORD figures showing the quota or allotment to each nation and the amount which each nation has paid into this Organization?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not have those figures.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If they are available, I think they should be placed in the RECORD. I have received a great many inquiries on the subject, showing the widespread interest in it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Undoubtedly those figures will be presented to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when the new bill comes up for consideration. Undoubtedly the figures are available.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the interest of various Senators, as indicated in the debate, I think the figures should be placed in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think I can throw some light on the matter. It will be remembered that Governor Lehman testified that the respective countries generally had paid their commitments to the fund, and that in the case of Great Britain, the British would appropriate a fund in addition to the amount to which they were committed; and there were some other additions. So, according to Governor Lehman, the answer is that the countries originally participating in the plan have paid their commitments to the original fund.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That answer is not satisfactory to me. If I can obtain the figures showing the amount which each nation has agreed to contribute and the amount which each nation has paid, I should like to have those figures placed in the RECORD. I am not satisfied with the general statement regarding the participation of various nations.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can give the Senator the rule whereby the contributions were solicited. The rule was that each one of the forty-odd united or associated nations which joined in the organization should contribute an amount estimated to be 1 percent of its national income during the year 1943. The national income of the United States during that year was estimated at $135,000,000,000, and on that basis we appropriated $1,350,000,000. I can also state to the Senator that that sum amounts to 71 percent of the total contributions. We are by far the largest contributor, because we had by far the largest national income.

Whether when the other measure comes before the Senate we shall wish to adopt that rule regarding contributions or some other rule is a question for the Senate to consider. But that is the way the matter was handled in the first place.

I am further advised, as I am sure the Senator from Maryland will confirm, that all other nations which committed themselves to 1 percent contributions—I think there are 46 or 47 of them—have paid the full amounts up to now, except in the case of the United States, and some of them have exceeded their amounts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then I think some one should know the amounts they have paid.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not happen to remember what the amounts of the contributions were.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I shall be very glad to give the Senator from Alabama a list of the contributions.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to have the list placed in the RECORD. I would not remember it. I want the information available.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, the Senator would not remember it. The list to which I refer is a statement of contributions implementing and operating the organization. The last figures which we have been able to obtain are as of September 30, 1945. The figures show, for instance, that Australia agreed to contribute $38,400,000, and that she has paid the entire amount which she agreed to pay. The list shows the contributions of all the nations participating in the plan. I ask unanimous consent that the list or statement, as it appears on page 2 of the report submitted by Mr. CANNON, from the House Committee on Appropriations, to the House of Representatives, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of contributions (operating and administrative)—all countries, as of Sept. 30, 1945

[Values in United States dollar equivalents]

Country	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization	Total contributions paid or available on request	
		Amount	Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Australia	$38,400,000	$38,400,000	100
Belgium*	175,000	175,000	100
Bolivia	95,000	32,000	33
Brazil	30,000,000	10,000,000	33
Canada	69,369,000	69,369,000	100
Chile	2,153,000	0	0
China*	875,000	875,000	100
Colombia	2,356,000	52,000	2
Costa Rica	400,000	0	0
Cuba	35,000	35,000	100
Czechoslovakia*	175,000	100,000	57
Denmark*	19,000	0	0
Dominican Republic	350,000	245,000	70
Ecuador	150,000	0	0
Egypt	4,256,000	70,000	2
El Salvador	129,000	5,000	4
Ethiopia*	9,000	9,000	100
France*	700,000	700,000	100
Greece*	87,000	87,000	100
Guatemala	9,000	9,000	100
Haiti	49,000	49,000	100
Honduras	59,000	59,000	100
Iceland	718,000	718,000	100
India	24,042,000	24,042,000	100
Iran	18,000	0	0
Iraq	18,000	18,000	100
Liberia	9,000	9,000	100
Luxemburg*	9,000	9,000	100
Mexico	3,602,000	1,148,000	32
Netherlands*	262,000	262,000	100
New Zealand	8,476,000	8,476,000	100
Nicaragua	129,000	5,000	4
Norway*	52,000	52,000	100
Panama	409,000	142,000	35
Paraguay	38,000	10,000	26
Peru	1,000,000	793,000	79
Philippines*	9,000	9,000	100
Poland*	175,000	100,000	57
Union of South Africa	18,135,000	4,130,000	23
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*	1,750,000	1,000,000	57
United Kingdom	322,400,000	322,400,000	100
United States of America	1,350,000,000	800,000,000	59
Uruguay	520,000	485,000	93
Venezuela	1,017,000	17,000	2
Yugoslavia*	122,000	70,000	57
Total	1,882,760,000	1,284,166,000	68

*The Council recommended that member countries whose area had not been occupied by the enemy contribute 1 percent of their national income for 1943. Countries indicated by the asterisk are those whose area was occupied by the enemy and such countries have contributed only to the administrative expenses.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has been kind enough to furnish me with a copy of the fourth report to the Congress regarding United States participation in UNRRA. In the report is the same tabulation which the Senator from Tennessee has just obtained consent to have placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I desire to hold the floor for only another moment——

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wish to observe that, as I understand the matter, our authorization of this appropriation was one of the inducements which led many other nations to agree to contribute to the UNRRA fund, and I understand that all the other nations have paid their contributions on the strength of the representation that we would contribute $1,350,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is no question about that. What happened, of course, was that there was a meeting of approximately 40 nations which formed the original association. They arrived at a plan which was adopted on November 9, 1943. Subsequently the Congress passed the act of March 28, 1944, adopting the plan and agreeing to contribute. When we did that, in 1944, the other nations followed suit. All of them have made their contributions in proportion to their national incomes, as estimated, in 1943.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the matter, under the act providing the authorization for which we are now asked to appropriate, we shall have met our full obligation under that act when we make this appropriation; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then the question before us is whether we shall continue under that obligation or whether we shall commit ourselves to a new obligation. That question will be taken up by the Senate in connection with consideration of a separate measure, one which now is pending in the House of Representatives, so I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it is now before the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So we are now under obligation to make this payment or appropriation, inasmuch as the other countries have made the contributions which they had agreed to make.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the question of whether we shall continue the arrangement and obligate ourselves further is a matter to be settled under another bill which is to come before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Forty-four nations of the UNRRA held a meeting this year in London and adopted the following resolution:

Resolution relating to further contributions

Whereas it is deemed essential to make financial provision for the completion of the work of UNRRA; and

Whereas it is contemplated that UNRRA will complete its shipments to the receiving countries in Europe not later than the end of 1946 and in the Far East 3 months thereafter; and

Whereas the programs of the administration should be subject to continuing consideration in the light of the relative needs of the availability of supplies and finance before any final determination of the extent or cost of such programs can be made;

Resolved, That the Council recommends:

1. That the member governments should make available on the basis of the recommendations contained in sections 4 and 5 of the financial plan an additional contribution approximately equivalent to 1 percent of the national income of the contributing country for the year ending June 30, 1943, as determined by the following contributing member government.

That is exactly what has been reported to the House of Representatives. That is what the House is debating today and will vote on tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I to understand that we are asked to duplicate in the future what we have done in the past?

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill which was introduced by Representative SABATH is House bill 4649, and is a very short measure. It reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution of March 28, 1944, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization," is amended in the following respect:

(1) The first section is amended by striking out "$1,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,700,000,000."

(2) Section 9 is amended by striking out "1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

That is all there is to the bill which the House of Representatives is now considering. It is being considered under a wide-open rule that the House may vote on any amendment to the bill, including the proposal to deny contributions to countries which prevent activities of our press correspondents.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may have already been explained by either the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Tennessee, but what was the reason for striking out the provision at the top of page 3 beginning in line 2 of the pending joint resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The language did not mean much. It reads:

Provided further, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities.

That language merely implies hope. That is why we thought that it was utterly unnecessary. Secondly, UNRRA does not make these purchases at all. All that UNRRA will have under this joint resolution is a credit of $495,000,000, 10 percent being in cash and 90 percent being in credit. If UNRRA should wish to buy some wheat, for example, to be shipped abroad, all it could do would be to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and say, "We want to buy so many million pounds of wheat for shipment abroad. You buy it for us and we will pay you with the credit which we have been given." So the actual acquisition of any agricultural product, or any manufactured product in the United States is accomplished by the purchasing agent of our Government. UNRRA is not in the market at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It makes no direct purchases.

Mr. HAYDEN. It makes no direct purchases. It makes requisitions on the Commodity Credit Corporation, for example.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If we should have a surplus of some commodity which UNRRA requests, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be in position to furnish it out of such surplus.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, arrived at the same conclusion that some others of us arrived at, namely, that the language to which reference has been made did not mean anything of essential importance. UNRRA will have credit in the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, UNRRA would have to obtain the goods and materials in the United States in any event.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, Germany, not being a member of the United Nations, receives nothing under this proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The original resolution authorizing the appropriation is perfectly clear on that point. If the Germans and the Japanese need any food, they must depend upon supplies being furnished them by our army of occupation. The agreement which was entered into reads as follows:

The governments or authorities whose duly authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

Being United Nations or being associated with the United Nations in this war,

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services.

Mr. LANGER. Has any appropriation been made for use in Germany or Japan?

Mr. HAYDEN. No UNRRA appropriation has been made for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. Has any other appropriation been made for that purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; the Army now has money which it spends in feeding some of the people in Germany, and it will possibly be required to feed people in Japan. However, such work will not be performed by the UNRRA.

Mr. LANGER. Aside from the money which the Army is using, has there been any other appropriation made for the same purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. LANGER. As many of us know, a person of German extraction in this country is not allowed to send any money or supplies to his relatives in Germany.

Mr. HAYDEN. There may have been military reasons for enforcing such a rule in the past, but I do not know that they will continue forever.

Mr. LANGER. Is it the intention of the Government that the Army shall continue to supply necessities to Germans and to Japanese?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; unless the Congress changes its present policy. When the bill to which I have referred arrives on the floor of the Senate it will be subject to amendment. However, under the existing law we depend on the army of occupation to take care of the needs of the conquered peoples.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me, I may say that the appropriations for the Army in connection with the subject to which the Senator from North Dakota has referred will expire June 30 next.

Mr. LANGER. Many persons have written me and stated that they wished to send supplies to their relatives in Germany, but that our Government has absolutely refused to transport or deliver them.

Mr. HAYDEN. General Eisenhower is now in active charge as Chief of Staff and will be familiar with the situation to which the Senator has referred. I suggest to the Senator that he consult with the General and see if an arrangement can be made for persons in this country to send articles to relatives in Germany.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has explained very lucidly how supplies, food and provisions are obtained here in this country. I believe, however, that a statement should be made for the information of the Senate with reference to what is done with those supplies after they are obtained. As the Senator has said, no money is paid out, but supplies are turned over to the various governments. UNRRA does not distribute any of the supplies. Distribution is made by the provisional or other governments which may be in control. In the countries in which these supplies are distributed UNRRA does not give supplies solely to the indigent. It gives them to the wealthy as well. The supplies are sold to the wealthy. They are sold for the purpose of raising funds in order to pay the cost of distributing them to the poor and to the indigent. It has been said that that is the most practical mehod of administering the matter. That may be true, but I do not think it is generally understood that these supplies are not distributed by UNRRA at all, but instead they are turned over to the various governments for distribution. The governments distribute them without any cost on their part because they take the supplies and sell them to those who want to buy them, and use the money resulting from the sales to pay the cost of distribution.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am in entire accord with the suggestion of the Senator that this matter be thoroughly looked into. The time to do it is when the bill to which I have referred comes later before the Senate. I frankly do not agree with him that it is not a proper way to do it. There may be a better way, and I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will look into the matter carefully.

At the time the original bill was passed the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] questioned the UNRRA officials as to whether or not they would dispose of some of these products by sale and he was so advised. That is a matter concerning which we perhaps do not have all the facts, but we feel it ought to be thoroughly investigated by the Committee on Foreign Relations when they consider the whole question of policy. We felt that it was not proper to take it up on this joint resolution because it is a legislative and administrative matter.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I am not at all opposing the passage of this joint resolution. I simply wanted to give that information to the Senate so that it may be considered when the other bill, which will prolong the activities of UNRRA, comes up. I think it is a matter which, first, the committee ought to inquire into and which, secondly, the Senate and House ought to act upon.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no doubt that that will be done.

Mr. OVERTON. It may be that the present method is a practical way of doing it, but it does not appeal to me as being a sound business principle at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me, upon the other hand, to be the soundest and most business-like way to do it. That is where the argument arises.

Mr. OVERTON. I think on reflection the Senator will come to the conclusion that there may be considerable, shall I say, waste of UNRRA's goods and supplies under the present method of procedure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if, as we are advised, UNRRA is distributing supplies to those who are wealthy and able to buy, it is probably being done very much to the detriment of those who are suffering and whom we are trying to relieve.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it will take some time to argue the merits of the question, but let me state briefly what the situation is. UNRRA ships, say, a million tons of wheat to Greece because the Greeks are starving. That wheat has to go through the mill and be made into flour, and then the flour has to be baked into bread and distributed throughout Greece so as to get it in the hands of the starving people. That is done by the Greek Government. We turn the wheat over to the Greek Government, and the Greek Government sees to it that the wheat is milled, and it pays the cost of transportation and distribution throughout Greece. How can it afford to pay for it since it is broke? It can afford because there is a price fixed for the bread, and if a Greek has drachma with which to buy a loaf of bread he is required to pay for it. Sixty percent or more of it has actually to be given away, but those who can afford to pay for it, those who have drachma, are required by the Greek Government to pay, and the money is used by the Greek Government to pay for the milling and transportation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his explanation, but the point I am getting at is whether those in the greatest need are actually being relieved.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; they are. UNRRA has 300 people in Greece to see that no one is overlooked, to see that there is no discrimination because of race, religion, or any other reason, and to supervise the accounts of the Greek Government, and to see, if there is any profit, that the money is properly used. That is the arrangement. There may be a better one, but it has worked well for UNRRA. If a better one can be found than that which is being carried out now, let us try to find it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield, I believe the procedure should be carefully and very understandingly explained. As I understand, the goods are not only given to indigents but also to the needy, and the needy may include the rich and the poor alike. If the wealthy received any of the goods and have funds they must pay for the goods, and, as the Senator from Arizona explained, the money thus received is used to distribute the goods in the particular country and, if any money is left over and above that, it goes to make a further contribution to relief. UNRRA maintains a commission to see that everything is conducted in the most efficient way possible.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the general plan. A way may be found to modify it when the bill is further considered; it may be handled in some other way and improved. I do not think it is a perfect plan, but it was the plan adopted when we first authorized the relief work to be undertaken. We are going to have another authorization in a few days, and then we can discuss other plans.

Mr. MEAD. Should there not be a review of the present plan?

Mr. HAYDEN. By all means, there ought to be a review of it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I want to take merely a moment. There have been a great many criticisms of inefficiency on the part of UNRRA, and I have no doubt it is inefficient. I received recently a letter from Mrs. Lois Sevareid, of New York, who was a member of the UNRRA mission to Greece, and who tells a very graphic story of the difficulties which were encountered and the reasons why there was inefficiency. For one thing, UNRRA was a stepchild of the armed services until the war ended. UNRRA is still completely dependent for shipping and supplies on the government with which it deals. It has no operating force of its own.

I think this letter is a very valuable contribution to the thinking on this whole subject, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, *November 4, 1945.*

DEAR JOE: Because the Senate is due to consider the appropriation for UNRRA sometime in the near future, * * *.

I would appreciate your consideration of my own plea for a look at UNRRA from the standpoint of one who has put in 2 years of intensive struggle to make it work, to get food and clothing to the distressed people of Europe.

I joined the Office of Foreign Relief of the United States Government in September 1943, at which time it was under the jurisdiction of the State Department. By the time I got to Cairo, Egypt, on December 1, 1943, it had come under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Economic Administration, and

by January 1, 1944, we were under the control of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which had been set up at the Atlantic City Conference late in 1943.

I was sent over as a stenographer and was the third member of the Relief Administration to arrive in Cairo. We were concerned primarily with planning relief for the Balkans, when they should be liberated, and the British Army should have withdrawn, and we were also concerned with assisting the British Army in operating the refugee camps in the Middle East, which eventually housed some 70,000 Greek and Yugoslav refugees.

Because I have had long experience in working with emergency Government organizations and because of my previous experience in working in foreign countries, I sacrificed 15 pounds of my allowed 55 pounds of luggage on my travels to Egypt (via ATC) to enable me to carry with me a portable typewriter, stenographer's notebooks, pencils, carbon, clips, etc.

One of Congress' chief complaints about UNRRA is that it is inefficient. I submit that Congress is absolutely right, but that UNRRA is unavoidably inefficient. I did not expect to find the advance relief guard operating efficiently when I got to Cairo, at which time we were not an international organization, but under the jurisdiction of the United States Foreign Economic Administration. There is always a time lag between the setting up of any emergency agency, even in the United States Government, the appropriation of funds for its operation, and its efficient operation.

For 3 weeks I had no desk, no chair, and I typed the essential papers on my portable typewriter, which was perched on a window ledge. This was not efficiency. Nor was it efficient for me, later, when UNRRA came into being, and the United States Army and Goverment administrations quite rightly were no longer willing to supply us with stationery, pencils, etc., etc., and I had to rush out all hours of the day and purchase supplies on the Cairo market, with whatever personal funds I could spare at the moment.

But UNRRA had no funds. No appropriations had been made by any of the Governments who had subscribed to the UNRRA agreement. In understanding the operations of an international organization it must be bore in mind that its operations are carried out by nationals of various countries, who, no matter how hard they try, cannot entirely escape their previous prejudices, habits, and allegiances. Its operations are dependent, first, on grants of funds by the governments of the member nations, and, secondly, on instruments and agencies of national governments. Our transportation and communications were possible only through the use of United States or British military and diplomatic facilities. We had no funds to set up our own, nor no facilities for setting up a system of our own. We were at the mercy of officials of these national agencies whose first concern and legal responsibility was to their own governments and national interests, and not to UNRRA, except to the degree to which they were ordered to facilitate UNRRA by their home offices. This does not mean that there were not men of good will attached to national agencies who were willing to aid us in every way possible, but it does mean that there were those who were not willing to aid us unless so ordered.

Eventually, in February and March 1944, more personnel for UNRRA arrived, but they were all top executives, badly needed, indeed, for present operations in the refugee camps and for planning of their particular fields and services in the relief of the Balkans. However, no top executive can be efficient without adequate secretarial help. At one time there were 25 top officials, serviced stenographically only by me and 2 Egyptian typists, whose every word had to be supervised closely by me because they had not been sufficiently trained. I can see quite readily how the United States Army and civilian transport officials, who had probably never worked in a foreign country, would conclude that stenographic personnel, which was theoretically available in Egypt, should be furnished from there, and that limited passenger space on ATC should not be used to send out American stenographers. However, there is not only the basic language difficulty, which makes it almost impossible to use a foreign stenographer. They are also almost untrained, as American girls are, in the efficient use of the typewriter.

At this time there was no office manager, so I took over the duties of managing the office, and I begged, borrowed, stole, and, as a last resort, bought desks, chairs, and equipment for these 25 officials. (Remember, at this time there still was no appropriation of any funds by any national government for UNRRA.) The American legation graciously let us stay on in their building but could spare us only half a floor, which consisted of 6 rooms and a hall. It is impossible to house 25 men and 3 girls efficiently in 6 rooms. We did our best, men shared desks, but none of them could work efficiently, particularly in the middle of conferences that others were obliged to hold.

At this time, in March, as I remember, the British government appropriated funds for UNRRA. So we were able to start negotiations for rental of a building, installation of telephones, purchase of office equipment, etc. We had no accountant, but with the help, the patience, and kindness of the United States Treasury representative in Cairo, who was much overworked, but who had agreed to keep UNRRA accounts until our own accounting system was set up, I doubled as accountant until accountants arrived for UNRRA.

Also about this time, Governor Lehman arrived in Cairo, to discuss with the British UNRRA's taking over of relief activities projected for the Balkans, while the British army was still in occupation. This visit, these resulting conferences, and the consequent publicity, greatly activated public interest in UNRRA in Egypt, and we began to have many applicants for work. We had no personnel officer, so I interviewed prospective employees, and shunted off the more likely candidates to the appropriate officers.

Of course, my health broke under the strain of these many activities, and I was shipped off to the United States Army hospital for several weeks—inefficient, of course. I was a year later sent home for the same reason, I had worked so long and so hard that my health broke under the strain, and someone else had to be shipped out to replace me. Most inefficient procedure.

When I returned to work in May, UNRRA had a new office building, new typewriters, new stenographers, accountants, furniture, paper, all essential for efficient operations. I do not mean to imply that there were ever enough stenographers, paper, typewriters, desks, etc., for efficient operations. Our funds and credit were limited. The United States Congress had not yet appropriated funds for UNRRA.

At this time, I was relieved of any responsibility for the Balkan operations, and devoted my attentions entirely to the Greek mission. We encountered the same difficulties that stood in the way of efficient planning and operations as we had in the original Balkan operations. Naturally, Balkan operations as a whole came first, and we had to make do with what was left. Personnel dribbled in whenever the United States Army and the British Army succumbed to the pressure of UNRRA officials in Washington and London, and allowed space to us. We lured as many as possible to the Greek mission.

We set up a training program, organized classes in Greek, in Greece's political and economic history and geography. It was far from efficient, and any trained educator would have thrown up his hands in horror, but it was the best I could do, and it did help acquaint the people who were going to work in Greece with its language, customs, politics, and geography.

We had no administrative personnel assigned to the Greek mission. Mr. Laird Archer, who was chief of mission, had to concern himself with the policy and planning, and with diplomatic exchanges with representatives of the Greek Government in Cairo. So it devolved on me to do what organizational work was required. With the help and suggestions of everyone I could get to listen to me, I drew up an organizational chart, for the Greece mission, and outlined plans for operation in accordance with the policies laid down by UNRRA headquarters, the Balkan headquarters, and Mr. Archer. This was far from efficiency, but it was better than nothing.

Perhaps you have never worked in a foreign country, but if you have you will appreciate the difficulty of the telephone service in Egypt. Egyptian telephone service, probably not too good at best, was overloaded with foreign official and Army demands. If we had to get in touch with the Minister of Public Welfare, say (Egyptian Government offices are open from 11 a. m. until 2 p. m. only), it was often impossible to get a telephone call through to him within that period of time. Three-quarters of an hour to put through a call we considered a minor miracle of speed and efficiency.

Apparently certain Members of Congress do not realize that it is often not possible, for diplomatic reasons, for an international organization to be efficient. Say, for example, that as an expert in office routine I conclude that the most efficient method of routing a paper is to send it first to X, who has to act on it, and then to Y and Z for their information. That is the way we would do it in America. But, alas, in Egypt the procedure would be to send the paper first to Z and Y for their information, and lastly to X, who would keep the paper and act upon it. (Remember, we had not enough typists and paper to allow us to duplicate papers.) Now, Z, in this instance, happens to be Egyptian, and he would consider it an insult to his country and to their methods of doing business if I, as an American, route it first to X (who probably is also an American). So, for diplomatic reasons, and to protect the feelings of the sensitive national representatives, we must route it to Z first. This is not efficiency. This instance can, of course, be duplicated in every minor problem of international organization's operations.

With the liberation of Greece in October 1944, we came to the immediate transport of our personnel, equipment (such as it was), and or putting into operation our plans. We were entirely at the mercy of the British Army's decisions as to what personnel was needed for relief in Greece and the order of their importance. The British Army concluded that the top executives were needed first, and so they were sent there, with no secretaries, no typewriters, no paper, no adding machines, to help them carry out their jobs. There was no office furniture because the British Army had concluded that it was more important to take cargo space, limited at best, for food. This was undoubtedly right, but it didn't make for efficiency of relief operations.

Remember that, although the Congress of the United States had made half of its promised appropriations to UNRRA, we had no transport, no communications of our own. We had to rely on the British Army. It often took from 1 week to 10 days for a telegram to get from our headquarters in Athens to Cairo, and vice versa. We were confronted with the spectacle of top officials, stranded in Athens, with nobody to direct them to do the work, and the operating

forces, stranded in Cairo, with no direction. This is not efficient.

I do not think there is one of us who does not agree that military requirements are of first importance, when we are fighting a war. But the spectacle of the American Army and the British Army, on whom we were dependent for transport and communications, shunting everything of a relief nature into second place after everything of a military nature, I submit was not entirely necessary nor efficient on their parts. I could cite you many, many instances when relief interests, i. e., transport of food and personnel, were shunted aside for the transport of Army officers and equipment which had no direct or even delayed bearing on the prosecution of the war.

I can cite other instances of inaction on the part of the military which resulted in relief personnel and supplies being delayed or not transported at all. Of course, the military were severely handicapped in the matter of transport and communications themselves, because the Germans had destroyed the roads, the bridges, the boats, the railroads, etc. But in many instances, when there was transport, the Army refused to allow relief personnel to be transported because of what they—the Army—determined were unsuitable facilities. For example, the British Army allowed women relief workers to go only to Athens, to which large enough boats were sent from Egypt to furnish what the Army considered adequate accommodations for women. The fact that these women, for the most part nurses and doctors, were needed in the islands, and other remote parts of Greece, to which there were no means of transport from Athens, didn't seem to weigh in the consideration of the Army officials at all. We pleaded in vain that they be sent on the cargo boats that were going with troops and supplies—probably the only boats that would go there for the next few months. The women personnel concerned were quite willing to go under any conditions—they were only anxious to get to work, to help the people they had come so far to help, and they couldn't swim that far.

It is impossible to distribute medicines, food, supplies, and clothing efficiently in second-caliber trucks, limited in number to what the Army thinks it can spare, over blasted roads. My personal feeling is that it is an absolute miracle that anything was distributed, that people did get fed. And it is due only to the high courage and determination of those UNRRA personnel who were willing to leave their comfortable homes in America and go forth, on faith, to help the people of Europe, to risk their lives so that people could be fed.

This brings me to my second point—the often circulated report that UNRRA is the laughing stock of Europe. I submit that the only people in Europe who are laughing at UNRRA are those well-fed politicians and cynics who have always laughed at America—because, quite wrongly, since the majority of personnel of UNRRA is American. America is getting the credit (and the blame, if you like) for the UNRRA operations in the eyes of most Europeans.

I submit that the people of Cyros, who had lived for four long years in isolation from the rest of the world except for the Germans, did not laugh when the first American UNRRA man appeared to help them, to distribute foods, medicines, and warm clothing. They wept because anyone cared enough to come to their aid, to share their misery and privation. The spiritual lift was much greater than the material aid.

I submit that the people in the hospitals of Athens, who were cut off from all outside aid, caught between the crossfire of the EAM and the British forces during the revolution in the fall of 1944, did not laugh uproariously when the men of UNRRA risked their lives to bring the old, the ill, and the new-born babies food and warm blankets, risking their own lives in that murderous crossfire.

I submit that the people of Greece, and I am sure that the story is duplicated throughout the rest of Europe, do not laugh at the spectacle of men and women of good will who have come at personal sacrifice far from their loved ones and comfort and good food and safety, to share with these suffering peoples their misery, their common hunger, and to try to help them.

They are not the most efficient of personnel, the Congress of the United States is quite right, but people who have an interest in their fellow men seldom have the time to be efficient—they are less apt to be concerned with whether or not they get paid, depending on the whim of the Congress of the United States, than are efficient fellows.

But with their courage, their faith, and high hopes they have instilled in the suffering people of Europe the will to struggle onward, the realization that there is some justice, some understanding and sympathy, and appreciation for the hideous tortures they have gone through, through no real fault of their own, and I submit finally that certain Members of the Congress of the United States have no right in the name of humanity to hamstring and restrict and make more difficult the job of these good people in their unselfish efforts to bring aid to the suffering masses of Europe.

Sincerely yours,

LOIS F. SEVAREID.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let the first amendment be stated.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question—$550,000,000 is quite a large sum of money. I feel that I am obligated to vote for the bill, but at the same time, while I am doing that, I also think of how well we could use $550,000,000 in the United States in making easier the lives of the returning soldiers by building homes for them, building farm-to-market roads, and so on. I have been thinking that the UNRRA organization is overstaffed. Has the Senator any information as to how many employees Governor Lehman has on his pay roll?

Mr. HAYDEN. That information is available in the annual report which is made. I do not happen to have it before me. This is the story, as I understand, of UNRRA employees: It was organized in the middle of the war—the agreement was made in 1943 and we appropriated the first money in 1944—and it was very difficult to secure experienced personnel to handle an undertaking of this kind. I have no doubt at all that there is inefficiency on the part of inexperienced employees. The people who went into it were of the type who could not get into the Army and Navy because of age, but who were imbued with a sort of military spirit, wanting to do good but not knowing how to do it in a business-like way. That has been the trouble.

Now we are advised by General Eisenhower, in his testimony before the House committee, that the situation is being rapidly corrected. Members of the Commissary and Quartermaster's Corps, both in the United States and British Armies, have been detailed to straighten out many of the kinks, and General Eisenhower in his testimony said that there had been a great improvement in recent months.

It stands to reason that if we could get men of experience out of the armed forces, or out of other agencies in our Government, they would be much more efficient than the first group.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I shall be glad to get further information about this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at this point I should like to put into the RECORD a statement of the administrative and operating expenses. I ask that the information be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Administrative and operating personnel as of Aug. 31, 1945

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL (AS DEFINED BY UNRRA COUNCIL)

Office:	
Headquarters, Washington, D. C.	1,136
Training School, University of Maryland	6
European Regional Office, London	939
Southwest Pacific Area Office, Sydney	67
Mediterranean Office, Caserta, Italy	9
Liaison Office, Berne, Switzerland	2
Poland Temporary Delegation	[1] 6
India Temporary Delegation	[1] 1
Brazil Liaison Office of Procurement	5
Colombia Liaison Office of Procurement	3
Mexico Liaison Office of Procurement	2
Cuba Liaison Office of Procurement	1
Chile Liaison Office of Procurement	2
Carribbean Liaison Office	1
Total	2,180

OPERATING PERSONNEL [2] (AS DEFINED BY UNRRA COUNCIL)

Area:	
Displaced persons program (mostly in Germany)	4,952
Albania Mission	26
Belgium Mission	5
Czechoslovakia Mission	19
Denmark Mission	3
France Mission	16
Greece Mission	386
Italy Mission	246
Luxemburg Mission	6
Middle East Office	127
Netherlands Mission	4
Norway Mission	5
Philippines Mission	4
Sweden Office	1
Yugoslavia Mission	143
China Office	40
In training at headquarters	82
Total	6,065

[1] Not including three additional persons from headquarters.

[2] About 75 percent of the costs of the operating missions, exclusive of base allotments and transportation to overseas stations, are paid from local currency made available by recipient nations.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, my reason for making the inquiry is that I read in the press some time ago that two ladies who were on the pay roll of UNRRA in England, and had been for a year, resigned in disgust, since they had nothing to do. Yet they were drawing pay from the UNRRA funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. We had no proof about that, and it is difficult to keep up with newspaper articles.

Mr. BILBO. My attention was also directed to conditions in the local office of UNRRA in the District of Columbia, where recently a counterfeiting outfit has been uncovered in the office itself. They had one employee who was engaged in counterfeiting Uncle Sam's money, and was operating under four different names. Evidently there must be some loose business somewhere in the formation of the personnel to handle this vast sum of money.

Mr. McKELLAR. All I can say to the Senator in reply is that I never before heard of the incident he has mentioned. I suppose I should have read the papers more closely. I hope to heaven that if there has been any counterfeiting or any other criminal action on the part of UNRRA officials or employees, or anyone else, they will be prosecuted and given the limit, because any person who will cheat, swindle, or defraud in the case of charity money should receive very severe punishment. Under certain circumstances I might tell him where I thought he should go.

Mr. BILBO. Two of these employees of UNRRA—and I understand they were all getting handsome salaries—were caught counterfeiting money at Fourteenth and P Streets, in the District of Columbia. They were working out of the office, which is at 1344 Connecticut Avenue. They are now in custody for counterfeiting.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope they are not only in custody, but that they will soon be tried and put in jail for their crimes, because, regardless of where they work or the nature of their employment, if they are violating the law, they should be punished.

Mr. BILBO. The point I was making was that there must have been some looseness in the organization of those handling this vast sum of money, or they would not have hired as an employe of UNRRA a man who had a record of operating under three different names.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall try to answer.

Mr. BYRD. I understood from the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona that all the other countries had paid their allotments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. We pay about 71 percent of the entire amount, but the other nations have contributed quotas.

Mr. BYRD. It has only been done recently, then.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the testimony before our committee.

Mr. BYRD. Governor Lehman was before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures about a month ago. My understanding is that a country's quota is based upon 1 percent of its national income.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BYRD. And the country itself fixes the figures as to its national income.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, the organization apparently has nothing to do with it. Then the payments are made in kind. For instance, a country such as Brazil may furnish coffee. I understand only about 10 percent of the payment is made in cash.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The same rule applies to us, of course.

Mr. BYRD. It occurred to me, in the investigation we conducted, that there was no proper supervision to see that the countries which paid in kind made a reasonable charge for what they furnished. They may furnish meat, they may furnish sugar, or some other commodity, but apparently each country determines the amount of its national income on which its 1-percent allotment is based, and also fixes the prices of the materials it furnishes in kind. I merely call the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to this because I think when the next bill is drawn it should be put in much better form than the measure which is now before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The matter should be much more carefully gone into. That is a legislative matter, and comes before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I urge the members of that committee, as I have already done, to go into that and all other questions, such as the one raised by the Senator from Mississippi and questions other Senators have suggested. This is charity money, and it should go to people who are in need, who are suffering either for food or clothing or medicine.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, the other bill will come before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on that part of the amendment to strike out all from page 2, line 2, after the figures "1947", down to and including line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was to strike out beginning with line 8, page 2, down to and including line 11, page 4, as follows:

No part of the appropriation herein shall be available subsequent to December 31, 1945, for the furnishing of relief or rehabilitation supplies or services to any country unless and until (A) the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, in the case of such country, will be made only under agreements between United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing:

(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

(2) That such country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in such country, to retain title to all motor transport equipment supplied by the Administration, and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

(B) That for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds appropriated hereby, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials, or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds provided herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration whch may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatves of the press and radio of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATION FOR THE CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Appropriations an original Senate joint resolution, making appropriations for contingent expenses of the Senate. The joint resolution carries an appropriation of $400,000 to be turned over to Mr. Oco Thompson, the financial clerk of the Senate, to pay expenses of investigations which have been authorized. The fund is entirely depleted, and it is necessary to appropriate this money.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be

engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, including compensation to stenographers of committees, at such rates as may be fixed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but not exceeding 25 cents fiscal year 1946: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses except in accordance with the provisions of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, approved June 3, 1926, as amended.

REHABILITATION OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1610, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1610) to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1945."

TITLE I—COMPENSATION FOR WAR DAMAGE

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established a Philippine War Damage Commission (in this title referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall consist of three members, to be appointed by the President of the United States. One of the members of the Commission shall be a Filipino. The members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year. The terms of office of the members of the Commission shall expire at the time fixed in subsection (d) for winding up the affairs of the Commission. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall not impair the authority of the remaining two members of the Commission to exercise all of its functions. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. Members of the Commission shall receive their necessary traveling and other expenses incurred in connection with their duties as such members, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof.

(b) The Commission may, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and may make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. Officers and employees of any other department or agency of the Government may, with the consent of the head of such department or agency, be assigned to assist the Commission in carrying out its functions. The Commission may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the Government, utilize the facilities and services of such department or agency in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

(c) The Commission may prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary for carrying out its functions, and may delegate functions to any member, officer, or employee of the Commission or of any other department or agency of the United States or of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

(d) The Commission shall, so far as practicable, give consideration to, but need not await, or be bound by, the recommendations of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission (created by the act approved June 29, 1944) with respect to Philippine war damage. The Commission shall wind up its affairs not later than 2 years after the expiration of the time for filing claims under this title.

SEC. 102. (a) The Commission is hereby authorized to make compensation to the extent hereinafter provided on account of physical loss of or damage to property in the Philippine Islands occuring after December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and before October 1, 1945, as a result of one or more of the following perils: (1) Enemy attack (including action taken by or at the request of the military, naval, or air forces of the United States in resisting enemy attack); (2) action taken by enemy representatives, civil or military, or by the representatives of any government cooperating with the enemy; (3) action by the armed forces of the United States or other forces cooperating with the armed forces of the United States in expelling the enemy from the Philippine Islands; (4) looting, pillage, or other lawlessness or disorder accompanying the collapse of civil authority or incidental to control by enemy forces: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be payable only to qualified persons having, on December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and continuously to and including the time of loss or damage, an insurable interest as owner, mortgagee, lien holder, or pledgee in such property so lost or damaged: *Provided further*, That any qualified person who acquired any deceased person's interest in any property either (1) as heir, devisee, legatee, or distributee, or (2) as executor or administrator of the estate of any such deceased person for the benefit of one or more heirs, devisees, legatees, or distributees, all of whom are qualified persons, shall be deemed to have had the same interest in such property during such deceased person's lifetime that such deceased person had: *Provided further*, That no payment or payments shall be made in an aggregate amount which exceeds whichever of the following amounts, as determined by the Commission, is less: (a) The actual cash value, at the time of loss, of property lost or destroyed and the amount of the actual damage to other property of the claimant which was damaged as a direct result of the causes enumerated in this section; (b) the cost of repairing or rebuilding such lost or damaged property, or replacing the same with other property of like or similar quality: *Provided further*, That in case the aggregate amount of the claims which would be payable to any one claimant under the foregoing provisions exceeds $500, the aggregate amount of the claims payable to such claimant shall be reduced by 25 percent of the excess over $500.

(b) When used in this section, the term "qualified person" means—

(1) any individual, who on December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and continuously to the time of filing claim pursuant to this title, was a citizen of the United States or of the Philippine Commonwealth or of the Philippine Republic;

(2) any individual, who at any time subsequent to September 16, 1940, and prior to August 14, 1945, served honorably in the armed forces of the United States or of the Philippine Commonwealth, or honorably performed "service in the merchant marine" (as defined in the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1943);

(3) any church or other religious organization; and

(4) any corporation (or, upon dissolution, its successor if it satisfies the requirements of this paragraph (4)) organized pursuant to the laws of any of the several States or of the United States or of any Territory or possession thereof (including any corporation or sociedad anonima organized pursuant to the laws in effect in the Philippine Islands at the time of its organization), but excluding any corporation wholly owned by the Commonwealth of the Philippines (or the Philippine Republic).

SEC. 103. The Commission shall make no payment under the provisions of this title—

(a) to any enemy alien;

(b) to any person who, by a civil or military court having jurisdiction, has been found guilty of collaborating with the enemy, or of any act involving disloyalty to the United States or the Philippine Commonwealth;

(c) to any corporation or sociedad anonima owned or controlled by any of the persons specified in clauses (a) and (b) of this section;

(d) to compensate for any loss of or damage to property which, at the time of loss or damage, was insured against any one or more of the perils specified in section 102 hereof, except to the extent that the loss or damage exceeds the amount of such insurance, whether or not collectible;

(e) to compensate for any loss or damage—

(1) for which the War Department or the Navy Department is authorized to make payment, or

(2) for which compensation or indemnity is otherwise payable, or has been paid, or is authorized to be paid, by the Philippine Government or by the United States Government or by their respective departments, establishments, or agencies,

unless the Government, department, establishment, or agency concerned has declined to pay compensation or indemnity for such loss or damage;

(f) unless the claimant shall file with the Commission, within 9 months after the enactment hereof, a claim in reasonable conformity with the requirements of this title and such reasonable regulations as shall be established by the Commission.

SEC. 104. (a) No claim shall be paid unless approved by the Commission or its authorized representatives, and on account of each claim so approved the Commission may make immediate payment of (1) so much of the approved amount of the claim as does not exceed $500 or 1,000 Philippine pesos, plus (2) 80 percent of the remainder of the approved amount of the claim. After the time for filing claims has expired, the Commission shall determine the amount of money available for the further payment of claims. Such funds shall be applied pro rata toward the payment of the unpaid balances of the amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to section 102 of this title.

(b) Of the funds appropriated for the purpose of paying compensation under this title, $5,000,000 shall be set aside for the payment of claims filed by churches and other religious organizations on account of loss of or damage to property consisting of churches, parish houses, and other property devoted to religious purposes (excluding schools, hospitals, and other charitable institutions). Subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable with respect to claims filed by churches and other religious organizations with respect to such property; but, after the time for filing claims has expired, the funds set aside pursuant to this subsection shall be applied pro rata toward paying such amounts as are authorized to be paid pursuant to section 102 with respect to claims filed by churches and other religious organizations with respect to such property, and shall be applied without discrimination to the proportional payment of all allowable claims filed by churches and other religious organizations with respect to such property. No payments with respect to such claims shall be made except from the funds set aside pursuant to this subsection.

(c) The Commission may, at its option, make payment, in whole or in part, of the amount payable in the case of any claim authorized to be paid under this title by rebuilding or repairing lost or damaged property, or replacing it with other property of like or similar kind. The amount expended for such purpose in any case, including the

fair value of property transferred to the claimant, shall be deemed to have been paid to the claimant on account of his claim, and such amount shall in no case exceed the amount authorized to be paid under this title on account of such claim. The Commission is authorized to acquire such property, to have such work done, to make such contracts, and to take such other action as may be necessary for the purposes of this subsection.

(d) All of the provisions of this title shall be subject to the requirement that, to the fullest extent practicable, the Commission shall require that the lost or damaged property be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired before payments of money are actually made to claimants under this title.

SEC. 105. Not later than 6 months after its organization, and every 6 months thereafter, the Commission shall make a report to the Congress concerning operations under this title.

SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount of $330,000,000 for the purposes of paying compensation to the extent authorized by this title, and of such sum, not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available to pay the expenses of the Commission.

(b) Any sums received by the United States from the Japanese Government or the Japanese people by way of reparations or indemnity on account of the war—

(1) shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States until the sums so covered into the Treasury are equal to the sum of the amounts appropriated for the payment of compensation under this title and the amounts appropriated for carrying out the purposes of title III of this act;

(2) when the amounts covered into the Treasury under clause (1) are equal to the amounts so appropriated, one-half of any further sums so received by the United States from the Japanese shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States and the other one-half shall be paid to the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines (or the Philippine Republic) until the amount so paid to such government plus the amounts appropriated for the payment of compensation under this title and the amount appropriated for carrying out the purposes of title III are equal to the amount estimated by the Commission to represent the total loss of and damage to real and tangible personal property in the Philippine Islands from the causes enumerated in section 102 (a); and

(3) thereafter shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 107. Whoever, in the Philippine Islands or elsewhere, makes any statement or representation knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues loss of or damage to property for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any claimant any compensation pursuant to this title, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Commission with respect to any claim for compensation pursuant to this title, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value under this title, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 108. No remuneration on account of services rendered or to be rendered to or on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim for compensation pursuant to this title shall exceed 5 percent of the compensation paid by the Commission on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the Philippine Islands or elsewhere, receives on account of services rendered or to be rendered in connection with any claims for compensation hereunder, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

SEC. 109. Except as lawfully provided in policies of insurance heretofore or hereafter issued by the War Damage Corporation pursuant to subsection (a) of section 5g of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, the authority herein granted to the Philippine War Damage Commission shall be in lieu of and shall supersede all authority previously conferred on the War Damage Corporation to furnish protection or pay compensation with respect to property situated, at the time of loss or damage, in the Philippine Islands, and the protection authorized to be extended and the compensation authorized to be paid by the Philippine War Damage Commission shall be in lieu of all protection heretofore extended or authorized to be extended by the War Damage Corporation with respect to property situated, at the time of loss or damage, in the Philippine Islands, except to the extent provided in policies of insurance heretofore or hereafter issued by the War Damage Corporation. The War Damage Corporation is hereby prohibited from providing for or paying compensation for war damage in the Philippine Islands except to the extent provided in its policies of insurance heretofore or hereafter issued in consideration of a premium paid therefor.

SEC. 110. The classes of property enumerated in this section, whether situated in the Philippine Islands or elsewhere, are hereby excluded from protection, compensation, or consideration under this title, and the Commission shall not make any payment, directly or indirectly, on account of loss of or damage to such classes of property:

(1) Accounts, bills, records, films, plans, drawings, formulas, currency, deeds, evidences of debt, securities, money, bullion, furs, jewelry, stamps, precious and semiprecious stones, works of art, antiques, stamp and coin collections, manuscripts, books and printed publications more than 50 years old, models, curiosities, objects of historical or scientific interest, and pleasure aircraft;

(2) Vessels and watercraft, their cargoes and equipment, except (a) vessels used or intended to be used exclusively for storage, housing, manufacturing, or generating power, (b) vessels while under construction until delivery by the builder, or sailing on delivery or trial trip, whichever shall first occur, and (c) vessels propelled by sail;

(3) Real property (other than standing timber, growing crops, and orchards) not a part of a building or structure;

(4) Intangible property;

(5) Passenger-carrying motor vehicles except those used principally for commercial purposes;

(6) Property diverted to the Philippine Islands, by authority of the United States Government or otherwise, as a result of war conditions; and

(7) Property in transit (a) which at the time of loss or damage was insured against war perils, or (b) with respect to which insurance against such perils was available, at the time of loss or damage either at reasonable commercial rates or from the United States Maritime Commission.

SEC. 111. All departments, commissions, offices, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States Government, upon the written request of the Commission, are authorized to make delivery and conveyance to designated claimants, or to the Commission, of any surplus property of the United States in the Philippine Islands deemed by the Commission to be similar to that for which compensation is requested, or to be suitable for the rebuilding or repair of the property damaged or destroyed. The transfer of such property to such claimants shall be at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency. The Commission shall pay such fair value to the disposal agency.

SEC. 112. The War Damage Corporation is authorized and directed to consult with, and in every manner possible to assist and cooperate with, the Commission, to aid the Commission in its performance of duties hereunder, and to make available to or deliver to the Commission all records, claims, files, and other documents in its possession pertaining to Philippine claims. The Commission is authorized to give such weight as it may deem proper to any reports, certificates, or recommendations of the War Damage Corporation, or its adjusters or claims service offices.

SEC. 113. The Commission shall notify all claimants of the approval or denial of their claims, and, if approved, shall notify such claimants of the amount for which such claims are approved. Any claimant whose claim is denied, or is approved for less than the full allowable amount of said claim, shall be entitled, under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, to a hearing before the Commission or its representatives with respect to such claim. Upon such hearing, the Commission may affirm, modify, or reverse its former action with respect to such claim, including a denial or reduction in the amount of a claim theretofore approved. All findings of the Commission concerning the amount of loss or damage sustained, the cause of such loss or damage, the persons to whom compensation pursuant to this title is payable, and the value of the property lost or damaged, shall be conclusive and shall not be reviewable by any court.

TITLE II—DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

SEC. 201. In order to expedite the disposition of surplus property of the United States in the Philippine Islands and to aid in—

(1) repairing and replacing buildings, equipment, and other property of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and other governmental units in the Philippines, in cases where such buildings, equipment, or other property have been damaged, lost, or destroyed in the war, and otherwise restoring and facilitating the normal operations of governmental units in the Philippines;

(2) restoring and providing essential public buildings, services, works, and utilities, including hospitals, schools, and other institutions furnishing essential health and welfare services in the Philippines; and

(3) rehabilitating the economy of the Philippines and aiding and encouraging private enterprise in such economy;

the Department of State, the disposal agency for the Philippines designated under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, acting through the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to transfer to the Commonwealth of the Philippines, without reimbursement, property of the United States now or hereafter located in the Philippine Islands and declared surplus under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, upon such terms and conditions, including the use or disposition of such property by the Commonwealth of the Philippines, as the Commissioner may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 202. At the time any such property is so transferred to the Commonwealth of the Philippines, the Commissioner shall make a record of (1) the items transferred, (2) the condition of such items, and (3) his estimate of the fair value of such items. The Department of State shall furnish a copy of such record to the Surplus Property Administrator, and shall also make quarterly reports to the President and the Congress concerning the administration of this title.

SEC. 203. Any surplus property now or hereafter located in the Philippines which is not transferred to the Commonwealth of

the Philippines under section 201, may be disposed of by the Commissioner by sale, upon such terms and conditions as the Commissioner determines to be best suited for achieving the purposes stated in section 201, and without regard to other provisions of law relating to the sale or disposition of property of the United States. Any such sale may be made for a consideration greater or less than the fair value of the property concerned. In making such sale, the Commissioner may accept pesos as consideration. Any such surplus property which has not been disposed of by the Commissioner may be requisitioned by any other department or agency of the United States for its own use; and, upon the receipt of any such requisition, the Commissioner shall transfer such property to the requisitioning department or agency upon reimbursement of the fair value thereof. The proceeds derived from any disposal of surplus property by the Commissioner under this title shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States. If the consideration upon any disposal of property by the Commissioner be other property, such other property may be disposed of by the Commissioner in the same manner as surplus property located in the Philippines.

SEC. 204. No military weapons, munitions, or toxic gas shall be transferred or otherwise disposed of under this title.

SEC. 205. The Commissioner is authorized to appoint an advisory committee to advise him upon the action to be taken by him under this title.

SEC. 206. The fair value of the property transferred to the Commonwealth of the Philippines under this title, as estimated by the Commissioner, shall not exceed $30,000,000 in the aggregate.

SEC. 207. The Commissioner may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the performance of his functions under this title, and may delegate and authorize successive redelegations of any authority conferred upon him by this title to any officer or employee of his agency or of any other department or agency of the United States or of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

TITLE III—RESTORATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC PROPERTY AND ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICES

SEC. 301. As a manifestation of good will to the Filipino people, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) the sum of $120,000,000, to be allocated from time to time by the President of the United States among the various programs set forth in sections 302, 303, 304, and 305, and (2) such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 306 to 311, inclusive.

PUBLIC ROADS

SEC. 302. (a) As recommended in a report based upon an investigation now being made in the Philippine Islands by the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency, and to the extent that the findings in such report are approved by the President, the Public Roads Administration is authorized to plan, design, restore, and build, in accordance with its usual contract procedures, such roads, essential streets, and bridges as may be necessary from the standpoint of the national defense and economic rehabilitation and development of the Philippine Islands.

(b) The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers, to be designated by the President of the Philippine Islands from the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, maintenance, and highway traffic engineering and control necessary for the continued maintenance and for the efficient and safe operation of highway transport facilities.

PORT AND HARBOR FACILITIES

SEC. 303. (a) As recommended in a report based upon an investigation now being made in the Philippine Islands by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and to the extent that the findings in such report are approved by the President, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to carry out a program for the rehabilitation, improvement, and construction of port and harbor facilities in the Philippine Islands, such work to be done by contract, insofar as practicable, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and in accordance with established procedures applicable to river and harbor projects.

(b) The Chief of Engineers of the Army is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to provide training for not to exceed 10 Filipino engineers; to be designated by the President of the Philippine Islands from among the engineer officers of the Philippine Army and the regularly employed staff of the Philippine Public Works Department subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of port facilities and other works of improvements on rivers and harbors.

PUBLIC PROPERTY

SEC. 304. The Philippine War Damage Commission, within the limits of the appropriations allocated to it for carrying out the provisions of this section, is authorized to compensate the Commonwealth of the Philippines (or the Philippine Republic), the provincial governments, chartered cities, municipalities, and corporations wholly owned by the Commonwealth of the Philippines (or the Philippine Republic), in the Philippine Islands, for physical loss of or damage to public property in the Philippine Islands occurring after December 7, 1941 (Philippine time), and before October 1, 1945, as a result of the perils listed in section 102 (a) hereof, in any case in which compensation for such losses or the rebuilding, repair, or replacement of the lost or damaged property is not provided for by the transfer of surplus property under section 201 hereof, or provided for under the provisions of this title other than this section or otherwise provided for by the United States Government or any department or agency thereof. To the fullest extent practicable, the Commission shall require that any lost or damaged property for which it decides to award compensation under this section shall be rebuilt, replaced, or repaired before payments of money are actually made to claimants under this section. The Commission in its discretion may request the Federal Works Agency or the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army to undertake the rebuilding, repair, or replacement of property for which the Commission awards compensation under this section, and, from the funds available for carrying out the provisions of this section, may transfer to such Agency or Corps of Engineers the funds necessary to pay for the work requested. The Federal Works Agency and the Corps of Engineers are authorized to rebuild, repair, or replace property in accordance with any such request of the Commission and to expend the funds so transferred to them for such purpose. The Commission shall have full power to select, and fix the priority of, cases in which compensation will be awarded or property rebuilt, repaired, or replaced under this section, and to determine the amount of such compensation and the extent to which such property will be rebuilt, repaired, or replaced, taking into account the relative importance of various projects to the reconstruction and reconversion of the economy of the Philippine Islands and such other factors as the Commission deems relevant.

PUBLIC HEALTH

SEC. 305. (a) The Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency is authorized to cooperate with the Government of the Philippine Islands, and with other appropriate agencies or organizations, in the rehabilitation and development of public health services and facilities throughout the Philippine Islands.

(b) To accomplish such purposes the Public Health Service shall at the earliest practicable time survey the health situation in the Philippine Islands, and is authorized to replace, expand, or install such health services and facilities in the Philippine Islands as are deemed essential to preservation of health, and may assist in the rehabilitation and development of a Philippine quarantine service for prevention of introduction of disease from abroad or from one island to another. The Public Health Service may set up demonstrations and establish training centers in the Philippine Islands; may establish and maintain in the Philippine Islands a school or schools for the purpose of providing practical instruction in public health; and may, at any time prior to January 1, 1948, provide 1 year of training in appropriate schools or colleges in the United States to not more than 100 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippine Islands subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in public health methods and administration. It may replace equipment and supply reasonably necessary additional equipment, utilizing for this purpose, so far as possible, surplus property, and may recommend to the Commission the repair or construction under the provisions of section 304, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, of buildings deemed essential to the rehabilitation of public health and quarantine functions.

INTERISLAND COMMERCE

SEC. 306. (a) In order to restore and improve interisland commerce in the Philippine Islands, the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to charter under such terms and conditions (including nominal rates of charter hire) vessels of less than 2,000 gross tons to individuals, corporations, or cooperatives or other forms of business organizations in the Philippine Islands if the Commission determines that they possess the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications, necessary to enable them to operate and maintain the vessel in the interisland commerce in the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That any charter entered into under the authority of this section shall contain a provision requiring that the vessel shall be operated only in the interisland commerce in the Philippine Islands.

(b) The Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, is hereby authorized to permit not exceeding 50 Filipinos each year, to be designated by the president of the Philippine Islands subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), to receive instruction in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps and at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y. The persons receiving instruction under authority of this section shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid from the same appropriations, and, subject to such exceptions as may be determined by the chairman, United States Maritime Commission, shall be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadet midshipmen at the Merchant Marine Academy appointed from the United States; but such persons shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States merchant marine by reason of their graduation from the Merchant Marine Academy.

INTERISLAND AIR NAVIGATION

SEC. 307. (a) The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the Department of Commerce

is authorized to acquire, establish, operate, and to maintain a system of air-navigation facilities and associated airways communications services in the Philippine Islands for interisland airways operation and to connect the Philippine airways with international and interoceanic routes.

(b) The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to train not exceeding 50 Filipinos each year, to be designated by the President of the Philippine Island subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in air-traffic control, aircraft communications, maintenance of air-navigation facilities, and such other airman functions as are deemed necessary for the maintenance and operation of aids to air navigation and other services essential to the orderly and safe operation of air traffic.

WEATHER INFORMATION

SEC. 308. (a) The Chief of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce is authorized to establish meteorological facilities in the Philippine Islands as may be required to provide weather information, warnings, and forecasts for general agricultural and commercial activities, including meteorological service for the air routes on which air-navigation facilities are operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and to maintain such meteorological offices until the Philippine Weather Bureau is reestablished and in position to assume responsibility for the service.

(b) The Chief of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce is authorized, under such regulations as he may adopt, to train not to exceed 50 Filipinos in the first year and not to exceed 25 Filipinos in each succeeding year, the trainees to be designated by the President of the Philippine Islands subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), and the training to include meteorological observations, analyses, forecasting, briefing of pilots, and such other meteorological duties as are deemed necessary in maintenance of general weather service, including weather information required for air navigation and the safe operation of air traffic. The training of these employees shall be in addition and not in lieu of Weather Bureau employees to be trained under current Weather Bureau appropriations.

PHILIPPINE FISHERIES

SEC. 309. (a) The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Government of the Philippine Islands, and with other appropriate agencies or organizations, in the rehabilitation and development of the fishing industry, and in the investigation and conservation of the fishery resources of the Philippine Islands and adjacent waters.

(b) To accomplish such purposes the Fish and Wildlife Service shall conduct oceanographic, biological, fish cultural, technological, engineering, statistical, economic, and market development studies and demonstrations and fishery explorations, and in conjunction therewith may establish and maintain a vocational school or schools of fisheries in the Philippine Islands for the purpose of providing practical instruction and training in the fisheries; and may, at any time prior to July 1, 1950, provide 1 year of training to not more than 125 Filipinos, to be designated by the President of the Philippine Islands subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in methods of deep-sea fishing and in other techniques necessary to the development of fisheries.

(c) The Fish and Wildlife Service is authorized to acquire, construct, maintain, equip, and operate such research and experimental stations, schools, research and exploratory fishing vessels, or any other facilities in the Philippine Islands that may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(d) The Maritime Commission is authorized, upon recommendation of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, to make arrangements for the transfer by sale or charter of small vessels, considered by the Maritime Commission to be satisfactory for the purpose, to be used in the establishment and continuance of a fishing industry to be operated in or near the Philippine Islands. Such transfers may be made on such terms and conditions, including transfer for a nominal consideration, as the Maritime Commission may approve, but only if, in the opinion of the Fish and Wildlife Service, such small vessels so to be used for Philippine Island fishing are not needed by the fishing industry of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEYS

SEC. 310. The Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce is authorized to continue, until June 30, 1950, the survey work which was being conducted by it in the Philippine Islands prior to December 7, 1941. The Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is authorized to train not exceeding 20 Filipinos each year, to be designated by the President of the Philippine Islands subject to the provisions of section 311 (c), in order that they may become qualified to take over and continue such survey work on and after July 1, 1950, and to pay all expenses incident to their temporary employment and training.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 311. (a) The Government of the Philippine Islands shall provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the execution of the projects herein authorized.

(b) The several bureaus and agencies of the Government authorized by this title to undertake projects in the Philippine Islands are hereby authorized, in the prosecution of such projects, to cooperate with the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth (or the Philippine Republic), and to accept contributions of labor, materials, and money from such Government and its political subdivisions and to utilize such labor, materials, and money in the prosecution of such projects.

(c) Wherever in this title the training of Filipinos at the expense of the United States Government is authorized, the head of the bureau or agency under whose supervision or control the training is given may establish minimum requirements as to education and experience, provide for competitive examinations, or establish such other standards for qualification for such training as in his judgment may seem necessary and advisable, and under such regulations as may be adopted from time to time may provide for the payment of all expenses incidental to such training, including, but not limited to, actual transportation expenses to and from and in the United States, allowances for tuition, educational fees, and subsistence.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875), and section 8 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 456), any Filipino who is appointed for training or instruction as provided in this act may be admitted to the United States for such training or instruction upon certification to the Immigration and Naturalization Service by the head of the bureau or agency under whose supervision the training or instruction is to be given that such entry is necessary in connection with the training or instruction: *Provided*, That the privilege of entering or remaining in the United States for such purposes shall terminate within a reasonable time after discontinuance of the training or instruction or upon failure of the person appointed to abide by the conditions of his appointment: *And provided further*, That the head of the bureau or agency concerned may at any time terminate the appointment of any person appointed under this act if in his judgment the best interests of either the United States or the Philippine Government make such action advisable, and his decision shall be final and conclusive.

(e) Unless otherwise provided by law this title shall expire on June 30, 1950.

TITLE IV—THE UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER

SEC. 401. Until the Philippine Islands attain their independence, the functions, powers, and duties exercised in the Philippine Islands by any officer, employee, department, or agency of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be exercised under the general supervision of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, and the officers, employees, offices, missions, and other agencies exercising such functions, powers, and duties shall be deemed to be attached to the office of the High Commissioner.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, having explained this bill on a previous occasion, unless there are some questions, I am reluctant to go over the ground the second time. The purpose of the bill, briefly, is to rehabilitate the Philippine Islands in the least costly way we can provide.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are some minor technical amendments I wish to bring to the attention of the chairman of the committee. On page 19, line 22, the following language appears:

As recommended in a report based upon an investigation now being made.

The investigation has been completed. I offer an amendment to strike out the words "now being", in line 23, on page 19.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. The same language appears on page 20, beginning in line 19, as follows:

As recommended in a report based upon an investigation now being made.

I offer an amendment to strike out the words "now being", in line 20, on page 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 28, line 24, of the bill, the full title should be "The United States Maritime Commission." I offer an amendment to insert the words "United States" before the word "Maritime."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I spoke to the chairman of the committee the other day with respect to paragraph (d) of section 311, appearing on page 31 of the bill. The question was raised by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that after the quota is filled, a Filipino would have a different status under the immigration law when the Philippines become independent than he previously had. That suggestion was contained in a letter from the Immigration and Naturalization Service which I placed in

the RECORD. I took the matter up with the drafting service, and Mr. Murphy of that service rewrote the paragraph, and, in order to make perfectly clear what will be done before and after independence with respect to Filipino students who come to the United States, I offer the amendment prepared by the drafting service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 22, inclusive, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(d) Any Filipino who is designated for training or instruction as provided in this act may be admitted to the United States for such training or instruction upon certification to the Immigration and Naturalization Service by the head of the bureau or agency under whose supervision the training or instruction is to be given that such entry is necessary in connection with the training or instruction, notwithstanding the provisions of section 8 of the act of March 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 462; 48 U. S. C. 1238), and notwithstanding any provision of the laws of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, expulsion, or registration of aliens: *Provided*, That such admissions shall be deemed pursuant to section 3 (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 154; 47 Stat. 607; 54 Stat. 711; 8 U. S. C. 203): *Provided further*, That the privilege of entering or remaining in the United States for such purposes shall end within a reasonable time, to be fixed by regulation of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General, after termination of the training or instruction: *Provided further*, That the head of the bureau or agency concerned may at any time terminate the training or instruction of any person under this act if in his judgment the best interests of either the United States or the Philippine Government makes such action advisable, and his decision shall be final and conclusive: *Provided further*, That any such Filipino who shall fail to depart from the United States within the reasonable time fixed by regulation, as herein prescribed, shall be subject to being taken into custody and deported, as provided by section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162; 8 U. S. C. 214).

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator respecting the attitude of the committee toward the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, has the amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been disposed of.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Maine any objection to the amendment?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that the amendment be disposed of first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I want to be sure of my understanding as to the attitude of the committee toward the bill. I have had the belief that it came to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the committee. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. TYDINGS. There was no adverse vote in the committee which passed on the bill.

Mr. WHITE. That is what I understood.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, what is the total sum involved in this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. The total sum involved in the bill cannot be given definitely in terms of money for the reason that a portion of the aid given to the Filipinos is in the form, first, of the sale of surplus property now in the Philippines, which those in charge of the property say cannot, in most cases, be economically transported back to the United States, and that to maintain it in the Philippines will entail a larger expense than perhaps its salvage value would justify. Therefore, if we eliminate items of that kind from the bill, which mean a great deal to the Philippines, the amount of remaining money would consist of approximately $330,000,000. Of that $330,000,000 there are $200,000,000 in the War Damage Corporation. The Filipinos had no chance to obtain war insurance. However, by a letter of the Chairman of the War Damage Corporation it was provided that, even though they could not obtain insurance, they would be entitled to insurance up to $100,000,000. So we have perhaps a legal as well as a moral obligation to the extent of $100,000,000 of those funds which are now a profit to the Government, inasmuch as they were paid in and no money was paid out. So if we subtract that again from the amount of money provided by the bill that would reduce it to $230,000,000.

However, the bill contains a provision that any money which may be received from Japan by way of reparations for damages shall be placed in our Treasury rather than in the Filipino treasury until the amounts provided for in this bill are completely liquidated.

So there is a reasonable possibility—I do not say it will happen—that when all the accounts are checked up, the cost of this program to the Treasury of the United States will be very much smaller than the figures which now appear in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In rehabilitating the Philippines to what extent are we going with respect to private property that is destroyed? Are we undertaking 100-percent rehabilitation?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; we are not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To what extent are we going?

Mr. TYDINGS. We have adopted the philosophy of the average fire-insurance policy. Most of the fire-insurance policies contain the 80-percent clause. We have provided a top of approximately 75 percent of the estimated damages sustained for the Philippine War Damage Commission to pay. In addition to that we have eliminated every claim which is not filed by a national of the United States or of the Philippine Islands, and, difficult as it may be for us to realize it, that eliminates immediately one-third of all the claims. The Chinese, who represent a large percentage of the population in the Philippines and who are quite largely interested in its industries and merchandising, are not included under the provision of this bill. So, therefore, we have eliminated, to begin with, one-third of all the private property claims, and are paying approximately 75 percent of the remaining private-property claims. And we have eliminated automobiles, jewelry, furs, and articles of that sort, because they are nonproductive in the rehabilitation of the Philippines, and we have centered our efforts on those things which, when reconstructed, will contribute to the economy and rehabilitation of the islands, rather than to pay claims to persons who might then leave the country and live on the money.

We have, furthermore, provided that the money so appropriated shall be used to reconstruct the industries and the buildings which have been damaged, rather than to pay in cash, the whole philosophy being to start the wheels of industry turning again so that employment will follow in their wake.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I should like to inquire further. How far are we to go with regard to rehabilitating or reconstructing Government property? Are we to go all the way with respect to such property?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; we are not. The bill provides first of all that the Government may receive without paying for it up to $30,000,000 worth of the surplus property we now have in the Philippines. After that point the Government would buy any surplus property it wanted to acquire.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator misunderstood me. What I am inquiring about is with reference to Government buildings or property of any character, which belonged to the Government or municipalities.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Arizona is familiar with the situation, and I will ask him to answer that question.

Mr. HAYDEN. The report which we received was to the effect that the Philippine National Government, the provinces, and cities, had suffered damage to the extent of about $195,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. To Government property.

Mr. HAYDEN. To Government property. The theory of the committee was, first, that we would reimburse them as we reimbursed private individuals, at the rate of 75 percent. So we said, "At the outside, your reimbursement will be $150,000,000. Of that, $30,000,000 will be in the form of surplus property, which you may obtain as a gift. That leaves $120,000,000. We will not give you a cent of that in cash." We sent to the islands some men from the Corps of Army Engineers. They are looking over the reports to which I referred a while ago. The reports relate to ships sunk or damaged, the repair of ports, and so forth.

Mr. TYDINGS. And repair of bridges, roads, and other facilities.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. We are undertaking to do constructive work for the

people of the Philippines which will help them to help themselves. That is the situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me interject to say that in the course of the war the commander in chief in the Philippines issued orders to the Filipinos to destroy bridges, machinery, and other property, and told them that the Federal Government would compensate them. Therefore the thought projected by the Senator from Arizona is that in the case of public buildings, bridges, and other public enterprises, instead of giving the Filipino Government the money we are working out a plan for the rehabilitation of certain structures which were destroyed, and providing the sum of money which he has specified to be spent by us, under our own rules and under our own discretion, to accomplish rehabilitation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wonder if on other islands we have similar obligations which we shall have to meet.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know the Senator will agree with me that when we consider the whole Filipino problem, in view of the action taken in behalf of UNRRA, it is very difficult to withhold this practical help for a people who fought and died by our side. They have been completely loyal, and have contributed a great deal to the hastening of VJ-day.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not complaining, but I understand that the assistance rendered through UNRRA goes also to those who were our allies, and whom we liberated.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. They stood by our side.

Mr. TYDINGS. The situation in the Philippines is somewhat different. The Filipino people were under our own flag.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think we owe them something, but I wished to inquire how far we were going.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is this bill different from the $100,000,000 bill which the Senator introduced when he came back from the Philippines?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is the same in philosophy, but not in extent. It differs in extent only because full evidence has been adduced as to the need.

Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that before we began consideration of the bill we asked the War Damage Corporation to make a comprehensive survey in the Philippines. We had figures from the military authorities, and we had figures from the Filipinos, but we wanted a survey by an independent agency of experts. The over-all picture of the damage which occurred in the Philippines is, roughly, approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars. As I have explained, this bill will probably cost the American Government finally not more than $200,000,000 or $300,000,000, if it costs that much, and with good fortune it may be that it will not cost us $100,000,000.

Mr. LANGER. Is the amount provided by the pending bill in addition to the $100,000,000 provided by the bill which the Senator originally introduced?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The pending bill supplants the former measure. We have thrown certain restrictions around the expenditure, so that the amount of increase will probably come back into the Treasury.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know why the Chinese are excluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. For this reason: If we included the Chinese we would have to include the British and the Dutch. We do not know whether those Governments, from the reparations which they will receive, will pay the claims of Americans who were in Java or Burma. The committee, therefore, excluded other nationals, with the understanding that in the future we would accord to any other nationals in the Philippines the same treatment accorded by foreign governments to our nationals, wherever they might be located.

Mr. LANGER. The majority of the Chinese claimants are not our nationals, are they?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. What proportion of the total claims is represented by the claims of the Chinese?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should say that the claims of Chinese, British, and Dutch nationals together amount to nearly a third of all the damage claims which could be filed in the Philippines. They have all been excluded for the reasons which I have stated, after very careful consideration.

Mr. LANGER. What proportion of the claimants are Chinese?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should say a substantial proportion. I have not the figures at hand. They are in the report. My recollection is that more than half of them are Chinese.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator have any objection to including them in this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. It would mean a tremendous change. Let me say to the Senator that we are not unsympathetic to that situation. Intelligent legislation will depend upon what reports we receive, how the claims are distributed, and many other factors. For example, suppose Japan should pay $1,000,000,000 in reparations. Suppose we should forego our share of it, and let the Chinese, who certainly deserve well of us, have it, and suppose we should provide that Chinese nationals in the Philippines should be compensated on the same basis as that which applies to others provided for in the bill. It was because of all those imponderables that we did not venture into the field of foreign nationalism at this stage.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, the committee is not going to discriminate against the poor Chinese.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. We are sympathetic; but this is not the time to consider that question. We could not consider it intelligently.

Mr. LANGER. I am in favor of this bill, but I wished to be sure that the Chinese were given the same protection as that accorded to other nationals.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think we might say that even China, while not in a very satisfactory financial condition, could perhaps assist our nationals in China in replacing some of the buildings destroyed. The Chinese could at least provide local currency. So we simply left this question for a future deal, so to speak, with the governments of those countries where we have nationals who have lost their property during the war. We should like to see them receive the same kind of treatment, so far as it is within the capacity of those governments, that we give their nationals in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. TYDINGS. As the Senator from Ohio says, when we know what that is, we will do our part, in line with what I have already stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of the bill.

The destruction of property in the Philippine Islands, as estimated by the War Damage Corporation, is about $800,000,000. That loss is divided as follows: $195,000,000 of public property; $139,000,000 of church property; and $464,000,000 of private property. That is an estimate, but it is an estimate made by intelligent men.

At the beginning of the war we adopted the policy of insuring all property in the United States. The President of the United States set aside $100,000,000 for the purpose of insuring American property which might be destroyed by bombing or otherwise. In the early part of 1942 we enacted a law extending such insurance all over the United States. It followed the general policy of the British Government, which levied a tax on every piece of property, and from that tax paid the war damage. We could not levy a direct property tax, so we had to make the insurance system a voluntary system. But it was to a large extent a Government affair. We charged people in the Mississippi Valley just as large premiums as we charged on the coast, although the risk was probably only a fifth or a tenth of what the risk was on the Atlantic coast. We adopted that principle.

Under the President's first declaration the plan was extended to the Philippine Islands. We were unable to continue the voluntary system in the Philippine Islands simply because the people there were not able to take out the insurance. Besides, we did not know whether we would ever get the islands back, what their condition might be, or whether we could check the damage. So the plan was not extended to the Philippine Islands, although the original act authorized it to be so extended, and although, so far as I can see, the principle was absolutely applicable. It was applicable in Hawaii, and to a limited extent we have paid out of that fund war damages to persons in Hawaii. I believe that some damage in this country has been paid for.

So far as I am concerned, in the consideration of this question, the Philippines are a part of the United States. They fought on our side. They were a possession of the United States. To my mind, for this purpose they were just as

much American citizens as the people of this country, and I thought we should treat them approximately as we would have treated people in California if California had been similarly devastated. If there had been an invasion of California, I cannot doubt that, with the policy established by the War Damage Insurance Act, we would have paid all the war damage in California. In the case of the Philippines we know what the actual condition is. The Philippines are the only part of the United States which has suffered physical damage, and I believe we should be extremely generous in settling the Philippine claims.

We have provided, in effect, that the war-damage insurance funds shall be effective up to 75 percent, provided the money is used for the replacement of property actually destroyed. Under the insurance plan, the government would have been able to insure its property, just as a State would have been able to insure its property in this country. We have provided approximately $150,000,000 worth of work or surplus property for the Philippine government. That also is approximately on a 75-percent basis. But we feel that they should participate. They are able to provide labor, perhaps, to help in the reconstruction. They are able to borrow money locally for that purpose if they do not have the money themselves—and they may have the money.

So in their case we have provided that the Federal Government itself will have work done and will expend money and will give surplus property up to $150,000,000. That is to be done by the Federal Government, so far as the roads are concerned. The Public Roads Administration will rebuild the roads to the extent that the Commission thinks that should be done and is possible to do under this total over-all limitation. The Army engineers are directed to rebuild the wharf facilities. The Commission will also call on the Army engineers or the Public Roads Administration to rebuild the railroads, for instance, and to put them back into operating condition, or to rebuild the electric-light and public-service plants. That will be the course of the larger operations. If there is any money left, other damage may be paid for—for instance, in order to help the government replace some of its public buildings and public property.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator give us an estimate of the total amount of money which the American people will contribute for the rehabilitation of the Philippines?

Mr. TAFT. The total cost probably will be in the neighborhood of $450,000,000, to cover a total, actual, out-of-pocket loss of $800,000,000. If we obtain reparations from Japan, which otherwise probably would go to the Philippines, where the damage occurred, we shall reimburse ourselves from those reparations. Furthermore, from the insurance plan we have collected $220,000,000 worth of war-damage-insurance premiums, and I think that money can properly be limited to the repairing of damage. In other words, the people in this country had their insurance. They were fortunate; there was no bombing here; and we have premiums in the amount of $220,000,000. That money has been put into the Treasury. In substance, it will cover approximately 75 percent of the private-property damage for which we shall make reimbursement. So we can hardly say that that money will come out of our general tax receipts. Thirty million dollars of the $450,000,000 will come out of surplus property. Probably it would cost more to bring it back to this country and sell here than to turn it over to the Philippine government.

So I do not believe the actual out-of-pocket expense will exceed the expense of the Army and the Navy and the Army engineers and the Public Roads Administration in replacing the main facilities of the Philippine Islands.

I do not think our action is in any way overgenerous. I belive very strongly that in the Far East our whole prestige and the future opinion of the people of Far East of the United States will depend, as it has in the past so successfully, on our treatment of the Philippine Islands. If we can set up the Philippine Islands again so that they can move forward, so that they will not have to spend 5 or 10 years in scraping together the funds or whatever else it may be necessary for them to have in order to try to rebuild their cities and to replace their manufacturing facilities, I feel very strongly that throughout the Far East we shall receive from our contribution, because of our accomplishment in finishing the great job we have done in the Philippine Islands, a credit which will amount to far more than any money which we are called upon to spend under this bill.

Mr. President, I very strongly hope that the pending measure will be passed unanimously by the Senate, and I feel confident that we have worked out the fairest and most practical way of carrying through this great purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill, and I wish to state briefly my reasons for supporting it. There are intangible assets in this picture which amount to far more than the tangible assets. We know how the "underground" in the Philippines worked with the few American soldiers who escaped from Bataan and Corregidor into the mountains. We know how, by and large, the Philippine people cooperated with our military forces and made MacArthur's success possible. We may ask why that happened. The answer must be that in the Philippines the people generally felt that the Americans would carry through to the end, to see that the liberties of the Philippine people were regained. The Filipinos remembered the treatment which America had showered, we may say, on them in the years following our entrance into the Philippines. The Philippine people themselves are an example of how to bring about peace in this world. In other words, I mean that when we went into the Philippines, the Filipino people were a backward race. We did not take from the Philippines; we gave to the Philippines. We took education to them; we took to them the American concept of the inviolability of contracts. We took to them, to a large extent, what has been known as the American way. The Philippine people, by and large, have appreciated what we gave to them.

Then the war came. The result was that we were paid back a hundredfold for all the generosity and all the fair dealing which we had bestowed on the Filipinos.

As has been suggested by the Senator from Ohio, the next century may belong to the Far East. China, with her 450,000,000 people, is in a state of ferment. China has been our friend. Why? The Chinese remember what we did in the days of the Boxer Rebellion. Mr. President, all of us recall that when indemnities were demanded from China, the United States was the one nation which said to China, "We do not want an indemnity. You take it and send to America the best young brains you have and let them receive an education in America, and then return to your land." That paid dividends a thousandfold.

Mr. President, now we are telling the people of the Philippines that America is going to spend $450,000,000 to aid them in their work of rehabilitation. That is no small sum. Of course, a large proportion of it has already been accumulated in insurance premiums. But, Mr. President, we shall spend that $450,000,000 to rehabilitate the Philippines, to rebuild universities, churches, highways, schools, and docks, and thus to bring into existence once again the economic life of a country which has been blotted out. We are trying to bring economic help to the Philippines. But that is not all, Mr. President; we are again doing for an Asiatic people what we did during the Boxer Rebellion days. We are endeavoring to manifest brotherhood in action. Words are cheap. Deeds are what count. We are sowing seed so that in future years it may well be said that America, looking ahead in 1945, did that thing which kept her safe in the emergency of this day and generation.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1610) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the consideration of the second measure which I understand the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland desires to have considered, the Federal pay bill (S. 1415) be made the unfinished business, subject to the following conditions: That the bill will not be taken up actively before the Senate until noon tomorrow, and that in no event will there be a vote upon the bill itself until Monday next or some day thereafter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, merely in order to clarify the Senator's unanimous-consent request, I may say that he referred to the second piece of legislation which I desire to have considered. Senate bill 1610 has now been passed. The second measure is Senate Joint Resolution 119 which is a simple measure fixing a date for holding the next Filipino election. Passage of the joint resolution has been requested by the President of the Philippines.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, earlier in the day I objected to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California that the Federal pay bill be made the unfinished business. Since then informal discussions have taken place between Members of the Senate who are especially interested in the proposed legislation, and I believe that the request now made by the Senator from California embodies a tentative agreement entered into by all interested parties. I have no purpose to renew my objection.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 119 to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I did not hear the reference to the joint resolution because I was conversing with another Senator when the Senator from Maryland asked that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. The joint resolution is to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands. It results from a message which was sent from the White House a few days ago in which President Truman and President Osmeña joined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 119.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, although the joint resolution is short and speaks for itself, I wish to make a brief explanation of it.

As a result of the war which took place in the Philippine Islands, the poll books, election registers, and all the election machinery were largely destroyed. It is, therefore, difficult to hold an election in the Philippine Islands as of today. Furthermore, the country is economically paralyzed and many of its people are dislocated. It has been necessary for the Army and the Navy to go in and feed the people and take possession of wide areas. Because of the war, it was not possible to hold elections on the date specified in the Filipino Constitution. One of the reasons for that situation was that the Japanese were in possession when the date for the elections arrived. Since then it has not been possible to hold elections. It is now necessary that the country be politically reconstituted by an election of a president, vice president, and members of congress.

The pending joint resolution proposes to fix a date, providing that the Philippine government does not fix a prior date. The joint resolution will be effective only in the event that the Philippine Government fails to act.

The joint resolution comes before the Senate upon the request of the president of the Philippine Islands, as well as upon the request of the President of the United States. I cannot see why any Senator should oppose the measure. It is merely an additional one to help the Filipinos get back into their former stride of balanced, stable, political and governmental operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines not later than April 30, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date for such elections, and the date fixed shall not be subsequent to April 30, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date, then April 30, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

SEC. 2. The president and vice president then elected, the senators then elected (who shall be all but those then in office whose terms continue until December 30, 1947), and the members of the house of representatives shall take office, and the elected Philippine Congress shall convene in regular session not later than May 28, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date or dates for the assumption of office and for the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session, and the date or dates fixed shall not be subsequent to May 28, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date or dates, then May 28, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date for assumption of office and the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session.

SEC. 3. The term of office of the president, vice president, and representatives then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945. The terms of office of eight of the senators elected at such elections shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945; and the terms of eight senators then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1943. Division of the senators elected at such elections into these two classes shall be made in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. The term of any senator then elected to fill a vacancy in a term expiring on December 30, 1947, shall expire on that date.

SEC. 4. The manner of holding such elections shall be as provided by the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASE OF COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader what is the program for the remainder of the afternoon?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that following the passage of the joint resolution relating to elections in the Philippine Islands the so-called pay bill was to become the unfinished business.

Mr. DOWNEY. That was the agreement, but it was also agreed that consideration of the bill would be postponed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I believe that tomorrow the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] desires to have the Senate take up the bill from the Committee on Commerce which is known as the ship sale bill, consideration of which will not take very long. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has indicated his willingness to allow consideration of the pay bill to be temporarily laid aside while the ship sale bill is being considered.

There is an informal understanding that the pay bill will not be voted on before next Monday. That does not mean, however, that amendments offered to it may not be voted upon during the remainder of the week. I believe that the Senator from California has agreed that on next Monday consideration of the pay bill may be temporarily laid aside in order to consider the hospital bill. So far as I can tell at the present moment, when those matters are out of the way the pay bill will be given an unrestricted right-of-way.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield for a question or an observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Kentucky has indicated that on tomorrow the ship sale bill will be taken up, and he has expressed the belief that little opposition will be voiced to it, and that it will be speedily disposed of. I have had no occasion to see the bill or make a study of it, but I believe I should say that I have received some letters extremely critical of at least one provision of the bill, and whether it will lead to controversy I do not know. I merely say that for the information of the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a chance we always take when a bill is taken up. Frequently we are optimistic about controversial provisions of the bill, and when we get into it we find the optimism was not justified. But I would say that by and large the bill will not take a great deal of time. The program, so far as I can foresee it now, is as I have stated.

The understanding is that the pay bill is the unfinished business, but that there will be no further proceedings on it today. Therefore I suggest that we take up the Executive Calendar and dispose of that, with the view of recessing until tomorrow.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 693) entitled "An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move the adoption of the report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair), laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Col. Clark Kittrell, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27, 33 U. S. C. 642), vice Col. Malcolm Elliott, relieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Olsen to be Register of the Land Office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand this nomination may go over for another day.

Mr. WHITE. This is the Idaho nomination?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Donnelly to be Collector of Internal Revenue for the district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Floyd S. Daft to be senior scientist.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leslie Richard Groves to be Assistant to the Chief of Engineers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 5 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 3, 1946

×Maj. Charles Llewellyn Gorman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Albert Carroll Morgan, Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from January 4, 1946

×Maj. John LaValle Graves, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 5, 1946

×Maj. Herbert William Kruger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. William Earl Watters, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Leo Henry Dawson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Milton John Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Carl Budd Wahle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Lester Vocke, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. John Leon Dicks, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Herman William Fairbrother, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Thomas Edward Meyer, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. LaRoy Sanders Graham, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Francis Lavelle Ready, Cavalry.

×Maj. David Hottenstein, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Ray Brooks Floyd, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Ray Eugene Marshall, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Karl Clifford Frank, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Clyde Anderson Burcham, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Randall James Hogan, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert Nicholas Young, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

×Maj. James Frederick Phillips, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

×Maj. Douglas Valentine Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Frederick Williams Watrous, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Charles Elford Smith, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Raymond Edward Culbertson, Air Corps.

×Maj. Maynard Harper Carter, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. LeGrande Albert Diller, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

×Maj. Robert Parker Hollis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Isaac Davis White, Cavalry (temporary major general).

×Maj. Max Hosmer Gooler, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Joseph Howard Harper, Infantry (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Newton Farragut McCurdey, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

×Maj. John Julius Dubbelde, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

Maj. Joe Ford Simmons, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Clarence Turner Hulett, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Maj. Daniel Powell Poteet, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Gerson Kirkland Heiss, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Ransom George Amlong, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Walter Howard DeLange, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Robert Kelsey Haskell, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

×Maj. Ralph Adel Snavely, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

×Maj. Claude Armenius Thorp, Cavalry.

×Maj. Aloysius Eugene O'Flaherty, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be first lieutenant with rank from January 19, 1946

Second Lt. Dimitri Alexander Kellogg, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Richard Traber Batson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Charles Calvert Benedict, Air Corps (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Edward Lee Shelęy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. John Hugh Buckner, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John Jones Upchurch 3d, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Allen Knowlton, Cavalry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lawrence Harold Bixby, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. DeWitt Clinton Armstrong 3d, Infantry (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Keith Gordon Lindell, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Robert Nelson Smith, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. George Anthony Rebh, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Howard Deane Elliott, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Samuel Nairn Karrick, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward James Hardebeck, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Ambler Camm, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Fred Brenning Waters, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edmond Lawrence Faust, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Leslie Freer, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Raymon Dempsey, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Douglas King Blue, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Howard Franklin Wehrle 3d, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Paul Roscoe Ellis, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. John McClure, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Louis Theodore Seith, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Ralph Fishel, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Oliver Frankosky, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Daniel Harrison, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Elmer Bennett, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Edward Joseph Bielecki, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Hugh Cook, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Creel Marshall, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Johnson Talbott, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Darrie Hewitt Richards, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Clarke Duncan Hain, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Albert Emmanuel Saari, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Milton Ernst Stevens, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Cecil George Young, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Lewis Evans, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Love Starnes, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Vernon Keith Sanders, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Guthrie Hillman, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles William Lenfest, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Quinton Donaldson IV, Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Jack Jean Jones, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Mitchel Goldenthal, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Lowell Boyd Fisher, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Belleau Burlin, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Carpenter Raaen, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Kunkel Sykes, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Michael Costello, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Emmett Robinson Reynolds, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Glenn Glasgow, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Randolph Richardson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Franklin Prague Shaw, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Herbert Gordon Kolb, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Francis Hamilton Bonham, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Ralph Mills Hofmann, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Stuart MacVeigh, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Frederick Mark Smith, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Beardsley Grace, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Clifford Pinkerton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Conrad Epping Koerper, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederick Sherwood Porter, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Rice Ardery, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Milton Albert Behn, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Morse Wood, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Franklin White, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Roger Alexander Bertram, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph Lincoln Cadwallader, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Thomas Henry Beeson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Robert Emil Fiss, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leslie Buckingham Harding, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Robert Myers, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Rexford Herbert Dettre, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Bernhardt Cobb, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Louie Hamilton, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter William Hogrefe, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Henry Frederick Grimm, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Asbury Holt 3d, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Seton Maloney, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Leroy Weber, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Michel Andre George Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Francis Xavier Kane, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Stephen Otto Benner, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Quentin James Goss, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John George Moses, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Cleo Merton Bishop, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Ernest Hensel, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Earl LeRoy Hehn, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
× Second Lt. Thomas Everett Griess, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Dan Morey Parker, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Wendell Lowell Bevan, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Alfred McKinney, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Frank Johnson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Foster Stephens, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Francis McDermott, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Donald Henry Vicek, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Vernon Edward Trinter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Hiram Glenn Turner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Laurence Shortall, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Harold James Bestervelt, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Charles Edward Hardy, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Edward Boyd, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Harrison Dover, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Jacob Shultz, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Arthur Kerig, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Robert Nickel, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James McClain Huddleston, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edmund Barber Edwards, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Miller Wilson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Muldrow, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph Joseph Truex, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Stewart Canfield Meyer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederick Clayton Spann, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Isaac Cary, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Floyd Oralee Tobey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Frederick Martin King, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edmund James Carberry, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Reed Hahn, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Ben Lee Baber, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Henry Anson Barber 3d, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George Spoor Weart, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Edward Andrepont, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lawrence Philip Bischoff, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Gray Wheelock 3d, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Gregg Henry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lowell Lyndon Wilkes, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Marion Hopkins May, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Bernard Smith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. McGlachlin Hatch, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Vasco John Fenili, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Rex David Minckler, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Francis Casimir Kajencki, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Adrian St. John, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Joseph Courtney, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leo Mose Blanchett, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Merle Landry Carey, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Alfred Lukacs Toth, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kirby Alexander Gean, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Russel McKee Herrington, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Guy Kurtz, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Walter Richard Taliaferro, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. George William Porter, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Clifford James Moore, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edwin James Willcox, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Joseph Hynes, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Jacob Luther, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. William Frederick Pitts, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Arthur Anson Marston, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Howell Broach, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph William Benson, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Erwin Kuffner, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Edward Potter Foote, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Clifton Lewis Butler, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Roderic Thomas Wriston, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Eugene Wilbourn, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Hixon Shaffer, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Dana Lee Stewart, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Robert Michael, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Edward Kelleher, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roy Alexander Sanders, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Moses Joseph Gatewood, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Hugh Mease, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Jay Gorman, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Alden Hine, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Lester George Taylor, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lee Boyer James, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Hayes Fritz, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Gregory Hoyt, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Louis Locke Wilson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. James Willis Ledbetter, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Harold Kilburn Roach, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Henry John Ebrey, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Patrick Gerald Wardell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James Justus Cobb, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Algin James Hughes, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Ernest Lacy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Younger Arnold Pitts, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Warren Joseph Lane, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harold Staats Walker, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. William Edmund Larned, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Roy Lindsay Bowlin, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Thomas Walsh Flatley, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arvid Paul Croonquist, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Charles Francis Alfano, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Sprague Beightler, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. James Emerson Bush, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Joseph Sebesta, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Joseph Bartholomew Conmy, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Peeler Stabler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jessup David Lowe, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Raymond Cecil Brittingham, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jesse Benjamin Hollis, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Oliver Williams DeGruchy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Earl Stoll, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Shirley Wood, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clarence Maude Davenport, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Roger Louis Fisher, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Victor Arnold Franklin, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Lamar Hardy, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Russell Jackson Smith, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert LeVerne Davis, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Virginio Lorenzo Antonioli, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Hepburn Bruner, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Riley Mitchell, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Pearson Wade, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Leslie Doyle, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Crocker Catlin, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Walter Edwin Nygard, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Bates Windsor, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Eugene Baden, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George William Criss, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Warren Thompson, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Richard Turner Schlosberg, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert James Rader, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Gilmore McNamara, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Arthur Vincent Jackson, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Bradley Lundberg, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Howard Anthony Linn, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Edward Harrington, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Alexander McGough 3d, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Gerard Vincent Cosgrove, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Willard Baer, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Sidney Zecher, Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Winthrop Armstrong, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Logan Edwards, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Roy Ross, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James Fisher Frakes, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Robert Morehead Cook, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Diebold Brady, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Norman David Greenberg, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Norman Daniel Cota, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Terry Ellis, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Kamell Maertens, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Pete Daniel Pavick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Frederick Daye, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Luck Danforth, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Henry Joseph Mazur, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harry Hall Pritchett, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James Alfred Rippin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. John Edgar Van Duyn, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Alexander Stuart, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Edward Roberts, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Jacob Norris, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Altus Emory Prince, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Dennis Healy, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Thomas Edward Ramsey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Daugherty Mason Smith, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Thomas Robert Watson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Edwin Waters, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Thomas Russell, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert John Walling, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Cecil Wray Page, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Lossen Lane, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Alvin Wirt, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Eugene Lewis, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Burton Francis Hood, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edward Henry Murray, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Everard Hatch, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Marshall Little, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Myron Haines Dakin, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Herbert Suddath Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Henry Hodgen Kirby, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Kearie Lee Berry, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Anthony Riccio, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Barton Kyle Yount, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Harvey Watson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. William Robert Stewart, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Herbert Eugene Kemp, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Theodore Thomas Lutrey, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Roland Anderson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Lester Heltzel, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Leonard Lawrence, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Darwin Jack Kitch, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ernest Darius Scott, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jacob Whitman Klerk, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lester Meltzer, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Johnston Hovde, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Hamlin Schofield, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. William Douaire Neale, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Leopold Dworak, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Charles Herbert Burr, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. John Daniel McGowan, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. James Daniel Moore, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Franklin Powell, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Robert Victor Whitlow, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Barton James Mallory, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Ernest Griffin, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. James Franklin Hackler, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. John William Barnes, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Thomas Wilson Brown, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Hugh Fagan Jordan, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

×Second Lt. Kenneth Ecklund Buell, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Hiram Pietsch, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

× Second Lt. Robert Lee Bullard 3d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

×Second Lt. William Martin Thompson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. William Joseph Cook, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. Britt Stanaland May, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Lyle Marvin Lappin, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. George Romanta Kinney, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Donald Kyle, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Elvy Benton Roberts, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Edward Allen Doran, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Hugh Fautt, Jr., Air Corp (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Chester John Butcher, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lieutenant George Thomas Prior, Air Corps (temporary major).

×Second Lt. John Milton Cutler, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Rossignol Lovett, Air Corps (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Boone Seegers, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Arthur Pershing Hurr, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Second Lt. Sidney Conrad Peterman, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Wesley James Curtis, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Ernest Charles Raulin, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. David Harvey Barger, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Henry Benton Sayler, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Carlos Maurice Talbott, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert McNeely Peden, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Everett Edward Lowry, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Thomas Henderson Farnsworth, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. John Joseph Nazzaro, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. James Creelman Huntley, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Morton Campbell Carmack, Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. Joseph Edward Nett, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Frederick Dolby, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Elbert Pritchett Epperson, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Everard Kidder Meade, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lucian Dalton Bogan, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Marvin Jay Berenzweig, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Jack Fontaine Dulaney, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Raymond Francis Ruyffelaere, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

×Second Lt. Howard Everett Moore, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

×Second Lt. William Harold Dannacher, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Victor Anthony Cherbak, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).

Second Lt. James S. Changaris, Infantry (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Jonathan Waverly Anderson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Haywood Hume, Air Corps (temporary captain).

×Second Lt. Thomas Arthur Mesereau, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Melvin Sidney Thaler, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

×Second Lt. John Parsons Wheeler, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Roy Robertson Wilson, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Harvey Linton, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Eugene August Wink, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Henry Tucker 3d, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Stanley Livingston James, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Belmonte Pasquale Cucolo, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. James Anthony Aleveras, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

To be first lieutenant with rank from January 21, 1946

Second Lt. Robert Tompkins Blake, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Fletcher Emory Ammons, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 17, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

To be major

Capt. Eugene Rhea Chapman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 8, 1946, subject to examination required by law.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Forest Vernon Bockey, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 6, 1946.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Homer E. Williams, Calera, Ala., in place of R. E. Bowdon, Jr., resigned.

Mabel G. Matlock, Irvington, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leigh V. Burch, Seale, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARKANSAS

Ibrie D. Trice, Roe, Ark., in place of W. F. Bock, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Helen L. Hellwig, Bodega Bay, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Jeanne E. Merian, Valley Ford, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

COLORADO

Fern Conklin, Fraser, Colo., in place of E. E. Carroll, retired.

William Kloster, Ramah, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Martha C. Dana, Roggen, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charlotte Johnson, Somerset, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

GEORGIA

Cyrus E. Tolbert, Omega, Ga., in place of C. H. Tolbert, transferred.

HAWAII

Jack A. Hall, Eleele, Hawaii, in place of J. I. Silva, retired.

ILLINOIS

Cornelia Runyan, Colona, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Myrtis P. McCluskey, Maunie, Ill., in place of J. E. Farny, deceased.

KANSAS

Doris M. Ralston, Lincoln, Kans., in place of G. W. Ryan, deceased.

MAINE

Arthur A. Sprague, Liberty, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ois C. Brackett, Rangeley, Maine, in place of H. H. Herrick, deceased.

MARYLAND

Maude R. Phelps, Clarksville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary E. Cavey, Ilchester, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ethel Goddard, St. Marys City, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MINNESOTA

Howard M. Drinkwalter, Zumbro Falls, Minn., in place of A. H. Sugg, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Lula M. Flippen, McCarley, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MISSOURI

Bernice W. Stites, Barnhart, Mo., in place of James Macnish, retired.

Andrew P. Drury, Bloomsdale, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Laura M. Leach, Martin City, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

M. Vernon Davis, Newtown, Mo., in place of A. E. Duley, transferred.

MONTANA

Martin P. Browne, Lambert, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bertha Paulson, Sandcoulee, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Maud M. Young, Belvidere, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Fred A. Ott, Hooper, Nebr., in place of G. H. Looschen, resigned.

Helen Queen, Macy, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEW JERSEY

William L. Mongan, Berlin, N. J., in place of W. K. Bittle, transferred.

NEW YORK

Edith M. McEwen, Colton, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Marie Gardner, Fly Creek, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leonard A. Cafferty, Harpursville, N. Y., in place of M. E. St. John, resigned.

George D. Davison, Highview, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Dorothy B. Driscoll, Kauneonga Lake, N. Y., in place of T. E. Driscoll, resigned.

Harry Burns, Williamstown, N. Y., in place of J. F. Healy, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Hazel E. Wilson, Fittstown, Okla., in place of R. H. Floyd, resigned.

OREGON

Margery A. Kron, Garden Home, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Frank A. Chesaro, Brackenridge, Pa., in place of L. F. Matthews, removed.

Homer C. Wheatman, Unionville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

TENNESSEE

Louise White, Clairfield, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Hayden Glover, Elmwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Jennie Ruid, Loretta, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vivian A. Edberg, Radisson, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WYOMING

E. Kathleen Galloway, Winton, Wyo., in place of K. L. Marceau, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 5 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Charles A. Donnelly to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Floyd S. Daft to be senior scientist in the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath of office.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Leslie Richard Groves to be assistant to the Chief of Engineers with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Robert N. Culbertson, Blairsburg.
Hans A. Tvedte, Dolliver.

MISSOURI

Thomas W. Sincox, Washington.

NEW JERSEY

Katherine Stilwell, Blawenburg.

NORTH CAROLINA

Nelda L. Spruill, Pinetown.
Woodie G. Ammons, Robbinsville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edwin S. Blakeslee, East Smithfield.
Evalyn M. Roberts, Morganza.

VIRGINIA

Minnie P. Chambers, Arvonia.
H. Warren Conant, Chincoteague Island.
J. Walter Bailey, Woodstock.

WEST VIRGINIA

Nannie V. Duncan, Crumpler.
Ernestine Harris, Fenwick.
Howard H. Altizer, Newhall.
William T. Moomau, Petersburg.
Alma D. Gwinn, Shrewsbury.
Esther White, Stollings.
Carlos V. H. Cook, Van.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art supremely glorious, we most fervently pray that the spirit of our Master may more thoroughly obtain in the ranks of men. When reviled, He reviled not again, but bore with patience and fortitude the burden of His mission. O let us not fear the clouded face of human nature; through the things of time, space and sense, out of pain and discord, let come that freedom of peace and harmony toward which the world of men moves and strives.

Keep our Republic free, O God, from those sins which have wrecked so many lands, leaving only the monuments of ruin and dismay. Persuade us that no section of our social order can live built on the crumbling rocks of selfish desire and disunity. Preserve us, we beseech Thee, from the graveyard of divergent groups and grant that we may never be guilty of denying to any man those rich privileges guaranteed by our founding fathers. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2518. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1580. An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he expected to make later today in the Committee of the Whole an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Admiral Land and a copy of a wire sent by Admiral Land to Harry Bridges.

GENERAL HURLEY

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers have a phrase "speaking off the cuff." Some of our diplomats, and I refer particularly to Tyler Kent and Gen. Pat Hurley, who are supposed to be diplomats and represent the opinion of the United States, have taken it upon themselves to make their own policies and refuse to cooperate. I believe General Hurley, before he uttered a word, should have consulted with the President of the United States and acted as a true diplomat.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand certain telegrams which I have recently received. These bear on a matter we had up last week when the deficiency bill was before the House. Let me read one from Phoenix, Ariz.:

Local conditions regarding need of veterans' hospital more acute every week. Veterans from all over America arriving daily and no hospital facilities available. In the name of justice, please speed building of hospital here in valley of Maricopa County, Ariz.

Respectfully,

G. A. TODD,
Member of Veterans' Hospital Committee, Representing United Spanish War Veterans.

This wire is one of several, all carrying the same thought and plea, I have received confirming what I said in debate on the bill last week—that the building of veterans' hospitals is urgently needed. Time will not permit reading one from Commander Grant, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and others.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN OVERSEAS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on the problem of the transportation of soldiers and sailors back home, I have some definite information from a man who up until a couple of days ago was working on a Victory ship, the *Petersburg Victory*, if you want the name. That ship has been transferred by the Maritime Commission from the service of bringing soldiers home to an intercoastal shipping company for commercial service. I am also informed that there are 14 other ships, at least, concerning which positive knowledge is had that this same thing has happened. I think this is all wrong. I do not believe commercial shipping, coastwise or otherwise, should be allowed in any respect to interfere with transporting men home who are eligible to come back. These ships should be kept in the service of troop transport until that job is done.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have until midnight tonight to submit a report on the bill S. 380.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I

have for today be postponed until next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday of this week, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein several editorials about Indonesia.

REPORT ON TROOP RETURNS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote briefly from a recent War Department release dated November 20 concerning the all-important subject of men eligible for release being returned from overseas:

> Indications are now that shipping will be over the hump, no longer the critical factor, about January 1 in the Atlantic, and during April 1946 in the Pacific.

Further along the report says:

> The volume of returning soldiers is mounting steadily. In November, 697,000 troops are expected to land, 502,000 at eastern ports and 195,000 at western ports. December will be the peak month with 423,000 arriving on the east coast and 306,000 on the west coast.

If the War and Navy Departments and the War Shipping Administration will only secure more ships to bring the men home I am sure an earlier date than April can be attained for the Pacific. These agencies should also see to it that no more boats are diverted to improper or commercial purposes until these servicemen are all returned home. I feel strongly that the War and Navy Departments and the War Shipping Administration should use every available ship for that one purpose until the final result is accomplished. Speed is of the essence. Thousands of these men are already months overdue. Each day lost hurts not only them but also their families and friends.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

HAROLD J. LASKI AND FREDA KIRCHWAY

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why our Department of State continues to permit "Red" troublemakers, like Harold J. Laski, to enter the United States. Laski's rabble-rousing speech in New York City, in which he attacked our American way of life, was an insult to every person in the United States. As far as I am concerned, these "Red" "bleeding hearts" from England ought to mind their own business, and believe me, if their demand for an American loan is any criterion, they have plenty of business to handle.

It is particularly interesting to note that the Astor Hotel meeting, which Laski addressed, and at which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Sidney Hillman were present, was sponsored by the well-known Communist, Freda Kirchway. Her Communist affiliations are about as numerous as those of Mother Bloor. Among them are the following:

Sponsor: North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Sponsor: Mother Bloor banquet.

Member, national committee: All-America Anti-Imperialist League.

Sponsor: American Committee for Anti-Nazi Literature.

Signer of petition: American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

Member of committee: American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

Member, advisory board: American Student Union.

Signer of appeal: Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression.

Representative individual: Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo.

Sponsor and member of advisory board: Descendants of the American Revolution.

Member, advisory board: Film Audiences for Democracy.

Member, advisory board: Films for Democracy.

Sponsor: Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights.

Sponsor: League of Women Shoppers.

Member of committee: Medical bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy.

Signer of open letter: National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.

Signer of message: National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Member: National People's Committee Against Hearst.

Contributing editor: New Masses.

Owner, member of executive board, and contributor: New Masses.

Sponsor: Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign.

Signer of manifesto: Union of Concerted Peace Efforts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution on the atomic bomb by some scientists from the University of Minnesota.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an excerpt from a letter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermonth [Mr. PLUMLEY] may address the House tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JAMES F. SCANLON

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, James Scanlon has served the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations in an important capacity as a clerk for more than 30 years. He has been unfailing in his courtesy to the membership of the House and to those people in the Government who have had business with him. He is one of the finest, ablest, and hardest-working men that I have come in contact with during my service in the House of Representatives. As he is retiring at this time, I want to pay this slight tribute to him and to his good work.

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, some time ago we did away with the three-man board and changed the law so that Mr. Symington is now in charge of the disposal of surplus property. He is trying

to dispose of that property but on account of other legislation that you passed his hands are tied, and he is having the time of his life disposing of surplus property. He cannot do the job that should be done. He is going to be criticized. You will be criticized. There will be many accusations made against him, and you are not going to dispose of surplus property and help this country and help the people who want to be helped unless the law is changed in order to give him more authority and more power to aid in disposing of the property now, not next month or next year. Let us do a good business job and finish the job by giving him the power to dispose of that surplus property. In that way you will be better off, the country will be better off, the ex-servicemen will be better off, and everybody will be better off. So, why do you not do it Change the law for disposing of the surplus property before you adjourn for Christmas.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the Council for American-Italian Affairs.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] over the radio last night.

ADDRESS BY MRS. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to commend to every Member of the House, those present and those not present, that they read the broadcast made by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] last night. I give it to you as my opinion that her address is extremely timely and one of the most profound, and one of the grandest, utterances made anywhere in this country in the last 10 years or more.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE ON THE LABOR QUESTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, patriotic Americans from one end of this country to the other are applauding President Truman for his message to Congress on the labor question. Many Members complain that he did not go far enough, but we know he did go in the right direction.

Honest laborers throughout the country applaud him, because they realize that their future welfare is being jeopardized by certain alleged labor leaders who are merely interested in dictatorial power for themselves.

There has never been such a drive of communism against the American Government as is taking place today. An editorial in the Washington Post this morning winds up with these words: "All hail the revolution," after discussing the Communist anarchy parade around the State Department by these enemies of this Government. Two nights ago a little puny Communist from England named Laski, who is over here trying to stir up a revolution in this country, made a speech to a Communist meeting in Madison Square Garden advocating the overthrow of this Government or the abolition of its sovereignty, which means the same thing. I say it is about time the American people woke up and demanded that everybody on the Federal pay roll either get on the beam for America or get off that pay roll; and that every alien enemy get out of the country, and stay out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 444, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, an amendment prohibiting the use of funds involved in the bill (H. R. 4649) in countries that refuse free access to examination of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration operations by representatives of the United States press and radio. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 195]

Adams	Geelan	Norton
Barry	Gillie	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Mich.	Hagen	Powell
Brehm	Hall,	Rivers
Buckley	Edwin Arthur	Robsion, Ky.
Campbell	Hancock	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Mo.	Hart	Savage
Carlson	Hébert	Sheridan
Celler	Henry	Simpson, Pa.
Clements	Hoeven	Slaughter
Coffee	Holifield	Starkey
Courtney	Hook	Stevenson
Crosser	Hope	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	Horan	Talbot
Daughton, Va.	Izac	Voorhis, Calif.
Dawson	Jackson	Vorys, Ohio
De Lacy	Jensen	Weiss
Dickstein	Keefe	White
Dingell	King	Winter
Doughton, N. C.	Lea	Wolcott
Fernandez	Lewis	Wolverton, N. J.
Fuller	Lyle	Wood
Gathings	McGlinchey	Woodrum, Va.
Gearhart	Mansfield, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us makes in order H. R. 4649, a bill to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, commonly known as UNRRA. This is an open rule and provides for sufficient time—1 day's general debate and then reading of the bill for amendments.

There is some question about the verbiage of the rule relative to an amendment which is made in order. I wish to assure the gentleman on the other side that it was my purpose to comply with their request to have the verbiage so that the amendment they have in mind, the so-called free-press amendment, will be held to be in order.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very much pleased that the chairman of the Rules Committee has seen fit to mention that very question which has arisen as to the germaneness of the so-called free access to the news amendment, which is similar to the amendment I introduced when we had under consideration recently the bill providing an appropriation for UNRRA. The wording of the rule was a little difficult for me to understand.

I am happy that the gentleman has stated that in his opinion under the provisions of this rule the amendment mentioned would be held germane. I wish also to say to the chairman of the Rules Committee and to the House that in consultation with the Assistant Parliamentarian I have been assured that under the provisions of this rule the amendment which was offered before will be germane.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. I regret exceedingly, of course, that it

is hard for the gentleman from Ohio to understand or construe the verbiage of the rule which I let him dictate. Perhaps, of course, the stenographer did not have accurately recorded what he said.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman will yield just a little further?

Mr. SABATH. With pleasure, as at all times.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Sometimes that which a person dictates is misinterpreted. I am afraid the gentleman did not understand that which was dictated on this rule because certainly the provisions of the rule are not the words I used in dictating the suggestion.

Mr. SABATH. But the intent is there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The intent and purpose are there.

Mr. SABATH. I stand by the statement that this so-called free-press amendment is not a perfect one by any means. I think it is unnecessary and unwise; nevertheless I am in favor of its being considered and I know it will be held in order. An identical House amendment was recently stricken in the Senate when it considered the last UNRRA bill.

I presume the provisions of this bill are known to nearly every, if not every, Member. I know that every Member here is in favor of our great Government keeping its pledges, carrying out its legal as well as its moral obligations. There may be some criticism of the expenditure of the funds or the administration of UNRRA, but, so far, I have not heard any really serious charge against the UNRRA organization. There may have been some administrators who were a little reckless, some might even have been dishonest, but, immediately that came to the attention of those in charge, they were dismissed; and now I understand that those Members who have been abroad and all others who have made a thorough investigation, are satisfied that, taking into consideration that there are about 8,500 people administering the act in many countries, there may be in some circumstances minor practices that may not be strictly economical or perhaps in some instances may even be unethical; but human nature is human nature, and among 8,500 administrators and employees we must expect to find a few who are incompetent and a few who wilfully transgress at times.

I am pleased that later the provisions of, and the need and the necessity for, the bill will be explained to the House not only by the chairman and the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but by an outstanding gentleman who has studied foreign affairs for months and who has the complete confidence of the House.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. It is impossible to get a copy of the rule, there is none on the desk. Let me ask the gentleman this general question: As I understand, this rule does not prevent any amendment that is germane to the bill, does it?

Mr. SABATH. It is an open rule. The gentleman from Ohio ought to know by this time that whenever the chairman of the Committee on Rules can do so, whenever he is not voted down, he always reports an open rule to give the membership an opportunity to vote on any and all provisions and offer proper amendments to their hearts' content.

Mr. JENKINS. The trouble with all of that is the gentleman is voted down a good many times and we do not know from what the gentleman says what the rule means.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman's influence, perhaps, with the Members on his side might help me sometimes, although, being perfectly frank, I cannot criticize and shall not criticize either majority or minority members of my committee, because they have been helpful in many instances in trying to do the right thing.

Mr. JENKINS. Getting back to my question, my question was, as I understand the rule, although we have not seen it, it is an open rule, with one exception, which exception is the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] fathered before on the floor of the House.

Mr. SABATH. That is right.

The rule appears in a very recent issue of the RECORD.

It is not only an open rule but it permits the offering of an amendment that perhaps otherwise would not be in order. I refer to the so-called free-press amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It is an open rule plus one amendment which possibly would not be in order except for this particular rule?

Mr. SABATH. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. One other question. This bill is not an appropriation bill, it is an authorization, and the money provided for in the authorization bill cannot be expended and will not be available until the House or the Congress through the regular appropriating agencies provides the money, is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is practically always right, and especially at this time he is right.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I commend the gentleman and the position he has taken this morning and how happy he should be that he can come out here for a rule on behalf of this great humanitarian proposition. We have considered the rescission bill and we are not asking for more funds to fight a war. We can now expand our abilities in other directions.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for his timely observation. I hope to God that we will not be obliged to ask for any funds for war purposes in the future.

It is extremely regrettable that a few gentlemen on the floor of this House and some in the other body make erroneous statements, but I hope unintentionally, that are published widely and tend to effect disunity and discord among nations that have fought so valiantly and successfully to suppress the most savage tyranny and bigotry that ever attempted to bar the march of progress.

These gentlemen are unmistakably actually endangering cooperation, peace, and friendship among the great nations. For instance, they are and have been continually challenging the sincerity of and respect Russia has for her plighted word: First, it was alleged that Russia would make a separate peace with Germany; that Russia would not cross the Russian western boundary to continue fighting Germany; that Russia was during the war negotiating a peace pact with Japan; that Russia would not let us use her airfields that were in proximity to Japan; that Russia would not aid us in the war against Japan. But what really happened? Every allegation against Russia has fallen of its own weight. No less a personage than Mr. Churchill is authority for the statement, which proved true, that Stalin promised the United States, England, and China that within 3 months after the fall of Germany he would be at war with Japan. The war with Germany ceased May 8, 1945, and exactly 3 months thereafter, or August 8, 1945, Russia declared war on Japan. And did Russia stop at her western border when she had chased the defeated Germans thereto? She did not. Then it was said that Russia would not go beyond Warsaw in helping the United Nation's war effort; but ultimately we found her valiant and victorious armies storming and taking the Nazi hotbed, Berlin.

Russia was severly criticized for negotiating a so-called peace pact with Germany in 1939. Any well-informed person knows that Russia, then unprepared for war, had to make a saving deal with Germany in order to gain 1 year within which to at least partially prepare for that which Russia well knew was in the future, namely, a long war with Germany. Churchill often said that he would negotiate an agreement with the devil if it would save his dear England; and why should Stalin be blamed for doing the same thing?

Obviously, Russia needed time to switch her powerful armies and their equipment from western Europe to the far east, else Russia would have sooner declared war on Japan. The allegation that the atom bomb and that Japan was already in the bag influenced Russia to declare war on Japan is also untrue. Russia needed a breathing spell and time to transfer her mighty armies eastward and that she accomplished her promise so punctually and well is to her everlasting credit. I forget to mention that Russia, respecting her treaty obligation, had to give Japan appropriate notice of her intention to cancel the then existing peace treaty between the two countries, which was another factor in delaying action by Russia against Japan.

Russia drove the Huns from not only her own country, but she cleared Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, East Prussia, and Yugoslavia of that black beast. And were those mighty campaigns expensive? It is reliably estimated that Russia has ocular proof in the form of 15,000,000 graves of her war effort. Many say that we furnished Russia the things necessary to ac-

complish her great success in the war. Let us see what the facts really are. We furnished Russia, through the lend-lease agreement, many materials and much food. I have not at hand the amount Russia advanced us by lend-lease in reverse, but she did make a substantial contribution in that way.

Looking at the matter from the painful basis of dollars versus deaths, in all probability we should have lost at least 3,000,000 more men if we had been required to meet Germany and her allies in a one-front war. What would have been our fate in landing in France if Germany could have centered all her armies in the two areas in France through which we entered Europe? Where would we have been; with England also, if the great Russian Armies had not so successfully engaged the German Armies all the way from Stalingrad to Berlin? Yes, Russia did help us very materially, and do not forget that. Eminent historians tell us that nothing like the Russian defense of Stalingrad ever happened before on this globe. Referring to a little history, did not Russia give us Alaska for a very very small part of its real worth, and did not Russia, in 1862–63, exercise a restraining influence upon those who were very much in favor of a division of the Union.

And is it any wonder that Russia, attacked three times in 25 years from the west, should strive with utmost zeal to have friends instead of enemies on her west front, and have that front fortified against potential enemies? Would not any prudent nation do likewise? And yet we frequently hear that Russia is preparing for aggression and the violation of the rights of weak nations. Remember, please, that the Treaty of Versailles erased Russia's exit to the Baltic on the west.

The Russians went into Manchuria in order to expel the Japanese, and now that the job has been consummated she is withdrawing in accordance with her plighted word.

The charge is now being made in irresponsible circles that Russia is aiding the Communists of north China. Opposed to that allegation we have the word of Russia that she is positively favoring and supporting the regularly constituted National Government of China, and abundant proof of that assertion from Chinese sources. Has not Mr. Hurley repeatedly assured us that the Russians are actively supporting the legal Government of China? Yet, despite these affirmations and this proper and regular conduct of Russia toward other nations, some among us continue to question the aspirations and the sincerity and sanctity of the Russian promise.

True, Russia does not at all times agree with the British policies and she is not desirous of helping Great Britain strengthen her hold upon her colonial possessions, such as India, which is seeking and has been promised freedom. So far as I have heard, few persons criticize the British cooperation with Spain, Italy, Portugal, her conduct in Greece, in Java, in Iran, and her trade arrangements with Argentina and other countries. England and the oil industry are conducting nefarious, but shrewd, propaganda against Russia in order to gain control of Iran. That seems to have the approval of those Fascist-inclined gentlemen here and the capitalistic group in England and elsewhere.

Only this morning I read with profound disgust a statement in the press by a Senator from Mississippi, urging the strengthening of Germany, a policy that Great Britain pursued after World War I when she inspired Germany to gain strength to destroy Communist Russia. Statements like these are most dangerous and provocative in the extreme. The statement I have in mind reads as follows:

Meanwhile, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi, bluntly called for an economically strong Germany as a bulwark against Russia.

He told the Senate that Russia was a "predatory, aggressor nation."

Communism, he said, soon would take control of all Germany unless the United States abandons its sadistic policy toward this late enemy state. He suggested a new program to permit the Germans to find contentment in prosperity, and thus remain in the orbit of western civilization.

WANTS REICH RECOVERY

EASTLAND cautioned that there can be no permanent European recovery without German recovery.

In a 5,000-word speech, EASTLAND charged that the United States was starving the German people, and letting their industries be carried off. If this is continued much longer, EASTLAND said, it will drive Germany into the arms of communism.

EASTLAND recalled that Germany has served both as neutralizing agent and as a barrier between the oriental hordes and a western civilization 2,000 years old.

The Senator offered four specific recommendations:

1. Repudiation of the doctrine of collective guilt of the German people.

RELIEF NEED NOTED

2. The United States to demand that the starvation rations of the German people be increased, with a separate American relief machine to be set up.

3. Reunion of the four German zones under a central, non-Nazi civil administration.

4. End scorched earth reparations policies and set German peacetime industry in motion.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that Russia aims to safeguard herself against the capitalistic group, the Fascists, and the Nazi ideologists?

Russia is not demanding anything that may be of real interest to us. She has been so seriously wounded that she naturally craves peace so that she may repair her injuries and rebuild and enlarge her commercial progress.

I hope the practices and policies being pursued by these Fascists will be investigated to learn how far-reaching this conspiracy extends in an effort to involve us in another devastating war.

I realize that most of these statements and press notices are from the same kind of people who hated Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal so fervently, although they may be made only for political advantage at home, in line with the shameful fight made against the League of Nations. I need not point out the desirability and the necessity for all right-minded, patriotic, loyal citizens decrying these irresponsible utterances and writings that surely tend toward involving us in serious potential and menacing dangers.

Somehow those who are fighting for freedom and liberty nowadays are always charged with being Communists. Under that theory, should we not call Washington and his gallant followers rebels? In their days the word "Communist" was not known or little used, but currently "communism" is a handy stick with which to indefinitely tar those who disagree with their Fascist-inclined, monopolistic, cartel-group accusers. And, later, what about those in the South who waged war against the Union? How would they be designated if their activities had occurred within the last 10 or 15 years? Yet those brave men were undoubtedly sincere, and they were ultimately granted an amnesty.

Because a few misled men and women in this country who are opposed to some British practices, such as using the United States and other Nations to pull their own chestnuts out of the fire, and other national ills, and parade their sentiments openly among us, those who seek a pretext to defame, vilify, incite, and inflame against Russia charge that these demonstrators are Communists and link them with the good name of Russia. No matter how harmless these advocates are, what good they mouth, and what respectable liveries they wear, they are, for the want of a better name, labeled "Communists."

These demonstrators at least work overtly, and they are less harmful than the representatives of the Fascist, Nazi ideologies, who said they would rather see Russia defeated instead of Germany.

Peace-minded Americans are bound to condemn these oft-repeated statements and activities of those who wittingly and unwittingly are gradually but surely trying to involve us in the worst thing that could infest any country—war.

I do not wish to make an exhaustive speech because I do not want to deprive the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who will follow, of the opportunity to explain the bill more thoroughly and lucidly than I can.

Before yielding to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I am going to yield to my colleague the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], 30 minutes, and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education may be permitted to sit during the remainder of the day while general debate is going on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a

release of the Public Relations Section of the Fifth Army of the United States in Italy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the able chairman has fully explained this rule. On this side of the aisle there is no objection to the consideration of the rule. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that this bill requires $2,700,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. That is a great deal of money, especially when we realize that our national debt is now approaching nearly $300,000,000,000. I know that this country has made certain obligations. It has made certain commitments to various foreign countries in regard to relief and in regard to the sheltering, the feeding, and the clothing of the people in those countries. I expect to vote for this authorization, but I reserve the right to oppose further spending for the relief of the world.

In regard to this $2,700,000,000, that amount of money represents about $100 for every family in the United States. When we have our Community Chest Fund drive I question whether there are many Members of Congress who give $100 for the needy in their own country, but we sit here appropriating what amounts to $100 for each family in the United States to take care of the starving and the destitute throughout the world. Some people seem to think more about foreign countries than they do of the United States.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill calls for $2,700,000,000?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. I think the gentleman will concede that he is mistaken.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I mean this amount, with the other authorizations, totals $2,700,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. This bill calls for $1,350,000,000. It merely amends the original act which was $1,350,000,000, which has already been authorized and appropriated by this House. This calls for $1,350,000,000 based on 1 percent of the income of the United States for the year 1943. This is merely an authorization.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. This is an authorization for an additional $1,350,000,000, making a total of $2,700,000,000.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], and ask unanimous consent that she may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on November 26 on the floor of this House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] made a lengthy speech on the subject of China which was so replete with factual errors and distortions that anyone in this House having the least knowledge of China must feel obliged to correct at least the more obvious, elementary, and flagrant errors in that speech.

You will not be read a lengthy lecture on China in the dogmatic, omniscient manner of the gentleman from Washington. Though I have had a lively interest in the subject for many years, and although, unlike the gentleman from Washington, I have at least seen China, I do not pretend to oracular wisdom on so vast a subject. But even in such a complex subject there are a few ascertainable facts, the falsification of which ought not to go unrebuked on the floor of this House. It is with a few such facts that I propose to deal.

First, the gentleman from Washington asserted that in areas where Communist-led troops were strong, the Japs were more quickly disarmed than elsewhere and Mr. Speaker, anyone who will take the trouble to look at a map of China will see that on VJ-day the Japs occupied in China—not counting Manchuria—at least 50 cities of 100,000 population or more. Three months after VJ-day the Chinese Communists had succeeded in taking over from the Japs exactly one of these cities, the city of Chefoo. Meanwhile the Government troops—in some important cases with American help, but in the great majority of cases without any help from us—the Government troops had taken over all the other cities and had disarmed at least two-thirds of all Japanese soldiers in China. If we call the roll of the famous cities of China which were taken over from the Japs without American aid, it would include cities which all of us here have heard of—Canton, Hankow, Foochow, Ningpo, Swatow—not to mention dozens of cities less familiar to our ears such as Tai-yuan, Tsinan, Lao-yang, Kiu-kiang, I-chang, and so on—all taken over with negligible assistance from America, or none whatever.

If the Communist-fed gentleman from Washington has any claims to present on behalf of the Communists as to how many Japs they have disarmed, let him make them. I have as yet heard none. But I can inform the House, that contrary to Communist propaganda minimizing the number of Jap soldiers in China—and in this speech I will throughout exclude Manchuria since that has not been under official American observation—in China after VJ-day there proved to be not less than 1,100,000 Jap soldiers. Of these the Communists have not conceivably disarmed more than 20,000 or 30,000, whereas the total number of Jap soldiers who have been disarmed amount to at least 800,000. American assistance in this task has been essential, but we cannot claim to have done more than a quarter of the work. The rest of the job which we may state arithmetically as 600,000 Jap soldiers disarmed has been done by Chinese Government troops.

The Communists try to gain American sympathy by wild claims such as were made on this floor last week. They have the gall to try to make you believe that the Chinese Communists disarmed more Japs more quickly than the government. The plain fact is that for every Jap disarmed by the Chinese Communists, Chiang Kai-shek's troops, unaided, have accounted for 20. To twist such figures around is, I submit, a form of misrepresentation which ought not to be practiced on the Members of this House.

Now, secondly, just as they are now trying to make you believe that the Chinese Communists have been great Jap-disarmers since VJ-day, so another part of the Communist line is that the Chinese Communists did a better job during the war than Chiang Kai-shek's troops did. This part of the Communist party line can also be punctured with figures—grim figures.

The Japanese never desired to exaggerate the seriousness of their struggle against Chiang, but the Japs did nevertheless keep an audit of their killed and wounded. This audit shows that more than 2,000,000 Japs were killed and wounded in China. Now the Communists never even venture to claim how many Japs they killed and wounded; they know they would be laughed at if they claimed even as many as 200,000 Jap casualties. Well, grant them that. Who killed and wounded the other 1,800,000 Japanese? There is only one answer to that question, Mr. Communist, and that is the grim answer to your—shall we say—unsportsmanlike misrepresentations.

Now let us go on to a third point. The Communists as everyone knows were guerrillas; they never maintained as the Government did over long years, hundreds of miles, at one time 2,000 miles, of organized resistance on a line of battle. The Communists were guerrillas. Guerrillas can do plenty of damage to the enemy by such feats as jumping on a railway guard and tearing up a piece of railroad. And during the war, the Communists—let us give them full credit—did a fair amount of this, just as non-Communist guerrillas did. Now here is an interesting fact: In 2 months after VJ-day the Communists tore up more railroad track in north China and destroyed more railway equipment than in any 2 years before VJ-day. Who were they hurting, who were they assaulting after VJ-day? Not Japan—the Japs had quit. They were assaulting the body of China, and thereby they were assaulting all the United Nations, and especially they were assaulting a vital interest of the United States which is peace and order in China.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of facts—the sometimes unpleasant arithmetic of facts. It is a simple fact that the Chinese Communists have done more destructive damage in north China since VJ-day than they did before.

Now, let us make two or three more factual corrections to the encyclopedia of error which was presented to you by the gentleman from Washington. In at least one other case the correction can again be made by cold, arithmetical fact.

Mr. DE LACY'S most absurd error is contained in the following fantastic assertion:

> During the war only the brief period of General Stilwell's vigorous efforts at elemental reforms saw even temporary improvement in the general defeatism, inefficiency, downright bad government—

And so forth. Now, that is profoundly unfair to the gallant General Stilwell, since he would be the first to say that he was much too busy on the Burma side of the Hump to devote more than a very small fraction of his time to the reforms of the Government of China. And it is an even more stupid insult to Chiang Kai-shek, and the millions who stood with him not only against "defeatism"—how these Communists love isms—but against the terrible specter of defeat itself. But we will make the correction to this comical or tragic bundle of error by an arithmetical fact. The one great index of defeatism or defeat or inefficiency is inflation. When General Stilwell took his command in China, the Chinese dollar in the black market or free market—whichever you like—was about 40 Chinese dollars to 1 American; when he left it was between 1,000 and 1,500 Chinese dollars to 1 American. That is, in the Stilwell period inflation increased by at least 2,000 percent. The increase in inflation after Stilwell's departure up to VJ-day—nearly 1 year—was about 50 percent. Now, let me be clear. Gallant General Stilwell bears absolutely no blame for this. This was a situation beyond his control, and he was otherwise occupied. I am simply pointing out how you may expect to get from Communists not merely a little distortion but a distortion of 180 degrees. The Communists, trying to make General Stilwell their man, associate with him a period of improvement in the situation in China, whereas the truth is that he was there during China's worst years during which China came almost to collapse. And nothing better indexes the truth than the arithmetical fact that during the period to which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] refers inflation rose 2,000 percent—2,000 percent—whereas after we got ourselves extricated from the Communist saboteurs the rate of inflation fell from 1,000 percent per annum to 50 percent.

Now we have made four basic corrections to basic errors and we have made them with arithmetical fact. Two errors cannot be dealt with by arithmetic, but they are also questions of fact.

These two errors are, first, to assert that the Chinese Communists have established a wonderful democratic regime in the areas they control and, second, to talk as the gentleman did of the Kuomintang's pretensions to one-party dictatorship.

As to the Communist achievement in government, the simple fact is that the Communists in China have never established any form of stable government whatever. The best way, in a word, to dramatize this fact is that until they occupied one small city after VJ-day, the Chinese Communists had never been in control of what could be called even a middle-sized city. Maybe they could do a fine job of government—incidentally Stalin does not think they are capable of governing. The fact to emphasize here, is that to date they have never governed. Therefore all the claims for their so-called reforms are entirely untested if not irresponsible claims. To claim that the Communists have ever governed any tiny part of China with a degree of public responsibility remotely comparable to the Central Government in both domestic and foreign affairs, is the grossest distortion in the whole vocabulary of Communist distortion.

And finally as to the Kuomintang pretensions to one-party rule: If the Kuomintang is making any pretensions, the pretensions it is now making is that next year it will end one-party rule.

As an example of the frightful and frightening ignorance which I hope alone explains why the gentleman from Washington can swallow so much of the Communist Party line—one more word about the Kuomintang and one-party rule in China. The idea of one-party rule may or may not have been a good idea for China. But whose idea was it? It was the idea of the man whom the Communists pretend to revere even more than he is revered by the government; it was the idea of Sun Yat-sen.

Whatever some gullible Americans may think, no responsible Chinese, Communist or other, thinks that Sun Yat-sen's idea was a bad idea for China. And by the same token, today, every responsible Chinese from Chiang Kai-shek down thinks the time has come to end the period of one-party rule. Of course, we never hear in this House from the Moscow-tuned voices any objection whatever to one-party rule in Russia, but we do hear them yell their heads off about one-party rule in China. Let them save their breath and keep their peace. In China one-party rule is no issue; the only difference of opinions are as to the tough, practical problems of how to end it and exactly what methods of government will best serve the interests of 450,000,000 people when, next year, the Kuomintang gives up monopoly of government.

And these hard, practical Chinese questions, Mr. Speaker, we dare hope will be settled tolerably well next year—almost as tolerably well as we shall settle some of our much less difficult problems here—we dare hope.

China will have a better chance to solve them better if we Americans are not distracted by Communist propaganda but hew to the line of honorable, decent cooperation with the people of China as individuals, as law-abiding groups and through the lawful Government of the Republic of China.

Some of you may ask: but who are we to believe concerning Chinese affairs? Well, if someone gets up on this floor and makes a great parade of his love and concern for China, it is not irrelevant to wonder whether, apart from the Communist issue, he ever gave any evidence of having been interested in doing anything to help China or to advance Chinese-American relations. I do not ask that only the ardent friends of China should speak of China on this floor. Far from it. The duty of all of us is to speak first as Americans. We all recognize that it is important to America that she should pursue a right and not a wrong policy in China. But we do not like to see someone pretending to be full of loving concern for the Chinese people when the only thing that provokes him to action is a matter which primarily concerns the Communist Party.

Finally, let me say that I have hopes that our troubles in regard to a true American policy toward China are largely over. I share the belief of the vast majority of Americans that General Marshall would not go to China unless he had a clear policy behind him, and we know he would not go there with a policy which was in any sense contrary to the interests and ideals of our country.

None of us are so foolish as to expect miracles in times such as these. But I, for one, do believe that, with a sound American policy, we shall see China well on her way to becoming a united and progressive nation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. May I inquire whether the gentlewoman has informed the gentleman from Washington she intended to take him to task and criticize him?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the lady yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] got interested in having the Members of the House called to this floor when they are being attacked. I have been attacked by that left-wing crowd time and time again and I have never been notified yet.

Mrs. LUCE. Furthermore I am not attacking the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY]. I am rectifying his errors.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In fact, the Chinese Communists are attacking the territorial integrity of China which we had guaranteed by several treaties, are they not?

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman has made a very true point. I thank him for it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the lady has noticed that the statements made in the speeches here attacking the administration, in favor of the Chinese Communists, were verbatim the statements carried on some of these Communist placards now being carried around the State Department to insult Secretary Byrnes?

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for the observation. There is not the shadow of a doubt that the statements made on the floor about China in the speech to which I refer followed the Communist Party line in every essential.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. May I call your attention to the fact that when Tung-Pi-Wu came to this country for the San Francisco Conference as the one official Communist delegate representing the north China regime, the first thing he did when he landed in San Francisco was to take a plane for New York where he held a 5-hour conference with Mr. Jaffe and Mr. Browder at which time

Jaffe had in his office stolen files from naval intelligence and the State Department giving all the information on Chiang Kai-shek's army.

Mrs. LUCE. I thank the gentleman for contributing that most illuminating fact.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was given permission to extend an article in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Public Printer advises me that it will take 4½ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $234. I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the cost that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to hear the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] say there would be no opposition on his side to the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I said there was no objection to the rule.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is what I said. I therefore take it for granted that the rule will be adopted, and my remarks will be addressed to the bill that will be brought before us under the rule.

I have heard it stated that there is more opposition to UNRRA in the United States than in all the rest of the world combined. If that be true, it must be because we have been farther removed from the unparalleled destruction and suffering of the war-torn countries of the world. Yet we have not escaped. Over a million of our boys have been killed and wounded. I heard a chaplain on Armistice Day in Winchester, Va., say, "No casualty list is light if the name of your boy is on it." I know on December 25 there will be many mothers in this country who will stand before their Christmas trees with tears in their eyes while in their heavy hearts they recall the lament of King David over his son Absalom: "Would to God I might have died for thee."

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill, because to me it represents a legal obligation on our part. In the spring of 1944 we voted to go into an international organization for relief of war-torn countries and were then joined by 46 other nations.

When it became apparent in London last summer that we did not have enough funds to do the necessary job to which we were committed, our distinguished representative, Mr. Will Clayton, of the State Department, committed us to carry on for another year on the same basis, which was 1 percent of each contributing nation's national income as of 1943. We had an income then of $135,000,000,000, which makes our pro rata contribution for 1946 $1,350,000,000.

I am for this bill, because to me it represents a moral obligation on our part. We are the chosen representatives of a Christian nation, which does not want us to echo in these halls the cynical answer of Cain when asked, "Where is thy brother Abel?" We subscribe to the ethical teachings of the first century, which includes the statement that no man liveth to himself and no man dieth alone. That statement was issued in a small world dominated by the Roman legions. Science has brought the mighty nations of the modern world jostling together, and man's mastery of the air has wiped out boundary lines, and we now know, as Wendell Willkie so truly said, we are living in one world. We know the ethical teachings to which we subscribe.

We talk beautifully about democracy. We know what we should do to live our democracy and to make good our boast that we are a Christian nation.

He that has light within his own clear breast
May sit i' the center, and enjoy bright day;
But he that hides a dark soul and foul thoughts
Benighted walks under the midday sun;
Himself is his own dungeon.

The Nation, the Christian Nation of the United States, looks to us for leadership here and abroad in a new type of world, in a world that is dedicated to friendliness and peace, in a world in which we hope war can be eliminated as the arbitrament of international differences.

I am for this bill, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in voting this appropriation; even if we put it on a charity basis we will be casting our bread upon the waters to be returned, as Billy Sunday once said, "covered with butter and jam." I understand that the Army, on the basis of the relief that we would have friends and international cooperation, is asking for an appropriation of $10,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and that the Navy on the same basis is asking for three and one-half billions. When I hear of an appropriation I proceed to translate it into terms of taxes, because that is my primary field. Those appropriations of $13,500,000,000 translated into taxes would mean that the last peacetime rates of 1939 applied to the anticipated income of $130,000,000,000 would not produce enough for our proposed peacetime Military Establishment if $13,500,000,000 be appropriated for that purpose. Who could say if we decided to face the world alone, to have an armament that would enable us to feel secure without a friend or any ally, what the crushing tax burden of this Nation might be?

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill because there appears no other plan, and without this aid millions in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Albania will die this winter. Among those in charge of this program are Commander Jackson, of Australia, who serves as senior deputy director general, a man of extraordinary ability; General Gale, of the United Kingdom, who was General Eisenhower's chief administrative officer, now heading the London office; Lieutenant General Morgan, also of the United Kingdom, who was General Eisenhower's deputy administrative officer, in charge of UNRRA's displaced persons operations in Germany. Major General Rooks, deputy administrative officer in the Mediterranean theater, has been released by our War Department to serve as deputy director and executive officer of UNRRA headquarters here in Washington. I am informed that many other top-grade civilians and military personnel will join the UNRRA staff and its China mission if and when UNRRA obtains the additional funds it needs to complete its program. The only other agency we might have had was the Army, and General Eisenhower recently testified the Army could not do the job. You know how we have been clamoring to bring our boys home.

As a former football player I enjoyed seeing Doc Blanchard on the Army team perform in Philadelphia last Saturday and I took particular note of the fact that when the Navy tacklers met him head-on he bowled them over. Look at the picture of his first touchdown. I was sitting within 20 yards of him when he made it and I saw the Navy man fall on his back when he hit Blanchard straight from the front. They could only stop him when they made a slicing attack from the side and took him off his feet. Opponents cannot meet the issue face on in the matter of feeding the starving of Europe; it will be the slicing attacks that will take the program off its feet by those who say: "I am for it, but."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell those who propose to vote against this bill that UNRRA of its own volition has adopted every plan for better administration that has been proposed on this floor with the exception of the so-called free-press amendment which it was powerless to adopt. I have pointed out that 47 nations are now giving relief, not in Russia, not in Germany, but in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Albania.

Next year if we have the funds we hope to extend that relief to Italy, Austria, and China. UNRRA can arrange and has arranged for all of its employees to get all the information that it wants and needs from every country in which it operates. We have no right, legal or moral, to amend an international agreement unilaterally to provide that if this relief, for instance, should be extended to the Ukraine or to White Russia, Russia must give to all private representatives of the press complete freedom to operate in those countries. I say that that amendment is a slicing attack to take this program off its feet by those who would not dare make a head-on tackle.

We have made five international agreements: San Francisco, two at Bretton Woods—the International Bank and the stabilization of currency—one for international food and agriculture, and one for UNRRA. This is the first one we have been called on to actually implement. If we fail on this who will

there be in the nations of the world to trust us on the rest of the program?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I hate to interrupt the gentleman in his great speech; nevertheless I feel that the membership of the House and the country should know that the amount we are authorizing here will be used to take care of our surpluses that we will ship over there and the surpluses that are already over there.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. You cannot spend dollars anywhere else but here. Who can furnish the food? The United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. Already three of those countries have imposed rationing on their citizens. Canada returned to rationing of meat while we took it off. They are living up to their agreement. Russia is living up to her agreement. But UNRRA is now behind in operating funds to the extent of $580,000,000 and we owe of that amount $550,000,000. In estimating the deficit for the current fiscal year, due to war spending, at $30,000,000,000, the items for UNRRA of $550,000,000 for 1945 and $1,350,000,000 for 1946 have been included.

There has been distributed over two and a half million tons of supplies to the needy people over there. They need to spend $270,000,000 this month in our country for food and other supplies and from $270,000,000 to $300,000,000 next month or else many are going to suffer, many are going to die.

The money will be spent here. It will take from our market some surpluses that we can well afford to sell and maybe some other things that we should gladly share with those less fortunate than we.

I hope and believe that this Congress will do the right and honorable thing on this program of international cooperation.

It is the problem of urgency in this matter that concerns me most. I am told, and I do not question it, that if UNRRA is not given funds in addition to the $550,000,000 recently appropriated, it will have to cut by more than two-thirds its shipments in February, and will have no supplies for shipment thereafter. This means that without additional funds UNRRA collapses in the middle of perhaps the worst winter that all of the nations which it is aiding have ever faced. Only by acting immediately to supply UNRRA with the needed funds can this catastrophe be prevented. If there is not to be a great reduction in the flow of UNRRA's relief supplies to Europe during February, and an almost complete stoppage of the flow during March, UNRRA must have in hand additional substantial funds not later than January 10. By that date arrangements for procuring and shipping relief supplies during February must be made or such supplies will not flow.

These are the facts. There is only one conclusion to draw from them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] such time as he may require.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is only through an informed public we can know the benefits contemplated under this legislation are actually given to the starving people of Europe, and it is only through a free press and a free radio the American people can obtain and receive full and complete information as to the operation of this international agency.

Therefore, as provided in this rule, I expect to offer at the preper time and at the proper place, when this measure is before the House tomorrow, an amendment identical to that which was adopted by this House on similar legislation a short time ago.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems important to point out that some of the remarks that have been made here by advocates of UNRRA are not consistent with reality. For instance, today some talk about being faced with war. The truth is that, as of today, we are in a war already. We are in a war in China. It is as it was before the recent war, when American ships carried scrap iron to the Japs and our Government gave aid at the same time to China. Today, in China, Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Government is fighting the Communists. The United States is aiding that Nationalist Government of China, headed by Chiang Kai-shek. At the same time the Communists are being aided by Russia, and we, the United States, are giving aid, through UNRRA and loans, to Russia. In short, we are acting as an arsenal for both sides of a war and are a party thereto. Now, you cannot, as I see it, think about UNRRA unless you think about that situation, too.

Look at Europe. At Yalta, followed by Potsdam, Europe was divided so that today an iron curtain of Russian steel separates northeastern Europe from southwestern Europe. Northeastern Europe is occupied by the Russians on a line extending from Stettin to Trieste. To the southwest of that line is the rest of Europe, which is the industrial part, which is occupied by the Anglo-Americans. On the north in the Russian zone of occupation, are all of these countries to which UNRRA is donating; Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechslovakia. That is the Russian sphere of influence on the north of the iron curtain. I am not including Greece, which is in the control of the British, and UNRRA is donating there, too. But UNRRA is not giving food in the Anglo-American sphere, which is our responsibility. The population is not allocated as in normal times, moreover, since part of Germany has been given to Poland and is in the Russian sphere of occupation. There are millions—the number is not precise, but I think some writers have estimated that there are 19,000,000 displaced Germans or persons of German extraction who have been dumped over from the Russian sphere, including Czechoslovakia, into the Anglo-American sphere of truncated Germany. We cannot feed those millions of refugees while UNRRA is giving the people in the Russian-occupied sphere all of our American surplus material. To add to that, all of the area in the Russian sphere at the north is the surplus food area of Europe, which you might compare to the Midwest surplus food area of the United States. There are columnists and newspaper correspondents of some repute who say that today there is much surplus food in that area. We cannot get into the Russian puppet countries to see for ourselves, but that is reported that there is food lying on the ground unharvested on the farms in the Russian occupied area.

This is entirely plausible. Why? Because these millions of farmers have been dumped into the Anglo-American sphere and their farms communized and given to people who are not accustomed to doing farm work.

Therefore, as I see it, in voting for UNRRA you are voting to prevent the food going to the starving people in the Anglo-American sphere, and instead giving it to those who do not need it in the Russian sphere. In addition, you are aiding Russia in a war in China in which you are already fighting on the other side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, if all of us want the functions of UNRRA to be successful I think we must first go to the bottom to find out with just what kind of governments and with what kind of men UNRRA is going to deal. I propose to talk about one of those governments and one of those men this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, the march of quislings to Washington has begun. Before long there will be a section in our Nation's Capitol known as quislings row. The first and foremost quisling of all history has just arrived in Washington. I say he is the first and foremost quisling in all history because he has proved to be a quisling of not only one country, but a quisling of two countries—one of which is our own United States of America.

I refer to Oscar Lange, a would-be Ambassador of Poland to the United States of America. He has just arrived in the United States of America with fresh instructions from Moscow—posing as an Ambassador of Poland. For Oscar Lange to pose as an Ambassador of Poland is grossly immoral and in violation of every segment of international law. The fact is, Oscar Lange represents only the group in Poland who rule Poland with Moscow guns pointed at their heads. This present so-called government in Poland has no authority whatever except the force of Moscow. These present rulers of Poland were not selected by any election and are usurpers in every sense of the word.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. No; I will not yield. I have too much to say that is more important than what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. PATRICK. That is too bad.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In the eyes of decency and international law these rulers in Poland are nothing but a conglomeration of gangsters, criminals, forgers, fakers, and quislings. In fact 33 nations of the world still flatly refuse to recognize them and flatly refuse to have anything to do with them.

Oscar Lange is a shining example of the type of quisling who have taken over Poland in typical gangster and quisling fashion. Oscar Lange is a man who even out-quislings Quisling. He is a traitor of the first order.

Let us look at his record. Born a son of German settlers in Poland, the country he betrayed, he received an excellent education at the expense of the government he betrayed. In 1937 the Polish Government he betrayed even offered him a scholarship to go to the United States for further study. At that time Poland was being pressed by Germany to join Hitler. As soon as Oscar came to the United States, while accepting funds from the Polish Government to study in the United States of America, he indulged immediately in propaganda against the government that was feeding him. His quisling traits became known as soon as he hit American shores. Showing typical German ingratitude towards his benefactors, he indulged in anti-Polish activities and was satisfied for Hitler to destroy Poland—in fact it pleased him when Hitler did take over Poland.

But Oscar Lange was in danger. When Hitler attacked Poland, and later when Russia attacked Poland, Lange was still a citizen of Poland. Being a citizen of Poland, he feared the Polish Government might draft him into service to fight for the country that gave him his education and even a scholarship to study in America. The fear that he might be drafted to fight for Poland led Oscar Lange to seek American citizenship. Once he was enjoying the protection of American citizenship—the danger of his being called to fight for his country—Poland—was gone.

Hence, in 1943 he became a citizen of the United States of America. Now he had protection. It was protection he wanted and nothing else. Patriotism has no place in Oscar Lange's heart. Citizenship of a country for Oscar Lange is only a means of getting what he wants. He turns it on and off like water or electricity. One day he is a citizen of one country and the next day he wants to be a citizen of another country.

But now that he was safe as an American citizen in 1943 and after seeing that Hitler no longer could keep Poland—but things started to pick up for Russia and it looked like Russia might now get and keep Poland—Oscar Lange got a change of heart and changed from pro-German to pro-Russian.

So, as soon as he became an American citizen, he joined every pro-Russian organization in the United States, and while enjoying the protection of the Stars and Stripes, he held in his heart the hammer and sickle.

He then became a leading speaker on the speakers bureau of New America. Ten days after he became a citizen of our country he spoke for a new social order in America by saying that our Constitution was of the horse-and-buggy age. This is clear evidence that he took his oath of citizenship in our country under false pretenses. The fact that he criticized our form of government 10 days after he became a citizen ought alone to show Oscar Lange up for the quisling he is.

He became a member of the Chicago Committee of the Russian War Relief.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Instead of giving relief to the Russian people, these funds were spent to lavishly entertain the Soviet delegates to the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I do not see what point of order the gentleman has to make.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is speaking entirely out of order without any permission.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit that I am speaking in order because when we are appropriating or authorizing the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 to help the people of foreign countries, we have to deal with the governments of those countries and the leaders of the governments of those countries. I am talking about the leaders and the governments of those countries we propose to help, and I submit that I am proceeding completely in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin will proceed in order.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order if it will help any.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think you should withdraw it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. In May 1943, Glos Ludowy, the Soviet newspaper in Detroit, called Oscar Lange an eminent Polish-American scholar.

Later Oscar Lange was listed as a speaker at a rally in Carnegie Hall, New York, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. He refused to speak when he learned that one speaker was going to criticize the Soviet Union for executing Alter and Erlich, two prominent Socialist Polish labor leaders. Even if the Russians killed labor leaders, that was agreeable to Lange—as long as those killed were Poles.

Later in 1943, Oscar Lange bitterly attacked General Sikorski for organizing a Polish Army in Africa, England, and Scotland. He was afraid that the organizing of any army outside of Poland might some day be used to restore a free and independent Poland. Poland was under German and Russian control and Lange did not want that condition to be disturbed.

Lange later was instrumental in organizing the Kosciusko Legion, a pro-Communist legion in America who salute only the Russian flag—but never the American flag.

Later Oscar Lange made himself a self-appointed ambassador and got our State Department's approval to fly over to Moscow with Orlemanski. Lange wanted fresh instructions from Moscow. Ordinary communications might be intercepted and decoded. Moscow called Lange to come at once. To cover up, he took a priest with him. Lange came back from Moscow with fresh instructions on how to destroy Poland. He carried out those instructions to the letter.

As soon as Lange returned from his Moscow trip he and his stooges stepped up their activities in the United States of America. He now addressed Communist meetings all over the United States of America and waved the Red flag and completely forgot the American flag whose protection he was now enjoying. Moscow now referred to Lange as the only Pole in the United States of America they could truly trust.

By now Hitler was driven out of Poland, and there was no division of feeling in Lange's heart. Knowing Russian control over Poland was assured and approved at Yalta, Lange now spoke fully and completely in favor of Russian domination over Poland.

But now Oscar Lange did not need the protection of American citizenship any more. The war was over. The Polish Government that might have drafted him was betrayed and abolished. So now Lange renounced his American citizenship and became a citizen of the Soviet Union. He got what he wanted out of his American citizenship. It has no further value to him for the time being. So now he betrayed Poland, and he betrayed the United States of America, the country to which he took an oath of allegiance. He now out-quislinged Quisling and became a quisling of two countries.

The past 3 months Lange spent in Poland commuting constantly to Moscow to get fresh instructions. He has now landed in Washington with credentials from Moscow to be an Ambassador of Poland.

By all rules of morality, just why does our State Department permit such goings on? By what rules of morality does our State Department govern to recognize such a quisling as an ambassador to any country? Is that the kind of people our State Department proposes to deal with? If that is the case, I am ashamed of our State Department. If that is the case, I no longer hold one iota of respect for our State Department.

I thought that we fought a war to hang quislings. But it looks like if a man out-quislings Quisling he gets to be an ambassador. Oscar Lange's appearance in Washington, posing as an Ambassador of Poland, reaches the lowest and rankest performance in all history. If his credentials are accepted by our State Department, I think that Congress ought to find out why.

The present so-called government in Poland is not a legal government in any sense of the word. No true Pole had a voice in that government. It is a government by force—by Russian arms and nothing else. Thirty-three nations refuse to have anything to do with it.

Oscar Lange has no more right to be an Ambassador of the Polish Govern-

ment than I have a right to be Soviet Ambassador to this country. Oscar Lange is a quisling and a traitor of the first order. He betrayed the United States of America in its strained relations with Russia. Oscar Lange is just another Russian Ambassador period. He would betray his mother if he thought it would promote Oscar Lange.

The height of his betrayal is evidenced by the fact that although he renounced his American citizenship he wanted it clearly understood by the State Department that his wife will keep her American citizenship. Why? Because if anything goes wrong, Lange will claim American citizenship again behind the skirts of his wife and again enjoy the full protection of American citizenship which he has already once betrayed.

Yes, the quislings are beginning their march to Washington. The first and the worst of them is already here to take over the Embassy of 25,000,000 brave and gallant people of Poland who have been betrayed by their allies. Is it any wonder that America is losing its influence the world over? One just cannot deal with a quisling and command respect nohow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include therein several letters.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, many people have been interested in the possibility of personally sending a package of food to their relatives and acquaintances in Europe, especially those places which are not serviced by UNRRA. I have been advised that some 22 voluntary agencies in the United States engaged in foreign relief are about to organize a nonprofit corporation to permit the purchase of food packages by individuals and institutions in the United States and have them sent to their relatives and acquaintances. I also am informed that Mr. Donald Nelson, formerly of WPB, may become the active director of this proposed organization and that details will shortly be announced, including the countries where facilities can be granted for the delivery of packages. The corporation, I am informed, is to be known as Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe.

There has been so much interest manifested in this organization by Members of the House of Representatives and many of my constituents that I have made some inquiry as to what form would be used in the shipment of this food. I am told that in September and October of this year UNRRA purchased 7,700,000 cases of surplus 10-in-1 food packages. The Army had purchased these 10-in-1 food packages for the purpose of supplying our troops in the Pacific.

Each of these packages contains 10 breakfasts, 10 dinners, and 10 suppers. They include various kinds of meats and concentrated food and accessory packages containing soap, some chocolate bars, and so forth. These packages are so well wrapped that I have been told they would withstand submerging in water for several days. No repackaging is necessary, and they are ready for delivery. It was stated at one time that 7,700,000 of these packages were in Europe and ready for delivery. That is not the fact. My information develops the information that 4,000,000 of these packages are already in transit and will be distributed by UNRRA and over 3,000,000 additional packages will be available to this new organization by UNRRA, which has informed me it will be glad to turn them over to Mr. Nelson's organization when the organization is ready for operation. I understand the plan is to sell these packages to individuals and institutions at a cost of approximately $12 each. If this organization is formed, it would then be possible for an individual American to send his contribution to the organization with the name and address of the party to whom he wishes it delivered. This service would be supplementary to the relief work being done by UNRRA, and I understand the Department of State and the President's War Relief Control Board are in favor and giving encouragement to this proposed corporation.

It is my understanding that UNRRA some time during September and October purchased from the United States Army $100,000,000 worth of food, including the 7,700,000 packages of 10-in-1 rations and many millions of packages of C and K rations. This information is for those who have asked during the debate as to what additional efforts are being made to feed hungry people other than through UNRRA.

Regarding the request for new UNRRA authorizations, Mr. Speaker, I reserve my decision until I have heard all of the debate. I include in my remarks a few letters and a telegram from farm organizations indicating their position on this legislation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 4, 1945.*

Representative KARL STEFAN,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The National Farmers Union, understanding you intend to speak tomorrow on behalf of the new authorization for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, wishes you to know that it strongly urges the passage of the bill without amendments or riders that will in any way hamper effective relief among the hungry and distressed abroad. Our members believe that the leadership of the United States toward a better world will be impaired if it does not generously fulfill its commitments, and that the consciences of the American people will not approve of failure of Congress to meet this obligation. Farmers above all others would deplore seeing people in other lands hungry if there is any step that the United States can take to aid them. Moreover, from a coldly realistic point of view, American farmers wish to see surpluses disposed of so that they will not depress domestic price levels. But our members also feel that passage of the bill should be followed up by stringent administrative action to see to it that every dollar of UNRRA funds buys all possible foods and fibres and that allocations are made to insure these commodities actually getting to the people that need them. Good luck.

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1945.

Hon. KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEFAN: The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has consistently supported the establishing of the United Nations Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization as institutions for the promotion of world peace. Consistent with this policy we recognize the necessity of feeding, clothing, and otherwise caring for the destitute and suffering peoples of liberated and conquered countries.

Toward this end we urge the fulfillment of our commitment to UNRRA. At the same time, in order that the resulting benefits may be as great as possible, we urge that appropriate steps be taken to assure timely, efficient, and effective use of such funds.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1945.

Hon. KARL STEFAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEFAN: I have been informed of your interest in the action taken by the National Grange in the seventy-ninth annual session at Kansas City, Mo., last month in regard to the meeting of our relief commitments for Europe.

The resolution adopted represents action taken after careful consideration, including first-hand information from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration urging endorsement of the bill for additional UNRRA appropriations. The resolution follows:

"While military hostilities have ceased, the job of reconstruction lies before us. Hunger, want, and distress in war-torn areas are increasing as the resulting effects of active conflict.

"A program for relief of distressed people has been developed. It has been entered upon in good faith. Our promises have been made. Fear has been allayed and hope restored because of the action taken by all the United Nations.

"Our obligations to suffering humanity must be fulfilled and we urge Congress to meet the commitments made, and to do what may be necessary to aid deserving war-torn nations to become self-supporting."

Sincerely,

FRED BAILEY.

NOVEMBER 21, 1945.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLOOM: At the last annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, held in Chicago last December, the voting delegates, elected by the Farm Bureau members, adopted a series of recommendations calling for the United States to play its part in world affairs, and to use its position of world leadership to assist not only in the maintenance of international peace and security, but also in the solution of international economic problems, in order to lay a sound economic foundation for an enduring peace.

In its resolution on international cooperation, the federation stated: "Due to a combination of many factors, this Nation is in a position of world leadership. We cannot shirk our responsibility to future generations."

Among the various measures for postwar reconstruction the federation recognized the necessity for temporary relief assistance to peoples in war-torn areas, and urged that the United States lend a helping hand to weaker nations to meet these needs, but stressed that such assistance should be directed in such a manner as to "effect real rehabilitation and to assist nations to help themselves and lay a sound foundation on which to build world trade"; and that the United States should set an "example for them to follow in the organization of their domestic economy, by sharing our technical skills, and helping them to help themselves create a fuller and more abundant life." We believe that merely "furnishing of vast amounts of relief in the form of goods or money over an extended period of time will aggravate, rather than solve, international problems."

Pursuant to these recommendations, we have supported the appropriation of necessary funds to enable the United States to complete its initial commitment of $1,350,000,000 to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to provide needed relief for the peoples of war-torn nations.

We are informed that the $800,000,000 already appropriated by the United States to UNRRA has been completely exhausted, and that the additional contribution by the United States of $550,000,000, recently approved by the House, which is the final installment on our initial pledge to UNRRA will probably all be used before the end of 1945 because of the extreme distress now prevailing in many of the war-torn nations.

It seems unthinkable that our Nation would be willing to withdraw any further assistance and leave millions of men, women, and children destitute in the middle of winter. I believe the American people want to see our Nation do its part in relieving the suffering and distress in war-ravaged countries and to assist them to get on their own feet as soon as possible.

We, therefore, favor the objective of H. R. 4649, authorizing an additional appropriation of $1,350,000,000 to UNRRA as our contribution to enable this international organization to complete this relief program.

This would be in the nature of an authorization or pledge of funds. The appropriations actually made by our Government would be determined later by the Appropriations Committee and Congress in the light of subsequent needs as they develop. Thus Congress will have the opportunity to determine the actual contributions which may be required from time to time until this program is completed. If conditions should improve unexpectedly and the needs for additional funds should prove less than anticipated at this time, Congress can revise its actual appropriations accordingly.

It is our understanding that the nations participating in the UNRRA organization have agreed that its activities will terminate in Europe not later than December 31, 1946, and in China not later than 1947.

While UNRRA has made many mistakes and there has been much dissatisfaction with its administration, it would appear too late now to attempt to establish a new agency in its place. The present organization was created as a result of the cooperative action of the United Nations, and a total of 47 nations are actively participating in this set-up, and 31 which were invaded are providing supplies and funds for the relief operations. In other words, it is a going concern and is already at work on the job. If this set-up were to be scrapped and a new international agreement had to be negotiated and a new organization had to be set up, much time would be lost and perhaps many thousands of lives of distressed people would be lost in the process, as the winter season is already at hand.

We urge, however, that our Government use its influence in every appropriate manner to bring about improvements in the administration of UNRRA to see to it that relief extended through UNRRA is not used by any government for political purposes; that such relief be extended on a basis of justifiable need without discrimination; that in extending such relief, emphasis be placed upon helping people to help themselves as far as possible; and that each country should assume responsibility for taking care of its own people as soon as possible.

With respect to the contribution of the United States, we believe use should be made, as far as possible, of agricultural commodities which are in surplus supply. Due consideration, of course, must be given to the requirements of a properly balanced diet. We are likely to have surpluses of a number of important food commodities in the United States next year, and it is just common sense to make the maximum use of these surpluses to relieve distress and destitution. We therefore recommend the inclusion in H. R. 4649 of the same requirement which was included in the UNRRA appropriation in H. J. Res. 266, which reads as follows:

"*Provided further*, That, insofar as possible and practicable, agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply shall be utilized in filling United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration requisitions for food and agricultural commodities."

Hoping that these recommendations will meet with the approval of your committee, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President*.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries a lot of money. It is my opinion that it must. It is America's effort to meet a destitution and need such as through the centuries the world has scarcely ever known before. Out of this war there has come only one important Nation in all the world that was not bombed or invaded. That Nation is our own. Deeply as America has suffered from the loss of the lives of her sons, and willingly as our people have worked to bring victory, we find ourselves today immeasurably better off economically than all the rest of mankind.

Furthermore, the world needs, above all things, to follow American leadership toward a better world of true freedom and hope for all mankind.

Democracy is the child of hope. Dictatorship is the product of despair, hunger, and starvation. No blow that could be struck by this Nation in the cause of democracy and freedom is as important right now as the getting of food to the needy and hungry people of the world.

Not long ago a report was issued by the Postwar Policy and Planning Committee, which I signed and helped to prepare. In that report our committee laid down certain requirements which we said ought to be met by other nations, by Russia, for example, before any money is loaned to those nations by the United States in the future. I do not have time to account what those different stipulations were, but I will say I am in agreement with them as to loans and similar economic measures. But here in this bill we confront a different and far more insistent problem—that of helping to provide the minimum necessary food for people who need it not only today or tomorrow, and through this winter and the coming spring, but who needed it 2 months ago. There is need also in countries which are not served by UNRRA. It should be made possible for private organizations to bring relief to the starving people of Germany. There should be efforts by both our Government and private agencies to help the people of the western European democracies, like France and Holland. But the greatest need of all can be met and must be met by the measure which is before the House today. I do not believe anyone can conscientiously oppose it, and I doubt that more than a handful of Members will do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain quotations and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when UNRRA was up for consideration the first time, I made some predictions with reference to the approach to the problem of feeding and clothing the destitute millions of men, women, and children in war-torn Europe and Asia. I realized then as I do now that there already existed and had existed for many generations organizations here and abroad trained in the distribution of food, clothes, medicine, to the victims of war, flood, or famine, wherever any one or all of these afflictions visit mankind. Is it not the money of American citizens which it is proposed to tax from them for the funds called for under the pending legislation? Is it too much to ask that it be administered by the Red Cross which has been operating as an angel of mercy since it was organized by Congress, January 5, 1905? This great humanitarian agency has been carrying on its program of mercy for 41 years, and not once has the integrity of those who have administered the countless millions contributed to it been questioned. For almost half a century it has sent its trained personnel to the field of every major disaster throughout the continental United States. It has distributed trainloads of food, clothing, and shelter without corruption, black markets, thievery, or graft. It is an organization loved, respected, and generously supported by countless millions. It is a member of the International Red Cross, an organization founded at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1864. The absolute confidence of the American people in the National Red Cross is too well known to require further praise or discussion. With the unblemished record of the National Red Cross, of the International Red Cross, why were these ignored as a means of administering relief, and instead UNRRA, a political and corrupt organization, set up to play power politics with human suffering and

misery? The Christian church organizations were likewise disregarded as instruments of relief.

It is known that the funds intended to feed the starving men, women, and children have in many instances been used by totalitarian nations to control the votes and even the lives of famine-stricken citizens when called upon to vote where a plebiscite has been held. To be specific, food intended for the starving victims has been sold in the black market by UNRRA agents while babies starved for need of that food. Think of the ghastly disclosure which recently came to light as late as November 29 of this year. Six hundred UNRRA employees purged for selling to black markets. Dismissals, suspensions, and arrests in three Reich zones. This amount of corruption in just two zones where UNRRA is supposed to be feeding and clothing the hungry and naked. Who disclosed this disgraceful corruption? It was Leo J. Margolin of New York, Chief of the UNRRA Information Bureau in Europe. Mr. Margolin was quoted in the Washington Star of November 29, 1945, as saying:

> All were involved in black-market dealings—actually selling or being a party to selling at black-market prices foodstuffs and clothing earmarked for victims of war.

Furthermore, Mr. Margolin, according to the article in the Washington Star, to which I have referred, said that in the last 5 weeks 13 UNRRA workers had been arrested and another had been sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment during investigations in the British zone by military police and UNRRA officials.

Let me say right here that the investigation of the corruption and black-market operations of UNRRA has thus far covered only a small portion of the field in which it is operating. There has been no statement made that UNRRA would be purged of its crooks until the delay occurred in the enactment of this legislation. Something had to be done, so now, to appease public wrath, a joint statement has been issued, according to the press, by Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick A. Morgan, Chief of UNRRA operations in Germany and formerly Assistant Chief of Staff for General Eisenhower, a statement in which Sir Raphael Cilento Brisbane, Australian Director of UNRRA in the British zone, stated as follows:

> We are determined to ferret out from the ranks of honest, sincere UNRRA workers members of teams who put personal profit above their trust of aiding unfortunate victims of war under our care.
>
> There is nothing more low and despicable than stealing from these luckless people, and UNRRA intends to see that the personnel of the organization keeps faith with the 47 nations supporting UNRRA, with the armies which sponsor its work, with displaced persons in Germany, and with other displaced persons who are our charges.

Mr. Speaker, I have some responsibility to those whom I have the honor to represent. They do not expect me, I am sure, to be a party to voting these funds to a corrupt organization, even though the organization is prefaced with the word "charity" or the word "relief." It is not charity, neither is it relief, when funds intended by generous-minded people for distressed and starving victims of war are corruptly used for other purposes. There will be no aid to masses of the suffering while the money appropriated by the United States and the other nations tolerate any agency which in the short time it has been operating already stands convicted of a violation of the sacred trust imposed upon it. At a time when nation after nation is coming here for loans and hand-outs running into billions of dollars, we owe to those whom we represent to be cautious in voting for such huge amounts, especially when we are put on notice of the improper use of the funds so appropriated.

The people I have the good fortune to represent are generous, kind, and charitable. Moreover, they are honest. I was in charge of eight States in the Red Cross campaign for the first $100,000,000 fund in World War I. The communities in my congressional district exceeded their quotas, and they have done so ever since. I was abroad during 1917 and 1918 and I know what a glorious record the National Red Cross made in that war. Both our National Red Cross and the International Red Cross are honored and respected by all nations, and each has an unsullied record in dispensing clothing, food, medicine, and shelter and all kinds of relief. Moreover, the personnel of each of these humanitarian institutions is made up of trained, experienced, and honest men and women. There is nothing that would bring greater confidence and hope to the suffering victims of the battle-torn countries than to know that these two humanitarian agencies were to replace the graft-ridden UNRRA in handling their problems of relief. Failure to insist upon an accounting of the funds and the services rendered by UNRRA, unless insisted upon will foster distrust, ill-feeling at home, and those who are robbed of their food by black-market operations will look upon Americans as grafters and cheats.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4649, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has held very lengthy hearings on this resolution and here are just a couple of points I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee at this time because other points that go more into detail concerning UNRRA will be brought up in debate later on.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that the Foreign Affairs Committee has received not one—not one—communication of any kind against this bill; and further, not one request to appear before the committee in opposition to this bill. There was one witness against it who appeared before the committee at the request of one of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but that request was not made directly to its chairman.

The one point that has been stressed right along, Mr. Chairman, has been the tremendous amount of money this relief is going to cost this country. It is not as much as we spent after the First World War. I believe the total amount called for in this bill amounts to only the cost of about 4 or 5 days of the war, and is equivalent to the additional amount the war would have cost had it continued for 4 or 5 days longer. The point, however, that I wish to have the Members realize and understand is that the 1 percent called for in this resolution is 1 percent of the income of the United States for the year 1943—1 percent of our income. Now, if the sum is large, $1,350,000,000, we all should be grateful and thankful to our dear God that He made this country so prosperous that we could afford to give 1 percent out of that tremendous sum that this country has made, which equals $1,350,000,000. That is the only way to judge this amount adequately and not talk about what we are giving. We are the only nation in the world that has really made anything substantial, the only nation in the world that has had an income, and because we have been so prosperous, because we have been so successful, Mr. Chairman, we have had this tremendous income; and we are asked to spend only 1 percent to feed and to cloth and to shelter all of the poor unfortunate people throughout the world. One percent. Some of our dear colleagues here think that is a tremendous amount to spend.

Mr. COLE of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. No; I am sorry I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that UNRRA has made mistakes. We must, however, take into consideration the things that were happening around the world at that time. The world was upset and, Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is any way in which one can calculate the tremendous cost to all the nations and all the people of the world, the tremendous cost of this war we have just gone through. It has been estimated by some people who have made a study of the subject that this war has cost the peoples of the world financially, not counting the misery, death, and suffering it has brought, one trillion and a half of dollars—one trillion and a half.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read what General Eisenhower, who appeared

before the committee on Thanksgiving Day, had to say. If you will look on page 281 you will find General Eisenhower's testimony, and on page 290 you will find Monsignor Boland's testimony. Both of those gentlemen testified that the only complaints they had heard in reference to UNRRA were when they came back to this country. Read the testimony of these two gentlemen. You will take the word of General Eisenhower I know, because he certainly has no axe to grind in this matter. The opinion of General Eisenhower is especially valuable here. He said to the committee that he would have thrown up his hands in despair if he had been given the job that UNRRA faced. In answer to a question by a committee member General Eisenhower said:

> If anyone had given me the job of organizing UNRRA under the conditions that existed all during that campaign, I think I would have thrown up my hands in helplessness because at that time we—

That is, the Army—

> demanded everything and we got everything. That UNRRA made any progress at all I consider remarkable.

General Eisenhower summarizes UNRRA's present effort by saying:

> I know from my own observation in Germany that it is operating with steadily increasing effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate on this bill I sincerely hope and trust that we will get the facts presented by both sides; and after the facts are presented to the committee, I feel satisfied that the Members will vote favorably on this resolution.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is it not true that UNRRA's job in Germany only consists in taking care of displaced persons and that Mr. Clayton testified on page 8 of the hearings that the Army did do a phenominal job of taking care of displaced persons at the rate of a million a month?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That seems inconsistent with General Eisenhower's statement that he could not do it or that he knew anything about UNRRA in Germany.

Mr. BLOOM. He was in Germany. He said from his observations in Germany.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But UNRRA is not feeding people there.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not say that, General Eisenhower did not say that; the gentlewoman herself said that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman say that UNRRA does feed people in Germany?

Mr. BLOOM. It takes care of displaced persons in Germany.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I wanted to ask the gentleman practically the same question. I believe the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs should clarify what UNRRA really is doing in Germany.

Mr. BLOOM. It only handles displaced persons.

Mr. STEFAN. I think that is the answer.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. How long will existing funds that we have already voted last? Will that see them through the winter?

Mr. BLOOM. No. This $550,000,000 that the House appropriated the other day, now before the Senate, will last, if they get the appropriation now, until the first of January. They will have it all spent between now and the first of January, and I refer to the $550,000,000; not the authorization in the present bill. To process that much goods, food, and material and get it over there requires time. Even then, these supplies will last only until around the middle of February. So if the Senate today should approve that appropriation for $550,000,000 and the bill should become law on Friday, then they will start to spend it. They have to get the merchandise and they have to get it over there. This is most important. If they do not get this authorization for the additional $1,350,000,000 and the appropriation through by the first of the year, UNRRA will have to practically cease operations, because there will be a serious lapse between the amount that they are receiving now, the $550,000,000, and this amount, and they cannot buy any more goods until the appropriation is made. So, therefore, from now until February, and after that, they will have nothing more to feed the people in Europe with.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, has the job been bigger than we originally contemplated? Have the existing funds lasted as long as we expected them to last?

Mr. BLOOM. When you say "lasted as long as," you must remember that if the war was still on the funds would last longer, for the simple reason that relief could not be made available in many countries; I mean we did not know—that is, UNRRA did not know, and no one knew—when the war was going to be over. They could not operate in the occupied countries of our allies until they were liberated and invited to come in there by the Army or until the Army had gone out. It is only then that they can go in and operate. Now, as to how long the money was going to last, nobody could tell until we knew what the situation was. No one knew what the situation was in any of these countries until we entered them. I will say this: That UNRRA started to operate as soon as they could get in there, and naturally this amount that we are asking for now is to bring them through this coming year of 1946 up to harvest time, so as to put these countries back on their feet and make them self-sustaining, and then, with China, relief is to go on for 3 months in 1947.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I understood the gentleman to say that the existing funds would probably last until about the middle of March.

Mr. BLOOM. No; I did not say anything of the kind. Is the gentleman talking about the $550,000,000?

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. That will last about a week from the time they get it, but the material that they buy for that $550,000,000, before it gets over there and is distributed, will be some time around February or March.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. As I understand, the gentleman explained that the $550,000,000 that we have already voted will last, if they get hold of it right away, until about the middle of March.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; or February.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. How long did the gentleman say the $1,350,000,000 that we are appropriating now will last?

Mr. BLOOM. I said it will last until the beginning of the coming harvest, fall. That is all they expect it to last, and for the first 3 months of 1947 in China.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I think the chairman misunderstood the gentleman's question. As I understood his question it was how long would the $550,000,000 last.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. That was about the middle of March.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. What I want to know is how long the appropriation we are about to make today, the $1,350,000,000, will last.

Mr. BLOOM. Until the coming harvest. We expect to be out of Europe by that time.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. It is my opinion that it would not need as much money in the warm months as in the cold months, if the present amount of $550,000,000 is going to last until the middle of March.

Mr. BLOOM. If they cannot use it they will not use it, but the gentleman sees the position we are in today because we do not have it.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Does the gentleman expect that further appropriation will be needed?

Mr. BLOOM. No; I do not expect that. Nobody has ever said it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many nations have joined in this agreement to give 1 percent of their incomes as of 1943?

Mr. BLOOM. The full list appears on page 2 of the report of the House Committee on Appropriations on House Joint Resolution 266.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to have that report to study it a little bit.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman is welcome to this copy I have here.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Our income for 1943 was estimated at $135,000,000,000, and this authorization is 1 percent of that amount?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I may have misunderstood the gentleman, but did I correctly understand him to say that no country had an income for that year except our country?

Mr. BLOOM. No; I did not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. All the countries that signed this agreement had incomes then, did they not, more or less?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; but the gentleman must remember that many of the countries, such as Holland, were at war and had been invaded.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes, I understand that. Have all of the countries taken steps to authorize or appropriate the money they signed up in the first instance, as we did?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. The gentleman refers to the previous bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Have they all paid in their contributions?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes. All the countries, even Russia, an invaded country, have contributed to the running expenses and the upkeep of UNRRA.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have seen reports contrary to that statement, emphasizing that only a few of the countries that signed the agreement have met their obligations.

Mr. BLOOM. I think we are the only one that has not. I am pretty sure that we are the only one up to the present time of those in the 1-percent group that has not met its obligations.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is a great deal of question about these funds not getting to Poland and to the Polish people, who are needy, and who are included in our gifts, I suppose they could be called.

Mr. BLOOM. No one has made any complaint to the committee or asked to appear or written a letter to say that anything of the kind has ever happened.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I suppose the gentleman has seen quite a lot in the press to the effect that the Russian soldiers have intercepted the relief and it has not reached the Polish people.

Mr. BLOOM. Things have been intercepted from the Army and have been intercepted from the Navy all over the world. Wherever the Army and Navy and our people have gone things have been intercepted, and the black market has gone along with it. Do not blame it all on UNRRA, and do not blame it on the Army or the Navy

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If we make this additional gift for relief, have we any means now of controlling that situation so that the needy Polish people will get what is coming to them and what we want them to get?

Mr. BLOOM. That is right. I am for it. My parents were Polish, so I am in favor of giving Poland or any other country what is coming to them.

As to the question the gentleman asked with reference to Poland, on page 9 of the report, in the fourth paragraph, the gentleman will find a full report on Poland and what is going on there and what they are getting.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I have heard it said that the Russian Armies have a policy of living off the land, and that they are moving very slowly and gradually back and forth from Russia to Germany through Poland and that a lot of the goods we are sending to Poland actually is reaching the Russian Army. Has the gentleman's committee had any word on that?

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman wants to investigate or have arguments on all the reports that have been heard, he would not get home for Christmas, or maybe for the Christmas of 1946, either. Why did not someone come before our committee and tell us something he knew, not what he heard? No one even asked to come. Oh, you heard about a lot of complaints. I heard somebody that heard so-and-so and did so-and-so, but there is no proof; not one word of proof.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, when this international organization known as UNRRA was first conceived here, I was greatly impressed by it and supported it. It was our first attempt in this new era of the world to enter upon a great enterprise of constructive and united service. We did not understand then, of course, just what terrible abyss the world was falling into of moral and intellectual ruin and confusion.

I worked hard for and voted for the original appropriation for UNRRA. The $550,000,000 that has been appropriated is a moral obligation, in my judgment, from which there is absolutely no possible or honorable escape for this Nation. We are now asking for the authorization of an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 more. Together, these two appropriations would amount to about $100 per family in this Nation or $20 for each man, woman, and child. Now, that is an enormous gift to make under present conditions. When this appropriation was asked for at first, I was confronted, as I know you are and every thoughtful man or woman must be, with the terrific challenge of facts that confront us. We have a debt which will be a millstone around the neck of enterprise and the economic life of this Nation for generations to come. We are in a world of flux and confusion and antagonism out of which we must emerge in time, but that does mean a long time of terrific testing of our moral and intellectual resources.

Thus, I was very troubled as to my duty with reference to this second appropriation. But, perhaps because of certain training that I had in years gone by, I fell back upon my usual approach to every public problem—the moral approach. Here we are the most prosperous Nation the world has ever known. But we are characterized by one aspect of our character that delights me and fills me with pride and gratitude, that is the sense of responsibility among all classes of our people toward suffering wherever it may occur. Down through the years, our people stood out among all the peoples of the world in their philanthropic self-sacrifice to alleviate human suffering either here or abroad. So today I approach this problem from the point of view of the moral attitude that is normal to our people and has been from the very beginning of our history. That moral sense of obligation to suffering is what drives our people at this time to assume this tremendous new burden amidst all the burdens that are being laid upon our backs at this hour.

There is another aspect, from the moral point of view, and that is our responsibility not only to these suffering millions but to ourselves. We did not create this horror abroad. We are not responsible for the existence of these starving millions or these desolated homes or these ruined cities, or a world broken to its foundations. We are not responsible for that. That was the work of a monstrous failure, morally, spiritually, and mentally, on the part of one or two of the great races of this world. We had to go in and win a war against that, and there is the result of it, and it will continue to be there; and we now have the moral responsibility to ourselves, because, if these starving millions are permitted to go over the precipice, are permitted to go on to the inevitable end of starvation, ruin, and revolution, there is no doubt in the world that there will come rolling back upon us waves of unrest, difficulty, and darkness which may lead us immediately into a third world war. So, we have to take our responsibility, in face of this condition, to ourselves. I believe if we are true to ourselves we will have to appropriate this money for these purposes.

Personally, I think this is all that ever ought to be done. I do not now see how we ever ought to try to do any more. If we cannot finish this job with this money, I dislike to prejudice the future, but I would find it very difficult to advocate another such appropriation.

Now, before I sit down, I want to say one word about this freedom-of-the-press thing. I was told with this amendment was offered that we could not hitch freedom of the press with starvation. That did not impress me. I thought it was a rather tricky answer. But I want to have my position absolutely clear. We are putting up 72 percent of this money. It is a free gift out of the toil and sweat and love of our people—140,000,000 of us. We are entitled to know how that money is administered, where it goes, and what it does. But, through our long history we have had one instrument of information upon which we have depended absolutely to lead us into the light concerning these great abstruse problems. That is the public press. Upon that foundation I take my stand, whether you have an amendment or not, that the UNRRA organization as it administers this fund,

to the end of the last dollar, ought to have with it the representatives of the American press, to tell us every day what is going on and where the money is going. Our people are entitled to it. It is a moral obligation in this hour that we have that information. You can hitch it into an amendment or any way you like. Personally, I would like to see it in the form of instructions to the UNRRA organization that that be done.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. That is particularly true in light of the black-market operations which have been disclosed.

Mr. EATON. There is no doubt that the black-market operations are one pimple in the general infection of moral decay in the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Apparently there are 600 of those black-market operators who have been rounded up. You could shorten that word "pimple."

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Was it originally understood we would contribute 72 percent of all the money?

Mr. EATON. One percent of our total national income in the year 1943.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I understand that, but, computed on that basis, would that make our contribution 72 percent of the whole.

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. And the other nations that were to contribute the other 28 percent have done so?

Mr. EATON. Yes; up to date. We are a half billion behind, but we will catch up if we do our duty here.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Did your committee make any investigation at all with respect to the setting up of an organization such as they had after the last war? I talked with a representative of that last organization in Russia, and it seemed to me that an organization like that could be set up almost overnight, and employ a lot of American veterans.

Mr. EATON. I do not believe our committee made any very serious study of that question. Having one organization now, to add another one would be like hitching up a horse and an ass together, which is contrary to the Scriptures.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that there should be some system of inspection by some organization other than UNRRA? UNRRA to date has been observing itself according to answers made by Governor Lehman to me. It seems essential that we should have some sort of independent agency or some other section of the State Department inspecting the work of UNRRA. I think some of these things would have been prevented had that been done, that much of the dishonesty would have been prevented. UNRRA is not going to tell on itself.

Mr. EATON. The gentlewoman has in mind something in the nature of an independent auditing organization. I prefer to put the keen-minded newspapermen on the job.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why not have the newspapermen who aid the intelligence officers and they aid the newspapermen?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman kindly ask the lady whether she will vote for this resolution if that is done the way she wants it?

Mr. EATON. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has heard the question. Does she care to answer?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will vote for the resolution if certain other amendments are adopted.

Mr. BLOOM. A conditional commitment.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, if this intercommittee war is over, I will retire.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the greatness of this country and its success. It occurred to me as I heard those references that perhaps one of the reasons for its success and greatness is to be found in the fact that it is simply natural for the humane people we are in America to invariably look with favor upon and generously answer the pleas of suffering humanity. The first evidence of that I witnessed was back in my little town of Livingston in Alabama, when some good citizen would commence and circulate a subscription list when there was a widow and orphans who needed food, taking up a collection for them. Or, perhaps some man without this world's goods would fall ill or become injured and they would take up a collection for him. Or perhaps a transient in our midst would suffer some calamity and the same would be done for him. Then came the Community Chest and other similar organizations which did that humanitarian work in a concerted, combined way. Then came World War I and the Hoover relief thereafter, which did a great job, which in its size, however, was small, very small compared to the one which confronts the world today. However, the United States defrayed the entire expense. Incidentally, that relief cost this country approximately $2,600,000,000, which is the total amount which will have been subscribed to UNRRA by this country with the passage of this legislation and an appropriation to cover it.

The difference being that at that time the amount was 4 percent of the national income of our country, whereas now it is 2 percent of that national income because of this success and progress we have had and made in the meantime. In other words, from that angle the contribution will have been just half of what it was last time. A far vaster relief job will have been accomplished but all of the United Nations will have participated in the expense in accordance with their ability. Not only will the United States not foot the entire bill as it did before, but the participation of the other countries can but be quite productive in the realization of their peoples of international responsibility.

Between the wars there was concerted action for relief by the people of America, for Finland, China, Greece, Japan after the earthquake, and for various other peoples of the world who suffered. In other words, it is just natural for the American people to answer these pleas, and I repeat, this fact is one of the reasons for our greatness and our success.

Then came the recent war. The Hoover relief commenced after the last war, or perhaps it entered Belgium before the armistice. But this war came on. The leaders of this country and others foresaw that the relief would be so much greater than before that this organization, UNRRA, was born. It was born by the invitation of this country to all the others of the United Nations to send a delegate or delegates to Washington, and later to Atlantic City, to participate in its organization. But before that invitation was extended the proposal was fully explained to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. Changes were suggested and made.

On November 9, 1943, the representatives of these 44 nations met and signed this agreement at the White House, then proceeded the next day to Atlantic City, where the details were worked out. Our present Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, incidentally, presided over that meeting. It was agreed at that meeting, not by the United States alone, but by those 44 nations, that this organization would commence with a contribution of 1 percent of the national income of those 44 nations for the year ending June 30, 1943.

What has happened since? A gentleman indulged the suggestion a moment ago that only a few of those countries have contributed. The fact is that the entire 1 percent of the national income of those United Nations has been contributed, except, I believe, about $580,000,000. And who owes most of that? This great, prosperous United States of ours, this country we so love and revere, the richest and most prosperous of them all, owes $550,000,000 of the $580,000,000. Of course, that will be remedied, I hope today, in the other body. But that is the situation as of this moment.

UNRRA under that agreement proceeded with its humane work. Having heard all of the testimony at that time, having heard practically all of the testimony relative to the present bill, having visited many parts of the world on two different trips last summer, one of which had for its main purpose ascertaining what we should do about UNRRA, having attended numerous sessions of the Council meeting in London last July; with the information I so gained, I unhesitatingly express to you the opinion, despite the criticism you have heard—and criticism occurs of any great, big undertaking, you know that—but despite that criticism, UNRRA has done a great job, UNRRA has accomplished much, UNRRA has saved thousands, if not millions, of lives.

As an illustration of the magnitude of its work and how it is accelerating now,

on March 31 of this year it had only shipped 37,000 long tons of supplies to Europe, whereas in July of this year alone 296,500 tons were shipped, in August, 318,837 tons; in September, 418,167 tons, and we have now reached the period when about a million tons a month are going to suffering humanity in other lands. It has made mistakes. Yes, it has made mistakes. What organization has not made mistakes? I tell you that those mistakes have been just as greatly magnified and exaggerated in my opinion, as any mistakes about which I have ever heard. The Army has made mistakes. All armies make mistakes in the very nature of things. The difference is that the mistakes of our Army cost American lives whereas whatever lives, if any, have been sacrificed by the mistakes of UNRRA were not those of Americans.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman has heard practically all of the hearings, of course. Is it the gentleman's opinion that as a matter of self-interest it is to our advantage to invest these funds to take care of the situation in Europe and prevent bloodshed and strife and revolution, and what not, despite the faults that have been pointed out here in Congress and other places?

Mr. JARMAN. There is no shadow of a doubt about that. Furthermore, regardless of our moral obligation, regardless of the obligation resulting from the signing of the UNRRA agreement and the approval thereof by this Congress, regardless of all our other obligations in the premises, if we waive them all aside and forget them for a moment, from a purely selfish business standpoint it is good business for the United States to indulge in this additional contribution to UNRRA. Yes; mistakes were made, but let us not permit the trees to hide the forest. As we refer to those mistakes and criticize them, let us also think at least a few of the many good things UNRRA has done. Time, of course, is not available for me to go into detail about them, but I do want to indulge in one or two quotations from General Eisenhower.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. JARMAN. Gladly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to thank the gentleman for his fine statement, because it agrees with my views after having visited Palestine and a great part of Europe last summer.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman for his concurrence. I am not at all surprised that he feels that way, because any conscientious man who is not a professional carping critic constantly in search of faults, who will make the trip the gentleman made, cannot refrain from reaching that conclusion. Unfortunately many have not seen it as the gentleman and I have, and some permit the trees to obscure the forest.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentleman point to abuses in connection with the administration of relief following World War I in any way comparable to the abuses that have been uncovered in connection with the present relief administration?

Mr. JARMAN. I cannot, because at that time I was a soldier over there, and neither while I was over there nor after I returned did I look for abuses. I have not spent my entire time looking for them now, and therefore I have no comparison.

Quoting from General Eisenhower:

I know from my own observation in Germany that it—

That is, UNRRA—

is operating with steadily increasing effectiveness.

Another quote from him to which the chairman has already referred but which I want to emphasize:

I should say this, if anyone had given me the job of organizing UNRRA under the conditions that existed all during that campaign—

That is, the war—

I think I would have thrown up my hands in helplessness because at that time we demanded everything and we got everything. We had to get the job done and it was a discouraging thing. That they made any progress at all I consider remarkable and I guarantee that they are improving steadily.

Just as the Army under the able leadership of that great soldier, General Eisenhower, had to get the job done, it is similarly necessary for someone, and UNRRA is the only feasible organization to do it, to get this aftermath job of the war done. I quote further from General Eisenhower:

Now that the fighting has ceased and the danger is less obvious, it is perhaps difficult for people in this country to visualize the desperate needs of the people of Europe and the necessity, if our military victory is to have lasting significance, of our successfully completing the job of making possible a peaceful world.

I am fully confident that the people of Europe can recover from the grievous blows they have suffered if they can be helped through this period. However * * * we in the United States * * * must be prepared to discharge a very heavy responsibility. We must, now, make our proportionate contribution to the relief of Europe in order to insure the permanence of our military victory.

Of course, the war was not concluded as speedily as we had hoped. There was much more devastation than anybody could conceive of at the time of that UNRRA council meeting back yonder in Atlantic City, because we based our calculations on the last war, which came abruptly to a conclusion with the armistice. So the time when the funds would be exhausted approached. Came the meeting of the UNRRA council in London last July.

The representative of the United States on that council, Assistant Secretary of State Clayton, proposed that another 1 percent of the national income, of the year ending June 30, 1945, be contributed by each nation. The council readily agreed, and it is as a result of that agreement of the council that this legislation is here. I heard Assistant Secretary Clayton make the statement that he could not speak for the Congress and could not guarantee it but would recommend the additional contribution. I heard the United Kingdom member assure the council that his country's second contribution would occur. It has, as has that of Peru. Doubtless those of numerous other nations will be rapidly forthcoming.

Did the United States err up to this point in entering this organization? Have we made a mistake in doing so? Should we have remained out? Or did we have the responsibility that I believe was ours to go into it? Have we any responsibility that has occurred since that time in the premises?

While my dear and charming friend, of whom I am especially fond, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, is eminently correct in stating that in the final analysis those criminals who are being tried in Germany and those who will be tried in Japan are really responsible for all of this destruction, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that directly the German Army did not cause all of the destruction in Normandy, for instance. It was necessary for our Army to destroy many farms, many houses, many roads, and many railroads in order to drive the Germans back across France into Germany.

Similarly, neither the Italian nor the Germany Army is directly responsible for the destruction of Cassino and those farms and orchards thereabouts. On the other hand, their stubborn resistance made it necessary for the Allied army to indulge in much of that destruction. Of course, it was absolutely necessary and unavoidable, but the fact remains that our Army was compelled to do much of it.

That walled city in Manila stands out in my mind as the most tragic illustration of that in the world—that walled city which was one of the famous places of the Orient. There is not a habitable room in it now. By retiring there for their last stand the Japs made General MacArthur do what they knew he hated most to do—destroy that city. As they destroyed that city they necessarily destroyed farms and fruit trees and other possibilities of producing food for the people.

Furthermore, did we not encourage the underground in the Philippines, for instance, and in Italy, and in all the invaded countries? Did we not encourage them to sabotage every effort of the Germans and destroy their roads and railroads as well as their crops? Do we not have some responsibility for the fact that they scorched the earth in such magnificent fashion as to greatly hasten the end of the war? But, as my distinguished friend mentioned a moment ago, waving all of that aside, and considering one who is unable to realize any of those responsibilities, I would say to him as I said to the gentleman from California, that from a strictly business standpoint, it is good policy for us to do our part and not fall down on an organization which

we started and urged other countries to join. If for no other reason, let us dwell momentarily on this one, particularly now with the atomic bomb. Every one of you knows as well as I do that civilization simply cannot survive another war. I am one of those who confidently believe that another can be avoided. I am equally confident that this is impossible without international understanding, good will, and cooperation. Yes, I am quite hopeful that the United Nations Organization, to which I believe the other body subscribed without strings yesterday, will succeed in eliminating war in the future. Toward that end it behooves all nations, and certainly this leading one of the world, to contribute everything possible. Therefore, from a psychological standpoint alone the United States simply cannot afford to withdraw support from this first unified activity.

Assuming that I am correct in the opinions that the dire need exists and that meeting it is our responsibility, along with that of the other United Nations, what is the alternative to doing it through UNRRA? While the Army did a magnificent job of relief immediately after it entered conquered countries and is doing so today in Germany, general relief is certainly not the Army's job, nor would the people of the United States stand for its members effecting it. The Red Cross has been suggested, and some have suggested an entirely new organization. When one realizes, however, that speed is of the essence, he understands the ridiculousness of either of these suggestions, particularly if he is familiar with the Red Cross and its functions. With reference to the necessity for immediate action, permit me to quote the director general of UNRRA:

> Mr. Acheson and Mr. Clayton have already presented the reasons for the proposed legislation. In simple terms, they are that UNRRA's total financial resources under its first authorization are virtually used up, but its job is only half finished.
>
> I cannot exaggerate the urgency of the situation.
>
> We are completely broke at the present time and we just cannot, out of the funds that are now available, make any additional purchases from American funds.
>
> Even with this $550,000,000 our January and February operations, to say nothing of the period beyond, will be seriously curtailed and shipments will have to stop completely in the very early part of the new year unless we get both the authorization and the appropriation contemplated by this resolution by the end of December. Every day's delay in appropriating this money slows our operations, at the very time when they should be accelerating. It means less value for every dollar spent.

Now, since speed is of the essence, it is difficult to understand the apparent widespread desire to slow up our contribution by retarding, damaging, unnecessary amendments. Of course, I can thoroughly understand the interest of those who are opposed to this legislation in such amendments, who I think should vote against the bill, but it is difficult indeed for me to appreciate the position of one who pretends approval and support of the carrying out of this obligation by our country and at the same time proposes dangerous, delaying amendments. Do not misunderstand me to believe that all of the proponents of these amendments are insincere, because I am sure such is not the case. I simply do not understand the reasoning of those who are really interested in the success of this endeavor.

The displaced Pole, the Chinese coolie, the Philippine guerrilla will suffer just as much and be equally dead if his starvation results from delaying amendments to this legislation, no matter how high sounding may be their purpose, as if he had starved as a result of our failure to participate in this worth-while endeavor at all, or our failure to continue such participation by defeating this legislation. Yes, the Greek peasant who needs a few seed to plant early next spring in order to put himself on a self-sustaining basis next fall will be just as hungry then and just as much a public charge if his failure to receive those seed results from delaying amendments as he would should it result from our failure to pass the bill at all. I might add that none of these can eat freedom of the press, nor do any of them exert great influence on whether or not it exists in their country.

Every single witness opposed the so-called free press and other amendments except one who largely based his opposition to the bill in its entirety on his conviction that nationals of different countries cannot cooperate and who offered nothing as a substitute. He was neither for nor against amendments because he was against the bill in its entirety.

I wish to heartily congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ADAMS], who voted for this so-called free-press amendment before and stated on the floor on November 26:

> I believe the people of this country today would vote overwhelmingly to provide our share of the funds immediately needed for UNRRA. * * * From reliable information it is clear that right now our failure to provide our share of the funds for this United Nations organization is costing untold human life.
>
> Although I am one of those who voted for the free-press amendment and believe in the principles for which it stood, the result has been delaying.

Of course, every Member of this House agrees with freedom of the press but I repeat, these suffering people, many of whom will probably die because of the delay which will be caused by this amendment if passed, cannot eat freedom of the press.

Pursuant to authority heretofore granted by the House, I quote herewith an editorial from this morning's Washington Post on this subject:

> NO TIME FOR POLITICS
>
> Europe's children are unlikely to read the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to learn the loftiness of intent with which some Members of Congress espouse the principle of freedom of the press. But they will know about that espousal all the same. They will know about it, if it should prevail when the House of Representatives acts tomorrow on the UNRRA authorization bill, through the twisting pain of hunger and disease which the great principle will inflict upon their infant bodies. They will know; and we at home will have won the dubious right to read about their agony.
>
> These children of Europe, liberated by our armies and by the armies of our allies, desperately need the $1,350,000,000 contribution from the United States which UNRRA is now asking Congress to authorize. They need this contribution because UNRRA's funds, including even the $550,000,000 appropriation still awaiting final congressional approval, will be exhausted by the end of this year. If UNRRA's flow of supplies to the needy is to continue without interruption, the new contribution must be authorized, and an adequate appropriation of money must be made before the first of the year—indeed, before Congress goes into recess, as it plans, for a Christmas holiday. UNRRA must have these fresh funds if it is to place orders for food and other supplies to be delivered throughout the hard winter that lies ahead.
>
> The House Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended passage of the UNRRA authorization bill—without the attachment of any shackling amendments. But the bloc of Republican Congressmen who tried to tie their so-called free press rider onto the $550,000,000 appropriation now threaten to do the same in connection with the new authorization. This rider would prohibit the use of American funds in any country which maintained any barriers to free reporting by American newspapermen. It is, as we have said before, a provision which is administratively altogether unworkable. And what is worse, it would impose a special condition upon our participation in an international undertaking—a political condition to which the recipient nations could not in self-respect accede and which would invite the 46 other participating nations to impose all sorts of crippling special conditions of their own.
>
> The effect of this amendment, if it prevailed, let us make no mistake about it, would be to prevent the delivery of relief to the people who need it most. Even an unsuccessful attempt to attach this amendment to the bill could have disastrous consequences. For the amendment must be fought; and if it should delay the granting of funds to UNRRA beyond the first of the year, it would be paid for in suffering and in human life. The Republicans who choose to make a party issue out of this spurious defense of press freedom will be engaged in the ugliest form of politics. Democrats who support them will share in the contempt which Americans cannot fail to feel for so heartless an action. None of us, in or out of Congress, will be able to find much cheer in the Christmas season if we default in our responsibilities to our fellow human beings overseas.

One more thought, the passage of this resolution will by no means really cost the United States the amount authorized because of the fact that a large amount of the supplies will be furnished in the form of surplus Army property now in the countries involved. Would it be better for this surplus property to be junked in those countries or sold for practically nothing, for it to be expensively transported back to this country and junked, or sold for a song, or for it to provide a large part of the contribution authorized by this legislation? In this connection I quote Assistant Secretary Clayton:

> We expect that a very substantial part of that $550,000,000 (which I hope the other body will appropriate today) and the $1,350,000,000 (authorized by this bill), or a total of $1,900,000,000, will really be the contribution to UNRRA by the United States of surplus materials and property abroad for which we would otherwise get very little real cash.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], a member of the committee.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, there was one observation made by the gentleman from Alabama, who preceded me, which I think was very important. He told us after the First World War this relief job cost us $2,600,000,000, and represented 4 percent of our income at that time, while in the present instance it will cost us $2,700,000,000, and will represent only 2 percent of our income. That seems very plausible and a good salesmanship argument. But it must be remembered that after the last war we had a picayune debt of $26,000,000,000, while at the present time we have a debt running all the way from $262,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. I do not think anybody knows just how much it is. It must be further borne in mind that in 1921, after the war, that 4 percent of our income was based on real income, while in this instance it is based upon our income in 1943, which was a war year, when half of our production was for war purposes and half of our income was for war purposes and not real income.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Comparing the needs at the end of the last war and the previous war, the gentleman will admit, will he not, that the damage which was done and the suffering which was inflicted was far greater because so many more countries were involved in this last war?

Mr. JONKMAN. May I say to the gentleman I was not addressing myself to that proposition.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thought that would be involved.

Mr. JONKMAN. I was speaking with reference to the relative amount of our contribution. I say that you should have both sides of the question in order to have a true picture.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I was calling the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the need is greater now.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is too often the mistake we make. We take one side of the picture and give it to the public, and the public does not get the other side of the picture. I want them to have both sides.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it may safely be said that the American people as a whole are in sympathy with the humane, noble, and helpful ideals and objectives which form the basis of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It will cost them only $1 out of every $100 of their income per year. Through this contribution it is probable that they will not only save many persons from death by starvation, but also alleviate the pangs of hunger and the undermining influence of malnutrition to literally millions of people.

However, I believe that they also want every dollar they contribute to effect the greatest possible relief among these people of the invaded and liberated nations. They have a right to expect this from UNRRA.

While UNRRA has had a difficult task, I believe that Members of Congress are justified in their dissatisfaction with the disappointment and failures of UNRRA by its sponsors and administrators ever since its inception.

After its organization at Atlantic City, the sponsors of UNRRA in the United States came to Congress with the proposal that this job be done by certain of the United Nations instead of by the United States alone. We are told that to do the job would take $2,500,000,000. Assistant Secretary Acheson of the State Department appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and said, on page 262 of the hearings:

> As I said before in regard to this subject, I would guess the fund will be between $2,000,000,000 and $2,500,000,000, and probably closer to $2,000,000,000.

Then on page 48, Mr. Acheson said:

> It is a fact that it is a very difficult thing to estimate, because we do not have the figures for other countries outside of our own as of the year ended June 30, but the best estimate we can make at the present time is that our national income will be about $135,000,000,000 for the year just ending and that the income of the whole area, all the areas including our own, would be somewhere in the neighborhood of $230,000,000,000.

In other words, that would make a total contribution of $2,300,000,000, of which our share would be $1,350,000,000. Thus we would be contributing 60 percent of the fund while all the other nations together would be contributing 40 percent of the fund.

Instead of that it has turned out that while we are contributing the full amount of our quota, all the other nations together have contributed only $485,000,000, or just about one-half the amount anticipated, while we, of course, are bound and held for the full $1,350,000,000.

Now, I do not wish to hold Assistant Secretary Acheson responsible for this miscalculation, for I presume it would have to be largely guesswork. But the fact remains that we are now contributing 72 percent as against 28 percent of all other countries. Had this fact been known at the time there are many Congressmen who say we might better have done the job ourselves and alone, and had control of the entire distribution, over which we now have practically no control whatsoever. We could have done a much better job of alleviating human suffering.

Nor is this all. In the same hearings and on page 95, Assistant Secretary Acheson said:

> Now the recommendation, as Mr. VORYS pointed out yesterday, is for a contribution of 1 percent of 1 year's income. It is not recommended that you pay 1 percent of every year's income. It is a once-for-all contribution.

In other words, here was a definite statement that our contribution of $1,350,000,000 would do the job. Now, there is an old adage that when you are called to give only once for a purpose, you can afford to be generous and liberal. But when you are called upon for a gift that is to be repeated and be continuous, you must be more judicious. Undoubtedly many Members of Congress had this in mind when they voted for UNRRA at that time.

I want to be perfectly fair and say that there was a slight modification of the above unqualified statement, for Assistant Secretary Acheson was asked, "Mr. Secretary, do you mean you will not be back if you get this full amount?" And the chairman of the committee gratuitously volunteered, "Do not promise that"; and while he did not change his statement as above quoted, Mr. Acheson did say then:

> I most certainly could not promise that. * * * We hope very strongly that this emergency can be gotten over under the plan that we now have.

So that while there was some doubt cast, the foregoing positive statement was not changed, and it justified Congress in the belief that the billion three hundred and fifty million would do the job.

Well, here we are; not only are we being asked to bear 72 percent instead of 60 percent of this noble undertaking, but it is now an annual obligation. It is my considered opinion that UNRRA will be back next year for another billion, three hundred and fifty million. This perhaps would not be so bad if the American people felt that they were getting satisfaction for their money and actually reaching the objectives they are seeking to attain. However, I am afraid that such is not the fact, and I know many Members of Congress feel that such is not the fact.

The hearings on the present bill began on November 14 and continued through to the 23d of that month, and never have I attended hearings on a bill in which it was so difficult to get at the facts, even just the fundamental facts. Even UNRRA's bookkeeping is equivocal, and in the absence of a satisfactory explanation is subject to the criticism that it covers up the real facts. When we add this to the gross maladministration of UNRRA abroad, which I shall not discuss, it presents a dismal picture indeed.

Let us take table 8, purporting to give the status of contributions by member governments as of June 30, 1945, and apparently revised as of September 15, 1945. This is contained on page 33 in the Fourth Report of the President to Congress on the United States participation in operation of UNRRA, and was released October 11, 1945.

This table gives the list of contributions by the United Nations for operation purposes and lists 17 nations as having contributed. However, it does not at the head of the column give an unequivocal statement, but reads, "Paid or available on request." Reference to that tabulation will show that the total paid or available on request is $1,268,000,000. Then there is another column labeled and headed, "In process of contribution" totaling $597,000,000, which includes the $550,000,000 recently appropriated by the House of Representatives of the United States in full payment of its subscription. Now this heading on the first column, "paid or available on request," to

my mind is very misleading. It smacks a good deal of a previous experience when we were told of what we had for preparedness for war and later found out that it was on hand and on order, mostly on order. It seems to me that if there were moneys that were not paid but available on request, they should be listed in a separate column and the reasons given as to why they were not collected, and why they were only available on request. However, as the column stands, you cannot distinguish between the two, and the United Kingdom is listed in that column for its full subscription, $319,775,000. Now, one would naturally assume that UNRRA has received and collected the full amount or that at least it is available for feeding or rehabilitating the liberated countries at any time.

However, I am satisfied that such is not the case. Such facts as do exist on this had to be gleaned from a paper labeled, "Statement by Director General Herbert H. Lehman on the urgency of the second 1-percent contribution," in which we read that of the $485,000,000 contributed by countries other than the United States, $183,000,000 has been spent for supplies, and so forth, and $122,000,000 obligated for supplies and delivery in November and December. Then it goes on to say, and I quote:

> The balance of $180,000,000, consisting chiefly of sterling from the United Kingdom contribution, will be spent for commodities in Great Britain. It will be appreciated, I am sure, that the supply position of the United Kingdom and other countries, with the exception of Canada, which has made available its full contribution, all of which has been spent, is less favorable than that of the United States, and that the range of commodities, particularly in foodstuffs, which can be bought with sterling, is extremely limited.

From this it is apparent that the $319,000,000 from the United Kingdom is not all available; that $180,000,000 of it consists of blocked sterling which is useless to UNRRA. The underfed people in Europe cannot eat blocked sterling. It is true that we cannot ask the United Kingdom to provide supplies for this blocked sterling which it does not have, for as stated in the foregoing quotation, the supply in the United Kingdom is very limited. We know that in foodstuffs and such essentials as Europe needs, the United Kingdom was only 40 percent self-supporting before the war. It now claims to have brought this up to 60 percent. So the United Kingdom still has to import for its own survival. It is therefore, in no position to contribute to UNRRA unless it purchases in world markets, which under the charter of UNRRA it is not obliged to do, for 90 percent of its quota may be purchased in the country making the contribution.

As late as September the United Kingdom itself was the recipient of foodstuffs and other supplies from the United States under lend-lease, and while it may have then been in some position to make contributions, even if it had to use lend-lease articles, that source, namely lend-lease, has now been closed to them both for their own support and for use toward UNRRA if it was so used.

But I ask in all fairness, why should not the report state the facts in this respect and say frankly that while credit for blocked sterling has been made available by the United Kingdom, this does not mean that commodities are available.

Now, I could even swallow that. If the United Kingdom cannot meet the obligations of its contributions to UNRRA, well, that is that. But the State Department juggles its figures and makes them to appear as if my country, the United States, is welching on its obligations and is in default, while on the other hand the figures purport to show that the United Kingdom is meeting its obligations, and that is more than I can swallow. And I claim that this is just what the State Department is doing, as I shall show. Pat Hurley had something when he said that the subordinates in the State Department need investigating.

Upon reference to the hearings on this bill, you will find that I struggled to get a true picture of UNRRA's financial condition.

I told Governor Lehman in effect that UNRRA was a unit, that it had received—assuming that it gets our $550,000,000 contribution approved in the House—$1,835,000,000; that in order to exercise sound judgment on this further contribution of $1,350,000,000 I would like to know how much it had spent of the foregoing amount, how much it had on hand, how long that which they had on hand would last, and what inventories they would have either in the liberated countries or elsewhere after the last shipment had been made; that if UNRRA was a unit, then its funds from all sources should be utilized simultaneously. I noted that their bookkeeping was a heterogeneous muddle, and purported to give two sets of accounts, one for the United States and another for nations other than the United States; that one set showed a deficit and the other a balance, which was not understandable. I even had representatives of the State Department in conference in my office and insisted on such a unified statement. Nevertheless, I have never received it up to this moment. I did receive from members of the State Department, too late to insert or use in the hearings, a more detailed statement or balance sheet, but still consisting of two accounts, one for the United States and the other for nations other than the United States, which are as follows:

United States funds

Funds made available	$800,000,000
Commitments, Oct. 31, 1945	800,000,000
Allocations, Oct. 31, 1945	791,073,029
Obligations, Oct. 31, 1945	690,562,773
Supplies shipped by Oct. 31 paid from funds of the United States	485,000,000
Mission operating expenses, administration and displaced persons operations	15,000,000
Total by Oct. 31, 1945	500,000,000
Obligated but not shipped	$190,562,773
Committed but not obligated	109,437,227
Total available for future shipment	300,000,000
Shipments for November 1945	198,000,000
Balance, Nov. 30, 1945	102,000,000
Additional appropriation under consideration	550,000,000
Total	652,000,000
Shipments for December 1945	280,000,000
Balance, Dec. 31, 1945	372,000,000
Shipments for January 1946	280,000,000
Balance, Jan. 31, 1946	92,000,000
Shipments for February 1946	280,000,000
Deficit for February shipments	−188,000,000

Funds of countries other than United States

Total funds made available by other countries by Oct. 31, 1945	$485,000,000
Commitments, Oct. 31, 1945	353,505,357
Obligations, Oct. 31, 1945	315,232,106
Supplies shipped by Oct. 31 paid from other than United States funds	151,000,000
Mission operating expenses, administration and displaced persons operations	32,000,000
Total by Oct. 31, 1945	183,000,000
Obligated but not shipped	132,232,106
Committed but not obligated	38,273,251
Available but not committed	131,494,643
Total available for future shipment	302,000,000
Shipments for November 1945	52,000,000
Balance Nov. 30, 1945	250,000,000
Shipments for December 1945	70,000,000
Balance Dec. 31, 1945	180,000,000
For supplies taken from Allied military authorities in Greece Yugoslavia, and Albania:	
United Kingdom	44,000,000
Canada	1,500,000
Total	45,500,000
Available for supplies in other countries	134,500,000

At the December rate of $70,000,000, this balance will approximately be sufficient for shipments through February 1946.

These statements do make possible some analysis, and it will be noted that the tabulation shows that up to and including October 1, 1945, shipments from the United States account amounted to $500,000,000 and from countries other than the United States $183,000,000. Now, that is a ratio of about 3 to 1, which is as it should be inasmuch as we are contributing 72 percent. But let us say roughly for convenience 75 percent of the fund is contributed by us and 25 percent by other nations, which, as I said before, makes a ratio of 3 to 1.

From that point on, however, they throw the ratio into a 4 to 1 proposition, as shipments for the United States for

November 1945 run to $198,000,000, while the shipments for the other United Nations are listed as $52,000,000. There is, of course, no justification for changing this ratio of 3 to 1 into 4 to 1.

Then for December they propose shipments for $280,000,000 on account of the United States and only $70,000,000 for countries other than the United States, which again is a ratio of 4 to 1. Then for January 1946 and February 1946 they propose $280,000,000 each month on account of the United States, while they propose no corresponding quota for countries other than the United States, but merely say that at the December rate of $70,000,000, the balance of $180,000,000 with certain deductions which I do not understand will approximately be sufficient for shipments through February 1946.

But they say while the account of countries other than the United States will balance at the end of February, that of the United States will show a deficit of $188,000,000.

Now in the first place, this is the first time I have seen bookkeeping of a joint contribution to a fund for expenditure in which one contributor's money is spent faster than that of the other. Certainly if any of you contribute 75 percent to a fund and I contribute 25 percent, every dollar that is spent—yes, every cent, even to the very last cent—contains three-fourths of your money and one-fourth of mine, so that our capital vanishes simultaneously. But UNRRA has a different system which pretends to show that United States contributions go faster than the others by one hundred and eighty million, just the amount of the British blocked sterling.

But that is not all. If you will total up the amounts in the United States column, five hundred million shipped by October 31, one hundred and ninety-eight million shipped in November, and two hundred and eighty million for December 1945 and January and February of 1946, this totals not $1,350,000,000, the amount of our subscription, but $1,538,000,000, an excess of one hundred and eighty-eight millions. Again I say that is just the amount of the United Kingdom blocked sterling. In other words, what they were unable to get from the United Kingdom, they have blandly shipped on our account and the United States shows a deficit of one hundred and eighty millions.

Or, if you want to double check this analysis let us approach it from another angle. I said a moment ago that these figures up to October 31 show shipments on United States account of $500,000,000, and on account of countries other than the United States $183,000,000. That totals $683,000,000. Now, their total contributions—including the $550,000,000 appropriated by the House—are $1,835,000,000. Subtracting $683,000,000 shipped up to October 31 from the total of $1,835,000,000, leaves $1,152,000,000 available. Now if they proposed to spread and make that last over a period of 4 months, November, December, January, and February, it would average $288,000,000 for each month. Let us for clarity figure $280,000,000. On a 3-to-1 ratio, that would mean shipping each month on account of the United States $210,000,000 and for the countries other than the United States, $70,000,000. But instead of shipping $210,000,000 a month on account of the United States, they have 1 month of $198,000,000 and 3 months of $280,000,000. In other words, they are shipping on our account the $180,000,000 tied up in United Kingdom blocked sterling, which will be unavailable until doomsday. With this kind of cover-up bookkeeping it is no wonder the United States account shows a deficit. It is my honest judgment from these juggled figures that except for and because of the United Kingdom blocked sterling, the contributions of countries other than the United States have, on a ratio basis, all been dissipated, and that for the months of December, January, and February the United States is bearing the burden of foreign relief all alone.

Then I tried to find out from the witnesses: Assuming that these large shipments are made up to end of February, how long will those supplies last the liberated countries? It surely is not to be assumed that if commodities in the amount of $280,000,000 are shipped up to the end of February, they will all be consumed by that date. But on this, namely the inventory of foodstuffs and other commodities in the liberated countries or elsewhere at the end of February 28, 1946, I could gain absolutely no intelligence or information. For all UNRRA knows, according to its bookkeeping, there may be enough to last into the middle of the summer. How, then, can Congress authorize or appropriate intelligently?

While we are talking about cover-up bookkeeping, I also want to say a word about covering up and keeping information from the American people. We have been spending a great deal of time on the question of freedom of the press, and freedom of information in the liberated countries, either as an abstract principle or with reference to information on distribution of UNRRA supplies. Instead of discussing that situation, it is far more important that we consider the right of the people of the United States to have freedom of information about the operation of UNRRA which reaches this country.

At the hearings there appeared a witness, Raymond E. Lindgren, from Chicago, who had for a short time been a member of the UNRRA organization in Europe, and who made what the chairman called very serious charges against UNRRA. Now, he was only giving direct evidence of things which many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and others knew in a general way to be the facts. I believe I know something about judging the fairness, credibility, and value of the testimony of the witness, and I thought he made a very fine, fair, and intelligent witness, and was well able to present his facts. But in the newspapers which I read of his appearance, and this included the New York Times, I saw nothing of the character of his testimony, but only a belittling of his status as a witness.

And again, on November 29, there appeared in the Washington Evening Star, a news item stating that more than 600 of UNRRA's workers had been suspended or arrested for diverting relief supplies into the black market. This purported to be an official statement by Leo J. Margolin, of New York, Chief of the UNRRA Information Bureau in Europe. And the substance of the news was in quotation from Mr. Margolin. It seems almost incredible that a reliable and reputable newspaper such as the Star should be wrong about news from such a source, and in quotes. Nevertheless, that was immediately cut from the next issue of that paper, and an alleged correction came out that the 600 employees had been dismissed for incompetence, and newspapers all over the country carried an alleged correction of the first statement.

Now, it does not make much difference to me, in judging the efficiency of UNRRA, whether a wholesale dismissal of personnel such as this is based upon black-market operations or just general incompetence. In fact, the first might be less reflection upon the efficiency of the management of UNRRA, because an employer can only with difficulty protect himself from dishonesty of employees originating in a new kind of work. Be that as it may, this wholesale discharge of personnel showed the same woeful disorganization and inefficiency that Mr. Lindgren had made reference to, and yet UNRRA seems to have the influence to suppress information of this kind from the public.

Other instances could probably be cited, but this covering up of UNRRA's woeful inefficiencies from the American public does not inspire confidence in alleged reform.

The foregoing remarks force the irresistible conclusion that I hold no brief for UNRRA. On the contrary, I harbor the opinion that with intelligent and judicious administration, our job in rehabilitating Europe could probably have been accomplished without further authorizations and appropriations.

Nevertheless, I feel constrained to support this bill for two reasons.

First, having set out to succor the suffering people of Europe, I do not believe the American people will abandon them to their fate merely because UNRRA may have lost and squandered most of the first consignment of supplies sent for European or even world relief. They would not want it said next summer that even a few thousand in remote places had starved, or that millions perhaps had suffered the pangs of hunger and cold through the winter, and were in ill health from malnutrition for want of one dollar out of every hundred dollars of American income.

Secondly, I do not think that from a practical viewpoint we could, with winter upon us, form or find a new organization; even if we could, article X of the Agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration precludes such action, for it provides as follows:

> Any member government may give notice of withdrawal from the Administration at any time after the expiration of 6 months

from the entry into force of the Agreement for that government. Such notice shall take effect 12 months after the date of its communication to the Director General subject to the member government having met by that time all financial, supply, or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it."

However, I think we should immediately take steps to insure that UNRRA is wound up within a year as now contemplated. If further relief is needed in the Far East it can be effected under a new organization or even the United Nations Organization. As now constituted, UNRRA is governed entirely by the Council of UNRRA, over which the Director General and the UNRRA administration has no control. We have only one vote on that Council, and they can saddle on the United States relief for any country they see fit. The UNRRA Council now has an ambitious program, which is secret, but in all probability contains such amounts as 250 millions for Russia, 200 millions for Austria, 450 millions for Italy, 800 millions for China, and so forth, and all the United States can do about it is pay. We should have the courage right now to take the honorable way out.

The only honorable way out is an amendment or something similar, which I shall propose when the bill is read, and which is as follows:

Amendment to H. R. 4669 offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 1, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Immediately after the enactment of this act notice shall be given, and communicated to the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, of the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Such notice shall be given and communicated by the President of the United States or by such other official of the Government as the President may designate, in conformity with the provisions of article X of the agreement concluded by the United States and associated governments on November 9, 1943."

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the total amount contributed to UNRRA was $1,878,000,000, of which we contributed $1,350,000,000 and the other countries reneged and still owe $47,000,000.

Mr. JONKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Some months ago I inquired of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress about Russia's contribution to this fund and was advised by the Legislative Reference Service that their quota to the fund was $400,000,000, but that no money had been placed in the fund by the Russian Government. Can the gentleman bring me up to date on that? Has that contribution been made, or any contribution of that type?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am not sure that the gentleman is right about the amount, $400,000,000, but, of course, Russia, as an invaded country, is not asked to contribute to the fund. However, they do contribute to the administration fund. That is the fund that is used for administering the operating fund, to which alone I shall address myself. It may be that is $400,000,000, but I would not think it is as much as that.

Mr. BLOOM. No. It is $100,000,000.

Mr. BUFFETT. They were making some contribution to the administrative fund, but in the original discussion on the UNRRA bill I went over the proceedings with some care and mention was made of the fact that occupied countries would not contribute, but there was no statement I have been able to find that invaded countries would not contribute. The Library of Congress had the very definite opinion—where they got it I do not know—that Russia was supposed to contribute to the fund itself, and they supplied me with the figure $400,000,000.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think that is erroneous. I do not believe Russia has been asked to contribute. Countries that have been invaded have not been asked to contribute.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder how many more of these appropriation bills for UNRRA we may anticipate? Can the gentleman enlighten the House upon that subject?

Mr. JONKMAN. It is my considered judgment that they will be back next year for another $1,350,000,000. These habits are hard to get out of.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not think the gentleman wants to give out the impression that the "available on request" is anything suspicious. The gentleman can explain what "available on request" means.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman will explain it.

Mr. BLOOM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONKMAN. That has been covered in my remarks.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of UNRRA.

In 5 countries of Europe today there are 30,000,000 children under 14 years of age who have never known what it felt like to have enough to eat.

They cannot remember anything but brutality, fear, hate. Hundreds of thousands of them are orphans. Their earliest memories are of their fathers being hunted like wild animals, their mothers dragged off to concentration camps from which they never came back. These are the children of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece.

Tomorrow those children—those of them who do not starve—will be adults.

Our children here in America will be adults, too. And together those children of war-torn countries and ours must run a world in an atomic age. Through UNRRA we insure our children's safety by helping a little to give those children a decent start. We are the richest people on earth—and nobody has ever called us stingy. Americans are not the kind of people who can be indifferent to hungry children. Our GI's could not. Time and time again war correspondents, writing the story of the GI's march across Europe, sent home stories about American soldiers giving away their chocolate bars to half-starved youngsters along the way, filling their tin hats with water to wash away tears and grime from thin little faces.

But even if we were so inhuman as not to care what happens to the world's starving children, we cannot afford to ignore them.

We cannot let them grow up, desperate and embittered, with diseased bodies and warped minds.

We cannot afford it in this atomic age, remembering what just one crazy man did to the world in our generation when that world was ripe to be picked. There appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House a woman who did relief work in Europe following the First World War. Listen to what she said:

Those of us who did this relief work, after a year or two, kept saying to each other, "If you starve bodies, the thing that is really going to happen is that it is going to affect their sense of security, their minds, and their emotions." All of us felt that.

Then it was confirmed for me in 1937. I went back to Vienna. I had been in charge in Vienna, where we fed about 186,000 babies in 1920 and 1921. One couldn't know all the families, of course, but one came to know some of them. Some of the mothers of those youngsters came to me in 1937 and said: "We wish you would talk to our sons. They have joined a secret Hitler youth movement, and we would like to see what you can do to persuade them to get out of it."

I talked to those youngsters—lovely kids, really, but neurotic—and they turned on me fiercely, taking the position that a person such as I should know that the only memory they had in the world was a memory of starvation when they were children.

I would like to point out to the Members of this House that UNRRA is the first operating international organization that goes beyond a mere negotiation level. In UNRRA 44 nations are sitting down together and, not only planning methods of doing a job on which they can all agree, but actually doing the job together. In a sense this is a testing ground for the United Nations Organization itself—a pilot plant to test out world cooperation.

The American people are not being asked for much money. In terms of the amount we have put into the war—into destruction—it is "peanuts." Think what could be done toward rebuilding the world with the amount of money we put into just 6 months of war without ever questioning the cost.

To win the peace it will take the same kind of imagination, the same kind of daring it took to win the war.

We are willing to go on spending vast sums of money for armaments—and to enlist highly trained people to handle those arms.

The money we pay into UNRRA is insurance money against the future use of those arms.

When we talk about insuring ourselves against another war, remember, another war will be the last war. And remember, it won't make any difference, if we pull the world down around our heads, whether our Budget is balanced or not. You cannot build peace in a world that is starving, freezing, disease-ridden.

The time is now. This next year will tell the story.

The job UNRRA has started must be continued. Welfare is not a side issue in UNRRA's program of rehabilitation. The women, the children, the aged, the sick, and the disabled millions who survived enemy occupation and the devastation of war in Europe and the Far East need something more than food to ward off starvation and clothing to cover their nakedness. They require a great deal of help, extra help, beyond these obvious necessities. Millions of war orphans need homes and care and guidance if they are to have a chance to grow up into sane, responsible citizens of the world of tomorrow. Young people of both sexes need professional guidance and training for useful occupations if they are to forget the horrors they have seen and even taken part in. They will need this guidance if they are to be prepared for usefull, honorable lives.

When UNRRA was organized, the United Nations made specific provision for welfare services for victims of war—in particular for children, expectant and nursing mothers, the aged, and the disabled.

The governments in their planning at Atlantic City did not assume that UNRRA would do the whole job. On the contrary, they expected to do as much of it themselves as they could. They anticipated, however, that the structure for administering welfare services which had been in existence before the war upon liberation would be found destroyed, and the skilled and experienced welfare staffs killed or scattered. They knew also that the tremendous problems that would face the staff that remained would overwhelm them unless some assistance were forthcoming from the resources of the United Nations.

To meet these problems, UNRRA created within its organization in Washington a Welfare Division staffed with some of the outstanding persons in the relief and welfare field in the United States and other United Nations. The Federal Security Agency and the Children's Bureau, two of the outstanding public social agencies in the United States, lent UNRRA some of its key people. Two of the largest private welfare organizations in the country did likewise. The small group that was assembled began to bring together a hard-hitting, experienced staff which was available to any of the liberated areas that found its own welfare staff inadequate to do the job.

Today there are approximately 100 trained, experienced welfare specialists, exclusive of Displaced Persons Operations, recruited from many of the United Nations, working as part of the UNRRA missions in the areas in Europe and the Far East in which UNRRA is providing assistance to the governments. When one thinks of the size of the areas covered by UNRRA's operations in Greece, Italy, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Poland, and China—when one thinks of the tremendous need of the populations in those areas, particularly of the children, the aged, and the disabled—one wonders how such a small group can carry out the responsibilities placed upon the Administration by the United Nations to "make specific provision for the welfare services." The answer lies in the fact that UNRRA has scrupulously refrained from building up its mission personnel beyond the actual needs of the governments which it is assisting, and, secondly, that the specific needs of the vulnerable sections of the populations are just beginning to emerge from the general sufferings of the populations as a whole.

The UNRRA welfare technicians who have been assisting the governments did not enter the countries with any preconceived plan of operations, no program for overhauling the country's social welfare administrative machinery to make it conform to established or accepted patterns. They entered the country armed with as much information as the government could give them concerning the structure of prewar welfare services and the needs they were likely to encounter. And also with the knowledge that they were needed to help the governments restore their social-welfare machinery to get the urgently needed food and clothing to the people without resources as rapidly as it was humanly possible to do so.

To accomplish this, UNRRA's welfare staff has been working along three lines:

First. Helping the governments determine the extent of the need and the size of the problem and then assisting in organizing the administrative machinery for distributing the necessary supplies.

Second. Helping organize special programs for the care of children and other special groups such as the disabled.

Third. Helping the governments organize special training programs for their nationals who are needed to carry out the welfare job, and bringing to the governments the latest information and knowledge developed in the welfare field in other countries.

Let me illustrate these points with specific examples of what this staff has been doing and why. First, that of helping the governments build the machinery to bring food and clothing to the people.

Recently a message from Italy was received which reported:

> Food in position to feed 1,500,000 mothers and children by end of November. School-lunch program now in full swing. Naples and Rome to be extended in the fall throughout the schools of Italy.

Behind these simple statements lies the story of the hard and difficult task performed by the UNRRA Welfare Division of the Italian mission. These statements also testify to the accomplishments achieved in a few short months in a nation held in the grip of Fascism for over 20 years and battered by war five more years. With the transportation system almost completely destroyed, Italian welfare agencies completely disorganized, and with the economy practically bankrupt, the UNRRA mission faced the challenge of helping the Italian people to help themselves. It was not only a question of providing supplies and transportation to establish a feeding program for children and nursing and expectant mothers, but perhaps more important to get the Italian agencies and organizations organized so that they could carry out the program themselves.

In addition to the usual problems brought about by lack of transportation in Italy, the first problem which faced the welfare staff was how to circumvent the notorious black market. Such items as sugar, milk, white flour, which we were importing for child-feeding programs, were likely to land in the black market unless we found a new and different method of distribution. The second problem was overcoming the attitudes and methods with which the Fascist regime has indoctrinated the people of Italy. This could not be accomplished by statements and assurances. This had to be accomplished by deeds and by establishing working relations with Italian Government officials from the ministers down to the Syndaco—Mayor—of the tiniest comuna. UNRRA had to prove to the Italian people that it was different from the Nazis and Fascists. It had to prove that it had no ulterior motives in its work in Italy. It had to prove that it was genuinely concerned as representatives of the United Nations with the welfare of the women and children it wished to serve.

Prior to March 8, 1945, when the Italian Government-UNRRA agreement was signed, it was not possible to establish official contacts with the Italian agencies, but, in spite of this, UNRRA's welfare personnel was able to do the groundwork and set the stage for our program of care and welfare services for children and expectant mothers. UNRRA representatives were able to visit the areas in greatest need and to survey these areas in terms of resources and facilities. They were able to secure information from Allied Military Government and Allied Commission officers. They were able to meet "unofficially" with representatives of the governmental ministries and agencies which would be involved in its program to discuss and exchange ideas on how operations would take place.

On the basis of this groundwork, the first supplies that arrived were allocated to feed the women and children in the badly devastated provinces of Frosinone, Latina, Aquila, Pescara and Chieti. These provinces span the peninsula and were the scene of the bitter Liri Valley campaign from Cassino to Rome. The cities of Rome and Naples were also selected as areas of greatest need because they depended upon other agricultural provinces for their food.

The blueprint of the organization for distribution was worked out jointly by the UNRRA welfare staff and the responsible Italian Government officials. However, to make this a living, working thing required tremendous organizational activity on the part of UNRRA.

Since it was decided not to use the ordinary channels for food distribution,

UNRRA had to work out an alternative. The only way it could guarantee that precious food would not get into the black market was by establishing working committees made up of the most responsible people in the provinces and in the communes. Emphasis on the need for local organization stemmed from the fact that the national government was weak and liable to fall. In the event that this happened, providing there were strong local organizations, the program could continue in operation until a new cabinet was formed. The provincial committee included the following: Governor, the public health officer, the superintendent of schools, a representative of OMMI—the National Organization for Maternal and Child Welfare—a representative of the church, a representative of the governmental food agency, a representative of the Italian assistance agency and other persons engaged in child and maternal welfare work. The communal committees were composed of the local counterparts of the organizations represented on the provincial level. The organization of these committees provided an opportunity for the Italian people to work together in a democratic fashion. For the first time in Italy, women were represented on committees and participating in community affairs.

Committees were first organized in the cities of Rome and Naples and the devastated provinces. By the end of May committees were organized in 27 southern Italian provinces then liberated. The high food commissioner was designated as the person in the Government responsible for the child-feeding program. While a representative of the office of the commissioner of food was always present at the first meeting of the provincial committees, the UNRRA district welfare representative has to provide the major portion of leadership in getting the committee work under way. It was necessary for the UNRRA field staff to assume responsibility for details of operation that had not been anticipated when local organization plans were developed. Gradually, however, the provincial committees assumed and discharged more of the responsibility expected of them.

To illustrate this point, the committee in Latina is a good example. Latina Province, which was formerly named Littoria, was one of Mussolini's pet projects. It was a completely modern province built on reclaimed land which was formerly the Pontine marshes. This province had been a Fascist stronghold. This province had also been subject to severe war damage. At the first meeting of the committee, because of the political differences, feeling ran so high that it was necessary to call the police to prevent a riot. The Government officials were floundering around because they had been used to operating by Fascist or directive from Rome. They were not accustomed to making decisions through democratic discussion. Committees had been merely used to rubber-stamp decisions already arrived at by the Fascist Party. Now they were required to act on their own initiative. A measure of UNRRA's service is a comparison of this first meeting with one that took place 4 months later. At this meeting there was an orderly agenda, and reports by the various members of the committee indicated that they had learned to make decisions and carry them out in a democratic fashion. This is something that UNRRA has contributed to the Italian people, which cannot be counted in dollars or tons, but which, we trust, will continue long after UNRRA's job in Italy is completed.

In the first distribution, over 200,000 children and nursing and expectant mothers received UNRRA's supplementary food. Where cooking facilities were available, communal feeding operations were set up. Where there were no cooking facilities, food was distributed in small packages. The standard distribution comprised milk, lard, sugar, peas, beans, flour, and fish, which went to make up an additional daily meal for each child of 750 calories.

Parallel with the development of the feeding program were other developments. The democratic Italian agencies participating in this program were strengthened. School lunch programs developed in Rome and Naples were instrumental in attracting children back to school. Conferences were organized by specialists on the UNRRA staff, providing the Italians with the latest nutritional information. Recreational projects for children were initiated to reduce delinquency. A committee was organized by a member of the UNRRA welfare staff relating to the care of children in institutions.

With the liberation of the northern provinces, and the end of the war, and the easing of the shipping situation, which permitted the continuous flow of UNRRA supplies to Italy, our program developed and expanded. Each succeeding month brings a strengthening of the UNRRA-Italian operation and an increase in the number of children and nursing and expectant mothers fed. By the time winter arrives, the most needy of the Italian women and children will be receiving UNRRA supplementary food.

In Greece UNRRA's problems of helping to organize governmental machinery for relief purposes were, in the main, similar to those faced in Italy. As in Italy, the UNRRA staff set out to stimulate the development of the democratic committee structure to help decide which communities were to receive the supplies and which individuals in these communities were to receive supplies free. After 6 months of long and arduous work with the welfare officials in the Greek Government, a law was passed by the Government, which established in Greece a nation-wide public-assistance program. Welfare centers are being established by the Government in each of the 39 provinces. As a result of the legislation passed by the Greek Government, the people know the conditions which make them eligible for free supplies, they know where to go for them, and they know what to do and where to go if they believe that their case has not been handled justly.

The UNRRA welfare staff is working closely with the Greek officials responsible for organizing the centers and are advising them in the details of staffing the centers, organizing appeal boards which are part of the plan, and observing carefully the daily operations of the centers to insure that the basic necessities are given to those who are in greatest need. For the first time, Greece has a nation-wide program for administering relief to the needy so that they can be assured of equitable and speedy relief. As in Italy, UNRRA has been able, by the presence of a few skilled specialists experienced in dealing with relief, to help the Government get the supplies to its people at a time when speed was of the essence.

In Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, central and local leadership has been more dynamic. The Government and people quickly took the initiative in organizing machinery to handle emergency relief needs or reestablishing prewar social welfare agencies and institutions through which basic supplies are being distributed, and crucial needs of special groups are being met. In these countries, therefore, the UNRRA staff has not been called upon to carry the same kind of responsibilities as in the case of Italy and Greece.

Another major area of our activities has been in helping the governments restore their child-welfare programs. I do not think it necessary to recount the sufferings of the children of Europe, particularly those in the countries being assisted by UNRRA. There are approximately 100,000,000 people in these areas, and roughly, a fourth, or 25,000,000, are under 14 years of age. Not all of these children, of course, are in need. But the numbers reported orphaned, homeless, and in need of special care are staggering. Although this is an age of large totals, where millions and billions have become commonplace, I, for one, feel overwhelmed when I am told that 50,000 children in Greece are orphaned—that of the 5,000,000 children left in Yugoslavia, about 3,500,000 are in dire need and 500,000 have been left homeless and orphaned—that special feeding must be organized for the 4,000,000 children in Poland—and that in China the total of needy children runs into the tens of millions. Of all the services which UNRRA has been called upon to give to the governments, the demands for aid in meeting the needs of the children have been most insistent. Not only are the governments requesting food and clothing, but also help in organizing the facilities and programs through which specialized care can be brought to these children.

UNRRA's welfare staff helping the governments include skilled technicians with many years of experience in developing programs for the care of children. These specialists have been called upon by the governments, in every country in which UNRRA is operating, to aid children along three lines: (a) to help restore the institutions and other facilities caring for the homeless and orphaned; (b) to develop feeding programs; and, (c) to develop special programs for care for the undernourished and sick.

In the main, the work of the welfare staff has been that of helping the Government survey the problem, advising on the kinds of supplies and equipment that

are needed to restore or institute the necessary programs, and then as the supplies arrive in the country, to help the local welfare people establish the facilities.

In Greece the UNRRA staff has helped organize care for 30,000 orphaned and homeless children by restoring the institutions, and has helped the Government register about 20,000 others in order to try to get as many as possible back to the homes of relatives. In Yugoslavia, its people are working out plans for caring for almost 500,000 children, and special supplies to establish 200 homes to provide for about 20,000 are already on the way. Because of the relative inexperience of most of the local Yugoslav welfare workers, UNRRA is being called on by the Government to work with the National Ministry of Welfare in going out into the provinces to help in surveying the problem and working out programs to meet the situation. In Czechoslovakia, the story is the same. As a result of UNRRA's help in evaluating the situation and counseling the Government's welfare officials, supplies are on the way to establish 100 child-welfare centers and missions for 20,000 children.

One of the first concerns of the Governments, after their return to the liberated areas, has been to provide the maximum possible assurance that at least the children would be fed. They knew well the consequences on the future of their countries if the malnutrition of the children remained uncorrected. For Greece, UNRRA has worked out a program for feeding 900,000 children through school lunches and child-feeding centers. Poland, where its mission has just begun to work, has already reported that 4,000,000 children in the cities would need to be provided with a special feeding program. I have already described the program in Italy where a million and a half children and mothers are receiving supplementary foods. In all of this work of establishing the pipe line through which the food reaches the needy children, UNRRA welfare technicians have helped blueprint the program, organize the facilities and local staff needed to carry it out, and have helped iron out the inevitable difficulties that arise in any new operation.

Some of the governments have already been able to go further than organizing their child-care programs simply to meet the elementary needs of shelter and food. Greece with the aid of an UNRRA staff has been able to establish summer rest camps for 45,000 undernourished city children. The story of the establishment of these camps is a story of improvisation, requisitioning, and borrowing tents from the British Army, and emergency shipments of supplies from the United Kingdom and the Middle East. With this experience behind them, the plans of the Greek Government for caring for 100,000 city children next summer should materialize without the struggle that was experienced this year. Czechoslovakia, like Greece, has already progressed with establishing youth hostels for about 30,000 undernourished young people who are being given special treatment to restore them to health and fit them for new responsibilities in their communities.

The battle to save the children of Europe will be a long one. The energy with which the governments are tackling the problem, and the progress they are making gives much more hope than anyone would have dared to express a year ago. The governments now know their problems. They know what to do.

I indicated earlier that in organizing UNRRA, the Governments hoped to be able to use their own people to carry out the task of bringing relief to the needy. I am glad to say that, in the main, they have been able to find the necessary numbers of people. It has remained for UNRRA to help the governments organize short training courses to orient the new workers to the job they were to do. Thus when Greece began to establish its nation-wide program for public assistance, it became necessary to man the 39 welfare centers established under the law. The UNRRA Welfare technicians working with the local people are helping to train these new workers to carry out their tasks efficiently and understandingly.

The story of the activities of the seven UNRRA welfare specialists now in China illustrates best perhaps how this international Organization is helping the governments organize themselves to bring relief to their people. UNRRA Welfare people have been in China only about 4 months, some only about a month. Nevertheless, in that short time UNRRA has helped the Government organize a program for relief in one of the most devastated provinces of China, and through this Organization to begin the training of the thousands of Chinese workers who ultimately will be needed to administer the Chinese relief program. Early in May, the United States Army headquarters appealed to UNRRA for relief for refugees in Kweichow and Western Hunan provinces. The Japanese offensive south of the Yangtze River in 1944 had forced hundreds of thousands to flee from their homes and to march in the dead of winter across the high plateau land of Kweichow. Many were refugees for the fourth or fifth time.

As soon as the request for aid was received from the United States Army, UNRRA dispatched several of its staff to the area to determine what should be done. One of the most obvious needs that was reported was to organize shelter and feeding for thousands of the refugees who were living in half destroyed shacks and hovels, all showing evident malnutrition and about a third ill with dysentery, malaria, and typhus. One of the UNRRA welfare staff and four Chinese agricultural students were sent down—the four students to receive training while helping the UNRRA staff member. This is what they did in 1 week: They took over two refugee camps housing several hundred refugees, chiefly war widows and aged persons; they obtained local help to clean up some of the most habitable of the ruined buildings and moved the refugees into them; they set up a feeding station to feed not only those in the camp but refugees living outside the camp; they obtained the services of a local doctor to care for the sick. Five died during the week, but those that are left have a chance. The UNRRA worker returned to his headquarters when the week was over. The four Chinese agricultural students who were being trained are carrying on the job. Soon they will be training other and newer Chinese workers, who, in turn, will transmit their experience to others. The organizational and administrative experience of the UNRRA staff is being used by the Chinese Government to bring actual relief to the Chinese people in such a way as to enable the small UNRRA staff to exert its maximum influence.

The Chinese Government has been planning its relief operation for months, and included in its plans is an ambitious plan for training thousands of Chinese workers who are to be used in the relief operation. Many will be trained on the job as described above. Others will necessarily need to be trained off the job. For this group training centers are being established by the Chinese Government. The UNRRA welfare staff are acting as advisors to the Chinese in developing the content of the training designed to last 1 to 4 weeks. During this brief period the Chinese workers are being taught the methods of establishing and managing mass feeding stations, methods of distributing relief supplies, and methods of remodeling salvaged army clothes. The first of the centers, organized in Chungking a month ago, is turning out about 100 trained workers a month. Other centers are in process of being organized.

I have tried briefly to sketch the activities of the relatively small group of UNRRA people, participating as part of the UNRRA missions in the work of helping the governments channel the UNRRA supplies they are receiving to their people. It is a long jump from the warehouse at the port to the needy individual in the interior of a country. We who are accustomed to our efficient commercial distribution system of our country, and to our smooth working relief agencies, perhaps cannot visualize the enormous task that has faced the governments which are receiving UNRRA supplies. But, day by day, the machinery for getting supplies and social services to the people is growing stronger. It is gathering strength from this great work in fostering the organization of the country's social services—services designed to meet the needs of these people who cannot provide for themselves, and to meet them in a sympathetic and democratic way.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the task which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has assumed—the task of saving millions of war victims in the invaded lands of our allies from starvation or death from disease or exposure—will make UNRRA the greatest single customer of the American farmer.

UNRRA's purchases of foodstuffs alone—providing she has the funds to

make these purchases—will probably be more than $600,000,000 during the coming year. While she is engaged in the great humanitarian work of helping the unfortunate peoples of the liberated areas of Europe and China to survive, UNRRA will, at the same time, be playing a leading part in maintaining a strong economy for our own citizens. Her relief purchases will benefit the grain grower, the stock raiser, the dairy farmer, the poultryman, the cotton planter.

Procurement for the armed forces, already sharply curtailed with the end of hostilities, will dwindle still further as millions of our veterans are discharged from the service and return to their homes. But while the purchases of the services grow smaller, UNRRA's demands, on the other hand, must increase if the tide of famine in the devastated areas of Europe and the Far East is to be stemmed.

Included in UNRRA's essential relief needs are not only those foodstuffs for which there will be wide demand, but other food items which are certain to be in surplus supply. Unless these foods are disposed of to UNRRA, they will have to be held until they have spoiled or else be dumped on the market at prices so low as to disrupt the entire farm price structure.

The end of the war found the Army with large surpluses of foods which had been procured when it seemed probable that the war would last longer than it did. Were these goods to be placed in the open market here the surplus situation, always a threat to the prosperity of the American farmer, would be further aggravated. Fortunately, however, UNRRA can make use of these surpluses. She has negotiated for the purchase at a price of $100,000,000 for huge quantities of canned meats, Army rations, peanut butter, fruit spreads, juices, and so forth. These supplies represent most of the known Army surpluses in continental United States.

UNRRA recently agreed to accept from the Department of Agriculture 100,000,000 pounds of meat hashes and stews in 6-pound cans—all other claimants on United States food supplies refused to accept these products.

UNRRA recently agreed to contribute $3,000,000 and $5,000,000, respectively, to assist in the solution of the surplus sweet and surplus white potato problems.

UNRRA recently helped to underwrite the Department of Agriculture's canning program by committing funds to procure 200,000 bags of dry wrinkled peas.

UNRRA recently bought 30,000,000 pounds of soya flour and 15,000,000 pounds of soya grits that threatened to go out of condition.

UNRRA recently bought some 50,000,000 pounds of dried soup more than half of which consisted of reconditioned soup which had to be reprocessed by UNRRA to render it palatable.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say a moment ago that UNRRA had purchased sweetpotatoes to send abroad?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The reason I ask that is that a Member said to me this afternoon on the floor that he understood UNRRA would accept only Irish potatoes and would not use sweetpotatoes.

Mr. RABAUT. No; both types of potatoes are being purchased, and this action relieved the surplus market.

UNRRA recently bought 15,000,000 pounds of chick peas, which had to be reprocessed to make them into palatable food.

UNRRA is in a position to help the American farmer in the disposition, through new uses or the continuation of wartime uses, of various products, the present or prospective supply of which is in excess of effective demand. For example, few of our people in peacetime will accept dried eggs when shell eggs are available. Now, with dried eggs in surplus UNRRA has signed up to take 50,000,000 pounds of surplus dried eggs as soon as funds become available, thereby affording assistance to America's poultry industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will any of this food make the recipients of UNRRA ill? It does not sound like very attractive and palatable food to send to poor people who are starving.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think that the gentlewoman would feel that anything done by this country would be for any other purpose than to help and to improve the health of the unfortunate people of the world.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman, but UNRRA is not this country alone.

Mr. RABAUT. The items I am referring to now are, concerning the relief of America and at the same time assisting those who come under the mantle of UNRRA.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I see.

Mr. RABAUT. "To whom much is given, much is expected in return." That is the point I am trying to make; that even as we do all these things for the people of the world we are being helped ourselves through the gracious hand of Almighty God.

Dairy products were in extremely tight supply until after VJ-day. Now they are in surplus. For fourth-quarter shipments of 1945 UNRRA has procured, or is procuring, almost 200,000,000 pounds of evaporated milk, over 20,000,000 pounds of dried whole milk and 68,000,000 pounds of dried skim milk. These large purchases have been of significance in removing what otherwise would have been surplus dairy products. UNRRA's demands for dairy products will be even greater in 1946. They may be as high as $150,000,000.

Wheat will continue to be the principal staple in UNRRA's feeding program. Up to the first of October, UNRRA had sent from the United States approximately 150,000 metric tons, more than five and a half million bushels of wheat, and 50,000 metric tons of wheat flour. If the wheat is available, UNRRA—providing also that funds are available—will be in the market for 2,500,000 metric tons nearly 100,000,000 bushels—of wheat and for nearly 1,000,000 tons of wheat flour.

The cotton planter of the South can look to UNRRA as one of its greatest customers in 1946. If funds are available, UNRRA is prepared to take approximately 120,000 long tons—more than half a million bales of United States cotton.

The desperate needs of the helpless victims of Nazi and Japanese aggression is the compelling reason for the American Congress to grant UNRRA's appeal for funds to carry on the work of mercy. It is gratifying to know that our humanitarianism will also directly benefit a great sector of our own citizenship—the American farmer.

Again I say to whom much is given, much is expected in return.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman has made a very fine and informative statement. It presents facts and figures that some people have not thought about. As I understand, under this authorization, 90 percent of all the funds appropriated for UNRRA will be spent here rather than be spent abroad. As the gentleman has said, it will take care of some of the surplus cotton and other agricultural products which we have in superabundance.

Mr. RABAUT. I will say to my friend that had I not made a trip this year to Europe and seen conditions at first hand, I do not believe I would have the tremendous interest which agitated me to the point of gathering these statistics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

COLONEL SCHWARZKOPF, IRAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, during the initial part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, on Monday, December 3, I addressed the House in connection with some rather startling and disturbing conditions which prevail in Iran at the present time. My remarks in that connection will be found beginning on page 11361 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In reply to that portion of my speech of Monday, in which I stated that the salary of Col. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, of the United States Army, was being paid out of funds of the United States

War Department, and that he was acting as commander of the gendarmerie of Iran, Mr. Michael J. McDermott, a State Department official, today issued a press statement, stating that Colonel Schwarzkopf is serving in an advisory capacity only.

I do not know with what authority Mr. McDermott speaks for the State Department, but I do know that he speaks with very little information to support his statement.

Here are the facts concerning Colonel Schwarzkopf:

First. He is on the pay roll of the United States Army today, although serving with the Iran gendarmerie under contract with the Iranian Government. This contract was asked for by the Government of Iran and American action favorable to its conclusion was instigated by our Department of State, not by our War Department.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday a high State Department official told me that Colonel Schwarzkopf's salary was being paid by the Iranian Government, and that he was not on the pay roll of the United States Army. However, that same high State Department official later in the day corrected himself and admitted my statement to be correct.

Second. Colonel Schwarzkopf's reference to himself as the commander of the gendarmerie. In a conference in Teheran, attended by the lady from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who I am pleased to see on the floor attending to duty as usual, the American Ambassador, Wallace Murray, and several others, along with myself, Colonel Schwarzkopf told us in September that he was acting in the capacity of commander of the gendarmerie.

Third. In a letter over his signature, dated September 5, 1945, Colonel Schwartzkopf states specifically:

> The mission was sent to Iran for the purpose of reorganizing the Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie. It consists of eight officers and two enlisted men. The chief of mission has been vested with full administrative authority and is in effect the chief and commander of the gendarmerie.

He signs his letter, Mr. Chairman, "H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Colonel, Infantry, United States Army, Chief, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie."

I am a little disturbed, Mr. Chairman, that under prevailing conditions and at a time when foreign secretary Ernest Bevin of Great Britain tells us that the gendarmerie of Iran are clashing with troops of the Soviet Republics, we should have a condition existing in which an American Army officer in American Army uniform, in the pay of the War Department, under a contract inspired and instigated by the State Department, can sign a letter in which two lines, in juxtaposition, say, one, "Colonel, Infantry, United States Army," and, secondly, "Chief, Imperial Iranian Gendarmerie."

Small wonder, in my opinion, that the Russian Government, in response to the Secretary of State's request, under date of November 26, sent back the reply that it does not propose to take its troops out of Iran.

As I said in my initial statement of December 3, to which Mr. McDermott's statement to the press today pretends to be an answer, we must enter the court of world opinion with clean hands. No place in the letter sent by Mr. Byrnes to the Soviet Government was there any indication or intimation that we were expecting to remove our officials from the Iranian Army and the Iranian Gendarmerie.

Fourth. Since this letter was addressed to a representative of our State Department, it is reasonable to suppose Mr. McDermott could have had access to it if his zeal for accuracy was as great as his zest for publicity. Certainly, it is reasonable to suppose that an American Army officer who writes, "The Chief of mission has been vested with full administrative authority and is in effect the chief and commander of the gendarmerie" and signs himself "Chief" is doing far more than "serving in a strictly advisory capacity" as stated by Mr. McDermott.

The questions in my letter to Secretary of State Byrnes, dated December 3d, were put in good faith. My speech as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 3d was made in the interests of bettering our foreign relations with our most important allies and for the purpose of bringing into the open activities which I believe helped impel Russia to reject the requests contained in the State Department's note to Russia released November 26. I am sure I shall receive a direct, factual, and considered reply from Secretary of State Byrnes. In the meantime, I suggest Mr. McDermott get all the facts before attempting to discuss through the newspapers a situation which I would reasonably suppose the State Department would want to consider carefully before replying to the five direct questions I asked of it in my letter of December 3rd.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that Mr. McDermott is long on volubility and short on verisimilitude.

I am sending a copy of this statement to the press gallery so that the newspapers may be fully advised and forewarned concerning the type of information that Mr. McDermott puts out while signing himself as Chief Information Officer of the State Department.

I am in favor of getting information out of the State Department, but I think it should be accurate, complete, and official. I do not think there should be an effort to disguise the facts. I think we shall have a reply direct from the Secretary of State which Mr. McDermott might well then release to the press stating officially the justification of the State Department for the activities which it is undertaking in foreign areas at this troubled period in world history.

UNRRA

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word or two about UNRRA. When I first voted for UNRRA it was with considerable enthusiasm, and I then took the floor and delivered myself of quite a speech in support of UNRRA for I recognized the great need of Europe, I recognized the responsibility that America had as the greatest of all nations to help the stricken. I thought it would be a fine experiment through international cooperation to bring together to work many men of many nations in a great humanitarian and charitable cause.

The next time I voted for UNRRA it was with less enthusiasm, but I voted for it again. After seeing it in operation in Europe and especially in the far eastern sections of Europe this summer and hearing the testimony before our committee I shall vote for it this time with the least enthusiasm of all.

Some people may ask: Why do you vote for it at all if you feel that way about it? I will answer that question first. I am going to vote for it in the first place because I recognize the great and overwhelming need which exists in Europe today for foodstuffs, for clothing, for shelter, for medicine, and for certain rudimentary transportation facilities. I recognize that America desires to help and is responsible for helping, and I recognize that this $1,350,000,000 we are authorizing today and the $550,000,000 which the Senate approved in its appropriation act a few hours ago and which this House will certainly concur in, that that approximately $2,000,000,000 will help somewhat to relieve the situation. It is not going to help anywhere near the degree that its enthusiastic advocates suppose it will who came to us in good faith and said, "Pass UNRRA as it is." I wish it were as good as they think it is. But it is going to help some and because I am unwilling by any vote of mine to do anything which would deprive those starving, hungry, suffering people of what little aid we can string out to them through UNRRA, I shall vote for it as it is, with amendments to make it better or without amendments, because it seems to be the only possible, conceivable opportunity we are going to have as Americans to do something officially to help those suffering peoples in the unfortunate war-stricken areas of the world.

I regret that there has been such a complete bankruptcy of leadership on the part of this administration, that it cannot propose a more workable system for enabling Americans to give to Europe the relief they would like to see be made available through official action of this Government. I regret there is such a bull-headed attitude on the part of the administration of UNRRA, at least, that it resists any attempts by anybody to offer any corrective amendments of any kind. It assumes it cannot be made better, so it urges us to go along with it as it is.

Consequently it seems to me that this administration certainly must assume full and complete responsibility for the activities of UNRRA. For its success it should be commended if it does the job that they claim it will with this new $2,000,000,000. For its failure it should be held responsible because of its reluctance even to accept amendments which Secretary of State Byrnes himself proposes as being acceptable. I refer you to the five amendments he

proposed on page 270 of the appropriation hearings on UNRRA. If the majority refuses to accept amendments and UNRRA does not give relief to the people it should, theirs is the responsibility.

What are the kinds of amendments that should help? I think the amendment which was called the "free press" amendment and which I think should be called the "full information" amendment if written into this bill will be helpful, because it would mean then that the spotlight of public opinion focused by impartial observance of the radio and press would concentrate itself on UNRRA to the point that there would not be a miscarriage of funds and misuse of supplies but, on the other hand, there would have to be a very careful adherence to the primary objectives of UNRRA. I am convinced from my experiences in Europe and from the observations I have made and from all the testimony before us, and I am speaking now about this new authorization and not the appropriation bill just approved by the Senate, that if we put some kind of full-information amendment in it will give more relief to more needy people in Europe more speedily delivered.

The second amendment that I think would be helpful is the one that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], offered in the consideration of the appropriation of $550,000,000, a simple, direct, effective amendment, which states that the title and control of the trucks which UNRRA delivers to these countries shall be kept in the hands of UNRRA and the petroleum supplies directed by UNRRA, so that the use of the trucks would be limited to the purposes intended by UNRRA. Certainly that is going to mean more relief; certainly that is going to mean fewer politicians running around European highways in UNRRA trucks; it is going to mean fewer attempts on the part of foreign groups to misuse UNRRA trucks. In other words, the truck is going to be used to haul medicine, shelter, clothes, and food to the needy areas of those stricken lands. It will be interesting to note the arguments advanced to offset that amendment, but they will be advanced just the same.

The third amendment which I think is tremendously helpful would be one providing for impartial administrators of UNRRA missions. If you would like to find some pretty good support for that amendment, as I suggested it in committee, you can turn to the hearings on UNRRA and read pages 31, 32, and 33, of my interrogation of Mr. Clayton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I proposed a policy which I think would be helpful, and Mr. Clayton agreed with it but said it should not be done by Congress, it ought to be done in some other way. Maybe next year after UNRRA is over with they might experiment with it, but it should not be done by Congress now. Surprisingly enough, every representative of the State Department as well as the Governor of New York, every time the suggestion was made for the correction of an UNRRA fault—and they admitted it had many—said it should not be done by Congress. They do not feel that Congress should be in the picture except as it comes to opening up the spigot to the extent of $2,000,000,000; that should be done by Congress. But none of the corrective measures, none of the experience gained by Members of Congress who observed UNRRA in action in Europe this summer, should be reflected in the bill. So Mr. Clayton said it should not be done by Congress. Poor Congress passes the bill but UNRRA writes the ticket. That is their creed.

I think that some such amendment like this should be included though this would not be the exact language, which would say that "no head of an UNRRA mission shall be selected from among the nationals of the country in which that particular mission is operating or from a country adjacent thereto."

This would increase the efficiency of UNRRA in Poland and Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia 200 percent. I think it is a good amendment. I am afraid it will not be adopted, and I am going to have to vote for UNRRA anyhow because it is the only chance we have to do something for those people, so I am going to string along. But I want the country to know that the responsibility for the failure of Congress to exercise its judgment and put in corrective legislation rests squarely with the administration of UNRRA which has stubbornly refused to permit the approval of a single corrective amendment in committee. There are other corrections which should also be written in. I hope this House will make the effort.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. In order not to confuse the membership, since Poland has been mentioned, some may believe that a Russian is heading the UNRRA delegation in Poland. I want to say to the gentleman that the delegation in Poland is headed by a Canadian gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. I would suggest that the gentleman be sure to date his remarks, because in August the head of the Polish delegation was a Russian. I asked one of the State Department officials this question, "Are you sure it is not going to be a Russian after Congress approves this bill?" and he said, "No; I am not sure." You will find that in the hearings. So I hope the distinguished gentleman will date his remarks. Today it is a Canadian, but he does not have a permanent assignment in Warsaw.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I would just like to say to my distinguished colleague that he asked Governor Lehman whether he would make a promise that a certain thing would not happen in the future. Does the gentleman not think that he was trying to put him on the spot, as it were?

Mr. MUNDT. I was trying to.

Mr. BLOOM. And he was smart enough to not let you.

Mr. MUNDT. And I was worried about the reason back of his sagacious evasion.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman asked him to do something in the future. Of course, he could not do that. It might be necessary for the benefit of UNRRA to put someone in there, so do not blame Governor Lehman.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not blaming Governor Lehman. I am just quoting him. I want to say too that I do not object to Russians in charge of UNRRA missions. I think they certainly have a right to have their relative position and their relative responsibility, but it is not good policy to have them in charge in their own country and their own districts any more than it would be good policy in any other country to have nationals operating in countries adjacent to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it the gentleman's understanding that Governor Lehman has control of the personnel in the different countries, or is it voted upon by the Council?

Mr. MUNDT. It is my understanding, subject to correction by my chairman, that in a matter of that kind Governor Lehman would have control and that he would not have to take it up with the Council.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is more up to the Council than to the governor. I think the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will agree with me that Governor Lehman, who is the head of UNRRA, is trying to do a very, very good job. He is just as eager to have UNRRA be successful as anyone.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly think he is trying to do a good job. I am sorry that the good job is not being achieved to a greater degree.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But my contention is that he is controlled by the Council.

Mr. MUNDT. To that the chairman appears to agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, sitting here well fed, well clothed and shod, warm and comfortable, it is hard for us to realize that the lives of millions depend upon our action tomorrow. It is hard for us to face the fact

that men are dying of starvation and exposure, even as we debate this issue and make our neat points about the best ways of carrying out relief. If we postpone our decision, we shall increase the toll of death.

The weather is cold abroad and there are few homes with any heat. There are few people with adequate clothing and shoes and a comparatively small number with enough to eat. In a leisurely way we are considering the issue and proposing that if we bring bread, we could also demand that our newspaper men have the freedoms which we pride ourselves on in our mature democracy. In a way, however, to suggest that we would not give bread unless our newsmen received such freedoms, would be like saying that we would shoot the children of a town if its mayor is a tyrant. As Senator VANDENBERG put it:

> I am unable to make mercy an arbitrary hostage to the lifting of the iron curtain at this tragic moment in human history. * * * The iron curtain is in the control of governments. It is the people in these areas who die for want of bread.

There is urgency about UNRRA. The delay which has held up $550,000,000 of our previous commitment has already created unnecessary hardships in the reorganization of UNRRA allocations. Procurement was suspended on more than $49,000,000 of desperately needed supplies so that the bare essentials of food could be provided. Among the supplies which had to be dropped were vaccines for typhus and the plague, drugs, chemicals, and surgical dressings, amounting to more than $6,000,000. Roofing material, corrugated steel for emergency shelters, shoes, clothing, repair equipment for farm machinery, and veterinary supplies. These were to have played an important part in equipping people against the rigors of winter and in preparing them to make the most of the spring crops. It was our slowness of action which forced the tragic reorganization and the cut in these supplies for UNRRA.

When the $550,000,000 of our first authorization is finally available, more than half of it will be immediately committed for goods which should have been shipped weeks back. Before the end of December the total amount should be committed. Those shipments will carry UNRRA through January. That is as far as the funds will stretch. Unless we act favorably on the second assessment, UNRRA will have to fold up early in 1946. We must not delay our decision, moreover, or the pipe line will run dry. The average interval between the placing of an order against available funds and the delivery of the supplies to those for whom they are intended ranges from 2 months in the case of available foodstuffs to some 8 or 9 months in the case of supplies which must be processed or manufactured. There are some who criticize UNRRA for this delay, but justice should point out that there are shortages everywhere today and that UNRRA has no magic wand for overcoming these hurdles. If therefore we let the pipe line run dry, or decide never to fill it again, we are delivering a cruel Christmas present to those peoples of the United Nations who have suffered every conceivable anguish in the last 4 years.

No one has been hungry in America because of the war. We continue to be the best fed people in the world and we eat from 3,000 to 4,000 calories of food a day while in Europe men are lucky if they receive one-half that amount. Shall we cut off even the niggardly rations which UNRRA insures to these hungry millions?

The new appropriation would be less than what we spent on 5 days of the war effort. This sum would carry the peoples through this grim winter and help them to help themselves through 1946. In the Far East the aid would extend through the first quarter of 1947.

As the only major power which was neither bombed nor invaded, we must bear the chief burden of relief. Where the war was fought, there is ruin, hunger, and desperation. On top of the disruption of 4 years of war, Europe suffered this year from the worst drought which it has known for a generation. Nature seemed to conspire against the feverish efforts to produce and the crops were shriveled from southern France through Italy and Greece. It is hard to measure the debt of the United Nations to those countries which made the supreme sacrifice in resisting the enemy and buying time for the rest of us to prepare. Little Greece held back the Fascist forces and then heroically took on the Nazi juggernaut of mechanized might. Similarly, Jugoslavia, spurning the safety of a compact with Hitler, which its rulers had secured, battled against impossible odds and with the most tragic losses. Again, we can never forget that Poland took the first stand against the enemy and was martyred in its fight, while Czechoslovakia was betrayed and turned over as the first spoils of Nazi victory. These countries have suffered excruciatingly. It would not only be inhuman to leave them today in their great need, but it would be a tragic mistake in statesmanship. It would mean abandoning these people to leaders who preach violent and totalitarian solutions to their problems. Certainly the Communists could then rightly claim that the democratic nations were a heartless, mercenary lot.

Some people argue that while relief is essential, the job should be carried out by another agency. There is no other agency to do the job. The International Red Cross, often suggested, refers to a group of agencies, one of which is the League of Red Cross Societies, which coordinates the activities of the national sccieties, but does not itself engage in relief operations. There is no International Red Cross organization to do the job, and if one of the conference agencies were asked to undertake it, it would have to recruit a new staff, reorganize its whole function, and in short, start to build an entirely new set-up. Moreover, it would have to negotiate with all the member nations of the Red Cross and of UNRRA. This would involve the added expenditure of further millions in organizing a vast new international agency.

It has been suggested by some that the Army could be given UNRRA's functions. General Eisenhower, rising from a sick bed on Thanksgiving Day to give his unqualified support to the continuance of UNRRA, made his answer on this. When hostilities are over, he declared, administrative work should be turned over to civilian agencies as rapidly as possible Besides, he pointed out, in those very countries where UNRRA carries its major programs, Greece, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, and Poland, our troops have no excuse for appearing. One might ask, moreover, even if these countries were persuaded to allow our troops to enter, would the American public tolerate our boys being detained overseas to do this relief job? Even in Germany where our troops are performing administrative tasks, General Eisenhower explained that they were not equipped to carry out UNRRA's functions with the displaced persons. In one camp which he had visited, five babies had just been born, and he commented that his men were not trained for baby caring.

Having visited several of the displaced persons camps in both Germany and Italy, I saw his point. The UNRRA team which takes over the work of a DP camp is equipped with doctor, nurses, and welfare workers. Their functions range from screening the DP, which is essential since thousands of former Nazis are trying to turn into DP's and escape from Germany, carrying out the epidemic-control program, which includes delousing, vaccinations, and medical help, and caring for orphaned youngsters and rehabilitation of persons who have been demoralized through persecution and uprooting. There are young children who were torn from their homes, branded with a number and delivered to some German as farm hands or household laborers. They have forgotten their native language, and have known no kindness nor constructive help. The rehabilitation of such children and the tracing of surviving members of their families are among the human problems which the Army should not be asked to tackle.

Then there are those who say we should do all the relief work ourselves and should not cooperate with other nations in an international organization such as UNRRA. I am doubtful, however, whether these gentlemen would have the same enthusiasm for this plan when it came to paying the bills. For if we went it alone, then we would not get the $533,000,000 which is the contribution of the other nations on each assessment. If we were to do the full job, our appropriations would have to be that much heavier and one can imagine the shrieks of indignation which would be leveled at the British Empire and the South American countries for not carrying their share. Of course, it is sometimes difficult to work with other countries, but during the war we found that we could cooperate with the British, the Dominions, and the Russians. In these days of the atom bomb, we certainly should show that we can work together to save lives. This is a goal for all men and women of good will, without regard to politics or ideology.

UNRRA is the first peacetime venture of the United Nations and for that reason alone, we must see that it succeeds. It would be a dismal omen for all future cooperation on more controversial and permanent projects if the United States pulled out of this humanitarian project even before the United Nations Organization is launched.

Today there is no agency but UNRRA to do the job. We have General Eisenhower's word moreover that from the administrative angle UNRRA is steadily improving. At first it had every disadvantage for it could get only the scrapings of the barrel after the Army was satisfied in supplies, shipping, and personnel. The conditions were so chaotic that General Eisenhower assured our committee that if he had been asked to do the job, he would have "thrown up his hands in helplessness." He said that under the handicaps UNRRA was given at the start, he considered it remarkable that they could make any progress. Since VJ-day the situation has changed completely. There are now surpluses, plenty of shipping and a chance to get the best personnel. For this reason there has been a general tightening up of the organization in the past 3 months and the services of some 600 of the European staff have been terminated. An erroneous press report recently spread the story that this reorganization was due to black-market manipulations. This, of course, was false and related to one Czech who is in prison for selling coffee on the black market and the arrest of another dozen who may be tried for similar manipulations. The discharge of the 600, however, was due rather to their lack of ability, illness, incompetence, and such less newsworthy causes. With the opportunity to get an improved staff, UNRRA cleaned house.

To quote General Eisenhower once more:

> UNRRA has been infused with new and vigorous leadership in whom I have the fullest confidence. The British have made available to UNRRA my former Deputy Chief of Staff, General Morgan, and my former Chief Administrative Officer, General Gale, who are now in active charge of UNRRA operations in the field. These men, typical of the new leadership, are experienced administrators of unquestionable competence and I should like to add, of unquestionable integrity.

Even if we could speedily devise another mechanism, it would be doubtful if this new mechanism could show a lower administrative cost, for the administrative costs of UNRRA have run to only 2⅛ percent of the total expenditures. This is an extraordinarily low figure. The Director General takes no salary and even pays his own expenses, except for actual transportation costs. Other administrative costs are cut to the bone because the actual distribution of materials is turned over to the various local governments and agencies. For UNRRA itself to conduct the actual distribution would of course involve a colossal budget and an enormous bureaucracy. While at times the functioning of these local agencies is imperfect due to the chaotic conditions which come in the wake of war, yet that very functioning has often had a beneficial byproduct in building up again the local agencies which must carry on.

I have myself visited a number of these local institutions which use UNRRA supplies, such as schools and orphanages in Italy, where meals are provided by UNRRA, factories where supplementary foods are available to nursing and expectant mothers and undernourished children, a preventorium out of Athens, run by a benevolent society, and so forth.

There are those who are ready to attack UNRRA on the ground that the amount which is expected to be allotted to China is too small in comparison with its own needs and with the allotments to Europe. May I remind these gentlemen that the Chinese Government is planning to spend an amount approximately equal to the part UNRRA provides. The total will be somewhere between eight hundred million and one billion dollars. If these gentlemen still do not think this is enough, which is probably correct, then there is an easy way for them to show their concern. Let them prepare an amendment to increase the total authorization by two hundred millions or more and earmark it for the Chinese. I, for one, would support such an amendment.

But the real trouble lies deeper. Nearly everyone gives lip service to the principle that we should help to feed the starving and care for the sick. But the instant we start to do it, then the brickbats begin to fly. We hear incessant and carping criticism on petty details of administration and attempts to discredit the work of saving the lives of tens of millions because out of the 8,000 UNRRA employees there have been some incompetents and a few rogues. Worst of all, there has been a constant attempt to delay action by trying to spin out the hearings to an interminable length and to keep the issue from being considered by the House and Senate. Although Congress convened 3 months ago, it has not yet passed upon the final appropriation under our first authorization. When this new authorization is passed, we shall have to repeat the process to secure a new appropriation. In the meantime, tens of thousands may die of starvation and exposure. The gentlemen who are delaying action, of course, all subscribe to the Ten Commandments, one of which says "Thou shalt not kill." Some of their actions, however, fit that cynical version of the commandments by Arthur Clough which advises:

> Thou shalt not kill, but needst not strive
> Officiously to keep alive.

In the Christmas season above all others let us make haste with our help. Let us not dawdle while men, women, and children die.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said on the floor this afternoon that UNRRA is perhaps the only agency that can do the job. I have a message that may bring a great deal of disappointment to many of you who heard our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] speak of another organization encouraged by UNRRA and by the Department of State, an organization which was endeavoring to supplement UNRRA in caring for some of the badly needed relief in Europe. I refer to the organization known as CARE, an organization set up to handle remittances and shipments to Europe. It was hoped that Mr. Donald Nelson, former Director of the War Production Board, would head this organization, but I am very sorry to report that following considerable research on my part I am afraid that organization is doomed to failure because of the many obstacles that have been placed in its path.

About September or October of this year UNRRA purchased from the United States Army about $100,000,000 worth of surplus food. That surplus included 7,700,000 cases of what is known as 10-in-1 rations. This package is so well sealed, I have been informed, that it will withstand water for many days, even though submerged. It contains 10 breakfasts, 10 dinners, and 10 suppers, all well-balanced meals. We were first informed that UNRRA was willing to transfer these 7,700,000 cases of 10-in-1 rations to this proposed organization in which over 32 nonprofit agencies of the United States were interested. It was intended that those of you who were anxious to send a package of food to relatives, to loved ones, or to friends in Central Europe not serviced by UNRRA would be able to do so by merely furnishing this organization the name and address of those people you wanted to help, and a package would be delivered by this organization.

Mr. BLOOM. Would the money have to go with it?

Mr. STEFAN. Absolutely. This would have to be paid for. I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs knows anything about this organization or not.

Mr. BLOOM. I do.

Mr. STEFAN. All right. Has UNRRA paid the Army $100,000,000 for this food as yet?

Mr. BLOOM. I just wanted to let the gentleman give the committee the benefit of the facts. He said all they have to do is to give the name and address. They would have to pay money.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; certainly. Hundreds, thousands, or millions of Americans would be willing to pay for a package of that food to feed some starving human beings somewhere in the world. As I understand it, UNRRA approved this organization, and the President's board approved it. The fact of the matter is, I have a letter from the President's board indicating that Donald Nelson had accepted the directorship of this organization and had already begun to work on it; but today I am informed that because this organization is unable to get these packages, in spite of the fact they were promised the packages, according to the information I have received, it will be unable to operate. I am very sorry to report that to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, who knows more about the matter than I do.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that Mr. Donald Nelson came all the way from the Pacific coast to Washington yesterday in the hope of starting this organization, then found the situation very different from the way it was presented to him a few days ago

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is correct. Donald Nelson was promised 7,700,000 cases of these rations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, when he arrived in Washington he was told he could have only 1,000,000 of these cases of 10-in-1 rations. To be fair to UNRRA, I understand that 4,000,000 of those cases are somewhere in transit, that 1,000,000 cases or 2,000,000 cases are on the way; but if at one time they had given Mr. Donald Nelson encouragement to come to Washington to head this organization they certainly should have carried out their promise.

Mr. HERTER. Does not the gentleman feel that the millions of Americans who have heard about this through the press should be advised just what has happened in this situation, and the fact that even the gentleman and myself cannot ascertain how those packages came to be shipped, where they are now and why they are no longer available?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct and he is saying something which really caused me to take the floor to talk to you today about this matter. I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents who had heard about these packages, who had heard about this organization, who are willing to send their checks and their money to this organization in order that they might participate and help supplement UNRRA relief.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not that confirm my statement and belief that there should be some check-up of this organization called UNRRA, some sort of intelligence used as to what is being done and where these packages have gone?

Mr. STEFAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is absolutely right. We all want to help, but we want information and the American people want information. They are anxious to help and certainly we should have more information about this organization in which so many charitable, nonprofit organizations of the United States are interested, and I take the floor at this time to advise the membership of the House that I cannot intelligently reply to letters I have received from my constituents because I cannot secure dependable information. Certainly Donald Nelson, who has endeavored to head this organization, who has had some encouragement, should get more encouragement from the House of Representatives.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the State Department or Mr. Lehman or anyone in the State Department given the gentleman any information?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. Colonel Wood came to me today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What did he tell the gentleman?

Mr. STEFAN. He indicated that these packages are not in Europe at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Why not?

Mr. STEFAN. However, 4,000,000 are on the way, he indicates, and 2,000,000 additional are somewhere on the way, but he could not give me the information as to where they are located.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a situation that is inexcusable to me.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman, I am sure, is familiar with the fact that the State Department has done everything it could to further this scheme and that they have encouraged it in every way possible.

Mr. STEFAN. That was confirmed in my conference with Colonel Wood. They are doing everything they possibly can to encourage this.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not also true that the State Department secured permission from some 12 foreign countries to admit these packages free of duty in anticipation of this service being inaugurated.

Mr. STEFAN. That is absolutely the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

UNRRA IN POLAND AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the passage of the UNRRA bill. My recent official visit to Europe as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, gave me an opportunity to observe personally the great need for relief, which can only be met by this organization. I concur fully in the statements made to our committee on last Thanksgiving Day by General Eisenhower, and by other witnesses who appeared before us, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The plight of the people in Poland and Czechoslovakia today is one that cries out to every person in the civilized world, who is in a position to send them help. Poland was the first country to suffer the ravages of total warfare. It was the battleground for almost 6 years. The armies surged back and forth across it with all the horrors of modern warfare. In my visit to Poland last summer, I found that 90 percent of the country, particularly the capital city, Warsaw, was demolished. The only building that stood out in fairly good condition was the Polonia Hotel, where we made our quarters. This building was saved because it was used as the Gestapo headquarters.

The Czechoslovak Republic was one of the first to be overrun by the Nazis and, by bitter coincidence, was the last country in Europe to be liberated. This fact, which resulted from the country's geographical position in central Europe, made it hard for the liberated allies to reach and has made it equally difficult for the relief and rehabilitation supplies of UNRRA to reach the stricken people.

The United States has always been a generous nation. Time and again we have proved it after war, famine, and disaster. There is no reason why we should change now. These countries are our allies; they need our help.

This country has joined with 46 others of the Allied Nations to see that the starved and homeless destitute millions of Poland and Czechoslovakia are saved. I had an opportunity to actually see the beginning of this great deliverance campaign in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Admittedly the physical destruction of transportation and supply lines made confusion and waste in the initial stages of this operation. Reports reaching me now indicate that drastic changes in personnel and the opening of the ports of Danzig and Gdynia to replace the cumbersome and inefficient overland transportation from Constanta have greatly improved the picture.

What is the situation in Poland today? First and most important is the food shortage. By December 1, 1945, shipments have reached a total of 307,000 tons, costing nearly $164,000,000. The need is still far from being met. Reliable persons who have surveyed the situation agree that, left to itself, Poland would have only half enough food for bare existence for its population, at least until the harvest of vegetables and fruits next summer. Even this pitifully small amount cannot be distributed equitably over the country. In some of the agricultural sections the populace will not be too badly off. In the large industrial centers the situation is desperate.

The estimates of food needs are predicted on restoration of agricultural production next crop year. But merely anticipating a crop is one thing, and planting and harvesting it is a far different problem.

Not only was Poland's internal transport ruined but also its tools and capacity for food production were ruined by the invader. Draft animals for use on farms and for hauling produce to market were taken away by the thousands. Farm establishments were systematically dynamited and burned with all the tools, clothing, and bedding they contained. Dairy cattle were confiscated or killed. Poultry is virtually completely gone. Feed grain and seeds were ruthlessly requisitioned. Along the main roads farm tools and equipment were seized by the invading settlers whom the Germans picked to occupy the conquered land.

So, if Poland is to produce next year any substantial supplies of food for itself, as many as possible of these operating tools and equipment must be replaced now.

There are other needs in addition to food production, and just as urgent, but not as large. Supplies of new clothing in the country have been nonexistent for 6 years. The same is true of shoes and bedding.

The health situation is extremely bad. Tuberculosis, malnutrition, the ailments of war and exposure, and venereal disease are common, particularly among the displaced-persons group. There have been outbreaks of typhus. As part of the work of its mission, UNRRA experts are helping the Polish Government to fight these health menaces and the fight is backed with the ammunition of hundreds of tons of medical and sanitation supplies.

An UNRRA staff is in Europe now to acquire Army surplus materials for building, trucks, and fuel to restore 45 hospitals and 45 convalescent homes in Poland.

Czechoslovakia's main prewar route for imports was the Elbe-Vitava River system. This will not be usable until next summer. The railroad from German seaports into the Republic has just been opened and it brings only a trickle of supplies. In the meantime food, clothing, and medical supplies so badly needed have had to take a long sea voyage to the Rumanian Black Sea port of Constanta and a long haul over a single-track railroad to their destination.

The country's 8,000-mile railroad network is largely out of commission. Seven hundred and forty railroad bridges were destroyed and only 12,000 freight cars remain out of the prewar total of 97,000. Prewar truck ownership of 110,000 vehicles averaging 2 tons capacity was reduced to 13,000, with little fuel being available for them.

To meet the crisis in distribution of both home-grown and UNRRA food, UNRRA is sending in thousands of trucks. Most of these trucks are derived from military surplus obtainable in Europe. They will make possible the distribution of great quantities of food in remote sections of the country this fall before winter closes the damaged roads.

Before the war the Republic raised about 70 percent of its own food, the main imports being animal fats and wheat. The vampire economy practiced by the Nazis resulted in a grave deficiency of most of its foodstuffs and fodder. Furthermore, 1945 harvests are down 25 to 50 percent from normal. Resources of cattle and hogs are estimated at only 50 percent. For 6 years there has been no fertilizer. Tractors and farm manpower alike were driven out by the Germans and Russians for their own uses. Trucks and other forms of transport, including railroad rolling stock, were confiscated.

Among the foods being sent in are wheat, flour, canned fish, lard, dried peas and beans, and sugar, as well as a variety of other commodities in lesser amounts. Raw cotton and textiles are flowing in and will be used in Czech factories producing cloth and clothing.

That the Czechoslovak people are grateful for all this assistance is unquestioned. Jan Masaryk, Minister of Foreign Affairs for Czechoslovakia, voiced the gratitude of the nation. He said:

We in Czechoslovakia are very, very grateful to UNRRA. UNRRA came in time; even a little sooner than we expected. There was still fighting in the eastern part of our country, and victory was moving toward Prague when the people of UNRRA arrived. In eastern Slovakia there was definite starvation. For about 10 days the people were getting nothing except a bit of very inferior bread. UNRRA came with meat, fats, prunes, and also even coffee. Then medical supplies have been mentioned. We were at the threshold of a typhus and typhoid epidemic. We got penicillin and other drugs in time, and a disastrous situation was averted.

My concern for the suffering people in these war-torn countries urges me to ask for immediate passage of the total authorization provided in this bill without any hampering amendments. Delay means untold prolongation of human misery, disease, and death.

Mr. BLOOM Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, since there has been an attack today on the character of Oscar Lange, one-time resident of Chicago and now Polish Ambassador, I think in fairness one statement should be nailed at once. There could be no question of military service for Mr. Lange since he has a badly crippled foot.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the time has come to indicate to the committee at this late hour in today's debate that this is not an appropriation bill. This is merely an authorization bill and all of the procedure incident to appearance and hearings before the fiscal committee are yet to be made. I think the committee, and later the House, should keep that fact in mind. I do not see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I would like to point out that the British Government has already appropriated 1 percent of its national income for 1943 and was the first government of the United Nations to make the appropriation for this second contribution to UNRRA. The British Government has appropriated $300,000,000 and they had already paid in sixty million of that three hundred million. It was indicated by the Council in London that as soon as the United States took action it would rapidly be followed by all of the other member nations, because they have shown a policy and a tendency in all matters, with rare exception, to follow the precedent and leadership set by the United States at Council meetings and generally this has been indicated by the voting, as I have been advised. In further reply to the gentleman from Michigan, I would like to indicate that it is true that the balance of $180,000,000 remaining unpaid in the first contribution consists chiefly of sterling from the United Kingdom contribution, but there is very clear reason why. On page 106 of the hearings it is fully explained in reply to Mr. JONKMAN's question in committee by Governor Lehman. I now read from Mr. Lehman's statement:

Status of funds received from other countries: You will recall that in addition to the $300,000,000 already made available by the United States, there has been made available from other contributing countries the sum of $485,000,000. The status of those funds is—

1. Spent for supplies, mission operating expenses, displaced persons operations, and administration management, $183,000,000.

2. Obligated for supplies for delivery in November and December, $122,000,000.

3. The balance of $180,000,000 consisting chiefly of sterling from the United Kingdom contribution will be spent for commodities in Great Britain. It will be appreciated, I am sure, that the supply position of the United Kingdom and other countries, with the exception of Canada which has made available its full contribution, all of which has been spent, is less favorable than that of the United States and that the range of commodities, particularly in foodstuffs, which can be bought with sterling, is extremely limited.

Therefore, if UNRRA is to do the job for which it was created and not suspend its work at the time when the very lives of millions of men, women, and children depend upon it, an additional 1-percent contribution from the member governments will be imperative before the end of 1945.

I hold no brief for the British Government—my great, great grandparents on both sides of my family would probably turn over in their graves if they heard me defend Great Britain here. The fact remains, however, that I have great admiration for the job done by the brave British people and the British Empire during this war, and certainly it is difficult, if not impossible, for Great Britain to supply the food and use that sterling silver to supply those foodstuffs of which she is so gravely short herself.

I cannot think of a better reason for the United States of America to accelerate at this time our assurance to Great Britain and the other allies of the United Nations that because of the conditions that exist in those countries, even if they have not paid the last blood dollar they agreed to contribute, that the United States of America should indicate her willingness to make our additional contribution and at once. This is not the time for Uncle Sam to become Uncle Shylock and demand the last pound of flesh as a condition precedent to our taking action on this bill at this time. If my friend from Michigan is merely stating for the RECORD his objections to the bookkeeping methods of UNRRA and to the manner in which their statistical division sets up charts then, of course, I have no quarrel with him, but I must insist, however, that I most vehemently disagree with him if his remarks are intended as an argument against the passage of this legislation.

I say further that I gathered the impression from the gentleman from Wisconsin that he was casting an aspersion upon the loyalty and the integrity of the Foreign Service of our State Department and the fiscal office of UNRRA. May I say in reply to that that if the gentleman meant there was any deep-dyed conspiracy that existed in the Fiscal or Budget Departments of the State Department and UNRRA deliberately to draw a picture beneficial to Great Britain, if he implied dishonesty or disloyalty by anybody in those departments, that was ungracious, unfounded, and as an understatement, I can say unkind indeed.

I have the honor of being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I sat through those hearings for 3 weeks.

No place at any time did any witness indicate even remotely or indirectly that possibility. That is nothing but a creature of the gentleman's imagination. I am afraid the General Hurley incident is causing a lot of people to look with apprehension under a lot of beds.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Will the gentleman identify the gentleman from Wisconsin to whom he refers.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. JONKMAN. Did I say Wisconsin?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. JONKMAN is from Michigan.

Mr. FLOOD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Mr. JONKMAN of course is a credit to either State. I regret that time will not permit me to reply to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Many of his remarks I was most anxious to rebut but neither his nor my time allotment will permit. This is most lamentable because of his attack on certain phases of UNRRA.

I rise in support of the bill now before the House, H. R. 4649, to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. This calls for the additional contribution by this Nation of $1,350,000,000, on the same basis as the other members are to contribute, 1 percent of the estimated 1943 income. At this point I would like to emphasize that UNRRA is not an American organization; it is not an agency set up by the United States alone. UNRRA is a vast international organization in which the United States participates in direct ratio to its national income and with the fact ever in mind that the United States was not a nation suffering enemy invasion.

I shall support the bill as it was reported to the House without amendment and respectfully and most earnestly urge the House to do likewise. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I sat through three long weeks of daily hearings on this most important legislation, and listened to an array of informed and impressive and distinguished witnesses earnestly advocating the passage of this bill with all possible dispatch in order that the purpose of UNRRA, with which no one disagrees, be served.

Many harsh things have been said against the manner in which UNRRA has been operating. And undoubtedly many additional will be added. I hold no brief for badly selected personnel or whatever inefficiency may have existed or for whatever other well-founded criticisms have been and will be presented here. My wonder is not that some fault can be found, but rather that under all of the seemingly unsurmountable obstacles so much good was accomplished. Again it can be said, "Never have so many been indebted to so few."

I do not propose to argue and debate with any of my colleagues their views on this or that incident of fault, fact, or fiction. Let me say that many of the same utterly fantastic rumors and deliberate falsehoods that were whispered and shouted about lend-lease are being now bandied about with reference to UNRRA—and of course by the same people and I suppose for the same unpleasant purposes. Of each of these evil ones I say in paraphrase, "And still the wonder grew how a mind so small could contain all he knew." It is a great compliment to all men that the number of these is inconsequential—quantitatively and qualitatively.

But, by the same token, I listen with attention and respect to those who have at heart the great humanitarian purpose of UNRRA, but offer honest and sincere criticism to the end that the desired purpose be best served.

But I hope, as well, that the interesting, academic, and administrative problems that, of necessity must develop in considering a plan such as this, will not be so inviting as to forget that time is of the essence in the authorization of this additional sum. People the world over are starving. Already it is too late to save some—many more can never be saved if this bill were to become law in the next 2 minutes instead of the next 2 months. This House just passed the legislation necessary to meet the United States obligation to which we stood committed on the initial contribution $500,000,000—to fail to finish this task would be the world's outstanding example of bad management if nothing else. And let it never be forgotten by my practical-minded friends who claim they are not their brother's keeper, that the UNRRA appropriations from their point of view are the cheapest possible premiums this Nation can get on an insurance policy to help in the struggle for United States and world peace and security. This is my answer to those who think they devastate the proponents of this bill with the platitude smugly mouthed, "You cannot buy friendship." Well, my counting-house companions, you surely can have no objections to buying a little insurance. There is more than one way to look at Napoleon's famous remark that "An army marches on its stomach."

Never before in the history of mankind have men been called upon to solve a relief problem of greater magnitude and complexity than that resulting from the present war. Even if UNRRA had functioned in absolute perfection from its inception, a condition no sane person would impose, under the circumstances of its birth, the problem as of today, and the prospective problem, in the same field, for the next year and one-half, at least, would still remain to be met and concluded with some degree of completeness. UNRRA's financial crisis has snowballed as a result of ever-increasing demands that far exceed original expectations. China alone has requested $900,000,000 and a big request forthcoming from deserving Poland. Much of this difficulty is due to the fact that the original program was laid out before the liberation of the countries now in need of most aid and no accurate measure of the devastation in those areas was possible. For the same reasons, administrative costs have been greater than anticipated. This is just as good a point as any to dwell further on the matter of administrative expenses for UNRRA. Too little answer has been given to the too unfounded criticism of this phase of UNRRA. Here, as is always the case, with rare exceptions, an examination of the facts will disclose that UNRRA is to be praised rather than abused for its record. And I refer to the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee, pages 81 and 82. At that point in the hearings Governor Lehman, the Director General of UNRRA, testified under examination that less than 2½ percent of the expenditures of UNRRA went to administrative expenses and at no time, regardless of whether the percentage was figured on the amount paid in or the amount authorized, did the figure exceed 3 percent. That is a commendable record and compares favorably with any like governmental program, even excepting the herculean problems confronting UNRRA from its beginning up to this moment.

I would like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to insert in my remarks that portion of the record of the hearings dealing with the matter of administrative expenses:

Chairman BLOOM, Mr. EATON.

Mr. EATON. Governor, I was going to raise another question that was raised in your early testimony before this committee with respect to one movement, at least, and that was helping people to help themselves, but I am not going to raise that question now.

I do want to raise one other question: I have no doubt in the world that the desire of the people to help these distressed people through this terrible winter season is absolutely normal among the American people. It is not a question of legal obligation. Our people traditionally have had that spirit of brotherhood and help in times of need regardless of race or creed; that has always been a part of the spirit of the American people. That is the basis upon which we face this situation and facing it we have got to answer a very practical question. We are now face to face with this winter. There are other people who propose finishing the program at the end of 1946 in Europe, and people will and are raising this question in and out of Congress, and we have got to consider it seriously. UNRRA has had a billion dollars or more since the time it was created and now actually finds itself having no money, and to use your classic expression, finds itself broke.

The question our people will raise is, What has happened to all these billions of dollars that have been raised; what proportion of that has been spent for administration and salaries and expenditures of that sort, and how much of that could have been saved and used now before we go on to make further demands upon our resources? That may sound somewhat materialistic, but it is a question that must be answered in the minds of the general population of this country.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that is a very practical question, of course. My figures are based on the assumption that we will get the $550,000,000.

Mr. EATON. We are morally obligated for that, and of course, we must keep our agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. My figures are based on the receipt and expenditure of the entire $1,883,000,000. That includes the contributions of this country, the United Kingdom, Canada, and other countries.

Chairman BLOOM. The amounts that have been allocated or authorized, not the amount appropriated.

Mr. LEHMAN. No.

Mr. EATON. It includes the $550,000,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. From November 1943, when UNRRA was organized, through the end of 1945, our administrative expenses are estimated to be $16,600,000; our mission operating expenses—that is, the expenses of the missions in the field—are estimated at $24,300,000 for the same period of time.

Mr. EATON. That is $40,000,000 plus.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is $41,000,000, which, on the basis of $1,883,000,000, would be less than 2½ percent.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. What would the percentage of expenditures for administrative expenses be if you use the base—the money which has actually been expended—rather than the base of the total amount, some of which has never been paid into UNRRA as yet?

Mr. LEHMAN. On the basis of the $1,300,000,000 that has actually been paid in, the expenses would be the same, of course, but the percentage would be different.

Mr. MUNDT. The percentage would be different?

Mr. LEHMAN. The percentage would be about 3 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. Has the $1,300,000,000 all been spent?

Mr. LEHMAN. All of the American portion has been spent or committed. We have some balances in some of the other countries which are rapidly being spent.

Mr. MUNDT. The point I am trying to make, Governor, is that in order to determine the percentage of administrative expenses you should use the basis, not the amount that has been authorized in the program but the money that has been paid in—the money that has actually been utilized in relation to operation. Would not that give us a better percentage then for judging the efficiency of UNRRA's administrative operations?

Mr. LEHMAN. Well, Congressman, I am not going to argue the question very long because there is not a sufficient difference between 2½ and 3 percent, but I would like to point out that I do not agree with your reasoning, if I may. After all, we are operating on the assumption, and have been operating on the assumption that we are going to have $1,880,000,000, and we have had to make our preparations on that basis. We have to have the operating division; we have to have the accounting division; we have to have the field missions; we have to have them just the same for $1,300,000,000 as for $1,880,000,000, particularly when you consider that $550,000,000 of it is to come from the United States, and, of course, we have been counting on that amount.

So the figures I have given you are through the calendar year 1945, and certainly, in my opinion, any calculation should be based on the amount which we will have spent by the end of this year.

Mr. MUNDT. I still think, although that is the practical answer to Mr. EATON'S pending question, that you should utilize a percentage figure based on the actual expenditures in relieving the needs for Europe.

If you utilize this suppositious basis, you might as well include in the administrative percentage cost the amount that would be involved in the anticipated amount.

Mr. LEHMAN. The percentage would be about the same with respect to the $1,880,000,000. But as I say, I do not want to take up the time of the committee arguing the question, because so far as I am concerned, 3 percent is mighty good, and it makes little difference whether it is 2½ or 3 percent. But I do want to state that we have gone into China, Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Czechoslovakia, and other countries, and we have set up our various organizations on the assumption we would get all the funds pledged. We could not wait until the situation was right on top of us to make our plans.

Some of the Four Horsement still ride. UNRRA is fighting hunger, cold, and disease. The best argument for UNRRA is the humanitarian one. We do not want to live in a world in which the innocent are allowed to starve, freeze, and lie unattended when they are ill. Some Members of the House oppose UNRRA because they think it inefficiently managed. Others, sad to relate, but, oh, so few, thank the good Lord watching over this honorable body, make the hardhearted argument that it is not our business to "feed the world." UNRRA at best will not "feed the world." Putting in the $500,000 we were honor bound to do means that some people who might have died will stay alive. Some of them will stay alive on horse meat, whale meat, blood sausage, and herring, about half the fats and dairy products they need, about one-fifth the sugar they need. This great democratic forum is not the mart to trade in human suffering. If we put another $1,350,000 into it—1 percent of our estimated 1943 income—the saving in life will be greater.

Despite its slowness in getting started, its difficulties in finding ships and cargoes, the political obstacles placed in its path in some countries, and some weaknesses in personnel now corrected by a hard-hitting, efficient personnel section, UNRRA has rescued perishing human beings in half a dozen countries, and in recent months its bulk achievements have grown rapidly.

Remember that 35 countries, spread over Europe and Asia and containing more than half a billion people, have passed under the Axis yoke. They have been robbed of their wealth, their economies have been destroyed, and their peoples today are in semistarvation. But even UNRRA does not intend to distribute to these sufferers "the fat of the land." The specified food tonnage will not restore diets to prewar levels but would provide only 2,000 to 2,650 calories per day. The 2,000-calorie level is considered the minimum for life without real hardship, disease, and want. The American standard for office workers is 3,000 and for physical workers 3,500. And millions upon millions of persons are now living in these distressed areas on 1,400 to 1,700 calories per day.

The older generation is ravaged by disease and hunger; typhus and tuberculosis are spreading; malnutrition threatens to maim the younger generation for life. Tons of food, medicine, and clothes and other materials will have to be channeled to liberated Europe and the Far East where alone a population in China greater than the entire population of the United States are now desperately in need of relief. This is the relief part of UNRRA.

Who will take the responsibility for the continuation of this tremendous task? Who will see to it that a hope for freedom from want and fear is given people, so that instead of desperate social conflict, there will be the normal living and thinking that makes a stable world, a hope of establishing the production of foods and other goods, acceptable community and political organizations and governments to provide for the reconstruction of their own countries? Who will pay for the seeds, the wool, the cotton, the plows, the flour, and the serum to prevent epidemics that are no respecters of national or geographic boundaries and might be expected to spread to other nations and consequently represent a hazard to the entire world. This is the rehabilitation part of UNRRA.

Yesterday, there was passed in the Senate of the United States, certain phases of the great Charter of international security signed by the United States at San Francisco. But that Charter, as yet, is only a promise. If any of the member nations fall prey to famine and pestilence, there can be no security for any of us. Our responsibility is clear. We of the United Nations who have suffered least from the cataclysm of war must continue our efforts to provide out of our resources the means to meet the continuing crisis. This requires supplies and equipment. Kindly expressions will not feed empty stomachs, nor grow food nor cure and prevent sickness. Relief means food, clothes, medicine. Rehabilitation means supplies and equipment, and they all mean money.

The words of President Truman on October 11, 1945, in his letter of transmittal to Congress of the fourth report of UNRRA defines the United States position on this world significant program:

> Through UNRRA the United States is making and will make its contribution for relief to the liberated peoples. In order that these people may move ahead toward the tremendous task of reconstruction, they must have the basic materials to regain their strength. Where we at home have shortages and inconveniences, millions in other lands lack even the bare necessities of life. Life abroad in the coming winter will depend upon the outside assistance which this country and other countries can render to the liberated peoples.
>
> UNRRA, struggling as it has in the face of world deficits of critical supplies and of shipping, has made a substantial beginning in the immense task of relief and rehabilitation. The more this task can be speeded up through the early delivery of vitally needed supplies, the sooner it will be possible for UNRRA to withdraw, leaving the liberated peoples on a firm footing to carry on their own life. The Government of the United States and the other members of UNRRA are meeting this common problem as the United Nations are attempting to meet other world problems—together and to the best of their respective abilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the issue before us today may be in some respects controversial, but it is certainly not complicated. The sole question for our determination is whether or not the United States Government will continue to act with the other members of United Nations in prosecuting the task of relieving the distressed and starving peoples of the devastated countries of the world, or whether we will cease all further effort and leave these distressed peoples to their fate.

Not one of us is unaware of the widespread suffering now extant in every land

subjected to the ravages of the recently terminated war. Not one of us has not for months, and time and time again, had presented to him vivid stories of the terrible condition now existing throughout Europe from the English Channel to the Dardanelles, in both near and far eastern Asia and in all lands, the soils of which were marked by the marching feet of a ruthless invader. That these unfortunate conditions exist is an undisputed fact. The situation has been shown by the testimony of witnesses who have but recently returned from the various countries affected and who testified from a knowledge gained through observation and personal contact with the suffering peoples.

The proposal before us is not for the appropriation of an initial contribution of the United States to UNRRA, the international organization for relief of the devastated countries, but it proposes a duplication of this country's former contribution of $1,350,000,000 for a continuation of the work already in progress and not yet completed.

The United States is not the only government called upon for this additional contribution. On the contrary, each and every one of the other 46 members of United Nations will again give 1 percent of its national income to this great cause—the relief of human suffering.

The resolution under consideration was referred, on its introduction in the House, to the Foreign Affairs Committee. That committee has held extensive hearings, beginning on November 14 and ending on November 23 last. The committee gave an opportunity to be heard to every individual who desired to speak upon the subject, either as favoring or in opposition to the proposal. It is indeed significant that out of all of the witnesses appearing before the committee there was but one who offered any opposition whatever to the resolution. It is also significant that this one opposing witness neither questions the immediate and pressing need for relief nor offered objection to an appropriation by Congress for that purpose, but his opposition stemmed solely from his personal objection to the international character of UNRRA, the organization in responsible charge of carrying on the work. The one and only suggestion of this opposing witness was that this work of relief to all of the suffering peoples of the world should be done by the United States alone, and not through the agency of any other organization.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. Like so many Members of the House, I am heartily in favor of the purposes of this bill, and will support it. But I would like to ask the gentleman if he could give me a piece of information. Can he explain how and why the Chinese appropriation under UNRRA is so small per capita compared with the appropriation made to other beneficiary countries. I am told, for example, that Albania is getting $22.42 per capita; Yugoslavia, $27.84 per capita; and Greece, $52.45 per capita; but that the Chinese people, of whose need and suffering the gentleman has just spoken so eloquently and who have been longest in the war, are getting only $1.25 per capita. Will the gentleman tell me how that per capita decision was reached?

Mr. KEE. I believe if the gentlewoman will read the hearings and the testimony, I think, of Governor Lehman, that is fully explained. Possibly, and I am making this as a personal observation, it is explained by the tremendous population of China. It would be the same, perhaps, if it were in India due to the tremendous population and the difficulty of making an allocation equal to the population of the entire country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mrs. LUCE. Is it then the gentleman's conception that our purpose under UNRRA is to feed people on a strictly mathematical, or population basis, and not according to need?

Mr. KEE. No, indeed. It is my understanding that authorities who know and who are well advised were taken into consultation regarding this allocation and that the allocation was fixed on an equitable basis.

Mrs. LUCE. But the gentleman himself has just said the decision was reached upon the population basis.

Mr. KEE. Oh, no; I beg the gentlewoman's pardon.

Mrs. LUCE. Then it was reached on the question of need?

Mr. KEE. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon. She is mistaken. I did not make that statement. I said that was a personal view of my own that perhaps population had something to do with it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Before VJ-day, the ports of China were not open at all, so we could not get anything in there. But if the gentlewoman will read on page 9 the report on China, I think she will get the information she wants. But this new authorization, of course, will call for a redesignation of funds for China.

Mrs. LUCE. Can the gentleman tell me how much still remains not allocated, which might still go to China?

Mr. BLOOM. That, I cannot say.

Mrs. LUCE. The figures given me are $179,000,000 still unallocated under the tentative program of UNRRA operations. Would that be substantially correct?

Mr. BLOOM. It may be, if that is the figure that was given to the gentlewoman by UNRRA. It might be correct. But I would want to say when you refer to India that India has contributed to UNRRA.

Mrs. LUCE. I did not refer to India. I referred to Albania as getting $22.42 per capita and Greece the largest allocation of all, $52.45 per capita, and Yugoslavia $27.84 per capita.

Mr. BLOOM. When this new authorization is appropriated, I am sure you will find the largest amount of this appropriation of $1,350,000,000 will go to China and Italy.

Mrs. LUCE. So it is, indeed, because I have the figures; but per person, per empty stomach, the Chinese get less than anybody else, although they have been in the war longest, and suffered so very greatly.

Mr. KEE. May I call the gentlewoman's attention to the fact that the figures as to the allocation of the funds we are asking to be appropriated now are purely tentative and subject to revision.

Mrs. LUCE. Then, it is the gentleman's opinion that the allocation for China can still be increased and will not be decreased?

Mr. KEE. In my opinion, it can be increased or decreased, but in my opinion it will be increased.

Mrs. LUCE. Who, finally, will make that decision?

Mr. BLOOM. If the gentleman will yield, that goes to the Council. The Council does that, as far as increasing or decreasing the amount is concerned.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. I have before me the allocations that have been made to date, assuming that the $1,350,000,000 is appropriated. The allocation for China is $562,500,000, excluding shipping costs. These figures are not final, but these are the last tentative allocations.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say that those figures which you say are the figures you got for the allocation of the $1,350,000,000 have not been given out. They have not been allocated yet by anyone.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention in this connection to the testimony of Dean Acheson in very intelligent explanation of why there may be differences on a pro rata basis, in the allocations of UNRRA, which explains the matter very fully, showing us why it is necessary.

Mr. KEE. I recall that, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr KEE. If there is any method through which public sentiment can be accurately determined, the array of witnesses appearing before the Foreign Affairs Commitee in support of this resolution certainly indicates that it is the overwhelming sentiment of the American people that the work of UNRRA should be continued and that the necessary funds to carry it on should be made immediately available. Many of these witnesses did not speak for themselves alone, but came before the committee as the authorized representatives of great organizations of the country. Before us, earnestly urging this appropriation, appeared representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, National Education Association, American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Grange, National League of Women Voters, National Women's Trade

Union, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Catholic Welfare Council, National Council of Jewish Women, and many others of strength and influence. Not a single organization of any character whatsoever sent a representative before this committee in opposition to the proposal.

It has been urged that the relief of the distressed peoples of the world is a moral obligation upon the United States and its citizens. That this is true will probably not be denied, but in my humble judgment there is a greater obligation, imposed upon us as the victor in the greatest war of all time, to establish and forever maintain a just and permanent peace. There can be no peace anywhere, in any land or country where the people are hungry. Peace must be founded upon reason, and you cannot reason with the naked, the freezing, and the starving.

It does not require the gift of prophecy to say that today there is a spirit of unrest in practically every land that was visited by the horrors of war. Is there any wonder that the people grow restless day by day and month by month when they are without food, without clothing, and without homes? Is it any wonder that in many of the devastated countries of the world the spirit of unrest has grown to the proportion of a resolution? Can we hope for anything better until these people are fed, clothed, and housed Can we hope to establish even a temporary peace until the immediate needs of these people are satisfied? Therefore it is not only a moral obligation we have resting upon us, it is an obligation we owe not alone to those who are hungry and unclothed but also one that we owe to all the rest of the world—to all peoples and all countries everywhere who are looking to us for the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

One more comment and I am through. It is not only my hope and prayer that this resolution be adopted by an overwhelming vote of this House but I also sincerely trust that it will be adopted without any restrictions or inhibitions. We cannot use human suffering in a trade for political advantage. We cannot offer relief conditioned upon changes in the policy of other governments. We cannot deny bread to the hungry, clothing to the naked, and homes to the homeless because some official or officials of another government decline to modify their views in conformity with our demands. I plead today that we do not use our charity as a club with which to compel a needy people to conform to our policies.

If you are opposed to our taking any action for relief of the peoples of the world, then vote against the resolution. But in the name of justice, of right, and in all fairness to those who suffer, let us make this contribution freely and cheerfully, and with no hampering restrictions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman where he received the information regarding the allocation to China and other countries, because our committee did not receive that information from UNRRA.

Mr. HERTER. The figure that I quoted a moment ago I received from two independent sources. The first source was from UNRRA itself. The second source was from the head of the Chinese Mission, who is here in Washington and who had been given the figure by UNRRA, and who in turn wrote me a letter giving me that figure as being the one that he had been told was the allocation for China.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Our committee felt we should be given very much more information than we were. When we asked about future allocations they were said to be too secret to be given out.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that all of this information was given in executive session and it is not to be quoted here by any member of the committee or anyone else.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not secure it from the UNRRA witnesses before the committee.

Mr. BLOOM. I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know what there is in this bill that the honorable chairman cannot let be divulged to the public when we are giving away billions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed.

Mr. HERTER. I can sympathize with the chairman of the committee with regard to giving out these figures. On the other hand, as the figures were given to me with no restrictions whatever by the head of the Chinese Government organization which is going to receive the money, I do not see that I am under any compulsior to keep the information confidential.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There was no restriction from UNRRA as to the gentleman's making it public, was there?

Mr. HERTER. There was no restriction from UNRRA.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support the bill before us. I am supporting it for two principal reasons: First, because I feel that the need has been very clearly shown to exist; and second, because I feel that UNRRA is not only the single organization equipped to meet this need, but it has in recent weeks shown a very marked improvement in its administrative skills and in the personnel which is heading the most important sections of its various component parts. As an example of the latter fact, I might point out that Major General Rooks, from the State of Washington, who was a member of Eisenhower's staff, has now been appointed in charge of the Washington office. You have General Gale in London; you have General Morgan in charge of displaced persons; you have General Drewry in Poland. You are getting today very much better executive personnel throughout the whole of UNRRA than UNRRA had in its early stages. I am not suggesting that UNRRA was responsible for the caliber of some of its early personnel.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Is not the simple reason for that the fact that these men available today were not available in the early stages when UNRRA was organized? At that time we were scraping the bottom of the barrel and could not get the type of men we needed.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite correct. That has altered the situation very materially. I have been told, for instance, that insofar as operations in China are concerned we are developing a very much stronger personnel than that which was at first anticipated.

The question of need, it seems to me, as far as this discussion is concerned, can well be boiled down to the needs of the two principal countries which will be the recipients under this additional appropriation. It is a strange procedure for us to have an appropriation of $550,000,000 not yet voted upon by the Congress, although I hope it will be very shortly, and at the same time to be authorizing an additional $1,300,000,000 concurrently. The reason for that, I think, has not been sufficiently brought out. It is because the UNRRA program is now being expanded to take in at least three new areas that we never contemplated under the original appropriation. Those are China, Italy, and Austria.

The Italian situation is very little understood. From the moment that the American and British armies invaded Sicily the entire question of caring for the needs of the civilians of Italy was financed under the disease-and-unrest formula of the War Department and was administered by the Army supplemented by the British Army and the Canadian Army.

The amounts that have already gone into taking care of the civilian population of Italy total very close to $1,000,000,000. They have come out of the military appropriations. The most fertile northern agricultural areas of Italy were being fought over during the planting season, and the balance suffered a very severe drought which decimated the cereal crops. Italy today is living from hand to mouth on shipments of foreign grain that are going into the ports of Italy.

On the 1st of October all military appropriations ceased and Italy is being fed today and can be fed until about the 1st of January by a transfer of $100,000,000 that was made from lend-lease appropriations to FEA; so that today FEA—and in turn, the State Department, which took over the functions of FEA—is feeding Italy. Italy's situation became so severe, partly as a result of the very thing that some of us predicted

when we were there last summer, namely that the Italian Government would be unable to amass through its governmental organization for collecting grain known as the Amassi sufficient grain from its own farmers in the northern area to take care of even a small percentage of the Italian people. Now it is finding itself very seriously pinched and for the month of December emergency methods have had to be used in order to get sufficient grain into Italy in order to prevent a recurrence and a very great spread of the hunger strikes that have already taken place in Naples and other cities in that country.

Unless and until this second amount of money is made available, the $1,300,000,000, there is going to be no way to take care of that Italian problem after the 1st of January. It is for that reason, to my mind, that we have an emergency before us from the point of view of acting quickly on this particular appropriation.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Does the gentleman have the figures on how much is going to be spent in Italy out of this additional amount?

Mr. HERTER. The exact amount is not stated, but the estimates that were made at the time this was discussed by the UNRRA council meeting in London and with UNRRA officials in Rome, are available, and there is nothing secret about the estimates. They run between $400,000,000 and $450,000,000 to carry Italy through from the 1st of January to its next harvest.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Does the gentleman have the estimates for the various countries where aid is going to be given by UNRRA?

Mr. HERTER. I have them but I do not feel at liberty to make them public at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Italians ask for small tools in order to make things with their hands? They were asking for them a year ago and that was promised them. It was promised they would be sent from this country and also grain would be sent. There was great suffering then, and even more now.

Mr. HERTER. I think there are a good many things to be sent to Italy, as well as to other countries over there, and those things are included in the industrial rehabilitation figures of UNRRA.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any information or figures regarding the proposed barter, tokens or payment from Italy to the United States?

Mr. HERTER. No; I have heard that discussed very frequently. There is this question which arises in connection with that: In the case of the rehabilitation program for Italy there was the question of shipping raw cotton into northern Italy so that the spindles could be put to work there for the production of clothing. The urgency for clothing in Italy itself is tremendous. There has been an assumption—I think a correct one—that any UNRRA cotton which is spun in Italy would be retained in Italy for the people of Italy and not go into international trade. In addition to that, there have been some commercial negotiations on behalf of cotton brokers to finance the shipment of cotton in exchange for the return of the finished products.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So that they would come back to this country and compete with our finished products?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that all of the raw material that is sent to any of these countries that UNRRA is supplying aid to is made up into material by the factories or mills there for home consumption? Is it not to be considered, and never has been considered, to be a matter of exporting any of this stuff?

Mr. HERTER. That is only an assumption.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman know of any place where UNRRA has been operating where a country being in desperate need of goods manufactured it and exported it to any other place?

Mr. HERTER. No; I do not. On the other hand, I favor doing that very thing in certain areas; for instance as between northeastern Yugoslavia and northwestern Italy. I think it might be perfectly possible to have a barter arrangement, where an exchange of badly needed commodities for cotton textiles would be desirable.

Mr. BLOOM. If they need it in some other place, then we would not send it to Yugoslavia.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do they plan sending Czechoslovakian shoes to this country?

Mr. HERTER. No. As far as I know there is no intent to send leather to Czechoslovakia and return the finished shoes to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Where a sum is allocated to one of these countries, does the sum allocated include the shipping expenses?

Mr. HERTER. It depends on how you figure it. The figure that was given me in connection with China did not include the shipping expense.

Mrs. LUCE. That is to say, the figure which the gentleman hazarded a guess upon, the five-hundred-and-sixty-odd million dollars, does not include the shipping expense?

Mr. HERTER. No. I am very glad that the gentlewoman raised that question, because I think there is one thing that all of us who are favorable to UNRRA ought to examine very carefully, and that is the hideously high shipping costs that are being charged by the United States Shipping Administration today for relief goods being shipped all over the world. It is costing UNRRA over 20 percent of its entire appropriation to pay shipping costs to the United States Government, and also to some British shipping interests when shipments go out of Canada. But today the freight rates, it seems to me, are out of all proportion, and certainly under a competitive system such as we had before they would never continue at the terrifically high rates. Every dollar going into shipping costs is coming out of the relief supply.

Mrs. LUCE. In the case of a country like China, which is the most remote country to come under UNRRA relief, the shipping costs over so vast an area, if included in the sum, might very well consume a great deal of the actual allocation of funds, might it not?

Mr. HERTER. That is correct.

Mrs. LUCE. Then in the final analysis a good deal of the sum could go into shipping expenses, so that in the end very little relief food and other relief items would actually be put into the mouths of hungry people, compared to what we thought we were appropriating?

Mr. HERTER. That is true. As I understand, the figure quoted was a figure minus shipping costs. It was not inclusive of shipping costs.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman must admit that UNRRA has nothing to do with the cost of shipping. That is a matter of record. They have to pay that cost nevertheless.

Mr. HERTER. I am merely recording a fact.

Mr. BLOOM. I agree with the gentleman, but I mean he does not want to blame UNRRA because UNRRA is being blamed enough. The gentleman does not want to blame UNRRA because of paying shipping costs on long hauls to China, for instance.

Mr. HERTER. I am not blaming UNRRA; in fact, it is the other way around. I am trying to point out that this shipping item is such a large item and that additional funds are badly needed, because the supplies UNRRA gets to individuals in the needy countries are cut down by that amount.

During the course of the discussion today I think it was the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] who made the first statement on behalf of the Committee on Rules and stated that Mr. Clayton in London, at the UNRRA conference, had made what amounted to a commitment by this country for this additional sum of money. I think in fairness to Mr. Clayton it ought to be made perfectly clear that Mr. Clayton made no such commitment. Mr. Clayton made it just as clear as he knew how to

every government concerned that he would make a recommendation; that he was in no position to make a commitment; that only the Congress of the United States was in a position to make a commitment.

In that connection, I would like to read section 6 of the act which we are now being asked to extend, which reads as follows:

SEC. 6. In adopting this joint resolution, the Congress does so with the following reservation: That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Certainly nothing can be clearer than that from the point of view of the enabling act which created UNRRA and made us a party to UNRRA. I mention that at this time because in the report that has been presented by the Committee on Foreign Affairs there appears on the first page a summary of the enabling act containing only sections 1 and 9, which are the only two sections that are amended. There is no reference whatever to sections 2 through 8. I think it is well worth while for every Member of Congress to read those sections, because every one of those sections was a restriction by the Congress of the United States upon its adherence to the UNRRA Convention and upon the authorization of the initial money that was appropriated. Every one of those restrictions is renewed in the bill that is now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2½ additional minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. I mention that fact because there has been a great deal of agitation with respect to so-called crippling amendments. I want to address myself to that subject for a moment because I am going to put in the RECORD now, so that it may be read by anyone who is interested, the text of an amendment which I shall offer tomorrow when the bill is read for amendment.

The amendment I am proposing in no way restricts the additional authorization. It will in no way retard the operation of relief. It cannot be charged that this amendment is keeping food out of the starving babies' mouths, as has been the case with other amendments offered here. The amendment is offered for the sole purpose of trying to strengthen this organization so that it can do an effective job.

The amendment reads as follows:

After line 11 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(3) Add a new section 8 (a):

"'8 (a). In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following recommendations:

"'A. That the United States member of the control committee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is hereby directed to endeavor, by appropriate resolutions, agreements, or otherwise, to secure favorable action by that committee or by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Council to attain the following objectives:

"'(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of a recipient country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

"'(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"'(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in a recipient country, to retain title to all motor-transport equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

"'B. The President is hereby requested to endeavor, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they may be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplies and services.'"

I should like to address myself to that amendment for a moment. I checked only yesterday to find out whether since our earlier debate on the subject of UNRRA in Yugoslavia, for instance, either our Government, the British Government, any other government or UNRRA has been able to obtain the text of the secret trade agreements between Yugoslavia and her neighbors. They have not been able to do so.

What is happening here today is that relief is being put into a country—and I am sorry to be singling out Yugoslavia for I have no particular quarrel with Yugoslavia, but I am merely using it as an example—which has secret agreements with Russia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Albania, all dealing with the export and the import of the very types of things which the relief organization is supposed to bring into that country. To my mind, no one can defend an intelligent application for relief supplies unless they know what is coming in or going out of the country. All my amendment does is to suggest that the American member of the council do his best to get full information on imports and exports adopted as a principle of UNRRA. It does not say it is a condition.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. According to the figures supplied to me, Yugoslavia was the second highest country, Greece being first, to receive allocations on a per capita basis. Whereas it is not possible to starve people into accepting American ideas or ideology, it may be possible to feed them into accepting alien ideologies, if we do not watch just such things as the gentleman has tried to cover in his amendment, that is, secret trade treaties. Is that not so?

Mr. HERTER. Yes. I am confining my argument principally to the relief end of this thing and am trying my best to get out of the political end of it. I am talking only about an efficient and intelligent relief operation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman read the report presented to the Committee on Appropriations submitted by the Secretary of State, in which he says:

That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from and imports into such countries, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to UNRRA.

The Secretary of State said they would have not too much objection to that.

Mr. HERTER. Each one of these suggested amendments I am saying should be made an objective of our representative on the Council has already been included on the list of the amendments that Secretary Byrnes said they would have no objection to.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The same principles would hold good in regard to the final decision as to whether White Russia and the Ukraine would benefit from UNRRA, would it not?

Mr. HERTER. Yes; some would.

Mrs. BOLTON. There would be some balance there as to the capacity of the Soviet to do that itself, would there not?

Mr. HERTER. Yes; but I am pointing out that my amendment would not in any way stop anyone from giving anybody any relief. It merely instructs the American delegation.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In other words, the amendment which the gentleman has read here is merely a suggested amendment to try to do those things and not to make it mandatory?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is quite correct. It will in no way slow up the operation of relief in any sense whatsoever.

The second amendment is the one that deals with the so-called freedom of the press. That amendment very clearly merely requires the President to use his best offices to facilitate the entry of members of the press into the countries that are recipient countries in order that they may report on the distribution and services of the UNRRA organization. I am hoping very much, in view of the attitude shown toward these amendments by the chairman of the committee, that they will be acceptable. I think that the objective of every one of these amendments has been admitted to be desirable on the part of the State Department, on the part of UNRRA itself, and on the part of many Members of the House. Therefore, I hope they will be accepted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me, I include the following letter:

LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington.

MR. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANNON: In the course of our recent telephone conversation, you asked me to give you the views of the Department concerning a number of amendments which have been suggested for inclusion in the requested appropriation legislation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

During the hearings on the appropriation, Assistant Secretary Clayton explained that the Department felt that any amendments of the kind proposed would be inappropriate in connection with the legislation under discussion.

As you know, the $550,000,000, which has been requested, is the remaining amount already authorized for the participation by the United States in the work of UNRRA. It is presently contemplated that the $550,000,000 will be required for relief expenditures during the next few months—probably by January 1, 1946. The proposed amendments, on the other hand, are directed toward the expenditure of funds after January 1, 1946, and therefore it would appear far more useful to discuss their inclusion in legislation for a further authorization when such legislation is submitted.

Aside from the appropriateness of the legislation as a vehicle for the amendments suggested, we believe it is unwise for the United States to begin a process which may lead to the imposition of restrictive and undesirable conditions on UNRRA's operations by other countries.

It is my hope that the appropriation can be made subject to no conditions other than those already included by the Congress in the authorization act. I recognize, however, that there is considerable sentiment in favor of the suggested amendments, and I should not want the Department's opposition to all amendments to prevent the prompt appropriation of the funds. The need for additional procurement of supplies in the United States is desperately urgent if relief is to continue uninterrupted during the coming winter, and it will be impossible for UNRRA to continue its programs without further funds.

For these reasons, I am enclosing a draft of provisions which the Department believes could be included in the appropriation bill without imposing upon UNRRA impossible administrative burdens or responsibilities inappropriate to an international organization.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity you have given me to comment on the amendments which have been proposed. I know you recognize the importance of our full participation in international organizations of which we are members. I therefore hope that the remaining amount authorized for our participation in UNRRA can be made available free of any unduly restrictive conditions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

[Enclosure: Draft.]

DRAFT

At the proper place in the provisions making appropriations for UNRRA insert:

"No part of the appropriation herein for carrying out the provisions of the joint resolution of March 24, 1944, entitled 'Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization,' shall be available for that purpose for the relief and rehabilitation of a country subsequent to December 31, 1945, unless and until the President has received from the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration a certification to the effect that the furnishing by such Administration of relief and rehabilitation supplies and services to the government of such country for the nationals of such country will be made only under agreements between the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and such country or other suitable arrangements providing—

"(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of such country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to UNRRA.

"(2) That markings on supplies furnished by the Administration which indicate the national source of such supplies will not be changed.

"(3) That at regular periods such country will make available to UNRRA statements of its current financial position, which statements shall set forth in detail all receipts of such country from the sale and from the rental of supplies furnished by the Administration.

"(4) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in such country, to retain title to all motor transport equipment supplied by the Administration, and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

"(5) That the press of such country will be permitted to publish all statements, relating to the operations of the Administration in such country, made by the administrative head of the Administration's mission in such country;

and, furthermore, that no part of the appropriation shall be used to provide any relief and rehabilitation supplies to be shipped to the receiving countries in Europe later than December 1, 1946, or to the receiving countries in the Far East later than March 1, 1947."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to use this time particularly to answer some of the false and untrue statements that have been made about UNRRA and its aid to Poland. About 2 weeks ago Senator JAMES MEAD, of New York, and I spent several hours with the Vice Premier of Poland, Mr. Mikolajczyk, who was here in Washington en route to Poland after attending the Food Conference in Canada. Undoubtedly the Polish Nation and the Polish people have suffered more terribly, I believe, than any other nation or people on the face of the earth. The information that we received was so appalling, so disheartening, so distressing that it is hard to repeat. Amongst other things, he said to us this: "If you walk along the streets of Poland and ask a person whom you meet on the street, 'Have you lost anyone in your immediate family, a brother or father, sister or mother?' they say, 'Yes; one, two, three.' Ninety-nine out of a hundred people you meet on the streets of Poland will give you that answer. That is, ninety-nine out of a hundred people you meet on the streets have suffered the loss of someone in their immediate family."

Another thing which was hard for me to understand and realize about the terrible situation there was that here in America we know that our Nation is built upon the family life. We have the head of the family, the mother and the father, to look after the children, to see that the family is taken care of. The family responsibility is headed by a mother and father. We know that the foundation of our Nation is built upon that. I think we are accustomed to thinking in those terms for the world.

He said to us this: "Congressman, one-third of the families of Poland have no head at all. That is, both father and mother are dead." Both father and mother. "One-third of all the families, the children, are left without a father or mother, to shift for themselves."

There is no one to look after these children; no one to be the head of the family; no one to look out after all those family responsibilities.

He said to us further: "Another one-third of all the families in Poland have only one head of the family. That is, either the father or the mother is dead."

In other words, two-thirds of all the families in Poland do not have the proper leadership at the head of the family unit to take care and look after the problems of the family.

He said: "Under those conditions, you see what we are faced with in this plan of reorganizing our Nation, and what terrible problems we have before us."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have here a very interesting news item which appeared in the New York Times of December 1, where Miss Katharine Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, a very efficient public official—her late father was a Member of the United States Senate—in relation to Poland says this:

About 1,000,000 people, half of them in Warsaw, reported homeless. Although food and clothing are scarce, the lack of protection against cold is the greatest threat.

Now, mark what I read now. It is amazing.

Confining it to the children—

There we come to the little youngsters, the future citizens—

Little children, 1 child in 9 of Poland's 7,000,000 children, under 14 years of age, has lost both parents, and another one million have only one parent living.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That bears out substantially what we were told.

Six years of war have left Poland economically prostrate, with only the will and determination of her population and aid from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to start her back on the long road to rehabilitation.

Today thousands of Poland's 23,000,000 people are alive because of UNRRA. More thousands who will live to rebuild Poland—or die from hunger and starvation—are waiting breathlessly to hear that the United States Congress has made it possible for the life-giving supply line to continue to flow the long distances from the farms and factories of America to broken and war-torn Poland.

There has never been any doubt of Poland's desperate need for UNRRA supplies. An appeal for aid—and UNRRA preparations to meet it—occurred months before January 17, 1945, the day Warsaw was liberated. Because of UNRRA's preparations to meet this appeal, the first ship carrying UNRRA supplies to Poland actually left New York Harbor months before the UNRRA-Polish agreement was signed.

The UNRRA-Polish agreement, similar to UNRRA agreements with other countries, and the basis under which UNRRA operations in Poland are carried on, was signed by UNRRA and the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity in September 1945. Consequently UNRRA's major operations in Poland have really just begun.

From March 12, however, the day when the first UNRRA supplies for Poland left New York Harbor for Constanza, until December 1, 1945, UNRRA supplies shipped to Poland had reached a total of more than 307,000 gross long tons costing around $164,000,000. Much of this represents tonnage shipped under all the difficulties of wartime operations and is only the beginning of a rapidly accelerating pipe line. Three hundred and seven thousands tons of UNRRA supplies already shipped to Poland represent a magnificent achievement in overcoming war and post-liberation difficulties. Until very recently—in fact, it was September 5 when the first UNRRA ship reached the Polish port of Gdansk—all supplies destined for Poland had to go via the Rumanian port of Constanza and to be transshipped by rail. Poland was liberated from the east, and the Polish ports of Gdynia and Gdansk on the Baltic were not freed until the very last days of the war. The mines that infested the North and Baltic Seas were so plentiful that no shipping of any kind via Baltic ports was permitted by the military until the waters had been mineswept and certified as safe. Then the urgency of military needs for the ports prevented nonmilitary shipments for a time. Not until August 14 could the first UNRRA cargo leave New York Harbor for a Polish port. It reached Gdansk on September 5.

Food supplies for Poland's hungry millions stand high in UNRRA's shipments. The German Army, not content simply to loot Poland's food supply, destroyed her capacity for food production, and food is the No. 1 need that UNRRA is seeking to supply. More than half of the 307,000 tons that UNRRA has shipped is food—flour, canned fish, lard, dried peas and beans, and sugar.

For Poland's ravaged agricultural plant that is beginning to run again in the face of insurmountable difficulties, UNRRA has shipped more than 33,000 gross tons of agricultural rehabilitation materials, such as farm machinery, fertilizers, seed, and veterinarian supplies. By mid-October 3,300 tractors had arrived. Regular shipments of livestock are being made to help Poland replenish the herds so vital to an agricultural country. By early November Poland had received from UNRRA 300 horses and 700 head of horned cattle. The task of full rehabilitation of Poland's agriculture will take at least a generation of patient labor and care by the farmers of Poland, but the task has been well started with UNRRA supplies.

Tons of clothing are regularly going to Poland for a population that at best has only 20 percent of its minimum clothing needs. More than 75 percent of the adults and 85 percent of the children of Poland are without shoes. By the end of October UNRRA had shipped to Poland more than 27,000 tons of clothing, textiles, and hides in an effort to meet at least partially the desperate needs of the population before the coming winter. It had also shipped 3,030 tons of yarns and textiles, 16,000 tons of raw cotton, and 1,888 tons of raw wool. In addition to providing urgently needed garments, these raw materials will make it possible for the mills to start working once more.

One of the most terrifying problems facing Poland, and consequently facing all of Europe, is the health problem. Thousands of Polish people are dying monthly from tuberculosis, typhoid, malnutrition, and dysentery. These diseases are widespread and are taking rapid toll of a population already exhausted by 6 years of war. Malnutrition, lack of clothing, lack of shelter, and dead bodies still buried in the ruins of the cities are not helping the health problem. To meet these problems, UNRRA has been able to ship some 4,300 tons of medical supplies, and technical medical personnel with the UNRRA mission in Warsaw are working closely with the Polish Government. Ninety hospitals and convalescent institutions are promised by UNRRA for Poland. Quite aside from the fact that the American people, because of humanitarian reasons, are unwilling to continue to let thousands of people in Poland die, the threat of epidemics beginning in Poland and spreading throughout Europe must give us pause. Epidemics raging throughout Europe may well reach the United States in spite of all possible precautions.

As important as any other item in the UNRRA supply program are the trucks which UNRRA is racing into Poland for the distribution of supplies throughout the country; trucks, just as much as the food and medical supplies they carry, mean the difference between life and death to a war-ravaged population. Poland will have to have about 60,000 trucks in order to get some sort of effective internal transportation since railway transportation was completely destroyed by the invading armies. UNRRA expects to be able to make available to Poland about 20,000 trucks and 3,000 trailers. From the western hemisphere alone more than 6,500 motor vehicles have been shipped to Poland and by mid-October, 4,000 trucks had arrived. UNRRA is rushing into Poland hundreds of trucks every week. Many of these are from Allied army surpluses.

Seventy-five locomotives from United States military surpluses in Belgium have already been delivered to Poland and 59 new ones are being produced in the United Kingdom. UNRRA is also attempting to procure 4,000 freight cars.

As in other receiving countries, the major job of distribution of hundreds of thousands of tons of supplies in Poland is the responsibility of the Polish Government, not of UNRRA. The Polish Government normally takes title to UNRRA supplies at the port. It would be impossible for UNRRA to undertake large-scale distribution of relief supplies in any country except by employing thousands of people. Furthermore, by using normal trade channels, the economic structure of the country and its regular channels of distribution remain unchanged.

In Poland actual distribution of consumers' goods supplied by UNRRA is undertaken by the Central Cooperative Federation "Spolem", acting as an agent of the Ministry of Supplies. The Ministry of Supplies, however, establishes consumers' rations, prices, and other techniques of equitable distribution. Medical supplies are distributed through the Ministry of Health and other special supplies, not going immediately to the final consumer, through other appropriate ministries. In all instances, UNRRA staff are free to travel and to observe distribution throughout the country to see that supplies are distributed without discrimination. After touring Radom, Krakow, Gliwice, Wroclaw, and Lodz, UNRRA staff reported that distribution was in complete conformity with the UNRRA Council resolutions pertaining to nondiscrimination. Priority in distribution is given to welfare and health institutions and to heavy workers. Furthermore, UNRRA staff in Poland also reports that there is widespread knowledge of UNRRA among the Polish people. All Polish papers give UNRRA frequent and favorable publicity. Packages shipped from UNRRA bear UNRRA markings and frequently the national labels of their country of origin.

There has been much loose talk about the composition of the UNRRA mission in Poland, with charges that the mission was under the domination of outside forces. I should like to clear the misunderstandings that exist in this area. As of November 29, the UNRRA mission in Poland actually consisted of 16 persons. The chief of that mission is Brig. Charles Mills Drury, a Canadian; the deputy chief for supply and requirements is an American, Clifford Wilson. He was the acting chief of the mission until Brigadier Drury's arrival. As of November 29, the chief agricultural specialist, chief medical officer, chief observer for distribution and head of the industrial rehabilitation unit of the mission were all American citizens. As a matter of fact, out of the 16 persons on the UNRRA staff, 8 were American, 2 Canadian, 5 were British, and there was 1 Soviet citizen appointed in charge of the transportation function in the mission.

As of the same day there were en route to the mission in Poland an additional 6 persons, 5 of whom were American and 1 of whom was a Britisher. Again as of the same day there were in process of appointment to the Polish Mission in Washington 10 additional American citizens, most of whom will depart within the next week or two and who will act as distribution observers. Some of these are Detroiters, well known and prominent citizens of our city. More-

over, UNRRA has appointed an American as chief public relations officer.

The major functions of the mission will be to help the Polish Government develop its requirements for supplies, to advise on specialized health and welfare problems, and to observe the distribution of UNRRA supplies in order to insure the United States and other contributing governments that international supplies are being distributed without regard to racial or political discrimination. I have personal knowledge of the conscientious effort that UNRRA is making to secure competent observers for its Polish mission. Several of the United States members of the staff, who will act in this capacity, are members of Polish-American families with a deep and lasting understanding of Poland's needs and of the desire of all Polish-Americans to keep flowing a pipe line of supplies so vital to the rehabilitation of a brave and courageous people. Every one of the observers, American citizens, are veterans of World War I or World War II, or both. They are fine Americans, anxious to do a good job and promote better understanding between America and Poland.

I should like to conclude by saying a few words about the status of private American agencies in Poland. Here, too, there has been much misinformation. All Americans interested in Poland will be happy to know that on Saturday the Polish War Relief Association's mission, headed by Bishop Stephen Woznicki, of Detroit, left for Poland, where it will discuss with Polish Government officials arrangements for immediate operations in that country. UNRRA has done everything possible to facilitate the departure of this mission and to assure it success. At the present moment Fathers Swanstrom and Wycislo, representatives of the National Catholic Welfare Council, are in Warsaw for the same purpose and for some time the joint distribution committee has a representation in the country. These organizations will retain their identity and operate according to plans mutually agreed upon by the societies and the Polish Government, with UNRRA acting as a coordinating unit in order to prevent waste of supplies, manpower, or money.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman spoke of shipments to Constanza. Does the gentleman know whether those shipments have been delivered in Poland? I may have missed it in the gentleman's statement. Have they reached Poland from Constanza?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes; Poland did receive them. I have verified that because I have been very deeply interested in knowing the true facts about it. Poland has received those supplies.

Mrs. BOLTON. I know Yugoslavia has had very great difficulty in getting supplies from Constanza up to Yugoslavia and I was interested in knowing whether Poland was experiencing the same difficulty.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The supplies that came through Constanza were very small indeed. Poland received very little in tonnage from Constanza. Most of the 307,000 tons so far received have come through the Baltic ports.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RYTER].

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the desire of the American people to share their abundance with the ragged and starving millions in Europe and Asia. I have received many letters from constituents offering to contribute ration points or to continue rationing, if that would release more food.

The recent Gallup poll revealed that 85 percent of the American people answered "Yes" to the question, "Should we help feed Europe and Asia?" What outlets have we given this generous American impulse?

Private organizations are characteristic of our national life. The great bulk of our citizens belong to at least one religious institution or agency concerned with the welfare of others. Everyone in this House has probably contributed to overseas relief through one of these organizations. Yet, the physical devastation and human suffering left in the wake of this war is so vast that no one voluntary agency or group of agencies has sufficient resources to do more than peck at the outer fringes of the problem. They have a special contribution to make, however, inside the framework of an over-all intergovernmental organization which is prepared to make use of various abilities and resources. UNRRA is that intergovernmental agency.

From its inception, UNRRA has recognized the importance of these private relief groups to supplement large-scale relief with additional and specialized services. The following policy was established at the Atlantic City Conference:

UNRRA will welcome the efforts of foreign voluntary organizations to provide at their own expense and subject to the regulation of the Director General, relief, welfare, and health services in addition to the services provided by UNRRA so long as the following conditions are observed:

(a) The services which voluntary organizations are operating under their own responsibility should not prejudice any services provided by a government or by UNRRA itself;

(b) The services operated by voluntary organizations should not draw on any local resources which could, in the opinion of UNRRA, be better used to meet other emergency needs;

(c) UNRRA must be satisfied as to the general competence, health, and personal character of the people who are employed by the voluntary organizations for relief and welfare work;

(d) Foreign voluntary organizations will be expected to help indigenous organizations and agencies to assume responsibility for relief and welfare services in their own area at the earliest possible opportunity.

Over 50 voluntary agencies of national character are operating in Europe and Asia. Twenty United States organizations are actively associated with UNRRA in the countries it serves. In general, this assistance takes one of the following forms:

First. The loan of skilled and professionally trained personnel to UNRRA.

Second. The conduct of planned programs of relief and rehabilitation supplementary to the basic program of UNRRA.

Third. The contribution of supplies to UNRRA or, with the assistance of UNRRA, to an agency or institution in the country for distribution to the people.

LOAN OF PERSONNEL TO UNRRA

UNRRA's first request for assistance to war victims occurred in 1944 at the height of the European military campaign. Fifteen United States voluntary agencies helped meet the shortage of trained personnel by placing their own experienced foreign-relief workers at the disposal of UNRRA.

Under a mutually adopted program of cooperation, voluntary agencies paid the salaries of more than 100 of these workers. UNRRA provided their transportation and maintenance and assumed responsibility for their supervision.

Since the end of the war, most of these agencies have been developing their own supplementary relief and rehabilitation projects and need their own personnel for these specialized services.

UNRRA is releasing these loaned workers as fast as they can be replaced by UNRRA employees. Their services have been of incalculable value.

SUPPLEMENTARY PROJECTS

When a voluntary agency or an UNRRA mission finds a job which can be appropriately handled by a private group, that private group submits its plans of operation to UNRRA and the national government involved. Once that plan is approved, UNRRA assists the agency by facilitating the movement of personnel, providing aid in the shipment of supplies, and making necessary arrangements with governments and indigenous agencies and institutions in the countries where the operation is to take place. UNRRA extends to the personnel of voluntary agencies working on approved supplementary projects, access to congregate mess and billeting facilities, basic rations, and mission stores. For these services UNRRA is normally reimbursed by the voluntary agency personnel or by the agencies. Accessibility to these UNRRA facilities is a very considerable convenience to the agencies and greatly enhances the effectiveness of their work.

I wish I could tell you what each of the individual organizations is doing in these countries, but the limitation of time will only permit me to describe a few.

EXAMPLES OF THIS HUMANE ACTIVITY

First. In Greece, where hunger and privation have hit the children most desperately, the Near East Foundation has established 16 special feeding and health centers. These centers provide medical care and supplement the regular government ration distribution by special foods required by subnormal children. Children remain an average of 3 months. As rapidly as they reach a satisfactory state of recovery, they are replaced by others.

Second. The Unitarian Service Committee and the Congregational Christian Service Committee, in collaboration with UNRRA, operate a medical nutritional

project in Italy. This project determines nutritional and associated medical needs in selected areas through a carefully supervised experimental feeding program with individuals who have suffered prolonged starvation; and assists local medical groups to apply this knowledge to their rehabilitation problems.

Third. In all of the war-devastated countries, livestock has been greatly depleted, yet milk is needed more than ever before to offset rising tuberculosis, particularly among children. The Church of the Brethren, the Falls Cities Cooperative Milk Producers Association of Louisville, Ky., and other individuals have donated more than 200 cattle to replenish diminishing stock. One hundred and fifty Holstein heifers were shipped to Poland to supply milk for hospitals and nursing homes. Bulls were brought into Greece for an artificial insemination project. The groups contributing these valuable animals say "We are anxious that our cattle serve as a testimony of our good will and friendship for the people of Europe whose homes in many cases have been destroyed by our own bombs. These cattle will be the best ambassadors of good will this country can send to the people who know the horrors of war and starvation."

Fourth. Nine voluntary agencies are performing important services to the displaced persons in Germany under an agreement reached last May by SHAEF and UNRRA. The work of these agencies is primarily in the fields of welfare and morale services—education and vocational training, recreation, religion—and the distribution of supplies provided by the agencies incident to these programs. Specialized case work and resettlement services are offered by some of the agencies.

I would like to quote a cable received this week from the government of one of these countries:

> Had we not been able to call on the services of these individuals throughout these past months, we should have been severely handicapped and unable to carry out many of our most important functions.

CONCLUSION

These all too brief examples of the effective operation of voluntary agencies in cooperation with UNRRA answer the plea of Americans to help their neighbors overseas.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I assure you I shall be very brief in my remarks. I feel, however, that I would fail in my responsibility to this body if I did not take this opportunity to report to you my own practical experiences during a period of 5 weeks in the countries of Europe this late summer almost exclusively in the interest of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation. I recognize, as do all of you, that in the organization of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation it came at a time when the question of drafting the best in personnel was difficult. I recognize by my observations and I recognize by what has been transpiring since my return that there did occur some very great errors. I recognize, too, that the errors are being corrected. I appreciate the magnitude of this institution. An institution of such magnitude can rightfully be charged with errors. Outside of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], I think we made as comprehensive a study of this great problem as anyone who left this Congress for that purpose. We met the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] on several occasions and I can assure you he speaks with genuine authority when he discusses this question with you.

The amendment that he proposed when we had before us the appropriation of $550,000,000 and the amendment he proposes to offer I am heartily in accord with. It was my privilege to be in the same room with this gentleman in London when he presented these amendments to Commander Jackson, one of the most accomplished gentlemen in the service of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization and they were all approved in my presence.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] presented the amendments he read here today to that council?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. We discussed them in London in the presence of Commander Jackson, one of the most accomplished men on the staff of this organization.

Mr. BLOOM. The only thing I am sorry about is that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] did not present these amendments at the right time if he already had them when the other appropriation bill was submitted.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. He did present them.

Mr. BLOOM. Not in this form.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. He is presenting some additional ones today.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] never presented the amendments he read here today.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. That is right.

Mr. BLOOM. Because I have been thinking that perhaps I may assent to the amendments because if they are what I think they are, from what I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] read, I do not see any objection to them at all, and I hope I will be able to accept these amendments so far as I am personally concerned, though I am surprised he did not offer them before. I think they are very good amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I am sure he did offer several amendments when the last appropriation bill was up for consideration.

Mr. BLOOM. I want to make myself clear on that. They were not in this form, not in the wording he read today on the floor of the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Perhaps not the ones he presented today, but he did present some equally important.

Mr. Chairman, much discussion goes on in reference to the errors of this organization. There are many who are skeptical about the Russian influence. It was our privilege to travel extensively over the countries that were then being served by UNRRA. We talked to the lowliest peasants who were the beneficiaries of this in many instances, we talked to government officials, and we talked to our own representatives. We had the privilege of studying the missions in different countries and I am glad to come back and report to this Congress that on all occasions we found the personnel in the missions of the highest caliber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman said that he discussed this matter with peasants and with people who were beneficiaries of the act. What countries were you in?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. We were in practically all countries UNRRA was then serving.

Mr. WHITE. Was the gentleman in Czechoslovakia and in Poland?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Yes, and in Greece and Italy.

Mr. WHITE. Was the gentleman in the Balkan countries too?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. We were in Czechoslovakia, particularly, and in Belgrade. We covered quite extensively that part of the world.

I wish to say, in conclusion, that it matters little what the objections may be. I would have had no objection had some other organization been set up to do the job, but we set up this particular institution. The question now before us is action. Whether there have been errors made or not, we can no longer delay. I have no disposition at this particular moment to engage in what we usually refer to as sob stuff. I say to you that it is now a serious question. It would have been all right if some other organization had been set up to do the job. This one was set up. I had no part in it, but I believe it is trying to do the best possible job than can be done.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Did the gentleman consider whether UNRRA could do a better job than the Red Cross?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I have no disposition to debate the merits of any organization. I would be glad to support any organization. The point I am making is that we do not have time to make any change. The people today in these distressed countries of Europe are needing help and needing it badly. It was my privilege to go into various cities that had been almost completely bombed. I remember distinctly one village of 400 buildings, and every one of

them had been bombed or burned. It was impossible to walk down the street and find a place where one could go to seek shelter, let alone a place to sleep. Truly, those people are in need. So it brings up this very important question, What is to be our national policy? Are we to continue the Christian spirit that we have practiced in the past? If that is the policy we have adopted in the United States, then there is no occasion for further debate.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman would not pursue that policy if it would bankrupt this country, would he?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. No. I do not think by pursuing it that you will bankrupt this country. I would like to say further to the gentleman that I believe this policy is one of the great policies this Nation can afford to follow, because we are dealing with the foundation of America's future.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have no further requests, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say at this time that I feel very happy because of the speeches made here today on both sides of the aisle. I think we understand the situation perfectly, and I think the country and the world will appreciate that we are trying to do the best we can.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to get the viewpoint of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on a matter that concerns me very much. Assuming this bill passes, in relation to the appropriation following the passing of the bill, what is the gentleman's opinion as to the necessity for that and the timing of it?

Mr. BLOOM. May I say to the gentleman that if this bill passes the House tomorrow, I think that the Committee on Appropriations should hold hearings immediately in order to get the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of this amount, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate will not yet have passed it, for this reason, that if UNRRA does not receive this appropriation by the 1st of January, it will have to stop, because it will have no funds to work with, for the simple reason that the $550,000,000 that is being considered for appropriation by the Senate will all be used up by the 1st of January.

So this is most important. If we are going to continue UNRRA and try to save the lives of people all over the world, this legislation and the appropriation will have to be passed by the 1st of January. That is the extreme urgency of it. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. McCORMACK. It certainly does. I believe the opinion of the chairman of the committee has great importance, and I thought it advisable to get his opinion at this time as to what the effect would be if the appropriation was not made until after we met sometime in January.

Mr. BLOOM. That would be terrible. It would break up the work of UNRRA, and there would be millions of people starving throughout the world if that was not accomplished at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution of March 28, 1944, entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization," is amended in the following respect:

(1) The first section is amended by striking out "$1,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,700,000,000."

(2) Section 9 is amended by striking out "1946" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, pursuant to House Resolution 444, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], and to include therein a letter written to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] at the time the appropriations for UNRRA were being considered, also a draft of suggested amendments to the UNRRA legislation that were included as a part of that letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Alexander Brin. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $78, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, after considerable time and research I have prepared an article on the resources of the British Empire which includes a number of insertions. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will take 3½ pages of the RECORD and will cost $182, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today. The hour is very late and it is storming outside. Out of consideration for the Members of the House, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the same privilege next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Louis R. Wolter, of the Waterville Methodist Church, and in another instance to include an article by Richard Harding Armstrong on uniform divorce and marriage laws appearing in the latest law magazine.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON UNRRA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which they may extend their remarks on UNRRA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE FEDERAL BALLOT BILL

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, known as the soldier-voting law.

The purpose of the bill, in brief, is to amend the act by striking out title III which provided for the use of what is known in the act as the Federal ballot.

For the benefit of the new Members and to refresh the memory of the Members who were here when the act was passed, you will recall that the Federal ballot bill, sponsored by Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, and Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, originated in the Senate, was approved by the Senate and sent to the Committee on Elections in the House.

The Committee on Elections in the House disapproved the bill and approved a new bill providing that the soldiers should vote by absentee State ballots. After much debate, the House passed the State ballot bill, which went to a conference of Members of the House and Senate.

At this point I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN, on the majority side of the House for the great patriotic effort he displayed upon the floor of this House time and again leading the fight in what he believed to be not only in the interest of the service people to whom we were trying to extend the vote, but in the interest of preserving to the States, as

the Constitution dedicated that right should be preserved to the States, the right to hold elections. This bill never could have passed in as good form as it did pass had it not been for the great efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman RANKIN. I am glad to pay him tribute at this time. I also want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman GIBSON and the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman MANASCO, of the majority side of the House, and many of the able men upon the majority side of the House who supported this bill. At this time I want to pay the highest tribute to the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman ELLSWORTH, and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman GAVIN, and to the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman LECOMPTE, and others on the committee who worked painstakingly and long on the conference committee between the House and the Senate.

In the conference there was such insistence on the part of those in the Senate and those in the House who favored the Federal ballot that a compromise was agreed to which provided that those State governments which would authorize the Federal ballot as being legal in their States could give the soldiers a chance of voting either the Federal or State ballot.

The final bill permitted about 20 States to offer both ballots to the servicemen while the governors of 28 States of which my State of Illinois was one, held that the Federal ballot was illegal or unnecessary.

The administration of the act by the War Ballot Commission has proved conclusively that the Federal ballot as a voting instrumentality was a complete failure and that it should now be deleted from the original act.

Now that the war is over this Congress should clean up this statute by taking out of the act the provision for the Federal ballot, because it has proved under a most painstaking administrative test by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to be unworkable, and under this test it has been proven that the soldiers did not want and did not make use of the Federal ballot to any considerable extent. The Federal ballot should be stricken from the act because it lays an impossible and an unnecessary burden upon the military services.

Any Member of Congress who will read Senate Document 6, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, an 81-page report made by the former Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, Chairman of the War Ballot Commission, submitted by Robert P. Patterson, Acting Secretary of War, in which he reported to the Congress for all of the military services, cannot escape the conviction that it is the duty of this Congress to amend this act at the earliest possible date.

The Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress, when this bill was before them, were divided in thought. All of them wanted to furnish the best opportunity for the soldiers to vote. Some of them thought that in addition to the regular State absentee ballot which was provided under one of the bills that the Federal ballot should be included.

Now regardless of how we divided on this question as Members of Congress in the Seventy-eighth Congress I am hopeful in the consideration of this bill in the committee and later on the floor of the House that the Members of this Congress will forget who were right and who were wrong on former legislation and approach this bill strictly on its merits and with the thought as to whether we shall leave this impossible requirement of the Federal ballot on the statute books or whether we will wipe it out, relieve the military services of the tremendous burden of its administration, which action will encourage the States to further amend their laws so that in soldier voting in the future those few States who need to move their primary dates up will know what the permanent law is, and what small changes it will be necessary for them to make in effecting the best absentee-voting possibilities for any of their sons and daughters who may hereafter be or remain in the service.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman is quite correct in his statement that every member of the committee and every Member of the House had one idea in mind when the soldier-voting bill was under consideration last session. That idea was that we should provide a means for the people in the services to vote. The services, after this law was passed, undertook sincerely and at great cost and with great effort, to provide votes for every person in the services. The States, on their part, when the ballots were cast and the State election machinery came into play, carried out their part of the job very sincerely and used every effort to make the plan successful. As the gentleman has stated, we have the report of the Federal Ballot Commission, which I believe the gentleman will review in his remarks later. This report clearly indicates the futility of the effort to provide a Federal ballot.

I have in my hand a certified copy of a resolution adopted on October 13 by the National Association of Secretaries of State. The secretaries of state are responsible in the several States for the conduct of elections, and they have studied this Federal ballot plan, the soldier vote law, Public Law 712, and have come forth with a recommendation which was made in the form of a resolution at their convention in New Orleans recently. I would like to place the text of this resolution in the RECORD at this point. It reads as follows:

Resolution 2

Whereas the National Association of Secretaries of State convened in session in the city of New Orleans October 11, 12, and 13, 1945, and therein gave full and complete consideration and discussion to the subject of soldier and sailor voting; and

Whereas the several secretaries of state charged with the responsibility of conducting elections in their respective States summarized their experiences in the 1944 elections; and

Whereas the States have amply provided voting facilities for the complete State ballot, which includes Federal as well as State and local offices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Association of Secretaries of State, That this association wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the War Ballot Commission, and the Army, Navy, and Shipping Administration, through its personnel; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be informed that by motion duly made, seconded, and carried, the National Association of Secretaries of State recommends that any Federal legislation on servicemen voting be enacted, if at all, not later than March 1, 1946, and that such legislation retain the use of the free air-mail service in transmitting the ballot material to and from the serviceman and the local State election officials, and that such legislation eliminate the use of the Federal ballot.

I hereby certify that I am secretary of the National Association of Secretaries of State, and that the above resolution is a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the association on October 13, 1945.

WADE O. MARTIN, JR.,
Secretary.

I think that resolution, coupled with the statements made by the War Ballot Commission and the Secretaries of the Army and Navy, but, most of all, this request to the Congress of the United States by the secretaries of the 48 States, makes it our plain duty to comply with the request made by the secretaries and follow out the recommendation based on the experiences in the 1944 election.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman from Oregon. It is truly a very interesting and powerful statement on the part of responsible people, and I am sure the Congress will give a great deal of consideration and attention to that statement.

I urge the Congress to do away with the Federal ballot on the facts contained in the report of former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, which he made to the Congress. I feel sure a careful reading of his report will convince you such action should be taken.

Let me read from page 53 of his report, in which he says, and I quote:

In addition to having to provide sufficient Federal balloting units to company levels all over the world to meet an estimated potential of voters in each organization, it was necessary to print and similarly distribute three soldier voting posters in a hundred and forty thousand copies each, 520,000 posters in all. Furthermore, half of each soldier voting manual (and there were 140,000 of them printed) was devoted to the Federal procedure. The time and effort employed by already busy officers and men overseas in the global distribution of these units, posters, manuals, etc., to every company, detachment, and vessel outside of the United States and in the actual administration of title III cannot be readily measured. Perhaps as much as 75 percent of the time employed by overseas soldier voting personnel in voting administration was of necessity spent on the Federal ballot, which was used by less than 2 percent of the soldiers overseas of voting age.

Continuing, he said:

It was estimated by the second largest overseas theater that about 30,000 man-hours were devoted, in addition to regular full-time military duties, to administering the Federal balloting procedure; and in this

theater only 7,154 Federal ballots were executed. And, as stated above, a large percentage of those who voted by Federal ballot later received, voted, and sent in their State absentee ballots, further reducing the effective use of the Federal ballot.

Then he concludes with this most significant statement, and you will note in this statement which I am about to read to you that he does not recommend that the Congress do away with the Federal ballot as a voting instrument. Of course, he would not openly feel that it would be proper for him to so advise Congress. Apparently, however, he goes as far as he can safely go when he says, and I quote:

These facts raise question whether the Federal ballot, as provided under title III of the statute, is of sufficient utility to justify its continuance as a voting procedure in time of war.

You will recall when this bill was up, the Secretary of War favored the Federal ballot. As Chairman of the War Ballot Commission he did a splendid job in administering it and I want to pay the highest compliment to him, the Secretary of the Navy, to Colonel Cutler, Commander Devers, Commander Hays, and others who handled this tremendous task with such efficiency.

But after having administered it the former Secretary of War makes the above statement, which should carry great influence with the Members of Congress in considering the deleting of the Federal ballot from the present statute.

You will note he says that in one theater, after the voting officers had performed their regular duties, that it was estimated they then put in over 30,000 man-hours in attempting to get these short Federal ballots to the voters and get them voted, with the pitiful results that out of the second largest overseas theater less than 7,154 of these ballots were voted.

May I point out to the Members of the House that his report also shows that one voting officer was appointed for each company command or for like rank in other services? The voting occurred when the fighting all over the world was intense, when we were crossing the English Channel, for instance, and fighting through northern France and establishing beach heads for the invasion in southern France in the European theater, yet 150,000 soldiers were compelled to waste their time and endanger their lives, and many of them were wounded and lost their lives in crawling from fox hole to fox hole and going from one front to the other with this Federal ballot so that the soldier might have it personally delivered to him where he could personally vote it. I venture to say few, if any, Congressmen who will read this report will insist on retaining this Federal ballot, and I venture the assertion that had they known that the enactment of this law would have caused the loss of lives and the wounding of soldiers unnecessarily, none of them would have voted for it.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to place in the RECORD a table showing the number of potential voters and some remarks taken from pages 51 and 52 of the former Secretary of War Stimson's report on the administration of voting in the last election to the Congress of the United States:

[From the report of Secretary of War Stimson]

COMMENT ON FEDERAL BALLOTING PROCEDURE PROVIDED UNDER TITLE III

23. Attention is invited to the insignificant use by soldiers, and by servicemen generally, of the Federal ballot:

Estimated total personnel of Army, Navy, and merchant marine of voting age overseas	4,900,000
Total Federal ballots executed overseas and transmitted to the United States by such personnel (includes a few "attached civilians")	108,691
Less: Ballots received too late to be counted, executed by voters from nonauthorizing States, prematurely voted, or otherwise not effective	9,868
	98,823

Thus, only 2 percent of the soldiers of voting age overseas from all States took opportunity to request and execute a Federal ballot.

I want to particularly call your attention to the second table, which shows that of 10 States authorizing the use of the Federal ballot where the soldier had his selection as to whether he would use the State ballot or the Federal ballot, 446,974 chose the long ballot, or State ballot, whereas only 28,136 voted the short, or Federal, ballot:

	10 States authorizing use of Federal ballots	10 States not authorizing use of Federal ballots	Total
State absentee ballots	446,574	1,086,968	1,533,942
Federal ballots	28,136		28,136

Combining this with the fact that former Secretary of War Stimson makes the bold statement that less than 2 percent of the soldiers overseas who were eligible to vote used the Federal ballot ought to be sufficient evidence without going any further to prove the case for its speedy demise.

Let me read further from former Secretary of War Stimson's report, which you will find on page 55, and I quote:

The Army encountered all the difficulties which the Congress anticipated. But commanders did not seek to avoid the task because it was hard or dangerous. They made extraordinary efforts to provide voting opportunities to all persons under Army jurisdiction, despite adversities of battle, weather, and geography. In overseas theaters, involved in major military operations—France, Italy, Southwest Pacific, Philippine Islands, China, Burma—the decisions of local commanders were conclusive as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations in their respective areas.

The greatest obstacles to practical administration related naturally to battle conditions—the fluidity of fighting personnel, the enormous confusion of combat, the concentration of all energies and all means of communication in the struggle. Some idea of these inherent complications are reflected in General Eisenhower's report to the War Department.

I hope every Member of Congress will read General Eisenhower's report to Secretary of War Stimson. He tells how it was necessary for his men to crawl from fox hole to fox hole under enemy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire while delivering official war ballots to personnel engaged in combat. How the men became casualties, lost their lives, and how other untrained officers had to carry on.

I quote General Eisenhower:

The administration of Public Law 277 * * * was carried out under very difficult periods of operation in this theater. The first phase was conducted during the period on the beachhead just prior to the break-through and envelopment of the south flank of the enemy forces in the Caen-Argentan area, and while part of the command was astride the English Channel en route from United Kingdom or staging to debark from United Kingdom.

The second phase was the pursuit from the Caen-Argentan area with the occupation of Paris and Channel ports and contact with enemy forces on the Maginot line.

The third phase or Federal balloting period was during the reorganization, attack, and passage through the Maginot line, and the organization and attack of the Siegfried line.

Headquarters European theater of operations moved to the Continent by echelons, and at the same time kept increasing by activation of new units in the form of base sections and control missions from existing installations in the United Kingdom. It was necessary to establish different headquarters and new commands at the same time movement was in progress. This, at times, rendered difficult the prompt dissemination of information and maintenance of close liaison in soldier voting by various echelons.

The greatest difficulty encountered by the major commands was in keeping in touch with units such as quartermaster, signal, engineers, medical, and other types of companies which were divided into sections and platoons and widely separated due to combat operations. The same is true of the Air Force with their wide dispersion of units, attachment to front-line commands, with the remainder of the Air Force located throughout France, Belgium, Holland, and the United Kingdom. These units were continually on the move and failed to receive official communications sent to them with reference to soldier voting. The supply of this material could only be maintained by personal contact direct with the various headquarters sections and units by soldier-voting officers. Units had to be oriented and new directives issued to them, then they would probably move on again to another major command. At one time advance section of the communication zone had originally assigned and attached to it over 1,200 units, with a total strength of 200,000 troops scattered over a tremendous geographical area.

The primary concern of this command has been to make certain that each officer and soldier had an opportunity to vote. It has been necessary in many instances for voting officers and others to crawl from fox hole to fox hole under enemy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire while delivering official war ballots to personnel engaged in combat. Soldier voting officers of units engaged in combat became casualties and other officers had to be appointed and instructed under difficult conditions. In some instances this left the distribution of ballots to first sergeants or any other officer picked on the spot, who had no opportunity to read the regulations applying to soldier voting due to the intensity of combat and rapidity of movement.

Again quoting from the report:

There were also difficulties, not directly related to combat, which were encountered all over the world. Outposts in northern Greenland were frozen in, except during the summer months, and could not be reached for Federal balloting. A small detachment above the Arctic Circle was able to receive vital supplies and medicines dropped by plane, but could send nothing out. Still other small detachments, like one in the inaccessible mountains of southwest China, had no contact with the outer world at all except by radio. Where such isolated and remote groups could be reached, it was necessary for voting officers to go by plane, by boat, by tractor, and on foot. The distances to be traveled were very great; more than a thousand miles up the Amazon; to isolated islands in the south Atlantic; throughout the Aleutians; to Burma, the Ukraine, West Africa, Iran, New Zealand. These problems of distance and weather and other difficulties are illustrated in the report from the China-Burma-India theater.

Again, on page 57 of the Stimson report, he relates how a voting officer taking executed ballots to an Army post office at the European front was killed by enemy fire. The records of a voting officer in the Southwest Pacific were obliterated by the explosion of a hostile bomb. A sudden German counterattack engulfed an American detachment in France on the day designated for Federal balloting, captured the balloting supplies and took prisoner some of the voters. Even in noncombat zones one theater soldier voting officer was killed and another was gravely injured in two airplane crashes while engaged in getting the ballots to the soldiers.

Let me try to bring home to the Members of the House just how serious this Federal ballot law proved to be. Men were killed and wounded trying to administer the Federal ballot, and out of 4,900,000 men of voting age in the armed services only about 80,000 of them voted this ballot. Out of the millions who voted the absentee ballot, there is no record that any American soldier lost his life in the operation of the State absentee ballot. This raises a question, in my judgment, that will cause the Members of Congress to want to clean up this situation and to take this iniquitous law off the statute books.

Here is what happened at Guam, and again I quote from the report:

The floating docks had broken apart, making passage in the small harbor dangerous. The vessel was not allowed close to shore and no one was permitted to go ashore except those with very urgent business. The voting officer had some executed Federal ballots which had to be mailed because the contemplated next stop would be at a date too late to have the ballots arrive within the United States on time. He managed to get permission to go ashore to mail the ballots. The motor on the launch gave out, the rudder broke away, and the open launch became swamped. It was after the few passengers took to the oars that they were able to beach the launch without further mishap or personal injury. At this time Guam was not yet completely secure and, as the post office was not at the seaside, it was necessary for the voting officer to be escorted through the jungle trail by an armed guard to the post office at the airfield.

At this point may I raise the question, was this sacrifice and danger encountered worth it?

Mr. Stimson gives in his report an account of voting officers going thousands of miles up the Amazon to personally deliver a few Federal ballots; to islands in the Caribbean, and by airplane over the Himalaya Mountains to small groups in China where they could reach them. To Greenland on the Arctic Circle, and to the terrible climate of the Aleutians, endangering the lives of men trying to carry out the law prescribed by this Congress to personally give an opportunity for them to vote the Federal ballot, when any of them who wanted to vote could have the complete State ballot mailed directly to them only upon their request.

I referred to just a few incidents out of his report as to the impossibilities and the terrible danger to human life in the administration of the Federal ballot. I did this because the lives of our soldiers were, and are, more important than the cost of the administration of this act, and before passing on to the cost of the administration and other phases of the act I would like to make the statement that the voting of 80,000 of these Federal ballots is not worth the life of one single American soldier which this act caused to be unnecessarily lost, and the unfortunate thing of it is that many of them were killed and wounded in trying personally to get this Federal ballot to the men on the lines of combat.

Now, just briefly let me refer to the expenses and difficulties of the administration of this act. The total printing expense according to former Secretary of War Stimson's report was about $115,000. This amounts to practically nothing compared with the general overall expense it required of 150,000 voting officers who, during the voting time, spent over 75 percent of their time at such duties. The expense of the telephone and communications generally was enormous. The use and cost of hundreds of planes and ships was enormous. Undoubtedly if all of the expense of administering this act was paid at commercial rates and salaries, it would run into countless millions of dollars, and the net result was about 80,000 ballots cast. All soldiers could and would have used the complete State ballot at practically no cost or effort.

For the Federal ballot alone there were printed 9,400,000 ballots, 9,400,000 outer envelopes, 9,400,000 inner envelopes, and because of atmospheric conditions it was necessary that they be packed in ballot units in water-resistant cartons. The military services ordered and were furnished 7,600,000 of these water-resistant cartons.

To get this material out, orders were placed with 9 envelope factories, 4 in Chicago and 5 in New York. And, in order to supply the overseas voters of the 20 States permitting the use of the Federal ballot, it was necessary to have printed and sent out 520,000 big posters which carried the names of nearly 500 Congressmen and Senators. These thousands of posters of necessity had to spread out to every service command all over the world to reach the American troops because some few men were likely to be serving from each of these States which permitted the use of the Federal ballot.

In addition there was printed 140,000 soldier voting instruction manuals which were likewise distributed and then there were millions of other pieces of literature plus radiograms and various other expensive communications. Animated movies calling to servicemen's attention general voting procedures were purchased and were used and shown overseas thousands of times to millions of soldiers and sailors. Voting booths or places to vote were provided on land and on sea all over the world for the use of those who cared to vote the Federal ballot.

Yet, notwithstanding all of the expense and this colossal task placed upon the Army and Navy when they were fighting a war to protect the very life of this Nation and all of the publicity and advertising it was necessary for the services to do to give the men overseas the best opportunity to know who were running for Congress and the Presidency and in addition, the hardships the 150,000 soldiers went through, the loss of the lives of men and many of them wounded, the pitiful result was that only 2.2 percent of the voters who had an opportunity to vote the Federal ballot voted it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that Congress will continue this mistake. That is why I have offered this bill to correct it. There will probably be something over a million men in the service in the future in peacetime. Their movement will not be so fluid naturally as in times of war. Communications carrying to them the news of the home front will not be disturbed. Those who are overseas will be able to keep in close contact with our Government at home. Mail addressed to them will reach them more promptly than ever before. Many of them will want to vote in the future and they will have abundant time in which to procure the regular State absentee ballot containing all of the names so that they may cast an intelligent vote. When the Federal ballot is stricken from the statute there are a few States which will probably make their laws to better conform to the voting of absentee ballots.

There is nothing at stake now of a political nature. We are not in a campaign and can approach this legislation in the best interest of all who will be effected. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Elections will call an early meeting for the consideration of this bill and I have every confidence that he will. I hope and believe all of the Members of the House will approach this legislation without any thought of who was right or wrong when it was placed on the statute books in the Seventy-eighth Congress, but with the impelling thought that we shall forget the past and strike the Federal ballot from the statute books which has proved itself expensive, very difficult of administration, which has cost the lives of some of our boys in the past and may cost the lives of others in the future.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. The gentleman referred to the long ballot and the short ballot.

Mr. VURSELL. Yes; that is the State ballot and the Federal ballot.

Mr. RAMEY. That is, the so-called Federal ballot was the one that had blanks, no names?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

Mr. RAMEY. Whereas the long ballot that most of them voted was the ballot containing the names of the candidate of every party from President and Governor clear on down to coroner?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. That gave them an opportunity for a complete vote?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. As I understand the gentleman's bill, only the Federal-ballot provisions in the previous law will be removed and all of the other provisions for expediting soldier voting under the State absentee-ballot laws are left in the law; is that correct?

Mr. VURSELL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Would the passage of the gentleman's bill do away with all of these hazards that he has just mentioned?

Mr. VURSELL. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DISCHARGE SERVICEWOMEN FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which provides for the discharge of all Wacs, Waves, Spars, and women Marines, except those who are directly engaged in activities in Army and Navy hospitals and those who are performing duties connected with the discharge of servicemen at separation centers.

The women of our armed forces who volunteered their services during the war have done a magnificent job. The work was difficult; the hours were long, and the discipline was severe. Now, their job is finished. The argument no longer prevails that the women's reserves of the armed forces are needed in order to relieve men for combat service. They ought not to be required to remain in the armed forces. Continuation of the women's reserves is a useless and unnecessary drain upon the public treasury. They should be discharged immediately and thereby save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

The present laws establishing the women's reserves authorizes their continuation in the armed forces until 6 months after the declaration of the end of the war emergency. When this declaration will come, no one knows. If our reconversion processes are to be retarded because of the lack of such a declaration, it will interfere materially with the return of our country to a normal peacetime economy. Servicewomen in the armed forces are not necessary as a part of the reconversion process. As a matter of fact, they are most essentially a part of our civilian life. I am besieged on all sides by requests from our servicewomen that they be discharged. The progress which our Army and Navy is making toward their discharge is totally inadequate and, therefore, because of this apparent reluctance to speed up discharges of servicewomen, I have found it necessary to introduce this legislation. The hypothetical basis upon which servicewomen are being discharged today—approximately 1 servicewoman to every 10 servicemen—is a ridiculous formula and should be discontinued immediately.

Recent statistics show that there are about 75,000 Women's Reserves in the United States Navy, and approximately 70,000 Wacs in the United States Army. It is obvious that the rate of discharge since the end of the war has been too slow.

Mr. Speaker, many services now performed by women in the armed forces that are really needed can be carried on by women or men qualified under civil service. If any servicewomen want to continue in the jobs they now hold where such jobs are necessary, or if they want to qualify for other civil-service positions, they will have the advantage of veterans' preference for such positions, but they certainly will not be compelled to stay on the job as is now being done. I think there are a number of assignments held by servicewomen that are not now required since the war is over. For example, I do not think it is necessary to keep hundreds of women in service, namely, in Washington, whose chief responsibility is that of driving automobiles for Army officers. Now that hostilities have ceased, surely most of them can drive their own cars. If not, then there are plenty of ex-servicemen who will be glad to handle the job.

The bill which I have introduced provides that some of the Women's Reserves shall be retained in order to assist in work at hospitals and in connection with the discharge of servicemen at separation centers. I believe that these activities are most vital at the present time, and with respect to them the Army and Navy should not be placed under any handicap whatsoever. However, after such important work is completed, I will further advocate that servicewomen so engaged shall be discharged at the earliest possible date.

The dictatorship governments of the world regimented their womanhood into their military machines. During wartime it might have been necessary for us to follow such procedure. I shall, however, actively oppose a national policy of the United States, if such proposal is submitted, which provides for the retention of servicewomen as a part of our military machine in time of peace.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ISLAND OF RHODE ISLAND PROPOSED AS IDEAL FOR PERMANENT HOME OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about a cite for the permanent home for the United Nations Organization. The committee which will recommend a definite site is now meeting in London. It is not yet known for a certainty that the permanent home of this great hope of mankind will be located in the United States. However, a national publication in which many of us have a great deal of confidence, on Monday of this week, expressed the belief that the committee would recommend that the permanent home of the United Nations Organization be located on the eastern coast of the United States. This expression of opinion leads me to tell you about the ideal spot for locating this great international organization.

I am aware of the efforts being made by officials of Boston, Philadelphia and other cities to bring the headquarters of the United Nations Organization to the United States. I know these cities are sincere in their offers to provide a home for the great organization whose purpose is permanent peace among all men. I am confident that all these cities, although fervent in their hope that they will be permitted to provide a haven for UNO, are more concerned with providing for this great institution the best that is available. For that reason I suggest that it would be far more purposeful of Boston, Philadelphia, and the other cities on the eastern seaboard if the officials of these cities would lend their support to the suggestion which I have already made—that the permanent home of the United Nations Organization be located on the "Isle of Peace."

The very name of this beautiful isle suggests that here mankind's great hope could find the atmosphere in which to do its best work. The Organization would commence its deliberations under the most magnificent of auspices. Nature and history combine to provide an enthusiasm which will help in great measure to enable the representatives of peoples all over the world to work out a formula that will provide for us, for our children and our children's children, an era of peace and prosperity, an era marked by the cooperation of all peoples, an era which will prove that it is possible for man to live with his brother, an era which will witness the outlawing of armed aggression as an instrument of national policy.

Such an era is a lot to expect. It sounds like a dream of utopia. It can be had if we are willing to strive hard enough to achieve it. The success or failure of our efforts in that respect will be determined in a large measure by the men and women who will come here to represent the various peoples of the earth when the United Nations Organization has become a real fact—when it is set up and operating in the home which it is to have for its deliberations.

Because there is to be so great a reliance on the deliberations of these national representatives, it is no more than fitting that we provide for their work the very best we have to offer.

For this reason I ask your support of my suggestion that the permanent home of the UNO be established on the Isle of Peace. Here there is all the beauty of Mother Nature coupled with historical tradition which will fortify any man in his fight for real democracy. Taking up arms for freedom long before 1776, the early settlers of the Isle of Peace struck the blows which echoed throughout the Colonies and resulted in the later establishment of the Continental Congress. Bloody battles were fought on this Isle of Peace, bloody battles which foretold

the courage and bravery of the Minute Men of Cambridge and their brothers throughout the Colonies in America's first fight for freedom and democracy.

The Isle of Peace was early recognized as a haven for the members of all religion. First visited by the Vikings who left their monuments which still stand as evidence of this island's relations with the rest of the world, the Isle of Peace has provided refuge for the oppressed of many lands.

Her lush green fields inviting rest and recreation; the blue waters of the Atlantic providing at once the soothing tranquillity of the sea and a challenge to all men brave enough to go down to the sea and fight her storms, the Isle of Peace possesses beauty to be found nowhere else in America.

Here there are miles of ocean front where the mighty—and sometimes violent—Atlantic batters at the granite cliffs which serve as a shield along part of Newport shore line. Here are deep, quiet harbors where vessels, from cabin cruisers to the largest carrier or battleship afloat can find a safe anchorage.

Here are the most beautiful beaches on the eastern shore to provide relaxation and surcease from the cares of the day. Here is the cliff walk, extending for 10 miles along the very edge of the sea. Here are mile after mile of beautiful country lanes and roads inviting every visitor to explore the magnificent features of an island which cannot be duplicated anywhere in the world.

This beautiful land was called the Isle of Aquidneck by the Narragansett Indians. Its name means peace. By early English navigators, overcome by its beauty, it was called the Island of Rhodes and from this island the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations takes its name.

The first spot in the New World to pronounce and maintain religious liberty, Rhode Island was also the first spot in the New World to promulgate a bill of rights protecting individual liberty. As early as 1663 Rhode Island had obtained a charter, unique in the then known world, which provided as its purpose "that a most flourishing civil state might live and best be maintained with full liberty in religious concernments."

Here is a background of freedom and democracy which will serve as a splendid foundation upon which to build the future peace and security of the nations of this world. Here is the ideal environment wherein men and women dedicated to peace can work out the many and varied problems which will beset their paths. With a tradition rich in culture the island of Rhode Island offers to the United Nations Organization its best hope for complete success.

Permit me to explain very briefly why I believe this most beautiful spot is ideal for this purpose.

We can all agree that our United States is the ideal location. Then why the island of Rhode Island any more than another place? In brief, because the island of Rhode Island offers every facility which can be provided by other cities and areas in the country—and the island of Rhode Island has none of the disadvantages under which these other locations must suffer.

A short ride by automobile, boat, train, or plane from all the principal civic centers on the eastern coast and the Middle West—this beautiful island can provide the maximum of political and mercantile contacts, all manner of educational facilities, every form of entertainment, and yet it provides within itself the optimum of peace and tranquillity. Its climate has been characterized by Dr. Ellsworth Huntington, of Yale, as the best in the United States. The Boston Herald termed it better than California or the Riviera, and Dr. William C. Rives, of Washington in 1910 referred to the remarkable natural healthfulness of Newport's climate.

Newport has always been a great naval base. It has been proposed as the summer Capital of the United States. Scarcely any international figure has come to our country who has not enjoyed the cool breezes wafted in off the Atlantic to cool the hills and fields of Newport. It has been for several generations the summer playground of the United States. In the three winter months of the year the average temperature is not below 32°.

Millions have been spent in erecting elaborate estates. These mansions, which contain from 18 to 113 rooms, are now available to the United Nations Organization for offices, libraries, or living quarters. Several have already been tendered to the executive committee at London. In addition, there are acres and acres of land available for new buildings. Hence, there will be no need for delay while buildings are erected, while facilities are installed. In Newport, R. I., the United Nations Organization will find a progressive community, proud of its history, conscious of its obligations as host to this great international organization. There will be nothing lacking in Newport's endeavor to accommodate the men and women from all the great nations of the world. These representatives of other lands will find in Newport the exemplification of everything grand, everything fine. In short, they will find the ideal American city. They will learn at a glance why we Americans are so proud of our homeland.

I ask your assistance. We want the United Nations Organization in my Rhode Island. If this organization is to come to the United States I think you will want it housed in the finest spot in America. I am sure you would not want the organization encumbered and inconvenienced by all the handicaps it will find in the big cities—cities which lack adequate office space, adequate housing, adequate educational facilities, adequate recreational facilities even to care properly for their present populations. It is my sincere belief that you would prefer Newport for the United Nations Organization. We want each of you to come to Rhode Island. I hope you can come to our beautiful State to see what we have to offer to the United Nations Organization. I hope you will see this great international organization in operation in our State, then I know you will agree with the late Richard Washburn Child who said of Newport:

> Places have flavor. Some have a past. Some give forth a sense of permanence and peace—of creative yesterdays and a creative future. Some make life personal, so that all human beings are invested with an absorbing aliveness; in contrast to those where modern life has made cardboard figures of humanity. Newport is a place where persons are persons "on their own."
>
> The island geography and the Gulf Stream make the climate like Bermuda. Autumn lingers deliciously until the New Year's eggnog. We have the eternally whimsical sea and the over-luxuriant land. We sail, we fish, we swim, we play tennis. Folks drop in for tea, and the affairs of the Nation are discussed. Newport is so constantly and intimately in touch, through brains, American and foreign, with the world! And yet we do see the sky, and the mist, the rain, the garden, the rainbow and the sunset.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY (at the request of Mr. FOGARTY) was given permission to extend his remarks by including an address by Archbishop Cushing of Boston at the memorial mass of the One Hundred and First Infantry veterans at the Cathedral of the Holy Cross.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOEVEN, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1580. An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss; and

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a hearing at 10 a. m. on Thursday, December 6, 1945, on H. R. 4781, in room 1414, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will have an executive meeting on Thursday, December 6, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 446, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill, H. R. 4779, to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

854. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report (list No. 1) reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of two individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by his immediate predecessor, Attorney General Biddle, and a report (list No. 2) of the cases of 145 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 380. An act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3573. A bill for the relief of George Pathy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 4907. A bill to provide for the conveyance of Fort Brady, in Chippewa County, Mich., to the city of Sault Ste. Marie; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4908. A bill to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4909. A bill to provide for the discharge of members of the Women's Reserves of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution authorizing postage stamp commemorating the victorious defense of the island of Malta; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "Compensation for injury, death, or detention of employees of contractors with the United States outside the United States", as amended, for the purpose of making the 100-percent earning provisions effective as of January 1, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. REED of Illinois introduced a bill (H. R. 4910) for the relief of Harry G. Weaver; which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1372. By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Petition of 233 citizens of Anderson, Ind., urging passage of legislation directing the immediate release from the armed forces of all men and women who have had 2 years or more of active duty, and who have served any part of such period overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1373. Also petition of 131 members of the Farm Bureau Cooperative Association of Huntington, Ind., opposing universal military training in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1374. Also, petition of 33 residents of the community of Upland, Ind., opposing universal military training in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1375. Also, petition of 15 employees of the Highway Department of Grant County, Ind., opposing universal military training in peacetime; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1376. By Mr. HAVENNER: petition of Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic of Northern California, urging support of Senate Joint Resolution 50, which authorizes the acquisition of Temple Heights, Washington, D. C., for a recreation center for Government employees during the war and for erection of a Civil War memorial thereafter; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1377. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1378. Also, petition of Harry Bortin, Washington, D. C., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to revision of Senate Joint Resolution 69; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1379. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Daytona Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the granting of loans and credits by the Government of the United States to foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1380. Also, petition of Local 195, Journeymen Tailors' Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House Resolution 376; to the Committee on Rules.

1381. Also, petition of the Aluminum Co. of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their reply to the report of the Attorney General dated September 11, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, our Father, we give Thee thanks for the exceeding great inheritance by which the life of our generation has been enriched; yet we bewail with shuddering shame that the mastered and harnessed powers of nature which could lift mankind to the serene heights of the good life have been used to debase and destroy. We pray that with changed hearts those of the present, to whose hands the keys of the future have been entrusted, with a wisdom whose beginning is penitence, may use the knowledge now vouchsafed to the race as a sacred stewardship for all mankind. In a violent day when a molten earth is being poured into new moulds enable those who think and speak and act here as chosen servants of the Nation to continue steadily in the undaunted company of those who, having tasted of the power of a saner and fairer earth, can never be satisfied with the world as it is but who are patiently and steadfastly devoted to the world which is to be.

In the Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 5, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE — ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 693. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss;

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan;

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 1862. An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2518. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States;

H. R. 2930. An act for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll; and

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty King George VI.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 119)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, amounting to $1,200,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 120)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the United States Civil Service Commission, amounting to $1,600,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL (S. Doc. No. 121)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol, amounting to $19,000, fiscal year 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION—MEMORIAL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a memorial signed by 175 citizens of Winfield, Kans., remonstrating against peacetime military conscription until conditions of military camps have been made more satisfactory for intensive training. I ask unanimous consent to present the memorial and that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION TO CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

We, citizens, church groups, and clubs, of Winfield, Kans., do most earnestly petition Congress to do nothing hastily in passing this peacetime military conscription bill.

But should this conscription ever seem necessary, we are irrevocably opposed to it until Congress and the Army and Navy officials clean our camps and their surrounding territory, both here and abroad, from liquor (including beer), prostitution, and gambling. We know it can be done if Congressmen and military officials want it done.

The disgraceful conditions caused by allowing liquor and prostitution in our Army and Navy territories in Germany and Japan are appalling and not much better in our own country. We protest our 18-year-old boys being placed where such conditions exist.

Further, we suggest such training be given in high schools and colleges—with supplementary intensive training in clean summer camps.

RESOLUTIONS OF VERMONT STATE FARM BUREAU

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD certain of a large number of resolutions which were adopted at the annual meeting of the Vermont State Farm Bureau on November 9, 1945. I will indicate the numbers of the resolutions. They are numbered 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 19. I have marked them with a red check.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

10. We reaffirm our resolution of 1944 supporting the St. Lawrence seaway and Champlain cut-off.

12. Because we believe the work of the soil-conservation districts in Vermont is valuable, we favor the formation of more such districts to cover the State. Each district should own enough heavy equipment to take care of the farmers' needs. To this end surplus war machinery should be made available.

13. We urge that subsidy payment be continued on the 1945 level through June 30, 1946, when present authority terminates; after which time we propose that renewed subsidy legislation be available unless there be other adequate means to maintain a price sufficient to hold farm income in proper relation to our economy. Be it further resolved that the possibility of using direct pricing be fully explored.

14. Whereas the present parity formula no longer reflects a normal price relation between dairy and poultry products as compared with other farm products, and an obsolete parity formula has now been made the basis of a program of support price for farm products at 90-percent parity for a period of 2 years after the war, and if dairy prices sink to the support level, fluid milk at the farm would decline about 35 percent, we resolve that there is a need for revision of the parity formula to provide a more equitable basis for support price after the war on dairy and poultry products.

17. Because credit unions are a form of cooperative which provides a practical means of regular saving of money and of self-help credit for productive purposes, and because cooperatives can borrow money from credit unions for purposes of expanding the services they render and many cooperatives may want to enlarge their facilities during the near future, we ask the farm bureau to recommend to its members that they study the possibilities of credit unions and use them to the fullest possible extent.

19. To prevent postwar deflation and to insure permanence of price levels, we believe that the development of cooperatives and of a flexible controlled monetary system is essential, and we believe that those two factors would prevent inflation, deflation, and monopoly and would avoid the necessity of business and labor controls and of restricted production.

EXPORTATION OF TIRES—RESOLUTION OF BOTTINEAU COUNTY FARMERS' UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Alda Fraser with an accompanying resolution adopted by the Bottineau County Farmers' Union of North Dakota relative to the exportation of tires and requesting that Congress act to place the tires on the markets in the United States.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OMEMEE, N. DAK., *December 3, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution drawn up at board of directors' meeting of the Bottineau County Farmers Union.

Sincerely yours,

ALDA FRASER,
County Secretary.

Whereas the people of North Dakota find that even with a tire permit it is impossible to get a tire because of exportation of tires to foreign markets: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress act at once to place these tires on markets in the United States.

BOTTINEAU COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
ALDA FRASER, *Secretary,*
DUNCAN FRASER, *President.*

GARRISON DAM—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition in the form of a resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission relative to the Garrison Dam.

There being no objection, the petition in the form of a resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives in Congress, in passing the supplementary appropriation bill, placed the following limiting clause on the $2,000,000 item for the Garrison Dam in North Dakota: *"Provided*, That any dam constructed at the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir site shall not be operated at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level unless operation at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level subsequently is authorized by law, and no part of this appropriation shall be used to design or construct dikes or levies for operating such dam at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level"; and

Whereas the highest permitted level is thereby 1,830 feet and the operating level would have to be materially below this level to reserve room for floodwaters; and

Whereas such low level would greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control, and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir; and

Whereas the upstream storage of floodwaters would be reduced, part of which is needed for sustained down-river flow, and it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir that is necessary for a successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project; and

Whereas the Federal Government has established the Inter-Agency Basin Committee on which all departments of the Government having to do with the development of the Missouri River Basin are represented, and on which the people of the Basin are represented by the Governors of the States in the basin; and

Whereas all of the factors pertaining to the Garrison Dam were considered by said Inter-Agency Committee at a meeting in Omaha, Nebr., on August 16, 1945, at which all five members of the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, made up of the Governor and four appointed members, one from each quarter of the State, and three of whom have served for more than 7 years, were present; and

Whereas the Inter-Agency Committee, with the approval of the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, gave unanimous approval of the plan for the construction of the Garrison Dam as submitted to Congress without the limitation of the aforementioned clause attached by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the rights and protection of the property of the people in the Williston, N. Dak., area were fully considered and amply provided for; and

Whereas, in actual operation it should be only seldom and for short intervals that it would be necessary to operate the reservoir at the full 1,850-foot level, at which time the Williston area would be fully protected.

Now, therefcre, we urge Congress, and especially our North Dakota members in Congress, to delete before final passage the clause limiting the operating level of the Garrison Reservoir at 1,830 feet above sea level, and prohibiting the construction of dikes or levees to protect property when operating at a level higher than 1,830 feet.

In any development program of this kind we must expect some opposition from persons who, even when fully paid for their property, do not like to move or be disturbed. Their rights must be recognized and paid for or protected to the fullest extent, but the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission cannot let the whims of such individuals stand in the way of the greatest benefit to our State, nor should Congress let it stand in the way of the greatest benefit to the Missouri Basin.

Unanimously approved by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission November 30, 1945.

PETITION FOR RELEASE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, a petition signed by citizens of several different States addressed to the President and Congress and requesting immediate and unconditional release of all conscientious objectors.

There being no objection the petition was ordered to be printed without the signatures attached, in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION TO OUR PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS FOR THE IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF ALL CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

At this time, while our Government is condemning the individual within the Axis borders for his irresponsible submission to the militarists in his country, it is hardly consistent that our Government should be punishing individuals in our own country for exercising this discretion and judgment the lack of which is so strongly deplored in others. If the conscience of the individual is to be exercised freely, the conscientious objector must be freed from the threat of prison or the concentration camp. In the name of all the noble traditions of freedom in America, the tyranny of the state over the minds and convictions of our own people must be wiped out.

In agreement with the foregoing, we, the undersigned, respectfully petition that all conscientious objectors to conscription, regimentation, and war, now in prison, be freed immediately and unconditionally. We further recommend that the law under which such imprisonment is made possible be repealed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2321. A bill for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank; without amendment (Rept. No. 815).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 936. A bill for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 816);

H. R. 1976. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 817);

H. R. 2054. A bill for the relief of Rastus L. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 818); and

H. R. 2223. A bill for the relief of Catherine Bode; with an amendment (Rept. No. 819).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 820);

H. R. 2306. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper; without amendment (Rept. No. 821); and

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick; without amendment (Rept. No. 822).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2102. A bill for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi; without amendment (Rept. No. 823);

H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger; withcut amendment (Rept. No. 824); and

H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 825).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 683. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple; and for the relief of Marie Nepple; with amendments (Rept. No. 826);

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers; without amendment (Rept. No. 827);

H. R. 2401. A bill for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde; without amendment (Rept. No. 828);

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad; without amendment (Rept. No. 829);

H. R. 2746. A bill for the relief of Annarae Weiss; without amendment (Rept. No. 830);

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 831);

H. R. 3073. A bill for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 832);

H. R. 3273. A bill for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer; without amendment (Rept. No. 833);

H. R. 3574. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 834);

H. R. 3759. A bill to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 835); and

H. R. 3987. A bill for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh; without amendment (Rept. No. 836).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 837).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 1661, to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1662. A bill to authorize the presentation to Lt. Col. William J. Wilkins of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1663. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Edward Archdale;

S. 1664. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to the heirs of Pierre Gladeau;

S. 1665. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1666. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Leslie Warrior;

S. 1667. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to John W. Jones; and

S. 1668. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John Akers a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution favoring an international agreement abolishing compulsory universal peacetime military service; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946—AMENDMENT

Mr. EASTLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which was

referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following:

"SENATE

"Office of the Secretary:

"To enable the Secretary of the Senate to expend from the appropriation for 'Salaries of officers and employees of the Senate,' fiscal year 1946, the necessary amount to increase from $2,460 per annum to $2,700 per annum, beginning January 7, 1946, the salary of the special officer attached to his office, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, hereby is amended accordingly."

VOLUNTARY PORT SECURITY FORCES AND COAST GUARD AUXILIARY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1613) extending certain recognition and rights to members of the Voluntary Port Security Forces and members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary who were enrolled as temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment and Mr. MAGNUSON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes.

This bill is designed to carry out the recommendations contained in the President's message of December 3, 1945. It provides for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate and report upon certain labor disputes which vitally affect the national public interest, in cases where such disputes have not yielded to settlement through mediation, conciliation, or voluntary arbitration. The bill does not purport to establish a comprehensive plan for the prevention of labor disputes or for settling them. It does seek to provide machinery, to be used only in certain cases vitally affecting the public interest, for making impartial investigations and impartial recommendations for the settlement of disputes. The parties would not be legally bound to accept the findings or follow the recommendations of the fact-finding boards, but the general public would know the facts and would have an adequate basis for forming an opinion as to the merits of the controversy.

The bill adopts the principles underlying one of the chief features of the Railway Labor Act; that is, the provision for the appointment of emergency boards. Unlike the Railway Labor Act, the bill does not undertake to prescribe or regulate the procedures to be followed by employers and employees in negotiations concerning changes in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions. The Railway Labor Act provides that at least 30 days' notice shall be given of any intended change in agreements affecting rates of pay, rules, or working conditions. It requires that such changes shall not be made, except by agreement between the parties, until after conferences have been held by the representatives of the employers and employees, and the National Mediation Board has had an opportunity to attempt to bring the parties to agreement or to induce the parties to submit their dispute to arbitration. If a dispute between a carrier and its employees is not settled by means of the foregoing processes, and if such dispute in the judgment of the Board of Mediation threatens substantially to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, the Board of Mediation is required, under the Railway Labor Act, to notify the President, who may thereupon, in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute. The report of the board is to be made to the President within 30 days from the date of its creation. After the creation of the board and for 30 days after it has made its report, no change, except by agreement, may be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

It is this last-mentioned feature of the Railway Labor Act, relating to emergency boards, which is similar to the proposal contained in this bill. The bill leaves negotiations between the parties and efforts toward mediation and conciliation to be governed by existing procedures and laws, but, like the Railway Labor Act, it provides a further step which may be taken when other efforts have failed. As in the case of the emergency boards appointed under the Railway Labor Act, the parties to the dispute would be required to continue their work and operations during the deliberations of the fact-finding boards and for a brief period thereafter. However, the period is not so long as that prescribed by the Railway Labor Act.

EXPLANATION BY SECTIONS

The first section of the bill contains a short title for the act.

Section 2 provides for the certification to the President, by the Secretary of Labor, of labor disputes for which fact-finding boards may be appointed. The Secretary of Labor is directed to certify a dispute to the President when he finds that the agencies of the Government charged with the functions of mediation and conciliation have been unable to bring the parties to the dispute to an agreement and have been unable to induce them voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration and that a stoppage of work seriously affecting the national public interest and affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or the national defense, or commerce within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States, has resulted or threatens to result from such dispute. Such certifications are to be published in the Federal Register and are to designate the parties to the dispute. Whenever a question arises concerning the representation of the employees involved in the dispute, such representatives are to be determined by the National Labor Relations Board in the manner provided in section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act.

Section 3 provides for the appointment of fact-finding boards and defines their powers and duties. The President is authorized to appoint a fact-finding board at any time within 5 days after a dispute has been certified to him by the Secretary of Labor. The President is not required to appoint a board in any case, but may do so in his discretion. The board is to be composed of three or more persons, none of whom has any pecuniary or other private interest in the employers or employees who are parties to the dispute. The board is required to make a thorough investigation of the dispute, giving the parties to the dispute a full and fair hearing. The board must submit its report to the President within 20 days after its appointment, unless the time is extended by agreement of the parties, with the approval of the President. The report is to contain the findings of fact made by the board and such recommendations as it deems appropriate.

Subsection (b) of this section makes the provisions of section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act, relating to the investigatory powers of the National Labor Relations Board, applicable with respect to fact-finding boards appointed under this act. That section provides for the administration of oaths, requiring the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and provides that agencies of the Government shall furnish information in their possession.

Subsection (c) provides that the board may prescribe rules and regulations and provides that members shall receive compensation at such rate, not exceeding $100 a day, as may be fixed by the President, together with their necessary expenses.

Subsection (d) provides that the Secretary of Labor shall provide stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and necessary facilities, services, and supplies for the fact-finding boards. This subsection also provides that when a fact-finding board has made its report the board shall be dissolved and its records shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

Section 4 provides that when the Secretary of Labor has certified a dispute to the President under section 2, the parties to the dispute must continue work and operations, or if a work stoppage has already occurred must resume work and operations, and must continue such work and operations during the period of 5 days within which the President is authorized to appoint a fact-finding board. In any case in which the President does appoint such a board within the 5-day period, the parties must continue work and operations until the board makes its report and for 5 days thereafter. During the period that work and operations are continued under this section, they are to be governed by the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect immediately prior

to the beginning of the dispute, except that such terms and conditions may be changed by agreement between the parties. This subsection also makes it unlawful to interfere with or prevent work or operations during such period by lock-out, strike, or otherwise.

Subsection (b) of section 4 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; and that no court shall issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent. This provision is similar to one contained in the Railway Labor Act.

Section 5 exempts disputes subject to the Railway Labor Act from the provisions of this bill.

Section 6 authorizes an appropriation of sums necessary for carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1661) to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Labor Fact-Finding Boards Act."

CERTIFICATION OF DISPUTES

SEC. 2. Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds—

(1) that there is a labor dispute in which the agencies of the Government charged with the functions of mediation and conciliation have been unable to bring the parties to agreement and have been unable to induce the parties voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration; and

(2) that a stoppage of work seriously affecting the national public interest and affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or the national defense, or commerce within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States, has resulted or threatens to result from such dispute;

the Secretary shall certify such findings to the President. Any such certification of the Secretary shall be published in the Federal Register and shall designate the employer or employers involved in such dispute, the groups or units of employees involved in such dispute, and the representative or representatives of such employees. The employers, employees, and representatives so designated shall, for the purposes of this act, be regarded as the parties to the dispute. Whenever a question arises concerning the representation of such employees, the Secretary of Labor may request the National Labor Relations Board to certify to him the names of the representatives of such employees; and such Board shall determine the names of such representatives in the manner provided in section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act and shall certify such names to the Secretary.

FACT-FINDING BOARDS

SEC. 3. (a) At any time within 5 days after the date of such certification by the Secretary of Labor, the President, in his discretion, may appoint a board to investigate such labor dispute and to make a report containing its findings of fact and recommendations with respect to such dispute. Such board shall be composed of three or more persons, none of whom has any pecuniary or other private interest in the employers or employees who are parties to the dispute. The board shall proceed expeditiously to make a thorough investigation of all facts which it deems relevant to the dispute. The board shall give the parties to the dispute a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by their representatives. Within 20 days after the date of its appointment, the board shall submit to the President a report containing its findings of fact and such recommendations concerning the dispute as the board deems appropriate. The time for submitting the report of the board may be extended by agreement of the parties, or their representatives, with the approval of the President. Any agreement extending such time shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) The provisions of section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act (relating to the investigatory powers of the National Labor Relations Board) shall be applicable with respect to any board appointed under this section, and its members and agents, and with respect to the exercise of their functions, in the same manner that such provisions are applicable with respect to the National Labor Relations Board and the powers vested in it by sections 9 and 10 of the National Labor Relations Act.

(c) Any board appointed under this section may prescribe or adopt such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to govern its procedures and the exercise of its functions. Each of the members of such board shall receive compensation at such rate, not exceeding $100 a day, as may be fixed by the President, and shall receive his necessary travel and other expenses incurred in connection with the work of the board. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of Labor.

(d) The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the board to perform its functions. When a board appointed under this section has made its report, the board shall be dissolved and its records shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

WAITING PERIOD

SEC. 4. (a) During the period of 5 days following the date on which the Secretary of Labor makes a certification to the President under section 2 with respect to a labor dispute, and, if a board is appointed under section 3 to make an investigation concerning such dispute, during the period beginning when such board is appointed and ending 5 days after the date on which it submits its report—

(1) the parties to such dispute shall continue or resume work and operations under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect immediately prior to the beginning of such dispute, except that such terms and conditions may be changed by agreement between the parties; and

(2) it shall be unlawful for any person to coerce, institgate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere with or prevent such work or operations by lock-out, strike, or otherwise, or to aid any such lock-out, or strike or other means of interfering with or preventing such work or operations by giving direction or guidance, or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike or other benefits to those participating therein.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render labor or service without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor or service by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be applicable with respect to any labor dispute subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. Such appropriations as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since the bill is patterned from some of the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, it might be of interest to the Congress and to the public for me to submit for the RECORD a short summary of the procedure resorted to in recent months to settle railway disputes, and also to make as part of my remarks a brief synopsis of the individual railroads and air carriers, and employees involved, with resultant conclusions reached in each case. It will be most interesting and encouraging to note that practically all cases were amicably settled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the following:

First. Executive Order 9172, establishing a panel for the creation of emergency boards for the adjustment of railway labor disputes.

Second. Procedure under the Railway Labor Act.

Third. Information concerning emergency boards set up under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945.

Fourth. Summary of panel emergency boards designated and reporting to the President under Executive Order No. 9172.

Fifth. Emergency boards created under section 10, Railway Labor Act, which considered disputes on a Nation-wide basis.

Sixth. Emergency boards appointed from the National Railway Labor Panel to investigate disputes, national in scope, between railroad carriers and organizations of their employees.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9172—ESTABLISHING A PANEL FOR THE CREATION OF EMERGENCY BOARDS FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR DISPUTES

Whereas section 5 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (ch. 8, title 45, U. S. C.) provides that for a period of 30 days after mediatory efforts of the National Mediation Board have failed to settle a dispute "no change shall be made in the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions or established practices in effect prior to the time the dispute arose"; and

Whereas duly designated and authorized representatives of employees may, during this 30-day period, take a strike vote and fix a date for the strike to become effective; and

Whereas section 10 of the said Railway Labor Act requires the National Mediation Board to notify the President if an unadjusted dispute threatens, in its judgment,

substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation service, and provides that upon receipt of such notification the President may, in his discretion, create a board to investigate and report respecting such dispute; and

Whereas the national interest demands that for the effective prosecution of the war there shall be no strike votes taken, or dates fixed for the beginning of strikes, or strikes, lock-outs, embargoes put into effect, which would affect the transportation industry covered by the Railway Labor Act.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the Statutes of the United States, and in order to adjust the policies and procedures under the said act to the requirements of the war emergency, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. There is hereby created, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, a National Railway Labor Panel of nine members, hereinafter referred to as the Panel, to be appointed by the President, and to be qualified as to membership thereon in the same manner as provided in section 10 of the Railway Labor Act for membership on emergency boards. The President shall designate a chairman from the members of the Panel and shall fill vacancies thereon as they may occur. The Chairman of the Panel shall receive such compensation, together with necessary traveling expenses, as the President may prescribe. The members of the Panel shall receive necessary travel expenses and subsistence expenses or per diem allowances in lieu thereof on such days as they are actually engaged in performance of duties pursuant to this order.

2. Whenever a dispute between a carrier or carriers and its or their employees concerning changes in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, or whenever any other dispute not referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, is not adjusted or settled under the provisions of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Railway Labor Act, the duly designated and authorized representatives of employees involved in such dispute may, prior to notice by the National Mediation Board to the President of a threatened interruption to commerce, notify the Chairman of the Panel of the failure of the parties to adjust the dispute and of their desire to avoid the taking of a strike vote and the setting of a strike date. If, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Panel, the dispute is such that if unadjusted, even in the absence of a strike vote, it may interfere with the prosecution of the war, he may thereupon select three members of the Panel to serve as an emergency board to investigate such dispute and to report thereon to the President. Subject to the provisions of section 10, such board shall have exclusive and final jurisdiction of the dispute and shall make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute.

3. The National Mediation Board shall furnish the Panel stenographic, investigative, and such other facilities as may be necessary; and within the limits of the funds provided, and upon the certification of the Chairman of the Panel, shall make such other disbursements as are necessary to effectuate this order.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 22, 1942.*

PROCEDURE UNDER THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Section 5, first, of the Railway Labor Act, amended, defines the functions of the National Mediation Board with respect to the mediation of disputes between carriers and employees in any of the following situations:

(a) A dispute concerning changes in rates of pay, rules, or working conditions not adjusted by the parties in conference.

(b) Any other dispute not referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board and not adjusted in conference between the parties or where conferences are refused.

(c) The National Mediation Board may proffer its services in case any labor emergency is found by it to exist at any time.

Cases under paragraphs (a) and (b) above are customarily referred to the Board through applications filed by either the carrier or employees. In any of the above three situations, the National Mediation Board is required to use its best efforts through mediation to bring the parties to agreement. If such efforts are not successful, the Board shall immediately endeavor, as its final required action under the law, to induce the parties to submit the controversy to arbitration. Such arbitration, if agreed to by the parties, is conducted under the provisions of sections 7 and 9 of the Railway Labor Act, amended.

Section 9 provides that the award of an arbitration board when filed in the clerk's office of the district court designated in the arbitration agreement, shall be final and conclusive on the parties, subject only to impeachment on the grounds that the award was not confined to the stipulations in the agreement to arbitrate or that any member of the arbitration board was guilty of fraud or corruption.

If either of the parties to a dispute are unwilling to submit the question to arbitration (which is not mandatory under the law), the National Mediation Board concludes its mediatory efforts in the dispute.

Section 5, first (b), of the law provides that if arbitration shall be refused by one or both parties, the Board shall at once notify both of them in writing that its mediatory efforts have failed and for 30 days thereafter, unless in the intervening period the parties agree to arbitration or an emergency board is created under section 10 of the act, no change shall be made in the rates of pay, rules, or working conditions or established practices in effect prior to the time the dispute arose.

If a situation arises where either party to a dispute declines arbitration and the labor organization threatens to withdraw its membership from the carrier's service and such withdrawal in the judgment of the National Mediation Board threatens substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to such a degree as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services, the Mediation Board notifies the President who may thereupon in his discretion create an emergency board under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act to investigate and report on the dispute. Emergency boards are created separately in each instance. The law requires them to investigate the dispute promptly and report to the President thereon within 30 days from the date of its creation unless this date is extended by mutual agreement and the approval of the President.

After the creation of the emergency board and for 30 days after the board has made its report to the President, no change, except by agreement, shall be made by the parties to the controversy in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

It will be noted from the above that two so-called cooling-off periods are provided in disputes handled under the Railway Labor Act, the first being the 30 days after formal notification to the parties by the Board that its mediatory efforts have failed, and the second, the period of time elapsing from the date of creation of the emergency board to the date of 30 days after the rendition of its report to the President.

There are no penalties provided under the Railway Labor Act if the organization should break either one of these cooling-off periods by calling a strike pending recommendations from an emergency board. The theory of the Railway Labor Act is that the force of public opinion will be sufficient to induce both parties to a dispute handled under it to observe these provisions of the law.

During the war time emergency provision was made under Executive Order No. 9172 for the creation of emergency boards for the consideration of such matters from the national railway labor panel upon application by labor organizations to the chairman of the panel without the necessity of taking strike ballots.

NOVEMBER 28, 1945.

INFORMATION CONCERNING EMERGENCY BOARDS SET UP UNDER SECTION 10 OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1945

Fifteen emergency boards were set up under section 10 during that period, as follows:

1. Union Railway of Memphis: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Dispute involved application of an adjustment board award. Emergency board was created September 19, 1944, and reported to the President September 29, 1944. A settlement was effected between the parties through the efforts of the emergency board.

2. Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Emergency board was created September 19, 1944, and reported to the President October 4, 1944. Dispute involved rates of pay. Recommendation of emergency board was rejected by the organizations and their membership went on strike lasting from November 10 to November 25, 1944, both inclusive. On the latter date the organizations agreed to accept the recommendation of the emergency board and the employees returned to work.

3. Bingham & Garfield Railway: Organization involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. Emergency board was created November 14, 1944, and reported to the President November 25, 1944. Dispute involved employment of fireman or second man on electric locomotives. Report of the emergency board was adverse to contentions of the organization, which rejected the recommendation and set a strike date. The road was taken over by the United States Government during December 1944, and it is understood that it has been recently returned to the owners. There was no change in working conditions during the period of Federal control.

4. Steelton & Highspire Railroad: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Emergency board was created December 12, 1944, and reported to the President December 30, 1944. Dispute involved rules. Recommendation of the emergency board was accepted by the organizations.

5. Seaboard Air Line Railway: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Emergency board was created December 15, 1944, and reported to the President January 17, 1945. Dispute involved right to the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen to represent engineers in reinstatement cases without consent of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Recommendation of the emergency board was accepted by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and placed in effect by carrier.

6. Kentucky & Indiana Terminal Railway: Organization involved, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Emergency board was created February 6, 1945, and reported to the President February 20, 1945. Dispute involved various grievances and time claims. The emergency board's recommendations were accepted by the employees.

7. Central of Georgia Railway: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Order of Railway Conductors. Emergency board was created February 8, 1945, and reported to the President February 24, 1945. Dispute involved various rules

and grievances. A settlement was effected between the parties by the mediatory efforts of the board members.

8. Des Moines & Central Iowa Railroad: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Dispute involved requests for increased wages and vacation rule. Emergency board was created March 7, 1945, and reported to the President March 28, 1945. A settlement was reached between the parties at the conclusion of the emergency board hearings.

9. Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and Switchmen's Union of North America. Dispute involved requests for various rules, none of which have been handled in mediation and also numerous grievances involving interpretation of adjustment board awards and other matters. The emergency board was created March 8, 1945, and reported to the President March 29, 1945. Its recommendations were accepted by the organizations and the carrier.

10. Missouri Pacific Railroad: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Dispute involved rules, grievances, and time claims. The emergency board was created April 7, 1945, and reported to the President May 5, 1945. Its recommendations were accepted by the organizations.

11. Colorado & Wyoming Railway: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Dispute involved requested wage increases and vacation rule. The emergency board was created May 18, 1945, and reported to the President June 7, 1945. Although its report was adverse to the positions of the organizations, nothing further has been heard from them on the subject.

12. River Terminal Railway: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Dispute involved grievances and time claims. Emergency board was created May 22, 1945, and reported to the President June 13, 1945. Its recommendations were accepted by the parties.

13. Illinois Central Railroad: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Dispute involved representation rules and various grievances. The emergency board was created May 24, 1945, and reported to the President July 24, 1945. Its report was rejected by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, which organization set a strike date, and the road was taken over by the Government.

14. Georgia & Florida Railway: Organizations involved, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Dispute involved request for standard southeastern wage scale for trainmen and enginemen. Emergency board was created June 16, 1945, and reported to the President July 7, 1945. Its recommendation for an increase of 4 cents per hour was rejected by the organizations and the men went on strike August 7. A direct settlement was made on the basis of an increase of 5 cents per hour and the men returned to work August 24, 1945.

15. Erie Railroad: Organization involved, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Dispute involved various rules and application of certain adjustment board awards. Emergency board was created June 28, 1945, and reported to the President July 18, 1945. As its recommendations were favorable to the organization, the report was accepted.

Summary of panel emergency boards designated and reporting to the President under Executive Order No. 9172, during fiscal year 1945 (July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945)

Date created	Parties involved	Issues in dispute	Date of report to President	Acceptance or rejection of report by parties
Dec. 6, 1944	Pacific Electric Ry. versus Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.	Wages	Dec. 29, 1944	Accepted.
Dec. 26, 1944	Lake Terminal R. R. versus Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.	Negotiation of agreement	Jan. 13, 1945	Do.
Jan. 15, 1945	Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. R. versus Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.	Rules and wages	Feb. 13, 1945	Do.
Do	Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. R. versus Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen.	Wages	do	Do.
Jan. 25, 1945	Texas Electric Ry. versus Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.	Negotiation of agreement	Feb. 24, 1945	Differences resolved through mediation efforts of panel board.
Jan. 26, 1945	Railway Express Agency versus Brotherhood of Teamsters.	Equalization of wages	Feb. 18, 1945	Accepted.
Feb. 24, 1945	Eastern Air Lines versus International Association of Machinists.	Review of panel chairman's denial of collectively bargained wage increases.	Mar. 16, 1945	Do.
Feb. 28, 1945	Pullman Co. versus Order Railway Conductors	Wages, hours, and rules	Apr. 23, 1945	Do.
Mar. 8, 1945	Sacramento Northern Ry. versus Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.	Wages and rules	Apr. 4, 1945	Do.
Do	Southern Pacific Ry. versus Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.	Extensive Rule Changes	July 12, 1945	Recommendations generally unsatisfactory to employees, but accepted.
Mar. 29, 1945	Atlantic Coast Line versus Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.	Rules	Apr. 14, 1945	Carrier rejected part of recommendations.
Apr. 25, 1945	American Airlines, Northwest Airlines, Braniff Airways, and air-line communication employees.	Review of panel chairman's denial of collectively bargained wage increases.	July 18, 1945	Stabilization Director approved wage increases.
May 18, 1945	Pan American Airways and International Association of Machinists.	do	do	Do.
May 22, 1945	Missouri Pacific R. R. versus Train Dispatchers Association.	Rules	June 22, 1945	Most issues resolved through mediation efforts of panel board.
Do	Wabash Railroad versus Train Dispatchers Association.	do	June 19, 1945	Case withdrawn by union.
June 14, 1945	Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis versus Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.	Wage reduction	June 21, 1945	Dispute composed by parties with aid of panel board.

EMERGENCY BOARDS CREATED UNDER SECTION 10, RAILWAY LABOR ACT, WHICH CONSIDERED DISPUTES ON A NATION-WIDE BASIS

1. An emergency board was created by the President's proclamation dated September 27, 1938, consisting of Walter P. Stacy, Chairman, James M. Landis, and Harry A. Millis, to consider a dispute between a joint conference committee representing practically all the principal rail carriers in the United States and 18 railroad labor organizations which represented practically all organized employees on these carriers.

The subject of the dispute was a proposal made by the carrier to place in effect a horizontal wage reduction of 15 percent for all railroad employees as of October 1, 1938. The emergency board recommended that no decrease in the wages of railroad employees be made at that time, and the recommendations were accepted by the carriers.

2. An emergency board was created by the President July 10, 1940, consisting of John P. Devaney, Chairman, Dexter M. Keezer, and Harry A. Millis, to consider a dispute between the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees and the Railway Express Agency, Inc. Since the operations of the express agency are Nation-wide, this dispute involved employees of the agency at a large number of points over the country.

The subject of the dispute was a request on the part of the Brotherhood for a reduction in the work week for all employees represented by the organization from 48 to 44 hours without reduction in weekly pay. A similar reduction had previously been placed in effect for Railway Express Agency employees represented by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America.

The emergency board recommended that the workweek for employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks be reduced without reduction in compensation on the same basis as for employees represented by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. These recommendations were made effective by the carrier as of October 1, 1940.

3. An emergency board was created by the President on September 10, 1941, consisting of five members, namely, Wayne L. Morse, Chairman; Thomas R. Powell; Joseph Willits; James C. Bonbright; and Houston Thompson. This board was created to consider a dispute between the various railroad labor organizations representing practically all organized employees on the rail carriers and conference committees representing the principal rail carriers of the United States.

The subject of the dispute was a request of the employees to increase rates of pay which had been countered by proposals from the carriers to revise certain rules and reduce wages. After extended hearings, the emergency board submitted its report to the President on November 5, 1941, recommending certain increases for the employees. These recommendations, while acceptable to the carriers, were rejected by the employee organizations. The train and engine service organizations voted to strike, effective December 7, 1941. The organizations representing the nonoperating railroad employees, while they did not set a strike date, announced that the recommended wage increases were insufficient. The President, after conferring with representatives of the disputing parties, reconvened the emergency board on November 27, 1941. The reconvened board offered its mediation services to the parties, which offer was accepted, and after a series of mediation conferences, the emergency board reported to the President on December 1, 1941, that a basis for settling the dispute had been agreed upon and the threatened national railway strike had been averted. Subsequently mediation agreements were signed between the carriers and

the organizations representing the employees placing the terms of the settlement in effect.

EMERGENCY BOARDS APPOINTED FROM THE NATIONAL RAILWAY LABOR PANEL TO INVESTIGATE DISPUTES, NATIONAL IN SCOPE, BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND ORGANIZATIONS OF THEIR EMPLOYEES

Since the issuance of Executive Order 9172 on May 22, 1942, creating a National Railway Labor Fanel, there have been three outstanding national dispute cases investigated by emergency boards appointed from the panel. A brief account of the establishment of these boards, the issues involved in the disputes, and the events subsequent to the report of the boards to the President is presented below:

1. REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE EMERGENCY BOARD APPOINTED FEBRUARY 20, 1943, FILED MAY 21, 1943

This dispute involved practically all the large railroads of the United States and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. The dispute concerned wage rates of engineers and firemen with special attention to rates for Diesel electric and electric locomotives together with questions involving the number of employees who should be assigned to the operation of Diesel equipment. The recommendations of the Emergency Board were regarded as unsatisfactory by the employees and, at the request of the President of the United States, the parties negotiated further with respect to the issues in dispute and reached an agreement substantially in accord with the major recommendations of the Emergency Board.

2. REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE EMERGENCY BOARD APPOINTED FEBRUARY 20, 1943, FILED MAY 24, 1943

This dispute involved approximately 1,000,000 nonoperating railway employees and virtually all the railroads in the United States, as well as the Railway Express Agency and several refrigerator-car and stockyard companies. The employees, represent by 15 railway labor organizations, filed requests for a wage increase of 20 cents an hour and a union shop. The emergency board in its report denied the request for a union shop as contrary to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. With respect to wages the emergency board recommended an increase of 8 cents per hour. Accepted by the employees, this recommendation was disapproved by the Director of Economic Stabilization, who offered certain suggestions for a possible solution. The case was considered further by a special board appointed by the President, which made recommendations concurring with the views of the Director of Economic Stabilization. These recommendations were considered inadequate by the employees. The case remained deadlocked and following unsuccessful conferences with the President of the United States, the President, in the face of an imminent strike threat on the part of both the nonoperating employees and the operating employees in another case referred to below, ordered the Federal control of the railroads. Agreement was reached between the parties January 17, 1944, and the carriers were returned to private control January 18, 1944.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE EMERGENCY BOARD APPOINTED MAY 31, 1943, FILED SEPTEMBER 25, 1943

This dispute, involving operating employees, may be considered as a companion case to the nonoperating controversy referred to above. The five train and engine-service labor organizations, representing these crafts of employees on virtually all the railroads of the country, had served requests for an increase of 30 percent or a minimum of $3 per day. The emergency board recommended an increase of 4 cents per hour or 32 cents per day under the so-called Little Steel formula. This recommendation was approved by the Director of Economic Stabilization but was rejected by the employees. A strike vote followed and a strike date was set for late December 1943. The President of the United States intervened and offered to arbitrate the issues. Two of the organizations accepted the President's offer to arbitrate and three raised certain objections to the arbitration procedure. As a result the President, faced with a strike situation involving certain operating employees as well as the nonoperating employees, ordered Federal control of the carriers effective December 27, 1943. Agreement was reached with the three operating unions, which had declined the President's offer to arbitrate, on January 14, 1944, which agreement was approved by the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do hope the committee to which the bill has been referred will proceed to have hearings as soon as possible because legislation of this character is necessary at this time.

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY RESPECTING THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY—LETTER FROM W. STUART SYMINGTON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from W. Stuart Symington, Administrator of Surplus Property, addressed to L. M. Brile, president, Fairmont Aluminum Co., Fairmont, W. Va., dated November 20, 1945, stating the policy of the Government respecting the aluminum industry, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I inserted in the RECORD a letter I had written to Assistant Secretary of State W. L. Clayton, concerning the $390,000,000 loan made by RFC to the British Government in July 1941.

The conditions of the loan are so basically important to the fundamental philosophy of free enterprise in this country that I desire to discuss the matter further.

In 1941 the British were desperately in need of dollar exchange in the United States. In order to secure the loan the British Government expropriated securities of representative American companies owned by British citizens and nationals, paying for them in sterling. In this way, the British Government became a substantial or controlling owner of the stock of a large number of American companies. Four types of securities were involved:

Listed stocks and securities of 83 large representative American companies. I desire to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of the companies showing the British Government ownership.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Securities of other corporations (consisting principally of listed securities)

Stock	Number of shares—	
	Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
Allied Stores Corp., cumulative preferred	35,000	None
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., common	19,000	19,000
Amerada Petroleum Corp., common	133,000	133,000
American & Foreign Power, $7, first cumulative preferred	100,000	100,000
American Locomotive, cumulative preferred	4,800	4,800
American Locomotive, common	----------	8,400
American News Co., capital	10,000	10,000
American Rolling Mills, common	133,000	133,000
American Smelting & Refining Co., common	56,000	56,000
American Sugar Refining Co., cumulative preferred	4,000	4,000
American Telephone & Telegraph, capital	70,000	70,000
American Tobacco Co., B common, nonvoting	34,000	34,000
Arkansas Power & Light $7 cumulative preferred	6,000	3,975
Barnsdall Oil Co., common	50,000	50,000
Briggs Manufacturing Co., capital	34,800	34,800
Chrysler Corp., common	36,000	36,000
Columbia Gas & Electric, 6-percent cumulative preferred, series A	19,000	19,000
C. I. T. Financial Corp., common	59,000	59,000
Commonwealth & Southern, $6 cumulative preferred	50,000	50,000
Consolidated Gas Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore, common	11,000	11,000
Continental Baking Co., 8-percent cumulative preferred	12,000	None
Eastman Kodak Co., common	57,000	57,000
Electric Power & Light Corp., $6 cumulative preferred	15,000	15,000
Flintkote Co., common	27,000	27,000
First National Bank of City of New York, capital	1,300	1,300
General American Transportation Co., common	10,000	10,000
General Motors Corp., common	434,000	434,000
Gillette Safety Razor Co., $5 dividend cumulative convertible preferred	30,000	30,000
W. T. Grant Co., common	11,800	23,600
Great Northern Railway Co., $6 preferred	44,000	44,000
Ingersoll-Rand Co., common	54,000	54,000
Loew's Inc., common	34,000	102,000
P. Lorillard Co., common	12,500	12,500
Marlin-Rockwell Corp., common capital	7,000	7,000
McGraw Electric Co., common	20,700	20,700
Monsanto Chemical Co., common	53,000	53,000
National Biscuit Co., common	60,000	60,000
New York Air Brake Co., Co., common	8,500	8,500
Oxford Paper Co., $5 cumulative preference	25,000	25,000
Public Service Corp. of New Jersey, common	24,000	24,000
Radio Corp. of America, common	177,000	177,000
Radio Corp. of America, $3.50 cumulative convertible first preferred	8,000	8,000
St. Joseph Lead Co., common	10,000	10,000
Sears, Roebuck & Co., capital	47,000	47,000
Servel Inc., common	30,000	30,000
Shell Union Oil Co., common	900,000	900,000
Simmons Co., common	17,500	17,500
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., capital	130,000	130,000
Standard Brands, common	170,000	42,500
Standard Oil (Indiana), capital	315,000	315,000

Securities of other corporations (consisting principally of listed securities)—Con.

Stock	Number of shares— Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
Sterling Drug, Inc., common	36,000	72,000
Timken Roller Bearing Co., common	19,000	19,000
Tri Continental Corp., $6 cumulative preferred	30,000	30,000
United Shoe Machinery Corp., common	15,000	15,000
U. S. Steel Corp., cumulative preferred	21,000	21,000
Vick Chemical Co., capital	10,000	10,000
Westinghouse Air Brake Co., capital	40,000	40,000
Wheeling Steel Corp., $5 cumulative convertible prior preferred	7,000	7,000
F. W. Woolworth Co., capital	247,000	247,000
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., common	75,000	75,000
Celanese Corp. of America, 7 percent cumulative prior preferred	52,519	None
Celanese Corp. of America, 7 percent cumulative second preferred	45,783	45,783
Celanese Corp. of America, common	321,135	335,096 112⅝/1680
Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., $3 cumulative convertible preference	32,978	32,978
Climax Molybdenum Co., common	89,995	89,995
Congoleum-Nairn Inc., common	299,181	299,181
Dividend Shares, Inc., capital	3,655,550	3,655,550
W. R. Grace & Co., 8 percent A cumulative preferred	4,700	3,676
W. R. Grace & Co., 8 percent noncumulative B preferred	4,160	3,667
W. R. Grace & Co., 6 percent cumulative preferred	3,400	2,885
W. R. Grace & Co., common	26,400	52,452
Great Northern Iron Ore, trustees certificates of beneficial interest	79,132	79,132
International Paper Co., 5 percent cumulative convertible preferred	53,334	53,334
John Morrell & Co., capital	57,000	51,294
Pure Oil Co., 5 percent cumulative convertible preferred	8,693	8,693
Singer Manufacturing Co., capital	74,173	73,701
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), capital	198,002	198,002
Consolidated Natural Gas Co., capital	----------	19,80(
U. S. & International Securities, $5 cumulative first preferred	29,988	29,488

Securities other than stock	Amount Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
American & Foreign Power, 5-percent gold debentures	$2,750,000	$2,750,000
Cities Service Power & Light Co., 5½ percent gold debentures due 1952	250,000	None
Cities Service, 5-percent convertible gold debentures	1,237,600	1,237,600
Virginian Corp., collateral trust 5-percent serial note series M	1,974,000	1,474,000

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, 66 unlisted stocks and securities in which the British Government is a substantial or controlling owner. I desire at this point in my remarks to have inserted in the RECORD a list of the companies and the securities involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Securities of corporations in which British ownership is substantial or controlling

Stock	Number of shares— Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
U. S. Potash, 6-percent preferred	615	None
U. S. Potash, common	262,480	162,480
Delta & Pine Land Co., capital	2,976	2,976
Delta Planning Co., common	3,434	None
Linen Thread Co., capital	60,000	60,000
Yardley of London, 4½-percent preferred	30,595	30,595
Yardley of London, common	87,247	130,870½
Harry Ferguson, Inc., A common	6,000	6,000
Harry Ferguson, Inc., B common	1,500	1,500
R. T. French Co., capital	35,000	35,000
Atlantis Sales Corp., capital	50	50
Oldbury Electro-Chemical Co., capital	8,400	8,400
Lea & Perrins, Inc., A stock common	2,107	2,107
Lea & Perrins, Inc., B stock common	5	5
Arkwright Finishing Co., capital	7,000	7,000
Interlaken Mills, capital	19,969	19,969
Distillers Co., Ltd., capital	850,250	850,250
Morganite Brush Co., Inc., capital	7,500	7,500
B. Priestley & Co., Inc., capital	2,500	2,500
Firth-Sterling Steel Co., 7-percent cumulative preferred	2,532	None
Firth-Sterling Steel Co., common	40,752	None
Keasbey & Mattison, capital	20,140	20,140
Funch Edye & Co., capital	12,000	20,000
Twenty-Five Broadway Corp., capital	11,300	11,300
Baker Perkins Inc., 7-percent cumulative preferred	1,049	None
Baker Perkins Inc., common	64,696	64,696
Pacific Molasses Co., Ltd., capital	3,750	37,500
A. J. White, Ltd., capital	500	500
Menley & James, Ltd., capital	1,550	1,550
Hecht, Levis & Kahn, Inc., capital	4,000	4,000
Crown Mills, Inc., 7-percent cumulative preferred	5,000	None
Crown Mills, Inc., capital	9,997	None
F. W. Berk & Co., Inc., capital	100	100
American Association Inc., capital	151,844	151,844
Mica Insulator Co., capital	5,359	5,359
C. Tennant Sons & Co., of N. Y., capital	7,164	2,139
American Thread Co., 5-percent cumulative preferred	427,477	381,674
American Thread Co., common	1,197,375	1,197,375
Joseph Tetley & Co., Inc., 8-percent cumulative preferred	4,580	4,580
Joseph Tetley & Co., Inc., common	4,000	4,000
Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co., 8-percent cumulative first preferred	610	610
Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co., 8-percent noncumulative second preferred	31,600	31,600
Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co., common	197,334	197,334
J. & P. Coates (R. I.) Inc., capital	144,991	144,991
Clark Thread Co., capital	179,991	179,991
Clark Thread Co. of Georgia, capital	18,605	18,605
North Georgia Processing Co., Inc., capital	800	800
Stowell-MacGregor Corp., common	4,399	4,399
Spool Cotton Co., Inc., capital	2,491	2,491
Jonas Brook & Bros. (U. S. A.), capital	92	92
Dentist Supply Co. of N. Y., common	100,765	100,765
F. W. Cook Co., capital	1,005	1,005
Norma Hoffman Bearings Corp., 6 percent cumulative preferred	7,029	7,029
Norma Hoffman Bearings Corp., common	90,000	90,000
Ensign-Bickford Co., common	10,779	10,779
Okonite-Callendar Cable, 6 percent noncumulative preferred	1,000	1,000
Okonite-Callendar Cable, common capital	7,495	7,495
Pembroke Chemical Corp., capital	255	255
Josiah Wedgewood & Sons, B capital	440	440
Josiah Wedgewood & Sons, A capital	300	300

Securities other than stock	Amount Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
Delta & Pine Land Co., first mortgage bonds	$3,000,000.00	$2,687,633.12
Delta & Pine Land Co., demand note	1,800,000.00	1,689,731.00
American Association, Inc., 5-percent second mortgage B income debentures	1,420,250.00	1,420,250.00
Assignment of Fine Cotton Spinners and Doublers Association, of money due from Delta & Pine Land Co. of Mississippi	1,926,000.00	1,926,000.00
Assignment from Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., of money due from Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp.	26,347,350.40	26,097,350.40
Okonite-Callendar Cable Co., first mortgage, 5-percent debentures	275,000.00	75,000.00

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the capital stock of 40 British-owned United States insurance companies. At this point in my remarks I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a list of these insurance companies; and

An assignment of earnings of the United States branches of 41 British insurance companies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

British-owned shares of United States insurance companies

Stock	Number of shares Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
American & Foreign Insurance Co	14,900	14,900
Capital Fire Insurance Co. of California	9,955	9,955
Eagle Indemnity Co	19,905	19,905
Federal Union Insurance Co	9,925	9,925
Globe Indemnity Co	24,875	24,875
Newark Fire Insurance Co	398,436	398,436
Queen Insurance Co. of America	49,885	49,885
Royal Indemnity Co	24,914	24,914
Seaboard Insurance Co	5,935	5,935
Star Insurance Co. of America	9,935	9,935
American Central Insurance Co	19,985¼	19,985¼
California Insurance Co	24,945	24,945
Columbia Casualty Co	9,996	9,996
Commercial Union Fire Insurance Co. of New York	9,837½	9,837½
Commonwealth Insurance Co. of New York	9,935	9,935
Homeland Insurance Co. of America	9,935	9,935
Mercantile Insurance Co	9,935	9,935
Pennsylvania Fire Insurance Co	9,955	9,955
Columbia Insurance Co. of New York	9,935	9,935
Imperial Assurance Co	9,120	9,120
Phoenix Indemnity Co	11,000	20,000
United Fireman's Insurance Co. of Philadelphia	37,950¾	37,950¾
Potomac Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia	7,990	7,990
Orient Insurance Co	9,955	9,955
Safeguard Insurance Co	7,405	7,405
Eureka-Security Fire & Marine Insurance Co	199,994	199,994
Monarch Fire Insurance Co	102,154	102,154
Sun Indemnity Co. of New York	8,360	8,360
Sun Underwriters Co. of New York	5,935	5,935
American Union Insurance Co	9,935	9,935

British-owned shares of United States insurance companies—Continued

Stock	Number of shares	
	Originally pledged	Held on Oct. 31, 1945
Central Union Insurance Co.	4,955	4,955
Provident Fire Insurance Co.	18,200	18,200
Manhattan Fire & Marine Insurance Co.	2,425	2,425
Seaboard Fire & Marine Insurance Co.	39,394	39,394
Yorkshire Indemnity Co.	4,500	4,500
Eagle Fire Co. of New York	99,325 84/1000	99,325 84/1000
Norwich Union Indemnity Co.	5,000	5,000
Albany Insurance Co.	16,870	16,870
Prudential Insurance Co. of Great Britian in New York	5,926	5,926
Caledonian-American Insurance Co.	2,955	2,955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the information just furnished by the Senator mean that the British control these companies, or merely own stock in them?

Mr. MOORE. In some instances, they own a controlling interest in them.

The present market value of these securities held by RFC is in the order of $775,000,000. The net balance remaining due on the loan after crediting accumulated reserve income is $242,925,058. Thus, the British Government has a dollar equity in these securities of over a half billion dollars.

If we are going to loan the British Government three and one-half or four billion dollars, it is certainly proper and, in fact, we shall be derelict if we do not insist that the RFC loan be liquidated and the amount sought to be borrowed by the British Government be reduced by the equity of the British in these American securities. Common, ordinary business principles demand such action.

First. The British badly need dollar exchange in the United States. Liquidation of the loan will give them over half a billion dollar credit.

Second. Sound business policy requires that the proposed large British loan be cut to the economic minimum in order that we may be relieved of carrying any greater burden than that required by the economic necessities of the situation. A majority of the American people will favor a loan to the British Empire made on this basis, but to go farther than that will incur the just denunciation of the public officials responsible for the negotiations.

Third. Liquidation of the RFC loan will result in divesting the British Empire of this large ownership in American private enterprise. Government ownership of private enterprise by any government, including our own, is repulsive to our philosophy of government. No one would condone the ownership of these securities by the Government of the United States. Why then, should not we take whatever legitimate steps at our command to divest the British Government of such ownership? The presently proposed loan to the British Government affords the opportunity for this action. If the RFC loan is not liquidated now, then there can be no reasonable expectation that the British Government will relinquish these profitable investments in American private enterprise at any time in the near future. Let us be realistic enough to understand that the British people have chosen national socialism as their form of government. They are at the moment engaged in the nationalization of the British financial and industrial systems. The ownership of these American securities by the British Government is wholly in line with a socialistic philosophy.

Large concentrated ownership of voting shares, such as these holdings of the British Government, many times is the balance of power that represents actual corporate control. Industry management recognizes these possibilities and justifiably is disturbed by this encroachment of government ownership.

No better time could be found to liquidate these securities than at present. The stock market is high. The British Government is in a position to reap more than 50-percent profit on the appreciated value of these securities that will avail them badly needed American dollars.

In most cases, the blocks of shares owned by the British Government can be absorbed by the stock market without depressing prices. In cases where the quantity of shares held might have a depressive effect if dumped on the market, I am confident such transactions could readily be negotiated through American banking houses without disturbing the stability of the market.

It is my understanding that a tentative agreement concerning the terms of the loan was reached yesterday between the negotiators of the respective countries. If the proposed terms do not include a provision for the disposal of the American securities owned by the British Government and a liquidation of the RFC loan, then I urge upon the Congress the extreme importance of insisting upon such condition.

SIGNING OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATION CONTROL ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD.

Mr BYRD. Mr. President, in company with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and Representatives WILLIAM WHITTINGTON and FRANCIS CASE with whom I was associated in sponsoring the legislation, I have just returned from the White House where we witnessed the signing of the Government Corporation Control Act by President Truman.

In connection with this occasion, I ask leave to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement which I send to the desk at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Through this act Congress, after almost 10 years of effort, gains financial control over nearly a half-hundred Government corporations and their numerous subsidiaries whose independence of any control in the past has caused them to be regarded as "a great fourth branch of government."

Commenting previously on the Byrd-Butler bill, as the Senate version of the measure was known, President Truman said:

"I heartily favor this proposal. It is a long delayed, forward step applying the sound doctrine of an executive budget, as enacted in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, to the many important Government corporations which have since come upon the scene."

Objectives of the legislation were indorsed also by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General, and the Director of the Budget.

The law, following recommendations by Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, provides for congressional fiscal control over corporations in which the Federal Government has invested more than $13,000,000,000, which have more than $20,000,000,000 of gross assets including interagency items, and which are empowered directly to obligate the credit of the Government to $33,000,000,000 and this may be pyramided many times.

The control is to be achieved through congressional action on business-type budgets for the corporations to be included in the President's Annual Budget and through action on commercial-type audits and reports to Congress by the Comptroller General. The law provides further that the Secretary of the Treasury shall approve financing and Government security transactions by the corporations and their depositaries. Creation of additional Government corporations without action by Congress is prohibited, and those now operating under State charters are required to dissolve or liquidate, subject to reincorporation by act of Congress. The budget provisions apply only to wholly owned Government corporations, but the Audit and Treasury provisions apply also to the mixed-ownership corporations in which part of the capital stock is owned by the United States and part by borrowers or other private holders. Most of the corporations previously were not subject to Government audit.

Use of the Government corporations for carrying on Government functions was settled constitutionally many years ago, but little use was made of them until World War I. Many of the first wartime corporations were liquidated quickly after the war ended, but they mushroomed again during the depression period, and the number was multiplied many times during the recent war. The growth and independence of these corporations with authority to obligate the Government's credit was causing concern as far back as 1936, when certain of them were prohibited from incurring obligations for administrative expenses except pursuant to specific annual appropriations. Since then it has been increasingly recognized that some means was necessary to coordinate the financial programs of the corporations with that of the Government as a whole and that they should be subjected to some control. The situation was made a subject for study by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and as a result of its findings the Whittington-Case bill was introduced in the House of Representatives and the Byrd-Butler bill was introduced in the Senate.

The broad fields of activites in which these corporations are engaged will be recognized from the list of them:

WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Commodity Credit Corporation.
Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
Production Credit Corporations.
Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations.
Farmers Home Corporation.
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Defense Plant Corporation.
Defense Supplies Corporation.
Metals Reserve Company.
Rubber Reserve Company.
War Damage Corporation.
Federal National Mortgage Association.
The RFC Mortgage Company.
Disaster Loan Corporation.
Inland Waterways Corporation.
Warrior River Terminal Company.
The Virgin Islands Company.
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated.
United States Spruce Production Corporation.
Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
Institute of Inter-American Transportation.
Inter-American Educational Foundation, Incorporated.
Inter-American Navigation Corporation.
Prencinradio, Incorporated.
Cargoes, Incorporated.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Petroleum Reserves Corporation.
Rubber Development Corporation.
U. S. Commercial Company.
Smaller War Plants Corporation.
Federal Public Housing Authority (United States Housing Authority).
Defense Homes Corporation.
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
United States Housing Corporation.
Panama Railroad Company.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated.

MIXED-OWNERSHIP GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Central Bank for Cooperatives.
Regional Banks for Cooperatives.
Federal Land Banks.
Federal Home Loan Banks.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement and to report on the progress of voluntary enlistments in the Army. I am advised this morning that between the dates of November 15 and November 21, 46,024 men volunteered for enlistment in the Army of the United States. That is at a rate of 7,670 each day.

The Senate will recall that on November 30 I reported to the Senate the figure given me by the War Department respecting voluntary enlistments. At that time we were told that in the month of September 12,000 volunteered in the Army, and in the month of October 65,000 volunteered in the Army, and that between November 1 and November 15 81,094 volunteered. I call this matter to the attention of the Senate today so that Senators may know that rapid progress is being made under the Voluntary Enlistment Act, and that the Senate should act upon that information.

On Tuesday last I called up for action in the Military Affairs Committee, Senate Joint Resolution 116, which provides for the stopping of the drafting of fathers, and further provides that any man with a child or children may assign that as a ground for application for discharge from the armed services. I regret to state that the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate refused to report favorably that resolution. I state at this time that it is my hope that before the Senate adjourns for the Christmas holidays, I may be able to bring that joint resolution to the floor of the Senate.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government is the unfinished business.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, in line with the understanding of yesterday, and by the courtesy of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] who is in charge of the bill which is the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called ship-sales bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Maryland propose to ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so the Senate may take up for consideration the bill which he has in charge?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. I make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) It is necessary for the national security and development and maintenance of the domestic and the export and import foreign commerce of the United States that the United States have an efficient and adequate American-owned merchant marine (1) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times; (2) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (3) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; (4) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel; and (5) supplemental by efficient American-owned facilities for shipbuilding and ship repair, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and to facilitate the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operations.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term—

(a) "Commission" means the United States Maritime Commission.

(b) "War-built vessel" means an ocean-going vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more, owned by the United States and suitable for commercial use—

(1) which was constructed or contracted for by or for the account of the Commission during the period, beginning January 1, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945; or

(2) which, having been constructed during the period beginning September 3, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945, was acquired by the Commission or the War Shipping Administration during such period.

(c) "Prewar domestic cost," as applied to any type of vessel, means the amount determined by the Commission, and published by the Commission in the Federal Register, to be the amount for which a standard vessel of such type could have been constructed (without its national defense features) in the United States under normal conditions relating to labor, materials, and other elements of cost, obtaining on or about January 1, 1941. In no case shall the prewar domestic cost of any type of vessel be considered to be greater than 80 percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of the same type.

(d) "Statutory sales price," as applied to a particular vessel, means, in the case of a dry-cargo vessel, an amount equal to 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost of that type of vessel, and in the case of a tanker, such term means an amount equal to 60 percent of the prewar domestic cost of a tanker of that type, such amount in each case being adjusted as follows:

(1) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel is not in class, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the cost of putting the vessel in class.

(2) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel lacks desirable features which are incorporated in the standard vessel used for the purpose of determining prewar domestic cost, and that the statutory sales price (unadjusted) would be lower if the standard vessel had also lacked such features, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the amount of such resulting difference in statutory sales price.

(3) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel contains desirable features which are not incorporated in the standard vessel used for the purpose of determining prewar domestic cost, and that the statutory sales price (unadjusted) would be higher if the standard vessel had also contained such features, there shall be added the amount estimated by the Commission as the amount of such resulting difference in statutory sales price.

(4) There shall be subtracted, as representing normal depreciation, an amount computed by applying to the statutory sales price (determined without regard to this paragraph) the rate of 5 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date of the original delivery of the vessel by its builder and ending with the date of sale or charter to the applicant in question, and there shall also be subtracted an amount computed by applying to the statutory sales price (determined without regard to this paragraph) such rate not in excess of 3 percent per annum in the case of a vessel other than a tanker, and not in excess of 4 percent per annum in the case of a tanker, for such period or periods of war service as the Commission determines will make reasonable allowance for excessive wear and tear by reason of war service which cannot be or has not been otherwise compensated for under this subsection.

No adjustment, except in respect of passenger vessels constructed before January 1, 1941, shall be made under this act which will result in a statutory sales price which (1) in the case of dry-cargo vessels (except Liberty type vessels) will be less than 35 percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of the same type, (2) in the case of any Liberty type vessel will be less than 31½ percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of such type, or (3) in the case of a tanker will be less than 42 percent of the domestic war cost of tankers of the same type. For the purposes of this act all Liberty vessels shall be considered to be vessels of one and the same type.

(e) "Domestic war cost" as applied to any type of vessel means the average construction cost (without national-defense features) as determined by the Commission, of vessels of such type delivered during the calendar year 1944, except in case of any type of vessel the principal deliveries of which were made other than in the calendar year 1944, there shall be used in lieu of such year 1944 such period of not less than six consecutive calendar months as the Commission shall find to be most representative of war production costs of such type.

(f) "Cessation of hostilities" means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, or the date so specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, whichever is the earlier.

(g) "Citizen of the United States" includes a corporation, partnership, or association only if it is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended. The term "affiliated interest" as used in sections 9 and 10 of this act includes any person affiliated or associated with a citizen applicant for benefits under this act who the Commission, pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed hereunder, determines should be so included in order to carry out the policy and purposes of this act.

SALES OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO CITIZENS

SEC. 4. (a) Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, at the statutory sales price. If the Commission determines that the applicant possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable him to operate and maintain the vessel under normal competitive conditions, and that such sale will aid in carrying out the policies of this act, the Commission shall sell such vessel to the applicant at the statutory sales price.

(b) At the time of sale, the purchaser shall pay to the Commission at least 25 percent of the statutory sales price. The balance of the statutory sales price shall be payable in not more than 20 equal annual installments, with interest on the portion of the statutory sales price remaining unpaid at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, or shall be payable under such other amortization provisions which permit the purchaser to accelerate payment of the unpaid balance as the Commission deems satisfactory. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance with interest shall be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessel sold.

(c) The contract of sale, and the mortgage given to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the purchase price, shall not restrict the lawful or proper use or operation of the vessel.

CHARTER OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO CITIZENS

SEC. 5. (a) Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to charter a war-built dry-cargo vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, for bare-boat use. The Commission may, in its discretion, either reject or approve the application, but shall not so approve unless in its opinion the chartering of such vessel to the applicant would be consistent with the policies of this act.

(b) The charter hire for any vessel chartered under the provisions of this section shall be fixed by the Commission at such rate as the Commission determines to be consistent with the policies of this act, but, except upon the affirmative vote of not less than four members of the Commisison, such rate shall not be less than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price (computed as of the date of charter). Except in the case of vessels having passenger accommodations for not less than 80 passengers, rates of charter hire fixed by the Commission on any war-built vessel which differ from the rate specified in this subsection shall not be less than the prevailing world-market charter rates for similar vessels for similar use as determined by the Commission.

(c) The provisions of sections 708, 709, 710, 712, and 713, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable to charters made under this section.

SALE OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO PERSONS NOT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Any person not a citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel (other than a P–2 type or other passenger type and other than a bulk dry-cargo Liberty type), under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission. If the Commission determines—

(1) that the applicant has the financial resources, ability, and experience necessary to enable him to fulfill all obligations with respect to payment of any deferred portion of the purchase price, and that sale of the vessel to him would not be inconsistent with any policy of the United States in permitting foreign sales under section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended; and

(2) after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, that such vessel is not necessary to the defense of the United States; and

(3) that such vessel is not necessary to the promotion and maintenance of an American merchant marine described in section 2; and

(4) that for a reasonable period of time, which in the case of tankers and "C" type vessels shall not end before 90 days after publication of the applicable prewar domestic cost in the Federal Register under subsection 3 (c) of this act such vessel has been available for sale at the statutory sales price to citizens of the United States, or for charter under section 5 to citizens of the United States, and that no responsible offer has been made by a citizen of the United States to purchase or charter such vessel;

Then the Commission is authorized to approve the application and sell such vessel to the applicant at not less than the statutory sales price. Notwithstanding paragraph (4) of this subsection, not to exceed 10 "C" type vessels, except C–3's, may be sold to noncitizens at any time after such date of publication at not less than the statutory sales price.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States, except in accordance with subsection (a), or upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States, but where the vessel so sold is being transferred to foreign registry and flag, the mortgage securing the unpaid balance of the purchase price and interest thereon shall contain provisions according to such mortgage the priorities over other liens and encumbrances accorded such mortgages on merchant vessels under the laws of such registry and flag.

ORDER OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 7. (a) In exercising its powers under this act and under other provisions of law with respect to the sale and charter of war-built vessels, the Commission shall give preference to citizen applicants over noncitizen applicants, and as between citizen applicants to purchase and citizen applicants to charter, shall, so far as practicable and consistent with the policies of this act, give preference to citizen applicants to purchase. In determining the order of preference between citizen applicants to purchase or between citizen applicants to charter, the Commission shall consider, among other relevant factors, the extent to which losses and requisitions of the applicant's prewar tonnage have been overcome and shall in all cases, in the sale and charter of a war-built vessel, give preference in such sale or charter, as the case may be, to the former owner of such vessel, or to the person for whom the vessel was constructed but to whom delivery thereof was prevented by the United States. In determining the order of preference between noncitizen applicants to purchase, the Commission shall consider the extent to which losses in prewar tonnage of the various member nations of the United Nations, incurred in the interests of the war effort, have been overcome, and the relative effects of such losses upon the national economy of such member nations.

(b) After the cessation of hostilities, operation of vessels in commercial service by the United States, either for its own account or through operating agents under agency agreements, shall, except as specifically authorized by law, be continued only to the extent necessary to effect orderly transfer of vessels to private operation.

EXCHANGE OF VESSELS

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission is authorized to acquire, in exchange for an allowance of a credit on the purchase of any war-built vessel under section 4 or any vessel acquired through exchange under subsection (d) of this section—

(1) Any vessel owned by a citizen of the United States, other than a vessel purchased under this act; or

(2) Any vessel owned by a foreign corporation, if—

(A) the vessel was constructed in the United States, and has, after December 7, 1941, been chartered to, or otherwise taken for use by, the United States; and

(B) the controlling interest in such corporation is, at the time of acquisition of such vessel hereunder, owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States, and has been so owned for a period of at least 3 years immediately prior to such acquisition; and

(C) such corporation agrees that the war-built vessel purchased with the use of such credit shall be owned by such citizen or citizens and shall be documented under the laws of the United States.

Such allowance shall not be applied upon the cash payment required under section 4. A war-built vessel shall be deemed a new vessel for the purpose of section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and section 510 (e) of such act shall be applicable with respect to vessels exchanged under this section to the same extent as applicable to obsolete vessels exchanged under section 510 of such act.

(b) (1) If, within 90 days after the publication of the applicable prewar domestic cost in the Federal Register under section 3 (c) of this act, the owner of a vessel eligible for exchange under subsection (a) makes a firm offer binding for at least 90 days, to transfer the vessel to the Commission in exchange for an allowance of credit provided in subsection (a), the amount of such allowance shall be the fair and reasonable value of the vessel as determined by the Commission under this section. In making such determination the Commission shall consider: (A) The value of the vessel determined in accordance with the standards of valuation established pursuant to Executive Order 9387 (8 F.R. 14105) as of the date of such offer, (B) any liability of the United States for repair and restoration of the vessel, (C) the utility value of the vessel, (D) the effect of this act upon the market value of such vessel, and (E) the public interest in promoting exchanges of vessels as a means of rehabilitating and modernizing the American merchant marine. In no event shall the amount of such allowance, in case of dry cargo vessels and tankers, exceed (A) (1) if the vessel or vessels tendered in exchange are of equal or greater dead-weight tonnage than the war-built vessel or vessels being acquired, 33⅓ percent of the statutory sales price (unadjusted) of the war-built vessel or vessels, or (2) if the vessel or vessels

tendered in exchange are of lesser dead-weight tonnage than the war-built vessel or vessels, such proportionate part of 33⅓ percent of the statutory sales price (unadjusted) of such war-built vessel or vessels as the dead-weight tonnage of such vessel or vessels, tendered in exchange bear to the dead-weight tonnage of such war-built vessel or vessels, or (B) the liability of the United States in connection with the repair or restoration of such vessel under any charter to which the United States is a party, whichever is the higher. In the case of passenger vessels tendered in exchange, the amount of the allowance shall not exceed the percentages of statutory sales price computed under (A) (1) and (2) above by gross tons instead of dead-weight tons, or such liability for the repair or restoration of such passenger vessel, whichever is the higher. In any case where the vessel tendered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall not exceed the price paid the United States therefor plus the depreciated cost of any improvements thereon. No vessel may be exchanged under this section which pursuant to the terms of any charter with the United States has been restored to condition by the United States, or for the restoring of which pursuant to the terms of such charter a cash allowance has been made to the owner.

(2) If, after such offer is made, and prior to its acceptance, or prior to the acquisition of the vessel, by the Commission, the vessel is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, then in lieu of paying the owner any amount on account of such loss, the offer shall, for the purposes of subsection (a) and this subsection, be considered as having been accepted and the vessel as having been acquired by the Commission under subsection (a) immediately prior to such loss.

(c) The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer in complete or partial settlement of any claim against the United States (1) for just compensation upon requisition for title of any vessel, or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel which was acquired for use by the United States, but only to the extent such vessel is available for sale to the claimant.

(d) In the case of any vessel constructed in the United States after January 1, 1937, which has been taken by the United States for use in any manner, the Commission, if in its opinion the transfer would aid in carrying out the policies of this act, is authorized to transfer to the owner of such vessel another vessel which is deemed by the Commission to be of comparable type with adjustments for depreciation and difference in design or speed, and to the extent applicable, adjustments with respect to the retained vessel as provided for in section 9, and such other adjustments and terms and conditions, including transfer of mortgage obligations in favor of the United States binding upon the old vessel, as the Commission may prescribe.

ADJUSTMENT FOR PRIOR SALES TO CITIZENS

SEC. 9. (a) A citizen of the United States who on the date of the enactment of this act—

(1) owns a vessel which he purchased from the Commission prior to such date, and which was delivered by its builder after December 31, 1940; or

(2) is party to a contract with the Commission to purchase from the Commission a vessel, which has not yet been delivered to him; or

(3) owns a vessel on account of which a construction-differential subsidy was paid, or agreed to be paid, by the Commission under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and which was delivered by its builder after December 31, 1940; or

(4) is party to a contract with a shipbuilder for the construction for him of a vessel, which has not yet been delivered to him, and on account of which a construction-differential subsidy was agreed, prior to such date, to be paid by the Commission under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

shall, except as hereinafter provided, be entitled to an adjustment in the price of such vessel under this section if he makes application therefor, in such form and manner as the Commission may prescribe, within 60 days after the date of publication of the applicable prewar domestic costs in the Federal Register under section 3 (c) of this act. No adjustment shall be made under this section in respect of any vessel the contract for the construction of which was made after September 2, 1945, under the provisions of title V (including section 504) or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

(b) Such adjustment shall be made by crediting the amounts thereof against any mortgage indebtedness to the Commission with respect to such vessel (prorated over the unpaid installments thereof), and by refunding the balance, if any.

(c) The amount of the adjustment under this section shall be the excess of—

(1) the purchase price of such vessel, reduced by an amount representing both normal depreciation at the rate of 5 percent per annum from the date of delivery to the purchaser to the date of enactment of this act, and excessive wear and tear by reason of war service, at the same rate and for the same period as that used in computing the statutory sales price under paragraph 2, or in lieu thereof by the amount of any amortization applicable up to such date under section 23 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code if such amount is larger; over

(2) the statutory sales price of the vessel as of the date of the enactment of this act, determined as if the vessel were owned by the Commission, plus, in case a credit as part of the purchase price of the vessel was allowed for an obsolete vessel traded in under section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the excess, if any, of such credit above the value of such obsolete vessel determined by the Commission, as of the date of transfer thereof to the Commission, in accord with the standards of valuation in section 8 of this act.

For the purposes of paragraph (1), the purchase price of a vessel on account of which a construction differential subsidy was paid or agreed to be paid under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be the net cost of the vessel to the owner.

(d) An adjustment shall be made under this section only if there are included in the adjustment agreement provisions binding upon the citizen applicant and any affiliated interest to the effect that—

(1) the liability of the United States for use (exclusive of service, if any, required under the terms of the charter) of the vessel under any charter party made prior to the date of the enactment of this act shall be limited to 15 percent per annum of the adjusted purchase price: *Provided*, That any payments made to the Commission on the original purchase price of the vessel in excess of 33⅓ percent of the adjusted purchase price, and interest actually paid to the Commission on the amount of the price adjustment shall, at the option of the applicant, be credited against the amount of charter hire required to be refunded to the United States pursuant to the provisions of this subsection; and

(2) the liability of the United States under any such charter party for loss of the vessel shall be determined on the basis of the adjusted purchase price, depreciated to the date of loss at the rate of 5 percent per annum; and

(3) in the event the United States, prior to the termination of the existing national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, uses such vessel pursuant to a taking, or pursuant to a bare-boat charter made, on or after the date of the enactment of this act, the compensation to be paid to the purchaser, his receivers, and trustees, shall in no even be greater than 15 percent per annum of the adjusted purchase price; and

(4) if the applicant for an adjustment under this section has received payment or has a claim for payment on account of the loss or requisition for title of a vessel built subsequent to January 1, 1935, taking place since May 27, 1941, and before the date of enactment of this act, the payment or claim for payment on account of such loss or title requisition shall be redetermined or settled in an amount not to exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hands of the owner as of the date of loss or requisition, determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(e) (1) If an adjustment in the purchase price of a vessel is made under this section, the income and excess-profits taxes of the vessel owned under the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year within which the delivery of the vessel was made to the purchaser and for subsequent taxable years, shall be redetermined. For such purposes of redetermination, the vessel shall be considered as having been acquired at the adjusted purchase price, and the income and deductions attributable to such vessel shall be determined as if this section had been in effect on the date of such delivery.

(2) At the election of the taxpayer, any overpayment of tax resulting from the recomputation required under this subsection for any taxable year may, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, in lieu of being credited or refunded, be applied as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(f) Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall not apply with respect to (1) any vessel which is eligible for an adjustment under this section, or (2) any vessel described in clause (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (a) of this section, the contract for the construction of which is made after September 2, 1945, and prior to the date of enactment of this act.

LIMITATIONS ON ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS OF ACT

SEC. 10. No person shall be eligible to purchase or charter a war-built vessel under this act, or to receive an adjustment under section 9, unless such person makes an agreement with the Commission binding upon such person and any affiliated interest to the effect that the liability of the United States under any charter party or taking for use, made or effected prior to the date of the enactment of this act, for the loss, on or after such date of enactment and prior to September 3, 1947, of any vessel owned by such person and under charter to the United States (excluding a vessel with respect to which an application under section 9 can be made) shall be limited to an amount equal to just compensation as of the date of said loss, determined pursuant to existing law or such amount as may be mutually agreed upon subsequent to the date of the enactment of this act as just compensation under the provisions of existing law.

NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET

SEC. 11. (a) The Commission shall place in a national defense reserve (1) such vessels owned by it as, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, it deems should be retained for the national defense, and (2) all vessels owned by it on December 31, 1947, for the sale of which a contract has not been made by that

time, except those determined by the Commission to be of insufficient value for commercial and national defense purposes to warrant their maintenance and preservation, and except those vessels the contracts for the construction of which are made after September 2, 1945, under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. A vessel under charter on December 31, 1947 shall not be placed in the reserve until the termination of such charter. Unless otherwise provided for by law, all vessels placed in such reserve shall be preserved and maintained by the Commission for the purpose of national defense. A vessel placed in such reserve shall in no case be used for commercial operation, except that any such vessel may be used during any period in which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

(b) Any war-built vessel may be made available by the Commission to any State maintaining a marine school or nautical branch in accordance with the act of July 29, 1941 (Public Law 191, 77th Cong.; 55 Stat. 607).

REACQUISITION BY UNITED STATES

SEC. 12. There shall be included in every contract for the sale of a vessel under this act provisions binding on, and running with the title of, the vessel to the effect that in the event the United States, prior to the termination of the existing national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, or prior to the expiration of 5 years from the termination of such emergency, charters or takes such vessel for bare-boat use while owned by a citizen of the United States, the charter hire paid to the owner of the vessel, shall be at a rate in no event greater than 15 percent per annum of the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hands of such owner as of the date of such charter or taking, determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, and that in the event, prior to the termination of such emergency or prior to the expiration of such 5 years, such vessel, while owned by a citizen of the United States, is repurchased or requisitioned for title by the United States, or is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, the compensation paid to the owner of the vessel shall not exceed the adjusted basis of the vessel in the hands of such person as of the date of requisition or loss, determined under section 113 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. (a) The Commission is authorized to reconvert or restore for normal operation in commercial services, including removal of national defense or war-service features, any vessel authorized to be sold or chartered under this act. The Commission is authorized to make such replacements, alterations, or modifications with respect to any vessel authorized to be sold or chartered under this act, and to install therein such special features as may be necessary or advisable to make such vessel suitable for commercial operation on trade routes or services or comparable as to commercial utility to other such vessels of the same general type.

(b) The provisions of section 202 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 shall not apply to contracts of the Commission for or relating to construction of ships.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 883), no vessel sold or chartered by the Commission under this act to a citizen of the United States shall be prohibited from engaging in the coastwise trade of the United States while owned by or chartered to such citizen or citizen successors in interest merely because it was under foreign registry on or after May 27, 1941, and prior to its sale or charter under this act to such citizen, if it is otherwise entitled under the laws of the United States to engage in such trade.

(d) All moneys received by the Commission under this act shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. The provisions of sections 201 (d), 204 (b), 207, 209 (a), and 905 (c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall apply to all activities and functions which the Commission is authorized to perform under this act.

REPORTS

SEC. 14. The Commission shall on July 1, 1946, and every 6 months thereafter, make a report to Congress with respect to all activities and transactions under this act which have not been covered by any previous report.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 15. No contract of sale or of charter shall be made under this act after December 31, 1947.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, unless the Senator from Maryland objects.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; I do not object.

Mr. BREWSTER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Guffey	O'Daniel
Ball	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hart	Overton
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Russell
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stanfill
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taylor
Capehart	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Carville	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	McMahon	Wagner
Downey	Magnuson	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	White
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Mitchell	Willis
George	Moore	Wilson
Gerry	Murdock	Young
Gossett	Murray	
Green	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] have been excused. They are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, it is quite obvious that we now possess many oceangoing merchant ships which will not be needed in peacetimes. Similar in purpose, Senate bill 292 and House bill 3603 were introduced, designed for the purpose of making possible or at least facilitate the disposal of ships not likely necessary to the United States Government or its citizens in postwar days.

It was obvious, however, that the title given these bills "The Sale of Surplus Ships" was quite inadequate as a description of the aims and purposes of the bills and of the problems involved. It was apparent, also, that before we could decide what ships we should sell we had to consider various questions—for example, the history of our oceangoing shipping, the number of merchant-marine ships our Nation had owned at various times in our history, and especially at the beginning of this war. We also had to give consideration to the amount of shipping which other nations possessed before the war and now own, as well as to the present needs of our country and other countries. What was the amount of prewar shipping, and what would be our probable needs in postwar days? Naturally, many questions affecting important international trade were closely involved.

And so, before we could determine what would be our need in postwar days, we had to form some estimate as to what would be the shipping needs of the rest of the world and how they would probably be supplied. The entire field of international trade by water—past, present, and future—required study. The elimination of Germany, Japan, and to a large extent Italy, from oceangoing trade is making grave changes in the international shipping picture. How much of our own commerce did we carry in our own bottoms before the war and what percentage are we likely to carry in the future? How much of the trade of the foreign nations are we likely to handle in our ships? It is quite obvious that the World War just ended is leading to the most far-reaching readjustment of international trade, territorial alinements, and governmental authority generally which the world has ever experienced.

We have subsidized part of our shipping and some of it has operated without subsidies. The relations of the Federal Government with subsidized companies differ in many respects from its relations with unsubsidized companies. I will stop here for a comparison.

During the war we turned over to various members of the United Nations, usually under operations of Lend-Lease, a number of ships under charter at nominal charter rates. Approximately 600 of such vessels are now held by other nations. Of these Great Britain now has 405; Russia 120; Norway 24; China

3; Greece 17; Poland 6; Belgium 6; France 9; Chile 4; and the Netherlands 6.

On March 2, the return of these ships to us will be due unless we renew existing arrangements or make new ones. This situation involves questions of international relations and policy.

The basis for selling these ships prompts queries fully as complicated. For instance, we have already sold some ships and if we were under the terms of this bill to sell vessels on a basis totally different than that already employed, questions of inequality of treatment might easily arise.

Should we sell to foreign buyers or restrict our sales to our citizens? Should we sell only, or should we lease or charter; if so, under what conditions?

I have referred to only a few of the myriad of questions concerning our maritime policies which have to be settled before we can reach conclusions as which ships should be sold or otherwise disposed of.

I will not attempt here to trace the history of our national shipping policy, which has been fitful and on the whole very unsatisfactory. At various times we have possessed a merchant marine which carried a large percentage of our now international commerce by water, and also a very considerable part of that of the other nations of the world. For various reasons, resulting mainly from competitive difficulties growing out of our higher costs of construction, operation and the nature of our governmental regulations, our shipping facilities have again and again been allowed to dwindle and to fall almost into disuse. At the beginning of the First World War in Europe we were deprived to a considerable extent of the use of foreign ships as carriers of our international commerce, and our own facilities for that purpose were entirely inadequate. In 1944, the Second World War brought to us the realization that we were in a dangerous position because of an insufficient amount of shipping facilities available to us.

During the First World War the Federal Government began a shipbuilding program, pushing it as rapidly as seemed to be feasible.

Everyone knows that preparation for shipbuilding requires much time in acquiring, or at least developing, shipyards. Tooling requirements are heavy and slow of realization. Materials and skilled workers must be made available. So, in spite of our efforts we did not launch any new ships under our shipbuilding program until after the armistice. Fortunately, the ships of our allies were substantially adequate for the needs of ourselves and our allies in spite of the ravages caused by the submarine.

At the end of World War No. 1, we insisted most fervently and vigorously that we would never permit our shipping facilities again to become clearly inadequate to meet a similar emergency. As we know, we did not live up to that firm resolve. The result was that when conditions in Europe in 1936 threatened the peace of the world, we realized our repeated mistake and attempted to make amends. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 revived and revitalized the merchant marine and the shipyards, and as the world knows, ships were an indispensable factor in the death struggle with the Axis Powers.

I must not stop here to discuss the highly successful and efficient record of ship construction and operation under the skillful guidance of Admiral Land and his associates. Never before have so many ships been constructed by this Nation or any other Nation in the world in a similar period of time, and never has such worldwide service been carried out, not only in the interest of war commerce, but also in rendering direct assistance to the armed forces.

The United States, in its efforts to ward off defeat in that unprecedented gigantic and tragic struggle, built around 6,000 ships, aggregating nearly 58,000,000 dead-weight tons. Before the war the United States had about 11,500,000 tons, consisting quite largely of ships actually or greatly obsolete and, in any case, suffering gravely from obsolescence. It is estimated that the postwar tonnage will be around 95,000,000 tons, as compared with the 1939 world tonnage of about 75,000,000 tons. What will we need immediately after the war? Probably the postwar American merchant marine may employ 15,000,000 to 17,000,000 dead-weight tons. Some more optimistic persons say 20,000,000 tons. No one can really know at this time.

The House of Representatives for a year or more gave careful consideration to House bill 3603 and its predecessors. After the House of Representatives had made many changes in suggested drafts, House bill 3603 was passed. Meanwhile the Senate committee considered a similar bill, known as Senate bill 292. The chairman of the Commerce Committee, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], had referred the matter to a subcommittee of which I am chairman. My associate members are the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Our subcommittee held many hearings in regard to this proposed legislation, and numerous executive sessions followed, in which the subject matter was discussed at very considerable length. The subcommittee reported to the Commerce Committee a bill which, with a few changes, was adopted by the Commerce Committee last week unanimously, and I was directed by the Commerce Committee to report the bill to the floor of the Senate. So the matter is now before us for consideration.

There are two main objectives in this measure—(1) the establishment of a firm, pricing policy for the sale of war-built merchant merchant vessels; (2) the creation of an inactive merchant vessel reserve readily available for security needs, but frozen so far as commercial use is concerned.

At this point let me read the declaration of policy and some definitions as set forth in the bill as approved by the Commerce Committee, which struck out the text of the bill as it was passed by the House and inserted new text, as follows:

That this act may be cited as the "Merchant Ships Sales Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) It is necessary for the national security and development and maintenance of the domestic and the export and import foreign commerce of the United States that the United States have an efficient and adequate American-owned merchant marine (1) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times; (2) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (3) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; (4) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel; and (5) supplemented by efficient American-owned facilities for shipbuilding and ship repair, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and to facilitate the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operations.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term—

(a) "Commission" means the United States Maritime Commission.

(b) "War-built vessel" means an ocean-going vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more, owned by the United States and suitable for commercial use—

(1) which was constructed or contracted for by or for the account of the Commission during the period, beginning January 1, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945; or

(2) which, having been constructed during the period beginning September 3, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945, was acquired by the Commission or the War Shipping Administration during such period.

(c) "Prewar domestic cost," as applied to any type of vessel, means the amount determined by the Commission, and published by the Commission in the Federal Register, to be the amount for which a standard vessel of such type could have been constructed (without its national-defense features) in the United States under normal conditions relating to labor, materials, and other elements of cost, obtaining on or about January 1, 1941. In no case shall the prewar domestic cost of any type of vessel be considered to be greater than 80 percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of the same type.

(d) "Statutory sales price," as applied to a particular vessel, means, in the case of a dry-cargo vessel, an amount equal to 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost of that type of vessel and in the case of a tanker, such term means an amount equal to 60 percent of the prewar domestic cost of a tanker of that type, such amount in each case being adjusted as follows:

It is, of course, obvious that the statutory sales price referred to must be subject to various readjustments in specific cases. The ships are in varying kinds of physical condition. Some would need repairs and improvements to bring them up to what might be regarded as a normal condition. In a few cases some of the ships now have special features in addition to those which are customary or normal. Therefore, to the statutory sales price would be added or subtracted, in the case of each ship, a sufficient amount to reckon upon that ship's being in customary condition. Page 28

and the first 2 lines on page 29 of the bill set forth the method by which this equalization is to be made.

Since ships depreciate with time and use, some such allowance should be made. Therefore, the bill provides that from the statutory price, 5 percent per annum shall be subtracted for the period beginning with the date of original delivery of the vessel and ending with the time of the sale to the applicant who is seeking to buy.

As other allowances are provided for, since ships which have been in war service might in some cases have been subjected to even greater rate of depreciation because of war service, an extra allowance could be made, in the discretion of the Commission, not exceeding 3 percent per annum in the case of a vessel other than a tanker, and not exceeding 4 percent in the case of a tanker, for excessive wear and tear due to war service for which the owner would not otherwise be compensated.

These allowances, if unlimited, might absorb all or practically all of the statutory sales price. The price might be so low that a sale of the very old ships might be encouraged instead of a sale of the ones later built. Therefore, it has seemed best to fix a floor for selling prices. This is fixed at 35 percent of the domestic war cost of dry-cargo vessels, except Liberty ships, and at 31½ percent of Libertys. The ceiling for tankers is at 42 percent. It is to be noted, however, that these prices are based not upon domestic prewar costs but upon domestic war costs, which are approximately 30 percent higher than prewar domestic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing prewar domestic and war domestic costs of various types of vessels constructed under authority of the Maritime Commission.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preliminary estimate of ship sales bill prices

[Figures here given are tentative, pending availability of data with respect to contracts which are not yet completed. Adjustments for special features are not included]

Type	Estimated cost as at Jan. 1, 1941	Estimated cost of 1944 deliveries	Statutory sales price (new ships)	Floor price
	Per ship	*Per ship*	*Per ship*	*Per ship*
Small cargo (C1-M-AV1)	$1,280,000	(1)	$640,000	(1)
C1 [2]	1,940,000	$2,564,000	970,000	$897,400
C2	2,100,000	2,600,000	1,050,000	910,000
C3	2,460,000	3,175,000	1,230,000	1,111,250
Victory, 15 knots	1,980,000 [3](1,946,400)	2,433,000	973,200	851,550
Victory, 17 knots	2,130,000	2,797,000	1,065,000	978,950
Liberty	1,350,000 [3](1,278,400)	1,598,000	639,000	503,370
Tanker, 14 knots	2,400,000 ([3] 2,378,400)	2,973,000	1,427,040	1,248,660
Tanker, 15 knots	2,400,000	3,009,000	1,440,000	1,263,780

[1] Adequate figures not yet available.
[2] C1 type includes both shelter deck and full scantling.
[3] 80 percent of 1944 average.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The shifting in the basis from prewar domestic cost to war domestic cost is not really essential, but it does permit greater facility and convenience in calculation. That is the reason the change has been made.

The table to which I have referred shows how the floor would operate in special types of vessels. It would, of course, in the case of dry cargo ships, except Liberty ships, be somewhere between 35 percent and 50 percent of domestic war cost. As to Liberty ships the ceiling would be somewhere between 31½ percent and 50 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. How many ships does the Maritime Commission now have?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Approximately 6,000.

Mr. BYRD. What is the floor which is to be placed in connection with the sale of those ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The ships cost approximately $15,000,000,000. Just what they are worth, it is difficult to tell. Some have seen war service and some have not.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. How many of them is it being proposed to sell?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, it is very difficult to state definitely. We think we will need approximately one-third of them. As to the remainder, we will either want to sell, charter, or put them into a reserve fleet.

Mr. BYRD. Then it is proposed to sell ships which cost originally approximately $15,000,000,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. They cost approximately that much.

Mr. BYRD. What does the Senator believe it will be possible to obtain from the sale of the ships which will be sold?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I don't really know. I have asked members of the Commission and other people in regard to estimates, and found that the subject is a very speculative one. I ask the Senator to follow the procedure to which I referred a little while ago. We take 50 percent of the domestic prewar cost. There are certain deductions which are made, such as 5 percent per annum for a ship while in service, and 3 percent per annum additional for war service. Moreover, we have established a floor. That floor is the one to which I have just referred. The floor is somewhere between 30 percent and 50 percent, in the case of dry cargo ships, except Libertys, and between 31 percent and 50 percent in the case of Libertys. The various tables will show how the different calculations are made in regard to each ship.

Mr. BYRD. What is the minimum amount which those ships can be sold for? The Senator has mentioned 35 percent of the original cost.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; the floor is 35 percent of the domestic war cost. In other words, at that point we change the procedure of calculation. Up to this point we estimate on what is called the statutory prewar basis; that is, a basis based upon the prewar cost. When it came to establishing the floor, because of convenience in calculation the floor was placed at the domestic war cost, which was approximately 30 percent higher than the prewar cost.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Would it not be accurate to say that this entire matter, in all respects, involves a disposal of surplus property? The laws governing that subject do not go so far as to place a floor under prices in connection with the sale of such material. We all realize that much of the surplus property will be sold at a very low price. In the case of ships, we are putting a floor under them and writing other provisions for a closer control than has been exercised with regard to other surplus property.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is entirely correct. It has seemed best to the committee that some attempt should be made to place a floor with respect to the sale of any of these ships.

Mr. BYRD. What I am trying to find out is the kind of floor which is being placed. Is it based on the original cost of each vessel?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We start out with this basis: It is 50 percent of what would be the domestic prewar cost of the vessel.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to interrupt the Senator for the purpose of asking him how prewar cost is determined. Does the Senator have a definition of it? What year is used as a basis for prewar cost?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The basis is 1941. The cost in 1941 is used as a guide.

I shall now endeavor to answer the question of the Senator from Virginia. We try to estimate what would have been the prewar cost. Then we take 50 percent of that estimate. That is subject to——

Mr. BYRD. Right at that point, what is regarded as prewar cost?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The cost of construction as of 1941.

Mr. BYRD. That cost is estimated.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, some ships may have been built since 1941, but an estimate is made. Is it made on the basis of tonnage?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We took the year 1941 as a basis because the cost of construction went up during the war on an average of about 30 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Fifty percent is taken of the cost of 1941. Is that figure based on tonnage? I refer to the ships now.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The question is, What would the construction of a ship of that character have cost, so far as we can estimate it, in 1941?

Mr. BYRD. Then 50 percent of that cost is taken.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. What else is done?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Then we deduct from that amount 5 percent for each year in which the ship was in service.

Mr. BYRD. Let us assume that the ship has been in service for 4 years. What is the average?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let us say 2 years. It is purely a matter of estimate.

Mr. BYRD. And 5 percent is deducted.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Five percent a year.

Mr. BYRD. Five percent of the 50 percent?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Five percent a year for 2 years would be deducted from the 50 percent, which would leave 40 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Is the rate of percent which is deducted based on 50 percent, or is it based on 100 percent? The Senator has already said that the calculation starts first with 50 percent of the cost of construction as of 1941.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is based on 100 percent.

Mr. BYRD. I see. Now we have got down to 40 percent.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. It is then possible that there will be another deduction, in view of the fact that some of these ships have been in war service. It is realized that if they have been in war service the rate of depreciation may be greater. A further allowance, in the discretion of the Commission, may be made of not exceeding 3 percent per year ordinarily, but 4 percent for tankers.

Mr. BYRD. Let us take 2 years. That is 6 percent more to be deducted.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. That brings us down to 34 percent.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. What else takes place?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Those are the deductions. There may be made some deduction which would represent the amount necessary to put the ship in condition. I refer to a normal type of condition. Some ships have facilities which make them better than normal. In many cases their condition is below normal. So there might be some item of deduction or increase there.

It seemed best both to the committee and to the House of Representatives, which passed the bill, that a floor should be provided. Of course it can readily be understood that the sales price as adjusted might be almost wiped out or reduced too far. So an attempt has been made to fix a floor in every case and the floor is 35 percent of the domestic war cost—not the prewar cost, but the war cost—in the case of dry-cargo ships, 31½ percent in the case of Liberty ships, and 42 percent as to tankers.

Mr. BYRD. How much more would the Senator say the war cost was than the prewar cost?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Approximately 30 percent.

Mr. BYRD. I do not see why it is necessary to do all this calculating, then, with respect to prewar cost, because, after all, we come back to the point of taking the ceiling on the war cost.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the Senator's question is a very natural one, and it is one which occurred to members of the committee. Admiral Land stated that the method of procedure he recommended and we adopted was the easiest one by which the whole matter could be handled. There are no inherent difficulties in it. It is simply a method of calculation.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has gotten down to 34 percent of the prewar cost. The war cost is 35 percent more than the prewar cost. That does not work out.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course not. Let me explain. Thirty-five percent of the domestic war cost would be, say, 42 or 43 percent of the domestic-prewar cost, since the war cost is approximately 30 percent more than the prewar cost. Does the Senator follow me?

Let me illustrate. Take a $100,000 ship at prewar cost; that ship would cost $130,000 if constructed during the course of the war. For the convenience of the Commission the committee has agreed that the basis of calculation should be shifted from prewar cost to war cost when it comes to fixing the floor.

I can say, roughly speaking, that the ceiling on a dry-cargo ship instead of being about 35 percent would be probably about 42 percent, considered from the standpoint of the prewar domestic cost. In other words, 35 percent of the prewar-domestic cost might correspond to 42 percent of the war-domestic cost.

Mr. BYRD. What confuses me, and I imagine other Members of the Senate, too, is that there are two bases. The bill takes a percentage of the prewar cost, and then fixes the price on the war cost. Why not take one or the other, so that we will know what we are doing?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator entirely and that question was discussed in our committee and by the House of Representatives. The Maritime Commission was of the opinion, however, that the matter was simplified by making that shift in the method of calculation.

Mr. BYRD. I do not see that it simplifies it at all to have two bases upon which to calculate when there is a difference of 35 percent between the two, one 35 percent higher than the other.

Let us get back to the $100,000 ship. What is the minimum amount for which the Maritime Commission could sell a $100,000 ship which has been in service, say for 2 years?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the only way to answer that is to take up a concrete case and consider it. I have a table here——

Mr. BYRD. Let us take it up and carry it out in the case of a $100,000 ship.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We can take up each classification of ships and show just what the prewar domestic cost was and what the war domestic cost was. In some cases the war cost represented an increase of 30 percent and in other cases more than that, and some less.

Mr. BYRD. Take a $100,000 ship, what is the lowest price for which such a vessel could be sold?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Very well; let us take a $1,000,000 ship. It would not be a Liberty ship—but we will say its prewar cost was estimated to be a million dollars.

Mr. BYRD. The war cost, then, would be 35 percent more than that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let us say approximately 30 percent more; but the prewar cost which we are using as a gage would be a million dollars. From that there would be deducted 50 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. That would leave $500,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. From that $500,000 there would be deducted 5 percent a year for the life of the ship.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. That would make $50,000 off for 2 years, leaving $450,000. No; I am wrong about that. If 5 percent for 2 years were deducted from the total amount originally paid, it would leave $400,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. And there would also be deducted in some cases, in the discretion of the Commission, 3 percent a year for war service.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. For 2 years, then, that would be $60,000 on a million dollars. So we have gotten down to $340,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. When the floor is reached the Senator will see that all those allowances will not be made.

Mr. BYRD. Let us finish this illustration, because, frankly, I do not understand it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am trying to make it plain.

Mr. BYRD. Can we not get to a point where no further deductions are made?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I cannot do that until the Senator allows me to bring in the 35 percent, because the statement is incomplete without it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the way to proceed in the matter is to make all the deductions whether they go below the floor or not. Then, on recalculation, a vessel will not be sold before a floor is put on it. I think the Senator from Virginia is correct. All the deductions are made, and then if they represent a figure which is below the floor, the vessel cannot be sold below the floor. There are also some other additions mentioned.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is correct. I was going on to show that in some cases these deductions would not be allowed because after they have been calculated then there would be the 35 percent of the domestic war cost as a floor which would be 35 percent of $1,300,000 because of the floor. So no matter what the grounds of deductions amount to, these deductions cannot operate to carry it below 35 percent of $1,300,000.

Mr. BYRD. I do not understand it. I should have to go through all the other figures to arrive at that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish I could be more explicit in explaining it to the Senator, because the point he raised is one we discussed in the committee. The Maritime Commission say that for many reasons this method of shifting from a prewar to a war basis would be of assistance to them.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, it is proposed to sell these ships for 35 percent approximately of their war cost, most of them having been built during the war.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; 35 percent of the war cost.

Mr. BYRD. Thirty-five percent of what they cost the United States Treasury. We would sell them for one-third of their cost. I am not criticizing; I am merely trying to find out what is the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct for most kinds of ships, but let me remind the Senator that we have fixed a lower ceiling for Libertys. Instead of being 35 percent it is 31½ percent of war cost and we fix a ceiling of 42 percent of war cost in the case of tankers.

Mr. BYRD. To get back to the $10,000,000,000 worth of shipping, the minimum price for the sale of the $10,000,000,000 worth is $3,500,000,000. In other words, there will be a loss to the Government of $6,500,000,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Probably that would be close to it since tankers would be higher and Libertys lower.

Mr. BYRD. There would be a loss of about $6,000,000,000 on the ships which are to be put up for sale. Of course, as I understand, more than the minimum might be obtained, but I do not think anybody is going to pay much more than the minimum, if the minimum is fixed in the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; he will not.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator propose that we vote on the bill today, or is he willing to give Senators an opportunity to become familiar with the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The President and the Maritime Commission, and other officials of the Government, are keenly desirous that the bill be passed at the earliest posible moment. I do not wish to hurry the Senator in reaching a decision, but it is desirable that we sell the ships as quickly as possible, and any delay in our disposition of them may result in our losing sales, as I shall explain later. So every day counts. I hope the Senate can come to a conclusion at the earliest moment possible.

Mr. LANGER. I am in somewhat the same condition in which the Senator from Virginia finds himself. He does not seem to know much about this matter, and I know less.

Turning to page 31 I find the bill says:

> At the time of the sale, the purchaser shall pay to the Commission at least 25 percent of the statutory sales price.

If there is a Liberty ship which we are to sell for 31½ percent, 25 percent, roughly, would be 8 percent, would it not? The buyer could buy the ship by paying 8 percent, and then have 20 years in which to pay the balance, in equal annual installments.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is the language "at least 25 percent." That involves some discretion in the Maritime Commission.

The problem of the disposition of these ships is not a very easy one, and the Government has carried on the policy for a long time of making rather easy terms for the sale of the ships. It did so during the war. So that policy has been incorporated in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. On page 30 we find the definition of a citizen of the United States. This is the first time to my knowledge that a corporation has ever been defined as a citizen. It has always been classified as a "person." I wonder what the reason was for calling a corporation a citizen. That language occurs on page 30.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It reads:

> "Citizen of the United States" includes a corporation, partnership, or association only if it is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended.

What is the question?

Mr. LANGER. Usually a corporation is known as a person. I wonder why suddenly a corporation is to be known as a citizen.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Perhaps it was to save time. We can call a corporation a person or a citizen, but in order to avoid unnecessary language, I suppose, we are trying to designate who, under the act, would be considered a citizen.

Mr. LANGER. If the corporation were composed of stockholders who were aliens, is this an attempt, by any chance, to make it possible for aliens to come in and buy a ship simply by owning stock in a corporation, and the corporation being called a citizen?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. The Senator will notice that there are provisions further on in the bill to the effect that if the purchasers are foreign corporations, a majority of their stock must be controlled by American citizens.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator will find, under section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, that in order for a corporation to be a citizen of the United States, under the pending proposal, 50 percent or more of the stock must be owned by citizens of the United States, which would prevent the very thing the Senator from North Dakota speaks of, having aliens control an American corporation.

Mr. LANGER. What percentage did the Senator say?

Mr. BREWSTER. In excess of 50 percent must be owned by Americans.

Mr. BYRD. Where is that provision?

Mr. BREWSTER. In section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that it was obviously not desirable, probably, to include in this bill many definitions, and incorporate much language which is already covered by existing statutes. So as far as possible we try to avoid repetition of what is already the law.

Section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916 reads as follows:

> That within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless the controlling interest therein is owned by citizens of the United States, and, in the case of a corporation, unless its president and managing directors are citizens of the United States and the corporation itself is organized under the laws of the United States or of a State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, but in the case of a corporation, association, or partnership operating any vessel in the coastwise trade the amount of interest required to be owned by citizens of the United States shall be 75 percent.

The bill does not attempt to change in any way the existing law in regard to the definition of a citizen.

Many questions arose which probably require some consideration, but the idea behind the bill has been to restrict its scope, so far as we could do so, to matters which are concerned directly with the sale of ships. In other words, the whole policy in the committee has been to limit the range of the bill as far as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In a newspaper this morning I noticed that the Government is selling Fairlington, and some of the other home projects, including the one at McLean Gardens. There is nothing in the negotiations for those sales to the effect that the purchasers can buy them by paying 8 percent down and then having 20 years to pay the balance. Does not the Senator think the cases are somewhat analagous?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. They may be analagous, but the experience of some of those who are very familiar with shipping business is—also bear in mind the fact that what we want to do is to sell these ships—that it is desirable to make terms very liberal, so far as the terms of payment are concerned. Perhaps the terms may be too liberal, they may be too tight, but the committee felt it would go along with the policy suggested by the Commission, based upon its experience in using liberal terms, especially as to terms of mortgages.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. What about a partnership? Suppose there were one partner who was an alien, and the other was a citizen of this country, and they were equal partners. How would the Senator define that?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No attempt is made in the bill to make any definition in regard to that.

Mr. BYRD. What is the definition? I should be hesitant to vote for a bill which would permit an alien to have an equal right in a ship of this country that an American citizen had, on a 50-percent basis.

Mr. LANGER. There might be two aliens and one citizen in a partnership.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, if we can sell these vessels to foreign countries, let us know we are doing it at the time we do it, and not let some bogus corporation or partnership purchase the vessels and then take them out of the country.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not know that there would be very much incentive to do that, because there is a provision later in the bill which permits sales to foreigners, but preference is given to our own citizens.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that, but if we make the sales to foreigners, we should know we are making them to foreigners.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me read again what I read a while ago from the shipping act:

> SEC. 2. Within the meaning of this act no corporation, partnership, or association shall be deemed a citizen of the United States unless a controlling interest therein is owned by citizens of the United States.

That provides that in the case of a partnership the controlling interest must be in citizens of the United States. That is the existing law.

Mr. BYRD. In that case, then, of course, a citizen of the United States could own 51 percent and an alien could own 49 percent. Could the citizen then sell out to his partner? Why could he not sell out the next day if he desired to do so, buy the ship in the name of the partnership, complying with the law, then sell the whole thing to the alien?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We have many ships, and no one thinks that the home market will absorb them all. Therefore, provision is made for sale to foreigners.

Mr. BYRD. That is all right; I am not objecting to that, but it seems to me foreigners can become partners with citizens, and in that event an American citizen could sell his interest to a foreigner.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is true. On the other hand, we can sell a ship to a citizen and he can, in turn, sell it to a foreigner.

Mr. BYRD. There is no protection in the bill. These are American ships being sold at a discount of 65 percent. There will be a loss of $6,500,000,000 on the ships proposed to be sold, and I think there should be some regulation whereby these cheap ships—because they are cheap ships—will not go into foreign hands, unless we know they are going into foreign hands.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia that the provision for the sale of ships to foreigners contemplates the possibility that they may be sold on the same basis as to American citizens, or at least on no better basis.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator think there is a clear distinction, because if they are sold to foreigners they are sold with the knowledge on the part of the seller that he does sell to foreigners? The Senator may want to hold to a certain opinion and I to another. But under this partnership plan, as I see it, American citizens can become partners with citizens of other countries and obtain title to a ship after owning, let us say, 51 percent, and then sell that 51 percent to the aliens.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia that what we have tried to do is to avoid restrictions on the operations of the market. What the Senator says might apply to a case in which we sell a ship to a citizen and he sells it to a foreigner. That may or may not be desirable.

Mr. BYRD. But the bill is predicated on the assumption that a citizen of this country has the first chance to buy the ship.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. By this subterfuge the citizen may not have the first choice. He may be in a partnership with an alien and then sell the ship to the alien.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That brings in the element of time. Citizens of the United States are given a preference for 90 days, either to buy or to charter. After that the market is open to foreigners.

Mr. BYRD. Still it is only open at the option of the Mariitme Commission, is it not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The Commission does not have to sell to foreigners.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; the Commission does not have to sell to foreigners.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator regards these as cheap ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; I regard these as being cheap ships. On the other hand, I will say to the Senator that the problem of disposing of these ships is going to be a very difficult one. Those familiar with the industry feel it is wise to avoid putting in the bill needless restrictions. It is quite true that we can sell to our citizens and then they can sell to foreigners. But the committee did not feel that such a possibility warranted it in interposing obstacles to the disposition of the ships, because our problem is, and is going to be, a big problem to get rid of these ships.

Let me call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to a section in the existing law bearing on the subject, as follows:

> Except as provided in section 611 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, it shall be unlawful, without the approval of the United States Maritime Commission, to sell, mortgage, lease, charter, deliver, or in any manner transfer, or agree to sell, mortgage, lease, charter, deliver, or in any manner transfer, to any person not a citizen of the United States, or transfer or place under foreign registry or flag, any vessel or any interest therein owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States, or the last documentation of which was under the laws of the United States.

So the law does impose some very definite restrictions along the line which the Senator from Virginia has in mind.

Mr. BYRD. The Maritime Commission can give its consent, as I understand.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, I was taking the statement of the Senator that there were no restrictions on the sale of a ship owned by an American to some other country or a citizen of some other country. Did not the Senator make that statement a little while back?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I did not mean to give the impression that it could be done without the permission of the Maritime Commission. If I left that out of my statement it was a matter of inadvertence.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know why this property cannot be sold in the same way as any other property, to the highest bidder?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the matter has been given very careful consideration. Whenever attempt is made to decide a question of that kind it is necessary to consider the nature of the business involved. Some of those who have given this matter very careful consideration are of the opinion that if we were to attempt to place these ships on the market to be sold to the highest bidder, the market would be deluged and we could not forecast what price we would get. There is no way of knowing what the result would be if we suddenly attempted to put 4,500, or whatever the number of ships may be, on the market in the hope that we could sell them at public auction. I cannot guarantee to the Senator from North Dakota that we would not do better by taking such action. I can simply tell him that the deliberate opinion of those of our committee who have gone into this matter very carefully is that we should attempt to fix some figure and some basis such as we have outlined in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the matter seems very unreasonable to me. I do not believe any business concern would sell its property in this manner. The Government can reserve the right to reject any and all bids. The Government can put up for sale one ship at a time, or 20 ships or 40 ships or 50 ships.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator must always bear in mind the nature of the market. The Senator may be entirely correct in his contention, but I say that those of us who have studied the question very carefully have arrived at a contrary conclusion. We believe that selling so many ships, under such unusual conditions, and with such a restricted market requires special formulas, and we have tried to set them forth in this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Frankly, however, I do not like the bill, the little I have seen of it. I do not know much about it. Here it is, 50 pages long, with an explanation of it in very fine type, 22 or 23 pages long.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill is only about half that length. The rest of it is the House bill, which the Senate committee struck out. So the bill which we present is about 25 pages long, still of course quite long.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, Senators are interested in what the House passed, and what was stricken out, and why it was stricken out.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I repeat what I said a little while ago, that this matter has been given very great consideration. The House of Representatives considered it, I think, fully half a year, and I do not know of any matter that has been before the Senate Commerce Committee which has been more carefully considered than this bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the difference between the House bill and the bill reported by the Senate committee?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will explain it from time to time as I proceed. There are a number of differences. One, which I will mention at this particular time is as follows: Instead of 50 percent of the prewar cost, the House fixed 55 percent for the subsidized companies and 50 percent for the nonsubsidized companies. In other words, the House gave the nonsubsidized companies a preference of 5 percent. That matter was considered very carefully by the Senate committee, and the conclusion was reached that it was better to put them all on the same basis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell us the difference between a subsidized company and one which is not subsidized?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is a very long story. The Senator knows that the costs of construction and operation in this country have been and are very much greater than in foreign countries. We accept that as a premise. That difference was recognized, and in many cases it was realized that some ships, at least in certain routes, could not compete with the ships of foreign countries without Federal assistance. Years ago we attempted to have what was called a mail subsidy, which was certainly not a tight mathematical way of reaching the problem. It was more or less of an arbitrary basis.

When the act of 1936 was being drafted and considered, the conclusion was reached that the thing to do was to try to meet the situation fairly. Therefore, in cases where a subsidy seemed to be necessary, there was a provision that 50 percent of the difference in the cost of construction in this country, as compared with the cost abroad, could be allowed as a subsidy under some condition. There was also an operating subsidy of not over 50 percent under certain conditions. The Senator knows that the difference in cost of construction in the United States as contrasted with foreign countries is very large. The estimate was often made before the war that it cost about twice as much to build in this country as to build abroad. So we will assume that there was quite a difference.

The result was that in the act of 1936 we went at the question rather openly and frankly, whether wisely or not is a matter of opinion. We attempted to provide differential subsidies in cases where a subsidy seemed to be necessary.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean that the United States Government pays 50 percent of the cost of operating these vessels?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Under certain conditions; yes.

Mr. BYRD. Does that apply to all the vessels we operate?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. Some ships are not on a subsidy basis. When they are on a subsidy basis, many regulations are imposed by the Federal Government. Some companies are not subsidized. They feel that they can operate without it. They prefer to be relieved of the many conditions, which I shall not attempt to go into here.

Mr. BYRD. What is the total annual cost of that operation?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is no real opportunity to estimate cost now because of war conditions.

Mr. BYRD. What was the cost just before the war?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We have not very good figures on that subject, because, under the act of 1936, we began launching ships just about the time of Pearl Harbor. Before the plan could really get into operation, the war was on us. Then, as the Senator from Virginia will recall, we entered into a pooling arrangement by which the ships of our Nation, and some of those of foreign countries, were pooled.

Mr. BYRD. We enacted the law in 1936.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. What was the estimated cost at that time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. When the bill was passed, we thought we were going to build about 600 ships a year.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator give some approximate figure as to what the legislation was expected to cost? The Senator introduced the bill and handled it, did he not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; I did not. I was on the committee. I do not think I handled the bill on the floor. At that time we contemplated that we needed a certain number of ships. That program of construction was stepped up tremendously again and again and it is most fortunate for us that it was.

Mr. BYRD. What would be the cost in the case of an average ship, if the Government paid 50 percent of the operating costs?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I have seen some figures which I consider authoritative in the case of one line. The figures indicate that the cost was about $250,000 a year. However, that money is sequestered, in a way. It cannot be distributed as income. It must be placed in a fund for replacement of ships when they are worn out.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that at first there was some inclination to attempt to go into the matter of subsidies in this particular bill, but we realized that what we wanted to do was to sell ships. It may very well be that postwar conditions will make it necessary for us entirely to revamp our merchant marine policy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Has the subsidy law expired?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No.

Mr. BYRD. Is it still in existence?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is still in existence, but it has become practically inoperative during the war.

Mr. BYRD. I understand; but when the demand comes again, the legislation is in existence providing for the payment of subsidies?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The legislation is in existence. I can realize that it will be desirable for us to consider a new program for the postwar period.

Mr. BYRD. Would it be possible to sell to a corporation or firm one of these ships at 35 percent of its cost, and then pay 50 percent of the operating costs as a subsidy?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No.

Mr. BYRD. Why not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator means the cost——

Mr. BYRD. The minimum price is 35 percent of the cost.

Mr. LANGER. And it is necessary to put up only 25 percent of that amount.

Mr. BYRD. I am not speaking of the amount which is put up. The minimum price is 35 percent of the war cost.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Would that same ship be eligible for subsidies to the extent of 50 percent of its operating costs?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I did not understand the question a moment ago. There is no restriction or limitation in the bill upon that subject.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me that we are conferring a great benefit, if we are to sell ships at 35 percent of their cost, and under the other legislation pay 50 percent of the operating costs as a subsidy.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me emphasize what I stated a little while ago. What we are trying to do is to get sales legislation through. Every day we delay we miss some sales. I am inclined to think that the whole question of postwar construction, subsidies, and so forth, should be considered afresh, but it was not deemed best to attempt to go into it in this bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Suppose I wished to buy a Liberty ship which cost $1,000,000. What would it cost me?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The cost of some of them was nearly $4,000,000 during the war. Costs of construction went up considerably.

Mr. BUCK. If I wished to buy a ship which cost $1,000,000, I would have to pay a minimum of 35 percent of that amount and I would have to put up only 25 percent in cash. Is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Probably so, remembering that the minimum selling price of the Liberty ships is 31½ percent, and not 35 percent. That price is based upon the war cost.

Mr. BUCK. All I would have to put up would be 25 percent of the reduced price?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct.

Mr. BUCK. I hope we will not make the price of these ships too low. I should like to cite an example of a ship which was sold after the last war. The name of the ship was the steamship *Effingham*. It was built at a cost to the Government of $1,966,000. It was sold in 1932 for $48,000. During the period between 1933 and 1937 the owner had a United States mail contract under which he collected an indirect subsidy of $247,000. In the period between 1937 and 1940 he collected an operating subsidy of $139,000. Then he put the ship into service in the last war, and under lend-lease he collected a charter hire in the sum of $326,000. Finally the ship was lost at sea, and the Government paid the owner a total insurance of $727,000. Adding those figures, the insurance paid by the Government plus the charter hire amounted to $1,053,000, and the ship cost him $48,000. We are in the wrong business. Could anything like that happen under the terms of this bill?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think I can throw some light on the discussion.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I have received the same information. I have studied it to some extent. It seems to me that it is not particularly credible information.

Mr. BUCK. I have not had an opportunity to study it. I note that the authority for the story is a letter from the Comptroller General, which is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 11, 1943. This information came to me only a few minutes ago, and I have not had an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that our experience in selling ships after the First World War was not very satisfactory. Apparently we did not have a sound policy for the disposition of our ships and not really a consistent one. The Senator mentioned a low price in the letter he read. I can recall an example in my own experience. I was a director in a company which had taken over, as salvage, 20 ships costing nearly half a million dollars each. They had belonged to the East Coast Fisheries Co. We eventually sold them for about $10,000 apiece. The Senator may recall that after the First World War the market dropped considerably. We do not know what will happen if we set up a formula in this particular case. We hope to be more fortunate. The formula which is submitted to the Senate is not entirely satisfactory to everyone, but it seemed to be about as good a formula as we could evolve after studying the matter very carefully.

Beginning in line 18, on page 27, there is a provision that in no case shall the prewar domestic cost be considered as more than 80 percent of the domestic war cost. That language was inserted out of abundance of caution, but no practical question is involved, inasmuch as experience has demonstrated that probably there is no case in which the prewar domestic cost reached 80 percent of the domestic war cost. In short, that provision has little significance.

A Liberty ship converted into a tanker is regarded for these classifications as still a Liberty ship. On page 30, in lines 8 to 17, appears a definition of domestic war cost. Definitions of cessation of hostilities and of citizen of the United States also appear on that page.

On pages 31 and 32 is a provision under which any citizen of the United States may, if he has the qualifications required in the opinion of the Commission, purchase a war-built vessel. In doing so, he will pay 25 percent of the statutory sales price. For the balance due, he can give a mortgage at an interest rate of 3½ percent per annum, providing for liquidation of the entire purchase price in not more than 20 equal annual payments. Of course, Mr. President, there has already been considerable discussion of this point.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That provision means that the purchaser will have to pay, as a down payment, only 8 percent of the original cost; is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That might be so.

Mr. BYRD. How are the other payments to be made?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. They are to be made in not more than 20 equal annual payments—in the discretion of the Commission, of course.

Mr. BYRD. Will the ship be insured during that time, then?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. Provision must be made for insurance of the ship in order to protect the mortgage; and as long as the mortgage exists, that requirement must be adhered to very closely.

After careful consideration, the committee approved of the policy of making these sales in such way as not to restrict the lawful or proper use or operation of the vessel. It is the desire, therefore, to keep these restrictions to a minimum.

I wish to emphasize that point, because it is easy to fix the prices at which the ships shall be sold, but it may not be so easy actually to sell the ships. So what we are trying to do in this bill is to eliminate as many restrictions as we possibly can, and, certainly, get rid of all those which do not seem to be absolutely essential in the interest of the Government.

Also, it was decided to change the House provisions which permitted purchasers of vessels to be operated unsubsidized to buy the vessels at prices cheaper than those required for vessels to be operated under subsidies. The House had fixed the sale price for dry-cargo vessels to unsubsidized operators at 50 percent of the statutory prewar cost, and at 55 percent for unsubsidized operators. Our committee decided not to enter, in this bill, into the many differences between the two types of operators, and therefore we have fixed the price at 50 percent for each type of operator.

Mr. President, I agree entirely with what has been suggested by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and also the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], namely, that when it comes to shaping up our postwar policies in connection with the consideration of problems in regard to shipping, it will be desirable that we give entirely fresh consideration to the whole problem of how we are to build ships and operate them, and generally as to the duties and functions of the Maritime Commission. At the present time it is not very clear to anyone what they should be. Their determination will depend to a considerable extent upon the circumstances which develop during the next year or so.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me ask what good it would do to develop such policies after the ships are sold to various persons at $8 on a hundred.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am not saying that the lack of subsidies or the existence of subsidies has any bearing on the sale of these ships. It may be that it has. However, what we wish to do is to dispose of the ships. Then we can take up the whole matter of our maritime policy. But it is not essential that that be done by the pending bill. It seems unwise to try to crowd into this bill many other provisions, important though they are, which are not particularly germane to the question of how the ships shall be sold. Naturally, our preference is to sell the ships, not to retain ownership by merely leasing or chartering them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Is there also a subsidy for the building of ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is a construction subsidy, and under certain conditions there is an operating subsidy.

Mr. BYRD. What percentage of the cost of the ship is the construction subsidy?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The construction subsidy may not exceed 50 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Will the same ship also have an operating subsidy?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It could have one; yes.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, in the first instance the Federal Government would pay 50 percent of the cost of the ship, and subsequently it would pay 50 percent of the operating cost; and the owner of the ship would receive any profits which might accrue.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Under existing law that is possible.

Mr. BYRD. So the owner or the operator would receive all the profits; the Government would receive no profits, although it put up 50 percent of the cost of the ship and 50 percent of the operating expenses.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Well, there are provisions in regard to establishment of reserve funds and those requiring all profit after 10 percent to go to the Government and other limitations.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator means 10 percent after allowance for depreciation, I assume.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. That is worked out rather carefully. In other words, if the operator receives a subsidy, he is subject to certain restrictions as to the route to be used and with regard to what he shall do in the way of putting up reserves, and so forth. That program is quite a complicated one, but I wish to emphasize the fact that it does really exist.

Let me also emphasize that the general purport of the bill is to take the United States Government out of the ownership and operation of merchant vessels as far and as soon as feasible. However, it is recognized that in some cases, if suitable sales are not available within a reasonable time, it will be to the interest of all concerned to have the vessels chartered on a bare-boat basis. Now a word as to charter rates. The charter rates are fixed at not less than 15 percent of the statutory sales price at the date of charter, unless at least four members of the Commission vote for a different rate. An exception is made in the case of passenger boats having accommodations for more than 80 passengers. In such cases the Commission may adopt what are the prevailing world market rates for chartering. The reason for this exception is apparent—namely, in order to meet certain kinds of competition.

Mr. President, as desirable as it is that we sell or charter our vessels to our citizens, nevertheless it is realized that in

all probability they will not be able to absorb the market. Therefore, it seemed best to make some provision regarding sale of the ships to noncitizens. Consequently, we have provided that under certain conditions some ships may be sold to noncitizens. Certain passenger ships and dry-bulk-cargo Liberty ships are excepted from that provision. The reason for the latter is that the dry-cargo Liberty ships will probably be needed by us as colliers. On pages 34 and 36 of the bill those conditions are set forth at considerable length.

Before there may be any sales made to noncitizens, the Commission must determine in each case that the ship is not needed for our own merchant marine, nor for our defense program after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy as to our defense requirements. A ship otherwise available for sale may not be sold to a noncitizen. The sales price must be not less than the statutory sales price to a citizen.

There is, however, this exception to which I have referred: 10 C-type ships, other than C-3, may, without waiting the 90-day interval—as is usually required of noncitizens—be sold to foreigners. This provision attempts to care for the situation which has grown out of the fact that our Government acquired certain ships from certain countries at the beginning of the war. We are in duty bound to return those ships in good condition, or to substitute other ships to be supplied to former noncitizen owners. In many cases the original ships have been destroyed.

In order to meet the situation—I have in mind the case, for example, of Chile—where we took over ships under the obligation to return them in good shape, a special provision is incorporated to the effect that those 10 ships may be sold immediately without waiting for the 90-day interval to elapse, which ordinarily is a bridge between selling to citizens and to noncitizens.

An attempt is made in this bill to set forth various orders of precedence. In short, the preference is to sell to a citizen instead of a noncitizen. Among citizens, preference is given to those whose prewar tonnage has been reduced by the action of the United States Government in taking over their ships. It can readily be perceived that in some cases our citizens have been almost denuded of their ships.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on what page of the bill is the subject matter to which the Senator is now addressing himself?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. On pages 35 and 36.

We have also made provision setting forth preferences in regard to sales among members of the United Nations. Nations whose fleets to a very large extent have been destroyed, would be given some preference in the matter of sale over those whose losses have been less. We think that is an equitable doctrine and that it should be applied. Allow me to emphasize that what we want to do is to get the United States Government directly and indirectly out of the ownership and operation of ships. The theory of the bill is that we should, in every way possible, foster private ownership and operation.

Naturally, if the United States attempts to sell war-built vessels, the question of exchange will arise. The pending bill attempts to make various provisions for such an exchange. On pages 36 and 40 of the bill the conditions are set forth in considerable detail. A noncitizen may exchange any vessel, except one which he may have acquired under the act. Ordinarily, a noncitizen may not exchange. The exception is with reference to a foreign corporation. In that event, however, certain conditions must be met. Those conditions are the following: First, the ship must have been constructed by the United States after 1941 and taken for use by the United States. Second, the controlling interest in the corporation must for 3 years have been in a citizen or citizens of the United States. Third, the ship must have been owned by the United States and documented under its laws.

We now come to procedure. Within 90 days after the Federal Register sets up an applicable prewar domestic cost, a firm offer for at least 90 days to transfer the vessel must be made. Then there are outlined various conditions regarding value, utility, public policy, and effect upon the market, all of which must be considered by the Commission, and must be determined favorably to the applicant. Likewise, the allowance is restricted to 33⅓ percent of the sale price, unadjusted, of the vessel to be purchased. Then there is a sliding scale in connection with certain vessels. If the United States is under obligation to repair under a charter, a larger amount is allowed.

We want to sell ships, and it may be realized that it is desirable to make some exchange. But if we were to make allowance for the ship offered in exchange equal to the entire price of the war-built ship, it can readily be seen that instead of the United States getting out of the ship-owning business it would probably be acquiring more ships than it owned at the beginning. So we are trying to fix an arbitrary figure so that when we arrive at a conclusion involving an exchange, the ship offered in exchange shall not constitute more than 33⅓ percent of the price of the new ship.

When the ship was purchased in the United States, no allowance, equitably adjusted, can be made other than what the United States receives.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is there any provision made whereby we can get back some of our lend-lease money?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am rather pessimistic about there being any provision in the pending bill regarding such a matter.

Mr. LANGER. I refer to taking ships from other countries.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I was talking about the exchange of ships with citizens. That subject has no reference to foreigners. I was referring to a procedure to be followed when a citizen comes forward seeking to buy one or more ships, and offers some old ship or ships in exchange.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator said that some countries had given or had loaned us ships during the war.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We took over some ships from other countries. We entered into agreements with them that we would return the ships in as good condition, or that we would make satisfactory adjustments on them.

Mr. LANGER. What I want to know, Mr. President, is this: If we again give the same countries lend-lease, do we deduct the value of these ships from the lend-lease which such countries have received?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is nothing in the pending bill which would cover any subject of that kind. Of course, lend-lease has come to an end. If the Senator has reference to any loans to foreign countries, that matter would have to be determined by the language of the agreement under which such a loan were made.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that lend-lease has come to an end so far as giving other countries money and material is concerned, but it has not come to an end so far as collecting is concerned.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; we will try to collect what we have loaned in many instances. But the pending bill has reference to the disposition of ships. The provision to which I have referred has specific reference to the United States Government in its acquisition of ships from Chile or Denmark, or from some other country. We needed those ships. In effect, we told those countries that if they would turn over to us those ships we would do the right thing with them when the emergency had come to an end. Various provisions were incorporated in the agreements with those countries, in setting forth such a purpose and our intention. It would facilitate adjustments with those nations if we were to put 10 ships, for example, in a sort of special class and permit them to be utilized, at the discretion of the Maritime Commission and, of course, of the President, in liquidation of the claims against us, whatever they might be. In the case of the loss of a vessel, an exchange is made as though the vessel had been received in exchange by the United States before the loss occurred. I think that is more or less like a business way of getting at the proper payments to be made on the loss. Likewise certain claims against United States loss for ship requisitioned or chartered can be settled in whole or in part by selling a war-built vessel to the applicant. That is merely a method by which the Government can pay some of its debts, by turning over ships for that purpose.

Where the United States has chartered a vessel for use, and is under obligation to restore it, the United States can, instead of repairing the vessel, which may not really warrant such expenditure, sell the owner of the ship so chartered a war-built comparable vessel. The reason for this option is very obvious. There is no justification for the United States to be obliged to repair a vessel if one is already available for sale which would suit the needs of the owner of the boat which has been chartered by the United States.

I think that is a very wise provision, which would help us dispose of claims which citizens might have against the United States.

The policy of selling these ships at less than their cost naturally brings up the question, How about those who were buying ships during the war and paying full prices?

A citizen who has bought or contracted to buy a vessel built after December 31, 1940, and which he chartered back to the United States, and owns it on the date of the enactment of this bill, might find himself at a grave disadvantage in comparison with purchasers under the act unless some adjustment were made as to the amount which he had paid or agreed to pay for the ship heretofore purchased. On pages 41 to 46 efforts are made to provide for equalization by refunds. These provisions are somewhat technical, but they have been worked out quite carefully. I may say, speaking roughly, that the program sets forth attempts to follow out the fiction that instead of having purchased when he did, he is doing so when he is in reality asking for a readjustment. In other words, the fiction is that in undertaking to arrive at a proper refund we will say, "In order to find out what the refund is, let us assume, for the sake of the discussion, you did not buy that ship 3 years ago, but only chartered it, and that you are buying it today. Therefore we will make an accounting on the theory that during the time you really owned the ship you only leased it, and work out an adjustment of the price accordingly." That is probably about as practical a way as could be devised to work the matter out.

This requires an accounting, reckoning upon various items, such as credit for amount paid or agreed to be paid, interest upon actual payments, allowance for taxes compiled on a readjusted basis—which is quite technical—and insurance premiums paid, repairs made, customary allowance for depreciation, and other items based upon the fiction that the sale was not actually made when it was purported to be. On the other hand, he is charged with a theoretical or imaginary charter hire during this period between the actual purchase and the date of the adjustment. Thereby, a policy can be carried out of avoiding a discrimination against earlier purchases and also possible dislocations in the operations of the industry. All these and certain other factors are then compared with statutory sales prices so then an equitable adjustment can be made.

I know this is somewhat technical, but I believe that the formula which has been prepared and which is here presented is, on the whole, a reasonable and workable one in order to make adjustments with those who purchased at the high prices, and therefore should not be placed in unfair competition with those who bought under the act at much cheaper prices.

Of course, there is a time limit, and therefore the claim for the readjustment must be made within 60 days of the publication in the Federal Register of applicable prewar domestic costs. In case of loss, the ship must have been built subsequent to January 1, 1935, the loss taking place since May 27, 1941, and prior to date of enactment of the act.

In furtherance of the policy of trying to relieve our shipping, as far as possible from restrictions as to trade, routes, services, and the like, provision is inserted to that effect. Therefore, a ship so readjusted would be free, for instance, to engage in domestic trade.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to compliment the able Senator from Maryland, who is a member of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am also a member, because he has given unselfishly of his time and has pursued this subject with statesmanlike diligence. I think he is entitled to the compliments of the entire committee and of the Senate itself.

There is a matter which has been brought to my attention, which was discussed in the committee, but which will not go to conference because it is my understanding it is not provided for in the bill as it passed the House. For that reason I trespass upon the good nature of the Senator to bring the matter to his attention. It pertains to section 8 (b), page 39, lines 11 to 19. If lines 11 to 19 were stricken from the Senate committee amendment it would then go to conference, and it could be considered by the conferees.

I could explain the suggestion, if an explanation were necessary, by quoting from a memorandum which was left with me by the Association of American Shipowners. The memorandum proceeds to say:

> Section 8 would place arbitrary restrictions upon the amount allowable on the trade-in of ships that had been purchased from the Government. Owners of such vessels could not receive as a credit more than the cost of the old ship plus the depreciated cost of any capital improvements.
>
> Many ships, formerly owned by the Government, were sold at low prices when the market for ships was low. When some were sold, the buyers had to agree to spend a certain amount to place them in efficient operating condition and also, no doubt, to provide work in American ship repair yards. Other buyers made substantial expenditures although not obligated to do so. But owners who may wish to trade in such ships cannot know what the Commission will consider to be capital improvements. It seems likely that many ships that were purchased from the Government would, for trade-in purposes, have only nominal value. On the other hand, the intrinsic value of many of them, measured by their earning power, will be much more than nominal and unless the Commission is given power and discretion to take them in at their true value, they will remain in the merchant marine in the place of newer vessels better suited to serve the national security. And the war-built vessels that might otherwise replace them may well be sold abroad.

I should like to have my colleague's comment on that statement.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator from New York that there is a good deal of merit in that suggestion. It is always more or less reasonable, in the case of the disposition of a vessel, to give close consideration to what its apparent market value is. But let me suggest a concrete illustration.

Suppose the Government had sold a ship for $100,000, and then there is a desire to trade the ship in. It is provided in the bill that the basis must be $100,000 as an adjustment. It might very well be that the purchaser could go on the market and get a higher price, perhaps two or three hundred thousand dollars. He might feel, under those circumstances, that the Government should pay what he could get.

Of course, that opens up a good many doors. In the first place, instead of having a formula for guidance, we would have many special factors to consider.

I think it is only fair to bear in mind that the bill is aimed at trying to dispose of ships, and the provision for trade-in is a special privilege aimed to meet the demands of the trade.

I think it is somewhat unreasonable, perhaps, for a shipowner who has bought a ship for $100,000 from the United States, and then desires to buy a ship costing considerably more than that also from the United States, to say, "It is true I paid you only $100,000, but you ought to allow me $300,000 on that ship. Let me make the $200,000 profit." That may perhaps be reasonable, but it certainly subjects the Treasury of the United States not only to some uncertainties, but to some very heavy demands.

I think that when it comes to the matter of trade-in, we can put up a very reasonable argument to the effect that a man who offers a ship in a trade-in, and who has acquired it from the Government, should not expect to make money on the transaction with the Government.

Mr. MEAD. Would that be true if, after purchasing the ship, we have been using as an illustration, for $100,000, he invested a like amount in the improvement of the ship? Would he be given full credit for the amount of improvement which resulted from his investment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. He would probably be charged with any depreciation, and he would be given the benefit of any adjustment to his credit due to improvements, and so forth. The idea would be to adjust the price, using the prior figure of $100,000 as a basis.

Mr. MEAD. If the ship will bring more in monetary value to him in the open market, can he sell the ship in the open market without injury insofar as rebuilding his fleet is concerned?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not see that there is any obstacle in the way of his selling it in the open market. If he tried to sell it abroad there might be some restrictions which now exist which would apply, but if he wanted to sell it to the Government I do not know that there would be any obstacles. Instead of trading it in for $100,000 plus the adjusted figure, he might prefer to sell it for $250,000, and use that money for the acquisition of a new ship from the Government.

Mr. MEAD. And yet that would not result in any injury to him insofar as acquiring other and newer ships from the Maritime Commission is concerned?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Nothing of that kind occurs to me at the moment. I cannot see that there would be any obstacles at all in such a case.

Mr. MEAD. I do not wish to interfere with the presentation the Senator from Maryland is making respecting the bill, but I should like to ask him whether it would be his good judgment that the matter go to conference?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The committee considered the matter carefully, and if my memory is correct there was not any very strong sentiment in favor of it in the committee. I rather feel, under the circumstances, that I would hesitate to take it to conference.

Mr. MEAD. In view of the fact that there is a wide difference between the House and the Senate version, is it the Senator's opinion that the conferees have very broad powers at any rate?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; the conferees do have very broad powers in that matter. I am not sure just exactly how it would go in this particular instance, because I do not have the language before me.

Mr. MEAD. Then, Mr. President, it will be satisfactory to me to present the matter to the conferees for such adjustment as they may see fit to consider.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, there are several other features to which I want to call attention at this time. It is realized that quite possibly we will not be able to sell all these ships or to charter them to our citizens, and after that attempt is made, that we will not be able to sell them to foreigners. In other words, certainly in the spirit of an abundance of caution we feel it desirable that we should make some provision as to what we are going to do with these ships undisposed of. It is certainly not desirable that they should stay in the market indefinitely. Senators can certainly see that if we did so, it would tend to discourage those who might now wish to buy ships, from buying them. They might say, "Well, we will not buy now. We will wait, and after awhile the Government may become tired of pursuing this sales policy. The market may go down, and then we will buy at a lower figure in a demoralized market." So in order to meet that condition there is a provision for what we call a national defense reserve fleet, and in this reserve fleet such vessels owned by us, after consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, as the Commission deems should be retained for the national defense fleet shall be placed in it.

That, Mr. President, is not all. All vessels owned by it on December 31, 1947, where there is no sale or no contract of sale in existence now needed for defense programs, will be placed in this reserve fleet. And likewise any ships which are under charter-party will at the expiration of the charter-party be placed in the reserve fleet. The idea is to fix some date at which the operations of this bill will come to an end, and that when those ships are placed in that reserve fleet they will remain there and will not be available for commercial purposes. Of course, they will be available in case we need them for our defense program.

There is one exception, however—at least, I am sure it wil' not be questioned by anyone. From time to time it will be possible to take out one of these ships in the reserve fleet and turn it over to the marine schools. We realize that the marine schools need these ships for training purposes, and, therefore, instead of the marine schools being required to buy ships, the obvious and simple and practical thing to do is to permit ships to be taken, if necessary, out of this reserve fleet and to use them for that particular purpose.

There is a provision in the bill reading as follows:

> No vessel sold or chartered by the Commission under this act to a citizen of the United States shall be prohibited from engaging in the coastwise trade of the United States while owned by or chartered to such citizen or citizen successors in interest merely because it was under foreign registry on or after May 27, 1941, and prior to its sale or charter under this act to such citizen, if it is otherwise entitled under the laws of the United States to engage in such trade.

We know, of course, that it was desirable in some cases that some of our ships should go under foreign registry during the war. This provision is placed in the bill in order to make sure that there is no disability against these ships as the result of the policy of going under foreign registry.

Mr. President, during the war the Maritime Commission has been using a revolving fund. The receipts which came to it from many sources went into that fund, and were used by the Commission subject, of course, to the provisions of the law. There is some reason why that policy should continue, because the Maritime Commission will have to pay out considerable sums of money for repairs, for readjustments, and perhaps for other purposes, and it is very difficult to forecast what those amounts are going to be. However, the committee decided that it was desirable to abandon the practice of the revolving fund, and so there is a provision in the bill that these funds as they come in, go into the Treasury, and therefore the Maritime Commission will be restricted to the funds which are specifically appropriated to it. That policy seems to be in accordance with what we think is a sound peacetime policy.

There is a provision that reports shall be made semiannually.

Then the question of a limit to the operations of this bill has been incorporated.

As I stated a moment ago, it is highly desirable that these ships should not be hanging on the market indefinitely. That is not desirable probably from the standpoint of the Government, and I say that most assuredly it is not desirable from the standpoint of the industry. Consequently the concluding sentence of the bill provides:

> SEC. 15. No contract of sale or of charter shall be made under this act after December 31, 1947.

Mr. President, I have attempted in a somewhat rambling and desultory manner to comment on some of the provisions of the bill and have tried to explain some of them. This bill has been a very difficult one to frame out, and one with respect to which there have been some differences of opinion. I feel that to a very large extent the differences have been eliminated.

There is one point to which I want to call attention at this time.

Now for a special matter you will recall that citizens can either purchase or charter. When it comes to foreigners we have allowed them the facility to purchase under some conditions. But in this bill there is no provision which provides for chartering to foreigners.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. With reference to the Senator's statement about citizens who can either buy or charter, the subcommittee struck out the words "dry-cargo" on page 32, line 13. As I understand, after the subcommittee made its report the full committee reinstated the words "dry-cargo."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from California is entirely correct. I have not so far touched on that point, but I wanted to do so. We eliminated in the committee any provision by which tankers could be chartered to citizens or to noncitizens.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator that I have an amendment to strike out the words "dry-cargo" which I do not know whether he would care to consider at this time or take to conference. As a member of the subcommittee I felt, and I feel now, that there is no equity in making a difference between dry-cargo vessels and any other vessels. This provision would not require the Maritime Commission to charter, because we all understand that the main thing we are trying to do now is to sell and dispose of these vessels. But in case the Maritime Commission is unable to make a sale, rather than have these vessels tied up in a ships' graveyard somewhere some of us felt that it would be more logical to permit the Maritime Commission—and it would be permissive only—to charter the ships if it had been unable to make a prior sale and if it would mean the difference between tying the ships up in some ship graveyard or putting them into service.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator will recall that there was much discussion on this point, and there is, of course, much of merit in his point. The committee reached its conclusion only after very careful consideration, and there was some difference of opinion. Those who were somewhat familiar with trade conditions felt rather strongly that it was desirable to eliminate chartering tankers to foreigners. I shall discuss that question a moment later when the Senator offers his amendment. At this time I merely state that it is a matter which received very careful consideration.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude my statement by calling attention to an amendment which was adopted by the committee, but not incorporated in the bill. I was directed to present this amendment on the floor of the Senate as a committee amendment, although it is not part and parcel of the bill itself. It has reference to the possibility, under some conditions, of chartering vessels to foreigners. So far as I recall, no member of the committee was in favor of a general policy of chartering to foreigners. There were some conditions, however, to which they gave special consideration. The State Department was very much interested in that phase of the matter, and I also discussed the question with the President of the United States, and found that he was very much in favor of something being done along the lines which I shall suggest.

During the course of the war approximately 600 ships were turned over to our allies for their use, and also for the resultant benefit of our war effort. In many cases those ships were chartered at very nominal prices. At present about 600 of such ships are in the possession of our allies. Great Britain has 405; Russia, 120; Norway, 24; China, 3; Greece, 17; Poland, 6; Belgium, 6; France, 9; Chile, 4; and The Netherlands, 6.

What is now going to happen? On the 2d of March those ships will have to be returned to this country by the nations which I have mentioned unless some other agreements are made. Under the terms of the bill as presented, it is possible under certain conditions for foreign nations to buy these ships. The President and the State Department felt that there should be even wider discretion. They felt that there should be some option under which those nations could, under certain circumstances, continue to hold the ships under charter. If they do so, it will have to be on terms no more favorable than those available to citizens.

So an amendment was adopted by the committee which under certain conditions would permit the ships which are now in the possession of those nations to be continued under charter.

It was realized that that was not quite all what was needed, because some of the Allied Nations had lost ships more heavily than others. So there is a provision that in addition to the 600 ships, certain others may be chartered to certain nations, so as to equalize the situation. So far as I can estimate, this would not mean more than approximately 60 additional ships. It is merely an equalization policy in regard to those nations which have lost more heavily than others.

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, after line 7, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

(e) Any vessels (except tankers) owned by the United States which on September 1, 1945, were bareboat chartered or otherwise transferred as defense aid by the War Shipping Administration to any member nation of the United Nations under authority of "An act to promote the defense of the United States," approved March 11, 1941, as amended (55 Stat. 31), and vessels (except tankers) available for sale to noncitizens pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section may, when authorized by the President, be bareboat chartered by the Commission to any such nation (hereinafter referred to as "chartering nation") or to nationals of such nation, for operation under the laws of such nation. (The deadweight tonnage of vessels chartered under this subsection to any chartering nation (and its nationals) at any time shall not exceed such percentage of the tonnage under charter or defense aid transfer on September 1, 1945, to the member nation which has suffered the largest merchant ship war losses, as the tonnage of war losses of such chartering nation is to the said war losses of such member nation) except that the amount chartered hereunder to the chartering nation may in any event be equivalent to the tonnage of vessels under charter or defense-aid transfer to such nation on September 1, 1945. Charters of vessels under this subsection shall be at such rate and on such commercial terms as the Commission determines to be appropriate in the circumstances but not at rates or on terms more favorable than those prescribed under sections 5 (a) and (b) of this act for charter of vessels to citizens. After enactment of this section no vessels available for charter under this subsection may be chartered to persons who are not citizens of the United States as defined in section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, except under the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it the Senator's intention to ask for action on this amendment now?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should like to have it disposed of, but I do not wish to press for action if good reason to contrary can be shown.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There was considerable discussion of the amendment in the committee, and if the Senator wishes to have it considered at this time I think a quorum should be present.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. This is the only committee amendment which has been offered, aside from the fact that the committee practically rewrote the bill. As the Senator will recall, the committee did not incorporate this amendment in the bill, which I thought it should have done. It is offered as a committee amendment. It is the only committee amendment which I am directed to offer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since I opposed the amendment in the subcommittee, and since I think it is a rather basic amendment, which the committee did not see fit to include in the bill itself, but brings in an extraneous amendment, so to speak, if the Senator wishes to have action on the amendment at this time I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee, to the committee amendment on page 35, after line 7.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answer to their names:

Austin	Green	Myers
Ball	Guffey	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hart	Overton
Bilbo	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hayden	Reed
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Briggs	Hill	Russell
Brooks	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Huffman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wiley
George	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Gossett	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

DISCHARGE OF MIDSHIPMEN BECAUSE OF UNSATISFACTORY CONDUCT OR APTITUDE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment insert the following: "or whenever it is determined by a unanimous decision of the Academic Board that any midshipman possesses insufficient aptitude for becoming a commissioned officer in the naval service"; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
W. STERLING COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill deals with the procedure to be followed in case of the dismissal of a midshipman from the Naval Academy. We originally sought to lessen the red tape which is now involved when a student has been found guilty of misconduct and it has

become necessary to remove him. There always follows the necessity of making a report and having it reach the President's desk for his approval. In some cases this has required two or more weeks after a student had been guilty of serious misconduct and had remained around the institution without attending classes, and so forth. This bill sought to remove the delay usually involved and vest in the Secretary of the Navy, after hearings, of course, the responsibility of removing a student for misconduct.

Originally the bill also contained a provision that a midshipman could be dismissed not only for misconduct but also for a lack of aptitude. The conferees agreed to an amendment, which the House approved, requiring that in the case of inaptitude there must be a unanimous vote by the academic board in finding inaptitude actually to exist before a midshipman could be dismissed. That is the only change which has been made, namely, the substitution of a modified clause for the language in the original bill.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

JOSEPH A. HANNON AND ELEANORE M. HANNON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore H. Hannon, which were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$6,542.52" and insert "$6,191.52"; in line 7, to strike out the word "their" and insert "all"; and in line 9, to strike out "and for personal injuries to Eleanore M. Hannon."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand this bill is one in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] was very much interested. I am advised that he has no objection to the amendments which the House has made to the bill in the form in which it passed the Senate, and I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I understand that I still have the floor, and I have been asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] to yield. Will the Senator tell me how long he expects to speak?

Mr. BILBO. I am under the impression that I shall speak for only a few minutes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 83.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 83) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to advance discretionary apportionment funds to be used for the purpose of making plans for the National Memorial Stadium as a postwar project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object. Until the slum districts of Washington are taken care of, I shall not be interested in a stadium.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 83.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the motion of the Senator from Mississippi should be agreed to, the consideration of the pending bill would not only be set aside, but the motion would also displace the bill sponsored by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], with reference to an increase in pay of Government employees. I believe that, perhaps, when the bill with reference to which the motion has been made, is understood, it will be passed unanimously. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his motion at this time.

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I wish to cooperate with the Senator, and I think that if the bill were properly understood it could be passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the statement which has been made I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. Inasmuch as the Senator has withdrawn his objection, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Without further explanation of the bill, I object to its being now considered.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I submit that consideration of the bill may consume a week.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that before making his unanimous-consent request, he make a brief statement and advise the Senate as to the purposes of the bill. I do not think the bill is of the nature that many Senators think it is. If the Senator from Mississippi will make a short statement with reference to the bill I think he will be able to have it passed.

Mr. BILBO. If there is no objection, I shall be happy to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. President, last year, 1944, when a large number of bills had been introduced in the Congress to provide for the building of the National Memorial Stadium as a monument to veterans of World War I and World War II, I submitted a joint resolution providing that instead of considering all those various and sundry bills a commission be appointed to make a survey and an investigation with reference to just what kind of a stadium was desired, how large it should be, where it should be located, how much it would cost, and from where the money to construct it would be obtained. The joint resolution was enacted and the commission was appointed. The commission was composed of former Senator Burton, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and myself, as Members of the Senate; Representative SIMPSON of Illinois, Representative LANHAM of Texas, and one other Representative whose name I do not now recall. There was also appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia three men, namely, Mr. Reilly, president of the Second National Bank of Washington, Mr. Akers, of the Washington Board of Trade, and Mr. Russell Young, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners.

The nine men to whom I have referred made a study of the subject. The further we went into the matter the more we became concerned about making a report to the Congress after completing our investigation. We tried to devise a plan by which the proposed project would become self-liquidating, and at the same time not cost the taxpayers of the country one cent. I appointed three committees, one to study the site, one to study the plans, and one to study the financing.

The Commission met not long ago and signed an interim report. We recommended that a joint resolution be passed by the Congress making the construction of the stadium eligible under the Reconversion Act of 1944, and leaving to General Fleming the question of determining how much money would be required to prepare the plans and specifications which the Commission felt to be absolutely necessary before we could get any commital of the money necessary in order to construct the stadium. The money, as a loan from the Public Works Agency, would be subject to subsection (c) of title V of the Reconversion Act which provides that the first money received in accordance with our financial plan must be used in paying back whatever funds General Fleming might advance in the preparation of plans and specifications.

Mr. HILL. In other words, as I understand the proposal, the report of the Commission to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, is not to the effect that the Federal Government shall pay for the actual cost of the construction of the stadium. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. BILBO. I repeat, Mr. President, that the construction of the stadium will not cost the Federal Government one cent. I am opposed to the Federal Government paying anything for the construction of the stadium. I want the project to be a self-liquidating one, and to be properly financed.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the proposal is to raise funds from private sources for the actual construction of the stadium, on the basis of the stadium being a memorial to the soldiers of World War I and World War II. Am I correct?

Mr. BILBO. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, Congress gave to the Federal Works Administration certain funds to be used by it in making advances to States, counties, municipalities, and other governmental bodies for the preparation of plans for public works during the postwar era.

Mr. BILBO. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. All the Senator's bill would do would be to let the Public Works Administration, under General Fleming,

make an advance not to exceed $150,000 for the purpose of preparing architectural plans and designs and determining what would be the character and nature of the stadium and its approximate cost. The Senator is asking for the proposed stadium the same right to obtain a loan or an advance that the Congress has given to States, municipalities, and other subdivisions of government throughout the United States.

Mr. BILBO. It is purely a question of eligibility.

Mr. HILL. The measure simply provides an advance of money to make architectural plans and designs and determine the character and nature of the project and approximately what the cost will be. Is that correct?

Mr. BILBO. That is correct. Mr. Reilly, who is one of the big bankers of Washington, appeared before the committee and said we would have no trouble in securing proper financing if we had something definite in the way of plans for construction to submit to the financial agencies and money centers that would loan the money and proved to them that the stadium would be a self-liquidating proposition.

We found in our investigation that there was but one stadium in the United States which was not a white elephant to the community that built it. Why? Because they confined themselves to the gate receipts from the stadium, and the gate receipts were so small that they could never obtain a sufficient amount to pay for the stadium. So they have all been white elephants except one in California.

The proposed stadium for Washington is of such a plan, such a size, such a scheme, and on such a basis that it will be self-liquidating. It will cost $25,000,000, but we have no doubt about being able to get private financing. Remember that after it is built, after it is financed by private money, payments will be made, and, of course, there will be bonds issued against the receipts, and as the bonds are retired year by year, then ultimately the whole stadium will become the property of the taxpayers of the United States. It is a Federal proposition.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are the bonds which it is proposed shall be issued to be guaranteed by the United States Government?

Mr. BILBO. No, sir. The bonds will be guaranteed by whatever we are able to put up as security for them and they will also have back of them the receipts of the stadium.

Mr. LANGER. A moment ago the Senator used the expression that the proponents of the stadium had a financial scheme. Would the Senator mind detailing what it is?

Mr. BILBO. I shall be glad to do that. Upon the advice of the architect and with the endorsement of Billy Rose, who is a great sportsman and showman—and, by the way, I will say confidentially that he would like to come down and operate the proposed stadium for the commission whenever it is constructed—in addition to a stadium that will seat 175,000 people—I started out wanting a stadium that would hold 200,000, but on the advice of the architect and in working out the plan we decided to cut it down to 175,000—there will be other features and attractions.

It is to be an all-weather, all-the-year-around stadium. It will have a roof so that those who patronize it will not suffer from the cold, and will not freeze, as did those who attended the football game in Philadelphia the other day.

Then will be the receipts from 25 or 30 attractions. One expert went so far as to say we could put in at least 40 attractions a year since the stadium will be covered and the weather will have no deterrent effect; but to be conservative, let us say 20 or 25. To the gate receipts of the stadium from this source there will be additions because under the bleachers of the stadium there will be provided a series of rooms, 48 in number, one for each State, to enable it to make a display of its resources and industries and agricultural products.

In addition to that, provision is made for a world of rooms, which will be rented to industry. To industries in the United States that have something to sell and display and show to the people of the world, it is proposed to rent these rooms. As Washington is the capital of the greatest Nation on earth and millions of people come here yearly, the industries of the country will want to place on display their products—all the new inventions and new gadgets, sewing machines, television sets, and everything that people want to buy.

We figured—and all agreed—that this would be the greatest source of revenue and in that way, with a cover and a roof for these displays and these machines, we will be able to get money to make the project self-liquidating.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what will be the charge for admission?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator for a statement of a few minutes. It appears that the subject is leading to debate and it looks as though it might displace the unfinished business. I hope the Senator will not ask for any further indulgence. I yielded for a brief statement, and it has led to quite extended debate. I will ask the Senator if he does not feel that he has made his statement which he contemplated when he asked me to yield temporarily? He asked for only a few moments.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] informs me that he will object, so I will withhold my request for the present.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of certain Government-owned merchant vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], on behalf of the committee, on page 35, after line 7.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, there are a few Members in the Chamber who I think were not present when I offered this amendment on behalf of the committee, and I shall make a brief restatement in regard to it.

First of all, the amendment is a committee amendment. It was adopted by the committee, but not inserted in the bill. I was asked, however, as chairman of the subcommittee, to present it on the floor as a committee amendment. So much for its status.

What does the amendment propose to do? Under the bill we are considering there is provision for selling and chartering ships to citizens of the United States. When it comes to foreigners, however, the provision is somewhat different. First of all, there is a right provided for in this bill for sales to foreigners, but junior to the opportunities of American citizens. That has been gone over at considerable length, and I shall not now go into particulars, but in the bill as it is before us, apart from the committee amendment, there is no provision under which ships can be chartered to foreigners. We know that during the operations of lend-lease a number of ships, approximately about 600, were turned over to Great Britain, Russia, and other countries, a list of which I gave a few moments ago. Those ships were used primarily for the purposes of the war effort.

On the 2d of March those ships will have to be returned by those countries, unless we make new arrangements. Under the bill there is a provision by which foreigners may buy those ships under certain conditions. Our State Department feels very strongly—and I may say that I have discussed the matter with the President—that it is highly desirable that we put in the bill some provision permitting some discretion in the case of the ships which are already in the possession of these countries. Great Britain has about 405; Russia has, I think, 124; and other nations have smaller numbers, totaling about 600 in all.

So on the 2d of March, instead of saying to any nation that has these ships, "Now you return these ships or pay us what we see fit to charge," we feel that there should be some method by which they could be re-chartered, not on the old basis of a nominal rate, but on terms of certainly no more favorable than we can charter ships to our citizens.

An exception is made, however, in regard to tankers. No tankers can be chartered to foreigners.

It seems to me this is a very desirable amendment. We know the international situation is one which has many complexities. I see the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on the Senate floor. Certainly he has been a most indefatigable and helpful worker in trying to solve some of these international problems.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I should like to understand better this charter arrangement. Is it for an indefinite period? The Senator says the foreign chartering is limited in accordance with the terms of similar charters we are able to enter into with our own citizens.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No chartering of any of these ships to a foreigner can be made on terms more favorable than we charter ships to our own citizens.

Mr. GERRY. How is that determined? Is that set forth in the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is covered at considerable length in the bill, and I have attempted to explain from time to time the various provisions by which these charter arrangements are made. The idea is that in the case of a foreigner no charter would be more favorable than would be a charter to one of our own citizens.

Mr. President, I think it is very desirable that the amendment be adopted. Not many ships are involved, and eliminating the tankers, the ships are old, and not of great value. Our State Department feels at this time that it wants leeway in utilizing such charters. The State Department has many matters coming before it for consideration, and I think it is very unfortunate and totally unnecessary at this time to say to the Department, "Oh, no; you cannot do that. No discretion whatever shall rest in the Commission, even with the approval of the President, to charter any of these boats."

As I have said, the number of ships involved is small. Their value is very slight. I think, however, that they have a psychological value, which we should not ignore at this time.

Mr. President, I am not here to suggest any plans of appeasement or anything of that kind. No one wants to do that. But when we have so many matters to consider in our relations with other nations, why not leave to our President and our State Department as free a hand as we can consistent with our own safety and welfare?

For that reason, I sincerely hope that the amendment which was adopted by the committee, though not inserted in the bill, will be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. On page 31, in section 4, under the heading "Sales of war-built vessels to citizens," we find the following language:

> If the Commission determines that the applicant possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable him—

And so forth. On page 33, in section 6, under the heading "Sale of war-built vessels to persons not citizens of the United States," we find that the correspondent phrase in line 18 is—

> That the applicant has the financial resources, ability, and experience necessary to enable him to fulfill all obligations * * *.

In other words there the requirements for the citizen are greater than the requirements for a noncitizen, are they not?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; I do not think so. If the Senator will read further he will see that there are special limitations placed upon foreigners which do not apply to citizens.

Mr. GREEN. In the section relating to sales to citizens there is the provision:

> Ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications.

In the case of foreigners the provision is—

> financial resources, ability, and experience.

In the case of the foreigner it is limited to those three qualifications; but in the case of a citizen "other qualifications" are required. So it would seem to me that greater qualifications are required of a citizen than of a foreigner.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is correct if he restricts his discussion to that particular language, but if he will read further on that page, and also read the language on the following page, he will see that many restrictions are placed upon the transactions with foreigners.

Mr. GREEN. Why does not the bill provide "and other qualifications" in the case of the foreigner?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not see any particular objection to that, but if the language "and other qualifications" were placed in the bill at that point, and then we were to proceed and state a number of things, it would result in a rather undesirable arrangement.

Mr. GREEN. That, however, was done in the section relating to sale to citizens.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes, but we do not say that such a vessel is not necessary for the promotion of the merchant marine.

Mr. GREEN. The new amendment, it seems to me, is along the same lines. The language is that a foreigner shall not have any greater—I do not know what the Senator calls them—let us say, advantages, from this legislation than a citizen. Why should a foreigner have as much advantage?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. A foreigner does not have as much advantage, because if the Senator will read farther along in the bill, on the next page, he will see that some limitations are placed upon the foreigner. Frankly, I do not visualize any particular difference in construction of the language. The Commission has discretion anyway as to what it will do. It will consider the matter very carefully when it comes up in connection with any question of sale or charter. The Commission has a great deal of leeway under many provisions of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. I think the Commission does have a great deal of leeway, but the restrictions placed on the Commission are more definite against the citizen than they are against the foreigner.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Personally I do not object to language such as the Senator might propose to place in the bill. I think it is rather unnecessary, however, when we consider the text which follows. I do not see that it would do any harm at all, but frankly I believe it is hardly necessary in view of the language which follows. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that we want to be just as careful as we can be.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from Maryland keeps saying that foreigners will have no greater advantages than citizens. He thinks it is a great argument to make that the foreigner is not going to have any greater advantages than the citizen.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator wants to insert "and other qualifications" in connection with foreigners it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. GREEN. Oh, no. I am simply using that argument to show the spirit behind the amendment, that is all. I cannot go through this bill and change it. What I stated is only one illustration.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill has been before the House and Senate for a long time, and the language has been considered very carefully. I think there is, as the Senator will see in the bill, an attempt to give preference to the citizen all the way through. No sales can be made to a foreigner if a citizen wants to buy or to charter.

Mr. GREEN. That is within 90 days.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator will find language in the bill giving the citizen the preference.

Mr. GREEN. If the committee has considered this language so long and so carefully it seems unnecessary to amend it now.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think I can throw some light on the matter if the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me to interrupt him.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Rhode Island has not proceeded far enough in his reading. I think he would understand——

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I was asking for information, but I did not obtain it.

Mr. OVERTON. I am giving it.

Mr. GREEN. I did not ask the Senator from Louisiana; I asked the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I suggested to the Senator from Rhode Island three times that if he would read the language on the next page he would find the answer to his question.

Mr. OVERTON. "Other qualifications" are defined in reference to a citizen. "And other qualifications necessary to enable him to operate and maintain the vessel under normal competitive condition." That would not apply to vessels to be sold to foreigners, to be operated by them. It applies to vessels sold to citizens.

Mr. GREEN. It certainly would if the amendment which the Senator from Maryland now proposes were to be included in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. No, Mr. President, it would not. The chartering of those vessels to foreigners would not require them to have qualifications to operate and maintain the vessels under normal competitive conditions. Do I make myself clear, I may ask the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GREEN. Another criticism of the same language would be the introduction of the word "experience." In other words, that no one without experience could buy these ships. That means that

no new enterprise could be established, that the sale is limited to those already in the business. It seems to me that is very undesirable. I would prefer to give the privilege to Americans to encourage them to enter upon the shipping business rather than to foreigners who have the experience.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator that first of all he may be, though I am not sure, giving entirely too restricted a meaning to the word "experience." It does not say "experience in shipping." It says "experience." It may be that when the Commission considers these matters it may want to give consideration to what has been the general experience of the applicant in or out of shipping and to the relative amount of experience of two applicants for purchase. But let me again emphasize that all through the bill efforts have been made to give preference to citizens. These restrictions, as brought out on the next page of the bill, illustrate that. I also want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that it would be very desirable, of course, if our citizens absorbed all these ships. They have the preference, but suppose they do not acquire all the ships. So in order to keep the ships from being laid up we have placed in the bill the conditions under which, if our citizens do not buy or charter them, foreigners may buy them. That is only to help develop the market.

Mr. GREEN. I wish the Senator from Maryland would explain why, if an American without experience applies, he cannot buy a ship.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Experience in what?

Mr. GREEN. Exactly. Why does not the bill say what experience? It does not mean experience in breathing.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the Senator from Rhode Island would feel that we want to give the Commission quite broad powers. I do not think we can sit here and define in detail what it can consider.

Mr. GREEN. Exactly. Give the Commission broad powers and do not limit the Commission to sale to citizens who have certain qualifications. The bill provides that the Commission cannot sell to an American citizen unless he has ability. It cannot sell to an American citizen unless he has experience. It cannot sell to an American citizen unless he has financial resources. It cannot sell to an American citizen unless he has other qualifications necessary. Then the Senator accuses me of wanting to put limitations on the power of the Government to sell to American citizens. I say that all the qualifications provided by the bill would limit the sale to American citizens. Some of the restrictions on the sale to American citizens ought to be withdrawn before the ships are sold to foreigners.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the policy of the committee has been to eliminate just as many restrictions as we thought could be done. In the beginning many restrictions were suggested, and some were tentatively approved, but the whole policy of the committee was to get rid of as many restrictions as possible. If the Senator feels that there is any discrimination against citizens—and we did not think so in the committee—so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing that the Senator prepare appropriate language which he thinks should be placed in the bill to make it perfectly obvious and clearly apparent that there is no discrimination.

I think that if the Senator will consider the whole bill from beginning to end he will see all the way through an intent to give preference to American citizens, and properly so.

Referring to the pending amendment, I hope the Senate will act favorably upon it. I do not see that we have anything to lose. Secretary Byrnes has written me a letter in which he states that he believes this proposal should be adopted. I am at a loss to see what particular damage would result. Not many ships are involved, and they would not interfere with our trade. We should not fetter our State Department at this time in carrying out the many extremely important duties which it has, by failing to take such action as seems to be necessary.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Will the Senator agree to strike out the word "experience"?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; I cannot do that. I am willing to add qualifications. If we are to dispose of these ships I think it is highly desirable that the Maritime Commission should give some consideration to the character of the purchasers, what they have been doing, and so forth. Obviously, we do not want these ships to get into the hands of people who are clearly unfitted to operate them. Why not leave some general language in the bill?

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from Rhode Island is the one who wishes to give the Maritime Commission greater freedom in sales. It is the Senator from Maryland who is insisting on the restrictions, and saying that the Maritime Commission should not sell to an American citizen unless he has the necessary experience. I would leave it to the discretion of the Maritime Commission and not impose such restrictions. I would free the Maritime Commission from restrictions in sales to American citizens. There are more restrictions with respect to sales to American citizens than with respect to sales to foreigners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on behalf of the committee to the committee amendment on page 35, after line 7.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I understand that the junior Senator from California wishes to discuss this amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Does the Senator wish to have me yield to him for that purpose or does he desire to obtain the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to obtain the floor after the Senator has concluded.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will postpone any further comments I may have on this amendment until after the Senator from California has finished.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I regret that committee meetings being held today, all of which are important, prevent a larger attendance in the Senate Chamber during the discussion of this bill, because I believe that the ship sales bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation which has been before the Senate in the brief time I have been a Member of the Senate, and perhaps one of the most important that will be before the Senate during this session of Congress.

I believe that a rather fundamental policy is involved, and one with respect to which the Congress of the United States has some responsibility. I for one am not willing to surrender to the State Department alone the responsibility for determining a major national policy.

I believe that the meat of the coconut in the situation is this: At the present time we have perhaps the best opportunity for the sale of these vessels, either domestically or to foreigners, that we shall ever have. History following the last war showed that after a period of time ships cluttered the market and the price constantly went down. We shall never have a better opportunity to sell to foreign nations or to domestic lines than we shall have in the immediate future.

The position which I took in the subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce was that at this time we can sell the vessels, whereas if we permit chartering of the vessels to foreign nations, we shall find that they will use them for a period of 1, 2, or 3 years, and then return them to us, and we shall have a vast accumulation of outdated vessels.

In the meantime foreign nations, in their own shipyards, and perhaps with funds furnished by the people of the United States, will be building newer, more modern vessels in order to compete with the American merchant marine. It seems to me that it is far more logical and sensible, as a part of American policy, to permit foreign nations to buy these vessels now and take ownership rather than merely use them for a period of years and then return them to us.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. HART. I wish to be sure that I correctly understand the Senator. Is he talking about the general policy of chartering vessels to foreign nations, or is he discussing only the 600 vessels which are now in the hands of certain nations under the terms of lend-lease?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am speaking of the general policy of chartering vessels to foreign countries. It seems to me that that is a major policy with which we are faced, and with respect to which the Senate has a very definite responsibility. For that reason it seems to me

that the Congress of the United States should make certain that there is not placed in this bill a provision which would permit chartering to foreign nations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the basic philosophy of what the Senator from California has said, but I think we ought to clear up the fact that if foreign governments do charter these vessels, the charter price will be at least 15 percent of the cost of construction. If the vessel were chartered for 3 years or more, the foreign governments would pay, under the charter, just as much as though we sold the vessels to them outright, under the 50-percent provision. The charter price would be at least 15 percent of the cost.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The difficulty is that the vessels would come back to us, and we would then be loaded with a great many antiquated vessels. As a matter of national policy, I believe that the United States should maintain possession of leadership by having the fastest, most modern merchant marine, and the best, fastest, and most modern commercial air service. As a matter of national policy I believe that we should do everything we can do to encourage activity along both those lines.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I stated, I do not disagree with the basic policy of the Senator from California; but the situation in which the Maritime Commission finds itself is that there are approximately 600 ships on lend-lease to various countries. Many of them are old ships; ships which we do not want back anyway, according to the testimony of Admiral Land. Many of the foreign governments say that they cannot purchase them outright, but that they can probably charter them for a period of 2 or 3 years, in which case they would pay us the purchase price anyway, because they can charter them only by paying a minimum of 15 percent of the cost. We shall receive a return in one way or another. Why not try to get something out of it? Possibly some of the nations would keep the ships for even a longer period, because they are short of tonnage. It would be very fine if we could sell them all to foreign governments; but the best judgment we could get on this question was to the effect that there would be probably very little sale of these ships, and that probably the only method by which we could realize something would be through charter. Basically I think we all agree with the premise stated by the able Senator from California.

The committee very reluctantly asked the Senator from Maryland to present this committee amendment. We felt that it contained so many pros and cons, and that the situation was so ticklish, so far as foreign policy was concerned, that we did not even want it reported as an amendment to the bill. We were afraid that it might hurt the original bill.

That is the situation in which we find ourselves. I do not know how else we can get out of it unless we wish to take back the 600 ships and put them in a "boneyard."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will not the Senator admit that if we are ever to dispose of these vessels by sale to foreign nations, we stand a better opportunity of doing so as of the time when the agreement expires than 2 or 3 or 4 years from now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think there is no question about it; but even though now is the best time to sell if we can sell—of course, we can sell some—the point which we had to consider was, how many ships we thought we could sell, as against what we thought we might get over a period of 2 or 3 years by chartering.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How can the American merchant marine compete if we permit these vessels to go on charter for 2 or 3 years, and then come back to us, leaving the United States with a fleet of fairly antiquated vessels, while in the shipyards of Britain and the continent of Europe American funds are being used to build the latest vessels, which will probably outperform our C–2's? New vessels would probably be built on the basis of a loan from the United States, which would very likely be without interest for a period of 5 years, and with an amortization period of 50 years, terms with which no American industry can possibly compete.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe that these ships enter into that consideration. The ships which we are discussing would not be in any way competitive. If foreign countries were to use them as their merchant marine, I do not believe that they would compete with the American merchant marine. Most of them are obsolete ships, which no one wants.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But if they are returned to us we shall be saddled with the ships.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HART. I think there is a little confusion, because it was repeatedly stated before the committee that nearly all these ships are so old and inefficient that if they were returned to us they would have only scrap value.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Connecticut have said. Not many ships are involved. As the Senator from Connecticut says, they have very little value except scrap value.

I am in general accord with the principles which the Senator from California has laid down. However, I think it is rather a pity to make this point at the present time, under the special circumstances which exist. There is no particular advantage to be derived from it. No one in the world believes that these ships will seriously compete with us. The opinion of the Maritime Commission and of all those who considered the question very seriously is that there is no such thing as real competition in these ships.

As I have stated, the State Department has requested this provision. From the material and practical viewpoint, the question is really a minor one. I am not discussing the theory which the Senator from California has advanced so eloquently, but I believe that the practical problem involved in a minor one. I think it would be a pity not to go along with the recommendation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I may have misunderstood him, but I certainly received the impression from those who had some experience in maritime matters that pretty generally those interested in the American merchant marine, both in and out of Government, felt that the policy which I have tried to enunciate on the floor of the Senate today was a sound American policy. It was only after pressure from the State Department in their negotiations with other nations that they have, as the Senator will point out, somewhat reluctantly changed their views.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not understand that there was any particular pressure from the State Department. The State Department discussed this matter very frankly, and we welcomed their suggestions and their ideas.

I do not wish to trouble the Senate with repetition; but I feel that in this matter, which is relatively small from a practical viewpoint, but which will have very great psychological value, it will be a mistake not to adopt the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, let me state to the Senator from California that it is my understanding that the Maritime Commission will sell as many of these ships as possible. There is no prohibition against the sale of the ships. We merely allow them to charter the ships, in cases in which they may deem it advisable, and in which we would not want the ships back, anyway. Of course, I realize that often there is a temptation on the part of citizens of foreign countries to charter, rather than to purchase. But I do not see how any harm can occur under the provision in question, because with a 15-percent minimum charter they will have to pay for the ships, anyway.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, why not let them buy the ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They can buy all they wish to buy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is under no illusions, I trust, that if something is given away, people are not likely to buy it. If the terms which are made are such that it is not profitable to purchase, purchases will not be made. Personally, I think it is time for us to have a little enlightened self-interest in our dealings with foreign countries. If we do, we shall receive greater respects from the rest of the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think we are giving away anything. I think a charter price of 15 percent is rather high, and it would apply only to foreigners who could not raise 50 percent of the purchase price in the 12-month period in which they would be permitted to buy. On the other hand, they could pay the 15-percent charter price over a 2-year or a 3-year period. Unquestionably it will be better to charter the ships

to persons who are able to pay the charter hire, rather than to attempt to sell the ships to persons who eventually will not be able to pay for them, with the result that the ships would be turned back to the Maritime Commission. The Maritime Commission does not want to have all of them turned back.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize the fact that a rather unusual step was taken, in connection with this amendment, by inserting in it a provision that when a proposed charter under these conditions was under consideration, the proposed charter of the vessel to a foreigner must be authorized by the President of the United States. We have felt that he should be the final judge as to whether there was significance in our policy which would warrant us in deviating from our general policy of not chartering to foreigners. So we have incorporated that language, and under it I emphasize the President of the United States would have to authorize each one of these charters.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Let me ask where the charter limitation of 15 percent appears?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know the exact page on which it appears.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is on page 32, in the last paragraph. There the Senator will find a specific provision that the charter rate shall be not less than 15 percent.

Mr. GREEN. That applies only to citizens; does it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The amendment provides that the charter would be subject to the same terms and that the charter rate should not be less than 15 percent. Consequently, the vessels could not be chartered for any less than that to foreigners.

Mr. GREEN. Very well.

Let me ask the Senator from Washington whether he approves of limiting these sales to Americans with experience.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know; I am somewhat inclined to agree with the Senator from Rhode Island. I do not know why that language was inserted. However, it seems to me it could just as well be inserted, because I think the Maritime Commission would have to determine that qualification.

Mr. GREEN. It is a limitation as to Americans who have ability, in the first place; in the second place, financial resources; in the third place, experience; and in the fourth place, other qualifications. However, in the case of foreigners the other qualifications are left out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it would be rather difficult for the Maritime Commission to pass upon the qualifications of foreigners.

Mr. GREEN. But why have the Commission pass on the qualifications of Americans if it is not to pass on the qualifications of foreigners?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The qualifications of a citizen of the United States would be of direct interest to the Maritime Commission because it has the duty of prescribing rules and regulations for the American merchant marine. What a foreigner does with his ship, after he charters it or buys it, is something about which the Maritime Commission could not do very much.

Mr. GREEN. The question is largely one of security for the payment of the vessel, is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I recall in connection with shipping bills which were handled by the House of Representatives when I was a Member of the House, I think the provision was originally inserted, because at the time there were some fly-by-night concerns which would go into operation and make a proposal to the Maritime Commission to purchase some ships, and this provision would give the Maritime Commission an opportunity to give preference to persons who had had experience. I think that provision has been included in all similar bills.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Washington is absolutely correct. The provision is entirely customary. When the ships are purchased, it may be that the down payment will not be more than 25 percent, and in that event the mortgage for the unpaid balance may extend over a period of 20 years. I think it is not unreasonable to insert some language providing that the Maritime Commission shall give some consideration to the qualifications and experience of the persons who desire to purchase ships under such circumstances.

Mr. GREEN. But the Senator knows perfectly well that in this connection "experience" means experience in shipping.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am not sure about that, Mr. President. However, the Senator knows that one who takes a mortgage gives some consideration to the experience and other qualifications of the purchaser. When the Government is selling these ships on such favorable terms and over such a long period of time, I think it well that it should give consideration to various factors which ordinarily are considered by a prudent man in selling property and taking back a mortgage.

Mr. GREEN. That is quite true, if the main object is to develop a merchant marine. But in this case the main object is to get rid of the ships, even if they are sold for junk. Consequently, it seems to me that these words are out of place in the bill, especially if they limit the power of the Maritime Commission to sell the ships. We are making a very small body of customers who can buy the ships, and the Maritime Commission will go abroad and sell them, rather than sell them to Americans. I think that is the wrong way to proceed.

I should like to hear some Senator, speaking in behalf of the committee, explain the policy regarding such a procedure. It seems to me it does not make sense.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that it is not at all satisfactory to pick out three or four words in a long bill and say they state the policy. If the Senator will go over the provisions of the bill step by step, he will observe that almost invariably preference is given to our own citizens and never to foreigners. There would be no need whatever of including any provision with respect to sales to foreigners if it were not anticipated that possibly the home market would not absorb all the ships.

Mr. GREEN. Then why limit the home market, as the bill would do, and why include these artificial restrictions on the discretion of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator that if we did not have the requirement that they could buy on such very reasonable terms and over such a long period of time I should be rather inclined to follow the Senator's judgment. But if we are going to let purchasers give back mortgages which will run over a period of 20 years, certain investigations and restrictions are quite desirable. The Senator knows that a mortgage on a ship is not quite as stable or secure as a mortgage on land. The Senator from Maine will correct me if I am mistaken, but I assume that a mortgage on a ship is not as stable or secure as a mortgage on land because of dangers of it being supplanted in priority.

Mr. GREEN. A mortgage on such a ship when sold to an American is much more secure than a mortgage on a similar ship sold to a foreigner, a citizen of a country that is bankrupt. Does not the Senator from Maryland agree?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That may be so, but it is rather difficult to indulge in abstract statements of that kind and be entirely satisfied with their accuracy. I do not wish to be critical of foreign nations. Many of our allies have had most difficult problems, but they have weathered them. I shall not assume that they will not make every effort in the world to meet their obligations.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator knows that I do not question whether we have sympathy with them, but I also sympathize with American citizens who have had debts piling up and who are paying high taxes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I did not say I sympathize with our allies, though they surely merit it. I simply say that I believe that foreign countries will make every reasonable effort to meet their obligations in regard to our ship transactions.

Mr. GREEN. No doubt there would be. But why put in the provisions as to Americans and not as to foreigners, and claim that we must have security against Americans which is not required of foreigners?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think it is a normal provision but it is not one of paramount importance. If the committee, after having given the matter very careful consideration, had not inserted the language, I should have been happy about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand the situation, the Maritime Commission is given a mandate that if the Senator and I, for example, not having

had any shipping experience, wish to form a corporation and go to the Maritime Commission to buy ships under this bill, and if at the same time the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who have had some shipping experience, wish to buy ships, they will receive greater consideration of the Maritime Commission, who will say in effect, "Well, we will sell the ships to the persons who have the greater experience." The reason, I assume, that similar language has not been included with reference to foreigners is that the Maritime Commission cannot be concerned with the qualifications of foreigners. What we want is money for the ships. With reference to foreigners, only the countries in which they live can determine whether their shipping men are qualified to operate under their flags.

Mr. GREEN. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that he read the language of the bill. The language requires the same ability of a foreigner as it requires of a citizen.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought the Senator was objecting to the words "other qualifications."

Mr. GREEN. That was one of the objections.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The main reason for the language, so far as the foreigners are concerned, in the event that they purchase any of these ships, is that we may be able to inquire of them as to their financial standing. So far as experience is concerned, I suppose that each country has its own conception of who are great shipping men.

Mr. GREEN. I am very glad that each of us understands what the word "experience" means in connection with the text to which reference has been made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. I am trying to understand the issue in this amendment regarding the chartering of vessels to foreign countries. Is it the purpose of the amendment to get rid of four or five vessels which may not be very good vessels, or is it the purpose of the amendment to help foreign nations?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I would say that perhaps elements of both questions are involved. It would be possible, perhaps, to get rid of ships by charter in some cases which otherwise would have to come back to us on March 2, or shortly thereafter, and then go in some cases to the scrap pile, as we might have no use for them. On the other hand, as I tried to emphasize a while ago, we are working out many very intricate matters with foreign nations. I think it is obvious to all of us that it is desirable for the President and the State Department to have a free hand, or at least that it be as free as it is possible for us to make it, in connection with this matter. As I stated a while ago—I am not sure that the Senator heard me—there is in the amendment a specific provision to the effect that each one of the charters to foreigners must be approved by the President. Such a requirement is made in order to emphasize the fact that we think there is some importance or some significance existing from the standpoint of our international policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the amendment there is reference to a very complicated percentage of tonnage to the chartering nation with reference to the total amount of tonnage lost by the member nation. I will read the language. I do not understand it. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

> The dead-weight tonnage of vessels chartered under this subsection to any chartering nation (and its nationals) at any time shall not exceed such percentage of the tonnage under charter or defense-aid transfer on September 1, 1945, to the member nation which has suffered the largest merchant ship losses as the tonnage of war losses of such chartering nation is to the said war losses of such member nation.

And so forth. That language is very complicated.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree with the Senator that the language does not contain in it the element of simplicity.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the purpose of the amendment more to help a nation that has suffered large war losses than it is to retain for us our ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Running all through the bill, it is provided that where a choice must be made the preference is to be given to the citizen who has lost the more heavily, from the standpoint of percentage. That is also the provision with regard to a sale to a foreign country.

Some of the nations have lost more heavily than have others. In a particular instance it may be that a given nation which has been very active in the allied ranks, has been left with only one or two ships. So in order to equalize the situation, in addition to the 600 ships which those nations now have, the amendment contemplates that an additional number may be chartered. No nation except Great Britain and Russia has more than approximately 16 or 17 ships. In order to carry out a policy of equalization there has been inserted the clause which would permit a small additional number of ships to be added to those chartered to foreigners. So far as I can ascertain, there would be involved at the most not more than 50 or 60 additional ships. In other words, in addition to the 600 ships not more than 50 or 60 ships might be required in order to carry out this rounding-out equalization principle which we have utilized all through the bill in our transactions with citizens.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the matter is so important that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

I ask the Senator from Maryland if he intends to press for a vote on the pending amendment? If so, I shall withhold my amendment until a vote is taken on the amendment which the Senator from Maryland has offered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Did not the Senator from North Dakota make the point of no quorum?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Having made that point, is it not obligatory, in accordance with the rule, for the roll to be called?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington did not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have propounded a question to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I desire to avoid interfering with any Senator who desires to speak. I do not know whether any other Senator wishes to discuss this amendment or not. If any Senator wishes to discuss the amendment, I do not wish to discourage him from doing so, but I should like to continue with the bill, and dispose of it as quickly as possible. If there is no further discussion to be had on the amendment, it seems to me that we should have a vote upon it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator from North Dakota made the point of no quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota did not have the floor for that purpose. The Senator from Washington had the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not yet understand from the Senator from Maryland whether he wishes to have a vote taken on the amendment, or proceed with a discussion of other amendments and have a vote taken later on his amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to ask a question of the minority leader. I ask him whether or not he, or any Member of the minority, desires to discuss this amendment? I have not heard of any Senator who wishes to discuss it further.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has asked me a question. I have no desire to discuss the amendment myself, but I should like to hear an explanation of it so that I may have some inkling of what is its purpose and what will be its effect. There has been no explanation of it which was adequate to my dull understanding.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Will the Senator be a bit patient with me until I try again to explain the amendment?

Mr. WHITE. I have been patient with the Senator for 4 hours. I shall always be patient with him. However, I am getting near the bottom of the barrel. But, as I have said, I shall always listen to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator knows that under the bill in its present form——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator is indulging in a violent presumption. I do not know what is in the bill. The truth about the situation is that the subject matter of this bill was discussed in the other House for weeks and months. It came to the Senate on the

2d of October, and was referred to the Committee on Commerce, where it remained for 2 months and 2 days. It was reported to the Senate only day before yesterday, and the first I ever heard of it was on yesterday. I confess that instead of being patient I have been very impatient that the matter should be forced on us at this time with no opportunity given to Senators generally to become informed concerning a most conflicting and complex piece of legislation with respect to the maritime policy of the United States.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the Senator from Maine will recall that I spoke to him and said I would be very glad to follow out his wishes, that I would not bring the bill up today if he objected. Furthermore, I have no desire to press for a vote, and in order to show that that was my inclination, I asked the Senator a question a little while ago. I should be glad to know what the Senator wants me to do.

Mr. WHITE. If I could have just what I wanted, I would have the Senator recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce. That would be my first choice.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is somewhat pessimistic about what the committee has done.

Mr. WHITE. No; I am not pessimistic about what the committee has done. I am pessimistic and I am out of sorts because a bill of great complexity, and with respect to a most important problem, is brought to the floor of the Senate and made the subject of consideration when there has been no opportunity for most of the Senators even to read it the first time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Does not the Senator recall that I told him I would not bring it up if he preferred that I not do so?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator said that, and then I was overwhelmed with importunities, and I yielded, and I have been bottled up until this moment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Now that the Senator has reached—what shall I say—a spirit of more clear-cut, definite purpose, what would the Senator like to have done now?

Mr. WHITE. I would like to have the Senator from Maryland move to recommit the bill.

Mr. GREEN. And bring in a report. We have not any report on the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Ultimately, of course, there should be a report.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is a report on the bill. After wrestling with this matter 2 or 3 months in the subcommittee and the general committee, I naturally would be opposed to any motion to recommit the bill. But of course the Senator has the privilege of making the motion.

Mr. WHITE. I am not going to make a motion to recommit the bill, and I have to admit that I did finally agree that I would not object to its consideration, but that does not stop me from indicating my distress over the situation, and my hostility to the bill, so far as I understand it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask the Senator, who made an exceedingly generous concession to my request a little while ago, what does he now desire? The bill is before the Senate. Would he prefer that I not ask for a vote on the pending amendment at this time? What would he like to have me do?

Mr. WHITE. I am not interested in this particular amendment, I do not know enough about it to be particular about it, but, as I have said, if I had my way about the matter, and if the Senator would yield to my recommendation, the recommendation would be that the bill be recommitted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have yielded to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from California is merely trying to ascertain whether we are going to press for a vote on the committee amendment today, I will yield the floor for that purpose. If not, I myself have two amendments which I should like to have disposed of today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he would be willing to let the bill go over until tomorrow, in view of the small attendance present and the fact that, in my opinion, this is an important amendment and one which I believe should be thoroughly understood. If the amendment is to be pressed to a vote, I shall have to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I assure the Senator from California and the Senator from Maine that my amendments are very simple, and I think any senatorial mind will be able to understand them.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I must say to the Senator from California, in answer to his suggestion, that I am somewhat embarrassed. The pending bill has its place today due to the courtesy of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who yielded for that purpose. For me to agree to the bill going over until tomorrow—certainly I should want to do anything any Senator wanted me to do—would put me in an awkward situation with the senior Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. It would be satisfactory to me for the bill to go over until 11 o'clock tomorrow, if Senators would try to dispose of it by noon, and I could make a very brief statement to the Senate this evening on the Federal pay bill. I should like to have Senators take to their comfortable homes and consider overnight, some very simple data I have to give them about the Federal employees. I think perhaps after they digest these data, along with a good meal, they may come back favorable to the Federal pay bill. So I should like to have opportunity this evening to make a brief address, of 15 or 20 minutes, on the Federal pay bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I appreciate greatly the courtesy of the Senator from California, who has been most helpful to us in disposing of the ship-sale bill, which is most urgent. Every day we postpone action we lose opportunities, perhaps, of disposing of some of our ships.

I am not in a position to state what time we are to meet tomorrow, nor am I in a position to say how quickly we will get through with the bill, but if the Senator desires that the bill be displaced, or whatever the necessary parliamentary procedure should be——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, it is not necessary to displace the pending bill to enable the Senator from California to speak on his bill. As the distinguished Senator knows, there is no rule of germaneness among the rules of the Senate. Any Senator can speak on anything he desires to discuss, and there is nothing to prohibit the Senator from California talking on his bill at any time he may get the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that the plan which he has in mind is perfectly agreeable to me, and that I shall not attempt to secure action on the pending bill today, but it will be our intention to bring the bill up tomorrow as soon as the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. HILL. I do not think we can agree to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. There are a number of important committees meeting tomorrow morning, and I do not think we can meet tomorrow before the regular hour, 12 o'clock.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the rather indefinite statement I have made in regard to the matter is agreeable to the Senator from California, I will gladly add that I shall not ask for any further action today, either on the bill or on any amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, Mr. President, I would not press my request. What the acting majority leader has just said I know is a correct statement. If the bill, then, is to go over until tomorrow, I should like to detain the Senate for only 15 or 20 minutes this evening in order to make a very brief statement in reference to certain data I have prepared for the information of Senators.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I hope the distinguished Senator from California, if he has a real speech he wants to make on the bill, will proceed and speak at this time, not necessarily limiting himself to 15 minutes. I do not think the Senate should recess in 15 minutes, when we consider the fact that there are two bills we are seeking to dispose of, the bill in charge of the Senator from Maryland, the ship sales bill, and the bill of the Senator from California, the pay bill. I do not think we should take any action now which would commit us to taking a recess in 15 minutes. We should put the rest of the day to good use.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then, if the Senator from Washington will yield the floor, I should like to proceed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before I yield, I should like to submit three amendments to the ship sales bill, and request that they be printed so that they will be available tomorrow, with the understanding with the Senator from Maryland that none of these amendments will be voted upon or discussed until tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, I have no control over what Senators will discuss; but so far as I am concerned, I shall not ask for any action on the amendments or on the bill today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor to the Senator from California.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The pay bill is one of the most important bills that has come before the Senate affecting employees for a long time. I do not think the Senator from California should discuss it unless there is a quorum present.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not wish to have a quorum called this evening.

Mr. LANGER. The pay bill is very important.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion and attitude very much, but I might say to the distinguished Senator that we might not be able to get a quorum at all; and even if we did, I do not know that my eloquence would hold it very long.

Mr. LANGER. Then would not the Senator rather proceed tomorrow?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I should rather speak this evening, to leave certain data with the Senators who are now present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Federal pay bill is Senate bill 1415, and, stated very briefly, it would increase by 20 percent all the wage rates of the workers in the administrative branch of the Government. It would also make some increases in the pay of legislative employees, and the increases would likewise affect the members of the Cabinet and the heads of commissions and departments. I shall not make a more particular and detailed explanation of the persons who will be affected by the bill than what I have already said, since later in the debate there will be extended discussion as to the categories which will be affected.

I am glad to have the attention of the Senators who are present this evening, so that I may tell them why I think it is the imperative duty of every Senator thoroughly to understand the issues and problems involved in this particular bill.

For the purpose of the discussion I wish to divide the Federal employees into two categories, first those whom I might denominate as in the lower income brackets, and then those who are in the higher brackets. I have arbitrarily taken an annual salary of $2,341, and arbitrarily placed those drawing below that figure in the low-income group, and those drawing above it in the higher income group.

First, I wish categorically to say, and I wish to show to Senators, that those employees who are in the lower categories, as well as the other Federal employees, have been the least liberally and fairly dealt with among all pay groups in the United States, except perhaps Members of Congress. Compared with profits on business, compared with farm income, compared with wages of industrial workers, we have allowed the Federal workers to lag far behind, so that their present real pay, because of the increased cost of living, is far below what it would be necessary to give them in order to make it equivalent to the wage they were earning in 1941.

Mr. President, I may perhaps seem somewhat emotional over this subject. I realize, I want to say to the distinguished Senators present, that if we are now paying these Federal employees as much as we fairly can, judged by the productive power of the Nation, and judged by what other comparable wage earners are receiving, of course then the fact that the great majority of Federal workers are leading bleak and desperate lives, on the verge of insolvency and despair, cannot make any difference. But if we have allowed such a condition to develop that these workers in the lower categories are placed in a condition of insolvency and insecurity unjustly, as compared with other workers in the Nation, then, Mr. President, we have indeed the imperative duty to proceed as rapidly as we can to make adjustments.

I have prepared a very brief chart which I ask to have passed out to all Senators present. I do this not ironically, but sadly enough, with entire accuracy to show the sad story of a Government worker in Washington, D. C., in 1945. This data reads as follows:

Under present pay schedules, 75 percent of the Federal workers in the classified list receive less than $2,341 annually. The average pay of this 75 percent group is $1,896 annually—$158 monthly.

In the testimony as to the financial condition of Government workers last spring several concrete cases were presented. We have several concrete cases this time. I have unhappily spent time during the last 2 or 3 months interviewing probably 50 governmental workers in this category, and I discovered that the cases which were given in the record are typical and correct. I discovered the further fact, that married couples in Washington today on the average have to pay $60 a month rent if they furnish their apartment, but the utilities are provided. Some fortunate people may secure an apartment for $50 or $55 a month, and some may have to pay $65 or $70. But on an average most couples in Washington have to pay $60 a month for their rent.

Their food costs them about a dollar a day apiece, and this case includes male workers who buy their own lunch out of their cash money at noon, when they are at work, and do not take lunch with them.

The streetcar fare, passes for the two, comes to a little more than $12.50 a month.

The workers' retirement annuity payment, which must be made, comes to $8.50.

The taxes of one man with a dependent, on the average salary of $158 monthly, amounts to $16.50.

The total for rent, food, streetcar fare, retirement, and taxes is $157.50. That is about the imperative average necessary expense for those items alone here in the city of Washington for a married couple.

After paying for the items listed above, the worker making $158 monthly has 50 cents a month left for the following: medical expenses, clothes, telephone, movies, newspapers and magazines, savings, drugs, laundry, insurance, interest, vacations, and for the having of a baby, if the couple is willing to in a bleak and dreary world such as this.

The truth is that this group is now going into debt to the loan sharks, some of them, and some of them rapidly sacrificing what little bonds and savings they may have had.

Meanwhile we have so delayed the raising of their pay that their real pay in real buying power is substantially less than it was in 1941. In other words, out of all great groups in America we have allowed this group to have its pay severely cut to a point where, as I know from personal conversations, a great majority of workers in Washington as the holiday season approaches are facing bleak despair.

It is true that this typical case which I have taken, a couple without a baby, is the mean of the cases. There are certain more fortunate employees, such as the young women workers of the Capital, who out of their salary have to provide for only one. Their taxes are almost double. Their retirement annuity is the same. Proportionately food and lodgings cost them more, but many girls room together, two or three or four at a time, in order to get by. And alas and alack, I find that perhaps half of these young women, not married, living alone here in Washington, are contributing to an aged parent or some dependent brother. Indeed, I recall the case of a woman from Atlanta, Ga., who appeared before our committee, and whose story nauseated me. I do not know how it affected other Senators. But she was contributing $25 a month to her mother in Atlanta, Ga. She was her sole support. Here was a woman of 55, a humble Government worker, seeking work at night to become a stenographer, still with hope and fire in her heart. Well, her budget showed, I think, 40 or 50 cents cash, and there was vital need of medical attention, and an operation that she could not have. She had no money for amusements or clothes or drugs or savings.

I challenge any Senator to deny the validity of these figures. They are made up out of 50 case histories which I will willingly submit to the Senate whenever they want narrated the unhappy, harrowing details of conditions existing in this Capital itself.

I have said that the average young single woman is more fortunate than the couple portrayed in this chart. But on the other hand there are yet more tragic

and terrible cases. They are the cases of married Government workers with one, two, three, or four children. We had the financial budget of two such Government workers, one living, as I recall, in Alexandria and the other in New York City. One was a young veteran back from the war. So long as he had the 30 percent added to his pay because of overtime he was able to manage, but with that stripped away, with a wife and four children to support, as I remember, on $168 a month, he is facing insolvency and despair so immediately that I wonder he can continue in his job.

Mr. President, if the American Nation is so unfertile in its farms, and so lacking in machinery and capital and technique that our workers must live on the ragged edge of starvation, that is one thing, but I do not believe that to be true. I think we have the productive power in America, in our fertile fields and miraculous factories, to produce a decent subsistence living for all our citizens.

Mr. President, I have had placed on each Senator's desk a series of charts containing data which I think are very relevant and very interesting. I will not bore Senators with a lot of complicated figures, but let me say that between 1929 and 1941 the technical genius and labor of America increased the output per man-hour in manufacture from a base of 100 to 142.7. In other words, in 11 or 12 years the genius of America increased productive output in factories per hour by more than 42 percent.

The national income as a whole, including service trades and farmers as well as industrial workers, increased, I think, about 25 percent.

The Federal worker has not had his pay changed since 1927, except for one increase and one decrease in the depression period. That did not alter the general result. So the Federal worker gained no benefit by an increase in productivity of 25 or 30 percent in the Nation, and neither did the poor unfortunate Member of Congress.

What became of that increase to 142 percent? The average hourly earnings in manufacturing went from a base of 100 to 126.1. Industrial prices went down to only 97.2. So over that period of time prices remained practically stable, and profits accounted for about 15 percent of the increase. From 1927 to 1941, in spite of an ever-developing productivity, the Federal worker, including Members of Congress, received no benefit from the increasing productivity of the land.

I have placed below that chart another story which should appeal to everyone, because it picks up in 1940 and goes through to 1944, showing what was happening in the Nation. The latest figures released by the Government indicate that we have now officially taken the position that between January 1, 1941, and the present time, the cost of living has gone up 33 points. For sometime we were erroneously figuring it at 30 percent. So far as I know it is now admitted by all economists and yesterday it was officially proclaimed by Judge Collett, that 33 percent is the correct figure. I have a letter from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which has developed the statistics, showing the same conclusion. So over the period of time from January 1, 1941, to the present time, the cost of living has gone up 33 percent.

If we take the profit return on investment, which means the net worth of corporations and unincorporated societies, and take the period from 1936 to 1939 as the base, we find that in 1940 the profit return on investment before payment of taxes was 191 in 1940, 350 to 1941, 417 in 1942, 485 in 1943, and 476 in 1944. I do not believe that those figures are quite fair, because we levied very heavy taxes against profits. So let us take the increase in corporate profits over the 4- or 5-year period, in terms of percentage.

By 1944, after paying taxes, profits were 246 percent of those in the normal period. During nearly all this period the Federal worker did not receive one cent of increase. While corporate profits were steadily going up he was working overtime for the first year or two, and was not even paid for the overtime. He was later paid time and one-twelfth, and for 2 or 3 months time and a half.

We come next to the increase in net farm income. Of course, there is a joker in these figures, because the net income of farmers was very low in the base period. However that may be, the average net income per farm proprietor advanced from a base of 100 to 293. I am not complaining because of that. Our farmers went through dreary, terrible years, and they were entitled to make a good profit. I am not in any way complaining about those profits, nor am I complaining about the profits which business men made. I am not criticizing anything except our failure to keep ourselves and our own groups at least within hailing distance of the other groups.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me finish this statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want the Senator to get away from the farmers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will let the Senator come back to the farmers.

Of course, the most accurate comparison is that of Federal workers with other workers. Profits and farm income are not wholly comparable with the wages of Federal workers, but wages of industrial workers are. Let us see what happened to them.

In 1940 they were 105 plus; in 1941, 117; in 1942, 139. At that time we had not added one dollar to the income of our Federal workers, although the cost of living had increased 30 percent by that time. By 1943 the figure representing wages of industrial workers was 161; in 1944, 173. Thirty percent of that was due to overtime, about 19 percent to upgrading, and perhaps 30 percent to increases in basic wages.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Perhaps I should not impose on the Senator, but he is calling attention to some rather startling statistics which I shall try to go into at a later time. He singled out farmers particularly. I wish to call his attention to the fact that in the base period farmers were not doing very well. They were at a particularly low economic level. Therefore, 150 percent or 200 percent of practically a subsistence wage did not amount to too much of a dollar increase in their net income. In other words, 100 percent of nothing is not very great. Later I shall try to discuss the figures to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator does not have to discuss them, so far as I am concerned. I have already stated what he has just stated. However, I must say that, at least so far as California is concerned, I believe that the farmers of California have been very prosperous during the last 4 years. I am very happy over it. They had it coming to them, and to whatever extent I helped to bring about that result, I am glad. I do not think I can claim any great amount of credit, but if I could, I should like to do so. I am certainly glad to see the farmer made prosperous. In California, at least, the farmers have been paying off their debts and putting money into bonds. They have savings accounts ready to buy machinery. I hope that situation will continue. I do not know whether it will.

We have now seen what we did for the other groups. The total amount of increase in industrial pay was about 73 percent. At the time of Pearl Harbor the Federal worker was on a 39-hour week. That is important. That figure will come up later. He was not on a 40-hour week, but a 39-hour week.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor most of the Government employees began to work overtime, but most of them did not receive any compensation for overtime. I believe a few workers in the Army and Navy did. Federal workers worked through 1941 without any compensation for overtime, with the cost of living going up. They worked through 1942. It was not until 1942 that we passed the temporary-overtime-pay bill. We reenacted that law in 1943. It did not provide compensation for overtime, except to the extent of time-and-one-twelfth. There was a ceiling of $2,980, and the increase did not affect anyone receiving a salary in excess of $5,000. So it was a most curtailed and self-limiting measure.

That law remained in effect until 1945. In the spring of that year a bill was introduced granting pay increases for overtime to Federal workers. I believe the bill as originally introduced provided for an increase of 20 percent. The Government made objection to the 20-percent increase because it was claimed that the increase would be in violation of the Little Steel formula. The distinguished Senator from Iowa and the distinguished Senator from Virginia were instrumental in suggesting a plan under which the 16-percent increase which was given, within the Little Steel formula, was distributed to a greater extent to workers in the lower-paid categories than to those in the higher-paid groups. We finally worked out a plan under which wages were increased 20 percent on the first $1,200, 10 percent

on the bracket from $1,200 to $4,600, and 5 percent on the bracket from $4,600 to $10,000. So the person receiving $1,200 or $1,500 obtained twice as much of an increase as the person receiving the highest salary.

That plan was very wise and generous. It was suggested by the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Iowa, and all of us readily acquiesced in it. I was very unhappy that the Government held the increase down to 16 percent, because the cost of living had increased about 35 percent. While we were relieving the workers to some extent, most of the workers were working from 4 to 8 hours overtime, at practically straight time. They received some additional money. The only thing that saved the Federal workers during the past 2 or 3 years was the fact that they were enabled to work 44 to 48 hours a week.

Our committee and the Senate rejected the true overtime-pay formula, but the House of Representatives wrote it into the bill and we accepted it in conference. For 2 or 3 months the workers of Washington were in good financial condition because, by virtue of the 48-hour week and the 30 percent thereby added, they were getting much higher pay than they had ever previously received.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator should make clear that before that time-and-a-half true overtime pay became operative it was canceled, except for the Army and the Navy, by the issuance of an Executive order reducing the work-week to 44 hours.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be glad to stand by that statement. Of course, Mr. President, the great bulk of the workers were employed by the Army and the Navy. The other workers were receiving time-and-a-half pay for the extra 4 hours of work. I am very glad to have the Senator correct me on that point.

Consequently, Mr. President, the average basic increase of pay for Federal workers has been only 15.9 percent; let us call it 16 percent. Senators who may be opposed to the increase now under consideration—although I hope none will be opposed to it, for it is urgently needed—will point out that the average annual earnings of Federal employees have increased, not the 16 percent of the basic raise, but 21.3 percent. Such distinguished Senators think that is a factor which should be taken into account and should be used as a basis for denying Federal workers the increased pay which I personally favor.

Mr. President, how does it occur that while the basic pay increased only 16 percent, the average annual earnings increased 21.3 percent? Three factors enter into that situation. In 1942 we granted an increase—it was substantial, perhaps 5 or 10 percent; I have forgotten the exact amount—to the custodial employees, bringing all of them up to $1,200 a year, I believe, and granting some increases in limited categories. That increase resulted in a 1 percent average increase over the whole pay schedule. It may be that in determining what Federal workers in Washington should be paid, we should go back and take into account the 1-percent increase which brought certain custodial employees, principally male employees, up to a minimum of $1,200 a year.

Prior to 1945 in the civil service there were within-grade advancements. If an employee did his duty properly and if he was in the lower brackets, every 18 months he received an increase in the magnificent sum of $5 a month, or $60 a year. If he would stay in Government employ for 7 long years, efficient and faithful, he might hope to receive at the end of that time $300 more than he was receiving at the beginning. If the worker was in the upper brackets, he could receive a somewhat greater increase, although not very much, but instead of taking 18 months to obtain it, it would take him 30 months to do so.

In the last pay bill we reduced the time for within-grade advancements from 30 months and 18 months, respectively, down to 18 months and 12 months. We do not know how the last within-grade rules have affected the pay schedule because not sufficient time has elapsed to enable us to measure it. But over the course of the period from 1941 to 1945, those slow, minute, humble within-grade raises brought a few workers up $25 or $50 or some other small amount a year. The total effect upon the average pay schedule was 2½ percent. Some distinguished Senators will argue very strenuously and sincerely that those within-grade increases must again be counted against all employees and must be taken into consideration.

In addition, there is what is called upgrading. It amounted to approximately 2 percent on the average. For instance, a janitor might have been about to quit his job, and in order to keep him in the Government service, perhaps he would be up-graded and would be called a custodian, or perhaps a custodian would be up-graded and called a superior, or something of the sort. In private industry, which many persons love to compare to the Government service, the up-grading amounted to 19 percent. In the Federal Government it was held down to about 2 percent. I would say that if the Army, the Navy, and other Government agencies vitally needing workers gave way to their desire to obtain workers only to the extent of affecting the general average 2 percent, I think the Civil Service and other Government agencies should be congratulated. At any rate, all the figures—both those for private employers and those for private employees—indicate that in private industry the up-grade increases amounted to 19 percent, as compared with 2 percent in the Government service.

So we have an average increase by upgrading of 2 percent, a 1-percent increase for custodial and other workers, and perhaps a 2½-percent increase in the case of within-grade advancements, making a total of 5.4 percent. Some Senators will eloquently and fervently argue that in determining what we shall do in the case of arriving at the proper pay for Federal workers, we must figure, not that they received a pay increase of approximately 6 percent, but that they have had an annual average increase of 21.3 percent. I should say that a Government employee who remained in Washington for four or five long years and gained an extra $5 or so in his pay check because of greater seniority and experience should not be charged with it at this date. Likewise let me say that I am very firmly of the opinion that the upgrading which occurred in the Government service during the war years has now been reversed. I judge that by the hundreds of complaints which I have received from workers who are being downgraded.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate longer tonight, if we may now have an adjournment or take a recess.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH. I have been very much interested in listening to the Senator's discussion. I should like to ask a question in connection with it. I have been engaged in the conference committee which is considering the Government reorganization bill, which contemplates a study by the President of all Government bureaus, agencies, and so forth, and looks forward to the reduction of the number of Government employees in those agencies. I wonder whether it would be more appropriate to consider the proper compensation for the body of employees which the Government will have after those reductions are made, rather than to make these advancements at this time, when there are on the pay roll so many persons who may not continue to be there. Or is the Senator trying to do justice for something which he considers has been wrong in the past?

Mr. DOWNEY. Oh, no. In the first place, I wish to say that in my opinion the Federal workers have been wrongfully and inequitably treated up to the present time. Their net pay is greatly below what it was in 1941, and I think such treatment is far from equitable. The Federal workers need the proposed increases in order to enable them to pay for food, clothing, and medical care. A man cannot wait for a year to let his wife have any kind of operation or to buy her sufficient food. Some say we should let the Federal workers wait a year or 2 years. But, Mr. President, they do not have enough to live on; and it is clear they are being unjustly dealt with, because of every great group of workers in the United States, they are the most poorly paid.

Mr. President, let me say something else which I am sure will greatly appeal to the very high commercial ability of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. Every week, now, hundreds of workers are leaving the Government service. In many cases they are the best workers we have. The Government now has more complicated and more important business than do all the great corporations in the United States combined, but we are not paying sufficient wages to the workers in the upper brackets to hold the number of good men we should have. Every department head tells the same story. Here is a man, for instance, receiving a salary of $6,000. Perhaps he

is one of the best men available for that work. He finds that in private industry he can receive $7,500 or $8,000, so he leaves the Government service and enters private industry. Here is a man who in private industry can receive $15,000; so he does so. Perhaps he is one of the best men in the Government service.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that we must act now. If we do not, if we wait until next spring or next summer, or perhaps if we never act, the Government will lose immeasurably in efficiency and in money by denying to these workers decent and adequate pay, judged by the most modest standards.

Let me also say to the distinguished Senator that if Senators wish to work at a salary which—in view of the fact that they must maintain two homes and must incur extra expenses, including travel expenses—is not sufficient for them to live on, that is their burden and their responsibility; but I do not think Senators have a right to wait 6 months or a year or 2 years before remedying the unhappy situation of the great numbers of Government workers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I simply am raising the point of the very large number of bureaus and agencies which the Government has at the present time, and I am trying to get clear in my own mind whether the Senator is advocating an increase all the way through for the present enormous pay roll. I entirely agree that we should give adequate pay, whatever it may be, to all our workers, but it seems to me that at the present time we have far too many persons on the Government pay roll. I wonder whether we should not wait until we liquidate many of the Government agencies, before we determine what the increased pay should be.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine one of the graphs or tables to which I have referred, he will notice that the number of workers in the Army and Navy has already greatly declined. I do not know whether the Army and the Navy still have more workers than they need.

Mr. SMITH. That is my question, Mr. President. I wonder whether we still have more workers than we need. I do not wish to interrupt the distinguished Senator's argument with reference to what an individual should receive for the work which he performs. However, I am wondering if that is not an over-all problem to be considered when we consider the size of the Government's pay roll.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, today thousands of men in Government departments are working on that very problem. Every agency is making plans for reduction and demobilization. The primary responsibility, so far as the administration is concerned, is on the Bureau of the Budget. But we in Congress also have a responsibility. If there are more employees in the Government than there should be, we should do something to correct the situation. I may say that the primary responsibility, so far as the Congress is concerned, is on the Appropriation Committees of the House and of the Senate. I do not blame those committees. But if the condition is present about which complaint is made, it is because Congress has appropriated more money than it should. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been the chairman of the joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress which has given the problem special attention during the past 3 years. If there is any responsibility, it is not on the poor unfortunate man receiving a salary of $100 or $175 a month, on which he is trying to support his wife and child or children. If we have been neglectful, and I do not think we have, the responsibility for the present swollen bureaucracy is on us, and no one else.

Mr. SMITH. I am sure the Senator will agree that the entire subject is one which we must consider.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Maple T. Harl, of Colorado, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the unexpired term of 6 years from September 6, 1945, vice Leo T. Crowley.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Olson to be Register of the Land Office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be passed over for 1 day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is passed over.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the name of Col. Clark Kittrell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 6 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Clark Kittrell to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Beneath Thy mighty hand, O God, we humble ourselves in prayer. Holy, holy, holy! Thou art a Father full of compassion and to be trusted through all experiences, even unto death. With this blessed assurance, we pray Thee to lead us that we may be unafraid in all situations. Lay Thy hand of blessing upon our country that the power of right may prevail, inspired by the precepts of the immortal Teacher of Galilee. Let us feel the directive urge of Him who is the Lord of hosts that we may learn how to apply His standards in our daily tasks. Guide, we pray Thee, the destinies of our people and make happiness and industry coextensive under all circumstances. Keep us duly conscious that the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous and His ears are open unto their supplications. Hear us in our humble prayer, in the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1610. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 693) entitled "An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital."

CONTINGENT FUND OF THE SENATE

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 125, making appropriations for the contingent expenses of the Senate, and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from Kentucky explain the resolution.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 125, which provides an appropriation of $400,000 for the Senate alone. They have exhausted their funds for investigations and similar matters, and they will not be able to meet a pay roll on the 15th of this month unless this money is provided.

It is not necessary to send this to the Committee on Appropriations, because we never attempt to go into the Senate items to find out whether they are right or wrong, and they do not do that with reference to our appropriations. I feel that it is perfectly justified, and since the money is needed immediately, I trust the reservation of objection will be withdrawn.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With all these investigations going on in the House and the Senate, and the Senate requesting $400,000 to continue them, the Senate or the White House or anybody in the House of Representatives has never told us how or when we are going to get the money. Has the Senate given the gentleman any information of that kind?

Mr. O'NEAL. All I can say is that the amounts are authorized. A majority of the Senate decided that these things were necessary. They proceeded with the authorized investigation and they have not now enough to meet their pay roll.

Mr. RICH. The House of Representatives has been doing that for several years. They have been appropriating, appropriating, appropriating, but there is no one who can tell us where this money is coming from. Four hundred thousand dollars is a large sum of money. Now, some day we are going to be bankrupt just because we get bills of this kind, nobody in our body being able to tell us how to take care of these bills. It is certainly an unsound procedure to keep on appropriating without knowing where the money is coming from.

Mr. TABER. Just so we may know a little something about what is going on, I will call attention to the principal reason why at this time this money is being spent and why this deficiency exists. I happen to know something about it.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee is conducting an investigation and at the present time they are going over the shipments and payments on account of lend-lease. The lend-lease accounts are in a terrible state of confusion and require auditing. If we are ever going to recover any more of those funds, if we are ever going to get that jumble and mess straightened out we have got to provide the operating funds to do it with. That is the principal reason I am prepared to agree to this amount at this time.

Mr. O'NEAL. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that a Senate Investigating Committee has now found out what the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Dies Committee, have been telling the people for a long, long time, that there were people in the State Department who were literally perpetrating treason against this Government, that they had been commissioning Communists in the War Department who were dedicated to the overthrow and the destruction of this Government. That they have been making a racket, in a measure, out of the Civil Service, and that some of them have been stealing the records out of the State Department.

If the Senate Committee will carry on this investigation and turn this situation wrong side out and protect this country, protect the President, protect the Secretary of State and protect this Government, from these subversive elements, it will be worth infinitely more than the amount provided in this measure.

Mr. RICH. I agree with that and I have no objection to spending it this way in this instance but I am just calling attention to what faces this country if we keep on at the rate we have been going in creating deficit after deficit.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think a continuation of this investigation is extremely important because there are many stories to the effect that lend-lease material is still being used for fighting purposes. This matter should be thoroughly investigated. I am for this appropriation.

Mr. O'NEAL. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

I renew my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a proposal to allow $400,000 for the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no objection to it. I merely wanted to invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that a large part of that money will go to the Senate Small Business Committee. They are doing fine work, and they are properly spending money on the basis of about $200,000 a year, whereas a similar committee on the House side set up originally on the statement that it would cost about $100,000 a year, has operated on less than half that, as the Committee on Accounts can verify, and now an attempt is being made to cut it even further. I just want to express the hope that the House will be as considerate and solicitous of the welfare of small business as the Senate has always been.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I regret very much I was not here earlier but I was delayed on account of concluding a hearing of the Committee on Rules. Is this a bill providing funds for certain Senate committees?

Mr. O'NEAL. It is for the Senate alone. The Senate passed this resolution yesterday.

Mr. SABATH. Why not amend the resolution and insert an amount for the Small Business Committee of the House?

Mr. O'NEAL. I hardly think that would be a proper procedure at this time. The Senate passed this bill to meet an emergency. They need the money to meet their pay roll.

Mr. SABATH. It would not take long to offer that amendment to provide a decent appropriation for the House committee. It has done a splendid job and it is entitled to a few additional dollars.

Mr. O'NEAL. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, but we should not do that at this time.

(Mr. McCORMACK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say a word that I think should be said here and now. This is not a House resolution, it has nothing to do with the operations of the House, and if we are going to have comity between these two bodies, we must not have interference between the two bodies. The President of the United States in talking to a group of us one time said: "I always sign every bill that carries a contingent fund for either the House or Senate. Now I am asking for a little something to conduct my business down here."

Let us permit the Senate without argument to conduct its business and make its appropriations for its contingent fund as it has always permitted us to do.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I did not intend by my remarks to indicate that the House should interfere in any way with the wishes of the Senate or with Senate action; nevertheless, I am interested in seeing that the House committee shall not be deprived of the same rights, and the same privileges and, to some extent, the same appropriations to carry on its work which I know has met with the approval of the entire Nation.

(The Speaker resumed the Chair.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter, together with a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE EIGHTH REPORT OF THE HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1335) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 445), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 4,000 additional copies of the eighth report (H. Rept. No. 1205), current session, entitled "Economic Reconstruction in Europe," of the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, submitted pursuant to House Resolution 60, be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CURRENT REVENUE ACT OF 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1336), a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED, containing an analysis of the current Revenue Act of 1945 entitled "Questions and Answers on the Revenue Act of 1945," be printed as a House document; and that 42,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 30,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 10,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURGIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative programs of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a statement from Mr. Donald W. McKone, judge advocate of the Merchant Marine Veterans' Association of the United States.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered on Saturday by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued by the Senate and House Republicans.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include letters and clippings.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article and three different items of verse having to do with Christmas and the New Year.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the Union County (Iowa) Farm Bureau.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on socialized medicine.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials on the subject of Indonesia.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the labor question.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered before the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to propound a question to the majority leader, if that is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. May I inquire of the majority leader if he expects to program for the coming week the co-called Hobbs bill, the antiracketeering bill, as it is commonly known, and the bill dealing with certain phases of the labor problem reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I had no intention of putting them on next week's program. However, as the gentleman and the House know, seven legislative days have transpired, and it is within the province of any member of the Committee on Rules to call them up. But if I am served with notice by a member of the Committee on Rules that they intend to do it then, of course, I will program them.

Mr. COX. It is with some reluctance that I say to the majority leader that the Committee on Rules having granted the rules for the consideration of these bills, I feel it my duty to the country to insist on calling them up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Georgia is of course acting within his rights under the rules of the House,

and I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has served notice on me. In view of the fact that the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Rules desires to have these rules called up, seven legislative days having passed, and the additional fact that the gentleman has served notice on me that he intends to do that, which I again say I appreciate, I shall put them on the program for next week.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, in order that I may ask a question of the majority leader?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand, the program now is that the veterans' bill will follow the bill now on the floor?

Mr. McCORMACK. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. Both of those bills will be disposed of today or tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The veterans' bill is the next order of business after the disposition of the UNRRA bill. I expect that we shall be able to take that up by tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. It will not take long to dispose of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the next order of business, anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. If we get through with this bill in time, perhaps we can take up the veterans' bill today.

Mr. McCORMACK. If there is time; it is the next order of business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain editorials and statements by Mr. Bowles.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MURPHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Walter Lippmann on UNRRA.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters, one from the Secretary of the Navy and one from a chaplain with 4 years' service.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4649, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, these are perilous days in which we live. The whole world is suffering from the effect and shock of a major operation, for war is like unto surgery in its most intensive and extensive form. The fighting period is comparable to the wielding of the surgeon's knife to eliminate some foreign substance or enemy of the body which must be removed if the patient is to live, but the days following the operation and the treatment of the patient in those critical days of recovery often determines whether the operation is a success and whether the patient shall live or die. The aftermath of war and the days immediately following the ending of hostilities are just as critical in the lives of nations as are days of convalescence in the lives of individuals who have undergone surgical operations. The greatest war in history has just been fought, but it is not ended. The fighting has ceased and our enemies have unconditionally surrendered but in the language of another, "victory cannot be complete until it is finalized in the council chambers as well as on the battlefields of the world."

The peace treaty has not been signed or even written and no conference has been held to determine what its provisions shall be. Until all of this is done, it does not lie in the power of anyone to write finis to this war.

Too many of our people take no interest in war until the shooting starts, and far too many lose all interest when the shooting ends. If the American people would use the same aggressive spirit and display the same unity to prevent war as they do in winning it after it starts, there would be fewer wars; and if when the shooting stops we would remain militant and united until a treaty of peace can be adopted and the affairs of the world can be stabilized, in part, at least, the possibility of another war would be far more remote.

Slightly more than 3 months have passed since VJ-day, and yet we are beginning to make the same mistake we did at the end of the last war—the war is over; let us demobilize and forget it and go about our own business and solve the problems peculiar to America and let the rest of the world solve theirs. That was the spirit at the end of the last war and that is beginning to be the spirit of many now. Such a spirit and such an attitude endangers the peace of the world, both now and hereafter.

It will not help to preserve peace nor help to solve the problems to be settled at the peace conference to begin now calling our allies names, impugning their motives, and predicting a future war with them. It is right and proper that we should stand up for America and her rights and see that they are properly safeguarded and preserved at all times, but denunciation and name calling of our allies will not help to solve the difficult problems of peace that lie ahead.

With the advent of the atomic bomb and other modern weapons of destruction by which the heart of America could be made the battlefield from the very inception of war, it behooves us to think soberly, to plan wisely, and to act discreetly, fairly, and judiciously in our relations with all nations. Let us do nothing to cause any nation to lose faith in us or to doubt our pledged word. Let the world know that America will not run out on her allies and that she will finish every task which she begins.

The action of the Congress of the United States on the pending bill to further participate in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is fraught with importance, not only to the suffering and starving people whom it is designed to help, and thousands of whom will die if it is not passed, but failure of passage would be a staggering blow to world peace and world cooperation. I shudder to think what would be the effect on the world in its present chaotic condition if the news should be flashed that the United States, the richest and most powerful nation, the nation that initiated the creation of this great humanitarian organization, had severed its connection with the other 46 member nations and would make no further contributions.

Those of us living in the United States where no bombs have fallen, no cities have been destroyed, and no fighting has taken place cannot visualize or fathom the meaning of that term "the ravages of war" used by General Eisenhower. We cannot realize the plight of these countries where the battles have raged and whose people have endured the hardships and privations of war, in China for 8 years and in Europe for nearly 6

years. I have not seen China since the war, but I have visited Europe and it is impossible to describe the devastation and destruction wrought in many of the countries there. Many cities, both large and small, have been destroyed and laid waste, homes are gone and many people have no place of abode.

As to the critical need of help just now, I quote from General Eisenhower's testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee on this bill:

There are few places in Europe today where people are not cold, hungry, and apprehensive of the future. * * *

I am fully confident that the people of Europe can recover from the grievous blows they have suffered if they can be helped through this period. However, if this bitter situation is not to become so disastrous as to make men wonder if it was worth while to have taken up arms against the Nazis, we in the United States—which is truly the land of plenty as compared to Europe—must be prepared to discharge a very heavy responsibility. We must, now, make our proportionate contribution to the relief of Europe in order to insure the permanence of our military victory.

I have noted suggestions that the United States should discharge this responsibility single-handed. While such a method might prove to be efficient, time will not wait while we organize, as a new venture, the gigantic relief system which is required. The need for the services of an experienced and effective relief organization is immediate. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established to do this specific job and it would be wasteful to dissipate its experience, trained personnel, and operating momentum. In its relief activities, UNRRA now has behind it that experimental period through which any relief organization must pass. It is already operating throughout much of Europe and I know from my own observation in Germany that it is operating with steadily increasing effectiveness.

Moreover, UNRRA has been infused with new and vigorous leadership in whom I have the fullest confidence. The British have made available to UNRRA my former deputy chief of staff, General Morgan, and my former chief administrative officer, General Gale, who are now in active charge of UNRRA operations in the field. These men, typical of the new leadership, are experienced administrators of unquestionable competence and, I should like to add, of unquestionable integrity. They are two of the finest officers and soldiers it was within my privilege to serve with during this war.

I wish the entire membership of the House could understand the indescribable condition and need of this assistance. General Smuts of South Africa, who knows conditions in Europe, said recently, "You see today a ruined Europe. If tomorrow you hear of suffering, disease, starvation, and death on a large scale, unknown before in times of peace, remember that that was in the first place the curse of Hitler and in the second place the dreadful responsibility of the German people who allowed such a monster to become their master."

Hitler said he would either win or destroy Europe and civilization. The allies prevented his winning and it is now up to us to see that his second threat—the destruction of Europe and civilization—is not fulfilled.

When recently in Europe, I saw in Italy, France, Belgium and Luxemburg thousands upon thousands of white crosses marking the last resting places of brave American boys who gave their lives that Hitler should not win and become the master of the world. Will we falter now when it takes only dollars to finish the job?

This Congress has appropriated billions of dollars to win this war. Will be hesitate now to authorize appropriations to save life and to save civilization? Let us pass this bill gladly, with no strings attached to it and no amendment that will deny to any needy persons the sustenance to keep them alive. Let the world know that America stands by its commitments and will cooperate with the other nations of the earth to restore civilization and preserve the peace of the world.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should probably wait until later in the afternoon to make my remarks, but I want to get back to a meeting at 2 o'clock. However, I did not want to let this occasion pass without making a few remarks on the pending bill. I have just asked permission to have inserted at length in the RECORD the remarks by Mr. Walter Lippmann in the papers of America today.

I should like at this time to read just a few excerpts from that statement by Mr. Lippmann. I quote from the Washington Post of Thursday, December 6, 1945, page 11, column 1:

A minority, chiefly but not entirely composed of Republicans, has been holding up the appropriations for UNRRA, alleging that American funds should not be used in any foreign country which does not give American newspaper correspondents full opportunity to report how the funds are used. Any experienced journalist who has worked in foreign countries will tell Congress that this method of promoting freedom of the press is a piece of plausible nonsense. It is one of those proposals which seem sensible enough when first they are looked at and quite senseless when they are looked into.

For it is a proposal to have American reporters perform the duties of American officials. It supposes that American newspapers have enough foreign correspondents to cover regularly and continuously the distribution of relief in all the cities of Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Italy, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Korea, Formosa, and China. It supposes that this army of American correspondents—which of course does not exist, which could not be recruited, which American newspapers could not afford to maintain, whose reports our papers would not have space to publish—that this army of newspapermen can make more accurate reports on the operation of relief than our Embassies and Legations and consulates, our military missions, and our intelligence services, not to say the Americans who serve in UNRRA itself.

I am now going to drop down a bit and quote the following from column 2:

It never was, and never could be, the function of the press to be inspector, accountant, auditor, detective of a widespread, complicated operation like the administration of relief in some 13 or 14 foreign countries. These gentlemen in Congress may think they are paying a compliment to the press, but in fact they are trying to burden the press with a responsibility which it cannot discharge.

Then, again, going to the bottom of the column:

If the best of our editors and correspondents do not want to have helpless and destitute people suffer and die in order that they may get access to the rigidly censored countries it is not because they need any instructions—

I am leaving out a few words because of the rules of the House—

about the importance of freedom of the press. It is because they do not wish to strike foul blows for their principles, and that they do not think it wise or decent to submerge the principles of liberty, which are meant to give life and hope to mankind, in a morass of misery and disease and death.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Michigan has given his talk on the floor of the Senate, in view of the fact that the Senate of the United States has by voice vote adopted the $550,000,000 appropriation, in view of the fact that the overwhelming abundance of evidence before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House was in favor of this bill without the adoption of the gag, so-called free-press amendment, I hope this House will forget politics, alleviate human suffering, and pass this bill without hamstringing it with such an amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Texas as he made his remarks a few moments ago, and the great feeling of tenderness he has as a friend of these nations of the world. And then I wonder if he is one of those tender-hearted, pious, pitiable persons whose good will for other peoples of the earth supersedes his own desire to help the people of the United States of America. I am sure we have those here in this country of ours, and I believe they exist in this Congress. The gentleman from Texas referred to the fact, also, that if we did not make this appropriation the nations of the world will lose faith in us.

Mr. Chairman, I question very much whether we should get mixed up in the internal affairs of all the nations of the world. As far as I am concerned, it seems to me that we are meddling too much now in the form of government that each one of these nations has, both large and small. I do not want foreigners to run our country, and by that same token I do not think we should run their affairs.

We have people from foreign nations coming over here trying to make this country communistic. I do not believe in that sort of thing. I want them to go back to their own countries, stay there, and attend to their own business. There are a lot of people in these foreign nations who are not going to welcome our meddling in their business. I want to be very careful, therefore, that through this appropriation of $1,350,000,000 we are not sticking our nose into some other country's business. We should be very careful what we do.

When it comes to relief, there are a lot of things we ought to do to help the poor and starving peoples of the world. But are we doing it in the right way by passing this appropriation bill? I do not think we are. Let me make some suggestions.

Every day there comes to my office circulars from the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture advising of surplus property that the Army previously purchased for their use and which is now for sale to the general public. This morning there came in a request for bids on 250,000 pounds or more of dried whole eggs. Not many of the people in this country use dried eggs when they can get fresh eggs. Those were bought for Army use. Why not let the people of these foreign countries have those dried eggs? Last week I got a circular from the Department stating it had many thousands of pounds of dried milk. Why not give the dried milk to the people of the foreign countries? We can use fresh milk. I have here another circular from the Department of Agriculture saying that it had a great deal of Vienna sausage for sale. Why not send that sausage over to Vienna? It was bought for the Army. It is good food.

Mr. Chairman, we have tons and tons of surplus foodstuffs, as well as tons of rationed food that was bought for the Army. That food should be good for those people over there to sustain life if it was good enough for our Army. Certainly it should be good enough for those people over there now who are in need. Why sell all this foodstuff at a fraction of what it cost the Federal Government when we could dispose of it by giving it to the people who are needy in foreign countries to alleviate their hunger and sustain life?

Let me cite one other item which I know something about. I refer to blankets. There were made for the Army over 80,000,000 blankets. They took an inventory the other day and they find they have over 40,000,000 blankets on inventory and the war is over. The Army requested the industry to manufacture nothing but blankets during the months of July and August up to the middle of September. They would not allow them to make a thing for the civilians of this country. They said, "You must make nothing but blankets." Now the Army has 42,000,000 blankets lying on our shelves. Why not give those blankets to these people over there if they are freezing to death?

There are also millions of pounds of other materials that were obtained for the Army and Navy—food and clothing. Why not give those people some more thread, thimbles, and needles, and let them sew garments from this cloth to their own fit and form? Let us turn this over to the Red Cross, let the Red Cross handle it, and we will do a whole lot better job. You will take care of the starving in the way we always have done it before the UNRRA was born of the New Deal. You will take care of them efficiently. You will care for their needs economically, and you will stop the graft and inefficiency that has been reported by UNRRA. You can save millions of dollars for the Treasury. You can feed the starving and stop the graft and inefficiency. Oh, I am for charity and the starving, but I want to do so wisely and carefully, as well as judiciously, thinking of America at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my views on this matter have already been expressed. My constituency is composed of about 340,000 people, and I think I voice the sentiments of the majority of the people of my district when I support this legislation. The American people have always responded to the cry of hunger and privation, and if there ever was a time and if there ever was a place in the history of the world when such a cry should be heeded, it is now. I have supported every piece of legislation that has been offered in this House toward the winning of the war. We have appropriated billions of dollars, and I think I have done my duty by supporting that legislation. Next to that I think that the legislation now before us, which is not an appropriation but an authorization for suffering humanity is of paramount importance. The cry has come to us from all of these war-ravaged countries for help. We should respond in the American way. We have always responded. This is as much an American way as free enterprise and free speech. There has never been a cry that has come to our citizens for help but what it has been met, and I feel perfectly justified in supporting this legislation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe we would do a better job in taking care of those people if we did it through the Red Cross the way we have always handled relief measures in foreign countries, rather than coming in here now making appropriations and having a set-up of one of the most extravagant organizations and one of the most extravagant administrations that this country has ever known?

Mr. BURGIN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I have just received a letter, and I will ask permission to include it in the extension of my remarks, from the Director of the Red Cross, and he says they are not equipped to handle this. This is his opinion.

Mr. RICH. Let us equip them then to handle it, because they will do a better job and do it in a way that will be more satisfactory not only to ourselves but to the people of those foreign countries. Certainly more efficiently and economically.

Mr. BURGIN. Those who know, such as General Eisenhower, and I consider him tops along that line, state that the Army cannot do it and that this organization could not be displaced by another one.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Is it not true that the International Red Cross does not refer to an operating agency? The International Red Cross consists of a group of agencies including the International Red Cross Committee, the International Red Cross Conference, and the League of Red Cross Societies. None of these agencies is equipped to do this particular job. The league is simply an association of national Red Cross societies united for the purpose of mutual assistance and cooperation. None of those groups has such a set-up. They are different councils of the Red Cross. You would have to start drafting an entirely new set-up.

Mr. RICH. Has not this country for the past number of years given relief through that organization? As long as I can remember, and I am a good deal older than the gentlewoman, we have always, through the Red Cross, given relief to and in foreign countries.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Does the gentleman mean the American Red Cross?

Mr. RICH. Yes. The American Red Cross, which has formerly handled our relief.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. That is solely an American agency, and we would have to foot the entire bill.

Mr. BURGIN. I thank the gentle lady. May I read the letter I received from the American Red Cross, signed by its chairman?

I may say that the American Red Cross is not equipped to do the work that is proposed to be done through UNRRA.

There is no doubt about that. Of course, it will take considerable time to set up another agency. General Eisenhower said he was convinced this could not be done in time. Of course, there have been mistakes made and we have emphasized those mistakes. This is not the only organization that has made mistakes. But the time is short. The cry for help is great. I hope to meet St. Peter someday, and I do not want to see him hold up an emaciated child staring me in the face and accusing me of not helping when we had the opportunity.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] referred to an article by Walter Lippmann appearing in the Washington Post this morning. In that article Mr. Lippmann also says:

Great Britain has fulfilled her pledge; we have not.

And further on—

The delay is a scandal and a dishonor. Already, for lack of funds Congress had promised it, UNRRA has had to cancel orders for medicines, clothing, shoes, seeds, plows, and material to provide emergency shelters.

If Mr. Lippmann had been apprised of the real facts, he would not have written anything of that kind. I like to read Mr. Lippmann, but, in this article, I say that the facts are being concealed from him, so it is not his fault at all.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] replied to my remarks yesterday in which I tried to bring that out. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a very valuable member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He is very thorough and incisive in his fact finding before

he legislates. Therefore, I take the greatest satisfaction in saying that it is because they have been carefully concealed that the facts are not apparent to him and are not coming out to the public. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, apparently unknowingly, stated in one sentence the facts as they really are. He said:

1. Spent for supplies, mission operating expenses, displaced-persons operations, and administration management, $183,000.

2. Obligated for supplies for delivery in November and December, $122,000,000.

3. The balance of $180,000,000, consisting chiefly of sterling from the United Kingdom contribution, will be spent for commodities in Great Britain.

That is what I said yesterday. What does that mean? That one sentence, in paragraph 3, states the fact. Great Britain contributed $319,000,000 to the fund. One hundred and eighty million dollars of that we know is sterling, and it was sterling al' the time. The balance of the $319,000,000 may have been something else, but this $180,000,000 is still sterling.

When UNRRA came to ship goods to Europe, it could not use that sterling. And yet this constituted over 59 percent of the United Kingdom subscription. That sentence states that it will be spent in the United Kingdom. The gentleman further quoted that "commodities which can be bought with sterling is extremely limited." In other words, they are not to be had in the United Kingdom. Britain is in default. I said yesterday I did not blame Britain, because she could not do it, but the point is, they use $180,000,000 of our money to make up for Britain's deficiency, as I showed by the facts yesterday, and then claim we are in default. That is why I said their books are entirely out of balance. They are $180,000,000 out of balance. They show that Britain still has $180,000,000. It will have it until doomsday if it remains sterling. And this $180,000,000 sterling represents 37 percent of all contributions by countries other than the United States. It might as well consist of wooden nickels as far as getting needed commodities for hungry people.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, our spending, which should be in the ratio of 3 to 1, was upped, as I said yesterday, to 4 to 1, when they came to this sterling as shown in the accounting. We were buying these commodities for the United Kingdom and we are furnishing the money that Britain did not spend. Then, in the statement that I placed in the RECORD, they say that we are in default, we have a deficit. As I say, I think we should have the real facts.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that this money that is in England today, about which the gentleman is speaking, can be used at any time if called upon by UNRRA for goods the British Government can supply? It can be used at any time, it does not make a particle of difference whether it is today or tomorrow. The money is there to be used by UNRRA.

Mr. JONKMAN. If the time ever comes that the United Kingdom has anything we want.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. JONKMAN. And it has not. As I explained yesterday, Great Britain was not self-supporting before the war. It supported itself only 40 percent in the way of food. In Europe they do not need sterling, they need food.

Mr. BLOOM. They need other things, coal, or anything that England has. I do not think the gentleman wants to leave the impression that this money is lying over there and is not going to be used by UNRRA if it finds we can get goods England has that we can use. That is what it is for.

Mr. JONKMAN. But as I just said the quotation which the gentleman from Pennsylvania uses as his authority says in effect, that the United Kingdom has none of those commodities. England should have exchange to buy the goods, and she does not have it.

Mr. BLOOM. Is she going to give dollars?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I also had the pleasure of following my distinguished colleague who I assured the House was a credit to both the State of Michigan and Wisconsin. On this question of Britain's contribution or Britain's failure to contribute: now, if my friend from Michigan has as his purposes only pointing out to the Committee today that he disagrees with the methods of bookkeeping of UNRRA and that he does not like the statistical methods and the way they make charts down there, then, of course, I have no disagreement with him. That is a matter of opinion, and as a former distinguished auditor and accountant I am not going to debate that point with him.

But if he suggests that that is any argument, interesting as it may be and academic as it is, if it is any argument against UNRRA and the purposes of UNRRA, then, of course, to my amazement the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] and I are in vital disagreement. I am sure the gentleman does not mean there is any deep-dyed, dark conspiracy between the Budget Bureau of the State Department and the fiscal officers of UNRRA to hide or conceal anything or to color anything in behalf of Great Britain. As I said before, my ancestors on both sides of the family would probably turn over in their graves if they heard me defending Great Britain about anything. But I have a great admiration for the character and bravery of Britain and its people, and I say there is no indication in these statements or hearings where any such thing has taken place. On the contrary, here is a statement read by Governor Lehman in which he says exactly what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] stated. There is no concealing of anything.

The balance of $180,000,000 consisting chiefly of sterling from the United Kingdom contribution, that remains unpaid.

There has never been any doubt about it. Nobody ever said it was paid. There is no conspiracy. There is no hiding of any statement. The UNRRA fiscal officers themselves are the source of the information that the gentleman from Michigan presented to the House. How can that possibly be construed as fraud, conceit, or duplicity? There is no element of it in any way. On the countrary, I say to the committee today that we do not want the United States of America to become at this last minute the insistor upon the last blood dollar to be extracted from our allies in dollars and cents, and I am sure the gentleman from Michigan does not want that any more than I do. The gentleman from Michigan will vote for this bill today just as I will.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONKMAN. I said that yesterday. I said yesterday that they probably cannot pay, but that is no reason that we should say the United States is in default and that Great Britain is in balance. I object to that.

Mr. FLOOD. I reply to my friend in this wise: Nobody ever denied that the United States was in default. Of course, we were in default until the Senate and the House passed the $500,000,000 bill. The Senate did so the day before yesterday and, of course, the President will sign the bill. So to all intents and purposes, the United States of America, as I stand here this afternoon, is not in default. Let us understand that. The statement I have here before me, before this action was taken, of course, stated that the United States was in default. And we were in default. Nobody ever said Great Britain was not in default. I simply say this: If these charts and of course the gentleman from Michigan understands that there are traditional statements about statistics—there are various kinds of liars and there are various kinds of statistics—I understand that very well—I say if he disagrees about the method of setting these things up, then I have no quarrel with him. But there is no attempt on the part of UNRRA to hide anything from the Congress or the people at any time.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Lippmann must act on the way that things are set up. That is my objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I am presenting to you the argument in behalf of the legislation before this Congress. I hold a brief for Mr. Lehman today, and pay my respect to the brilliant job he has done as UNRRA chief. I would be glad to talk this over with Mr. Lehman and the gentleman, but not today.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. RYTER. When there is talk about the sterling bloc, must it not be remembered that 90 percent of this fund of the contributing countries must be spent within those countries?

Mr. FLOOD. That is true. Of course, in fairness to the gentleman from Michigan, he did mention that in his argument yesterday. Under the agreement of the general contract, 90 percent of the funds are to be earmarked for spending in the country making the contribution. That is true of England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: After line 11 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(3) Add a new section 8 (a):

"'8 (a). In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following recommendations:

"'A. That the United States member of the control committee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall endeavor, by appropriate resolutions, agreements, or otherwise, to secure favorable action by that committee or by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Council to attain the following objectives:

"'(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of a recipient country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

"'(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreements, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"'(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in a recipient country, to retain title to all motor-transport equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

"'B. The President is hereby requested to endeavor, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they may be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplies and services.'"

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of consideration of this amendment, I demand that the amendment be divided between sections (a) and (b), and separate consideration be given to the two subjects.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOOM. Is a request of that kind to take the gentleman from Massachusetts off his feet? He has not had a chance to say anything. I think the gentleman should be given a chance to explain his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not take the gentleman off his feet. The Clerk will read the first part of the amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given an additional 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Clerk report the first part of the amendment before the unanimous-consent request is made.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: After line 11 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(3) Add a new section 8 (a):

"'8 (a). In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following recommendations:

"'A. That the United States member of the Control Committee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall endeavor, by appropriate resolutions, agreements, or otherwise, to secure favorable action by that Committee or by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Council to attain the following objectives:

"'(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of a recipient country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

"'(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"'(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in a recipient country, to retain title to all motor-transport equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.'"

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. Am I to understand that by the request made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] my amendment has now been split into two separate parts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the matter pending now before the Committee is the part the Clerk has just finished reading.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes on the first part of the pending amendment.

Mr. HERTER. A further parliamentary inquiry, if the Chair please.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. May I be recognized on the second part as if it were a separate amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be treated as a separate part and the gentleman will be recognized to discuss it separately.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOOM. Under the ruling of the Chair just made the last part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts would not be pending before the Committee and it would not be a substitute, because there is nothing before the Committee at this time. The gentleman from Massachusetts would necessarily have to reintroduce that part of his amendment so as to have something before the Committee in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe the record speaks for itself. The gentleman from Massachusetts offered one amendment. Upon a demand for division the Chair ordered the amendment divided. Both parts, therefore, are in order.

The CHAIRMAN. That statement is correct.

Mr. BLOOM. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOOM. I understood the Chair to state just a moment ago that the only thing before the Committee at this time is the first part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. So there is nothing else before the Committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There will be just as soon as we complete action on the first portion of the amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Then the amendment before the Committee is not a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that the entire amendment as originally offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is before the Committee, but it has been divided into two separate parts; so the matter now immediately pending for decision is the first part of the amendment, and it is on that part that the gentleman from Massachusetts has been recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. That is satisfactory.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for an additional 5 minutes in order that he may fully explain his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five additional minutes, or a total of 10.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered follows very closely the form that was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the original authorization of the $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA which was passed early in 1944. In that enabling act there were some eight particular reservations or recommendations on behalf of the Congress that were made in connection with the charter of UNRRA and in connection with the interpretations of that charter. I am following the same form in suggesting this amendment as a recommendation by the Congress of the United States to be followed by the President and by our representative on the Central Committee of UNRRA in the carrying out of our intent in approving this further authorization. I may say at the outset that I favor fully this further authorization.

I want to say that the amendment I am recommending not only follows the

form that was used in the original authorization but likewise uses the form that was used in the Bretton Woods agreement when the Congress specifically instructed its representative on the bank to pursue a given course.

What is the course that I hope we will instruct or request our President and our representatives on the UNRRA Council to follow? The first three suggestions follow the identical language adopted by this House some 6 weeks ago in connection with an appropriation for $550,000,000. Each one of those three was approved by the Committee on Appropriations, they were adopted by the House, and I am told have been rejected by the Senate. However, when they were adopted by the House they became a condition for the furnishing of relief. In other words, unless these conditions which are still stated to be desirable conditions became accepted fact the appropriation of $500,000,000 would have been invalid. In this particular case we are not trying in any way to hold up an appropriation or hold up any relief work, but are merely expressing our views as to what is desirable and helpful in making this relief operation a more successful operation.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is very familiar with the work of UNRRA. The gentleman did a great service to his country this past summer in the trip he made over there investigating the work of UNRRA, for which we are grateful. I am glad to note that the amendment which the gentleman offers is not mandatory, as he just explained, but is a recommendation which we hope might be carried out. I think that is in better form, especially since we are dealing with an international organization and, in my opinion, it is more desirable to make it a request rather than make it mandatory.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman. There is a very good reason for making this request rather than making it mandatory. That is the time element involved in this entire relief operation. Let us not fool ourselves. This winter will be the critical time, this winter will be the time when the shortage of foodstuffs, coal, lack of shelter and lack of medicine, in going to be the most acute. It will be this winter when the relief money and supplies are needed the most. For that reason, instead of making the conditions mandatory, we put it in this form so there will be no danger whatever of slowing up the effectiveness of whatever relief we might give.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I simply wish to say to the gentleman and to the House that no better job was done during the past summer for UNRRA, for the United States, and for the United Nations than was accomplished by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I wish to heartily congratulate the gentleman on his sincerity of purpose and the magnificent work he did. Therefore I am very much inclined to follow any suggestions in which the gentleman indulges because I know he is sincere.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree that the gentleman has offered a good and proper amendment and I favor it. When the gentleman stated that we had better make this provision permissive rather than mandatory, he is referring to the second half of his amendment?

Mr. HERTER. I have not come to a discussion of the second half of the amendment, but that part will likewise be permissive.

The three points that are covered in the first part of this amendment deal, No. 1, with the secret trade agreements which unhappily still exist among some of the recipient countries of UNRRA aid and which make an intelligent appraisal of the needs of those recipient countries impossible. The second deals with the freedom of movement, with the necessary credentials and so on, for UNRRA personnel, so that they can use their maximum effectiveness in observing the distribution of relief in the recipient countries.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The barter agreements are included in the trade agreements?

Mr. HERTER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are extremely important in connection with this matter.

Mr. HERTER. It includes barter agreements, but in addition it requires specific information on imports and exports so that UNRRA will have intelligent knowledge of what is happening to the produce of the country.

The third amendment deals with the question of retention of titles to motor transport. That matter has been discussed here very considerably. It allows UNRRA to retain title to motor transport if it sees fit to do so in order that it may more effectively have a complete and accurate check as to where relief supplies may be sent.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand, if we adopt the gentleman's proposal, then it will not be necessary to follow that through into the appropriation bill, will it?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

The second part of the amendment which has been divided by the motion of the gentleman from Ohio deals with the very controversial question of freedom of the press. I shall read again the wording that I am offering on that, a wording which I hope will be accepted.

(b) That the President shall endeavor through appropriate channels to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they may be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation supplies and services.

As every Member of the House knows, it is proposed in the very near future to extend the activities of UNRRA into countries where it has not yet been operating, notably China, Italy on a large scale, Austria, White Russia, and the Ukraine. In the case of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, disregarding for the moment Greece and Italy, the administration did make every effort to get American newspapermen into those countries to allow them to report without censorship on whatever they found there. The Administration was uniformly successful in those endeavors so that today Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, are open to the press of the United States and other nations, and their reports are allowed to come through without any censorship whatever. There was a serious problem as to whether or not within the Ukraine and White Russia this could be accomplished. I think every Member of the House feels that it is a very desirable thing to have accomplished. What this amendment of mine does is merely to say that the Congress recommends that the President use every facility to try to get American pressmen into those areas.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman be willing to add to his amendment a provision that the representatives of the Department of State make a survey of a check-up or audit to be sure that those provisions are carefully carried out?

Mr. HERTER. I would want to consider that very carefully.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should not want it to be added to the gentleman's amendment if he does not wish it. It would be permissive as are the provisions of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HERTER. I question that, but I think probably the State Department could do that by arrangement with UNRRA now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. It is my understanding that there will be offered as a substitute for the second part of my amendment, section (b), freedom of the press, an amendment formerly adopted by the

House and offered by the gentleman from Ohio. That amendment would condition all relief appropriations upon the allowing of American press representatives to go into these areas of the world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand, the gentleman will discuss the second portion of his amendment when it comes before the House and it will, of course, follow the vote of the first portion of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HERTER. I should be very glad to leave it that way.

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RYTER. My recollection is that the second part of the gentleman's amendment, as the gentleman informed the House yesterday, read "The President is hereby requested to endeavor" and this morning I understood the Clerk to read "The President shall endeavor."

Mr. HERTER. The reason for that is that the wording of the first part has likewise been amended, that Congress does so with the following recommendations; in other words, there is no instruction as such. I should be very glad to check the wording of the second part with the gentleman. There has been an alteration of a few words, but it does not alter the sense in any way whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, since we find that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is purely permissive and involves only a recommendation, and no compulsion, I certainly see no objection to it. But getting back to some of the remarks made by the previous speakers with reference to Britain's contribution to UNRRA's funds, I desire to call the attention of the members of the committee to the fact that England's aliquot assessment is $322,400,000, but England has not as yet put up that money. The goods, the equivalent of the money, may be available. Rather it is allegedly available. It is only a pledge. Nothing has actually been set aside. Let us get the record straight in that regard.

This morning we received an announcement that an Anglo-American pact has been consummated whereby England is to receive from us a loan of $4,400,000,000. What assurance have we that England will not use some of the proceeds of that loan as a contribution to the extent of $320,400,000 to the UNRRA fund?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The United States has been subsidizing England for 20 years.

Mr. CELLER. I am inclined to believe that statement in part. Congress, I am sure, is going to have some very sharp and caustic comments to make upon that Anglo-American pact. We ought to be certain that before we give that money to Great Britain she will not use some of those funds for UNRRA purposes and that she will dissolve the sterling area bloc pool which is directly related to numerous of the devastated countries which have been and will be the subject of UNRRA relief, countries like Holland, Denmark, and Norway, with which England has made bilateral pacts granting England very decided advantages with reference to trade with those countries.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to the gentleman from New York, I know that when he reads the agreement made with reference to this credit loan he will find that all the things he has mentioned in his address here are taken care of.

Mr. CELLER. No. Indeed no. The gentleman is too guileless. I have seen the parts of the pact as reported in the press. All England does is to say that she will try, that she will endeavor to remove these very irritating trade restrictions which have the effect of jostling off the international sidewalk American traders. You cannot find any words in that pact whereby England agrees definitely and in certain language that she will remove, for example, the imperial tariff preference and that she will do away with the sterling area bloc pool. All we have is the usual mumbo-jumbo diplomatic language which may be susceptible to any and sundry interpretations depending upon who is doing the interpreting. Britain claims she is stone broke. I am amazed that the facts have not been disclosed, the full facts, to the American public. I will say to my distinguished colleague from New York, the distinguished chairman of the committee, that if England is stone broke, how comes it that we now discover not from the State Department, not from English sources, that England at this very moment has over $3,500,000,000, including securities and moneys in American banks. These assets very properly should have been undisclosed during the war for purposes perhaps of military security, but we must rip the veil of secrecy from all these assets that England has in this country, and then and only then should the Congress be called upon to ratify this gigantic loan of $4,400,000,000.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Can the gentleman state the rate of interest that England is to pay on this loan?

Mr. CELLER. Oh, yes; let us touch upon the matter of interest for a moment. England says she will pay 2 percent interest in one paragraph. Then in another paragraph it says if her dollar balances are not in her favor, then she need not pay the interest. Who is going to be the judge as to whether the dollar balances are in the favor of England? We are asked to trust Great Britain. We must trust she will not be guilty of her usual financial wizardry and financial manipulations in her bookkeeping. I do not trust Great Britain in that regard. She has failed to keep many of her treaties. I have in mind particularly the treaty of 1924 between the United States and Great Britain, whereby, for example, she agreed that there would be no discrimination with reference to land ownership and immigration into Palestine on the ground of race or religion. What did she do? She tore up that treaty with the white paper of 1939. Everyone but Jews may now enter Palestine. Everyone but Jews may acquire land there. She tore up her obligations under the mandate over Palestine for 1917. I could give you many other treaties to which Great Britain has thumbed her nose. I cannot trust further a country that fails to keep its treaty obligations. I surely would not loan her money. I want no truck with a man who does not keep his promise. And it should be so with nations. We should have no truck with nations unless they keep their treaty obligations, unless they know the meaning of honor.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield again to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Did the gentleman state that the rate of interest was 1½ percent?

Mr. CELLER. It is supposed to be 2 percent.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Is it fair for England to pay 2 percent on this big loan when GI Joe has to pay 4 percent on his loan?

Mr. CELLER. What difference does it make whether you say it shall be 2 percent or 1½ percent or 1¾ percent. You are not going to get the interest. You are not going to be paid any installment of principal, either. See what happened last time. England still owes us billions of unpaid loans growing out of the last war. Somebody once said it is cheaper to give than to loan—it costs less in the end.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I thank the gentleman from that observation.

Mr. CELLER. What situation will develop with this loan to Great Britain? It is a loan that will support what? Too damn much socialism at home and too damn much imperialism abroad. See what Great Britain is doing now with reference to her imperialistic designs in Indonesia. She has the temerity, mind you, to use our guns and our tanks and our Thunderbolts and our lend-lease materials—lend-lease, mind you—to mow down, maim, and strafe innocent victims in Dutch territory and has the temerity even to place our lend-lease material in the hands of Japanese and Indian troops in that Dutch territory. She is doing the same thing in Indo-Chine, French territory. I ask you to weigh very carefully before you sign on the dotted line giving Great Britain $4,400,000,000 for these dastardly purposes.

As to socialism at home, see what Mr. Laski, prominent spokesman of the British Labor Party, the party of Attlee, Bevin, and Morrison, said in New York, in Madison Square Garden, when he attacked our system of government and said that the private-enterprise government, our Government, in on the road to autocracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I went along with UNRRA last year. I expect to vote for the appropriations this year for this agency. I do so with the understanding that in casting my vote today it will result in an attempt, at least, to solve the ills of Europe in feeding the millions of starving people who are groping in the darkness of despair.

By the same token, I believe we should reach out into the far Pacific, into China, into all these other parts of the globe where people are suffering, and lend a helping hand.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the appropriation of this money today we will be accomplishing something in the program which we have all determined to follow. I have received a great many letters from home. Many of them are from discharged servicemen who have seen some of the deplorable conditions that exist in Europe and in the Far East. Those men report first-hand the sights they have seen, the misfortune, the hardships, the misery, and the unhappiness going on all over the world, because men, women, and children are lacking for food, clothing, and shelter. If by my vote today I am able to help succor those millions of people who are downtrodden, I gladly support this measure.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EWDIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. While the gentleman is lifting the veil, I wonder what can be done about lifting it for those little Balkan States that have been overlooked, those States that have been overrun by the Germans and the Russians. Do they get any benefit?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I believe all these formerly occupied countries must come in for their share of attention, as far as UNRRA goes, with all the resources at the hands of the United States.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But I have heard no intimation that they are to be included or that they are benefiting by UNRRA.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield further. While we are talking about doing for others, it is fitting that I go into one subject of particular interest to myself, and I know it is of interest to many other Members. Reference was made to pork last week when we were considering the flood-control question in the deficiency bill and also the veterans' hospital amendment which was offered in the same bill. I have not heard a word about pork today. I suppose I speak out of turn to even suggest that there should be any pork in connection with the $1,300,000,000 which we are authorizing UNRRA today. Yet, I will have the temerity to mention the fact that there could be some pork in some of this appropriation and that not every dollar which is being appropriated for these starving peoples of Europe and Asia will go to the purposes for which it is designed.

Today we have the right to consider the welfare of the veteran. We have the right, while we are aiding people in other countries, to look after those veterans who have come back and are trying to get jobs and trying to get a square deal in America today.

I suppose again I am striking a discordant note when I say that I believe the bonus issue will come up once more. I believe that before many more years you are going to face a bonus question in this country that will make the bonus issue of World War I look small, and for that reason I am considering introducing legislation which will provide a $2,000 bonus for every veteran of World War II. I am also considering adding to this $2,000 in the case of all those discharged with physical disability at least $500, or perhaps $1,000, or whatever you choose to make it.

I hope the House will give consideration to the veteran while it is thinking about these countries across the seas.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement upon closing debate on this amendment and the substitute.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman's request apply only to the divided first section?

The CHAIRMAN. That will have to be stated by the gentleman submitting the request.

Mr. BLOOM. I stated "this amendment and all amendments thereto," so the substitute would be included.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the second part of the amendment is not "an amendment thereto"; it comes as a separate proposition.

The Chair will put the question. Is there objection——

Mr. BLOOM. In that case, then, Mr. Chairman, the second part of the amendment being considered a separate proposition, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BLOOM. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object; I think it should be an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, speaking extemporaneously I desire to say that I hear so much of gossip, I hear so much of rumor, I hear so much of everything that has no place in this argument if you are really trying to produce evidence and facts before this great House, that I thought it would be refreshing to refer you to actual text and qualified opinion. Let me call attention to the testimony of General Eisenhower, upon his appearance as a witness for UNRRA, before the Committee and as recorded at page 282 of the hearings. I quote as follows:

> If this bitter situation is not to become so disastrous as to make man wonder if it was worth while to have taken up arms against the Nazis, we in the United States—which is truly the land of plenty as compared to Europe—must be prepared to discharge a very heavy responsibility. We must, now, make our proportionate contribution to the relief of Europe in order to insure the permanence of our military victory.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I am convinced that the best way of developing the habit of cooperation is by building and supporting effective operating international organizations such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

On November 1, in argument between myself and the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I then argued that under the original articles of UNRRA, to tack on the so-called free-press amendment which was essentially the same as is today offered, would invalidate the appropriation we were then considering for UNRRA.

I again repeat what I then said to the effect that there was no provision in the original UNRRA agreement dated March 28, 1944, by which you can immediately, or promptly—or even within any reasonable time, where starving neighbors are concerned—expect that two-thirds of 44 nations will agree on this sort of an amendment. The manner in which these original articles can be amended is set forth in article 8 thereof. It provides for favorable action of two-thirds of the Council membership. The Council is expected to meet about twice a year only. Therefore, when this amendment is adopted, you enact a legal condition precedent, as it were, to hungry children getting milk and freezing folks having warmth. In my judgment, it will prove a practical barrier to relief which we are not only legally but morally obligated to render to these world neighbors of ours. This amendment, in effect, puts a prohibition upon food supply for starving and freezing people, until we endeavor to reform the philosophy we disagree with.

I am very happy to now notice that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who admittedly has studied this far more than most of us, admits, in effect, that my argument, found on page 10285 of the RECORD of November 1, 1945, was fundamentally sound. I call your attention to that argument again, because I am very sure that on this day if we undertake to tack on to and amend the articles of incorporation of UNRRA any condition or any reservation which is compulsory, before

money for food is available, it will invalidate and postpone the use of the money until or unless that condition precedent or that conditional reservation is first put into effect. Do you choose to try to reform the attitude of certain nations toward the press, as paramount to saving probably millions of lives?

I submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is probably not compulsory or a condition precedent to the granting of relief. However, I do wish to emphatically call the attention of the whole committee to the fact that it is fundamentally necessary that you strike out of his amendment the two words "or otherwise" as set forth in paragraph (a) of his proposal. I have just called attention to the reasons why, to the gentleman from Massachusetts and members of the committee, before I rose to speak.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say that I have prepared, with the consent of the gentleman from Massachusetts, a clarifying amendment along the line the gentleman has just suggested.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman. I am sure it is fundamentally necessary that those words be stricken, and thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and committee members also for accepting my reasoning about it.

Mr. FLOOD. That is in reference to the first part, of course.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I now call attention to the preamble to the articles of agreement of UNRRA, and I read to you the following:

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shal be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services.

In my few remarks about this fundamental premise, in the clearly stated preamble to the original UNRRA articles, I am going to assume that every Member of the House is in utmost good faith and desires that this money shall go to Europe at the earliest possible moment. I shall also assume, that every Member of the House feels as I do, that which is a proposed gift without the spirit of the giver is bare—and is not a gift at all. I take the position that this is not a gift; it is an investment in world peace and world solidarity, good will and world understanding, I am for it.

It is an investment in preventing a pestilence which if not prevented, will breed hate, antagonism, suspicion and ill will toward America by hundreds of millions of growing children as well as by adults in other parts of this world neighborhood in which we now live.

Is anyone here so short sighted as to believe that Europe can be naked and hungry and cold very long, because we are so greedy and selfish and un-Christian as to refuse to give them a crumb to eat and a bit of coal to build a fire to warm by, and yet have America increasingly safer for the democratic way of life? Pestilence, hunger, filth, these when not the fault of those who are starving and freezing, are fertile soil for extremes of conduct. The conditions now rampant in the former war zones of Europe at least, are pregnant with the possibilities of revolution by force instead of evolution by reason. This UNRRA is an investment in sounder economic and social conditions as well as a gift. It will return to us a thousandfold, in the form of an earlier and a more durable relationship of the young and old of the world to America and likewise it will do America good to continue to share its rich blessings from God on high.

Not by argument, nor by refusing to grant this aid to the starving, nor by any other means can the world now be changed from being a world neighborhood. Distance and time are eliminated by the forces of nature and the genius of man. We will have to learn to live in a world neighborhood or we will get no reasonable chance to live in a world at peace at all. Atomic power already has, and other like discoveries no doubt will soon, compel us to literally get upon our knees in prayer and with the hope that the world shall come to know the truth which will make the civilized world free of fear of destruction at the hands of inventive man. And this world neighborhood daily gets smaller and smaller as regards transmission of every factor which makes or destroys international good will and collaboration. Therefore what is here said from day to day either builds for peace or wrecks the building of enduring peace.

Does any Member deny that the legislators or rulers of other nations of this world neighborhood have a right to take our words as the expression of American opinion to an unduly large extent? And, if we speak of derision and suspicion of our world neighbors, have they not a right to think and speak of us in like manner? And if we spell hate and ill will toward the people of a nation, do we suppose that people will think of us in terms of love and good will? I wish to repeat that by our words and conduct in connection with UNRRA we either help build a world of good will or we contribute to the factors which contribute to world wars.

Recently I was rather dumbfounded to meet a Member who had never noticed the list of purposes for which UNRRA money could and would be expended. So I desire to call your attention to them, in accordance with Resolution No. 1:

RESOLUTION NO. 1

Relief supplies: Essential consumer goods to meet immediate needs, such as food, fuel, clothing, shelter, medical supplies

Relief services: Such as health and welfare; assistance in caring for, and maintaining records of, persons found in any areas under the control of any of the United Nations who by reason of war have been displaced from their homes and, in agreement with the appropriate governments, military authorities, or other agencies, in securing their repatriation or return; and such technical services as may be necessary for these purposes. (See also Appendix, p. 29, regarding displaced persons.)

Rehabilitation supplies and services: Materials (such as seeds, fertilizers, raw materials, fishing equipment, machinery, and spare parts) needed to enable a recipient country to produce and transport relief supplies for its own and other liberated areas, and such technical services as may be necessary for these purposes.

Rehabilitation of public utilities and services: So far as they can be repaired or restored to meet immediate needs; such as light, water, sanitation, power, transport, temporary storage, communications, and assistance in procuring material equipment for the rehabilitation of educational institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this list contains no frills and nc nonessentials. It is a list of the necessities of daily life for human existence. It provides the means whereby these poor people will be enabled—yes, reasonably assured of ability—to help themselves to self-security and self-support. This is the way it should be.

And then, because I spoke with some Members who had not had opportunity to read the list of nations which formed the UNRRA international organization I call your attention to the following list of 44 member governments, to wit:

UNITED NATIONS AND GOVERNMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THEM

Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, French Provisional Government, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

This list, gentlemen, goes to the essential of world collaboration if we are to have world peace. Knowing one another as nations in a world neighborhood has the same beneficent result it does for neighbors on the same street to engage in a community or neighborhood project in good faith and with good will toward each other.

Let the vote for UNRRA by us today be without a crippling amendment or one which will cause a single child to starve or freeze to death.

Let us vote for the UNRRA today by a unanimous vote. Let us do it in the spirit of a gift to starving and freezing and deserving world neighbors. But, let us not forget that such a gift is a definite investment and insurance money toward a more democratic world today and tomorrow and toward an earlier and enduring world peace. No gift for this purpose, no investment in this atomic world will pay such certain and lasting dividends.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a clarifying amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD to the Herter amendment: In section (a) strike out the words "or shall endeavor" where the words first appear and insert in lieu thereof the words "is hereby requested" and strike out the words "or otherwise" in the following lines.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I realize in these strained and troublesome days it is unpopular for any of us to speak a word for America or in defense of our own country. The fashionable thing in these trying times, particularly in pink-tea circles and among the striped-trouser boys in the Diplomatic Corps, is to think of the ills of all the world and to ignore our people at home. I am getting just a little sick and tired of listening to loud flannel-mouthed commentators over the air and reading certain cunning columnists in our newspapers and, I am sorry to say, to hearing a few speeches on the floor of this House, by people who seem to think that the United States of America is responsible for this war as we were the last; that we are shamefully and disgracefully ignoring our obligations and responsibilities in this postwar period. One would gather the final impression that we are responsible for most of the world's ills and woe.

As just a plain, ordinary American, I resent these insinuations. No nation in the history of the world has ever been so kind and generous and helpful to other countries as has the United States of America. In every disaster this Nation has gone to the relief and succor of people in distress. Even when the tidal wave and the typhoon destroyed human life and property in Japan only a few years ago, we sent shipload after shipload of supplies of food, clothing, and medicine to that stricken country. Our American Red Cross has sent relief to the furthermost corners of this earth. The Rockefeller Foundation has established schools and hospitals all over this world to minister to suffering humanity. Our Christian churches in the United States for many years have sent hundreds of millions of dollars to every darkened corner to bring light to heathen peoples, to promote their social uplift, political advancement, and economic welfare. Twice in our own generation we have gone to the rescue of our allies.

A quarter of a century ago, when our American armies reached Chateau-Thierry, the French were throwing away their rifles and heading toward Paris. Our marines and Infantry went on from Chateau-Thierry through Belleau Wood to the Meuse, the Argonne, and Soissons. Many of them never came back.

After that war we fed all Europe and loaned nearly $13,000,000,000 to our allies which, up to this sad hour, have never been paid. Little Finland is the only debtor who kept her word. Now they come to us and say that we are not shouldering our responsibilities and meeting our obligations. Twenty-five years after being called a Shylock, the only appreciation and gratitude we receive for saving their necks is that for the second time in a quarter of a century we were corkscrewed into a global conflict.

Does anyone here doubt that Stalingrad would have capitulated had it not been for American armament, tanks, planes, and guns, food and clothing sent to the Russians? Does anyone think that Russia would ever have gotten through to Berlin without the help of American industry, the workers in our factories, in our mines, on our farms, or without our loans?

Who won the war in Europe that has just closed? Were not three-fourths of all the Allied soldiers American troops in the Mediterranean theater, in north Africa, Sicily, and Italy, and on the western front? What would the world have done without Eisenhower, Bradley, Devers, Simpson, Hodges, Patton, Patch, and Clark down in Italy? Yet, all the time George Patton was racing across France and down through Germany into Austria and Czechoslovakia the only headline I could read in a London newspaper was Monty had begun a new offensive. Still, it is disgraceful and shameful that we are not helping poor, suffering humanity.

I do not know how long I shall remain in this chamber or on this earth, but when I shuffle off this mortal coil I want any friends I might be lucky enough to leave behind to say of DEWEY SHORT there never was a time in the darkest hour of the war or following when Joseph Stalin loved Russia more than he loved America. I hope I care as much for my own country as Winston Churchill does for the British Empire, and that is nothing against Stalin and Churchill. I congratulate and admire them both. They were our allies. They are still our allies. Of course, we are going to share all good things with the other nations and peoples of this earth. We have shared so much already that we do not have much left to share. It is high time we took an inventory of our own $300,000,000,000 debt and of the misery and woe that we find in our own country. Few people realize to what an extent we have exhausted our natural resources. We furnished 70 percent of all the oil in this war. We have pumped many wells dry. We have dug out our lead, zinc, and copper. We have burned our coal and consumed our iron. Yet some folks say we are shirking.

Lend-lease? We have furnished $60,000,000,000 to our allies in lend-lease alone. It was supposed to be a wartime measure and end when the war ended, but it did not. We have transferred about $20,000,000,000 since VJ-day in lend-lease to our allies. You know, lend-lease was supposed to be a two-way track, it was a double pipe line; it was supposed to come over here as well as go over there. But the old cow has had her head in the manger here in America, where we have been feeding her, watering her, and taking care of her, but her other end has been in Europe and it has been milked dry. No, we have been pitching too long. It is time to do a little catching. America is not the richest country in the world. We only work harder and are more generous—perhaps more foolish. Both Great Britain and Soviet Russia have larger populations and vaster natural resources than do we. Yet, we are to be not only the "arsenal of democracy" but the granary of the world. Bosh!

Mr. Chairman, we should not forget that under the Bretton Woods Agreement we set up the World Bank with international commitments of approximately $10,000,000,000—the United States share could be six billions.

Already, under the Export-Import Bank we have pledged $3,500,000,000—these are in addition to lend-lease. Already we have appropriated $1,350,000,000 to UNRRA. Already 72 percent of the total, whereas the other 42 nations have given only 28 percent. Now we are asked to vote another $1,350,000,000 on the same basis and at the same ratio. I claim this is not only slushy sentimentality and bad economics but if continued it will mean financial bankruptcy and national suicide for our country. It must not go on.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was eminently correct when he said we should tear the veil of secrecy off these foreign investments in our own country. I mean all of them. We all know that Queen Wilhelmina owns the Westchester out here in Washington, D. C. God only knows how many other investments she has now in this and other countries. We also know that we have restored the Dutch Empire to Holland, as we restored the British Empire in the Far East to England, and no doubt will give part of Indochina and the present Thailand back to France. Uncle Shylock, Uncle Sap. History has a mean, a peculiar, a naughty, and an ugly way of repeating itself.

Now they come to us after we have won the war in the Pacific almost single-handed, MacArthur and Kenney, LeMay and Nimitz, Halsey and Spruance, Krueger and Eichelberger, Chennault and Stilwell, and a host of other heroes. We all know that we moved from Australia island by island for those thousands of miles across vast distances almost alone, single-handed, while fighting a terrific war in Europe with 3,500,000 men—we got only 2,000,000 men there in the last war—3,500,000 men in Europe, with thousands of them not back yet. Many will never come back. And all the time we were fighting single-handed the war in the Pacific, we got a little paltry help now and then. We finally reached Japan. At what a price. Japan was whipped long before the atomic bomb was dropped. Personally, I am sorry it was ever dropped in the fashion it was. It was not necessary. It established a dangerous precedent. It will not help us in the future. Japan was whipped, she had sued for peace. She was whipped before Russia thought of coming in, and Russia came in on the tail end in order to pick off the south end of Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, to help cut the pie and get her share of

the cake. Now she wants to have part control, after we have won the bloody battle single-handed she wants to tell us what bases we can have. Oh, I am growing sick and tired of these moral uplifters and world reformers. And especially of those who cursed Russia yesterday and embrace her today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. I have just got started.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman very much. I also appreciate the good spirit of my distinguished friend, the able majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, from whom we will hear shortly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say it is all right to help your neighbor. Who does not want to do it? "Recompense to no man evil for evil. Be honest in the sight of all men. If thy neighbor hunger, feed him. If he thirst, give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head."

America has always been inclined to follow the advice and dictum of St. Paul. That is what we have done as a nation. Yet some of these professional uplifters find it so much easier to take care of other people than to take care of their own, that they come in and say we are being parsimonious and niggardly because we do not give them the dome of the Capitol. We have given our coat, vest, shirt and pants and soon we will have to join a nudist colony.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. It might be interesting to note with reference to what aid Great Britain gave that when our ships went through the Suez Canal Britain charged us for the passing through of our ships and our soldiers $50,000,000, but when her ships went through the Panama Canal we let them go through free.

Mr. SHORT. Why, we have to pay for some of our own air fields abroad. They have even tried to collect for damage and destruction of property in the last World War and, no doubt, they will be back here with hat in hand, as both now are, Britain and Russia, one asking for six-billion-odd dollars and the other one for anything he can get. We heard over the radio this morning that Britain was going to get a $4,400,000,000 loan with no interest for 5 years and then interest at 2 percent after that over a 50-year period—if the balance of trade was in her favor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to ask one question before my friend completes his statement with reference to one thought that I have in mind. Is the gentleman for or against the pending bill?

Mr. SHORT. I am against it with all my heart and soul. I talk as I vote and vote as I talk. I wish more Members would do the same. I am surprised that the gentleman is so undiscerning that he could not arrive at that conclusion without my assistance. I have never voted for this mockery because of irregularities, incompetency, inefficiency, and downright thievery. Six hundred in the administration drawing fat salaries were arrested less than a month ago dealing on the black market.

Now, I hope, having been brought up as I was, that I have a little milk of human kindness in me. After all, ice water does not flow through my veins. I would like for the world to know just how much each one of you and how much I individually give of our own money to charity and whether or not you would be willing to lend more money to your neighbor to whom you made a loan 25 years ago and which he has never paid back, and whether you would be anxious to give him another $4,400,000,000 now. You know you would not. But you do not care about the taxpayers' money. You are a liberal—with the other guy's dough. I have always been taught that charity begins at home. I think a good citizen is not the man who takes care of the whole community and lavishly wastes his substance upon his neighbors while his own wife and children are in want and need. "He that provideth not for his own is worse than an infidel." You do not have to go to Europe to find misery. I have seen it. I have seen it dozens of times in every country over there during the past quarter of a century. And I have seen it hundreds of times here in the United States. I am not so narrow-minded or such a hidebound provincialist after all, but let me tell you I have, in my own congressional district in the Ozark Mountains, gone barehead and barefoot until I was 14 years old and lived on opossums, pawpaws, and persimmons. We were glad to do it, too. We never asked for a dole out of the Federal Treasury because we wanted to keep our freedom. We did not have to take orders from bureaucrats. My people are willing to do it today, but so long as I know they have crown jewels of the King and the Czar—and I have seen them—they are brilliant and would bring a neat sum on any market today, enough to run any government for quite a while—as long as they wear ermine and emeralds in London and Moscow, as long as foreign assets are hidden in nearly every country of the world, I am not going to vote for $1 to take butter and bacon, cornpone and sowbelly out of the mouths of my poor people. Our old people are now drawing inadequate pensions, not enough for medicine, let alone fuel, rent, food, and clothing. Why not take care of them before the rest of the world? You can take that for what it is worth.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, as usual when my friend from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is in the proper mood, he has made a rambling speech, traveling all over the world, covering all subjects for which he was so noted before Pearl Harbor.

At the outset the gentleman from Missouri made an observation as if he were a martyr; that it is hard to say a word for America. As I sat in that chair my mind went back only 5 years when in this very chamber were fought the legislative battles necessary to save and preserve his country and my country. I remember the extension of the Selective Service Act, which passed this House by one vote, and those who were being attacked then were men like myself who were fighting for the passage of that bill. We were the ones who were speaking for America on that occasion. My distinguished friend from Missouri was speaking on the other side of the question. Is that right?

Mr. SHORT. It is absolutely right, and I am proud of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right. If you are proud of it——

Mr. SHORT. Yes; I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. That uncovers the gentleman's mind. The gentleman is proud that he voted against it. Now, in the light of 4 years of war, he is proud that he voted against extension of the Selective Service Act. I give him credit for misjudgment, but now, after 4 years of war——

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Sit down. I do not yield. After 4 years of war, with hundreds of thousands of boys having sacrificed their lives, the gentleman now says he is proud he voted against extension of the Selective Service Act. If that bill had not passed, I dare not undertake to prophesy what the situation would have been in America today.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What did you get out of the war but communism and corpses?

Mr. McCORMACK. One thing is certain, that the United States of America won the war and we are still a free nation.

Of course, I could talk about all the other bills——

Mr. SHORT. I wish you would.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. You can take pride in your vote if you want to, but I am thinking of the country known as the United States of America.

Before Pearl Harbor we were fighting to get legislation passed that anybody with common sense ought to have known was necessary to its preservation. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] voted against all those bills. We were the ones who were fighting for the passage of bills, against an honest and misunderstood public opinion. We had to face political ruin and defeat, and we accepted it with the knowledge that, even if defeated, we were casting votes that were necessary for the preservation of our country.

The gentleman also says there are some Members of this House who are making the statement that the United States of America was responsible for this war. I agree with the gentleman;

that is one statement he makes that I am in agreement with, the ones who were making that statement are on the Republican side and not on the Democratic side.

Mr. SHORT. No! No!

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no! Oh, the gentleman would say "No" anyway! Who is it that is trying to put the United States of America on trial and trying to show that we excited the Japs to attack America? Not the Democratic Members of the House.

Yes; he made that statement unconsciously under emotional stress which constitutes the truth and is consistent with the true facts; and, yes, the gentleman says he is sorry we dropped the atomic bomb on Japan. Just pause for a moment and realize what that means. The invasion of the Japanese islands would have been necessary had that bomb not been dropped. He talks about his love for the boys in uniform. Yes; I know he loves them, but let us be practical. The atomic bomb shortened the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The atomic bomb shortened the war by weeks if not by months. If the American forces had had to invade the main Japanese Islands it is estimated that in killed alone 250,000 to 400,000 American boys would have lost their lives, and more than a million would have been wounded. The dropping of the atomic bomb not only hastened the ending of the war, but it brought safely back to the homes of America from 250,000 to 400,000 young Americans who would have paid with their lives had the invasion taken place, and a million were saved from being wounded. That is what the atomic bomb did; yet the gentleman from Missouri is sorry we dropped it on the dastardly Japanese.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I respect the convictions of my friend from Missouri and listened with genuine interest to his summarization of the aid which this country has afforded to the peoples of the world. In that statement I concur.

However, I expect to vote for the pending bill. I need no reminder from any professional uplifter that hunger is a Communist. Long ago it was that stern old prophet Isaiah who wrote that "when a man is hungry he shall fret and fretting he shall curse his God and his king."

That sentiment is as true today as when it was uttered by Isaiah long ago. One can search the literature of the ages and never find anything to improve upon it in its simplicity and persuasiveness.

It is that thing which disturbs me most as I contemplate the distress which is so abundant in the world. There is no question but what the virus of communism is marching across the world and we must make diligent endeavor to arrest its spread and to prevent it from placing its ugly stamp upon the traditions and institutions of our own country.

Because hunger is such a resolute Communist I hope that in supporting this measure and making available some of the largess of our own country that it will help to drive back the first line of despair and be a contribution to the preservation of freedom.

From this action I hope to find some sense of spiritual satisfaction in having tried to assuage the hunger of distressed peoples in other countries. In part I shall do so from a spirit of thanksgiving that our own country has been untouched by the blight of war. For that we can be grateful.

In the Southland of our country are 25,000,000 lush and productive acres where cotton and fiber can be produced to help clothe people who are in distress. In the Middle West I so recently rode across the prairies in Illinois and there I saw the sentinel stalks of corn weighed down with gleaming golden ears that will probably make a crop of 3,000,000,000 bushels in this crop year. All these acres have been untouched by bombs and shells and so from the largess which they will yield we can share with hungry people in the hope that our generosity will assist in arresting the march of strange ideologies across the earth.

Let me say that when I returned from that recent journey over the world in the course of which I made an examination of UNRRA operations, I spoke frankly and freely and criticized as generously as any Member of this House. In my mind was but a single idea and that was to make this first international operation in the interest of humanity as effective and efficient as possible.

I believe I know quite as much about UNRRA both here and abroad as most of the Members in this Chamber. In recent weeks I have had several conferences with Commander Jackson who now serves as the operating chief of UNRRA. In fact only this week he came at the request of myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] to present his story and to indicate freely and frankly what improvements had been made and what improvements might be expected in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Commander Jackson for his candor, his forthrightness and his administrative capacity. He is an interesting person. At one time he was a sheep rancher in Australia. He is of Scotch ancestry and the traditional frugality of the Scotch has never deserted him. He enjoys the rank of commander in the British Navy and has served as a supply officer in many corners of the world. I have faith in his integrity and I salute him for making real improvement in UNRRA.

Many weeks ago when he first came to my office for a conference he quite agreed that the criticisms which have been hurled at UNRRA were richly deserved and he interposed no defense.

When I said that UNRRA stinks as an administrative operation, I know that he agreed with that sentiment. It became his responsibility to go through the organization from top to bottom to clear deadwood, to recruit competent administrative heads and to make it in truth and in fact a functioning organization. While the hearings were in progress on the pending bill on the third floor of this very Capitol, UNRRA was discharging 600 of its personnel in Europe for inefficiency and other causes and discharging an additional 13 persons who had been apprehended in black-market operations. I, for one, am willing to salute the man who can take the odor out of UNRRA and make it an agency that will creditably perform the humane function for which it was intended.

I do not take back a single derogatory statement which I made about this agency recently when the bill to appropriate $550,000,000 to its account was on this floor for consideration. Moreover, I feel that the close scrutiny and attention which Congress devoted to its operation has been one of the most salutary things that has happened in a long time and was really the moving force in having it purged of professional uplifters whose hearts may be right but whose notions may be wrong.

To my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] let me say that I share your convictions about people on the outside who are constantly offering advice to Congress and berating for what they esteem to be its sense of omission and commission. I have high regard for Walter Lippmann but I am not too concerned about what he writes in his column because it is physically impossible for one to do a column on a different subject virtually every day in the week and properly inform himself on the background of the measures which come before us.

When committees of Congress labor earnestly day after day to explore the facts, how shall a commentator or columnist fortify himself with all of the facts on a different subject every day of the week.

Nor am I interested in the harangues similar to that which was indulged recently by a minister of the gospel here in the Nation's Capital who so dramatically declaimed from the pulpit that the Congress was betraying its trust in delaying action on UNRRA legislation and who then urged his communicants to write or wire Members of the House and Senate. He, too, can cherish his personal opinion but it is our responsibility to make this a working organism.

After all if there be a greater sin than letting people go hungry, it would be the sin of sending goods and supplies to distressed countries only to have their distribution administered by people who are more concerned about their own misadventures than they are about the job to which they were assigned.

We have made definite progress in renovating UNRRA and I trust that under the watchful eye of this body there can be further renovation to the point where we can cherish some pride in its operation.

To share our largess from a spirit of thanksgiving does not indicate a lack of devotion to our own country and its

needs and problems. I believe it is not only a manifestation of our gratitude for the fact that physically our country has been untouched by 6 years of war but also that the heart of America still rings true when confronted with distress.

Even as the gentleman from Missouri has so well and truly said, this Nation has been the first to provide relief to countries in all corners of the earth in time of distress and emergency and we shall follow through in that same high tradition.

I shall vote for this measure.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois who has just spoken, because he is living up to the platform just fresh from the press written by the Republican Members of this House. He has shown you that the United States is wealthy enough to meet this obligation and, therefore, he conceives his duty to be to support the newly written platform of the Republican Members of the House which I take great pleasure in reading.

> We will engage in essential international relief as a humanitarian obligation and to prevent chaos through misery. We demand sound management and protection against exploitation in this connection. We will assist other nations to rehabilitate themselves under arrangements consistent with intelligent American self-interests and over-all limitation that shall not jeopardize our own economic recovery and stability.

Who will say that this appropriation will jeopardize the future financial standing and credit of the United States? Therefore, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is out of step with his own platform. He ought to read it, and in accordance with the time-worn usage obey the platform of his associates.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the majority leader has temporarily left the floor. I rise to deplore the tendency on his part occasionally and on the part of the gentleman who just spoke to draw a party line when we are discussing questions of this character. Today was not the first time that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has ventured to draw the red herring of votes on the extension of the period of service under the Selective Service Act across the trail of measures pending before the House. He speaks of the Service Extension Act as the extension of selective service, as if selective service itself was expiring and had to be extended which was not the case at all. The implication always has been that votes which were not cast for the extension of the period of time of service under the act were votes against the continuation of selective service; that is utterly inaccurate and wholly wrong.

Those who were Members of the House at that time must recall that the issue involved at that time was not an extension of the act itself; the issue was whether or not those who had already served 1 year under selective service and training should be required to serve an additional 6 months or whether, when they had completed their year, they should be permitted to go into the Reserves, and then if additional duty required be called as Reservists to serve on active duty, while new selectees were called to fill the authorized trainee strength of 900,000.

I recall the situation very clearly because I discussed it with General Marshall and I discussed it with other officers of the War Department at the time. They all agreed that if those who had obtained their 1 year of training under the act were released, as the law provided when they entered, they could be called back to active duty 5 minutes later under their Reserve liability and have time start to run on that Reserve liability.

I realized that there was a need at that time for continuing a large number of trained men in the service to man our outposts, and had proposed and had introduced legislation to authorize 2-year enlistments with credit on the Reserve service, which I know that many men in the War Department regarded as a practical solution.

Many people other than the gentleman from Massachusetts have referred to the passage of the Service Extension Act as the "extension of selective service" as if had that bill not passed, the whole selective service force would have been disbanded and ended. That was not true. Selective service was still in force. The men would still have continued to be called under it.

The act had not expired nor was it about to expire, nor has it expired today. The original act, as amended, is still in force. The extension related solely to the period of time of training which could be required without a declaration that national interest was imperiled. It extended that time from 12 to 18 months. That was the extension, and not the life of the act itself. Let the record be clear on that point, once and for all.

Now, then, I would not have taken any time here today except for the fact that this false issue had been brought up again. I expect to vote for this bill as I have for other bills of this character. I regard this as part of the job of cleaning up the war.

My votes for the preparation of the defense of our country did not begin after Pearl Harbor, even by interpretation under the standards of the gentleman from Massachusetts. At the start I opposed lend-lease because I thought it was an act of war and would take us into the war and I believed we would be better off in many ways to grant outright credits to the allied countries at war. They could have made their own procurements, and we would not have the questions that have arisen since with regard to titles to surplus lend lease and things of that kind. But when lend-lease was voted and became law, I supported appropriations to carry it out and opposed crippling amendments. I said that even if I was riding with a driver who was taking what I thought was the wrong road, I would certainly try to see that he had gasoline to get through. And the authorization before us today, I regard as part of the job we undertook some time ago.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It seemed to me when I was listening to the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts that his argument on that particular subject had the same flavor as that of the nonexistent fortification of Guam issue.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Be that as it may, I hope that the Members of my side of the aisle will not permit their natural sympathies to vote for this bill to be dulled or impaired in any sense by the attempts of any speaker this afternoon to draw a partisan or political issue here when none exists.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, debate to be confined to the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. He has made a very exhaustive study abroad in the countries where UNRRA is operating, and also in this country. It is vital that there should at least be suggestions and requests as to the operation of UNRRA. While I wish the provisions were mandatory, it is at least a help to have them in the resolution as requests and suggestions. Certainly the opinion of the Congress, which represents the United States, should carry great weight as the United States gives 72 percent of the UNRRA money and supplies. I saw something of the suffering and starvation abroad last year. I saw the generosity of our soldiers to the hungry peoples, especially the children of Europe. The American soldiers are both kindly and generous. Our soldiers are coming back, and they will be there no longer to help feed and care for those people. Many will be there no longer to be our ambassadors of good will.

Granted the difficulties under which UNRRA operated, there has been inexcusable use of the moneys and the provisions of UNRRA. I said to the Congress when UNRRA was first passed, that it would not work out satisfactorily, that Governor Lehman's hands were tied. I tried to secure a better organizational plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, who has also made a very exhaustive study of the whole UNRRA. He was the first Member of Congress to investigate thoroughly the operation of UNRRA. He returned to the United States and was critical of UNRRA as administered. Today he states that conditions in the operation of UNRRA are greatly improved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentlewoman will indulge me in an observation, it seems to me that in the last 30 or 40

minutes we have lost sight of the fact that pending here are the amendments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. I thought I heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] indicate that he looked with some degree of favor upon these proposals, inasmuch as they are only recommendations, after all, are operated, of course, through the control echelon of UNRRA, and are nothing more than recommendations in order to bring about some kind of an arrangement or agreement by resolution or otherwise with respect to the trade agreements, the facilities, and safe conduct for these people, and finally with regard to motor transport equipment and the title thereto. I do hope that the chairman of the committee will see fit to accept these amendments, since they are permissive in form. I think they do meet a genuine need.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOOM]. My understanding yesterday was that he would have no objection to them. I understood him to say he would not get to them, but would agree to them.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday as soon as the gentleman from Massachusetts had read his amendment that I did not see any objection to it at all. I say to the committee at this time that I see no objecion to the amendment, and I am going to vote for it. May I say also that I have spoken to a great many members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Republicans and Democrats, and we find no objection to it. So I think we are in favor of the amendment as clarified and as it has been divided; that is, I see no objection at all to the Herter amendment as it was read here this morning, as clarified.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is what we will vote on first, and then vote on the other part. That is my understanding. I am very glad the gentleman has agreed to accept the amendment as amended. I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] really adds force to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is a very valuable guide to Governor Lehman in his administration of UNRRA and it will strengthen his hand every way.

Mr. BLOOM. I take the position that the Herter amendment as read here has been divided and is acceptable. Of course, if it is going to be amended or substituted by something else, then I must make a reservation. But the amendment as read is clarified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only thing pending, of course, is section (a) of the amendment and section (b) will be considered as a separate amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; that is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the chairman is agreeable, of course, to the amendment now pending and which is at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, the gentleman understands there was a clarification of the amendment subsequently debated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]. That is what the gentleman from New York refers to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in response to a statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] before we had this burst of oratory with respect to the British loan, I desire to call to the attention of the House some factual information which appears in the Appendix of the RECORD with respect to the British loan which I understand is to be announced from the White House at 5 o'clock this afternoon. I call your attention to this factual information as presented in the RECORD in an article which I have prepared on our national debt and the British loan which is to be found on page A5293 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

In order that we may know something about the resources of Britain with reference to her application for this loan and the liberal terms proposed to be given, I want to call the attention of the House to the following:

GOLD RESERVES IN BRITISH MINES

The British have proven up and have yet to mine 446,660,000 ounces of gold valued at $35 per ounce, which amounts to $15,633,100,000, but gold has a much higher value than $35 per ounce abroad. The table of British unmined gold reserves inserted here was obtained from the Department of the Interior:

[In thousands of fine ounces]

Africa:	
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	10
Bechuanaland	300
Egypt	50
Gold Coast	12,000
Kenya Colony	1,400
Nigeria	40
Rhodesia	15,000
Sierra Leone	1,400
South West Africa	20
Swaziland	20
Tanganyika	2,500
Uganda	200
Union of South Africa	260,000
Asia:	
British India (including Burma)	5,000
Malay States	700
Sarawak	300
North America:	
Canada	100,000
Newfoundland	400
South America:	
British Guiana	700
British Honduras	20
Oceania:	
Australia (including Tasmania)	32,000
Fiji	2,400
New Guinea	8,000
New Zealand	3,500
Papua	700

The estimated grand total is 446,660,000 fine ounces.

The above table is an estimate compiled by the Department of the Interior. We now come to a table limited to the measured unmined gold reserves of the British Empire compiled by the Treasury Department, together with a rough estimate of the total unmined gold reserves of Great Britain amounting to 700,000,000 fine ounces:

"MEMORANDUM ON THE GOLD ORE RESERVES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

"The measured underground gold ore reserves of the British Empire have been estimated by the Bureau of Mines as follows:

"Measured gold ore reserves

"[In millions of ounces]

"Country:	
Union of South Africa	57
Canada	34
Southern Rhodesia	4
Gold Coast	9
Australia	11
British New Guinea and New Zealand	4
Fiji and Tasmania	1
Tanganyika	5
Total	125

"Measured ores refer to those ores which have already been surveyed and staked out. Although the bulk of these measured ores are commercially workable, it cannot be assumed for the total, which may include known and measured ores not worth mining at present prices.

"The practice of mining companies varies, but many companies measure a sufficient quantity to cover the amount they expect to extract during the next 4 or 5 years.

"Total commercial reserves for the British Empire, that is, total ores which are economically workable, are estimated to be in the neighborhood of 700,000,000 fine ounces. This is based on the assumption that South Africa has enough ore to continue its present rate of production of approximately 12,000,000 ounces for 40 years, which would amount to a total of approximately 500,000,000 fine ounces of gold underground. It is estimated that another 200,000,000 fine ounces of gold will cover the other gold-producing areas of the British Empire. These figures are, of course, very rough estimates."

The 700,000,000 appears to be nearer the correct figure when the fact is taken into consideration that an estimate of the gold reserves in South Africa alone, obtained from the Department of the Interior at the time the first lease-lend bill was under consideration, placed the South African unmined gold reserves at well over 400,000,000 ounces.

THE PRESENT VALUE OF GOLD

The following table on gold values in the several nations is taken from the Mining Journal of October 15, 1945:

"GOLD AS HIGH AS $89 PER OUNCE

"The following is a partial schedule (obtained from the U. S. Treasury) of gold prices prevailing in foreign countries:

"Country or city:	*Per ounce*
Chile	$48.00
Argentina	48.00
Bombay	62.40
Greece	80.00
Cairo	88.50
Baghdad	89.00

"When foreign countries will accept gold at these prices in payment for their products, shipped to other countries, the United States is going to find itself out on a limb in demanding over twice as much gold for its exports. Trade is going to go to the nations which will accept the least quantity of gold in payment."

The amount of the gold reserves of the Government of England and its dependencies, as well as the dollar holdings of the British family of nations, is a deep, dark secret. But we do know that during the

war period the British have been permitted to make heavy withdrawals of our monetary gold stocks from the United States Treasury and transfer to British ownership. One reason given by informed sources and off the record is that in making British purchases during the war, United States currency was not acceptable in some quarters of the Empire. United States gold was demanded and given.

The following statement and table of the United States gold withdrawals from the United States Treasury was obtained from the Treasury Department:

"CHANGES IN THE MONETARY GOLD STOCK OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 1, 1943, TO OCTOBER 31, 1945

"On January 1, 1943, the value of the monetary gold stocks of the United States amounted to $22,726,000,000, as is shown in the attached daily statement of the United States Treasury for that date. On October 31, 1945, the value of the monetary gold stocks of the United States amounted to $20,037,000,000 (daily statement attached). The decrease of $2,689,000,000 in the value of the monetary gold stocks of the United States which occurred between these two dates was due to the sale of gold to foreign governments and central banks. The attached tables show purchases and sales of gold in the United States by foreign countries through June 30, 1945. Later figures are not available.

"This decrease in United States monetary gold stocks reflects primarily changes in our balance of international payments on goods and service account which have resulted from developments arising out of the war. Among these changes are the increase in our purchases abroad of strategic and other materials needed in the war effort and the curtailment in our exports of civilian goods not essential to the prosecution of the war."

Passing from that to the next Great Britain resource, I would like to call attention to the gold in the Treasury of the United States. We had $22,000,000,000 behind our currency system.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Do you see how the White House or anybody in the executive department has authority to grant a loan like this?

Mr. WHITE. I understand it is to be approved and submitted to the Senate in the nature of a treaty. I do not think the House will have an opportunity to vote on it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Not that anybody in this Congress ever misses a chance to give anything away, but I do not see how they have the authority to make a loan like this.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. I want to present these facts for the serious consideration of my colleagues. We had $22,000,000,000 in gold. Under the law, the currency of the country is supported by 40-percent gold coverage. Recently we reduced that amount of coverage to 25 percent. The British have just withdrawn during the war period and during the time we have been giving them $28,000,000,000 of lease-lend, some half a billion in gold, as you will find in this table. That gold was transferred from the ownership of the United States to the ownership of the British Empire.

Withdrawals of gold in the United States, by foreign countries

[In millions of dollars]

Country	1943	1944	First 6 months of 1945	Total
Argentina	219.5	159.6	91.8	470.9
Brazil	131.7	69.8	10.0	211.5
China	20.0	25.0	124.4	169.4
Chile	18.5	29.0	1.0	48.5
Cuba	30.0	65.0	60.0	155.0
Portugal	10.9	62.8	27.9	101.6
Switzerland	38.9	78.8	53.9	171.6
Turkey	39.9	59.8	5.0	104.7
Uruguay	31.4	35.9	18.0	85.3
United Kingdom	50.0	600.3		650.3
Venezuela	21.5	41.0	50.0	112.5
Other countries	173.8	77.0	21.5	272.3
Total	786.1	1,304.0	463.5	2,553.6

It will be noted from the figures presented in the above table that our ally, England, alone withdrew well over a half billion dollars in gold at a time when in many parts of the British Empire the value of gold was much higher than the fixed price of $35 per ounce in the United States.

UNITED STATES SUPPLIES BRITISH SILVER COINAGE WITHOUT COST

In addition to supplying England with half a billion dollars in gold, our Government generously furnished Great Britain 300,000,000 ounces of silver, practically all of which was coined and put into circulation at a higher currency value than the American silver dollar.

The following table has been obtained from the Monetary Research Division of the Treasury:

"Silver lend-leased by the United States to foreign governments[1]

"Country:	Millions of ounces
United Kingdom	88.1
India	226.0
Australia	11.8
Netherlands	56.7
Ethiopia	5.4
Saudi Arabia	13.9
Fiji	.2
Belgium	.7
Total	407.8

"[1]All silver lend-leased to foreign governments must be returned to the United States on an ounce-for-ounce basis. The silver lend-leased was used for industrial purposes related to the war, for purposes of price stabilization, and for coinage."

This loan of 325,000,000 ounces of silver is to be melted down and returned to us when the British reestablish their credit control and paper money circulation in their own country and in their dependencies.

Right here, our Government and the American people should take warning from our past experience with British manipulation of silver money after the last war when they extracted and sold 90,000,000 ounces of silver obtained by debasing their subsidiary coinage which was reduced from 0.925 fine to 0.500 fine and then shifted the money of India from a gold exchange basis to a gold bullion basis. This money manipulation was operated to retire and replace India silver coinage with paper currency and was followed by dumping the melted-down silver bullion on the world market—a scheme that broke the price of silver bullion to lower than 25 cents per ounce, thereby destroying the purchasing power of our oriental customers, which started a price decline and business stagnation that spread across the country with disastrous results to our national economy.

In light of this experience, surely the United States Treasury officials will not stand idly by and let another depression overtake the country by a repetition of British silver manipulation.

BRITISH MONEY TABLE

The money value of silver in the United States silver dollar is $1.2929 per ounce. By consulting the following British money table, we find that the money value of silver in most British countries is in excess of the nominal value of silver in the United States silver dollar.

"BRITISH MONEY TABLES

"One shilling is equal to approximately 20 cents.

"There are 20 shillings to the pound.

"There are 12 pence in a shilling.

"The value of a penny in our money is equal to 2 cents.

"Sixpence equals one-half shilling.

"The minor coins of the British are represented by: 2 pence—tuppence; 3 pence—threepence; 4 pence; 6 pence.

"Anything above 2 pence is minted from silver.

"One-half penny—hapenny—is equal to one of our cents."

Value of ounce of silver in silver currency in the British Empire

Australia	$1.1146
Indian rupee (11/12 fine)	.8728
Indian rupee (0.500 fine)	1.5950
Canada	1.6666
Egypt	1.2797
Ireland	1.4790
New Zealand	2.0688

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. No paper that I have seen has said just how this loan will be made. Is this loan to be made in gold or in dollars?

Mr. WHITE. It is a loan of credit from the United States to the British Government, Some of it is supposed to be used here in buying supplies as you will find from press accounts discussing the matter.

I would like to pass on now, if I may, to the next part of the article:

BRITISH DIAMONDS

The value of diamond jewels measured by carats varies according to quality and size and is variously estimated. Your investigator is unable to obtain any estimate of the unmined British diamond reserves. Investigation discloses that the Government and the operating companies are very close-mouthed as to their diamond resources and mining operation. The figures on the British diamond reserve has been obtained from the Department of Justice, who has had occasion to investigate the diamond industry cartels recently. The Assistant Attorney General's letter is inserted herewith:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES COURT HOUSE,
New York, N. Y., November 29, 1945.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITE: Your letter of November 26, addressed to Edward S. Stimson, was received today. Mr. Stimson advises that the diamond reserves of the British Empire, according to an estimate made by Don C. Bliss, of the American Embassy in London, are 43,847,000 carats. The same estimate places the diamond reserves of the Belgian Congo and Portuguese Angola at 116,000,000 carats. The British Empire reserves are largely reserves of gem diamonds, while the Belgian Congo and Portuguese Angola reserves are chiefly of industrial diamonds.

Mr. Bliss has a whole series of mimeographed reports on the diamond industry which can be obtained from the State De-

partment in Washington. The information above is obtained from his report No. 90, American Embassy, London, England, February 17, 1944, the subtitle of which is "VI. Production Trends." The general title of the whole series is "Production and Distribution of Industrial Diamonds."

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General.
LAWRENCE S. APSEY,
Chief, New York Office, Antitrust Division.

The value of diamond jewels is variously estimated from $200 to $1,200 per carat. In making a conservative estimate of the British diamond reserve at $200 per carat, it appears the British have a reserve of diamonds amounting to $8,769,400,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Great Britain has already authorized $300,000,000 to this second UNRRA contribution and has already paid in over $60,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to ask the gentleman at that point what part of the British contribution has been paid in.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman mean of the second authorization?

Mr. WHITE. No. I mean the first one.

Mr. FLOOD. All of the British contribution has been paid that was authorized. This is the second one that I am talking about.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the British are in arrears with their contribution to UNRRA.

Mr. FLOOD. No. The authorization was made by Great Britain and can be drawn against in Great Britain. This is the second one in which they have already authorized $300,000,000 and have now paid in, as of today, $60,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] has expired.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was considerable discussion regarding the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe. I have a memorandum which I will read into the RECORD that came to me from UNRRA, and which memorandum I have handed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] who has read it and who has confirmed its contents, at least from his point of view.

This is dated December 5, 1945, and is as follows:

1. On being approached by the Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe in connection with the provision by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration of the supplies necessary for CARE to commence its operations, UNRRA made it clear that:

A. It regarded CARE's proposed operation with great interest and sympathy.

B. It was prepared to assist to the maximum possible, compatible with its own operational necessities.

C. It was ready to receive any concrete proposal and consider it carefully.

2. No later than yesterday and after full discussion of the situation, the following points were established by the officials of CARE and the Director General of UNRRA:

A. UNRRA is ready to make available to CARE, 2,800,000 packages of 10-in-1 rations. A further 1,000,000 packages can be made available to CARE from the Army. In addition, UNRRA is prepared to turn over to CARE quantities of C-rations and K-rations.

B. It was proposed that the 10-in-1 rations be sold for $10 per package; thus the total value of 10-in-1 rations available to CARE from UNRRA and the Army would be sold to the public for approximately $38,000,000.

3. This substantial quantity of food should, however, be shipped to Europe with the least possible delay. It must not be permitted to remain in warehouse here while there is such a great need for these supplies in liberated countries abroad. It is therefore essential that the sponsors of CARE undertake immediately the necessary organizational work and arrange for the immediate taking over of the supplies and their earliest distribution, in Europe, including the countries for which UNRRA has supply responsibilities.

That, Mr. Chairman, ends the memorandum.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement I have prepared under the title "UNRRA's Health Program."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

UNRRA'S HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Chairman, we have heard about the amount of supplies sent to the countries receiving the aid of the United Nations through UNRRA. The tonnage figures for these shipments are impressive: 1,025,422 tons of food, 132,050 tons of agricultural supplies, 81,304 tons of clothing and so on down the line. Toward the bottom is an item which in my opinion is far more important than its place on any tonnage list would be likely to indicate. It is 8,137 tons of medical and health supplies—less than three one-thousandths of the total goods and supplies procured or delivered to the nations receiving UNRRA aid or about 6 pounds out of every ton shipped.

This 6 pounds represents the vaccine flown across the Adriatic to stop a typhoid epidemic, the bandages and pain killing drugs packed by muleback over tortuous mountain trails, and iron cots unloaded and set up to get a bombed-out hospital started again. Among the medical supplies provided are several hundred precious phials of penicillin placed in the hands of a distribution committee to stop infection and a black market; the DDT spray, and the sprayers that got the malaria inflicting mosquito, and the emergency supplies that helped curb the cholera epidemic, flown across the hump to Chungking before the Japanese surrender.

In order that we may understand the full significance of these supplies I would like to talk for a few minutes about the health program of UNRRA by which they are procured, dispatched and put to work.

During the difficult early days before the invaded countries were liberated—when military calls on the health personnel of the uninvaded nations was heavy and little or no tangible aid in the form of health supplies could go forward—two important commissions met in London. Both of them were composed of experts from Canada, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, United Kingdom, and the United States. One UNRRA commission met to plan for the health and sanitary control of those people who come later to be known as displaced persons. At that time they were refugees fleeing the enemy or unfortunate workers forced from their homes to serve as slave labor in territory controlled by the enemy. I will say more about that work later, and also about the assistance the UNRRA health staff is providing for the countries where missions are operating. But first let us go back to London.

The other commission of health experts meeting there devoted itself to bringing the earlier international sanitary conventions up to date. These conventions, as you know, are agreements between governments for mutual health protection. The history of them goes back over a hundred years. They are successful agreements in the field of international cooperation. They are necessary and they work. But during the war, the International Office of Public Health in Paris was not able to perform its full functions while under German occupation. Something had to be devised to take its place. New methods of disease control and the growing volume and increasing speed of air traffic made revisions necessary. The revised conventions have now been adopted by a sufficient number of nations. They came into force last January. And as a service agency for the United Nations, UNRRA is now entrusted with their administration. This includes the dissemination of epidemic intelligence among the governments and the delineation of endemic yellow fever areas for quarantine purposes.

The establishment of standards to which yellow fever vaccines recognized in quarantine, shall conform, is another of UNRRA's convention responsibilities for the protection of our health. An international experiment is at present being carried out under UNRRA auspices to determine the immunizing power of vaccine manufactured in the French laboratories at Kakar.

I should like to add a word here in regard to the American republics. The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau continues to act as the general coordinating agency.

The revised conventions, administered by UNRRA, provide for the notification by signatory governments of any communicable diseases which, in the opinion of UNRRA, constitute a menace to other countries. Formerly the so-called convention diseases include only plague, cholera, typhus, yellow fever and smallpox. In these ways, UNRRA is not only improving the chances of controlling epidemic diseases but is actually curtailing their potential spread across the frontiers. This type of work may be thought of as preventive medicine. But in the war-torn countries receiving the aid of the United Nations, UNRRA is also called upon to effect a cure.

Some of you may recall the epidemics which swept Europe during and after the First World War. Even though World War II was far more extensive than its predecessor no overwhelming and war-engendered epidemics have as yet taken place.

We should, however, still keep our fingers crossed on that score. The setting for disaster is perfect. The danger, especially this winter, is far from over. But there are a few things in our favor that we didn't have 25 or 30 years ago.

This time, although destruction of dwellings, hospitals, public water supplies and transportation systems has been more thorough and over wider areas, and although there are thousands, nay millions more homeless, hungry people, we do have at our disposal vastly improved techniques and much better weapons for combating disease.

In order that the new techniques and weapons may be used to the full UNRRA offers consulting services and advice to nations receiving aid. There are now some 188 doctors, nurses and sanitary engineers attached to the UNRRA missions in these countries. The service they are rendering in helping the local ministeries of health reestablish themselves is one of the most far reaching aspects of the UNRRA program. This is related to the furnishing of health and sanitary supplies, the needs for which were worked out on the basis of estimates and "intelligence" before the time of liberation. The original supplies to each of the UNRRA countries were based on these early estimates. For the remainder of the program UNRRA will ship supplies based on the actual needs in the countries as determined by the local health authorities in consultation with members of UNRRA health staff.

BATTLING MALARIA

Malaria and tuberculosis are two diseases which because of war conditions can be regarded as almost world-wide problems. They are jeopardizing the general economic conditions as well as the public health in countries where they are prevalent.

Before the war the malarious area in Europe stretched from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, covering the whole of the Balkans and the whole of the Mediterranean coast with small areas in such countries as Hungary and Holland. Anti-malarial work in progress broke down during war operations, with the result that there have been substantial increases in the malarial figures in all these countries.

Strange as it may seem, the loss of livestock in Greece has been a contributing factor to the spread of malaria there. The malaria-infected mosquito in Europe, I am told, prefers the blood of a horse or cow to human blood. When it can, it will bite animals, and with no ill effects. When there are no horses or cows the mosquito feeds on human blood and injects its poison as it feeds.

Today 6,000 out of 11,000 villages in Greece are malarious, 85 percent of the area of Greece and her islands are now affected. The average number of cases annually is between one and two million, and each year approximately 5,000 Greek people die from malaria.

In the Pontine region in Italy, after the Germans damaged the pumping system which formerly drained the marshes, the percentage of malaria rose from 2 to 35 percent among the civilian population. In the province of Latinia the number of cases reported in September 1944 reached nearly 1,600. The problem will continue until the countless number of water-filled shell holes can be filled in, and the pumping and drainage systems restored to working order.

As a result of this enormous increase in the percentage of disease in the liberated malarious countries, one of the first tasks of the UNRRA missions is the planning, in collaboration with the national governments, of a malaria-control program utilizing the most modern weapons.

Because of early shipping and procurement difficulties the program did not go ahead as fast as UNRRA doctors wanted it to move. But now the malarial control operations are under way in the worst malarial areas.

In Italy the program started with the spraying of 1,200 houses with DDT. Ditching and draining of mosquito breeding areas is also being done. The work is being carried out by the Italian Government with close consultation with the UNRRA sanitary engineering staff.

Italian engineers are being trained to supervise work of malaria control units throughout Italy. UNRRA will supply the materials.

The UNRRA mission in Greece reports that malaria was eliminated this summer from the swampy Patros area. Next spring airplanes fitted with aerosol-spraying apparatus will continue the battle. The planes, procured from Army surplus in the United States, have already been shipped overseas. Two Greek pilots and a mechanic are in this country learning how to operate the spraying planes in order that they may take over this work from UNRRA personnel before long. Then they can train operatives in their own country. When UNRRA steps out of the picture in Greece this valuable health and sanitation project will go on as a function of the government. At that time, for the first time in their long history, the people of Greece will be free of the curse of malaria.

PROGRESS AND PLANS FOR THE CONTROL OF TUBERCULOSIS

Tuberculosis has increased rapidly in all the European countries since the war began. Children and young adults are the most common victims of the plague. While little is known of the mortality and morbidity rates of tuberculosis in the recently occupied countries, the number of cases has doubled in many parts of Europe and in the Balkans, where the tuberculosis mortality was high before the war. The war has set conditions back to where they were 25 years ago. The number of deaths from tuberculosis in Rome increased 115 percent between 1940 and 1944. The extent of the calamity in Poland seems likely to be unprecedented.

Detection and isolation of active cases is the first step in the control of tuberculosis. Working toward this end, UNRRA specialists with portable X-ray units have organized Nation-wide surveys. In Greece and Italy their special concern is for the children, although numbers of adults have also been examined. By agreement with the Greek Government, food to the extent of 3,000 calories daily is now being given to all tuberculosis cases.

It is difficult to hospitalize even serious cases. Damage to hospitals and consequent loss of hospital beds has been severe in war-torn Europe. In Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia it is estimated that approximately 20 percent of all hospital beds have been destroyed, while in Greece the percentage of tuberculosis beds destroyed is quoted as 50 percent. As a result of UNRRA's work, however, repairs are being made to hospitals wherever possible. Beds are being made available and UNRRA supplies are now making it possible to treat tuberculosis victims. The 7,611 tons of medical and sanitary supplies include a number of 200-bed and 40-bed, completely equipped, hospital units which can be used wherever needed.

Last month the Yugoslav mission urgently requested the service of the UNRRA mobile photofluorographic unit and its specialist personnel. Accordingly, the outfit working in Italy since March of this year was moved on to Yugoslavia. Two Italian units put in order by the Italian Mission, will continue the work there.

With UNRRA's assistance and advice, national anti-tuberculosis leagues and associations are again organizing. They will assist with local fund raising and carry on education work somewhat after the fashion of our own TB association here. The formation of such organizations to back up the public health work of the governments of the countries is another sign of recovery.

PROBLEMS OF NUTRITION

The Health Division of UNRRA is giving special attention to nutrition for the simple reason that the food deprivations experienced by the people in the ex-enemy occupied areas has resulted in conditions of widespread malnutrition and even starvation. We are all aware that malnutrition plays an important part in tuberculosis, malaria, and typhus. So, in order to secure dependable evidence as to the actual extent of malnutrition, UNRRA found it necessary to have its experts make surveys of sample groups. These surveys have been carried out in France, Belgium, Holland, Greece, Italy, and in the extensive refugee camps in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria for which UNRRA assumed administrative responsibility in May 1944. Several outstanding church groups in this country have cooperated with UNRRA in making these surveys.

Preliminary reports generally state that young children have not suffered as severely as those over 10 years of age. The older children show lack of growth as well as other signs of malnutrition. The picture is, of course, spotty because of local conditions and the failure of internal transport. The rich did not suffer as much as the poor, and those who could afford to buy on the black market

are better nourished than those who could not. But UNRRA services and relief are open to all who need them regardless of ability to pay.

These UNRRA surveys not only provide bases for immediate relief work, but provide information of considerable value for further study and will contribute to human betterment in this field. Their immediate value to UNRRA is to help direct food supplies to the people in greatest nutritional need. In Italy, standard medical reports on clinical evidence of malnutrition are now required when UNRRA relief is supplied, and the reports sent to the Ministry of Health furnish material on which the food program for the entire country is planned. Physicians and public health nurses in the liberated areas are being trained in the newer techniques of nutrition. Nutrition conferences, including demonstration of the uses of UNRRA foods, have been widely held, and in Athens a small experimental kitchen has been established where the preparation of UNRRA foods not previously in common use in Greece is adapted to recipes conforming to Greek food habits. Special brochures have been prepared on the uses of powdered milk and soy flour.

The horrors of the notorious Belsen Concentration Camp have been made known to us. In April one of UNRRA's nutrition experts, who had been working closely with SHAEF Netherlands mission studying the nutrition problem in Holland, received an urgent call to come to Belsen at once. He was needed for consultation with medical and public health officers of the Twenty-first Army Group and the Second British Army. They asked his advice on the best manner of treating those who had not yet died. An UNRRA nutrition expert was later called for to assist in the medical care of survivors at Belsen. He was put in charge of a detachment of 96 medical students enlisted through the British Red Cross. These people fed, treated, and returned to life many hundreds of victims of Nazi oppression. An UNRRA hospital unit has since been supplied to Belsen and an UNRRA matron is in charge.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE DISPLACED PERSONS

The tremendous responsibility of caring for the millions of displaced persons in Germany and facilitating the return to their homes was shared by the military and UNRRA. To this effort, the Health Division of UNRRA has contributed approximately 490 doctors and 450 nurses to work in teams in the camps, and a small medical, nursing, and sanitation staff for the operating headquarters office. Now that Europe has been liberated, UNRRA has been able to secure personnel from many European countries, and today doctors and nurses of the Health Division come from almost all of the 47 nations.

As a preventive measure, the DP's receive a DDT antityphus dusting to destroy disease-carrying lice. A routine health examination follows as quickly as possible to determine which ones are in need of treatment or hospitalization for any cause.

The assembly center for displaced persons at Hanau, near Frankfort, affords a practical demonstration of what can be provided by way of medical care in an isolated spot. This center houses about 8,000 people. It has been divided into several units according to nationality and the language spoken—Polish, Russian, Italian, and so forth. Each unit has its own dispensary. Several doctors and nurses drawn from among the professionals housed there comprise the staff. They serve under the supervision of the UNRRA doctor who is a Frenchman, and his assistant, a skillful surgeon of Dutch nationality. Each dispensary reports daily to the medical center. Even before the debris had been cleared from the bombed building which serves as medical headquarters, that center was doing everything medical that needed to be done in a community of 8,000 far from average individuals. The level of medical care that is being provided is high—by any set of standards, and especially remarkable with the limited resources that were at first available.

One of the earliest field activities of health division personnel was the medical nursing and sanitation work among the 40,000 refugees in the Middle East camps. Today many large contingents of healthy people from these camps have been cared for by accompanying doctors and nurses of the division, and repatriated to their liberated countries. Before they started home they were given essential immunizations.

Health rules proposed by UNRRA to the European governments for the health and sanitary control of displaced persons have been largely followed and no serious epidemics have spread across frontiers as a result of the movements of these people. The report of the UNRRA Commission is being used as a basis for planning for the health and sanitary control of displaced persons in the Far East. An epidemic of measles, brought in by new arrivals from both Yugoslavia and Greece, was the only serious outbreak of disease that occurred in any of the camps.

Today, the training in nursing hygiene, antimalarial control, and the use of DDT in disinfestation received by the refugees while they made their homes in camps in the Middle East is already proving a valuable contribution to the public health work of their own communities now that they have been repatriated.

The work is not over in Europe. There are still some 650,000 people in the camps that must be cared for until homes can be found for them.

UNRRA should also be able to complete the health work so auspiciously begun in the countries receiving its aid in the next 18 months. As you know, UNRRA is scheduled to wind up all its operations in Europe by the end of 1946 and in China by the end of the first quarter of 1947. During this period the health ministries of governments can be strengthened so that they will be capable of carrying their own burdens. They will still have heavy ones, for it will be years before war-weakened population can be brought back to normal. That part of the work will go on long after UNRRA is out of the picture. Meanwhile, until the countries are able to stand on their own feet financially, drugs and other needed health supplies must be brought in, and sound professional assistance given whenever epidemic threatens.

THE PROGRAM IN THE FAR EAST

With the surrender of Japan UNRRA's field of action has grown enormously. Even before the Japanese surrender the UNRRA health program had a foothold in China. Several Chinese experts, aided by UNRRA, were brought to this country for further training. They are back in China now working and teaching others in a theater of operations which is the largest any public health program has ever had the courage to face.

I wonder how many of you were aware that in the late spring of this year cholera began breaking out in the overcrowded sectors in and around Chungking, an area in which many of our troops were stationed? UNRRA dispatched a team of doctors and sanitary engineers with orders to help fight the impending epidemic. Their speedy and effective action in cooperation with the Chinese brought the dread disease of cholera speedily under control.

This step was taken at the urgent request of the military and the Chinese Government. UNRRA acted in pursuance of responsibilities placed by member nations on this service agency of ours.

Today health personnel for the Far East are being recruited and sent as rapidly as possible to the seven health districts into which liberated China has been divided. The Chinese Government is carrying more than a proportionate share of the load, but UNRRA doctors, nurses, sanitary engineers, and supplies are the keystone of the program. Without continued assistance of the United Nations until March 1947 the health work which the local government has so valiantly planned would collapse.

No matter what body we turned to or created there are certain jobs to be done. National health organizations must be assisted and put on their feet as soon as possible. The extreme shortage of medical, sanitary, and hospital supplies must be overcome. Epidemics must be put down and their spread prevented. At the present time UNRRA is discharging these responsibilities. Its work on a global scale in the field of public health cannot be duplicated by any other agency.

I think all of us here are not insensitive to humanitarian appeals. Personally, and as a nation, we want to do all in our power to alleviate suffering. We could not pass by on the other side of the road when there is a rickety child standing in need of milk, or when there is a malarious family struggling to regain economic independence.

But here in America we have an interest in the UNRRA health program that is not entirely humanitarian. Our concern for controlling epidemics is, in part, self-interest. It has been demonstrated time and again that disease knows no national boundary lines. An offensive program for controlling epidemics abroad is the best defense against war-engendered disease at home.

Aside from our strong desire to prevent suffering wherever and whenever we can, and our interest in keeping our own shores free from foreign pestilence, there

is yet another reason why we in America should be intolerant of an undernourished, disease-ridden Europe and Asia.

In the first place, the work of rehabilitation moves slowly when populations are widely inflicted with malaria or tuberculosis, or when thousands are exposed to typhus or cholera and may be dying. We know from experience that sick people do not make good farmers. Unless farm families are healthy, crop yields are cut. And in the city when a wage earner dies of tuberculosis the whole family goes on relief. People beaten down and weakened by malaria can't give a struggling new government the kind of responsibile citizenship it needs. In order that industry and agriculture may flourish the people must be healthy. Foreign exchange and the production of exportable goods are dependent on a healthy industry and agriculture.

And now we come to this country. To a great extent our own domestic economy is dependent on maintaining a marginal foreign market. To get right down to brass tacks, sick people do not make good customers. And if we are either foolish enough, or callous enough, to let hundreds of thousands of people die of uncontrolled epidemics, well we will soon find out that we cannot do business with a graveyard.

Right now the entire medical program of UNRRA—from the administration of international conventions for the control of aerial navigation to the stopping of an epidemic in a city in the interior of China, is one of the best forms of insurance I know of. It is the kind of a program that makes sense—an investment in international well being abroad that is also an investment in prosperity and safety at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the first part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as amended.

The first part of the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second part of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER:

" 'B. The President shall endeavor, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplies and services.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes on this amendment because I believe the issue is very clear, and it is not unlike previous amendments voted on.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. Do I understand that the gentleman and I have agreed that he will accept as a clarifying amendment in the first line of section (c) following the words "the President" the words "is hereby requested to" striking out the words "shall endeavor"?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to.

Do I understand the gentleman offers that as a clarifying amendment?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD. Was the amendment read carrying the clarifying language to section (b) as well as to section (a)?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment as modified has not yet been read.

Mr. FLOOD. Is it in order for me now to move such an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Such motion is not in order. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. HERTER. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. FLOOD. May I request the gentleman from Massachusetts to make such a motion at this time?

Mr. HERTER. I shall be glad to offer such a motion. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified by adding in the first line after the word "President" the words "is hereby requested to" in lieu of the words "shall endeavor."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the suggested amendment to the second part of the pending amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD to the second part of the amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: Strike out the words "shall endeavor" where they first appear and insert in lieu thereof the words "is hereby requested to."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. Do I understand that the first motion comes on the Flood amendment? I shall be very glad to accept the Flood amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the second part of the Herter amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, to return to the subject matter of this amendment it deals with a subject about which a great deal has been said on the floor of the House, namely, whether or not the members of the American press shall be allowed to view the work being done by UNRRA and report to this country on the work in certain areas on the world.

Personally I feel that it is extremely important that that be done but I feel it should be done voluntarily and not be made a condition precedent to the use of any money for relief. As I said earlier, with respect to the first part of my amendment, I feel we should not make that a mandatory provision at the present time because the time element is so important in this entire relief operation if it is to be effective. Everything that we give must be available as soon as possible so that it can be put to use during this critical winter. For that reason the amendment that I have offered is a recommendation on the part of the House that the President be requested to facilitate by special agreement or whatever proper channels we may choose to use, the entry of members of the American press into those recipient countries where today they are prohibited from entering and reporting on the work.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman believe that in accepting the clarifying amendment he is putting the Congress—representing 130,000,000 people—in a very embarrassing position in reference to requesting that the money we appropriate be publicized? If the request is refused, then the Congress is turned down and the American people are turned down. The gentleman puts us in that position. Does not the gentleman think that is the position he is putting us in?

Mr. HERTER. I do not think it is an embarrassing position in any way. There is a very important issue involved. We are dealing in the future operations of UNRRA in sections of the world that are closed to all outsiders.

Mr. WHITE. Why put us in the position of being refused at all?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is not interested in that subject, but he is trying to put it across in the House.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I refused to yield.

Mr. Chairman, without endangering the success of the relief operations, I am trying to get the American members of the press an opportunity to go into the sections where they are now prohibited from going in order to report on the various relief operations. There is a bigger question involved than that raised by the gentleman from Idaho, and that is the question as to whether or not in years to come we are going to develop the kind of understanding with our neighbors to the east which comes from knowing what is happening now. I feel that is an extremely important issue and I disagree very fundamentally with Walter Lippmann and the statement he published this morning because I do not think Walter Lippmann is familiar with relief operations. After all, in this relief operation there are hundreds of thousands of tons—millions, in fact—of goods being shipped into various countries. It is not difficult in this relief operation to be able to trace what happens to that colossal quantity of material and see whether or not it is being properly administered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the statement that I made previously to the committee in reference to the first part, section (a), of this amendment, which is agreeable to me and a

great many members of the Foreign Affairs Committee on both sides. I wish, also, to state at this time that this part, section (b), just read and explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as corrected, is also agreeable to us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment to section (b).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio as a substitute for section (b) of the Herter amendment:

"SEC. B. Provided, for the purpose of keeping the people of the United States fully and properly informed as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished various countries and peoples by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, that none of the funds hereby authorized to be appropriated, or none of the commodities, supplies, materials, or services purchased or obtained through the expenditures of funds authorized herein, shall be furnished to or used in any country of which the controlling government interferes with or refuses full and free access to the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by representatives of the press and radio of the United States; or maintains any barrier—technical, political, legal, or economic—to obtaining, dispatching, and disseminating the news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, or discriminates against the representatives of the press and radio of the United States in rates and charges for facilities used in collecting and dispatching such news; or censors, or attempts to censor, in time of peace, news of any and all activities of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which may be prepared in or dispatched from such country by representatives of the press and radio of the United States."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered as a substitute for that by the gentleman from Massachusetts is practically identical with the amendment which was adopted by this House to the appropriation resolution passed a few weeks ago for the sum of $550,000,000 to complete the original commitment made by the United States to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. The measure which we have before us today provides for an entirely new commitment and has no connection with the original commitment or legislation authorizing the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 of funds for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Therefore, it is very proper, in my opinion, that we consider under just what conditions we wish to enter into this new agreement and to assume this new responsibility or commitment. In another legislative body when the amendment adopted by the House a few weeks ago came up for discussion, it was argued that the amendment should not pertain to the appropriation authorized under the original bill because such an amendment had not been contained in the original authorizing legislation. During the debate on this matter in the other legislative body it was stated that when a new legislative measure should come before it, such as this particular measure that we are now considering, that this amendment would be given the most serious consideration, and a number of the leaders and outstanding members of both parties announced that they expected to support such an amendment at that time.

We have fully argued and discussed the provisions of this amendment. I believe it is familiar to everyone. It is not a restrictive amendment at all. It is an amendment that simply provides the American people shall have some impartial information as to how the money they furnish under this legislation, or the food or the clothing or the medicines purchased through their contributions, are actually distributed to the starving and to the needy people of Europe. It seems to me that the inclusion of such a requirement in this law is nothing more nor less than being fair to your constituents and to mine, the people who will be called upon to pay the cost of this commitment that the Congress may make for them.

Certainly if the American people are to have the unvarnished and unbiased truth they can get it only through a free press. There is nothing in this legislation which requires any other country to grant freedom of the press to their own people. The only requirement in this amendment is a very simple one, that the representatives of the American press and radio be given access to the news of that which is being done by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, wherever it may operate. Under this amendment no authority is conferred upon the representatives of the American press to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations, or to compel other nations to give them that right. They can cover and report only the news of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It is only in that way we can be assured that the very thing we want to do through this legislation is being done, as a matter of fact.

I know there has been a section of the press in America that has criticized this amendment. It is not surprising to me. I know that one or two columnists, as we call them, have also been critical of this amendment. It is not amazing to me that the editorials and the columns on this subject just happen to appear, many of them, on the morning this amendment is being presented to the Congress.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is because we have columnists and fifth columnists.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For some time we have had here in America, and seemingly we are getting more of them in these days, some men and women who seemingly are more interested in the welfare of other nations than they are in the welfare of their own country. There has not been a time that I know of, in my recollection, when one of these columnists, who has been quoted here on this floor rather liberally today, has ever spoken out for the interests of America when there was any opportunity whatsoever to be for the interests of any other nation.

I am growing just a little sick and tired of these tactics and falsehoods, of this propaganda, and of this pressure that has been so apparent throughout the country to the effect that the American people are not entitled to know what is being done with the funds they furnish under this authorizing legislation.

I say to you that any honest, decent organization, and I do not care whether it is UNRRA, whether it is some branch of our Government, or whether it is some business, no honest, decent organization is ever fearful of permitting the press and the radio to know what its activities are.

I am wondering why there should have been such a great drive made in the last 2 or 3 weeks to endeavor to convince the Congress of the United States that the American people should be given no opportunity to know what is going on in the administration of UNRRA. There must be some reason behind it. Why, you might as well say we should bar the press from the gallery of this House, or that we should bar them from the various departments of this Government, as to say we should bar them from reporting on the operations of UNRRA, inasmuch as we are contributing 72 percent of all the money which goes into the financing of that organization.

May I say, in closing, that I am just a little bit suspicious of any amendment which may be offered here, supposedly for a free press, when it has the approval of the distinguished gentleman who is in charge of this bill on the majority side.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that the Committee of the Whole will turn down this substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio and adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. It will be recalled that the gentleman from Massachusetts stated that this was the same amendment which was put on the UNRRA appropriation bill recently and which was passed by this House by a vote of 188 to 168. Seventy-four Members were not here and did not vote. It went over to the Senate. I understand the Senate has deleted that amendment, passed the bill, and sent it back to us without even a roll-call vote in that body. Now, we all are in favor of freedom of the press. But let us see what the press itself says about this thing. Representatives of the press are the ones who are most jealous of their free-press rights. The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House was in session here for 2 weeks on this bill. Through that very medium of the press and freedom of the press, word went out throughout this land that this bill was under consideration in that committee. Certainly, every newspaper in the land knew about it. Not one single newspaper in the United States requested time before that committee to appear in opposition to this bill on account of the absence of a free-press provision. Not one

single newspaper made such a request. On the other hand, there were dozens of representatives of the press of the United States who came there to testify and say that this so-called freedom-of-the press amendment was a misnomer and that it would as a matter of fact be dangerous to the freedom of the press instead of preserving that principle.

So far as news is concerned, with reference to UNRRA or the operations of UNRRA, the Director General testified that not on any occasion had his representatives been denied the right to go into the countries where UNRRA was operating to get information and the news. They have been given access to every nation every place where UNRRA operated. They went into those countries and saw what was going on and how the job was being done. Members of the House, there is a more serious question involved here than either this amendment or the substitute. The question arises here as to whether the United States, which has pledged itself to membership in an international organization for relief of human need and suffering, has a right now, after it has pledged itself to the principle of cooperation, to take unilateral action here and say, "Yes; we have already given our word, but we want to change the rules of the game on our individual say-so. Suppose the 45 nations in UNRRA should individually demand the right to claim something for themselves along a similar line? At this late date it would be preposterous and it would wreck this organization. It would wreck the other organizations that are now being perfected to insure peace for this world and maintain monetary and educational stability and things of that kind. It is just ridiculous. We want news to be given concerning what UNRRA is doing, but it should be given upon the insistence of UNRRA itself and not through unilateral action here.

May I call to the attention of the House that Mr. Clayton, who sat in the Council of UNRRA in London, testified that not one single proposition which the United States representatives had suggested to the UNRRA Council had been turned down. I have no doubt but that the proposition that representatives of the press of the United States have free access will be given every consideration by the Council of UNRRA. I believe they will do everything in the world to give it. But, do not forget, we must not demand. We do not have the right to demand out of the hides and bones of the starving people of Europe and Asia that they and their governments guarantee freedom of the press or freedom of religious worship, or freedom of assembly, or any other kind of freedom, because dying and starving people cannot wait for that.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just as I congratulated the gentleman from Massachusetts this morning, I wish also to again congratulate the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ADAMS], who voted for the amendment we are discussing now, to the last appropriation bill, and who, on November 28, said on this floor:

> I believe the people of this country today would vote overwhelmingly to provide our share of the funds immediately needed for UNRRA. From reliable information it is clear that right now our failure to provide our share of the funds for this United Nations Organization is costing untold human life. Although I am one of those who voted for the free-press amendment, and believe in the principle for which it stood, the result has been delay.

Mr. Chairman, when the representatives of the United Nations signed the UNRRA agreement at the White House on November 9, 1943, and proceeded the next day to Atlantic City to work out the details of that agreement, it was a united effort, generally so understood by all, on the part of 44 nations. It was generally understood and agreed that those 44 nations would act in accord and unanimously in behalf of suffering humanity of invaded countries. Of course, it was necessary for the legislative bodies of the different countries, those which have legislative bodies, to approve or disapprove the agreements that were signed. There was no provision for an amendment of that agreement by any of the legislative bodies. It was necessary for them to vote it up or down. Consequently, a majority of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee do not believe that unilateral action should be attempted by this country. We are in thorough agreement with the idea of freedom of the press. Naturally, no one has any monopoly on the desire that these funds be used properly. Therefore, we thoroughly agree with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], which is entirely suggestive and recommendatory. We equally thoroughly disagree with the substitute which requires and demands action, and would withhold our contribution if such action as some of us wish on the part of another of these 44 nations does not occur.

May I add that no Member of Congress nor any other witness appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of this amendment. Every witness interrogated, which means every witness who appeared except one who was opposed to the entire bill, expressed positive opposition to it.

Now, suppose we pass it. Doubtless certain representatives of other countries also have pet ideas that they think might be popular in their areas. Naturally, if we indulge in a restricting, delaying amendment, many of them might be tempted to do likewise, and before any relief ever reached these starving people they would be so dead and so long buried that it would be impossible to resurrect them. Yes, the displaced Pole, the Chinese coolie, the Philippine guerrilla will suffer just as much and be just as dead if his starvation results from a delaying amendment such as this as he would be if it resulted from the fact that no UNRRA existed or from the defeat of this bill. The Greek peasant, who is in sore need of a few seed to plant next spring that he and his family may be self-sustaining next fall, will be just as hungry at that time and just as much a public charge if his failure to become self-sustaining results from a delaying amendment such as this as he would be if this bill were not passed at all. If you are opposed to this bill, vote against it, but do not try to kill it in this indirect way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard indeed for me to understand the logic of men who are not willing to stand up for a free press throughout the world.

The sunlight of publicity is what is needed in all the darkened countries of the earth today. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] talked about the Philippines. A free press, or free news service, already exists in the Philippines; we have no trouble there on that score.

He spoke about Greece. The Greeks admit our newspaper reporters, our press agents at any time.

He spoke about the Chinese coolies. Of course, if we are going behind the lines and join the Communists, we might have some trouble getting news out to the rest of the world, but if we stand by those Chinese under Chiang Kai-shek who stood by us when our boys were dying on Okinawa and Iwo Jima at the hands of the savage Japs, then our press representatives will be permitted to go in, just as they are now, and keep us fully informed.

There is absolutely no argument in favor of sending American money where the American press is refused permission to go.

Read what is going on in those Communist dominated countries, read the reports from Bulgaria. The little peasants who welcomed the Communists with opened arms were shedding bitter tears in 24 hours at seeing their homes stripped and their stock driven away. Read the press reports from our own reporters in Bulgaria. If that condition is going to prevail, the American people ought to know it. They ought to know what they are getting out of this thing. Read the arguments of Dorothy Thompson, one of the bitterest enemies Hitler ever had. Read her articles of the rape of innocent women in the Communist controlled areas of Europe; read of the murder of innocent men, and the robbery and plunder of helpless people of all classes in the Communist-controlled areas.

Read the letters of Dr. Piper of Princeton University and the testimony of the rape, murder, robbery, and plunder that is being perpetrated against the Christian men, women, and children in the Communist-controlled area of Germany.

Do you want the Christian people of America to send money in there and then deny a free press to go along with it?

We all want to feed the starving people of Europe; but we want to know what is being done with the funds we provide.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman believe our American citizens ought to know where UNRRA aid is going in these puppet countries? It does not go where it is needed—the Anglo-American occupied sections where they really need it.

Mr. RANKIN. Communism is based on hatred for Christianity. In my opinion, if you send this money behind closed doors and drawn curtains, the hungry, suffering, abused, outraged, helpless Christian people of Europe will get just about as much out of it as Lazarus did out of the banquet of Dives.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not also true that there is grave danger of a controlled press attacking this country and creating great prejudice against it?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes.

We have stood for a great deal in this war. But certainly our people who contribute these funds should know what is actually going on in those countries where the money is being spent.

One of the greatest things that can happen to the Christian people of the world is a free press, free information at all times, and not a subsidized channeling of malicious propaganda.

If we are going to send this money, if we are going to take it out of the pockets of the American taxpayers, I would much rather turn it over to the Red Cross. There is not an agency of mercy on earth that stands higher than the American Red Cross, and the Red Cross of the world so far as that is concerned.

Turn this money over to the Red Cross and let them see that this money is used for the purposes for which the American Congress appropriates it. We were not responsible for the outbreak of this war, but we were responsible for winning it; and, for God's sake, if we are going to appropriate money to try to save the suffering people of the world let us see that this aid reaches them.

I am not opposed to feeding these unfortunate people; but I am opposed to having this money spent in secrecy, and probably used to fight the cause of Christianity, or to poison the peoples of other countries against us.

Therefore I shall vote for the Brown amendment to guarantee the representatives of the press the right to go to any place where these funds are sent and to keep the people of this country informed as to how it is being spent.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Brown amendment and I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I am as violently opposed to any semblance of communism and any of its forms as is he. I have represented my church from one end of this country to the other for 10 years in opposition to communism, on the national radio and in articles I have written against it. But I would like to point out that the Brown amendment does exactly the opposite from what the gentleman from Mississippi suggests.

Russia is the country he is worrying about. For that matter, so am I. Why not say so? I am concerned about the millions of people in Poland, and I think many Members of this House are as well.

I cannot think of a greater weapon that you can place in the hands of Soviet Russia to destroy the millions of Poles who have not yet been destroyed than to give that country the Brown amendment. There is no doubt that the Government of Poland is a puppet government for Moscow. We all know that. You give to Russia the right to keep out of Poland or any place else representatives of the American press and that means that UNRRA cannot go in. If UNRRA cannot go in, the millions of men, women, and children that we are trying to save and keep alive will die because the Brown amendment will prevent UNRRA from going into those countries. Good heavens, can you not see that? If this Brown amendment were before the Russian parliament, or whatever it is called, they would pass it unanimously and destroy an opposition in any country in which they are connected directly or indirectly. Can you not see further than your noses, you, who support the Brown amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my distinguished leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that in the election recently held in Austria less than 5 percent of the votes were for the Communist candidate.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to appeal now to my colleagues on my side of the aisle who I think through misunderstanding supported the Brown amendment when it was offered as an amendment to the appropriation bill. Let me remind you that the Senate by a viva voce vote unanimously disagreed and threw out the Brown amendment when it got there. Let me also point this out to you: Some of you who did vote for the Brown amendment before thought that you were voting for freedom of the press. The press is not concerned about this problem here. From one end of the country to the other the press, since the Brown amendment was passed by this House, has denied that it wants its rights so valiantly protected, and "methinks" the gentleman from Ohio "protesteth too much" the sanctity of the freedom of the press with which the press is not concerned here and generally states itself that there is no freedom being sacrificed.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What assurance can the gentleman give the country that the relief which is going to Poland is getting to the deserving people under the present secret operations of this agency?

Mr. FLOOD. May I say that I am not presumptuous enough to assure the gentleman of anything, but I will go this far——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, there is no more important matter in this world than that the peoples and the leaders of one country should understand the peoples and the leaders of another country. The agency for this understanding is surely a free press and radio everywhere. I would like to draw your attention to a grave misunderstanding of the Chinese people and one of their leaders which appeared this morning in our newspapers and which should not be allowed to go uncorrected. It is a statement made by Mrs. Roosevelt concerning the Chinese people and Madame Chiang Kai-shek.

Now, no one has ever heard a public word from my lips in condemnation of Mrs. Roosevelt. In my books Mrs. Roosevelt is one of the world's noble women, a woman of great good will and of wide energies bent to laudable goals. But even she can sometimes fail in displaying her proper virtues of heart when they are most needed. It has been said in the Bible that "in many things we all offend," and "if any woman offend not in words the same is a perfect woman." "But from some mouths will often proceed both blessings and curses."

Out of Mrs. Roosevelt's mouth there came this morning a most ungenerous statement, the more so, since it gave us a picture of one great woman belittling another great woman.

At Fort Devens, Mass., while talking to the wounded veterans at Fort Devens General Hospital yesterday, Mrs. Roosevelt said that Madame Chiang was unable to live democracy; that she, like the Chinese people had never had an opportunity to practice democracy in action. She also went on to say that Madame Chiang was "two different people. She could talk very convincingly about democracy and its aims and ideals and be perfectly charming about it, but," said Mrs. Roosevelt, "she hasn't any idea how to live it."

Mrs. Roosevelt said that Madame Chiang, in fear of harm from Communists, had lobbies cleared before she would enter them. "She told me," Mrs. Roosevelt said, "that Communists were very dangerous people, and she couldn't comprehend how I dared go around unattended where there were Communists in this country."

Mr. Chairman, let us look at Madame Chiang Kai-shek's record, to see whether

or not she knows what "democracy in action" means.

I wrote that record several years ago. I see little reason to change it in any essential. I said:

Madame Chiang Kai-shek is one of the greatest living women. Not only as the wife of China's Generalissimo Chiang, the leader of 450,000,000 people, but in her own right she fulfills the conditions of greatness in a leader. Except for a period of illness in this country, she has never left her war-torn country.

In the long years of revolution and war which have swept over her huge country, she has tirelessly extended comfort, aid, and inspiration to the lowliest and most helpless of their victims; she has implacably sought to punish the aggressors, and in all the desperate and heartbreaking conditions which have faced her country, she has been unflinching, intrasigent, honorable, and cheerful. By her own explosive spirit, she has helped to bring about a vast explosive change in the spirit of her people. And to be able to change for the better the spirit of a whole nation is, after all, the mark of greatness. Above all, her "personality" excites honest affection, profound interest, and deep admiration in other peoples and other nations besides her own.

"Personality" eternally defies analysis. But on several simple counts one may delineate, if not explain, the greatness of this 46-year-old Chinese woman.

First. Madame Chiang is one of the world's best wives. No one in China curries favor with Mayling Chiang by insinuating that she is "the power behind the throne" or the brains behind the Gissimo. She knows that she is, at best, the moon, while he is the sun of China, and that the light that shines from her is his reflected glory. Quite simply, Madame believes that without her husband China today would probably be a Japanese province, but that without her Chiang would still have been in there fighting, not so well, perhaps—but still fighting. For 15 long years she has shared—not shouldered—all his disappointments, discomforts, and dangers.

After a 7-year courtship—a courtship of which her Christian Chinese mother did not approve because at that time young General Chiang was a heathen, Miss Mayling Soong took Chiang to Christianity. And he took her to the altar. They were married in Shanghai in 1927 by the president of the YMCA. But, unlike any western bride, from that day on Mayling Chiang seldom knew the comforts of a home or the peace of domesticity.

Bridegroom Chiang had a Communist revolution on his hands, a disunited country to forge into unity, a backward country to awaken to progress, and, later, a terrible foreign enemy to beat. A soldier's wife, she lived with the general in bivouacked camps all over China. She flew with him in airplanes over needle-pointed mountain ranges, she slept and ate with him in dugouts among the falling shells. And always she gave him comfort, loyalty, and encouragement. So for 15 years she has been target No. 2 for the assassin's bullet, the traitor's poison, and the Japanese enemy's bombs.

The highest tribute that any man could pay to a helpmate, Chiang Kai-shek has paid to his wife. When an interviewer, urging him to send Madame Chiang to America, said, "She would be worth a division to you there." Chiang replied, "Ah, but she is worth 10 divisions to me here, by my side, in China." Madame Chiang knows as well as any wife alive "what every woman knows"—that to put her husband's interests and aims and dreams first, to guide and never to lead, to counsel and never to command, to suggest and never to insist, is to stay not only supreme in his heart but foremost in his councils. Today everyone in China knows that the Gissimo was the mainspring of China's great war effort and the dynamo of the Chinese Renaissance—but they also know that Madame Chiang supplies much of the electrical energy.

Second. Perhaps no other woman living has played the role of mother to more babies, children, and young boys and girls. She has personally adopted 40,000 war orphans. She has made it her unique business to see, not only that they are fed and clothed, instructed to read and write, given vocational training, but that like good children of a good mother, they grow up loving one another and—China. She has spent hours and days of her time visiting with them, talking with them, singing and playing with them, planning and hoping for them.

Third. Madame Chiang is one of the world's best organizers. In the early days of her marriage she started what came to be known as the New Life Movement in China. This movement, ridiculed at first by the intelligentsia, began by fighting for a Nation-wide campaign against dirty houses and dirty bodies, against spitting in public places and against frivolities of all sorts among the upper classes. But through the years the movement gradually widened until it became a dynamic political and social force in China. It has enlisted the aid of Chinese women everywhere—brought Chinese women who have never before been out of their "back yards" into the arena of public life; inspired them to take part in government, to educate the underprivileged; to instruct young girls how to be healthy and useful mothers; to institute schools for vocational training, handicrafts and scientific farming; to fight a woman's war against sloth, corruption, and ignorance among the masses; to help do away with child slavery, "the scourge of China," and opium smoking—in short, to take a vigorous part in the reconstruction of China in the very midst of Japan's brutal effort to destroy it. No feminist, Madame Chiang has nevertheless liberated for useful social activity more members of her sex than any other woman alive, including Mrs. Roosevelt.

Fourth. She is a woman who believes in fighting for democracy. She has visited the front lines under shell fire time and time again with the Gissimo and, in the many bombings she has undergone, she is the first to leave her shelter and go among the soldiers and citizens to rally them.

Fifth. She has worked incessantly to develop a strong and well-equipped Chinese Red Cross. In a land where Chinese ladies were taught throughout the centuries never to "lose face" before the lower classes by serving them, in a land traditionally indifferent toward wholesale suffering, she has herself washed the gangrened feet of farmer-soldiers, and bound the wounds of peasants caught in air raids. Her example has aroused the people—particularly the upper classes—to a belated appreciation of the sufferings and sacrifices of their soldiers and civilians.

Sixth. She is one of the world's most influential missionaries. Both her American-educated Chinese father, Charles Jones Soong, and her Chinese-born mother, Katherine Nyi Soong, were devout Methodist Episcopal missionaries and she has carried on the spirit of their work in China. Her greatest triumph was, of course, the conversion of the Gissimo. Since then, many of China's leaders have adopted Christianity because in Madame Chiang and the Gissimo, they have seen that Christianity seems to work certain miracles that had not seemed possible in China before. She has promulgated Christian teaching and education in the great Chinese universities and missionary work among the people. Every member of Mayling Chiang's powerful family is a Christian. Her dead brother-in-law, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the present Chinese Republic, was also a Christian.

Seventh. She has done more than anyone living to bring to the peoples of the East a knowledge of the West, and to the people of the West a knowledge of the East. The marked trend in China today toward western culture, western methods, and a western outlook can be largely traced to her influence, not only on the Gissimo—who has never been out of the Orient and who speaks only one word of English, "darling," which he uses to his wife—but also to her influence on all of China's keymen, and, most directly, on the people themeselves. To the people she has extolled the merits of western progressivism and industrialism. Her vigorous "western approach" to the historic question of disease, poverty, suffering, and death has helped to kill the fatalism and resignation that have so long imprisoned the Chinese spirit. Conversely, in her writings, her speeches, her short-wave broadcasts to this country, and by the supreme example of herself, she has helped to show America and Europe, not only the vast political and military importance of China to the West, but the spiritual and cultural values of her country. One has only to imagine how much less we would know of China today if Madame Chiang had not warned us, over and over, not only of the Japanese military peril, but of future political and spiritual dangers to the West if we do not once and for all forget our outmoded ideas of the "white man's superiority" when dealing with nations as ancient, as civilized, as heroic as China.

Eighth. She is one of the world's most skilled woman diplomats, politicians, enlightened statesmen. Throughout the years when China was fighting alone against Japan, China was never completely without friends. Madame Chiang always counseled the Gissimo, in spite of his anti-Communist bias, to keep Russia an active unofficial ally and, also, to keep her well-loved America a potential ally. Embittered as she also must have been with the West's appeasement policy of militarily and economically aiding Japan in the very face of facts that screamed to be recognized, Madame Chiang and the Gissimo seldom lost their patience, recriminated or threatened, and never, never sold out, or made deals with other Axis powers—although the history of the past 8 years in China is full of pages showing the pressure that was applied on the Gissimo, and Madame Chiang, to do so.

Mr. Chairman, is this a portrait of a woman who does not know how to live democracy?

I ask Mrs. Roosevelt, had she spent the last 8 years of her life in a country all but swallowed by a brutal enemy, or a country starved and blockaded from without, and torn from within by civil strife, would she be galloping about that country, alone with nothing but a secretary? Would she pass through lobbies, let us say, unescorted by armed guards, if the Communists of this country were armed to the teeth, and eager to overthrow the established Government of America? She might, if she were foolish—or if she chose to play the role of traitor to her Government, but although she has, like all of us, sometimes spoken foolishly, I think she would then not act so foolishly or so unpatriotically.

Mr. Chairman, it is rumored that Mrs. Roosevelt took some offense on matters of protocol during Madame Chiang's visit to America, and later when she returned for a long period of hospitalization. None of us knows the details of these matters, but surely if some small social grievance was given, Mrs. Roosevelt's understanding of human nature is deep enough so

that she might forgive those, and not use them as a reason for indicting the democratic conduct of a woman like Madame Chiang Kai-shek, who through so many long and terrible years used all her strength, all her wisdom, all the words that came from her own mouth to keep China on the side of democracy, and to make for better understanding between our two nations.

To give praise and understanding where praise and understanding are both due and helpful, surely, Mrs. Roosevelt, that is democracy in action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I believe thoroughly in the statement of our chaplain the other day that America is liberty's wonderland. I believe in our system. I am neither a Socialist nor a Communist, but I consider this amendment nothing less than a Russian-baiting amendment. When we have such problems with Russia as we have to consider, Iran, Poland, Japan, China, and the Balkans, and our foreign administration has to take these matters up with them, if you insist that we have the press come in there and tell about UNRRA—and it affects only Russian-controlled lands—can you guarantee Russia that these men will not speak of the Russian system or their politics, or the way it is administered, after they get out of there?

This is dynamite, headed for trouble. I am not willing to tell Russia what kind of a government she should run, even though I do not believe in her government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the Brown amendment.

In March 1944, the House by a vote of 338 to 54, and the Senate by 47 to 14 passed Public Law 267, with no strings attached, providing that we give UNRRA an amount equal to 1 percent of our national income in 1943. Other United Nations made the same pledge.

The Senate struck out this identical Brown amendment providing restrictions on the spending of this appropriation.

Legally and morally we are committed to keep our original pledge and to comply with the terms of the law passed by us. This law had no strings attached to it then. Why should we handcuff the administration of this humane law now? You would not help out a poor and starving family at Christmas, or any other time, and then go into their homes and tell the poverty-stricken and grieving mother what way she should spend the money for her starving babies.

This will never be a happy world or this a happy Nation if we permit, by a crippling amendment, millions of poor, helpless, and starving people to go to their death. We are legally bound; we are morally bound to carry through with UNRRA.

Revolutions are caused by poverty. The coming winter may tell the story whether civilization itself is to survive.

The heart of the American people is sound. They are willing to cut down on their own food and clothing to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

Civilization is on trial; this great Nation is on trial and I plead with you today to keep faith with the legal and moral law by helping the millions of starving mothers, fathers, and babies, who depend on us, as to whether they will live or die. If we keep faith with our congressional promise I am sure it will bring untold blessings to this Nation of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, on three previous occasions I have voted for UNRRA; first, for confirming the agreement and then twice for the commitments we made. I intend to support this bill. However, a serious question has been raised here today, and an argument has been lodged against it, whether or not we should attach the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. The argument lodged against it has been made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS]. I can very well understand that to attach a condition to a contract is a dangerous thing to do after that contract is made, especially when one party to that contract seeks to attach that condition alone.

May I observe, however, that if this bill passes without the amendment being attached regarding a free press, it seems to me the obligation and the responsibility will be upon those nations which receive aid, or administer the relief we intend, to see to it that the American people, who are providing 72 percent of the relief, be given all the news and all the facts in reference to the administration and distribution of the relief we provide in this bill.

I now want to ask a question. There has come to me some information this afternoon that Italy has received about $50,000,000 under UNRRA for expectant mothers and children. We find no fault with that. Further, the information is to the effect that there is some agreement pending, perhaps secret, that Italy is to receive $450,000,000 more from UNRRA—and I do not complain with that—but I rise to ask if at the same time that we grant UNRRA relief to Italy, is it true that Russia is demanding reparations from Italy? Is there anyone on the committee who can answer that question? If there is, I pause and will permit any member to use my time to answer it.

Mr. BLOOM. That has never come to my notice in any way, shape, or form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will say to the gentleman, who is one of the ablest Members of the House, that Russia did demand reparations from Italy, but our State Department repudiated that demand on the ground that Italy was in need of help from us and, therefore, was unable to pay any reparations.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for answering that question. That is the answer I wanted.

Mr. BLOOM. May I say that the statement to which the gentleman refers has been mentioned in the press, but as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] has stated, this demand has been very strenuously objected to by both Britain and the United States, if that is what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; that is what I refer to.

Mr. BLOOM. That was objected to.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that not one reason that the International Conference in London blew up?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know. I was not there.

Mr. RANKIN. I am just asking for information. We know it wound up in a confusion of tongues, and I understand this was one of the elements in that confusion.

Mr. BLOOM. We objected to it and so did England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, on the vote we will soon take here in the House today rests the fate of another great American plan. UNRRA is an American idea, conceived in American minds, and formulated in an international group first meeting in America. Its first hope of success was based on American help both in moral and material support. Without the persistent suggestion from the United States the idea would never have taken shape in the first place. Are we going to continue to play the role of the nation which conceives plans for international cooperation and then strangle the child of our very own social fiber in its infancy? If we fail UNRRA today and thus fail the suppressed and starving millions, we will have gone a long step toward establishing claim to first place among all the nations of the earth to the distinction of proposing much and doing little to make international cooperation work.

I favor contributing to UNRRA and working with that international group according to plans established by the Organization for bringing relief and hope to those who sacrificed what they had on a war altar which they did not build.

With the dawn of the new atomic age just breaking over the rim of civilization, is there not at least one sphere of human relationship in which we can work harmoniously with an international group? If we cannot work in harmony with our neighbors and friends in the very elementary field of relief, how do we expect to prove any degree of sincerity in the really complex spheres of international relationships? In my opinion, there is nothing in the future

for our country or for the world either attainable or worth striving for except that which comes through international cooperation and international action. The day of every nation for self alone is very definitely in the past. An isolated America in the world of today would be as futile and as out-dated as the bow and arrow of the Indian or the side saddle of the gay nineties.

I favor UNRRA, not just because it is a test of our willingness to work in an international group, but because it is fulfilling an obligation which the devastated areas have a perfect right to expect. In the liberated countries just a few months ago, we were urging the native peoples to blow their bridges, destroy their crops, wreck their means of production, with the promise of help and restoration when these drastic means brought liberation sooner. We played up the idea of how wonderful liberation would be. We did not raise such questions as these: Do not blow any bridges until the American press is admitted; do not use any bombs if the labels are not clear; beware of black markets or we will withhold further aid. I wonder just how deep we will permit their disappointment to go. I wonder just how much bitterness we will justify.

I realize, as all of you do, something of the magnitude of the sacrifices we have made to suppress what we believe to be wrong. As has been said here on the floor of the House, no casualty list is light if your boy's name is on it. Still, with our very heavy sacrifices, we are well fed, we are well clothed, and we are well housed. We are the country least touched by the real devastations of war. From our relatively comfortbale position, it is extremely difficult for me to justify our action in withholding help which we have pledged and are in a position to give.

If our Nation is to make the contribution to world peace, order, and freedom, for which we have fought so heavily for the privilege of making, then let us get on with making the contribution in this great opportunity which UNRRA affords. The starving people of the world will find little relief from such excuses as freedom of the press, package labels, dishonest workers, national rivalries, and so forth. And, after all, would it not be faulty reasoning to make the suffering millions of war casualties the victims of conditions over which they have practically no control.

A vote for UNRRA without strings is, in my opinion, a vote for extended peace. And, in my opinion, a vote against UNRRA and for hampering reservations is a vote for misunderstanding and for a brief period of peace. If we continue to fail to discharge to ourselves and to the world the obligations which come to us through the destructive processes of war, then I can see little justification in further conflicts which will surely come if we do not have the courage or the will to help correct the conditions which will foster and produce future conflicts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say I am not in favor of blindly following mere words. I think the American people have a right to know that the money we are appropriating is going to the hungry people and not going to the liquidators of the hungry people and of other innocent people in Europe. I cannot understand the cowardly attitude that says we must permit the liquidators to do as they please, if there are any liquidators. I am not assuming there are. I shall assume that all these nations which have hungry people want to let us know that it goes to the people for whom we appropriated it.

In the first place, how much longer are we going to be made suskers—not only suckers but blind suckers—in permitting ourselves to be humbugged into something we know nothing about? If we had taken a little more intelligent interest and demanded a little more publicity in time, perhaps we could have avoided World War II. I know we were made suckers when we permitted 43 "gi' me, gi' me" nations to put over upon our—should I say our people who did not know any better—our representatives who had no diplomatic intelligence, that each nation was to pay 1 percent of its national income, so that we as one nation agreed to pay as much as the other 43. No; not as much as the other 43, but over three times as much as the other 43. How was that put over on our dumb representatives of the State Department of our Government? By somebody making a motion that the amount each nation was to pay was to be 1 percent of their national income. They did not tell you, and our diplomats did not know, that our national income was being stimulated by creating a $300,000,000,000 indebtedness. Our national income is just on paper. It does not exist as a reality. And yet we assumed three times as much obligation to feed the hungry people of these 43 nations that started the war, which we had nothing to do with starting.

Then we sent our boys to win that war for a bunch of liquidators, if the language used on both sides of the aisle is correct. I have no reference to Russia. I hope the Russians are gentlemen. If they are as black as the gentleman from Pennsylvania painted them, then we have got into some pretty bad company, and we had better wash our hands of them and do it while we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is a bill relating to human beings. That is the primary objective of the bill. It is the primary thing we should keep in mind. Each and every one of us in America has ingrained in our minds and in our hearts the great rights that the framers of the Constitution established, and which we have inherited from past generations. One of those great rights is freedom of the press. But today we are confronted with the problem of trying to save human beings.

This bill is not aimed to assist governments, it is aimed to assist human beings in other lands. Countless millions of them, many children among them with their parents lost; in Poland it is estimated that 1,000,000 out of 7,000,000 children under 14 years of age have only one of their parents living, and several hundreds of thousands with no parent living. That is the primary objective of the bill—to help and save human beings.

My remarks today are not against the Herter amendment, because I believe it is constructive and I intend to vote for it. I respect the views of my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the sincerity of his motives and purposes, in offering his amendment, but I am in frank disagreement with him that such an amendment should be put on a bill of this kind. Suppose this amendment were adopted and put into practical operation, UNRRA would be denied to countries unless the President certified that freedom of the press existed in those countries, with millions of people faced with starvation, with millions of people faced with the vicious cold of the coming winter. In the disillusionment resulting from their suffering those people are likely to react and turn toward the ideology of communism, or even turn toward anarchy.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman does not mean to say that under this amendment the President would be compelled to certify that freedom of the press existed in all these countries, does he?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted and goes into operation as a condition precedent for the relief of human suffering in those countries the President would have to certify there was freedom of the press, and where he did not so certify those people would not get relief.

I wish to make one further observation, there is no one more opposed to communism than I. I am the author of every bill that has passed the Congress in the last 17 years aimed at subversive activities in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago we were called upon to appropriate $1,350,000,000 to aid the people in the occupied countries. The war was on. We were led to believe that no additional sum would be called for.

Now we have the bill before us providing for an additional $1,350,000,000. There is no indication that a similar sum will not be called for in the future.

If this bill is passed, our contribution to this cause will be $2,700,000,000. Forty-three other nations, including Russia and Great Britain, have signed up agreeing to contribute to this fund. The total amount will be approximately $3,600,000,000.

It will be seen that our country is being called upon to pay three times as

much into this fund as the other 43 or 44 nations all together.

This reminds us that Secretary of War Stimson, after the western drive in Europe, stated that we furnished more than 75 percent of the men on that western front drive. We furnished as large, if not a larger, percent of the equipment.

It is a matter of common knowledge that we furnished 85 percent or more of the men and matériel in the Pacific war.

I think a large part of the payments of these 43 or 44 countries into the relief fund has been secured from the United States in lend-lease, loans, or gifts, and our allies have actually paid out of their own funds much less than 25 percent of the three billion six hundred million.

SIXTY-FIVE BILLIONS

Secretary Wallace, of the Department of Commerce, on November 26, 1945, issued a report in which he stated that up to June 30, 1945, we had turned over to foreign countries, under lend-lease, $42,021,000,000. We are also advised that since that time, June 30, 1945, there has been turned over and released to the various nations of the world approximately twenty billions more. The total amount requested by the administration for lend-lease was approximately sixty-eight billions, and I am convinced that in some way or other this entire $68,000,000,000 will be turned over to the foreign countries either as lend-lease, loans, or gifts, or in some other manner.

In this report Mr. Wallace states that up to June 30, 1945, we disbursed or expended in foreign countries $13,045,000,000. This does not include lend-lease. These billions represent what our Government on its own account spent in foreign countries up to June 30, 1945. This represents money spent in buying food and other supplies in foreign countries. It also includes over 3,000 military installations, mainly air bases and port facilities, at a cost of $2,413,000,000. They are still there. In addition the War Department sent abroad civilian-relief supplies, mainly food and clothing, exceeding $800,000,000, for the purpose, as stated by the War Department, of preventing civilian disease and unrest in the liberated and occupied countries. Up to June 30, twenty-nine billions of the $42,021,000,000 of lend-lease went to the British Empire, and ten billions went to Russia. But, as we have pointed out, additional billions have gone to these countries since June 30, 1945. In addition to all of these our country and agencies have loaned and advanced to foreign governments approximately two billions more. Therefore all in all we have, by way of gifts, lend-lease, loans, and so forth, given or transferred to these foreign countries a total sum in excess of sixty-five billions. And now we are called upon to contribute an additional $1,350,000,000. Our population is estimated at 140,000,000. Sixty-five billion represents $480 for every man, woman, and child and over $2,000 for every family in the United States.

Of course, this has no reference to the hundreds of billions we spent in the winning of the war.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW HOW THEIR MONEY IS BEING USED

Is the relief money that the American people supplied being used for relief purposes?

It has developed a bureaucracy having about 8,000 officeholders being paid salaries equal to or higher than are paid in the United States. Only about 15 percent of these officeholders administering this relief are American citizens. The others are people of foreign countries. We furnish about 75 percent of the relief money and have only about 15 percent Americans engaged in administering relief. Of course, these foreign officeholders are receiving the highest pay, no doubt, they ever received in their lives.

While much of the relief program and acts have been kept more or less secret, it leaked out recently that over 600 of these officeholders had been found to be dishonest or incompetent. Many were arrested and jailed for using these relief supplies in the black market. Last year some of these funds were used by the political organizations that carried on this program to aid the administration candidates. No doubt millions of this money were used to gain the good will in this country of those who have friends in the countries where this relief is being administered. It is a well-known fact that a lot of this relief was used in the various countries to promote political ambitions of individuals and groups in those countries.

AMERICAN PEOPLE AND NATION GENEROUS

Our Nation and people have shown themselves to be the most generous of any nation or people in all history. The people have paid tens of billions of dollars in taxes and the Nation has borrowed hundreds of billions of dollars from the people. We are facing a national debt of three hundred billion and we will have a deficit this fiscal year of thirty billion or more and we are facing deficits for a number of years in the future. Our churches, relief, and welfare organizations have contributed enormous sums in money and supplies. Our casualties are more than 1,000,000 of the flower of the young manhood of the Nation. We have expended more than twice as much as all of our allies have expended on the war and in aiding our allies. Eighty-five million American people, out of their earnings and many of them at great sacrifices, have bought bonds to aid in the prosecution and in the winning of the war. We have stripped millions of acres of our forest, greatly depleted our oil, copper, coal, and other supplies. The American people have assumed a burden that cannot be discharged in one-half of a century. They must continue to sacrifice year by year in taxes for 50 and perhaps 100 years, and now our Government has already made arrangements to loan to France two and one-half billion, and closely following upon that arrangement and the consideration of this bill we are informed that our Government has agreed to loan to Great Britain $4,400,000,000, payable in 50 years and without interest for 5 years and only 2 percent interest thereafter. Of course, Russia is seeking a loan for billions. So is China and other countries. The press reports that in this arrangement to loan Britain this huge sum of money we have canceled the billions of obligations that we hold against Great Britain. In view of our experience with these same countries after World War I we can reasonably assume that none of these countries, unless it is little Finland, will pay any sums or materials advanced to them in this war or pay the sum we now loan to them. The claim has been made in many quarters that the recent bond sales was to bring our boys home. This cannot be true. Congress had already provided for that. These gifts and loans would be all right if we had the money. We do not have the money. In order to make these gifts and loans we must borrow the money from all of our people and if we continue in this course, how can we repay these loans to our people?

The administration is being liberal with the money of the American people. The American people in the end will have to dig up the taxes to satisfy the billions that are being given away so freely. Mr. CANNON, a Democrat, and the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, stated in substance the other day on the floor of the House that our country was facing bankruptcy and disaster. How can we keep from reaching the point where our bonds of this country like other bankrupt countries will be worthless? No one believes more sincerely in the principle taught by the Man of Galilee than I do, yet Holy Writ clearly states that we should provide for our own household first. I cannot lend my support to a policy and program that in the end must destroy the credit of this Nation and impoverish the people of our own country.

Russia and the small countries over which she exercises control have received, and will receive if we pass this bill, more than five hundred millions in relief money and if any segment of the population of these small countries did not or do not cooperate with Russia they did not and will not get relief.

Poland was overrun and devastated by both Russians and Germans. The Poles needed relief as much or more than any other country; but it is a matter of common knowledge that Russian soldiers and others intercepted the relief going to Poland.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia that were overrun and raped by both Germans and Russians and now under Russian control, so far as we can learn, have received no part of this relief although they are in dire need of it. Russia has placed her big paws on these little countries and she has drawn the curtain of secrecy around them and no report can be had.

Great Britain, which is interested in maintaining kingdoms in Italy and Greece, has made the most of the distribution of this relief to those favoring her ideals of government.

The immediate proposal now before us was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and that is, Shall this Nation refuse to grant relief to those

countries that refuse to permit accredited American newspaper correspondents to enter those countries and report to our country and the world the conditions that they find in relation to the distribution of this relief?

We must borrow this money from the American people, and the American people are certainly entitled to know what disposition is being made of their money. Some of our colleagues think this is an unreasonable limitation. I observe in my home town, county, and State that public officials are not only required to make reports of the number of officials and others employed, their salaries, and the amounts expended, but their records are open to the newspapers and to the citizens generally. A free and untrammeled press is one of the very essential things to preserve freedom and to keep our Government clean and honest.

About 2 years ago, after we had sent billions of lend-lease to Russia, we were amazed when our Ambassador to Russia announced that there had been no publicity given to the Russian people as to the source of the bounty that they had been receiving from the American people. This caused our Ambassador to be withdrawn. The only offense he had committed was in insisting that the Russian press should let the people of Russia know what we were doing for them. Our Government has had information that Russia and some other countries have failed to disclose to the Russian people the relief money and benefits that we have been, under this present program, giving to the Russians and that the information has been kept from a lot of the smaller nations who are receiving millions of dollars.

I can see no reason for keeping these facts from the Russian people and other countries except they desire to use this relief to play power politics and control people of these respective countries through relief. I wonder if they have learned of the success that our Democrat friends have had politically in the use of relief money and benefits in this country.

We have also observed with sorrow that the British, aided by the Japs, have joined with the Dutch in keeping millions of the people of Java under subjection and Britain has joined with France, aided by the Japs, to keep the people of Indochina in subjection; and our boys have been kept in China and we are spending enormous sums of money there by reason of the civil strife between north and south China.

These disturbing situations are occurring in other countries that have been the recipients of the bounty of the American people. Yes; we want to aid the widows and orphans and the needy people; but it seems to me that in these wars that have developed since VE-day and since VJ-day, many widows and orphans have been or are being made and cities and countries devastated, not by the Japs or Germans but by those who were associated with us in overturning the Japs and Germans and who are, in our opinion, violating the San Francisco Charter and our great desire to have peace with liberty and justice.

Under all of these circumstances, I do not feel justified in taking the bond and tax money of the American people and turning it into the hands of those who are not observing the San Francisco Charter and not cooperating in a great program of peace, liberty, and justice with the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago we had a bill similar to this at the time we were authorizing an appropriation of $550,000,000 for the relief of the needy peoples of war-torn Europe. That bill had an overwhelming vote in this House.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the American people from one end of this country to the other are enthusiastically in favor of sharing what we have and giving what we can to relieve the suffering in Europe. On the other hand, the American people have a lot of sound, common sense. No nation in the world today has a debt burden as heavy as the burden of debt hanging over the heads of the American Nation; no nation has ever before in all the centuries of history paid as much in taxes as America paid last year and in connection with the burden that is now placed on her shoulders. In addition to the one they are bearing now an added tax will be necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill. The people are entitled to know where that money is going.

Over on my side of the House we Democrats voted in large numbers last time for an amendment practically the same as the Brown amendment. I did it because I could not vote the money of my people away and then go back home and have them tell me that I voted away their money without at least giving them a chance to find out what country it went to and whether it went to the people they wanted to help.

From one end of this country to the other in recent weeks prominent men descended from people of these European countries have told the people of the United States that although vast quantities of material and vast sums of money presumably have gone into their countries, the needy of the countries were not getting it. They stated it is going somewhere else.

How can I go back to the people of my district, how can you go back to the people of your district and face that sort of charge, when you are voting to lay another tax burden on their shoulders? I am sure they are willing to take it if they know the money they are spending is going to relieve the needy; but if people who were born in those countries and who have kept in touch with them come back here here and tell us that, although you people are being taxed for it, that money is not going to feed the people you think it is going to, I think it is up to us to put a clause in this bill to give us the right, not to control the press of that country, not to interfere in their internal affairs, but giving the right to the American people to know what becomes of the money we generously give.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am very sure that all fair and decent persons want relief to go to the needy and the suffering abroad. I have worked with these 434 Members of Congress, all colleagues of mine, and I know that every Member here is a decent person. Everybody wants relief money to be spent most wisely and most efficiently. There is just a difference of opinion as to how that can be accomplished.

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that heads of countries will agree to the Brown freedom-of-the-press amendment in order to secure this money for their countries. I am not afraid of that at all, Mr. Chairman. I am very much worried to have the freedom of the press not allowed in those countries, because I fear that the press in these countries that will not allow freedom will be used against the United States for propaganda with a view to creating antagonism against the United States. We will be said not to be willing to help those persons and the needy will not receive relief.

Today I am very much alarmed, Mr. Chairman, because we do not know more about our foreign policy, what is going on in other countries, or what our policy is in other countries. I am very much alarmed, Mr. Chairman, because so many of our soldiers today are giving up their lives in foreign countries, and this country is not conscious of what is going on.

The people of the United States are entitled to know the facts. I am in favor of the Brown amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. I take the floor to explain that there were three reasons that caused me to favor the reporting of the rule which provides that the misnomer "free press" amendment shall be in order. In the first place I have always believed that the House membership should have an opportunity to vote on a controversial matter. Second, because I feel that in view of the fact that the Senate defeated a similar House amendment when the first UNRRA bill was considered that it would not favor the adoption of a like amendment at this time and, third, in my desire to obtain favorable action in the reporting of a rule without further delay and not because I favored the unwise former action of the House.

Mr. Chairman, it is not because I do not believe in free press that I oppose the amendment, as I cannot bring myself to believe that it is intended for that purpose, but merely to give certain press representatives whose newspapers are unfriendly to the cause of relief to the peoples of the stricken countries the opportunity to send in critical and unfriend articles carrying charges that will make headlines in their newspapers.

Naturally, the people of some of the foreign countries make complaints as to our dispensation of the relief and I observed that the gentleman from Mis-

souri [Mr. BELL] opposing the bill charged that he had heard from many outstanding people in some countries who complained that they were not receiving the aid to which they were entitled. The lady from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] and others are opposed to this relief principally on the grounds that it may help some people in communistic countries. It appears to me that the lady and a few others in this House are suffering from communistic hallucinations. While I dislike the Nazi, I feel that some of this aid should be extended to them to save them from starvation, knowing full well it will not be appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, we have attained a splendid reputation the world over for keeping our faith and in the promises we have made. We have attained a reputation by aiding humanity and in carrying out our pledges and assurances. Therefore, we must maintain that reputation and our good name which is bound, I am sure, to be recognized and appreciated by the unfortunate people who have been driven from their homes and which only this action can save them from starvation. I believe this great country of ours should carry out its obligations, and I feel that it will, without attaching any strings that may bring about conditions that will make it impossible to do justice to those deserving people.

Personally, I am in touch with and I hear from people all over the United States because of my position, and I know that the good women and good men, the good Christians all over, believe in the teachings of Christ to feed the hungry. They believe in feeding the hungry and doing justice to all. "Love thy brother as thyself."

Before I conclude, may I say there will be a meeting tomorrow at 2 o'clock of the Committee on Rules on the civil-service-retirement bill. Everyone opposed to it is invited to appear.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Brown substitute amendment. I do so because I am convinced that the publicity which was demanded by Mr. Herbert Hoover in the operations of the American Relief Administration following World War I contributed greatly to the well-known success of that organization. Full publicity of the functions of UNRRA will end many of the irregularities of which we are now complaining.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that while Mr. Lehman favors secrecy, Mr. Hoover demanded full publicity. As the result, Mr. Lehman's administration is noted for its inefficiency and crookedness, while Mr. Hoover's administration succeeded in every way without one criticism made against it. Mr. Hoover's ARA functioned in 20 countries, while Mr. Lehman's UNRRA is functioning in but 7 countries. Nearly 19,000,000 metric tons of food were distributed by the ARA, in Great Britain, Russia, Rumania, Poland, Armenia, Austria, Lithuania, Latvia, France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Germany, Finland, Danzig, Estonia, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Belgium.

To date, Mr. Lehman's UNRRA is functioning only in Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, and China. And, according to statements that have been made in this debate, the people of these countries are receiving foodstuffs valued at less than 25 percent of the money being appropriated. Mr. Hoover's organization functioned with but a few people in the administrative offices of the American Relief Administration while the UNRRA is employing thousands.

No, there was no secrecy in the operations of the ARA, and the foodstuffs we purchased went to the starving people of 20 countries of Europe, rather than into the black markets of Europe, as has been the experience under the UNRRA. Let me repeat. Mr. Hoover demanded publicity. Mr. Lehman demands secrecy.

As someone has well stated, there were no monkeyshines in the American Relief Association in the dark days following World War I. There was no fear of hurting the sensibilities of the countries on the receiving end of our relief. The object was to care for the hungry and needy. In this connection I wish to quote several clauses of the so-called Riga agreement which was negotiated between the Russian Government and the ARA.

The first clause is especially interesting in view of the current reports of and the suspicions being voiced today:

First, that the ARA may bring into Russia such personnel as the ARA finds necessary in the carrying out of its work and the Soviet authorities guarantee them full liberty and protection while in Russia. Non-Americans and Americans who have been detained in Soviet Russia since 1917 will be admitted on approval by the Soviet authorities.

And these clauses are interesting, too:

Eighth. That the relief supplies are intended for children and the sick, as designated by the ARA * * * and remain the property of the ARA until actually consumed by these children and the sick, and are to be distributed in the name of the ARA.

Ninth. That no individual receiving ARA rations shall be deprived of such local supplies as are given to the rest of the population.

Tenth. That they will guarantee and take every step to insure that relief supplies belonging to the ARA will not go to the general adult population nor to the army, navy, or government employees but only to * * * (children and the sic "without regard to race, religion, or social or political status").

Eleventh. That Soviet authorities undertake to reimburse the ARA in dollars at c. i. f. cost or replace in kind any misused relief supplies.

The twenty-first clause of the Riga agreement is especially pertinent to my argument to support the pending amendment, and in view of reports of irregularities in UNRRA, such as switched labels, now being told by our returning soldiers. It reads:

Twenty-first. That they will acquaint the Russian people with the aims and methods of the relief work of the ARA in order to facilitate the rapid development of its efficiency and will assist and facilitate in supplying the American people with reliable and nonpolitical information of the existing conditions and the progress of the relief work as an aid in developing financial support in America.

This is the manner in which the American Relief Administration carried on, Mr. Chairman. As the result the starving people of Europe were fed and the ARA emerged from its job without one bit of scandal. There was full publicity. That is what this pending amendment will bring. And it will save UNRRA many headaches and the taxpayers of America many, many dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VCORHIS].

Mr. VCORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many Members have had occasion to read the column in this morning's Post written by Mr. Walter Lippmann to which reference has already been made in the debate. I believe it worth while to reemphasize, before this vote is taken what Mr. Lippmann had to say. Actually the only way in which we shall get accurate information about what is happening to UNRRA relief is through American officials abroad, either officials of UNRRA or officials of our own Government. To expect American press correspondents to go beyond the sources of information they normally use, which are according to Lippmann those very same official sources, is to place upon the press a responsibility which it cannot be expected to discharge.

It appears to me that any man or woman who is deeply concerned about the position of America in the world today will see clearly how important it is to that position for our country to meet this crisis in human destitution in as simple and direct and evidently generous a way as it can be done.

True, I cannot assure the House that the thing is going to be done perfectly. I believe it is going to be done much better than would have been the case had these questions not been raised here. I am glad they have been raised. But when it comes to the type of bill we are going to pass, I think we shall have to do it to a considerable extent on faith in the American officials of UNRRA and upon faith in the officials of our Government in the nations where the relief is given. For that reason, I hope the proposal made by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be favored and the proposal made by the gentleman from Ohio will be defeated, for I believe that the proposal of the gentleman from Massachusetts is far better calculated to place our country in the kind of unassailable position which it can place itself in here and now by doing generously all that anyone could expect her to do to relieve the distress of the world. May I say that will be done in contrast with the fact that from certain other nations there has been quite an opposite type of action. I have faith that in the long run those two types of action, the one on the part of America and the other on the part of certain other nations, will live in the minds and the hearts of the

people of the world to the benefit of this Nation and all she stands for.

But most important, Mr. Chairman, are the hungry people of the world. As long as we can help them it is our Christian duty and privilege to do so. That is all this bill is for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I think I am somewhat more optimistic about this question of the freedom of the press in some of these other nations than a good many of my colleagues here in the committee. The fact is that the ideal is gaining ground steadily and healthily, even in some of those regions in which we believed it could not flourish. For example, members of the press are admitted to Czechoslovakia, to Poland, to Yugoslavia, and to Austria. All four of those nations are receiving assistance from UNRRA. The same is true in Italy and in Greece. Likewise, China, I believe that with the area of resistance, if I may so call it, constantly narrowing, it would not be healthy for us as a government to lay down an ultimatum to anybody. A declaration by this Congress in the form suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] would, in my judgment, have an exceedingly healthy and helpful effect, not only because it expresses the ideals in which we believe, but because it does so without challenging anybody and without offending people. There are all kinds of people in this world. There is a great area in eastern Europe in which there has never been any freedom of the press. It is absolutely unknown. Slowly but surely the bordering nations about which we have spoken so often here, are admitting representatives of the press. I think the Herter amendment will be exceedingly influential. It proceeds in orderly fashion. It does not carry an implied threat, but it lets the whole world know how we think about the freedom of the press. That is the best way to win the world to our way of thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] to close debate.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has preceded me, the very able gentleman from New York, I think has summed up in a very few sentences the reasons why the Brown substitute should be defeated and why the Herter amendment should be adopted. The very best reason that anyone could have if they voted for the Brown amendment before and vote against it as a substitute on this occasion, is the example of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who supported that amendment before, but who says now that he is convinced that in the mandatory form it is unwise and he has therefore modified and changed his amendment to read as follows:

That the President is hereby requested through appropriate channels to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Adminstration administrative supplies and services.

We are seeking to act, as has been so well stated by the gentleman who has preceded me, in a manner not to give offense and calculated to get results. I believe it would be far more effective and at the same time there would be no possibility of denying some people in some countries UNRRA relief, as would be the case under the Brown amendment. If the Brown amendment is adopted, we say, "No relief can go to that country." There would result death from starvation and cold, and misery to the poor and helpless people who could not help themselves. As was said by the distinguished majority leader, this is a humanitarian measure. Let us put it upon that ground. If we do, I think we shall certainly vote down the Brown substitute and adopt the more reasonable and sensible Herter amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the second part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the second part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], as amended.

The second part of the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONKMAN: Page 1, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Notice shall be given, and communicated to the Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, of the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, so that such withdrawal will be effective on June 30, 1947. Such notice shall be given and communicated by the President of the United States, or by such other official of the Government as the President may designate, in conformity with the provisions of article X of the agreement concluded by the United States and Associated Governments on November 9, 1943."

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in order that we may at the appropriate time, in a legal, lawful, and orderly manner, wind up the UNRRA organization. It is offered under article X of the agreement which was made by the United Nations in forming this Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Administration.

Article X reads as follows:

Any member government may give notice of withdrawal from the Administration at any time after the expiration of 6 months from the entry into force of the agreement by that government. Such notice shall take effect 12 months after the date of its communication to the Director General, subject to the member government having met by that time all financial, supply, or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it.

Mr. Chairman, UNRRA was formed for the purpose of affording war relief, not for general relief purposes.

It was formed only to give relief to the war-stricken nations that had been invaded as a result of the war, and it should be confined to that purpose.

I think that by June 1947, we will have reached our objective. I think we should bear in mind that when UNRRA was approved in this House it was our opinion that we should carry the stricken nations through one crop period. If we pass this bill, we will have carried them, with the exception of China, perhaps, through two crop periods.

In passing, lest there should be any misunderstanding about it—there was some implication to that effect yesterday afternoon—I want to say that I shall support this bill without amendment or with reasonable amendment. It does not make any difference to me. I stated my reasons for that yesterday, but I do think we should proceed in an orderly manner and with a little foresight as to how we are going to dispose of the UNRRA organization. If we do not do anything, we will be at this same period next year still bound by an agreement that we cannot get out of for a year.

There was some discussion in the committee as to whether or not after war relief had been accomplished, UNRRA might continue, for instance, to give relief to famine-stricken people, and so forth, and to countries that are now receiving war relief who are probably suffering as much from famine as from the ravages of war.

I do think that if that time comes it should be taken up by another organization or by the United Nations Organization. The reason I think we should adopt this amendment is that the United States led in the conception of UNRRA. I think it led in the organization of UNRRA and I think it led in the operation of UNRRA at least with reference to the contributions that have been made. I believe it may safely be said that there are a number of nations—and I think it is probably true of all the rest of the nations—who feel the burden of UNRRA fully as much as does the United States; that is, I believe we are as well able to bear it as any other nation, and they should be made to feel and have confidence that this is not a continuing organization that is going to run from year to year. I believe too that just as we took the lead in forming UNRRA we should also take the lead in winding it up. By the adoption of this amendment other nations will have some program to go by, some assurance that if they make this year's contribution then they are through with it; and I think that suggestion should come from the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because the gentleman from Michigan, who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, never suggested an amendment of this kind while the legislation was under consideration in the committee. This is the first time it has ever been suggested to me or to the committee. Furthermore, the gentleman is acquainted with the fact that in all the hearings it was stated it would take through the year 1946 for UNRRA to finish its relief work in Europe and the first 3 months of 1947 in China. That would take us up to April 1, 1947. What the gentleman's amendment does is to say to UNRRA that it is compelled to wind up its tremendous organization within 3 months when all officials, all representatives of UNRRA, have stated it would take not only all of that time but 3 months of 1947 as well to continue its work in the Pacific. That would be an impossible task. Furthermore, no money would be saved whether this amendment carries or is defeated. The fact remains, however, that its passage would tie the hands of UNRRA as far as we are concerned if only 3 months were allowed them to complete their work.

As I said in the beginning the amendment was never considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which the gentleman from Michigan is a member. He never presented it to the committee or mentioned it in any way. I do not believe this is the way to bring up such an important amendment. I therefore recommend that it be disagreed to.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. Is it not also true that UNRRA will be through in Europe in 1946 and aware that their job is done so that they can use those 3 months of 1947 to wind up their affairs? I think it is orderly procedure.

Mr. BLOOM. It is also true, and this is a fact, that the biggest part of the work yet ahead of UNRRA lies in the Pacific area and China, where so many people need its help. As the gentleman knows, it has been stated several times that this Pacific area work will require the first 3 months of 1947. That would mean that after their work was completed it would still take them 3 months of effort without their having a dollar to work with, to complete its work. And this in itself is an immense task, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. JONKMAN. How long does the gentleman propose that UNRRA shall continue?

Mr. BLOOM. I should like to see it closed out just as soon as it can be closed out. As the gentleman knows, the administrative expenses of UNRRA are defrayed separately by all member nations of UNRRA whether they contribute their 1 percent to its relief funds or not.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman who offered the amendment speaks of orderly procedure. This amendment is a rather vital one and should have been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs so that the various angles with respect to it could have been considered and determined. It is dangerous to adopt an amendment offered on the floor without having been given consideration by the committee.

Mr. BLOOM. I may say to the gentleman, and he knows I will keep my word, that I will be very glod to consider an amendment of this kind in the committee at any time and get the opinion of the officials of UNRRA and see whether it is possible to do it or not. I am agreeable to that, but I do not think this is the way to bring it up.

Mr. JONKMAN. I want to apologize to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for not thinking of it during the committee consideration of this matter, but I was busy with other matters.

Mr. BLOOM. So was I.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think it is an evidence of good faith if we pass this amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. I will go into it the first opportunity.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am in favor of the pending amendment. I think it would make for orderly procedure and result in much more prompt delivery of food and needed things for the hungry people in Europe and the Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply for the purpose of emphasizing the reply to the question of my good friend from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], who inquired when we propose to end UNRRA. While I am in thorough agreement with the opposition to his amendment, because I do not think such snapshot action should ever be taken on the floor of the House, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House and the gentleman to something he is well aware of, as are all other members of the committee, and that is the hearings are full of evidence that the UNRRA organization has every intention of concluding its work in Europe, except perhaps the winding up of loose ends, by December 1946, and 3 months thereafter in Asia.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, unless this Congress makes this move to close up UNRRA I do not think we have any assurance that the American representative on UNRRA will move to close it up. I give you as an example the way the American representative there is acting at this time. Mr. Clayton, the American representative, testified that on his motion at a recent meeting of the UNRRA organization there was put through the proposition that $250,000,000 shall be given to White Russia and the Ukraine. Those are part of Russia. Russia is ineligible under the constitution of the UNRRA agreement to get any aid.

Mr. Chairman, it simply shows how some fellow travelers who are operating in connection with UNRRA are willing to do anything to the damage of the United States to sell a piece of cotton or some machine tools at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. May I say that the gentlewoman from Illinois is eminently right. We have absolutely nothing to say about the continuation of UNRRA except through the UNRRA Council, on which we have one member. They can say absolutely who is going to have help, where they are going to spend the money, and how long they are going to run. There is only this opportunity for the Congress to express itself by giving instructions to the President that we are going to be through when this authorization is finished and it is the only time that the Congress will get to speak on this subject.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for this bill. The people of America have never been niggardly when its wealth has been needed to relieve known human suffering. But under this bill we are giving tacit approval to the allotment of $250,000,000 to Soviet Russia. And I submit that no information has been given the Congress to show that Russia is not in position to finance its own requirements. It is true that on page 148 of the committee hearings there is a statement that the UNRRA Committee on Ability to Pay held a hearing on the subject. At that hearing, as per Mr. Lehman—and I quote:

They—

Meaning Russia—

submitted a document.

Thereupon this Committee on Ability to Pay—composed of one American and four men of other nationality—decided that Russia was not in position to pay. So we pay $250,000,000. And that remarkably persuasive document has not been made available to us nor did our representative on this Ability to Pay Committee testify before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. This, Mr. Chairman, is blind giving. It smells.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Russia has gold and uranium which the scientists they have taken from Germany are working on in connection with the atomic bomb.

Mr. BUCK. I agree with the gentlewoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 1, line 9, strike out the sum "$2,700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,850,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to cut the authorization in this bill to $500,000,000. On yesterday the distinguished chairman of our committee had this to say with reference to the bill, and I quote from page 11487:

We are the only Nation in the world that has really made anything substantial, the only Nation in the world that has had an income, and because we have been so prosperous, because we have been so successful, Mr. Chairman, we have had this tremendous income; and we are asked to spend only 1 percent to feed and to clothe and to shelter all of the poor unfortunate people throughout the world.

I submit to the members of this Committee that there is no showing in the RECORD how much money has gone to feed and clothe and shelter the poor people all over this world. I think that the American taxpayer is getting a poor run for his money. In support of my amendment I want to submit some figures which indicate that we can reduce this authorization to $500,000,000 and still do a good job in feeding and clothing the poor unfortunate people of this world.

I submit the following figures, not from the RECORD nor from the testimony before our committee, but I have gone to the ranking minority Member of the House Committee on Appropriations and from him I get the figures which I submit to you.

As of December 1, 1945, there was $1,284,000,000 unspent. A few days ago we appropriated $550,000,000; therefore on the 1st of December 1945, we had available $1,834,000,000. I am informed that for shipments in the month of September $531,000 was spent, leaving a total of $1,303,000,000 as of the 1st of October. For shipments in October there was an estimate of $128,000,000, actually spent $106,000,000, leaving available as of the 1st of November $1,197,000,000. For shipments in November, estimated $250,000,000, actual $245,000,000, leaving a balance of $952,000,000 as of the 1st of December. It is estimated that for shipments in December there would be spent $350,000,000. Therefore, there would be available as of the 1st of January $602,000,000.

I say that if we authorize $500,000,000 at this time it will give us a total of $1,102,000,000 to spend, for at least the first quarter of 1946. Further I submit that in view of the fact that many competent civilian agencies today propose to help feed and clothe the starving people of Europe and all over the world we should give them an opportunity to do so. They are clamoring for that chance. I submit that here are the figures to show that we can do a good job for the first quarter of the year 1946 and not go back on the commitments we have made in this matter. There has been no showing before the committee or at any time during this debate that it cannot be done.

Recapitulation

Funds available as of Dec. 1, 1945	$1,284,000,000
Recently appropriated	550,000,000
Available December 1945	1,834,000,000
For shipments:	
September 1945	531,000,000
	1,303,000,000
October 1945	106,000,000
	1,197,000,000
November 1945	245,000,000
	952,000,000
December 1945 (estimated)	350,000,000
Available as of Jan. 1, 1946	602,000,000

Mr. Chairman, if we add the five hundred million proposed by my amendment, that would mean a total of one thousand one hundred and two millions for use in first part of 1946 and this is ample to care for that period. The American taxpayer is entitled to this consideration. It is important that the United States remain solvent if it is to do a real relief job.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, of course I am opposed to this amendment. Again, at no time from the beginning of UNRRA up to the present time—and I was in it at the beginning—has any suggestion of this kind ever been made. We must remember, in connection with my comments of yesterday, that all the nations have agreed upon this one standard—that is, 1 percent of the income of their respective countries for the year 1943. So if we were to cut this authorization, naturally the other countries would do the same thing, and it would destroy the principal point we have made in our agreement with UNRRA.

The gentleman who offered this amendment never suggested an amendment of this kind in the committee meetings, although he was there all the time. No one has ever suggested an amendment of this kind.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The gentleman will recall that the galley sheets in this matter were not ready until last Thursday afternoon. On Friday noon I had a call from the clerk of the committee wanting to know whether or not I would O. K. the proof. I say that is too short a time to examine the galley sheets and to submit the proposition to the committee.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman knows the procedure of the committee and also of the House. To offer an amendment of this kind he does not need a galley proof. The galley proofs are, as you all know, merely the proofs of the hearings. The gentleman was present at all of the hearings, in executive session and otherwise. No suggestion of this kind was ever made, or has ever been made any other place, either on this side of the Capitol or anywhere else.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is not the complete answer that this is an authorization bill, and before any money is appropriated the Committee on Appropriations will have to have hearings and the need will have to be shown? Therefore, the question is not one to be debated at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. That is a very good point. The idea is that we cannot do anything with reference to this at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is worthy of the support of every Member, for it seeks to reduce the amount by $500,000,000. UNRRA has not administered its affairs in such a way as to encourage enthusiastic support. The amount provided in the bill less $500,000,000 will leave enough to carry the program for another year. By the end of the harvest season of 1946 we will know whether we should contribute any more money. I am firm in my belief that it would be better to reduce this amount as provided in the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 75, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 1, line 9, after the figure "$2,700,000,000", strike out the period and add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no funds herein shall be used to pay the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration contributions to the "provident fund" of employees thereof when any employee separates from the pay roll thereof before such employee reaches 65 years of age."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in the Director General's report of September 1944, the following statement is made:

One of these special benefits is to provide a provident fund. It is intended to solve various problems.

The statement goes on to say:

This fund is made up of deductions of 5 percent from the salary of each employee, plus an additional 7½ percent contributed by the Administration, the total to be available to the employee upon leaving the Administration with an honorable record after at least 6 months of service.

In other words, an employee, if he has been in the service of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for a period of only 6 months, is permitted to draw out not only what he paid into the fund but also the part that

the Administration paid into the fund. I know of no authority or precedent that can justify this arrangement. Civil Service personnel in the employ of the Federal Government are not provided with anything of the sort. They cannot draw out any part of the Government's contribution to the retirement fund except in the form of retirement benefits after the age of retirement, and even then only if they have had 5 years or more of service.

So that the salaries paid by UNRRA, which, together with other allowances, in my judgment, represent the highest income received by the personnel of any government agency in the world, are not the real salaries. The real salaries are those listed, plus an amount equal to 7½ percent of those salaries. For example, a salary listed at $14,000 is really $15,050. One listed at $10,000 is $10,750, and so on. This 7½-percent contribution to the provident fund, in my judgment, is irregular. It does not conform with the practices which we pursue in this country. Therefore, I think it should be prohibited.

Here is an injustice that is being carried out by UNRRA. It seems to me that those Members who are really sincere in their protestations that they want to see UNRRA renovated will prove themselves by voting for this amendment.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I believe the gentleman said they had to have an honorable record in order to enjoy the benefits of which he spoke. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. REED of New York. At the rate that these thieves are operating black markets, they will not get many of the benefits.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. UNRRA is part of an international organization. Does not the gentleman think that the bureaucrats of an international superstate should be permitted to have super security?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. They are apparently getting it at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

I hope this amendment will not prevail. It was recognized at the outset that UNRRA would necessarily have to draw its personnel in the main from the United States Government and from other member governments. With this in mind, officials of OFRRO, the relief organization of the United States Government which preceded UNRRA, had extensive conferences and communications with the United States Civil Service Commission for the purpose of ascertaining the benefits enjoyed by United States Government employees so that UNRRA could offer similar conditions of employment to Federal employees who wished to work for UNRRA.

As a result of these conferences with the United States Civil Service Commission, UNRRA decided to arrange a provident fund comparable in nature and amount to the United States civil-service retirement fund, and otherwise adopted the United States Government personnel policies. UNRRA employees have been notified that the benefits accruing to them in the provident fund may be used to make payments into the United States civil-service retirement fund.

In other words, UNRRA's provident fund is a pension plan for its employees—employees in a temporary organization—which is designed to protect and continue the rights of those same employees in the pension plans they enjoyed with their previous employer.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 39, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if today were 6 months ago, I would not vote for this bill to authorize appropriation of another $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA, but would vote instead for America setting up a relief organization of its own to do the job, or at least to handle our own share of the job—that would have been my position then not because I do not want the job done but because I think it would have been done better that way. It just is not natural for even American citizens to be as careful in spending American public money, as they are of their own private funds. It is even less natural for citizens of other countries to be as careful of money that is 72 percent American as they would be of money given by their own countrymen.

When the original UNRRA proposal was before us, I argued as strongly as I could in favor of it because among other reasons I felt that if we could not cooperate with other nations on the matter of feeding the starving, then on what could we ever hope to cooperate? I thought that was a sound position; but I think now that I was wrong. Relief is one of the hardest instead of one of the easiest matters on which to get cooperation because food is a much more powerful weapon in dealing with a hungry man than is a bayonet or even an execution squad. I believe we could have carried out our 72 percent of the program far better for all concerned if we had handled it through an American organization over which we would have had control as well as responsibilities. But we didn't do that.

Now we have a situation which has changed in the last 6 months. First, the war is over. If we had time to set up another agency and get it in full operation, an American agency to do our part of the task and let the other nations organize likewise, if they wish, to do their share, I would urge that this be done. Then it would be done in the most efficient and effective way possible. But there is not time. The war is over and it will be this winter, these next few months, which will be the most critical. It would not do much good to get food next year to people who are going to starve this winter. The transfusion has got to be administered now, we cannot put it off 3 months or 6 months. Our choice now is not between this and something better, but between this and nothing at all in the next few months. Therefore my conscience tells me to support this action today, anything else will be too late.

The second thing that has changed the picture considerably in the last half year is that with the end of the war it is possible to get a much higher grade of personnel in UNRRA, and our many protests have led to the engaging of abler and more experienced administrators. As a result there is evidence from any number of countries of a much better job being done with less graft, less political influence, and less waste and delay than was the case only 6 months ago. So I feel under obligation today to vote for this authorization with the hope and the confident expectation that the administration will steadily improve and that this money will be spent in a way which will be both humanitarian and, in the long run, beneficial, not only to the recipients, but also to ourselves.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Yesterday the gentleman from New York said that the $550,000,000 we appropriated a month ago would carry UNRRA through until March of next year.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Then why not wait until that time before making a further appropriation?

Mr. JUDD. Because the harvests in Europe and Asia do not come in March. People can and will starve between March and June or July. The money has got to be appropriated now in order to get the supplies on the way to take care of those people after March when the $550,000,000 runs out. We have got to keep the pipe line full, not wait until it is completely exhausted and then start filling it up again.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What assurance have we that this transfusion is going to occur now?

Mr. JUDD. I do not have any absolute assurance of its success any more than I would if I administered a blood transfusion to a patient in need of it. I have no positive assurance that the patient is going to live as a result of the transfusion, but I do have the certain knowledge that without the transfusion he has no chance whatever of living. So we must provide this transfusion now because there is every reason to expect that it will be life saving to literally millions of people.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. If they kept the food from reaching the black market, there would probably be enough to carry them past the next harvest.

Mr. JUDD. I am not discouraged by these reports of black-market operations. I am glad the reports are out, because they do not mean the situation is getting worse. They mean it is getting better. They indicate corrections and tightening up and firings that were long overdue. I would be much less likely to vote for this appropriation if these reports had not come out. They show that improvements are being made, that those in charge of UNRRA are at last really cleaning house. It is encouraging rather than discouraging.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman made the statement that it is either this or nothing. I cannot agree with him on that point. If the gentleman studies the relief procedures and the relief organizations following the other war I believe he will come to the conclusion that we could in a very short time set up a relief organization that would be better than what is being done now.

Mr. JUDD. May I say to the gentleman that I have studied the relief procedures used after the other war and consulted with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] who was at the very center of that program. I became convinced, as is he, that it simply is not practicable or even possible to set up another organization now and get it going in time to save several millions of people this winter.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, pursuant to House Resolution 444, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 327, nays 39, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

YEAS—327

Allen, Ill.	Bailey	Bell
Andersen, H. Carl	Baldwin, Md.	Bender
	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bennet, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Barden	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Barrett, Pa.	Biemiller
	Barrett, Wyo.	Blackney
Andrews, Ala.	Bates, Ky.	Bland
Andrews, N. Y.	Bates, Mass.	Bloom
Angell	Beall	Bolton
Arends	Beckworth	Bonner
Bradley, Pa.	Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Wis.
Brooks	Hale	Neely
Brown, Ga.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.
Brumbaugh		O'Brien, Mich.
Bryson	Hancock	O'Neal
Buck	Hand	O'Toole
Buckley	Hare	Outland
Bulwinkle	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Bunker	Harness, Ind.	Patman
Burch	Harris	Patrick
Burgin	Hart	Patterson
Butler	Hartley	Peterson, Ga.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Pfeifer
Camp	Healy	Philbin
Campbell	Hébert	Pickett
Canfield	Hedrick	Ploeser
Carnahan	Heffernan	Plumley
Case, N. J.	Hendricks	Poage
Case, S. Dak.	Henry	Powell
Chapman	Herter	Price, Fla.
Chelf	Heselton	Price, Ill.
Chenoweth	Hess	Priest
Church	Hill	Quinn, N. Y.
Clark	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Clason	Hobbs	Rabin
Clements	Hoch	Rains
Cochran	Holifield	Ramey
Cole, Kans.	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Combs	Hook	Rankin
Cooley	Howell	Rayfiel
Cooper	Huber	Reed, Ill.
Corbett	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Courtney	Izac	Resa
Crawford	Jarman	Richards
Crosser	Jenkins	Riley
Cunningham	Jennings	Robertson, N. Dak.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ind.	Robertson, Va.
Daughton, Va.	Johnson, Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Davis		Rockwell
Dawson	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rodgers, Pa.
De Lacy		Roe, Md.
Delaney, James J.	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Delaney, John J.	Judd	Rogers, N. Y.
	Kean	Rooney
Dickstein	Kearney	Rowan
Dirksen	Kee	Russell
Dolliver	Kefauver	Ryter
Dondero	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Douglas, Calif.	Kelly, Ill.	Sadowski
Douglas, Ill.	Keogh	Savage
Doyle	Kerr	Sheppard
Drewry	Kilburn	Sheridan
Durham	Kilday	Sikes
Eaton	King	Simpson, Ill.
Eberharter	Kinzer	Smith, Maine
Elliott	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Ellsworth	Kopplemann	Smith, Wis.
Elsaesser	Kunkel	Snyder
Elston	LaFollette	Somers, N. Y.
Engel, Mich.	Landis	Sparkman
Engle, Calif.	Lane	Spence
Ervin	Lanham	Springer
Fallon	Larcade	Starkey
Feighan	Latham	Stefan
Fellows	LeCompte	Stewart
Fenton	LeFevre	Stigler
Fisher	Lesinski	Sullivan
Flannagan	Link	Sundstrom
Flood	Luce	Taber
Fogarty	Ludlow	Talle
Folger	Lynch	Tarver
Forand	McConnell	Taylor
Fuller	McCormack	Thom
Fulton	McCowen	Thomas, N. J.
Gallagher	McDonough	Thomas, Tex.
Gamble	McGregor	Thomason
Gardner	McKenzie	Tolan
Gary	McMillan, S. C.	Torrens
Gavin	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Geelan	Madden	Trimble
Gerlach	Mahon	Vinson
Gifford	Manasco	Voorhis, Calif.
Gillespie	Mansfield, Mont.	Wadsworth
Gillette		Walter
Gillie	Mansfield, Tex.	Wasielewski
Goodwin	Marcantonio	Weaver
Gordon	Martin, Iowa	Welchel
Gore	Martin, Mass.	Welch
Gorski	Mathews	West
Gossett	May	Whittington
Graham	Merrow	Wickersham
Granahan	Michener	Wigglesworth
Granger	Miller, Calif.	Wilson
Grant, Ala.	Mills	Wolfenden, Pa.
Grant, Ind.	Monroney	Wolverton, N. J.
Green	Morgan	Woodhouse
Gregory	Morrison	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Murdock	Worley
Gwinn, N. Y.	Murphy	Zimmerman

NAYS—39

Abernethy	Boren	Clevenger
Arnold	Buffett	Cole, Mo.
Bishop	Byrnes, Wis.	Cox
Cravens	Mason	Schwabe, Mo.
Dworshak	Miller, Nebr.	Schwabe, Okla.
Earthman	Norrell	Scrivner
Ellis	O'Hara	Shafer
Gibson	Phillips	Short
Hoffman	Pittenger	Smith, Ohio
Johnson, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.	Stockman
Jones	Rich	Sumner, Ill.
Knutson	Rizley	Vursell
McGehee	Robsion, Ky.	Whitten

NOT VOTING—66

Adams	Gathings	O'Konski
Allen, La.	Gearhart	Peterson, Fla.
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Hagen	Rivers
Boykin	Hall, Leonard W.	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.		Sasscer
Brehm	Halleck	Sharp
Brown, Ohio	Havenner	Simpson, Pa.
Cannon, Fla.	Hoeven	Slaughter
Cannon, Mo.	Hope	Stevenson
Carlson	Horan	Sumners, Tex.
Celler	Jackson	Talbot
Chiperfield	Jensen	Tibbott
Clippinger	Keefe	Traynor
Coffee	Lea	Vorys, Ohio
Colmer	Lemke	Weiss
Curley	Lewis	White
D'Ewart	Lyle	Winstead
Dingell	McGlinchey	Winter
Domengeaux	Maloney	Wolcott
Doughton, N. C.	Mundt	Wood
	Murray, Tenn.	Woodrum, Va.
Fernandez	Norton	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mr. Murray of Tennessee for, with Mr. White against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Havenner with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Tibbott.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Hoeven.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FULL-EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 449, Rept. No. 1342), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of S. 380, an act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the

bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN AGE OF APPOINTEES TO THE NAVAL AND MILITARY ACADEMIES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 1123, an act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy, with a Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy."

The amendment was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM D. MITCHELL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 110, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what the resolution is?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the employment of Mr. William D. Mitchell as counsel for the Joint Committee for the Investigation of Pearl Harbor, the selection was made because of the desire of the committee to secure an attorney of unusual ability. This resolution waives the application of certain provisions of the Criminal Code as to Mr. Mitchell. The provisions are that if he receives compensation, under the statute he would not be able to practice law or present any claim against the United States for a period of 2 years, and other similar provisions.

I may say that I have polled the Committee on the Judiciary, and there is no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. The prohibitions of the law were never intended to apply to special counsel such as mentioned in this bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; the gentleman is correct; they were intended to apply only where a person is regularly employed in the Government.

Mr. HANCOCK. Where he is regularly employed as a Government attorney, then leaves the employ of the Government and takes cases against the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And uses information he got as an employee of the Government.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is a perfectly proper bill, and ought to be passed.

There is no objection on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, 365, or 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel serving under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, passed by the Senate on September 6, 1945, and passed by the House of Representatives on September 11, 1945.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made by Commissioner Bashore at Sacramento, Calif.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain exhibits from UNRRA.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from the Washington Daily News and in the second to include an article from the Evening Star.

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain correspondence.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 448

Resolved that ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, of New York, be and he is hereby elected to the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other some correspondence.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include portion of an editorial relating to the Alien Property Custodian, Mr. James E. Markham.

A REVISED EDITION OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, instead of taking the time allotted me today, as heretofore granted by special order, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution to have printed a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress.

In this connection and for your information right at this point, I include an extension of remarks made by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan, LOUIS RABAUT, in support of a similar resolution introduced on March 20, 1939:

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to insert in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the concurrent resolution introduced this day by me to have printed a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress.

This great work, which is the outgrowth of the Directory of the United States Congress and the General Government first published in 1859, has not been revised since 1928. The last volume of Hinds and Cannon Precedents officially states that a revised compilation be made periodically—and the 10-year period has already elapsed.

The need for the new compilation is apparent. It is shown by the fact there are more than 1,000 Members of Congress, who have served since 1928, whose biographies are not in the present volume. Of the 96 present Members of the Senate, 70 do not appear in the present work. And of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, 362 have no mention in this 1928 edition. Furthermore, there is need of much revision of the biographies of former Members of Congress whose names are included. Because the records were obscure, between two and three thousand biographical sketches of Members who served in the early Congresses, before 1850, should be revised and additional information added. Since 1928, many other

changes have occurred which should be recorded. During this 10-year period many of the former Members have died, and hundreds have left Congress for other reasons.

Mr. Ansel Wold, veteran clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing, who compiled the present edition, has continued his research, I am told, during these last 10 years. He has uncovered much new information that is of historical value and should be included in the revised edition. The present edition contains about 9,000 biographical sketches, all checked as carefully as possible during a 4-year period of study from 12 to 16 years ago. It contains more than 1,740 pages and lists historical data regarding all the Presidents from George Washington to Calvin Coolidge. It also contains a record of the Continental Congress, the census apportionment of Representatives through the years as the States joined the Union and the size of Congress grew. Beginning with the Fortieth Congress, March 4, 1867, this book lists Members of the House by congressional districts.

This present edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress is a revision of the Dictionary of the United States Congress, published in 1859 and revised in 1869 by Charles Lanham; the Biographical Annals of the Civil Government of the United States, published in 1876 by Charles Lanham and James Anglim; the Lanham edition of 1876, as corrected by Joseph M. Morrison in 1887; the Political Register and Congressional Directory of 1878 by Ben Perely Poore; the Biographical Congressional Directory of 1903 by O. M. Enyart; and the 1911 revision of this work. Before 1809, apparently no effort was made to publish a directory of Members of Congress.

The value of the present book as a work of reference is incalculable. Not only the Government officials in Washington but schools and libraries throughout the country have need of such reference material.

From this brief sketch of the evolution of this great work and the deficiencies in the present book the need for a revision of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress is manifest.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are so frequently requested to furnish information with respect to the present location of former Members; the date of death and place of burial of those deceased and their length of service; and a hundred other matters of information that are sought which should be available publicly, are embarrassed by the lack of information which should be in the libraries of the land and easily at the disposal of the public.

We do ourselves a distinct disservice and reflect upon the service rendered by the men who have preceded us, whose names should be included, when we are so penny wise and pound foolish as not to provide for the publication of this revised book as one of worth-while reference, now, when we have the material available and in the hands of Ansel Wold, clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing.

It is a fact that Ansel Wold, who compiled the edition of 1928, has been wise and foresighted enough to get and to keep in his personal files much of the information respecting former members which ought to be in book form accessible to us all. He has made this a service of love and respect and not of obligation. He has tried to keep the data up to date in his files.

Now that the war is soon to be over we should not longer refrain from bringing this valuable reference book up to date, while Ansel Wold is with us to do the job, and it can be done. Moreover, some day in the future it will cost much more than now.

Soon it will be next to impossible, except at much greater expense of time and money, and we will regret our parsimoniousness. Action should be no longer deferred.

I trust every Member who hopes ever to have his name included in such a volume as is proposed will recognize his first obligation to those who have preceded him, and second, to himself and to his posterity.

Really, Mr. Speaker, not to bring this book up to date is inexcusable as a congressional neglect, unjustifiable from every standpoint, and is a reflection on the good judgment of every one of us, as I see it.

As a reference book it is an encyclopaedia of information nowhere else to be obtained except at considerable expense of effort, time, and money by those who seek to be advised with respect to so much information in regard to the Members of Congress as this book will readily supply.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized.

A NEW ECONOMY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker—

> The old order changeth, yielding place to new;
> And God fulfills Himself in many ways,
> Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
>
> —*Tennyson.*

An old world lies dead all about us. Few men realize this as yet, but it is true.

The old laissez-faire finance capitalism passed into history as the world-wide economic collapse of 1929 engulfed the nations.

World War II finished the job. As if years of want, disease, terror, death, and destruction were not enough, the very power of the universe in a lethal weapon has been released upon the earth with consequences which even the boldest and most far-sighted will not dare to predict.

A new age is struggling to be born. But no man can dare guess as yet whether it will be the most fearful age in all mankind's long history or one of progress, peace, and hope.

We talk much about keeping faith with returning veterans. But we shall not keep that faith unless we have the courage to live with foresight and understanding in the new world which their weapons have forged.

No good will come of trying to sweep the institutions of the past wholly away. There has been much evil in that past—poverty, unemployment, greed, hatred, war. But that same past has given us, also, a precious heritage which includes the beginnings of true freedom, the foundations of constitutional democratic government, great advances in learning, science, education, and technology and above all the basic inescapable truths of religion. Our purposes, therefore, must be to preserve and cherish those things which are good and true, even as we cast out those things which are unworthy.

But no good can come of merely clinging to the past, resisting every attempt at progress, hiding our heads in the sands of time, believing a fairy tale about how past ages can be revived in the uncertain and dynamic future that surrounds us now. In this day of stark suffering and dynamic development such attempts spell a gospel of blind despair.

Mankind is plagued by fears. By fears of foreign countries, of continued violence and future war, of violent revolution and civil strife. Depending upon one's position there is fear of the power of private monopolies, or of labor unions, or of government. Millions are haunted by fears of unemployment, hunger, want, and persecution. These ghosts are terribly real.

It is a principle of psychology that fears are overcome only by constructive action to remove their cause. But what kind of action? The problem is as universal as human life, as broad as the world itself. We want a solution in which we can believe with a whole heart. We want one that contains a secure basis for the new world which will preserve as many as possible of the values of the past. Above all we know that we shall lose all that is best in life unless the methods which are used are such as will develop the best qualities in human individuals—methods which will help people to grow and to become more self-reliant, more truly hopeful, more deeply religious people.

Some, with blasphemous cynicism, will say there is no such solution. They are wrong. Such a method lies before us waiting for us to grasp it with vigor and enthusiasm, ready to be used for building the new and better world. By this method the voluntary, self-directed efforts of groups of people can build for themselves a real security without either the loss of freedom or undue reliance upon government.

The outstanding fact about the modern economic world is the machine. James Watt's steam engine started a chain of events which in two short centuries has brought us to the atomic bomb and has almost completely changed mankind's way of making a living. These changes have been not only technological but sociological as well, for as a result of the industrial revolution the average man has lost almost completely his chance to own the tools with which he works. Unless this course can somehow be altered it will remain true that only in agriculture, the handicrafts, and a few other occupations will any real opportunity still exist for the worker to be also the owner of the means of production. And so mankind has been threatened—and is more seriously threatened today than ever before—by three kinds of tyranny. All of them imperil his liberty, his self-reliance, his opportunity for development, most of all his hope.

The first of these is the tyranny of private monopoly power, the power that owns or attempts to own all the tools, all the facilities, all the patents, all the technical knowledge in given fields of industry, production, or distribution.

The second tyranny which threatens mankind's freedom is that of a dictato-

rial state divorced from responsibility to or control by the people's will. It is not true that government services to the people need result in such a tyranny, but it probably is true that governmental control of the entire economic life of a nation must almost inevitably carry with it political dictatorship, and the loss of the people's freedom.

But a dispossessed people can see nowhere to turn except to their government when distress comes upon them. And the third tyranny is the tyranny of fear, fear of unemployment and bankruptcy, and the war and death that follows them. The third tyranny is the worst of all.

Through all her early history, America has stood against these tyrannies. She was once a Nation of vast areas of free, unexploited, and above all, unowned land where the average citizen could carve out for himself a farm and with it economic independence. But the face of America is different today. Her free land is all taken up, her economic life dominated by huge concentrations of capital utterly beyond the reach of the average citizen.

Is the spirit and hope of the old America to die? Are there but two alternatives to the problems we face? Must we choose between control of the people by private monopoly on the one hand or by governmental power on the other? Surely we will not be so lacking in vision as to say that. For there is a better way, a middle road which can restore reasonable security to the people through the exercise of their own effort and their loyalty to one another. Yes; even the opportunity to own a share in this great modern industrial machine can be restored to the common citizens of our country. A middle road can be found. It is a way, a method, an organizing principle which has been tested in the fire of human experience in many lands and found to be good. It is the cooperative way of life—the cooperative method of carrying on our business.

Cooperation is as old as civilization itself, for it is the very root from which human civilization has grown. The outstanding thing that distinguishes humankind from the animal world is the ability of men to cooperate with one another for the attainment of desired goals. Cooperation began when the first group of primitive people made up their minds that it was better to work together to keep their precious fire burning than it was for all to go their individualistic ways, preying upon one another and thus allowing the fire which otherwise might have afforded protection for all to flicker and sink into cold, dead ashes.

Ever since that earliest day people have been solving problems by means of cooperation. The machine itself is a monument to the principle of cooperation. Civil peace is possible only because law-abiding people cooperate for its maintenance.

And so it is no wonder that, as men and women have faced the sometimes baffling, highly industrialized world of today, they have turned to this age-old tried and trusted method. For cooperation is the application to our problems of the Golden Rule and the principle of human brotherhood.

There are today in the United States and Canada some 4,000,000 people who are members of credit unions. Why? Because they have discovered out of experience that it is possible for many people with small savings to pool together those savings, to borrow money from themselves when necessary, to pay interest to themselves, and thus to escape the necessity of paying exorbitant tribute to loan sharks and other money lenders. The credit union is simply a means of organizing a people's lending institution so that the people's money may be available to meet the people's needs and so the people may be free.

In many respects the credit union is the fundamental type of cooperative. It has been in large part through credit unions of fishermen, miners, and other people that the great cooperative movement of the Canadian maritime provinces has been built. That movement stands today as one of the outstanding examples of all time of the successful application of basically right principles to extremely difficult and distressing human problems. With the University of St. Francis Xavier as its center and source of inspiration, there has been built in Nova Scotia particularly a pattern of life which could well be copied by the people of many other parts of the world. At the mining town of New Waterford, where miners dig coal 5 miles out under the sea, the credit union owns its own building and constitutes the bank of credit for one of the finest cooperative stores anywhere in the world. This credit union also operates the town's circulating library and is the headquarters for most of the community activities of this entire city. This is one demonstration of what the people can do when they learn to put their own small savings together for the promotion of their common welfare.

There was a time when the fruit farmers of the West, along with all other North American farmers, found themselves at the time of harvest utterly unable to secure a decent price for their crops. Indeed, the more abundant their harvest the weaker their bargaining position became and the lower the price they received. No one farmer's fruit mattered very much to those who controlled the market. Nor was the individual farmer in a position to keep his crop from rotting and spoiling if he did not sell it immediately. Those few people who stood in the position of buyers of these farm commodities were able therefore to drive the price received by the farmers to ruinously low levels and then to resell the crop at exorbitant margins of gain for themselves. Unfortunately, this condition still exists as to many agricultural crops today. But there are other cases, notably that of the western fruit growers, many poultrymen, dairymen, and grain farmers where the method of cooperation has been applied. There the farmers have decided that there is no reason why they should not assemble together the production of the individual farms, sell it cooperatively, cut down unnecessary middlemen's margins, and thus gain for themselves some degree of control over their own economic welfare and destiny. The method of cooperation has proven by far the most effective means of enabling the farmer to secure something like his fair share of the price the consumer ultimately pays for food in the United States and Canada.

By means of cooperatives moreover, the farmers have added to the total income of agriculture and kept in the hands of rural producers that portion of the cost of food which was once represented by unnecessary middlemen's margins.

The marketing cooperative is the farmer's sales agency. It belongs to him and represents his interest in the distribution channels of the country as no other type of agency in the world could do. It has meant, where the cooperatives have been strong, the difference between having as much as 60 percent of the consumer's dollar reach the pockets of the actual producers of a food commodity instead of having only 30 percent of the consumer's dollar reach the farmer and the other 30 percent go into the coffers of handlers and middlemen of one kind or another.

When the first cooperative retail store was started in Rochdale, England, in 1844, it was begun by those 28 poverty-stricken Englishmen as a means of raising their standards of living. They had tried without success to get increases in their wages. So they turned to the method of attempting to make those wages go further in the purchase of the food their families needed. Their experiment proved a success—so great a success that as of today one-sixth of the purchases of British consumers are made at their own cooperative stores, one-third of the purchases of Swedish consumers are made at their own cooperative stores, while varying percentages obtain in other countries.

The significance of this does not become clear until we realize that the root cause of unemployment and economic distress in modern nations has been the fact that the people have been chronically unable to purchase with their incomes as much as they could produce with their energy employed on modern methods of production. Therefore, any method which makes the consumer's dollar stretch 10 or 15 percent further in the purchase of goods must be a direct contribution to the solution of the basic problem of this modern day, the problem of bringing into balance the people's power to buy and their power to produce. Clearly this is a matter of the greatest importance. But perhaps a still greater value in the little dingy store in Rochdale and all its successors down through the years has been the fact that those stores have given to the people who owned them as cooperators a feeling of possession, of proprietary interest. This little spot in the great complex economic machine has belonged to them. Their feeling toward it has been like that of a farmer toward his farm or a home owner toward his home. Only in some respects it has been even more poignant because this experience of ownership has come to people who in most cases could not know it in any other way. The bulk of them have been city dwellers renting rooms in apartment houses and working with tools belonging to someone else.

Mr. Howard A. Cowden, the president of the Consumer Cooperative Association of Kansas City, Mo., has pointed out that all the factories in America have actually been paid for by the consumers who bought their products, but that the only factories which the consumers own are the ones which belong to cooperative members.

Cooperation then is a means of organizing the consumer buying power of the people in such a way that it can be employed by them to acquire an actual ownership stake in the modern industrial machine. What the cooperative really does is to transfer what otherwise would be an unnecessary profit-margin into an investment on the part of the members of the cooperative in the ownership of their business.

One of the best illustrations of this that I know of is to be found in what the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperatives have done in the field of petroleum and petroleum products. Some years ago the approximately 100,000 Indiana farmers who compose the Farm Bureau Cooperatives purchased a fleet of tank trucks for the delivery of gasoline and other oil products to the farmers of that State. The savings effected, that is, the margin between what the delivery of the gasoline would otherwise have cost if it had been furnished by the big oil companies in the usual way and the amount that it actually did cost when delivered by the cooperative trucks, was devoted to paying for the cost of the trucks. In 11 months all debts had been paid and the fleet of trucks belonged outright to 100,000 Indiana farmers. They then proceeded to purchase some oil wells and some river barges and to lease some pipe lines in order to supply petroleum products from the southern portion of Indiana to other parts of the State. This whole distribution system is now returning to the cooperative members $1 each year for every $1 they invested in it. These 100,000 Indiana farmers own their local petroleum marketing associations and those associations in turn own the pipe lines, the refineries, the oil wells, the barges, the tank trucks.

Now all of the savings effected by this cooperative distribution system are returned at regular intervals to the purchasers of these petroleum products. And when we consider the economic problem as a whole, we can see the contribution which the cooperatives make toward its solution. For this Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative petroleum system means that instead of these farmers turning their money over to the oil monopoly to swell the surpluses of huge companies in Chicago or New York banks, the savings from the efficient cooperative system increase the purchasing power of every rural community in the State of Indiana, and thus continue to be a part of the active demand on the part of rank and file people for the goods and services which they need. Every single person in those Indiana communities profits by this result and every single manufacturing plant in the country and all the workers employed therein derive some indirect benefit from this improved distribution of the purchasing power generated by American production.

Since cooperatives belong to the people whom they serve, they inevitably bring into the economic life of the Nation a competitive element which is always striving to bring a better quality product to the people than they had before. Again I will take an example from the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperatives. Dissatisfied with the quality of lubricating oil which was being furnished by the oil companies, the Farm Bureau Cooperatives in that State tried to get a law passed by the legislature to compel oil companies to sell lubricating oil on the basis of known and stated specifications. They did not succeed in getting the law passed, nor did they succeed in getting any company to make its sales upon that basis. Accordingly, the Farm Bureau Cooperatives built their own laboratory and developed their own lubricating oil from their own petroleum produced by their own wells. They sold this oil at standard going prices for lubricating oil. They devoted the savings, the difference between the actual cost and going market selling price, to paying off the cost of their laboratory so that it might belong debt-free to the people themselves. And this margin, the margin between real costs and inflated selling prices, proved enough to pay the entire cost of the laboratory and all of its equipment in the short space of 9 months. And even more important is the fact that because of this exercise of the basic cooperative principle of furnishing the best possible product to the people, a better oil was made available—one which increased the life of machinery and added to the wealth, therefore, not only of the cooperative members, but of all of the other people in these communities.

The economic world in which we live is one dominated by huge aggregations of capital and tremendous concentration of machinery and industrial power. The great need of the people of our time is to feel that some part at least of this huge machine is theirs. True conservatives, in the best sense of that word, will fervently desire that this result be attained. For the man to whom something belongs is the man who best understands the importance of preservation of the worth-while values of the past. It is not only the progressives, then, but also the conservatives who should hope for a growth of the cooperative movement.

Now, the trouble with the present situation is that as a rule the great aggregations of industrial and financial power which dominate our economic life are actually opposed to extending their own businesses or increasing their own production. For such action might mean that the particular commodity or service which they have to sell would become truly plentiful and not only give the degree of benefit to mankind of which it is really capable, but also become cheaper in price.

The cooperative point of view is exactly the opposite.

It was not very many years ago that the Power Trust told the farmers of the United States of America that it was impossible for electricity to be furnished to the farm homes of our country at less than 72 cents per kilowatt-hour. Rural electrification was at a standstill. We were decades behind some of the far poorer countries of Europe in this respect. Then came the rural electrification cooperatives, assisted this time, it is true, by the availability of Government loans, but depending primarily, as they must always do if they are sound, upon the readiness of the consumers of that electricity to guarantee the repayment of the loan and to seek ultimate ownership in their own names of the power lines and transmission systems. For the first time the cost of electricity was brought within reach of American farmers. And so because the principle of cooperation was available to be used, millions of American farm homes have been lighted up, millions of farm housewives have had burdens of drudgery lifted from their shoulders, millions of farmers have found their operation tremendously simplified, and millions of farmers' children have been able to read their school books under good electric lights when otherwise these things would have been impossible.

And, best of all, the time will come when these rural electric systems will have been paid for, the Government loans liquidated, and when this portion at least of one of the most highly integrated businesses, one of the most highly monopolized types of industrial power in all the world, will have had the ownership thereof spread among millions of simple people throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

Are cooperatives enemies of democracy and freedom? Are they enemies of private enterprise? No. Quite the contrary is obviously true. The cooperative is the one best hope of true economic freedom, of true private enterprise, if you will, for the millions of common people around the world. It is the only way I know of in which they can own the things they pay for.

Against this background of what cooperatives have meant, against these facts which indicate what they can mean in the future, let us now turn to one of the most discouraging stories of human blindness and lack of vision that has ever splotched the pages of history.

The farmers of America formed their cooperatives largely to deal with one of two problems. The first of these problems was the inability of farmers at the time of harvest to secure a fair and just price for their crops when their only market was controlled by a few powerful middlemen. Before the coming of the cooperatives, the thousands of farmers all of whose crops would ripen at approximately the same time found their bargaining position as sellers so weak that they received for their crops only a tiny percentage of what the consumers finally paid for the food represented thereby. In order to solve this problem, many groups of American farmers formed cooperatives so that in effect one farmer or one farmer's agent could sell the crops of the whole group and thus secure something like a fair price for them. The other major cause of the formation of farmer cooperatives was the inordinately high price of many staple farm supplies, feed, fertilizer, and pe-

troleum products for example. Farmers found that by organizing themselves to do business cooperatively they could in effect have one farmer or one farmer's agent make purchases of these supplies in large quantities thus saving a portion of the exorbitant margins of profit formerly charged by handlers and producers. Moreover, with a group of loyal cooperative coowners of such a distribution system to depend upon as regular customers it was possible for these cooperatives to start in to manufacture feed, fertilizer, and petroleum products and thus to establish a yardstick of real costs of production. In this manner monopolistic controls were broken down and the entire community benefited, whether they were members of the cooperative or not. Now there were some people who did not like this sort of thing. They were the people who had found it highly profitable through the years to exploit American agriculture and American consumers by, on the one hand paying an unjustifiably low price for farm products and on the other charging unjustifiably high prices to the cooperative farmers for their supplies. As the cooperatives began to relieve the farmer's problems it naturally cut into the business of some of these people and so they organized what they called the National Tax Equality Association with Mr. Ben C. McCabe as president. Mr. McCabe, it so happens, is also president of the National Elevator Co. of Minneapolis, Minn., and a large dealer in grain which is one of the farm crops which cooperatives have begun to handle. Moreover, according to the Muskegon Chronicle, Muskegon, Mich.:

> The board of directors of the National Tax Equality Association is made up mostly of representatives of businesses which likewise have come into direct competition with the developing farmer cooperative movement.

Now the National Tax Equality Association is not the only agency that has been attacking cooperatives, but it is probably the best example of the kind of unfair and deceitful tactics which are now being used against cooperatives and which we may expect to be further used in the future. Under the guise of tax equality this National Tax Equality Association has spread propaganda throughout the Nation and particulary to small businessmen to the effect that a cooperative was un-American, a danger to private enterprise and somehow or another all tied up with Government ownership of business and industry. Of course the facts are exactly the opposite. For if America stands for anything, she stands for opportunity for the common man; and the cooperative offers that common man his best chance to share in the ownership of the highly integrated business and industry of today. Furthermore, cooperatives are the opposite of Government ownership because they offer the one best chance for private individuals in our Nation to solve their economic problems without reliance upon Government. And finally, cooperatives are one of the best defenses of true private enterprise for the reason that they almost alone have proven able to stand across the path of monopolistic control of business and industry and open up once again opportunity for fair competition on the part of all.

But the National Tax Equality Association goes further. It appeals to all the taxpayers of the Nation on the ground that cooperatives are exempt from taxes. Now the fact is that partnerships and individually-owned businesses are just as tax exempt as are farmer cooperatives. For in the case of partnerships and individually owned businesses, no corporation taxes are paid and the reason is that it is assumed that the individual owner of a business will, as an individual, pay taxes on his income anyway so that it is unnecessary and probably unfair to tax his business as a corporation as well. Cooperatives stand in exactly the same position.

Under the Constitution of our country and under all of the tax laws of our Nation, that portion of the money which passes through the hands of a cooperative as a trustee for its member owners, and which the cooperative is legally bound by its own charter as well as the law of the land, to pass on to its owner members in full, is not income to the cooperative at all, any more than money received by an employer which he pays out to his workers under a profit-sharing scheme is income to the employer or money received by any other business which it divides with its customers on the basis of the volume of business done by them with that business. Any business in the United States that wanted to enjoy the same degree of tax exemption which cooperatives have can do so if it will bind itself legally and by its articles of incorporation to pay back to customers in the form of patronage refunds the profit margin earned upon their business. Every member of a cooperative, no matter what kind it is, pays taxes as an individual upon every dime of income he receives as a result of his membership in the cooperative. He does this in exactly the same way that an owner of an individually owned business or partnership pays his taxes. Now there is a certain percentage of farmer cooperatives, perhaps half of them, which does qualify for a special tax exemption provided by Congress as a means of assisting agriculture. These exemptions do not apply to any cooperative excepting farmer cooperatives, and in order to get the exemption, the farmer cooperative must measure up to seven rigid standards laid down in the law. Those standards are as follows:

First. Substantially all of the voting membership control, or voting stock—if organized on a stock basis—must be owned by bona fide producers of agricultural products who market their farm products, or purchase their farm supplies, through the association.

Second. Basically, the organization, whether incorporated or unincorporated, must be a farmers, fruit growers, or like association, organized and operated on a competitive basis. As used here, the term "like" means "pertaining to agriculture, in all its branches."

Third. If an association is organized with capital shares, dividends thereon shall not exceed 8 percent per annum—or the legal rate of interest of the State where issued, whichever is greater—on the consideration for which the shares were issued.

Fourth. The volume of business done with nonmembers must not exceed the volume of business done with members, and, as to purchasing activities, the volume of purchases made for nonmembers who are not farmers shall not exceed 15 percent of the total volume.

Fifth. In the payment and crediting of patronage refunds, all patrons must be treated alike whether they be members or nonmembers. Absolutely no preferential treatment may be afforded member patrons over nonmember patrons in the payment, distribution, or crediting of patronage refunds.

Sixth. Reserves created from patronage retains shall be limited to those required by State law, or such as are reasonable for the transaction of the business of the association. The interest of each patron in retained capital reserves shall be recognized and established by appropriate entries on the association's records. The liability of the association to the patrons for such retained reserves shall be clearly established.

Seventh. Proper records shall always be kept to show the patronage refunds and credits of all patrons—members and nonmembers alike—and also the interest of each patron in retained reserves.

Now, this tax exemption granted to farmer cooperatives amounts to very, very little indeed. About 1 percent of all the business of the United States is handled by all cooperatives put together and of all the corporations and businesses in the Nation about 1½ percent are cooperatives, 13 percent are corporations, and 86½ percent are individually owned businesses or partnerships. So it is important to get a perspective about this matter.

The real truth is, however, that what the National Tax Equality Association is after is to destroy every cooperative in the United States by compelling the cooperatives to pay taxes not only upon any income that it may have and retain for reserves or that it may use for the payment of return upon capital investment, but also upon money paid out in patronage dividends to cooperative members or passed on to farmers as their share of the proceeds from the sale of a crop. Of course the National Tax Equality Association is trying to do something in this case which simply cannot be done in decency or equity or in accordance with the law of the United States, for none of this money belongs to the cooperative at all but rather to the members and it is only held in trust for them for a brief period by the cooperative.

The National Tax Equality Association and others who work with it know full well that if they could have their way through a constitutional amendment or otherwise about the double taxation of cooperative member's funds, cooperatives could not continue to operate as they do at present. What then would the cooperatives do? This apparently is something that the National Tax Equality Association has never thought of. Because every cooperative has always

been in a postion to undersell its competitors if it wanted to; and this is precisely what they would do if a tax were levied against patronage dividends. Cooperatives would then simply give their members the financial advantages of cooperation by selling to them at real cost—that is they would pass on to their member owners the benefits of cooperation in lower prices instead of waiting until the end of the year and giving them those benefits by means of patronage dividends. Marketing cooperatives would sell farmers' crops in pools but would have the checks made out to each individual farmer in the first place instead of in businesslike fashion receiving only one check and then dividing the proceeds among the men who had grown the crops.

The principle of cooperation is too strong—too fundamentally right, and too everlastingly necessary as an antidote to our economic and social ills—to be destroyed by a device such as that suggested by the National Tax Equality Association. And if these people really want some competition which they cannot meet and which the cooperatives have refrained from subjecting them to up to date, then all they have to do is to press their present tactics. Then, indeed, the competition of cooperatives would become a thing to be feared by other types of business because the cooperative after all is in a far stronger position essentially than any other type of business organization.

The tragedy of the present situation does not consist in the childish propaganda of the National Tax Equality Association. That tragedy arises from the fact that at the very moment when our country most needs the contribution which only cooperatives can make to the basic well-being of its people, the development of their fundamental characters, and the establishment of hope in their hearts, there should be arising a program of bitter misrepresentation and of profound intent to destroy the cooperatives, root and branch. That this effort will not succeed, I am wholly confident. That it should have ever been attempted is a sad commentary on the cupidity of some human beings.

Never before have cooperatives been so needed as a means of solution to the problems of American farmers or as a means of restoring opportunity for ownership and hence for a solid stake of the welfare of a free society for all the people. Never before, however, have cooperatives been subjected to so bitter an attack as at the present moment.

Let every man, therefore, who cares about the future of his country learn the true facts about what cooperatives really are and about what they really stand for—let him realize that they are not the enemies of small business but are, on the other hand, the only instrumentality so far devised which can be unquestionably successful in meeting monopoly on its own ground and breaking its power.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, during the past summer it was my privilege to travel with a group of Representatives who visited the European theater of operations, the Mediterranean theater, the Africa-Middle East theater, the Persian Gulf Command, and the India-Burma theater. We were in more than 30 countries. As we traveled from capital to capital and from nation to nation, the topic most often discussed was the foreign policy of the United States. In conversations on international relations the question which I heard most frequently was this: What is the foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I believe it was with 10 others that we made this study. May I direct the attention of the gentleman from New Hampshire to the fact that we visited the parliaments in northern Ireland and in England and I believe the gentleman noticed that any member of parliament could summon any representative of a department of government to come before the representatives of the people and be cross-examined in open forum. Now, you are a representative of the people. You are elected. The people can hire and fire you every 2 years, but the heads of our governmental departments are appointees. They are not responsible to the people. To the appointive power only. It seems to me it would only be proper that we have the right, as representatives of the people, to summon the representatives of the State Department or any other department here and ask questions about their functions. Perhaps it is functioning properly. I have no criticism of any department until I know all the facts. The preamble of the Constitution of the United States starts out with "We, the people"—the representatives of "We, the people" have little opportunity to get information.

After your study abroad, and after you denied yourself the opportunity to take a vacation and went over there and made a study, did not the results of that study lead you to the conclusion that there should be opportunity for the people of the United States to know everything about the departments that they have no choice in choosing? They can choose you for 2 years and watch your record. They cannot choose any department. Does not the gentleman believe the people who choose you should have the right to say that you, their representative, should have the power to ask them to come in and answer questions? Maybe the reason they criticize the State Department is that we have not had the opportunity to get knowledge.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The British system differs from ours. The Ministers are asked questions on the floor of the House of Commons. They are Members of the House of Commons. There is some merit to this system. I am not convinced, however, that it should be adopted in this country. I will add that we have the opportunity of cross-examining or questioning the heads of the departments before our standing committees. However, I think the matter of foreign policy is so serious that there should be—and I am going to explain my resolution in this speech—a select committee of the House whose duty it is to make a thorough study and review of our foreign policy, with power to investigate the State Department and the Foreign Service.

The comment most frequently made not only abroad but within the borders of the United States is that we have no foreign policy. We hear an increasing number of statements concerning the lack of a United States foreign policy.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I noticed the gentleman said that comments were heard that the United States has no foreign policy. May I direct his attention to what we heard in Oslo and in the capitals of two or three other countries over there. My sense of what they said was that they did not say that we did not have any foreign policy, they said, "Why do not you do like Britain? Why do not you advertise your foreign policy? Why do not you say what your policies of government are? We do not know. Our libraries are filled with British books, and so forth, but we have nothing from you. We do not get information."

Does the gentleman remember that being said to him, particularly in Oslo? My sense of what they said, relating to the OWI, was, "Why do you not have an office of information that lets other countries know what your State Department and other departments are doing?" Does the gentleman remember their using these words, "You have the greatest country on earth, the most powerful, the most unselfish. Why do you not become the smartest?"

Mr. MERROW. I remember that, and I thank the gentleman. The general impression, however, is that other powers have a definite foreign policy, but we do not.

One has only to mention this subject on any platform to provoke smiles and to elicit unfavorable remarks concerning our foreign relations and the operation of the Department of State charged with the execution of foreign policy. This state of affairs is exceedingly alarming. The growing avalanche of adverse criticism in connection with our foreign policy and the State Department causes us grave concern. In western Europe, in the Balkans, in the Middle East, and even in India, I heard many Americans make pleas for a firm, realistic foreign policy on the part of the United States. In this country, I have heard the same pleas. I have heard many who have familiarity with foreign affairs ask for more realism and less sentimentalism, for an objective policy, and for a definite stand by this country. Repeatedly, we hear the assertion that this power or that power has a definite policy, that this state or that state knows exactly what it

wishes, but the United States of America is drifting in the postwar world without policy and without objectives. We are a great and growing world power. If we maintain our position of leadership, it is essential to chart a definite course in the complex and tangled field of foreign affairs.

Any foreign policy to be effective must have the support of the people. We in this House are the representatives of the people of the United States. We are close to the people. We must stand for election every 2 years. This House has a definite responsibility in foreign affairs. We vote on the appropriation of billions of dollars to be spent in foreign countries. It is the duty of this House to assist in resolving the chaotic condition which exists in our foreign relations. We have a large stake in world affairs. Our country has invested billions of dollars and has sacrificed thousands of lives in two great world wars. The rapid movement of events has put us in a position of leadership unique in history. It is essential for us to determine in what direction we wish to go. Mr. Speaker, if this House by inaction fails to make a thorough study of the foregin policy of the United States and fails to present its findings to the people, we will, I fear, be guilty of doing a disservice to this Nation. On the 29th of November, I introduced House Resolution 433 which if passed would create a select committee of 23 members to study comprehensively our foreign policy. This committee is to report every 90 days and make its final report on January 2, 1947. I have purposely asked for a large committee because of the variety and the complexity of the prcblems to be considered. Tireless effort on the part of several subcommittees will be required in order to present a clear picture of our international relations. I have asked for reports every 3 months because of the urgency of immediate action. Time is exceedingly important. As we lay the foundations for the postwar world, it is imperative that our action be definite, clear, and realistic.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. You saw a demonstration of the Congress in relation to foreign policy of the United States here today. You will remember Ambassador Kirk mentioning it to you in Italy. He said the United States just spells unselfishness. "The United States is just giving to the entire world without a string tied to it." The United States spells Christianity in action. This is the policy of the United States: We give to everybody; we help everybody; we trust everybody; we look into the soul of things. Now, that is our foreign policy. We have demonstrated it right here this afternoon. When the question was raised as to whether we should say something about the freedom of the press and not give where freedom of the press is not allowed, the Brown amendment was voted down. The House said, "Why, the United States trusts everybody. We give to everybody. We are just unselfishness in action. That is all."

And in return for that the only question involving our safety is whether the world is going to be grateful. The other day, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] said that scientifically we have gone so far, but if spiritual values do not overcome scientific study, we are gone. What did we do this afternoon? We demonstrated spirituality. Anything that was the result of material mental discipline was forgotten. We just gave. That is our demonstration of Christianity, or shall we say even more than that, the United States of America did for the suffering world this afternoon what David Livingstone died for. The United States of America this afternoon did more in charity in official action than even the most charitable could believe. Now, with that example before us this afternoon there is a test of the gratitude of the world. The United States of America only asks the world now, "Quit themselves like men and be strong"; that they follow our example; to have real character and likewise be totally unselfish. Even UNRRA has assured the Congress that every cent will go to help others—that there will be no salary grabs and that no one will be exploited. Truly this is a Christian Nation. It was practiced today.

Mr. MERROW. I think that this is a splendid example of our generosity, but this is only one part of the foreign policy.

For the purpose of clarification, I am going to read my resolution:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in' the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) A comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world, such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan States, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) An investigation of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) The formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) Improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States;

(3) Methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) The communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days—the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1947.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

This resolution provides that the committee conduct a comprehensive study of all phases of our foreign policy both political and economic including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world. This, I fully understand, is a heavy task but American money has been spent and American lives have been sacrificed in every section of this earth. Our interests are everywhere and they must be protected. The study proposed by my resolution includes a review of our policy in reference to each country and in respect to each geographical region such as the Balkans, the Middle East, the Far East, South America, etc. For example, we have peculiar problems in the Middle East and an entirely different set of problems in the Far East. Each section should be studied very carefully.

The resolution calls for an investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States. Constantly and repeatedly serious charges are being made against the State Department. One has only to talk with Members of this House or with people outside of the Congress to hear very grave accusations in the conduct of foreign affairs by the State Department and the foreign service. If these charges are as stated, then I am sure you will all agree that something must be done and done immediately if the public welfare is not to suffer irreparably. If the charges are unfounded, then it is the duty of the Congress to secure the correct information and make it available to the people so that the work of the Department can go on unhampered and free from the growing cloud of suspicion. Since there is so much criticism of the Department of State both in the Congress and outside of the Congress, I feel that it is the solemn duty of the representatives of the people to make a thorough study of the activities of this Department. The second part of my resolution states that the investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to, first, the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States. To end the existing confusion in reference to the foreign policy of the Republic, this House can perform a tremendous service by making concrete suggestions in respect to the formulation of a realistic policy which will serve the best interests of our country. It is time that we consider carefully our position in world affairs and make absolutely certain that our interests are ably represented abroad. Our first concern must be the welfare of the people of the United States.

In the second place the investigation is for the purpose of improving the operation of the administration of the Department of State and the foreign service of the United States. This Department is in a key position. Charged as it is with the conduct of foreign affairs it ought to be the most effective arm of our Government. I have heard many suggestions for improvement including increasing the salaries of the members of the foreign service, bringing them home oftener to the United States, and establishing schools to train diplomats. I am certain that a comprehensive study of ways and methods to improve the effectiveness of the service of the State Department would be a most valuable aid in improving international relations.

My resolution further provides that the study and the investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions and the communication of such information to the people of the United States. When this is done the people through their representatives will be in a better position to make decisions on the great issues of foreign policy which must be resolved in the years that lie ahead.

I know of nothing any more important than the clarification of our position in world affairs. To complete the study I have proposed is a real assignment and will demand the best efforts of a carefully chosen and able committee. We need a thorough survey of our foreign relations and a complete investigation of the department charged with the responsibility of representing us in this contracting world. Such a committee as I propose should meet the difficult issues of foreign policy head-on, study and investigate fearlessly without fear or favor, and set their faces firmly against the deplorable procedure of whitewashing. It is our duty to learn the truth and to transmit the truth to the people. In so doing this House will make a most valuable contribution to the future majesty, grandeur, and glory of this great Nation. We must keep the faith with those who have won this war. If we are to aid in the building of another world and if we are to keep America free, secure, and the finest place on earth in which to live, then a realistic, firm, intelligent, definite, and objective foreign policy must be developed and developed immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Rules Committee will conduct a hearing on House Resolution 433 in the immediate future and that an early opportunity will be afforded for the appearance before the committee of those who are interested in the questions I have been discussing. I hope that shortly the measure will be reported favorably to the House and subsequently passed by a decisive vote. We shall then have a select committee for the purpose of studying our foreign policy, for the purpose of conducting a complete investigation of the Department of State and the foreign service, and for the purpose of making definite recommendations to the Congress on the development and execution of a realistic, over-all foreign policy for the United States of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) from 4 p. m. today through Tuesday, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAVENNER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Illinois). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CEILING PRICES ON CITRUS PRODUCTS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from a constituent in Milwaukee, which referred to the prices being charged for citrus on the market in that city. From that the gentleman from Wisconsin drew the conclusion that prices on citrus, as a result of the lifting of the ceilings, had been increased from 50 to 100 percent in the various cities of this country.

I rise today to correct that understanding, if it exists on his part, and to give the figures which actually have resulted from a lifting of the price ceilings.

I am not questioning the fact that the conditions which the gentleman records in this statement may have existed. It is a known fact, whether there are ceilings or not, that the market changes from time to time, sometimes rapidly. It is also a known fact that whenever a price ceiling is removed, the market is very apt to bounce.

In the case of snap beans, which are sold by the hamper, and upon which the OPA wished to place a ceiling of $2.85, and under the emergency section of the act was compelled to remove that ceiling, the price, as I recall, rose on one New York market to something in the neighborhood of $8, but it remained there only a few hours, and then dropped back to the price of approximately $3.30, which is exactly what the trade said would be necessary if snap beans were to go to the market.

In other words, I call your attention again to three things which I have repeatedly pointed out in connection with the figures from OPA:

One, that these figures are notably inaccurate and can usually be checked upon and found to be inaccurate.

Two, that the OPA does not consider the actual price paid by the consumer but merely the price which the OPA says is the ceiling. Thus, if, as the Secretary of Agriculture did when he was chairman of a special committee of this House, investigators were to go into the markets and find that in some 12 out of a total of 13 markets, poultry was selling above the OPA ceiling, still the statements from OPA would continue to state that the housewife was paying the ceiling price. I am not sure that I have the number of markets correct.

Third, as I have many times pointed out, the OPA interest is only in the price and not whether the housewife is able to find on the markets the things which are under discussion. The OPA considers that to be the problem of some other agency.

Now, coming back to citrus prices, here are the actual figures on citrus prices for the 2 weeks which have elapsed since the ceilings were removed. Remember, these include the bounce, the jump, at the beginning when the ceiling was removed, and when certain areas—and perhaps Milwaukee would be included in this category—were short of citrus fruits. The inevitable result would be that until citrus fruit could be gotten to that market the price would be higher than the previous ceiling price. Even taking into consideration rises of the kind to which the gentleman from Wisconsin referred, I now give you the prices for the whole period and I point out to you that these controls were only removed or the 19th of November with the understanding, which I think—I did not have time to look it up, Mr. Speaker—but I think the understanding was that they were to remain off until January 13 and that the January date was included in the regulation which appeared in the Federal Register.

Presuming that I am correct in that statement, I say here on the floor, Mr. Speaker, that it is a breach of faith for the OPA today to go to the Department of Agriculture, and to Judge Collett of the Office of Economic Stabilization and ask that citrus ceilings be returned immediately when we have only now had a normal market by which to determine prices, and if my statement is correct that OPA did set January 13, then I charge OPA with a breach of faith because here are the figures. I will give you figures from the 10 principal markets of the United States. From this a very fair figure can be obtained.

Oranges. The average price of Florida oranges, interior, for these 2 weeks, has been $4.26 a box as against a previous ceiling of $4.59. For Indian River oranges, again Florida, the price has been $4.66 a box as against a previous ceiling of $5. For California oranges, for reasons I will explain in a minute, the price is $5.54 against a previous ceiling of $5.36, which is an increase for the entire time of only 18 cents a box for California oranges. I said I would explain that. We knew the large oranges, being in small production, would go above the ceiling. The small oranges, being in large production, would go down, which is just exactly what my friend from Wisconsin would like to have in Milwaukee, because those are the juice oranges.

Grapefruit. Texas grapefruit has fallen from the previous ceiling of $3.56, including the first jump, to $3.48. Florida grapefruit, interior, has risen to $3.95 from $3.60 a box, previous ceiling. Indian River grapefruit has risen from $4.10 to $4.79, a very small rise.

Taking the weighted average of all shipments of oranges, the actual increase for the United States for this 2 weeks, including the first jump, is 8.6 cents per

box. An average box contains more than 200 oranges.

For grapefruit the increase is 36.9 cents per box. The increase for all the United States for all kinds of citrus fruit is 2.1 cents per box. That is actually less than the housewife was paying before the citrus ceilings went off.

Let me give you two more facts. The first is that, on these figures alone, the increase is about one-hundredth of a cent per orange to the people in the United States, on the average. Let me give you the further fact that on the OPA's own figures, based on an investigation of three to four hundred markets in the United States selling citrus fruits, since the removal of the ceiling, 20 percent of the citrus was selling over previous ceilings, 20 percent was selling at the previous ceiling, and 60 percent was selling under the previous ceiling.

Prior to that, also on the OPA's own figures, more than 20 percent of the citrus fruits were selling over ceiling price.

I want to clear up the record, because whether the gentleman from Wisconsin knows it or not, this is exactly the sort of information which we get constantly from the OPA, and it should be corrected whenever it occurs.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. First of all, I am not certain from the gentleman's remarks as to just where the figures came from. Were all of the figures he quoted from the OPA?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. The latter figures were from the OPA and the others are the official market figures of the United States.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I want to make two points. First of all, as the gentleman himself indicated, there is no question about the figures, insofar as the city of Milwaukee is concerned. In addition to the letter which I received from a reputable manufacturer in that city, the Milwaukee Journal published a story with exactly the same information in it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All right. I was going to speak about that. Your letter was dated November 26, which happened to be a Monday. Obviously there was no market on Sunday and no market on Saturday; so the previous market must have been on Friday. That would have been on the Friday after the ceiling was removed on a Monday. So that would be exactly the time that you should have had the irregularities. I suggest that probably your friend did what I do sometimes, he dictated the letter on Saturday and said "yesterday" meaning Friday; the stenographer transcribed it on the following Monday but forgot to change the day.

Mr. BIEMILLER. That may be correct. The second point I want to make is that only today, speaking before the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Bowles again made this statement:

> Your wife will tell you that some grades of oranges, lemons, and grapefruit moved up 50 to 100 percent in the first few days following the action of OPA in removing the price restrictions.

A similar story has been told to me by at least a dozen Members of this House from various geographical areas scattered about the country, and my own wife reports the same thing right here in Washington.

Mr. PHILLIPS. As of when?

Mr. BIEMILLER. As of this week, in purchasing oranges, and finding that they have increased 50 percent in price during this period.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would like to answer that. Mr. Bowles again is guilty of the partial truth. Mr. Bowles says that citrus fruits rose 50 to 100 percent. I do not doubt that at all. Commodities of all kinds under those circumstances could. Mr. Bowles should say that this would refer only to certain markets in the United States where there is a shortage of whatever the commodity might be—potatoes, snap beans, or citrus—when the ceiling was taken off; but in just a few days, the time it takes to get a train or truck from the producing areas to that market, the prices fall again.

I am glad the gentleman brought up Washington, because that is a subject upon which I have spoken many times. That is on the doorstep of the OPA. It is one place in the United States where the greatest and most evident violations of OPA regulations have taken place. In the days when Mr. Bowles was patting himself on the back, almost to the point of wrenching his elbow, over poultry prices, poultry was selling on the market here as high as $9 a chicken, yet the OPA has never been able to correct the Washington situation. The OPA spectacles are not bifocals like mine are. They have no short vision on the OPA spectacles. They have only distant vision. The OPA can see what is going on in Milwaukee, but in the entire life of the OPA it has never been able to see what is going on in Washington.

Since this has been brought up, I ask unanimous consent not only to make certain correction and extensions of figures in my remarks, but also to include a letter which the chairman of a subcommittee of the House Agricultural Committee wrote 2 days ago to Mr. Bowles confirming a statement I had made about OPA figures not being reliable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, regardless of the strictures of the gentleman from California upon the OPA, the fact does remain as he himself indicates, that at a minimum there is a short period of time following the lifting of price ceilings when prices do jump on any product.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no argument about that. Prices could go up a great deal, or a little, or they could fall. It would depend on the market, which would then adjust itself.

Mr. BIEMILLER. And there is certainly going to be a tremendous revulsion on the part of the people of this country against those who permit the premature lifting of prices on any commodity in this country.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I do argue against that immediately, because the answer is the answer proposed to the OPA from the very beginning; to permit production. The people of the United States will never object to reduced prices, which is exactly what they will get very shortly, in many commodities, when OPA restrictions yield to normal production and distribution. I have never opposed price control when it was needed. It is not needed today on citrus fruit.

The letter addressed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] to the Administrator of the OPA was as follows:

> DEAR MR. BOWLES: You will recall, that on November 14 you appeared before and made a statement to the House Committee on Agriculture with reference to the poultry situation and the advisability of suspending ceiling prices.
>
> You will also recall that several members of the committee questioned the figures you used as the basis for your argument and it was agreed that the committee's attorney, a representative from your office and a representative from the Department of Agriculture, would make an analysis and report on your statement.
>
> I enclose herewith a copy of the analysis of your statement and I am wondering if you will not agree, that your statement was misleading, not authorized by the facts, and goes a long way in justifying a statement made to you in the meeting by Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS to the general effect, that Members of Congress cannot rely upon the figures issued by the Office of Price Administration.

OPA

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and include certain post cards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to make these remarks by reason of the address of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I am wondering whether it is the OPA, or what propaganda agency it is, which is responsible for the cards Members of Congress are now receiving. I have received a great many, and they are practically all in the same wording:

> DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way unless you support OPA on controlling prices.

> 5244 JANET AVENUE, SYLVANIA, OHIO.
>
> DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation.
>
> Well, it looks as though we are on our way unless you support OPA on controlling prices.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> EARL DAVIS.

> TOLEDO, OHIO, *November 30, 1945.*
>
> DEAR SIR: Are you interested in controlling inflation and preserving the American standard of living?
>
> If you are, vote to support the OPA price control and the Pepper-Murray 65-cent minimum-wage bill.
>
> Yours,
>
> W. H. BOYERS.

> 1316 TECUMSEH STREET, TOLEDO 7, OHIO.
>
> DEAR SIR: Vote to support the OPA on price control if you are interested in controlling inflation and a higher standard of living.
>
> R. PIETRYKOWSKI.

1604 FERNWOOD, TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: All we have been having for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way. Support OPA.
Yours truly,
R. EICHELBERGER.

2540 ELITE AVENUE, TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR HOMER: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way toward it unless you support OPA on controlling prices.
A. C. MILAN.

1304 HAMILTON STREET.
DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks so unless you support OPA on controlling prices.
FLOYD HANERNIK.

BERKEY, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way unless you support OPA on controlling prices.
SAM NAPREIALA.

---

442 EAST HUDSON STREET, TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way unless you support OPA on controlling prices.
GEORGE NOSAL.

TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way unless you support price controlling.
F. SIEMIENTHOWSKI.

---

149 EAST CENTRAL AVENUE, TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: Vote for OPA price control and the Pepper-Murray 65-cent minimum-wage bill.
FRANK KORNECZNY.

2209 MULBERRY STREET, TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: Please vote for OPA price control and Pepper-Murray 65-cent minimum-wage bill.
R. SCHATZER.

TOLEDO, OHIO.
DEAR SIR: All we have been hearing for the last 4 years is inflation. Well, it looks as though we are on our way unless you support OPA on controlling prices.
Yours truly,
OLIVER SMITH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on military training.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 1862. An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2518. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States;

H. R. 2930. An act for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital; and

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 693. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britanic Majesty, King George VI; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 1862. An act relating to the rank of chiefs of bureaus in the Navy Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2518. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States;

H. R. 2930. An act for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital; and

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing to begin at 10 a. m. on Friday, December 7, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 4779) to enable debtor railroad corporations whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 445. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report. No. 1205, current session, entitled "Economic Reconstruction in Europe," for the use of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning; without amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Revenue Act of 1945," as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1338. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1152. An act to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3995. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 449. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 380, an act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4911. A bill to authorize and empower the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of public vehicles to be licensed and operated as taxicabs in the District of Columbia and to limit the number of taxicab driver licenses to be issued; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4912. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautic Act of 1938, as amended, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 4913. A bill to grant pensions to certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4914. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Biographical Directory of the American Congress up to and including the Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. Res. 447. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4199, a bill to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4915. A bill for the relief of Irving W. Learned; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. R. 4916. A bill for the relief of Abraham Spevak; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 4917. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4918. A bill granting a pension to Benjamin Cowden Ash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Archibald J. Alcorn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of the estate of Curtis Wilson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1382. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution from the Otsego County, Thirty-first Congressional District, State of New York, Pomona Grange, demanding equality of farm prices with those of labor and industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1383. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the crew of steamship *Henry Hadley*, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their support of H. R. 2346; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1384. Also, petition of the crew of the steamship *Henry Hadley*, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permanent Fair Employment Practice Committee; to the Committee on Labor.

1385. Also, petition of the crew of the steamship *Henry Hadley*, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to S. 1171; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world where all without is change and decay, and within fear of failure and of the unknown future haunts our hearts, at the springs of Thy abiding presence, we keep alive our faith in values that are permanent and of the kindly light behind all the shadows. Whether joy or pain be our lot, fulfillment or disappointment, even though the waters roar and though the mountains are shaken into the seas, still may we be upheld by an encompassing strength which is of Thee and by that sustaining power enabled to face the light of any day or the terror of any night. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 110) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 105) authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Revenue Act of 1945" as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1123) to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD (S. Doc. No. 122)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board, amounting to $1,200,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of two individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by Attorney General Biddle, and a report of the cases of 145 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED MAGNESIUM PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to Government-owned magnesium plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report of the Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 6, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 693. An act for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda Estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss;

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan;

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty, King George VI; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of President Truman's proposal providing for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in view of the misrepresentations which have been made concerning the objectives of Senate Joint Resolution 112, the resolution on Palestine which was introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, and in which the senior Senator from Massachusetts has joined, the Senator from Ohio and I have addressed a communication to President Truman in which we demonstrate the falsity of these misrepresentations. What we say in our letter to President Truman is supported by historical utterances made by President Wilson, Lloyd George, General Smuts, and the British Royal Commission itself. Because of the widespread interest in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that our letter to the President be printed in the RECORD, and I urge all Senators to read the letter and give its contents their careful consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Ever since we introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 112 on Palestine, a continuous campaign, both open and covert, has been conducted against the bill, and more particularly against its basic proposition—that the Jews shall have the right of free entry into Palestine so that they may reconstitute it as a democratic commonwealth. Whoever may be behind this opposition and whatever their motives, their campaign has taken the form of a gross misrepresentation of our position and of the intentions of all who support Jewish aspirations in Palestine. The misrepresentation centers in the astounding and baseless charge that it is proposed to establish in Palestine a theocratic state, or a state based upon religious or racial discrimination. This insidious campaign has now been carried to the White House in an obvious attempt to influence the administration. We, therefore, find it necessary to make a full statement of our position in order to dispel such fantastic misconceptions so assiduously fostered.

1. In drafting our resolution we had before us the Palestine planks of the Republican and Democratic platforms adopted by the national conventions of the two parties in Chicago, 1944. The relevant words in the Republican platform are as follows:

"In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth."

The corresponding language in the Democratic platform is as follows:

"We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

Our resolution is, therefore, no more than a restatement of the position taken by both major parties representing, as they do, the great majority of American citizens.

2. The expression, "Jewish Commonwealth," is not novel. It was not recently invented to represent a new idea. It antedates the Palestine mandate and was used repeatedly by the leading statesmen of Great Britain and the United States in the crucial years preceding and following the Peace Conference at Versailles when the territorial settlements were in the making.

3. That this was the sense in which the British Government had understood its commitment was stated by Mr. David Lloyd George, Prime Minister at the time of the Balfour Declaration, who testified before the British Royal Commission on Palestine as follows: "It was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish Commonwealth."

General Smuts, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, on November 3, 1919, spoke of "an increasing stream of Jewish immigration" and of "a great Jewish state rising there once more."

Mr. Winston Churchill spoke in the same vein: "If, as may well happen, there should be created in our lifetime on the banks of the Jordan a Jewish state under the protection of the British Crown which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event will have occurred in the history of the world which would from every point of view be beneficial."

The British Royal Commission attested that "Lord Robert Cecil, in 1917, Sir Herbert Samuel, in 1919, and Mr. Winston Churchill, in 1920, spoke or wrote in terms that could only mean that they contemplated the eventual establishment of a Jewish state."

4. The position of the United States in favor of the evolution of Palestine into a Jewish state was equally clear. That this was the understanding of the American delegation at the Peace Conference appears explicitly from the Outline of Report and Recommendations prepared by the intelligence section of that delegation, in accordance with instructions for the American plenipotentiaries. This report, dated January 21, 1919, summarized the American attitude in the following recommendation: "That the Jews be invited to return to Palestine and settle there, being assured by the (Peace) Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the protection of the personal (especially the religious) and property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish state in fact."

5. In harmony with this position, President Woodrow Wilson on March 3, 1919, declared: "I am persuaded that the Allied Nations, with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth."

6. It cannot be suggested that the statesmen we have quoted, from Lloyd George to Woodrow Wilson, lacked the capacity to express themselves in clear and precise terms. Each of them was a master of the English tongue. Nor would anyone in his senses impute to those enlightened statesmen the advocacy of a "racial state" or a "theocracy" when they used the term "Jewish Commonwealth" so freely. What they obviously intended and stated in so many words was that in Palestine, their ancestral land, the Jews should be free to grow into a majority and not be kept down artificially to the position of a minority in which they find themselves in every other country in the world. This is the core and essence of the proposal.

7. It is clear from the foregoing that our resolution does no more than give renewed expression to the purposes of the British and American statesmen who framed the policies of the Allied Nations. Their statements are, if anything, more explicit than the terms of our resolution. The objective remains simple and clear: To insure that all Jews who desire to settle in Palestine shall be guaranteed the right of entry so that they may develop and repopulate their ancestral land and so that Palestine may become a Jewish state in the sense that Jews will constitute the majority. Our resolution adds the proviso that the Commonwealth thus to be created shall be one in which "all men, regardless of race or creed, shall enjoy equal rights."

8. This is also the official position of the Zionist movement repeatedly expressed. Time and again, on countless occasions, the Zionist organization made it crystal clear that it contemplates a democratic state in which complete equality of rights and status shall obtain between all citizens, irrespective of race or faith, and between all religious groups within the state.

Under the circumstances, it should be impossible for any well-informed person to maintain in good faith the fantastic notion that the formula "Jewish Commonwealth" implies any domination of the Jewish religion over the adherence of other faiths.

9. Millions of Jews in the Old World regard themselves, and are regarded by their neighbors, not merely as a religious denomination, such as Moslems or Baptists, but also as a people with a distinctive culture, characteristics, and traditions. By the Balfour Declaration and the mandate, the nations of the world recognized that just as the Czechs, the Greeks, the Magyars, and the Irish, or any other recognized nationality are entitled each to a homeland of its own, so the Jewish people was likewise entitled to its national home. The mandate, therefore, speaks of the recognition "given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the ground for reconstituting their national home in that country."

10. We are reluctantly driven to the conclusion that the misrepresentations to which we have referred and the false issues raised with regard to the projected Jewish Commonwealth are intended to confuse the public, to deprive the Jewish people of their established rights, and to assist the British Government in evading its obligations under binding international agreements. Neither we, nor other Senators who share our views, nor the American people will be deceived by these tactics.

11. Finally, Mr. President, it is our conviction that the passage of such a resolution is more urgently required now than ever before, in view of the joint Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry about to be organized. Our country can only proceed on the assumption that the pledges given to the Jewish people and embodied in international covenants shall be honored. If the joint committee proceeds on that assumption, its hands will be strengthened by the passage of the resolution. If the committee is not instructed to proceed on that assumption, it is the more necessary that the traditional and basic position of the United States with regard to the Palestine question should be reaffirmed so far as it lies in the power of Congress to do so.

We trust, Mr. President, that this statement will contribute to a clarification of this question touching an important aspect of our foreign policy.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. WAGNER.
ROBERT A. TAFT.

RETURN OF EXAMINING CORPS OF PATENT OFFICE TO WASHINGTON—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the American Patent Law Association, October 9, 1945, relating to the return of the examining corps of the Patent Office to Washington.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas—

1. The most important problem facing the Nation today is the reconversion to peacetime production, with maximum employment, and in the shortest possible time;

2. Attainment of maximum employment will be greatly aided by the establishment of new industries and the manufacture of new products, and the national interest requires that every condition which retards the establishment of new industries and the manufacture of new products should be corrected promptly;

3. Investors and manufacturers will not establish new businesses or manufacture new products without obtaining reasonable assurance against infringement of valid patents and without reasonable expectation of being able to obtain good patent protection on new products;

4. The present divided condition under which the United States Patent Office is operating, with the examining corps located in Richmond, Va., and the public search room and other service divisions located in Washington, D. C., greatly impedes the making of patent investigations required for the establishment of new industries and the manufacture of new products;

5. The public search room of the Patent Office in Washington is now operating in only one-half of the space which it occupied before the recent war and the increased demands placed on this service in recent weeks has exceeded its capacity to such extent that the crowded condition is intolerable;

6. When the examining corps of the Patent Office was moved to Richmond at the beginning of the war the examiners were assured that they would be returned to Washington immediately after the end of the war emergency, and that this office would be the first of the displaced bureaus to be returned;

7. More recently, and before the surrender of Japan, it was officially stated that the examining corps of the Patent Office would be returned part by part to its own space in Washington as fast as the space became available;

8. Since the signing of surrender terms with Japan certain space in the Commerce Building formerly occupied by the Patent Office has been vacated without being reoccupied by the Patent Office, but is being occupied by the Surplus Property Board;

9. Other space formerly occupied by the Patent Office in the Commerce Building is now occupied by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, which are not under the Department of Commerce and have no connection with the Patent Office;

10. The north end of the Commerce Building was originally constructed to meet the peculiar needs of the Patent Office, and is the logical place for this Bureau;

11. About one-half of the examiners have continued to own their own homes in Washington, and many still have their families in Washington;

12. The public announcements that the Patent Office would be returned to Washington in the immediate future have created an uncertainty as to the tenure of the examiners in Richmond, and as a result many Richmond landlords refuse to rent living quarters to examiners;

13. The Patent Office has lost more than 200 highly trained examiners since the examining corps was sent to Richmond, about one-half of this number having transferred to other Government agencies in Washington and more than 100 having gone into the armed services, and most of these examiners will remain lost to the Patent Office so long as the examining corps remains in Richmond;

14. In its divided condition, and with its loss of trained examiners, the Patent Office is working at a great disadvantage and with serious inefficiency, and is not in a position to render the greatly increased service that is being required of it in the reconversion program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national interest will be greatly served and the reconversion program will be substantially aided by the immediate return of the examining corps of the Patent Office to Washington, and to this end it is requested that the space formerly occupied by the Patent Office in the Commerce Building be vacated immediately, and the entire Patent Office be reassembled in the Commerce Building; and

That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of Patents, the Director, Bureau of the Budget, the Commissioner of Federal Housing, to the chairmen of the following congressional committees: Senate Committee on Patents, House Committee on Patents, Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, House Committee on the District of Columbia.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD some resolutions adopted by the National Reclamation Association at its annual convention in Denver, Colo., November, 14, 15, and 16, 1945. These resolutions are extremely timely, especially in the light of pending legislation before the Congress.

The convention was attended by more than 800 delegates, representing all the land and water interests of the 17 arid and semiarid States of the West. The resolutions reflect the careful thought and study of those attending the convention.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution 7

"Whereas there have been introduced in the Congress five bills proposing the creation of valley authorities and such proposed legislation is designed to encompass the entire United States in water, natural resource, and social resource development under the control of authorities; and

"Whereas the National Reclamation Association since 1937 has consistently opposed the development of natural resources through regional authorities; and

"Whereas the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the United States Senate have recommended that the pending Missouri Valley Authority bill do not pass and also have denounced the authority principle for the following, among other reasons:

"1. Existing laws and procedures provide for full integration of the activities of established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water and land resource development. These policies and procedures protect State rights and interests, as well as State water laws, and provide for full cooperation between the local, State, and Federal interest.

"2. The Bureau of Reclamation affords the benefits of resource development on a regional basis without the objectionable features contained in proposed authority legislation.

"3. Under the pending authority legislation, policy and laws respecting the use and control of water, heretofore established by the Congress, are abandoned and State water laws and States' rights and interests in water and its utilization and control are destroyed.

"4. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Bureau of Reclamation would either be eliminated entirely from a river basin under the control of an authority, or their activities would be curtailed at the will of such an agency. The laws under which these agencies now operate and the basic provisions of the present reclamation law would be drastically changed by the enactment of proposed authority legislation.

"5. Enactment into law of the bills would seriously delay the construction of works planned by existing agencies of Government-coordinated regional developments and authorized by Congress.

"6. The authority bills provide a means for the expansion of Government control of States, natural resources, and individuals by Federal corporations. In essence they propose to create instruments of government with questionable and irresponsible powers affecting the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the people of every section of the United States.

"7. The creation of authorities constitutes the surrender to Federal corporations of power which the Congress does not possess under the Constitution. It is contrary to democratic traditions.

"8. Local self-government would be denied by the enactment of such legislation.

"9. The Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the United States Senate correctly appraised authorities when it said:

" 'It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic processes. It would mean the creation of a superstate—neither Federal nor State, and not contemplated by our Constitution. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a three-man board, not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself. It would constitute a virtual abdication by the Congress in favor of government by Federal corporations wielding autocratic powers. It would challenge State sovereignty and destroy systems of laws, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered.'

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the National Reclamation Association at its fourteenth annual convention*, That it reaffirms the position of the association in opposition to the creation of regional valley authorities and that the association shall continue to take all possible measures to prevent the passage of the pending authority bill and any and all other similar legislation which may hereafter be introduced in Congress."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolution 10

"Whereas Congress has authorized many water projects for postwar construction, within the 17 Western States; and

"Whereas hostilities have ceased and the time has now arrived for construction thereof; and

"Whereas a number of these projects have as yet received no appropriations of money from the Congress, or in some cases, where such appropriations have been made, funds so appropriated have been impounded by the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas such impounding of funds appropriated by the Congress after extensive and thorough hearings on all points involved is entirely unjustified and constitutes an unwarranted interference with the legislative branch of the Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the officers of this association are authorized and directed constantly and diligently to urge Congress to appropriate money for the immediate construction of projects authorized by Congress and, whenever funds which have been appropriated are impounded, to protest vigorously against such action and urge their immediate release."

To the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolution 2

"Whereas there are now at least three bills before Congress providing for Federal activity in the field of stream pollution abatement; and

"Whereas the responsibility for the formulation and execution of stream pollution abatement programs rests principally with State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association expresses itself in favor of the inclusion of a congressional declaration of policy in all Federal stream pollution legislation which will appropriately recognize and protect the rights and responsibilities of the States in stream pollution abatement programs."

"Resolution 8

"Recommends that States establish machinery necessary to carry out States' responsibilities under 1944 Flood Control Act and 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act

"Whereas the Federal Flood Control Act and the 1945 Federal Rivers and Harbors Act each contain a congressional declaration of policy which requires that the interests and rights of the States in water utilization and control shall be recognized, preserved, and protected; and

"Whereas under such policy, Federal administrative agencies are directed to cooperate fully with State governments in the planning of flood-control and navigation projects; and

"Whereas the requirement for cooperative Federal-State participation in Federal flood-control and navigation programs squarely places the responsibility upon State governments to provide governmental machinery necessary for their effective participation in such programs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Reclamation Association recommends that the States establish such machinery as is necessary to carry out their responsibilities under the policy enunciated by Congress in the enactment of the 1944 Flood Control Act and the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act, and requests the Council of State governments to undertake a program to effectuate this objective."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution 9

"Whereas it is the position of the National Reclamation Association that the States are vested with the right and power to regulate and control the use of water within their respective borders; and

"Whereas the rights and property of citizens and the local tax structures which support local government in the States and areas comprising watersheds are seriously affected by present and proposed policies aimed at perpetual Federal ownership of water-use facilities erected in or adjacent to these streams; and

"Whereas statutory provision should be made for declaring, defining, and protecting the rights, titles, and interests of the several States in and to such facilities, and the income derived therefrom; and

"Whereas provision should be made for the effective and economical administration of all such facilities with direct representation for all interests properly concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the president of the National Reclamation Association be empowered and directed to appoint a committee of five members of the association to assemble data and make a study of the rights, titles, and interests of the several States concerning all such facilities and to make report thereon, with recommendations for such procedures as will protect the interests and welfare of the people in the areas affected; and be it further

"Resolved, That said committee be empowered to call to its assistance such persons as the directors of the member States of the National Reclamation Association may designate as representatives of such States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the president of the National Reclamation Association be authorized to invite cooperation in the study proposed herein by such other States, organizations, or individuals as are interested in these basic problems."

To the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Resolution No. 1

"Whereas the intent of the Reclamation Act of 1939, as indicated by its legislative history, as viewed by the reclamation interests of the West, and as interpreted by the Bureau of Reclamation for 5 years following the adoption of the act, was that costs chargeable to power, in addition to operation and maintenance costs, should be sufficient to return to the United States the power construction cost plus interest at 3 percent per annum on what is described in the act as 'an appropriate share of the construction investment'; and

"Whereas the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, under an opinion given on September 29, 1944, held:

" 'That a proper interpretation of section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the Department's Appropriation Act of 1939 require that the minimum rate schedule be such as to produce revenues sufficient only to meet in addition to the return for operation and maintenance cost, an amount equal to 3 percent of the power construction costs with the proviso that if total revenues thus produced are insufficient to repay all costs allocated to power to be repaid by power revenues "other fixed charges" must be included in the rate schedule to produce revenues sufficient to repay such costs' * * * and

"Whereas although the Solicitor's interpretation of the 1939 act provides for minimum power rate schedules only, it nevertheless lays a basis for fixing costs chargeable to power, and adjusting rates in accordance therewith, contrary to the accepted intent of the 1939 act at the time of its adoption, with results and implications of vital concern to the reclamation programs and to the national interest; and

"Whereas the application of the Solicitor's opinion particularly to a broad program of basin-wide development may have wide-reaching effects contrary to the intent of Congress and to the policies now and heretofore supported by this association, which have asserted the principle that power production should be incidental to reclamation and should return, in addition to its share of operation and maintenance costs, at least a sufficient amount to repay the power construction investment, plus interest as provided in the act, and, where possible, and in returning the cost of the irrigation features where the latter, if charged in full, would impose a burden beyond the ability of the water users to repay: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the National Reclamation Association, That the policy in Reclamation development which would be effectuated by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, above mentioned, should not be permitted to prevail; and be it further

"Resolved, That this association hereby registers its belief in, and approval of, the intent of the law as originally interpreted, and directs its officers to seek the enactment by the Congress of legislation making such intent effective and rendering nugatory the opinion of the Solicitor referred to herein."

"Resolution No. 3

"Whereas the reclamation of arid lands is increasingly an important undertaking in the vital reconversion program, through providing homes and occupations for war veterans, and for meeting the urgent need for increased food production; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation's plans for the fullest utilization of the Nation's water require a great deal more information on the quantity and quality of the surface and ground waters of the West; and

"Whereas continuance and expansion of the Geological Survey's stream-gaging, ground water, sedimentation, and quality of water programs are essential in planning the development and administration of irrigation enterprises; in dividing waters of interstate streams equitably between States, by compact or otherwise, for assuring a better understanding between water users; and for promoting a more effective use and control of water; and

"Whereas a deficiency now exists in funds available to the Geological Survey for carrying on its present water resources investigations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the secretary-manager, officers, and directors of the National Reclamation Association are authorized and urged to support the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey in their efforts to provide now and in the immediate future additional stream-gaging facilities and to expand investigations of ground water, sedimentation, and quality of waters in the West, and to that end to take all steps necessary to advise Members of Congress of the importance of more adequate water investigations, and to urge the appropriations required therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That this association, through its officers, members, and associate members, strongly urge upon our representatives in Congress the necessity of providing an adequate supplemental appropriation to the gaging-stream item in the Interior Department budget to match all State offerings for the present fiscal year."

"Resolution 4

"Whereas the National Reclamation Association, by resolutions adopted at its annual conventions in 1943 and 1944, has consistently advocated the development of a comprehensive program of watershed research in the upstream portions of western drainage basins; and

"Whereas in spite of past efforts of the association, wartime restrictions on research appropriations have prevented the development of such a comprehensive program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the officers of the National Reclamation Association again be authorized and requested—

"(a) to promote the development of a comprehensive western-wide program of investigation by the Forest Service into the management of forest and range lands in relation to the water resource;

"(b) to give their full support to such a program of watershed research;

"(c) to take all necessary steps to advise Members of Congress of the importance of such investigations; and

"(d) to urge adequate appropriations for their full development."

"Resolution 5

"Recommends adjustment of 40-hour-week provisions to permit Federal ditch riders to work longer hours during irrigation season, less at other periods

"Whereas as the result of a Federal Government regulation establishing a 40-hour week for Government employees, the Secretary of the Interior has applied the regulation to all employees of the Bureau of Reclamation, including those engaged in the operation of Federal irrigation projects; and

"Whereas though the 40-hour week can be successfully applied to some groups of employees operating irrigation projects, it is not feasible to apply this regulation, during the irrigation season, to employees engaged in the delivery of water for the reason that water is run in irrigation canals 24 hours per day, each day, during that part of the irrigation season when continuous use of water is required; and

"Whereas when operating employees are restricted to a 40-hour week, responsibility for the operation of irrigation works must be divided among two or more employees, a situation which has resulted, and will continue to result, in friction, misunderstanding, and evasion of responsibility among such employees; and will cause an impairment of irrigation service, waste of water, and crop loss on project farms; and

"Whereas the aforementioned difficulties find a practical solution in applying the 40-hour week to such employees engaged in the delivery of water during the period of minimum water use; and to permit such employees to work such hours per week during that part of the season when continuous use of water is required, as has been the practice in the past, thus continuing the unimpaired service heretofore enjoyed: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this association urgently recommends to the Secretary of the Interior that he designate as essential overtime workers, during the period of afore-mentioned continuous use of water, employees engaged in the delivery of water to water users in Federal irrigation projects; and if such designation be found not feasible that appropriate action be taken to bring about the desired effect herein set forth."

"Resolution 6

"Whereas the reclamation law and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto provide for the delivery of operation and maintenance of federally constructed projects or divisions thereof to the properly organized bodies of water users in such projects or divisions when certain conditions prescribed by that law have been complied with; and

"Whereas such delivery of operation and maintenance is in the interest of the water users and the reclamation program in general; and

"Whereas it has been called to the attention of the National Reclamation Association that there are instances wherein the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to deliver operation and maintenance to a district for many years after it had complied with all legal conditions and repeatedly made formal request for a delivery contract; and

"Whereas this association, by Resolution No. 14, adopted at Denver, Colo., on October 29, 1943, and by Resolution No. 9, adopted at Denver, Colo., on November 17, 1944, declared that, in view of the above premises, it was the opinion of the association that operation and maintenance of all projects and divisions thereof, constructed under the above laws and being operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, should be given over to the properly organized bodies of water users at the earliest possible date after they have complied with all legal conditions; and

"Whereas it has not been observed by the association that any change of policy has been made by the Bureau since the adoption of said Resolutions Nos. 14 and 9: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Reclamation Association does hereby reaffirm the principle declared in said Resolutions Nos. 14 and 9, and does hereby respectfully request that the Bureau of Reclamation correct its policy and initiate action to conform to that principle; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation with the request for a statement of the views of the Bureau; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the officers and representatives of this association are directed to endeavor to carry into effect the objects of this resolution."

"Resolution 11

"Whereas the intent of the reclamation laws is to accord equal treatment to every type of water users' organization, and there should be no discrimination, under any Federal statute, between irrigation districts, water users' associations, mutual ditch companies, and other types of water users' organization: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That in view of that intent the reclamation laws and other Federal statutes should be clarified where necessary to insure that the application of water revenues and power revenues to repaying the cost of construction, to pay operation and maintenance expenses, and otherwise to reduce the cost of water to the farmer on a reclamation project by whatever type of organization it is operated, does not constitute a dividend or distribution of such revenues, but a proper disposition of the resources of a multiple-purpose project, as intended by Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the officers and appropriate committees of the National Reclamation Association are instructed to present and endeavor to secure the adoption of clarifying legislation to the foregoing effect."

"Resolution 12

"Whereas in numerous reclamation projects in the 17 Western States customs of land use and occupation have developed and vested rights have attached through ownership and use which will make it difficult and uneconomical to conform to the fixed acreage limitations now required by the Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the association strongly urges that the Congress give favorable consideration to the requests of all projects for the modification of the requirements of the acreage limitation provisions of said reclamation acts so far as the same apply to such projects, with due regard to the prevention of speculation in project lands to the end that conditions incident to long experience gained through past development and general usage may not be disturbed."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4683. A bill to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 838).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families; with amendments (Rept. No. 839).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of November 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 7, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell	113 Park Blvd. SE	Federal Communications Commission	$1,800

B. K. WHEELER, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Fred R. Miller	7535 17th St. NW	Veterans' Administration	$5,810
Bertha M. Heck	3107 Mount Pleasant St. NW	do	2,166

[1] Both assigned to permanent Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation.

WALTER F. GEORGE, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1669. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert J. O'Connor; and

S. 1670. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Richard K. O'Connor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1671. A bill to give widows of any deceased person, entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, credit for each child regardless of number, removing present top limit of $100 monthly; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1672. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Department of the Interior of surplus lands and property of Federal agencies on reclamation projects; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND PUBLIC-HEALTH CENTERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DONNELL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DOCUMENTS BEARING ON TERMINATION OF ANGLO-AMERICAN FINANCIAL AND TRADE DISCUSSIONS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made in Washington by the President of the United States and in London by the Prime Minister of Great Britain on December 6, 1945; a joint statement by the United States and the United Kingdom regarding the understanding reached on commercial policy; a joint statement regarding settlement for lend-lease reciprocal aid, surplus war property, and claims; and a financial agreement between the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE SHRINE LUNCHEON MEETING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Shrine luncheon meeting at Washington, D. C., on December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR MITCHELL ON PROBLEMS OF ALUMINUM-PLANT DISPOSAL

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by him on the problems of aluminum-plant disposal, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HOSPITAL CENTER

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hospital Center," published in the Washington Evening Star of December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DAR NEGRO POLICY—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the column entitled "Fair Enough," by Westbrook Pegler, published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HURLEY CONTROVERSY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Exit Pat Hurley," by Maxwell S. Stewart, published in the December 8, 1945, issue of the Nation; and an article headed "Thinks Hurley might give Chinese benefit of his 1931 Oklahoma plan," by Lowell Mellett, published in his column entitled "On the Other Hand," which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED PEACE DEPARTMENT—ARTICLE BY JACK H. POLLACK

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Do We Need a Peace Department?" written by Jack H. Pollack and published in the January 1946 issue of Tomorrow magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Guffey	Myers
Ball	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Gossett	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] have been excused. They are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on official business. He has been excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, by unanimous consent H. R. 3603, to pro-

vide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, is now before the Senate for consideration, and all of yesterday was devoted to a discussion of the bill. It has developed, however, that some of the Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity to study the bill carefully. It is a long bill, a technical one, and quite complicated.

Therefore, Mr. President, in response to the requests of several Senators, and also in order that there may be a better opportunity to give consideration to the bill over the week end, I ask that the bill be laid aside. It is my intention to ask that it be taken up again early next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland call for the regular order at the present time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I shall not object to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland that the ship-sales bill be temporarily laid aside. I wish to compliment the Senator from Maryland. I know how anxious he is to have the bill passed by the Senate, and how important it is that action be obtained on it. The Senator from Maryland has worked on the bill for about 2 months, and it is a complicated measure and one which requires much study. I hope the Senate will bear with us so that we can get the bill passed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is called for. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 1415.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to continue the discussion of the bill which is the unfinished business.

SPEECH BY PROFESSOR LASKI, AND THE PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is with grave concern that I invite the attention of this body to philosophies of government recently expressed by the head of the dominant party in Great Britain—the party now in control of the government of that great nation.

I refer to a speech delivered on Monday of this week at the Hotel Astor in New York by Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party. His position in relation to the party in control of the Government in England at the moment might be compared to that of the chairman of the Republican Party or the chairman of the Democratic Party. It might be more aptly compared to the position of Mr. Hannegan, who is chairman of the Democratic National Committee. While I have not been able to secure a complete copy of Professor Laski's speech, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point, the most complete summary thereof I have been able to obtain from articles appearing in the following newspapers: The Washington Post of December 4 under the caption "End free economy or bring a third war, Laski declares"; from the Washington Times-Herald of December 6, an article with a a Chicago date line under the heading "Kennedy calls Laski arrogant apostle of Red anarchy"; and from the Washington Daily News of December 4, under the heading "No nation fit for atom trust, Laski asserts."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

END FREE ECONOMY OR BRING A THIRD WAR, LASKI DECLARES

NEW YORK, December 3.—Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, asserted tonight that free enterprise economies must be scrapped because they lead to war which, in the atomic age, would destroy civilization.

"There is no middle way," he contended. "Free enterprise and the market economy mean war; socialism and planned economy mean peace. All attempts to find a compromise are a satanic illusion. We must plan our civilization or we must perish."

Speaking in the Astor ballroom at a dinner closing the 3-day atom-bomb forum held by the National Associates, Professor Laski charged bluntly that even though atomic energy ultimately is no secret, American and British "great vested interests" are trying to keep the "secret" from Russia.

"You know the result—a halt to confidence and the rise of ugly suspicions about the imminent chances of a third world war," he said.

The 52-year-old British Labor chairman, a prolific and leftish writer and speaker, summarized in this way his answer to the challenge of the atom bomb:

"Every implication of this discovery means planned internationalism, economic, social, political. It is an international discovery. The planning of its application has been international. The organization of its future use must be international also. There is no nation state fit to be trusted with the development of atomic energy."

Professor Laski, a former lecturer at Harvard and Yale, making his first visit to the United States in 6 years, was emphatic in linking the atom bomb and future war problems to the project of getting rid of society "dominated by businessmen."

"It is clear to any honest observer," he said, "that a society dominated by businessmen could not be trusted to create the mental climate in which the development of atomic energy would be confined within the framework of peace. They would not give the common people the education because they fear its outcome.

"It is the businessman who has split our society into two—the political society and the economic society. They have made the policeman the sanction of the first, and the threat of starvation the sanction of the second.

"There is only one country in the world today where this dichotomy has been transcended. There is only one country, also, where science and technology can be developed without sacrificing the education of man and fearing the break-down of social well-being, or community consciousness.

"It is significant that only in the new world of Russia has the businessman ceased to count. It is also significant that one of the major preoccupations of the great vested interests is now to keep the 'secret'—which is no secret—from the knowledge of Russia."

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

KENNEDY CALLS LASKI ARROGANT APOSTLE OF RED ANARCHY—EX-ENVOY TO BRITAIN REMINDS SOCIALIST CAPITALISTIC UNITED STATES SAVED BRITAIN TWICE

CHICAGO, December 5.—Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain, tonight assailed Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, for his impertinence in suggesting that the United States should trade its system of free economy for some brand of socialism.

"How can Laski have the gall to assert that capitalism is dead when the British Empire has been saved twice in 30 years by the capitalistic United States?" asked Kennedy, who resigned his London post in 1941 after serving 4 years.

APOSTLE OF ANARCHY

"I know Laski, and he is an arrogant apostle of anarchy who has spent his time shuttling between Moscow, London, and New Haven peddling his particular brand of socialism."

Although denouncing Laski's theories, Kennedy warned that the United States is in danger of stumbling into some form of socialism or communism, the true nature of which the public has only the foggiest idea.

"Whether we keep our free economy or trade it for something about which we know very little is the big political issue ahead," he told an audience of 1,000 at a dinner meeting of the Economic Club of Chicago.

UP TO BUSINESSMEN

"It is up to businessmen to sell our economic system to the public," he asserted. "They must do as good a job on that as they do on their own products. Unless the advantages of our system over others is brought home to everyone there is no reason to believe that the trend toward more and more government will be checked."

Kennedy criticized business for delaying its complaints about Government policies until they have been put into effect. The only effective antidote for unsound Government policies is aggressive political action by businessmen as individuals, he said.

[From the Washington Daily News]

NO NATION FIT FOR ATOM TRUST, LASKI ASSERTS

National sovereignty, free enterprise, and market economy must go to assure peace in the atomic age, Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, announced last night, while priests, members of the Holy Name Society and Catholic war veterans picketed him at his New York hotel.

War is "the outcome of the exercise of governments of unlimited sovereignty," Laski said, and: "Socialism and planned economy mean peace."

He declared no nation is fit to be trusted with development of atomic energy, and demanded that secrecy be abolished.

Laski denounced British foreign policy and the economy of the United States—the direct road to serfdom—and spoke approvingly of Russia, because there the businessman has ceased to count.

The pickets were protesting an alleged slight to the church in a Laski radio speech several weeks ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. Preceding, as it does, the deliberations of this body concerning the authorization of a gigantic loan to Great Britain—a loan which, it is said will serve largely to stabilize the economy of the world, and, in particular, will save the British Empire from bankruptcy—the philosophy expressed by Professor Laski gives me much concern, and in my opinion should give

every Member of this great body much concern.

That would not be true were his statements those only of an individual British citizen, or those of a leader of a minority party in that nation, but the remarks I shall mention more specifically come from the head of the party now in control of the British Government—the same Government which we are now asked to save from bankruptcy.

Just what does the professor have to say concerning this Nation—our Nation—which is asked by his Government to be the Samaritan of the British Empire, and of the world. In the first place, as he is quoted by the New York Times, he criticizes our existing form of economy as "the direct road to serfdom."

Frankly, I am surprised that the professor's party—and his party is in control—would be so free as to request aid of an economy headed direct for serfdom, unless it be sought to hasten such slavery. Again, the professor states:

> Free enterprise and the market economy mean war; socialism and planned economy mean peace. All attempts to find a compromise are a satanic illusion. We must plan our civilization or we must perish.

Of course, the United States has been troubled always by wild-eyed idealists who wish to tell us how to conduct our own business, and how poorly we have been conducting it. Nevertheless, it is to be noted that most of them, including the learned professor, like to receive the remunerative compensation derived from lecture tours and writing in this country.

The professor, strange to say, hinges any possible solution of what to do with the atomic bomb and the avoidance of future wars upon getting rid of society dominated by businessmen. He states:

> It is clear to any honest observer that a society dominated by businessmen could not be trusted to create the mental climate in which the development of atomic energy would be confined within the framework of peace. They would not give the common people the education because they fear its outcome.

That is not all. The professor continues:

> It is the businessman who has split our society into two societies—the political society and the economic society. They have made the policeman the sanction of the first, and the threat of starvation the sanction of the second.

It is not strange that this Nation—so dominated by businessmen, as the professor charges—should have done as well as it has to this date. Is it not fortunate for the British Empire that such businessmen were able to provide so many billions of dollars to save the Empire from destruction in the recent war? Is there not some significance to the fact that this Nation did, using the professor's own words "create the mental climate" necessary to building the greatest fighting force in the history of the world, and contributed so much to the winning of the struggle from which we have just emerged? Is it a mere coincidence that the same Nation—the United States, if you please—is taking the lead in creating the mental climate necessary for the protection and welfare of the small nations of the world, and for the establishment of peace?

By what strange quirk of human nature does the professor's party now seek further aid of the Nation whose form of government the professor so much deplores, and whose overthrow he seeks. Why does his party seek aid of our society, whose sanction, as the professor says, is "the threat of starvation"?

Where in the world can there be found the high level of education now existing in the United States? Not, even, in the British Empire. Nowhere else in the world can there be found the standards of living that we have here. In no nation does labor enjoy the position and freedom it here holds. And yet, the professor has the audacity to damn those very things which now make it possible for the United States to provide relief for the world. Incidentally, let me add, that I trust in doing so, we shall not become and be called—a "sucker."

Apparently the professor regards Russia as the utopia of modern civilization. He says:

> There is only one country where science and technology can be developed without sacrificing the education of man and fearing the break-down of social well-being, or community consciousness. It is significant that only in the new world of Russia has the businessman ceased to count.

It is a mystery to me how the professor and others arrive at such a high evaluation of Russian society. Shrouded in mystery, as it is; hidden behind the dark veil of secrecy, as it is; following a road of isolationism, as it apparently is; suspicious of the world, as it appears to be, I fail to see how anyone on the outside can properly evaluate either Russia's accomplishments or Russia's goals.

However, if the professor likes the society of Russia so well, why does he not select that nation as his domicile, and there dwell in prosperity and contentment?

There is an old adage that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." If the professor is so interested in the advancement of society, why does he not lecture at home? Surely a few sheckels could not influence his high motives. This is not the first time a labor government has been in control in Great Britain. How much advancement has labor made in that nation? Compare its progress with the progress of labor in this country. That is all that need be done.

So much for the professor and his individual philosophy which would always tear down, but offers no stones or mortar for sound and stable reconstruction. What concerns me is this: Does he speak for the Government of Great Britain? Occupying the position that he now holds, I must assume, for the present at least, that he does.

If that be true, then I, for one, am now serving notice upon the Members of this great legislative body, and upon the world that unless Professor Laski is repudiated, I cannot support legislation granting any appropriation for the salvation of any such government. If such is the philosophy underlying the government which seeks such enormous financial assistance, such a loan would be a betrayal of American principles and ideals, and would serve only to make insecure the future peace of the world.

I have a high regard for the British Empire. I wish to do anything I can, consistent with American interests, in aid of that government. I wish to see international cooperation and good will. I hope and pray that in conjunction with the other nations of the earth we may achieve permanent peace. My vote has supported those beliefs and principles. I expect to continue along that line.

However, I point out that cooperation is not a one-way street. Good will cannot be bought. He who constantly bestows gifts frequently receives only the envy or condemnation of the donee.

I feel that those I represent expect of me the upholding of the principles I have mentioned. On the other hand, I was not elected a United States Senator to sell America short, or to hand over our pocketbook to those who denounce and seek to destroy the system which filled that pocketbook. I remember when the able Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, made the statement that he was not elected Prime Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. I am serving notice at this time that I was not elected a United States Senator to assist in liquidating the American form of government.

Unless the British Government, through the medium of the Prime Minister thereof, expressly and clearly disavows and renounces the position taken by Professor Laski, I cannot and will not support the making of the loan sought by that Government. I, for one, am sick and tired of doing things for other countries and other peoples and then having them come to our shores and try to undermine and ruin our form of government. I am in favor of making a loan to Great Britain on a practical basis, and will support it, but I will not support a loan when the head of the Labor Party, which is in control of the Government in England and who must have some responsibility and something to say about policies, comes to our shores and stands on the platform in one of our hotels and tells an American audience that our private enterprise system must go, that if it does not it will lead to slavery and serfdom, and that the only system worth while, and the system we must adopt, is a system of socialism or communism. I, for one, will not support it. The time has arrived when we must stop appeasing—when we must call a spade a spade. I sincerely hope that the Government of Great Britain will repudiate the statement which Professor Laski made in New York City earlier this week.

HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before addressing the Senate on the pending bill, I wish briefly to advert to another matter.

At the last call of the calendar, when we reached House bill 2716, dealing with the proposal to provide doctors and dentists for emergency attention to employees in the Federal agencies, the

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] objected to the passage of the bill by unanimous consent. They desired to have time to investigate it. They have reported to me that they have investigated the bill and that they have no objection to it.

Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that the bill is a rather simple routine measure, providing for the same type of medical service in Government agencies as is provided by practically all our great corporations, and even by the Senate of the United States. There were extended hearings in the House, and the American Medical Association representative approved the bill. The National Safety Council and the representatives of several large corporations also approved it. There were hearings before the Civil Service Committee, and there was no objection of any kind from any member of the committee.

The bill is in charge of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and I can assure the minority leader that there is no objection to it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator again identify the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. It is House bill 2716.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

Mr. WHITE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the bill was reported to the Senate with the approval of the entire membership of the Civil Service Committee?

Mr. DOWNEY. It has the approval of both the House and Senate committees.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The bill referred to by the Senator from California was reported by me from the Committee on Civil Service. I merely wish to explain to the Senate the present situation and my attitude on the bill.

So far as I am personally concerned, I am reasonably well satisfied with the bill. I was sufficiently satisfied not to object to its consideration the other day. However, since objection was made by the Senator from Mississippi, I have received vigorous objection from one of the State agencies, not to the general principles of the bill, but to some of its provisions, which it is believed were left in the bill through inadvertence. This morning I had a conference with some of the members of that agency. I do not fully agree with their apprehensions. Yet I must say in all fairness that there is some reason which would stimulate their apprehensions in the language of the bill. I can very easily understand how they could be misled by some of the language of the bill which, to say the least, is somewhat vague and indefinite.

I may say that one of the objections was in regard to the language of the bill on page 2, in respect to the question of the limitation of health activities which the Civil Service Commission would be authorized to go into. The language is as follows:

> The health services * * * shall be limited to (1) treatment on the job of minor illnesses and minor general conditions except in cases of emergency, or of injury or illness sustained while in the performance of the employee's duty in accordance with the act of September 7, 1916,

Objection was made that that flies directly in the face of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission's activities already set up by law and functioning.

I hesitate to bring up this matter at this time, because in regard to a subject so far reaching as this, I believe amendments should not be simply tacked on willy-nilly to a bill of this character. However, let me say this morning it was suggested that that sentence be changed so as to read:

> Treatment on the job of minor illnesses and minor dental conditions, together with emergency attention.

The object of that suggestion was to get away from any implication that the provision of the very limited service which we are hoping to set up in the departments would be enlarged to permanent treatment if a major emergency occurred while an employee was on the job. In other words, if an employee broke a leg while on the job, the emergency treatment would not be continued over a period of weeks or months by the department until the employee had recovered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator satisfied that with the amendment which he has just read, Senators who have previously objected to the bill are now content that it should be passed?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have had no conversation with the Senators who have objected, so I do not know. The Senator from California has discussed it with them, I believe.

Let me say to the Senator from Maine that in respect to this particular provision, the language I just read by way of amendment satisfies me, as an individual member. I am not prepared to make an all-out recommendation that it answers the purpose. I believe it does, but it has not been studied very carefully.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I repeat what I said a moment ago, namely, that if the members of the committee are a unit in support of the proposal, I do not feel inclined to object to it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say that I submitted this amendment to the Senator from California this morning; but no other member of the committee has seen it, so far as I know. I am not raising objection, because so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to go ahead with the bill. But I rather hesitate to face the other members of the committee with proposed amendments unless they have had an opportunity to examine them.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator need be apprehensive in that respect. In my own judgment, the bill is all right. If it is not, this change will make certain the accomplishment of what all of us in the committee favored. As chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I am very happy to accept the amendment which I understand the Senator is proposing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is a member of the committee. I am quite certain that he has not seen the amendment. He is one of the members of the committee who made inquiry of me at some length subsequent to the committee's recommendation of the bill. I certainly do not wish to take advantage of his situation. I have not even answered his inquiries in detail.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Iowa would prefer that the bill not be considered now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. From my own standpoint, I say that as an individual I would just as soon have the bill considered, because personally I am reasonably well satisfied with it. I believe it will accomplish the desired objective, provided this amendment is added to it, and also in view of the fact that there also is an amendment, proposed by the objectors to the bill, with respect to clause (4), on page 2. That clause reads as follows, including four words in the first proviso:

> Shall be limited to * * * (4) education and preventive programs relating to health, including the alleviation of health hazards in the working environment.

The objection raised to that—and it has been raised subsequent to the hour or two of hearings which were held on the bill—is that it tosses the Civil Service Commission directly into competition with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, which already has the duty of supervising, regulating, and changing health hazards and providing for their elimination, and that we are now setting up the Civil Service Commission with a duplicating power in the vast field of Government service. I think that is their objection. I am not prepared to say whether the objection is valid, because we have not gone into the matter.

Mr. BYRD. I referred to a letter which I received from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and I told the Senator about it and gave it to him. I was informed that a special study of the question had been made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator that the so-called exhaustive study which we made on the bill occurred under the following circumstances: The bill came up unexpectedly one day in the Civil Service Committee. The Member of the House of Representatives who had had charge of the bill in the House appeared before the committee, and for 30 or 40 minutes we discussed the provisions of the bill. From an over-all standpoint, I became convinced that the objectives of the bill were desirable, but

that it was somewhat detailed and complicated. Then we left the subject. The next morning some other members of the committee were present at the committee meeting, and the bill was again considered.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that he is in charge of the bill. It is his duty to present it and endeavor to secure its passage by the Senate. In whatever the Senator desires to do about the bill the chairman of the committee will be happy to acquiesce. It is agreeable to me to have the bill go back to the committee for further consideration if the Senator desires that course to be followed, or if he does not wish to have the bill considered today, I shall make no complaint.

I may say to the Senate that the bill is considered to be of rather imperative nature by Mr. RANDOLPH and the other members of the House committee and the persons who have appeared for it. But the obligation and responsibility are upon the distinguished Senator from Iowa. If he will now state to the chairman of the committee what he wishes to do in relation to the bill, the chairman of the committee will be very happy to acquiesce.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is my recollection that the Senator from California called up the bill this morning and asked unanimous consent to have it considered. If I am in charge of the bill, at least I did not call it up. I am merely attempting to give the Senate the benefit of the meager information which I have had on the bill, and I state that, so far as I am concerned, I shall vote for the bill with the amendment, hoping that the controversial matters can be ironed out in conference.

If the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, wishes to have the bill passed at this time, he may proceed to do so; that is up to him. As I have said, the Senator from California requested unanimous consent for consideration of the bill. If he wishes to have the Senate proceed with its consideration, I have no objection. I simply offer that suggestion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he has the letter from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission which I sent to him?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the chairman of the committee answer the questions which are propounded in the letter.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know whether the chairman of the committee has a copy of the letter.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if it is necessary to go into those details at the present time, the chairman of the committee is happy to do so. Since the bill was approved by the committee, communications have been received from the Public Health Service and from, I believe, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, both of whom made certain recommendations and suggestions in reference to the bill. I reviewed those matters with our attorneys and with the Civil Service Commission, as well as with Representative RANDOLPH, and we arrived at the conclusion that the bill, in its present form, is a proper bill. I likewise discussed the matter several times with the Senator from Iowa, and called up the bill only this morning after having consulted with the Senator and knowing that he was here in the Chamber.

The Senate committee has made certain amendments. It was agreed by Representative RANDOLPH and myself that if and when the Senate passes the bill and conferees are appointed on the part of the Senate, we will give representatives of the Public Health Service and the United States Employees Compensation Commission, as well as another group, the osteopaths, an opportunity to appear before the conferees and again state their position.

As I have already said, I do not wish to elaborate upon the argument, so far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, and so far as Representative RANDOLPH, who has made an extensive study of the matter, is concerned. However, we think the bill is entirely proper in its present form and, as I have already said, it was unanimously reported by the committee. The only objection I have heard is the one which was made on the Senate floor today.

Mr. President, I have a perfecting amendment relating to the definition of "physician." I should like to have the amendment read, and obtain unanimous consent to have it agreed to and incorporated in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, after "environment:", it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided*, That wherever the professional services of physicians are authorized to be utilized under this act, the definition of 'physician' contained in the act of September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, ch. 15, sec. 790), shall be applicable."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, all the amendment would do would be to incorporate in the bill the same definition of "physician" that has been used in prior statutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has the Senator given consideration to the letter from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission stating that this bill would duplicate existing facilities?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I did not receive a copy of the letter to which the Senator refers, but a representative of the Commission came in and discussed the matter with me.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Iowa should read the letter from the Commission and see what objection it has to the bill. The letter states that this bill would duplicate many of the facilities which are already in existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2716 to provide for health programs for Government employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from California if he has considered the letter from Mrs. Jewell W. Swofford, Chairman of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, which contains suggestions of a number of amendments to the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I can only restate to the distinguished Senator what I have already said. This bill was developed primarily under the leadership of Representative RANDOLPH of the House of Representatives and a committee of that body held extensive hearings in regard to the matter. A minor hearing was held before our committee, and I personally read from rather exhaustive hearings which had been held on the bill. When questions were raised by the Public Health Service and by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, I referred those issues to Representative RANDOLPH for discussion. He and I agreed that there was no necessity and no cause for any amendment being made to the bill, but that instead, the bill should be passed by Congress as reported from the committee. However, we agreed that if the Senate amended the bill and the bill went to conference, Representative RANDOLPH would see that the conferees would call before them representatives of the Public Health Service and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

I wish merely to make this statement and then, so far as this bill is concerned, I shall be through. If the procedure to which I have referred, and the statement which I have made are not satisfactory to the Senator from Virginia, I have no objection to his making an objection or having the bill recommitted to the committee for further investigation and study.

Mr. BYRD. I asked the Senator the question whether he had considered in detail the suggestions which were made by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have already answered the Senator twice. Yes; I have.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated that he talked with some Representative.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. I did not see the letter to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to read the letter. It is from Mrs. Jewell W. Swofford, the Chairman.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BYRD: In view of your interest in bringing about simplification of governmental procedures and the elimination of overlapping and duplication of functions in the Federal service, I wish to invite your attention to proposed legislation now pending on the calendar of the Senate, certain features of which I am constrained to believe may have escaped your notice at the time such legislation was reported from the

Committee on the Civil Service. I refer specifically to the bill (H. R. 2716) to provide for health programs for Government employees.

The report of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives upon this bill stated the legislation proposed therein would center in the Civil Service Commission "the responsibility for coordinating health services for all Federal agencies."

The report then outlines what is contemplated under the term "health services," as follows:

"(1) Treatment of minor illnesses and dental conditions.

"(2) Treatment of minor noncompensable injuries and diseases, with the objective of keeping employees at work.

"(3) Health examinations.

"(4) Referral of employees to private physicians.

"(5) Educational and preventative programs relating to health, including the alleviation of health hazards in the working environment."

In respect to objective (2) above it appears that the provisions of the bill are much broader than is indicated in the committee report. In fact, instead of limiting medical treatment to "minor noncompensable injuries and diseases," as the report states, the proposed legislation would seem to provide for treatment without limit in any case of injury within the purview of the Federal Workmen's Compensation Act of September 7, 1916. The bil provides that health services "shall be limited to (1) treatments on the job of minor illnesses and minor dental conditions except in cases of emergency or of injury or illness sustained while in the performance of duty in accordance with the act of September 7, 1916."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, first, let the chairman of the committee say that he is totally at variance with the extreme statements contained in the letter. I think that the language of the bill is guarded and sufficient, but perhaps the Senator from Virginia does not understand that the Senator from Iowa has suggested an amendment which I believe is satisfactory to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and which makes very clear what the Senator from Iowa thinks the bill means, and what the Senator from Virginia and myself think it means. So, if the bill contains the error to which reference has been made—and I do not believe that it does—the error can be cured by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to continue reading the letter:

It appears clear that the exception removes entirely the limitation which purportedly is intended to restrict such medical service to treatment of "minor illnesses." In other words, medical treatment in cases of occupational injuries could embrace any and all treatment required by the nature of the injury.

The Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, includes all necessary provisions for the medical care of civil employees of the United States who may suffer injury or illness caused by their employment. Such law provides that medical care will be provided through governmental facilities where practicable and it places upon the Compensation Commission responsibility for providing such medical care.

The enactment of the bill H. R. 2716 in its present form will invite confusion and probably give rise to conflict of jurisdiction in providing medical care for injured employees. It will bring another governmental agency, the Civil Service Commission, into a field of service now exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Compensation Commission for the Civil Service Commission would be made responsible "for coordinating the health services" which, as indicated, would include medical care of injured employees.

In respect to objective (5) above, the report of the House committee states the authority contemplated in the bill would include functions also within the statutory jurisdiction of the Compensation Commission; namely, accident prevention. The report states "alleviation of health hazards in the working environment" would include attention to such matters as "lighting, ventilation" * * * and "elimination or control of occupational hazards—for example gas and dust."

The functions illustrated by example are now being performed under specific statutory authority directing the Compensation Commission to make studies and investigations of the causes of injury (which includes disease) and to develop means for preventing them. Enactment of the bill H. R. 2716 with present provisions for development of safe working conditions will bring the Civil Service Commission into another new field and result in overlapping and duplication of the functions of the Compensation Commission with the inevitable resulting confusion, inefficiency, and waste of public funds.

The Compensation Commission can see no justification for retaining in the pending bill the specific provisions to which attention is directed, particularly in the light of the effect they would have. If it is deemed necessary to enact such legislation at this time it would seem prudent at least to perfect it so far as practicable and to eliminate any questionable features prior to enactment. Although it would seem that responsibility for supervising the establishment of essential health services in the Federal establishments and coordinating such health work might be placed more advantageously upon the Public Health Service rather than in an agency without facilities in the health field, this Commission does not oppose the pending measure or the administrative plan it contemplates. However, it does urge modification of the bill so the final legislative enactment will not create confusion or bring about duplication of effort and conflict of jurisdiction in the administration of the medical and accident-prevention provisions of the compensation law.

The Commission knowing of your efforts to eliminate such conditions as presently exist in the Federal administrative structure suggests for your consideration amendment of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on the Civil Service, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, beginning with the word "except," strike out the language which follows to the semicolon in line 13.

Page 2, line 16, strike out the word "preventive" and the language beginning with the word "including" in line 16 through the word "environment" in line 17.

The changes suggested above will not interfere with the purported objectives of the bill and in the opinion of the Commission will be in the public interest. I will be glad to discuss the proposed changes with you at your convenience if you so desire, or furnish any further information you may request.

Very truly yours,

MRS. JEWELL W. SWOFFORD,
Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator reserving the right to object?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. This bill has been on the calendar for some time. It has been reached on the calendar, and objection has been raised to it. It seems to me, if I may say so to the Senator from Virginia, that it ought not be taken up now with all of the confusion that seems to exist as to its present form and as to amendments which might be offered. So, unless the Senator from Virginia objects to its consideration, I feel that I should.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Maine. Amendments should be considered, and that would be very difficult to do now with but few Members of the Senate present. I think this is a vitally important bill. It apparently gives the Civil Service Commission jurisdiction of certain matters over which other administrative agencies have heretofore exercised control. Therefore, I object to consideration of the bill at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. As I have already said, the distinguished Senator from Iowa is in charge of this bill and has been since it was reported by the committee. I might suggest to him, in view of the circumstances which have arisen, that the wise thing to do would be to ask unanimous consent to recommit the bill to the Civil Service Committee for further hearing. Manifestly, if doubt is going to be expressed by members of the Civil Service Committee who were present at the hearings and voted to report the bill favorably, Senators who know nothing about it will be reluctant to support it. So I suggest to the Senator from Iowa the propriety of asking unanimous consent to recommit the bill to the Civil Service Committee for further hearings. He is in charge of the bill, and I do not desire to intrude upon what policy he may want to develop, but, as chairman of the committee, I make the suggestion to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, just a word to further clarify my position. I think I mentioned a moment ago that some of the objectors, who represent a large governmental agency that thinks its toes are being stepped on by this bill, were in my office this morning. They presented their objections and offered the suggestion which was contained in the letter read by the Senator from Virginia a moment ago. In one instance they wanted a very short statement to replace the rather verbose statement which is now in the bill. At that time they brought up the question of the confusing details of the bill which they thought should be changed. I said, "That fits pretty well into this bill. I am fairly well satisfied with it myself, but its language may seem confusing." I told them that I had reported the bill from the Civil Service Committee, and therefore would have charge of the bill on the floor of the Senate. I said further, "I will assure you that I myself shall not call up the bill for at least a few days, until we can go into this thing and see how these amendments will fit in, and I will consult the Senator from California, other members of the committee, and perhaps some Members of the House by telephone."

I came in this morning without any intention of calling this bill up today.

Since the Senator from California asked unanimous consent to have it considered I am not going to object to consideration of the bill because I am personally satisfied with it, but I believe there are others who are not, and it is an important piece of legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was not present during the hearings; I was present when the bill was reported. I think it a vitally important bill. I am entirely in favor of the objectives of the bill—I want that clearly understood—but to establish a new agency in the Civil Service Commission and to give it administrative functions which now belong to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, as it apparently does, is a question that should be carefully considered. I think it is an important subject, and as a member of the committee who was not present at the hearing, but who was present when the bill was ordered to be reported, I believe that the bill should be recommitted, not for the purpose of killing it but for arriving at a more thorough understanding of it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in view of the suggestion of the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, and in view of the statement of the Senator from Virginia, who is a member of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for the remainder of the afternoon. I wish to appear before the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, shortly before I concluded my address to the Senate yesterday on Senate bill 1415, the Federal pay bill, I had expressed the repeated opinion that of all of the great labor groups in the United States the Federal workers had been the least favorably dealt with. I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that while the cost of living index has gone up 33 points from January 1, 1944, to the present time, the basic increase of the Federal worker has gone up only about 16 percent. Indeed, I might say to Senators that, since in the last pay bill we gave the advantage to the workers in the lower brackets, some of the workers in the upper brackets have had less than a 9-percent increase in the last 5 years, and consequently their real wage or buying power has been cut some 24 or 25 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to his own report, where it says, at the bottom of page 2:

> With increase under the 1945 Pay Act, average straight-time annual earnings of Federal workers have increased only 21.3 percent.

That is in the report submitted by the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that is not a report made by the chairman of the committee except as reflecting certain testimony which was given before the committee; but taking that testimony at its full value, it does not in any way deny the validity of what I have just said. The basic increase in wages has been 15.9 percent. We speak of it roughly as 16 percent. Beyond that 16 percent, away back in 1942, we raised the minimum of custodial workers to $1,200 a year, and gave slight increases to some other workers. A very small fraction of the workers in the Federal service received that increase, and it did amount to an average of 1 percent, spread over the entire pay roll. About 25 percent, as a result of long-time service in the Government, some within-grade employments that can affect the total, average about 2½ percent. Because of the critical situation of the labor market, the Army and Navy were compelled to do some upgrading to a total extent of about 2 percent, spread over the whole pay roll.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. In just a moment. I have carefully examined the records of the Government, and I find 80 or 85 percent of the workers in the upper brackets are still receiving about the same basic pay they received in 1941. I think a worker who was getting $8,000 in 1941 is now getting $8,750. Consequently those workers have had about a 9-percent increase. They have not had any within-grade promotion; they have not had any upgrading. They did not benefit by the raising of the minimum. They are left here, at the end of 4 or 5 years of long, arduous work, with 25 percent less buying power than they had 4 years ago. It does not matter how one may quibble or deny that, that is the simple conclusion.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I to understand that the Senator does not agree with the report of his committee with respect to his own bill? As a matter of fact, here it is, in plain, unequivocal language—I will read it again:

> With the increase under the 1945 Pay Act, average straight-time annual earnings of Federal workers have increased only 21.3 percent.

Mr. President, that does not include any upgrading. That was fully brought out in the testimony, in which Mr. Flemming, representing the Civil Service Commission, said that no figure of upgrading was included; in fact, he indicated that he did not know how much upgrading there had been, that is, employees promoted from one grade to another involving an increase in salary and percentages on pay increases. That should be included.

The Senator said yesterday that the increase was only $5 a month. Evidently the Senator did not have before him the schedules. An employee who receives $2,000 now gets $100 a year in-grade increase every year, under the 1945 act. In other words, there is an automatic increase of $100 each year for a period of 6 years.

As the employee goes higher, the increase is greater. A $2,540 employee gets an automatic increase of $110; a $2,650 employee an increase of $110; a $2,880 employee an increase of $110 a year; a $3,310 employee, $110; a $3,640 employee, $110. That is an automatic increase every 12 months.

In the higher brackets, which increase every 18 months automatically, there is an increase as high as $210 a year, for the $4,300 employee, and the $5,180 employee gets $210 a year. I do not see how the Senator can repudiate and disclaim the fact that here is a report made by his own committee, on his own bill, and I assume he had some part in preparing it—which specifically and unequivocally states that straight-time annual earnings have increased since 1941, for Federal employees, by 21.3 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. First, Mr. President, let me categorically correct the Senator on one statement. The declarations I made about the time of within-grade employment, and the amount, had to do with the period before 1945, and if the Senator was on the floor of the Senate when I made the statement, he should have known it. What we were discussing was how much of a raise there was in the average straight-time earnings of Federal employees from 1941 to July 1945, and the statement I made had to do with that period of time.

As I stated on the floor at the same time, on July 1 we did liberalize the within grade employments as to amounts, and as to a decreasing time factor, and that is the figure the Senator has just given. But we have no way of judging yet the effect of those figures. We do know what was the effect of within-grade advancement from January 1, 1941, to July 1, 1945.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. We want to get the figures correct. The $60 a year to which the Senator refers, under the old law, was paid only in the lower brackets, but under the Senator's bill an employee getting $2,200 would get a $100 increase, just as he does now.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is exactly what I stated yesterday.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said $5 a month, and all he has to do is look at the record and see that he said it.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is $60 a year.

Mr. BYRD. It is not a hundred dollars a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. The hundred-dollar-a-year provision has existed only since July the 1st.

Mr. BYRD. I differ with the Senator. I have a statement here from the Civil Service Commission showing that an employee who, under the old law, received $2,200 a year, got an automatic in-grade promotion of $100 a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; but my statement about $5 a month, or $60 a year, was made with reference to workers getting less than $2,200. I stated that in the cate-

gories higher than that, the increase was greater, but in the categories under $2,200, it was $5 a month, or $60 a year. The period of time was 18 months.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated a little while ago that under the old law none of them got as much as $100.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I did not. I was talking about workers in the lower category.

Mr. President, let me also say that Mr. Bowles appeared before the Civil Service Committee, as did Mr. Flemming. Mr. Bowles, in making his calculation, computed it upon basic earnings, eliminating the factors of within-grade employment, premium promotions, and upgrading.

Another difference also appeared. Before Pearl Harbor the workers were working a 39-hour week. After Pearl Harbor they worked 40 hours, and Mr. Bowles gave weight to that factor of 2½-percent increase in the number of hours required of the workers, and Mr. Flemming did not.

Again, I state unequivocally that the Senator inadvertently has been guilty of a serious inaccuracy. The 5.3 percent which Mr. Flemming testified appears in the average earnings above the basic allowance does include upgrading. Mr. Flemming said he did not know how much to allocate to upgrading and how much to allocate to promotions, but that both factors appear in the 5.3-percent figure. They would have to appear because what has been done is this: The number of employees as of January 1 was taken, and their total compensation figured, and the average was struck. The same thing was done on July 1, 1945. By that means we know how much was the average increase in straight hourly earnings. That comes to 21.3 percent. Since then I have been able somewhat to refine the figures, and we find that that 5.3 percent is made up in this way: One percent because of the increase to the custodial employees; 2½ percent because of within-grade advancing, and about 2 percent or slightly less from what we call premium promotions or upgrading.

I might at this time pay a high compliment to the Army and Navy and to our Government agencies because the figures clearly indicate that during this critical war period upgrading in governmental agencies was kept down to 2 percent, while in private industry it reached 19 percent. I am not criticizing private industry for that. There was a great dearth of workers, and a man of a lower category could sell his services above his natural category, and industrialists, in order to get work done, in many cases, had to pay substantially above the common category or standards. The figures of both industry and employees indicate very clearly that upgrading in industry during the war raised wage compensation by 19 percent, and the figures are just as plain that in the Government the increase has been kept down to less than 2 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Civil Service Commission has repeatedly stated that it cannot give the number of upgradings. That is one thing that I, as one Member of the Senate, have been trying to obtain for a long time. The Commission is not even able to give a list of them. So exactly how the Commission can make an estimate of cost I do not see.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think that Mr. Flemming's testimony was crystal clear on that point.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator will not deny, however——

Mr. DOWNEY. May I finish, please? His testimony very clearly established that above the basic allowance the increase had comprehended about 5 percent-plus. Included in that 5 percent was within-grade employment, upgrading, promotions, premium promotions. Mr. Flemming stated in the hearing that he could not allocate those figures precisely among that 5.3 percent. But I might say to the distinguished Senator that since the hearing was concluded the Senator, I am sure, has received from the Civil Service Commission a letter which indicates that 1 percent of that raise was due to the custodial raise, and 2½ percent was due to within-grade employment, and the balance was due to upgrading or promotion.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not deny, does he, that the over-all increase amounts to 21.3 percent? No matter how it was made, salaries were increased to that extent. I think the Senator is wrong about including the upgrades, but I am unable to locate the testimony now. I will find it later.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall appreciate the Senator finding it so.

Mr. BYRD. Has the Senator a letter from the Civil Service Commission to the effect that the other grades are included in the 21 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. That the upgrading is included?

Mr. BYRD. The upgrading; I mean promoting employees from one grade to another grade. Where is that letter? Does the Senator have it?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that if an employee in the Government receives a promotion to an already existing position, that does not show in the upgrades, and it should not show in the upgrades. If one man were to leave the Government and another man were to come in and take his job——

Mr. BYRD. That is what I have been talking about. The Senator and I apparently have been talking about different things. I mean that the upgrading, the taking of a man from one position and putting him in another grade, is not included in the 21 percent. What is the Senator's opinion about that?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; all those things are included. Promotion is included. Where the promotions have not tended to raise the average, that is if the promotion of an employee did not raise the total average, it would not appear to the extent that there are more employees in the higher brackets.

Mr. BYRD. Let us take this case. Suppose a man is in grade 10, which now pays $3,970. He is put in grade 11 which pays $4,300. Does the Senator contend that that increase is included in the 21.3 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. If his being put in that grade made an extra man in that grade, one more than there was——

Mr. BYRD. I am not putting "ifs" into the question. The Senator stated that I was totally wrong when I stated that the upgrades were not included in this estimate. Did the Senator intend to say that when an employee is taken out of one grade and put into another grade at a $500 increase in salary, such increase is not calculated in the 21 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. It would be included, but let me say that if it did not increase what had been the existing number of workers at that salary it would not raise the average. It would be there, but it would not affect the average. If it brought an extra employee into a higher category it would appear.

Mr. BYRD. But the particular employee received an increase. That is the point I am making.

Mr. DOWNEY. He might receive an increase to take the place of a man who left the job, and if the other man left and he took his job at the same salary, and somebody took his job at the same salary, coming in from the outside some place, while the figures would be calculated in this problem, it would not raise the average.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but the employee who was promoted to a higher grade received an increase. That is what I contend.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot find in the testimony the exact statement at the moment, but it is quite definitely my recollection that Mr. Flemming testified, and repeated, and produced the figures, showing that in such a case as the Senator from Virginia referred to, that is an advance in salary, say, of $500 by promotion to another grade, that is not taken into consideration in the 21.3-percent increase. His explanation is, and I think there is some soundness to it, that that does not change the general over-all pay averages. It is not taken into consideration when we talk about a 21.3-percent increase. If it were, it would increase the 21.3 percent by a considerable amount. That is my recollection of the testimony.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I now want to demonstrate from figures how very minor is the effect of upgrading, particularly in the higher brackets. Our highest category of pay starts at $8,750 and goes to $10,000. On December 31, 1944, there were 1,134 such employees, a very small number in the higher brackets. By September 30 of this year the number had dropped to 1,021. In other words, in the last year we have materially reduced the number of men in the upper brackets of pay in the classified list. Of the 1,021 men only 120 were receiving $9,000; only 42 were receiving $9,275; only 13 were receiving $9,500; only 140 were receiving $9,800; and only 82 were receiving $10,000 and over, while at the bottom of the grade were the remainder of the 1,021 men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the

RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimates of employment subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by salary levels

Base rate July 1, 1945, Public Law 106	Number of employees, Dec. 31, 1944 (actual)	Percent of total		Estimated number of employees	
		At each level	Cumulative	Sept. 30, 1945	June 30, 1946
Total	1,221,272	100.00	100.00	1,100,000	860,000
$864.00	220	.02	.02	198	155
936.00	48	(1)	.02	43	34
1,008.00	2	(1)	.02	2	1
1,080.00	3	(1)	.02	3	2
1,152.00	8	(1)	.02	7	6
1,440.00	25,166	2.06	2.08	22,667	17,721
1,506.00	31,194	2.55	4.63	28,096	21,966
1,572.00	33,583	2.75	7.38	30,248	23,649
1,638.00	5,915	.48	7.86	5,328	4,165
1,704.00	228,736	18.73	26.59	206,023	161,072
1,770.00	31,951	2.62	29.21	28,778	22,499
1,836.00	8,164	.67	29.88	7,353	5,749
1,902.00	219,187	17.95	47.83	197,422	154,348
1,968.00	34,153	2.80	50.63	30,762	24,050
2,034.00	4,814	.39	51.02	4,336	3,390
2,100.00	128,227	10.50	61.52	115,494	90,295
2,166.00	55,323	4.53	66.05	49,829	38,958
2,232.00	8,523	.70	66.75	7,677	6,002
2,298.00	3,720	.30	67.05	3,351	2,620
2,320.00	76,601	6.27	73.32	68,995	53,941
2,364.00	14,853	1.22	74.54	13,378	10,459
2,430.00	12,374	1.01	75.55	11,145	8,714
2,496.00	1,479	.12	75.67	1,332	1,041
2,540.00	4,281	.35	76.02	3,856	3,015
2,562.00	211	.02	76.04	190	149
2,650.00	44,944	3.68	79.72	40,481	31,649
2,760.00	5,957	.49	80.21	5,365	4,195
2,870.00	2,245	.18	80.39	2,022	1,581
2,980.00	64,846	5.31	85.70	58,407	45,663
3,090.00	9,599	.79	86.49	8,646	6,760
3,200.00	2,560	.21	86.70	2,306	1,803
3,310.00	21,106	1.73	88.43	19,010	14,862
3,420.00	2,282	.19	88.62	2,055	1,607
3,530.00	927	.08	88.70	835	653
3,640.00	45,653	3.74	92.44	41,120	32,148
3,750.00	6,999	.57	93.01	6,304	4,929
3,860.00	2,028	.17	93.18	1,827	1,428
3,970.00	8,474	.69	93.87	7,633	5,967
4,080.00	1,636	.13	94.00	1,474	1,152
4,190.00	501	.04	94.04	451	353
4,300.00	20,641	2.51	96.55	27,598	21,577
4,410.00	116	.01	96.56	104	82
4,520.00	2,725	.22	96.78	2,454	1,919
4,630.00	85	(1)	96.78	77	60
4,740.00	1,161	.10	96.88	1,046	818
4,960.00	675	.06	96.94	608	475
5,180.00	17,233	1.41	98.35	15,522	12,135
5,390.00	2,215	.18	98.53	1,995	1,560
5,600.00	1,173	.10	98.63	1,057	826
5,810.00	707	.06	98.69	637	498
6,020.00	708	.06	98.75	638	499
6,230.00	7,812	.64	99.39	7,036	5,501
6,440.00	877	.07	99.46	790	618
6,650.00	606	.05	99.51	546	427
6,860.00	266	.02	99.53	240	187
7,070.00	360	.03	99.56	324	253
7,175.00	2,973	.24	99.80	2,678	2,093
7,437.50	343	.03	99.83	309	241
7,700.00	192	.02	99.85	173	135
7,962.50	87	(1)	99.85	78	61
8,225.00	248	.02	99.87	223	175
8,750.00	1,134	.10	99.97	1,021	798
9,012.50	133	.01	99.98	120	94
9,275.00	47	(1)	99.98	42	33
9,537.50	15	(1)	99.98	13	10
9,800.00	156	.01	99.99	140	110
10,000.00 and over	91	.01	100.00	82	64

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. The table clearly indicates that in the upper bracket the overwhelming proportion of employees—perhaps 75 or 80 percent—are at the lower limits of the bracket, and have been since the war started. Why have they been in the same position during the past 4 or 5 years? Because the Classification Act fixes the number of employees in a group and the amount of money they may be paid. Consequently, unless the Appropriations Committee and the Senate desire to appropriate the money to pay additional employees in any bracket, high or low, the bracket simply cannot be increased.

I believe that some light will be thrown on this subject by reading a letter from the Civil Service Commission which was written at the request of the Senator from Virginia, and which gives members of the committee the information which I have been stating, contrary to the statements of the Senator from Virginia on the floor of the Senate today. I understand that every member of the committee received such a letter. The letter is dated November 26, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR DOWNEY: At the hearings which were held in connection with S. 1415, Senator BYRD asked certain questions relative to advancements in salary from one grade to the next, and also relative to within-grade salary advancements.

It is impossible for the Commission to make an over-all study of the advancements from one grade to the next. Also, it is impossible for us to make a satisfactory study for any given agency or group of agencies. Such advancements do not necessarily have any effect on the average earnings in a given agency unless they result in placing a larger percentage of persons in the upper brackets.

I interpolate to say that that should be obvious to everyone—

Consequently, the only satisfactory kind of study would be to take case histories of individuals and indicate what their progress has been in the Federal service over a given period of time.

We believe, however, that such case histories do not necessarily have any bearing on the consideration of a bill such as S. 1415. If, for example, one person has come into the Federal service at a salary of $2,600 and has advanced to a salary of $5,600 while a second was hired initially at a salary of $5,600, certainly it would not be argued that the first person, because he had received salary increases within the Federal service, should not be given the benefit of any overall salary increases, while the second person who had been hired at $5,600 and had stayed at $5,600 should be given the benefit of such a salary increase.

We have, however, made an analysis of the within-grade salary advancement situation as of June 30, 1945. The results of this analysis are as follows:

An analysis of the salaries and grades of the Federal civilian employees in positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended (i. e., approximately 1,220,000 employees as of June 30, 1945) shows that, as of June 30, 1945, 71 percent were at the minimum pay rates of their grade, and 29 percent above base pay for a given grade; 8 percent were at the middle or higher in the grade; only 1.6 percent of all employees had reached the maximum. There has, of course, been a shift in these percentages as a result of the passage of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945. The reductions in force which are now taking place in the departments and agencies make it impossible, however, to determine the nature of these shifts.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me finish this observation.

This letter and the records conclusively show that the overwhelming proportion of Government employees are below the middle of their grade, and the great majority at the minimum of their grade. It would be hard to understand how there had been any undue within-grade promotions in view of those figures.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. That is easy to explain. These promotions are automatic. The employees have not served the required length of time. Prior to the last pay act promotions were given every 18 months. They are now received every 12 months. If an employee has just entered the service, he will be at the bottom of the grade until he has served for a sufficient length of time.

What the Senator has read confirms what the Senator from Virginia has stated, namely, that pay increases to employees by reason of upgrading, unless new positions are created, are not included in the 21 percent. If new positions are created, they are included. I know of some employees who have received increases of $3,000 by upgrading. If such an employee is placed in an existing position it may not be considered by the chairman of the committee as an increase in the total amount of salaries paid, but the particular employee benefits to that extent. That is exactly the statement which I made at the beginning, and which was challenged by the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know what is in the mind of the Senator from Virginia. I believe that the facts are crystal clear. The facts show that over the past 4 or 5 years there has been an average increase in straight-time earnings only of about 21.3 percent in the Government service. The distinguished Senator may reiterate to the contrary as long as he wishes, but he cannot convince me that the 5.3 percent does not include every possible kind of increase in the average earnings. If promotions tended to bring into the service a higher percentage in the upper categories, that would be reflected. If a promotion of one man were balanced by another man going out, or another man coming into the lower bracket, of course it would not show up.

Speaking as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, with some knowledge of the subject, I am satisfied, from the most careful examination of data, that what we roughly term "upgrading" in employment has been only 2 percent in governmental forces as compared with 19 percent in private industry. I am not criticizing private industry; but so far as I am concerned, I believe that governmental agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees, and the Civil Service Commission, have done an outstanding job in this respect.

I wish to advert to a statement which was made yesterday. If, as the distinguished Senator from Virginia has repeatedly said, we have an extreme, swollen bureaucracy, the primary responsibility rests on the Congress of the United States. For months every year subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees in both the House and Senate review, analyze, and determine figures. No new employees can be added

in either the upper categories or the lower categories unless the figures are carefully reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget and carefully considered by the Appropriations Committees. I know that on the floor of the Senate we must largely take the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. So far as I am personally concerned, I congratulate the members of the Appropriations Committees. I congratulate the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget. I believe that they have done an excellent job. But to get back to the issue here involved, if we have been so inefficient that we have allowed money for a swollen bureaucracy, and there are 200,000, 300,000, or 500,000 more employees in the Government than there should be, the responsibility rests upon Congress, the Appropriations Committees, the Bureau of the Budget, the President of the United States, and the heads of the departments.

To suggest that because we have been inefficient and neglectful some unfortunate clerk making $175 a month should not be allowed an advancement to bring him up to the index of the cost of living seems to me to be a harsh and oppressive suggestion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have found the testimony of Mr. Flemming with respect to whether the upgrade promotions are included in the 21 percent. His testimony on that point appears on page 14 of the hearings, as follows:

Senator BYRD. Certain individuals, of course, have got a larger percent of increase.

I meant the upgrade promotions.

Mr. Flemming then said:

Yes; but you must take a look at the over-all salary structure.

We have got to look at what is paid for a particular job. People have gone into and gone out of the jobs because of the high rate of turn-over.

So, although you can take individual cases and although you can show that an individual might have received advancements by being promoted, and might be earning more money now than he had received at the beginning, nevertheless, that does not affect the over-all average annual salary earning because the Government is paying the same salaries for the various jobs he has occupied.

In other words, this 21 percent I am using here for the Government and the better than 30-percent figure that Judge Collet uses for industry are absolutely comparable figures, and it does show what has happened to the salary structure of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Flemming, let me clarify this in my mind, if I can.

We have increased the average basic compensation slightly less than 16 percent.

Mr. FLEMMING. If you are talking about the base rate of pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. But you have increased the average compensation about 21 percent?

Mr. FLEMMING. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that differential of approximately 5 percent, does it not cover the situations or conditions that Senator BYRD is speaking about? That is, your within-grade promotions?

Mr. FLEMMING. That is right.

That was the testimony as to upgrade promotions. There is the evidence of Mr. Flemming that the upgrade promotions are not included in the figures for average increases in salaries, although the Senator was rather severe in his contradiction of me when I made that statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has confidence in at least two governmental agencies; perhaps more; I have no indication to the contrary. One is the Office of the Comptroller General and the other is the Bureau of the Budget. I shall undertake, before some time next week, to secure from each one of them a letter, and I venture the assertion that the letters will indicate the accuracy of what I have said on the floor of the Senate, namely, that any promotions which resulted in additional pay to an employee——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is not what the Senator said.

I made the statement that the upgrade promotions of an individual were not reflected in the average increased earnings, because of the fact—and naturally so—that when an employee is promoted to a job which already exists and which has been vacated by someone else, that is not an increase in the pay structure. The Senator challenged that statement and said it was not correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Oh, no, Mr. President; I totally agree with that. When one employee takes the place of another who has vacated a higher job, of course the average pay schedule is not affected—assuming, of course, that the man in the lower category has a successor who thereafter receives the same amount of pay which he was receiving. Again I state that the 5⅓-percent increase beyond any doubt includes every kind of upgrading, within-grade salary advancements, premium promotions, or whatever you please.

Mr. President, in addition to the issue which the distinguished Senator from Virginia and I have been so good-naturedly discussing on the floor of the Senate, we have had differences of opinions on some other issues. Inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Virginia wrote me a letter stating his position on those issues, and in some cases gave out public interviews to the press thereon, I should like now very briefly to advert to some of the other issues which have been matters of controversy between the distinguished Senator from Virginia and myself ever since I have been on the Civil Service Committee, and—I simply express this opinion—with almost every other member of the Civil Service Committee. The distinguished Senator from Virginia objected to reporting the bill at the time that action was taken, and he urged that he desired to have a further investigation made. Among other subjects, he was quite anxious to have investigated what we term regional discriminations in the payment of Federal employees. The chairman of the committee took the position that it was not proper or advisable for our committee to undertake, as a part of its consideration of this bill, the laborious and exhaustive task of investigating the possibility of regional wage discriminations throughout the United States; and I should like to have the Senators who now are in the Chamber know why the chairman of the committee took that position.

In the first place, on every pay bill which has been before the Civil Service Committee since I have been a member of it—perhaps for 4 years—this same issue has been very ably and persistently raised by the Senator from Virginia, and just as regularly almost every other member of the Civil Service Committee has expressed himself not only as disinterested in such an investigation but as opposed to regional wage discrimination. When I first came to the Senate of the United States, I was soon thereafter appointed a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. That issue came before that committee for discussion; and every Senator on the committee, including the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], expressed unequivocable opposition to regional wage discrimination, believing it to be totally unjust, impracticable, and impossible.

As a result of that discussion, I made an investigation. I found that many times in the House and Senate there had been weeks or months of investigation of a most complicated nature to determine the cost-of-living standard in Washington, Baltimore, New York, Alexandria, Richmond, or Winchester—wherever it might be—and that after the most careful study, almost everyone reached the conclusion that regional wage discrimination because of lower cost of living was not possible. So during the recent committee hearing when this question was raised, I interviewed almost every member of the committee on the subject and I found that almost every one of them, from wide experience with this issue, had made up his mind that regional wage discrimination was impolitic, impossible, and unjust. Mr. President, I continued my investigation, and I found that frequently in Congress during the past 30 years there have been long and laborious investigations on this subject, and always with the same finding of impracticability.

At one time district judges of the United States were paid varying salaries, based on where they were conducting their courts. After a hearing, the rule was changed in 1891. At some time in the 1920's another hearing was held and a complete report was made showing the impracticability of paying judges varying salaries at different places in the United States.

The most dramatic case rose under President Coolidge in 1924. Congress had increased the pay of the postal workers. The committee had at length considered the desirability of establishing regional wage awards according to the cost of living in the various areas of the United States. The committee almost unanimously had reported against

a provision for regional discriminations, and the bill was passed without containing it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what he means by "regional discriminations"? Those words contemplate the payment of salaries somewhat in accordance with the variation in living costs throughout the country.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator has more aptly stated the situation than I could, and if he desires to state his position in any further detail I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to state it except to say that the word "discrimination" used in this particular case may not be understood. Inasmuch as the bill is based on the cost of living, some consideration should be given to the varying costs of living which, as everyone will admit, prevail throughout the country. I never suggested any investigation which would delay consideration of the bill. All I asked for was an opportunity to bring witnesses before the committee. The chairman of the committee denied me that right. I shall discuss the situation later.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, President Coolidge vetoed the postal bill on several grounds. Apparently, the major reason was that the bill did not provide for a variation in the wages to be paid to postal workers according to the living standards in the various areas in which the employees were performing their work.

Thereupon an argument took place on the floor of the Senate preliminary to voting upon overriding the President's veto. The Senate failed to override the veto by, as I recall, one vote. The vote was in the proportion of almost two to one against President Coolidge on the question, but inasmuch as the two-thirds rule prevailed the veto message was sustained. However, a substantial majority of both Republicans and Democrats voted against the President on that particular issue.

I wish to read first from the remarks which were made at the time by one of the distinguished Republican Senators who spoke upon the subject. Senator Moses, speaking in the Sixty-sixth Congress, page 1127 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, stated:

> I am well aware, Mr. President, of the weight of the argument which may be advanced that there are living conditions in the great cities of the Union which are intolerable and which warrant a higher increase of pay to postal employees and Government employees generally in those centers above an increase which might be granted to postal employees or Government employees of any other character in a smaller community, but the committee in dealing with the whole question was confronted with certain alternatives, the first of which was proposed by the Post Office Department, namely, that we should set an arbitrary line, based upon the receipts of a given post office, above which line there should be large increases and below which line there should be small increases of salary. Necessarily, Mr. President, such a proposal carried with it a mere rule of thumb for dealing with the controverted question. Necessarily also, sir, on either side of the line thus set arbitrarily there would be great injustices and consequent confusion and demoralization in the Postal Service.
>
> We were confronted with another alternative, that we should set up a bureau in the Post Office Department which should constantly devote its time to figuring upon the index number of the cost of living in the various sections of the United States, with consequent and frequent readjustment of postal salaries based upon those computations. No one could forecast the number of clerks that would be so required; nobody could estimate the cost of maintaining such a bureau, but everybody could foresee that whenever such an adjustment of salaries took place there would be very great repining among those postal employees whose salaries were reduced and probably some feeling on the part of those whose salaries might be raised if their salaries should not be sufficiently raised.
>
> Then we came, Mr. President, to the alternative which the committee adopted, namely, of treating the Postal Service as a unit. We discovered that every other service in the executive departments which touches wide sections of the country and comes in contact with large bodies of our fellow citizens is treated as a unit. A customs inspector, for example, at Vanceboro, Maine, which is a mere railway junction point on the Canadian frontier, receives exactly the same salary as a customs inspector of the same grade working in New York City. An immigration officer stationed at the same point in Maine receives the same pay in his grade that the immigration officer receives in New York City, and the various officials of the Public Health Service scattered throughout the country receive identical pay in identical grades for identical classifications of work. We saw no reason why we should differentiate as between the Post Office Department and other executive departments of the Government, and we decided to treat the Postal Service as a unit and to make uniform increases in salary, though we well knew that in some instances salaries would be provided in excess of those paid for comparable employment by private employers, and in some instances salaries would be much larger in their purchasing power than the same salaries would be in the more populous centers of the country, but our whole feeling was that the increase in salaries granted by this bill proceeded upon an accurate differential among the various grades in the Postal Service, beginning with the laborers and going up to the higher executives, and that as a whole the increase in salaries was justifiable.

I have before me quotations from the remarks of several other Senators on the same subject. As I have already said, a large majority of both Republicans and Democrats voted to override the veto of President Coolidge.

I have before me a quotation from the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who spoke on the floor of the Senate at that time. He said:

> It is true that the President does talk about some other things in his veto message. It is quite true that he says something about differentials; but that is a part of his argument against the demand of the postal employees. He says that if the postal employees are anywhere underpaid we should find those centers in which the living costs are so high as to necessitate an increase in salaries. In other words, he argues for the principle of differentiation in salaries. The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads did not see fit to take that view of the matter. We very cheerfully recognize that there is a certain sense in which that suggestion, which was made to us, makes a strong appeal to prevailing and accepted business methods, but for other reasons we reject it; and so far as I am concerned I always will oppose the fixing of postal salaries upon that principle and for reasons that to my mind at least are sufficient.

It may be interesting to know how the Senators who are still Members of the Senate voted on the question of overriding the President's veto. The Senator from Georgia Mr. George, the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. Gerry, the Senator from Virginia Mr. Glass, former Senators Harrison and McNary, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. McKellar, former Senators Robinson, Sheppard, Walsh of Montana, Underwood, and many other Senators voted against President Coolidge in his contention. The only Senator who is now a Member of the Senate of the United States and voted to uphold the provision for regional wage variations was the distinguished Senator from Kansas Mr. Capper.

Mr. President, when I found that distinguished elder statesmen of my committee and of the Senate were thoroughly familiar with the issue, had grown up with it, and had formed fixed and conclusive opinions with reference to the impracticability of making variations in pay-roll compensation because of existing differences throughout the country in the cost of living, I was unwilling to consume months or weeks of the time of our committee in holding such an investigation as the one to which reference has been made.

Let us see how impracticable such a proposal is. Suppose a postal clerk in Buffalo carries identically the same amount of mail and works the same number of hours required of a worker in Omaha or Des Moines, Iowa. Does anyone think the distinguished statesmen from Nebraska or Iowa would consent that their postal workers be paid less for doing identically the same work as that being done elsewhere in the United States?

Would anyone want to pay a collector of internal revenue at Portland, Maine, if there is one there, a lesser sum for performing his duties if the amount of his collections and business were the same, than is paid in some other city in the United States?

In any event, Mr. President, let me say that, having found an overwhelming majority of my committee, after long years of consideration, with closed minds on this issue, having discussed it with many Senators and not finding one Senator favoring such a proposition except the Senator from Virginia, I concluded that in the press and pressure of Federal business my committee would be totally defenseless if we should spend weary weeks or weary months determining the relative cost of living at Alexandria and Washington, D. C., Baltimore, Chicago, Winchester, and Richmond, and then try to apportion salaries in conformity with the figures obtained. I reached the same conclusion arrived at by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the

then Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Moses, and other distinguished leaders of the Senate, that such a plan would never be accepted by Congress, and would be totally impracticable, and with a large majority of the committee with closed minds, I was unwilling to hold hearings on the subject.

Mr. President, I should like to take up another point at issue between the distinguished Senator from Virginia and myself—we have many—but he seems to have left the Chamber, and I do not desire to discuss the points in his absence.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, would the Senator care to yield while I make the point of no quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. I should be glad to have that done, but first let me make the statement that the majority leader suggested to me that for some reason which he did not reveal to me he desired an adjournment or recess at 2:30 o'clock today.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps we might move it up by half an hour on the majority leader, in his absence.

Mr. DOWNEY. While I value greatly the very high quality of the Senators who are listening, that very high quality is very much diluted by the lack of quantity, and I should very much prefer to try to find a larger attendance of the Senate upon which to exercise the privilege of setting forth the facts which I have. So it is satisfactory to me, if the distinguished Senator thinks it would be proper, to adjourn or recess.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think it would be very unbecoming of me to assume the right to suggest to the majority leader or other Senators on the other side what the procedure should be. I can appreciate that the Senator from California would like to have present the Senator from Virginia and many other Senators who are interested in the measure which is before the Senate. I think the alternative, however, between taking a recess and the Senator proceeding with his discussion in their absence, is to make the point of no quorum, and I feel constrained to leave the choice to the majority side.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be happy to make the choice if the distinguished minority leader will tell me what choice I should make. That is throwing the ball right back at him.

Mr. WHITE. If I indicated what choice the Senator should make, it would not be his choice.

Mr. DOWNEY. In that the distinguished minority leader is very much mistaken. I have been watching him for many years, and I have seen his wisdom and his universally good judgment, until almost always his judgment and his choice are my judgment and my choice, and I assure him that would apply to this case.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from California is most gracious, and in what he has said of me he simply impeaches his own judgment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before I myself then suggest a recess, unless one of our leaders comes on the floor, I might tell what is perhaps at this stage of the proceedings an appropriate story, and if there is one word used in the story which seems perhaps out of place on the Senate floor, I wish to say, first, that the Senate rules allow it, and second, I am only quoting a very distinguished man when I use this word.

Mr. Herndon, in his Life of Abraham Lincoln, says that at one time when Lincoln was campaigning for Congress he was at a small town, and went to the meeting hall. There were only two persons in the hall, one being Mr. Herndon, Lincoln's partner, the other a stranger. Mr. Lincoln looked, with his melancholy eyes, out over the dismal and vacant hall, then went down and shook hands with Mr. Herndon. He said, "Herndon, I know why you are here." Then, turning to the other gentleman he said, "But why in h—— are you here?" I know why the Senators present are here, namely, they are here to be attentive listeners, and I appreciate their presence.

Mr. President, I see our distinguished acting majority leader now in the Senate Chamber, so I shall not have to tell any more stories.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I understand the Senator does not desire to proceed further at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like very much to proceed, but I am making statements in reference to some of the Senators, and controversies I have with them, and I am very reluctant to proceed in their absence. I understand they are called to committee meetings.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the Senator from Virginia who is very much interested in the bill, and two other members of the Committee on Civil Service, the committee which reported the bill, the other two Senators being also very much interested in the bill, have to be at a very important meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. I have been so informed. Before our leader suggests a recess or an adjournment, I might advance proceedings in this way. I should like to call up and have read the amendment I have on the desk providing for the increase of congressional pay to $15,000. I might say that, coupled with that proposal, are two other proposals, but I desire only to submit to the Senate at this time—not to have voted on now, but merely to have read—the proposal so far as it concerns the increase of congressional salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum each.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to present at this time subdivision (a) of section 6, which has just been read.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator asking that we dispose of one of these amendments?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am merely calling the amendment up for reading. I shall seek a vote on it as soon as possible when the Senate is again in session and I can have the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, is the amendment the Senator is proposing the one which covers section 6 (a), (b), and (c)?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am merely proposing subdivision (a) of section 6. I shall later, perhaps, call up the other proposals.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it the Senator's intention to call it up for a vote first of all the amendments he intends to offer?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We will vote on subsection (a) of section 6 first, but the Senator does not propose that we vote on it today?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct. The distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] told me he would like to address the Senate for a few moments on the bill, so I shall continue until he arrives on the floor, which will be in a very few minutes.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to call to the attention of Senators a Gallup poll on the subject of pay raises. I know there are certain Senators, because they have told me, who are somewhat worried and distressed about voting in the Senate at this time on a controversial wage issue because of its effects or repercussions upon the wage controversy in the Nation generally. I cannot agree with the justice or logic of that view. I think that as Senators of the United States our duty is very clear—to decide what kind of a raise we think Federal employees ought to have, and to give it to them, even though it would not please certain labor leaders or certain industrial leaders. But I suppose to a certain extent every Member of Congress is justified in being affected by public opinion; indeed, it may be we should be here to reflect the will of the majority of our people. So in that connection I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the result of three or four Gallup polls which have been taken in the last few months, showing the opinion of the American people on the desirability of wage increases.

First, I want to say that Gallup polled the American people on the question whether it was their belief that workers should be given a 30-percent increase in their wages to balance the loss of overtime, and, as I recall, the result was 55 percent against and 45 percent in favor, with the overwhelming majority of businessmen, industrialists, and farmers opposed to the raise, and a very large proportion of the factory workers and union-labor workers favoring it.

Since that time Gallup has twice polled the American people on the desirability of raising wages by 15 percent, and on this subject there is an overwhelming popular approval, not only when counting all classes combined but when segregating the classes. Every class is overwhelmingly in favor of giving

American workers a 15-percent pay increase to balance the amount of money lost by the lack of continued overtime.

On the poll with respect to the question of a 15-percent wage increase the national vote was 64 percent in favor and 27 percent opposed. Professional and businessmen: 60 percent for and 33 percent against. White-collar workers: 66 percent for and 27 percent against. Farmers: 49 percent for and 38 percent against.

All manual workers, 71 percent for, and 19 percent against. Union members only, 83 percent for, 14 percent against.

Since the date of that poll Gallup has again polled the American people on a 15-percent and a 30-percent increase. The last vote on the question of the 15-percent increase was as follows: Favoring the 15-percent increase, 69 percent, opposed, 22 percent.

I desire to point out to my colleagues that a large majority of every group in the United States, based on their common experience and judgment and common sense, favored a 15-percent increase.

I further wish to point out to my colleagues that admittedly the factory and industrial groups have at the very least a 10-percent favorable margin over the Federal workers, and any group knowing the exact facts who favored 15 percent for industrial workers generally, by the same logic would have to favor a 25-percent increase for Federal workers.

In this connection I wish to say that several corporations have already given wage increases ranging from 15 percent to as high as 30 percent, and it is generally understood that practically every industry is willing to make at least some adjustment to the worker because of his loss of overtime pay.

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] desires to have me yield, I am glad to do so.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, first of all I wish to explain to the Senate that I have watched the progress of this bill very closely. It was not always possible for me to attend the hearings, but I attended a number of them, and I was also present whenever any vital committee discussions were held respecting this proposed legislation.

The present chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee has held that responsibility since Senator Bulow left the Senate. He has diligently pursued his task. He has treated the members of the committee with the utmost courtesy. He has held frequent hearings and has given the employees, their representatives, and others interested in the legislation many opportunities to present their views.

I desire to open my remarks on this bill, which I favor, by commending the chairman of our committee for his fairness, for his grasp of the subject of the subject, and for his uniform courtesy to everyone interested in the affairs of the civil service. At this particular juncture of our economic progress I think we are fortunate in having as the leader in this legislation the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. His knowledge of the economic situation, his grasp of the economics involved in this bill, his desire to make a contribution beyond the scope of the employees affected, is, in my judgment, very commendable.

Mr. President, the Senator states the case in support of this bill very effectively and very succinctly in a communication which I received from him a short time ago. He explains in that communication that Federal employees are now averaging in real purchasing power from 10 to 20 percent less than they received in the year 1941. He explains that this is true because their basic increase has averaged less than 16 percent, while the cost of living has increased from 30 to 36 percent. He explains additionally that since VJ-day almost all overtime in the departments and agencies of the Government has been eliminated, thereby reducing Federal wage costs approximately 25 percent. While this has resulted in a great saving to the Government, he goes on to explain it has left many Federal employees in desperate financial straits.

Mr. President, I know that to be true. I know that there are many Federal employees, particularly those in the lower brackets, who are seeking additional opportunities to augment their meager wages, who are engaging in work outside of that which they perform for the Government in order to make sufficient money to enable them to carry on.

The chairman then goes on to say that beyond the 25-percent saving accruing to the Government from the elimination of overtime, hundreds of thousands of employees have been discharged and are continuing to be discharged, thus further reducing the Federal expenditures.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] if it is the intention to have consideration of the pending bill go over from about 2:30 today until the first of next week? The reason I ask is that there is a very important meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee which begins at 2:30. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and I are on that committee, and it happens that we are three of the members of the Civil Service Committee who are vitally interested in the pending legislation. I will say in all sincerity that it is my opinion that the meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee, which begins at 2:30, is one which it is necessary for us to attend.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I knew that neither he nor the Senator from Virginia could be present after 2:30 this afternoon, and since we have certain differences of opinion I was reluctant to proceed in the absence of the Senators. But the Senator from New York now has the floor and he would like to proceed at this time. May I ask the Senator from Iowa if he would have any objection to the Senator from New York continuing his argument, and we will at least dispose of that much of our presentation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, neither would I have any right to object to the Senator from New York proceeding, nor would I have any disposition to try to circumscribe his presentation of the case. But I should like to ask whether it is the intention of the Senator from California to attempt to bring anything to final action today, that is by way of amendment or otherwise?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President. The Senator may be assured that I shall not call any matter to a vote, and I shall not make any further remarks unless called upon for information by some Senator. There will be no action taken this afternoon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, unfortunately I shall have to return to Indiana the early part of next week for a check up because of my recent automobile accident, and it is possible I may not be present to vote on the bill providing for an increase in Government employees' salaries. I wish to take this opportunity to say that I am in hearty accord with the bill, and if I could be present I would vote for it. I hope to obtain a pair with a Senator who is against the bill. I think it is a timely measure, I think Government employees are underpaid, and in my opinion this is a fine step in the right direction.

Mr. MEAD. As everyone understands, the bill provides an increase of 20 percent in the pay of the employees affected, except those in the legislative and judicial departments of the Government, where the increase averages 10 percent. The chairman of the committee explained very logically the reason for the difference between the 20-percent and the 10-percent increases.

Mr. President, I wish to generalize a little so far as my argument for the bill is concerned. The distinguished chairman of the committee has given us all the facts and details which in my judgment are necessary for us in arriving at a decision.

The situation in the city of Washington, particularly as it affects the employees in the lower brackets, is not only serious, but in some cases tragic. If anyone were to attempt to budget the meager salaries received by employees of the Federal Government, particularly those in the lower brackets, so as to meet the ordinary run of expenses which one has to meet in Washington, there is only one conclusion that any thought on that subject could bring to mind, and that is that the increase recommended by the Civil Service Committee of the Senate is modest and moderate, and not at all, in my judgment, subject to criticism. Employees of the Government in the lower brackets have a most difficult time providing shelter, food, and proper clothing, and meeting the ordinary necessary expenses of life. In my judgment

it is a bad example for the Government of the United States, the richest Government in all the world, a Government which can now with good grace extend liberal loans' running into billions of dollars, in order to rehabilitate other nations, and in many instances meet their pay rolls, to treat its own employees as they are being treated under present circumstances.

Mr. President, while some wages may under certain circumstances be too high, I never heard anyone justify such a complaint applying to wages in the Government service. While the theory of high wages can be advanced at this critical juncture of our country's history with good grace and economic soundness, this bill does not even approach the wage scale which might be called high wages. No large corporation in the United States has a wage scale which, in comparison with the wage scale set forth in this bill, can be used as an argument against the bill. The salaries being paid by the large corporations of the United States, while in many instances not large enough, are in nearly all cases in excess of the scale prescribed in the very modest proposal before the Senate.

I believe this is a time when we can with economic justification recommend this proposal, and recommend generally higher wages throughout the United States. Many thousands of employees in the lower brackets are leaving the Government service for better opportunities. They are employees who are trained and skilled in their work. If we can prevent costly turn-overs, which contribute very largely to the inefficiency of Government, we can save more money than the sum set forth in the statement given to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Not only are employees in the lower brackets in desperate need; not only are employees in the lower brackets leaving their positions, but employees in the higher brackets as well are leaving. They, too, find it difficult to make both ends meet. Many leaders in the executive departments of the Government have informed my colleagues and me that the difficulty which besets them, the reason why they are unable to meet the standard of efficiency required of them, is that they cannot keep the necessary personnel. Every day when we pick up the newspapers we find that men are leaving the Government service and going into private enterprise, receiving $25,000, $50,000, $75,000, and even $100,000 a year. Men who have established themselves in the Government because of their ability as executives have made as much of a sacrifice as they can make. In need of financial help, they have left the Government and gone to work for private enterprise.

It is a serious state of affairs when the Government of the United States finds itself in that situation at a time when an efficient government is a vital necessity. Our Government must meet the most complex problems in all its history; and upon the solution of those problems will depend the prosperity of the organizations and institutions which are taking men and women away from the Government. We are losing men who are skilled, trained, and experienced, because of the fact that they cannot live under existing conditions as laid down for them under the Federal wage schedule.

So, Mr. President, this bill which has been considered by the Senate Committee on Civil Service comes before the Senate at an appropriate time. I regret exceedingly that we must delay action on this Friday afternoon, with the Christmas vacation looming in the near future. I regret that we shall have to put it off until Monday. When Monday comes there will still be meetings of committees which take Members of the Senate from us today. It seems to me that we ought to proceed with the consideration of the bill. We ought to discuss it on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. It is of vital importance. If we are to take a recess until Monday, I hope that will be the last delay until a decision is reached by the Senate and the bill is passed.

Mr. President, wage legislation is a very wholesome and constructive subject for the Senate to discuss. There is more in this subject than appears upon the surface. The determination which we now make, both so far as the Government is concerned and so far as private enterprise is concerned, will either hurry the day when we shall enjoy widespread prosperity which will be prolonged and enduring, or will hasten the time when the history following the last war will be repeated. We shall either augment the buying power of the Nation, which has seriously suffered as a result of curtailments following war production, or we shall drift into a very serious economic struggle which may precipitate another depression.

So, Mr. President, with a full realization of the seriousness of this problem, its effect upon the employees of the Government, its effect upon the efficiency of the Government, and its effect upon the economy of the country, I hope that we may begin on Monday to take up the bill section by section, until such time as we arrive at a determination, and I trust that the determination reached will be one favorable to the bill.

I wish to commend the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee for bringing the bill before the Senate, and for the fine explanation he has made of it. I hope he will continue his militant advocacy of the bill until it is passed, and that it will be passed at an early date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had intended to say more about the pending bill, but I shall reserve any further statement for a later opportunity. I wish to speak briefly about the housing situation, unless some other Senator wishes to discuss the pending bill.

Housing is linked with the issue of Government salaries, because unless adequate housing is provided in the District of Columbia additional financial burdens will be imposed upon the employees affected by the pending measure.

The housing situation is very serious. It is growing more serious from day to day. The tragedy of it all is that those of us who have been here during the past 4 or 5 years have had opportunities to secure pleasant, clean, sanitary housing accommodations. But apparently there are no more houses to be had. The existing housing accommodations are filled, and they have been filled for the past year or two.

Mr. President, who is it that is now coming home to look for a place to live? It is the boy who answered the call to arms, the boy who left his home, vacated the premises, and went away to do battle for his country. He is the man who now is here looking for the realization of the dream of his fox-hole days—a job and a home. There is a possibility of his getting a job; but, Mr. President, I do not know how long it will take him to find a home. From experiences which come to mind, it seems to me he will find it a most difficult problem and one which will require a prolonged period of time.

I hold in my hand an article which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday. The heading of the article really tells the story. It is this: "Housing toughest problem veteran faces; expert describes situation as 'explosive.'"

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION TO PROVIDE HOUSING FOR SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES—JOINT RESOLUTION REPORTED

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at this time I am delighted to report Senate Joint Resolution 122, to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of

providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and I submit a report (No. 839) thereon.

The joint resolution authorizes an additional appropriation of $160,000,000 for the purpose of moving houses now in the United States from places where they are not needed to places where they are now needed for the use of ex-servicemen. I think the Senate realizes that 3,000,000 of our men have been discharged from the service since VJ-day. The Army and the Navy expect to discharge 10,000,000 more by the end of 1946. A great many of those who were in the service either were married just before they entered the service or were married while they were in the service or will be married immediately after they leave the service. That situation causes in the United States a tremendous housing problem the like of which we have never faced before, due to the fact that during the war we were able to build only a few houses for the civilian population. So this measure is reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for permitting me to interrupt his remarks at this time.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it was a pleasure to yield to my distinguished and able colleague, and I congratulate him and the Committee on Education and Labor for the expeditious manner in which they have considered and reported the joint resolution. I introduced it some time ago; and, as has been so well explained, it will permit the Federal Housing Authority to move family housing units from places where they were vitally necessary during the war to places where they are vitally necessary now in the postwar period. Passage of the joint resolution will help a great deal in relieving the housing shortage.

I also trust that the Congress will be very quick to pass the permanent housing measure which has been introduced by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] in conjunction with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. That bill, known as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which now is receiving consideration, will supplement the temporary housing program, in that it will provide a permanent housing program which the country needs very badly. However, Mr. President, the joint resolution will provide an interim program, and it will permit the moving of family housing units from places where they were originally constructed to places where the present need is obvious.

Mr. President, at the time I yielded to the Senator from South Carolina I was reading from an article appearing in the Washington Post of yesterday. The article is by Sam Stavisky, the Post's veterans editor. The article reads in part as follows:

HOUSING TOUGHEST PROBLEM VETERAN FACES; EXPERT DESCRIBES SITUATION AS "EXPLOSIVE"—125,000 MEN DUE BACK SOON, MANY SEEKING QUARTERS

(By Sam Stavisky)

When it comes to housing the veteran coming "home" to Washington is strictly in the dog house.

With demobilization speeding up daily, with 125,000 GI's due back to the District, the situation is fast becoming critical.

Mr. President, "critical" is not a strong enough word.

I now read further from the article:

One housing expert makes no bones about the worsening situation. He frankly describes it as "explosive."

Unquestionably, shelter is the toughest problem facing the returning veteran here. Not even the matter of making a livelihood is as imminent to the GI who's coming back to be reunited with his family.

NO TIME TO LOOK FOR JOB

Pfc Frank Beuchert, Jr., was discharged at Fort Meade last Sunday. He was overseas 2 years, and now desperately wants to be back with his wife and two children "so we can be a real family again."

But as it stands, Frank and one of the children must live with an aunt at 764 Rock Creek Church Road NW., while his wife, Mary Jane, and the other child must live with his family at 712 Somerset Place NW. He doesn't even have the time to look for a job.

"We'll just have to eat our savings," Frank says. "I just couldn't concentrate on a job until we find a place to live together."

Scores of District of Columbia families are separated over wider areas.

"I've returned here to my job, and I'm staying in one room while my wife and son are living with relations 265 miles away," writes A. E. Fulford, 638 Park Road NW.

"Being separated for three long years was hard enough, but when you can't live with your family as a civilian, certainly something ought to be done about it."

Mr. President, that is a tragic situation.

The article continues, as follows:

WHAT'S BEING DONE

Just what is being done about it here?

The War Housing Center is currently placing 500 to 600 veterans and their families in apartments or houses monthly, or about one quarter of the 2,000 veteran applications made last month.

Altogether, there's a backlog of 3,000 applications from veterans in search of homes.

Mr. President, if we were to summon the Congress to remain in session day and night without any recess whatsoever, we should hardly be beginning to make the sacrifice which these boys have made over and over again—these boys who are looking for homes, but who will not find homes until the program to provide temporary homes and the program to provide permanent homes are fully and completely enacted. So I hope that before the Christmas recess is taken, the Senate, at least, will enact both the measures for the temporary housing program and the permanent housing program.

Mr. President, the housing situation for veterans is no longer merely a problem. It has reached the stage of an acute national emergency. Emergency action on the part of the Federal Government is required.

The veterans' housing need is the product of no one's imagination. Make no mistake about it, the Nation's housing shortage exists not only in our major cities, but hundreds of smaller communities are in dire need.

The situation is so desperate that the emergency can no longer be passed off as a community responsibility. Thousands of men from battle fronts half way around the world are tramping the streets in search of any place in which to rejoin their families and resume a normal life.

We all know that our servicemen have wanted two things above all else upon their return, namely, a job and home. But a job without a place to live is not much to come back to.

Foreseeing the danger of present conditions, Congress last June amended the Lanham Act by adding title V to make provision for some degree of relief for these veterans until such time as the resumption of residential building can provide the real answer to the Nation's housing shortage by adding thousands of new dwellings to the permanent housing supply.

Generally, States and municipalities have thus far failed to take steps to meet the situation.

Title V of the Lanham Act, among other things, provided for:

First. Veterans and their families to be given preference in any vacant federally owned war housing.

Second. The removal of temporary war housing which becomes vacant as the result of out-migration from war centers to congested areas for the use of veterans.

Third. Construction of new temporary housing for veterans and their families where the need clearly existed.

The National Housing Agency has carried out this policy to the limit of its powers. It has established regulations giving veterans and their families occupancy preference in all federally owned war housing, and has frozen the disposal of any movable war housing units except to house veterans and families of men still in service.

It has made available temporary housing, including trailers, to communities, colleges, and universities for the use of student veterans returning to school under the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights. It has urged both community and State officials to give wide publicity to the plight of the veteran to the end that any part of the private housing supply becoming available through turnover be reserved for veterans.

Communities have been urged to, and have been aided in, establishing or expanding local referral housing services for veterans. Mayors have been asked to appoint emergency committees on housing.

Under title V of the Lanham Act, Congress made available any funds available under title I thereof. Title I authorized the appropriation of $1,500,000,000 to carry out the purposes of that title; $1,464,313,000 has been appropriated to carry out the purposes of title I. All of the funds appropriated for those purposes have been expended except for

$74,355,000 of the appropriation, which was rescinded. At the present time there are no funds available for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I or title V of the act, and the only remaining authorization is an authorization for the appropriation of $35,627,000 to carry out the provisions of those titles. Accordingly, I submitted a joint resolution to increase the existing authorization from $35,627,000 to $195,627,000, in order that the National Housing Agency may carry out the provisions of title V of the Lanham Act in the present emergency.

Mr. President, the authorization has been approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, and the report of that committee has been made to the Senate by the able junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If the measure is adopted by the Congress it will then be possible for us to include in the pending deficiency bill, either in the committee or when it comes before the Senate for consideration, the additional money which will be required.

No new temporary construction is contemplated with this money. It will be devoted to supplying ultimately 100,000 temporary dwelling units to communities and educational institutions for the relief of veterans.

Some 75,000 of these family units, which will be taken apart or panelized and moved from their present sites to the areas of need, will come from the temporary housing erected for war workers.

Mr. President, these buildings were constructed under the direction of the Federal Housing Authority for use as family dwellings. They were fully equipped for the purposes for which they were constructed. For the most part they were clean, sanitary, pleasant, wholesome and attractive, even though they were not so large or so spacious as they should have been. However, they were built for the use of family units. They proved to be very effective during the war. I would not wish to see our veterans or anyone else living permanently in small homes of this type, but I would prefer to see them living in this type of family dwelling than to be called upon to live in barracks buildings where many of them have already lived for a long period of time, or in what might be called temporary shelters. I believe Mr. President, that these buildings will augment our present supply, and will provide better home surroundings than will the barracks type or domiciliary type which might otherwise be supplied.

It is anticipated that the remaining 25,000 family units will be provided through conversion of dormitories and barracks into family housing accommodations. That will be done under the direction of the Federal Housing Administration. It has the experience and the know-how in connection with using material and equipment, such as light, heating, and plumbing now located in the barracks and dormitories which will be razed for the purpose of constructing small family units. Those family units will resemble the temporary units which were used by the war workers.

Heretofore, the cost of removing temporary housing and re-erecting on new sites has had to be borne by communities or colleges. But in most instances communities and colleges either do not have the funds or cannot legally expend money for such a purpose.

I also propose amending the Lanham Act so as to make it possible to utilize temporary and other structures and facilities which are surplus to the needs of Federal agencies.

At the present time it is not possible to utilize fully the existing structures because of the provisions of the law which requires that a payment be made when structures are to be transferred from other Federal agencies to the National Housing Agency to be moved off the site and converted to housing at another place. The purpose of this amendment is to meet this problem by authorizing Federal agencies to transfer surplus properties to the National Housing Administrator for conversion of those properties to meet housing needs of servicemen, and to provide that such arrangements may be made without reimbursement for the cost or value of the structures to be transferred.

Mr. President, a great many camp and cantonment facilities are now under the control of the Army and the Navy. Our Senate committee, in investigating the war effort, has been diligent in attempting to bring about very quick and speedy distribution of those surpluses which may be found in camps and cantonments, and which are no longer necessary to the war effort. We believe that if those camp and cantonment facilities are quickly declared surplus, and if the building material, such as roofing, sash and doors, as well as all necessary lighting, heating, and plumbing equipment, is declared surplus and placed on the market, a very necessary need will be supplied. With other available materials, private enterprise will be enabled once again quickly to go into the business of building homes for our people.

Heretofore the Federal Government has been unable to give financial assistance to communities and institutions in moving temporary housing. Under the authorization now sought, the Government will be able to pay the cost of moving and re-erection of the housing, and the municipalities and institutions will provide the sites and connect the utilities.

While the relief which this legislation will provide can take care of some of the most acute need, it will by no means completely solve the problem. It has been estimated by the National Housing Agency that 1,200,000 American families were living "doubled up" on September 30, 1945. Preliminary estimates show that another 2,000,000 families must double up by December 31, 1946, unless there is a far greater volume of new construction than now seems possible.

These figures include returning veterans. Specifically the NHA has estimated that 1,600,000 married veterans discharged by December 31, 1946, whose families now live with friends or relatives or in nonhousekeeping quarters, will not have established homes to which to return. It was further estimated that 1,300,000 single veterans will get married by December 31, 1946. That makes a total of 2,900,000 married veterans without established homes.

Mr. President, that is a very serious situation, a very serious problem, one which we cannot postpone very much longer.

Rough estimates indicate that some 800,000 of these veterans will share living space with others voluntarily, or not be in the market for homes, and that possibly a million veteran families can be taken care of in existing vacancies in private and public housing through the release of quarters by war workers and the normal dissolution of families. Those are very liberal figures, I should say. It has been estimated, too, that perhaps as many as 475,000 units of new housing may be completed by December 31, 1946.

With all these favorable figures there will still be 1,110,000 veterans' families to find accommodations in the presently occupied housing supply. They simply cannot do it. The room does not exist. This is not a very encouraging outlook, but is a challenge which we cannot ignore.

So much for the present emergency. I urge quick action for obvious reasons. We owe a debt to the veterans who fought our battles. They were taken from their homes, called upon to live in tents and barracks, and they are entitled to pleasant, healthful homes, and we should see to it that they are provided for them.

There are also hundreds of thousands of other citizens of this country in need of decent homes. There are families living in substandard housing and in slums. Certainly the time has come when we should deal with that problem from a long-range point of view.

Fortunately there is before the Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal, to attack, for the first time, all phases of the problem, and to provide for that unified approach which is necessary for its successful solution. The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is an all-out attack, one which will point to a proper solution of the problem. It is the General Housing Act of 1945, on which hearings are presently being held before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, I wish that bill could be passed today. I wish we could start the construction contemplated tomorrow. I wish it was the housing contemplated in that bill that we were preparing for our veterans by virtue of the joint resolution which has just been reported by the Committee on Education and Labor. But it will take time not only for the passage of the bill through the Congress, it will take time to assemble the necessary critical materials, prepare the plans, and make other necessary provisions.

Mr. President, I hope the bill will be enacted speedily, and I know that thereafter it will be administered rapidly.

We are taking a step in the right direction by the enactment of the permanent housing bill. Under the provisions of that bill private enterprise will be given assistance to do as much of the postwar housing job as possible, a job estimated at more than a million homes a year for the next two decades. Private enterprise will be encouraged to build for the great mass or middle market, made up of families of moderate incomes.

Cities would be aided in clearing their blighted areas and assembling land for redevelopment at an economic cost. For the lowest income group, the low-rent, public-housing program is expanded. The bill should be passed before we recess for the holidays.

We need all these provisions in order to move forward on the long-term housing job ahead. Surely for a Nation which made such a record as ours in war the job is not too big. All we need is to tackle it in the same spirit in which we went to war, and we will move forward toward the goal of a decent home for every American family.

Mr. President, there is increasing activity along this line, both in the Congress and in the country at large. In my own State, the State and municipal housing authorities are taking renewed interest in the subject. Recently the State housing authority visited Washington, and, with the assistance of Members of the congressional delegation and the departments, including the Federal Housing Authority, made arrangement for the utilization of barracks buildings and similar shelters as an emergency method of taking care of the returning veterans.

I regret that a program of that kind is essential. I had hoped that barracks facilities, the lumber, the roofing, all the lighting, heating, and plumbing fixtures would in large quantities be placed upon the market so that the Federal Housing Authority or private enterprise could, by adding other materials, begin quickly to build temporary family housing units for the veterans. Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is indicated that an emergency is at hand when State and local housing authorities are seeking for materials of this particular type with which to build houses of the kind I have mentioned.

I would favor the immediate inventory of all the building materials and supplies in Army and Navy depots, the immediate surplusing of all the facilities in camps and cantonments no longer required by the Army, and placing them all on the market, so that in one great drive private enterprise and public authorities could build decent, clean, wholesome, sanitary homes for the returning veterans. We could augment that by the program which is embodied in my resolution, by removing temporary housing projects, built for war workers, from areas where they are to be found, to areas of great need, in many instances adjacent to our communities, particularly our cities. Of course, the activity is not altogether confined to the cities. There are many small communities which need housing very badly.

Mr. President, we should move rapidly in the direction of utilizing all the surplus material that is now held by the military and of relocating temporary family units, and we should promptly enact the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. Then, with all the energy at our command, we could begin to approach the time when there would be opportunity for every family in America to live in some kind of a house, and from there on we could improve the situation until—and I hope it will not take many years—it could be said to the world that citizenship in the United States carries with it the right to live in a decent, wholesome, healthy, sanitary home.

Mr. President, I hope that in the emergency we all realize is upon us, and upon us in a most dramatic way, by reason of the fact that we are unable to find lodgement for the men who have returned from the fox holes, the pup tents, the barracks, and the battlegrounds—we will with renewed vigor and firm determination make it one of the great objectives of our congressional program to provide as quickly as possible suitable homes, a sufficiency of homes, and a sufficiency of good homes, for the people of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who is chairman of the committee which bears his name, the Mead committee, formerly the Truman committee, has stressed the importance of and the emergency situation relating to housing. I wish to say that I do not think there is a State in the Union with a more acute problem than the State of California in this regard. Not only has California a terrific shortage of homes but also a very large number of servicemen coming back without a place in which to live. The building materials held by the War and Navy Departments, which the junior Senator from New York mentioned, I think furnish one of the most immediate sources of building supplies, and I wish to join with him in stressing the urgency of the situation upon the War and Navy Departments.

Some time ago I communicated with both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and asked for information specifically giving facts as to the amount of building material available in the Army and Navy depots and the amount that could be released. I also requested that they furnish the committee information as to the amount of building material which is on shipboard in the Pacific, because I have been informed that there was a considerable amount of building material at Okinawa and in the harbors of Japan.

Mr. President, I think as a matter of national urgency the War and Navy Departments, without being pressed by Members of the Senate or by the Mead committee, or by other committees of the Congress, should of their own volition recognize the importance of the situation and declare that material, or a large part of it, surplus.

As a specific example, I found that the Navy had at Port Hueneme in California and at Tacoma, about 97,000,000 feet of lumber, but when they proceeded with their explanations as to where that material would have to be used they finally got down to a point where less than 5 percent of that large amount was to be made available to the civilian economy.

Mr. President, it is true that under the procedures we have set up for the disposal of surplus materials, if a particular branch of the Government cannot use the material itself, it notifies other branches of the Government, and in this particular case, after the Navy put aside the amount of lumber they felt they needed, they notified the Army, and the Army declared they needed a certain amount of additional lumber, and the point was finally reached where about 20,000,000 feet were left. Then it was said that new requests were coming in from both the War and Navy Departments which would result in using up even that amount which might otherwise be available to the civilian economy.

Mr. President, I think the crux of the situation is this: During the wartime period, very rightfully and very properly, the civilian economy had to give way in priorities to the armed services, but now that the war is over I think that those who are doing the planning in the War and Navy Departments must realize that there is an urgent situation in the reconversion process, and they themselves must readjust their sights and must determine that the civilian economy should now have some priorities.

I have no doubt whatever that the Army and Navy can make reasonable explanations as to why the supplies which are available in the various Army and Navy depots should be used by the services themselves. But I think they should reexamine the whole problem, and certainly the Congress of the United States should reexamine it and should determine that certain of these materials should be put aside and the civilian requirements given a priority.

That same situation exists at Lathrop where there is a large amount of supplies in the way of pipe, conduits, soil pipe, caterpillar tractors, and so on, which are urgently needed. In the woods of Oregon and Washington these caterpillar tractors are needed by the lumber industry, which desires to help relieve the housing situation.

I wish to join the junior Senator from New York in saying to the War and Navy Departments that this is not a matter which should be put off for 1 week or 1 month or 6 months. It is a matter which they should take up immediately.

THE PRESIDENT'S LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the President's Labor-Management Committee adjourned November 30. Although it is too early to appraise the results of its deliberations, I am inclined to feel that much good has been accomplished, particularly in identifying the areas of agreement and disagreement. It is greatly to be hoped that the future meetings which the conferees provided for

will further reduce and clarify the remaining points of difference.

There was one point of agreement which was especially gratifying to me. It relates to the National Labor Relations Board. I am sure it will be of interest to other Senators. As reported by the New York Times on December 1, in separate reports, committees representing the labor and management delegations reported to the conference. Labor reported as follows:

Labor is of the opinion that industrial relations will be best promoted and the functions of the National Labor Relations Board will be best performed if that agency remains an independent body.

Labor believes that industrial strife can be lessened by prompt disposition of representation cases.

To that end labor urges adequate financial provision for the performance of these duties of the National Labor Relations Board.

Management reported as follows:

To the end that the National Labor Relations Board may be enabled best to perform its functions in the prompt and impartial determination of representation questions, the Board should remain as an independent agency and should be provided with adequate appropriations.

There was disagreement on other aspects of the subject under consideration, but on these two points there was obvious unanimity. Both reports say the same thing about the National Labor Relations Board, although they use slightly different language. It is perfectly clear that the authorized spokesmen for both labor and management have agreed that the National Labor Relations Board should remain an independent agency and should be provided with adequate funds to discharge the heavy responsibilities imposed upon it by Congress.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CURRENT REVENUE ACT OF 1945"

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 105, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED, containing an analysis of the current Revenue Act of 1945, entitled "Questions and Answers on the Revenue Act of 1945," be printed as a House document; and that 42,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 30,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 10,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is a concurrent resolution coming over from the House, providing for the printing of additional copies of a House document. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution. The motion was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of its business today the Senate may stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DELAY IN RETURNING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on my return to the office today I found a Christmas greeting which had come from Hawaii. There appeared upon it the following in print:

There's a certain charm to old things
Never found in something new,
Which is why this Christmas greeting
Brings the old, old wish to you!
Merry Christmas.

Written in ink on the back of the greeting there appear the following words which have caused me to rise at this time.

Are you having a merry Christmas this year? Senator, ours is quite miserable, thanks for your lack of action on the matter closest to our hearts. A very large number of us, plus our families, are keenly disappointed in you gentlemen of Capitol Hill. You may not like the consequences. Our slogan here is: "No boats—no votes." Get the troops home.

Respectfully,

FROM A GI IN THE PACIFIC.

I again invite attention briefly to the words "Thanks for your lack of action. A very large number of us are keenly disappointed in you gentlemen of Capitol Hill."

Mr. President, the thought which came to my mind was this: Why do the GI's in the service blame the legislative branch of the Government for the failure to get them home? Who is propagandizing them, or who is failing to tell them the truth? Only the other day I was talking with Admiral Land, who informed me and others that he was transferring a large number of troop ships from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Again I inquire, who is to blame?

We read in the newspapers what seems to be authoritative statements to the effect that ships come to our ports from the Far East with only a few soldiers aboard. Why are not the soldiers in the Far East told the truth? Everyone knows that the world is full of incipient fires. The fires in the Far East and in the Near East, as well as in Germany, are apparent to everyone. However, it is not the function of the legislative branch to operate ships. Neither is it the function of the Legislature of this great country, since the war is still on—peace has not yet been declared—to operate ships and bring back to their homes the men who were sent to fight in distant lands. The responsibility for that is certainly on the Executive, through the Army and through the Navy, and not on the legislative branch.

A while ago we were supposed to have a great departmental set-up which would give information to foreign nations. That department, the OWI, was transferred to the State Department. What are they doing about telling the men in the service why there is so much delay in bringing them home? It seems to me that in order to maintain the morale of the home folks, as well as the men who are away, they should be told the truth. If it be true that the boys cannot be shipped home, they should be told why. On the other hand, if there is ineptitude on the part of the Navy and on the part of the Maritime Commission, and if boats are coming to our shores empty when they should be filled with boys who are entitled to be discharged, we should know why that is the case.

Mr. President, this is not the first occasion on which I have received communications of the kind to which I have referred. There is now upon us the season of the year known as the season of good cheer, when we are supposed to be happy, and when we are supposed to sense something in the air which makes life worth living. When a GI boy places the blame upon us for not having been given an opportunity to return home, I ask this question: Are we going to return to that period of a few years ago when it was seemingly the function of the executive branch of the Government to get people of this country to believe that the legislative branch was hardly worth while? The men in our armed services have gone through hell. They should return to their homes with minds on an even keel, with poised intellects, and ready to meet the problems which will confront them on the home front. If they have had implanted in their minds, because of the neglect of some department or because of deliberate propaganda, that their Government and the legislative branch of their Government are not looking after their interests, it is certain that they will return in no mental condition to take up the duties which they will face upon their return.

So, Mr. President, I wish to say to the GI who wrote the Christmas greeting which I have read, that so far as I know the Congress of the United States has done its job. It is now up to the executive branch of the Government, or to the military, first to bring the boys back in ships which are abroad, if in the opinion of the Commander in Chief the boys should be brought home; and second, if the boys should not be brought home they should be told why. If ships are available and the boys should be brought home and are not brought home, the military or the Maritime Commission should tell us why they are not performing their duty.

I repeat that Admiral Land told me that everything possible was being done, and that ships were being transferred from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I believe they are being so transferred.

Mr. President, we have been told that the truth will make us free. If the simple truth were being told, a lot of boys would be free from distrust of their Government caused by a fear of not being treated fairly.

So, Mr. President, that is the answer which I would give to this boy if I had his name and his address.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

William E. Lee, of Idaho, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointment); and

William J. Patterson, of North Dakota, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1952 (reappointment)

By M McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Olson, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, which had previously been passed over.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the nomination of Frank Olson has gone over two or three times already, and I should like to have the nomination voted upon today. For that reason I suggest the absence of a quorum, as I should like to make a statement respecting the nomination of Mr. Olson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Guffey	Myers
Bail	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hart	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bridges	Hill	Revercomb
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Huffman	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	La Follette	Taylor
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Mitchell	Willis
Gerry	Moore	Wilson
Gossett	Murdock	Young
Green	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frank Olson to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am loath to take up the time of the Senate and inconvenience Senators in this manner at this late hour of the day. However, the nomination of Frank Olson has been passed over several times, and I should like to have it acted upon.

Let me give a brief history of the case in order that Senators may have an understanding of how the issue arose.

When I first recommended Frank Olson for the position of register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho, the Civil Service investigators looked into his record and found that in 1933 he had served a jail sentence of 90 days following a conviction under the Volstead Act—in plain English, for bootlegging.

I immediately wrote to Idaho, to the United States marshal, and had him investigate the matter. I told him to make a report to me regarding what he found. I have known Frank Olson since about 1937. From what I could learn he is a very splendid type of man and has a good standing in his community; so, of course, I was very much surprised when this development occurred. Accordingly, I had the marshal make the investigation. After making it, he wrote to me as follows:

Whatever the seriousness of Frank's ancient mishap may be, it should certainly be erased by the conduct of his life since that time and is more than overcome by the high regard in which he is held by everyone to whom I talked. He is certainly a good citizen and has held a number of responsible positions of trust in the past 10 years. He has been a school trustee, master of the local grange, watermaster, has charge of a Government gage at Bridge, and his wife is postmistress. None of these positions are very exalted but they certainly reflect a condition of trust by the people of that section. He is one of the best liked people I have ever been in contact with, and I can honestly say that I found no one who did not have a good word to say for him. As to the offense he was held for, from what I can learn, he merely elevated himself in the eyes of his neighbors when he refused to turn information in to the prohibition agents when to have done so would have meant his freedom.

Sincerely,

EVERETT M. EVANS.

Mr. President, I asked the marshal to make inquiry in the community, and I told him that if the people in that section of the State had anything to say for or against Frank Olson, to let me know. In consequence, I have received a number of letters. I hold in my hand a letter which I received from the editor of the local newspaper. Incidentally, he is a Republican; and, although I know him, certainly he is not one of my political supporters. I should like to say that Mr. Olson has written a column for this newspaper for a number of years—something on the order of Will Rogers' articles. The letter from the editor reads as follows:

THE OAKLEY HERALD,
Oakley, Idaho, September 30, 1945.

Hon. GLEN TAYLOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: This is to thank you for naming Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, to be in charge of the United States general land office at Blackfoot. I have known Mr. Olson for about 10 years and regard him as one of the truly interesting and useful men of our State.

The appointment is popular with the readers of my paper. Some of these people have known Mr. Olson all his life. Others don't know him personally but they have read his articles in my paper. Mr. Olson is a talented writer and an authentic humorist. With honesty, intelligence, and talent, Mr. Olson should do good work in the new position.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES BROWN.

I now read a letter from the chief of police at Burley, Idaho, which is the county seat of the county in which Mr. Olson lives:

POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Burley, Idaho, October 3, 1945.

Hon. GLEN H. TAYLOR,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: I address this letter to you to express my hearty approval of the nomination by you of Mr. Frank Olson for the position of register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho. I have been personally acquainted with Mr. Olson for more than 20 years—

Mr President, it will be recalled that the bootlegging episode occurred in 1933, which is only 12 years ago.

I read further from the letter:

And I know of no more sincere and enthusiastic supporter of the Democratic Party and of yourself than Mr. Olson has shown himself to be.

I believe that I am qualified to express an opinion regarding Mr. Olson's suitability for this position insofar as his character and ability are concerned, and it is my opinion that his qualities are such as will bring credit to the party and yourself.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. W. WILLIAMS.

I now read a letter from a doctor who lives in that section of the State and who has treated the Olson family for many years. The writer of the letter is a well-known and civic-minded person. His letter reads as follows:

BURLEY, IDAHO, *October 1, 1945.*

To Whom It May Concern:

I am happy to have known and to have had professional dealings with Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho. This acquaintance extends over a period of twoscore years, since I knew and treated both his father and mother before Frank assumed the responsibilities of married life and went out for himself.

There is more to the letter, but much of it is irrelevant to the subject presently under discussion. At the conclusion of the letter, the doctor states the following:

Mr. Olson can do his district, his county, his State more good as land commissioner at Blackfoot, Idaho, than any other man you may hand pick from Idaho or our neighboring States. I know because he is desert and irrigation conscious, and has learned it the hard way.

Let us put it this way when you honor him, you honor yourself. In a democracy there is always give and take and Frank gives first.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. G. E. CRANER.

I now read a letter from a prominent attorney in Burley, the county seat:

BURLEY, IDAHO, *October 3, 1945.*

Hon. GLEN H. TAYLOR,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAYLOR: Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, has requested that I write to you regarding the matter of his appointment to the office of register of the general land office at Blackfoot. I have been acquainted with Mr. Olson for approximately 8 years through his activities in connection with the Democratic County Central Committee, Cassia County, Idaho, and I know him to be a conscientious and enthusiastic supporter of the party and of yourself, and I know of no one who is more deserving of this appointment than Mr. Olson.

I believe that Mr. Olson's character and intelligence is such that he will perform the duties of the office of register with credit to himself and the Democratic Party.

With best personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

KALES E. LOWE.

I now read a letter from a prominent contractor in that section of the State, Mr. Dan J. Cavanagh, of Twin Falls, Idaho:

TWIN FALLS, IDAHO, *September 29, 1945.*

Hon. GLEN H. TAYLOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is my understanding that Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, is being considered for the appointment as Register of the Blackfoot Land Office, Blackfoot, Idaho.

This letter will act as an unqualified endorsement of Mr. Olson for that position. I have known him for a number of years and have followed his contributions to local newspapers and magazines, in which field he has gained considerable mention nationally.

Mr. Olson comes from old pioneer stock who settled in the Raft River Valley in Idaho before the railroads arrived. He is a solid, substantial citizen, and while I believe this would be the first important public office he would hold, he has always taken a lively interest in all civic and public affairs and has been a leader in his community in bettering the welfare of the people in his surrounding territory.

Having been brought up in the early settlement of the Raft River country, he has a wide knowledge of reclamation, irrigation, and range problems which should serve him in good stead as a register in the district land office. He is a sober, industrious man of unquestioned integrity and honesty, and I feel no hesitancy in urging his appointment to this office.

With kind personal regards,

Cordially yours,

DAN J. CAVANAGH.

The letter which I now read is from Hon. Henry W. Tucker, probate judge of Cassia County:

BURLEY, IDAHO, *October 1, 1945.*

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I am well acquainted with Mr. Frank Olson, of Bridge, Cassia County, Idaho; and that I have known him for the past 10 years, and that during that period he has been a fine, outstanding citizen of his community and this county. He is a loyal and patriotic American who has worked hard in our various war activities of this county and State.

I heartily commend him for the position to which he has been nominated, namely, the district land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY W. TUCKER,
Probate Judge and also
United States Commissioner.

I now read a letter from a banker at Albion, Idaho:

ALBION, IDAHO, *October 1, 1945.*

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I have known Frank Olson, of Bridge, Idaho, for the past 20 years. I have never known of anything happening in that time that would be a reflection of any kind upon his character. He is honest, industrious, and will make an earnest effort to do his best in any type of work he may undertake.

C. E. SIMONSEN,
President.

The last letter which I shall read is from Ernest G. Hansen, State auditor of Idaho. His letter reads as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, *August 4, 1945.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Briefly, this letter is to recommend Mr. Frank Olson as to his character and qualifications as follows:

I have known Mr. Olson for the past 13 years as an upright citizen of Cassia County, and have found him to be loyal, sincere, and honest. During the time I have known him he has made a livelihood for his family from an income of various minor positions, and he has always been willing to take his part in civic functions.

Very truly yours.

ERNEST G. HANSEN,
State Auditor.

Mr. President, having read those letters, I wish to say that Frank Olson has raised a large family of 10 or 11 children on a dry-land farm. Recently, when I attended the funeral of Senator Thomas, in Idaho, I saw Mr. Olson, and his hands were deeply cracked from the hard work he had been doing on his farm. I sympathize with him. I myself am one of 13 children, and I know that while my father was a fine and capable man he never was able to get ahead very far financially because of the large family he had to support. After we were grown and left home, he did very well financially, and I am sure that but for the fact that he had such a hard time financially during the earlier years he might have been here in the Senate long before I came here. I feel the same way about Frank Olson. I am sure he is an honest and capable man. I am convinced that he never committed the offense for which he was sent to jail, but rather that he took the blame for someone else.

I wish to say that it was a misunderstanding which resulted in having this matter come up in the first place. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] understood that I was to make this talk on the floor of the Senate. I offered to make it in the committee, but I did not understand that I was expected to do so. The Senator from Iowa understood that it had been agreed that I would make the talk and explain the circumstances. So when the nomination came up in the Senate, the Senator from Iowa rose to his feet and asked me if I had any statement to make. I really did not understand what he meant at that point, and I so stated. He then made the statement that Mr. Olson had been convicted and served a jail sentence. So now I am making my statement.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that Frank Olson is a wounded veteran of the First World War. He has had two sons in the service in this war, and a daughter who is taking nursing training. I have absolute confidence in his integrity and ability.

This appointment was made long before the junior Senator from Idaho became a member of the Senate. He has taken the position that inasmuch as an issue has been made, he wishes to have the opportunity of voting against the nomination. However, I wish it to be known beyond any doubt that the nomination is not of his sponsorship, but that it is of mine, and I take full responsibility for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Frank Olson to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. President, I shall like to be recorded as voting "no" on the confirmation.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maple T. Harl to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, and under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, December 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received December 7 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Bieri, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Rear Adm. William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Rear Adm. Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Rear Adm. George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 7 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Frank Olson, to be register of the land office at Blackfoot, Idaho.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Maple T. Harl, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Theodore W. Markham, Caspar.
Helen Cooper, Diablo.
Rena L. Post, Knightsen.
Peter Almos, Moffett Field.
Ferrell H. Lauraine, Oceanside.
Effie M. Inks, Port Costa.
Irene S. Gooch, Temecula.

FLORIDA

Roy Radcliffe Morris, Panama City.
Gertrude G. Whitfield, Salerno.

LOUISIANA

Barney N. Eubanks, Dry Prong.
C. Mildred Smith, Houma.

MARYLAND

Margaret E. Mulford, Galena.
Elizabeth R. Woodland, Marion Station.

MONTANA

Charles A. Berkner, Highwood.

NEBRASKA

Charles E. Opitz, Bertrand.
Frances N. Fauquier, Chapman.

NEW MEXICO

Lambert R. Dannenfelser, Jemes.

NORTH DAKOTA

Gladys L. Hall, Deering.

TEXAS

Lucile R. Ryon, Seadrift.
Orine H. Palmer, Tornillo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all comfort, the surety of human redemption, from whom nothing is concealed, keep us free from the shuddering depths of unbelief. In this seething world, help us ever to stay our faith on Thy saving graces. It is the Christ-sheen above and beneath men which makes them brilliantly courageous and sacrificially Godlike. When in the travail of sorrow and hardship, whatever the crisis, the perplexity or apparent defeat, let us lift up our faces with the abiding strength of faith supporting us. May we forsake our low-vaulted past and, together with the Lord God, work in building a more stately mansion of the soul of our Republic. Incline our hearts to put ourselves within the sweep of Thy directive truth and wisdom; to think and keep on thinking of the high and noble destiny of America, and with devout spirits and plodding steps, strive to open the way for greater progress. In Thy Holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1064) entitled "An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Office of Defense Transportation.
7. War Shipping Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two poems by Mr. Carlisle.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESSS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, December 17, immediately after reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a radio address entitled "A Precedent for Peace."

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of his constituents supporting Mr. LANE's bill for the establishment of a diplomatic school.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are greatly concerned about the continuation of the draft. Shortly after VJ-day, the President said that if we drafted 50,000 each month it would be sufficient to meet our military needs. Since the voluntary enlistment bill was passed by this House, I want to report that in the month of September there were 38,000 enlistments and in the month of October there were 79,451. From the 1st of November to the 15th of November, there were 88,547 enlistments. It is obvious from this report, Mr. Speaker, that there are enough men coming into the service today on a volunteer basis to meet the needs of the military. I believe we ought to give some thought at this time to the repeal of the Selective Service Act relating to inductions. There is no further need to induct any men. And a suspension of that law will not interfere with the discharge of men now in the service. I have offered the bill H. R. 4894 to effect this purpose.

H. R. 4894

A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and to suspend all inductions thereunder

Be it enacted, etc., That upon final passage of this act those provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, relating to the inductions of individuals into the military service of the United States are hereby repealed and no person shall be inducted for further training and service thereunder as provided in said act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts from a number of letters.

LOANS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement of my own in reference to loans to foreign countries. It is a little over 300 words, but not much.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his remarks.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on Who's To Make the Watches?

BRING THE PACIFIC VETERANS HOME

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from an outfit located in Cebu, in the southern Philippines, from which I would like to read an extract:

Public opinion and pressure can force a general speed-up of the demobilization from the Pacific and end the immense differenti-

ation between the different areas of the Pacific theaters. Many areas have shipped home men with 60 points while in the southern Philippines we have men with 70, 80, 90, and even 100 points still sweating out transportation.

Just because we happen to be the ones who are the greatest distance from home is no reason we should be passed by. We want a general speeding up of demobilization from the Pacific and on a more equitable basis. Then and only then will we have something to be thankful for this Thanksgiving season.

Here is word from another point in the far Pacific. Imagine the feelings of these men with 60 to 100 points, when 55 now makes a soldier eligible for discharge. These transportation bottlenecks must be broken. These men must be returned at once. They have earned a tripple A priority on boats.

The young man who sent me this requested me to "speak of this to others." I would have done so in any event. My purpose for weeks has been to focus attention on the plight of these men. This is their message to the Congress and the peopie. The Army and Navy must take action to carry out this all-important task. Congress has provided the President and the Army and Navy with the authority and the money. Let us have some action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, over the years and in every campaign in which I have personally been engaged, the officials of the CIO have misrepresented, condemned, and opposed me. The last few days I have been receiving wires and letters asking me to oppose legislation recommended by the President, and which is now being considered by the Labor Committee of the House. I refer to H. R. 4908. Believe it or not, I have advised all of those CIO officials who made that request that I am going along with them in opposing that legislation.

This afternoon, in the 15 minutes allotted me, I will give you the reasons.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some items from servicemen.

WANTON WASTE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with some of the Army and Navy bases in the Pacific as a result of my experience in the Navy during this war. One of the places with which I am familiar is a city called Noumea, New Caledonia. I have received a letter from a very responsible source in Noumea, and a part of it reads as follows—this has to do with the disposal of American property:

> Every day dozens of vehicles, boats of all sorts, and millions of dollars of material are thrown into the sea or burned.

Now, this is not the only complaint that has been made regarding other bases in the Pacific. I think at this time, when the world is looking for materials and equipment of all kinds, it is nothing less than criminal to throw this stuff into the sea.

I am introducing a resolution to investigate the wanton disposal of this American property at these overseas bases, and I hope it will receive the consideration of the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER—PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to.

Monday is District day. I have been informed that four bills will be submitted, S. 1212, S. 1278, S. 1152, and H. R. 3995.

Then on Monday there will be the Bulwinkle bill, H. R. 2536, a bill relating to agreements between carriers.

On Tuesday, there is the Arends bill, H. R. 3937, and the Hobbs bill, H. R. 32. It is quite probable it will be difficult to dispose of them both in one day, but I am putting them both down. The Arends bill will be called first.

Mr. MICHENER. Is that the May bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Arends-May bill.

Mr. MICHENER. It is the May bill with an Arends amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is probably correct. Therefore, we call it the Arends bill.

On Wednesday a resolution out of the Committee on Accounts to continue the Small Business Committee will be brought up.

The full-employment bill I am putting down for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, with 1 day's general debate. It may be that the members of that committee may want to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday in view of the fact that this resolution out of the Committee on Accounts will be called up and is assigned for that day.

The Hobbs bill. If the Hobbs bill cannot be considered on Tuesday, I am hopeful that arrangements will be made, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] on yesterday, to program it after the full-employment bill is out of the way, if it is his desire to program it later on.

Conference reports, of course, will always be in order and it is impossible to state when they will be brought up, but naturally there are some important ones pending on reorganization and the $550,000,000 UNRRA appropriation. There may be some others. Conference reports, of course, when brought in, will be acted upon as soon as pending business will permit.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman enumerate the bills to be called up on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. They are all bills on the District Calendar and deal with District business. I can enumerate the bills by title if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. MICHENER. No; it is sufficient to know that they deal with District of Columbia business.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; they are District bills.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman earlier this morning said that the May-Arends bill would come up next week. This morning, if I understood correctly, it was announced in the Committee on Labor that the leadership on both sides had agreed that the bills which have been reported out by the Military Affairs Committee would not come up until after H. R. 4908 had been disposed of.

Mr. McCORMACK. What leadership?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Republican and Democratic leadership of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can state to the gentleman is that, despite any agreement that may have been made in the Military Affairs Committee—and I have been somewhat conversant with that—the rule has been out for several days and I have no control over programing it if any member of the Rules Committee announces his intention to call it up. Such notice having been given, I naturally am going to program it. That notice was served yesterday by a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But if no member of the Military Affairs Committee calls the bill up, can it come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not within the control of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs as I understand the rules of the House, for they provide that when the Committee on Rules reports out a rule and it has not been programed within the next succeeding seven legislative days, any member of the Rules Committee can call the bill up at any time thereafter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] this morning made the statement before the Committee on Labor that the bill could not be called up if the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee did not call it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not my understanding. My understanding is

that any member of the Rules Committee after seven legislative days succeeding the reporting of the rule can call the rule up. The gentleman from Georgia served notice yesterday of his intention to do so; and in view of that I am programing the bill. I said yesterday I was not going to program it for next week so far as I voluntarily was concerned, but when a member of the Rules Committee, exercising his rights serves notice of his intention to call it up, I am going to program it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is with the understanding that the bill, H. R. 4717, to establish a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration is to be taken up this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. Another thing, I am not going to object to adjourning over until Monday. I have tried to give the Members of this House an opportunity to express themselves in favor of getting these boys home who served for 18 months or more or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school. I am not going to object to adjourning over until Monday because I want the Members to go home and see the fathers, mothers, and wives of these boys and get some first-hand information on how the American people feel about this proposition.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been no agreement in the Military Affairs Committee about calling up the bill the gentleman has been discussing.

The only thing that has happened in the committee is that the chairman did suggest that the matter be not called up by the committee or any effort made to call it up until it was determined whether or not the Labor Committee is going to report the so-called President's bill.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, if the rule passes providing consideration for the bill, the responsibility then devolves on the committee reporting the bill. It is discretionary with the committee reporting the legislative bill to call up the bill at any time after it has the rule, but the rule does not compel that it be called up forthwith.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will agree that after seven legislative days from the time the rule is reported any member of the Rules Committee can call up the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is absolutely right, but there are two different things involved and the gentleman knows that there are. One is the rule. The calling up of the legislative bill is a privileged matter, but it is up to the legislative committee to exercise its privilege under the rule.

Mr. BARDEN. Then it would not follow that any member of the Rules Committee could bring up anything except the rule after seven legislative days?

Mr. MICHENER. The Rules Committee loses jurisdiction as soon as the House passed on the rule.

Mr. BARDEN. It could not call up the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Without jurisdiction, no.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts understand that to be correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that after seven legislative days, when a bill is reported from the Rules Committee, under the rules of the House any member of the Rules Committee can call up the rule. My understanding of the situation is the same as expressed by the gentleman from Michigan. Having been served with notice that a member of the Rules Committee intends to call up the rule, although I was not going to program it, naturally I am programing it.

Mr. BARDEN. Would the gentleman propound a parliamentary inquiry to the original source of knowledge on that subject and get it settled?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman himself can propound the parliamentary inquiry. If the gentleman wants to, he may propound the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARDEN. It would not embarrass me at all but because one side of the House says one thing and the other side another I thought it would be wise.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think one side of the House says anything different on the subject than the other.

Mr. MICHENER. We are all in agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is, and I think it is the understanding of all of the members of the Military Affairs Committe following a meeting the other day, that the Military Affairs Committee through its chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, will not press for action on our bill next week, but would be prepared to go on with it pending action of the Labor Committee. I believe the chairman was authorized to contact members of the Rules Committee to that effect. The gentleman from Texas, I am sure, will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am assuming my responsibility as it confronts me at the present time. On Tuesday next, if the rule comes up, then the responsibility rests on somebody else's shoulders and that somebody else has got to assume their responsibility at that time. I am not undertaking now to look into their minds.

Mr. THOMASON. Neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] or I are authorized to speak for the Military Affairs Committee, but I think it is safe to predict that a majority of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs will insist on their bill being called up if this other bill is not called up in a reasonable time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that. All I say is that the rule can be called up by any member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that the rule states "that it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole." That motion must be made by some other Member besides a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cross that stream when he gets to it. The Chair will have charge of it at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. I was merely answering the question propounded by the gentleman from North Carolina. The Chair can recognize any Member of the House after the rule is adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMOBILIZATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the cessation of hostilities we have heard a clamor on all sides for the immediate release of those men in the armed forces whose magnificent efforts brought this war to a successful conclusion. Those of us who are sincerely interested in seeing that justice is done in the releasing of these men have been apprehensive lest this clamor result in injustices. I want to call your attention to an article that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post:

> Plans to ship 100,000 veterans by air this month from Pacific coast ports of debarkation to their homes in the East have been abandoned, it was learned last night.
>
> One reason is that the Air Corps, yielding to pressure from families of Air Corps personnel, has discharged men so rapidly that insufficient crews are left to undertake the huge ferrying job proposed.

By releasing trained personnel, 100,000 veterans will be held in service longer than they would have if the Air Corps had not yielded to pressure.

Let us permit those people charged with the responsibility of demobilizing our armed forces do it in accordance with the well-thought-out plans they have prepared. Further yielding to pressure will inevitably result in the slowing up of the program.

NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 119 to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this legislation?

Mr. BELL. The situation is this: Under the Philippine constitution the Philippine Congress cannot meet after the 30th day of this month. They have been engaged in a war and consequently

the elections of 1943 and 1945 could not be held. The purpose of this resolution is to give to the Philippine Government the power to hold elections not later than next April. It is very urgent legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I see the ranking minority member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is present, and I yield to him.

Mr. WELCH. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Senate Joint Resolution No. 119 which is identical with House Resolution No. 278, is now on the Speaker's desk. The House resolution was carefully considered by the Committee on Insular Affairs and reported unanimously. We support the request of our distinguished chairman in asking for immediate consideration of the Senate resolution.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, it is this: A Senate bill has been passed. A similar House bill has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Insular Affairs. The House resolution is on the Speaker's desk, and it is the desire to substitute the Senate resolution for the House resolution and pass it immediately.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas the interruption of constitutional processes of government in the Philippine Islands due to enemy occupation has prevented the holding of elections in 1943 and 1945 as provided by the Constitution of the Philippines; and

Whereas the term of office of the President of the Philippines has been continued by the joint resolution of November 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 590), until such time as a successor has been elected and qualified; and

Whereas the Philippine Congress under the terms of the constitution of the Philippines cannot convene after December 30, 1945, because the terms of office of members of the House of Representatives and of two-thirds of the members of the Philippine Senate will have expired on that date; and

Whereas the liberation of the Philippines and the restoration of constitutional processes of democracy in the Commonwealth now permit the holding of an election in the immediate future; and

Whereas the members of the electoral commission responsible for the conduct of the elections have already been appointed by the Commonwealth Government in accordance with the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth; and

Whereas the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines makes no provision for the emergency in which elections though of vital necessity cannot be held at the regularly scheduled time; and

Whereas it is the desire of the United States to fulfill her pledge to prepare the Philippines for independence and to make possible that grant of independence in accordance with existing law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines not later than April 30, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date for such elections, and the date fixed shall not be subsequent to April 30, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date, then April 30, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date elections shall be held for national elective offices under the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

SEC. 2. The President and Vice President then elected, the senators then elected (who shall be all but those then in office whose terms continue until December 30, 1947), and the members of the house of representatives shall take office, and the elected Philippine Congress shall convene in regular session not later than May 28, 1946. The present Philippine Congress shall fix the date or dates for the assumption of office and for the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session, and the date or dates fixed shall not be subsequent to May 28, 1946. Should the present Philippine Congress fail to fix such date or dates, then May 28, 1946, is hereby fixed as the date for assumption of office and the convening of the elected Philippine Congress in regular session.

SEC. 3. The terms of office of the President, Vice President, and representatives then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945. The terms of office of eight of the senators elected at such elections shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1945; and the terms of eight senators then elected shall expire on the date which would have been the case had they assumed office on December 30, 1943. Division of the senators elected at such elections into these two classes shall be made in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines. The term of any senator then elected to fill a vacancy in a term expiring on December 30, 1947, shall expire on that date.

SEC 4. The manner of holding such elections shall be as provided by the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 278) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, last night at the Mayflower Hotel in honor of Col. J. Monroe Johnson commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from the Third District of the great State of Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] on urging the selection of Tuskahoma as the capital of the United Nations Organization. Tuskahoma is not in my district, but no place more beautiful and more ideal than Tuskahoma could be selected for an international capital.

The word "Tuskahoma" itself has a very significant meaning. It is an old Choctaw word. It means "Red warrior." During the days before our statehood the Choctaw national colors were red and white. The color "red" signified bravery and courage. A free translation of the word "Tuskahoma" would be "Brave warrior."

Mr. Speaker, when the various members of the United Nations Organization come to the international capital they should be full of bravery and courage.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleagues from Oklahoma—the gentleman from the Kimachi [Mr. STEWART] and the gentleman from the valley of the Arkansas [Mr. STIGLER]—in further urging the consideration of the Tuskahoma area for the new Allied Nations capital. As my friend from the Third District has said, the future world capital should be a city in itself and not an appendage to an established metropolis. This Council of the Nations of the World is a new idea and should therefore be housed in a completely new city arising on virgin soil, with no disagreeable past to tarnish it.

Oklahoma is practically the geographical center of the United States. Delegates from the East or West would have to cross the whole continent if some coast-line city should be chosen—therefore the location of Tuskahoma is geographically perfect. There is no State in the Union that has more of all the natural resources than does Oklahoma. The close proximity of the largest known supply of natural gas in the world, the Guymon-Hugaton gas field, would supply the fuel and power for the city to be builded. The buildings would remain clean and the air pure, and we would not have the spectacle of soot-smoked buildings and impure air which we now see in so many cities of the North and East that are bidding for this location.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENDING INDUSTRIAL STRIFE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BOREN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MILITARY RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, during this war I have consistently refrained from making any suggestions or criticisms concerning the internal management of the military organizations. In recent weeks certain matters have been brought to my attention which I think should be given some consideration by the higher-ups. We all know that during wartime it is necessary to have strict rules and regulations in the armed forces and in many instances it is necessary to impose severe penalties for the infraction of such rules and regulations. However, although the war is over, those same severe penalties are being administered to the boys and men who violate such regulations, just as if we were still in a state of war. I do not think it appeals to the sense of justice of anyone that such a program or policy should be continued. I would very much regret to see it become necessary for the Congress to be forced to give this matter consideration. I see no reason why a fair application of a little common sense would not cause the Army and Navy to abandon the practice complained of.

DEMOBILIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, mention has been made that we should not make any suggestions as to the demobilization in part of the men in the service. While we were at war I accepted everything that the Army and Navy said and did 100 percent. But we are not at war now and do not need the great number of men in the services, in either the Army or the Navy, that we have. Until the Army and Navy adopt as a part of their policy the necessity of discharging boys from the service who need to come back home and go to school, as well as discharge men with wives at home, and one or more children waiting for them to come home, I do not propose to stop.

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I not witnessed it I would not believe what has occurred here this morning could possibly happen. I have heard this period referred to as one of current events. I have listened to every word spoken by probably 30 Members since the House convened 40 minutes ago without hearing a single reference to the tragic event of which today marks the anniversary. I have heard many references to the results of it. To the desire to bring our boys home, to the retarding influence political pressure naturally wields thereon, to a proposed location for the headquarters of the United Nations Organization, which has very appropriately developed as a result thereof. I have heard discussions of various labor laws, and what not. Yet no one has referred to the fact that 4 years ago today there occurred the most infamous, the most dastardly crime of history when those sneaking, treacherous, yellow little Japs all but destroyed our fleet in Pearl Harbor while their emissaries were here pretending to talk peace.

I consider it peculiarly appropriate that on this fourth anniversary of this criminal attack we receive the news of the conviction of one of those who followed up that dastardly deed by permitting the infliction of those unspeakably horrible atrocities on our American soldiers and citizens in the Philippines. Let Yamashita's body as it dangles from the noose be an unforgetable lesson to all war inclined leaders of the future. Let us hope and pray that it will deter them from the mad courses they might otherwise pursue by saying: "Be sure your sins will find you out." Do not overlook the new principle of international law which not only permits but requires the punishment of commanders for not preventing or stopping unspeakable atrocities by their subordinates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from the Washington News Digest, and in the other an editorial from the Veteran's Employment magazine.

Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article recently appearing in the Saratogan.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials on the subject of compulsory sickness insurance cost.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Washington Post.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects, and to include certain excerpts.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania took the floor and apparently criticized some of us who are doing all within our power to try to get these boys home. I know there are many officers in the Army and in the Navy who are splendid gentlemen and very sincere in their efforts to get the boys home, and in many cases they have cooperated to the fullest extent. But there is another group that is hard-boiled, and the moment a boy indicates any desire to go home he is called upon the carpet. He is told, "Who is your Congressman? What is he? What are you here for?"

I have a case like that where a young man has a wife and two children. The wife is desperately ill. When he called attention to a letter I had written, the officer said, "Who is he anyway?"

I am getting sick and tired of that arrogant attitude. Our boys have won a great victory and they are entitled to consideration. They know the facts and they are giving us the facts. It is up to this Congress to take some action to bring the servicemen home. I suggest signing petition No. 8 in the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CONFUSION IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the single greatest and most patriotic service Gen. Patrick Hurley has rendered to his country during his long and distinguished career as a public servant is his resignation as Ambassador to China to bring into the open the confused and confusing situation in our State Department, which has long been known to exist, but which no less drastic an act could have brought to a show-down.

How could we have won the war if some of the colonels and captains, after receiving orders from their commanding officer to move east, promptly moved west as soon as his back was turned?

Let us not imagine we can win the peace unless our diplomatic forces are as unified and as loyal as our military forces have been, and unless they pursue single-mindedly our diplomatic objectives, as determined by the President and Secretary of State, in the same efficient and vigorous and skillful way in which Eisenhower and MacArthur and Nimitz

and their men have pursued our military and naval objectives.

Let us insist on getting the most efficient State Department and diplomatic service possible all the way down the line.

IS CHRISTIANITY HER ONLY CRIME?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ESTABLISHING A DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 427, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 4717, known as the bill for the establishment of a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

I am pleased that I can support a rule for a bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I hope he will continue to bring in legislation in the future that I can support.

The intent of the bill is in the right direction but, unfortunately, it contains some provisions such as section 6 (a) and (b), which read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, without regard to civil-service requirements.

(b) Such appointments as described in subsection (a) of this section shall be for a probationary period of 3 years and the record of each person serving under such appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Nursing Services shall be reviewed from time to time by a board, appointed in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, and if said board shall find him not fully qualified and satisfactory he shall be separated from the service.

These provisions appear to be unfair and the same can be said of paragraph (d) of section 10 which reads as follows:

(d) A disciplinary board, when in its judgment charges are sustained, shall recommend to the Administrator suitable disciplinary action, within limitations prescribed by the Administrator, which shall include reprimand, suspension without pay, reduction in grade, and discharge from the Department of Medicine and Surgery of such person. The Administrator shall either approve the recommendation of the board, approve such recommendation with modification or exception, approve such recommendation and suspend further action at the time, or disapprove such recommendation. He shall cause to be executed such action as he approves. The decision of the Administrator shall be final.

I especially disapprove of section 16, reading as follows:

SEC. 16. (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by the administrator exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of the activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery or interagency rules governing its relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted on the same day to the Committee on Finance of the Senate of the United States and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Finance of the Senate or by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the chairmen of such committees. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance.

The section gives the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation veto power of any rules and regulations which may be prescribed by the Veterans' Administration. This is something that has never been heretofore attempted in legislation.

Another objectionable feature of the bill is that it eliminates civil-service requirements governing the appointment of employees, and I hope that when the bill is considered by the House this and the provisions which I have mentioned will be eliminated or at least amended.

Not only do I favor the objectives of the bill, but I favor also other legislation in the interest of our boys still outside the limits of our country. I am interested in bringing them back as speedily as possible. Further, I am interested in any aid that may be given these veterans. I am also interested in obtaining proper housing for them. Unfortunately, many of the servicemen who have already returned find it difficult—yes, impossible—to obtain living accommodations. For this reason, I believe, that in the interest of these men who have so well served our Nation, we should not utilize for other purposes labor and material that could and should be used for the construction of homes for them. I am also interested in having them obtain employment at a living wage. Notwithstanding the fact that for months industry has tried to make the country believe we will have from eight to ten million unemployed, the facts are there is just as much demand for labor now as there was during the war.

I hope that this demand will continue. Of course, we have had some strikes, but they were due to the fact that those who have acquired and made millions upon millions of dollars during the war, the war profiteers, are now trying to take advantage of these returning men. It appears and it is charged, and I believe there is foundation for these charges, that the employers had a tacit understanding when they claimed and advertised that there would be millions of unemployed in order to obtain their services at the very lowest possible figure, at a wage with which these men cannot provide for their families. Therefore, I hope that organized labor will continue to aid them to secure employment at wages that they are entitled to receive and that they can properly live on.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel that in the interest of these returning soldiers, the OPA will not remove the ceilings on foodstuffs or on other needed material. I am informed that within the last few days after the OPA removed the ceiling on citrus fruits the price has gone up from 300 to 600 percent, from two to six dollars a case on oranges, and so forth. These returning veterans are entitled to their oranges and grapefruit, or whatever they need, without being obliged to pay exorbitant prices or without being mulcted by paying prices two and three times higher than for which they previously sold. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would not object if part of the increase were to go to the grower, but as the situation now exists, this is not true. The increase goes mainly to the manipulator, to the contractor, to the packers, to the shippers who made contracts 2 or 3 months ago at the then low-prevailing prices. It is charged that the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. and other food-chain stores have purchased and contracted for in advance of the available and growing stocks of fruit and farm products and, therefore, are now gouging the consumers. If these charges are true, I shall demand that the OPA and the Department of Justice take immediate steps to remedy the situation and to provide measures to prevent future price manipulations of foodstuffs. Consequently the grower does not derive any additional benefit and, as I said, the returning servicemen and their families are mulcted and are obliged to pay these exorbitant prices. In the interest of our returning servicemen and in the interest

of our country, I hope the OPA will continue in its effort to hold down the prices not only of foodstuffs but of any and all materials needed for the construction of homes for these boys.

I have called attention to the fact that it is dangerous to permit prices to soar, because if this is permitted, it is impossible to forecast how high the prices of food and other articles will go. I remember after the First World War the activities of certain manipulators with respect to sugar and other commodities that they had hoarded and corralled, and I am fearful that the unscrupulous sellers and manipulators will attempt to repeat their gouging of the consuming public. Therefore we should encourage the OPA to hold down the prices and not be influenced by various industries or manipulators, and that it will protect the consumers, the returning servicemen, and those who have already returned to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, I am against inflation, and I believe the only way we can hold it down and prevent endangering the future of our Nation is for the OPA to continue to function as it has without any interruption or without any coercion on the part of the profiteers.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks, reserving the balance of the time, and I now yield to my colleague the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly appropriate that we should be meeting here on this December 7 in the year 1945 to set up an adequate medical service for the men and the women who during these years have been wounded and who have returned to us broken and ill. To my mind no one could have been put in charge of this long overdue reorganization of our veterans' medical service so completely able as Maj. Gen. Paul Hawley, who has been overseas, carrying the responsibility for the care of these same men in the European theater. He is a man of broad vision, of wide experience, and of great humanity.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am very happy to hear the gentlewoman speak of Gen. Paul Hawley. Gen. Paul Hawley began the practice of medicine in Union County, Ind., which is located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. His father was an eminent physician, and Dr. Hawley has certainly made tremendous progress in the Medical Corps of the United States Army. I do not know of a finer selection that could have been made to head the Medical Section of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is indeed true that Dr. Hawley brings with him an inheritance of understanding of the needs of the human being. In my contacts with him overseas I found in every instance that what he cared about was the boy that was wounded, and all the other things had to wait and take their places. He now has opportunity to serve the broken man, the wounded, the ill, the exhausted women, and he brings to this service a very rare ability.

The bill as it comes to us is not a perfect bill as I read it. There are a number of things in it which might well have been improved, but it is my sense of the situation existing both in the Veterans' Bureau and here in this House, that we will do well to accept it very much as it is. Then, as General Hawley said to me the other day when I asked him about it, it will be up to him and his staff to do such a fine piece of work that they will prove themselves worthy to suggest changes, which we in our turn should be very ready and glad to make when and if they are required for the best interests of the service. It is my very great hope that there will be an overwhelming vote for the passage of this bill.

Just one more word about the nurses of the country. I understand they are coming back and being demobilized, and that 17 percent of those demobilized 3 weeks ago have asked for service with the Veterans' Administration, saying "The boys still need us." It is because of the change in the whole character of the veterans' medical service. Good doctors who have been demobilized also are asking for service in that department.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the bill on this side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we commemorate on this day the military and naval tragedy of Pearl Harbor. The infamy of Japan while her emissaries were still fawning favor with America, on the morning of December 7, 1941, struck from life American soldiers and sailors and inflicted destruction upon our Navy with a suddenness and dastardly viciousness that stunned the world. Words cannot express our contempt for the perpetrators of that sneak attack upon our Nation—an attack which unified America under the inspired leadership of our then Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, as no other single fact in history was ever able to solidify the American people. Prayers in remembrance of the fallen heroes of Pearl Harbor and of all the frightful and gloriously victorious battles of the Pacific are mingled today with our prayers of thanksgiving that their sacrifice stayed the hand of war and barred the visitation of death and destruction from our land.

The silencing of the roar of the cannon and bomb upon the signing of an armistice should herald as we hope and pray the dawn of peace. And yet from far off lands come the reverberations of bloody struggles between nations and components of nations which proclaim with no uncertainty that peace has not thrown her mantle over the world. There remains great and arduous work to be done. The world for seven long years suffered from martial malignancy. During those years the life of an individual was held in callous contempt by those in places of high power who hated America and democracy. Unlike Pilate, these enemies of man sold their patrimony, not for silver, but for personal aggrandizement and in the sale agreed that cancerous philosophies would rule the world. Mass executions of helpless men, women, and children, annihilation of cities and towns, inconceivable degeneracy in the torture of prisoners of war, denial of God and religion, all evidence the extent of the degradation of part of mankind conceived and nurtured in the name of war. Chronic disabling disease is not incurable. But as the onslaught is not immediate, neither is the cure. So it is with the world today. Peace as the word implies and for which the man in the street years with heartache and hope, comes to men of good will. The gifts of life which bring the greatest happiness are not ours by fortuitous chance. They are earned by force of character. And America, with all her strength and power and glory must work unstintingly for peace—not only for America but for the world.

We can now look in retrospect upon Pearl Harbor. Men, women, and children throughout the extent of our country know the lessons of Pearl Harbor.

Pearl Harbor, among the many other lessons it taught, proved that in our war for freedom, those who there died to make life possible, proclaimed a single message to the living "We have laid the cornerstone of universal peace. You build the structure." The four freedoms, proclaimed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, have raised the hopes and stirred the hearts of men. But we must earn these freedoms—through intelligent planning. We must be worthy of these freedoms through common goodness. Otherwise they will become hollow phrases, barren of meaning through the destructive forces of greedy, selfish interests inspired by ignorance and malice. Wisdom and good will must be exercised and practiced for the greater good of the greatest number throughout our land upon which the sun never sets. The principles of Washington, of Jefferson, and Lincoln and Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt are in reality those fundamental American governmental truths for which we have fought since the founding of our country. We are all freemen. We will not permit of mass control or regimentation. America grew because her citizens were politically free and she was economically independent. A democratic state may be difficult to maintain because of such freedom, but democracy is the society which is natural to man because he is endowed with freedom of will. The state did not create man, nor give him his natural right of freedom. The state is never bound to safeguard and respect the natural rights

of man, who was man before he was a citizen. The success of the state in attaining the common weal through the protection of the natural rights of man is in proportion to the intelligence and goodness of its leaders. We must build the superstructure of world peace—permanent and immovable. The heroes of Pearl Harbor have thrown us the challenge—and we should not fail.

As I stand here, there goes through my mind a statement made by the present Premier of Japan only a few days ago, when he made a recommendation to the limited legislative body of Japan to investigate the causes of Japanese defeat so that there will be no recurrence of such a defeat of Japan in any future war. While those are not the exact words, that is the substance of what he said. In other words, the Premier of Japan called for an investigation to find out the causes for the defeat of Japan in this war so that they can use that information for the future. Certainly, under no conditions can we permit that to happen. I say fortunately we have in control of our forces in the administration of Japan for the United States a man who has made a great name for himself, a man I have never met personally but for whom I have the greatest respect as a citizen and a soldier, General MacArthur. General MacArthur is doing a great job in Japan. We should back him up and support him in the difficult task he has before him. I know that in the administration of the civil government of Japan, as long as he is there, any efforts by the Japanese leaders to investigate their conduct of the war with a view to correcting it for future wars that Japan may engage in will not be permitted.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt hated war. But in his message to Congress on January 6, 1941, he warned that America was not immune from involvement in war. He stated:

> As long as the aggressor nations maintain the offensive, they, not we, will choose the time and place and the method of attack. That is why the future of all American Republics is today in serious danger.

President Roosevelt outlined our national policy in 1941. We were committed to "all-inclusive national defense—to full support of all those resolute peoples everywhere who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our territory—to the proposition that principles of morality and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers." He tells the Nation bluntly in that message that the immediate need of the Nation was "a swift and driving increase in our armament production," adding "I am not satisfied with the progress thus far made." That as early as January 6, 1941.

In accordance with his desire for speed and more speed in the maintenance and development of an adequate system of national defense commensurate with the dire peril which confronted the Nation, President Roosevelt advised that the Congress of the United States should undertake, with the least possible delay, the construction of not less than 200 steel cargo vessels suitable for the use in the existing emergency, but of such type and design that would permit a most rapid construction. On March 15, 1941, at the White House correspondent's annual dinner in Washington, the President stated, referring to rumors rampant in the early days of World War I, that the people of America were disunited and cared more for peace at any price than for the preservation of ideals and freedom:

> Let not dictators of Europe and Asia doubt our unanimity now. Before the present war on September 1, 1939, I was more worried about the future than any people—most people. The record shows I was not worried enough. * * * The British people and Grecian allies need ships. From America they will get ships. They need planes. From America they will get planes. They need food. From America they will get food. They need tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds. From America they will get tanks and guns and ammunition and supplies of all kinds. * * * Our country is going to be what our people have proclaimed it must be—the arsenal of democracy.

On April 10, 1941, President Roosevelt requested of Congress statutory authority to take over any or all of the large number of foreign merchant vessels lying idle in our ports, stating that it was essential both to our defense plans and our domestic economy that we not permit the continuation of the immobilization in our hemisphere of shipping facilities. In March of 1941 Congress passed the lend-lease bill, which provided material aid for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States. On May 27, 1941, speaking of this bill, the President stated:

> Every dollar of material we send helps to keep the dictators away from our own hemisphere. Every day that they are held off gives us time to build more guns and tanks and planes and ships. We have made no pretense about our own self-interest in this aid. Great Britain understands it and so does Nazi Germany, and now after a year Great Britain fights gallantly on a far-flung battle line. We have doubled and redoubled our vast production, increasing month by month our material supply of tools of war for ourselves and Great Britain and China, and eventually for all the democracies.

During this speech the President prophesied:

> Nobody can foretell just when the acts of the dictators will ripen into an attack on this hemisphere, but we know enough by now to realize that it would be suicide to wait until they are in our front yard.

He stated as our national policy that we would actively resist, wherever necessary and with all our resources, every attempt by Hitler to extend Nazi domination to the Western Hemisphere or to threaten any and every attempt to gain control of the high seas. From the point of strict naval and military necessity, he promised every possible assistance to Britain and to all who, with Britain, were resisting Hitlerism to the end that the United States of America might enjoy human freedom. On that day, May 27, 1941, President Roosevelt, with profound consciousness of his responsibilities to his country, issued a proclamation declaring the assistance of an unlimited national emergency requiring "the strengthening of our defense to the extreme limit of our national power and authority." On June 9, 1941, in referring to the stoppage of production at the Los Angeles plant of an aviation company essential to national defense, the President stated:

> Our country is in danger and the men and women who are now making airplanes play an indispensable part in its defense.

On June 20, 1941, the President advised the Congress, in speaking of the sinking of the American ship *Robin Moore* in the South Atlantic by a German submarine, that the act of lawlessness appeared to be a first step in the assertion of the supreme purpose of the German Reich to seize control of the high seas. The President proclaimed that we as a Nation would not yield to any such domination. On July 21, 1941, the President requested an extension of the Selective Training and Service Act. Under date of September 11, 1941, speaking from the White House concerning the torpedoing of the destroyer *Greer* by a German submarine, the President advised the American people that from that date if any German or Italian vessel of war entered water, protection of which was necessary for American defense, they did so at their own peril. Under date of September 18, 1941, the President requested of Congress a supplemental appropriation of $6,000,000,000 approximately in addition to the $7,000,000,000 originally appropriated under the Lend-Lease Act. Under date of October 9, 1941, President Roosevelt recommended the repeal of Section 6 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 in order to allow the Army of merchant vessels, stating:

> I cannot impress too strongly upon the Congress the seriousness of the military situation that confronts all of the nations that are combating Hitler. We would be blind to the realities if we did not recognize that Hitler is now determined to expend all the resources and all the mechanical forces and manpower at his command to crush both Russia and Britain. * * * "I say to you solemnly that if Hitler's present military plans are brought to a successful fulfilment, we Americans shall be forced to fight in defense of our homes and our freedom in a war as costly and devastating as that which rages on the Russian front."

On December 6, 1941, the day prior to the anniversary, we are here assembled to commemorate, President Roosevelt dispatched a message to the Emperor of Japan which stated in part, as follows:

> Developments are occurring in the Pacific area which threaten to deprive each of our Nations and all humanity of the beneficial influence of the long peace between our two countries. Those developments contain tragic possibilities. * * * I am certain that it will be clear to Your Majesty as it is to me that in seeking these great objectives both Japan and the United States should agree to eliminate any form of military threat. This seems essential to the attainment of the high objectives. * * * During the past few weeks it has become clear to the world that Japan's military, naval, and air forces have been sent to south Indochina in such large numbers as to create a reasonable doubt on the part of other nations

that this continuing concentration in Indochina is not defensive in character. * * * The people of the Philippines, of the other islands of the East Indies, of Malay, Thailand, are asking themselves whether these forces of Japan are preparing or intending to make an attack in one or more of these many areas. I am sure that Your Majesty will understand that the fear of all these peoples is legitimate fear as it involves their peace and their national existence. * * * I address myself to Your Majesty at this moment in the fervent hope that Your Majesty may, as I am doing, give thought in this definite emergency to dispelling dark clouds. I am confident that both of us for the sake of the peoples, not only of our own great countries but for the sake of humanity in neighboring territories have a sacred duty to restore territorial amity and prevent further death and destruction in the world.

On December 8, 1941, the President addressed the Congress of the United States:

Yesterday, December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan. The United States was at peace with that nation and at the solicitation of Japan was still in conversation with its Government and its Emperor, looking toward the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. Indeed, 1 hour after Japanese squadrons had commenced bombing * * * the Japanese Ambassador to the United States and a colleague delivered to the Secretary of State a formal reply to a recent American message * * * [which] contained no threat or hint of war or determined attack. * * * I ask that Congress declare that since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, 1941, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese Empire.

These are but brief excerpts from epic statements of Franklin D. Roosevelt during the year 1941. He foresaw and advised Congress and the American people on repeated occasions of the threat to our national institutions from the tyrant-dominated Axis Powers and the danger of our involvement in war through sudden unprovoked attack upon America.

Tritely spoken, a football team of the offensive does not advise its defending opponent of the place or type of its play. Japan did not broadcast in advance the locale of its sneak attack. President Roosevelt, however, had repeatedly altered the American people of the possibility of an attack on either shore of this Nation. His magnificent exercise of executive power had done all that could humanly be expected of any one man occupying the position as Chief Executive of this Nation and as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The foresight of President Roosevelt throughout the long-troubled frightening days which preceded Pearl Harbor saved America from—not defeat, for America and her allies would never have succumbed to Axis domination—but from longer years of death and destruction which would have followed the visitation of war upon our country. As General Marshall states in his biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army to the Secretary of State—July 1, 1943—June 30, 1945:

This Nation is just emerging from one of its gravest crises. This generation of Americans can still remember the black days of 1942. In those hours Germany and Japan came so close to complete domination of this world that we do not yet realize how thin this thread of allied survival had been stretched. It is certain that the refusal of the British and Russian peoples to accept what appeared to be inevitable defeat was the great factor in the salvage of civilization.

President Roosevelt, more than any man, knew of the peril confronting America and the necessity of aid, and more aid, for Russia and England, and knowing, he acted for America.

Commemoration of the fourth anniversary of the attack upon Pearl Harbor recalls the history of our relationship with the Empire of Japan over the decade preceding the sudden and dastardly bombing of our naval forces on December 7, 1941. In 1931, when Japan seized Manchuria we as a Nation expressed disapproval. In 1937 we expressed our strong disapproval to the fresh outbreak of Japanese aggression in China in a manner that brooked no misunderstanding in Tokyo. We utilized trade embargoes. Thomas Jefferson once stated that an America would never stand idly by if an aggressor nation attempted to control Europe. He would have said the same thing of Asia in 1941 when Japan intended by rapid surprise the conquest and domination of the whole Far East.

On December 7, 1941, America awoke to the cruel fact that tyrant nations to the East and West were dangerously threatening the seas which guard our shores. Aroused to that power and force which only the American fighting spirit of fair play could accomplish, we, with our allies have won ultimate victory. But the words of President Roosevelt, spoken as late as October 12, 1942, still resound as a challenge to the world "It is useless to win battles if the cause for which we fought these battles is lost." Let us not forget that America fought for a just and lasting peace. We are moving ahead toward that goal. The American people are determined that there shall be world peace. Our allies are equally determined. No great objective was ever accomplished in a day. Building requires patience and courage and hope—these qualities of mind and heart are American qualities. Peace is impossible without faith and charity. America is charitable—America, unscathed by the scythe of war which desolated cities and razed towns and even countries, with sympathetic understanding appreciates the horror and destruction of threatened starvation which now faces the millions of homeless in the war-ravaged nations of the world. America will not forget these victims in her commemoration of Pearl Harbor. America has faith—faith in God—faith in her sister nations—faith in America and American citizens. With that faith, under divine guidance, America will never lose the cause for which World War II was fought—anymore than she will ever forget the significance of Pearl Harbor or the glory of the victory made possible by the selfless heroism and sacrifice of the members of her armed forces.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this fourth anniversary let us remember the lessons we learned from the tragedy of Pearl Harbor. Let us remember those who have passed to the Great Beyond, who have made the supreme sacrifice that our country might win this war and might live. Let us go forward with determination to do everything within our power, based upon the national interest of our country, and cooperate with the other nations of the world, if they have the same spirit, in the bringing about of an international organization that will accomplish the hopes of the average person everywhere, hopes difficult to attain, hopes that we trust and pray will be attained—universal peace for mankind for countless generations to come.

America will never forget Pearl Harbor.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole, and include certain excerpts from publications, and also certain statistics.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4717, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] will be recognized for 1 hour.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, first I desire to pay my respects to one of the best friends the servicemen of America ever had, Gen. Frank T. Hines, who served for more than 20 years as head of the Veterans' Administration.

He came in at a time when his predecessor had been driven from power for corruption in office. He took over at a time when the Veterans' Administration was demoralized. He brought order out of chaos, and served through one of the most stormy periods the Veterans' Administration has ever been through. He is now serving as our Ambassador to the Republic of Panama.

I just want to let the record show that I, for one, am grateful for his great services to the veterans of this country.

I also want to pay my tribute to his distinguished successor, Gen. Omar R. Bradley. In my opinion, President Truman could not have found a more able successor to assume the great responsibilities that now rest upon his shoulders.

He is a great soldier, a great American, and in my opinion he is making a great administrator.

I agree with what has been said about General Hawley, one of the outstanding physicians of America, a man who is doing everything in his power to give us what we need, a real medical department in the Veterans' Administration.

For 14 years I have been chairman of this Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. During all that time it has fallen to my lot to lead the fight for the disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. I am carrying out that responsibility today.

We recently conducted an investigation based on certain charges. A careful investigation showed that they had quoted men who were hopelessly insane, that they had made absolutely false statements in their writings and before the committee. But we went through all the hearings and we called, not only General Hines, but also General Bradley before the committee, and at their request we have reported this bill, H. R. 4717, to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

We found in our investigations that the Veterans' Administration had been imposed upon, especially when it came to selecting doctors. They were forced to take doctors from civil service, many of whom, in my opinion, got on the roll by questionable means. They have been compelled to take doctors that the War Department did not want. They have been compelled to take doctors who had got in uniform, some of whom did not want to go to the battle front. As a result, with the connivance of these publicity hounds, some of them have stirred up this trouble in the Veterans' Administration.

After thorough investigation we found there was not a similar institution in a single State that measured up to the average veterans' hospital in that State, or in any other State. We secured a list of these doctors showing when they were selected for each hospital, their date of birth, place of birth, and the date of their employment.

I am going to ask you to look over this list of names which I read to you.

Listen to this:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cole, Maj. Sidney S	Chicago, Ill	June 15, 1910	July 6, 1938
Foster, Lt. Col. Elden H.	Harrisonville, Mo	Sept. 24, 1881	May 15, 1922
Guller, Maj. Emanuel J	Kiev, Russia	Mar. 9, 1911	Sept. 6, 1941
Merrian, Maj. Sidney A	Montgomery, Ala	Feb. 17, 1888	Feb. 2, 1931
Sax, Capt. Max T	Russia	Dec. 25, 1903	Mar. 16, 1942
Trostier, Capt. Lewis S	New York City, N. Y.	Oct. 7, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Ferrell, Lee T	Hazelhurst, Miss	Oct. 23, 1879	Dec. 15, 1920
Mobley, Arthur	Riley, Ark	Mar. 26, 1889	(1)
Civilian dental officer: Kinzer, John D	Bedford, Va	May 10, 1895	Jan. 24, 1936
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Groves, Daniel C	Brockwayville, Pa	Jan. 9, 1878	Dec. 15, 1920
Commissioned medical officer: Mason, First Lt. William S.	Washita County, Okla.	Aug. 17, 1896	Dec. 15, 1942

ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adelman, Capt. Samuel I	Philadelphia, Pa	May 8, 1911	Nov. 19, 1940
Altschuler, Capt. Max G	Omaha, Nebr	Apr. 3, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Chelnek, Capt. Irving	Chicago, Ill	Feb. 25, 1916	Dec. 1, 1941
Cohn, Capt. Harold S	Russia	Dec. 30, 1888	May 1, 1940
Epstein, Capt. Isaac	New York, N. Y	Jan. 15, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Etter, Lt. Col. Roscoe	Warren County, Tenn.	Jan. 18, 1888	Jan. 6, 1931
Ketron, Maj. Hubert W	Pineville, Ky	Mar. 7, 1899	Aug. 27, 1929
Kleinman, Capt. Samuel B.	Russia	Jan. 3, 1914	Feb. 1, 1940
Last, Maj. Jeremiah	New York City	Aug. 22, 1908	June 3, 1938
Mathiasen, Capt. Henning W.	Omaha, Nebr	July 17, 1908	May 1, 1941
McClelland, Maj. Norman M.	Gilmer, Tex	Jan. 28, 1888	Nov. 6, 1931
Odegard, Capt. John K	Kalispell, Mont	Oct. 19, 1908	Aug. 1, 1941
Pravda, Capt. Eli	New York City	Dec. 12, 1913	Mar. 2, 1942
Schwarcz, Capt. Benjamin E.	Obestertze, Hungary	Apr. 23, 1903	Feb. 23, 1938
Sellers, Capt. Harry W	Ottumwa, Iowa	July 13, 1884	Apr. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Burdison, William R	Moscow, Tenn	July 10, 1905	July 3, 1937
Carroll, George F	Atlanta, Ga	June 17, 1884	July 20, 1934
Grubb, Donald J	Liberty, Ill	May 2, 1895	July 27, 1929
Moore, Tarleton	McKinney, Tex	Dec. 22, 1884	Sept. 20, 1919
Moore, William P	Smithville, Ark	Sept. 12, 1889	Feb. 6, 1931
Pedicord, Reece M	Wheeling, W. Va	Feb. 7, 1882	Nov. 1, 1944
Pitts, Wilton G	Hazlehurst, Miss	Nov. 20, 1891	Feb. 10, 1931
Susskind, Arthur	New York, N. Y	Sept. 12, 1910	Aug. 1, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Baker, Maj. DeWitt T	Cookeville, Tenn	Mar. 10, 1894	Oct. 12, 1927
Civilian dental officer: Cassidy, William J	Worcester, Mass	June 20, 1895	(2)

[1] Oct. 20, 1924, to May 11, 1930; Oct. 17, 1932, to Jan. 7, 1937; Sept. 10, 1942.
[2] May 29, 1922, to Feb. 29, 1924; Aug. 8, 1942.

AMARILLO, TEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Corson, Maj. Wesley C	Springfield, Ill	June 11, 1901	July 17, 1939
Handin, Capt. Irving L	Russia	Oct. 4, 1908	Oct. 4, 1938
Haugen, Maj. Ingvald J	Gilby, N. Dak	Apr. 9, 1897	Oct. 17, 1935
Herndon, Lt. Col. Oma E	Powelton, Ga	June 4, 1889	Sept. 8, 1918
Jacobson, Capt. Merlin E	Albion, Nebr	Apr. 3, 1902	Mar. 16, 1942
Walkes, Maj. Ernest E	Avon, S. Dak	July 23, 1895	Mar. 14, 1932
Wegener, Lt. Col. Karl F. E.	Germany	Jan. 9, 1884	Jan. 15, 1923
Civilian dental officers:			
Whitehead, William D	Durango, Colo	June 6, 1896	Nov. 21, 1930

AMERICAN LAKE, WASH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cullins, Col. John G	Junction City, Ark	Dec. 11, 1893	Dec. 1, 1920
Diamond, Capt. Leon S	Chicago, Ill	Aug. 6, 1915	May 1, 1941
Futterman, First Lt. Samuel.	New York, N. Y	Oct. 15, 1909	July 16, 1942
Jackson, Capt. Carl R	Carbondale, Ill	July 7, 1901	1935.
Marcovitch, Maj. Joseph	Kisheneff, Russia	Feb. 6, 1900	Oct. 18, 1937
Morgan, Maj. John D'Arcy	Portland, Oreg	Mar. 22, 1904	Apr. 9, 1935
Simon, Capt. Werner	Bremen, Germany	June 5, 1914	Sept. 16, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Neil, Thomas F	Limestone, Pa	Nov. 8, 1877	May 25, 1922
Commissioned dental officer: Edele, Capt. Fred L	St. Louis, Mo	Oct. 2, 1889	Feb. 9, 1921

ASPINWALL, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abramovitz, Capt. Leonard J.	Baltimore, Md	Jan. 29, 1911	Dec. 1, 1941
Barone, Maj. Andrew M	Fredonia, N. Y	Jan. 29, 1908	Jan. 17, 1938
Carroll, Col. Kelso A	Dudley, Ga	Feb. 14, 1894	May 11, 1932
Cohen, Maj. Archibald C	Clarks Harbor, Nova Scotia, Canada.	Feb. 13, 1909	July 8, 1940
Fellows, Lt. Col. William W.	Salisbury, Mo	Dec. 9, 1896	June 18, 1931
Fronduti, Capt. Lucian J	Jessup, Pa	Dec. 13, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Geer, Capt. Joseph A	Lancaster, Ohio	Mar. 16, 1914	June 1, 1942
Glushien, Maj. Arthur S	Brooklyn, N. Y	July 15, 1911	Jan. 12, 1939
Goodman, Capt. David H	Wilmington, Del	Nov. 25, 1908	Nov. 2, 1942
Huber, Maj. Charles B	Lancaster, Pa	Aug. 17, 1900	Mar. 1, 1937
Machover, Capt. Saul	New York, N. Y	Nov. 11, 1909	May 1, 1941
McClung, Lt. Col. Marshall L.	Charleston, W. Va	July 21, 1895	Aug. 15, 1920
Pullen, First Lt. Lee	United States	July 13, 1913	June 5, 1943
Rumball, Maj. John M	Rochester, N. Y	Apr. 20, 1909	July 8, 1940
Schwartz, Maj. Robert	Brooklyn, N. Y	July 28, 1910	Oct. 4, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Bloom, Charles Francis	Viola, Iowa	Feb. 5, 1881	Feb. 3, 1931
Buka, Alfred J	Pittsburgh, Pa	May 1, 1882	Apr. 24, 1944
Burkhart, Helen W	do	Aug. 10, 1913	Sept. 18, 1944

ASPINWALL, PA.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officers—Con.			
Eberson, Frederick	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 10, 1892	[3]
Ecker, Charles S	Oakmont, Pa	Jan. 5, 1881	Jan. 10, 1944
Hammond, James L	Lebanon, Ind	Apr. 28, 1878	Feb. 15, 1922
Ketterer, Clarence H	Butler, Pa	Jan. 13, 1887	Mar. 25, 1921
Kirk, Donald J	Pittsburgh, Pa	Dec. 18, 1889	Apr. 17, 1944
O'Donnell, Merrill C	Minneapolis, Minn	Aug. 16, 1915	Jan. 17, 1944
Rauch, Stewart E	Bethlehem, Pa	June 30, 1894	Apr. 24, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Ewing, First Lt. Frederick M.	Salisbury, Pa	July 15, 1897	Sept. 10, 1942
Lee, Maj. Walter S		Jan. 2, 1896	Oct. 6, 1920
Rushmer, Capt. Linden A.	Oakland, Calif	Oct. 27, 1905	May 23, 1941
Weil, First Lt. Ely	New York City, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1908	Aug. 1, 1944

ATLANTA, GA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abrams, Capt. Hayman Seelig.	Poland	Apr. 12, 1903	June 9, 1937
DiLorenzo, Capt. Gaspare	Sicily, Italy	Apr. 24, 1904	Oct. 16, 1941
Frischberg, Capt. Samuel B.	Kovel, Russia	Feb. 24, 1896	Apr. 1, 1942
Krantz, Maj. Simon	New Haven, Conn	Dec. 23, 1905	Nov. 11, 1935
Mestre, Maj. Ricardo	Mayaguez, P. R	May 20, 1889	July 14, 1919
Rosen, Capt. Leonard B	Fitchburg, Mass	Dec. 24, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Steiner, Capt. William E	Shawneetown, Ill	May 22, 1914	Feb. 2, 1940
Thurston, Lt. Col. John A	Thomaston, Ga	June 12, 1892	Aug. 20, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Beall, Charles R	Philadelphia, Pa	Feb. 16, 1897	Aug. 1, 1939
Bryant, Roy H	Calhoun, Ga	Nov. 24, 1889	Oct. 11, 1920
Daniel, Robert L	Union Point, Ga	Feb. 10, 1894	Dec. 28, 1923
Daniels, William	Chicago, Ill	Dec. 7, 1884	Dec. 17, 1931
Foster, Simon S	No record available	Jan. 22, 1887	Dec. 6, 1927
Hall, John H	Woodsdale, N. C	May 21, 1885	Sept. 11, 1922
McAllister, James	Mount Vernon, Ga	Oct. 3, 1892	Sept. 1, 1938
Nellans, Charles	South Bend, Ind	June 18, 1894	July 1, 1930
Thompson, William C	Anderson County, S. C.	Dec. 16, 1883	Oct. 16, 1944
Williamson, Milton	No record available	Mar. 3, 1893	May 15, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Boston, Capt. John A.	Warrenton, Va	July 14, 1889	Feb. 26, 1936
Civilian dental officers:			
Pettinger, Neil S	No record available	Aug. 16, 1907	May 15, 1944
Wells, Robert F	Stone Mountain, Ga	June 22, 1891	July 29, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Arthur, James F	St. Matthews, S. C	Aug. 19, 1889	June 9, 1922
Holden, Farish C	Johntown, Ga	Feb. 14, 1900	Jan. 22, 1945
Lahman, Rose A	Toronto, Canada	Oct. 2, 1907	Feb. 7, 1944
Longino, Dick R	Douglas County, Ga	July 20, 1888	Jan. 30, 1929
Treusch, Herbert L	Atlanta, Ga	Apr. 3, 1900	Apr. 3, 1944
Williams, David	Ashville, Ala	May 19, 1886	Apr. 1, 1944

AREA OFFICE NO. 4, ATLANTA, GA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Aimand, Claude	Lithonia, Ga	Jan. 3, 1891	July 1, 1921
Carter, Donald E	Nashville, Ga	Jan. 11, 1895	Feb. 1, 1944
Miller, Walter	No record available	Sept. 15, 1877	Jan. 9, 1945
Tryon, Lewis Roger	Hamburg, Pa	Mar. 22, 1872	Apr. 1, 1944
Turest, David	Lithuania, Province of Kaunos.	Dec. 25, 1902	June 23, 1941

AUGUSTA, GA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burdashaw, Maj. William J.	Atlanta, Ga	July 9, 1900	Apr. 1, 1932
Feinberg, Capt. Philip	Sioux City, Iowa	Apr. 14, 1915	[4]
Gancher, Capt. Ralph	Waterbury, Conn	Dec. 28, 1915	Mar. 16, 1942
McElroy, Capt. Robert B	Rogers, Tex	Jan. 9, 1912	July 8, 1940
Miracolo, First Lt. Charles C.	Italy	Jan. 1, 1907	Nov. 2, 1942
Schcinman, Capt. Leonard	New York, N. Y	Mar. 28, 1909	Mar. 16, 1943
Tighe, Maj. Leo R	Cohoes, N. Y	Aug. 13, 1890	Oct. 1, 1928
Vicary, Maj. William H	Lockport, N. Y	Sept. 6, 1909	October 1937
Walton, Lt. Col. Charles R.	Benton, Ark	Feb. 7, 1894	Mar. 8, 1922
Civilian medical officers:			
Clayton, Malcolm D	Roy, Ga	Aug. 31, 1888	May 14, 1921
Hutchison, Sam L	Belden, Miss	Nov. 18, 1902	June 11, 1936
Witten, Henry O	Coffee, Mo	Feb. 13, 1886	[5]
Civilian dental officer: Skinner, Edward J.	New Orleans, La	Sept. 25, 1891	Oct. 17, 1922

[2] Oct. 17, 1938, to Aug. 15, 1940; Aug. 24, 1942.
[4] In 1941.
[5] Oct. 1, 1920, to Jan. 10, 1926, Sept. 1, 1928.

BALTIMORE, MD., BALTIMORE AREA, OFFICE NO. 3

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Richards, Dickinson	Alton, Iowa	May 17, 1893	Dec. 23, 1944
Forney, Guy V	Peru, Ind	June 20, 1889	Dec. 20, 1927

BALTIMORE REGIONAL OFFICE, BALTIMORE, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baird, Maj. Paul E	Winchester, Ohio	June 6, 1903	Sept. 2, 1938
Di Iorio, Capt. Edward L	Newark, N. J	Nov. 17, 1911	Dec. 1, 1941
Fox, Maj. Nathan S	Berezdov, Russia	Apr. 22, 1896	July 6, 1937
Glickman, Maj. Leo G	No record available	Oct. 22, 1899	Sept. 26, 1926
Isen, Capt. Paul J	Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y.	Oct. 25, 1914	May 1, 1941
Ludwig, Capt. Irving L	Chicago, Ill	Jan. 25, 1905	Nov. 16, 1931
Commissioned dental officer: Vickery, Capt. Arthur L.	Rock Stream, N. Y	Aug. 6, 1894	Oct. 21, 1926
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Carroll, Charles J.	Dennisville, N. J	Dec. 16, 1872	Dec. 29, 1943

BATAVIA, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Badaines, Maj. Nathaniel H.	Poland	Apr. 20, 1902	Mar. 23, 1939
Bogen, Maj. Eugene F	Finland	Nov. 4, 1886	May 23, 1934
Bonner, Maj. William F	Bastrop, La	Dec. 25, 1884	May 1, 1937
Cajigas, Capt. Mariano	Puerto Rico	Sept. 8, 1905	Aug. 9, 1935
Catinella, Capt. Anthony S.	New York, N. Y	Apr. 15, 1908	July 16, 1942
Eisert, Capt. Otto	do	July 6, 1912	Sept. 16, 1942
Jolly, Lt. Lewis E	No record available	Mar. 3, 1912	Apr. 16, 1940
Kirsh, Maj. Israel E	Russia	Mar. 17, 1906	Feb. 11, 1938
Korol, Maj. Epharim	do	Aug. 15, 1894	Aug. 15, 1920
Locke, Lt. Col. Frederick C.	Vevay, Ind	Jan. 24, 1884	July 25, 1920
Roadruck, Capt. Roscoe D.	Albion, Nebr	Nov. 7, 1905	July 5, 1938
Sorenson, Lt. Col. Raymond.	Erwin, S. Dak	Jan. 15, 1904	Sept. 4, 1934
Civilian medical officer: Newlove, Frank E.	Winnepeg, Mass	Oct. 24, 1890	Apr. 1, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Day, Capt. Milligan E.	Georgia	Feb. 7, 1889	May 24, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blanchette, Lt. Louis A	Montreal, Canada	Aug. 15, 1888	June 19, 1944
Trott, Capt. Harold William.	Canada	Aug. 7, 1899	Jan. 25, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Malonson, James H	Gloucester, Mass	Dec. 20, 1876	[6]
McDowell, John S	Plattsburg, N. Y	June 1, 1894	Feb. 21, 1944
Waglom, Wesley W	New York, N. Y	June 18, 1881	Feb. 25, 1944

BATH, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alexander, Maj. Ralph E	New York, N. Y	Oct. 22, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Alvermann, Capt. Emil	Germany	June 2, 1908	July 9, 1937
Bolin, Maj. Neatha V	Cleveland, Kans	Aug. 31, 1905	Jan. 16, 1939
Feldberg, Capt. Irving	New York, N. Y	July 21, 1904	Feb. 3, 1941
Giacomini, Capt. Antonio J.	Wallingford, Conn	June 9, 1906	May 1, 1941
Kates, Maj. Samuel R	Cleveland, Ohio	Aug. 15, 1908	Feb. 17, 1937
Knoll, Capt. William	New York, N. Y	Dec. 29, 1904	Dec. 2, 1940
Koretz, Capt. Harold	Detroit, Mich	Jan. 18, 1910	Jan. 10, 1938
Lipton, Capt. Benjamin	Corona, Long Island, N. Y.	Dec. 20, 1907	Feb. 3, 1941
Salberg, Capt. Seymour R.	Chicago, Ill	Jan. 25, 1910	Mar. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Steindler, Leo	Baltimore, Md	Oct. 17, 1886	Nov. 1, 1921
Woodward, Roy	Steuben County, N. Y.	May 12, 1889	Oct. 20, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Hoos, Capt. Herman H.	Brooklyn, N. Y	Sept. 26, 1907	Nov. 2, 1939
Civilian dental officers:			
Endler, Joseph C	West Hoboken, N. Y	Apr. 7, 1892	Oct. 1, 1923
Hodges, Lowell B	Oak Forrest, Tex	June 4, 1896	Mar. 24, 1925

[6] Jan. 3, 1921, to June 1921, July 12, 1921, to Jan. 15, 1940, May 1, 1941.

BAY PINES, FLA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baranowski, Capt. Joseph A.	No record available	Mar. 3, 1908	May 1, 1941
Barnett, Capt. Ernest R.	do	Nov. 11, 1912	Jan. 8, 1945
Bevis, Lt. Col. William M.	Boscom, Fla	Oct. 16, 1882	Oct. 8, 1928
Deane, Capt. Harry R.	Chicago, Ill	Oct. 21, 1909	Mar. 1, 1938
Gorday, Capt. Abraham J.	do	Apr. 30, 1914	Aug. 29, 1938
Hanks, Maj. George W.	Panguitch, Utah	Mar. 14, 1892	Dec. 23, 1930
Jones, Lt. Col. Will O'D.	Milledgeville	Mar. 5, 1888	Feb. 20, 1932
Karmiol, Capt. Jerome	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 3, 1910	Feb. 3, 1941
Keller, Maj. Julian J.	Birmingham, Ala	Sept. 21, 1903	Jan. 9, 1935
Klapman, Capt. Martin J.	Chicago, Ill	Oct. 5, 1913	May 1, 1941
Manginelli, Capt. Vitus W.	New York, N. Y.	May 18, 1905	July 8, 1940
Range, Maj. Irving	Ulster, N. Y.	July 24, 1896	Mar. 12, 1937
Rock, Maj. John W.	Paducah, Ky.	June 9, 1889	Feb. 16, 1922
Sieger, Maj. Simon	Ostrow Lomza, Poland.	Dec. 25, 1901	Sept. 1, 1937
Simon, Capt. Sydney M.	Bronx, N. Y.	July 23, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Barnett, Ernest R.	No record available	Nov. 11, 1912	Jan. 8, 1945
Hughes, Charles W.	Wisconsin	Mar. 9, 1877	June 6, 1923
Nelson, James Van D.	Logansport, Ind.	May 1, 1878	Aug. 15, 1921
Nelson, Roger W.	Quincy, Mass.	Nov. 2, 1897	May 26, 1939
Thaler, Henry S.	Austria	Aug. 20, 1904	June 23, 1941
Thompson, William J.	Oneonta, N. Y.	Aug. 3, 1882	Aug. 4, 1944
Wendriner, Herbert V.	Breslau, Germany	Nov. 14, 1879	July 4, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Hatcher, Maj. William H.	Allen, Ky.	Mar. 15, 1893	May 1, 1920
Judge, Capt. Newell T.	Carbondale, Pa.	Nov. 15, 1897	Aug. 8, 1923
Lonnegan, First Lt. Joseph A.	New Orleans, La.	Mar. 27, 1909	Feb. 6, 1941
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Fleming, Mary R.	Monterey, Va.	Apr. 17, 1877	Feb. 15, 1944
Smith, Ray W.	Newport, Ga.	June 9, 1889	Feb. 2, 1924

BEDFORD, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burrier, Lt. Col. Walter P.	Biddeford, Maine	Apr. 12, 1882	Nov. 19, 1921
Edelstein, Capt Abraham.	Austria-Hungary	Oct. 24, 1916	June 1, 1942
Meislin, Capt. Jacob	Kremenchug, Russia	July 4, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Mercurio, Capt. Frank	New York City	June 26, 1912	Do.
O'Brien, Maj. John F.	Fall River, Mass.	Aug. 12, 1886	Apr. 4, 1928
Weber, Capt. Joseph E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	June 17, 1910	May 6, 1938
Zellin, Maj. Morris	Boston, Mass.	Aug. 12, 1897	May 21, 1924
Civilian medical officers:			
Adams, Winthrop	Cambridge, Mass.	May 18, 1887	Sept. 26, 1919
Blumenthal, Irving J.	New York City	Dec. 14, 1910	May 1, 1941
Braverman, Aaron H.	Chelsea, Mass.	Mar. 18, 1897	Jan. 15, 1923
Richter, Waldemar G.	Fargo, N. Dak.	Jan. 14, 1892	(*)
Commissioned dental officers: Schuman, First Lt. Elihu L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 18, 1906	July 1, 1941
Civilian dental officers: Sinton, William.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	May 5, 1883	July 1, 1921

BILOXI, MISS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Burns, Lt. Col. Ellis P.	Birmingham, Ala.	July 4, 1886	June 15, 1922
Heard, Maj. Wilbur L.	Camp Hill, Ala.	Jan. 12, 1889	Jan. 22, 1937
Hille, Maj. Richard W.	Norfolk, Nebr.	Oct. 2, 1898	Jan. 5, 1932
Iseman, Capt. Robert M.	Cleveland, Ohio	Feb. 10, 1912	Feb. 3, 1941
Manning, Maj. Wilkins R., Jr.	No record available	Apr. 30, 1910	Nov. 1, 1941
Pruett, Capt. William V.	Aberdeen, Miss.	Apr. 22, 1888	May 31, 1930
Civilian medical officers:			
Haslitt, Percy P.	Marshall, Ill.	May 7, 1880	Mar. 17, 1922
Henry, Hugh B.	Bluff City, Ark.	Mar. 16, 1890	Dec. 1, 1924
Larde, Charles D.	Salvadore, France	Jan. 16, 1898	Aug. 16, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Roberts, Capt. Thomas N.	Somerset, Ky.	July 7, 1893	Apr. 10, 1921

This is one of the best managed and operated hospitals in the whole country.

BOISE, IDAHO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allis, Maj. Sherman L.	Kansas City, Mo.	May 15, 1911	Oct. 5, 1938
Davis, Maj. Ralph E.	Foster, Mo.	Oct. 17, 1891	Nov. 1, 1920
Harris, Maj. Henry C.	Wake County, N. C.	July 28, 1893	Apr. 8, 1931
Kimelman, Capt. Nathan.	Warsaw, Poland	Feb. 18, 1912	May 1, 1941
Schuell, Maj. Gerald J.	Parnell, Iowa	Mar. 14, 1894	Mar. 6, 1934
Schulz, Lt. Col. Arthur W.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 30, 1892	July 16, 1928
Commissioned dental officer: Bouchet, Capt. Herman	Montreal, Canada	Feb. 21, 1898	Apr. 15, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Downs, Joseph M.	Chicago, Ill.	Feb. 7, 1890	Jan. 17, 1944

*Dec. 1, 1925, to Dec. 31, 1926; Mar. 6, 1927.

BOSTON, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer: Johnson, Capt. Goodwin A.	Keene, N. H.	Feb. 10, 1891	Aug. 30, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Berenson, Capt. Wyman.	Zaslov, Russia	Nov. 28, 1897	July 22, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Fasanello, John Baptist	Casano Al Jona, Italy	Mar. 7, 1900	Jan. 19, 1944
Kewer, Leo T.	Boston, Mass.	Apr. 13, 1888	Oct. 18, 1928
Quirk, Thomas C.	Watertown, Mass.	Jan. 6, 1889	Feb. 1, 1944

BRECKSVILLE, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Deucher, Capt. Richard G.	Cleveland, Ohio	May 3, 1914	July 16, 1942
Dredge, Maj. Thomas E.	Bellview, Minn.	Sept. 3, 1902	Nov. 10, 1930
Gilfoy, Maj. Francis E.	Adams, Mass.	Aug. 10, 1901	Mar. 6, 1935
Halberstein, 1st Lt. Abraham.	Warsaw, Poland	July 28, 1902	Sept. 16, 1942
Harris, Capt. Michael A.	Central Falls, R. I.	Sept. 21, 1911	Feb. 3, 1941
Ruegsegger, Maj. Franklin M.	Baltic, Ohio	Nov. 27, 1899	Sept. 11, 1931
Schneider, Capt. Irving M.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 18, 1914	May 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Bearden Fred	Solgohachia, Ark.	Dec. 10, 1884	Nov. 5, 1920
Bradford, Wm. H.	Nankipoo, Tenn.	Feb. 11, 1901	July 1, 1928
Cass, James W.	Maumee, Ohio	Sept. 20, 1882	Mar. 1, 1922
Pomerantz, Max M.	New York, N. Y.	June 5, 1909	Mar. 18, 1944
Post, Edward	South Bend, Ind.	Oct. 10, 1898	Oct. 26, 1934
Trockey, Sidney	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 10, 1889	Nov. 19, 1941
Ujhely Valentine	Budapest, Hungary	July 9, 1896	May 1, 1931
Commissioned dental officer: Eisenberg, Capt. Max M.	New York City	May 3, 1911	Jan. 18, 1943
Civilian dental officer: Koch, Harvey.	Sumner, Iowa	Oct. 25, 1892	Sept. 1, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Ward, Harry H.	North Girard, Pa.	Feb. 5, 1878	Aug. 27, 1923

BRONX, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Balcer, Maj. Edwin A.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 10, 1911	Oct. 1, 1940
Barnett, Capt. Jack J.	New York City, N. Y.	Aug. 31, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Begenau, Capt. Vernon G.	Beekskill, N. Y.	July 1, 1914	Jan. 4, 1943
Bergmann, Capt. Charles S.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 13, 1890	Aug. 17, 1921
Blum, Capt. Samuel D.	do	Sept. 1, 1907	Mar. 3, 1941
Brooks, Capt. Louis	Russia	Oct. 31, 1884	May 12, 1921
Carotenuto, Capt. Ralph J.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 15, 1907	Nov. 25, 1938
Caruso, Capt. Anthony T.	Newark, N. J.	Mar. 10, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Casesa, Capt. Philip R.	Sicily, Italy	June 6, 1909	July 1, 1942
Cook, Col. Robert C.	Bradley, S. Dak.	Mar. 28, 1887	Aug. 16, 1919
Davidhoff, Capt. Morris	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1900	Dec. 3, 1931
Deutschman, Capt. Reynold.	Cleveland, Ohio	Dec. 7, 1913	Sept. 16, 1942
Diamond, Capt. Norman	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 2, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
D'Oronzio, Capt. George B.	New York City	Feb. 27, 1901	Apr. 1, 1942
Eichenholtz, Maj. Sidney N.	Tarneu, Austria	Mar. 16, 1909	Feb. 17, 1937
Epstein, Capt. Jacob I.	New York City	May 28, 1903	Mar. 10, 1941
Flowers, Lt. Col. Hiland L.	do	June 13, 1894	Dec. 1, 1928
Frankel, Capt. Samuel	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 28, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Gellis, Capt. Sydney A.	New York City	Dec. 15, 1906	May 16, 1936
Gennis, Capt. Joseph	do	Feb. 1, 1912	Jan. 15, 1940
Glasser, Capt. Samuel M.	do	Oct. 28, 1908	Oct. 21, 1938
Gruenbaum, Capt. Max	Bucharest, Rumania	Nov. 7, 1886	May 14, 1921
Hardegree, Lt. Col. Harvey C.	Newman, Ga.	Feb. 4, 1891	Sept. 14, 1921
Joseph, Capt. Julius M.	Bronx, N. Y.	Oct. 6, 1910	July 13, 1944
Kapp, Maj. Louis A.	Koretz, Poland	June 25, 1888	May 9, 1936
Karlen, Capt. Saul H.	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 5, 1909	Feb. 3, 1941
Katz, Capt. Michael M.	do	Oct. 20, 1910	July 16, 1942
Katz, Capt. Sidney	do	May 27, 1917	July 16, 1942
Kemick, Capt. Irvin B.	Dubno, Poland	Nov. 14, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Kessler, Maj. Harry	New York City	Oct. 12, 1906	Oct. 21, 1935
Klein, Capt. Jacob	do	Apr. 26, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Labruier, Capt. Frederick J.	do	Sept. 6, 1884	Jan. 21, 1944
La Canna, Capt. Ralph L.	Mayfield, Pa.	Sept. 26, 1904	Mar. 16, 1942
Lattman, Capt. Morris	Russia	Aug. 16, 1896	July 16, 1936
Luloff, Capt. Harry	New York City	Jan. 11, 1911	Mar. 2, 1942
Marshall, Maj. Louis R.	Cleveland, Ohio	Dec. 11, 1899	Nov. 9, 1934
Matte, Maj. Michael L.	Gile, Wis.	Mar. 12, 1910	July 6, 1937
Mayer, Capt. Hyman R.	New York City	July 29, 1911	Dec. 1, 1941
Miller, Capt. Joseph S.	No record available	Oct. 28, 1909	Mar. 16, 1938
Moreland, Lt. Col. Randall.	Madison, Ind.	June 28, 1904	Oct. 20, 1932
Olson, Lt. Col. Ernest S.	Lemont, Ill.	Mar. 24, 1901	Nov. 16, 1931
Pfeifer, Capt. Jacob J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 2, 1889	Mar. 7, 1921
Pinks, Maj. David K.	Jersey City, N. J.	Aug. 25, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939

BRONX, N. Y.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Podryski, Capt. Vladimir	Russia	Dec. 25, 1903	Apr. 1, 1942
Porter, First Lt. Louis	do	Nov. 15, 1911	Sept. 1943
Priviteri, Capt. Charles A.	Sicily, Italy	Jan. 1, 1910	Oct. 10, 1938
Povlin, Capt. Sheppard S.	New York City	July 1, 1900	Nov. 22, 1943
Robinson, Maj. Adrian M.	Walnut, Iowa	Nov. 20, 1904	Nov. 16, 1934
Roswit, Capt. Bernard	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 12, 1910	Feb. 23, 1937
Schneck, Capt. Jack I.	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 10, 1908	Jan. 15, 1940
Schneider, Capt. Julius	New York City	June 6, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Schwartz, Capt. William A.	Minsk, Russia	Mar. 12, 1901	Mar. 16, 1942
Sheinmel, Maj. Archie	Brest, Poland	Jan. 15, 1906	Aug. 23, 1940
Spivack, Capt. Louis L.	New York City	Aug. 17, 1904	July 1, 1931
Steingold, Capt. Meyer	Norfolk, Va.	Dec. 7, 1912	Jan. 15, 1940
Straus, Capt. Bernard	New York City	July 30, 1911	Jan. 4, 1944
Tepperberg, Capt. Irving	do	Oct. 6, 1908	Mar. 1, 1938
Toomey, Maj. Joseph H.	New Brunswick, Canada.	Feb. 28, 1884	July 19, 1919
Young, Capt. William J.	Boston, Mass.	Sept. 9, 1881	June 3, 1930
Zane, Capt. Manuel D.	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Jan. 4, 1913	Feb. 2, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Abramson, Clarence	No record available	July 10, 1909	Aug. 23, 1944
Cohn, Franklin	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 10, 1883	June 13, 1931
Donovan, Timothy S.	Lawrence, Mass.	Dec. 27, 1876	Dec. 14, 1920
Emanuele, Louis J.	New York City	Feb. 25, 1908	July 8, 1940
Berrara, James A.	Portocannone, Italy	Feb. 5, 1896	Oct. 22, 1941
Fuller, Allen G.	Greenville, Mich.	Nov. 17, 1880	June 8, 1920
Fuller, Robert G.	Shiloh, La.	Apr. 9, 1887	Mar. 16, 1929
Kreuger, Erich G.	Lemgo, Germany	Dec. 23, 1903	Apr. 24, 1945
Lancer, John J.	No record available	Jan. 30, 1886	1925
Lindenauer, Harold	New York City	Oct. 26, 1907	Dec. 2, 1944
Mattice, Eugene	Pueblo, Colo.	May 6, 1888	Oct. 15, 1919
Minden, Bendix S.	No record available	Sept. 11, 1896	Aug. 17, 1944
Mittleman, A. A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 6, 1912	Feb. 3, 1941
Scannell, Edward	Concord, N. H.	Feb. 16, 1876	Sept. 17, 1932
Schwartz, Joseph A.	New York City	May 10, 1910	Dec. 29, 1943
Shimberg, Mandel	Troy, N. Y.	Oct. 16, 1894	Sept. 16, 1931
Silver, Jones	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 17, 1902	Apr. 24, 1944
Souther, Robert F.	Boston, Mass.	Feb. 15, 1876	Jan. 27, 1933
Steinberg, Miguel	Plonck, Russia	May 10, 1888	Aug. 4, 1944
Verner, William W.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 7, 1875	Jan. 23, 1922
Young, James J. L.	New York City	Mar. 23, 1876	Aug. 15, 1920

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bobowiec, Capt. Basil B.	Adams, Mass.	June 21, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Cinder, 1st Lt. Julius	New York City	Jan. 11, 1913	Mar. 1, 1943
Constantine, Capt. Oleinick P.	Luchyn, Poland	Oct. 22, 1908	Sept. 25, 1943
Dell Cort, Capt. Amerigo P.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 18, 1907	July 8, 1940
Levy, Maj. Edwin M.	St. Mary Parish, La.	June 17, 1895	Mar. 7, 1930
Ranno, Capt. Frederick S.	New York City	June 5, 1910	May 1, 1941
Rubin, Maj. Emanual	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 6, 1904	Jan. 16, 1935
Slocum, Capt. Yudell K.	Clifton Forge, Va.	June 5, 1904	Oct. 19, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Borden, Parker G.	Downesville, N. Y.	Jan. 16, 1879	[7]
Hansen, Hans	Denmark	Mar. 24, 1878	Jan. 15, 1923
Mueller, Donald F.	Dyersville, Iowa	Feb. 18, 1912	June 1, 1942
Wafer, Raymond F.	Hornell, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1880	Jan. 7, 1928

CASTLE POINT, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Ballou, Maj. DeForrest, Jr.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Mar. 21, 1885	June 15, 1925
Bates, Col. Carleton	New Jersey	Dec. 30, 1883	June 16, 1919
Beloff, Capt. Lewis	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 23, 1912	July 1, 1942
Emma, Capt. Edwin	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 14, 1912	Mar. 2, 1942
Goldstein, Capt. Leon	do	Sept. 23, 1914	Do.
Greer, Maj. Rex E.	Woodford, Okla.	Jan. 13, 1907	Sept. 16, 1938
Hartman, Capt. Joseph	Pap, Hungary	Mar. 11, 1906	Feb. 2, 1942
Huenagel, Lt. Col. Charles J.	Dale, Ind.	Feb. 17, 1888	Jan. 17, 1936
Lande, Maj. Frank	Brest-Litouis, Russia	Apr. 2, 1888	Feb. 24, 1931
Lerner, Capt. George	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 4, 1906	Mar. 1, 1938
Schumann, 1st Lt. David P.	Jersey City, N. J.	Feb. 25, 1913	Jan. 17, 1944
Tedesco, Maj. Joseph F.	New York City, N. Y.	Sept. 23, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Trevisano, Maj. Anthony	Palcrews, Italy	July 21, 1890	Mar. 1, 1928
Civilian medical officers:			
Andreyko, George	Austria	Feb. 12, 1899	Nov. 13, 1944
Brostin, James	Ireland	Nov. 11, 1877	July 13, 1922
Keirans, James E.	Willimantic, Conn.	Aug. 8, 1898	Mar. 21, 1928
Michelson, Nicholas	Riga, Latvia	Dec. 3, 1897	July 3, 1944
Sloat, Harrison	Watertown, N. Y.	July 20, 1878	Feb. 12, 1922

[7] June 24, 1920; May 1, 1927; Sept. 4, 1927.

CHEYENNE, WYO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allegretti, Lt. Col. Anthony J.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 1, 1907	Mar. 19, 1936
Clarke, Capt. Edward J.	Anselma, Nebr.	July 25, 1898	Nov. 2, 1931
Glicksman, Capt. Herbert Y.	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 16, 1914	Nov. 1, 1941
Griffin, Maj. Jack B.	El Reno, Okla.	May 15, 1912	Oct. 1, 1940
Steele, Maj. Ashby B.	Benton, Ark.	Nov. 8, 1901	Mar. 1, 1931
Stone, Capt. Calvin F.	Chicago, Ill.	Sept. 19, 1910	Nov. 16, 1942
Winsberg, Maj. James A.	do	May 2, 1910	Sept. 17, 1938
Civilian medical officers: Savage, Nephi H.	St. George, Utah	Feb. 19, 1892	July 1, 1944

CHICAGO, ILL., AREA NO. 6

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Bisdorf, Mathias	Cologne, Germany	June 3, 1881	Jan. 24, 1944
Gooder, Will	St. Paul, Minn.	Aug. 1, 1881	Mar. 16, 1945
Margolis, David	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 3, 1893	Sept. 22, 1919

CHILLICOTHE, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Ashmore, Maj. Buell L.	Hopkins County, Ky.	Dec. 4, 1889	Mar. 30, 1927
Esposito, Capt. Albert C.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 9, 1912	Oct. 16, 1939
Futrelle, Lt. Col. Walter E.	Conway, N. C.	Nov. 10, 1886	May 11, 1931
Halle, Capt. Louis	New York City	July 28, 1908	Feb. 2, 1942
Hanus, Capt. Joseph J.	Bryan, Tex.	Dec. 31, 1898	July 1, 1942
Hyman, Capt. Barnett M.	No record available	June 12, 1908	Oct. 1, 1940
Kravetz, Capt. Irwin	Jersey City, N. J.	Dec. 19, 1913	Feb. 3, 1941
Kruglik, Capt. Meyer	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 3, 1914	Feb. 2, 1942
Madden, Maj. Arthur B.	New York City	Apr. 4, 1894	Feb. 28, 1938
Sharp, Maj. William T.	Kimberly, W. Va.	June 29, 1907	Sept. 23, 1937
Tanner, Capt. Henry	New York City	Feb. 15, 1904	Sept. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Garrett, Ephraim Spencer, Jr.	Mount Willing, Ala.	Nov. 3, 1897	June 1, 1943

COATESVILLE, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allen, Maj. Adam G.	Miamisburg, Ohio	Sept. 4, 1908	Nov. 1, 1939
Horst, Capt. Elmer L.	Annville, Pa.	Dec. 2, 1912	Do.
McCullough, Capt. John D.	Solomon, Kans.	Feb. 17, 1905	Oct. 16, 1941
Polan, Maj. Simon	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 24, 1912	Nov. 9, 1939
Woods, Lt. Col. Leo G.	Birmingham, Ala.	Oct. 8, 1889	July 1, 1927
Civilian medical officers:			
Bailey, William	Lyndon, Vt.	Jan. 29, 1893	Feb. 1, 1944
Fulmer, Joseph C.	Williamsport, Pa.	Aug. 22, 1884	Feb. 25, 1921
Katzman, George M.	Ravno, Poland	Jan. 1, 1900	Mar. 16, 1942
Kotzin, Isadore	Pennsylvania	Apr. 29, 1907	Nov. 1, 1941
Miller, Clarence R.	Pacific, Mo.	Jan. 17, 1890	July 19, 1919
Podall, Harry C.	New Haven, Conn.	May 22, 1883	[8]
Civilian dental officer: Neilon, John E.	Addison, N. Y.	Jan. 18, 1891	Oct. 3, 1921

COLUMBIA, S. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allon, Capt. John J.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 25, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Barnett, Maj. Roy N.	Woodmere, N. Y.	June 6, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Burger, Capt. Mortimer D.	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 25, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Butt, Capt. William J.		May 15, 1887	Jan. 1, 1931
Eaddy, Maj. Albert M.	Timmonsville, S. C.	May 18, 1903	Do.
Hartnett, Maj. William C.	Toledo, Ohio	June 2, 1903	July 1, 1942
Miller, Capt. Harold	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 12, 1917	Mar. 16, 1942
Potozky, Capt. Henry	New York	July 7, 1909	Feb. 17, 1939
Rosenberg, Maj. Nathan	Kansas City, Mo.	June 30, 1894	Nov. 7, 1933
Zimmerman, Maj. Solomon L.	New York City, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1912	Dec. 1, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Birch, Louis	Warsaw, Poland	Dec. 29, 1906	Do.
Coffee, Henry Daniel	Ashland, Ga.	Dec. 20, 1886	May 4, 1925
Ruoff, John Sebastian	Natchez, Miss.	Aug. 15, 1889	Aug. 1, 1925
Smarr, Roy G.	Sharon, S. C.	Aug. 29, 1909	June 1, 1944
Woods, Jackson F.	Irene, S. C.	Apr. 25, 1896	Mar. 1, 1931
Commissioned dental officers:			
Richards, Maj. Paul E.	Eageltown, Ind.	Aug. 13, 1895	Oct. 19, 1931
Taylor, Capt. William F.		July 9, 1895	Dec. 17, 1930

[8] July 15, 1921, to June 11, 1925.

COLUMBIA, S. C.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Fishburne, Skottowe B.	Williamsburg County, S. C.	Nov. 27, 1875	June 16, 1922
Foster, Ralph K.	Lancaster, S. C.	May 11, 1884	Jan. 18, 1944
Hall, Price B.	Belmont, N. C.	Apr. 14, 1880	Mar. 2, 1944

COLUMBUS, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Hendman, Samuel.	Iberia, Ohio	Dec. 23, 1879	Aug. 22, 1921

DALLAS, TEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Freed, Maj. Harold	Lithuania	Dec. 28, 1890	Apr. 3, 1924
Fromm, Capt. Charles S.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 7, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Lipschultz, Capt. Bernard M.	do	Nov. 14, 1912	May 1, 1941
Magruder, Lt. Col. Charles	Monrovia, Md.	June 23, 1891	Jan. 17, 1925
Mock, Maj. Ernest L.	Bluffton, Ind.	Oct. 9, 1896	Sept. 1, 1936
Powell, Maj. Homer	Brownwood, Tex.	Oct. 4, 1889	Sept. 18, 1922
Sazama, Capt. John J., Jr.	Chicago, Ill.	Aug. 20, 1911	Jan. 16, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Beckman, Monroe A.	Oldenburg, Tex.	Aug. 8, 1888	Nov. 1, 1944
Karras, Ray	No record available	Oct. 4, 1888	Dec. 1, 1919
Patton, Edgar	Clay, Miss.	June 18, 1886	June 16, 1928
Rowe, Forsythe	Hillsboro, Tex.	Aug. 18, 1893	Sept. 13, 1922
Standifer, Charles H.	Bastrop County, Tex.	Oct. 15, 1882	Aug. 16, 1926
Stephenson, William O.	Corinth, Miss.	July 26, 1873	Feb. 3, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Powell, Capt. Daron H.	Eulogy, Tex.	Aug. 26, 1895	Aug. 21, 1928
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Booth, Carleton	Macomb, Ill.	July 9, 1871	Feb. 11, 1944
Gooden, Thomas M.	Stephenville, Tex.	Nov. 4, 1887	Jan. 2, 1945
Maxwell, Samuel A.	Dubuque County, Iowa.	Jan. 27, 1872	Mar. 12, 1945
McBride, James T.	Belleville, Ill.	Aug. 2, 1871	Nov. 4, 1943
Usury, Ralcigh S.	Calhoun County, Ala.	Feb. 11, 1885	Apr. 1, 1944

DANVILLE, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cancellieri, Capt. Remo	New York, N. Y.	Nov. 12, 1907	Nov. 2, 1942
Elledge, Maj. Lloyd C.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Feb. 2, 1898	Sept. 1, 1925
Klemmer, Maj. Herbert	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 19, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Lipkin, Capt. Sam J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 28, 1908	Oct. 6, 1938
Prata, Capt. Michael	New York, N. Y.	Mar. 29, 1903	Jan. 4, 1943
Rothman, Capt. Harold	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 27, 1913	Dec. 1, 1941
Werba, Maj. Daniel R.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Dec. 22, 1898	Mar. 16, 1927
Workman, Capt Abraham D.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 30, 1911	Feb. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Rice, George D		Aug. 31, 1880	Apr. 7, 1924
Rowland, George	Delaware, Ohio	Jan. 17, 1879	July 1, 1919
Thompson, John J.	Ontario, Canada	Oct. 26, 1879	May 26, 1924
Commissioned dental officers:			
Abraham, First Lt. Ray T.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Sept. 17, 1906	Mar. 13, 1942
Burke, Capt. John J.	St. Louis, Mo.	Oct. 11, 1888	Nov. 20, 1920

DAYTON, OHIO

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abramson, Maj. William	No record available	Aug. —, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Arduino, Capt. Lino J.	Centerville, Iowa	Dec. 18, 1914	Oct. 16, 1939
Barnett, Maj. Abner J.	Carthage, Miss.	Oct. 21, 1892	May 8, 1931
Brogan, Maj. Austin J.	Archibald, Pa.	Jan. 29, 1905	Jan. 20, 1938
Brown, Lt. Col. Robert N.	Johnson City, Tenn.	June 17, 1903	July 16, 1930
Burton, Lt. Col. Claud C.	Louisville, Ky.	Mar. 24, 1897	July 5, 1921
Camp, Capt. Walter H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 31, 1913	Dec. 2, 1940
Caruso, Capt. Rocco J.	Newark, N. J.	Nov. 27, 1897	Apr. 1, 1942
Chazin, Capt. Benjamin J.	Lubar, Russia	July 8, 1901	Dec. 1, 1941
Colangelo, Capt. Cornelius C.	United States of America.	Nov. 9, 1915	May 1, 1941
Davis, Capt. James S.	Boston, Mass.	June 22, 1913	Feb. 2, 1942
Dugdale, Capt. Frederick E.	Lowell, Mass.	May 28, 1906	Dec. 1, 1941
Einhorn, Capt. Harry	Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 11, 1909	Oct. 1, 1940
De Rago, Capt. Clifford L.	New York City	Nov. 28, 1900	Dec. 29, 1944
Eisenberg, Capt. Joseph A.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 27, 1908	Jan. 3, 1939
Garner, Cpat. Amos D.	Paragould, Ark.	Sept. 22, 1913	June 1, 1942
Holsinger, Capt. Robert E.	Washington, Ind.	Feb. 12, 1906	Mar. 2, 1942
Nolan, Maj. Don E.	Beardsley, Minn.	Sept. 21, 1905	Oct. 5, 1938

DAYTON, OHIO—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Rhodes, Capt. Marvin P.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 15, 1911	May 1, 1941
Robertson, Maj. Robert C.	Republic, Mo.	Aug. 6, 1883	Sept. 16, 1925
Royal, Maj. Warren M.	Georgia	Jan. 7, 1885	Aug. 10, 1924
Schillinger, Lt. Col. Edward N.	Covington, Ohio	Oct. 6, 1889	May 15, 1919
Speier, Capt. Aaron S.	Crete, Nebr.	Jan. 20, 1898	Mar. 16, 1942
Stewart, Maj. Edgar A.	Quincy, Ill.	May 6, 1881	Apr. 16, 1927
Thomas, Capt. Maurice C.	New York City, N. Y.	Apr. 7, 1902	Mar. 1, 1943
Zollett, Capt. Phillip B.	Russia	Apr. 10, 1903	May 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Brown, Arthur M.	Cherokee, Iowa	Dec. 31, 1881	May 10, 1920
Gartlitz, Arnold	No record available	Feb. 15, 1874	Apr. 15, 1928
Gillam, Anna J.	Worcester, Mass.	July 4, 1883	Sept. 1, 1944
Hynes, Joseph C.	St. Louis, Mo.	Dec. 4, 1878	Apr. 17, 1923
Lockwood, Kenneth L.	Covington, Ky.	Jan. 30, 1896	Oct. 16, 1944
Perkins, Ruffin	La Fourche Parish, La.	Jan. 5, 1880	Nov. 10, 1919
Reichard, Simon	Mauch Chunk, Pa.	June 8, 1878	June 1, 1921
Schiffer, Harry	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 5, 1908	Jan. 4, 1943
Sullivan, Claude	Zebulon, Ga.	Jan. 6, 1895	Aug. 1, 1923
Commissioned dental officers:			
Dailey, Lt. Frank L., USNR.	Larchmont, N. Y.	May 21, 1887	May 4, 1937
Linck, Capt. George A.	Leavenworth, Kans.	Nov. 24, 1899	Aug. 1, 1930
Pyfrin, Maj. Sherman A.	Connersville, Ind.	June 25, 1898	Jan. 20, 1924
Civilian dental officer: Fain, Henry G.	Atlanta, Ga.	Apr. 14, 1884	June 12, 1929
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers.			
George, Raymond	Woodford, Ill.	July 4, 1883	Jan. 16, 1930
Kitsmiller, Clyde A.	New Albany, Ohio	Mar. 5, 1872	Oct. 1, 1943
Neidhamer, Claude	Indianapolis, Ind.	June 18, 1891	July 1, 1931

DEARBORN, MICH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Caputo, Maj. Joseph M.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	June 20, 1906	Sept. 7, 1937
Fitzporter, Maj. Alonzo L.	St. Louis, Mo.	July 23, 1884	May 1, 1931
Fox, Maj. Morris E.	Malin, Russia	Dec. 22, 1908	Apr. 17, 1939
Fracasse, Capt. John	Pollutri, Italy	Nov. 15, 1907	Feb. 1, 1940
Hunter, Capt. Lawrence M.	New York City, N. Y.	June 7, 1905	June 1, 1942
Kamin, Capt. Louis	Slutz, Russia	Mar. 16, 1896	Apr. 2, 1938
Levin, Capt. Myron J.	Los Angeles, Calif.	Mar. 6, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Marcus, Maj. Ernest	Detroit, Mich.	July 8, 1909	Jan. 17, 1938
Nuzzolo, Capt. Charles A.	Paterson, N. J.	July 12, 1908	Nov. 2, 1942
Rothman, Maj. Herman R.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nov. 25, 1904	Feb. 1, 1934
Schlussel, Maj. Maurice J.	Austria	July 15, 1907	Dec. 18, 1933
Varco, Capt. Benedict William.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1904	Oct. 1, 1940
Waters, Lt. Col. Pattison A.	Denver, Colo.	Nov. 23, 1892	May 1, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Barnes, Van D.	Fayette, Ohio	Mar. 4, 1892	Sept. 16, 1930
Eakins, Fred J.	Robards, Ky.	July 27, 1886	Apr. 1, 1935
Howell, James A.	Grant City, Mo.	Mar. 29, 1892	Aug. 2, 1922
Makman, Saul H.	Akron, Ohio	Nov. 8, 1898	Feb. 1, 1924
Smith, Clifton H.	Underhill, Vt.	July 6, 1889	Nov. 1, 1919
Commissioned dental officers:			
Baker, Capt. William J.	Denver, Colo.	Mar. 20, 1894	Dec. 17, 1927
Jacobson, Capt. Clarence R.	Tracy, Minn.	Jan. 28, 1894	July 1, 1920
Pawl, 1st Lt. Earle E.	Marrissa, Ill.	Oct. 11, 1887	Nov. 4, 1943
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Hopkins, Samuel R.	Delavan, Ill.	Oct. 25, 1876	Oct. 8, 1928
Troxler, William E.	Greensboro, N. C.	June 18, 1895	Nov. 7, 1921

DENVER, COLO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Black, Maj. Walter A.	Mount Pleasant, Tex.	Jan. 15, 1888	Jan. 15, 1923
Breitzer, Capt. Bernard	New York City	July 26, 1908	Aug. 1, 1938
Fricke, Capt. Fred J.	Aloe City, Nebr.	Nov. 23, 1906	Mar. 27, 1936
Rosenberg, 1st Lt. Saul	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 18, 1912	Nov. 30, 1943
Civilian medical officer: Partington, Cyrus.	Fall River, Mass.	Dec. 12, 1889	May 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Lomax, Capt. Clifford C.	Bristow, Ind.	Oct. 16, 1892	Apr. 8, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian Medical officer: Boe, Roy A.	Soldier, Iowa	Nov. 25, 1900	Nov. 4, 1940

DES MOINES, IOWA

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bielinski, Capt. Stefan	Chicago, Ill	Apr. 17, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Bogan, Lt. Col. Robert J	Utica, N. Y	Sept. 16, 1898	Sept. 4, 1930
Carrow, Capt. Roland A	Goodrich, Ill	Feb. 18, 1900	Mar. 16, 1942
Everist, Maj. Guy V	Marshalltown, Iowa	Aug. 30, 1908	June 22, 1937
Frien, Capt. James J	New York, N. Y	Jan. 16, 1914	June 15, 1942
Hoffman, Maj. Clifford W	Laurel, Ind	Oct. 3, 1896	June 17, 1940
Miller, Maj. Dwight F	Portland, Oreg	Mar. 12, 1888	Feb. 18, 1938
Peck, Maj. Hyman	New York, N. Y	Feb. 12, 1908	Jan. 15, 1940
Samberg, Capt. Harry H	do	Sept. 30, 1904	Feb. 3, 1941
Wollenman, Maj. Max Joseph.	Ferdinand, Ind	May 30, 1901	Aug. 5, 1930
Civilian medical officers:			
Clark, Burton	Sheridan, Mo	Mar. 19, 1877	Jan. 1, 1928
Drysdale, William T	Punjab, India	July 27, 1882	Jan. 1, 1931
Larimore, Ogil T	Clifton, Kans	Feb. 27, 1894	Feb. 12, 1930
Nadig, Clyde M	Elizabeth, Ill	June 9, 1905	Oct. 1, 1940
Civilian dental officers:			
Akin, Hamilton L	Chicago, Ill	July 11, 1896	Nov. 15, 1943
Baldwin, John W	Le Raysville, Tenn	Nov. 21, 1888	July 23, 1928
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Corbin, Capt. Ray L.	Norway, Iowa	Oct. 17, 1897	Jan. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Brown, Harry W	Waterloo, Iowa	Aug. 9, 1880	Mar. 16, 1944
Trotter, William	Eddyville, Iowa	Sept. 17, 1880	Oct. 9, 1944

DOWNEY, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Benson, Maj. George B	Richland Center, Wis.	Sept. 14, 1902	July 8, 1940
Delong, Maj Edward E	Chicago, Ill	Dec. 9, 1909	Feb. 9, 1939
Gallo, Capt. William C	New York, N. Y	July 16, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Golob, Capt. Meyer E	Brooklyn, N. Y	Jan. 2, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Goode, Col. Delmar	Myrtle, Miss	Feb. 17, 1889	June 21, 1923
Green, Maj. John W	West, Miss	Mar. 28, 1889	Jan. 19, 1931
Mason, Maj. Aaron S	Russia	Mar. 3, 1911	Nov. 3, 1938
Rodriguez, Lt. Col. Antonio.	Puerto Rico	Dec. 22, 1893	Apr. 17, 1919
Simonson, Capt. Melvin	Chicago, Ill	Jan. 21, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Wood, Maj. Lorin F., Jr	East Hampton, Conn.	Mar. 3, 1885	June 1, 1925
Civilian medical officers:			
Erps, Benjamin	Hungary	Apr. 15, 1892	Dec. 15, 1930
Rohle, Andrew	Manferd, N. Dak	June 30, 1896	Mar. 1, 1945
Civilian dental officers:			
Cressey, William	Louisville, Ky	May 24, 1880	July 20, 1926
Feldman, Benjamin L	Chicago, Ill	July 1, 1909	June 1, 1942

DWIGHT, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Crowell, Maj. Marvin	Scotland, Ark	Sept. 27, 1896	Oct. 3, 1935
Harvey, Capt. Salmon C	New York City, N. Y.	Nov. 14, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Kendall, Lt. Col. William E.	Mason City, Ill	Mar. 17, 1884	Sept. 4, 1929
Knudson, Maj. Alvin B. C	Waubay, S. Dak	June 28, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Raich, Maj. John A	Kansas City, Mo	Mar. 16, 1901	Aug. 8, 1935
Schmerer, Capt. Frederick	New York City, N. Y.	Dec. 22, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Taylor, Septimus Theodore.	South Carolton, Ky	June 1, 1879	Dec. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Durkee, Capt. Eugene W.	Milwaukee, Wis	Jan. 7, 1896	May 24, 1937

EXCELSIOR SPRINGS, MO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Altomare, Capt. Edward P.	New York City, N. Y.	Dec. 23, 1911	Mar. 16, 1942
Bell, Lt. Col. Forrest G	Illinois	Feb. 28, 1892	May 26, 1936
Glasser, Capt. Joseph	Warsaw, Poland	July 1, 1910	May 1, 1941
Glasser, Maj. Seymour	New York, N. Y	May 27, 1909	Jan. 20, 1939
Keller, Capt. Louis	do	July 25, 1906	Nov. 1, 1939
Kozinn, Capt. Philip J	Poland	Sept. 6, 1912	Nov. 2, 1942
Mantell, Maj. Francis J	Laurel, Miss	Mar. 2, 1903	July 19, 1930
Netzer, Maj. Solomon	New York, N. Y	Sept. 22, 1900	Mar. 16, 1942
Schaff, Maj. Burnett	New Haven, Conn	May 14, 1908	Dec. 2, 1940
Tapp, Lt. Col. Ernest M	West Mansfield, Ohio	May 28, 1904	Dec. 3, 1931
Tripodi, Maj. Donald W	Italy	Nov. 14, 1894	Sept. 16, 1940
Civilian dental officer: Adams, Leo J.	Bainesville, Ohio	Feb. 28, 1892	Jan. 15, 1923

FARGO, N. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Diamond, Capt. Jack L	Brooklyn, N. Y	Sept. 2, 1909	Sept. 1, 1938
Einterz, Capt. George F	New York City, N. Y.	June 2, 1914	Feb. 3, 1941
Herman, Maj. Lester R	Conde, S. Dak	Mar. 18, 1891	Dec. 11, 1930

FARGO, N. DAK.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Manaugh, Maj. Hursel C	Lexington, Ind	Dec. 13, 1899	Jan. 4, 1932
Rosen, Capt. Michael	New York City, N. Y.	Jan. 12, 1905	Mar. 12, 1936
Smith, Lt. Col. Clifton H.	Underhill, Vt	July 6, 1885	Nov. 1, 1919
Tyson, Maj. John J	Ayden, N. C	Oct. 12, 1891	Sept. 18, 1934
Commissioned dental officer: Hauser, Capt. Walter C.	Anaconda, Mont	July 10, 1895	Sept. 24, 1931

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Kaufman, Capt. Benjamin M.	Manhattan, N. Y	July 7, 1912	Aug. 1, 1941
Kleiman, Maj. Aaron H	New York, N. Y	Feb. 12, 1908	Jan. 16, 1939
Levine, Capt. Daniel I	New York City, N. Y.	Jan. 26, 1911	Mar. 16, 1942
Leming, Capt. Howell E	Dardanelle, Ark	Jan. 16, 1900	Sept. 16, 1929
Tompkins, Lt. Col. Raymond D.	Lewiston, Ill	Jan. 3, 1884	June 13, 1921
Wolkin, Capt. Abraham	Newark, N. J	Oct. 18, 1909	Oct. 1, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Delaney, Joseph P	Green Bay, Wis	May 24, 1887	Aug. 1, 1930
Gordon, Frank N	Savannah, Ga	Apr. 12, 1879	Jan. 1, 1920
Shafer, Frank N	No record available	Dec. 3, 1876	Sept. 1, 1926
Civilian dental officer: Knox, Frank D.	Hannibal, Mo	May 19, 1893	Jan. 15, 1921

FAYETTEVILLE, N. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baird, Maj. John A	Fusen, Korea	Oct. 12, 1894	Sept. 1, 1931
Ebel, Capt. Alfred	Austria	Apr. 5, 1907	July 8, 1940
Hoot, Maj. Melvin P	Arkansas City, Kans	May 7, 1909	Dec. 2, 1941
Scott, Maj. Thomas G	Norwood, Ohio	Oct. 2, 1897	Mar. 13, 1936
Selikoff, Capt. Solomon J	Kiev, Russia	Mar. 12, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Stein, Capt. Elias	New York City, N. Y.	Aug. 16, 1910	Dec. 5, 1940
Walker, Lt. Col. Starnes E	Milan, Tenn	Mar. 15, 1887	May 15, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Corbett, Lacy W	Bishopville, S. C	Feb. 12, 1890	Jan. 2, 1931
Everett, Jesse J	Resaca, Ga	Sept. 4, 1880	[9]
Moore, Baxter S	Chester, S. C	Feb. 18, 1879	Oct. 1, 1928
Rachlin, Stanton A	Brooklyn, N. Y	July 29, 1907	July 7, 1936
Turner, John W	Milwaukee, Wis	June 21, 1880	Dec. 16, 1919
Weirick, Albert J	Marseilles, Ill	Dec. 19, 1877	[10]
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Lazenby, Earl K.	Thompson, Ga	Sept. 25, 1886	Oct. 10, 1929

FORT BAYARD, N. MEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Crays, Capt. William H	Loogootee, Ind	Nov. 14, 1906	Nov. 1, 1939
Keeler, Maj. Charles C	Oskaloosa, Iowa	Sept. 2, 1882	Mar. 2, 1924
Klein, Capt. Harold	Brooklyn, N. Y	June 25, 1910	June 5, 1941
Lazar, Maj. Harry	Chicago, Ill	Nov. 5, 1908	Oct. 10, 1938
Marbry, Capt. George W	Terre Haute, Ind	May 27, 1914	June 15, 1942
Nalty, Lt. Col. Walter C	Paola, Kans	Feb. 20, 1899	Aug. 13, 1929
Walker, Lt. Col. Albert G	Thomaston, Maine	Feb. 4, 1883	Mar. 10, 1920
Zausner, Maj. Joseph	New York, N Y	Feb. 27, 1910	Sept. 16, 1941
Commissioned dental officers: Morene, Capt. Albert.	Portland, Oreg	Nov. 11, 1897	Oct. 15, 1935

FORT CUSTER, MICH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baden, Capt. David D	Cleveland, Ohio	Mar. 18, 1898	Apr. 1, 1944
Herman, Capt. Louis	New York, N. Y	Dec. 15, 1907	May 1, 1941
Maniscalco, Capt. Anthony E.	Brooklyn, N. Y	Apr. 4, 1911	Sept. 16, 1942
Nunez, Capt. Edgar O	Grenada, British West Indies.	Dec. 17, 1903	June 1, 1942
Olsen, Maj. Albert L	Richfield, Utah	Oct. 12, 1904	Apr. 1, 1938
Orr, Maj. Eli H	Mount Erie, Ill	May 1, 1898	Mar. 2, 1931
Schwarz, Maj. Frank W	Philadelphia, Pa	Feb. 21, 1887	Jan. 16, 1923
Toms, Lt. Col. Roland E	Williamston, Mich	Nov. 9, 1889	Apr. 1, 1921
Weintraub, Capt. Arthur	Odessa, Russia	May 21, 1907	Dec. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Hentz, Roger P.	Courtland, Miss	Dec. 20, 1884	Dec. 15, 1921
Commissioned dental officer: Lundblad, 1st Lt. Clarence H.	St. Paul, Minn	May 18, 1893	Sept. 16, 1943
Civilian dental officer: Stevens, Edward.	Duluth, Minn	Sept. 16, 1891	July 24, 1940

[9] Sept. 27, 1922, to Dec. 30, 1922; Mar. 30, 1925.
[10] Mar. 16, 1922, to Jan. 31, 1927; May 1, 1931.

FORT HARRISON, MONT.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Faust, Capt. Joseph M.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Dec. 19, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Fitzgibbons, Capt. Thomas G.	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Jan. 10, 1895	June 1, 1942
Gier, Capt. Jacob B.	Russia.	Jan. 10, 1903	Oct. 21, 1935
Harmon, Maj. George A.	Rigby, route No. 1, Idaho.	Aug. 3, 1897	Dec. 7, 1937
Hines, Maj. Ralph E.	Leavenworth, Kans.	Dec. 16, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Perkins, Maj. John N.	No record available.	Feb. 13, 1892	Jan. 15, 1923
White, Maj. William E.	do.	Mar. 9, 1888	Jan. 6, 1925
Civilian medical officer: Tremblay, Julian L.	Marlboro, Mass.	June 29, 1884	June 3, 1935
Commissioned dental officer: Jones, Capt. Guy H.	Stewart, Minn.	Nov. 3, 1886	June 20, 1931
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Fortin, William H.	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 13, 1880	Feb. 1, 1923

FORT HOWARD, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Balter, Lt. Col. Abraham M.	Vilna, Poland.	Nov. 12, 1908	May 12, 1931
Brackin, Capt. John T., Jr.	Lansdowne, Pa.	Jan. 1, 1910	Nov. 16, 1942
Cullison, Maj. Robert M.	Montezuma, Iowa.	Nov. 2, 1891	Nov. 16, 1937
Fleck, Lt. Col. Warren LeRoy.	Neola, Iowa.	Feb. 28, 1889	Aug. 30, 1924
Hurwitz, Capt. Abraham B.	Baltimore, Md.	Apr. 4, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Ochs, Capt. Irving L.	Syracuse, N. Y.	Dec. 1, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Richards, Maj. Hyrum Y.	Perry, Utah.	Aug. 5, 1886	Sept. 28, 1931
Roberts, Capt. David A.	Morganfield, Ky.	Sept. 30, 1903	Mar. 17, 1936
Ryan, Maj. Francis J.	Hartford, Conn.	May 24, 1909	Mar. 18, 1939
Zuravin, Capt. Meyer H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 20, 1907	Mar. 1, 1943
Commissioned dental officers:			
Eastman, Capt. James B.	Winchester, Ind.	Nov. 24, 1890	July 29, 1920
Rosser, First Lt. Eli B.	Edwardsville, Pa.	May 22, 1894	May 24, 1944
Civilian medical officer: Mason, Frank E.	Easton, Md.	Feb. 18, 1893	Sept. 1, 1920

FORT LYON, COLO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Chat, Capt. Emanuel.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 13, 1909	July 16, 1942
Jackson, Maj. Benjamin F.	Ozark, Ala.	Dec. 29, 1899	Oct. 6, 1930
Mace, Maj. Norman C.	Portland, Oreg.	June 8, 1902	Apr. 18, 1931
Shrout, Col. Cecil B.	Buncton, Mo.	Oct. 31, 1891	May 1, 1920
Weinstock, Capt. Adolph.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 24, 1913	May 1, 1941
Wharton, Maj. Russell S.	Marysville, Ohio.	Sept. 15, 1894	Sept. 4, 1931
Civilian medical officer: Kimball, Isham.	Jackson, Ala.	Oct. 27, 1884	Oct. 11, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Gradoville, Charles M.	Plattsmouth, Nebr.	Dec. 8, 1895	Dec. 1, 1931

FORT MEADE, S. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fox, Capt. Thomas H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 12, 1907	Oct. 27, 1937
Kaney, Capt. Emil M.	Kiev, Russia.	May 22, 1906	June 15, 1942
Lewis, Maj. Claud.	Bible Grove, Ill.	Mar. 27, 1898	Feb. 17, 1931
McLin, Lt. Col. Thomas G.	Fairfield, Ill.	Apr. 17, 1882	Oct. 25, 1924
Peffer, Peter A.	Louisville, Ky.	Apr. 3, 1902	Mar. 6, 1945
Civilian medical officer: Olson, William E.	Sioux City, Iowa.	June 17, 1903	Feb. 3, 1941
Commissioned dental officer: Marsh, Capt. Robert E.	Bellingham, Wash.	Feb. 28, 1907	Mar. 1, 1941

FORT WASHINGTON, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Smart, Maj. James.	Chesterfield, Va.	July 10, 1893	Jan. 21, 1926
Werner, Capt. Merrill J.	Golconda, Ill.	Mar. 26, 1904	Feb. 23, 1938
Civilian medical officer: Benson, Charles Prue.	Woollers Rest, S. C.	Apr. 1, 1879	Mar. 16, 1931

GULFPORT, MISS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Dunn, Capt. Maurice.	Zitomir, Russia.	Dec. 9, 1910	Oct. 16, 1939
Hodges, Maj. Robert.	Austria.	May 24, 1883	Dec. 17, 1934
Hughes, Maj. James A.	Jearoldtown, Tenn.	Sept. 16, 1901	June 18, 1935
Miller, Maj. Saul D.	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 28, 1906	May 1, 1941
Sheffield, Col. Gettis T.	Dorsey, Miss.	Jan. 1, 1883	Mar. 1, 1927
Winick, Maj. William.	New Castle, Pa.	July 15, 1904	July 1, 1938
Wright, Lt. Col. Frederick L.	Stanford, Ontario.	Dec. 7, 1883	Nov. 1, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Davidian, Hagop.	Afion-Karahissar, Asia Minor.	Aug. 5, 1877	(11)
Suraci, Francis X.	Washington, D. C.	Sept. 18, 1902	(12)
Commissioned dental officer: Grau, Capt. Adolph E.	No record available.	Jan. 29, 1884	Aug. 14, 1922

HINES, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alexander, Capt. Howard G.	Snyder, Tex.	Mar. 4, 1907	Sept. 30, 1938
Andrew, Maj. Lloyd Brumund.	Table Rock, Nebr.	Sept. 7, 1896	Jan. 19, 1937
Baker, Lt. Col. Lyle A.	Greenfield, Iowa.	Sept. 13, 1904	Dec. 12, 1931
Baumrucker, Capt. George O.	No record available.	July 3, 1905	Dec. 20, 1943
Burstein, Capt. Harry.	New York City, N. Y.	July 11, 1909	Mar. 2, 1942
Bush, Capt. Mitchell W.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 8, 1909	Sept. 16, 1942
Caffee, Col. William M.	Marion, Ala.	Feb. 23, 1890	Dec. 27, 1944
Colton, Col. Warren A.	Vernal, Utah.	Mar. 29, 1883	Mar. 17, 1923
Fershing, Maj. Jennings.	New York City, N. Y.	Dec. 5, 1914	June 15, 1942
Frankel, Maj. Joseph J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Aug. 4, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Freeman, Maj. Bromley S.	New York City, N. Y.	May 23, 1912	Jan. 16, 1939
Givner, Capt. David.	Baltimore, Md.	June 1, 1903	Mar. 17, 1941
Greenberg, Capt. Arthur.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 22, 1913	Sept. 16, 1942
Grossman, Capt. Maurice O.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 17, 1910	Apr. 1, 1942
Iger, First Lt. Mortimer.	Bronx, N. Y.		Nov. 15, 1943
Kesert, Maj. Benjamin H.		Jan. 7, 1904	Nov. 29, 1930
Kline, Capt. Philip S.	Guadalajara, Mexico.	Aug. 19, 1910	Aug. 2, 1941
Kooperman, Capt. Myer.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 2, 1911	Feb. 3, 1941
Kulvin, Maj. Max M.	do.	Aug. 15, 1891	Feb. 11, 1931
Lane, Maj. John T.	San Antonio, Tex.	Dec. 11, 1911	Jan. 18, 1939
Lipson, Maj. Henry I.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 29, 1908	Oct. 3, 1938
McClanahan, Lt. Col. Charles W.		Sept. 9, 1891	May 16, 1924
McCue, Capt. Daniel J.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Aug. 26, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
McNamara, Lt. Col. William L.	Vienna, S. Dak.	Nov. 28, 1898	Sept. 23, 1930
Mednick, Capt. Edward D.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 17, 1944	June 15, 1942
Mitchell, Capt. Holland C.	New York City, N. Y.	Oct. 7, 1906	Feb. 19, 1941
Musgrave, Capt. David E.	Seattle, Wash.	July 25, 1908	Aug. 1, 1941
Phillips, Maj. Roy.	Cincinnati, Ohio.	Feb. 2, 1891	Jan. 30, 1931
Quamme, Capt. Roy K.	Bottineau, N. Dak.	June 21, 1905	Aug. 1, 1941
Quenzer, Capt. Fred August.	Chicago, Ill.	May 29, 1912	Jan. 3, 1939
Sackadorf, Capt. Harry.	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 21, 1906	Mar. 16, 1942
Schrek, Maj. Robert.	do.	Dec. 28, 1907	Nov. 4, 1937
Silver, Capt. Saul L.	do.	Oct. 2, 1909	Jan. 15, 1940
Slobodin, Maj. Harry.	do.	Feb. 7, 1909	May 17, 1937
Stephenson, Capt. Hack U., Jr.	Toano, Va.	Dec. 19, 1909	July 26, 1937
Stevens, Capt. Ernest J.	Santa Rosa, Calif.	Dec. 14, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
Thomas, Maj. Ralph A.	Treer, Kans.	Aug. 8, 1903	Jan. 24, 1938
Timberlake, Lt. Col. Harold P.	Demos, Ohio.	Jan. 6, 1891	Mar. 1, 1920
Trauba, Lt. Col. Norbert C.	Marathon, Wis.	Apr. 20, 1898	Sept. 1, 1928
Civilian medical officers:			
Alaben, Gerald R.	Argyle, Ill.	July 9, 1889	(13)
Cefai, Anthony F.	Malta (Europe).	Oct. 26, 1907	June 1, 1943
Costich, Kenneth J.	Rochester, N. Y.	Feb. 29, 1912	Sept. 26, 1938
Feldott, Harry R.	Batavia, Ill.	Feb. 1, 1895	July 14, 1919
Fitzsimmons, Joseph I.	Clinton, Iowa.	Dec. 10, 1898	Sept. 23, 1930
Flynn, John F.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 17, 1895	June 9, 1928
Frow, James R.	Lewiston, Pa.	June 2, 1883	Aug. 14, 1928
Funkhouser, Ralph M.	Indiana.	Aug. 14, 1884	June 11, 1921
Gburczyk, Frank H.	Joliet, Ill.	Jan. 19, 1894	Sept. 8, 1920
Graham, Albert P.	Early, Iowa.	Jan. 2, 1905	Jan. 10, 1938
Haeffner, Albert W.	Knoxville, Iowa.	Nov. 7, 1881	Aug. 16, 1944
Hemminger, John R.	Somerset, Pa.	Oct. 7, 1875	Aug. 16, 1944
Kipnis, Harry.	Russia (naturalized).	Dec. 17, 1905	May 4, 1931
Williams, Albert.	Madelay, England.	Mar. 15, 1881	Aug. 1, 1927
Krasner, Leonard.	Newark, N. J.	June 15, 1908	Oct. 1, 1940
Lenowitz, Herman.	Russia.	Mar. 4, 1897	Dec. 8, 1939
Ludwig, Dorothy B.	Cernauti, Rumania.	Nov. 16, 1909	Aug. 16, 1944
Maloy, Bernard S.	Rensselaer, Ind.	Jan. 3, 1874	Sept. 11, 1944

11 July 17, 1925, to Jan. 15, 1926; Aug. 11, 1926.
12 Aug. 8, 1930, to Apr. 3, 1940; Nov. 1, 1943.
13 1922 to 1923; Feb. 1, 1932.

HINES, ILL.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officers—Con.			
Ogden, Claude H	Cedarville, N. J	Oct. 21, 1890	Apr. 1, 1944
Randolph, Henry E	Raun, Ill	May 2, 1883	Jan. 2, 1923
Rowe, Lee B	Broadhead, Wis	Dec. 18, 1883	Sept. 18, 1944
Rushton, James S	No record available	Aug. 2, 1879	Oct. 15, 1924
Russell, James	Chicago, Ill	Nov. 16, 1898	Mar. 16, 1942
Shamaskin, Arnold	Russia	Aug. 22, 1881	June 26, 1940
Sherlock, William P	Des Moines, Iowa	Apr. 30, 1884	Jan. 7, 1920
Sodard, Anthony	Italy	Mar. 17, 1884	June 19, 1944
Ward, Benjamin F	Inez, Ky	June 29, 1891	June 20, 1919
Weinstein, Bernard	Norwalk, Conn	Feb. 22, 1914	Feb. 2, 1942
Zolla, Norman	Russia	Oct. 5, 1888	Jan. 24, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Lister, Maj. Clarence S	Manchester, Iowa	Oct. 8, 1881	Feb. 16, 1920
Logsdon, Maj. Cale M	Jinks, Ky	Nov. 2, 1896	Mar. 1, 1932
Swift, Maj. Lionel V	Stanton, Tex	Jan. 18, 1896	Dec. 15, 1922
Civilian dental officers:			
Cheely, Walter C	Denver, Colo	May 31, 1884	Nov. 4, 1919
Rohner, Joseph J	No record available	Nov. 2, 1888	Feb. 2, 1931
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bedessem, Lt. Col. Philip M.	Chicago, Ill	Apr. 5, 1891	Apr. 23, 1920
Wilson, Capt. Nilas M	Montgomery, Ind	Dec. 10, 1888	Feb. 9, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Blau, James W	Fountain Green, Ill	Mar. 19, 1881	Apr. 6, 1944
Brown, Paul F	Lake City, Minn	Oct. 19, 1877	Dec. 1, 1919
Danielson, Wilford	Osceola, Nebr	Dec. 20, 1891	[14]
Dowiat, Stanley A	Chicago, Ill	Aug. 2, 1901	Feb. 1, 1944
Doyle, Nicholas M	Caledonia, Ontario	Feb. 2, 1880	Jan. 18, 1944
Goy, Michael Charles	Poland (naturalized)	Sept. 20, 1884	Jan. 24, 1944
Hurka, Robert	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	May 1, 1887	Nov. 22, 1920
Karg, Frank	Kalomys, Poland	Jan. 29, 1906	May 1, 1944
O'Neil, Diflan G	Elgin, Ill	June 11, 1886	Feb. 14, 1944
Pedott, Meyer S	Russia	May 28, 1887	Jan. 17, 1944
Rategan, Edward H	Chicago, Ill	Apr. 21, 1891	Apr. 1, 1944
Roberts, Sidney M	do	Oct. 3, 1887	Do.
Romano, John R	Italy	July 10, 1888	Jan. 18, 1944
Stollenwerk, R. J	Milwaukee, Wis	Aug. 3, 1907	Nov. 1, 1943

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Campanella, Capt. Santo D.	New York, N. Y	Sept. 26, 1908	Nov. 1, 1939
Cramer, Maj. Lloyd L	Omaha, Nebr	Jan. 13, 1886	Dec. 7, 1929
Jewett, Lt. Comdr. George Rae.	Wabash, Ind	Dec. 1, 1897	Apr. 24, 1935
Levin, Maj. Louis	Wilma, Russia	Oct. 29, 1903	Oct. 1, 1940
Miller, Capt. George A	St. George, W. Va	July 20, 1907	Jan. 15, 1940
Ogg, Lt. Col. Francis W	Douglass, Kans	May 30, 1984	Aug. 23, 1943
Schneider, Capt. Martin	New York, N. Y	Apr. 15, 1913	Feb. 1, 1940
Welty, Capt. Dalton M	Hagerstown, Md	June 26, 1913	July 16, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Rainbourn, Richard.	Linnville, Ind	Sept. 26, 1877	Mar. 30, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Hanlon, Capt. John P.	Cherokee, Iowa	July 20, 1906	Nov. 12, 1938
Civilian dental officer: Roberts, Floyd J.	Rockford, Minn	July 14, 1876	Mar. 1, 1929

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blotner, Maj. Carl	Salem, N. H	Dec. 30, 1906	Oct. 6, 1938
Dodson, Capt. Ross	Glenville, W. Va	Apr. 11, 1883	Nov. 12, 1921
Levine, Capt. Morris H	Lowell, Mass	Nov. 4, 1905	July 8, 1940
Mertz, Capt. Philip	Dupont, Pa	Jan. 2, 1910	July 16, 1942
Pearlman, Capt. Carl Kenneth	Brooklyn, N. Y	Aug. 18, 1908	May 1, 1941
Schnitt, Capt. Sidney	New York, N. Y	Feb. 28, 1914	Oct. 1, 1940
Walsh, Capt. Eugene, L. B	Hawkeye, Iowa	Sept. 21, 1906	Jan. 17, 1938
Wiesenfeld, Capt. Benjamin	New York, N. Y	Aug. 14, 1910	Nov. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Copeland, Paul Richard	Ozark, Ill	May 28, 1894	Oct. 10, 1920
Geliman, Irving I	Odessa, Russia	Feb. 14, 1890	Jan. 5, 1925
Sasser, Thomas J	Woodcliff, Ga	Mar. 27, 1898	May 11, 1937
Willis, Carson	Bridgeport, W. Va	Feb. 24, 1878	Nov. 5, 1921
Commissioned dental officer: Timken, First Lt. William H	Rush Co., Kans	Oct. 11, 1895	Aug. 19, 1942
Civilian dental officer: Whitaker, Lee W	Olive Branch, La	Nov. 11, 1889	Nov. 27, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Moorman, Earl	Hardinsburg, Ky	Nov. 11, 1881	Nov. 12, 1925

[14] 1921 to 1926; Sept. 20, 1943.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adams, Maj. Donald R	Albion, Nebr	Nov. 23, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Bown, Maj. Albert J	Peoria, Ill	Aug. 1, 1898	Sept. 4, 1929
Choate, Maj. Alton J	No record	Jan. 15, 1883	Oct. 1, 1921
Finot, Maj. Philip H	St. Louis, Mo	July 17, 1882	July 1, 1919
Hare, Lt. Col. Earl Hazelton.	Sheridan, Ind	Aug. 26, 1890	June 5, 1922
Harmon, Capt. Jules	No record	Dec. 18, 1910	Dec. 2, 1940
Nowack, Capt. Henry J	Chicago, Ill	July 28, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Plotkin, Capt. Oscar M	do	May 26, 1912	Sept. 20, 1938
Riley, Maj. William J	do	Oct. 13, 1890	June 17, 1935
Sales, Capt. Louis M	New York, N. Y	Sept. 30, 1910	Nov. 2, 1939
Tremor, Lt. Col. Victor F	Owensville, Ind	Oct. 25, 1895	Feb. 29, 1930
Unger, Capt. Abraham	New York, N. Y	Oct. 24, 1911	May 1, 1941
Warshaw, Capt. Arthur H	Kansas City, Mo	Sept. 29, 1906	Mar. 10, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Helwig, Edward C.	Indianapolis, Ind	Nov. 15, 1884	Oct. 21, 1929
Commissioned dental officer: Toline, Capt. Clarence A.	No record available	Mar. 20, 1896	Jan. 26, 1932
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Warfel, Frederick	Hagerstown, Ind	Dec. 6, 1879	Apr. 3, 1944
Little, Edward O	Cicero, Ind	Jan. 27, 1878	June 11, 1919
Ulrich, Arlie J	Aurora, Ind	July 28, 1890	May 11, 1921

JACKSON, MISS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Civilian medical officers:			
Speir, Ross C	Furman, Ala	Aug. 11, 1884	Dec. 7, 1919
Wallace, James M	No record available	Apr. 10, 1878	Aug. 15, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Kahn, Alfred M	Jackson, Miss	Feb. 2, 1887	Dec. 1, 1921
Williams, Sidney C	Kosciusko, Miss	Apr. 24, 1885	June 5, 1920

JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abramson, Capt. Daniel J	Piedmont, W. Va	Dec. 25, 1912	Sept. 16, 1941
Bondurant, Maj. Alpheus J.	Charleston, Mo	Oct. 3, 1892	Sept. 16, 1921
Brennan, Capt. Louis V	O'Neil, Nebr	Sept. 30, 1908	Oct. 16, 1939
Briscoe, Capt. John R	Pettis County, Mo	Oct. 15, 1907	June 1, 1944
Edwards, Maj. Ernest V	Plato, Mo	May 11, 1889	Oct. 7, 1932
Epp, Maj. George J	St. Louis, Mo	Oct. 6, 1896	Mar. 17, 1939
Faxon, Maj. Donald E	Elgin, Ill	Jan. 13, 1896	June 17, 1929
Goodman, Maj. Jonathan N.	Keswick, Iowa	Oct. 3, 1898	Feb. 18, 1937
Isaacson, Capt. Phillip A	New York, N. Y	Apr. 26, 1913	Dec. 1, 1944
Levin, Capt. Abraham J	Liverpool, England	May 1, 1909	Mar. 3, 1938
Parker, Capt. William	Revere, Mass	Jan. 23, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Reilly, Capt. Terence M	Brooklyn, N. Y	June 30, 1911	Dec. 31, 1944
Sisk, Maj. Harvey E	Duluth, Minn	Oct. 17, 1909	Apr. 1, 1938
Wasserman, Capt. Sidney E.	Milwaukee, Wis	Feb. 1, 1910	June 22, 1937
Commissioned dental officers:			
Bland, First Lt. James A	St. Louis, Mo	July 15, 1896	Mar. 1, 1941
Larson, Capt. Harry O	Olivia, Minn	Jan. 7, 1890	Dec. 19, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Gilbert, Edward	Waupaca, Wis	Sept. 16, 1895	Oct. 8, 1929

KANSAS CITY, MO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer: Kelly, Maj. Alto L.	Midland City, Ala	June 26, 1891	Nov. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Aubrey, George E	Stithton, Ky	May 9, 1889	Feb. 22, 1944
Eye, Boyd F	Robinson, Kans	Oct. 28, 1888	May 1, 1930

KECOUGHTAN, VA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bailey, Maj. James P	Waxahachie, Tex	Oct. 7, 1900	Aug. 15, 1934
Brown, Capt. Leo R	Filipovo, Poland	May 28, 1907	Dec. 22, 1938
Davis, Capt. Lawrence C	Richland Center, Wis	Mar. 15, 1906	July 1, 1942
Frisch, Capt. Michael R	London, England	Nov. 21, 1903	Feb. 2, 1942
Kelly, Lt. Col. John E	Sevier County, Tenn	June 8, 1884	Feb. 5, 1929
King, Maj. Harold N	Warren, Ohio	Oct. 11, 1899	Aug. 23, 1930
Kuehn, Maj. Conrad A	Toledo, Ohio	Sept. 14, 1904	Apr. 23, 1941
Malmstead, Capt. Chester W.	Worcester, Mass	Apr. 15, 1910	Aug. 1, 1941
Migliore, First Lt. Anthony D.	Italy	May 1, 1901	Oct. 16, 1941

KECOUGHTAN, VA.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Miller, Maj. Benjamin	Bodbudkia, Russia	Apr. 4, 1909	May 16, 1936
Roberts, Lt. Col. Ernest S.	Pascagoula, Miss	Sept. 13, 1917	Mar. 13, 1936
Robinson, Capt. Robert F.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 26, 1913	Feb. 3, 1941
Switkes, Maj. Herman L.	Azernowitz, Austria	July 8, 1906	Aug. 8, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Butzke, Ernest J.	Beechwood, Wis.	Dec. 10, 1877	July 19, 1928
Dewey, Michael G.	Ashland, Pa.	June 2, 1889	Apr. 28, 1931
Commissioned dental officer: Gray, First Lt. Joe.	Memphis, Tenn.	July 9, 1906	Oct. 2, 1941
Civilian dental officers:			
Dorset, Ramon F.	Richmond, Va.	Oct. 20, 1891	Feb. 3, 1931
Durham, Benjamin J.	Shelby, N. C.	Oct. 23, 1879	Jan. 21, 1921

KNOXVILLE, IOWA

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Doles, Maj. James W.	Havre, Mont.	June 21, 1909	Nov. 1, 1938
Glesne, Capt. Orvin G.	Elkader, Iowa	Jan. 11, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Greenhouse, Capt. Abraham C.	Poland	Jan. 7, 1888	Mar. 12, 1937
Simmons, Capt. Abbott P.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 9, 1908	Dec. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Barrett, Thomas	Ensworth, Pa.	Dec. 31, 1881	Aug. 14, 1929
Davis, George V. P.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 7, 1884	Mar. 12, 1923
Dawson, Dudley	Scotland, Ill.	Dec. 22, 1886	Feb. 21, 1944
Pottorf, Joseph L.	Nevada, Mo.	June 27, 1895	Feb. 28, 1924
Salisbury, Frederick S.	Broken Bow, Nebr.	Mar. 30, 1892	July 11, 1925
Woods, Arthur R.	Nashua, N. H.	Apr. 9, 1881	Feb. 18, 1925
Commissioned dental officers:			
Gill, Capt. Harvey E.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Oct. 30, 1893	Mar. 1, 1922
Plant, First Lt. Rolland D.	Greenhill, Ind.	Sept. 26, 1907	Feb. 27, 1942

LAKE CITY, FLA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Byrd, Lt. Col. Emmett E	No record available	Jan. 14, 1891	Apr. 16, 1920
Carrozza, Capt. Natale S.	Italy	Jan. 1, 1903	Sept. 16, 1942
Isaacson, Capt. Morris	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1908	May 1, 1941
Kirkham, Lt. Col. Judd H	Juneau, Dodge County, Wis.	May 18, 1919	Nov. 17, 1930
Lustig, Capt. Julian	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 18, 1909	June 13, 1939
Sasso, Capt. Robert M.	Mount Vernon, N. Y.	May 21, 1913	May 1, 1941
Weinstein, Capt. Abraham S.	New York City	July 23, 1908	May 17, 1937
Civilian medical officers:			
Arnold, Laurie J.	Sanford, N. C.	Aug. 7, 1877	Apr. 8, 1921
Fearney, Frank A.	Providence, R. I.	Apr. 24, 1880	Nov. 11, 1920
Vermilye, John H.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 3, 1888	June 20, 1921
Vondahm, Howard C.	Tiffin, Ohio	Apr. 19, 1883	Nov. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Amick, Capt. James F.	Liberty, N. C.	Aug. 9, 1896	Nov. 21, 1923

LEGION, TEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Barshay, Capt. Bernard	Minsk, Russia	Sept. 3, 1902	Mar. 16, 1942
Bruce, Lt. Col. Paul C.	Sheakleyville, Pa.	Dec. 20, 1890	Jan. 8, 1931
Cassidy, Maj. William A.	Bangor, Maine	Mar. 18, 1905	Aug. 1, 1938
Davis, Capt. Daniel	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 1, 1908	May 1, 1941
Ivey, Maj. Hubert T.	Lenoir, N. C.	Dec. 17, 1896	Mar. 24, 1939
Melton, Capt. Ernest I.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 4, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
Murray, Capt. Clifford J.	Denver, Colo.	Feb. 10, 1907	May 1, 1941
Pucie, Capt. Charles	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 26, 1911	Nov. 2, 1942
Weissman, Capt. Herman	Medjibosh, Russia	Mar. 22, 1899	Mar. 1, 1943
White, Maj. Louis L.	Yedinitz, Russia	Oct. 5, 1895	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Fryar, Thomas V.	Corsicana, Tex.	Nov. 7, 1877	Feb. 25, 1921
Kennedy, Theodore A.	San Mateo, Calif.	Apr. 20, 1898	Nov. 19, 1934
Moore, Carrol L.	Statesboro, Ga.	Aug. 25, 1894	Sept. 1, 1920
Reid, Harry P.	Friar Point, Miss.	July 31, 1880	Apr. 1, 1931
Commissioned dental officer: Gisin, Capt. George J.	Denver, Colo.	Feb. 19, 1896	Jan. 16, 1922

LEXINGTON, KY.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baker, Maj. Samuel R.	West Point, Ind.	July 15, 1905	Jan. 20, 1931
Cook, Maj. Arnold A.	Toledo, Ohio	Jan. 5, 1906	Nov. 1, 1939
Gail, Capt. Irving A.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 23, 1910	Do.
Marren, Lt. Col. John J.	Two Harbors, Minn.	Apr. 20, 1904	Apr. 1, 1938
Mayer, Capt. Frederick	Frankfurt-on-Main, Germany.	Mar. 27, 1895	Dec. 3, 1930
Miller, Lt. Col. Oliver P.	Glenford, Ky.	Jan. 19, 1894	Nov. 10, 1921
Weltman, Capt. Joseph S.	Schenectady, N. Y.	Oct. 17, 1910	Oct. 1, 1940
Young, Maj. David P.	Springfield, Ohio	June 18, 1896	Oct. 30, 1937
Civilian dental officer: Marr, William W.	Washington, D. C.	Feb. 13, 1893	June 5, 1920

LEXINGTON, KY.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Astrom, Algot	Stode, Sweden	Nov. 22, 1881	Apr. 21, 1941
Nevitt, Phillip H.	Bradenburg, Ky.	Dec. 26, 1879	May 11, 1921

LINCOLN, NEBR.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Green, Maj. Ernest A.	Winterville, Mo.	Nov. 11, 1890	Mar. 1, 1931
Haley, Capt. Robert R., Jr.	Belton, Tex.	Nov. 5, 1896	Aug. 21, 1939
Krasner, Capt. George D.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 9, 1912	May 1, 1941
Lavender, Capt. John G.	Omaha, Nebr.	Apr. 8, 1918	Feb. 9, 1944
Levin, Maj. Stanley L.	Beaufort, S. C.	Aug. 8, 1910	Mar. 22, 1937
Marks, Capt. Morton G.	New York City, N. Y.	June 7, 1899	Feb. 23, 1937
Mullin, Maj. Richard F.	Omaha, Nebr.	Nov. 19, 1888	Oct. 30, 1931
Parillo, Capt. Orest J.	Naples, Italy	Apr. 21, 1910	May 1, 1941
Ritter, Capt. Jerome	New York, N. Y.	June 29, 1911	Oct. 1, 1940
Wilson, Maj. Nat J.	Vilki, Lithuania	Jan. 8, 9104	Jan. 23, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Eagleton, John	Decatur, Nebr.	June 19, 1900	Oct. 17, 1944
Scott, Harry A.	Edmeston, N. Y.	Apr. 29, 1890	Oct. 5, 1925
Commissioned dental officer: Oppenheimer, Capt. Otto P.	Elliott County, Ky.	July 16, 1896	Mar. 14, 1932
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Everett, Lt. (USNR) Ernest A.	Emington, Ill.	Jan. 29, 1889	Nov. 22, 1943
Civilian medical officer: Bell, David W.	Arlington, Nebr.	Jan. 12, 1879	Jan. 17, 1944

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer: Broadhead, Maj. William C.	Clayton, Mo.	July 26, 1884	July 15, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Crow, Capt. Edward W.	Little Rock, Ark.	Aug. 13, 1905	Feb. 20, 1944
Shearer, Capt. William F.	Cour Hill, Ark.	Aug. 10, 1896	Feb. 3, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Wilson, Paul W.	Hope, Ark.	Mar. 21, 1897	May 1, 1930

LIVERMORE, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Dunner, Capt. Edward	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 4, 1910	Sept. 16, 1941
Murphy, Lt. Col. Charles P.	Philips, Kans.	Dec. 8, 1887	Jan. 1, 1921
Putnam, Maj. Frank I.	Geneva, Nebr.	Apr. 25, 1883	Feb. 3, 1932
Rubinstein, Capt. Morris	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 20, 1895	Mar. 16, 1942
Stern, Maj. Morris E.	do	Jan. 4, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Beaudet, Elphege A.	St. Peter, Province of Quebec, Canada.	June 9, 1890	Apr. 24, 1922
Harrod, Charles P.	Austin, Ind.	Nov. 16, 1885	Jan. 15, 1921
Martin, Albert	St. Anne, Ill.	Jan. 31, 1886	July 15, 1920
Stinson, Henry K.	Lowell, Mass.	Nov. 28, 1875	Feb. 12, 1923
Yankowicz, Michael	McAdoo, Pa.	Oct. 26, 1896	June 1, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Group, Capt. Oren F.	Washington State	July 25, 1891	Jan. 16, 1921

SAWTELLE HOSPITAL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adashek, Capt. Eugene P.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Nov. 30, 1914	Sept. 16, 1941
Adelmann, Jerome	Russia	Aug. 26, 1911	July 16, 1942
Bayer, Col. Charles F.	Harmony, Ind.	May 10, 1891	Jan. 21, 1920
Binder, Capt. Maxwell J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 16, 1913	May 1, 1941
Clark, First Lt. George E.	Bedford, Mich.	Sept. 19, 1908	July 1, 1943
Colebaugh, Lt. Col. Chas. W.	Radford, Va.	Apr. 5, 1895	Oct. 1, 1930
Daitch, Capt. Morris B.	Newark, N. J.	June 10, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Dobyns, Maj. Gypsie J.	Woodland, Va.	May 17, 1903	Mar. 1, 1937
Fortner, Maj. Harry C.	Beaver Valley, Pa.	Nov. 8, 1890	Oct. 18, 1932
Galbreath, Capt. John C.	Morris Creek, W. Va.	Aug. 8, 1902	Aug. 1, 1941
Gore, Maj. William A.	Lynchburg, Tenn.	Aug. 8, 1898	Dec. 2, 1931
Goren, Capt Morris L.	Slutsk, Russia	May 25, 1908	July 5, 1938
Harris, Col. Richard L.	Wrightsville, Ga.	Oct. 25, 1896	Mar. 1, 1921
Holden, Maj. Isidore	Southampton, England.	May 30, 1904	Oct. 5, 1938
Holvey, Capt. Ervin H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Nov. 26, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Horowitz, First Lt. William.	New York City, N. Y.	Apr. 16, 1913	July 16, 1942
Hubbard, Lt. Col. Milton E.	Willard, Utah	Oct. 18, 1892	July 1, 1928
Hurwich, Maj. Jerome J.	Chicago, Ill.	do	Feb. 19, 1937
Kupersmith, Capt. Harry S.	do	Jan. 5, 1913	Feb. 1, 1940

SAWTELLE HOSPITAL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Lunsford, Capt. William B.	Roanoke, Va	June 22, 1890	Feb. 21, 1931
Lyons, Maj. Clinton G	Surgionsville, Iowa	Sept. 18, 1889	Oct. 12, 1927
Mandel, Capt. Harry	Brooklyn, N. Y	Oct. 12, 1910	Sept. 16, 1941
McClellan, Lt. Col. Jay H.	Statesville, N. C	Sept. 16, 1889	Nov. 7, 1924
Mollo, Maj. Louis D	Philadelphia, Pa	July 10, 1901	Jan. 4, 1932
Morgan, Maj. Howard P	Marshall, Tex	May 24, 1894	Dec. 17, 1930
Mumma, Maj. Claude S	Forreston, Ill	Mar. 18, 1894	Mar. 16, 1922
Newman, Maj. Harry William.	Ogden, Utah	Mar. 30, 1899	Dec. 6, 1930
Owens, Maj. Tracy C	Bedford, Ind	Mar. 10, 1902	(15)
Powell, Capt. Kenneth E	Lee, Ill	Nov. 24, 1906	July 18, 1938
Rabinowitz, Capt. David L.	Brooklyn, N. Y	Aug. 17, 1909	Feb. 2, 1941
Rock, Maj. Joseph H	No record available	Nov. 15, 1896	Sept. 17, 1926
Rosenberger, Capt. Maurice D.	Hancock, Ohio	Aug. 6, 1909	Oct. 1, 1940
Sabia, Capt. Daniel J	New York City, N. Y.	Aug. 7, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Satterlee, Capt. Albert H	Buffalo, N. Y	July 1, 1905	Jan. 3, 1939
Smith, Lt. Col. Horace D	Tennille, Ga	Apr. 27, 1903	Jan. 4, 1932
Smith, Capt. Jack Lawrence.	Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.	May 16, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Spickerman, Maj. Harold D.	Topeka, Kans	Feb. 17, 1904	Dec. 3, 1931
Suddeth, Capt. Leland F	Paris, Ill	Sept. 3, 1906	Mar. 2, 1942
Traxler, Maj. Paul S	Chicago, Ill	June 4, 1893	July 6, 1931
Van Vranken, Capt. Ralph.	Passaic, N. J	Sept. 18, 1895	Nov. 1, 1930
Volante, Capt. Anthony J	Philadelphia, Pa	Feb. 21, 1910	Oct. 25, 1938
Weiss, Capt. Benjamin J	Pittsburgh, Pa	Feb. 12, 1913	Nov. 1, 1939
Woodward, Capt. Frank A.	Burlington, Iowa	Sept. 19, 1884	Jan. 23, 1928
Ziedman, Capt. Irving	Chicago, Ill	Sept. 16, 1906	May 16, 1936
Civilian medical officers:			
Baro, Walter	No record available	Oct. 31, 1911	Sept. 1, 1944
Basham, Rue O	Richardville, Ky	Feb. 12, 1892	Sept. 25, 1931
Bowen, Ulysses	Metter, Ga	Dec. 5, 1897	Dec. 22, 1930
Brace, Robert W	Blackwood, N. J	July 21, 1875	Oct. 4, 1924
Burnett, Edward J	Terre Haute, Ind	Jan. 4, 1879	May 1, 1925
Cobb, Davidd H	Coating, Ala	Dec. 4, 1896	July 23, 1923
Dix, Isaac	Kirkwood, W. Va	Oct. 3, 1881	June 10, 1921
Dubrow, James L	Belopole, Ukraine	June 13, 1894	Sept. 21, 1931
Dulaney, Henry P	No record available	June 30, 1877	Mar. 1, 1913
Gorrell, James	Churchville, Md	Nov. 3, 1898	Aug. 1, 1941
Hantsch, Ferdinand K	Friedek, Austrian Silesia.	Jan. 26, 1892	July 16, 1928
Long, Frank L	De Soto, Mo	Nov. 18, 1882	Jan. 17, 1920
Nigh, John W	No record available	Nov. 11, 1884	Feb. 16, 1930
Pache, Francis C	Stockton, Calif	June 7, 1876	Oct. 1, 1921
Paynter, Harrison	Des Moines, Iowa	July 21, 1888	Mar. 1, 1941
Ramer, E. Blanche	No record available	Aug. 23, 1890	July 26, 1944
Rosow, Herman	do	July 25, 1907	Mar. 4, 1938
Scott, Robert	Donaldson, Minn	Sept. 29, 1885	Dec. 4, 1944
Commissioned dental officers:			
Neal, First Lt. Homer S	Carrollton, Miss	Mar. 23, 1891	Dec. 15, 1930
Saubert, Maj. Walter J	Kaukauna, Wis	Oct. 16, 1886	June 12, 1922
Van Aken, First Lt. Ray C.	No record available	Nov. 16, 1893	Sept. 16, 1943
Williams, Capt. Charles R.	Denver, Colo	July 24, 1897	Feb. 1, 1922
Civilian dental officer: Denson, Roy L.	Hallettsville, Tex	Jan. 9, 1892	Oct. 1, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Dixon, Capt. William B.	Spirit Lake, Iowa	Dec. 17, 1896	Apr. 17, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Kallock, Dudley	Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y.	Dec. 10, 1883	Oct. 1, 1931
Paulson, George	Davenport, Iowa	Feb. 4, 1886	Jan. 24, 1944
Phares, Willard	Jacksonburg, Ohio	Apr. 12, 1880	Mar. 19, 1948
Roach, Richard A	Chicago, Ill	Oct. 18, 1883	Nov. 1, 1920
Strickland, Clarence R	Greenfield, Ind	May 18, 1882	Feb. 21, 1944
Zimmerman, Randall	Stoystown, Pa	July 29, 1879	Dec. 4, 1944

LYONS, N. J.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fagley, Maj. Raymond C	Shamokin, Pa	Nov. 19, 1887	May 17, 1935
Flood, Maj. William A	Walloomsac, N. Y	May 23, 1887	Mar. 10, 1921
Gardner, Capt. Sidney M	Denver, Colo	Sept. 13, 1906	Apr. 1, 1938
Giannini, Capt. Francis F.	Italy	Dec. 25, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Hawkins, First Lt. William B.	Little Rock, Ark	Aug. 4, 1912	
Hoffman, Capt. Harry	Philadelphia, Pa	Nov. 5, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Kaplan, Capt. Leonard A.	Brooklyn, N. Y	Jan. 8, 1914	Mar. 16, 1942
Loeb, Maj. William A	New York, N. Y	Feb. 28, 1906	Mar. 9, 1935
Lopez, Lt. Col. Louis V	New Orleans, La	Jan. 7, 1894	June 14, 1920
Michaels, Capt. Joseph	New York, N. Y	July 12, 1911	Feb. 3, 1941
Mischler, Jay E	Atlantic City, N. J	Feb. 15, 1912	Feb. 2, 1942
Presberg, Maj. Mowey	Rochester, N. Y	Oct. 1, 1904	Jan. 6, 1936
Raimone, Capt. Salvatore	Brooklyn, N. Y	Dec. 14, 1907	Feb. 2, 1942
Roecker, Capt. Roland D	do	Mar. 30, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Sewall, Maj. Lee G	Marlin, Tex	Aug. 25, 1907	Mar. 7, 1938
Weitz, Maj. Paul	Czernawitz, Austria	Oct. 30, 1903	Jan. 15, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Hinckley, Livingston S	Newark, N. J	Apr. 23, 1893	Oct. 31, 1935
Hirrschoff, Ernest A. F	Dresden, Germany	July 28, 1880	July 6, 1925
Strotz, Charles M	Philadelphia, Pa	June 12, 1881	May 1, 1921

[15] In 1931.

LYONS, N. J.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned dental officers:			
Scopp, Capt. Irwin W	New York, N. Y	Dec. 8, 1909	July 22, 1942
Zercher, Maj. Joseph E	Topeka, Kans	May 9, 1895	July 16, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Whyte, Isaac H.	Chester County, Pa	Feb. 1, 1877	Aug. 16, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Gordon, Edward J.	Newburgh, N. Y	July 1, 1875	Feb. 20, 1929

MANCHESTER, N. H.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Civilian medical officers:			
Drury, Forrest J	Easton, N. H	Jan. 17, 1885	Dec. 16, 1930
Maby, Aloysius D	Cohoes, N. Y	Oct. 31, 1892	Nov. 1, 1921

MARION, ILL.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Ailts, Capt. Bernard H	Pekin, Ill	May 29, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Michaelson, Maj. Leon J	Rochester, N. Y	Oct. 28, 1913	Do.
Navin, Maj. James J	Norwalk, Ohio	Aug. 6, 1898	Jan. 6, 1932
Shawver, Lt. Col. John R.	Knox County, Tex	Feb. 11, 1907	Jan. 3, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Gorisse, Gustave	Rahway, N. J	Oct. 26, 1887	June 6, 1944
Hunsaker, Curtis A	Colden, Ill	Sept. 10, 1887	Jan. 15, 1927
Welch, Edward A	Springfield, Ohio	May 26, 1890	Mar. 22, 1920

MARION, IND.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Argent, Capt. Albert H	Leova, Rumania	Apr. 12, 1912	Oct. 16, 1941
Bean, Lt. Col. Victor H	Fulton, Mass	Apr. 6, 1886	Aug. 4, 1920
Botts, Col. Harry H	Lebanon, Ind	June 2, 1889	Jan. 15, 1923
Bourke, Maj. William W	Horton, Kans	Oct. 31, 1902	Feb. 16, 1931
Faust, Capt. Walter H	Altus, Ark	Sept. 9, 1911	Nov. 1, 1941
Ginsberg, Maj. Stewart T.	St. Paul, Minn	Apr. 18, 1906	Jan. 7, 1936
Hockett, Capt. Harry G	Anderson, Ind	Sept. 11, 1903	July 1, 1942
Jones, Maj. Ernest F	Milton, Ind	Mar. 23, 1900	Dec. 10, 1940
Milone, First Lt. Joseph E	New York, N. Y	Sept. 28, 1914	Jan. 4, 1943
Weinstein, Capt. Louis	Odessa, Russia	Apr. 19, 1895	June 15, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Helck, Capt. Solomon A.	Grayville, Ill	Feb. 19, 1882	Mar. 28, 1932
Civilian dental officer: Van Brackle, Woodfin H.	Clyde, Ga	Aug. 12, 1891	May 6, 1925

MEMPHIS, TENN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Boals, Maj. John O	Williston, Tenn	July 16, 1886	Apr. 16, 1921
Damashek, Capt. Samuel	New York, N. Y	Jan. 18, 1910	July 8, 1940
Dougherty, Maj. Hugh Robert.	Ashland, Pa	Oct. 4, 1903	Oct. 16, 1939
Foster, Lt. Col. Robert Heath.	Shiloh, Miss	Sept. 13, 1884	Jan. 21, 1933
Gross, Capt. Victor L	New York, N. Y	Oct. 18, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Levin, Capt. Jack	No record available	Jan. 26, 1912	May 1, 1941
McCann, Ezelle	Kewanee, Miss	May 13, 1885	Jan. 15, 1923
Rapp, Maj. Edwin Wallace.	Aurora, Ill	Apr. 18, 1891	Apr. 16, 1932
Rosenkranz, Maj. Otto H	Duisburg, Germany	Jan. 15, 1882	Aug. 1, 1920
Skinner, Capt. Morgan	Waupaca, Wis	Jan. 12, 1905	May 22, 1936
Wheeler, Lt. Col. Joseph Ed.	Meridian, Miss	Sept. 5, 1892	July 6, 1919
Civilian medical officers:			
Cooper, Arthur F	Trenton, Tenn	Aug. 26, 1881	May 27, 1944
Dodge, Horace C	Boulder, Colo	Mar. 14, 1877	Sept. 3, 1919
Isherwood, Ainsworth V	Drocut, Mass	Oct. 1, 1899	Mar. 1, 1943
Love, John M	Amherst, Va	May 24, 1878	May 5, 1934
Patton, Marion L	Bells, Tenn	Dec. 4, 1898	Apr. 1, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Bergeron, Capt. Maximilian P.	Hinesdale, N. H	June 6, 1886	July 5, 1923
Civilian dental officer: Reinert, Adrian.	Centerville, Wis	Jan. 27, 1906	Jan. 6, 1944

MENDOTA, WIS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Owens, Capt. Clarence G	Crookston, Minn	May 21, 1903	Dec. 1, 1941
Spiro, Capt. Harry M	Boston, Mass	Sept. 2, 1913	Mar. 2, 1942
Tompkins, Lt. Col. Harvey J.	Chicago, Ill	May 14, 1906	July 2, 1935
Trent, Lt. Col. Letcher E	North Carolina	Sept. 26, 1883	Mar. 9, 1922
Zolondek, First Lt. Sol	Poland	Dec. 15, 1908	Sept. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Singleton, Dennis E.	Paris, Mo	June 21, 1882	Sept. 1, 1939
Civilian dental officer: Harrymau, John W.	No record available	May 17, 1894	Apr. 9, 1937

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bank, Maj. Harry E	Milwaukee, Minn	Apr. 28, 1891	Jan. 15, 1920
Bundy, Lt. Col. Harry E	Aurora, Ill	Dec. 19, 1889	May 14, 1928
Falk, Capt. Abraham	New York, N. Y	May 27, 1905	Nov. 1, 1939
Golden, Capt. Howard	Bronx, N. Y	Aug. 8, 1915	Sept. 16, 1942
Hentel, Maj. William	New York, N. Y	Aug. 25, 1911	May 1, 1941
Katz, Capt. Louis J	St. Paul, Minn	Oct. 2, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Litman, Maj. Morris H	Kanelo, Russia	Mar. 15, 1899	Apr. 1, 1930
Mandell, Capt. Edward H	New York, N. Y	Jan. 23, 1899	June 1, 1942
McGregor, Capt. Catherine G.	No record available	Dec. 12, 1891	Apr. 21, 1944
Minsky, Capt. Armen A	Russia	Mar. 30, 1904	Nov. 3, 1929
Myers, Maj. Harry A	Herman, Ill	Feb. 4, 1890	Apr. 1, 1921
Neal, Maj. Joe M	Gallipolis, Ohio	Aug. 26, 1892	Aug. 2, 1920
Noonan, Capt. Dan Francis.	Waverly, Minn	Dec. 29, 1883	Apr. 4, 1944
Schwalbe, Maj. Milton L	New York City, N. Y	June 2, 1889	Dec. 23, 1940
Utendorfer, Capt. Robert W.	Harvey, N. Dak	May 22, 1912	Apr. 1, 1944
Westphal, Maj. Kean F	Pleasant Grove, Utah	Dec. 21, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Ziskin, Maj. Thomas	Grand Forks, N. Dak	Nov. 29, 1888	Oct. 25, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Abbott, John S	St. Paul, Minn	Nov. 15, 1883	Dec. 1, 1944
Burdick, Charles H	St. Louis, Mo	Aug. 1, 1886	July 5, 1929
De Courcey, Donald	St. Paul, Minn	Mar. 3, 1901	June 20, 1930
Hanson, Henry V	Hutchinson, Minn	Jan. 21, 1889	Jan. 29, 1923
Jensen, Louis C	Denmark	June 10, 1888	Aug. 23, 1921
Josewich, Alexander	Milwaukee, Wis	July 4, 1890	May 1, 1922
Nelson, Edwin G	La Porte, Ind	Aug. 26, 1890	July 18, 1921
Nelson, Oscar L	Minneapolis, Minn	Apr. 13, 1894	Nov. 8, 1937
Seaberg, John A	Evanston, Ill	Mar. 9, 1890	Aug. 15, 1928
Commissioned dental officers:			
Payne, Maj. Ralph S	Wabasha, Minn	Sept. 16, 1895	Apr. 10, 1921
Yonover, First Lt. Nathan	No record available	Mar. 20, 1900	Apr. 1, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Koontz, Sylvester.	Glenville, Minn	June 27, 1889	Jan. 1, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Sanderson, Capt. Oscar M.	Minnesota, Minn	June 2, 1889	Oct. 2, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Engdahl, Fred	Wilbank, S. Dak	Feb. 27, 1891	Mar. 30, 1944
Fahey, Edward S	Kingston, Ontario, Canada.	Nov. 18, 1876	Mar. 1, 1945
Joyner, Nevil M	Mason, Tenn	Mar. 24, 1899	Dec. 10, 1942
Ricketts, Floyd	Jeffersonville, Ind	Dec. 13, 1889	Feb. 16, 1944
Scanlan, Jerome E	St. Paul, Minn	Oct. 16, 1898	Jan. 19, 1944

MONTGOMERY, ALA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bailey, Maj. Marion P	Charleston, S. C	Jan. 26, 1893	June 5, 1935
Bernell, Capt. Stanley P	Camden, N. J	Feb. 14, 1913	Feb. 2, 1942
Rosenfeld, Capt. Frederick	Brooklyn, N. Y	Feb. 8, 1906	Dec. 21, 1936
Schmitt, Capt. Robert W	Nichols, Iowa	Nov. 20, 1908	Feb. 1, 1940
Witten, Capt. Morris	Brooklyn, N. Y	Mar. 27, 1913	Nov. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Fisk, Harley B	Fiskburg, Ky	Feb. 10, 1890	Sept. 27, 1930
Kienhoff, George W	Troy, Kans	May 17, 1885	Jan. 10, 1921
Newhauser, Mayer A	Monore, La	Feb. 26, 1883	May 20, 1920
Pafford, Jefferson W	Cafee County, Ga	Mar. 20, 1889	Sept. 17, 1931
Weinrib, Joseph	New York, N. Y	Dec. 23, 1904	Dec. 2, 1940
Commissioned dental officer: Miller, Capt. James L.	Carthage, Tex	May 11, 1882	May 3, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Garrett, Capt. James DeWitt.	Mount Carmel, Ala	Dec. 27, 1888	Mar. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Reagan, Cas	Delta, Ala	Sept. 12, 1889	Jan. 16, 1940
Stanley, William A	Opp, Ala	Mar. 22, 1890	Feb. 1, 1944

MOUNTAIN HOME, TENN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blau, First Lt. Leslie	Hungary	June 5, 1912	Sept. 16, 1943
Crouch, Maj. Henry W	Charleston, S. C	Feb. 9, 1900	Mar. 13, 1936
Frankenthaler, Capt. Sylvan A.	Neva, Tenn	Aug. 13, 1904	Apr. 1, 1942
Gambill, Maj. Ira M	do	June 18, 1894	Nov. 6, 1931
Good, Lt. Col. Richard W	Corning, Iowa	Mar. 3, 1896	June 15, 1926
Kantor, Capt. Milton	Bronx, N. Y	Jan. 27, 1912	May 1, 1941
Knapp, Capt. John A	Union, N. Y	Aug. 25, 1914	June 15, 1942
Levy, Capt Bertram L	Staten Island, N. Y	Mar. 6, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Morison, Lt. Col. James H. S.	Ewing, Va	Dec. 4, 1885	Sept. 15, 1934
Prescott, Capt. Kenneth H	Bloomfield, Nebr	Dec. 19, 1909	July 6, 1938
Russek, Capt. Allen S	Brooklyn, N. Y	Feb. 16, 1907	Feb. 2, 1942
Slade, Lt. Col. Charles K	Willacoochee, Ga	June 14, 1907	July 1, 1937
Waring, Maj. Harold R	Tyrone, Pa	Dec. 4, 1899	Jan. 2, 1942
Werner, Maj. Emil A	Crete, Ill	Dec. 14, 1890	July 11, 1921
Civilian medical officer: Carpenter, John D.	No record available	Mar. 29, 1880	Feb. 1, 1928
Commissioned dental officers:			
McDowell, First Lt. Harvey E.	Smithfield, Nebr	July 3, 1903	Oct. 14, 1940
Nixon, Capt. Marvin O	No record available	Sept. 4, 1906	Oct. 2, 1941
Talbert, Maj. Harry V	Hancock County, Ind	Oct. 30, 1888	June 1, 1930

MURFREESBORO, TENN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abel, Maj. Samuel E	No record available	Jan. 27, 1907	Jan. 1, 1945
Adams, Maj. Charles C	Manchester, Ill	Apr. 25, 1890	Mar. 2, 1931
Dodd, Maj. David William.	Vevay, Ind	July 7, 1892	Oct. 14, 1921
Hawkins, Capt. Henry M	Magnolia, Ark	May 9, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Jerrell, Maj. Paul M	Nobelville, Ind	Feb. 25, 1895	Oct. 15, 1930
Lawn, Maj. Harold J	Minneapolis, Minn	Oct. 28, 1911	Apr. 3, 1937
Martin, Capt. William D	Gladeville, Tenn	Apr. 22, 1886	May 1, 1944
Moore, Capt. George B	Madison, Ark	June 23, 1907	Feb. 6, 1939
Rosenberg, Capt. George	New York, N. Y	Sept. 2, 1896	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Covey, Clyde B	Buffalo, N. Y	Dec. 13, 1887	Feb. 15, 1920
Moore, John F	Washington, D. C	June 19, 1899	May 16, 1939
White, Alvah W	Upatoie, Ga	Oct. 10, 1888	Dec. 31, 1928
Civilian dental officers:			
Meyer, Frank E	Lexington, Mo	Jan. 12, 1887	Sept. 5, 1922
Phillips, Fred O	Huntsville, Tenn	Aug. 15, 1882	Feb. 18, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Glass, USNR, Lt. Sidney H.	Phoenix City, Ala	Apr. 11, 1898	Feb. 24, 1931
Herndon, Capt. Zelma Lamb.	Bement, Ill	Nov. 13, 1902	Jan. 25, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Barker, Hampton M	Alabama	Mar. 14, 1876	Apr. 16, 1945
Hind, John C	Brookfield, Ga	Sept. 3, 1892	Mar. 1, 1930

MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Alexander, Maj. Gilbert H	Brooklyn, N. Y	Nov. 6, 1908	Feb. 14, 1938
Bates, Lt. Col. Clarence E	Westire, Okla	June 30, 1894	Jan. 2, 1925
Dougherty, Maj. Arthur McI.	Litchfield, Minn	Aug. 8, 1901	Jan. 16, 1940
Mengel, Capt. Chester K	McAlester, Okla	Jan. 21, 1915	Aug. 1, 1941
Miller, Maj. Daniel H	Clatonia, Nebr	Oct. 31, 1899	June 6, 1932
Parker, Maj. James H	Berryman, Mo	Sept. 25, 1886	July 16, 1930
Rome, Capt. Albert	Boston, Mass	May 6, 1907	Jan. 12, 1938
Turner, Capt. Ralph D	Emporia, Kans	Aug. 1, 1909	Dec. 16, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Dyer, James H	Shelbyville, Tenn	Oct. 8, 1875	June 20, 1921
Freund, Norman L	New York, N. Y	Jan. 17, 1914	Nov. 15, 1944
Mitchell, Robert	Oklahoma Del. district, Indian Territory.	Apr. 10, 1876	Dec. 3, 1921
Mollica, Stephen	Lipari, Italy	July 16, 1893	Jan. 5, 1931
Robinson, Charles	Hernando De Soto County, Miss.	July 17, 1889	Mar. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Patriquin, Capt. Forrest D.	Newburyport, Mass	June 23, 1898	May 2, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Athey, Clanton R	Crenshaw County, Ala.	Dec. 6, 1886	May 17, 1930
Davis, Emmer P	Slantloud, Mo	Mar. 25, 1884	Jan. 28, 1944

NEWINGTON, CONN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Boswell, Maj. Clay S	Illinois	Feb. 8, 1898	Dec. 1, 1931
Bowen, Capt. Francis D	Grantsville, Md	Dec. 2, 1916	July 1, 1943
Brillman, First Lt. Lester P.	No record available	Jan. 21, 1912	Dec. 2, 1940
Cook, Lt. Col. Ambrose H	Cincinnati, Ohio	Jan. 17, 1902	Oct. 16, 1928
Dressler, Capt. Morris	New York, N. Y	Oct. 14, 1902	June 1, 1942
Fleri, Capt Santo Howard	Brooklyn, N. Y	Feb. 19, 1901	Mar. 16, 1942
Fox, Capt. Sidney	New York, N. Y	Feb. 16, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Marcus, Capt Emanuel	Brooklyn, N. Y	Jan. 27, 1909	Do.
Messina, Maj. Michael C	Italy	Aug. 8, 1901	Mar. 2, 1931
Musa, Maj. Agha B	Tabriz, Iran	July 18, 1888	Apr. 4, 1927
Preston, Lt. Col. Thomas R.	New Haven, Conn	Sept. 2, 1899	June 1, 1928
Prignano, Capt. John Vincent.	New York, N. Y	Dec. 20, 1914	July 16, 1942
Schwartz, Capt. George R	Milwaukee, Wis	Jan. 16, 1907	Aug. 22, 1935
Whiting, Capt. Herbert S	New York, N. Y	Jan. 28, 1906	Feb. 3, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Baskin, Abraham	Lepew, Russia	June 8, 1907	Jan. 16, 1939
Brennand, Everett C	Providence, R. I	Aug. 7, 1873	Dec. 29, 1919
McGovern, Edward	Bridgeport, Conn	Jan. 24, 1875	Sept. 1, 1935
Commissioned dental officers:			
Goldstein, First Lt. Hyman	Russia	Oct. 15, 1904	Jan. 17, 1942
Robbins, Capt. Clement J., Jr.	Hampton, Va	Apr. 3, 1900	Aug. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers: Egan, Capt. John Joseph.	No record available	May 15, 1885	Aug. 3, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Farley, Edward B	do	Oct. 19, 1885	Apr. 9, 1945
Tyler, Herman A	East Hartford, Conn	Aug. 13, 1877	Mar. 5, 1930

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Beranger, Maj. Edgar J.	New Orleans, La.	Aug. 27, 1892	Feb. 24, 1920
Di Tata, Maj. Domenick	New York City, N. Y.	June 2, 1908	Nov. 1, 1939
Musfelt, Capt. William S.	Long Pine, Nebr.	Nov. 22, 1902	[15]
Wiernik, Capt. Harris	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 25, 1908	Apr. 1, 1942
Zaller, Capt. Seymour	New York City, N. Y.	Apr. 4, 1903	[16]
Civilian medical officer: Guillotte, William F.	No record available	Sept. 15, 1878	June 1, 1944
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Marlette, George C.	Trilla, Ill.	Feb. 5, 1888	Apr. 30, 1930
Otto, Henry J.	New Orleans, La.	June 29, 1879	Feb. 14, 1944
Trepangier, Dalton	do	Sept. 27, 1898	Mar. 30, 1944

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned dental officers:			
O'Brien, Capt. Arthur G.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 25, 1895	Jan. 9, 1940
Westmoreland, Capt. William W.	No record available	Mar. 23, 1888	Feb. 1, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fink, Capt. Frank E.	do	Oct. 14, 1895	Jan. 11, 1944
Holzberg, Capt. Ida Ruth	do	June 28, 1898	Jan. 19, 1944
Livant, Capt. Saul	do	June 6, 1905	July 13, 1943
Michaels, Capt. Leo	do	Aug. 24, 1893	Jan. 21, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Little, Zack J.	Franklin Mills, Pa.	July 31, 1876	Apr. 20, 1931
Barron, William Power	Rusk, Tex.	June 8, 1877	Apr. 1, 1920
Dryfus, Milton L.	New Haven, Conn.	Oct. 26, 1890	Dec. 21, 1944
Friedman, Edward L.	Carmel, N. J.	Feb. 24, 1885	Dec. 12, 1944
Harberg, Hyman	Bronx, N. Y.	do	Jan. 19, 1944
Jacobs, William I.	New York, N. Y.	Mar. 4, 1897	Jan. 11, 1944
Kliger, Max	Odessa, Russia	Oct. 15, 1893	Jan. 3, 1944
Liotta, Matthew	Italy	Sept. 20, 1886	Dec. 27, 1943
Musante, Joseph	Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.	Dec. 19, 1889	Jan. 21, 1944
O'Connor, Eugene T.	Utica, N. Y.	Aug. 23, 1880	Jan. 26, 1920
Rosenberg, David	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 13, 1896	Jan. 12, 1944
Rubinowitz, Alexandria H.	New York, N. Y.	July 23, 1887	Do.
Sherwood, Arthur	New Haven, Conn.	Apr. 4, 1896	Feb. 14, 1944
Walther, John W.	Coburg, Germany	Oct. 12, 1880	Dec. 5, 1944
Weinauer, Heribert	Passau, Germany	May 14, 1899	Dec. 8, 1943
Wiener, Isidore K.	Newark, N. J.	May 11, 1884	Dec. 18, 1944
Chaney, Herbert M.	City not given, Ohio	July 14, 1873	Jan. 22, 1945
Looram, James F.	New York City	Nov. 22, 1888	Mar. 1, 1940

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Brown, Maj. Ralph W.	La Porte City, Iowa	June 24, 1886	Nov. 15, 1920
Dobson, Col. William M.	New Brunswick, Canada.	June 24, 1883	Mar. 16, 1929
Harris, Capt. Albert E.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	May 17, 1910	June 1, 1942
Kasper, Capt. Louis	New York, N. Y.	May 26, 1910	June 15, 1942
O'Neil, Lt. Col. Richard T.	Vicksburg, Miss.	June 5, 1889	Jan. 15, 1923
Plumb, Maj. Darley G.	Kirwin, Kans.	Aug. 23, 1883	Nov. 4, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Mayer, Stephen K.	Mainz, Germany	Nov. 20, 1890	Nov. 17, 1943
Steele, Fred E.	Stockbridge, Vt.	Sept. 11, 1883	Aug. 15, 1919
Civilian dental officer: Rogers, Francis.	Southboro, Mass.	Oct. 26, 1878	Dec. 8, 1920

NORTH LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Campbell, Col. Duncan D.	Rochester, N. Y.	July 20, 1885	May 1, 1924
Denning, Capt. Philip P.	Flushing, N. Y.	Sept. 17, 1905	Feb. 2, 1942
Doherty, Maj. William R.	Ohio	Oct. 4, 1912	Dec. 1, 1939
Mallin, First Lt. Aaron W.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 16, 1913	[16]
Riley, Maj. Wilbur K.	Wisner, Nebr.	Sept. 24, 1892	July 16, 1930
Robinson, Maj. Joseph A.	Fort Worth, Tex.	May 1, 1890	July 8, 1923
Snyderman, Capt. Henry	Vilno, Lithuania	Jan. 1, 1894	June 1, 1942
Stathakis, Capt. John	Sparta, Greece	May 10, 1904	Do.
Thomas, Capt. Theodore, J.	Narka, Kans.	July 24, 1904	Oct. 16, 1941
Walsh, Maj. William V.	St. Paul, Minn.	Sept. 8, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Wiggins, Maj. Charles Henry.	Scoba, Miss.	Oct. 17, 1899	Apr. 19, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Harkey, Clifford	Graves County, Ky.	Jan. 7, 1881	Mar. 17, 1921
Toney, Lee E.	Missouri	Apr. 22, 1886	June 17, 1935
Commissioned dental officer: Adams, Capt. Ward A.	Ozark, Mo.	Nov. 11, 1891	Apr. 14, 1921

[15] No record available.

NORTHPORT, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Carra, First Lt. Angelo D.	New York, N. Y.	Oct. 26, 1914	Aug. 7, 1944
Dancik, Capt. Daniel	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 27, 1911	Dec. 2, 1940
Drake, Capt. Robert J.	Severance, Kans.	Oct. 31, 1889	Dec. 1, 1941
Foster, Lt. Col. Harold E.	Owego, Tioga County, N. Y.	June 1, 1884	Sept. 21, 1927
Hawkes, Capt. James Henry.	Rosamond, Ill.	Nov. 18, 1908	July 8, 1940
Huddleson, Lt. Col. James H.	Portland, Oreg.	Mar. 15, 1887	Aug. 2, 1941
Kashe, Capt. Leo H.	Granby, Canada	July 27, 1903	Nov. 2, 1942
Naples, Maj. Angelo S.	Buffalo, N. Y.	Aug. 31, 1903	July 5, 1935
Steinberg, First Lt. Edgar I.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 24, 1914	Mar. 2, 1942
Turner, Maj. William J.	Wilkinsburg, Pa.	Sept. 22, 1907	Feb. 6, 1937
Verdel, Col. Louis F.	Memphis, Tenn.	Jan. 24, 1894	Jan. 1, 1922
Civilian medical officers:			
Brown, Leonard	New York City	Nov. 15, 1883	Nov. 15, 1924
Drubin, Lester	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 8, 1913	Oct. 1, 1940
Gilberty, Rich	New York City	Nov. 10, 1912	Sept. 16, 1942
Hermann, M. E.	Austria	Oct. 18, 1900	Oct. 2, 1944
Lazell, Edward	Boston, Mass.	Aug. 3, 1878	Dec. 6, 1921
Triolo, Antonio	Polerius, Italy	Nov. 29, 1896	Feb. 16, 1931
Commissioned dental officers:			
Bourquin, Capt. Justin W.	Pidionte, Pa.	Jan. 3, 1891	July 25, 1935
Weston, First Lt. Michael E.	Russia	May 18, 1907	Dec. 7, 1939
Civilian dental officer: Swartz, Leroy W.	Ickesburg, Pa.	Jan. 3, 1880	June 1, 1921

OTEEN, N. C.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Anolik, First Lt. William	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 2, 1916	Jan. 17, 1944
Ashley, Capt. Moe	do	Jan. 30, 1913	Mar. 16, 1942
Bernstein, Maj. David	Minsk, Russia	Oct. 20, 1910	Mar. 13, 1941
Beverly, Maj. Squire S.	Richfield, Ohio	Sept. 6, 1889	Nov. 21, 1927
Gruenwald, Capt. Charles	Warsaw, Poland	Oct. 13, 1906	Feb. 2, 1942
Jacobs, Capt. Paul	Pennsylvania	Apr. 9, 1905	Apr. 26, 1937
Kraus, Capt. Albert	New York, N. Y.	July 17, 1907	[16]
McAllister, Lt. Col. Max F.	Fayetteville, Ark.	May 2, 1904	[16]
Murphy, Lt. Col. James D.	Brookings, S. Dak.	Nov. 2, 1895	Mar. 10, 1939
Quinn, Lt. Col. David E.	Dennison, Ohio	Apr. 30, 1901	Feb. 1, 1932
Rauchwerger, Capt. Solomon M.	New York City, N. Y.	June 19, 1908	Dec. 2, 1940
Rogers, Capt. Raymond J.	Oconto, Wis.	Sept. 20, 1906	Feb. 3, 1941
Sedofsky, Maj. Nathan	New York City	June 1, 1910	Feb. 16, 1937
Speir, Maj. Charles H.	Bay City, Mich.	Oct. 13, 1900	Mar. 2, 1942
Spencer, Capt. Samuel	Boston, Mass.	Jan. 18, 1912	June 1, 1942
Tilton, Capt. Wecome B.	Allendale, Mo.	June 3, 1884	Sept. 16, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Barell, Harry	New York, N. Y.	July 16, 1904	Mar. 2, 1942
Brewer, Frank Benton	Viola, Tenn.	June 7, 1894	Apr. 28, 1920
Moyer, Ralph E.	Mountain Grove, Mo.	Oct. 11, 1895	Apr. 1, 1942
Proffitt, Ray V.	Gunnison, Colo.	Aug. 27, 1889	May 29, 1919
Williams, Harry B.	Rushville, N. Y.	Dec. 26, 1879	Feb. 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officers:			
Archer, Maj. Isaac H.	Hancock County, Ga.	Nov. 15, 1887	Apr. 1, 1921
Benway, First Lt. Emphy F.	Chicago, Ill.	Oct. 22, 1893	Mar. 15, 1937
Civilian dental officer: Daugherty, Herbert D.	Nashville, Tenn.	Dec. 17, 1894	Apr. 12, 1937

OUTWOOD, KY.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Abel, Capt. Louis	New York City	Sept. 19, 1911	Mar. 16, 1942
Berg, Capt. Lawrence E.	Red Wing, Minn.	Dec. 12, 1901	Dec. 1, 1941
Lipton, Maj. Philip	Riga (Latvia), Russia	Dec. 2, 1909	Dec. 1, 1939
Ross, Capt. Leon	New York City	Jan. 3, 1903	Feb. 2, 1942
West, Maj. Elmer J.	Cloquet, Minn.	Aug. 10, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Westfall, Capt. Marvin F.	Maryville, Mo.	June 21, 1907	July 8, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
James, Samuel H.	Long Island, Ala.	Aug. 20, 1880	Apr. 1, 1920
Kesterton, William J.	Mayfield, Ky.	May 31, 1885	Jan. 2, 1939
Newman, Luther Byron	Helenwood, Tenn.	July 12, 1899	Apr. 27, 1944
Thomas, Irl	Benton, Ky.	June 27, 1891	June 18, 1920
Twente, Julius	Lafayette, Mo.	Mar. 10, 1899	Sept. 16, 1942
Commissioned dental officer: Nixon, Capt. James W.	Wells, Minn.	Apr. 27, 1889	Sept. 16, 1940

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Doan, Capt. Duiane I.	Goltry, Okla.	June 25, 1910	[17]
Hardgrove, Maj. Thomas J.	Tigerton, Wis.	Jan. 30, 1905	Mar. 13, 1935
Thomas, Capt. Grace Fern	Gothenburg, Nebr.	Sept. 23, 1897	Apr. 1, 1944
Weaber, First Lt. Thomas H., Jr.	Allentown, Pa.	June 10, 1915	Aug. 2, 1943
Wills, Maj. John Walter	Brookhaven, Miss.	Nov. 6, 1882	July 1, 1922

[16] No record available.
[17] In 1941.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officers:			
Carlisle, Chester L.	Columbus, Ohio	July 18, 1876	Feb. 15, 1920
Defeo, Henry E.	Boston, Mass.	July 8, 1900	Nov. 1, 1939
Douglass, William C.	Troy, N. C.	Apr. 27, 1886	Dec. 1, 1925
Lasche, Percival G.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Feb. 21, 1875	Feb. 14, 1921
Manley, Louis V.	Ackley, Iowa	Aug. 24, 1898	May 20, 1936
Commissioned dental officer: McCrillis, Capt. William W.	Spencerville, Ohio	Jan. 12, 1887	Sept. 6, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Talle, Otto S.	Starbuck, Minn.	Mar. 21, 1897	May 1, 1944

PERRY POINT, MD.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Clarke, Col. Harry G.	Toronto, Ohio	July 7, 1885	Jan. 11, 1924
Hymowitz, Capt. Abraham.	New York	Nov. 12, 1910	June 15, 1942
McGreevy, Capt. Joan F.	O'Neill, Nebr.	Sept. 13, 1906	May 1, 1944
Malinowski, Capt. Mitchell V.	No record available	June 12, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Morrison, Maj. Benjamin G.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 8, 1908	Nov. 1, 1938
Nagler, Capt. Herman	Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 19, 1910	Mar. 1, 1943
Steckler, Capt. Philip P.	New York City, N. Y.	Feb. 12, 1910	Feb. 2, 1942
Trollinger, Lt. Col. Arvin E.	Hindsville, Ark.	Apr. 24, 1897	Jan. 18, 1935
Civilian medical officers:			
Covalesky, Victor John	Forest City, Pa.	Mar. 13, 1913	Oct. 16, 1941
Dolan, John E.	Kankakee, Ill.	Jan. 1, 1882	Oct. 30, 1931
Smith, Lucian C.	Stafford, Va.	Nov. 29, 1875	Jan. 22, 1931
Torrey, Eugene W.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 4, 1893	Mar. 11, 1940
Civilian dental officers:			
Lynch, George G.	Larchmont, N. Y.	May 11, 1897	Dec. 13, 1943
Reed, Oscar R.	Labadie, Mo.	Feb. 16, 1887	Jan. 1, 1921

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer: Edwards, Maj. Thomson.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Aug. 13, 1887	Mar. 1, 1921
Civilian medical officers:			
Davis, William J. L.	Paterson, N. J.	Feb. 5, 1876	Mar. 26, 1945
Diodati, Vincent	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 15, 1889	Oct. 28, 1919
Lewis, John F.	Scranton, Pa.	July 24, 1886	Feb. 1, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Small, John J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 15, 1892	Oct. 6, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Leginus, Capt. Peter G.	No record available	Mar. 29, 1903	Feb. 9, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Blew, Edgar M.	Bridgeton, N. J.	Mar. 27, 1882	Sept. 6, 1944
Harvey, H. Brooks	Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 3, 1896	Jan. 13, 1944
Laux, Leo J.	Sayre, Pa.	Dec. 27, 1894	Sept. 1, 1944
Morales, Manuel G.	No record available	Aug. 13, 1890	Feb. 1, 1926
Penrose, Thomas	Paterson, N. J.	Jan. 20, 1880	Apr. 18, 1921
Riggin, George H.	Seaford, Del.	Apr. 7, 1879	Mar. 1, 1944
Samuel, Meredith	Providence, Pa.	Aug. 29, 1875	Mar. 6, 1945

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Golomb, Capt. Milton W.	No record available	Aug. 15, 1906	Dec. 17, 1943
Lussier, Maj. Arthur H.	St. Rosalie, Canada	Jan. 18, 1897	Dec. 19, 1939
McFadden, Maj. Harry W.	No record available	Oct. 15, 1888	Jan. 20, 1945
Murphy, Capt. Samuel Alfred	do	May 9, 1889	Sept. 2, 1941
Nathan, Capt. Louis	do	Oct. 11, 1902	June 1, 1942
Yoder, Capt. Robert D.	do	Dec. 18, 1905	Feb. 23, 1944
Civilian medical officer: Lauer, Cyril F.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Apr. 22, 1889	July 19, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Hayes, Lee W.	North Tonawanda, N. Y.	June 9, 1894	Dec. 1, 1930
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Kretz, Capt. Stewart F.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 5, 1908	Apr. 12, 1943
Civilian medical officers:			
Edgar, Joseph C.	Coulterville, Ill.	Apr. 5, 1881	Mar. 13, 1944
Mehler, Carl J.	Sharon, Pa.	Oct. 31, 1882	Apr. 5, 1945
Parker, Albert G.	Clairton, Pa.	Apr. 8, 1908	Apr. 10, 1944

PORTLAND, OREG.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Broun, Maj. James R.	Moss Point, Miss.	Feb. 3, 1907	Oct. 10, 1935
Carter, Col. Paul I.	Hamilton, Va.	Aug. 28, 1885	Oct. 31, 1907
Eisendorf, Capt. Lester H.	Chicago, Ill.	Mar. 4, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941

PORTLAND, OREG.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Commissioned medical officers—Continued			
Fowlkes, Capt. Everill Wm.	Butterville, Utah	Mar. 31, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Gandin, Capt. Morris M.	Bachmut, Russia	Apr. 18, 1911	Dec. 1, 1939
Green, Maj. Joseph S.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Apr. 23, 1903	Nov. 4, 1929
Havlicek, Maj. Theodore L.	Verdigre, Nebr.	Sept. 10, 1902	Mar. 5, 1937
Hyman, Maj. Milton D.	New York City	July 2, 1911	June 15, 1942
Keller, Maj. George F.	Wisconsin	Dec. 24, 1899	May 4, 1931
Maguire, Lt. Col. Leo M.	No record available	Aug. 22, 1888	May 1, 1922
McClintic, Maj. James K.	Philipsburg, Pa.	July 6, 1891	May 1, 1931
O'Toole, Capt. Arthur J.	Omaha, Nebr.	Oct. 16, 1907	June 25, 1937
Owens, Capt. Guy E.	Norton, Kans.	Apr. 15, 1887	June 1, 1942
Revell, Maj. Arthur J.	Scammon, Kans.	Aug. 5, 1904	Apr. 1, 1942
Sherwin, Capt. Richard N.	Willamina, Oreg.	June 20, 1910	June 1, 1942
Wolski, Capt. Joseph B., Jr.	Chicago, Ill.	May 1, 1911	Mar. 1, 1943
Civilian medical officers:			
James, Ernest F.	Altoona, Pa.	May 1, 1874	Apr. 1, 1924
Pfeiffer, George E.	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 25, 1891	Nov. 26, 1920
Williams, Michael	New York, N. Y.	July 8, 1906	Aug. 2, 1943
Commissioned dental officers:			
Carson, Capt. Carlisle	St. Louis, Mo.	May 10, 1895	May 8, 1922
Roloff, 1st Lt. Edwin H.	Maple Creek, Wis.	Dec. 12, 1905	Aug. 2, 1942

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cooper, Capt. Maurice Z.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Feb. 19, 1905	May 1, 1936
Speidel, Capt. Glenn P.	Iowa City, Iowa	Aug. 13, 1897	Apr. 13, 1937
Civilian medical officer: Granata, Tancredi G.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 11, 1891	Feb. 1, 1944
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Caldarone, Alfred.	Providence, R. I.	Feb. 27, 1888	Oct. 24, 1921

RENO, NEV.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Blatt, Capt. Samuel E.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 10, 1905	Dec. 2, 1940
Seitz, Maj. Ira J.	Mandan, N. Dak.	Apr. 30, 1898	Oct. 1, 1931
Winikow, Capt. William E.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 4, 1907	July 8, 1940

ROANOKE, VA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adelman, Capt. Solomon	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 17, 1907	Aug. 1, 1941
Cibelli, Maj. Louis A.	New York City	July 29, 1909	Oct. 3, 1938
Des Rochers, Maj. Jean B.	Chicopee, Mass.	June 23, 1906	Feb. 2, 1937
Faingold, Capt. Joseph E.	St. Paul, Minn.	Nov. 20, 1909	Jan. 15, 1940
Gussion, Capt. Philip	New York	July 13, 1909	Do.
Hudgens, Lt. Col. John C.	Elberton, Ga.	Jan. 10, 1896	Apr. 14, 1925
Laibstain, Capt. Herman	Norfolk, Va.	Jan. 26, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Meyer, Maj. George I.	Pochahon, Ill.	Sept. 14, 1904	Dec. 10, 1934
Oxman, Capt. Morris F.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 3, 1910	July 8, 1940
Ransome, Maj. John T.	Hampton, Va.	June 21, 1893	Nov. 5, 1932
Ross, Capt. Samuel H.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 8, 1906	Mar. 2, 1942
Zobel, Capt. Harold	Grodna, Russia	June 30, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Drake, Clifford	Tennessee	June 24, 1881	Nov. 30, 1928
Pillar, Samuel	New York City	Oct. 19, 1899	Dec. 1, 1943
Wilfong, Clavel T.	Glenville, W. Va.	Jan. 15, 1893	Sept. 18, 1919
Commissioned dental officer: Nolan, Capt. James I.	No record available	July 4, 1886	Feb. 16, 1921
Civilian dental officer: Fussell, George E.	Abbeville, Ga.	May 31, 1892	Mar. 1, 1939
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Boice, James M.	Money More, Ireland	June 24, 1881	Mar. 15, 1945

ROSEBURG, OREG.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cohenour, Maj. Robert E.	Joliet, Ill.	Sept. 21, 1913	May 1, 1941
Pisetsky, Capt. Joseph E.	New York City	Nov. 15, 1909	July 16, 1942
Richardson, Lt. Col. W. P.	Salem, Oreg.	Feb. 1, 1894	Mar. 1, 1941
Rosenbliett, Capt. Sidney	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dec. 14, 1907	Jan. 17, 1935
Schaefer, Capt. Otto	Augsburg, Germany	May 5, 1909	July 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Kinney, Kenneth M.	Astoria, Oreg.	Oct. 23, 1890	Nov. 23, 1927
Melvin, George M.	Camden, Miss.	June 30, 1885	July 2, 1919
Commissioned dental officer: Amiot, Capt. William F.	Worcester, Mass.	Mar. 16, 1890	Nov. 26, 1919

RUTLAND HEIGHTS, MASS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Anderson, Capt. Nels H.	Marshalltown, Iowa	Sept. 26, 1907	Sept. 30, 1943
Boral, Capt. Henry	Poland	Nov. 1, 1905	June 1, 1942
Felderman, Capt. Jacob	Providence, R. I.	Nov. 5, 1909	Feb. 23, 1938
Gaines, Lt. Col. Justin E.	Mussel Fork, Mo.	Jan. 22, 1904	May 1, 1930
Gilbert, Maj. Meyer M.	Kuniey, Russia	Nov. 10, 1889	Jan. 16, 1939
Giventer, Capt. Max	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 15, 1908	May 1, 1941
Hechler, Capt. Robert	Springfield, Mass.	June 13, 1908	Mar. 16, 1942
Hoechstetter, Maj. Stanton S.	Wilkinsburg, Pa.	Mar. 1, 1904	July 28, 1930
John, Maj. Ralph C.	Lescott, Kans.	Nov. 19, 1894	Oct. 28, 1935
Kaplan, Maj. Rubin H.	New York City	Feb. 27, 1907	Aug. 1, 1938
Powers, Capt. Harry J.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Jan. 16, 1890	Mar. 27, 1939
Smerz, Capt. Anton	Chicago, Ill.	June 13, 1910	Jan. 15, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Hamlin, William E.	Boston, Mass.	Nov. 12, 1875	Nov. 10, 1920
Rooney, John F.	Worcester, Mass.	Nov. 13, 1889	Mar. 16, 1935
Wilson, John N.	Lansdowne, Md.	Jan. 7, 1900	July 1, 1929
Commissioned dental officer: Newton, First Lt. Bert W.	Newell, Iowa	Dec. 25, 1895	Dec. 16, 1942

SALINA, KANS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Civilian medical officer: Kenney, Clarence J.	No record available	Jan. 13, 1882	Apr. 1, 1922

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Dovey, Maj. Edward G.	Plattsmouth, Nebr.	Nov. 23, 1890	May 1, 1930
Humphrey, Capt. Norton R.	Fairwater, Wis.	July 13, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Mendelson, Capt. Max M.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Sept. 13, 1914	Feb. 2, 1942
Roberts, Maj. Nathaniel E.	Lebanon, Oreg.	Mar. 30, 1888	Feb. 3, 1931
Rosenberg, Capt. Harold	Bayonne, N. J.	Dec. 3, 1912	May 1, 1941
Winters, Maj. Allen C.	Jacksonville, Fla.	Mar. 28, 1907	July 5, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Forbes, Harry B.	Ogden, Utah	Oct. 29, 1877	Sept. 11, 1944
Hinckley, Elmer E.	Salt Lake City, Utah	Dec. 29, 1878	Feb. 16, 1945
Knowles, Charles E.	Springwater, N. Y.	Oct. 12, 1898	July 8, 1940
Commissioned dental officer: Snoddy, Capt. William H.	La Junta, Colo.	Dec. 22, 1894	Oct. 6, 1924
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Hummer, Leo F.	Iowa City, Iowa	Mar. 5, 1881	Jan. 7, 1944

SAN FERNANDO, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bailey, Maj. Jesse L.	Bynum, N. C.	Jan. 11, 1905	Mar. 19, 1938
Chandler, Maj. James B.	Madison County, Ga.	Nov. 1, 1903	July 3, 1934
Disney, Maj. Edward K.	Coal Creek, Tenn.	Jan. 6, 1896	Dec. 20, 1940
Hobson, Maj. Lewis C.	No record available	Jan. 15, 1886	Apr. 18, 1930
Leverton, Lt. Col. William R.	Bowie, Tex.	Aug. 20, 1882	Nov. 9, 1928
Malone, Capt. John T.	Louisville, Ky.	Oct. 10, 1890	Oct. 25, 1920
Mapes, Maj. William D.	Pueblo, Colo.	Nov. 3, 1907	May 19, 1936
Mensch, Capt. Saul A.	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 12, 1909	Feb. 3, 1941
Scarborough, Capt. Dorothy L.	Caddo, Okla.	Apr. 1, 1901	Aug. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Crede, William H.	Chicago, Ill.	July 13, 1879	Apr. 1, 1921
Damron, John E.	Union County, Ill.	Nov. 28, 1886	July 11 1930
Farnsworth, David C.	Lincoln, Nebr.	June 5, 1882	July 1, 1920
Commissioned dental officer: Bleasdale, Capt. John W.	Cleveland, Ohio	July 25, 1891	July 6, 1922

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Berger, Maj. Max M.	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 22, 1908	June 6, 1938
Berk, Capt. Morris	Kansas City, Mo.	June 2, 1912	Jan. 11, 1939
Briscoe, Maj. Lance E.	Greenville, Ind.	Mar. 1, 1890	Dec. 31, 1924
Creech, Maj. Clarence M.	Pacolet, S. C.	Mar. 16, 1903	Oct. 19, 1931
Donnelly, Col. James G.	Paterson, N. J.	Apr. 8, 1890	Aug. 16, 1921
Feldman, Capt. Sanford E.	San Francisco, Calif.	Apr. 20, 1914	Feb. 3, 1941
Majka, Capt. Frank A.	Tacoma, Wash.	Apr. 19, 1910	Nov. 1, 1938
Mann, Capt. Nathan	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 28, 1906	July 8, 1940
Movitt, Capt. Eli Rodin	Kiev, Russia	Dec. 24, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Schlosser, Capt. Joseph	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 2, 1913	May 1, 1941
Smith, Lt. Col. John V.	Independence, Iowa	Apr. 22, 1907	Oct. 28, 1935
Smith, Capt. Phillip B.	De Pere, Wis.	Mar. 9, 1912	Feb. 3, 1941
Wilson, Maj. Ernest LeRoy.	Olmstedville, N. Y.	Apr. 22, 1888	July 16, 1925

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officers:			
Baxter, Geoffrey H.	Sebastopol, Calif.	Apr. 10, 1899	Mar. 2, 1931
Chase, John S.	Denver, Colo.	Mar. 18, 1890	Oct. 20, 1934
Coney, Rembert J.	Maysville, S. C.	Mar. 27, 1882	July 6, 1931
Jillson, Walter A.	Orange, Mass.	Feb. 21, 1881	June 15, 1925
Kaess, Andrew Joseph	Vienna, Austria	May 11, 1879	July 14, 1944
Mitchell, Myron S.	City of Gaissin	Feb. 24, 1890	Oct. 4, 1944
Peace, Elber B.	Fort Norris, N. J.	Sept. 25, 1887	Mar. 27, 1922
Weber, Manuel L.	Vobolnik, Russia	Nov. 17, 1892	Nov. 20, 1930
Commissioned dental officers:			
Single, Maj. Harry A.	Merrill, Wis.	June 8, 1893	Mar. 1, 1921
Davis, Arthur L.	Mitchell, S. Dak.	Oct. 13, 1884	June 8, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officer: Bross, Capt. Samuel I.	Nikopol, Russia	Aug. 11, 1889	Sept. 21, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Ehlers, Reginald	Newark, N. J.	Dec. 3, 1886	Sept. 21, 1944
Baldwin, Anton	Baltimore, Md.	Oct. 25, 1887	July 22, 1942
Martin, John F.	Stonington, Conn.	Aug. 6, 1879	Aug. 15, 1921
Swenson, Reuben	Crookston, Minn.	Nov. 16, 1893	Apr. 30, 1941

SAN JUAN, P. R.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Compos Del Toro, Capt. Luis.	Puerto Rico	Feb. 22, 1897	Dec. 1, 1938
Serra - Chavarry, Maj. Jaime.	No record available	Jan. 17, 1893	Jan. 2, 1929

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Pascal, Capt. Oscar	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 25, 1910	May 1, 1941
Walsh, Maj. John S.	Sunderland, Mass.	Dec. 20, 1898	May 14, 1929

SEATTLE, WASH.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Appelman, Capt. Milton L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Aug. 3, 1909	Dec. 2, 1940
Clayberg, Capt. Harold D.	Chicago, Ill.	Jan. 24, 1892	Mar. 16, 1942
Ruben, Capt. Benjamin D.	East Port Chester, Conn.	Aug. 16, 1890	Feb. 10, 1941
Civilian medical officer: Carey, Leland O.	Palmyra, Iowa	Dec. 3, 1886	Dec. 5, 1928
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Caplan, Louis	Albany, N. Y.	Feb. 7, 1900	May 28, 1942
Capps, Paul G.	Illiopolis, Ill.	June 24, 1884	Dec. 11, 1944
Wilkinson, Harry	Brooklyn, Iowa	Nov. 2, 1882	May 16, 1944

SHERIDAN, WYO.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bennett, Maj. Edward R.	No record available	Dec. 13, 1905	Feb. 1, 1937
Glotfelty, Maj. James S.	Batavia, Iowa	June 15, 1905	Apr. 2, 1937
Mitchell, Maj. Henry S.	Oakland, Md.	Jan. 5, 1891	Oct. 30, 1930
Robins, First Lt. Sol. A.	Bielostok, Poland	Nov. 12, 1902	Dec. 2, 1940
Sterling, Lt. Col. Harold W.	Duenweg, Mo.	Sept. 26, 1903	Apr. 16, 1931
Stewart, Capt. John H.	San Antonio, Tex.	Jan. 1, 1902	Feb. 3, 1941
Civilian medical officer: St. Antoine, Henry.	Burlington, Vt.	Sept. 23, 1891	July 22, 1919
Commissioned dental officer: Clark, Capt. Raymond J.	Maryville, Mo.	Aug. 5, 1895	May 1, 1930

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officer: Cunningham, Capt. Robert S.	Wheeling, W. Va.	Jan. 31, 1907	Jan. 15, 1940
Civilian medical officer: Vermeulen, Peter.	Zeeland, Mich.	Feb. 3, 1886	Oct. 4, 1922
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Riner, Harold L.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 15, 1910	Sept. 20, 1943

ST. CLOUD, MINN.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Kaplan, Capt. Samuel	Newark, N. J	July 26, 1916	Mar. 2, 1942
King, Capt. Llewellyn H.	Washington, D. C	Oct. 1, 1899	Feb. 28, 1938
Klotz, Capt. Maurice	Belfast, Ireland	June 6, 1906	Sept. 13, 1937
Kuitert, Maj. John H	Spring Lake, Mich	Aug. 28, 1908	July 8, 1940
Passarella, Maj. Frank A	Chicago, Ill	Dec. 12, 1893	June 13, 1930
Rosenbloom, Capt. William.	Monessen, Pa	May 11, 1910	May 2, 1941
Schrier, Capt. Harold L	New York, N. Y	Nov. 8, 1913	Mar. 2, 1942
Wiggin, Maj. Dayton C	South New Market, N. H.	July 18, 1882	Jan. 23, 1923
Civilian medical officers:			
Davis, Charles F	Bethlehem, N. H	Oct. 6, 1886	Apr. 12, 1925
Pringle, John A	Pittsfield, Ill	May 1, 1888	June 16, 1921
Sharp, Earl	Waldo, Wis	Feb. 22, 1881	Do.
Civilian dental officer: Trainor, Aloysius J.	Graceville, Minn	Mar. 9, 1892	Dec. 16, 1920

ST. LOUIS AREA OFFICE

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Anderson, Frank	Springfield, Mo	Oct. 25, 1896	Sept. 16, 1944
Cashin, John E	Montgomery, Ala	Dec. 25, 1870	Jan. 18, 1944
Gomien, Scott	Colfax, Ill	Feb. 8, 1894	Dec. 17, 1923
Kaminskas, Joseph T	Chicago, Ill	June 3, 1911	May 2, 1938
O'Reilly, William	Alsey, Ill	July 15, 1881	Mar. 6, 1944
Sheahan, Edwin L	St. Louis, Mo	Aug. 10, 1882	Jan. 24, 1944

SUNMOUNT, N. Y.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Aronson, Capt. Abraham	Chicago, Ill	June 2, 1911	June 2, 1938
Crandall, Maj. Will G	No record	Apr. 4, 1892	Sept. 1, 1930
Doane, Capt. Edwin A	Los Angeles, Calif	July 18, 1906	June 15, 1942
Durham, Maj. William R	Maxeys, Ga	Aug. 12, 1902	Dec. 18, 1934
Gustafson, Capt. Carl J	Sweden	Dec. 24, 1886	May 1, 1941
Lipscomb, Col. Harold R	Carrollton, Ga	Oct. 21, 1894	June 4, 1921
McHugh, Maj. John B	Summit Hill, Pa	Nov. 29, 1907	Nov. 1, 1939
Schwartz, Capt. Louis	New York, N. Y	Feb. 27, 1903	Aug. 1, 1941
Walters, Lt. Col. Henry W.	Lincoln, Nebr	June 26, 1908	Jan. 17, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Byrne, Albert B	Fort Thomas, Ky	Sept. 9, 1893	July 19, 1944
Crumrine, Leslie B	Beallsville, Pa	May 10, 1884	Jan. 2, 1931
Harwood, Bruno S	Plock, Poland	Jan. 1, 1880	June 1, 1944
Purinton, Charles O	New Hartford, Conn	June 7, 1874	Oct. 29, 1920
Scott, McClure	Reeiston, Va	Nov. 13, 1876	Dec. 3, 1928
Civilian dental officer: Park, Laurence.	Stevens Point, Wis	Aug. 13, 1890	Dec. 20, 1921

TOGUS, MAINE

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Balkin, Maj. Seymour S	Russia	Mar. 31, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Dachslager, Capt. Philip	New York, N. Y	June 29, 1911	Nov. 2, 1942
Dunn, Maj. Robert H	Philadelphia, Pa	June 16, 1907	June 17, 1935
Gardner, Maj. William A	St. Mary, La	Jan. 20, 1887	Oct. 16, 1937
Harris, Capt. Ralph N	Pittsburgh, Pa	June 22, 1907	Feb. 3, 1941
Jump, Lt. Col. Clarence E.	Japan, Mo	Nov. 1, 1902	Feb. 15, 1937
Kaplan, Maj. Julius A	Boston, Mass	Nov. 1, 1898	Nov. 6, 1922
Lipton, Maj. Sidney	New York, N. Y	Dec. 21, 1913	Jan. 15, 1940
Mazzola, Maj. Stephen	do	Dec. 26, 1906	Aug. 1, 1941
Mountford, Lt. Col. Arthur H.	Salem, Mass	Mar. 23, 1886	June 8, 1925
Namiot, Capt. Charles	Russia	June 28, 1896	Feb. 2, 1942
Newman, Capt. Benjamin	New York, N. Y	June 20, 1915	June 1, 1942
Schwartz, Capt. David	Austria-Hungary	Apr. 10, 1903	Do.
Staciva, Capt. Stanley J	Kalisz, Poland	Apr. 10, 1905	Mar. 16, 1942
Ventimiglia, Maj. William A.	New York, N. Y	July 26, 1910	Jan. 6, 1941
Weinstein, Capt. Sol	do	July 24, 1909	Mar. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officer: Davis, Urey G.	Princeton, Ky	Dec. 15, 1885	May 1, 1923
Commissioned dental officer: Berliner, First Lt. David.	New York	Dec. 12, 1907	Oct. 9, 1941
Civilian dental officer: Butterfield, Percy R.	Winterport, Maine	Sept. 23, 1899	Mar. 1, 1930

TUCSON, ARIZ.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cameron, Maj. Lester	Picton, Canada	Aug. 1, 1894	July 8, 1931
Drozda, Maj. Joseph P	Omaha, Nebr	Sept. 2, 1906	July 1, 1942
Gipe, Capt. Walter W	Connersville, Ind	Aug. 16, 1884	May 22, 1944
Greenbaum, Capt. Philip S.	New York, N. Y	Aug. 2, 1908	July 8, 1940
Gunter, Lt. Col. Roy A	Canton, Ga	July 22, 1886	Oct. 20, 1919
McWhirt, Maj. Willis E	Lampasas, Tex	Sept. 23, 1884	July 4, 1920
Siegel, Capt. Philip	Beacon, N. Y	Nov. 18, 1909	Aug. 1, 1941
Titche, Maj. Leon L	Monroe, La	Apr. 7, 1910	Feb. 20, 1941

TUCSON, ARIZ.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE—con.			
Civilian medical officer: Anderson, Carl A.	Sweden	Jan. 28, 1879	Oct. 8, 1921
Commissioned dental officer: Yohe, Capt. Perce P.	Monongahela, Pa	Jan. 1, 1893	Nov. 15, 1920
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officer: Seibert, Alexander W.	Illinois	Sept. 6, 1875	Aug. 6, 1919

TUSCALOOSA, ALA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Aibel, Capt. Louis	Brooklyn, N. Y	Aug. 7, 1903	Nov. 2, 1942
Byer, Capt. Louis	Manchester, England	Oct. 1, 1905	Mar. 16, 1942
Center, Capt. Abraham H	Savannah, Ga	Mar. 7, 1905	Feb. 3, 1941
Feldman, Capt. Raymond	Chicago, Ill	Oct. 27, 1909	July 17, 1939
Ingram, Lt. Col. George H.	Delta, Ala	Sept. 6, 1886	Jan. 15, 1923
Johnson, Lt. Col. George L.	Upson County, Ga	Apr. 13, 1882	Dec. 26, 1919
Kahn, Capt. Edward	Chicago, Ill	July 7, 1914	Sept. 16, 1942
Rackow, Capt. Leon L	New York, N. Y	Dec. 28, 1910	Feb. 3, 1941
Rhodes, Maj. Gilbert A	do	Dec. 29, 1889	Feb. 27, 1930
Roberts, Maj. Albert L	Gilbert, Miss	Oct. 11, 1888	July 1, 1922
Solovay, Capt. Julius	Brooklyn, N. Y	Nov. 24, 1909	Feb. 24, 1936
Commissioned dental officer: Tyler, Maj. Jesse M.	Bogue Chitto, Miss	July 17, 1885	Nov. 17, 1920

TUSKEGEE, ALA.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allen, Capt. Robert L	Barbados, British West Indies.	Sept. 16, 1901	Dec. 28, 1931
Parker, Maj. Prince P	do	Dec. 15, 1897	Oct. 8, 1924
Branche, Lt. Col. George C.	Louisburg, N. C	Jan. 10, 1896	Nov. 8, 1923
Carter, Capt. Peter J	Franktown, Va	July 28, 1889	Mar. 30, 1925
Davis, Maj. Harvey F	Chase City, Va	Aug. 22, 1896	Nov. 21, 1923
Dibble, Col. Eugene H., Jr.	Camden, S. C	Aug. 14, 1893	Feb. 16, 1936
Dickson, Capt. Leon A	Portland, Maine	Oct. 17, 1913	Aug. 1, 1941
Dwiggins, Maj. Horace G	Kansas City, Kans	Mar. 17, 1909	May 5, 1938
Johnson, Maj. Simon O	McIntosh, Ga	Dec. 1, 1895	Oct. 30, 1923
Kennedy, Capt. James A	Pine Bluff, Ark	Oct. 10, 1884	Dec. 18, 1926
Kersey, Capt. George M	Richmond, Va	Aug. 2, 1911	Feb. 2, 1942
Lewis, Capt. Willis E	Charleston, W. Va	May 14, 1898	Mar. 16, 1927
Looney, Capt. Gordon C	Springfield, Mo	Dec. 21, 1904	Aug. 1, 1941
Peters, Maj. Jesse J	Fort Wayne, Ind	Aug. 17, 1895	Nov. 1, 1926
Pitts, Maj. Charles N	Bibb, Ga	Nov. 3, 1900	Jan. 4, 1932
Richardson, Capt. Peter L	Charleston, S. C	May 5, 1898	Oct. 1, 1926
Smith, Maj. Alan P	Topeka, Kans	Feb. 27, 1895	Aug. 16, 1927
Taylor, Capt. Junius L	Newbern, N. C	Apr. 8, 1912	Feb. 2, 1942
Tildon, Lt. Col. Toussaint	Waxahachie, Tex	Apr. 5, 1893	Sept. 1, 1928
Williams, Capt. Joshua W.	Lightfoot, Va	Feb. 12, 1899	Feb. 21, 1938
Civilian medical officers:			
Berry, Joseph A	Charleston, S. C	Aug. 4, 1895	June 1, 1942
King, Drue	Augusta, Ga	Mar. 16, 1887	Oct. 22, 1923
Lee, Edwin H	Seguin, Tex	Mar. 3, 1886	Feb. 2, 1931
Mahone, Loniel A	Anniston, Ala	Mar. 16, 1894	May 1, 1930
Commissioned dental officer: Davis, Capt. Thomas B.	No record	July 3, 1885	Oct. 11, 1923

WACO, TEX.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Brannon, Maj. Earl P	Hastings, Okla	Sept. 28, 1908	June 1, 1938
Crowell, Capt. Robert W	Galveston, Tex	Jan. 6, 1914	Mar 16, 1942
Friedman, Maj. Carl	New Jersey	Mar. 24, 1914	May 1, 1941
Grossman, Maj. Maurice	Philadelphia, Pa	Dec. 5, 1907	Jan. 25, 1938
Holmes, Lt. Col. Mansell B.	Mount Vernon, Mo	Aug. 9, 1895	Jan. 26, 1927
Lupo, Capt. Thomas G	New York City	May 7, 1910	May 1, 1941
Marinacci, Capt. Alberto A.	Italy	Dec. 1, 1903	Feb. 3, 1941
Rubin, Col. Harry	Waycross, Ga	May 16, 1890	Apr. 1, 1921
Watman, Lt. Col. Morris	Odessa, Russia	Aug. 21, 1905	Oct. 16, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Gill, John L	Rosedale, Mo	Nov. 9, 1880	Feb. 18, 1925
Laird, John S	Newton County, Miss.	Jan. 24, 1882	Sept. 16, 1920
McDaniel, John F	Magnolia, Ark	Aug. 18, 1896	Nov. 8, 1922
Phillips, Warren M	Newton, Ill	Jan. 19, 1884	June 1, 1926
Smith, Joseph G	Groveton, Tex	Sept. 20, 1881	Oct. 1, 1928
Commissioned dental officer: Wyatt, Capt. Hamlette G.	Prices Branch, Mo	Nov. 15, 1892	Dec. 15, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Allison, Capt. Harold T	Brookings, S. Dak	Apr. 8, 1886	Apr. 30, 1942
Price, Capt. Enoch C	Waco, Tex	Jan. 26, 1885	Apr. 1, 1944
Civilian medical officer: Huddleston, William E.	Hayes County, Tex	Dec. 25, 1891	Feb. 10, 1944

WADSWORTH, KANS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Anderson, Capt. James O.	Lehi, Utah	Apr. 2, 1899	June 15, 1942
Berger, Maj. Morley	Pittsburgh, Pa	Nov. 3, 1905	Aug. 16, 1935
Epstein, Capt. Benjamin	New York, N. Y.	Aug. 18, 1910	Mar. 2, 1942
Ford, Maj. Harold V.	Kansas City, Mo.	Oct. 9, 1907	Feb. 18, 1935
Freeman, Maj. William K.	San Augustine, Tex.	Dec. 31, 1904	Jan. 6, 1936
Gellman, Capt. Milton B.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 27, 1912	(18)
Glazer, Capt. Michael H.	Riga, Cowna County, Russia.	Oct. 20, 1892	Feb. 1, 1938
Gross, Capt. Norman H.	New York, N. Y.	Feb. 13, 1911	Oct. 6, 1938
Haynes, Capt. Harry J.	Alexandria, Va.	July 2, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Hoberman, Capt. Morton	New York, N. Y.	Dec. 7, 1910	Feb. 3, 1941
Hoge, Maj. Solomon F.	Waynesburg, Pa.	June 26, 1887	May 16, 1928
Hohman, Maj. Louis M.	Cincinnati, Ohio	Feb. 8, 1896	Jan. 27, 1922
Ingber, Capt. Nathan G.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Mar. 18, 1908	June 3, 1938
Marshall, Maj. Malcolm Y	Kentucky	Sept. 14, 1889	Jan. 5, 1931
Mau, Capt. Walter	Riverdale, Ill.	Jan. 28, 1916	June 15, 1942
Slavin, Capt. Manuel	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 26, 1905	Dec. 2, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Allee, Gail D.	High Point, Mo.	Aug. 7, 1876	Feb. 15, 1920
Hunter, Matthew C.	Alto, Mich.	Feb. 1, 1890	Jan. 16, 1924
Ward, Melgie	Georgia	Feb. 24, 1882	Dec. 6, 1920
Williams, Frank Lee	Ellis, Kans.	Feb. 14, 1885	Aug. 21, 1919
Yates, Albert S.	Greyson, Ky.	Apr. 17, 1893	July 8, 1940
Commissioned dental officers:			
Fishman, Capt. Julius	New York City, N. Y.	Oct. 20, 1909	June 30, 1941
Owen, Maj. Victor S.	West Virginia	June 1, 1898	May 1, 1922
Civilian dental officer: Tate, Walla.	Franklin County, Ill.	Dec. 8, 1893	June 26, 1940

WALLA WALLA, WASH.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Beatty, Lt. Col. Jesse J.	Rockport, Mo.	Feb. 15, 1886	Jan. 21, 1920
Deagen, Capt. James R.	Bloomer, Wis.	Aug. 29, 1909	Nov. 1, 1939
Feldman, Capt. Noah	New York City, N. Y.	Jan. 5, 1909	Feb. 3, 1941
Jaffe, Maj. Bernard	Brooklyn, N. Y.	May 20, 1908	May 1, 1941
Lioy, Capt. Anthony D.	Jersey City, N. J.	Aug. 21, 1909	Jan. 7, 1944
Muirhead, Capt. Samuel John.	Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil.	Feb. 11, 1913	May 1, 1944
Smithson, Maj. Carl B.	Alva, Okla.	Aug. 11, 1895	Feb. 23, 1937
Warner, Maj. Oliver M.	Evansville, Wis.	Dec. 31, 1895	Jan. 16, 1933
Civilian medical officers:			
Jamieson, George	Devils Lake, S. Dak.	Oct. 2, 1889	Sept. 17, 1931
Nather, Fred B.	Grayville, Ill.	June 6, 1882	Dec. 12, 1919
Soderstrom, James C.	Malvern, Iowa	Jan. 22, 1905	Mar. 15, 1939
Civilian dental officer: Hamilton, Robert.	Chicago, Ill.	July 20, 1891	Apr. 22, 1930

CENTRAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

CENTRAL OFFICE			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baird, Col. John H.	Newark, Ohio	Mar. 8, 1890	July 15, 1921
Boswell, Lt. Col. John R.	Penfield, Ga.	June 14, 1898	Sept. 1, 1925
Brooke, Lt. Col. Charles R.	Prince Georges County, Md.	Oct. 25, 1891	Oct. 1, 1920
Cane, Lt. Col. Byron S.	Saranac, N. Y.	July 23, 1895	May 20, 1931
Cook, Lt. Col. Frederick M.	Heidelberg, Miss.	Feb. 11, 1888	Jan. 21, 1924
Culbertson, Lt. Col. William F.	Paola, Kans.	July 12, 1887	May 16, 1921
Harding, Col. James C.	Chicago, Ill.	Feb. 20, 1893	Jan. 21, 1921
Martin, Lt. Col. Earl A.	Tiffin, Ohio	Aug. 27, 1885	Oct. 1, 1928
Melia, Col. Hugo	Indianapolis, Ind.	Feb. 26, 1888	July 1, 1926
Mueller, Maj. Camillo F.	No record available	May 30, 1899	Aug. 26, 1939
Murphy, Col. Dennis J.	do	Sept. 11, 1886	Jan. 9, 1921
Rose, Col. Edwin J.	Cadmus, Ohio	June 9, 1884	June 15, 1920
White, Col. Herman C.	Dallas, Pa.	Sept. 28, 1893	Sept. 20, 1920
Wolford, Col. Roy A.	Piedmont, W. Va.	July 11, 1894	Aug. 1, 1920
Yokley, Lt. Col. Charles W.	Baileyton, Tenn.	Dec. 17, 1893	May 10, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Eastwood, Edmund	Greenwich, N. J.	Aug. 26, 1881	Oct. 22, 1941
Farmer, Myron H.	Newnan, Ga.	Aug. 30, 1889	Oct. 29, 1930
Griffith, Charles M.	Jasper, Minn.	May 22, 1882	July 28, 1919
Wood, Clayton L.	Stanford, Conn.	Nov. 9, 1888	Feb. 23, 1922
Commissioned dental officer: Trent, Lt. Col. Ralph W.	Leekesville, N. C.	Mar. 18, 1905	July 1, 1926
Civilian dental officer:			
Beers, Lloyd Y.	Bath, Pa.	Nov. 22, 1886	Dec. 12, 1919
Fowler, Milburn	Skowhegan, Maine	Sept. 21, 1891	May 16, 1920
Gilliam, Paul S.	Crittenden, Va.	Apr. 5, 1888	Aug. 17, 1921
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Veterans Claims Service			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Brimmer, Maj. Karl W.	McCook, Nebr.	Jan. 18, 1893	May 15, 1944
Crofton, Maj. George H.	Taunton, Mass.	July 4, 1888	Apr. 1, 1920
Dembrow, Maj. William L.	Russia	May 28, 1889	July 1, 1918
Drummond, Maj. Henry S.	Russellville, Ark.	Nov. 3, 1885	Apr. 1, 1931
Johnston, Maj. Henry V.	No record available	May 16, 1883	Oct. 15, 1928
Minthorn, Maj. Martin L.	Moorhead, Iowa	Nov. 6, 1895	Mar. 6, 1923
Rider, Maj. Ernest B.	Morgan City, Iowa	Dec. 25, 1888	May 21, 1938

[18] Feb. 1, 1940; Mar. 2, 1944.

CENTRAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.—continued

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
CENTRAL OFFICE—Con.			
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES—con.			
Veterans Claims Service—Con.			
Civilian medical officers:			
Ashley, Charles W.	Clinton, Ind.	Dec. 22, 1882	July 18, 1921
Barry, Howard J.	Oregon, Wis.	July 28, 1879	May 18, 1925
Brandenberger, E.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 11, 1887	July 12, 1921
Conger, Jason H.	Brushton, N. Y.	July 15, 1887	Dec. 12, 1921
Cook, Richard L.	Washington, D. C.	Nov. 5, 1878	Mar. 27, 1920
Ditchburn, David	Barcley, Pa.	Apr. 25, 1878	Mar. 21, 1921
Ernst, John R.	Louisburg, Kans.	Feb. 24, 1884	Feb. 20, 1930
Fales, Ella Roy	Huntsville, Ala.	Aug 9, 1874	Sept. 1, 1944
Hall, Jesse L.	Smithwick, Kans.	Dec. 13, 1886	Sept. 16, 1920
Howell, Dent H.	Marion, Ill.	Feb. 5, 1879	Mar. 1, 1921
Israel, Isaac J.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Aug. 20, 1885	Dec. 3, 1923
Lancaster, George	La Plata, Md.	Jan. 13, 1888	Dec. 1, 1930
MacLain, Marshall	New Jersey	Jan. 23, 1890	Nov. 15, 1920
Mehihop, Clarence W.	Dubuque, Iowa	Apr. 1, 1872	Jan. 3, 1944
Shirkey, Ivy G.	Sissonville, W. Va.	Jan. 31, 1890	Apr. 16, 1925
Thompson, Burton	Troy, Ind.	Dec. 29, 1885	Jan. 20, 1920
Travers, Edgar E.	Cambridge, Md.	Feb. 5, 1885	Dec. 15, 1930
Board of Veterans Appeals			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Clark, Lt. Col. Fred H.	Georgia	May 6, 1895	Aug. 3, 1920
Gladding, Maj. Walter R.	New Church, Va.	June 28, 1898	Apr. 16, 1942
Kimberly, Maj. David	No record available	Oct. 1, 1899	Mar. 19, 1942
Koch, Maj. Benno F.	LeRoy, Wis.	May 10, 1891	Jan. 15, 1921
Ladd, Lt. Col. John M.	Petersburg, Va.	Jan. 25, 1891	Dec. 1, 1920
Civilian medical officers:			
Brooks, Alexander	New York City	Jan. 19, 1886	July 20, 1921
Caldwell, Bernie	New Castle, Va.	Dec. 22, 1877	Dec. 1, 1919
Cooper, Edwin H.	Findlay, Ohio	Jan. 12, 1878	Mar. 22, 1920
Fisher, E. Moore	Chester, England	Nov. 2, 1875	Nov. 1, 1919
Foxwell, Raymond	Leonardtown, Md.	Dec. 20, 1891	(19).
Gilchrist, Edgar	Wolfsburg, Pa. (employee on extended sick leave).	Nov. 13, 1879	Sept. 16, 1904
Groover, Gordon	Savannah, Ga.	Feb. 24, 1892	Apr. 1, 1931
Nelson, John	Nebraska	Jan. 15, 1884	Aug. 1, 1920
Smith, D. O.	Derby, Iowa	Mar. 24, 1881	(20).
Insurance Claims Council			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Cavanaugh, Maj. Leo M.	Cumberland, Md.	July 6, 1888	Dec. 5, 1921
Knott, Maj. William L.	Washington, D. C.	Jan. 18, 1909	July 2, 1937
Leonard, Maj. Edward A.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 8, 1883	May 26, 1920
Schroeder, Maj. Leo P.	Calumet, Mich.	Sept. 13, 1889	Aug. 29, 1921
Stewart, Col. Harrison M.	North Adams, Mass.	May 16, 1888	May 27, 1922
Stretch, Maj. Clarence M.	No record available	Mar. 4, 1893	Nov. 27, 1939
Treccase, Maj. Joseph P.	Butler, Pa.	Sept. 29, 1898	Dec. 22, 1930
Yost, Maj. Ernest L.	No record available	Mar. 30, 1891	Jan. 17, 1944
Civilian medical officers:			
Drew, Henry C.	Baltimore, Md.	Apr. 5, 1887	(21).
Heffner, William J.	Springfield, Mass.	May 23, 1879	Mar. 5, 1919
Kneedler, Harry	Collinsville, Ill.	Sept. 23, 1870	Mar. 27, 1944
McDermott, Bernard A.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 19, 1884	Oct. 16, 1924
Osterhaus, Karl	Norfolk, Va.	Mar. 7, 1882	Dec. 1, 1919
Thompson, Ralph	Springfield, Ohio	Sept. 14, 1894	Feb. 15, 1945
Villaroman, Isabelo R.	San Rafael, Bulacan, Philippines.	July 8, 1909	Sept. 14, 1944
MOUNT ALTO			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Bacon, Lt. Col. Frank S.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Jan. 12, 1906	Nov. 16, 1931
Beardsley, Col. Lewis G.	Bridgewater, Conn.	Dec. 27, 1888	Mar. 1, 1921
Bersack, Maj. Solomon R.	Ukmerge, Lithuania	Feb. 3, 1908	Jan. 15, 1940
Blumenthal, Maj. Basil	New York, N. Y.	Nov. 23, 1909	Aug. 15, 1938
De Angelis, Maj. Carmelo E.	do	June 29, 1911	May 1, 1941
Eisner, Capt. Cyrus I.	do	Mar. 27, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Feinstein, Capt. Harold R.	do	Oct. 17, 1912	Mar. 16, 1942
Finck, Capt. Harold Y.	Jersey City, N. J.	July 2, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Goebel, Lt. Col. Clarence J.	Hartington, Nebr.	Oct. 16, 1900	Oct. 7, 1939
Goldberg, Maj. Herbert A.	New York, N. Y.	May 7, 1909	Feb. 14, 1936
Haynes, Lt. Col. Grady O.	Gate City, Va.	Oct. 31, 1895	Sept. 3, 1924
Kauffman, Maj. William P.	Port Jervis, N. Y.	June 24, 1904	Oct. 1, 1938
Kessler, Maj. Israel	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 18, 1908	Mar. 22, 1937
Levatin, Capt. Paul	Boston, Mass.	July 14, 1913	Feb. 2, 1942
Lindsay, Capt. Merrill K.	Topeka, Kans.	May 20, 1884	Feb. 7, 1944
Nesbitt, Maj. John W.	Sycamore, Ill.	Mar. 19, 1908	Feb. 7, 1937
Paul, Capt. Norman	Russia	Apr. 14, 1901	Dec. 1, 1941
Perkins, Maj. Hanson T.	Springfield, Md.	Aug. 26, 1899	Sept. 1, 1925
Pettengill, Maj. Warren M.	Haverhill, Mass.	Feb. 23, 1894	Mar. 30, 1931
Resta, Maj. George A.	Louisville, Ky.	Dec. 23, 1904	Sept. 16, 1931
Taylor, Capt. Ingram C.	Milo, Iowa	Oct. 7, 1904	July 8, 1940
Traum, Maj. Aaron H.	Fort Morgan, Colo.	Mar. 22, 1907	Jan. 4, 1935
Weinberg, Capt. Benjamin A.	Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 17, 1914	Aug. 1, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Barship, Maurice M.	Baltimore, Md.	Dec. 25, 1889	Nov. 24, 1928
Giltner, Harry A.	New Washington, Ind.	Nov. 6, 1878	Apr. 25, 1944
Gunion, John Paul	Washington, D. C.	Sept. 15, 1876	Aug. 25, 1921
Lacy, Justin E.	Bedford County, Tenn.	Oct. 18, 1878	Feb. 1, 1921
Commissioned dental officer: Lanier, Maj. William D.	Birmingham, Ala.	Feb. 24, 1889	Sept. 26, 1919
REGIONAL OFFICE			
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Byington, Maj. Samuel B.	Charlestown, W. Va.	Nov. 29, 1886	Oct. 19, 1921
Meade, Maj. Spencer V.	New York, N. Y.	July 19, 1904	June 14, 1938
Reichard, Maj. Morris	Hungary	Sept. 9, 1881	Feb. 28, 1924

[19] Feb. 8, 1926, to June 30, 1941; Nov. 3, 1943.
[20] June 27, 1918, to May 15, 1919; Sept. 16, 1920.
[21] Feb. 1, 1920, to Aug. 30, 1922; Oct. 16, 1922.

WAUKESHA, WIS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Garment, Maj. Edward M.	Boston, Mass.	Dec. 10, 1905	Apr. 8, 1937
Johnson, Maj. Herbert L.	Willacoochee, Ga.	Nov. 2, 1891	Apr. 1, 1927
Kellam, Maj. John W.	Pungoteague, Va.	Nov. 2, 1890	May 1922
Kimber, Maj. Karl E.	Clark County, Ohio	Jan. 3, 1907	Sept. 28, 1940
Civilian medical officers:			
Asper, Guy P.	York Springs, Pa.	Apr. 17, 1880	July 15, 1921
Carlin, Seymour	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Mar. 21, 1912	Mar. 16, 1942
Cassidy, Franklin	Charlestown, Miss.	Nov. 24, 1886	June 1, 1921
Darius, Dean J.	Athens, Greece	Aug. 2, 1908	Oct. 17, 1944
Civilian dental officer: Glicklich, Isadore.	Stepan, Russia	Feb. 15, 1896	Mar. 23, 1931

WEST ROXBURY, MASS.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Baxley, Lt. Col. Haughton W.	Baltimore, Md.	Apr. 22, 1896	Feb. 18, 1922
Cassell, Capt. Edward F., Jr.	Nieliose, Mass.	June 30, 1911	Aug. 1, 1941
Dalton, Maj. Stephan J.	Marlboro, Mass.	Nov. 4, 1894	Nov. 1, 1920
Imburgia, Maj. Frank J.	Akron, Ohio	Jan. 8, 1907	Feb. 2, 1937
Livingston, Lt. Col. Stanton K.	Wilbraham, Mass.	Apr. 10, 1898	Dec. 22, 1930
McLaughlin, Maj. Joseph H.	Whitman, Mass.	Sept. 30, 1893	Feb. 11, 1939
Rudman, Maj. Benjamin W.	Hartland, Maine	Dec. 2, 1892	Aug. 20, 1920
Salwen, Maj. Robert	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 3, 1911	Feb. 1, 1940
Shahon, Maj. Henry I.	Aydin, Turkey	Apr. 16, 1896	May 2, 1941
Simonetti, First Lt. Louis J.	Capriati al Volturno, Italy.	Mar. 17, 1906	Mar. 1, 1943
Stein, Maj. Tobias	Zelva, Poland	Sept. 10, 1906	Jan. 21, 1939
Toltz, Capt. Julius B.	Drinsk, Russia	Sept. 25, 1899	Mar. 16, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Sorkin, Joseph J.	Russia	Mar. 2, 1893	Feb. 2, 1937
Tartakoff, Samuel	Boston, Mass.	Oct. 2, 1899	Jan. 12, 1925
Commissioned dental officer: Kadison, Capt. Charles G.	New York, N. Y.	Jan. 1, 1900	July 11, 1938
Civilian dental officer: Delaney, Henry A.	Bronx, N. Y.	Aug. 17, 1888	June 7, 1924
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Medalia, David B.	Moscow, Russia	Dec. 12, 1888	Jan. 17, 1944
Moran, Andrew C.	Manville, R. I.	Apr. 27, 1890	Oct. 1, 1920
Sharry, Charles F.	Somerville, Mass.	Sept. 23, 1886	Oct. 4, 1944

WHIPPLE, ARIZ.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Hornyak, Maj. William J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	June 23, 1909	Oct. 16, 1939
Reed, Maj. Ernest Corydon.	Wichita, Kans.	Nov. 7, 1894	Oct. 23, 1930
Weinstein, Maj. Selig B.	Stepan, Poland	June 10, 1910	Nov. 1, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Brann, Harold	Roland, Ill.	May 28, 1884	Dec. 15, 1920
Daniel, Grover C.	Olioville, Ky.	Nov. 24, 1891	July 11, 1919
Fahy, John E.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Sept. 22, 1876	Apr. 15, 1920
McCreary, Marcellus	Evergreen, Ala.	Apr. 12, 1874	May 1, 1944
McKenna, Harold	Montgomery, Minn.	June 1, 1898	Aug. 23, 1930
Robins, Seymour	New York, N. Y.	Sept. 15, 1908	May 10, 1943
Wilkiemeyer, Fred	Newport, Ky.	Sept. 7, 1879	Sept. 16, 1925
Commissioned dental officer: Kettner, Capt. Eugene C.	Trinidad, Colo.	Oct. 17, 1895	Feb. 1, 1921

WHITE RIVER JUNCTION, VT.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Birnbaum, Maj. Leo	New York City	Aug. 20, 1894	Jan. 15, 1935
Cooper, Maj. Philip	Boston	Nov. 11, 1908	Feb. 3, 1941
Levitt, Capt. Harry	New York City	Jan. 8, 1904	Mar. 16, 1942
Warshawsky, Maj. Harry	Brooklyn, N. Y.	July 5, 1909	Feb. 16, 1937
Weiss, Capt. Andor A.	Czechoslovakia (now Hungary)	June 14, 1906	Dec. 1, 1939
Weissberg, Capt. Jonas	New York City	Dec. 16, 1909	Nov. 2, 1942
Civilian medical officers:			
Levy, Emanuel	Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 30, 1886	Apr. 1, 1920
Salomonsky, G. H.	Richmond, Va.	Mar. 12, 1903	Jan. 11, 1935
Commissioned dental officer: Sawyer, Capt. Bertram H.	Melrose, Mass.	July 5, 1894	Apr. 15, 1922

WICHITA, KANS.

Name	Place of birth	Date of birth	Date of appointment
MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Fitzgerald, Maj. Edward M.	Pine Island, Minn.	Aug. 29, 1904	May 1, 1936
Hinkle, Maj. Warren I.	Bigelow, Mo.	Dec. 2, 1895	Feb. 1, 1939
Paye, Maj. Philip H.	Grosse Pointe, Mich.	Sept. 14, 1909	May 1, 1941
Pearce, Lt. Col. Albert R.	Michigan	Oct. 27, 1888	Nov. 1, 1921
Zerlin, Capt. Isidore	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Apr. 11, 1909	Jan. 4, 1939
Civilian medical officers:			
Curtis, Howard C.	De Kalb County, Tenn.	Dec. 6, 1881	Jan. 31, 1925
Purves, George K.	Tracy, Minn.	Oct. 22, 1874	Nov. 1, 1944
Shelly, Hargus G.	Mulvane, Kans.	Nov. 18, 1881	June 1, 1922
Commissioned dental officer: Clais, Capt. Otto R.	Duluth, Minn.	Nov. 2, 1894	Feb. 2, 1925
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers: Boland, Frank W.	Walnut, Iowa	June 4, 1882	Jan. 16, 1944

WOOD, WIS.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICE			
Commissioned medical officers:			
Adashek, Capt. William H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Jan. 25, 1911	Nov. 1, 1939
Bensman, Capt. Louis L.	Peoria, Ill.	Apr. 7, 1912	Dec. 1, 1941
Berger, Capt. Louis M.	Chicago, Ill.	Aug. 18, 1908	Feb. 23, 1937
Bresnahan, Lt. Col. John F.	Boston, Mass.	Dec. 18, 1881	Jan. 29, 1931
Coon, Capt. William L.	Denison, Iowa	Sept. 27, 1906	Oct. 10, 1938
Dimond, Maj. Edgar A.	Lamar, Mo.	Sept. 30, 1912	Oct. 17, 1939
Fairall, Capt. Emmett R.	Kidder, Mo.	Mar. 29, 1892	Apr. 1, 1942
Falk, Capt. Victor S.	Stoughton, Wis.	Mar. 4, 1889	Apr. 17, 1944
Feingold, Capt. Philip P.	Russia	Aug. 4, 1899	Dec. 5, 1940
Fritz, Capt. William H.	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Nov. 28, 1907	July 1, 1942
Golkin, Maj. James	Russia	Apr. 21, 1908	Jan. 18, 1939
Jansen, Capt. Harold G.	Albany, N. Y.	Nov. 8, 1889	Apr. 1, 1942
Liberman, Maj. David L.	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Nov. 4, 1893	May 1, 1924
McKie, Capt. John F.	Near Northboro, Iowa.	Sept. 4, 1882	Apr. 1, 1944
Mullins, Lt. Col. Glenn	Douglas County, Ga.	Apr. 2, 1892	Nov. 27, 1931
Primakow, Capt. Max J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Oct. 12, 1906	Jan. 25, 1935
Rhea, Maj. Clarence W.	Forney, Tex.	Sept. 22, 1890	Apr. 1, 1921
Sagi, Capt. Joseph H.	Penbrook, Pa.	Aug. 8, 1912	Nov. 1, 1939
Sanfelippo, Capt. Anthony J.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Mar. 23, 1913	Mar. 1, 1943
Schaeffer, Capt. Bernard S.	do	Feb. 4, 1914	Jan. 15, 1940
Shirley, Maj. Amos R.	England	May 12, 1887	Mar. 10, 1920
Slaney, Lt. Col. John G.	Richland County, Wis.	Mar. 23, 1901	Mar. 8, 1932
Slaybaugh, Maj. James C.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 30, 1907	May 23, 1936
Stein, Maj. William	Jersey City, N. J.	Jan. 19, 1906	Mar. 3, 1938
Szymanski, Capt. Stanley R.	Erie, Pa.	July 1, 1912	June 15, 1942
Trepagnier, Capt. Francis B.	Chicago, Ill.	May 29, 1905	Aug. 1, 1941
Vogl, Maj. Henry L.	South Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 13, 1906	Aug. 26, 1941
Civilian medical officers:			
Alpert, Henry R.	New York, N. Y.	Apr. 13, 1907	Feb. 3, 1941
Artman, Edward L.	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 2, 1891	Mar. 14, 1938
Guilbert, Gerald D.	Yam Hill, Oreg.	Mar. 24, 1896	Sept. 3, 1936
Kristjanson, Hjorleifur T.	Thyngayaisysia, Iceland.	Mar. 18, 1876	Apr. 17, 1944
Liefert, William C.	Milwaukee, Wis.	Aug. 22, 1885	June 1, 1920
Maercklein, Arthur G.	do	Sept. 29, 1878	Mar. 16, 1944
McLaughlin, William J.	Templeton, Wis.	Apr. 29, 1885	Oct. 5, 1944
Meyst, Charles H.	Glencoe, Minn.	Feb. 9, 1876	Nov. 1, 1919
Orban, Louis C.	Budapest, Hungary	Apr. 11, 1889	Apr. 24, 1944
Parks, Charles William	Lincoln, Nebr.	June 20, 1888	Oct. 20, 1930
Schlomovitz, Benjamin H.	Milwaukee, Wis.	May 18, 1889	May 1, 1923
Sutherland, Justin	Sylvester, Wis.	Dec. 15, 1875	Sept. 11, 1944
Thomas, Clyde O.	Elizabeth, Ill.	Feb. 24, 1906	Mar. 16, 1945
Wilson, Richard S.	Harrison County, Ky.	Oct. 22, 1905	Oct. 2, 1939
Wolff, Morris	Muncie, Ind.	June 30, 1879	Mar. 1, 1921
Woodward, William T.	Democrat, N. C.	Feb. 8, 1883	Aug. 16, 1944
Commissioned dental officer: Eggena, Maj. Paul H.	Monticello, Minn.	Aug. 25, 1890	Mar. 13, 1920
Civilian dental officers:			
Baker, Roy H.	Girard, Kans.	Jan. 15, 1890	Mar. 11, 1922
Clark, Alexander	No record avaliable	Apr. 25, 1896	May 15, 1944
ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES			
Civilian medical officers:			
Burke, Charles H.	New Hampton, Iowa	Dec. 12, 1884	Jan. 26, 1931
Froede, Herbert	Milwaukee, Wis.	Apr. 28, 1895	Jan. 18, 1944
Kenney, Joseph F.	Delavan, Wis.	Mar. 28, 1886	Jan. 10, 1944
Land, Richard J.	No record avaliable	May 8, 1900	July 1, 1930
Weed, Linton G.	Oshkosh, Wis.	Oct. 27, 1894	May 1, 1941

Reread these names and then you will understand what we are trying to do.

They kick about the way minority groups are treated in this country. I want you to note the number of a certain minority group represented in this list of doctors.

In some places you will find more doctors from minority groups than there are patients of that group in the hospital. A great many of those doctors are aliens, or else have only recently come to the United States, and can barely speak the English language. Many of them do not have that bedside technique so necessary to establish that confidential relationship between a physician and his patient so essential for a doctor's success in his practice.

Many of them are disliked by the other doctors in the institution, many of them are resented by the nurses, many of them are disliked by the patients themselves.

With that situation in view, we have brought in this bill which has for its purpose the setting up of a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration and to untie the hands, if you please, of General Bradley and General Hawley in order that they may select doctors and pay salaries commensurate with their abilities. This measure will give them the right to go out and get doctors who meet the requirements and get rid of the restrictions that have stirred up so much trouble inside the hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take all the time of the committee because there are other Members who wish to speak. I trust, however, there will be no opposition to this bill. It is one of the best measures of its kind ever proposed to this House, so far as the veterans are concerned.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I am profoundly grateful, profoundly happy, that a measure I have favored and fought to secure the passage of for a very long time is about to become law. I am not entirely satisfied with the bill. I preferred bills that I myself introduced, the provisions of which were in a bill which later General Bradley recommended the enactment of. I felt that kind of Medical Corps would prove more satisfactory to those employed in the corps and would insure better service for the veterans. However, I am thankful to have this bill. Day after day I have taken the floor of Congress and pleaded and pleaded for a medical service. Day after day I pleaded with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to have more beds and better care for our veterans. Now at last the battle is won in the House. Later it must pass the Senate to become law. We must then make sure that the law we pass is carried out by the Veterans' Administration. Never again must tragic conditions—deplorable, inexcusable conditions, even beatings, in the hospitals for the mentally sick, due to overcrowding and lack of vision—take place again.

Briefly, this bill before us, H. R. 4717, would abolish the medical service in the Veterans' Administration as at present constituted, and would establish in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director. The functions of the department would be those necessary for complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The bill provides that the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the Office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service. It provides that the Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, eight Assistant Medical Directors, a Director of Nursing Service, a Chief Pharmacist, Chief Dietitian, Chief Physical Therapist, and Chief Occupational Therapist, each at a fixed statutory salary. Provision is made for the appointment of such other personnel and employees as may be authorized under the bill for the Office of the Chief Medical Director. The appointments in the Office of the Chief Medical Director are made for a period of 4 years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause, and reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Provision is made for the appointment by the Administrator of additional doctors, dentists, and nurses without regard to the Civil Service Classification Act, and also for the appointment of those with civil-service status such as managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, scientific personnel, and other medical and dental technologists. The conditions of eligibility for appointments, including professional and other qualifications, are set out in the bill for both those having civil-service and non-civil-service status. Provision is made for appointment of persons under the act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and for the payment for their services under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

As to doctors, dentists, and nurses, there is provided a probationary period of 3 years, with necessary administrative provisions for review of employment records and for their separation from the medical, dental, and nursing services if the person is found not fully qualified and satisfactory. Promotion of doctors, dentists, and nurses is provided for on the basis of examinations, and automatic promotions may be made within grade. Those now in the medical service as presently constituted will be continued therein until their qualifications are determined for service in the new department.

Provision is made for including in the computation of service for civil-service reinstatement purposes service performed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery by persons receiving appointments therein, and who at the time of such appointments shall have a civil-service status. and whose employment in the new department is terminated at any time. This provision, however, will not permit restoration of any position which has been abolished by this act.

As to doctors, dentists, and nurses, other than specified officials in the office of the Chief Medical Director established in the bill, provision is made for the grades and per annum full pay salary ranges showing the minimum and maximum within the grade.

The bill provides for specialty ratings for doctors, dentists, or nurses, sets out the conditions under which such ratings may be made, and prescribes the rating to be as an allowance, equal to 25 percent of the employee's pay, in addition to his basic pay, provided that his pay plus the allowance may not exceed $11,000 per annum.

The bill provides that persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions of and entitled to the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended. This was determined upon by the committee in preference to a military system of retirement.

For the non-civil-service employees, other than those in the office of the Chief Medical Director, provision is made for the establishment of disciplinary boards and for their organization and procedure, for the purpose of conducting investigations and answering charges. The Administrator, on recommendation of such board, where charges are sustained, would take the necessary action, which would be final.

The bill provides for appointment under civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, of such additional employees, other than those specifically exempt therefrom by the bill. It also provides that these employees shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon certification of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where such person is presently employed.

Provision is made for increasing the minimum salary range for hospital attendants. The range as provided in the bill runs from $1,572 minimum to $1,902 maximum.

The bill requires that the Administrator establish a special medical advisory group, composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, to be named by the Chief Medical Director. The function of the group is to advise the Administrator through the Chief Medical Director, and the Chief Medical Director direct, relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. It is required that this group hold regular calendar quarterly meetings, and that the number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to the members be fixed in accordance with existing law and regulations.

Provision is made for the attendance at meetings of associations for the promotion of medical and allied sciences of the personnel in the Office of the Chief Medical Director, and doctors, dentists, and nurses generally, subject to available appropriations. Provision is made for the placing of such employees in schools of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service and in civil institutions with the consent of the authorities concerned, for a period not to exceed 90 days in any one year for the purpose of increasing their professional knowledge or technical training, with the proviso that not more than 5 percent of such personnel may be placed on such duty at any one time.

Provision is made for employment by the Administrator, upon recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, and without regard to civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, of certain types of personnel on temporary full-time, part-time, or fee basis, and for certain other types on a temporary full-time or part-time basis, but that no temporary full-time appointments shall be made for a period of more than 90 days.

Provision is made for the establishment of residencies, and appointments to such positions without regard to civil-service or classification laws, rules, or regulations. This training in most specialties would embrace training outside the hospital in connection with the school, part of the time not being spent on work directly productive to the Veterans' Administration, but for the purpose of increasing the professional knowledge and technical training of the employee.

The bill provides that the Chief Medical Director, with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate the necessary regulations for the administration of the Department and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

It is provided in the bill that before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of the act shall be issued by the Administrator, exercising authority conferred by the act, other than administrative rules or orders governing conduct of the activities of the Department or interagency rules governing its relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted to the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives dealing with these matters for study, to consider whether such proposed rule or regulation is made in accordance with the spirit, letter, intent, or purpose of the act. Provision is made for the effective date of such rules or regulations in the event of action by these committees, or in the absence of such action.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill will pass the House unanimously. It has been a long hard fight to secure the passage of any medical service bill. I am not satisfied with this bill but it is at least a very forward step in establishing a strong medical corps.

It was reported unanimously by our committee. I am glad to pay tribute to the subcommittee that worked on the drafting of the bill for its painstaking and exhaustive study and the results that it achieved. I refer to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], the ranking Democratic member, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. We are grateful to them for their very hard work.

I also thank the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans and also the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the members of both those committees for reporting out the bill unanimously. It has meant much work and many debates.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is long overdue. It resulted from the fact that we did not have a medical corps in the Veterans' Administration during the war and from the fact that we were not able to secure the services of the most expert physicians and surgeons. This situation has been true for a good many years, Mr. Chairman, and, personally, I have felt at times that laymen were almost practicing medicine in the hospitals. There has been no excuse for the conditions in the hospitals, no excuse for overcrowding, no excuse for inadequate care. There was stubborn opposition to improving conditions.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to explain section 16 of the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is a long section. May I explain it when we come to reading the bill? That is the one that sends the regulations of the Veterans' Administration back to the committee before they go into effect.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to take that up later when we read the bill for amendment. I shall be glad to answer that later.

Mr. RABAUT. I refer to section 16.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Our wounded men require a highly specialized care, and in order to secure this highly specialized care it is necessary to pay our physicians and surgeons more than is being paid at the present time by the Veterans' Administration. For instance, we have over 14,000 amputees who will require very expert surgical care and special operations in the shaping of their stumps, in order that artificial limbs may be properly fitted. Then there are from 1,200 to 1,500 veterans with spinal-cord cases which also require expert surgery so that they may have ample opportunity to become almost normal and in order for them to get about with their braces and their crutches, and in order for them to earn a living. Some of these men are getting around today, although previously it was thought such improvement would be impossible.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak also of the so-called plastic cases, those wounded men who were so terribly mutilated that when they were first picked up on the battlefields their faces did not resemble human faces. The plastic surgeons have done a remarkable job by skin grafting, the putting in of bones, the making of artificial noses, and in general the entire reconstruction of the face, so that the men in the future may feel that they look like other people. Miracles have been and are being performed for these boys. Much still remains to be done. Many special surgeons are leaving the Army and Navy. The placing of veterans' hospitals near medical centers will allow these highly trained specialists to go to these hospitals to treat the veterans on a fee basis. Very fine work is done in fitting and making artificial eyes. The use of very powerful drugs today must be administered by trained physicians because overdoses may prove very disastrous. There is a boy at Walter Reed Hospital today who has had a very bad case of osteomyelitis and has had 14 operations. He participated in the first engagement in the African campaign. A wonder drug had been used for him recently, and it seemed to be curing his osteomyelitis. They have now been unable to secure that wonder drug, and today his osteomyelitis is redeveloping.

I should like to read into the RECORD a letter that one of the surgeons received who is now with one of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in which the Secretary of the American College of Surgeons declines to recommend him as a member of the surgical board. As you Members know, unless a surgeon is able to become a member of the American College of Surgeons, his rating is not high in the community. This bill will bring up the standard of the hospitals and medical service and training so that I think the doctors will be able to qualify for that membership.

The letter from the American Board of Surgery is as follows:

THE AMERICAN BOARD OF SURGERY,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 18, 1945.

I regret the delay in replying to your letter of July 30, which has been due to my absence from the city.

In evaluating your training to date, I wish to say it is doubtful whether any credit can be given for the period from July 1938 to January 1940, inasmuch as your work was not confined to surgery. This is one of the strict requirements of the board, enforced in all instances, and inasmuch as you were doing general practice during this time, it would not seem that you could meet the board's requirements in this regard.

The board has not in general accepted training in the veterans' hospitals, as these institutions have not as yet been finally approved for graduate training in surgery by the American College of Surgeons. Some of these hospitals are under survey at the present time, but until they have been fully approved I cannot give you any information as to how much credit might be allowed for this work.

Very truly yours,
J. STEWART RODMAN, M. D.,
Secretary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chairman of the committee in paying tribute to the splendid work of the gentlemen who have been handling and who are now handling veterans' affairs. General Hines, in spite of what somebody may have reported in publications recently put out, is regarded, I think, throughout the Nation as a good administrator and a splendid gentleman. We on the committee were closely associated with him and have appreciated his services throughout the years. I also join in the tribute to General Bradley and to General Hawley. I think that those gentlemen are going to acquit themselves splendidly in the high positions which they have assumed. As to General Hawley, I was soon convinced that he was an outstanding medical man and I believe that he is going to

do his best to give us a splendid administration of the medical side of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, this bill grew out of an investigation which was conducted by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House early this year. The members of that committee went throughout the United States and went into the hospitals and examined conditions from top to bottom. We reached a certain conclusion. I want to say here parenthetically that I found no great cause for criticism in the hospitals that I visited. I found nothing of grave moment for which the Veterans' Administration could be seriously criticized.

I want to say that in defense of the men who have been handling the medical side of the Veterans' Administration. I do not mean to say everything was perfect. True, I found weak places, things needing correction, things not to my entire satisfaction, but many of the weaknesses were the result of war conditions and, no doubt, common to other hospitals in the country, private and public. But we can and should strengthen our medical set-up in every way possible and that is what we are undertaking to do in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. With the exception of the crowded conditions of the hospitals, will not this bill cure nine-tenths of the troubles we found?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill or a bill simllar to it was recommended by General Hines before General Bradley took over.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Yes. General Hines testified about a former bill embodying some of the same material we have in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. When General Bradley came in, he endorsed the bill and asked that it be passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank my chairman for his contribution.

This bill is the result of a lot of hard work. This is rather a pioneering bill. I tell you very frankly that your committee worked on this bill very hard over a period of months.

We did not take snap judgment in reporting out this bill. We wrote and rewrote paragraphs and sections many times and tried to analyze every part of it.

Our objective in presenting this bill has been to achieve efficiency, not that the Veterans' Administration has not been efficient, but we felt that it could be made more efficient in the medical service, and we want to achieve more and greater efficiency. Admittedly there was room for improvement. Our objective has been to free the Veterans' Administration from some of the shackles that now, we think, act as an impediment and a deterrent to the best medical service. For instance, as everyone knows, doctors rendering this very high service to our veterans have had to come through the Civil Service Commission. I have felt and the members of that great committee have felt, and I believe you as Members of the House feel, that you can hardly expect the very highest type of service when you have to get all doctors through the Civil Service Commission. I say that not in a spirit of antagonistic to the Civil Service Commission, but I think we ought to place medical men who have charge of rehabilitating and restoring and treating these veterans on a higher plane than to have to subject themselves to an examination under civil service to get a job in the Veterans' Administration. I think a great many fine medical men do not like to submit to that. Many outstanding medical men might be inclined not to seek this work rather than submit to the red tape and annoyance of employment through civil service.

Now, let me give very briefly an outline of the bill.

The first thing we did was to abolish what we now have in the Veterans' Administration. We abolish the old and create a new medical service under the title of "Department of Medicine and Surgery."

We place the employees in the Veterans' Administration in the medical service in what I am pleased to call for the want of a better designation four categories. In the first category we establish a Chief Medical Director, a Deputy Medical Director, and eight Assistant Medical Directors, top-flight medical assistants. We fix the salaries for those few men. In this bill they are statutory officers in the medical service. These men are to be appointed by the Veterans' Administrator and, of course, he will collaborate with the Chief Medical Director of the Medical Service, who is at present General Hawley. These men, of course, are to be appointed without reference to the civil service. Their salaries are fixed. They will be appointed without an examination even, because they are top men, they are policy-making men. Then in the same category we authorize a director of nursing and provide for the appointment, if desired, of a chief pharmacist, and certain other chiefs, and fix their salaries. All appointments in this category are for periods of 4 years, but reappointments may be made for like periods.

In the second category, under paragraph (a) of section 4, we provide for the appointment of doctors, dentists, and nurses. Under this bill, the doctors, dentists, and nurses are likewise to be appointed outside of the civil service. That is the second group. But they will take an examination, such examination as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may prescribe. They will, like all other employees in the Veterans' Administration, receive civil-service retirement benefits. That is the only connection they will have with civil service. They will retain their civil-service retirement benefits, but they will be selected from outside the civil service.

In the third category, we have established certain other groups of employees. In that category we have the great group of employees, those below the doctors, nurses, and dentists. All those employees below doctors, dentists, and nurses, except those in section 14, will be under civil service and will be selected through civil service. Of course, they will have retirement benefits under the civil service just as all the other employees in the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The appointment of doctors, dentists, and nurses will be for a probationary period of 3 years. The object of that, of course, is to see how they get along and see how they perform during that period of 3 years. It all makes for efficiency. Not only are doctors, dentists, and nurses appointed as a result of examination but promotions are likewise based upon examination. The present medical service, of course, is continued, subject to examination and approval of their qualifications. In the fourth group or category will be found the temporary employees listed in section 14. As one would expect, they are not placed under civil service.

General Hawley was particularly anxious about the establishment of residences in the hospitals for the training of younger men and also the creation of specialists. The bill makes provision accordingly. The bill provides for disciplinary boards to hear charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct upon the part of doctors, dentists, and nurses and makes the decision of the Administrator final.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to point out a matter in the bill in which there were differences of opinion in the committee. I refer to placing osteopaths in the bill, along with medical doctors. General Hawley, who is to administer this bill and on whose shoulders the medical administration largely rests, strongly urged that this not be done. He opposed it and thought it was inadvisable to do it. He was under the impression that it would cause a lot of trouble and confusion, particularly among medical men, and we all agree that we need harmony. Frankly, I do not know enough about osteopathy to discuss its work in detail, but since it seems to be generally objectionable to medical men and since General Hawley, who must make this bill work, earnestly requested the committee to leave it out of the bill, I was among those who voted against including it in the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. It is not compulsory. It is merely optional with the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is true, but when you put it in the bill General Hawley seems to be of the opinion that it might be the cause of confusion and strife and he urges against it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say in conclusion that this bill, as a whole, is one of the finest bills ever reported out of the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee. We lay no claim to perfection. Like other legislation, it may have

to be amended as the need may be shown, but it is, I think, a great forward step in obtaining for our veterans the finest medical and hospital service in the world. We want them to have that. These heroes must have the best. I am happy that it was my privilege to give weeks and weeks of my time in framing this most important bill for our veterans. As chairman of the subcommittee that worked so long in framing the bill, I want to express my appreciation to the splendid gentlemen who served with me, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]. I believe this bill will go far toward curing whatever shortcomings there may have been in our veterans' hospitals. This bill creates and establishes the greatest hospital system in the world. I hope this House gives its unanimous approval to this bill and I trust it will become a law very soon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate and thank the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and particularly members of the subcommittee who did such a wonderful job on this bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Section 1 of this bill abolishes the medical service in the Veterans' Administration, and in its stead establishes a department of medicine and surgery under a chief medical director.

Second. It fixes higher salaries for the doctors, nurses, dentists, and pharmacists. What the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] referred to as the top-flight men. The purpose of this is to attract a higher standard of skill among the men and women who have most to do with our injured and ailing veterans.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of New York. I wonder upon what the committee based the number of eight assistant directors.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not know.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. There will be an amendment submitted to make that read "not to exceed eight."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The bill further provides for the setting up of disciplinary boards to handle troublesome conditions in the hospitals. It provides for the appointment of a special medical advisory group to aid in getting better skill among the medical profession who are working on these veterans.

The civil-service feature of the bill is one I wish to discuss more at length. You will recall that last spring certain charges were made in certain publications in the United States to the effect that first-rate men were getting third-rate medical care in the veterans' hospitals throughout the United States. The Congress by resolution authorized members of the Veterans' Committee to make an investigation. This investigation was made. I personally investigated hospitals from Pennsylvania clear through to Nebraska. I am sure when I tell you of my findings in those hospitals that I am speaking the opinion of a great majority of the committee, if not all of them, who were also out going through hospitals in various parts of the country.

First, I found the hospitals very, very good. I found the charges made in the magazines were mostly made out of whole cloth. There were a few isolated cases that gave an opportunity for some reporters to write up a story, but it did not apply to the hospitals generally. I found the food was good, well prepared, and clean. I found the veterans in the hospitals well pleased, on the whole, with the service they were receiving. This does not mean, however, that we did not find conditions that should be corrected, for the best interests of the veterans.

One of these conditions, that practically all of us found to exist, goes right back to what the civil service makes possible. I am going to paraphrase now a colloquy I had with the Administrator of one of these hospitals, and what he said in reply to me applies generally to every one I visited.

"Yes; we have a doctor or two, probably a nurse or two here that is destroying the morale of the veterans."

I said, "Why don't you get rid of them?"

"I cannot."

I said, "Why?"

"Because of civil-service regulations. The mantle of the cloak of civil service is wrapped around them and they are protected."

I said "What is the matter with these doctors?"

"Well," he said, "they are good in their medicine. They know their books. I cannot criticize them for that, but they have the wrong attitude toward the patients. They call them 'jerks.' They talk to them as if they are in there only to increase compensation for some ailment. They tell them they are not there in good faith."

I found cases where nurses had thrown bedpans at the patients, called them "malingerers" and said that they should not be there. Yet, in each instance, the professional capacity of those individuals was good.

Then I said, "Why can't you get rid of them under civil service?"

"Under civil service, I would have to file charges. They lie there for 30 days. I have to call in their colleagues to testify. They won't do it. I do not have time to follow it up. What happens? They are simply transferred to another hospital. The veterans in another hospital get the same service as the veterans here."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. From the gentleman's acquaintance with Government employment generally, would not the gentleman say that civil service leaves something to be desired in employment throughout the field service for a similar reason?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would not go that far at this time. I have always been an advocate of civil service; I believe in it; I have worked for it in the State legislature at home. Let me say in answer to the gentleman's question that the Veterans' Committee of this House is not interested in the civil service, it is not interested in the doctor, it is not interested in the nurse, it is not interested in the employees of the hospital, but it is interested in the veteran, the boy in the bed who needs the service; and if under civil service the veteran in the bed is not getting what he needs, then the civil-service regulations should be changed in the interest of the veteran.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am, of course, heartily in accord with the spirit the committee has shown, but my thought is that the same thing that is interfering with getting efficient and satisfactory—I should say satisfactory rather than efficient—satisfactory personnel in the veterans' service, I am inclined to believe, exists in some other fields of Government service, and there is room for improvement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Undoubtedly the gentleman's criticism has merit, but in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota, I want to say that I am talking for the veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that this puts the responsibility fairly and squarely on the medical service and does not give the medical service a chance to say that they cannot get such and such men out because of civil service? They will have to be very carefully selected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is exactly right; and we are trying to makes the service sufficiently attractive in the hospitals to draw a better class of doctors; we are increasing salaries hoping it will attract better men to the service and keep those already in the service interested in their work.

Further than that, we have not taken away any retirement or bonus benefits they have earned under civil service. We are only giving to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the right to discharge an employee who is not rendering first-grade service to the veterans. That is all the change we are making in the inroads upon the civil service. But I say that when civil service interferes with the veterans getting first-class treatment, I mean the bed patient, the boy in the bed, if civil service is the cause of that, we should amend the civil-service regulations to that extent; and that is where the subcommittee has done such a magnificent job in this bill.

Something was said in regard to section 16. The gentleman from Kansas will explain that in detail. Let me first say to the membership of the House, however, that you all voted for a similar provision last July when the revised GI bill was before you and passed this House unanimously. That is the reason for its

being in here. The reason for its being in the revised GI bill which is now in conference is that the regulations interpreting the GI bill and the manner in which it is to be administered were not written in accordance with the intent of Congress and the Veterans' Committee of this House. If they had been it would not have been necessary to amend it. If this regulation had been in the original bill so that the Veterans' Administration would have had to submit its interpretation, rules, and regulations to the committee that drafted the bill or to a subcommittee, the GI bill would be a functioning much better than it is now and more to the satisfaction of the discharged veteran.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. One further question, and first let me say that I am in accord with what the gentleman has been saying about the bill; but for the purpose of the record I believe attention should be called to one sentence in section 16.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman does not mind, I wish he would wait until the gentleman from Kansas takes the floor, for he is going to discuss that section in particular.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will touch on it now. I may say that the reason I am asking the question and wish it answered now is because I must go to an Appropriations Committee hearing in just a minute or two.

The sentence to which I refer reads as follows:

> Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Finance of the Senate or by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either.

Would the gentleman state whether "duly authorized subcommittee" means a committee with majority and minority party representation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay tribute to the entire membership of the Veterans' Committee and emphasize the fact that in approving this bill they took into consideration only the welfare of the veteran. I am aware that certain groups, organizations, and individuals may not like certain provisions of this measure, but when we legislate for veterans I say we should legislate for them and no one else. No matter how much particular individuals on the outside may be hurt, we should consider this legislation purely from the standpoint of the veteran. Your committee, I submit, has reported to you a veterans' bill, and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] a member of the subcommittee that worked on this bill.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is good legislation and I see a great necessity for it, because it will give to those in charge of the medical policy of the Veterans' Administration an opportunity to revamp, reorganize, and make certain corrections in policies that have existed in these hospitals since their inception; policies that should have been corrected a long time ago. In my opinion, they could have been corrected from an administrative standpoint and not through the necessity of additional legislation.

As a member of this committee I have had an opportunity to visit many of these hospitals in the past few months. I spent 4 days at a tuberculosis hospital down in North Carolina and also visited a tuberculosis hospital at Mendota, Wis. I spent over 3 weeks at Wood, a general hospital in Milwaukee, Wis., and some time at the general hospital in Biloxi, Miss., and the mental hospitals at Gulfport, Miss., and Waukesha, Wis.

Mr. Chairman, I have come to the very honest conclusion that the medical service in these hospitals has been poor and mediocre. I came to that conclusion from some of the things I have seen in these hospitals and because of the extremely weak and imaginary medical policy that has prevailed in the Veterans' Administration ever since its inception. It could not be otherwise, and I am going to explain to you the reasons.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been impossible for General Hines, as Administrator, to clean up this condition under the present law because he could not fire these doctors. He had to accept them, they were forced on him, but with this bill those changes can be made.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The gentleman is correct that this legislation is proper, that it will give the Administrator an opportunity to get rid of undesirable personnel, but he has always had that opportunity under civil service. I am for this provision knocking out the civil service; do not misunderstand me.

Mr. RANKIN. An article appeared the other day which I hope the gentleman noted. I know the other members of the committee saw it. This article cited the instance of one doctor who got on the civil-service list at the age of 86 or 87 years old and it cited another one who had been in an insane institution. What we are doing is untying the hands of the Veterans' Administration so that they can get the right kind of doctors to do the work.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent piece of legislation and it will bring about an opportunity to correct those conditions. The point I make is that these evils have existed ever since the organization of the Veterans' Administration and cannot be attributed to the civil service nor can they be attributed to the difficulties brought about by the war.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that all the years prior to the war this condition which he is now describing existed?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is my honest opinion.

Mr. DOYLE. Why was it not corrected before?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I will tell the gentleman the reason. There was a man at the head of the medical department who was completely dominated by a civilian and did not have the opportunity to exercise the judgment that a free, independent doctor should be able to exercise in a position of this kind.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will read the list of the names I put in the RECORD today and the date these men were selected, he will find that this trouble has grown up since the war broke out, that is, within the last 3 or 4 years. This trouble did not exist 10 years ago.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. It has increased.

Mr. DOYLE. One further question, and I refer to section 16 of the bill, and I direct the inquiry to the attention not only of the distinguished members of the subcommittee, but the chairman of the main committee as well.

Section 5 specifies that a doctor of osteopathy also may be employed. Relating section 5 to section 16, line 19, where it provides that the committee of the House shall consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, and intent, I wish to ask this definite question: Is it the intent of Congress that osteopaths may be employed? In asking that question, I will state frankly that I am in favor of osteopaths being employed, but I know of no way that the Veterans' Administrator will know whether or not it is the intent of Congress that osteopaths may properly be employed, unless the Congress speaks out on it. I want the RECORD to show whether or not it is the intent of Congress that osteopaths shall be employed.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. He is given discretion.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from California to that particular provision of the bill which says he may be employed.

Mr. DOYLE. I know that, and that leaves it entirely up to the Administrator.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is absolutely so.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to know specifically whether or not it is the intent of the Veterans' Committee of this House, if the question arises, to allow osteopaths to be employed.

Mr. KEARNEY. Speaking for myself, that was the intent of the Veterans' Committee when this section was put into that bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from California that it leaves it

optional with the Veterans' Administrator. This rule or regulation that the gentleman refers to in section 16 is merely a guard against what might be an attempt to make laws by regulation, and I understand there is a bill in the Senate to make it apply to all departments. But that section will not have the slightest effect on the employment of osteopaths.

Mr. DOYLE. I would like to ask either the chairman or the distinguished speaker another question or so, because I want to have this stated specifically.

As I understand this bill, it could easily be the case that the committee of Congress declare that it was not the intent of Congress that osteopaths should be employed, and I want to know what the intent of the committee of Congress is, as a matter of record, if I may have the answer, please, to that question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has had the answer two or three times. It is left optional with the Administrator.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I suggest to the gentleman that he offer an amendment to the bill, if he wants to make it mandatory; otherwise, it is permissive. Personally, I feel that any osteopath should be allowed to practice, provided he is also a doctor.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will be able to get a few additional minutes, because I think I have a message that this Congress should hear.

When I say that the type of service that our veterans have received throughout the years is poor and mediocre, I say that under the policy existing it could not be otherwise. In the first place, a professional man is attached to an institution for one of two reasons; either because of the pay which is allowed or because of the opportunity that is given him to reach professional attainment and to develop in his own profession. Neither of these was permitted under the old system, and as soon as a doctor became affiliated with a veterans' hospital, he developed very shortly into a glorified clerk. Most of his time, yes, 60 percent of his time was spent in writing out reports, in running errands, and in doing those things that are not necessarily of a professional nature. They did not let that man experiment. They did not give that man an opportunity to grow with his profession.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That doctor was never given an opportunity to take a refresher course. I have come across instances where men who have been connected with the institutions as head surgeons have not had an opportunity to take these courses. As an illustration, the head surgeon in Biloxi, Miss., who had been there for 25 years, on many occasions had requested an opportunity to take refresher courses so that he could keep abreast with, and be cognizant of, the developments in his profession, but he was not able to take them. That was generally the practice that prevailed in those times.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. If he did take those refresher courses, is it not true that he took them at his own expense?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is correct. Those things were discouraged. That doctor was not given an opportunity to grow with his profession. This has been a weak and unimaginative policy.

As an illustration, it was 6 months after the great wonder drug, penicillin, had been recognized and had been employed throughout the entire world that the Veterans' Administration started to use it. You will find examples of this throughout the entire policy and program employed during that period.

The average doctor has told me that after a short time he was interested only in getting his monthly pay check and in his eventual retirement. They took all of the ambition out of that professional man, they took all of the opportunity away from him and did not give him the things that were needed. Most of these men are good men, they are kindly men. They were generous to their patients. They had a proper understanding from a sympathetic standpoint. But they felt that inadequacy.

The most starting fact backing up the things I say is that throughout that entire period of time the doctors of the Veterans' Administration contributed very little to the advancement and development of medicine. That is a singular thing and an unfortunate one, because the Veterans' Administration has had a great opportunity, like other institutions. This is the greatest medical institution in the world, and they have had opportunities to contribute to the development and advancement of medicine, but they have not done that except in some minor developments, such as in osteomyelitis and in cancer at Hines University.

So, I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is much-needed legislation. I also say that most of these things could have been corrected by administrative methods through a policy instituted by a strong man at the head of the Administration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Compare the mental institutions of the Veterans' Administration with the State mental institutions, and you will find that up to the time this unusual condition occurred at the beginning of this war there was not a State insane institution in America whose record compared favorably with that of any veterans' mental institution throughout the country.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That is a correct statement, and I heard that same analysis made before our committee; but the fact is that it is an unfair comparison because the Congress of the United States appropriates at least twice the amount per patient that is available to the various State, municipal, and private hospitals throughout the country. There is no reason why the Veterans' Administration should not give much, much better service than that which is given in the State institutions, because we appropriate twice the money that is available to take care of the patients in the private hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If they had had the medical service all this time which I have begged for for years, and I have begged the Administrator to approve it, then they would not have had these things happen. The men would have been in as they were in the Army. They would have had a fine type. They would not have had beatings as they did in one of the hospitals, which was very tragic.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Why, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The passage of this bill will strengthen the hand of the Administrator in correcting the evils that the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Without question, it is of great assistance.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Following the thought expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] in regard to osteopathic doctors, I think it might be reasonable to point out that there will be a large section of our veterans who may have been accustomed to calling upon osteopathic doctors before they entered the service. Now, if they enter these hospitals, they may again call for that type of service. Therefore, I think it is proper for the committee to have included osteopathic doctors in this bill, since they may be required.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. That may be correct except that I would make this observation. Those who testified before the committee in behalf of including this profession stated that their profession allowed them to perform medicine and surgery of every possible type, including brain surgery and stomach surgery. I say that I do not know whether these gentlemen are qualified to do that type of work. If they could restrict it, according to my interpretation of that profession, which is the manipulation of the hands, I think that would be all right.

Mr. DONDERO. That could be determined by the medical administration that we are setting up under this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The man who appeared before the committee stated that in those States where they were licensed they had

to pass exactly the same examinations that medical doctors do.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Yes.

Mr. DE LACY. The gentleman has made a brilliant statement concerning some of the evils in this medical set-up and has placed his finger on the administration, and I think justly. I would like to inquire, in view of his statement, if he regards the way the distinguished chairman opened this debate—namely, naming a lot of people of apparently Jewish ancestry and then later trying to put the burden of the evils of this administration upon them—is in any way related to the extensive powers on page 6 of this bill which make it possible for the Administrator to choose and to define the qualifications and to make appointments without regard to civil service? Is there any effort here, sir, to weed out any class of doctors of any origin whatsoever from the service?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I regret that you have brought up this question. In all fairness and frankness, I am going to tell you from my study and observation I found in these various hospitals, and I am not going to give a reason for it, but in these hospitals, eight of which I visited, over 40 percent of the medical personnel of these institutions was of the Jewish faith. I am not giving a reason or explanation for it and I am not passing upon the qualifications of these men because I know in many instances they are excellent doctors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield one additional minute to the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say that the statement that I called anybody's name even of the Jewish faith is not true. I merely called General Hines' name, General Bradley's name, and General Hawley's name. The gentleman from Louisiana is making a very fine statement. I think he has answered the question very well.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The thought occurs to me that this legislation will perform much good. But this same legislation under the old medical policy would not have done a bit of good. It has to be done administratively. General Hawley is going to have a terrific job ahead of him. He is going to have a hard time to attract into the hospitals men of sufficient professional attainment to be able to do the job. I do not know how he is going to do it. But this bill makes it much easier for him because there are three things that will attract a man into these hospitals. One is adequate and sufficient pay. A doctor is entitled to that. We have increased the pay under this bill. That may bring some of these better talents into the hospital. It gives retirement benefits. Above all things, it gives the doctor an opportunity to come into a growing institution, an institution that is cognizant of the development of medical science.

General Hawley has shown great wisdom in determining that these hospitals should be established in large cities, where there are medical schools, medical centers, where they will be able to employ the services of great specialists on a part-time basis; where they will be able to take residents and interns into the hospitals and give those young men an opportunity to know medicine, so that our boys can get the very best possible service that can be given.

I think this investigation has resulted in great good. We all want to be fair. We do not want to break up this great system. I have the highest admiration for General Hines as an Administrator, but I think that General Hines, and I think Dr. Griffin, and I think those who have had charge of the medical policy of the Veterans' Administration should be highly criticized and condemned because they gave our veterans third-rate medicine through that period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, as has been well said, the primary interest of this committee is, as it always has been, in the welfare of the disabled veterans of the wars of the United States. The committee proposes here to give the best fighting men that this world has ever known the best medical service that is within reasonable reach of the taxpayers of this country. We think we have accomplished that very purpose.

If the Committee will permit, I will run through this bill hurriedly and take up some of the points that have not been discussed, and then I will answer such questions as the Members may care to ask.

In the first place, section 5 primarily sets out the requirements of the appointees.

First, he must be a citizen of the United States of America. There has been some criticism of that, but we maintain that any man who wants to serve the American veterans, if he cares enough to serve them, certainly should care enough to become a citizen of this country.

He must be in the medical service and hold a degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator. He must have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States, and so on.

We also provide so that we would not lose the services of these men who are now in uniform in these hospitals, so that these men who will soon be on terminal leave from the armed forces can immediately accept appointment under the Veterans' Administration and continue to serve in the Veterans' Administration and at the same time receive their terminal leave. Otherwise, we would lose their services.

Section 6 points out clearly that the appointments in this new medical department shall be by the Administrator only after qualifications have been determined and satisfactorily established in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Administrator. In other words, he says just exactly what requirements these men shall meet, and if any man, meeting these other two basic qualifications, can meet those requirements, then, certainly he should be entitled to practice in the veterans' hospitals.

As was previously pointed out, these men in the new medical department, even though they may have been with the Veterans' Administration for some time, are there on a probationary period for 3 years. If, after review by a board of their records, their services have not been satisfactory, they can be removed.

Promotions of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only upon examination given in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Administrator. In order that there should be no question as to the propriety of these men receiving full pay from the Veterans' Administration, we provide that these doctors, dentists, and nurses now in the present medical service shall remain in their present positions until the Administrator shall have determined their qualifications as hereinbefore provided.

Now we come down to one of the most important sections of the bill, and that is section 7. In that you will see we have set out the various grades of these medical men and we have set out the salaries to be paid. You might be interested to know that in 1929, which was the supposedly peak year as far as prosperity in this Nation is concerned, a study shows that the average net income of the nonpay-roll practicing physician was $5,224. That income later on for these nonsalaried physicians dropped to $2,948; and in 1941, with a little better times prevailing, the average income for these nonsalaried doctors went back up to $5,047. You will see that in this pay scale we are starting these new men at $3,640, and that as they go through the progressive grades they may reach a maximum salary of $9,800. That should be the inducement, the quid pro quo, this stuff we all try to get our hands on, that impels men to do certain things.

One further observation as to nonsalaried physicians: A study completed in 1941 shows that more than one-quarter of the nonsalaried physicians in the United States reported net incomes of less than $2,000. So with this scale of pay which we have provided in this section we feel that if lack of income, lack of pay, has been keeping doctors from the Veterans' Administration, this one section certainly will overcome that objection. Further than that, we know that people do not get sick by the clock. We found that in many of these hospitals under civil-service regulations and under the wage-hour law and other regulations doctors practice 40 hours a week. As we have gone through hospitals and seen 4:30 come around, we have seen doctors put on their hats and walk out, because if they had worked a few minutes overtime, compensatory time would have had to be given them, and it would have taken a great deal of complicated figuring and bookkeeping to straighten it out. In section (b) we provided that notwithstanding any law,

Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

There has been some discussion to the effect that one reason why perhaps we did not get the type of doctor we feel the veteran should have—and I feel that I can speak with a little bit of authority after having spent more than 2 years as a patient in veterans' hospitals—was that there was not enough inducement for a doctor to learn or practice any specialty. For this reason, in section 8—and this was largely upon the recommendation of General Bradley and General Hawley—there is provided a method by which a doctor may become a specialist. To do that, as shown in section 8 (b) he will not be rated as a medical or surgical specialist unless he is certified as a specialist by an American specialty board recognized by the Administrator where such board exists, or if no such board exists, where he has been examined and found qualified by a board appointed by the Chief Medical Director from specialists from the Department of Medicine and Surgery holding ratings in the specialty to which the candidate aspires.

Section 8 (b) provides that these men who by their desire, by their study, and by their efforts and aided by some of these things we will tell you about later, where they can take refresher courses and attend clinics to get the special training, they may, having qualified as specialists, receive 25 percent additional pay as qualified specialists. I may say frankly that I was not in full accord with that entire section and I felt, personally, that this pay of 25 percent should be collected only when these specialists were actively and actually practicing their specialty. I thought it smacked a little too much of the Army flying pay that some of our arm-chair flying officers have received, although their time for flying had long passed, but they keep qualified for that 50 percent merely by spending 4 hours a month in the air.

We also provided for retirement. There was a suggestion made that we should set up in the bill a retirement feature similar to that in the Public Health Service which is exactly the same as the Regular Army; however, in studying that we felt that that in itself would require the setting up of an entirely separate retirement system and machinery within the Veterans' Administration and we thought, through comparison of the facts and figures, that the retirement given in these higher salary ranges, the retirement provisions of the civil service, in other words, was adequate to properly compensate and care for a man in his older years after he ceased the active practice of medicine in the Veterans' Administration.

Section 10 provides what military men know as B-boards, benzine boards, disciplinary boards, if you wish to call them that, which will function after the 3-year probationary period. There is provided machinery permitting five doctors, senior employees in grade, to hear charges against any one of these men. doctors, dentists, or nurses, and after having made their investigation, having had a trial, in which the charged person is entitled to have his own attorney to combat the charges, if they think he has violated the regulations and is subject to discipline, the disciplinary board makes a recommendation, which must be reviewed by the Administrator and we provide that the decision of the Administrator, whether he approves in whole or approves in part or modifies in whole or in part, shall be final.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If we had had the salutary provision of section 10, to which the gentleman refers, in effect previously, does not the gentleman think we would have avoided a great deal of the trouble that has cropped up?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am quite sure much of the trouble would have been avoided, because as we went through the hospitals, talking to the chief medical officers and others, we found certain conditions to exist. I may say in passing that this is the only place in which I found myself in disagreement with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in many months. I did not find conditions as bad as he described them. I did find the magazine articles gross exaggerations, although in each hospital I did find sore spots. There were doctors who did not come up to what we thought they should and what the chief medical officers thought they should; but in view of all the red tape and the difficulty of bringing charges and proving them under the civil-service regulations, the chief medical officer got to the point where he said, "I cannot do anything about it anyway," arranged for a transfer of the man, and by so doing the inefficient doctor simply changed the scene of his activities, but the evil was not remedied.

Mr. RANKIN. If this law had been in effect, and the gentleman from Kansas has had a great deal to do with preparing this law, because he is on the subcommittee that did prepare it, then the head of the Veterans' Administration could have made the necessary changes and could have cleared up the situation?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it would have enabled them to have acted much more expeditiously.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I congratulate the gentleman and his committee on the splendid contribution they have made to the welfare of our veterans; but does not the gentleman think that the new administration ought to have the power to summarily remove, if you please, those doctors who have been attached to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. There is at present a medical service in the Veterans' Administration. Immediately on the passage of this bill that is wiped out, there is no more medical service in the Veterans' Administration; immediately upon enactment of this bill there is created a new department of medicine and surgery and under that new department all doctors, dentists, and nurses must be appointed. So that these doctors who have not measured up to certain standards, these doctors who are not fit to administer to the ills of American veterans, will be dropped from the rolls of the Veterans' Administration, they will not be taken into this new department, althought they will still retain their civil-service rating and may receive appointments in some other branch of the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On that point the gentleman states that they will retain their civil-service status.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does that apply to both nurses and doctors?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Doctors, dentists, and nurses; that is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Am I to understand that under the new set-up the nurses will not have any civil-service status?

Mr. SCRIVER. We were talking now about those who are presently employed in the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Those are the ones I am referring to.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If they are not retained by the Veterans' Administration under this new department they will still have their civil-service status as classes P and S, 3, 4, 5, or whatever it may be, but they will not be employed by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Assume now that they are taken over.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman is talking now about those who will be accepted in the new department?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They will not be under civil service. They will be under the regulations of the Veterans' Administration, but for retirement purposes they will be under the civil service, and that is the only place there will be any contact with those appointees with the civil service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Outside doctors could still be appointed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right. We are talking now about your full-time medical service.

If I may proceed to section 11, this may need a little bit of explanation because it may not be clear to many. First, we have taken care of doctors, dentists, and nurses. As the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] told you, there was a fourth category, auxiliary services, which takes in hospital attendants, dining room attendants, cooks, and bottle washers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It includes social workers, dietitians, and all that. Those are still under civil service and will remain under civil service. But this section provides that those other employees, those cooks or dietitians and those who are now presently employed in the medical service shall be transferred to the new department of medicine and surgery only if the manager of the hospital, home, or center, where they are presently employed, certifies that their services have been satisfactory; in other words, we know that there are some attendants who should never have been on the pay roll. They are on there now and you could try from now until doomsday but you could not get them off because of civil service. If the manager believes that this particular dietitian or cook is not qualified, has not been a proper employee, he merely refuses to list the name of the employee as having performed satisfactory service and that employee will not be taken into the new department of medicine and surgery.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am sorry, I have but a few minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. The only thing I am interested in, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa said that the gentleman from Kansas would reserve a minute to discuss section 16, and I would like to know something about section 16.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Time is so very short when you get on a bill like this that the time allotted me is not anywhere near enough.

Section 12 provides for an advisory group, which already exists. The only change is that we require them to conduct quarterly meetings and make recommendations.

Section 13 (a) provides that these doctors may attend meetings of their medical societies and all that to be kept current with the new practices and techniques that have grown up.

Section 13 (b) provides for 90 days in a calendar year where these doctors, not to exceed 5 percent, may be assigned to certain clinical schools and postgraduate courses, where they may pursue courses at the expense of the Administration.

Section 14 empowers the chief medical director to employ without regard to civil service, physicians, dentists, and nurses, on a temporary full-time basis, although not to exceed 90 days on a part-time or fee basis. That is particularly necessary at this time because there is growing every day a greater and greater load of claims for compensation and pensions that cannot now be met. In the District of Columbia alone there are more than 10,000 undecided compensation claims pending. This section means that the Administrator can go to the doctors of the District and have them work on a part-time basis, maybe evenings, or on a fee basis, and take care of examinations and help to break down this ever-increasing load of claims which exists not only here, but all over the entire Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Can the gentleman in that additional minute discuss section 16?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I will be very glad to, but I wish I had more time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I know from the buzzing I have heard back of the rail and elsewhere that some question has been raised about section 16. As the gentleman from Iowa pointed out a few minutes ago, almost this same section was adopted unanimously by the House in July when we passed the amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Had a similar provision been in that bill originally you would not have been receiving the letters you are receiving today about the delays and red tape encountered in the administration of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I should like to offer this suggestion, which I think will be entirely agreeable to the gentleman and the committee. On page 15, line 1, after the word "either", strike out the period and insert "if the Congress is in recess or adjournment." Then, on line 12, after "thereof", insert "as provided in subsection (a) hereof." In other words, if the Congress is in session the full committee ought to act.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think that is fair and acceptable and the gentleman's suggestion meets somewhat what we had in mind. All this does is regulate the regulator.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the gentleman will agree that if we had had this in some other measures we all might have been much happier.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate that. The committee of which I am chairman has monthly meetings with the Administrator to discuss these matters. But a subcommittee should not act if the House is in session.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I agree perfectly. The reasons why the subcommittee was put in there, so that these regulations could be scanned during recesses and adjourned sessions, because we know that there are going to be regulations written every day, and we felt it would not be fair to hold them up until we get back into session.

Mr. LANHAM. It is my purpose to offer these amendments.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] spoke to me about his proposed amendments, and I have told the members of the committee on our side about them. The amendments are satisfactory to them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think the suggestion is well made and I agree with it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it would be satisfactory to the committee on this side also.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It should be.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In respect to this just what would this consultation with the committee be?

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman means in relation to section 16?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It is not up to the committee or any subcommittee to determine whether the regulation is wise. That is the administrative end of it. We do not want to interfere in that at all. All we do is this. Having worked on this bill, knowing its contents, and knowing what we intended to have and what the purpose of the bill was, all the committee is ever empowered to do or is expected to do or should do is merely to scan that regulation and see whether or not it is in conformity with the letter, spirit, and purpose of the bill and the intent of Congress, and finally to see that there are no unusual or unexpected uses made of the powers herein granted, because we have granted a great deal of power here to free the Administrator's hand and let him do a job. We would be concerned, to be sure, that he makes no unusual or unexpected use of that power.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Apparently the gentleman is using synonymously the terms "Committee on Finance of the Senate" and "Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation" and "Congress."

Mr. SCRIVNER. No. Because in the Senate the Finance Committee handles veterans' legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But why should a committee which is merely an arm of the Congress determine a thing of this sort?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was mistaken a moment ago about the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] being on the subcommittee. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] was on the subcommittee that worked out this bill. I now yield him 10 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly what we are trying to do by this bill. I am not prepared to say why the Veterans' Administration needed correcting. I do not know whether it is because we did not have an efficient administration or whether it is entirely the civil service. I suspect it is a little of both, and I suspect further that any agency of the Government which took over the job that the Veterans' Administration had to do when this war started would have been in serious difficulties before too long. It is the biggest job any agency of our Government has had to do. I think we could anticipate trouble no matter what agency

had it. But regardless of that, which is water over the dam, so to speak, our job is to get an organization set up which will be of real service to the veterans of this country. As we looked over the Veterans' Administration, I think the primary thing that we developed was that the medical service was not what it should be. There are a lot of things which go to contribute to a good medical service. We could not possibly pay medical doctors of this country out of the Treasury of the United States the amount of money necessary to give the veterans the kind of treatment which they ought to have and which they need.

In other words, we could not go out and compete for the type of specialists and experts that these men are entitled to. So we have to give the doctors going into the Veterans' Administration something else. We have to try to provide more security in their jobs. We have to give them a decent retirement system. We must provide an agency and an organization of Government in which they can find some professional pride in serving. That is what we have tried to do. This is not a matter altogether of unharnessing the Veterans' Administration from civil service and raising the salaries. It is an effort to create a medical organization in the Veterans' Administration in which a doctor will feel proud to serve and of which he will be proud to be a part. After looking the whole situation over and trying to work these various matters into the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, we decided that the best way to do it was just to junk the whole business and start all over again. So we took the present medical service as it exists in the Veterans' Administration and simply said that it is hereby abolished. In other words, we threw it out. Obviously, we have an organization here—a going organization—and we could not take an organization consisting of thousands of people and say it was junked. We had to provide some way to get back the parts of it that we wanted to salvage. That is what this bill tries to do in addition to putting into the law those things which will contribute, we believe, to a better medical service. So we started at the top, and looking at the medical service more or less as a pyramid, with the medical director at the top, we ran down the pyramid a little bit and sliced off a chunk, and we said from here on up these men will be appointed directly by the Administrator.

Then we went down the pyramid a little bit further and we took the doctors, dentists, and nurses, and we said with reference to those that they shall be selected without reference to civil-service requirements, but would be selected after their qualifications are established by the Administrator on examination. Then we had the vast bulk of the remaining personnel of the Veterans' Administration—those are the thousands and thousands of people who work in the Veterans' Administration and who make up the vast base of its operation—we wanted to get a good many of those people back but at the same time provide the Administrator with sufficient discretion so that in the event there was someone in the organization he did not want he could get rid of that party. So in section 11 we provide that all of those people—who generally speaking represent the third group—should be moved back intact into the Department of Medicine and Surgery, subject only to the receipt of a certificate of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where that person is presently employed. When they go back, they are completely under the civil service. That is the method we used to reconstruct this entire system.

Our primary concern, as I said before, was with the professional end. We have taken doctors, dentists, and nurses out of the civil service. Some of the committee members felt we were going a little too far. General Hawley felt we should go further than that; that we should go down into some of these other brackets, such as physiotherapists, occupation therapists, and dietitians, and put them in the non-civil-service classification also. We decided not to do that, because we did not want to disturb, any more than we have to, the existing civil-service status of the employees of the Veterans' Administration. We felt that, generally speaking, these professional employees could be recruited and would be satisfactory employees, and that they did not have direct connection with the veterans, the patients, which the others do have. So, we only stepped down to take in those three categories to be left out of the civil service.

We did try to do some additional things to get doctors into the Veterans' Administration. Doctors are not going into the Veterans' Administration just for the salaries we provide. Men with the ability we want to take care of these veterans can go out into private practice and make a lot more money than we have provided, even under the compensation we have set up, and which is more generous than under existing law. We had to do something in addition to that. General Hawley wanted a better retirement system. He wanted us to put in the retirement system which the Public Health Service has. We would have done that if there was any way by which we could do it. I think the committee would generally like to have seen a more generous retirement system, but we could not do it without taking in the military retirement system or substantially the civil-service retirement system, or, in the third place, setting up an entirely independent and separate one for the Veterans' Administration. We did not want to do that. So, we left the retirement system as it is under the present civil service. We have some misgivings about its being good enough, but it was the best the committee could do without writing a special provision.

Section 8 relates to medical specialists, and seems to me very important. It is one in which General Hawley took a great deal of interest. That is the one which permits a man to be declared a medical or surgical specialist, and receive 25-percent increase in compensation. The 25-percent increase in compensation is important, but I do not think it is as important as setting up a specialist class, which gives a man a sense of professional accomplishment in the Veterans' Administration. One of the great things among professional men is to have a sense of professional accomplishment. It is the ambition of General Hawley to bring into this medical service men who have a high rating, men of even a national reputation, so that other doctors will be proud to serve with them. One of his pets is this section 8, whch sets up a system of medical and surgical specialists, allowing them additional compensation for additional qualifications, and in addition it will give them the pride which a man has in some professional accomplishment.

The matter of attending schools, which was mentioned by my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], apparently in the past has been discouraged. I do not know whether under existing law the Administrator would have had the authority to send men to school and to pay their expenses, but we put it into this bill in plain language so that there could be no question at all but that the doctors in the Veterans' Administration can be sent to school, and their expenses, while going to school, paid. That in itself is a singular inducement to men in the medical profession who want advancement. We do not want the Veterans' Administration to be the backwater of medical science in this country. That organization should be in the forefront of medical science. The only way we can keep men in the Veterans' Administration in the forefront of medical science is by providing a method for them to go to school, and to pay their expenses.

It has been suggested that perhaps that provision was a little broad and might permit some abuse, but I would rather see an authorization of that sort abused a little than not have any at all, and have the type of medical help which we want for the veterans.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. As I understand it, if a man is with the Veterans' Administration and receives this training and is afforded an opportunity to go to school, with part of his expenses paid, in order to keep himself abreast of scientific research and keep his hand in with current medicine, if he should retire from the Veterans' Administration or this new board, he would have to refund that money if he left within a short period of time thereafter, would he not?

Mr. ENGLE of California. If he leaves the service within 2 years after the completion of such course, he must reimburse the Veterans' Administration for the money which was advanced. That is to keep some fellow from going to school and then immediately leaving the service.

There is one section that will probably be subject to some controversy and I wish to mention it briefly. That is this

section 5, which prescribes the qualifications of those in the medical service and states:

They shall hold the degree of doctor of medicine or doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator and shall have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. General Hawley did not like this provision, and he said so in his testimony. In addition to that, I believe the general felt that he wanted to get along with the medical doctors in this country, and he was having trouble enough straightening them out with the conditions existing in the Veterans' Administration without having something put in this bill which might cause friction and antagonism. The Veterans' Administration wants to work very closely with the medical doctors in setting up the medical organization in the Administration. For instance, General Hawley wants to tie in with the schools of medicine, wants to set up the hospitals in such way that medical specialists will come to them to treat the veterans daily. He was afraid of this provision. But let me call attention to the fact that there are a lot of safeguards thrown around this provision. In the first place, it is purely a permissive section. It states, in effect, that the Administrator "may" employ osteopaths; and in addition to that, section 6 (a) states that the appointment of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator without regard to civil-service requirements. The thing which puzzles me a little is why the medical people should be so concerned about this provision where it is so thoroughly safeguarded, and where a medical man is, in fact, at the head of the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Just a minute; then I will yield.

I wish to add this one further statement, that as far as I personally am concerned as a Member of Congress I do not like saying to a veteran that he shall not have treatment by an osteopath if he wants it. In other words, by putting it in the bill, we will authorize the Administrator to hire osteopaths. Then if the veterans of this war receiving treatment under this act want osteopaths at least it cannot be said that the Congress of the United States has denied them that privilege. The authorization is there.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. I think the gentleman has very strongly and clearly stated an answer to the question I was going to ask; therefore, I will take no further time, because I was going to ask what the gentleman's opinion was as to the intent of Congress with reference to the employment of osteopaths, or authorizing them if the veterans wanted treatment by osteopaths.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to say that I happen to be one of those who has supported the American Medical Association in their opposition to the socialization of medicine; but I also take the position that the American Medical Association has no moral or legal right to say to me, to my son, or my nephew: "Thou shalt not have access to an osteopath in a veterans' hospital."

If the American Medical Association is sincere in not wanting Government dictatorial programs with respect to medical assistance, they should withdraw their opposition to this provision.

I propose to support the provision, because if a veteran wants an osteopath he is entitled to have one and it is not up to Congress to deny him that right simply for the purpose of making a job administratively practical to some administrator.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I agree with the gentleman. I do not care as a Member of Congress to say that a veteran shall not be treated by an osteopath if he wants to be treated by one.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HEDRICK. Suppose the veteran requires and wants a chiropractor and the treatment of a man of that character, what do we do about that?

Mr. ENGLE of California. We have not had that up for consideration. If the gentleman wants my personal opinion, I will say that we should not employ or authorize the employment of any particular kind of treatment except that which is recognized and established. The osteopathic treatment has certainly been recognized. There is a difference between that and the fellow, for instance, who believes in voodooism or something of the sort.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Who is going to decide which veteran has the right to osteopathic treatment, and which veteran shall have penicillin, and so forth. We have to have some supervision here.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That supervision is in the bill which provides only that the Administrator may employ osteopaths if the veteran wants them.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman said we are not going to deny the veteran the right to make a certain choice. We cannot deny him the right to have penicillin, sulfabiosol, or any other drug he wants, can we?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not a question of saying to a veteran: "You shall not have penicillin" or "you shall not have something else." We have laws, rules, and regulations in the States which qualify men to administer medicine. We qualify a pharmacist to make up that medicine. I cannot go to the drug store and buy anything I want to this afternoon unless I have a physician's prescription. So what the gentleman brings up is entirely beside the question.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I did not follow the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We are not trying to deny the veterans penicillin or any other medicine. We are trying to see that he gets it and we are untying the hands of the Veterans' Administration and of the head of the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration so that he can see that the veteran gets what he needs.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this point in the RECORD to read Resolution No. 390, passed by the American Legion at its national convention in Chicago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, this resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Veterans' Administration under its educational program is permitting returning veterans to take courses in osteopathy and chiropractics: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Rehabilitation Committee request the Veterans' Administration to permit payment for treatment of a service-connected disability by a licensed chiropractor or licensed osteopath in the same manner as payment is allowed to any licensed medical doctor in any and all cases where the veteran himself elects to have such treatment for his service-connected disability.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The gentleman stated that the salaries of the doctors have been raised very materially from the present scale under the provisions of section 7 of this bill.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Will it not be true, as a matter of practice, that these increases will go generally to those who have been in the service the longest, and not entirely on the basis of skill and ability?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to answer the question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The promotions are by examination and on recommendation. So there is a merit system in this medical service bill.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That, I believe, is correct—the positions these men get are established by examination.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Nevertheless, the discretion is left with the head of the service. May I ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts if it is not true that the promotions will be made

entirely upon recommendation of the superiors of those presently in the service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, no. A board acts upon all promotions and examinations. I do not think the gentleman need worry about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset may I say that I intend to support this measure because it will aid materially in providing the necessary medical care and attention our disabled veterans need and deserve. Throughout the entire period of time I have served in this legislative body I have given my full and unqualified support to all beneficial and worthy veterans' legislation, and that course will be followed as long as I am a Member of this great lawmaking body. Our veterans who are disabled must be cared for. We cannot neglect them in any respect. This measure will provide assistance for these men, and I will support this measure.

May I further say that it is my firm belief that in Gen. Paul Hawley, as head of the Medical Section of the Veterans' Administration, the man best qualified to handle the many and staggering problems that come before us in these untold thousands of cases has been selected. General Hawley is a Hoosier by birth and residence. After he completed his education he began the practice of medicine at College Corner, in Union County, Ind., with his eminent father, Dr. Harry Hawley. They had a large practice, and General Hawley, as his father, was highly successful in the practice of his chosen profession. General Hawley then entered the Army, in the Medical Corps, where he has made rapid and steady advancements until he was placed at the head of a group of our hospitals in the European theater during World War II, and he was made a major general because of his valor, his skill, and his fine attainments in his profession. I am confident General Hawley will render a great service to the people, to our Nation, and to the disabled veterans in this capacity. I commend him to the people everywhere. He is made of the right stuff, as was evidenced upon invasion day, when General Hawley, with his insignia removed, went upon the beach and advanced with our boys in the face of withering gunfire and the thunderous crashing of bursting bombs all about him. And, too, he is a thorough American. With Gen. Paul Hawley at the head of the Medical Corps in our Veterans' Administration I am confident our veterans will receive the proper care and training, and that the very best of medical care and attention will be given to every veteran who applies therefor.

Mr. Chairman, we must never stint our aid to the veterans of all our wars. They are our heroes, and they will remain forever our heroes. And as we go forward in this postwar period, let us resolve to do our best for our veterans, and that every disabled veteran who needs care and medical attention may have it. We must rehabilitate them in order that the future years may bring joy and happiness, and that their lives will not be blighted by the ravages of war because of inattention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly explained by this time. I want to state that the reason why, in my opinion, this bill was brought into being, was due to the fact that for many years, especially from the late twenties down to the beginning of our entry into the war, the Veterans' Administration, so far as hospitals of America were concerned, and so far as medical treatment of the various patients was concerned, it was on the downward grade. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in supporting the statement that he has already made concerning his investigation of the veterans' facilities in the United States. Since 1937 I have probably been in nine-tenths of the veterans' facilities of this country. Sometime during the early spring of this year, along with other members of the Veterans' Committee, I made an intensive investigation of some of the facilities, especially into the treatment of our disabled, and found that in many instances the care of these veterans was not in accordance with the American standard, in the treatment of men who have worn the uniform in time of national emergency and suffered disabilities as a result of their gallant service. I remember one particular hospital, conditions in which were brought to the attention of the committee not only by an investigation by some of the members, but it also became necessary for the Veterans' Administrator to send into this facility undercover men in order to get at the truth as to the treatment and abuse of the patients that happened to be quartered therein. As a result of that investigation the United States attorney's office at Brooklyn, N. Y., brought before the attention of the grand jury the cases of eight attendants who were charged with various degrees of assault upon the patients at this particular facility. There was also stationed at this hospital a group of enlisted men of the Army and some 15 of those soldiers were court-martialed for abusive treatment of the patients. Those men were fined, I believe, $50 and confined to their quarters for a period of 6 months. What the outcome of the cases were I have no information up to the present time. The above state of affairs should not and will not be tolerated so far as I am concerned.

We found on investigation that some doctors, not many, were men who were left over, let us say, from the horse and buggy days. The articles that were written in Cosmopolitan and other periodicals in many instances were true. I am convinced that the bill we are about to pass was brought to a head largely by the investigation made not only by the members of the Veterans'. Committee, but also as a result of findings by some special investigators from the Veterans' Administration and by the newspaper writers. Some mention has been made here concerning the type of professional personnel that we have in the facilities today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. KEARNEY. I regret, for one, that it has entered into this debate. This is my personal opinion, and I think it meets with the approval of a vast majority of the Members of the House, but I do not care what the doctor's name is so long as he is able to give good medical care to the veterans in our hospitals. The cry of our disabled is going to ring down through the years to come. These men deserve the best treatment we as a Nation can give them—and that treatment regardless of the cost. The heat of battle is over and we now face the cold, stark reality of postwar legislation. We can do no more than carry out our duty to those who need medical care and hospitalization. I believe this bill can certainly be described as a magnificent step in the right direction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, your Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has spent a great deal of time, study, and effort in preparing the legislation which is before you today. Naturally, as a result of our investigation of these various veterans' hospitals throughout the country we arrived at conclusions as to certain things needed to be done. We had different opinions about these things which needed to be done but we reconciled them after some difficulty in the committee. The bill you have before you today is the result of that give and take, and it is the best that we are able to present.

This bill has the endorsement of those who are familiar with the problems which it tries to correct. As the chairman of the committee pointed out to you earlier this afternoon, it has the approval of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who is naturally the person most concerned with this legislation because he is going to have the duty of carrying out its provisions.

Some reference has been made here today to the use of osteopaths under the provisions of the language of this bill. I think undue importance has been attached to that part of the bill. If an amendment is proposed by anybody, and I hope it will not be, to knock that provision from the bill, I am going to have quite a bit to say about it. I will oppose such an amendment. The members of your Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation are not interested in any jurisdictional dispute between doctors of medicine on the one hand and the doctors of osteopathy on the other.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I learned that in county hospitals sometimes there is a lot of conflicting jurisdiction between the civilian heads and the medical heads. Is the set-up the gentleman's committee has devised to eliminate that sort of conflict?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. It is, indeed. We found that the heads of some of these veterans' hospitals, the doctors, were doing entirely too much paper work, that they were prevented from making the rounds of the wards because of that fact, among others. We are trying to provide sufficient personnel under the provisions of this bill to take care of that problem, which I presume is one element of what the gentleman has in mind?

Reverting to this other proposal I was discussing, with respect to the kinds of doctors who will be employed under the provisions of this bill, this is a bill for the veterans, this is not a bill for the doctors, this is not a bill for the bureaucrats in the Veterans' Administration. I repeat, this is a bill for the veterans. It is a queer thing that while a war is on everybody is for the serviceman and nothing is too good for him, but when the war is over—it happened after the last war and it is happening again now, and we have seen evidence of it this afternoon—well, we are not quite so interested in the welfare of the serviceman. I say that because of the fact that during this war both the Army and the Navy used osteopaths not only in the United States but on the battle fronts. Now what happens? When the boy is discharged and comes back home and goes to a hospital we try to take osteopathic services away from him. It simply does not make sense; it does not add up. Let us be a friend of the veteran today, just as we were when he was fighting this war for us. I will have some more to say about that.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the Committee just how many States have the same requirements.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. There are 8 States, I will say to my colleague, in which doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine take the same examination. They have the same board and receive identically the same license to practice. There are 30 additional States in which doctors of osteopathy are licensed to practice major surgery.

Mr. FENTON. Can the gentleman tell the Committee just what States require 1 year of internship after graduation?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am not sure about that.

Our point is not that we think osteopaths are going to cure all the problems of the veterans but that in those jurisdictions where they are qualified it should be possible to use their services since the Veterans' Administration cannot find enough doctors of medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans Committee, of which I am a member, has given a great deal of thought and study to this bill. Under the leadership of Chairman Rankin and under the leadership on the minority side of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and other able members on the committee who served in the last World War, all of whom have a great interest in veterans' matters, serious study and consideration has been given and they have tried to open up a new day in medical science and medical surgery for the benefit of the veterans who have sacrificed to win the war and have now become or may become patients in the great Veterans' Administration of this country. It may surprise some of you to know that there are something like 83,000 patients now in the Veterans' Administration. It was the duty of this committee, and they have sought to discharge their duty, in giving legislative leadership to the establishment of the finest medical service and the greatest medical organization in the history of the world. That has been the effort of the committee. They feel after having made a most careful investigation of the various hospitals throughout the country that the former Veterans' Administration prior to the appointment of General Bradley was handicapped—handicapped from the bottom to the very top—handicapped in respect to being able to get people in the lowest ranks such as attendants because of the shortage of labor and handicapped with reference to the procurement of doctors because of the shortage of doctors. I understand even now that the war is over, as of January 31 there will be a shortage of something like 10,000 doctors and physicians who are needed in the Veterans' Administration. It is a colossal task to place upon the shoulders of any one man such as the great General Bradley, and it is a great responsibility that is resting upon the shoulders of the men in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation who have drafted this legislation. It is a great responsibility resting upon this Congress. But I am certain that the committee and the Members of Congress intend to do their very best to carry out the obligations that we owe to the men whose health has been impaired and whose physical ability by reason of wounds on the battle front has been impaired. That, in general, sums up today the thought, the hope, and the intentions of this committee. We believe we have made a great step forward in setting up this medical corps.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I am very much in favor of this bill and particularly section 7, which raises the compensation of doctors employed for the treatment of our veterans. I am very anxious that we get the best medical service possible for our disabled veterans. The thing that bothers me is this: The Administrator necessarily must delegate to some assistant the duty to recommend which of the doctors shall be placed in the chief grade, which in the senior grade, and which in the other grades. It seems to me that in turn that official will ask the manager of the facility involved to recommend who shall get the promotions.

I should like to ask the gentleman if we have any assurance that the Director will promote doctors to the higher grades solely on the basis of their skill and ability without regard to seniority and length of service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one-half minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. For the benefit of the gentleman from Wyoming, the manager or chief medical officer of a hospital has nothing whatsoever to say about who shall be appointed or what promotions shall be made. That is purely under the chief medical director, under the Administrator, upon examinations duly given, and qualifications met thereon.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is quite right. There is nothing to fear. For the first time, we have untied the hands of the Veterans' Administrator, to give him an opportunity to cut the red tap and administer to the veterans. This bill is drawn in the interest of the veterans and not in the interest of the doctors of this country.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman and I want to congratulate my colleague on his splendid presentation of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad that this bill is passing on the anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. At that time we sent our boys to fight. Mentally, I know each one of us resolved that each of those boys and girls should have the best possible care when they returned. Instead of finding beds for their racked and injured bodies when they came back, they found our crowded conditions, long waits for hospitalization and inadequate care. Coming back from the war, they found us as little prepared for their care and for peace as we were for war before Pearl Harbor. From today they can look forward to more adequate medical care. We must see that good care is continued. It means more than just passing a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see in this measure a provision in section 5 which puts doctors of osteopathy on a high plane with doctors

of medicine. I favor that as I have great faith in the science of osteopathy.

Naturally, I want veterans to have the very best of care. I believe well selected doctors of osteopathy are also capable of giving them that care. My experience with osteopathy, together with the endorsement of veteran organizations, together with my desire to furnish veterans their choice all cause me to favor including osteopathic doctors in section 5 of this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in bringing to the House H. R. 4717, the committee is bringing to you a bill on which they have worked rather long and diligently. The membership of the committee is convinced, I am sure, as all of you are convinced, that the best fighting men on earth should have the very best treatment that we as a grateful Nation can give them. I am sure we are able, as a nation, to give them what they deserve.

I do not agree with all the provisions of this bill. Indeed, it would be a miracle if a bill were brought from a committee, in which every member of the committee agreed on every point. But I am convinced that this bill, which is long overdue, will provide machinery through which we can improve our services to our veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in the half minute remaining to me I merely wish to add to what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts said a moment ago, that I am more or less glad this bill comes up on the anniversary of the most dastardly event in the history of civilization, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and at a time when those who are fighting with us under Chiang Kai-shek are now being blasted by Communists throughout this country.

It is time to put Americans on guard and to take care of our disabled heroes who made it possible for us to live in peace and security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired, all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the medical service in the Veterans' Administration, as at present constituted, is hereby abolished and in its stead there is authorized and established in the Veterans' Administration a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director. The functions of the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the Administrator) pursuant to this act, other statutory authority and regulations established pursuant to law, for the medical care and treatment of veterans.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state that all Members have been given permission to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If it is not taken out of my time.

Is this taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. RANKIN. I will ask that the gentleman be given more time. I want to straighten the Chair out on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent I obtained was that all Members be given five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on this bill. Under the rules of the House a Member who speaks in the House has 30 days when he asks permission to revise and extend remarks, he is not limited to the 5 days.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had as much faith in this proposal as has been expressed by its proponents. I predict that this new machinery which is being set up here—and I am taking into consideration the good intention that is back of it—will not do what you believe it is going to do.

I have heard a great many disparaging remarks about the doctors in the present Veterans' Administration set-up. I was the first examiner in my county and section for the Veterans' Administration. I have never been employed by the Government in any of the veterans' hospitals, but I have had some experience with physicians in such hospitals. Let me say that in my judgment those physicians have performed just as fine service as can be expected from the new set-up, so far as ability is concerned.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is there not a tendency in all bureaucracy to slow down, and to lose initiative, whether it be doctors, lawyers, or any other groups?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I shall answer the gentleman's question by predicting that within a year or so after this program is set up Members will be taking the floor of this House and say the same things about it as are now being said about the present set-up.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this measure, but I am not as sanguine that the results will be as great as some seem to think. You are going to set up a dictator of veteran medicine here and this person is going to have a lot of power. It will be a one-man control over medicine and surgery. You do not find anything like that in private medical institutions or, for that matter, in State medical institutions. They have governing boards and bodies, not dictators.

There will be penalties attached for violations of rules under this set-up and the dictator of medicine will prescribe the penalties.

Do you know how you could get a real medical service for the veteran? Give him the opportunity of choosing his own doctor in his own community.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that General Hawley is arranging in many communities so that a veteran may have his own doctor and the doctor be paid, particularly out-patients from hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to know whether it is the gentleman's considered opinion that the Director of Veterans' Affairs can dominate these doctors so that we will not get the best work out of them and their work will not be the best for the veterans?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not know what the attitude of the man who operates this institution will be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As written here, is that a possibility?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is possible. I would not want to say, though, that he would do that. But here is what is not taken into consideration, I am afraid, as should be. That is, the intangibles in the practice of medicine and surgery. The supposition is that under this bill you are going to get a higher grade of medical doctors than has obtained heretofore. I seriously doubt that. In the first place, I have not any particular complaint to make against the doctors serving in the Veterans' Administration. I still think they have done a mighty fine work and I base that upon my own experience in that particular field.

I wish it might be possible to amend this bill so as to divide responsibility in the operation of this program and not leave it to an individual. Why do we have to set up a czar over practically every agency that we establish. This measure should provide for a board composed of at least seven members.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that in having a Surgeon General of the Army and Navy that there is a dictator or that in having a Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, he is also a dictator?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I may answer the gentlewoman from Massachusetts by quoting the statement of George Washington in his Farewell Address when, in referring to the danger of centralizing the powers of Government said, "the love of power and proneness to abuse it dominates the human heart." That is the only answer I can give. It may be unavoidably so, perhaps, I do not know.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Army and the Navy need help of a higher standard.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The lady has a little more confidence in the effectiveness of legislation to bring about those changes than the gentleman from Ohio. That is where we disagree, perhaps.

At the proper time I am going to offer an amendment to strike out section 16 of this bill and shall discuss it at that time more fully. But at the moment I would like to say that I do not consider it even legislation. The proposal here is that you submit certain questions regarding proposed changes or rules and regulations, whatever you might call them, by this Veterans' Administration to the Finance Committee of the Senate and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House before putting them into effect, which will give either one of these committees the power to veto or even to legislate. Now, we have courts in this country, and it is presumed when Congress passes a law that it has passed a law. It is supposed that we know the contents of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Ohio. I feel very strongly, and I know that many of the doctors and many of the nurses have performed very fine and very expert service in the care of the veterans. Many of the examiners and many of the rating doctors have suggested ways as to how a man's disability could be connected with the service. Many of them owe their health and their livelihood to those very doctors today. Also, Mr. Chairman, those very doctors have told me that they have felt stifled so far as any chance of improving their surgery and their medicine is concerned. They know that before the Board of American Surgeons they are considered not first rate, and it hurts in every way. Also, Mr. Chairman, under the present system it has seemed that laymen have interfered in the practice of medicine. I inspected a veterans' hospital some years ago and there was a business manager in charge. When I arrived at 6 o'clock at night there was no doctor on the post. The manager had invited all the doctors to a dinner some miles away. There were some very sick men at the hospital. The patients told me at that time that often the business manager took the floor boys, the attendants, away to do the work about the offices and took the doctors away to rate cases so that the patients did not have the care that they should have.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. While the gentleman from Ohio was speaking he indicated that the cure for this would perhaps be for the veteran to secure the services of his home-town doctor. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts indicated that that is possible now. Will she please develop that? I have many letters from doctors in my district who say they have veterans in these communities who need some attention, yet they are unable to be taken into some of the veterans' facilities. How can that veteran at this particular time secure the services of the local doctor at Government expense?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that provision is made in this bill to employ doctors on a fee basis and on part time, and General Hawley has said that more doctors would be used on part time and on a fee basis. I think later on possibly a veteran can select his own doctor and the Veterans' Administration will stand back of the treatment of that physician.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there anything in this legislation which would make that possible?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, the provision for part time and fee basis.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it the section that refers to auxiliary wards?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; there is a section that refers to the part-time service or the fee that can be given to the doctor. The doctor would be paid a fee for taking care of the veteran.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] suggests that it is section 14. I have read that. I am wondering how the local doctor can get the information so he can go to the director and make application to become one of the part-time doctors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He can write directly to Maj. Gen. Paul Hawley, head of the Medical Service at the Veterans' Administration at Washington, or to the branch office in his area, which has a number of regional offices under its jurisdiction, or to the local office in his city or district.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the mechanics of it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. Or he can direct his application for part-time or fee basis to the Veterans' Administration here, to Maj. Gen. Paul Hawley, Director of the Medical and Surgical Service, at Washington. Many will have to be taken in because there is a pitiful shortage of doctors. Also, it will be helpful to have the services for the veterans of highly trained specialists who are not willing to give full time to their care.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. However, that is subject to the direction of the Administrator, is it not? That is entirely within his control?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It should be, otherwise a veteran might select a doctor who would have very little experience. We want the best for our veterans. They have given us their best. We owe it to them to give them the best we can. Nothing is too good for them. We must try to restore them to normal. We must set high standards, and I think the veterans should have their own hospitals where they can go if they want to. They ought not to have to wait. They cannot get houses and they cannot get hospital beds. It is very difficult for them to get doctors on the outside. I saw men on the Italian front last October who had been 158 days without replacement. As they lay in mud holes, in the ice and snow in fox holes. They must have longed for beds, for a house in which to live, and looked forward to their homecoming. And if lying wounded on the ground, or even on cots in the air evacuation hospitals, they must have longed for a more comfortable bed in a real hospital in the United States. They deserve completely good care and treatment everywhere. This bill, though late, will help insure it.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the following: Office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service.

SEC. 3. (a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, eight Assistant Medical Directors, and such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this act.

(b) The Chief Medical Director shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator. During the period of his service as such, the Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of $12,000 a year.

(c) The Deputy Medical Director shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator. During the period of his service as such, the Deputy Medical Director shall be paid a salary of $11,500 a year.

(d) There shall be eight Assistant Medical Directors, appointed by the Administrator, who shall be paid a salary of $11,000 a year each: *Provided*, That one shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operations of the Dental Service.

(e) The Director of Nursing Service shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operations of the Nursing Service. During the period of her service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid a salary of $8,000 a year.

(f) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist, a chief dietitian, a chief physical therapist, and a chief occupational therapist. During the period of his service as such, each chief shall be paid a salary of $6,000 a year.

(g) Any appointment herein above provided shall be for a period of 4 years subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

(h) Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER:

On page 2, line 10, after "Medical Director", insert "not to exceed" before "eight Assistant Medical Directors."

On page 2, line 25, strike out "There shall be" and insert "There may be not to exceed."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHELF: Page 2, line 16, after the words "He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine", strike out "appointed by the Administrator" and insert "(a) be a citizen of the United States, (b) hold the degree of doctor of medicine, who shall have successfully completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, be duly licensed to practice medicine or surgery in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia, and who shall have regularly practiced medicine or surgery continuously for a period of not less than 8 years appointed by the Administrator."

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I think the old order changeth, giving place to the new. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate and commend the chairman and members of the Veterans' Committee on both sides of the House for the excellent job they have done in giving to the veterans of World War I and World War II a new deal, insofar as medicine is concerned. I do not think there is any doubt but that this bill is going to help the veterans of all wars to receive that high type of medical care and treatment to which they are entitled. It is an emancipation proclamation, as I see it. As one who has laid in a hospital for almost 3 months during this war, I feel that I can speak with some knowledge as just what can be expected as the result of this legislation. For that reason, I offer this amendment, which I sincerely hope will be received as a constructive amendment. I want to try to clarify if I can the language where it says "he shall be a qualified doctor." I am sure that within your acquaintance there are doctors who may be a "qualified doctor" to the extent at least that they have graduated from a medical school and have received a degree of doctor of medicine, but they may not have actually practiced medicine. My amendment is an attempt to clarify such situation. I personally know of two doctors who are qualified doctors in that they were duly licensed, but one of these has not written a prescription for even a pill in over 25 years, the other likewise has not practiced in years and therefore is not capable of holding down a job such as this. If we are going to have a chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration, I feel that that man, in all fairness to our disabled veterans, should have regularly practiced medicine for a period of not less than 8 years continuously, if you please, so that he would be really qualified to hold this job. I do not feel that 8 years is out of reason or out of order insofar as this bill is concerned.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman made a statement that this was an emancipation proclamation. I think that is probably true. We were seeking to emancipate the Director of the Veterans' Administration. In the same breath, the gentleman is now asking with respect to one of these positions that we qualify the phrase "doctor of medicine." If we are going to free the hands of the Administrator, we must free them to the point that he can appoint those men he feels are qualified to fill these positions. Of course, I am in sympathy with the idea expressed by the gentleman.

Mr. CHELF. The chief medical officer must have qualifications to fill such a high position with the care of thousands of maimed, wounded, and disabled veterans to help rehabilitate at least to the extent of having regularly and continuously practiced medicine. I think the man who is his assistant should have regularly practiced medicine for at least 5 years. The man who is in charge of dentistry should at least have been practicing dental surgery for 5 years. Insofar as the other doctors under him are concerned, I think that that is taken care of in a very fine manner in the bill in the later section whereby they will be allowed to go to school in order to keep abreast with modern medicine, the latest techniques in surgery and wherein their expenses will be furnished them. This is as it should be because our veterans are entitled to the best medical care—that is why I want and advocate here not a "qualified doctor" as the head, but one who has had sufficient practice of medicine—who knows the practical side of medicine as well as theory in books—not a man fresh out of medical school—for according to this present language—as a "graduate doctor"—he is therefore a "qualified doctor" under the law. This is not enough.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The entire idea of the committee was simply to make it possible for the Veterans' Administration or the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to really administer this section and to free his hands so far as possible. Now, if we find he is stepping a little far afield and is not getting the type of man we want and if we find there must be some restriction, I feel sure the gentleman will find that the committee will go along with him.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot see how the committee very well could object to an amendment of this sort. It merely states that the man must have had 8 years' experience.

Mr. CHELF. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not see anything wrong with that. I am surprised that the committee did not put in some minimum limitation with respect to the qualifications for holding that position.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, I have been admitted to practice law for 14 years. I worked my way through school. As a result of that, without parents or funds, I was unable to make a living for the first 3 months that I was out of law school. I had to take a job which was completely foreign to my profession of the law. I served as secretary to the Honorable Ben Johnson, my illustrious predecessor, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky. That grand old gentleman, God bless him, learned of my plight and gave me a job. I worked at that job as his secretary for almost 2 years. I had no contact whatsoever with my profession. Then, later on, by the grace of God and my good friends back home, they elected me as prosecuting attorney of Marion County, where I served three 4-year terms. Of course, then I was back in my profession, studying, reading, learning, and, above all, practicing my profession as a lawyer. But if I had stayed on as his secretary, or sold insurance, stocks, bonds, or automobiles, I would not have been a qualified practicing attorney. Had I stayed away from my profession for 10 years or so, according to law, I would, nevertheless, have been a duly licensed attorney; but, had a vacancy developed as circuit judge in my district and I had run for it, what kind of a judge do you think I would have made? Why, I would not have known a leading question from hearsay evidence.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Would the gentleman's amendment eliminate General Hawley?

Mr. CHELF. No; I do not think so, because I think his record adequately qualifies him. I am sure from what was discussed here on the floor today that he has practiced for more than 8 years, and possibly 10 or 15. But if he, or anybody else, has not practiced medicine or surgery at least for 8 years, he has absolutely no business as the head of such an important medical post wherein the lives of our men are at stake.

Mr. GREEN. He could not have been a practicing physician in the Army.

Mr. CHELF. Well, if he was regularly engaged in the practice of medicine before coming into the Army, that, of course, qualifies him. I do not think there is any question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object this time, but there are some Members who would like to finish this bill today and would like to vote on the bill. Certainly the membership has had an opportunity to talk all day. We are all in favor of the bill. I am not going to object this time, but the next time I shall.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am in agreement with this amendment, because I am sure all of us know men who are qualified doctors of medicine who have simply occupied desk jobs. They may be good at planning. They have enormous influence over the practice of medicine, but they never delivered a baby or they never took care of a kid with diphtheria. They do not know the problem of the man who takes care of the sick. I do not want desk doctors down here, however skillful

they may be at drawing plans or lobbying. I want people who know about the reactions of people who are sick.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who is himself an eminent doctor in his own right, and I am extremely honored to have him support my amendment because now I know that I am right with the doctors in the House supporting me.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Would the adoption of this amendment prevent consideration of those men who went directly from medical school into the armed forces, in which they practiced their profession, of course?

Mr. CHELF. Yes; it would preclude one in such circumstance from serving as the chief medical officer, but it certainly would not insofar as the members of the medical staff under him are concerned. Frankly, I did contemplate offering an amendment stating that any member of the medical staff should have regularly practiced medicine not less than 3 years, but after reading the bill through and gathering the information that they would be afforded an opportunity to attend refresher courses and in such manner thereby be able to study and keep abreast with medical science and developments, I thought that would be taken care of, so I withdrew any idea I had of offering an amendment with reference to that feature. But, as I say, I am interested in this bill. I want this bill to do the job that this committee have planned for it. I feel that it will, but in my heart I feel also that these boys in our veterans' hospitals are entitled to real doctors, the best that money, brains, and education can secure and produce. We do not want an incompetent at the head who has not really practiced medicine. It is for such reason I offered my amendment and I sincerely trust that the House will adopt it in the interest of our veterans who have spilled their blood that the world might be a better place in which to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is unnecessary as far as citizenship is concerned, because the bill provides he must be a citizen of the United States. It also provides that he must be a doctor of medicine and he must have served a satisfactory internship.

As to attempting to put a strait-jacket on the Administrator from the standpoint of the number of years he has practiced, I think that is entirely unnecessary. We are going to have to trust somebody. If we cannot trust the Veterans' Administrator, we had better remove him. So, I think the amendment is entirely unnecessary. I think the bill takes care of the situation. I congratulate the subcommittee on its work in that regard. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

The question was taken; and on a division, there were—ayes 30, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 3, line 6, strike out subsection (e) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Director and Deputy Director of Nursing Service shall be qualified registered nurses, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the nursing service. During the period of her service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid a salary of $8,000 a year and the Deputy Director shall be paid a salary of $6,000 a year."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my acceptance.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there is an error in the amendment. The figure $6,000 should be $7,000. I ask unanimous consent that it may be modified accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 3, line 6, strike out subsection (e) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Director and Deputy Director of Nursing Service shall be qualified registered nurses, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the nursing service. During the period of her service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid a salary of $8,000 a year and the Deputy Director shall be paid a salary of $7,000 a year."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I present this amendment is because it seems to me the Director of Nursing Service is a sufficiently important position that the person holding it ought to have a deputy director as her stand-in when of necessity she is compelled to be away from her desk, whether out of the city on inspection tours, attending professional meetings or conventions, or on other business. We have made such provision for the Chief Medical Director; he has a deputy medical director who draws only $500 less than the Medical Director himself. It seems to me a mere matter of good sense that if we want maximum efficiency in the Nursing Service it is almost as important to have a most capable deputy director of Nursing Service as it is to have a deputy medical director. I have provided that the Deputy Director shall get a salary only $1,000 less than the Director of Nursing Service. Not to provide for such a deputy director is putting an undue burden and responsibility on the Director of Nursing Service. She would have no top-notch assistants until clear down to the regional assistants, or, as they are called, assistant directors out in the field.

I hope there will be no objection to this amendment and that the Members of the House will accept it, because it seems to me to be eminently worth while.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment. The Medical Corps bills that I introduced would have provided better pay and retirement conditions. As the gentleman from Minnesota has said, frequently the Director of Nursing must be out in the field. She must have a well-trained, well-qualified assistant to take her place in the office in Washington on such occasions. And while she is in her office her assistant director often will be out in the field.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very important amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. For example, suppose major matters relating to nursing in veterans' hospitals are brought to our attention and we want quick action. If the Director of Nursing Service is out of the city or ill, or on vacation, then we must wait for action on our requests until she gets back. She ought to have a qualified deputy under her so that a person who is substantially her equal in ability and authority is on duty all the time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the amendment will be agreed to. I am not satisfied with what has been done for the nurses in this bill, but it is better than present conditions. It offers the nurses more security.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Is the gentleman familiar with the provision for an Assistant Director of the Nursing Service at $5,180? And if so, is it the gentleman's intention to strike that out and substitute what he has proposed?

Mr. JUDD No; that is not my intention. As I understand it, and as I was told by a member of the committee, the term "Assistant Director" means a grade of nurse in charge of a certain type of work in hospitals throughout the country. I understand it corresponds to the term "chief grade" as applied to doctors.

Mr. ENGLE of California. What salary does the gentleman provide for the Deputy Director of Nursing?

Mr. JUDD. Seven thousand dollars. It is similar to the provision for the Chief Medical Director and his Deputy Medical Director, save that the Deputy Medical Director receives only $500 less than the Chief Medical Director whereas in my amendment the Deputy Director of Nursing would receive $1,000 less than the Director.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Veterans' Committee will accept this,

or at least that the House will vote the amendment into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a salary of $12,000 for the chief medical officer and $11,500 for his assistant. As stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, an assistant should be just as well qualified as the chief and must take over the chief's duties whenever the chief is absent.

The discrepancy between the amount proposed to be paid the chief nurse and assistant nurse is out of all reason. The gentleman's amendment modifies this to a degree, but I do not think that there should be a bigger spread between the chief nurse and the assistant chief nurse than the bill proposes as between the chief medical officer and the assistant chief medical officer. While I think the salary proposed is a little high, nevertheless, I am not disposed to get into a controversy in regard to it. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] if he would be agreeable to amending his amendment to read "$7,500"?

Mr. JUDD. Instead of $7,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. I will accept the modification.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the chairman of the Veterans' Committee accept the amendment and make it $7,500?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I would not go that far. The amendment goes far enough.

Mr. KNUTSON. As a matter of fact, I think the entire bill, as far as salaries are concerned, goes plenty far enough. The gentleman will meet with no dispute on my part from that standpoint.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do think, however, that the committee was in a most expansive and generous mood when it drafted this measure. However, these are inflation times and the buying power of the dollar today being only 50 cents as compared with 100 cents when the Republicans were in control, I realize we must raise salaries all along the line, both public and private. It will probably be necessary before the New Dealers get through experimenting with the Government to make further increases all along the line. So I am not so optimistic as to believe that this is the final word.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will compare these salaries he will find there is not very much of an increase, as a matter of fact, in the salaries except of those at the top. There is a very slight increase.

Mr. KNUTSON. I find that when the Veterans' Committee gets through fixing salaries there has been very little left out.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] accepts the amendment that I suggested. May I ask that the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, in the interest of harmony, accept it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman from Mississippi would accept it. I think it was a mistake in not doing it before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 47, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. There shall be appointed by the Administrator such additional personnel as he may find necessary for the medical care of veterans, as follows:

(a) Doctors, dentists, and nurses;

(b) Managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians; scientific personnel, such as pathologists, bacteriologists, chemists, biostatisticians, and other medical and dental technologists.

With the following committee amendment: Page 3, line 22, strike out "such."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Any person to be eligible for appointment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery must—

(a) Be a citizen of the United States.

(b) In the Medical Service—

Hold the degree of doctor of medicine or of doctor of osteopathy from a college or university approved by the Administrator, have completed an internship satisfactory to the Administrator, and be licensed to practice medicine, surgery, or osteopathy in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

(c) In the Dental Service—

Hold the degree of doctor of dental surgery from a college or university approved by the Administrator, and be licensed to practice dentistry in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

(d) In the Nursing Service—

Have successfully completed a full course of nursing in a recognized school of nursing approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a graduate nurse in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia.

(e) In the Auxiliary Service—

(1) Manager of hospital, home, or center—

Have such business and administrative experience and qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe;

(2) Pharmacist—

Hold the degree of bachelor of science in pharmacy, or its equivalent, from a school of pharmacy approved by the Administrator, and be registered as a pharmacist in one of the States or Territories of the United States or in the District of Columbia;

(3) Physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other auxiliary employees shall have such scientific or technical qualifications as the Administrator shall prescribe.

(f) Persons may be appointed under this act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and may be paid for their services rendered under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 3, insert a new section "(e)" reading as follows: "In the Auxiliary Service."

Page 5, at the end of line 7, strike out the period and insert a colon.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEDRICK:

Page 4, line 8, after the word "medicine", strike out the phrase "or of doctor of osteopathy."

Page 4, line 12, after the word "surgery", strike out the words "or osteopathy."

Page 4, at the end of line 11, strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment to H. R. 4717, I hope the members of the committee will not think this action is for selfish reasons. I have no ax to grind with the osteopaths. As a matter of fact, I have many close friends who are members of that profession and for whom I have the highest regard.

I am offering this amendment in the interest of the Veterans' Administration and in the interest of our veterans, who will receive treatment in the various veterans' hospitals.

It is my own personal belief that the osteopaths have not had a thorough and rounded course in medical science compared with the regular medical physicians. In other words, it is my understanding, schools in which osteopathy is taught do not give their students as wide a field in general medical knowledge, especially in the use of drugs and surgical training as compared with the grade A schools of our American medical colleges. However, I do believe osteopathy has a field all its own.

If the osteopathic physician would limit his practice to that field only for which he has been trained, the medical profession would not object but would encourage patients to avail themselves of such treatment.

It appears in many parts of the country the osteopaths are endeavoring to do those things which the allopath or medical doctor, is trained to do. These are the objectionable features, and we physicians are opposed to osteopaths being recognized and accepted by the Veterans' Administration on equal basis with the medical doctors.

It is doubtful, if the majority of the fathers and mothers of our veterans would be satisfied to have their disabled sons and daughters treated by men of this profession, except in cases where osteopathy is indicated.

I have been reliably informed that there are osteopaths who claim to be medical doctors and frequently tell their patients they have an M. D. degree. It is my understanding, men in this profession made statements to the veterans' committee they were medical doctors, when this bill was being considered. Gentlemen, if this be true, it certainly

would not be necessary to recognize them as osteopaths, as they would be eligible to serve in the Veterans' Administration as medical doctors and not as osteopaths.

As a veteran in the Medical Corps of World War I and as a practicing physician for 27 years, I am greatly interested in the health, welfare, and proper treatment of our disabled veterans returning daily from the bloody battlefields of foreign countries where they fought and served. The best treatment that can be procured for these men and women who have been fortunate enough to return is none too good.

It is understood the purpose of House bill 4717 is to insure the best scientific care and treatment known to medical science to hasten as near a complete and satisfactory recovery as possible to these returning veterans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Members of the House, If osteopathy is established in the Veterans' Administration on equal footing with the medical profession, do they believe the veterans would receive the best scientific treatment available?

And if they do not further believe having two schools of thought working side by side on equal basis in our veterans' hospitals throughout the country might cause confusion and disagreement between the professional men assigned to these institutions?

This might seriously result in the retardment of the scientific treatment to which these veterans are rightfully entitled, and likely would also lessen the efficiency of the entire veteran system.

Therefore, Members of the House, I would urge each of you to support my amendment to this bill.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if the gentleman would state to the Committee whether or not he is a member of the medical profession.

Mr. HEDRICK. I am.

I have had reliable information that certain osteopathic physicians have stated on frequent occasions that they had M. D. degrees. I am also informed that some of the osteopaths that appeared before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation made the statement that they had M. D. degrees. It is perfectly possible that some of them may have had M. D. degrees. If the osteopaths had M. D. degrees, why would it be necessary to pass this bill at all? They would be eligible for employment by the Veterans' Administration as M. D.'s and would not have to get employment as osteopaths. By itself, that does not look reasonable, I am sure.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Does the gentleman think the Congress should say to the Veterans' Administration that it cannot employ osteopaths?

Mr. HEDRICK. I think under this ruling the Surgeon General of the Veterans' Administration can hire an osteopath if the patient desires this treatment.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is all this bill gives him the right to do. He can do it if he vants to. It is purely permissive. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it simply means that the Veterans' Administration cannot hire an oseopath under any circumstances. Does the gentleman believe that should be done?

Mr. HEDRICK. I do not know. I really think it will cause confusion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If an osteopath is an M. D. as well as an osteopath, then he should be employed, is that not true?

Mr. HEDRICK. If an osteopath is an M. D., we would have no objection to his being employed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have some very fine osteopaths who are also M. D.'s.

Mr. HEDRICK. Some of them may be. I could not say about that.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I should like to have the gentleman answer this question: What chance would an osteopath have under the bill as it is now written with an M. D. running the show?

Mr. HEDRICK. If I were running it he would not have any chance, I promise you that.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. The very thing they are trying to avoid, I may say to my colleague, confusion in the Administration, and this investigation that has just been concluded by the committee, will be the thing that will occur if this prevails.

Mr. HEDRICK. I believe it will cause a lot of confusion if we have professional men from two schools of thought. For example, if a patient at a veterans' hospital who really needed penicillin was being treated by an osteopath, there might be confusion between the osteopath and the M. D. as to what treatment should be pursued, and as a result the veteran probably would not get the thorough treatment he should have as a veteran of the World War.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. What would the gentleman say in the case of a veteran who did not care to be treated with the use of drugs? Would the gentleman object to a Christian Science practitioner treating him?

Mr. HEDRICK. Yes, I would object to it if I were running the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RAMEY. Then the House of Representatives should never talk about bigotry again, should it?

Mr. HEDRICK. I say that you have to have a head of all organizations. You cannot have a mixture and use more than one class of professional men. You would have confusion and overlapping.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEDRICK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that mentioning Christian Science is bringing religion into the question?

Mr. HEDRICK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come before you with clean hands on this proposition. I am not a doctor of medicine. I am not a doctor of osteopathy. I have no doctors of any kind in my family on either side, except one doctor of philosophy with whom, of course, I claim no relationship.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will not deny, however, that he is from the State of Missouri, the home of osteopathy?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I do not deny it. My hands are still clean. The Kirksville College of Osteopathy is not in my district.

The gentleman may be further assured that if my people in my district especially the veterans were not against what this proposed amendment would do I would not be so interested in it. I should like to point out, seriously, some things which deserve your consideration in connection with this amendment which my friend, the gentleman and doctor of medicine from West Virginia has offered. I understood him to contend that the parents of the veterans would object if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is given the power to hire osteopaths under certain conditions. Now, it is most singular that that kind of argument should be made. Is this a new proposition? Of course, it is not. They did not object when their sons were given this kind of treatment in the hospitals in Europe and in the Pacific.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. I said except where osteopathy was indicated. They would object except in cases where osteopathy was indicated.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Then they would not object where osteopathy is used?

Mr. HEDRICK. That is right.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement to that effect. It is difficult to reconcile it with his amendment which would prevent the Veterans' Administration from using doctors of osteopathy.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman state whether General Hawley appeared before the committee and supported or disapproved of this?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am glad to answer that question. He did appear before our committee. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that he did not object to the qualifications of osteopaths. What he did indicate was that he hoped he would not be involved in a jurisdictional dispute between doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine as he might be if this provision was left in the bill. At no time did he say anything derogatory about doctors of osteopathy. He at no time in the hearings said he would not provide these services if authorized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is not answering the question. Did he approve of this amendment?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. He could not have taken any position on the merits of it. It has only now been introduced and I suppose he has never seen it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I do want to be fair. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. General Hawley is against putting osteopaths in this bill and so stated several times. He asked us not to put them in the bill. That will be corroborated by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]. It will be corroborated by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], who is on the subcommittee and who is for the osteopaths. It will be corroborated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], who is for the osteopaths.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would modify that corroboration to this extent. General Hawley said he preferred not to have them in, but he said that we were writing the legislation.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. He did indeed. I do not wish to misrepresent what he said. It is all in the hearings. What I said—and if the gentleman from Louisiana had been listening, he would have heard me—was that General Hawley did not object with reference to the matter of qualifications. He said he was not interested in what kind of degree they had, but he was interested in what kind of work they could do. You will find that on pages 45, 46, and 47 of the hearings. The gentleman from Louisiana is beside the point. General Hawley did say he preferred this provision be left out of the bill but did not do so before the committee from the standpoint of the qualifications of osteopaths. The committee obviously was not impressed with his argument.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I think the Congress should be informed as to the exact field of osteopathy. Will the gentleman be so kind as to tell the Congress to what extent those doctors can practice because, if I recall, the president of the association said they were qualified to practice any type of medicine or surgery.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman is in error, I believe. He did say in 8 States they are qualified and are licensed to practice the same as are doctors of medicine and that in 30 States they are licensed to practice major surgery. Certainly, we are not trying to give the veterans something they should not have or force anything on them. The American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and all the other veterans' organizations I know of, have gone on record in their national conventions in favor of giving the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs authority to hire these people when qualified. General Bradley and General Hawley are in favor of this bill. Naturally, they do not like everything in it. I do not either. But certainly we have no ground for adhering to their argument that we should not involve them in a jurisdictional dispute. This is a veterans' bill. This is not a bill for doctors of medicine or doctors of osteopathy or the bureaucrats in the Veterans' Administration. Certainly osteopaths cannot be hired at the present time. This law will authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to hire them. It provides in sections 5 (b) and 6 that the Administrator shall set up the qualifications they must have. You can be sure General Bradley is not going to put any quacks in his medical service. What he needs is qualified doctors, regardless of what kind of college degree they hold. He cannot get them unless we give him the power.

It has been charged that it would create confusion to use more than one kind of doctor in veterans' hospitals. Experience indicates otherwise. This is not an untried Government policy. There was no confusion between the doctors of medicine and the doctors of osteopathy during this war in the Army and Navy hospitals. There has been no confusion from the United States Employment Compensation Act, under which the civil-service employees are given the right to use doctors of osteopathy. There was no confusion during this war when legislation which every one of you voted for enabled doctors of osteopathy to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States to deliver the babies of our veterans. What is good for the serviceman should be good for him when he takes off his uniform and becomes a veteran. All of you voted to enable him to study osteopathy at Government expense under the GI bill of rights last year. Let us be consistent.

This bill is permissive in character. It does not force the Veterans' Administration to hire osteopaths. It does give them the power and safeguards it by providing that the Administration shall determine their qualifications. When they admit they cannot get enough doctors of medicine and then oppose tapping a huge reservoir of medical talent to whose qualifications they do not object, such action does not appeal to reasonable men interested in the welfare of the veteran and I am sure will not appeal to Congress. I am not against doctors of medicine. I prefer them personally. But I am not prepared to say a veteran cannot have an osteopath when needed and preferred by him. Are you? It is pure poppycock to say doctors of medicine would not enter a veterans' hospital using doctors of osteopathy. The doctors of medicine will not boycott our disabled veterans. General Hawley testified that they worked together in Army hospitals. Together they have written a glorious page in American medical and surgical history. I salute them both.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as some of you know, I happen to be a physician.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FENTON. Not at this time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FENTON. In just a moment.

Just about a year ago I had the privilege of touring Europe with the Military Affairs Committee, and saw what a great job General Hawley, who was chief surgeon of the European theater, was doing in the medical profession for our wounded heroes.

General Hawley, I might say to you, is just as much interested in the welfare of the veterans as any individual in this body. He has shown himself to be a great doctor and a great administrator. If it were not so, he would not have been appointed as Director of the Medical Department of the Veterans' Administration.

To clear up any doubts you may have as to General Hawley's thought in this matter, may I read to you a letter addressed to me under date of December 5?

DECEMBER 5, 1945.

HON. IVOR D. FENTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FENTON: This is in reply to your inquiry as to my position regarding the inclusion of osteopathic physicians in the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration under H. R. 4717.

I am strongly opposed to the inclusion in the medical service of the Veterans' Administration of any school or cult of the healing art which bases its practices upon theories rather than demonstrable facts. This is not to say that in regular medicine there are not gaps in knowledge that are yet to be filled, but, regular medicine abandoned theories as a basis of practice after the work of Pasteur, Koch, Laverin, and other pioneers in scientific medicine. This and other scientific work has caused the disappearance from medicine of almost every school of medicine which has been based upon theory rather than fact. Hahnemahnn, for example, exerted a profound influence upon regular medicine, but once regular medicine applied the reforms pioneered by Hahnemahnn, his school of medicine slowly disappeared and the homeopathic school remains today only as a name—for physicians accepting scientific principles and practicing regular medicine.

It is a mistake to perpetuate schools of medicine opposed to the great scientific facts now being made in medical research. It would be impossible to integrate into one efficient medical service for the Veterans' Administration, a school of healing which holds tenaciously to the theory that most, if not all, human ailments are the result of dislocations of the vertebrae. With X-ray technique so developed that minute variations in normal structure can be demonstrated and measured, it is impossible to show that diseases are caused by displaced

vertebrae or cured by manipulation of the spinal column. I do not mean to infer that, in a few conditions, osteopathic manipulation is not helpful, however, physical medicine, a specialty of regular medicine has long employed comparable methods in the treatment of these selected cases and there is no need for a special school of medicine for such cases.

The additional requirements of the great majority of schools of osteopathy in this country are not comparable with the grade A schools of medicine. It seems to me that if we employ osteopathic physicians, we shall have to say that we require one standard of competence for the regular physician, and a lower standard of competence for the osteopathic physician. This, and the irreconcilable divisions in thought will produce friction in the staffs of hospitals. For these reasons, I am unable to support the inclusion of osteopathic physicians in the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. HAWLEY,
Major General, A. U. S.,
Acting Surgeon General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want first to address myself to the general provisions of the bill and then to the specific provision under consideration in this amendment.

I think the committee should be complimented on bringing in a bill that certainly will improve the medical care in the veterans hospitals.

I want to say to those gentlemen who are suspicious of me that I am a member of the medical profession still in good standing, a fellow of the American College of Surgeons because I passed a specialty board, and I am rather proud of that particular fact. I am not speaking to you, I hope, from any partisan standpoint.

You do have in the bill the requirement that certain qualifications must be set up for men to become specialists; that they must pass an American specialty board. What does that mean? It means that those men who are going to be specialists in hospitals must pass an examination prescribed by the American Medical Association, by the American College of Surgeons, or the American College of Physicians and Surgeons. This is a good approach, and should be done. I do, however, feel there is a provision in this bill which should be changed. It comes in section 14 which sets up residencies in hospitals and makes it possible for osteopaths to have residencies in veterans hospitals.

I may say to you Members who might have some doubts, that the Medical Council Board has set up certain reservations, certain qualifications, and they are quite high, for men to take residencies in hospitals, and one of those qualifications is that a person cannot be an osteopath and be on that board and get credit.

In other words, if you pass the bill with section 14 (a) in it, you will nullify the thing you want to do. You want to give good service to the veterans in hospitals, but with section 14 (a) in the bill you will not be able to get good men to go into those hospitals for residencies because they will receive no credit. Now, do you want to help the veterans? Do you want to have a high quality of service or do you want mere quantity of service?

An osteopath does not do anything that a regular physician cannot do. A regular physician and surgeon covers the entire field. You have a specialty field here for osteopaths which I do not believe ought to be in this bill. I think you will, as the gentleman who preceded me pointed out, set up some irritations within your staffs, you will have a lack of cooperation that will eventually reflect on the type of care the veterans get in the hospital. So I say in all fairness to the veterans that you ought not to set up qualifications in this bill and include the osteopaths. If you are going to include osteopaths, why not also include chiropractors, neuropaths? They are all specialties; why not include them? They have just as much right to be in here as the osteopath; but if you do include them, you are not going to get the high qualifications in the men who serve the veteran.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman has read the bill, he will find that physiotherapists are provided for.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are no qualifications set up for them.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, yes; it provides for them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It provides for mechanical physical therapists. It provides that they shall have the qualifications prescribed by the Director.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will establish the qualifications required, and they will be uniform.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; but the gentleman has just heard the letter read to the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], written by General Hawley. In view of that letter, there is not much possibility of an osteopath, chiropractor, or neuropath being appointed under the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from the osteopathic State.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. General Hawley, on page 15 of the hearings, refused to take a stand on a similar question asked him; he did not take a stand similar to that which he took in the private letter written to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The letter stands as read.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. General Hawley will have the last say. Why insist on this amendment?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Because General Hawley might not always be Director of the Veterans' Administration. It seems to run in my mind I heard some threat of his resigning because of some political pressure.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Would it make any difference?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am only concerned about giving the highest quality of care to the veteran.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I am neither a doctor of medicine or of osteopathy, nor do I come from the State of Missouri, the home of osteopathy. I would call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact, however, that during the recent American Legion convention I attended the sessions of the National Convention Rehabilitation Committee and this very question was argued longer than any other resolution that was before that committee. The opinion was almost unanimous in that committee that if the veterans desired it there should be available to them the art or science of osteopathy and they went still further and included chiropractors.

After the First World War there were thousands of veterans trained as osteopaths and chiropractors. Advocates of the resolution also stated that after the recent war there will be still more thousands trained in that science, and if that science has any value at all then the veterans should be entitled to use it. If it has no value as a science, then the Veterans' Administration should not be spending the taxpayers' money to educate the returning veterans in those two professions.

I have no axe to grind for or against either profession. I have friends with whom I have fished, hunted, and had social activities who were doctors of osteopathy and doctors of medicine. If there are cases in which these veterans want that science and they desire it, if they feel it will result in their recovery more rapidly, they should have it. There were many men at this meeting in Chicago who took the floor and testified to the results that they had obtained and to the results their sons then in the Army had obtained. May I point out that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall prescribe the regulations and conditions under which these doctors of osteopathy shall be recognized by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What service does an osteopath perform that

a regular doctor does not perform and could perform?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know. I am not a doctor of medicine or osteopathy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell us what service an osteopath can render that cannot be rendered by a qualified physician or surgeon?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I would not argue with the gentleman about that. The point is that many people under certain conditions prefer osteopathic treatments and I believe veterans should have such treatments if they want them. That is the American way.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the gentleman include chiropractors.

Mr. SHAFER. I would if the committee had seen fit to include them in this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Would it not be a great service to the veteran to give him the kind of medical practitioner he wants?

Mr. SHAFER. Certainly. This bill only provides that they will receive osteopathic treatments when they themselves indicate they want them. Certainly they are entitled to such a choice.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia who introduced this amendment to eliminate osteopaths from this bill, and those who have spoken in favor of the amendment, are doctors of medicine. They have an axe to grind. Personally, I think their stand is a selfish one and it is indefensible. We are here today to legislate for the veterans and not for the doctors. We will have the opportunity to do the latter later.

I reiterate, I believe that when veterans want the services of licensed osteopathic physicians while being treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals, they are entitled to have that treatment.

Heretofore, the Medical Section of the Veterans' Administration has refused to authorize osteopathic services for the care of veterans in hospitals and for outpatient services. As a result, many veterans who sought such services have had to do so at their own expense.

In the course of the hearings on this legislation, General Hawley, Acting Surgeon General for the Veterans' Administration, said:

> I say we used osteopaths in the rehabilitation hospitals in the European theater of operations. That service in one hospital was headed by a man who was a doctor of osteopathy and a doctor of medicine. All the men who worked under his supervision were doctors of osteopathy.

It is true that General Hawley and Gen. Omar Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, have not recommended the inclusion of osteopaths in this bill. But in spite of that, I feel that the first duty of Congress is to the servicemen, rather than to any school or combination of schools of medicine or medical politics, and notwithstanding any possible arguments between the American Medical Association and the osteopathic doctors.

Dr. Ralph Fisher, of the Philadelphia College of Osteopathy, told the committee:

> It has been suggested, I understand, that if osteopathic physicians are appointed to the Medical Corps, the doctors of medicine may refuse to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration. To boycott the Government would be bad enough, but the idea of boycotting the disabled veteran if he is furnished the services of doctors of any school of medicine other than represented by the M. D.'s, is a bill of goods no one can sell to the Congress, the medical profession, and, least of all, the disabled veterans. In my experiences, if the professional organizations let the doctors alone the doctors of medicine and the doctors of osteopathy would get along all right. Most of this friction talk is a bugaboo and a red herring anyway.
>
> Surgeon General Hawley testified before this committee the other day that a physician in whom the veteran has no confidence is worse than no physician. Many veterans place their confidence in osteopathic physicians and surgeons. Their family physicians have been doctors of osteopathy before going into the service. Many of them will not get the relief they know could be obtained if osteopathic services were available. Such of these as are ambulant cases leave the Government hospitals and obtain osteopathic services at their own expense. We submit that it is grossly unfair to those veterans not to appoint osteopathic physicians to the Medical Corps and assign them to the veterans hospitals for their treatment.

That the disabled veterans want osteopathic services in the hospitals and for out-patient services is definitely evidenced by the fact that in the 1937 and succeeding national conventions, the DAV specifically requested the Administration to make osteopathic services available.

The resolution passed at these conventions reads as follows:

> Whereas there are many disabled veterans throughout the United States who desire and need osteopathic treatment for their disabilities acquired in the World War; and
>
> Whereas there is no provision in the National Veterans' Administration for such cases to have osteopathic treatment for their particular disabilities; and
>
> Whereas there have been demands made by them for special dispensation to be made that they have osteopathic treatment; and
>
> Whereas they have been refused such demands; and
>
> Whereas many disabled veterans have received untold benefits from treatments of service-connected disabilities as a result of osteopathic therapy, obtained at cost to the veterans in preference to the free medical treatment afforded by the Veterans' Administration: Be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, in convention here assembled at Columbus, Ohio, this July 31 to August 7, 1937, recommend that the Veterans' Administration rules be so amended that osteopathic service will be available to disabled veterans on application through the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

Doctors of osteopathy are licensed in all States. To withhold the benefits of osteopathic services from disabled veterans, as has been done in the past, seems to me indefensible. By the provisions of Public Law 558 of the Seventieth Congress, Congress made osteopathic services available to injured and occupationally ill civil employees of the Federal Government. Surely the disabled veteran is entitled to no less consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat this is a bill to help the disabled veterans, not one to help the medical doctors. This amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to repeat that I have absolutely supported the American Medical Association in its fight against the socialization of medicine. I think it is awfully cheap and unfair and un-American for a member of that association to stand up here and deny the veterans of this country the right to have osteopaths treat them if that is what the veterans want. We have 30 States that have licensed this profession. It has been accepted by the people of this country. There is not one sound reason on earth for me to support a proposal merely to satisfy a group of physicians or to satisfy an administrator when the desires of the veterans of this country are at stake. I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. When this question first came before the committee, I was a little enthusiastic to include osteopaths and make them available to the veterans, because I was under the impression that an osteopath was a doctor who would give physical manipulation and under many circumstances afford much relief to the patient, and to that extent I thought it would be fine. But when we had an opportunity to cross-examine Dr. Fisher, who represented this organization before the committee, I was informed that the members of this profession were competent, according to his impression, to practice any type of medicine or any type of surgery. I recall he was asked this question: "Speaking for the profession, is it intended that these doctors who may be employed would also practice surgery in the hospitals?"

"Yes, I think that he would do the surgery if he is qualified to do so just as a capable medical surgeon would. He is certified to be a specialist in surgery and he is accredited by our national association."

I recall having asked him: "What contribution has your profession made to the advance of the science of surgery and medicine?"

And this doctor, who is the head of the organization, said: "I do not know."

So I am a little concerned and feel that these doctors will be placed on the same plane and given the same prestige as doctors of medicine. I have nothing against this profession. I have utilized their services of manipulation for rheumatic conditions personally, and they do very fine work. It may be because I am ignorant, but I am not inclined to believe that these doctors get the proper training and the proper educational background

in which to place the care and custody of our boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my judgment constrains me to follow the conclusions just reached and expressed by my colleagues from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. SHAFER]. As we do away with discrimination because of race, creed, color, or state of origin, it does seem that we ought to be able to do away with discrimination because of difference in training in certain professions when it is undisputed that those practicing those professions render a worth-while service to humanity.

If I had my way, and the veterans wanted him, and he was available, I would have old Bob, who presides down here in the gymnasium, aid them, because he has helped many a Member, including myself, when a physician was not at hand or could not or did not relieve us. Not only that, but the medical profession—the American Medical Association—is almost—now, get that word "almost"—under its present leadership, as positive—what can I say?—as self-satisfied, seems as determined to be as monopolistic, as the American Bar Association, and I happen to be a lawyer. They act as though they did not want anybody to practice medicine except a few hand-picked individuals. Now, I do not go along with that attitude. If anybody can help the veterans, I say let them in. If the doctors cannot hold their own, it is just too bad. In my opinion, the medical profession can well stand upon its record of service to humanity. It has nothing to fear unless it be the ill-advised acts of some of the association members. Not only that, but I would say to my doctor friends on this side and to the American Medical Association, I fear you fellows are going to monkey around on legislation like this until you get socialized medicine, and I am against that. Please do not furnish ammunition to the advocates of socialized medicine, make it difficult for your friends to protect you and your profession.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the medical profession. I think I have probably leveled as much criticism at times as any Member of this House against my own profession because of its failure to do a lot of things that people who are sick need. We have usually concentrated too much on organic disease and given too little attention to functional diseases and the emotional disorders and needs of patients. I am not trying to justify or deny the shortcomings of members of my profession. But I am interested, as is every other person here in getting the best care possible for sick veterans. That cannot be done without making the program proposed in this bill one which America's physicians can wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support. I am interested here in only one question—not the relative merits of osteopaths, medical doctors, or what not—but this: Will we get the highest grade doctors of this country to go into the veterans' hospitals if osteopaths are appointed under this language which makes them eligible for appointment? Of course we will not. Maybe the doctors are wrong. Cuss them all you want to, but their position is based on their long experience at the autopsy table. Many of the very best will not themselves join the staff of a hospital where osteopathy is recognized on a par with their own scientific medicine.

Furthermore, I doubt if there is a grade A medical school in the United States which will approve for residencies veterans' hospitals if its graduates will there be trained or supervised in part by osteopaths. One of the main purposes of this legislation is to improve the standards of practice in veterans' hospitals so that they will be recognized by medical schools and professional societies as qualified for residencies. Do we want to defeat that end?

I am sorry the situation is as it is. I wish very much we doctors had done our job better, and there never would have been occasion for an osteopathic or any other marginal healing philosophy to develop for the care of certain conditions, mostly functional, to which many doctors formerly did not give adequate attention. I admit it, and I know more about the situation, I think, than any one of you who is not a doctor possibly can. But the fact remains, if we want to make sure of the best care possible for the boys, we will adopt this amendment, and then we can get the veterans' hospitals on a professional level which will attract the highest grade doctors in America, and which the medical schools will approve, so the ablest medical graduates will go there for fellowships, residencies, and so forth.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman is suggesting that if the medical doctors do not get their way in this proposition they will boycott the disabled veterans by not working in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. JUDD. No. It is not because they want to boycott veterans or to have their own way; it is because they want to give the veterans the best care possible. The doctors do not need these extra jobs. Any doctor that is any good in the whole United States has a good job today. I am not for this amendment because doctors want or need a sort of closed shop in veterans' hospitals, or want to keep everybody else out just so that they can hold the jobs. You will not be able to get enough high-grade doctors to take these jobs with all the increases in salaries, unless there is also a marked increase in professional standards. Anybody that is any good as a physician today can get half a dozen jobs.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. What does the gentleman mean by saying the M. D.'s would not go into these hospitals if the D. O.'s were there?

Mr. JUDD. Many would hesitate to go into them because they could not afford, as they would regard it, to lower their own professional standards or standing.

Mr. KEARNEY. They did not do that in the Army hospitals in Europe and in the Pacific. I do not think they will boycott the disabled veterans.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think they will boycott the disabled veterans, but they will feel that they cannot afford to lower their professional qualifications. That is one of the major reasons why most doctors have not been willing to work in veterans' hospitals in the past.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman believe the veterans themselves want treatment from the osteopaths?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should not intrude myself into this discussion, but we had a little preview of this in the Committee on Military Affairs.

I am terribly sorry that our doctor friends seem to think they, our M. D.'s, have a monopoly on all the knowledge there is about healing. On other matters they have an unusual detached and intelligent view. I think half of the problem in healing people is to get the patient to have confidence in the man that is treating him.

We all know osteopathy has been in existence now for many, many years. There are thousands and thousands of boys who served in the Army who are used to being treated by osteopaths and want that kind of treatment. The psychology of the provision of the bill providing osteopaths for those veterans wanting that type of training will be excellent. In the Military Affairs Committee we had a bill to give commissions to optometrists. The evidence was that there were thousands of optometrists in the Army, in the enlisted rank, who in civil life had been examining eyes and giving advice on eyes for a long, long time, yet the Medical Department of the Army fought that bill very, very strongly. They would not concede those men had one bit of ability or that they were entitled to any recognition in the way of a commission. I will say that our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], came out in a fine way in support of the bill. The result was that we finally got a law through the House of Representatives to do justice to 60 optometrists by giving them commissions. We thus recognized the great mass of men who knew optometry, who were in the Army, and had not had a chance to use their particular skill to help our soldiers.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. What the gentleman has stated is correct so far as I am concerned except that the bill was supposed to get a rule and be brought up here for discussion. That was my understanding

with the chairman of the committee. But that was not done and when a few people were present it was brought up under unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That may be true, sir, but the bill was reported out of committee by an overwhelming vote of confidence, in fact I do not think there was a dissenting vote. If you had any doubt about the bill, you certainly did not express it by your vote in the committee when the bill was passed out.

Mr. FENTON. I certainly did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think we should give these boys the kind of treatment they want if it is not harmful to them. These osteopaths are licensed in various States and are very competent. It will militate to the advantage of the veterans to give them this kind of service.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman tell me what kind of treatment an osteopath can render that cannot be rendered by a qualified physician?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He can render a special kind of treatment in which he is specially skilled over the average medical doctor, and the patient will have more confidence in him, because the patient wants him. I consider the latter very important.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen so many doctors on the floor for some time. My interest in this amendment grows out of several years' experience as a member of the board of directors of a general hospital. I am sorry to have to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from West Virginia. These doctors are loyal. They are loyal to the fight that has been going on for years and years of the doctors trying to maintain a monopoly on doctoring people. In the past this may have been a just fight because there may have been many things that were not of high standard. But let me call to your attention the fact that an osteopath at the present time in many States has to take the same training that a medical doctor does and, further, take 2 or 3 years of special training in osteopathy. They are highly qualified to take care of a great variety of cases. They use a great many electrical gadgets, and so forth, that medical doctors cannot safely use unless they, too, take some osteopathy. Doctors specialize nowadays, and it is getting to be more and more a question of specialization. Osteopathy is one of the specialties that doctoring and medicine need in the hospitals for many types of cases. The doctors' organization, the American Medical Association, judging from the past, certainly would be opposed to this, and the doctors who belong to the organization, I believe, are obliged to fight on that side. I do not think, however, that they should take advantage of their position as Members of Congress to carry on this fight for monopoly. You who do not believe in the closed shop certainly cannot believe in this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Then you believe in it because you believe in a closed shop.

Mr. SAVAGE. Even if I believed in the closed shop I would not be for this amendment.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Does not the gentleman think that the determining factor here should be: Has osteopathy helped the veterans in the past? If it has, we certainly should not discourage that practice of osteopathy in our veterans' hospitals in the future.

Mr. SAVAGE. Why, certainly that is true. May I say that if some States do not require high standards in examinations for getting a license it is not the fault of the osteopaths. It is the fault of that particular State and they ought to raise their standards. This is not a doctors' bill; this is a veterans' bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEDRICK) there were—ayes 29, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: On page 4, line 13, before the period, insert *"Provided,* That doctors of osteopathy may serve in veterans' hospitals in only those States whose laws require doctors of osteopathy to successfully pass the same examinations as doctors of medicine."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, those of you who have so violently upheld States' rights on various pieces of legislation now have the opportunity, through this amendment which is self-explanatory, to continue your position on States' rights.

The great State of Pennsylvania is concerned in this matter. Since the other amendment was rejected, I want to read to you the expressions of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, through its chairman of the Committee on Public Health Legislation, when he said:

We are informed that there has been inserted over the objections of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration a provision whereby osteopaths are recognized on the same level as doctors of medicine and are eligible to treat our veterans.

1. In Pennsylvania, according to several State supreme court decisions, osteopaths are not permitted to practice medicine and are not physicians legally qualified to practice medicine in Pennsylvania.

2. The board of medical education and licensure has no jurisdiction over the courses in their colleges; therefore, the board of medical education and licensure has no way of determining the educational qualifications of osteopaths in Pennsylvania.

3. Pennsylvania's osteopathic law does not require an internship of at least 1 year in an approved hospital after their preprofessional and professional course before making application for licensure; therefore, osteopathic physicians lack at least 1 year of training which regular doctors of medicine are regularly required to have.

4. If osteopaths desire to do the same work as doctors of medicine, they should conform to the legal educational requirements of doctors of medicine.

5. Osteopaths were not qualified to have commissions in our military forces.

Therefore, by inserting osteopathy into this bill, in our opinion, the Federal Congress will be responsible for lowering the quality of professional services to our veterans.

That is signed by Dr. Palmer, head of the committee on public-health legislation in the State of Pennsylvania.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this House had no way of knowing what the position of General Hawley and General Bradley was on this bill. No hearings have been published.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The hearings are right over there and are available to any Member of the House.

Mr. FENTON. I asked for the hearings and they told me they were not available. I do not know what went on in the committee. I had to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] certain details. He told me that eight States would come under the provisions of my present amendment, in that those States required osteopaths to take the same examinations as physicians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that is a fair amendment, and I hope it is adopted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment requires that osteopaths have the same qualifications as physicians and surgeons? They must meet the same standard of practice?

Mr. FENTON. Must pass the same examinations.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If that was done, it should reflect in the interest of the veteran who is going to be served by either the osteopath or the physician.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Would the gentleman be in favor of the osteopaths putting a similar amendment in that would refer to the medical men—that would restrict the medical men from practicing medicine unless they were osteopaths?

Mr. FENTON. Of course, I think the gentleman is putting the cart before the horse in that instance.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. There is no State in the United States which bars the practice of medicine, is there?

Mr. FENTON. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. FLOOD. I say, there is no State in the Union which bars the practice of medicine? In reply to my friend's question.

Mr. FENTON. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we cannot support this amendment. It would simply mean the concentration in those States where this practice is permitted of those veterans who want this treatment. This is a national law, this is national legislation, and it ought not to be limited to State lines.

I hope the amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 4, line 13, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided*, That a doctor of osteopathy may serve in veterans' hospitals in only those States in which he is licensed to practice osteopathy."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the point of order that this amendment is similar to the one already voted down.

Mr. JUDD. No; it is quite different.

Mr. RANKIN. It has exactly the same effect.

Mr. JUDD. No, I am sorry, it does not—if I may differ with the gentleman from Mississippi. The other amendment permitted osteopaths to practice in veterans' hospitals in only those States where they have passed the same examinations as passed by the regular physicians. This amendment would allow osteopaths to practice in those States in which they are licensed to practice osteopathy.

The bill as written allows an osteopath to get a license in a State where the standards are the lowest and then go over into some other State whose standards are higher and would not permit him to practice.

In all our country's long history we have always allowed the practice of medicine and the healing arts to be under the control of the States. This bill for the first time to my knowledge takes it out of the hands of the States. I am merely offering this amendment to keep it in the hands of the States. It provides that a doctor of osteopathy be allowed to practice in veterans' hospitals in only those States where he is licensed to practice. Surely that is fair enough. I do not see how the gentleman can object to that. Surely that is in the interest of protecting the veteran.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The Chair is of the opinion that the amendments are not identical.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say on the amendment. To protect both our State laws and our veterans, it seems to me we ought not to take this drastic step. We ought to allow doctors, either of medicine or of osteopathy, to practice in veterans' hospitals only in those States in which they are licensed. Under present laws a doctor can take our examination in the State of Minnesota and be allowed to practice in any other State which has reciprocity with Minnesota. Let us take the case of a man licensed to practice osteopathy in the State of Mississippi. Under my amendment, the State of Missouri will qualify him; he can practice in Missouri, as well as in Mississippi, or in any other State which will accept his Mississippi license. But I do not think we in Congress ought to overrule the laws of a State which does not allow osteopaths to practice, or which will not accept the license granted by some other State.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Assume a case of this kind: Suppose an osteopath were licensed in one of the eight States that were referred to earlier in the day; you would circumscribe his right to the State in which he was licensed, and yet even though he was able to do all the things a doctor of medicine could do he could not go into any other State where a veterans' hospital was located and where he was needed.

Mr. JUDD. Can he go into that other State under present law?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. He could under this bill.

Mr. JUDD. He could if this bill becomes law, but under the laws of the several States as they exist now he can not practice in any State in which he is not licensed to practice. Neither a doctor of osteopathy nor a doctor of medicine can do that. I am recommending that we adhere to our present policy. If a State is willing to qualify a man by licensing him to practice, then he can practice in a veterans' hospital in that State.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a doctor of medicine who is licensed in Arkansas cannot practice in any veterans' hospital in the United States and can practice only in Arkansas?

Mr. JUDD. No. I said I would be perfectly willing to have such legislation. As a matter of fact, it would not make much actual difference in the case of doctors of medicine, because doctors have labored for years to raise standards so that now almost any State in the Union will accept by reciprocity the medical license that is obtained in almost any other State.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not believe it is necessary now for a doctor practicing in a veterans' hospital to say anything to the State authorities because this is on Federal property and has nothing to do with the State law.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's amendment would make it possible for an osteopath in those States that recognize osteopathy to go into a veterans' hospital in that State and practice?

Mr. JUDD. That is right, if he gets a license in that State.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. This would only allow a doctor of osteopathy from one State to go to another State and limit his practice there to a veterans' hospital. In other words, it is in a Federal hospital for veterans in which he is limited to practice. This bill would not permit a doctor of osteopathy to go from one State to another and practice in the other State on the civilian population?

Mr. JUDD. No; he would be allowed to practice only in a veterans' hospital.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. It seems to me it would be very unwise and a departure from sound policy to override the rules which the States have set up. This bill gives a man who gets a license to practice in one State the right to go to another State and practice in a veterans' hospital in that State.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman think the Veterans' Administration would be in favor of his amendment?

Mr. JUDD. I think so. I have not inquired, I may say to the gentleman, but I believe it would. I cannot see why anybody should object to this.

Mr. FLOOD. Did I understand the gentleman to say the Veterans' Administration itself was opposed to the inclusion of osteopathy in this bill?

Mr. JUDD. It was so stated here and a letter from the Director has been read here this afternoon saying that he preferred that osteopaths not be given permission to practice in veterans hospitals. The main reason given was a fear of friction and other difficulties with personnel. If this amendment were agreed to that would be alleviated somewhat.

Mr. FLOOD. Under the circumstances, the gentleman's amendment would meet the situation and the Veteran's Administration would be in favor of the amendment now presented?

Mr. JUDD. I think this amendment largely resolves the difficulties and gives

adequate protection everywhere along the line.

Mr. FLOOD. And everybody would be satisfied?

Mr. JUDD. I think so.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not understand why the gentleman says this would establish a new departure. I think he used those words. This does for osteopaths exactly what is done for all physicians now employed in the Veterans' Administration. I do not see why the gentleman says it is a new departure.

Mr. JUDD. There is a good deal of difference. As I said, there are only a very few States now whose medical licenses are not accepted by other States. That is far from true of osteopathic licenses. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] pointed out, there are only eight States which license osteopaths for essentially the same services that doctors are licensed for, giving them the same examination as doctors. He said there are 30 States licensing them to practice surgery. A large majority of the States by reciprocity accepts the licenses of doctors from other States, whereas only a few, I understand, will accept by reciprocity the licenses of osteopaths.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no reciprocity involved so far as medical doctors are concerned. They are practicing in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is subject to the same criticism that the other one was. I repeat what I said a while ago. The recent war was not a State war or a sectional war. It was a national war as was World War I. This amendment would not, in my opinion, be acceptable to the Veterans' Administration, even if they opposed the original proposition.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, this amendment proposes to put into operation a barrier.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Which the governors of all 48 States have been trying to eliminate for years in order to facilitate the economic life of our people. Now we come along here and want to set up a Federal area in a Federal hospital and start creating barriers?

Mr. RANKIN. It would embarrass the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JUDD. The barriers are there now. A man with a license to practice in Missouri cannot go to Minnesota to practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that amendments be in order to any portion thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) Appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator, without regard to civil-service requirements.

(b) Such appointments as described in subsection (a) of this section shall be for a probationary period of 3 years and the record of each person serving under such appointment in the Medical, Dental, and Nursing Services shall be reviewed from time to time by a board, appointed in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, and if said board shall find him not fully qualified and satisfactory he shall be separated from the service.

(c) Promotions of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after examination given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Automatic promotions within grade may be made in increments of the minimum pay of the grade in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator.

(d) Doctors, dentists, and nurses in the present Medical Service shall be continued in their present positions until the Administrator shall have determined their qualifications as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

(e) In determining eligibility for reinstatement in Federal civil service of persons appointed to positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, who at the time of appointment shall have a civil-service status, and whose employment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery is terminated, the period of service performed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be included in computing the period of service under Civil Service Rule IX, except that this subsection shall not be construed as authorizing restoration of any position abolished by section 1 of this act.

SEC. 7. (a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in subsection (a) of section 4 of this act shall be as follows:

MEDICAL SERVICE

Chief grade, $8,750 minimum to $9,000 maximum.

Senior grade, $7,175 minimum to $8,225 maximum.

Intermediate grade, $6,230 minimum to $7,070 maximum.

Full grade, $5,180 minimum to $6,020 maximum.

Associate grade, $4,300 minimum to $5,180 maximum.

Junior grade, $3,640 minimum to $4,300 maximum.

DENTAL SERVICE

Senior grade, $7,175 minimum to $8,225 maximum.

Intermediate grade, $6,230 minimum to $7,070 maximum.

Full grade, $5,180 minimum to $6,020 maximum.

Associate grade, $4,300 minimum to $5,180 maximum.

Junior grade, $3,640 minimum to $4,300 maximum.

NURSE SERVICE

Assistant Director, $5,180 minimum to $6,020 maximum.

Senior grade, $4,300 minimum to $5,180 maximum.

Full grade, $3,640 minimum to $4,300 maximum.

Associate grade, $2,980 minimum to $3,640 maximum.

Junior grade, $2,320 minimum to $2,980 maximum.

(b) Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

SEC. 8. (a) Within the restrictions herein imposed, the Chief Medical Director may rate any doctor appointed under subsection (a) of section 4 of this act as a medical or surgical specialist: *Provided*, That no person shall at any one time hold more than one such rating.

(b) No person may be rated as a medical or surgical specialist unless he is certified as a specialist by an American specialty board, recognized by the Administrator where such boards exist; or if no such boards exist, he has been examined and found qualified by a board appointed by the Chief Medical Director from specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery holding ratings in the specialty to which the candidate aspires: *Provided*, That, whenever there are insufficient specialists, rated in the proper specialty, who are readily available to constitute such a board, the Chief Medical Director may substitute consultants with comparable qualifications employed under section 14 of this act.

(c) Any person, rated as a medical or surgical specialist under the provisions of this section shall retain such rating until it shall be withdrawn by the Chief Medical Director: *Provided*, That the Chief Medical Director shall not withdraw any such rating until it shall have been determined by a board of specialists that the person holding such rating is no longer qualified in his specialty.

(d) Any person, rated as a medical or surgical specialist under the provisions of this section, shall receive, in addition to his basic pay, an allowance equal to 25 percent of such pay: *Provided*, That in no event shall the pay plus the allowance authorized by this subsection exceed $11,000 per annum.

SEC. 9. Persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions of and entitled to the benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 691 and the following).

SEC. 10. (a) The Chief Medical Director, under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, shall from time to time appoint boards to be known as disciplinary boards, each such board to consist of not less than three nor more than five employees, senior in grade, of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, to determine, upon notice and fair hearing, charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of any person employed in a position provided in subsection (a) of section 4 of this act.

(b) The Administrator shall appoint the chairman and secretary of the board, each of whom shall have authority to administer oaths.

(c) The Chief Medical Director may designate or appoint one or more investigators, to assist each disciplinary board in the collection and presentation of evidence. Any person answering to charges before a disciplinary board may be represented by counsel of his own choosing.

(d) A disciplinary board, when in its judgment charges are sustained, shall recommend to the Administrator suitable disciplinary action, within limitations prescribed by the Administrator, which shall include reprimand, suspension without pay, reduction in grade, and discharge from the Department of Medicine and Surgery of such person. The Administrator shall either approve the recommendation of the board, approve such recommendation with modification or exception, approve such recommendation and suspend further action at the time, or disapprove

such recommendation. He shall cause to be executed such action as he approves. The decision of the Administrator shall be final.

SEC. 11. There shall be appointed by the Administrator under civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, such additional employees, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a), of section 4, and those specified in section 14 of this act as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That employees of the Medical Service as at present constituted, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a), of section 4, and section 14 of this act, shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon certification of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where such person is presently employed: *And provided further*, That the per annum salary range for hospital attendants shall be $1,572 minimum to $1,902 maximum.

SEC. 12. The Administrator shall establish a special medical advisory group composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, nominated by the Chief Medical Director, whose duties shall be to advise the Administrator, through the Chief Medical Director, and the Chief Medical Director direct, relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans, and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The special medical advisory group shall conduct regular calendar quarterly meetings. The number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members of such advisory group shall be in accord with existing law and regulations.

SEC. 13. (a) The expenses, except membership fees, of employees described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 of this act detailed by the Chief Medical Director to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical and related sciences are hereby authorized subject to available appropriations.

(b) (1) The Administrator is authorized to place employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 of this act on duty, for a period not to exceed 90 days in a year, in schools, of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, and in civil institutions of learning, with the consent of the authorities concerned, for the purpose of increasing the professional knowledge or technical training of the personnel of the Department: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the personnel of the Department be placed upon such duty at any one time.

(2) The Administrator is authorized, subject to available appropriations, to pay for tuition, transportation, and educational fees of personnel placed on duty under the provisions of subsection (b) (1) of this section.

(c) Any person authorized to attend a course of training shall be required to reimburse the Veterans' Administration the expenses thereof if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after completion of such course.

SEC. 14. (a) The Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, may employ, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, physicians, dentists, and nurses, on a temporary full-time, part-time, or fee basis; and dietitians, social workers, librarians, and such other professional, clerical, technical, and unskilled personnel, in addition to personnel described in section 3, subsection (a), of section 4, and section 11 of this act, on a temporary full-time or part-time basis at such rates of pay as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no temporary full-time appointment shall be for a period of more than 90 days.

(b) The Administrator shall have authority to establish residencies; to appoint qualified persons to such positions without regard to civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; and to prescribe the conditions of such employment, including necessary training, and the customary amount and terms of pay during the period of such employment and training.

SEC. 15. The Chief Medical Director with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; transportation of household goods and effects, and travel; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

SEC. 16. (a) Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by the Administrator exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of the activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery or interagency rules governing its relations with other agencies of the Government, a draft thereof shall be submitted on the same day to the Committee on Finance of the Senate of the United States and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives for study, to consider whether such rule or regulation is made in conformity with the spirit, letter, intent, and purpose of this act, and that no unusual or unexpected use of powers herein granted is proposed. Such regulation or order may be approved or disapproved by the Committee on Finance of the Senate or by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or a duly authorized subcommittee of either. In the absence of action by either committee approving or disapproving such regulation or order, it may go into effect not earlier than the fifteenth day following, but not including the date of the receipt of the draft of such proposed regulation or order by the chairmen of such committees. Disapproval of such regulation or order by either committee shall suspend its issuance.

(b) For the purposes of this section the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized to sit and act during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress.

SEC. 17. This act shall be effective from the date of its approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 8, line 1, strike out "nurse" and insert "nursing."

Page 9, line 14, strike out the words "per centum" and insert "percent."

Page 11, line 6, strike out the first comma, and on page 11, line 10, strike out the second comma.

Page 13, line 12, strike out the second comma.

Page 14, line 4, strike out "deductions" from pay for quarters and subsistence" and insert "travel", and on page 14, line 5, strike out the words "and travel" and insert "and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to raise a question about section 11. I am not going to offer an amendment to this section, but I want to ask this question: I am just wondering whether, as a matter of fact, the salaries provided in this section, and notably the salaries for attendants in hospitals, are high enough to get the caliber of people that ought to be working in these veterans' facilities. We have had a good deal of difficulty in regard to attendants, particularly in neuropsychiatric hospitals, and I am worried particularly about the attendants' salaries which appear on page 11.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from California. I have yisited nine of these hospitals. The doctors are stationed there but a short time—nurses maybe longer. It is especially in the neuropsychiatric hospitals that the attendant is there night and day. If you have only an attendant, that attendant gives the patients barbiturates to put them to sleep. I think the attendant should be an associate of the veteran and he should be a man of high standing. I concur in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman tell me whether there is any suggestion on the part of any member of the committee to increase that amount?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. May I say to the gentleman that the figure we put in the bill, on page 11, is approximately $200 on each level above the present salary per annum, and is the figure suggested by General Hawley. We put it in the bill at his suggestion, and if it does not work out, subsequently we will raise it again.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All right. I would like to say to the gentleman that that is exactly what I wanted to hear from the committee; in other words, this does represent an increase in the pay now received, No. 1.

In the second place, if we find that this does not get the caliber of people that ought to be in those jobs, the committee will be prepared to come before the Congress with another bill to further increase that compensation. Is that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from California is correct. It may be we will have to increase these salaries later, but for the time being this met with the approval of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One point I want to make is that I do not believe we ought to be penny-wise and pound-foolish with regard to getting the caliber of people that are needed in some of these jobs where they can minister so much to the needs of our veterans, and where the jobs are difficult at best.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I ask some member of the committee whether there is anything in this bill which gives any right of review to a physician who has been discharged? As I understand, the bill provides that the director can discharge any physician whom he deems incompetent. The question was raised

whether or not such a discharged person would have the right of review by any board or any other person.

Mr. RANKIN. We certainly would not have him put back on the roll by the Court of Claims.

Mr. EBERHARTER. This is not a facetious question. I should like to have an answer.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman will find that in section 10, where the disciplinary boards are established to hear grievances. It begins on page 9 and covers all of page 10.

Mr. EBERHARTER. As I see it, it does not say that if a doctor is discharged he has the right of appeal.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. He has the right to appeal to the Board, and the decision of the Administrator is final.

Mr. RANKIN. The decision of the Administrator is final.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is vital to pay these men well in order to get the best types. I am sorry they are not taken in as part of the permanent corps, with retirement benefits that would be a real inducement. Also, I feel that in every hospital there should be a permanent force. This is extremely important. I for one shall vote for an increase in their pay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to strike out my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that upon the adoption of this bill there will be a discussion upon important national issues by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], and that the two special orders which are supposed to precede have been canceled.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to leave two observations and make two predictions. I believe making predictions is a rather dangerous business, but I predict that under this bill you will have a much better administration of the Veterans' Administration and a much better group of men in there.

I also predict that about half of the medical men now in the Veterans' Administration will be looking for jobs when the bill does go into effect.

I further predict that it will be impossible to keep from making this a political football unless we have an Administrator that is a hard-headed, straight-jacketed man, because one of these days the medical men, dentists, and nurses are going to appeal to the Members of Congress and say, "Now listen. I supported you in your campaign." If we have a man at the head of the Veterans' Administration such as we have at the head of the Post Office Department, you can expect to make this a political football, which will not react in favor of the veterans of this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from Nebraska, I call his attention to the fact that General Bradley is a grandson on one side of a Confederate soldier and on the other side of a Federal soldier. I do not think he ever voted in his life. I think this Veterans' Administration will be clear of politics. I know it has been so in the Veterans' Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Of course, General Bradley will not live forever.

Mr. RANKIN. He will be here as long as we will.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska why half of the doctors will be looking for jobs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If we get a Hannegan here like we have at the post office, you will see a political football being made of this.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER:

On page 14, line 25, strike out the words "or a duly authorized subcommittee of either."

On page 15, lines 11 and 12, strike out "or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof."

On page 15, line 13, after the words "and act" insert "by duly authorized subcommittees" and strike out the word "sessions."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is similar in effect to the two amendments which I had suggested. Therefore, I will not offer those amendments.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have spoken to the gentleman from Texas about this. We were in accord on our ideas but our words did not quite reach the point we had in mind. I accepted Mr. Lanham's suggestion and, therefore, submitted these amendments to this section of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: On page 14, line 9, strike out all of section 16.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment to this section. I would prefer not to offer it until after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is acted upon. But will I be out of order in offering it afterward in case the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is not adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. After the gentleman from Tennessee consumes the time allotted to him for debate, the gentleman from California can offer his perfecting amendment. His perfecting amendment will then be voted upon. After that, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 64, noes 25.

Mr. EBERHARTER Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PRIEST. Does all of this come out of my time, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It does.

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing the amendment to strike out section 16, I would like to express my appreciation to the committee for bringing this bill before the House.

On February 19, last, I introduced H. R. 2253, to set up a medical commission corps in the Veterans' Administration. I am happy that this bill has been brought to the House.

With reference to section 16, without regard to the amendment that was agreed to a few minutes ago, I feel that the adoption of this provision in this bill would be a very dangerous departure for the legislative branch of the Government. Our functions are very well set out under the Constitution We are a legislative body. We have a judicial branch and an administrative branch of the Government. The effect of section 16, very briefly, it seems to me, would place the Congress or one committee of the House or the Senate in the position of assuming and exercising not only semiadministrative responsibilities but judicial responsibilities as well. They would then be in the position of interpreting the law that has been passed, and passing on administrative regulations for the administration of that law by the agency.

The distinguished chairman of this committee, in discussing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] stated this afternoon, and I quote his words:

We have to trust somebody, and if we cannot trust the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, then we should remove him.

I would say to the gentleman and to members of the committee, that that substantially is the way I feel about this section. We do have to trust somebody. If we cannot trust the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, without submitting the regulation to a congressional committee for their approval, then we should remove him and put someone there that we can trust.

In my opinion this is not only an unworkable provision but in my opinion it is unconstitutional.

It is a further encroachment by the legislative branch of the Government on the judicial and administrative branches of Government. In my opinion, it is entirely unworkable.

I tried all day to get some fuller interpretation of the first few lines of the provision, and I cannot understand yet what sort of rules and regulations or proposed rules and regulations the provision applies to. "Before any proposed regulation or order to carry out the purposes of this act shall be issued by the Administrator exercising authority conferred hereunder, other than administrative rules or orders governing the conduct of the activities of the Department of Medicine and Surgery," and so on through some language that I have not been able to get clear. I think the effect of the amendment would be to considerably hamper and retard the administration of Veterans' Affairs, and I hope it will be voted down, because it is unworkable, and I believe unconstitutional and a dangerous departure for the legislative branch of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California:

On page 14, line 23, strike out the words "or disapproved"; and on page 15, line 1, strike out the period and insert "; or such committees or subcommittees may present to either the House of Representatives or the Senate, a resolution disapproving such regulation or order."

On page 15, line 7, strike out the word "Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "the House of Representatives or the Senate."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry; I cannot yield in 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, briefly, would be to permit the Committee to approve a regulation, but it would not give the Committee the power to disapprove one. It would say that if the Committee saw fit to try to disapprove a regulation it would have to bring in a resolution to the House of Representatives, and the latter body would have to disapprove the matter.

It does not seem to me that the power to disapprove a regulation of this kind ought to be lodged in the Committee. It seems to me if it is going to be lodged anywhere it should be lodged in the entire body of the House. That is all there is to my amendment.

I now yield for a parliamentary inquiry if the gentleman wishes to make one.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I merely wanted to inquire whether or not the 15-minute limitation of debate applied to the previous amendment or to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi was that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to say in conclusion that unless this amendment is adopted I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. For how long?

The CHAIRMAN. For a little short of 2 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Members would read section 16. To my mind it is a very, very serious proposition to give any committee of this House the power of veto over any proposed regulation issued by an administrative agency. It is a radical departure from any legislation Congress has ever passed, that has come to my knowledge. I think it absolutely is without doubt an encroachment upon the prerogatives of the executive agencies of the Government. It would give a small committee of this House an absolute power over the administration of the medical department of the Veterans' Administration. It would be unwise in every respect. I doubt whether any agency of this Government which would agree to such a proposition would be entitled to any confidence. If we have confidence in an agency of this Government why compel it to come up here with every regulation and order it issues, and as the committee wants it, have a subcommittee, possibly a subcommittee of one member as the committee originally had it, disapprove it?

Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous type of legislation, and I hope the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I had intended to offer and about which I spoke a few minutes ago.

Do not forget that we struck out of a bill which was brought before this House relating to OPA a similar provision. The same argument was made against that provision that is being made against this one. The section should, of course, be stricken from the bill. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], said, this sets up these two committees, the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Veterans' Legislation as judges, and makes them virtually a legislative body too, it seems to me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It makes them a judicial body.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is what I meant when I said it would make them judges.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to section 16. When shall I offer it?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is now pending to strike out the section; a perfecting amendment is also pending which will have to be disposed of first.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is agreed to, what, then, is the parliamentary situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The question will then recur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to strike out the section.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That would strike out the section, notwithstanding the clarifying amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman states the situation correctly.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Has all the allotted time been consumed on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The gentleman from South Carolina is on the list after the gentleman from California.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the committee on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated on this floor time after time during the last several years that the executive branch of the Government was trespassing on the rights and privileges of the legislative branch by constantly reading matters and increased powers into legislation that were not contemplated by the Congress. That is, the executive branch of the Government was reading into the enforcement of the law things that were not embodied or even implied in the act.

As I understand it, this amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] means that when an executive or administrative officer undertakes to enforce this act and issues regulations and orders, before such orders or regulations go into effect they must first be submitted to the committee from which the bill was reported in the first place. If the committee feels that it is an order or regulation not contemplated in the law, then that committee has the right to bring it to the attention of the House and we will then decide whether the orders or regulations reflect the intention of the Congress at the time the law was originally enacted.

If they do not express the intention of the Congress then we can disapprove such orders and regulations and thereby prevent the executive branch from enlarging its powers and trespassing on the rights of the legislative branch. If the Congress really wants to put a curb on what is so frequently referred to as bureaucracy the amendment offered by the gentleman from California should be adopted, and a similar provision should hereafter be inserted in all legislative bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided; and there were—ayes 99, noes 11.

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much the undue haste with which we are disposing of this final important section of the bill. I have only this much to say that section 16, as it now stands, makes it possible for a subcommittee of one or two members, sitting during a recess or during an adjourned period of Congress to pass upon congressional policy by vetoing rules or orders or regulations which the administrative section of government, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, exercises or promulgates. We are adopting a policy here of allowing two men to set up or obstruct the policy of an administrator. A subcommittee of a committee of either House of Congress can obstruct the administrative functions of the Veterans' Administration. Therefore, I ask you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to strike out section 16.

I am heartily in favor of this bill, which will give General Bradley the necessary powers to correct the abuses which have accumulated during the administration of General Hines. The fact that such a bill is now necessary speaks more eloquently than words of the deplorable condition that we seek to correct. The responsibility for such conditions lies either at the door of the former Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, General Hines, or at the door of the World War Veterans Committee of Congress. It probably is the result of inefficient administration and in sufficient legislation and therefore a joint responsibility.

Attempts to whitewash the former Administrator or excuse the Veterans' Committee for their lack of diligence in advocating corrective legislation does not impress the thinking Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] for just this simple reason: A vote by this Committee in support of Mr. PRIEST's amendment I interpret as a vote of confidence in General Bradley. A vote against the Priest amendment I think General Bradley can interpret very clearly as a vote of lack of confidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California changes the situation very much. I fully appreciate the efforts of the veterans' committee on behalf of the veteran, but the provisions is really vicious. It strikes at the very heart of our system of three branches of government in our country and it will give undue power to two or three men of a congressional committee probably at a time when Congress is not in session, maybe in an election year when there are probably few Representatives in Washington to listen to the protests of the Veterans' Administrator, and it diminishes the confidence which we should have in General Bradley as the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration. I hope that the House will not put these restrictions upon him at the outset of his career as Veterans' Administrator. It will not be in the interest of the war veteran to retain this provision, in what is otherwise a very fine piece of work on the part of the World War Veterans' Committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOYLE: Page 15, line 8, after the word "issuance", section 16 (a) of said bill, add the following language: "*Provided*, That no such disapproval of such regulation or rule by the Administrator shall be of any force or effect unless said disapproval by the committee making the same shall be in writing and shall clearly set forth their reasons therefor."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the purport of my proposed amendment, as just read to you by the Clerk, goes to this important point in this section 16 (a), which I believe to be poor legislation. I hope the whole section will be stricken out when the opportunity to do so is given this Committee.

But as it now provides, it permits the disapproval of a proposed rule or regulation as determined upon by the Administrator as being in the interests of the veteran, by two or more members of this Committee who might happen to be functioning as a subcommittee, to stop the proposal of the Administrator. And, furthermore, they do not have to even send him written notice of such disapproval or give him any statement of their reasons for their disapproval. This sort of authority vested thus could easily result in a sort of functioning by too few Members over the destinies of the whole Department of Medicine for the veterans and its entire personnel. Remember you have exempted much of this personnel from civil-service protection.

My amendment will require a record made and reasons given for such committee disapproval. We certainly want to know by what reasoning our committee determines its course of important differences with the Veterans' Administration. I doubt the sufficiency of a committee of Congress trying to qualify as experts as to the internal workings of a complicated problem like this to such extent as this paragraph 16 (a) would require to be impartially helpful.

Furthermore, I do not want to have a committee of so few as a subcommittee is, determine for me what my interest and spirit is about any given legislation affecting the veterans, unless I have had opportunity to make clear just what my intent and spirit may be. No committee of Congress can announce my intention upon a matter about which I have had no express opportunity to declare my intent. Yet, at lines 19 and 20 on page 14 this right is given such subcommittee. This is too much power. It is neither necessary nor sound nor safe legislation.

I am surprised that with all the noise and confusion there is and the reasonableness of my amendment, that the committee does not accept same. I submitted it to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the committee chairman. He read it but said he could not accept it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As far as we are concerned, there is no objection to this amendment. That is probably the way disapproval would be expressed anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. We accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired except the time allotted to the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas for a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the Chair stated that all time had expired, and all time had expired because the gentleman from Mississippi took his seat thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that all time had expired except the time allotted to the committee.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I should like in this brief moment just to observe that this section 16 was merely one of those amendments to regulate the regulators, and that neither General Hines, when he was the Administrator, nor General Bradley, now that he is the Administrator, offered any objection to an amendment of this kind.

There has been a great deal of complaint at various times that we were abrogating our own legislative power and delegating it to these various departments. This section 16 merely does one thing, and that is to see that the regulations that are written are in conformity with the spirit and intent and letter and purpose of this law as passed, and that no unusual uses are made of the powers herein granted.

There have been many times when Members of this House have cried long and loud about the usurpation of powers by these various bureaus. This sort of regulation, which is not a new departure, was adopted in the amendment to the Readjustment Act of 1944 last summer just prior to the recess.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Mississippi because two speeches have been made since my amendment to this section was adopted. In view of the adoption of my amendment those speeches are in error, because in those speeches it was said that a subcommittee could still express disapproval and cause one of these regulations not to go into effect; but under my amendment that becomes impossible. The whole House of Representatives is the only body or the entire Senate is the only body that could disapprove a regulation and cause it not to go into effect under the amendment and under the section as now amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCRIVNER) there were—ayes 107, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 13, line 16, after the word "days", strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided also*, That after any veteran has been duly examined by the Administration and a condition has been diagnosed which entitles such veteran to treatment, such veteran shall have the right to select any physician and/or hospital in the community where he or she resides to care for such condition, and the Administration shall enter into an agreement with such physician or hospital to pay the costs of treatment."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not in order. The amendment is not germane.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order for the moment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, do we really want to do something to help cure the sick veteran? If the veteran is taken care of by his home physician and hospital, he already has obtained a substantial portion of the cure for his affliction. The mental comfort this would give him would go a long way toward helping him to get well. There is no question about that. It would be pleasing to him and to his family. I would like to know if we want to give the sick veteran the best treatment available, and if we do, then we should let him choose his own doctor. I wager that if this proposition were put up to the veterans of this country, they would vote overwhelmingly for this amendment, because they would like to be taken care of in their own communities where they know their doctors and hospitals and where they could be with their wives and friends.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The Chair is ready to rule.

Section 14 relates to the appointment and pay of employees by the Administrator. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio undertakes to direct the type of medical treatment, the selection of physicians, hospitals, and so forth, by veterans examined by the Administrator and diagnosed as requiring such treatment, which is beyond the scope of section 14. Therefore, the point of order is sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, pursuant to House Resolution 427, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 206, noes 0.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty Members are present; a quorum.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the House Military Affairs Committee today by the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army on the subject of universal military training.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Wooster (Ohio) Record.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Elsworth Huntington.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the special order granted me to address the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S LABOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, public indignation, approaching anger; the probability of violence and rioting if the widespread strikes continued to increase, lighted the path of wisdom and induced President Truman to loosen the shackles with which the Roosevelt administration, for 10 years or more, in behalf of its political allies, has prevented Congress from enacting remedial legislation designed to lessen labor disputes and prevent strikes.

Only the coming days will disclose whether the administration will permit the adoption of just, workable, effective legislation; whether Congress will legislate intelligently and effectively.

The President made certain recommendations and today the House Labor Committee, of which I am a member and which has been dormant for 10 years,

begins consideration of his recommendations, embodied in H. R. 4908.

Briefly, it provides that, whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that Government agencies charged with the functions of mediation and conciliation of a labor dispute have been unable to bring the parties to an agreement or to voluntarily submit to arbitration, and also finds that a stoppage of work seriously affects the national public interest and interstate or foreign commerce, the Secretary shall certify his findings to the President.

Thereupon the President may appoint a board to investigate the dispute, and to, within 20 days, make a report of its findings and recommendations.

The board or any of its agencies, under the bill, will have authority to examine the books and records of any party to a labor dispute; to compel "from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any place designated by such agent," the attendance of and the giving of testimony by any individual it desires to examine.

If, for 5 minutes, or preferably for an hour, you will examine the statement just made, which is accurate and can be verified by an examination of section 3 (b), line 24, page 3, and lines 1 to 8, inclusive, page 4, of H. R. 4908, you will arrive at the inescapable conclusion that the legislation requested is arbitrary, unjust; designed, whatever the intent, to add to rather than diminish the causes of labor disputes.

The bill provides that, while the Board is functioning, unless the parties otherwise agree, the status quo shall be maintained and that it shall be unlawful for any person to coerce or encourage, or conspire to coerce or encourage, any person to interfere with the operation of the industrial plan affected by the dispute. No penalty for a violation of this provision is provided for by the bill.

While the Board is required to make its report of its findings and its recommendations to the President, no further action, unless it be the publication of the report, is contemplated by the bill.

When the committee—biased or unbiased—and its employees have finished their inquisitions, its conclusions as to the merit or lack of merit of the claims of the parties to the dispute are, through the President, given to the public, and labor and management are then, because of public sentiment created by the report, presumed to settle the pending dispute in accordance with the recommendations.

The proposed legislation, if advanced as a remedy for the prevention of strikes, for the settlement of labor disputes, is a straw man, which will be either blown away or go up in the smoke of the first real industrial dispute.

A REMEDY

Do I hear you ask, If I don't like it, what have I to offer? Here is my answer:

Amend the National Labor Relations Act, which, once regarded as labor's magna carta, has been vigorously criticized by every responsible union leader as well as by employers. Such constructive amendments have been offered by me.

It is an unjust, unworkable law, designed to aid in the persecution of employees and employers who refused to accept the domination of a union. It promoted, rather than diminished, the causes of labor disputes.

It should be amended so as to protect the employees, as well as the union; so as to impose equal and reciprocal duties and penalties upon unions, members of unions, and employers.

Where a labor dispute occurs in a public utility, whose operations are controlled by the Federal Government, provide first for voluntary arbitration; that failing, settlement through a court award.

Pass the so-called Hobbs bill, which would end the practice of the teamsters' unions in levying tribute upon every trucker and truck driver who uses the public highway. The Senate has prevented the enactment of that law for more than 2 years.

Fourth, and more important than anything else, insist upon the enforcement of laws designed to prevent coercion, violence, and rioting.

Those things accomplished, labor disputes and strikes will gradually diminish in number and intensity.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the first of next week, or the middle of next week, one of the most publicized measures that we have been discussing this year will be brought to the floor of the House, the full-employment bill. In my remarks today I want to discuss some statements that have been made by various religious leaders of all faiths and denominations in which they express their hope that this House will pass this full-employment bill in its strengthened, forceful form.

Continually, in recent months, I have been asking myself, what is the essential meaning of democracy, and how is it related to basic human rights and to freedom?

I am very much concerned with this issue, because so many strange things have been said of late, in these congressional Halls, in committee hearings, in the press, and on the radio, all in the name of democracy.

I was under the impression that those of us who have lived through two terrible world conflicts, both of which were fought to preserve democracy, were pretty well agreed as to the meaning of the term. But when I listen to so much persistent and apparently sincere oratory directed against the right to work as undemocratic—when I am repeatedly told that if this country undertakes to plan against unemployment and depression, we shall lose our freedom—well, I begin to wonder whether we really understand this democratic system with which we are blessed.

The tenor and theme of my remarks today has been aptly summed up by Secretary Vinson who told the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

> It is a false dilemma which gives us the choice between full employment and free society * * * those who tell us that depressions are the price we pay for freedom are doing no favor to the cause of freedom.

Most of the opposition to the full-employment bill has been based on this false distinction which places democracy and freedom on one side and full employment on the other. Let me illustrate with some of the more recent remarks made on this floor.

Recently the chairman of the committee considering this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] told us:

> I think if this bill is passed in its present form it would wreck our system of private enterprise * * * it will enslave the workingmen of this country.

And another member of this same committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] stated:

> I think this bill as written * * * would be just about as dangerous as the atomic bomb. * * * It would probably eliminate the Congress within a very few years. * * * Full employment, if at all possible, is possible only with a completely regimented economy * * * only under some form of totalitarianism. * * * Most of the opponents of this bill would prefer going hungry in the future than seeing American democracy sold down the river for a mess of pottage.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that last sentence: "Most of the opponents of this bill would prefer going hungry in the future than seeing American democracy sold down the river for a mess of pottage."

I want to concur with Mr. GOSSETT in that statement. So, in fact, would not most, but all of the sponsors of the full-employment bill. But the issue I want to raise with you today is this—How long do you think American democracy will survive if large segments of the population are allowed to go hungry?

I am trying to be realistic about this democracy of ours. And it is when I am most hardheaded and realistic that I come to the conclusion that democracy is not compatible with mass unemployment. Full employment is a major requirement of democracy.

This is true in a double sense. Economically it is true because our democratic system of private enterprise depends upon markets and profits. And unless there is full employment there will not be enough purchasing power to support profits and markets, producers will have to turn to the Government or to monopoly controls, and the free competitive system will collapse. Much of the debate over the bill has been in these economic terms, and I do not need to elaborate the point here.

But it is also true in the much more fundamental human terms in which I am talking today that we cannot preserve our democracy if we allow millions of our citizens to go without means of livelihood, dignity, and self-respect.

Since none can speak so eloquently of these human values than those who have devoted their lives to working with men as individuals, I am going to talk today

largely through the mouths of church leaders. The men of the church, indeed, have been among the most ardent supporters of the full employment bill. The measure has been officially endorsed by the major Protestant denominations represented by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, by the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Synagogue Council of America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the United Council of Church Women, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, and the Methodist Federation for Social Service.

In addition, the most persuasive testimony we have had in the Senate and House committee hearings has been that of men like Bishop G. Bromly Oxnam; Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago and founder of the Catholic Youth Organization; the Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady; the Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio; Rabbi Abram Opher; Rabbi Stephen Wise; and Reinhold Niebuhr.

Typical of resolutions adopted by religious leaders is that of the Presbytery of this city of Washington on November 12, 1945. Because of its straightforward expression, I quote it here in full:

Whereas the Senate has passed the full-employment bill with some amendments (S. 380);

Whereas the House of Representatives, through its Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is considering the full-employment bill (H. R. 2202); and

Whereas the bill has suffered unfortunate and slow treatment: Be it

Resolved, That we, the Presbytery of Washington City, express our concern as Christian ministers and laymen:

(1) That the opportunity for work be afforded every able-bodied man, which is his God-given right;

(2) That Government take its responsible place with industry and labor in the provision of jobs; and

(3) That the committee report out the bill with a strong vote, free of encumbering amendments.

Be it further known that we shall support, individually and collectively, this bill, which we consider to be a cornerstone in the building of a stronger and better world.

Why should the church be interested in anything so mundane as jobs or the economics of full employment? How does its concern with moral and spiritual values reach over into the field of national budgeting to prevent unemployment?

Simply because the right to earn a living is a prerequisite for both the Christian and the democratic way of life. Both are built around the concept of individualism. If Christianity is the moral framework for true individualism, democracy is no less the institutional framework for true individualism.

The emphasis is all on that word "individualism," a term that implies the right of every individual to realize his potentialities. It means equal opportunity for every man to make the most of himself.

Without preaching a sermon I believe I could show you that the underlying theme in Christ's teaching is a recognition and justification of the individualism which is at the very center of moral life. Jesus taught individualism in various ways. In pleading for love and forgiveness He was asserting the duty of every man to recognize and respect with all his heart as well as his intellect the values of every other man. In the realization that one's own values have no priority over another's, one acquires humility and tolerance. At the same time there is the positive revelation that each man's purposes are equally important with all others, that each individual is responsible before God for his own highest self-fulfillment. From this flows a sense of sincerity, integrity, and a restless striving toward the ideal that is at once duty and privilege. Finally to realize that all men have the same responsibility of self-development, and thus stand in the same relationship to the ideal, culminates in a feeling of universal brotherhood. The one unchanging necessity of Christian living is the ceaseless unfolding of every personality. To this demand all moral precepts must conform.

Democracy, likewise, is a way of life—a way of life that encompasses all that we do and are and think. It is social, educational, and economic as well as political. Democracy means respect for the rights of the individual. It means that each person, regardless of his sex, his color, his religion, or his national background has certain inalienable rights which cannot be taken away from him by any human power. Moreover it contemplates that there should be equality of opportunity to develop those talents, abilities, and capacities which he has been endowed with by an Almighty Creator. This does not mean any gross equality. It does not mean $70 every Saturday for everybody. It does not mean a tearing down of our economic structure and an arbitrary division of income and wealth. It does not mean a college education for all. It means exactly what I said—namely, equality of opportunity without barriers.

Let me state this thesis in the simple words of some of the church leaders:

RABBI OPHER. It was the faith of the American people, both on the battle front and on the home front that this was a struggle for the preservation of democracy; it was our faith in human worth and dignity which produced the almost miraculous turn of the tide of the war and frustrated the Nazi pagan conspiracy against the moral foundation of our civilization.

Bishop SHEIL. In the economic system, it is the human person, as God created him, who is the key, the measure. There is only one standard by which to judge a given economic system.

Bishop OXNAM. Christianity believes that men and not things are the goal of social living. It believes in the solidarity of the human family, and seeks to put the common good first. It believes in equal rights for all, and understands that we progress insofar as we learn how to work together. It finds in love and good will the cohesive factor essential to social unity. Democracy likewise insists upon the worth of the human being, and recognizes the dignity of man. Speaking therefore as a Christian and an American, I regard the right to work as fundamental.

We hear a lot about the "natural rights of men," or "basic human rights." These are phrases that have become so trite, we seldom think about what they really mean. Yet we should think about them a great deal—because they have a profound significance, and a real bearing upon all of the important issues which come before this Congress.

In this modern world of ours the concept of the rights of men does not derive its significance from some obscure philosophy of natural law. Nor does it stem from the abstract doctrine of divine revelation. There is nothing obscure or abstract about the idea, because it flows directly from the ethical principle which I have described as the basis of both Christianity and democracy—the necessity that each individual should have the opportunity to realize his potentialities.

As a matter of fact, opportunity, freedom, human rights—all amount to just the same thing. It is that bundle of rights which we regard as fundamental which constitutes freedom. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom to associate, freedom of elections, freedom from fear, equal opportunity to education and economic security, equality before the law, freedom of competition—all of these are considered inherent natural rights—and together they add up to democracy.

Now of all these inherent natural rights of man, the most fundamental is the right to work. I say this without hesitation. And I say it without involving myself in a classification of human rights in the order of their importance because I do not claim that it is more important for man to work than for him to worship freely, or speak freely, or have a representative government, education, and so forth. But I do claim that without the right to work, these other rights lose their meaning. And without the right to work man does not have the opportunity to develop his potentialities. Without the right to work man is not free. Again let us listen to our religious leaders on this point:

If man has the right to life, then he has the right to the means of life. To admit the right to an end and at the same time to deny the right to the only means whereby the end can be attained is sheer folly. In the society in which we live, or in any other organized community life we can conceive, men live and can live only by their work; then it follows that man has a natural, inherent right to work. In the words of Leo XIII: "Each man has the right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure what is required in order to live in no other way than by work and wages." (Bishop Sheil.)

There is no use in implementing (the individual's) rights if we overlook this basic right. The citizen has a right to the things that are necessary for life. For the ordinary wage earner this means a full-time job. (Monsignor O'Grady.)

The (bill's) framers realize that freedom to engage in free competitive enterprise is, in the long run, dependent upon another aspect of freedom; namely, the right of the individual worker to a job. A man who cannot get a job is not free. (Bishop Oxnam.)

It is clear enough in a society where the great majority of people support themselves from earned incomes that employment is essential to the means of life. From this it follows that for most of us the only alternative to a job is poverty and the dole. I do not have to describe what this involves in physical terms—in terms of hunger and disease

and stunted development and broken bodies and lack of adequate shelter and clothing. These are too obvious for comment.

But what concerns me even more are the many ways in which unemployment chains not only the bodies but the spirit of men. As Rabbi Stephen Wise has said:

> The main evils of unemployment are not material in nature * * * unemployment mean(s) spiritual serfdom. * * * No boon or dole under whatever form or name can free men from the humiliation and corruption which idleness inevitably causes.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, this is not too obvious for comment. One of the principal arguments made by the opponents of the full employment bill is that the guaranty of the right to work would undermine men's characters. This argument was skillfully phrased by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] when he said:

> Were it possible to guarantee every person a job, to guarantee everyone security from hunger and want, would such be desirable? Would not such guaranteed security rob the average American of his finest attributes: initiative, thrift, resourcefulness, self-reliance, pride in achievement? To empty a man's backbone, even if you fill his stomach, is to do him an irreparable injury. Moral and spiritual values are, after all, our greatest source of strength and security.

Mr. Speaker, it is precisely because I am so concerned with these moral and spiritual values that I am talking to you so earnestly today. Therefore, I ask you to consider with me what unemployment really does to some of these values. And again I speak with the words of some of America's greatest spiritual leaders:

> Unemployment makes men useless, not wanted. (Bishop Sheil.)
>
> The bruised knuckles that have knocked at door after door seeking a job may heal, but the hurt in the heart of a self-respecting man who is denied the opportunity to earn his own living with his own hands and brain seldom heals. (Bishop Oxnam.)
>
> (Unemployment) is a threat to morality and character. It creates despair and resentment among the old, postpones marriage and family life among the young, breeds delinquency and crime, encourages antisocial attitudes, and fosters racial and religious prejudice. (Rabbi Opher.)
>
> Unemployment * * * reaches in its corroding effects far beyond the circle of * * * immediate victims. It menaces the texture and fabric of society and threatens its prime basis, the home and the family. Wives and children have no respect for a husband and father who does not have a real job while others do. (Rabbi Wise.)
>
> Unemployment makes men live in fear and, ultimately, hate. While mass unemployment endures men are in desperate competition with each other. (Bishop Sheil.)
>
> Those who are not employed hate those who are. Those who have work do not enjoy the fruit of their labor because they fear the hatred of the jobless of today and know that they themselves may be among the jobless of tomorrow. The cancer of unemployment generates contempt, hatred, and fear. However unreasoningly, it incites class against class, people against people, race against race, creed against creed, one generation against another. It destroys the national cultural capital, which must be transmitted by education or perish. It throws its dark shadow upon generations to come and gnaws at a country's life core. (Rabbi Wise.)
>
> Economic want militates against human well-being and fills man with harassing preoccupations and anxieties. It seriously hampers his efforts toward achieving his union with God. There are exceptions, but for the majority of men the consequences of material want are stunted lives and stunted souls. The continual fear and uncertainty of those whose daily bread is insecure impede the growth of the soul. The most searing and crippling effects of economic insecurity are not in the bodies but in the souls of men. (Bishop Sheil.)

These last seven paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, are not my words. They are the words of the men who know the most about those moral and spiritual values previously mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]. To me, they are the answer to the expressed fear that the guaranty of a job and of security from hunger and want would destroy the finest attributes of the average American.

I believe that the great mass of the American people are in accord, when the question of freedom is put in this way. But the real issue is, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to travel that well-known road that is paved with good intentions?

I am not being facetious when I ask this. Again, I am trying to be realistic. Too often in this country our difficulties have been due not to bad intentions, but to inertia. Too often things go wrong because of inaction, rather than mistaken action. That is why I cannot stress too strongly that we should take steps now to prevent unemployment. It is not enough to recognize our basic needs and values, or to prate about freedom; we must never cease in our efforts to translate these goals into concrete social action and to make freedom real. As Bishop Sheil has said:

> It is not enough to hold sound principles; they must be applied to the living, pressing issues which confront human beings.

Failure to do so would result in what Rabbi Opher has aptly termed "moral inflation." I quote:

> We think of economic inflation in terms of inflated values and worthless currency. Moral inflation would be a high-sounding slogan without meaning or implementation. It was this type of moral inflation that produced the period of debunking and cynicism between the last war and this war, which was the basis of the Nazi claim of the decadence of democracy. The repeated use of high-sounding words and slogans which are a necessary concomitant of war, when they are not translated into action is bound to bring about again the same kind of disillusionment and break-down of the moral system which we witnessed in the 1920's and early 1930's. During the war we heard a great deal about the "four freedoms," and the claim on the part of our statesmen and leaders in every walk of life that this was not just another war, it was a war as between paganism and religion. That will have to be translated into action if we are not to break faith with the American people.

And Bishop Oxnam underscores the same point by stating:

> The churches recognize that it is not enough to proclaim religious ideals. The ethical ideals of religion must be translated into the realities of world law and order, economic justice, and racial brotherhood. Nor is it enough for us, as citizens, to enunciate democratic ideals. They, too, must come alive in concrete measures that give them reality. Ideals thus become meaningful for the common man.

Unfortunately, one of the most serious obstacles to constructive social action to prevent unemployment is the belief of a small but influential minority that it cannot be done in a democracy. There have been several who have echoed the conviction of Mr. William Kleitz, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, who told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that depressions are inevitable under the free enterprise system.

Indeed, even in our own ranks—in this congressional body, whose very function is to take deliberate social action in the interest of the common welfare—there are some who have admitted to a defeatist philosophy which, if it had any validity, would make the law-making process itself completely superfluous and futile. One Member has told us:

> Full employment * * * if at all possible, is possible only within a completely regimented economy * * * only under some form of totalitarianism.

Another has followed up with the question:

> Throughout the history of the universe, does the gentleman know of any countries which have ever made a success out of full employment?

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to elaborate for you what I think on this score. You already know that I heartily concur with that great majority of economists who have become increasingly aware that depressions are man-made, and who have learned so much about its causes and its remedies, that they proclaim without hesitation that unemployment can be eliminated through bold, coordinated and intelligent economic statesmanship.

Those are the experts on economic relationships. But depressions are social as well as economic. They are caused by immorality and greed and lust for power as well as by economic mistakes. For that reason I am very glad to note that the experts on social relationships—the leaders of the church—have not despaired of mankind. They are not convinced that depressions are inevitable any more than they are willing to believe that wars are inevitable. They have faith that man is a master of his own fate, and they are willing to humble our freedom, our democracy, and even our Christianity upon that faith. Only they do not consider it a gamble, because they realize that unless we solve our economic problems we are in danger of losing these other things too.

This point has been especially well stated by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches:

> An influential part of our commercial and industrial world still insists that successive booms and depressions, the so-called business cycle, are inevitable. Our Congregational Christian Council for Social Action holds that this belief is an insult to the intelligence of America and an affront to the Christian conscience. We must continue to insist that depressions can be prevented until that belief gains acceptance.

Bishop Sheil reemphasizes this same point:

I believe that full employment is possible in America. I believe unemployment is unnecessary. I have no patience with that school of thought which maintains that business depressions and mass unemployment are inevitable. They are inevitable only because stupidity and greed and fear have made them so. Depressions and mass unemployment are not acts of God. They are produced by us through our inhuman economic practices.

One thing is certain, however. We shall not solve our economic problems unless we plan to solve them. We shall never abolish depression until we take deliberate preventive action to that end. As the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches said in an official statement, "History shows that our speculative booms and succeeding depressions are the direct results of lack of planning and controls."

This raises the issue as to whose responsibility it is to plan for full employment. To this question the answer is equally clear. Planning must be the responsibility of the Government for two reasons—one, because there is no other group in a position to take such a responsibility, and two, because planning for freedom is one of the primary functions for which government was organized in the first place.

It is hardly necessary to belabor the point that neither laborers, nor consumers, nor businessmen, nor farmers can undertake to prevent depression or to plan for full employment. After all, each of these groups is itself a victim of depression, and each is dependent upon the markets or the incomes generated by full employment. In the absence of such markets or incomes, each group has no choice but to restrict its operations—that is, its producing or its buying.

At the same time it is obvious, as Secretary Vinson has pointed out, that "somewhere there must be a responsibility on unemployment. There can be no vacuum, no void of responsibility on the most important domestic problem confronting the American people."

I realize that a great many people are afraid of Government planning. I also realize that this is because they confuse planning with totalitarianism. They forget that both dictatorship and democracies involve planning by the State, and that all depends upon who participates in that planning, and toward what goals that planning is directed. They fail to recognize the vital distinction between planning for slavery and planning for freedom—between plannning imposed from above and planning that derives from a cooperative partnership of the various groups in the economy.

It is not to lose our freedom to use our heads to solve the problems that must be solved if freedom is to endure. There are some who insist that to plan is to enslave. That, to me, is nonsense. When this Republic was founded we thought in terms of freedom, and sought to establish governmental forms best calculated to maintain and extend freedom. There is no reason why we cannot face the economic problems of our day and find solution in terms of freedom. (Bishop Oxnam.)

It appears to me that S. 380 preserves the essential partnership of Government and industry, preserving freedom for enterprise, but responsibility for planning and prevention of break-down rather than picking up the pieces after the catastrophe. (Rev. Ray Gibbons, Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches.)

For these reasons I want to emphasize exactly what it is that the original full-employment bill undertakes to accomplish. In the first place, that bill enunciates the principle that so far as possible jobs should be provided by private enterprise, and that Government policies should be directed toward stimulating private production. To this end the bill provides measures to promote the confidence necessary for private risk-taking. In the words of President Truman, it provides assurance—

Assurance that all the facts about full employment and opportunity will be gathered periodically for the use of all.

Assurance of stability and consistency in public policy, so that enterprise can plan better by knowing what the Government intends to do.

Assurance that every governmental policy and program will be pointed to promote maximum production and employment in private enterprise.

Assurance that priority will be given to doing those things first which stimulate normal employment most.

Mr. Speaker, I think that enough attention has not been given to the very significant fact that under the full-employment bill, direct governmental action to create jobs would be undertaken only if and when private enterprises fail to provide full employment. Those who feel that free private enterprise is equal to the task will have full opportunity and every encouragement to demonstrate this to be the truth; they have nothing to fear from Government intervention.

But suppose that private production does not measure up? Suppose there are certain deep-seated disbalances and maladjustments in our economic structure which make it impossible for the economic mechanism automatically to keep going in high gear? It is only in such a case that the full employment proposes Government action. And such Government action would take the form, not of edicts from above, but of policies decided upon by the people through the democratic process of lawmaking.

This is why the language of the bill is devoted, not to spelling out the specific steps that should be taken, but rather to outlining a procedure for making that lawmaking process more effective—effective in the sense of reflecting more adequately the will of the people.

The will of the people, expressed through their freely elected representatives, can hardly be termed totalitarianism. Actually the most striking aspect of the bill is its reliance upon constitutional processes to plan for the Nation's welfare. (Bishop Sheil.)

You have only to read the bill to see how it concentrates upon these "constitutional processes." It is directed primarily at more effective legislative procedures, and more intelligent and coordinated congressional programing. It establishes machinery for setting national goals, collecting all relevant information, appraising the toolkit of Federal policies for influencing the economy, and knitting all of these together into an integrated national economic policy. In so doing it throws the spotlight of responsibility upon Congress as the representatives of the people.

And it is important that the finger of responsibility should be thus openly pointed, because there is so much at stake. I repeat what I said before, that it is not only the vital right to work which is at stake, but also all of our freedoms, and our democratic system.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has wisely admonished this House in these words:

Let us work to preserve in peace the things we fought to preserve in war. * * * Let us examine with care any proposed legislation that would make revolutionary changes in the American way of life. Otherwise, gentlemen, we will wake up one sad morning to find that American democracy was just a glorious experiment.

I would supplement these excellent words, however, with the reminder that society is always changing, and that the essence of democracy is not to stand still, but to ensure an orderly process of change. It is precisely because we want to avoid revolution that we must take constructive advance action to avoid these catastrophes that lead to revolution. And of all the forces making for revolution, none is more potent than mass unemployment.

Again the words of the church leaders are pertinent:

Given full employment, and assuming the maintenance of civil liberties, there is no reason why the American may not pass through this day of fundamental transition without violence and with full respect for the orderly processes of democracy. (Bishop Oxnam.)

This bill is not, as some of its critics charge, a step in the direction of collectivism. It is, on the contrary, the kind of measure which will insure that our free economy will function in the direction of security for all of our citizens. It will, therefore, help to avoid the kind of economic crises out of which collectivism emerges. (Rheinhold Niebuhr, Union Theological Seminary.)

This country need never fear communism as long as it provides a decent living for the people. Communism does not flourish, it is not even desired, where justice and charity prevail in the social order.

A nation that is ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed in any considerable part is a fertile ground for the curse of totalitarianism. People bound down by misery and want; people weighted down by grinding poverty and harrowing fear are easy prey for the widely advertised security of totalitarianism. * * * If this Nation is ever destroyed it will not be by foreign enemies, but by poverty and wretchedness within. (Bishop Sheil.)

A man who cannot get a job is not free * * *. The bitterness in his soul soon becomes resentment, and the easily phrased economic panacea of the demagogue becomes attractive. It is in such souls that the seeds of revolution find warm soil. (Bishop Oxnam.)

The working classes, informed and articulate, will no longer endure the economic servitude to which many were subjected in the past. If capitalism in a republic does not permit them to work, they will sacrifice private ownership for state tyranny and trade liberty for bread.

Strangely enough, those who most heartily fear and hate socialism are the very ones who, by the injustices of their reactionary pol-

icies, drive the people to the desperation of the all-powerful state. (Archbishop Lucey.)

Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States originally requested that we pass full-employment legislation, this country was at war. However, even then the need for action was apparent. Now, with reconversion upon us and with the rolls of the unemployed mounting daily, that need has become acute. We cannot afford to wait, to wait until our streets are filled with sellers of apples, our freight trains thronged with transients, our local relief agencies wilting under their loads. From every standpoint, economic, social, moral, we must enact strong, forceful legislation designed to bring about conditions of full employment in this democracy of ours. Our economists have told us of the need—now our religious leaders tell us of that same need. Let us not be drawn into passing half-way or quarter-way measures. Let us give hope for the future to the American people by overwhelmingly enacting a decent, strong, full-employment bill.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN CHINA

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have an affectionate regard for the gentlewoman from Connecticut. We like to look at her on those rare occasions when she graces this body with her presence. We admire her easy carriage, we like to listen to her clear diction, and her choice application of epithets. I think perhaps the finest, most admirable thing about her is the political dexterity with which she contrives to voice the principles of Herbert Hoover and to maintain the unswerving political support of the Bridgeport Socialists. Those attributes insure her retaining the seat which she graces in this Congress.

We all know that the gentlewoman is something of a world traveler. Out on the west coast it is not regarded as any particular mark of distinction if someone goes to the Orient. In the speech which the gentlewoman from Connecticut made in which she referred to me rather unkindly, I think she said she had gotten to China, and until she mentioned it in her speech it seemed so little a virtue that I had not thought it worth while mentioning the fact that like many other men from the west coast I have been there too; in fact, I was there four times.

I rather imagine that the character of the associations the gentlewoman from Connecticut made in China colored her views just as I believe the conditions I observed and the people I talked to may have influenced mine.

I was not, of course, invited to dinner with the generalissimo, nor did I dine with the Ambassador, nor with any of the substantial big shots in China. I simply walked around, and looked, and talked to people. And perhaps the fact that I was there in 1927 just following the bloody suppression of the trade-union movement in Shanghai by the gangsters hired by Chiang Kai-shek might have colored my views of him too. I was always rather susceptible in these respects.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut is in the corner carrying the towel for General Hurley. It seems to me we ought to look a little bit into who General Hurley is. We all know, of course, his association with oil, his relationship to one of the major oil companies in this country. In addition to that, a Washington newspaper has done the country considerable service to again remind us of Mr. Hurley's famous plan when he was Secretary of War in the Hoover Cabinet of providing relief for the unemployed. It was the "garbage for unemployed plan" which Mr. Hurley endorsed, according to the Evening Star in an article published yesterday here under the headline "Lo the poor."

This magnificent plan for the relief of underprivileged Americans out of work through no fault of their own was to put in each restaurant a garbage can, four of them in fact, plainly marked for "meat," "potatoes," and other stuff. There was to be a sign that customers having enough money to eat in those days should not flick ashes into the food so that the leavings would be sanitary for the unemployed. Now, do not get the idea this was charity. The unemployed under this plan were to cut wood before they could get this garbage. I do not see how a man who initialed this document could be suspected of having any sympathy with the common man in China.

It is very little wonder that Mr. Hurley, when he first landed over there, promptly began to reverse the policies that President Roosevelt and Ambassador Gauss had carried out. Of course, it is no accident that some of the Members on the other side of the aisle maintain an interest in north China, because many years ago that is where Mr. Hoover got his wealth and affluence. The records of a British court, which I have not the time to quote now, will show how his intimidations and slick practices would have been successful had it not been for British law which interfered with his doing the Chinese out of millions of dollars of mining properties in that area. So, as I say, Mr. Hurley, and his former boss, Mr. Hoover, have a long-sustained interest in the economic resources of northern China.

May I say that the gentlewoman from Connecticut in her remarks about my speech the other day failed to meet the basic issues which I raised at that time. My chief contention was that Hurley had done more than any other single individual to bring about the Chinese civil war.

Let us see on what that contention was based. I have here the "Communist-fed" paper, the Washington Post, from which I quote an article by Marquis Childs in which he states:

> The easiest way to dispose of your opposition, if you are not too sure of your argument, is to yell "Communist."
>
> That was what Patrick J. Hurley did when he resigned as American Ambassador to China.
>
> What makes Hurley's outburst more difficult to understand is the fact that in China he has had his own way almost entirely. Those same foreign-service officers about whom he complains so bitterly were sent out of Chungking at his request. He would take no advice from them.

Then he speaks of Hurley's instructions from the President.

The editorial continues:

> While these were Hurley's instructions, he seems to have swung quickly into the nationalist orbit and increasingly resented the advice of younger men in the Embassy who urged him to bargain with Chiang in order to try to bring the two factions together. Stubbornly holding to his own viewpoint, Hurley drew closer to Chiang, who was naturally gratified to find that he was not required to make major concessions to the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote secondly from another Communist-fed organ, using the terminology of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, the Herald Tribune, of New York, which, on October 30, wrote an editorial entitled "The Catastrophe in China":

> As a result of the policies which have been followed during * * * incumbency of Patrick J. Hurley as American Ambassador at Chungking, there is grave danger that American troops will become involved in the fighting. Ambassador Hurley's all-out support of the Kuomintang (Chungking) government, has created a situation in which Americans are giving aid to one Chinese faction in its quarrel with another.

Then there is the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, November 28, which had this comment to make:

> General Hurley threw all his weight and all of the prestige of the United States Government behind Chiang Kai-shek. This encouraged the generalissimo to intensify his opposition to the Yenan group and to grant few, if any, real concessions to it. A rift which our diplomacy might have narrowed was, instead, widened.

The same Communist-fed journal, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, stated:

> The witches' broth in China, in which our soldiers are now involved, was stirred by General Hurley himself. American policy is assuredly subject to criticism, but it is strange indeed to find our chief policy maker in China opening himself up to an exposure of his own failure.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is pretty fair evidence, and if the gentlewoman from Connecticut had perhaps not spent so much time in traveling and a little more time reading the American press, she might not have thought my speech was so full of errors as she previously indicated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I decline to yield at this point. I will be glad to yield to the gentlewoman if she wishes.

Then I would like to come to a second issue which I raised the other day and which the gentlewoman failed to meet. That is the question: Did Hurley actually invoke a censorship which deprived the United States of valuable information from China?

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. I will not ask the gentleman to yield further, because when I spoke on the floor of the House the other day he was not present to ask me to yield, for which reason I shall let him continue uninterrupted.

Mr. DE LACY. The gentlewoman is quite courteous. She, as you know, did not notify me of her intention. But she may ask me questions at any time if she cares to in the course of my presentation here today.

I charged in my speech that Hurley had encouraged censorship and was otherwise responsible for closing the borders of North China to further investigation by American newsmen. This Communist-fed paper, the Chicago Daily News, in an article by Edwin A. Lahey, said:

Since the death of President Roosevelt, our Ambassador at Chungking, Patrick J. Hurley, has tortured American policy in China to fit the assumption that our only alternatives were to deal exclusively with the government of Chiang Kai-shek or with the Communist government at Yenan, described by Hurley as an "armed political party."

In the private view of many Americans in China, whose opinions are suppressed by strictly military orders against political discussion, or by the creeping Chinese censorship encouraged by Hurley himself—

May I emphasize: "creeping Chinese censorship encouraged by Hurley himself."

The article continues—

the real alternatives in China are either to persuade Chiang Kai-shek to set up a democratic coalition government or to produce a civil war.

There is a great deal more evidence on this which could be presented. I would particularly like to invite the gentlewoman's attention to this letter addressed to that distinguished leader, distinguished American, the head of the great Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas. This letter is signed by five distinguished press correspondents, all of whom have had long and distinguished service in China. The letter states:

The men—

Referring to the far eastern experts—the career men in our State Department—who Hurley has so unmercilessly attacked—

accused are unable to speak for themselves. We feel, therefore, that as witnesses sent to China by the American press we should announce our belief that the American Embassy in Chungking, upon Ambassador Hurley's assumption of office, was staffed by a good, honest cross-section of Americans. Some were liberals, others conservatives. They had in common only one quality—that all were reporting the truth to the American Government as they saw it.

As journalists, we should indeed be interested in seeing the publication of the dispatches of our trained specialists, side by side with Mr Hurley's official reporting in the past year.

The men whom Mr. Hurley attacks are people who have endured years of hardship in China, in pestilence and bombing, serving Americans' interests. We have met these men in famine areas, in air raid shelters, at the war fronts. They served as nobly and disinterestedly in the cause of our Republic as any soldier in uniform.

Mr. Hurley disagreed with them and got rid of them. By so doing he deprived himself and the State Department of American sources of information that his predecessors had found both valuable and objective.

Respectfully yours.

This statement to the Senator is signed, among others, by one of the most distinguished correspondents in the business, a gentleman who represents those outstanding American publications Time, Life, and Fortune, Mr. Theodore H. White. It is also signed by Richard Watts, former head of the OWI News Bureau in the Far East and previously with the Herald Tribune; Eric Severeid, famous radio commentator, and Annalee Jacoby and Jack Belden, outstanding correspondents in their own right.

I submit for the record that this is also perhaps part of that great Communist conspiracy to undermine our American policy in China of which we heard something on the floor the other day.

Now, on another issue—I raised, with which the gentlewoman took issue—she did not bother to avoid this one, she took some issue with it—as to what General Stilwell and Ambassador Gauss did do in China, I have here another Communist source, an outstanding Communist source, the St. Louis Star-Times, which says:

There may be some validity to Hurley's charge that "we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power bloc on the side of colonial imperialism against Communist imperialism," but considering the way he has been playing Chiang's game, he forgets the old rule that a man should come into court with clean hands. His predecessor, Ambassador Gauss, had worked hard to forge a solid front of the Chungking and the Yenan Chinese against the Japanese. So had "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, but after Hurley appeared on the scene Stilwell was recalled, probably at the request of Chiang Kai-shek.

I have other information here which I am not going to quote in detail. This news writer, Mr. Brooks Atkinson, of the New York Times, another distinguished Communist paper in the country, as of October 31, 1941, said:

The decision to relieve General Stilwell has the most profound implications for China as well as American policy toward China and the Allied war effort in the Far East. * * * Inside China it represents the political triumph of a moribund antidemocratic regime that is more concerned with maintaining its political supremacy than in driving the Japanese out of China. America is now committed at least passively to supporting a regime that has become increasingly unpopular and distrusted in China, that maintains three secret police services and concentration camps for political prisoners, that stifles free speech and resists democratic forces.

May I emphasize the next paragraph—

The fundamental difference between the Generalissimo and General Stilwell has been that the latter has been eager to fight the Japanese in China without delay and the Generalissimo has hoped that he would not have to. * * *

Relieving General Stilwell and appointing a successor has the effect of making us acquiesce in an unenlightened, cold-hearted autocratic political regime.

This is submitted on the general role of Stilwell and Gauss in China. I said the other day on the House floor that their policy was the Roosevelt policy, the policy America should follow, the policy of trying to get the contending factions in China together, of not favoring either side, of getting Chungking and Yenan and the intermediate groups, the Democratic League parties, together in a coalition government which would look towards free elections and necessary internal democratic reforms.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut said on the floor, I think rather imprudently, that that north China government to which I made reference was no government at all. She likewise made the point that the northern forces helped some against the Japanese, but in no considerable fashion. Of course, we have to acknowledge at this point that the gentlewoman from Connecticut did say that they did all the common people could. They were just guerrillas, and they did all the fighting they could. But let us see exactly the extent of this fighting.

It was said on the floor that part of the Communist lie, or whatever the language was, misrepresentation, I believe, was that there was very little fighting by Chungking and a very great deal in the north. The gentlewoman from Connecticut did not meet the figures which are incorporated in my speech the other day. I do not believe she can meet this.

This book is The Challenge of Red China, by Gunther Stein, who was the former correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor and the Manchester Guardian. I do not believe I need to labor the point that those are hardly Red periodicals. In this book recently published—and Mr. Stein was one of those who spent 3 months in north China, in that first group of correspondents who went up there—on page 327 he states:

In north China, 84 percent of the 14 Japanese divisions with 220,000 men engage the Communist-led Eighth Route Army. Only 16 percent face the remnants of the once very large Kuomintang-controlled armies at the fringes of this vast war theater which was overrun by the Japanese early in the war.

Then it gives the figures for central China and south China. I said in my speech that 64 percent of the Japanese forces in China were pinned down by the action of these northern guerilla fighters whom America did not arm and whom the Chungking government cut off through a vigorous blockade from any source of internal supply. That was based on an averaging of the 84 percent, the 59.5 percent, and the 22 percent that obtained in the relationships of these various portions of China. The figures are here for anyone to see. I do not want to take more of the time of the House in calculating them.

In addition to that, of course, the Japanese gave lively testimony of what they thought of the effectiveness of the Communist-led forces in the north. One of the paragraphs on page 396 quoting from Japanese statements, is as follows:

From the figures on the results of the Imperial Chinese Army action against the Chungking and Communist armies in December 1941, it is clear that the major hindrance to peace in eastern Asia is no longer the Chungking Government but the Chinese Communist Party. The stubbornness of the Communist troops has far surpassed that of the Chungking troops.

Now, friends and Members, that might not prove anything—it is Japanese propaganda perhaps, but it indicates they respected their enemy and at least thought they were getting a fight out of them.

The gentlewoman also said there was no government in the north of China. I have here a book by another distinguished American correspondent, Harrison Forman, called Report From Red China. He likewise went into north China and in his work he has a chapter called Village Democracy. I will not take the time to read from it but it shows the program that these peasants were trying to work out. It shows they had free elections in this little village and in other villages like it, across that resistance area which was mobilized behind the Chinese lines to fight for the freedom of the country. It shows that the Communists up there had limited themselves to one-third of the elected officials in each of the levels. I do not believe neither my party nor the party of the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut would submit ourselves voluntarily to a rule under which we would occupy only one-third of the seats in this House or any other body. Its purpose, as I stated the other day, was to draw all sections of the people into government in village democracies—not a highly complicated industrial democracy like ours—but village democracy. From these villages, delegates—representatives of the people—were elected to serve in governing councils for entire regions. Yet the gentlewoman denies that north China had government.

I now have some remarks to make upon the lack of democracy under Chiang Kai-shek—that which I called the pretension of the Kuomintang to a one-party dictatorship. The lady from Connecticut did not like that very well either. I have here a number of statements which bear that out. One of them is the words, of course, of Chiang Kai-shek himself. It is very odd that his book, which is the Mein Kampf of China, called China's Destiny, has never been permitted by him to have a single English translation nor has his strict censorship permitted any copy of any translation to come out of that country. It is very odd that no correspondent has ever been authorized to quote a single line from Chiang Kai-shek's book.

Some of us wondered why and we asked the Secretary of State to give us a copy—the State Department copy because they made a translation. The Secretary of State just smiled and said he thought at this moment it might not be wise to make it available. Mr. Speaker, if the chiefs of foreign policy of two governments think this book is dynamite, I am willing to take their word for it. I need not rely upon the Daily Worker or some other alleged Communist source.

I have additional evidence here of Chiang's kind of "democracy" in China:

> Today the Nationist Party is dominated by a corrupt political clique that combines some of the worst features of Tammany Hall and the Spanish Inquisition. Two silent and mysterious brothers, Ch'en Li-fu and Ch'en Kuo-fu, known to all the foreigners of Chungking as the CC clique (from the initials of their family name), practically control the thought of the nation through a combination of patronage, secret police, espionage, and administrative authority.

Now this comes from that outstanding publication, Life magazine of May 1, 1944. I think it is evident that the gentlewoman from Connecticut did not take time to read Time nor to understand Life.

In addition, I call attention to a significant clipping from the Shanghai Post and Mercury, dated November 30, 1945, which has been mailed to my office under recent date, by that outstanding student of China, Agnes Smedley. This article and Miss Smedley's letter tell how Chiang Kai-shek has just sent back to Shanghai as his representative, a Mr. Tu Yueh-sen.

This Mr. Tu Yueh-sen was a notorious racketeer in Shanghai. He is the man who, in 1923, led the gangsters who broke up the Chinese trade-unions that had just begun to flourish in that great city. He was the king of the opium traffic, king of prostitution, king of the notorious evils that I could see a part of with my own eyes when I was in Shanghai. He was and is the Al Capone, of China. Now he is sent back to Shanghai by the great exponent of democracy, Chiang Kai-shek, to whom we are giving our munitions and to whom we offer the lives of Americans in khaki and in marine green to sacrifice in suppressing the aspirations of the people of China for the right to vote and the right to simple agrarian reforms.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I will yield, since the gentleman was so kind earlier in the day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in understanding that Chiang Kai-shek represents one of the five great powers in the United Nations Organization?

Mr. DE LACY. I would say not. He represents a great party in China. If all the parties in China could be gotten together in a unified party, we could see progress there, see a market open for the great industries of your section and the shipping of my section.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is he not the accredited representative of China?

Mr. DE LACY. Accredited by what power?

Mr. HOFFMAN. By the Organization, by the United States, by Russia, and by Great Britain?

Mr. DE LACY. He is recognized, and his Government is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would you have us deny aid to him?

Mr. DE LACY. I would deny aid to him for the purpose of prosecuting a civil war in his own country, to eradicate the beginnings of democracy there and the beginnings of limited social progress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. Not at this time.

Another question I raised on the floor of this House was that General Hurley's reversal of the Roosevelt-Gauss policies was costing us friendship in China.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. DE LACY. I prefer not to, but if you insist, I will.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has constantly referred to the Roosevelt-Gauss policy. I simply want to say, when the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations was in China, in Chungking, in September we had a meeting with General Hurley and members of his staff and all the representatives of the United States they could get together. General Hurley at that time made the flat statement that he was not sent to China with instructions to support the central government if he thought it would succeed, or that he was not sent there to support the central government if he thought that was the best thing to do, but that his instructions by Mr. Roosevelt were to support the central government—period.

Mr. DE LACY. He placed that interpretation upon it. That is what caused the civil war.

Mr. JUDD. Did not Mr. Roosevelt send General Hurley back to China?

Mr. DE LACY. You know, there is an old fable about the old gentleman who was walking down the street and he saw a viper lying in the dirt, stung by the frost. He picked this viper up and put it in his bosom to warm it. The warmth of his body did warm the viper, but we all know the moral of that fable. The viper bit the bosom of the man who so befriended him.

Mr. JUDD. Did not Mr. Byrnes again urge Mr. Hurley to go back?

Mr. DE LACY. I prefer not to yield further at this time.

My charge on the House floor was that there had been armed intervention in China, and that we were not there primarily for the purpose of disarming the Japanese. On that point I quote another Communist source, Time magazine, for October 22, 1945, which described the effect of our armed intervention:

> Time and the full might of the United States in China were working against Mao Tse-tung and for the unification of Chiang's China.
>
> In the heart of Communist China, the ancient Manchu capital, Peiping, was smartly seized by Chiang's Ninety-second and Ninety-fifth Armies, flown from Hankow and Shanghai by the United States Tenth Air Force. Into Shanghai itself, surrounded by the chagrined Communist new Fourth Army, United States planes had borne Chiang's Ninety-fourth Army. Later the United States forces transferred its China theater headquarters into the city. Nanking was firmly held by Chiang's airborne new Sixth Army, Canton by his foot-slugging, United States-trained new First Army.
>
> On the China coast the Communist Eighth Route Army held a solitary port, Chefoo. But a strong United States naval force cruised offshore. At strategic Tientsin and Tsingtao, United States marines landed and nonchalantly took over. Later they would hand the cities to the Nationalist Government. Other marine contingents had raised their standards in Peiping and Chinwangtao.
>
> The United States was underpinning its energetic diplomacy with the sword, and the Communists were powerless to prevent it.

I should like to also quote another outstanding Communist source, the Christian Science Monitor, which gives a very brilliant explanation of the effect of what our intervention is accomplishing there in China. This is an article by Gordon Walker, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor:

> UNITED STATES ROLE TO EXPAND IN CHINA'S CIVIL WAR?—JAP "REFORMS" BARED—MARINES' TASK AID TO CHIANG
>
> (By Gordon Walker)
>
> CHINESE NATIONALIST ARMY HEADQUARTERS, MANCHURIA, December 5.—The American part in China's undeclared civil war appears almost certain to increase rather than taper off in the future.

This is the impression an observer receives after making a survey of the critical northeastern area of China, where American land and naval forces ostensibly are remaining behind to help demobilize Japanese armies.

Looking at the problem realistically, some 50,000 marines, together with the United States Seventh Fleet, are at present doing very little to demobilize and repatriate the Japanese here. A few Japanese are being rounded up and shipped home each week, but they are only a drop in the bucket compared to the numbers which could be moved out if the job were undertaken wholeheartedly.

AID NATIONALIST EFFORTS

The fact is that American military forces are here at the request of the Chinese Nationalist Government. Regardless of what operational duties the Marines and Navy may be undertaking, the main effect of their presence here is to bolster the Chinese Nationalist Army in its dual effort to halt Chinese Communist opposition and complete the job of reoccupying Manchuria.

On land, the United States marines' action is much like that of a "fleet in being"—the marines' presence is more of a threat to the Chinese Communists than are their actual movements. Marines are located at Tientsin and Peking, and are supplied over the same railroad connection with the sea that furnished much of the supplies to Chinese nationalist armies in southern Manchuria. And if in guarding their own supply line the marines also are guarding that of the Chinese Nationalists, it is put down officially as a coincidence.

At the important port of Tsingtao, on the Shantung Peninsula, United States marines are helping Chinese Nationalists occupy the town ostensibly to demobilize some 7,000 Japanese troops. If in the process of fulfilling this task the marines, in effect, are helping to prevent Chinese Communists from capturing the city and its vital network of heavy industries, that, too, is something officially "unexpected."

A similar situation prevails in the case of the Seventh Fleet, which landed marines in China last month and which also recently landed Chinese Nationalist troops at points in the Liaotung Gulf. The official reason for the presence of the Seventh Fleet is to implement the Japanese surrender and repatriation. If in the process the fleet units land Chinese Nationalist troops where they can outflank or attack Chinese Communist forces, that is something which did not appear on official operational plans.

PURPOSE VEILED

It does not take an observer here long to realize that United States forces are actively aiding the Chinese Nationalists more than they are demobilizing the Japanese. The actual sentiments of American military authorities here, moreover, were no more clearly indicated than over the past week end when Vice Admiral Daniel E. Barbey, new Commander of the United States Seventh Fleet, visited Gen. Tu Yuming, Commander of Chinese Nationalist armies in southern Manchuria.

The visit had very little to do with the question of getting the Japanese out of China. It was simply that the United States unofficially is very much interested in the progress of the Nationalist armies, and Admiral Barbey happens to be one of the most competent and most impartial observers in the China area.

Regardless of what these sentiments may be, the fact remains that American military commanders—unsupported by any clear definition of American policy toward China—seem for [illegible] to play a sort of politico-military subterfuge.

It leaves such men as Admiral Barbey and Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer at a distinct disadvantage, both in the field and at home where their role is not understood.

The situation which confronts them here is roughly this:

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist armies just are not strong enough to do the job they are attempting. The Thirteenth and Fifty-second Nationalist Armies here are part of the Twentieth Division trained and equipped by Americans during the war. But they still lack equipment and they fail to exercise sufficient military control to guard their own lines of communications.

Their supply lines into north China and Manchuria already are overextended, and as the advance continues, they become even more tenuous and open to sabotage. This leaves the Chinese Nationalists in the position of being unable to carry any weight as a potential or actual military power in north China. And at the same time it deprives them of the advantage of the military power with which to back up political negotiations with Communists at Chungking.

Putting it simply, Chinese Nationalist armies just do not have what it takes to establish their control over China's vast reaches. Even what de facto support is being lent by the presence of American land and sea forces there is not enough to establish this control.

The urgent question, therefore, which hangs over this bleak corner of the world is whether the United States intends to quit China entirely or openly give the Nationalists enough support to force some sort of decision. Unless this question is decided soon, the situation here could deteriorate to a point of threatening the peace in the entire Far East.

Greater aid to Chinese Nationalists does not necessarily spell taking sides incontrovertably against the Chinese Communists here. Some quarters here, including most capable observers, point out that the first step would be to give China some of the military supplies which presently are rotting in supply dumps in New Guinea and the Philippines. These supplies could be regulated in such a fashion as to give the Nationalists just enough support to force a compromise with the Communists but not enough to give the Nationalists an overwhelming upper hand.

Such a compromise might result in a sort of loose position with the Communists controlling certain provinces but paying allegiance to the Central Government. But even that much of a compromise, it is pointed out, might be preferable to having China rent asunder by civil war as would undoubtedly be the case if the country should be left to its own devices.

Does this policy of armed intervention in China win friends for the United States in China? I do not think it does. I think that it wins enemies there; and what is the good of a foreign policy that brings us enemies when we intend them to be friends? The Chinese liberals charge that General Wedemeyer—and these are the liberals, not the Communists or the Comintern people—in their magazine, Democracy, volume 2, No. 9, September 6, 1945, say:

It is fortunate that Lieutenant General Wedemeyer is not fond of making statements to the public because when he does make public statements they often arouse anxiety and uneasiness. This is because what he does, as well as what he says, closely affects the interests of the Chinese people, and if we are to judge from his careless and irresponsible attitude when he does talk, it seems to us that General Wedemeyer has never realized the influential position that he holds on China today.

As Chinese citizens maintaining an equally impartial attitude toward the Kuomintang, the Communit Party, and the Democratic League we wish to ask General Wedemeyer and other American political and military officials in China not to jeopardize the lasting friendship between the United States of America and China.

As to our landings in north China, let us see what the five Democratic League Parties in China had to say. In a national congress held in Chungking in October they formulated a platform which was most critical of our intervention and warned Chiang not to depend "on a certain foreign power for temporary comfort."

These are not the 100,000,000 people whom we help to suppress in north China, these are people over which Chiang already maintains his rule—the liberals and democratic groups in Chungking, China.

To offer further proof, I turn again to the Herald Tribune and to that Communist-fed news service, the Associated Press, which reported:

UNITED STATES LANDINGS IN NORTH CHINA

CHUNGKING, October 1.—A Chinese political middle-ground spokesman said today he fears that United States marine landings in north China may "complicate the internal problems of China" at a time when the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists are trying to work out details for a single Chinese Government.

Dr. Lo Lung-chi, one of the leaders of the China Democratic League, said that central government troops would follow the marines to Tientsin and Peiping and possibly clash with Communist troops stationed outside those cities.

Dr. Lo said that "we welcome American help in disarming the Japanese but we hope it does not complicate the internal situation."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the policy of Hurley in China does not win friends and cannot win them no matter how the gentlewoman from Connecticut tortures our foreign policy. She tortures it as does General Hurley. To believe them would be to believe that Hoover and Roosevelt were counterparts and that despite all the proof I have here offered to this House—proof of General Hurley's perfidy and lack of candor—proof that he carried out not a policy of diplomacy but a policy of diplomania; that despite all this proof, Hurley was really in China trying to unite that unhappy land by saying to Chiang Kai-shek that if he rid himself of all who did not agree with him, the United States would back him to the hilt.

I am not accusing the gentlewoman of lack of candor. At least for her part, she believes and says she believes in intervention—armed intervention, since no other interpretation can be put upon that word in view of recent circumstances. She believes in United States troops and supplies and equipment being utilized in China to put down the people's demand for democracy and for simple reforms.

From all General Hurley has said—and he has bespoke himself at great length and with what he calls much "emphasis"—and from the statements of his great admirer and defender, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, one can draw but a single conclusion. They do not believe in democracy in China. They do not agree that the United States should seek by peaceful means to unite that great

land across the Pacific under a coalition government. Such a policy of bringing democracy to other nations is sound for our former enemies. The people of these lands can have democracy, but we would deny it to our friends. We will not help give it to China's people.

There is the nub of the difference between the armed interventionists and those who beg for peace and democracy, between the gentlewoman from Connecticut and myself, between General Hurley and the late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Roosevelt advocated until his death a policy which would bring into a united coalition the forces of Chiang and the liberal elements within Chiang's own party—now virtual prisoners of Chiang; the five Democratic League Parties of China, now outlawed by Chiang; the Communist Party of China, now the victims of armed onslaught; and the nonparty groups in China—whose very right to speak their minds is now oppressed by Chiang.

This is not a dispute in China between Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists. This, as Roosevelt saw it, is a dispute between Chiang and every other group in China. Only through a coalition can democracy be assured in China, for only such a coalition government can offer the people of China a free election. Chiang promises an election to China only after he has suppressed all opposition. That is the policy of a Hitler.

Whether or not Hurley saw to what end his own private policy—or, if you prefer, his own private method of distorting the policy of Roosevelt; whether or not he saw to what end that would carry him I do not know.

But for the gentlewoman from Connecticut to attempt to wrap the cloak of Roosevelt around General Hurley and thus protect him, is to distort history and to attempt to destroy the memory of one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known.

I humbly suggest a course to the gentlewoman. Whether or not she agrees with me or with a single one of the authorities I have quoted here today; and whether or not she does sincerely believe that there is a Communist conspiracy so broad it engulfs the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, the Chicago Daily News, the St. Louis Star-Times, and even Time and Life and Fortune; whether or not she believes that General Hurley and President Roosevelt were twins; that regardless of these differences, I believe she owes it to the position she now takes to stand up in her own committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and demand a hearing on the resolution which six Members of this House introduced when I first took the floor here on China.

If she is so sure of her ground, then let us present our evidence; let us have our day in court. Let us hear not alone from General Hurley, but let the story of China be told by those who know it well—by General Stilwell and by former Ambassador Gauss, by correspondents who are begging now to tell the story of what they saw and what they know—of China, of businessmen recently returned from across the Pacific.

Let us hear from those who know. I confess my own knowledge of the present situation in China is not original. I point to the sources. Let the gentlewoman do the same.

The people of this Nation are entitled to have this debate raised from the level of name calling to the level of intelligent presentation of the facts.

If she is as sure of her ground as I, she will not hesitate a moment to accept my challenge to use her influence which is so great upon the colleagues of her own party in her own committee to see that a full and public hearing be given this question on House Resolution 408.

The people of this Nation are entitled to the facts.

When they learn them, they will little care what the gentlewoman from Connecticut thinks of me or my opinions, nor what I think of her.

For when the American people are given the truth—which it is within the power of the gentlewoman as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee to help bring out—when the people know the facts, I have no doubt they will insist on a return to the policies of peace across the Pacific, of democracy in China.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

INCLUSION OF ELECTIVE OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES AND HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS IN THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 452, Rept. No. 1344), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4199) to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN CHINA—THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND CHINA

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the testimony of General Hurley, as sensational as his resignation in protest against pro-Communist intrigue in the State Department, is letting some light into the dark corners of our wartime diplomacy, but we have yet to discover from that testimony the extent of the pressure put upon the generalissimo by the Roosevelt administration to conclude the Russo-Chinese treaty, signed on August 14, which gave Russia a naval base at Port Arthur and joint control over the South Manchurian Railway, and other concessions. But if such pressure was put, let those who now cry so vehemently against American intervention in Chinese domestic affairs by this administration deny that that pressure was also intervention by a previous one.

But it seems to me it is unrealistic to talk of intervention or nonintervention in this one world, in which the United States of America is the leading power. Whether we fail to exert diplomatic pressure, or whether we exert it, we are still intervening. For example, our failure to intervene in Spain in effect supports Franco. Our failure to intervene in support of Chiang Kai-shek now would support, in effect, the Chinese Communists and encourage civil war in China.

Now, all of the points just made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] concerning the so-called abandonment by General Hurley of the Roosevelt policy in China were fully met and answered this afternoon by Secretary of State Byrnes in a statement which he read before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary Byrnes said:

To achieve this longer-range goal (of a strong, united, and democratic China) it is essential that the Central Government of China as well as the various dissident elements approach the settlement of their differences with a genuine willingness to compromise. We believe, as we have long believed and consistently demonstrated, that the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek affords the most satisfactory base for a developing democracy.

He then went on to add:

If I understand correctly what Ambassador Hurley has stated to me, and subsequently to the press and to this committee, he entertains no disagreement with this conception of our policy. Moreover, he has indicated to me and to this committee that he has been unfailingly supported by two Presidents and three Secretaries of State in his effort to execute this policy.

The able gentleman [Mr. DE LACY] will now have to transfer his attack on Ambassador Hurley to Secretary Byrnes, the previous Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, and the late President who, according to Secretary Byrnes' understanding, all supported and were supported by Mr. Hurley in a commonly held policy in China.

The question is not should we intervene or should we not intervene anywhere in the world, since our great diplomatic power and weight are bound to be heavily exercised, whether as withdrawal or as intercession. The question before us in the Far East, as in all quarters of the globe, is: In whose interest should we intervene? I have no difficulty answering that question for myself. I do not believe that many other Members of this House have any difficulty in answering it either. Our intervention must always be in America's interest and in the interest of a peaceful world.

I do not question the right of the gentleman from Washington to define America's interests as he claims to see America's interest, on the floor of this House. I will defend his right to do so to the death, but I am equally within my rights in saying that I think that his policies, if put into effect, would not result in any benefit to this Nation, nor in the extension of freedom and the preservation of peace throughout the world.

I deeply mistrust his point of view on all foreign affairs for one reason which to me seems sufficient. The gentleman from Washington is beloved, long beloved, and deeply cherished by the Communist Party of America; and the Communist Party of America, like the Communist Party in every nation in the world, is a house organ, an extension, an adjunct, a tool of the foreign policy of the Kremlin. This is a fact that no politically astute man disputes.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Daily Worker of December 2. Its headline reads:

> Protests forcing show-down on intervention in China. Representative DE LACY speaks up for an aroused nation.

The rest is a panegyric to the gentleman from Washington's attack on this administration's policy of supporting our ally, China, and its established government in order to encompass the complete surrender of Japanese troops, and to restore the territorial integrity of China.

That headline in the Daily Worker which suggests that the gentleman from Washington is leading an aroused America to a contrary point of view to that of Secretary Byrnes and the President is rather overly optimistic, as matters are developing before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Now, one embrace from the Daily Worker does not necessarily make any Member of this House or any citizen of our Nation a Communist. Not even two or three such embraces will succeed in making Communists of Mark Childs, the editors of the Washington Post, the Christian Science Monitor, nor, I dare to hope, the Herald Tribune. There are very few public-opinion molders who, while advocating some policy that was currently being advocated by the Kremlin, have not felt themselves momentarily suffocated by the hot, moist, eager, humiliating embrace of the Daily Worker. But when there has been a long-time, tender, mutual embrace between the Communist Party and any citizen of our Nation from the time of Munich until now, we may be pardoned for reaching the conclusion that that citizen is, to put it mildly, attracted, if not wedded, to the Communist Party.

Every elected officeholder's public political record is open, or should be, at all times to the public for review. The able and courteous gentleman has made some glancing and facetious references to my own political record, by mentioning what he labeled my Hooverism, and the Socialist support he claims that I have found in the city of Bridgeport.

Now, since he has seen fit to comment on my political record and to mention where he thinks I derive my electoral and popular support, it is pardonable for me to do likewise. So let us review the political record of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] admitting that as the architect of it, he may have built it with the greatest faith, with the utmost zealousness, in the belief that some of the ways or perhaps all of the ways of the Soviet Union are good ways for the United States of America. I give this record, I assure you, for no other reason than to lend his persuasive and able arguments the weight they may deserve and in order that due consideration in the future may be given to the ideas of the gentleman [Mr. DE LACY] on the subject of American foreign policy. If the word "communism" appears with rather monotonous frequency in that record, it has appeared with equal frequency in the gentleman's previous remarks this afternoon.

In 1938 the gentleman from Washington was president of the Washington Commonwealth Federation, was vice president of the American Federation of Teachers at the time the federation was headed by Jerome Davis, a leading pro-Communist. At that time, 1938, Doxey A. Wilkerson of Howard University—Negro—was also a vice president of the federation. Later—in 1944—Wilkerson was head of the Communist Political Association in the District of Columbia and Maryland.

The gentleman from Washington protested the barring of the Communist Party from the ballot in the State of Washington—Sunday Worker, October 13, 1940. He was a signer of an appeal to dismiss the charges against the Russian-born Communist of long standing, Sam Dardeck, alias Sam Darcy, who was an official of the Communist Party in California and Pennsylvania. At one time, Darcy was head of the eastern Pennsylvania section of the party—Daily Worker, December 19, 1940, page 5. In 1941 the gentleman was a member of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, west coast Australian Communist and CIO organizer, who was ordered deported by the Federal Government as a result of his radical activities.

The gentleman was chairman of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born. According to the testimony of the late Anna Damon, for years and until her recent death the national secretary of the International Labor Defense—Communist—the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born is an affiliate of the ILD, the legal arm of the Communist Party.

In April 1941, the gentleman signed the call for the American people's meeting which resulted in the organization of the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House during the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact—1939–41.

The gentleman was an endorser of the International Workers' Order—Communist—plan for plenty—Daily Worker, January 20, 1941, page 3. He was a signer of the statement issued by the Committee for Citizenship Rights in Defense of William Schneiderman in 1941. Schneiderman was head of the Communist Party in California. The gentleman was a member of the executive board of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties in 1942, which Attorney General Biddle classified as a Communist front. The gentleman also signed an open letter to President Roosevelt in behalf of Harry Bridges, 1942. This letter was sponsored by the Nation Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

In 1943, the gentleman was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, successor to the Friends of the Soviet Union, which was declared a Communist movement in the final opinion of Judge Sears of the Department of Justice in the Bridges case.

The gentleman was elected to the City Council of Seattle in 1937 on the Commonwealth Federation ticket. He was defeated by over 20,000 votes in the 1940 Seattle elections. He was supported by the Young Communist League—see YCI Year Book for 1937, page 5.

The gentleman was a signer of a letter condemning the war powers bill—Daily Worker, February 18, 1941. He sent a telegram to the ILD dinner in 1942—Daily Worker, October 11, 1942, page 3.

In 1941, the gentleman was a member of the Schappes' defense committee. Schappes was a Communist professor in New York, admittedly a member of the Communist Party for 7 years. He was convicted and served part of a prison sentence for perjury in testifying before the Coudert-Rapp committee.

As president of the Washington Commonwealth Federation in 1940, the gentleman signed a paid advertisement which appeared in leading newspapers throughout the country, headed: "Defeat conscription at the polls today!" In this statement, the federation, which was devoting all its energies to fighting war and conscription, deplored "the shocking surrender of Congressman Mon C. Wallgren, a candidate for the United States Senate, and Charles H. Leavy, now seeking reelection, who cast their votes last Saturday for conscription and the military dictatorship."

In another statement which appeared in the newspapers in 1940, the gentleman said in part:

> The WCF urges the defeat of all who voted for or who advocate conscripting Americans for military service in foreign lands.

The gentleman was ousted from the faculty of the University of Washington in 1937 as a result of his political activity. His activities were vociferously defended by all the Communists in the State of Washington.

On May 11, 1941, the gentleman, in his position as acting national chairman of the American Committee for the Protec-

tion of Foreign Born, sent a letter of protest to Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, charging that the arrest of German and Italian seamen who had overstayed their leave in this country promoted war hysteria and incited unjustified suspicion against foreign-born residents. He declared unalterable opposition to the passage of a law which would result in the establishment of concentration camps in the United States, and he said that the arrests were "carried out with a view to influencing the actions of the United States Congress and attempting to pressure Congress into immediate enactment of a concentration camp bill."

The Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, of which the gentleman was a member, was organized in 1941.

The Washington Commonwealth Federation and the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, both of which were headed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY], issued a broadside on April 19, 1941, attacking the Department of Justice for the arrest and detention of Ernest Fox, a German Communist Party member who was organizer for the CIO in the State of Washington in 1937 and organizer of Local 7 and the Alaska local of UCAPAW, CIO.

The gentleman was a member of the Working Conference for Peace, American Peace Mobilization. Their slogans were: Get Out and Stay Out of World War II, Fight Every Step of War, Regain and Strengthen Our Democracy, and Defend the Rights of Labor.

The gentleman is a member of the national Committee of International Labor Defense—Communist. The ILD defended the Oklahoma Communist Party leaders who were indicted for sedition in 1942.

The International Labor Defense, of which the gentleman is a member, is the American section of the International Red Aid, of Moscow, according to its own constitution. Its purpose is to advance the cause of communism, to defend Communists against imprisonment and deportation, to give them legal aid and pay their court expenses, to aid their families if they are imprisoned, and to carry on organized agitation against their conviction or deportation and for their release. The ILD has fought the enactment of sedition laws, the registration of foreign agents and anti-Communist legislation.

The American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born has a program similar to that of the ILD, of which it is an affiliate. Its national president is Stanley Novak, of Detroit, an alien-born Communist, arrested and indicted for perjury by the Department of Justice in connection with withholding information regarding his membership in the Communist Party when he took his citizenship oath. At the present time Novak is also Michigan chairman of the International Workers' Order, another avowed Communist movement. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] was national chairman of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born from 1941 through 1943.

The Daily Worker of March 31, 1941, page 4, contained a picture of the gentleman from Washington with an accompanying article dealing with his election as president of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

These references will establish the fact that the gentleman [Mr. DE LACY] has, to put it gently, a definite Communist bias. I repeat, I do not challenge his right to continue these connections and zealously to follow the philosophy of government dictated by them. But it is against the background of such a predisposition to communism, which seems somewhat stronger than a mere idle flirtation with leftist ideology, that we must all view all the gentleman's remarks on democracy in China, examine his predilection for the Chinese Communists, and evaluate his passionate desire to see that American foreign policy is formed according to the interests of China's armed Communist Party.

Now, the gentleman has implied, as though it were to be held somehow against me, that I am subject to the influence of my husband. I do not dispute it. I am proud of it.

We enjoy the fullest exchange of ideas and opinions on political subjects, and the mutual confidence natural to husband and wife. In no subject are we in greater accord than on China. The gentleman also seems to feel that I should consider myself soundly ticked off and smeared by being called an exponent of Hooverism. I have no idea what he may mean by Hooverism as applied to my record of conviction in foreign policy. But I would like to take this opportunity, late in the evening though it is, and asking the indulgence of the patient Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, to restate, once again, the few simple tenets of foreign policy to which I have—I hope—as consistently adhered since 1939 as the gentleman has adhered to his communism.

I believed in 1938 and 1939, and I believe now, that fascism must be scotched, uprooted, and destroyed, everywhere in this world, north, east, south, and west, in all continents and in both hemispheres. I still believe in the Atlantic Charter, and I would fain keep all the sorely betrayed promises which that Charter made to the Poles and the people of Central Europe and the Balkans.

I believe that India should have her independence; and that we should do all in our diplomatic power to exert pressure upon our allies to see that there is a far greater measure of self-government in Indonesia. For at home and abroad, among nations, and among citizens, I am zealously set against racial discrimination, and "white superiority."

I believe in protection and sanctuary for all the non-Fascist stateless people of Europe who have no country of their own, or who are afraid, for their very lives, to return to the country they have, lest they be persecuted, sent to concentration camps, or murdered for their political convictions.

I believe in housing and feeding and clothing all the starving peoples of Europe, the Germans who are innocent of war crimes included.

I believe that to the utmost of our ability as a Nation to finance such a program, we should succor all starving and suffering people.

I believe that this country should seek world disarmament, using wherever possible in this matter, and in all international matters, the United Nations Organization.

Above all, I believe in freedom of the ballot, freedom of speech, and freedom of worship in all lands. Let those who will worship the god of materialism. Let those who will bow the knee before that soulless leviathan, the omniscient, omnipotent, omniverous state. I believe that the source and condition of American power is what it has been since the foundation of our Nation—our ancient trust in God.

Mr. Speaker, forgive this slight diversion, for I wish to speak about a resolution which I introduced on November 20. I did so for my own peace and my clarity of mind, and not until today have I called it to the attention of any Member of this House. But, somehow, today it seems germane to the subtle, unnamed dispute between me and the gentleman from Washington, and of all men of a like-minded philosophy. It is germane to that dispute because it touches on a fundamental divergence between the philosophy to which the vast majority of the Members of this House owe devout allegiance, and the philosophy of communism—at home, abroad, anywhere.

House Joint Resolution 277

Joint resolution concerning the source and condition of American power

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby reaffirms the faith of its founding fathers to the people of the United States, to all other governments, nations, and peoples, namely: That the inalienable rights of man, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and his birth in equality, are the endowment not of governments or men, but of the Creator: Wherefore, our Government, relying on the divine protection of Providence, shall continue to seek all national and international solutions in the belief that the only proper guide and sanction for the laws and actions of men are the laws and authority of God.

That sentence, gentlemen, lest any think it too mystic or remote from the historic political traditions of our beloved country, is a paraphrase of the opening and closing sentences of the Declaration of Independence; for the founding fathers had no such doubts concerning whence comes the light of freedom as afflicts many a man today, including the gentleman from Washington.

In passing, may I say that this resolution on the authority of God over our Government was referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This perplexing circumstance leads me to add to my political credo that I do not believe that God should be a foreigner to our shores, nor to the shores and valleys, mountains, or rivers of any nation on this earth. For where God is a foreigner, where He is exiled from the shores of any nation, then His handmaidens Stern Truth, Clear Conscience, and Sweet Liberty go into exile with Him. No ideology which does not believe in freedom under law and law under God offers any hope to the Members of this House, nor can the adherents of a materialistic and godless

ideology sell us or this Nation on the worth of their foreign policy, whether it be for China or Timbuktu.

Now, if this be socialism, if this be Hooverism, if this be reactionaryism, or if this is imperialism, then the gentleman from Washington will have to make the most of it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARE WE SAFEGUARDING OUR HERITAGE OF FREEDOM?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that is clearly demonstrated by the current Pearl Harbor investigation, it is that we have been woefully lacking in safeguarding our national security through the establishment of adequate intelligence services.

We were caught off base in the days of demolition and incendiary bombs and for that mistake we paid a heavy penalty in human life and costly matériel. Already these weapons, it seems, have become outmoded by the atomic bomb, which scientists assure us will soon be universally available. Therefore, in the future an assault upon nations will take only a matter of minutes, and its effects promise to be far more devastating than Pearl Harbor.

Common sense and reasonable foresight demand the perfection of our intelligence agencies in proportion to the advances made by modern science in the field of destruction.

What are we actually doing about it? Instead of strengthening the functions of government, we are undermining and destroying the inadequate agencies that we have. We are sapping the morale of thousands of men and women trained in the special art of detecting subversive activity. We have rendered these agencies futile in the face of danger far more serious than any in our country's history.

To say that all nations are desirous of peace and friendship with us, if only we would mend the evil of our ways, and that the millenium has arrived through the portals of the United Nations Organization, is only soothing sirup.

Picketing of the State Department, slanderous attacks upon American representatives in our armed forces and diplomatic services, contemptuous disregard of diplomatic notes, political strikes on land and sea, conducted by individuals obviously sympathetic with a foreign ideology of government, both at home and abroad, are not symbols of peace but of undeclared war.

Have we fallen so low in our national self-respect that we dare not exercise the firmness and courage to set our own house in order?

On October 10, in addressing this House, I called attention to the fact that six individuals, some of them important officials of the State Department, had been indicted by our efficient and systematic Federal Bureau of Investigation for purloining certain secret and highly confidential documents of our Government.

I called attention to the fact that, for some unexplained reason, these cases had been disposed of lightly, perhaps through some influence not yet made known.

Subsequently, on November 28, last week, I called the attention of the House to the fact that among these documents were important items involving this Nation's very security, which were apparently made available to agents of a foreign power, and that the purpose of these transactions was inimical to the established policies of the American Government.

I introduced a resolution asking that a searching investigation be made of these cases. Beyond that, nothing has been done, to my knowledge, to remedy this situation, and conditions are going from bad to worse.

Gen. Otto Nelson, who was chiefly responsible for an order to all Army theaters of war to destroy all subversive files, and whose record with our military intelligence service is far below par, has been appointed to reorganize similar services in the State Department.

Associated with him in this effort is Col. Alfred McCormack, whose record is equally dubious, and who was foremost in the effort to commission Communists in the armed forces of the United States. These Communist officers are now attacking the policies of the American Government.

As a vicious climax comes the news, published in the New York Journal-American of December 3, 1945, that the FBI has for 2 years been trailing a Russian secret-service agent who entered our country illegally and is here under a false passport, actively engaged in securing through numerous other undercover agents confidential data regarding the atomic bomb.

Hundreds of FBI agents have been engaged in this exciting chase, which has covered a continent, and yet our splendid FBI appears stymied and powerless to bring this man and his accomplices before the bar of justice.

I am placing this account in the RECORD to show the futility of the efforts of our intelligence agencies in dealing with those people who are undermining and who intend to destroy our Government.

There has been in this country for a number of years a notorious Comintern agent named Gerhard Eisler, alias Hansberger, who has been openly and actively engaged in attacking General MacArthur, General Patton, and the foreign policy of the United States. He is permitted to carry on his activities unmolested.

There is at the present time a case before the United States Supreme Court, in which the United Federal Workers of America, a Communist controlled union, is seeking to invalidate the Hatch Act, which bars Communists from Federal employment. Strangely enough, the Department of Justice has selected none other than Ralph F. Fuchs, a well-known left-wing attorney, to defend our Government's position.

I respectfully suggest that the House Committee on Military Affairs call in Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, our efficient chief of the FBI, to tell the country frankly and openly the threat facing our national security from Communist agents who are running fast and loose, to what extent his efforts have been frustrated, if any, by other agencies, and what remedial measures he would recommend.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; and

S. J. Res. 110. A joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code; and sections 361, 265, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 10, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings to begin at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 4779) to enable debtor railroad corporations whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

855. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

856. A letter from the Surplus Property Administrator, transmitting a report on magnesium plants; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

857. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1944; the number of pieces procured; the estimated mailings; the balance on hand June 30, 1945; and the estimated cost, by departments and agencies, for the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 4199. A bill to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 452. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4199 to extend the existing contributory system of retirement benefits to elective officers of the United States and heads of executive departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4921. A bill to amend the Employees Pay Act of 1945 to provide for payment of twice the regular basic rate of compensation for work performed on holidays; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4922. A bill to incorporate the American Field Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4927. A bill to promote the safety of railroad employees and travelers on railroads, and to promote efficiency of railroad operation by providing for the inspection and investigation of conditions under which train-dispatching service may be performed, and for the promulgation of rules and regulations governing such conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4928. A bill to extend the servicemen's free mailing privilege to include air mail and to provide for the free issuance to servicemen of postal money orders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 4929. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for more nearly equalizing public elementary and public secondary school opportunities among and within the States and Territories; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4930. A bill to provide for a Department of National Defense, Secretary of National Defense, Under Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 285. Joint Resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that election day be observed as a legal holiday in every State of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. Res. 450. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to conduct an investigation to ascertain the amount of surplus Government building material suitable for the construction and repair of dwellings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Res. 451. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the disposition, in foreign countries, of property under the jurisdiction of the armed forces; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES J. DELANEY:

H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Theresa Nespole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 4925. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Maj. Fred S. Poorman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4926. A bill for the relief of the estates of Mary Louise Laine, Joan C. Laine, Constance Laine, Arline Laine, and of the legal guardian of Rita Laine, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1386. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 95 citizens living at or near New Wilmington, Pa., protesting against any action on the part of Congress to establish a system of compulsory military training for the young men and boys of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1387. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., urging the immediate passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

1388. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lucile Barry, Omaha, Nebr., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to abolishing the Rankin House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

1389. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Civic Association of Ensenada, Guanica, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of the message of the President of the United States on the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Ralph C. John, S. T. M., assistant minister, Foundry Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou before whose throne of omnipotence the pageant of history is enacted, in these days of momentous decision, we entreat Thy presence with a new realization of dependence upon divine guidance. The vision of Thy Kingdom is ever before us; Thou hast quickened our minds to envisage a world founded upon truth and lighted by love. With an earnestness whose companion is humility, we pray that Thou wilt bring to submission our wills that we may enter the land of everlasting promise in sensitiveness to imperishable values, as these have been made manifest in the life and ministry of Jesus Christ our Lord. Make us judicious in the affairs of state, that our beloved land may commend itself in the council of nations. In personal life we would be irreproachable before Thee and before those who have entrusted their sacred destiny to our keeping.

We rejoice and are grateful that these mercies we may know under the ministry of Thy Spirit. Hear us in the blessed Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 7, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 7, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude; and

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operations of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

THE ATOMIC BOMB—ARTICLES COMPILED BY INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the International News Service has compiled a composite article on the atomic bomb with the collaboration of a number of the topmost scientists who worked on this project. It is composed of five very short articles, which have been published serially. I have examined the articles. I think that they are especially illuminating and that the International News Service has done a splendid job in making this discussion available to the American people on this very vital question.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles, which have been published on various days through the International News Service, be printed successively in the order in which they were issued.

I may say that some of the conclusions arrived at in these articles may not necessarily meet with the agreement of all people and may not necessarily meet with the agreement of all the scientists themselves nor of all engineers; yet the articles are illuminating, and I ask that at this point in the RECORD following my remarks all five of the articles, which, as I have said, are short, be printed serially.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The articles referred to are as follows:

ATOMIC SCIENTISTS SERIES

NO. 1

While President Truman, British Prime Minister Attlee, and Canadian Prime Minister King confer on the thorny problems of what to do about the future of the atomic bomb, scientists responsible for this earth-shaking discovery are also devoting intensive thought to global implications of the bomb.

Focusing new light on the challenging situation created by the dramatic harnessing of atomic power, a group of outstanding scientific veterans of the atomic bomb project herewith present their views on the future possibilities of the discovery—for good or evil.

The accompanying article is the first of five specially prepared by the editorial committee of the association of Oak Ridge scientists at Clinton Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tenn. The association embraces various atomic experts who have played an important part in producing the bomb at the famous Oak Ridge laboratories.

These articles have been approved for publication by the association's executive committee, composed of the following scientists who have been working on the atomic project at Oak Ridge:

Paul S. Henshaw, chairman of the group and senior radio-biologist of the National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Md.; Waldo E. Cohn, vice chairman, research fellow in biochemistry, Harvard University; Edward G. Bohlman, physical chemist, University of Wisconsin; James G. Stangby, Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago; Prof. Karl Z. Morgan, Lenoir Rhyme College, Hickory, N. C.; Spofford G. English, physical chemist, University of California; Richard N. Lyon, chemical engineer, University of Michigan; Richard P. Metcalf, physical chemist, University of Chicago; Harrison S. Brown, physical chemist, Johns Hopkins University; M. D. Peterson, research chemist, du Pont Co.; Lyle Borst, University of Chicago physicist; and Joseph Rush, University of Texas physicist.

"OAK RIDGE, TENN., November 12.—It was August 6, 1945. Enemy planes had been picked up by radar, and an air-raid alert had been sounded.

"Then the Japanese at Hiroshima smiled with relief—there were only three B-29's.

"Compared with the heavy raids, they could do little harm, it was thought, so the city went on about its business.

"A small object dropped from the leading plane. Suddenly, with a blinding flash and unprecedented roar, it became a gigantic fiery sun.

"Multicolored light streaked the heavens, and enormous clouds boiled into the stratosphere. Beneath was utter devastation, and then silence, a silence marred only by the crackling of the rising flames around the edge of the city, where there was something left to burn. * * *

"That is past, but what of the future? Do we face the fearful destroying power of the atomic bomb, or can we tame it? Will it be our servant or our master? That, we believe, is the very real problem which faces the Amercan people today.

"For, believe us, the atomic bomb is not just a bigger and better bomb. It is a decisive weapon; the war with Japan was over the moment these bombs were dropped.

"People are realizing this. All over the Nation newspapermen, Congressmen, radio commentators, the President, and the man in the street are discussing what to do—what can be done?

"They ask: Can we keep the secret? Are there defenses? Must we decentralize? Is world organization the only way out? Or should we shoot the scientists? A decision must be made, and it had better be the right one.

"In this and the next four articles, we who have worked for a number of years on making the atomic bomb will present to you these facts as we know them, that can be released within the limits of secrecy regulations, and the conclusions to which we have been led.

"Let us look at the alternatives, what atomic power can do for us, and what it can do to us.

"First, the bright side of the picture, the peaceful harnessing of the power of the bomb.

"The initial steps have already been made. At Hanford, Wash., piles of uranium and graphite are actually heating up the entire Columbia River. Thus we know not from theory alone, but from direct experience, the vast and controllable source of energy that we have tapped. To see what this means for the future we must understand two points.

"To explain the first, let us look at these enormous plants in the State of Washington. There, as we have said, great quantities of heat are produced, but there is one bad thing about this heat. We can make unbelievable amounts of water warm with it, but we can't make much steam with it.

"Only with steam, and preferably with superheated steam, can we put this heat to work. Thus atomic power plants must be made to run at high temperatures in order to operate engines, and there is every reason to believe that atomic engines will be a reality in a few years.

"The second point is this: People have argued that if a 100-pound bomb can wipe out Hiroshima, then a 1-ounce unit can run a car or a locomotive. This is wrong. It is like saying that if a horse can pull 1 ton, then a tenth of a horse can pull a tenth of a ton.

"Like the horse, atomic power units cannot be cut up. They are on an all-or-none basis. A plant will work only if it exceeds a certain size. Thus in the foreseeable future, at least, atomic power will be confined to large power plants.

"An operating plant produces an intense radiation of neutrons and gamma rays and a large fraction of its total weight would consist of shielding material to protect the operators from this radiation.

"Therefore, these plants will be of various weights, ranging perhaps from 50 to 1,000 ton. Nor will these power plants be cheap. Like the great dams, they will be expensive to build, but will be able to deliver enormous quantities of electricity or heat.

"In spite of these limitations, the results can be spectacular. There can be atom-driven ocean liners equipped with 50-ton boilers, lasting the lifetime of the ships, no additional fuel ever being needed.

"As larger and larger aircraft are made, these, too, would be propelled through the use of atomic power. In the not-too-distant future atom-powered space ships may become a reality.

"With abundant power at our disposal, we can air-condition entire cities. The filth and smoke of coal can be dispensed with. We can mine the oceans for their mineral wealth, which, incidentally, contain enormous quantities of uranium.

"Manual labor will be greatly reduced and machines will do the work more cheaply. Everywhere man will have more and more power at his disposal. He will earn more in shorter hours. He will have leisure time for recreation and education.

"He will be able to enjoy the benefits of radioactive elements produced in atomic energy reactions by improving his metallurgical technique, by increasing his medical tracer studies and by waging a more successful fight against cancer and other human diseases.

"This future is something to look forward to, to work for, But it is only half of the story. We must consider the other half. Atomic power can make life immeasurably better, but it can also destroy it entirely.

"What happened at Hiroshima is but a small foretaste of what any war to come would be like. Let us imagine that some foreign country 5 years from now, when it has its own atomic bombs, is planning a new super Pearl Harbor.

"Saboteurs quietly enter the United States carrying the parts of a hundred atomic bombs in their suitcases. These atomic bombs are assembled and hidden in a hundred of our largest cities and set to explode at a given time.

"To make things sure, a thousand V-2 rockets containing atomic explosives are launched at the appointed hour. In one instant our country would be a shambles—a sea of devastation.

"Our industries would be wiped out, our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force would be hopelessly paralyzed. All cities of 100,000 or more would be gone. The blow would be a knockout one. There would be no use of fighting back if we could. A fourth of the people in the country would be dead or horribly maimed.

"The scientists who have worked 3 years in secret to make these atomic bombs have felt deeply these terrifying possibilities. For 3 years we have had a chance to think about what they mean.

"During the war, our main concern was to make the bomb before the Germans did. But with the dropping of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the ending of the war, this was changed.

"We began to talk among ourselves and found to our surprise that we were in almost complete agreement. We felt, too, that it was our duty to put before the country the facts about the atomic bomb; only with an informed people could wise decisions be made.

"Thus it was that independently and almost simultaneously the scientists at Oak Ridge Clinton laboratories, at the University of Chicago, at the New York City metropolitan area, and at the Los Angeles bombs project in New Mexico formed organizations.

"Over 90 percent of all the scientists at these places joined. These associations were formed for the purpose of informing the public of some of the facts about the atomic bomb (that did not reveal secret information), and to point out the conclusions to which we had been led.

"We have been convinced that the atomic bomb must be controlled. We cannot tolerate another war. The question is, What to do?

"The urgency is great, in 3 to 5 years other nations will have atomic bombs. The scientific knowledge, the natural resources, the technical ability are available to any large nation. A monopoly by the United States just is not possible.

"Not only will other nations have these bombs, but there is no defense against them.

"One can shoot down a few of the V–2 rockets, or capture a few of the saboteurs. But let one slip through and a city the size of Albany is wiped out.

"The atomic bomb that fell on Nagasaki immediately made obsolete the one that fell on Hiroshima a few days earlier.

"We can expect the atomic bombs of the future to be a hundred or maybe a thousand times worse than these early samples. A hundred percent defense against this new weapon is essential but unfortunately is not humanly possible.

"What is true for us will be true for Russia, Great Britain, France. Every nation will be in the same position of fear of attack. We will find ourselves in a state of international mistrust and suspicion inviting an itchy trigger finger to start the earth on a path of destruction.

"There is only one way out of this dilemma—use of the atomic bomb must be prevented. But we can't outlaw it just by saying so; there has to be an international control with teeth in it.

"The organization that is to control the atomic bomb must be placed above the sovereignty of nations, and all nations must be subject to rigid inspection. There must be an international police force, only with world wide control can we look forward to a lasting era of peace."

NO. 2

This is the second article in a series about the atomic bomb's future specially prepared by the editorial committee of the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tenn. The association is composed of scientific experts who participated in the famous Oak Ridge project which played a major role in developing the atomic bomb. Paul S. Henshaw, noted radio-biologist, is chairman of the association:

"OAK RIDGE, TENN., November 13.—The development of the atomic bomb changed overnight the future that lies in store for us.

"In yesterday's article we discussed what this future might be. There was the promise of wonderful things to come, of a higher standard of living and a better life.

"There was also the fear of the terrible destructive power of the bomb and the urgent necessity of making sure there would never be another war. Such a war would mean the wiping out of our cities and our people.

"Many have realized this and are frantically searching for ways to guarantee our safety, As scientists who have been responsible for creating this dreadful weapon, we have an obligation to fulfill. We must inform people of the facts, and we must examine all the proposed safeguards in the light of these facts.

"Perhaps the most frequently suggested method of preventing future wars is summed up by the phrase 'keep the secret.'

"Great Britain, Canada, and the United States alone can now make the atomic bomb. We are presumed to be peace loving nations and to be trusted not to start wars; therefore let us keep the secret. Then no other nations can get atomic bombs to start a war. Or, even if they do succeed in making some, we can always keep ahead of them. Our bombs will always be bigger and better; we will have more of them.

"Such is the thesis of the 'keep the secret' school of thought.

"First, let us see just what these secrets are. By far the biggest one was that the bomb could be made to work. This was something nobody could know until we actually found it out. Until the very last, this was the major doubt in our minds.

"The Nazis would have concentrated their entire effort on atomic bombs had they been sure that they would work. Well, we let this secret out when we dropped the bomb on Hiroshima.

"Now the whole world knows they can be made, that they will work, and what they will do. Hence, the major occupation of any country planning for aggression will be to try to make these bombs.

"Can such countries succeed? The problems they face are very straightforward. They must make a certain amount of U–235 or of plutonium.

"They need find no magic formula to split these atoms. Whenever enough U–235 or plutonium is brought together the atomic explosion takes place automatically.

"The tasks, then, are to separate the U–235, or to make the plutonium, and to prevent the explosion until the proper moment.

"These problems are not secret; they are known all over the world. They have been described in detail in the official Government report by H. D. Smyth on the atomic-bomb project. It also tells what the successful methods were of getting the U–235; it describes how plutonium is prepared; it outlines the problems in setting off the atomic bomb.

"The entire world knows, then, that the bombs will work; it knows the methods of making them. All that it doesn't know now are the details of the processes: how the machinery is designed, what chemicals are used, and so forth.

"Those are the only secrets. But they are not very comforting. Any group of scientists, knowing these general facts, can work out the details just as we did.

"This conclusion is inescapable. People confronted with these facts are forced to admit that it is only a matter of time before the details can be worked out by others.

"They may argue, however, that other countries don't have enough good scientists to do this for a long time. By keeping these details secret, they say, we would be sure of a long period of monopoly.

"Actually, the fact is that had it not been for the aid of foreign scientists, we, ourselves, might have failed. At best it would have taken longer. It was not Americans who discovered that the uranium atom could be split; it was three Germans: Hahn, Strassman, and Meitner.

"On the atomic-bomb project we were aided by many men of foreign birth and training: Fermi, from Italy; Franck, from Germany; Szilard, Wigner, and Teller, from Hungary; Bohr, from Denmark; and Von Halban and Auger, from France.

"British and Canadian scientists have shared our work on an equal basis. Science is international. It is not restricted to one country, nor to one race; there are thousands of skilled scientists in countries other than our own.

"So far is it from being true that we have a monopoly of brains, that we on the project were desperately afraid for many months of the war that the next secret weapon of Germany would turn out to be the atomic bomb.

"We knew the Germans could make them; they had some of the foremost scientists in the world working on their bomb project.

"It is probable that only our block-buster air raids on their research laboratories, and the daring British commando raids on the heavy water plants in Norway prevented them from succeeding before we did. If they had, they would have won the war.

"It cannot be denied that the scientists of Russia, France, or South America will work out these missing details, and quickly.

"In addition to this, we can't say that we alone have the industrial genius and wealth to make atomic bombs. Actually, we used only a small fraction of our industrial power to make them.

"It cost us $2,000,000,000, but during the war we spent $2,000,000,000 every 9 days. The entire cost to us of the war was $300,000,000,000, so that less than 1 percent of our war budget was used on atomic bombs.

"Another nation starting now could do the job much more cheaply. It could choose one of the four processes we have described as being successful, and concentrate on it.

"By taking a little more time, it could avoid the inevitable waste of material for building plants before knowing that they would work, as we had to do.

"In short, another nation could do the job by exerting less than one-fourth the effort that we have. Other countries are entirely capable of this effort. In spite of bombings, Germany nearly succeeded; Russia is bound to.

"Can other countries get the raw materials? Certainly. There are deposits of uranium all over the world; the major uranium ores are in Canada, Czechoslovakia, and in the Belgian Congo. Others are sure to be discovered now that the value of uranium is known. Of the Big Three, we are the poorest in raw materials.

"Thus any major nation, and perhaps many smaller countries, will have the scientific brains, the money, the industrial ability, and the raw materials to make atomic bombs.

"In a few years, say 3 to 5, Russia, and perhaps France, will have a supply of them. The smaller countries will take longer, perhaps 10 or 15 years. America cannot make herself safe from an atomic-bomb attack by any policy of secrecy or monopoly.

"There can be no balance of power in a world armed with atomic bombs. These are offensive weapons and they are decisive. A single surprise attack will be sufficient to cripple and devastate any country.

"A hundred bombs planted by saboteurs or fired by V–2 rockets might be expected to kill or maim 40,000,000 of us, and would wipe out every important industry.

"Numerical superiority is meaningless. If a country is totally destroyed by a thousand atomic bombs in one night, it does not matter that the day before it had 10,000 stored away.

"Thus neither secrecy, monopoly, nor supremacy can protect us. Two other ways have been proposed: (1) To develop a good defense, and (2) to spread out our cities so that no one bomb could cause much damage.

"These we will discuss in the next two articles, but they offer no hope.

"A future Hitler could attack us with the assurance of destroying us overnight.

"The only method which promises to save us and the rest of the world is to set up an international control with teeth in it.

"No nation can be allowed to possess these bombs. If we do not voluntarily set up this control, we will have it anyway—from world conquest by whatever nation chooses to use the bombs first."

NO. 3

The chance of ever discovering an effective defense against the atomic bomb is regarded as negligible by scientists who helped develop the potent new weapon at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Their reasons are set forth in the following third article of a series prepared by the editorial committee of the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories:

"OAK RIDGE, TENN., November 14.—When the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, the Japanese had no idea what hit them.

"All that the military intelligence knew was that three planes had been sighted over the city. Then, suddenly, the Hiroshima radio was silent. There was no reply to urgent messages over the telephone, the railway telegraph, and the military wireless.

"By some magic, the entire city seemed to have disappeared.

"It was only when a Japanese colonel flew toward the city and saw the enormous pillar of smoke rising over a scene of utter ruin that they began to understand. A hundred thousand people were killed outright. Two hundred thousand burned and maimed were given what pitifully inadequate first aid could be brought from the nearest city.

"That is what happened at Hiroshima, and that is what could happen to any American city. For the first time, man has a weapon that can completely destroy. The atomic bomb is not just another military toy. It can change the fate of our civilization.

"We who have worked on the development of the atomic bomb have been deeply aware of the tremendous problems it poses. In the preceding two articles of this series we have shown there is nothing to prevent other nations of the world from having large stocks of atomic bombs in a few years.

"With the present public knowledge of what already has been accomplished, and under peacetime conditions, such bombs may be produced at a fraction of the cost and effort which we put into them.

"Within a few years they may well be within the reach of the smaller nations of the world, yet the atomic bomb, even in its present early stage of development, is a weapon without comparison. It is a weapon of overwhelming power—made to order for the dreams of conquest by a potential world tyrant.

"With this weapon, the odds are so heavily in favor of the aggressor that we can expect any future war to begin with a knock-out blow.

"The memory of Pearl Harbor is still fresh in our minds. Let us substitute for each of the bombers used in that attack a long-range plane or V–2 rocket. Each has one or more atomic bombs, and each is directed toward an important city or vital military establishment.

"It requires little imagination to picture a new Pearl Harbor in which our hundred largest cities are wiped out, 30,000,000 of us killed and many millions injured, the Nation hopelessly disorganized and at the mercy of the enemy.

"Are any defenses possible that can prevent such an attack? In order to answer this, three points must be kept in mind:

"The first is that the atomic bomb is radically different from ordinary bombs. It consists of perfectly stable and inert lumps of material. You couldn't explode one of these lumps with a ton of dynamite. They are as safe as a piece of clay.

"It is only when these pieces are brought together in a certain way that they explode. There is no possibility of an undesired explosion. A pilot carrying an atomic bomb would actually feel far safer than with a load of TNT—no chance hit by an antiaircraft shell could detonate his bomb.

"The second point is that because these bombs cannot be exploded prematurely there are no specific defenses against them. The best we can do is to prevent them from reaching their destination—that is, to shoot down the planes or rockets that carry them, and to intercept any saboteurs intending to plant them in our cities.

"The third point is that the defense must be completely airtight and foolproof. A single bomb slipping through could wipe out a center the size of Jersey City. The enemy can afford to waste bombs. If only ninety-nine out of a hundred planes are shot down, this attack will still be successful, for one plane does the work of 2,000.

"Let us suppose that we do go ahead with a policy of armed defense. We will have the world's most powerful Air Force, the world's largest and best-equipped army, the world's toughest marines, the best and biggest atomic bombs, and such defensive weapons as our ingenuity can devise.

"When our military intelligence informs us that other nations have, as we had anticipated, perfected the atomic bomb and gone into mass production, what shall we do?

"Should we immediately adapt the Nazi alibi of self-protection and make surprise attacks on such nations to subject them to our rule? If we are going to act on suspicion, what are we waiting for?

"Obviously, such an attack is entirely against our principles. We would wait to be attacked ourselves.

"This means a continuous and vigilant alert. We would have to be prepared to intercept at any instant a swarm of long-range planes winging through the stratosphere or a cloud of V–2 type rockets dropping like bolts from the blue.

"Our Navy would have to search the seas continuously; our patrol planes would have to fly day and night; the antiaircraft guns encircling every city would be manned 24 hours a day. Just to maintain this vigil means a major war effort.

"Not only must we guard against an attack from the sky but we could allow no saboteurs the chance of smuggling atomic bombs into our cities. We would have to guard every foot of our borders and scrutinize every single thing that went in or out of these cities. The FBI would expand a hundredfold or a thousandfold to watch every individual in the country.

"This Nation simply could not tolerate existing in such a state of watchful waiting. We couldn't go about our every-day lives, and even if we tried, it would probably be futile.

"Who can guard against human mistakes? It was the human element, not the lack of defenses, that made Pearl Harbor possible.

"Those of us who survived a surprise atomic bomb attack would find small comfort in a report that by brilliant and courageous efforts our military forces had intercepted 900 atomic bombs, permitting only 100 to destroy our principal cities and military installations.

"Yet even a defense as efficient as this is hard to imagine. We have yet to shoot down a single V–2 rocket in flight.

"We must conclude that, because the defense must be constantly on the alert and because it must be 100-percent complete, it is just not humanly achievable.

"If we are to rely on our own resources for our protection, the only remaining way to increase our chances of surviving a sudden blow is to disperse our cities. By spreading out our population and industry we could reduce the possibility of our being destroyed in the initial surprise attack.

"We could then have the opportunity to engage in a battle of mutual atomic warfare with our enemies. This proposal does not sound very attractive, but it has been seriously suggested. We will consider in the next article just what it implies.

"We have seen how hopeless it is to prevent other nations from making atomic bombs and how impossible it is to defend ourselves adequately against a sudden attack.

"As long as the atomic bomb is loose in the world there can be no safety from momentary annihilation. It must be made impossible for any nation to use it. But how?

"We have seen that treaties and international agreements are treated as scraps of paper by a nation bent on aggression. This is one agreement that must stick. It must be enforced.

"The only way that this can be done is to set up an international police force with sufficient strength and authority to enforce a complete inspection and control of atomic bomb facilities in all nations. This may seem an intolerable loss of sovereignty, but the price is small for the assurance of lasting peace."

NO. 4

Proposals to dismantle American cities and decentralize the population as a defense against future atomic-bomb attacks are discussed in the following article prepared by the editorial committee of the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tenn., who helped develop the revolutionary weapon. This is the fourth in a series of five articles:

"OAK RIDGE, TENN., November 15.—We are on the brink of a revolution far greater than that which overtook Russia, far greater than the industrial revolution which gave us automobiles, radios, and airplanes.

"This revolution was ushered in with the destruction of the Japanese city of Hiroshima by a single small atomic bomb. Man in his persistent prying into Nature's secrets has found something that dwarfs all that has gone before.

"He has tapped a source of power a million times more concentrated than the explosive in a block buster. What is more, he has created a Frankenstein monster that can destroy him.

"The next war, if it comes, will be waged with atomic bombs, and the first nation to use them will win that war. It will win it in the first few hours. It will win before the nation under attack knows who the attacker is.

"We in America, who have created this bomb, have a bear by the tail. There is no sitting back, no middle course. Regardless of what we do, other nations will have atomic bombs in a few years. It makes no difference whether we keep the 'secret' or not.

"Every major power has the scientific and industrial ability to make these bombs. There is no adequate defense against them. They will be sent through the stratosphere in V–2 type rockets; they will be smuggled in by enemy agents.

"There is no way of shooting down every single rocket and of catching every saboteur. And yet, if one slips through, an entire city would be wiped out.

"In this series of five articles, we who have worked on the development of the atomic bomb are placing before you the facts as we know them, and the conclusions to which they have led us. And of this we are sure: There is no lasting secret; there is no adequate defense.

"People have recognized that in a few years other nations will have atomic bombs and have thought seriously of ways to prevent the sudden devastation of this country in a surprise attack.

"Recognizing that armed defense is not enough, they have proposed that we spread out our cities and industries. With this decentralization, no one atomic bomb could seriously affect us, as one would if it hit present-day Detroit or Washington. Let us examine just what this proposal means.

"The present bomb kills everyone and completely destroys all industry over an area of 4 square miles. With a few years of improvements, this area of destruction may be 15 or 20 square miles.

"One such bomb would wipe out a city of 200,000 or would devastate the heart of New York or Chicago.

"To make decentralization effective, we would have to abandon all cities of more than 10,000 or 50,000 people and rebuild them as small scattered communities.

"Yet over 50,000,000 of us—nearly half our population—live in such large cities. The social and economic implications of such a mass migration are staggering. It would take sev-

eral years. To do it before other nations have atomic bombs we would have to start immediately—tomorrow.

"The cost would be enormous—at least equal to our present national debt. All our heavy industries would have to be torn down and rebuilt in small sections scattered here and there. Our transportation system would have to be tremendously expanded to serve a decentralized industry.

"It is probable that our standard of living would be reduced. We have been told time and again that it is the centralization and mass production methods that have given Americans the world's highest standard of living.

"City dwellers would have to adjust themselves to a new way of life. They would get away from city smoke and would lead more healthful lives. But they would have to do without their huge stores, their large public buildings. Football, the opera, and symphony orchestras could exist only on a much reduced scale.

"Washington would have to be decentralized as well. Congress could never meet in one body for danger of being wiped out in one blow. The huge Departments of the Army and Navy, Agriculture, and so forth, would have to be broken up into small units.

"The same would apply to State legislatures and offices. The whole problem of government is complicated enough as it stands. With decentralization it might strangle in its own red tape.

"Apart from these economic and social factors, there is another aspect that cannot be ignored. That is the question of what would happen to our democracy during such an upheaval.

"No one would know where or when to move. They would have to be told. Every step would have to be planned and organized.

"The Government would tell each individual what to do. Each industry would be ordered just where to put its scattered plants. The new communities would have to be under close control to be sure that they would not grow back again into large cities. Each would have its immigration quota; each industry could hire no more than so many men.

"This kind of control would be very close to a dictatorship. At best it would be a serious loss of personal liberty. It is hardly conceivable that Americans would submit to this kind of regimentation.

"It is safe to say that only as the very last desperate expedient would we consider this revolution in our way of life. Actually, as we will see, there is a much easier way to safeguard ourselves from the destruction of another world war.

"But one last objection must be raised to this plan of decentralization. It is more serious than the difficulty, the cost, or the danger of dictatorship. It is that the scheme would do very little good.

"In the first place, the enemy might have a still more destructive bomb than we had planned on. We would never know until too late.

"Still a second point is that this dispersal would not prevent another war. Instead of a mercifully quick destruction, the war might be prolonged indefinitely while each nation gradually reduced the others to ashes.

"These are not satisfactory preventives—it is war that must be abolished. There will be no victor in a future war of attrition with atomic bombs. Already in Europe we have seen that France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, have suffered as much or more than beaten Germany.

"Unless we take positive steps to prevent it, we will find ourselves in a world armed with atomic bombs. A war will then be inevitable—there is bound to come a Hitler bent on world conquest. We will be waiting for the first—and final—world atomic war.

"There appears to be only one solution to this problem—use of the bomb must be prohibited. This can be done with none of the social upheaval of decentralization; there would be no change in our personal lives.

"But this outlawing can't be done by treaties or gentlemen's agreements. What are 'scraps of paper' to an aggressor nation?

"We must have an effective world organization and an international police force powerful enough to prevent any nation from getting these bombs. As the foremost Nation on earth, we have the opportunity now to lead the world to a lasting security."

NO. 5

A five-point program for world control of the atomic bomb secret is advanced herewith in the last of five articles on the new weapon by the men who helped develop it—the Association of Oak Ridge Scientists at Clinton Laboratories, Oak Ridge, Tenn. This series was prepared by the association's editorial committee.

"OAK RIDGE, TENN., November 16.—This is the last of a series of five articles on atomic power. In these we have tried to state the facts as we who have worked on the scientific development of the atomic bomb know them.

"Of this we are certain: There is no lasting secret; there can be no adequate defense. In a few years, first Russia and then other nations will have atomic bombs.

"We can then repeat the weary cycle of the rise to power of some new Hitler bent on world conquest. Only, this will be the last war.

"We will be at the mercy of a surprise attack. Atomic bombs carried in V–2 rockets and long-range planes will reduce our cities to ashes and twisted steel.

"It has been apparent for a long time that sovereign nations do not exist in peace. Treaties and agreements mean nothing to an aggressor.

"The League of Nations was one of the first attempts to build a gentlemen's agreement. Nations drifted apart in increasing mutual suspicion and mistrust. There was nothing to prevent the rise of Nazi Germany.

"Today, we have another world organization—the United Nations. It is a step forward from the League of Nations, but it, too, is a gentlemen's agreement.

"No good would result from giving the atomic bomb to the United Nations in its present form, for it would prevent no major power from doing what it wanted to do.

"We cannot trust the methods of old-fashioned diplomacy. They are horse-and-buggy methods. With the development of atomic bombs by sovereign states, they cannot prevent a war which will largely destroy our civilization. We must have a world organization with the power to effectively control the atomic bomb and eventually all armaments.

"As atomic-bomb scientists we are not qualified to discuss the details of the new organization that is needed, but certain requirements are clear to us:

"1. In order to form the organization, cooperation of all the major nations is essential.

"2. The raw materials and mineral resources (involved in making atomic bombs) must become world property.

"3. The organization must have the power to make detailed inspections of all countries at all times.

"4. Military production of atomic bombs must be prohibited, and the organization empowered to use force if necessary to carry out this provision. Once everybody knows how to make the bombs, any attempt to make them or even the refusal to allow free access to a country for inspection must be treated as an act of war.

"5. The organization must be the sole possessor of atomic bombs, if any are made at all. Ordinary weapons, however, would be ample for police purposes so long as effective inspection is maintained. The existence of bombs anywhere would be a source of uneasiness and distrust. The manufacture of such weapons must be abolished altogether.

"Just what adverse effect would forming this organization have on our daily lives? Unlike the vast schemes for decentralization or going underground, there would be no tremendous upheaval in our way of life.

"There would be an international police force; it would cost us less than our own Army and Navy. There would be frequent inspections of our plants and scientific laboratories. We would notice this even less than we do the periodic inspection of our neighborhood grocer's scale by the man from the department of weights and measurements. And that is all there would be.

"How can we go about getting this world control? Not by our present policy.

"We have encircled the globe with our military power; we boast naval and air forces superior to those of the rest of the world combined and we are insisting on a ring of defensive bases under our exclusive control, at the thresholds of Europe and Asia.

"At the same time we have served notice that we are entering a world armament race. Our military leaders are making it clear that they are seeking to maintain and improve our weapons of war.

"We have adopted a policy of keeping the atomic bomb secret for as long as possible. The effect of this on other countries, especially Russia, is certain. They will develop their own atomic bombs with all possible speed.

"They will feel that only by force can they keep their place in the world. This is just what we would do if the positions were reversed—if the U. S. S. R. dominated South America, and held bases in Hawaii, Panama, and the Caribbean Islands, if instead of us, they possessed overwhelming naval and air power—plus the atomic bomb.

"We cannot allay such fears abroad merely by assurance of our good intention. Nor can we do so by a gesture of giving the bomb away.

"To give the remaining secret information on the bomb to other nations without at the same time leading in the development of an effective world organization for its control would only hasten the next war.

"Let no one mistake us, we do not want to give the bomb away. Rather, we want to take it out of the control of any one nation—including our own.

"As the leading Nation on the earth and the sole possessor of the atomic bomb for the next 2 or 3 years, we have temporarily a tremendous prestige. We must use it to make other nations realize that a world control with real teeth is the only guarantee of their security as well as of our own.

"This task of world organization must be undertaken immediately. It can best be done through a world organization. The matter should be the main topic of conversation at the next meeting of the Big Three.

"Russia will have to be convinced. For good reason or otherwise, she has always been suspicious of the western nations. Only by a sincere and resolute conviction that this is the only way, and by determined action to bring it about, is there a chance of success.

"We must succeed. The world cannot risk another war. The atomic bomb did not create this need for world organization. The increasing destructiveness of wars had long before made the need clear.

"Even the most enthusiastic prophets of a world order believed that so great a task could not be attained soon, or in one step. But now it must.

"The development of the atomic bomb has made it necessary that we succeed in a very few years. It has thrust before us a razor-sharp choice between mutual destruction or world order under law. There is no alternative.

"The atomic bomb is not merely another new weapon; it is the first uncertain step into a new order of power—the power of man over nature for his common good, or the power to destroy himself. Unless that power is matched by a new order of statesmanship, our civilization will be erased from the earth."

EFFECT OF OPA REGULATIONS ON MERCHANDISING

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have a short telegram which I just received which is typical of a great many telegrams and letters I am receiving from reputable businessmen of long experience. I should like to read this telegram as an illustration of what is happening in the merchandising field. It is addressed to me, and reads:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *December 7, 1945.*
The Honorable BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently recommend you investigate possibility of eliminating OPA and all phases except sugar, fats, and rent control. We have strong feeling this would eliminate much shoddy merchandise made by fly-by-night manufacturers at ridiculously high prices approved by OPA. We are getting dribble shipments from old-established firms while getting many offers by new firms we never heard of with prices approximately double reputable firms. If legitimate manufacturers are turned loose to produce, competition will soon level prices off and quality will improve rapidly. Retailers and the public will revolt at excessive prices. Reputable stores and manufacturers will not cut their own throats for short-term profits. Unless we get immediate action of some kind to encourage production of dependable merchandise scarcity of good goods will become so acute that the situation will not be manageable.

The telegram is signed by A. L. Killian, president, the Killian Co., of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and I use the telegram as a typical message from many merchandisers because I know of the splendid and outstanding reputation of this firm, its long history of honorable and reliable dealings, and the fact that any statement made by this firm along this line can be amply proved and substantiated by the facts.

REPORT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of receipts and expenditures incurred in the operation of St. Elizabeths Hospital during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of sundry members of the Berlin (Wis.) Baptist Women's Union, remonstrating against an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to equal rights; ordered to lie on the table.

A communication from Mrs. Isabella Senn, of Pittsburgh, Pa., relating to peacetime compulsory military training, unemployment compensation, and other legislation pending in Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WILEY:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft general housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Waukesha County (Wis.) Board of Supervisors, expressing gratitude to the gallant young men and women of the armed forces who so valiantly served the country and humanity in World War II, and pledging continued cooperation and financial support; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REQUEST FOR LOCATION OF UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL IN MIDCONTINENT AREA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand 10 identical letters or memorandums signed by 10 governors who make the request that if it is decided that the United Nations capital shall come to the United States, it be located in the midcontinent area. I ask unanimous consent that one letter be printed in the RECORD, and also the signatures of the 10 governors, and that the memorandums or letters be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for its study.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and one copy, together with the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF GEVERNORS OF MIDCONTINENT STATES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AS TO LOCATION OF PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The subscriber, as Governor of the State of South Dakota, joins with Governors of other midcontinent States in making the following representations to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, Congress, and all others whom it may concern:

1. The selection of a site for permanent headquarters of the United Nations is an important step in their organization and should be made only after careful and full consideration of all factors involved in the question.

2. Location of the site within the United States of America could be made most equally convenient and impartial to Europe, Asia, and Africa by selection of a site in the midcontinent area of our country.

3. A site in the midcontinent area would tend to give equal benefits to our Nation at large by balancing between the east coastal area, with the National Capital and early historical cities of the country, and our west coastal area, with its great cities and industries standing on the threshold of development of their great natural resources and expansion of commerce and industry through the Pacific area.

4. There are many adaptable sites of convenience and beauty in all the midcontinent States to which we respectfully invite your attention and urge exertion of your influence toward selection, for the purpose of giving equality of benefit and convenience to our Nation as a whole by location of the United Nations headquarters in the great midcontinent area.

M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of South Dakota; John C. Vivian, Governor of Colorado; J. H. Davis, Governor of Louisiana; Edward J. Thye, Governor of Minnesota; Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of Missouri; Sam C. Ford, Governor of Montana; Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska; Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of North Dakota; Jim McCord, Governor of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, Governor of Wyoming.

MEMORIAL AGAINST COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter signed by a group of juniors and seniors of the Wichita (Kans.) High School East, remonstrating against enactment of legislation providing for compulsory military training.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator from the State of Kansas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We are a group of high-school juniors and seniors at Wichita High School East, who, in the near future will be affected by compulsory military training. We all are now planning to go on to college, and are very much concerned with the outcome of this bill.

In a recent assembly at our school, the student body was addressed by Dr. Jerome Davis, a United States war correspondent just returned from Russia. Dr. Davis expressed an opinion with which we are very much in accord. He says that such a program creates a very undesirable appearance to the outer world, and that if our Nation should be forced into another war, it will be a war of science and not of large armies. He also said that he believes we should spend the money that would be spent on military training, on a program educating scientists, and maintain an army and navy just large enough to put their scientific weapons into effect.

We, the undersigned, agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Davis, and are passing this on to you as our representative, and thanking you for your service, we are,

Sincerely yours,

Jack Ferguson, Jim B. Olander, Tommy Hawkins, Conkey Decil, Robert Alexander Kness, David McCullough, Patrick Kelly, Dave Lockhart, William Thompson, Floyd Martin, Bill Sweam, Jim McCausland, Bill Buechel, Bob Shaw, Harold L. Morton, John C. Neely III, Jack Ranson, Scott Van Wormer, Tommy Hanson, Ralph Park, Bill Gardneau, W. R. Mosbacker, Robert J. Sandifer, Henry E. Zoller III, Ray Fleming II.

RELEASE TO FARMERS OF SURPLUS TRUCKS, TRACTORS, ETC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a petition from the Slope County Farmers Union adopted on November 24 which briefly states:

We hereby request and demand that Government surplus war property, especially trucks, tractors, tires, and farm machinery be released into this territory immediately for farm and agricultural use.

There being no objection, the petition was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOPE COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
Rhame, N. Dak., November 26, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At the sixth annual convention of the Slope County Farmers Union which was held at Amidon, N. Dak., on November 24, 1945, the convention went on record in favor of the following motion which was made, duly seconded and upon vote, carried without a dissenting vote:

"We hereby request and demand that Government surplus war properties, especially trucks, tractors, tires, and farm machinery, be released into this territory immediately for farm and agricultural use."

We request that you use all your power and influence in securing the release of these articles for agricultural purposes in this district.

Respectfully yours,
SLOPE COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
FRANK J. NESTOR, *County Secretary.*

RELEASE OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, a petition signed by sundry citizens of several States requesting that all conscientious objectors be immediately and unconditionally released.

There being no objection, the petition was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION TO OUR PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS FOR THE IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF ALL CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

At this time, while our Government is condemning the individual within the Axis borders for his irresponsible submission to the militarists in his country, it is hardly consistent that our Government should be punishing individuals in our own country for exercising this discretion and judgment the lack of which is so strongly deplored in others. If the conscience of the individual is to be exercised freely, the conscientious objector must be freed from the threat of prison or the concentration camp. In the name of all the noble traditions of freedom in America, the tyranny of the State over the minds and convictions of our own people must be wiped out.

In agreement with the foregoing, we, the undersigned, respectfully petition that all conscientious objectors to conscription, regimentation, and war, now in prison, be freed immediately and unconditionally. We further recommend that the law under which such imprisonment is made possible be repealed.

UNIVERSAL PEACETIME MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a resolution in the nature of a memorial adopted by the Brotherhood Congress of the North Dakota Evangelical Church assembled in annual session at the city of Jamestown, N. Dak., expressing opposition to peacetime military training.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas compulsory peacetime military training has recently been advocated by our President and by the military leaders of our Nation; and

Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States, certain measures providing for the compulsory peacetime training; and

Whereas we believe that such compulsory training, on a full-time basis, which would interrupt the educational and normal development of our young men is contrary to American principles and Christian ideals, and not in the best interests of this Nation nor in the best interests of our young men; and

Whereas we believe that a program of compulsory peacetime military training would not be in the interests of permanent peace because it would bring about an armament race among nations which recently were allies in World War II and would create suspicion and distrust among the nations of the world; and

Whereas our Nation has just won a war fought to eradicate the evils resulting from a program of militarism, when carried to its ultimate and logical ends: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Brotherhood Congress of the North Dakota Evangelical Church, assembled in annual session in the city of Jamestown, declare our uncompromising opposition to such compulsory peacetime military training, and that we urge our Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress to oppose any measure which provides for full-time compulsory peacetime military training, and which could place our military training on any other than a voluntary basis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD one of 74 memorials, all similarly headed, against peacetime military conscription, with merely the number of names noted and not the signatures.

There being no objection, memorials signed by 1,869 citizens of the State of North Dakota, were received and one was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

We, the undersigned, hereby oppose universal peacetime military conscription as expressed in President Truman's recommendation to Congress.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the month of November 1945, from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Helen Gauntlett [1]	1634 I St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.	$4,300
Virginia Kreamer [1]	3918 10th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,760
John W. Nelson [2]	2747 29th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	5,600

[1] Terminated Nov. 15, 1945.
[2] Loaned to committee starting Nov. 15, 1945.

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	$2,980.00
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,300.00
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	State Department, Washington, D. C.	5,180.00
Darel McConkey	509 Fontaine St., Alexandria, Va.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,650.00
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.	3,090.00
Mary Jane Oliveto	500 B St. NE., Washington, D. C.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	2,100.00
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,230.00
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.	9,012.50

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1673. A bill to grant pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1674. A bill for the relief of Michael Joseph Bennett, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1675. A bill for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. O'DANIEL introduced Senate bill 1676, to repeal the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPEAL OF EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during the war somebody had an idea that the winning of the war would be aided if we established an OPA. So we established OPA. All of our enemies have now surrendered unconditionally and the war is over, due to the heroic efforts and sacrifices of our armed forces on the fields of battle and in spite of the antics of OPA on the economic home front. The economic system of our Nation proved to be strong enough to withstand the fantastic regulations of OPA during the war. But, as I have already said, the war is now over, and it seems to me to be perfectly in order to ask for the unconditional surrender of the OPA so that our economic system of free private enterprise may get back into gear and function as it did before the OPA was born.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am sending to the desk a bill which would abolish the OPA, and ask that it be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1676) to repeal the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I heartily disagree with the sentiments which have been expressed by the Senator from Texas. I feel that if we were to abolish the OPA at this time we would simply surrender to uncontrolled inflation which could very conceivably end in the complete break-down of our economic system.

I feel that under those circumstances our democracy and our way of life might be seriously endangered.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 3, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"ERECTION OF A STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

"To enable the Architect of the Capitol to acquire a statue of George Washington and a suitable granite pedestal upon which to erect such statue and defray all expenses of erecting such statue upon the Capitol Grounds, all as authorized by the act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 299), $25,000."

FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute which we intend to offer to Senate bill 1661, to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes.

I ask that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the amendment intended to be proposed to the bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] last Thursday, in accordance with the recommendations in the President's message on labor relations, includes only the pertinent parts relating to the procedures for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes which were in title I of S. 117, which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] introduced last June for himself, the Senator from Minnesota, and the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton.

I wish to refer briefly to my reason for offering this title as a substitute for the Ellender bill. It is the result of the action taken by the Committee on Education and Labor on Friday last December 7, when the committee considered the question of holding hearings on pending labor legislative proposals. The bill had been introduced the day before, and drafted, I understand, after the President's message was sent to the Congress a week ago today.

Senate bill 1171, on the other hand, had been introduced on June 20, after more than a year of careful work and drafting. It covered the whole field of labor relations, and attempted to lay the basis for a sound and comprehensive Federal policy. Its authors, the Senator from New Mexico and myself, never contended it was a perfect bill, but we believed it could be the basis for a full and complete set of hearings by the committee, and of consideration by the committee of the whole field, and that after such hearing and such study the committee would then be in a position to proceed to draft a labor relations policy for the Federal Government which would stand a chance of success.

I have never felt that the Congress could without getting into trouble legislate in this tremendously complex and delicate field without full hearings and thorough consideration. I think our experience with the legislation we passed in a hurry a year or two ago, in a wave of emotion, demonstrated that it would be a mistake, and likely to get us into trouble, if we tried it again. We did not ask for immediate hearings on Senate bill 1171, because it is a very long and involved bill. We had planned to ask the committee chairman for hearings this fall, but when the President called the labor-management conference we deferred to that, and postponed our request until after the conference was over. The conference labored for 4 weeks, and brought forth a set of innocuous resolutions, which mean very little, and which contributed very little toward a solution of this very important problem.

Mr. President, I am sure Members of the Senate are familiar with the great deliberation with which the Committee on Education and Labor has proceeded during the last 5 or 6 years in the consideration, or, one might say, lack of consideration, of the several dozen bills on labor relations which have been introduced and referred to it. The committee proceeded with so much deliberation, in fact, that in the past 4 years no legislation in this field has come out of the committee, and, so far as I know, no hearings have even been held, although a number of bills have been introduced, and most of the majority members of the committee have opposed the tendency of the other House to get a little angry at strikes and pass piecemeal legislation in this field in a rush.

Mr. President, that attitude seemed to change after the President's message a week ago today. Apparently the President has dropped a hot potato in the laps of a majority of the committee, and now they want to get rid of it just as quickly as possible, and they seem to be adopting much the same policy which they have opposed for the past 4 years.

When the question came up in the committee, with several other members I tried to obtain consent for consolidated hearings on the Ellender bill, the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], and Senate bill 1171, introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself. We were unsuccessful. The committee, on a straight party vote, voted to confine hearings exclusively to the Ellender bill. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who made the motion, indicated that he wanted the hearings held down to a very brief period, and expressed the hope that a bill could be reported and acted upon before Christmas.

Mr. President, in order to get before the committee, during these hearings, the full subject of labor relations and of Federal policy relating to them, I have been compelled to offer the labor provisions of Senate bill 1171 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Ellender bill. I may say that I intend to offer it in the committee, and offer it on the floor

of the Senate when and if the bill reaches the floor.

It is still my conviction, despite the President's message and the apparent desire of some Members on the other side to rush through a piecemeal, stopgap piece of legislation, that the whole structure of labor relations in this Nation is far too complicated and too delicate for legislation of a piecemeal, patchwork character to be rushed through in a hurry, without full hearing, and without adequate consideration.

Mr. President, I intend to do all I can in the committee to see that full and complete hearings are held.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, when the amendments to the so-called GI bill were under consideration the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for himself and for his colleague [Mr. CORDON], offered the substance of S. 977 to that bill. S. 977 was referred to the Finance Committee, because when it was introduced it contained certain provisions affecting veterans directly. If those provisions were not in the bill it would be definitely a housing bill. It is the purpose of the proponents of the bill to eliminate those sections. I therefore ask that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 977) to aid in providing housing for veterans attending educational institutions, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PLATFORM ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the National Grange, which held its seventy-ninth annual meeting at Kansas City, Mo., on November 14, adopted a platform which concisely covers the many pressing problems agriculture is now facing. I ask unanimous consent to have this platform printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For constructive policies and straightforward declarations, the seventy-ninth annual session of the National Grange, just concluded at Kansas City, must rank as one of the most outstanding conventions of this widely known farm group—oldest of all the Nation's agriculture organizations. While not proposing new or radical remedies for solving the Nation's problems, the Kansas City convention faced those problems squarely, and left no doubt of the course the Grange proposes to pursue.

Education, cooperation, free enterprise, willingness to work, and national unity were strongly emphasized by the National Grange, as far more essential to a prosperous Nation than the countless panaceas which savor so much of discarded failures of past generations. The farmers' pledge to produce a Nation's abundance, if a living income is forthcoming, formed the basis of the Grange approach to present-day perplexities; but such pledge including insistence upon a like attitude by all other groups.

The Grange pledged its nearly 8,000 local units in 39 States to continue in practical community service its organized energies that have functioned so magnificently in recent years, in both leading and supporting war-winning activities; and reiterated its long-time insistance upon national economy, personal thrift, and united devotion to the public welfare.

Notwithstanding all the obstacles necessary to be quickly overcome in planning such a convention this year, the Kansas City session was well attended, much enthusiasm was shown throughout the entire 10 days, and a class of more than 1,600 candidates received the seventh degree of the organization, coming from 25 different States. The 1946 annual session was voted to Portland, Oreg.

Below in condensed form appears the Grange platform for agriculture, unanimously adopted by the convention after thorough discussion; followed by an itemized summary of the principal declarations, both favored and opposed, by the National Grange.

GRANGE PLATFORM FOR AGRICULTURE

The National Grange believes that a sound farm program is essential not only to the stability and prosperity of agriculture, but of the Nation as a whole, and submits the following basic principles which must be recognized in any successful readjustment program. For these essential policies the National Grange will continue to fight.

1. Farmers' equitable share of the national income must be secured through a modernized parity, to be obtained through fair market prices rather than by subsidies. Support prices may be justified where necessary to assure cost of production.

2. Both marketing and purchasing operative farmer organizations must be encouraged as the first reliance for adjusting and stabilizing marketings.

3. A Surplus Commodity Commission should be established by Congress, to be provided with a sufficient stock of remedies for emergency action in meeting the occasional surpluses inevitable in an economy of balanced abundance.

4. The Marketing Agreements Act should be extended to include producers of commodities which can use it to advantage, in assuring consumers adequate supplies at reasonable prices.

5. Marketing quotas, when approved by two-thirds of the growers voting in a referendum, should be provided for preventing surpluses from creating market gluts; supported by a two-price system domestically for diverting excessive supplies to inferior uses.

6. A two-price system for exports should be adopted, to be accompanied by international commodity agreements that assure American farmers a fair share of world markets at stable prices.

7. Conservation of the Nation's basic natural wealth of soil and timber must be promoted through sound soil building, water conservation, and fire-prevention programs.

8. Federal and State guidance and assistance should be available in the development of sound, long-range readjustment programs for problem areas.

9. Research in the sciences of production and processing should be greatly amplified: For discovery of new and expanded uses of farm products; and for improving marketing and distribution.

10. A Federal Office of Nutrition should be set up to cooperate with State, local, and private agencies in promoting improved diets, through research and education; with widest publicity given to such findings as an important step toward improved national health.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE FAVORS

Establishment of an international farm organization of various nations throughout the world.

Support of the United Nations' Organization and support of the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO).

Placing authority over the atomic bomb in the hands of an international body, under direction of the United Nations.

Fulfillment of our obligations to assist war-torn Europe in reestablishing itself.

Aid to war veterans in relocating on farms where they shall have a reasonable chance of success.

National preparedness through school training and adequate standing volunteer army.

Maintenance of free competition among all forms of transportation.

Removal of price controls as rapidly as supplies meet demands sufficiently to assure reasonable prices.

A modernized parity formula to include labor costs, which will remain constantly current.

Farmer-owned production and marketing cooperatives.

A sound farm-credit system, under an independent bipartisan Farm Credit Board.

Balancing the Federal Budget; elimination of needless Government bureaus.

Extension of social security to include farmers and farm workers.

Enactment of the Hobbs bill or similar legislation to prevent labor racketeering.

Wider research in methods of growing and distributing farm crops.

Extension of rural electrification as rapidly as consistent with sound financing.

Support of the Extension Service, but maintained entirely by public funds, and its benefits available to all farmers, without preference to any group or organization.

Continued operation of synthetic rubber plants through private ownership as soon as possible.

Expansion of the Blue Cross hospitalization service and increase in group health insurance protection.

A vigorous campaign to clean up objectionable moving pictures.

Effective national survey on causes of crime and delinquency.

Adoption of practical methods to curb the liquor traffic.

Federal statute making standard time mandatory in all sections of the United States.

Further development of Federal crop insurance.

Early construction of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Continuation of the school-lunch program.

Appointment of a road committee in every subordinate grange, and increased advocacy of farm-to-market roads.

Audit of Government corporations by Comptroller General.

Taxing unearned income at higher rate than earned income.

Closing avenues of escape for inheritance and gift taxes.

THE NATIONAL GRANCE OPPOSES

Peacetime military conscription.

Continued conscription of irreplaceable farm workers.

Removal of immigration restrictions.

Subsidies in lieu of fair prices.

Federal encroachment of State and local rights on water control.

Inflationary price increases.

Enactment of proposed revision of the Wage-Hour Act to establish horizontal wage levels and arbitrary wage minimums.

Sale of liquor to minors; radio liquor advertising.

Sale of liquor and beer in all military camps.

Continuance of wartime excess-profit taxes.

Federal control of education.

Abandonment of the tobacco-quota program.

Federal control and regimentation of scientific research.

Double taxation of same income by same taxing units.

Taxing patronage dividends.

Unwarranted increase in parcel-post rates.

Five-day marketing week at terminal markets for perishables.

THE GRANGE SETS UP "GUIDE POSTS"

Several years ago the Grange set up three basic "guide posts" and has repeatedly reaffirmed them. They have attracted widespread approval and were given new endorsement by the Kansas City session, which declared them fundamental in assuring permanent prosperity. Here they are:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth; or anything which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression—both physical and economic.

Applied to everyday problems, this means this Nation must continue to produce a balanced abundance; must prevent monopolies in agriculture, industry, or labor, which restrict production in order to enhance prices; must see that reasonable compensation is made possible for those who earn it; and must do this under the private-enterprise system, which provides an opportunity for everyone to develop his own talents as he may desire.

FOREIGN ESPIONAGE AND THE ATOMIC BOMB—ARTICLE BY HOWARD RUSHMORE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on December 3 there appeared in the New York Journal and American an article by Howard Rushmore which has to do with the activities of the FBI in trailing a Russian secret-service agent who was alleged to have stolen secrets of the atomic bomb. As I understand from the writer's statement this matter had already been referred to the State Department of our own Government. A shorter article, dealing with the same subject, was published in other newspapers. I desire to read two paragraphs of the latter article to the Senate:

Agents of the Communist Internationale not only tried to steal secrets of the atomic bomb, but bribed technicians and engineers to furnish blueprints of military equipment including jet-propelled airplanes, the New York Journal and American learned today.

The important paragraph follows:

Although these espionage activities are known to the State Department, no action has been taken to date against a Russian spy ring, which for 2 years has operated with unlimited funds and skilled personnel in an effort to steal confidential scientific developments.

Mr. President, I ask that the two articles may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET AGENTS PAID BRIBES TO ENGINEERS

(By Howard Rushmore)

Agents of the Communist International not only tried to steal secrets of the atomic bomb, but bribed technicians and engineers to furnish blueprints of military equipment including jet-propelled airplanes, the New York Journal and American learned today.

Although these espionage activities are known to the State Department, no action has been taken to date against a Russian spy ring, which for 2 years has operated with unlimited funds and skilled personnel in an effort to steal confidential scientific developments.

Both the FBI and the State Department refused to comment on the exposure of one of these Soviet agents who is living under an assumed name at a midtown hotel. A squad of G-men is keeping a 24-hour watch on his activities.

For identification purposes, he will be called Alfred Adamson, although this newspaper knows the real name under which he operates and the name of the hotel at which he resides.

The State Department months ago was given what the FBI considers to be irrefutable proof that Adamson had in his possession secret plans of the atomic bomb given him by an American scientist in Chicago, in 1943.

Activity of still another Russian agent in this country also has been given the State Department by the FBI, this newspaper learned.

This Russian, now in the United States allegedly as a member of a Soviet trading company, spent several months in one of America's largest airplane manufacturing plants as an "observer" of a "friendly" nation.

This plant was working on highly-confidential details of jet propulsion for military aircraft.

Although Russia, as ally, was given many of these plans, certain "top-drawer" secrets were withheld by American engineers.

A year ago the Russian contacted technicians employed on jet propulsion and left large sums of money with them pending delivery of secret blueprints and data.

RUSSIAN ATOM SPY TRAILED BY FBI HERE—G-MEN LINK PLOTTER WITH SCIENTIST

(By Howard Rushmore)

For the past 2 years the FBI has been trailing a Russian secret-service agent who it is believed may have obtained atomic bomb secrets, it was learned by the New York Journal and American today.

Surrounded by a squad of FBI men, operating on a 24-hour basis, this Russian is now living in a midtown hotel.

We will call him Alfred Adamson, although that is not his name.

The real name under which he operates and the name of the hotel in which he is staying are known to the Journal and American.

He entered the United States illegally from Canada in 1938. He carried forged passports. He first appeared in this country in 1931 as a member of a Soviet purchasing commission, but returned to Moscow the same year.

UNDER CONSTANT WATCH BY FBI

Since September 1943, except for a few hours when he escaped surveillance, only to be located on a train bound for the west coast and a Soviet ship, Adamson has been under constant watch by the FBI.

A small, gnome-like man wearing huge, horn-rimmed spectacles. Adamson is about 45 years of age. He has a furtive walk, a pair of deep-set piercing eyes, and a nervous habit of always looking over his shoulder.

Although the FBI has refused comment, it is known his every move, his letters, and even his cables to his Russian wife are recorded by the agents. With the help of the hotel management, the agents have been able to keep Adamson's room under constant guard.

Adamson operates with virtually unlimited funds. Despite the fact that he is "employed" by an obscure Communist music shop on Fifth Avenue, at $75 a week, Adamson has bank accounts ranging into the thousands of dollars in a number of Manhattan banks.

He first entered the case in Chicago in 1943.

The discovery of his importance and the reason for his illegal entry was not known until that date.

A scientist, working on atomic bomb development in a Chicago laboratory, had been suspect by military intelligence officials. Unwittingly, this scientist led the FBI to Adamson.

HANDS SECOND MAN A PACKAGE IN PARK

This scientist—whose name is in possession of the Journal and American—had gone for a walk through the park. He was trailed by two military intelligence officers assigned to watch all his activities.

The scientist was seen to stop and hand a second man a package. No words were exchanged and the second man went on his way.

The FBI was called in to the case after the rooming house address of the stranger had been ascertained by the military intelligence officer who had trailed him.

The man was registered as Alfred Adamson.

That night, while Adamson was out of his room, the FBI entered it and found the package.

This package was rushed to Washington and inspected by scientists assigned to the atomic-bomb project.

It was found to contain highly confidential details of atomic development.

Proof of this important "leak" sent all counter-espionage Government groups into immediate action.

The scientist was immediately inducted into the Army, as were more than 100 other persons subsequently believed guilty of passing out information on the atomic bomb.

This scientist is now stationed on an obscure South Pacific island where he can be watched.

Adamson's activities since the meeting in the Chicago park read like a spy thriller.

His lists of contacts include members of the Communist Party's national committee, doctors, lawyers, an electrical manufacturing executive, workers in the Soviet Embassy, Soviet vice consuls and numerous other persons in every walk of life.

The wife of a prominent Russian-born doctor living on West End Avenue sends cables to Adamson's wife in Moscow. This contact's name is in possession of this newspaper.

The owner of a Madison Avenue jewelry store serves as an intermediary for Adamson, and acts as a go-between for his more secret contacts. Her name and the address of the store is in possession of this newspaper.

The wife of the Chicago scientist now serves as Adamson's "postoffice" from her Brooklyn home, where she receives mail from out-of-State contacts. This mail, in turn, is delivered to Adamson.

Names of all these persons have been made available to Government agencies by the New York Journal and American.

Adamson is aware he is being watched. Twice he has tried to evade the cordon of FBI men surrounding him. Once he nearly succeeded.

A year ago Adamson made his first effort to pass on information believed given him by his many contacts throughout the United States.

CHASED THROUGH RED LIGHTS FOR AN HOUR

Leaving the apartment owned by the jewelry-store proprietor, Adamson late one night dashed into a car waiting for him at the curb near Fifth Avenue and sped away.

Two FBI autos followed down one-way streets and through red lights for more than an hour.

When Adamson entered the car, he had a brief case in his hand.

Government agents suspected atomic-bomb secrets were in the brief case.

After a wild chase, the Adamson car slowed down and the Soviet agent left it at his hotel.

He was not carrying the brief case.

While one FBI car halted to watch Adamson, the other G-men followed the car whose license plates subsequently revealed it was owned by an executive of a company which

during the war manufactured secret radar equipment.

This car proceeded for a few blocks, stopped at the curb, and a Soviet vice-consul in New York was seen to enter it.

The car then drove to the Soviet consulate.

The Soviet official was seen to leave the car, carrying the brief case which Adamson had in his hand.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to state that I believe the State Department should, if possible, make an investigation of the allegation contained in this article. To my mind it presents one further bit of evidence of the need for a thorough investigation of the State Department.

REPORT OF GENERAL MOTORS CONFERENCE OF UAW-CIO

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to inform Senators that the text of the report, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the General Motors Conference of UAW-CIO, with respect to the President's December 3 proposal of a fact-finding board and his request that the workers return to work immediately, has been filed in the office of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and is open to inspection by interested parties.

In calling attention to this matter, I do so as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and without necessarily adopting or acquiescing in the statements made. I think that UAW-CIO vice president, Walter P. Reuther, who is also director of the union's General Motors department, has shown an admirable spirit of cooperation in making available to the committee a running record of developments in the union's wage dispute with General Motors Corp.

THE DRAFT NOT NEEDED—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Don't Need the Draft," written by him and published in the American Magazine for December 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUTURE POLICY AFFECTING THE AIR FORCES — ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Same Mistake Again" prepared by him and published in the December issue of the magazine Flying, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Congressional Viewpoint," delivered by Senator BUTLER before the Golden Anniversary Congress of American Industry of the National Association of Manufacturers, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADEQUACY IN OUR TIME—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject "Adequacy in Our Time," delivered by him before the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, on the occasion of their eightieth anniversary, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCIENCE AND THE GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Science and the Government," delivered by Senator KILGORE before the Science Society of Washington, the Technical Reserve of the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, and the Section on Social and Economic Sciences of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Washington, D. C., December 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

IF YOU WANT PEACE PREPARE FOR PEACE—ARTICLE BY AUSTIN J. APP

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "If You Want Peace Prepare for Peace," by Austin J. App, Ph. D., from Our Sunday Visitor, of Huntington, Ind., the issue of November 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE M. PUTNAM, PRESIDENT, NEW HAMPSHIRE FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial in tribute to George Martin Putnam, president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation, from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., November 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PASSING OF MRS. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "The Passing of Mrs. Charles Evans Hughes," by Horace G. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as I have some engagements to inspect certain military establishments for the United States Army engineers, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for an indefinite period of time from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the loan of $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain is not a loan, it is an outright gift. There is no interest rate for the first 5 years, and after that we will probably play "Uncle Sucker" again, and renounce the entire so-called loan, as we did after the first war.

If the loan would result in increased trade between the two nations, there might be some sense to it. But obviously Britain is committed to her own Empire, which she gathers to her bosom with tentacles as grasping as those of an octopus. In fact, she has repeatedly put up trade barriers to shut out the products of American labor. To ship an American car to Palestine would cost about $2,700 just for the tax. Under international law, they cannot put this tax on, but they do it anyway.

The question I ask is, What is Britain going to do with the money? Have we any guaranty that it will be used in the interest of world-wide trade? Has Britain ever gone out of the way to give us anything?

On reverse lend-lease Britain rented us land for the use of our air forces and buildings for our armed forces, but the charges were exorbitant, and practically every soldier returning from Great Britain resented the beating that America was, in their minds, receiving at the hands of an ally who would not be alive today if it were not for us. Great Britain on reverse lend-lease was acting much like the grocer in a store who tips the scales to his advantage before he weighs the purchaser's meat.

Very frankly, I shall never vote to send a gift across the seas to an imperialist country while our own American farmers, unquestionably one of the hardest working groups of people in the world, are forced to repay the seed and feed loans which were made during the early 1930's when, because of drought, many a farmer did not have enough money to buy a new roof to shelter his cows.

How can we afford to throw our money away without any guaranty that it will be repaid and without any knowledge that America will benefit, when we cannot afford to cancel or adjust a debt to men who produced the food that fed this Nation at home and its soldiers abroad better than any other nation in the world was fed? The price? It was often 17 hours of back-breaking work by men old enough to have retired if it were not that their sons were sweating in the swamps of New Guinea or "sweating it out" over the flak-infested cities of Germany and Japan.

There are those who will say that, if it had not been for Britain, Germany might have won the war in Europe. I say that if it had not been for Britain, there might never have been a war in Europe. They helped to create the German Frankenstein and then could not master the beast. They hated what they thought was the socialist regime in Germany. And so, together with the Vickers people, the munitions kings, and people like Sir Henri Deterding, the oil king, all of them British subjects, they conspired to build a real first-class war party in Germany. They never believed that party would turn against them.

It was the British who broke the Versailles Treaty in order to give Hitler airplanes and arms. It was their undercover agents who supported him everywhere in his diplomacy. If the British had supported the democratic leaders of Germany, as they later supported Hitler, we would not have had a world war.

But some will say: "The war is over. Let bygones be bygones." I say the war is not over when Great Britain is using force to exploit all the unhappy and oppressed people of the world who are under her thumb.

What does self-righteous, pompous Britain say to her bombing of the innocent people in Java who want only the right to live in a free land, governed by their own people who, along with the peoples of India, Palestine, Iran, and Iraq, are imbued with but one urge—the same glorious, breath-taking urge that drove our forefathers to throw off the shackles of British tyranny, and create a country where men are created free and equal?

I read from the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

Until such time as Britain is willing to lay down her arms against the suppressed peoples of her colonies and grant them the rights that our forefathers fought so gallantly to obtain for us, I go on record as insisting that we refuse to throw money into her lap—money that will support a government whose foreign policy is in direct contradiction to everything we fought for in this past war.

When we sent our boys overseas to give their lives and limbs for a cause we felt just and right, we dedicated ourselves to maintaining a world that would make worth while their sacrifices. We cannot, we must not, throw away the people's money, throw it into the grasping hands of a nation that is denying the very cause in which she said she fought.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 191, the bill providing Federal aid for hospital construction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Hospital Survey and Construction Act."

SEC. 2. The Public Health Service Act (consisting of titles I to V, inclusive, of the act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 682) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VI—CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS

"PART A—DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 601. The purpose of this title is to assist the several States—

"(a) to inventory their existing hospitals (as defined in section 631 (e)), to survey the need for construction of hospitals, and to develop programs for construction of such public and other nonprofit hospitals as will, in conjunction with existing facilities, afford the necessary physical facilities for furnishing adequate hospital, clinic, and similar services to all their people; and

"(b) to construct public and other nonprofit hospitals in accordance with such programs.

"PART B—SURVEYS AND PLANNING

"Authorization of appropriation

"SEC. 611. In order to assist the States in carrying out the purposes of section 601 (a), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000, and such further sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 613 (b), such sums to remain available until expended. The sums appropriated under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General, State applications for funds for carrying out such purposes.

"State applications

"SEC. 612. (a) To be approved, a State application for funds for carrying out the purposes of section 601 (a) must—

"(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out such purposes: *Provided,* That after a State plan has been approved under section 623, any further survey or programing functions shall be carried out, pursuant to section 623 (a) (10), by the agency designated in accordance with section 623 (a) (1);

"(2) provide for the designation of a State advisory council, which shall include representatives of nongovernment organizations or groups, and of State agencies, concerned with the operation, construction, or utilization of hospitals, including representatives of the consumers of hospital services selected from among persons familiar with the need for such services in urban or rural areas, to consult with the State agency in carrying out such purposes;

"(3) provide for making an inventory and survey in accordance with section 601 (a) containing all information required by the Surgeon General, and for developing a program in accordance with section 601 (a) and with regulations prescribed under section 622; and

"(4) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and give the Surgeon General, upon demand, access to the records on which such reports are based.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall approve any application for funds which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 613. (a) Each State for which a State application under section 612 has been approved shall be entitled to an allotment of such proportion of any appropriation (other than an appropriation to carry out the purposes of subsection (b) of this section) made pursuant to section 611 as its population bears to the population of all the States, and within such allotment it shall be entitled to receive 50 percent of its expenditures in carrying out the purposes of section 601 (a) in accordance with its application: *Provided,* That no such allotment to any State shall be less than $10,000. The Surgeon General shall from time to time estimate the sum to which each State will be entitled under this section, during such ensuing period as he may determine, and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Surgeon General finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State at the time or times fixed by the Surgeon General, the amount so certified.

"(b) If at the time of the submission by any State of an application for funds under this part the Governor shall certify to the Surgeon General that no funds are available for carrying out the purposes of section 601 (a) in such State other than funds to be received under this part, and if the application by such State shall be approved in accordance with section 612 (b), the Surgeon General shall make an additional allotment to such State equal to its allotment under subsection (a). In any such case the State shall be entitled to receive, within its allotment under this subsection, an additional 50 percent of its expenditures in carrying out the purposes of section 601 (a) in accordance with its application. Estimates, certifications, and payments shall be made in the manner provided in subsection (a). An amount equal to 50 percent of the actual expenditures of such State for carrying out the purposes of section 601 (a), less the amount of any repayment which shall have been made by the State to the Treasury of the United States, shall be deducted from any allotment or allotments to such State under section 624.

"(c) Any funds paid to a State under this section and not expended for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

"PART C—CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITALS AND RELATED FACILITIES

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 621. In order to assist the States in carrying out the purposes of section 601 (b) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $75,000,000 for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals; and there are further authorized to be appropriated for such construction the sums provided in section 624. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General, State plans for carrying out the purposes of section 601 (b); and for making payments to political subdivisions of, and public or other nonprofit agencies in, such States.

"General regulations

"SEC. 622. Within 6 months after the enactment of this title, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council and the Administrator, shall by general regulation prescribe—

"(a) The number of general hospital beds required to provide adequate hospital services to the people residing in a State, and the general method or methods by which such beds shall be distributed among base areas, intermediate areas, and rural areas: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this title, the total of such beds for any State shall not exceed 4½ per thousand population, except that in States having less than 12 and more than 6 persons per square mile the limit shall be 5 beds per thousand population, and in States having 6 persons or less per square mile the limit shall be 5½ beds per thousand population; but if, in any area (as defined in the regulations) within the State, there are more beds than required by the standards prescribed by the Surgeon General, the excess over such standards may be eliminated in calculating this maximum allowance.

"(b) The number of beds required to provide adequate hospital services for tuberculous patients, mental patients, and chronic-disease patients in a State, and the general method or methods by which such beds shall be distributed throughout the State: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this title the total number of beds for tuberculous patients

shall not exceed two and one-half times the average annual deaths from tuberculosis in the State over the 5-year period from 1940 to 1944, inclusive, the total number of beds for mental patients shall not exceed five per thousand population, and the total number of beds for chronic disease patients shall not exceed two per thousand population.

"(c) The number of public health centers and the general method of distribution of such centers throughout the State, which, for the purposes of this title, shall not exceed 1 per 30,000 population.

"(d) The general manner in which the State agency shall determine the priority of projects based on the relative need of different sections of the population and of different areas lacking adequate hospital facilities, giving special consideration to hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources.

"(e) General standards of construction and equipment for hospitals of different classes and in different types of location.

"(f) That the State plan shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for the people residing in a State, without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for persons unable to pay therefor. Such regulation may require that before approval of any application for a hospital or addition to a hospital is recommended by a State agency, assurance shall be received by the State from the applicant that (1) such hospital or addition to a hospital will be made available to all persons residing in the territorial area of the applicant, without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, but an exception shall be made in cases where separate hospital facilities are provided for separate population groups, if the plan makes equitable provision on the basis of need for facilities and services of like quality for each such group; and (2) there will be made available in each such hospital or addition to a hospital a reasonable volume of hospital services to persons unable to pay therefor, but an exception shall be made if such a requirement is not feasible from a financial standpoint.

"(g) General methods of administration of the plan by the designated State agency, subject to the limitations set forth in section 623 (a) (6) and (8).

"State plans

"SEC. 623. (a) After such regulations have been issued, any State desiring to take advantage of this part may submit a State plan for carrying out the purposes of section 601 (b). Such State plan must—

"(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for the administration of the plan, or designate such agency as the sole agency for supervising the administration of the plan;

"(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) hereof will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this part;

"(3) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of nongovernment organizations or groups, and of State agencies, concerned with the operation, construction, or utilization of hospitals, including representatives of the consumers of hospital services selected from among persons familiar with the need for such services in urban or rural areas, to consult with the State agency in carrying out such plans;

"(4) set forth a hospital construction programs (A) which is based on a State-wide inventory of existing hospitals and survey of need; (B) which conforms with the regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General under section 622 (a), (b), and (c); (C) which, in the case of a State which has developed a program under part B of this title, conforms to the program so developed except for any modification required in order to comply with regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622 (a), (b), and (c), and except for any modification recommended by the State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and approved by the Surgeon General; and (D) which meets the requirements as to lack of discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for furnishing needed hospital services to persons unable to pay therefor, required by regulations prescribed under section 622 (f);

"(5) set forth the relative need determined in accordance with the regulations prescribed under section 622 (d) for the several projects included in such programs, and provide for the construction, insofar as financial resources available therefor and for maintenance and operation make possible, in the order of such relative need;

"(6) provide such methods of administration of the State plan, including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis (except that the Surgeon General shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual empoyed in accordance with such methods), as the Surgeon General prescribes by regulation under section 622 (g);

"(7) provide minimum standards (to be fixed in the discretion of the State) for the maintenance and operation of hospitals which receive Federal aid under this part;

"(8) provide for affording to every applicant for a construction project an opportunity for hearing before the State agency;

"(9) provide that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and give the Surgeon General, upon demand, access to the records upon which such information as based; and

"(10) provide that the State agency will from time to time review its hospital construction program and submit to the Surgeon General any modifications thereof which it considers necessary.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a). If any such plan or modification thereof shall have been disapproved by the Surgeon General for failure to comply with subsection (a), the Federal Hospital Council shall, upon request of the State agency, afford it an opportunity for hearing. If such Council determines that the plan or modification complies with the provisions of such subsection, the Surgeon General shall thereupon approve such plan or modification.

"(c) No changes in a State plan shall be required within 2 years after initial approval thereof, or within 2 years after any change thereafter required therein, by reason of any change in the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622, except with the consent of the State, or in accordance with further action by the Congress.

"(d) If any State, prior to July 1, 1947, has not enacted legislation providing that compliance with minimum standards of maintenance and operation shall be required in the case of hospitals which shall have received Federal aid under this title, such State shall not be entitled to any further allotments under section 624.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 624. Each State for which a State plan has been approved prior to or during a fiscal year shall be entitled for such year to an allotment of a sum bearing the same ratio to the sums authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 621 for such year as the product of (a) the population of such State and (b) the square of its Federal percentage bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all of the States. The amount of the allotment to a State shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this part, for payment of such State's Federal percentage of the cost of approved projects within such State. The Surgeon General shall calculate the allotments to be made under this section and notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts thereof. Sums allotted to a State for a fiscal year for construction and remaining unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to such State for such purpose for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), in addition to the sums allotted for such State for such next fiscal year. Any amount of the sum authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year which is not appropriated for such year, or which is not allotted in such year by reason of the failure of any State or States to have plans approved under this part, and any amount allotted to a State but remaining unencumbered at the end of the period for which it is available to such State, is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the next fiscal year in addition to the sum otherwise authorized under section 621.

"Approval of projects and payments for construction

"SEC. 625. (a) For each project for construction pursuant to a State plan approved under this part, there shall be submitted to the Surgeon General through the State agency an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof or by a public or other nonprofit agency. Such application shall set forth (1) a description of the site for such project, (2) plans and specifications therefor in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General under section 622 (e), (3) reasonable assurance that title to such site is or will be vested solely in the applicant, (4) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed, and (5) reasonable assurance that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will be not less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended. The Surgeon General shall approve such application if sufficient funds for the Federal percentage of the cost of construction such project are available from the allotment to the State, and if the Surgeon General finds (A) that the application contains such reasonable assurance as to title, financial support, and payment of prevailing rates of wages, (B) that the plans and specifications are in accord with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622, (C) that the application is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 623 and contains an assurance that the applicant will conform to the applicable requirements of the State plan and of the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622 (f) regarding the provision of facilities without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for furnishing needed hospital facilities for persons unable to pay therefor, and an assurance that the applicant will conform to State standards for operation and maintenance, and (D) that it has been recommended by the State agency and is entitled to priority over other projects within the State in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622 (d). No application shall be disapproved until the Surgeon General has afforded the applicant and the State agency an opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Upon approving an application under this section, the Surgeon General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the Federal percentage of the estimated cost of construction of the

project and designate the appropriation from which it is to be paid. Such certification shall provide for payment to the State, except that if the State is not authorized by law to make payments to the applicant the certification shall provide for payment direct to the applicant. Upon certification by the State agency, based upon inspection by it, that work has been performed upon a project, or purchases have been made, in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, and that payment of an installment is due to the applicant, the Surgeon General shall certify such installment for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury; except that if the Surgeon General, after investigation or otherwise, has ground to believe that a default has occurred requiring action pursuant to section 632 (a) he may, upon giving notice of hearing pursuant to such subsection, withhold certification pending action based on such hearing.

"(c) Amendment of any approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application. Certification under subsection (b) may be amended, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project. An amended certification may direct that any additional payment be made from the applicable allotment for the fiscal year in which such amended certification is made.

"(d) The funds paid under this section for the construction of an approved project shall be be used solely for carrying out such project as so approved.

"(e) If any hospital for which funds have been paid under this section shall, at any time within 20 years after the completion of construction, (A) be sold or transferred to any person, agency, or organization, (1) which is not qualified to file an application under this section, or (2) which is not approved as a transferee by the State agency designated pursuant to section 623 (a) (1), or its successor, or (B) cease to be a nonprofit hospital as defined in section 631 (g), the United States shall be entitled to recover from either the transferor or the transferee (or, in the case of a hospital which has ceased to be a nonprofit hospital, from the owners thereof) the Federal percentage of the then value of such hospital, as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which such hospital is situated.

"PART D—MISCELLANEOUS

"Definitions

"SEC. 631. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) the Federal percentage with respect to any State shall be 100 percent less the non-Federal percentage; and the non-Federal percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska), except that (1) the non-Federal percentage shall in no case be more than 66⅔ percent or less than 25 percent, and (2) the non-Federal percentage for Alaska and Hawaii shall be 50 percent each, and the non-Federal percentage for Puerto Rico shall be 25 percent;

"(b) the Federal percentages shall be promulgated by the Surgeon General between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General shall promulgate such percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of this title, which promulgation shall be conclusive for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947;

"(c) the population of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce;

"(d) the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia;

"(e) the term 'hospital' (except as used in section 622 (a) and (b)) includes public-health centers and general, tuberculosis, mental, chronic-disease, and other types of hospitals, and related facilities, such as laboratories, out-patient departments, nurses' home and training facilities, and central service facilities operated in connection with hospitals, but does not include any hospital furnishing primarily domiciliary care;

"(f) the term 'public-health center' means a publicly owned facility for the provision of public-health services, including related facilities such as laboratories, clinics, and administrative offices operated in connection with public-health centers;

"(g) the term 'nonprofit hospital' means any hospital owned and operated by a corporation or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual;

"(h) the term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, initial equipment of any such buildings, and landscaping the site thereof; including architects' fees, legal counsel, and all other expenses incidental to construction, but excluding the cost of off-site improvements and, except with respect to public-health centers, the cost of the acquisition of land; and

"(i) the term 'cost of construction' means the amount found by the Surgeon General to be necessary for the construction of a project.

"Withholding of certification

"SEC. 632. (a) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency designated in accordance with section 612 (a) (1), finds that the State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required by section 612 (a) to be contained in its application for funds under part B, or after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency designated in accordance with section 623 (a) (1) finds (1) that the State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required by section 623 (a), or by regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622, to be contained in its plan submitted under section 623 (a), or (2) that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been allotted or paid, or (3) that any assurance given in an application filed under section 625 is not being or cannot be carried out, or (4) that there is a substantial failure to carry out plans and specifications approved by the Surgeon General under section 625, the Surgeon General may forthwith notify the Secretary of the Treasury and the State agency that no further certification will be made under part B or part C, as the case may be, or that no further certification will be made for any project or projects designated by the Surgeon General as being affected by the default, as the Surgeon General may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances; and, except with regard to any project for which the application has already been approved and which is not directly affected by such default, he may withhold further certifications until there is no longer any failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

"(b) (1) If the Surgeon General refuses to approve any application under section 625, the applicant, or if any State is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action under subsection (a) of this section, such State, may appeal to the United States circuit court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Surgeon General shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(2) The findings of fact by the Surgeon General, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Surgeon General to take further evidence, and the Surgeon General may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceeding. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Surgeon General or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

"Federal hospital council; administration of title

"SEC. 633. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make such administrative regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. Any such regulations shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator.

"(b) In administering this title, the Surgeon General shall consult with a Federal Hospital Council consisting of the Surgeon General, who shall serve as chairman ex officio, and eight members appointed by the Administrator. Five of the eight appointed members shall be persons who are outstanding in fields pertaining to hospital and health activities, three of whom shall be authorities in matters relating to the operation of hospitals, and the other three members shall be appointed to represent the consumers of hospital services and shall be persons familiar with the need for hospital services in urban or rural areas. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Administrator at the time of appointment, two at the end of the first year, two at the end of the second year, two at the end of the third year, and two at the end of the fourth year after the date of appointment. An appointed member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms but shall be eligible for reappointment if he has not served immediately preceding his reappointment. The Council is authorized to appoint such special advisory and technical committees as may be useful in carrying out its functions. Appointed Council members and members of advisory or technical committees, while serving on business of the Council, shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $25 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The Council shall meet as frequently as the Surgeon General deems necessary, but not less than once each year. Upon request by three or more members, it shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to call a meeting of the Council.

"(c) In administering the provisions of this title, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any

executive department in accordance with an agreement with the head thereof. Payment for such services and facilities shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon between the Administrator and the head of the executive department furnishing them.

"Conferences of State agencies

"SEC. 634. Whenever in his opinion the purposes of this title would be promoted by a conference, the Surgeon General may invite representatives of as many State agencies, designated in accordance with section 612 (a) (1) or section 623 (a) (1), to confer as he deems necessary or proper. Upon the application of five or more of such State agencies, it shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to call a conference of representatives of all State agencies joining in the request. A conference of the representatives of all such State agencies shall be called annually by the Surgeon General.

"State control of operations

"SEC. 635. Except as otherwise specifically provided, nothing in this title shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee the right to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, maintenance, or operation of any hospital with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended under this title."

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read:

"SECTION 1. Titles I to VI, inclusive, of this act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act.'"

SEC. 4. The act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), is hereby further amended by changing the number of title VI to title VII and by changing the numbers of sections 601 to 612, inclusive, and references thereto, to sections 701 to 712, respectively.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson
Bilbo	Huffman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	Knowland	Stanfill
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Magnuson	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wheeler
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Gossett	Morse	White
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Murray	Willis
Gurney	Myers	Wilson
Hart	O'Daniel	Young
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending measure introduced by the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Justice Burton, and myself was thoroughly considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor composed of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself as chairman. The subcommittee over a period of weeks intensely studied and considered the proposals made at the hearings on the bill. At many different meetings it had present with it and secured the opinions of representatives of interested Government agencies, of the American Hospital Association and other organizations familiar with the hospital and public-health situation in the country. The subcommittee had these representatives participate in the consideration of the bill in its executive session in order to clarify points that had been raised which called for technical advice. Mr. George Bugbee, executive secretary of the American Hospital Association, was particularly helpful to the subcommittee.

After obtaining what is believed to be comprehensive technical advice, the subcommittee met further in executive session and after extended deliberation on all issues involved, agreed upon the bill which it unanimously reported to the full committee.

The full committee met to consider the report of the subcommittee and following presentation of that report reviewed again the major questions of policy involved. Except for minor technical changes the committee accepted the report of the subcommittee and the bill now before the Senate is the result of that action.

The bill commands more nearly universal support than any bill I have known in a long time. In fact, during the entire course of the long hearings before the committee not a single witness voiced opposition to the objectives of the bill.

The effect of the painstaking and thorough consideration given the bill has not been to change the principles of the bill, but to strike an agreement as to the mechanics by which the principles shall be accomplished. The principles remain exactly the same. Those principles were stated by me to the committee at the opening of the hearings on the bill. They are as follows:

First, that any hospital or other health facilities constructed with Federal aid be planned as part of a long-range health development and not as incidental to a public-works program; second, that no Federal funds should go into any health facilities until the need has been demonstrated by a careful survey; third, that construction shall be controlled through an agency of the State and not by direct Federal-local negotiation; fourth, that voluntary nonprofit hospitals as well as State, county, and municipal hospitals shall be eligible for assistance; fifth, that the principle of States' rights and local initiative be preserved and encouraged as essential to the success of any health program.

In brief summary, S. 191 proposes a program of Federal grants-in-aid for two purposes:

First. To assist the States to ascertain their hospital and public-health facility needs through State-wide surveys and to develop State-wide programs for construction of those facilities needed to supplement existing facilities so as to serve all the people of the State, and

Second. To aid in the construction of those necessary facilities for public and voluntary nonprofit hospitals and for public-health centers which State and local resources can help build and can maintain, and which are in conformity with the approved State construction program and the standards for construction projects required under the bill.

An appropriation of $5,000,000 is authorized for the survey and planning features of the bill, and $75,000,000 for each of the five fiscal years 1947 to 1951 for the construction program.

The total of $375,000,000 of Federal funds for the 5-year period would be matched by approximately $325,000,000 of State or local funds. The bill therefore would provide for a hospital construction program of approximately $700,000,000 for the 5-year period.

The Federal administration of this program would be entrusted to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Federal Security Agency, who would have the assistance of a Federal Hospital Council. This Council, consisting of the Surgeon General and eight members appointed by the Federal Security Administrator, representing both producers and consumers of hospital and health services, would share responsibility with the Surgeon General in the framing of general regulations establishing standards for State construction plans. The Council would also constitute the appeals body, in the event a State agency requested a hearing following the Surgeon General's disapproval of a State construction plan. The Council's other functions would be advisory.

Under the provisions of the bill the State construction plan would be administered by a single State agency, in consultation with a State advisory council

composed of representatives of nongovernment, as well as Government, groups concerned with the operation, construction, utilization, and need of hospitals and public-health facilities. During the period of survey, there would be the same requirements of a single State agency and of consultation with a State advisory council.

The bill does not provide a Federal program of hospital construction. It does provide a program of Federal aid to the States and their localities for hospital construction. It seeks to avoid and definitely does avoid the Federal grab-bag in the matter of hospital construction. It would have the Federal Government meet its responsibility in the matter of hospital construction and at the same time it would stimulate and challenge the States and their localities to meet their responsibility. It would encourage the States and their localities to assume their responsibility for carrying out the program to the greatest possible extent consistent with a proper check upon expenditure of Federal appropriations.

The bill recognizes the disparity in wealth in the various States and their localities and provides for special consideration for rural areas and low-income communities.

The bill seeks to provide a pattern for Federal aid which would give a proper basis for Federal and State relations in matters in which Federal aid may be necessary.

The principles and objectives of the bill have been endorsed, among others, by the following organizations: The Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, the Protestant Hospital Association, the American Tuberculosis Association, as well as the United States Public Health Service, and by all the large labor organizations—including the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Railroad Brotherhoods; by the major farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, and the Grange; by the National Congress of Parent-Teachers, the National Research Council, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and numerous other club and church groups.

We recall that not so many years ago—and unfortunately the condition still exists in many places throughout the Nation—being ordered to a hospital indicated the existence of a desperate and mortally serious condition. As Dr. Parran, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, said, a hospital then was "a port of last hope—a port of lost hope."

Today it is our first thought when illness attacks us because a hospital is more than a hospital in the old sense of the word. It is a "complex, technical machine, employing the latest scientific diagnostic aids, preventative and curative measures, and professional skills." It is a place which is necessary for the practice of modern medicine.

It is for this reason that so many of the witnesses testified that a larger number and better distribution of hospitals were the first necessary steps in providing improved and more adequate sorely needed medical care. Dr. Victor Johnson, of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, pointed out:

> The provision of hospital and diagnostic services occupies a key position in the more equitable distribution of medical care. The days of the horse-and-buggy doctor are gone forever. Good medicine can be practiced only when hospital and related diagnostic facilities are available. Physicians may choose, it has been found, to locate in a community providing these facilities even though his income may be less than in areas lacking them. Interesting studies have been carried out by the United States Public Health Service which have shown that in areas of equal per capita income, there may be three times as many doctors if hospitals are available as there are if such necessities of modern medical practice are lacking.

In discussing the postwar plan of the returning medical officers, Dr. Johnson told the committee:

> Studies conducted by the American Medical Association and the Committee on Postwar Medical Service indicate that twice as many medical officers who will return to civilian practice after the war will be willing to go to areas with deficient medical service if hospital and diagnostic facilities are provided, as compared with those willing to locate in medically deficient areas without such facilities, so that the bill will go a good way—or, let's say, part of the desired way—in providing not simply hospital care, but medical care associated with the hospitals as well.

Today need for hospital facilities in many areas is acute. As the practice of medicine has become increasingly technical and complex, the number of rural practitioners and practitioners in lower income communities has decreased accordingly. Doctors are concentrated where hospitals are available. Having spent thousands of dollars to educate and train themselves, doctors are naturally unwilling to practice where they do not have hospital facilities, where they do not have the tools with which to do their work. A great many communities are now without doctors. There is no probability of relieving this situation without many more hospitals and health centers and a better and wider distribution of them.

Dr. Clarence Poe, publisher of the Progressive Farmer, and chairman of the Governor's Committee on Hospital and Medical Care of North Carolina, in his very revealing statement on the necessity for this legislation, stated that the country is very badly in need of "more doctors, more hospitals, more insurance—these three—but the greatest of these needs is more hospitals."

Because the average person is coming more and more to recognize the importance and the relation of the hospital and health facilities to his own good health and well-being, the demand for these services has increased tremendously over the last years, and with very salutary effects. As evidence presented to the committee shows, death rates from all disease have fallen to an all-time low of 10 deaths per thousand population, as compared with the death rate 25 years ago of 13 per thousand population. Twenty-five years ago 100 infants out of every 1,000 live births did not survive through their first year. Now the average rate is about 40 deaths in every thousand live births, and in States like Connecticut where there are reasonably adequate hospital and health facilities the rate is approximately 30 per 1,000. Whereas 25 years ago nine mothers died for every thousand babies born, now less than 3.6 are lost—and again we find in the communities and States where adequate hospital and health facilities exist the maternal rate is two-fifths of the national average. Of course, we cannot attribute all these improvements in national health to more and better hospitals alone, but there is no doubt that hospitals and health centers constitute a major factor.

Mr. President, show me a State and the areas within it which have few hospitals or inadequate ones, and I will show you where there are too few or no doctors and where there are many unnecessary deaths. North Carolina, for example, was forty-second among the States in the number of hospital beds per thousand and forty-fifth among the States in the number of doctors per thousand. Largely, because of these two conditions, it was thirty-ninth among the States in the percentage of infants dying under 1 year of age, forty-first among the States in the percentage of mothers dying at childbirth, and forty-eighth among the States in percentage of selective-service rejections.

The most dramatic evidence illustrating what adequate health facilities and medical care can mean to the individual person and the welfare of the Nation were the statistics presented by Dr. Poe, of the North Carolina Hospital and Medical Care Commission. As Dr. Poe advised, of 1,154 former students of North Carolina orphanages tested by Selective Service for service in the armed forces, only 16 were rejected as physically disqualified—1.4 percent, as compared with a 52.4 percent rejection rate for the State as a whole. The students of the North Carolina orphanages received adequate hospital and medical care.

Taking 4.5 beds per thousand population as the standard of the need in general hospitals, the standard which your committee accepted for determining need as provided for in this bill, we find that only urban and wealthy communities have reached this standard. Only 11 percent of the counties in the United States have ratios of four or more beds per 1,000 population while 48 percent have ratios under four beds per thousand, and 41 percent of the counties in the United States have no approved general hospitals at all.

A parallel situation exists with regard to the inadequacy of beds in institutions for tuberculosis and the mentally ill. Furthermore, it is generally conceded that the equipment and facilities in many of these institutions are inferior in quality.

Public-health facilities throughout the country—whether located in high-income or low-income areas—are generally below standard, are too few in number, and are generally inadequate for the purposes of modern medical practices. Dr.

Reginald A. M. Atwater, of the American Public Health Association, testified:

It may be stated conservatively that less than 10 percent of the health departments are provided with health facilities even approaching reasonable standards of adequacy. Some of the remaining health departments occupy cramped quarters in basements or attics of county courthouses and city halls. Others are more generously provided for in abandoned school buildings or converted dwellings.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, using what he called a conservative standard for measuring need, estimated the number of hospital beds and health facilities needed in the United States as follows:

General hospital beds:	
New	165,000
Replacement	66,000
Total	231,000
Tuberculosis beds:	
New	59,550
Replacement	16,000
Total	75,550
Nervous and mental beds:	
New	115,556
Replacement	97,000
Total	212,556
Health centers	2,714

The Surgeon General estimated it would cost approximately $2,000,000,000 to build the facilities needed.

Why, Mr. President, does this great need exist? What accounts for, or what reasons exist which may explain this great national neglect for the health and welfare of the people?

Basically, the cause is economic in nature. Of the 10 States with the lowest per capita income, 8 had the lowest number of hospital beds per thousand as compared with all the other States.

Referring to this great disparity between sections of the country, W. R. Ogg of the American Farm Bureau Federation ascribed the poor distribution of health facilities in this country as being "due mainly to the economic disparity of rural areas with industrial areas, and the lack of sufficient local resources to provide such facilities."

The testimony shows that there is a very high direct relationship between per capita income and number of beds per thousand. For example, the eight States whose population was 70 percent or more rural in 1940, had the lowest per capita income ($300) and the lowest ratio of beds to its population (2.2 per thousand). The testimony also shows the problem is not confined to one or two regions, but is rather general throughout the rural areas in the United States.

In recognition of the problem the variable matching requirement and the allotment of the appropriations authorized under the bill recognize the relative inability of the States to provide adequate health facilities for their people. The poorer States are only required to put up 25 cents for every dollar of hospital and health facilities constructed, while the richer States are required to put up 66⅔ cents. A mathematical formula—which is objective and definite—apportions the total authorized sum among the States.

As the formula works out, 47.3 percent of the Federal grants will go to the 15 States with the lowest per capita income, while only 31.4 percent will go to the 18 richest States. Eighteen and one-tenth percent will go to the 16 middle-income States.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table compiled by the Federal Security Administration showing the estimated matching percentages, annual allotments of Federal grants, non-Federal expenditures, and total expenditures for hospital construction, by States, in accordance with the terms of the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Illustrative Federal matching percentages, annual allotments of Federal grants, non-Federal expenditures, and total expenditures for hospital construction, by States, under S. 191 (as reported)*

States (arrayed by per capita income)	1942-44 per capita income [1]	Federal percentage [2]	Federal allotment [3]	Non-Federal funds [4]	Total funds	
					Amount [5]	Per inhabitant
United States	$1,005		$75,000,000	$64,178,000	$139,178,000	$1.04
Connecticut	1,431	33⅓	404,000	808,000	1,212,000	.68
Nevada	1,372	33⅓	35,000	70,000	105,000	.68
California	1,366	33⅓	1,990,000	3,980,000	5,970,000	.68
New York	1,343	33⅓	2,873,000	5,746,000	8,619,000	.68
Washington	1,336	34	487,000	945,000	1,432,000	.70
Delaware	1,287	36	75,000	134,000	209,000	.74
New Jersey	1,261	37	1,169,000	1,990,000	3,159,000	.76
District of Columbia	1,254	38	274,000	447,000	721,000	.78
Oregon	1,204	40	398,000	596,000	994,000	.82
Rhode Island	1,198	40	255,000	383,000	638,000	.82
Michigan	1,183	41	1,869,000	2,690,000	4,559,000	.84
Massachusetts	1,177	41	1,433,000	2,061,000	3,494,000	.84
Illinois	1,175	42	2,791,000	3,855,000	6,646,000	.86
Maryland	1,169	42	769,000	1,062,000	1,831,000	.86
Ohio	1,167	42	2,469,000	3,410,000	5,879,000	.86
Pennsylvania	1,048	48	4,361,000	4,725,000	9,086,000	.98
Indiana	1,040	48	1,613,000	1,748,000	3,361,000	.98
Montana	1,008	50	238,000	238,000	476,000	1.02
Utah	972	52	336,000	311,000	647,000	1.07
Maine	968	52	440,000	406,000	846,000	1.07
Wisconsin	966	52	1,648,000	1,521,000	3,169,000	1.07
Kansas	961	52	983,000	907,000	1,890,000	1.07
Iowa	936	53	1,305,000	1,157,000	2,462,000	1.09
Colorado	935	53	660,000	585,000	1,245,000	1.09
Wyoming	934	54	154,000	131,000	285,000	1.11
Idaho	930	54	317,000	270,000	587,000	1.11
Nebraska	920	54	725,000	617,000	1,342,000	1.11
Missouri	885	56	2,305,000	1,811,000	4,116,000	1.15
Minnesota	876	56	1,610,000	1,265,000	2,875,000	1.15
North Dakota	872	57	351,000	265,000	616,000	1.17
Vermont	863	57	207,000	156,000	363,000	1.17
Arizona	833	59	455,000	317,000	772,000	1.21
Florida	828	59	1,687,000	1,172,000	2,859,000	1.21
South Dakota	817	59	398,000	277,000	675,000	1.21
Virginia	814	60	2,358,000	1,572,000	3,930,000	1.23
New Hampshire	804	60	337,000	224,000	561,000	1.23
Texas	791	61	5,238,000	3,349,000	8,587,000	1.25
Oklahoma	720	64	1,732,000	974,000	2,706,000	1.31
West Virginia	692	66	1,530,000	788,000	2,318,000	1.35
Louisiana	678	66	2,261,000	1,165,000	3,426,000	1.35
New Mexico	660	67	489,000	241,000	730,000	1.37
Tennessee	645	68	2,717,000	1,279,000	3,996,000	1.39
Georgia	624	69	3,142,000	1,412,000	4,554,000	1.41
North Carolina	606	70	3,546,000	1,520,000	5,066,000	1.43
Kentucky	589	71	2,714,000	1,169,000	3,823,000	1.45
Alabama	579	71	2,908,000	1,188,000	4,096,000	1.46
South Carolina	560	72	2,041,000	794,000	2,835,000	1.48
Arkansas	522	74	1,991,000	700,000	2,691,000	1.52
Mississippi	468	75	2,506,000	835,000	3,341,000	1.54
Alaska		50	37,000	37,000	74,000	1.02
Hawaii		50	217,000	217,000	434,000	1.02
Puerto Rico		75	2,152,000	718,000	2,870,000	1.54

[1] Survey of Current Business, August 1945, p. 13.

[2] Sec. 631 (a) provides that the Federal percentage shall be such that the remaining non-Federal percentage bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of the State bears to the national per capita income; the bill fixes a maximum limit of 75 percent and a minimum limit of 33⅓ percent on the Federal percentages and specifies the percentages for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. No official per capita income figures are available for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

[3] Sec. 624 provides that the Federal funds allotted to each State shall bear the same ratio to the total appropriation authorized as the product of its population and the square of its Federal percentage bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all States. Allotments shown in table computed on basis of rounded Federal percentages shown in preceding column and July 1, 1944, population estimates of U. S. Bureau of the Census, except that 1940 population figures used for Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

[4] Represents State, local, and private funds which must be expended to take up entire Federal allotment in preceding column.

[5] Represents sum of Federal and non-Federal funds.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize that the bill specifically directs that within the States special consideration shall be given to applicants for hospital and health projects serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources.

While I have emphasized the need for hospital and health facilities in the lower income and rural areas of our Nation, I do not mean to imply that the need for hospital and health facilities does not exist in the relatively wealthier sections of our country. Ordinarily there is a higher per-capita demand for hospital services in the more congested areas of the country, due to the living conditions. Also, obsolescence is high among existing institutions. Dr. F. C. MacLean, of Strong Memorial Hospital, Rochester, N. Y., has cautioned:

It should be remembered that figures on hospital facilities may be misleading in the sense that the ratio of beds to population

may appear adequate, but the character of the facilities may not be satisfactory or suited to the needs and demands of the public. Therefore, even a State like New York which may appear to be well supplied with general hospital beds, may require an extensive program of renovation and replacement of inadequate and outmoded facilities.

Due largely to the economic depression of the thirties, the sources of financial assistance which the voluntary hospitals relief upon, dried up with the result that relatively little hospital construction took place, and as we entered the present decade we were confronted with a large backlog of hospital construction. During the war relatively few hospitals were permitted to be constructed or expanded. Today, because of all this as well as the greatly increased demand for hospital services which have been created by the advance in medical science and the general awakening of people to the advantages of hospital care, the higher income areas and the urban communities of our Nation as well as the rural and low-income areas, are faced with the need for a large amount of hospital construction and rehabilitation. I believe that the funds authorized by the bill will go a long way toward stimulating and assisting these areas in catching up and going ahead with their hospital and health-facility programs.

The provisions in the bill for construction of public-health centers are of great importance. As Dr. Donald Smelzer, president of the American Hospital Association, pointed out:

> The rural areas of this country are, in many instances, the most unerprivileged insofar as hospital care is concerned. There is no possibility of providing closely adjacent to every rural resident, a hospital which will have all the diagnostic and treatment facilities needed for every disease. In these areas often the only hope for proper care is the health center having a limited number of beds for emergency care and for minor illness, such a unit also functioning as a center for the public-health activities in the community, a center for the health officer, and the public-health nurses.

The provision in the bill requiring each State to formulate and have approved by the surgeon general a State plan based upon a State-wide inventory of existing hospitals and a survey of needs, and the requirement that each application for funds must be in conformity with the State plan and be approved by the State agency administering it, will greatly stimulate and help to bring about an integrated system of health and hospital facilities within each State. The overall standards and general regulations issued by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, together with his expert advice and help, will bring about a more uniform and integrated national system of hospital and health facilities.

Mr. President, I would especially like to point out the importance of the survey and planning features to which I have just referred. At this moment we actually do not know in detail what the hospital and health facilities needs of the individual States and the Nation are.

When each State, however, completes its survey of need and makes an inventory of existing facilities we shall have for the first time a close-up, grass-roots picture of the real health needs of each State in the Nation. With this data as a basis each State will be able to prepare a truly intelligent and coordinated plan for meeting the needs revealed by these surveys. With this knowledge available we in Congress will have a substantial basis on which to judge the adequacy or inadequacy of the amount authorized in this bill. More than that, we will have a basis rooted in fact for the best means of working out and promoting sound health policies throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, if the time ever comes when we need to spend Federal money to take up the slack in employment, we can be certain that spending the money on hospitals and health facilities which the State surveys provided for in this bill will show are needed will insure a wise and most useful and beneficial expenditure of Federal funds. The survey is the "scientific way," as Dr. Victor Johnson, of the American Medical Association, expressed it, of approaching the hospital and health facility shortage.

In extending and increasing the health and hospital facilities of the country, the distinguished former Senator from Ohio, now Mr. Justice Burton, and I wanted a program of Federal aid which would be carried out in accordance with our best traditions in health and hospital care.

We wanted to build on what existed and make the fullest use of the knowledge, the experience, and the spirit that have advanced some sections of the country so far in the cause of good health and hospital care. It was for this reason that private nonprofit or voluntary hospitals, as they usually are known, were included along with public hospitals. We wanted to provide a maximum degree of flexibility and adaptation to local conditions. In the words of Dr. R. L. Sensenich, of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association, that is exactly what the bill does.

We wanted to keep responsibility where it belonged—upon the people who must render the service, especially since medical and health service is so personal in nature. We felt that by doing this we would insure the maximum understanding and highest efforts of all in carrying out the program contemplated under the bill. The bill will serve as a challenge to the States and local communities to prove that they can and will live up to their responsibilities. We believe they will.

As will be noticed from a study of the bill, we have endeavored to limit the power of the Federal Government over the program to the minimum degree necessary to a reasonable check upon the expenditures of Federal appropriations. In order to protect the Surgeon General from pressure groups in administering the program and to give him the benefit of having five outstanding experts in medical care and hospital administration and three representatives of the consumers assist him, a Federal hospital council is established. By setting up this hospital council we are trying to insure that a program largely technical in nature will be carried out in the most scientific and objective manner possible.

In selecting the United States Public Health Office to administer the program, we knew that we were selecting the agency which above all others in the Federal Government has demonstrated its ability to cooperate with State and local groups. As Father Alphonse M. Schwitalla, S. J., president of the Catholic Hospital Association said:

> There is no agency in the Government—

He was speaking of the United States Public Health Service—

> and perhaps I could go further, perhaps I could say in the Nation, that has more completely justified the confidence and trust that has been put into it by the people of this Nation.

I would like to pay my tribute to the present head of the Public Health Service, the Surgeon General, Dr. Thomas W. Parran. His services to the country have been outstanding. He is one of the great public servants of our time.

Nothing so strikingly pictures or so forcefully emphasizes the need for the passage of the pending measure as does the record of rejections by the Selective Service.

As of April 1, 1945, nearly 5,000,000 male registrants between the ages of 18 and 37 had been examined and classified as unfit for military service because of physical or mental disability. The number of those rejected for military service was about 30 percent of all those examined. In addition, after actual induction, approximately 1,500,000 men had to be discharged from the Army and Navy for physical or mental disability, exclusive of wounds; and an equal number had to be treated in the armed forces for diseases or defects which existed before induction.

Among the young women who applied for admission to the Women's Army Corps, generally known as the Wacs, there was similar disability. More than one-third of those examined were rejected for physical for mental reasons.

The Selective Service record shows that in the hour of its great danger the United States found that nearly one-third of the manpower of the Nation, upon which it had to rely for its defense, was unfit, because of mental or physical disability, to defend it. The first step toward the correction of so shocking a situation is the passage of the pending measure. If the United States is to be strong, if its people are to carry the many burdens of peace and be prepared to defend it, ours must be a Nation whose people possess the strength of health. The passage of the pending measure will be a mighty step down the road of national strength and health.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I address the Senate in favor of Senate bill 191, known as the hospital bill which has just been explained at length by the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

This bill proposes Federal grants-in-aid to assist the States in making inventories of existing hospital and public-health facilities, in surveying their needs, and in constructing needed facilities.

In view of my long and active participation in the development of such legislation as is now before us, it is gratifying

to me that the Senate is again ready for constructive legislation on this subject.

I address the Senate for two reasons: To encourage favorable action on S. 191, and to submit and urge important amendments to improve the bill before it is enacted. The Senate would commit a grave error if it were to pass the bill without the amendments which I intend to propose.

RELATION OF S. 191 TO THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

First, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the evident fact that the program contained in S. 191 is and should be an essential and integral part of the legislation recommended by the President of the United States in his statesmanlike message of November 19, 1945.

In that message, the President presented to the Congress the urgent and important need for a comprehensive and adequate health program for the Nation. With great restraint, and yet with clarity and force, he called to our attention the existing health needs. He indicated the extent to which we had failed to do, what we know how to do and are capable of doing, in making health services available to the people of the United States. He subdivided the large problems into manageable parts. He submitted a clear, logical, and practical program.

President Truman's program includes five specific recommendations for legislation:

First. Construction of needed hospitals and related facilities;

Second. Expansion of Federal-State public health, maternal, and child-health services;

Third. Federal grants-in-aid for medical education and research;

Fourth. Establishing a system of prepayment of medical costs; and

Fifth. Social-insurance protection against loss of wages from sickness and disability.

This is the first comprehensive national health program proposed to the Congress of the United States by a President—if not the first in American history, certainly the first in recent times. Beyond question, history will record it as one of the great messages on any subject of domestic legislation from a President to the Congress.

The favorable reception accorded the President's message by the press of the Nation reflects not only the clarity and soundness of the message, but also the timeliness of its recommendations. The Nation needs and the Nation wants a comprehensive national health program that will make the benefits of modern science and public health available to all the people. It is our duty in the Congress—it is our duty here in the Senate—to do our share in making this program a reality for our people.

The Members of the Senate will note that the first item among the President's five recommendations deals with construction of needed hospitals and related facilities. This is precisely the purpose of S. 191, which we are now considering.

BACKGROUND AND GUIDES FOR S. 191

The Members of the Senate know that jointly with my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I have been urging a comprehensive health and social-security program for the Nation. Within that program, I have been advocating Federal aid for the construction of needed hospitals and related facilities. In 1939 I had the privilege to be chairman of the committee which held hearings on Senator WAGNER'S health bill of 1939, Senate bill 1620, which contained proposals for Federal aid toward hospital construction. In 1940 I reported favorably for the Committee on Education and Labor on S. 3230, the National Hospital Act of 1940, which the Senate passed, but which died in the House. Earlier this year a program for Federal aid toward hospital construction was included in S. 1050, which I introduced jointly with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. Like the Senator from New York, I welcomed the introduction of S. 191 by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and gave every possible assistance to the hearings on the bill and to the work of the subcommittee which studied it carefully, and which favorably reported the amended version of that bill now before us.

Senator WAGNER and I have been quite agreeable to having our own proposals for a hospital construction program relegated to the background and to seeing the Hill-Burton proposals contained in S. 191 vigorously advanced for legislative enactment. We are pleased that the amended version of S. 191 which the Senate is considering today contains various improvements over the same bill as first introduced, and that many of these improvements were developed by the subcommittee through its adoption of provisions which the subcommittee found in our bill, S. 1050. I regret very much, however, that the subcommittee and the whole committee did not adopt certain additional amendments which I regard as essential for sound legislation.

On behalf of Senator WAGNER and myself, I have submitted seven amendments which I hope the Senate will adopt.

In his recent message on a national health program, President Truman laid down sound guides for the Congress in a paragraph which is so important that I want to read it to the Senate. Recommending a program of Federal aid for the construction of hospitals and related facilities, he said:

> In carrying out this program, there should be a clear division of responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government. The States, localities, and the Federal Government should share in the financial responsibilities. The Federal Government should not construct or operate these hospitals. It should, however, lay down minimum national standards for construction and operation and should make sure that Federal funds are allocated to those areas and projects where Federal aid is needed most. In approving State plans and individual projects, and in fixing the national standards, the Federal agency should have the help of a strictly advisory body that includes both public and professional members.

It is precisely at points on which S. 191 is not in accord with the President's recommendations that I ask the Senate to improve the bill before it is passed.

In reading the last sentence of the President's paragraph, I emphasize the word "strictly" because I want the Members of the Senate to note that the President said the Federal agency which should administer a hospital construction program "should have the help of a strictly advisory body." This means and is intended to mean—without any ambiguity whatever—that the advisory functions of a part-time council should not be mixed or confused with the administrative functions that should reside in a responsible full-time Federal official.

S. 191 PROPOSES A BAD AND DANGEROUS ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT

When the Committee on Education and Labor reportsd S. 191 favorably, I included in the committee's report a personal statement and reservation. In that statement I said:

> My principal reservation about S. 191 as amended, is that it includes a bad and dangerous administrative arrangement. It assigns certain essential administrative functions and powers to a part-time council which is without supervision, direction, or control.
>
> Present law provides that "the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency shall be administered by the Surgeon General under the supervision and direction of the Administrator" (Public Health Service Act, July 1, 1944, sec. 201).
>
> Thus, there is a direct line and continuity of authority between the President of the United States, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Surgeon General, and the law preserves the constitutional vestment of the executive power in the President.
>
> S. 191 proposes a new and different arrangement for the hospital survey and construction program.
>
> It provides that certain actions which are normal and essential to the administration of the program (e. g., approval of the general regulations which the Surgeon General must prescribe (sec. 622, p. 22)) shall depend upon a body called a Federal Hospital Council. Also, the Surgeon General's refusal to approve a State plan, which fails to meet the requirements of the bill, may be reversed by this Council (sec. 623 (b), p. 28).
>
> The reasons why these provisions are bad will be evident upon inspection. Eight of the nine members of this Council are to be appointed by the Federal Security Administrator to hold office for terms specified at the time of appointment and fixed by statute. However, only at the moment when they are appointed are they subject to his supervision or direction. Once appointed, they and the Council (except for its chairman, the Surgeon General) are entirely independent of both the Surgeon General and the Administrator. There is no procedure for appeal from the action (or inactions) of this Council, as there is from those of the Surgeon General. The Council is a totally independent agency of administration, since it is accountable to nobody, responsible to nobody, controllable by nobody. Yet this new kind of independent agency has important administrative duties, quasi judicial functions, and a veto power over the Surgeon General (and, hence, over the Administrator) in certain of his essential administrative duties for carrying out a program that involves granting large sums of money from the Federal Treasury to States and their political subdivisions and to private organizations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOSSETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator indicate in what respect the Council would have any administrative power?

Mr. MURRAY. The Council would have complete charge. The Council would control the Surgeon General completely in his administration, and he could not do anything without the Council's approval.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will read the powers of the Council he will find they consist of only two things. One is the making of general regulations and advance plans, which is strictly a legislative or quasi-legislative function. In that respect the Council acts with the Surgeon General. The only other function which the Council has, other than supervisory, relates to the appeal of a State from the action of the Surgeon General in refusing to approve a general State plan. That, I would think, is in effect a judicial function or quasi-judicial function. We had in one draft of the bill, if the Senator will remember, a provision for appeal to the courts on that question, and yet it seemed that it was a very technical question, and one in which technical knowledge was required, so it was felt that appeal should rather be to the Council than the courts. But I desire to suggest to the Senator that, so far as the administrative powers of the Surgeon General are concerned, I do not think there is any modification, and it seems to me that, so far as the administrative powers are concerned, the functions of the Council are purely advisory.

Mr. MURRAY. I will say to the Senator that I disagree with him, and I think that as I continue with my statement I will develop that point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's statement, but I must say that I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Ohio in what he stated respecting the powers of the Council. Only in the two instances to which the Senator from Ohio has referred does the Council have any authority: First, in approving the general, broad regulation for the making of the State plans, and, second, in acting as a board or council of appeal when a State plan has been rejected by the Surgeon General. In all other matters the Council is merely an advisory council and has only the right to advise. As I conceive the situation, the Council has nothing to do with the administration of the act or carrying out its provisions. The regulations are very broad and very general, and I may say that by the very language of the bill itself, are really very limited. After the regulations are once made for all the States, and approved by the Council, the Council passes entirely out of the picture.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I wish to call attention to the precise language of the bill in section 622, on page 22, which provides as follows:

> Within 6 months after the enactment of this title the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council and the Administrator, shall by general regulation prescribe——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. That is the very section to which the Senator from Ohio and I have referred. That is the section which provides——

Mr. MURRAY. That is the section which gives the Council complete supervision over the Surgeon General.

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; not complete supervision over the Surgeon General. It contains only the requirement that the Council shall approve the broad general regulations which prescribe general standard which the different State plans must meet. Outside of that there is no control over the Surgeon General. That applies only to the one proposition, which is the proposition of prescribing the general regulations to set up the broad general standards which the State plans must meet.

Mr. MURRAY. This is the first time in the history of the country that such a proposal has been presented, and it is entirely in opposition to the recommendation of the President contained in his message.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senator further at this time, but a little later, when the question comes upon the amendments which the Senator proposes to offer, I shall have something to say in reply.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, when interrupted I was reading from my personel statement incorporated in the committee's report. I continue reading from it:

> Nominal responsibility for the program under S. 191 is assigned to the Federal Security Administrator and the Surgeon General. The Congress and the public may expect to hold them accountable for its operations. But a council which is independent of them could exercise the real control.
>
> On all but the occasional days when they are acting as members of the Council on a per diem basis each of the appointed members is somebody else. As part-time appointees most of the year they are responsible to other employers and organizations and are potentially responsive to interests other than those of the Federal Government. Their primary fields of activity, interest, and concern must be expected to be those of their private business or profession, and it is unreasonable to expect that on the occasional days when they act as members of the council they will be insensible to their customary special interests. Such responsiveness is not objectionable in members of an advisory body; it should be carefully avoided in a body having final authority. The part-time Federal employment of the appointed Council members reinforces other objections to the proposed powers of the Council.
>
> It is the genius of our American democratic Government that responsibility and accountability go hand in hand with power and authority. S. 191 does violence to this fundamental policy, since it would give to a part-time council large powers and no accountability.
>
> The proposed Council is probably unprecedented. I could make for muddled, inefficient, and even bad administration.

I do not stand alone in objecting to the composition and powers of the proposed Federal Hospital Council. After making the statement which I have just quoted, I referred it to Mr. Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and asked him for an opinion upon it. In a letter dated November 7, the Budget Director concurred in my opinion that the provisions in S. 191 concerning the establishment and operation of a Federal Hospital Council are bad and dangerous from an administrative point of view.

I quote from the letter of the Director of the Budget Bureau:

> MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have your letter of November 5, 1945, transmitting a copy of Senate Report 674, on the bill S. 191, the hospital survey and construction bill, and requesting my comments with respect to your views, as set forth in Senate Report 674, on the provisions of S. 191 that have to do with the establishment and operation of a Federal Hospital Council.
>
> May I say, in reply, that I agree fully with the views you have expressed on the proper role of an advisory council of citizens who would not be full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government. On this general subject, may I refer you to my testimony on S. 1285 and S. 1297, bills introduced by Senators Magnuson and Kilgore, for the creation of a National Research Foundation?
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> HAROLD D. SMITH,
> *Director.*

The same views as those expressed by Mr. Smith, the Budget Director, were given by Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, in a letter of October 25, 1945, addressed to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and released by them in connection with hearings on the same bills to which the Budget Director referred.

AMENDMENT NO. 1: TO IMPROVE THE ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN S. 191

In order to improve S. 191 so that it shall contain sound administrative proposals on the point to which I have directed these remarks, we have submitted amendment No. 1. This amendment consists of three parts. The first part amends the opening lines of section 622, on page 22, lines 14 to 17. This part of the amendment changes the bill to require the Surgeon General to consult the Council before prescribing the regulation which he must issue in order to get the program started. The present bill unwisely and improperly requires the Council's approval before these regulations may be promulgated by the Surgeon General.

The second part of the first amendment amends lines 9 to 12 on page 28 of the bill. This part deprives the Council of any power to reverse the Surgeon General whenever he finds that a State plan does not meet the Federal requirements. The amendment still leaves the Council with authority to give the State a hearing. However, it provides that if the Council reaches a conclusion which disagrees with that of the Surgeon General, the matter shall be placed before the Federal Security Administrator for final determination.

The third part of the first amendment takes the form of adding a sentence at the end of section 633 (a) in line 18 on page 38. The effect of this third part would be to balance the first two parts. Having made the Council strictly advisory, this part of the amendment provides assurance that the Presi-

dent and the Congress will regularly be informed whether or not the Surgeon General is consulting the Council and whether he is taking or ignoring their advice. This part of the amendment also assures the Council a regular opportunity to make its opinions and recommendations for the program known in an orderly way to the President, the Congress, and the public.

Amendment No. 1, with its three parts taken together, would cleanse S. 191 of one of its worst and most unfortunate provisions. With this amendment, S. 191 would assure an orderly and sound administrative pattern and would be able to assure that the hospital construction program is likely to go forward successfully.

I strongly urge the Senate to incorporate this amendment in S. 191.

AMENDMENT NO. 2: PROTECTION OF THE FEDERAL FUNDS

Amendment No. 2 is submitted to the Senate in order to assure a wiser and fairer balance between the authorities and responsibilities of the Federal Government and of the State governments, respectively. The objective is to protect the use that is made of the Federal funds.

The program proposed by S. 191 is, by intent, a joint Federal-State program. This is sound. The Federal Government is creating the program and is providing Federal funds to make it effective, because of the national interest in the Nation's health and in the need for hospitals in providing modern health services. The Federal Government puts up the money and "sparks" the program; but practically all of the administrative discretions are given to the States. This is unsound.

The contemplated partnership of the Federal and State sovereigns should extend at least to the point of reserving to the Federal Government the right to take such measures as are necessary to insure that Federal funds are utilized only for necessary and worthy purposes. The Federal sovereign does not retain adequate protection in the present bill. Everything essential to assure wise use of the Federal funds is left to the States. This is a dangerous and unwise proposal, considering how inadequate—and, in many cases, nonexistent—State control of hospitals has been in the past.

In S. 191 all the major controls over standards for hospitals that are to be aided under this program are left to the States. Moreover, the Surgeon General must approve any project recommended by a State and found to meet certain requirements specified in section 625 (a) of the bill. If every State were to do a scrupulously fine job in approving projects, all would be well; but wherever and whenever a bad project might slip by, the Surgeon General would still have to approve the project and the Federal Government would have no protection or recourse. Federal aid, therefore, would be granted to such a project even though the Federal administrative officers had good reason to believe that the Federal money would be going to the support of an unworthy project. I do not hesitate to inform the Senate that such provisions in S. 191 were strongly opposed in the subcommittee by the competent Federal officers who had been invited to give technical advice.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not wish to give the impression that those provisions were opposed by all the Federal officers who appeared—by Dr. Parran, for example, who is to administer the act?

Mr. MURRAY. My understanding is that Dr. Parran was not in favor of it.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is mistaken. I feel quite confident that Dr. Parran is entirely satisfied with the provisions of the bill. The chief opposition, when these questions were raised, came from the representative of the Social Security Board who was present at the subcommittee hearings. But the sweeping statement that the Federal officials who appeared opposed it, if that is what the Senator said, is not really correct. Four or five Government representatives appeared, and I believe that certainly the mapority approved the provisions of the subcommittee's bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I may not be correct in saying that they all opposed it, but I am confident that the record will show that many important Federal officers did oppose it. I should like to refer to the record to see the position of the Surgeon General on this question.

In his message on a national health program, the President said that the hospital-construction program "should * * * lay down minimum national standards for construction and operation."

Let me emphasize that the amendment will assure that the States will have Federal support in establishing their own standards at an adequate level to protect both the Federal Government and the State governments.

The second amendment is in three parts. The first part would amend section 622 (e) on page 24, lines 6 to 8, to extend the standards which the Surgeon General is required to promulgate so that they will apply to maintenance and operation as well as to construction and equipment. This is in direct agreement with the President's recommendation.

The second part would amend section 623 (a) (7) on page 27 of the bill, lines 11 to 14, so as to require that the standards to be promulgated by the States shall be in accord with the Federal standards promulgated by the Surgeon General.

The third part of the amendment would insert a proviso clause to section 625 (a) of the bill, on page 31, line 19. The effect of this added language would be to leave the Surgeon General authority to refuse to approve a project which—for reasons unforeseen by the specific requirements of the bill—should not be approved for Federal aid. However, in order to protect against any possible arbitrary or capricious action by the Surgeon General in refusing to approve a project, the amendment also requires that such disapproval by the Surgeon General must be preceded by consultation with the Federal hospital council and must have the concurrence of the Federal Security Administrator. Moreover, this amendment in no way interferes with the right of an applicant whose project has been disapproved to seek judicial review in the Federal courts as provided in section 632 (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 3: USE OF FEDERAL-AID HOSPITALS BY ALL QUALIFIED DOCTORS

Tthe third amendment is intended to protect the doctors of a community where Federal aid may be given to construct a needed hospital. This would be accomplished by adding a subparagraph (h) on page 25.

We all know that the voluntary nonprofit hospitals and many proprietary hospitals have done and are doing a magnificent service to the people of this country. They should be encouraged and aided in performing a still better service. But we also know that there are some hospitals that are not up to the general standards of usefulness. And we know that many hospitals are used selfishly for the benefit of some doctors, while other qualified doctors in the community are excluded.

Senate bill 191 includes nonprofit agencies among applicants for Federal funds. Specific provisions are included to permit Federal payments to be made directly to such agencies when the State agency is not authorized to receive or is prohibited from receiving funds for and disbursing them to such agencies. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to assure that the specifications of the bill shall adequately protect the use which is made of public funds that may be granted to other than public bodies.

The amended bill contains provisions intended to assure that the services of nonprofit hospitals are available to all patients in the community. There are no provisions, however, to protect the Federal grants against the exclusive use of an aided hospital by the "closed" staff of a proprietary hospital that appears in the guise of a nonprofit hospital.

The provisions of the bill to assure community-wide use of hospitals constructed with Federal aid are good. They do not, however, meet the need to assure the use of the hospitals by all qualified practitioners in a community. The third amendment is designed to meet this deficiency in the bill.

The need for the amendment arises from the fact that under the bill Federal grants may be made to nonprofit hospitals, as well as to public hospitals. A nonprofit project could actually be—in effect—a hospital owned by a restricted group of doctors and operated for their exclusive use. No profit might inure to them from the hospital; but only they might profit from the opportunity to furnish medical or surgical services in the hospital. Such a project would represent an abuse of public aid.

The amendment undertakes to assure that the general standards to be issued by the Surgeon General require that a project aided by Federal funds will be available to all qualified practitioners for the performance in the hospital of such services as they are professionally qualified to perform. This is in accord with the best practice in community hospitals, public or nonprofit.

(At this point Mr. MURRAY yielded to Mr. STEWART, who addressed the Senate on the subject on an amendment to the Federal pay bill. Mr. STEWART's remarks appear following Mr. MURRAY's speech.)

(At this point Mr. MURRAY yielded to Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, who addressed the Senate on the subject of an extension of the time limit for a report on the Missouri Valley Authority bill. The remarks of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma appear following Mr. MURRAY's speech.)

AMENDMENT NO. 4: MORE ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the fourth amendment deals with the amount of money authorized to be appropriated in each of the 5 years of the hospital construction program proposed by Senate bill 191. The amendment makes a change on page 22 of the bill.

The committee report points out that the basic amount authorized to be appropriated each year for grants-in-aid to construction—$75,000,000—is only a fraction of the amount needed—page 6, last paragraph. Table I of the report—page 16—indicates that $75,000,000 a year would support $139,000,000 of construction, assuming that all States can and will take full advantage of their opportunities to obtain Federal aid. For the 5-year period authorized by the bill, the total program would amount to about $695,000,000 of construction. Compare this with a minimum estimated need of about $2,500,000,000 of construction as shown by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and others at the hearings on S. 191.

To be sure, the Congress can make additional authorizations later, as is recognized by the committee report—page 6, last paragraph. But precious time would be lost in the meantime. Hospitals will not be built where they are needed, and people will be suffering and dying needlessly for lack of hospital care.

The amendment proposes to authorize $150,000,000 a year of Federal funds, instead of $75,000,000 a year. Even this larger amount would still support only a fraction of the construction program that is really needed, but it would support a more substantial fraction—about one-half instead of about one-fourth, as proposed by S. 191.

AMENDMENT NO. 5: A MORE ADEQUATE STANDARD FOR PUBLIC-HEALTH CENTERS

The fifth amendment deals with an important technical standard on page 23 of S. 191.

The standard in section 622 (c), provides for a maximum of one public-health center per 30,000 population in a State. This is an exceedingly and unnecessarily restrictive standard. It would work to the special disadvantage of the States which have largely rural populations. A more liberal ratio would be desirable and justified. This is especially important if the rural areas are to have the services of public-health centers.

This amendment proposes that in place of 1 public-health center per 30,000 population, the standard should allow 1 percent per 10,000. While this may seem to be a technical and minor point, it is of the utmost importance to the rural States which so badly need public-health centers. Without this amendment, they would be frustrated in their efforts to build up an adequate system of public-health centers, especially in communities that do not need or cannot support fully equipped small hospitals.

AMENDMENT NO. 6: EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF PUBLIC AND PROFESSIONAL MEMBERS ON THE COUNCIL

This amendment, on pages 37 and 39, has the obvious purpose of giving equal representation to the public and professional representatives on the Federal Hospital Council, each with four appointed members. Since the Council will be dealing with questions of broad public policy, this is the sound way to balance the major interests. The Surgeon General, who will be the ninth member and chairman, will have the duty of presiding over the Council.

AMENDMENT NO. 7: AUTHORITY FOR THE SURGEON GENERAL TO MAKE LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Plainly, since this is a new kind of program, the Surgeon General should be authorized to make recommendations as to further legislation which may be needed. This amendment, on page 40, makes such provision.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate approve these seven amendments to S. 191. They are essential if we are to have a good bill and a sound program.

S. 191 BY ITSELF IS INADEQUATE: PREPAYMENT OF MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL COSTS IS ESSENTIAL

Finally, I should like to emphasize—as the committee report indicates—that S. 191 (as amended) fails to assure Federal aid to the poorest and neediest communities, and to be effective, this bill must be supplemented by other legislation.

Expecting that they will receive help in obtaining much-needed hospitals under S. 191, many rural areas and many poor areas may learn later, to their sorrow and disappointment, that they cannot qualify for Federal aid. If in advance they cannot give adequate assurances as to future financial support of a hospital after it is constructed, they cannot qualify for Federal aid toward construction.

The Committee on Education and Labor is well aware that many of the most acute needs for hospitals exist in communities that are too poor to provide all the construction funds, and too poor to pay for the effective use of hospitals—under existing methods of paying for hospital care—if they were built.

No one would want to see Federal funds under S. 191 used to build hospitals which would stand empty or be used at very low occupancy rates. Assurance of future maintenance funds is an essential prerequisite to justifiable construction. The committee considered various devices for requiring State financial participation so that no community, otherwise eligible for a grant under S. 191, shall be deprived of a hospital construction project by inability to assure future maintenance funds. However, all those devices for State financial participation, tentatively considered, were found to be unsatisfactory. On this point, the bill, as amended, is no stronger than it was when first introduced.

The bill leaves unresolved the problem of aiding the most needy communities or directing Federal aid to the communities or to the economic groups in the population which have the greatest need for such aid. The poorest and neediest communities will generally receive little or no help under S. 191.

Something could be accomplished toward meeting this problem of finding the maintenance money if the Social Security Act were amended—as has been recommended by the Social Security Board—to permit Federal matching of funds paid directly to hospitals by States and localities for the hospital care of needy persons, especially if the Federal matching were on a variable basis adjusted for the relative financial resources of the States. A provision to this effect is contained in title I, part C, of S. 1606, the bill introduced on November 19, 1945, by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and me to implement the President's recommendations for a national health program. But even this would aid only a fraction of the population involved, because the "means" test would still stand between the hospitals and those who are otherwise self-supporting yet cannot pay their way for hospital care. A very large expansion of tax-supported care would be required to meet existing needs if only this method were to be used.

The only other practical alternative that has been advanced proposes to use social insurance for hospital care in order to assure that people will be able to pay for hospital care when they need it. Such a solution is contained in S. 1606, which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and I introduced on November 19, to implement the President's program.

In his recent message on a national health program, the President very accurately dealt with this problem. He said:

> I want to emphasize * * * that the basic problem in this field (construction of needed hospitals and other health facilities) cannot be solved merely by building facilities. They have to be staffed; and communities have to be able to pay for the services. Otherwise the new facilities will be little used.

I urge upon the Senate that in approving S. 191, with the amendments which the Senator from New York and I have proposed, the Senate be fully appreciative that it is dealing with an essential part, but still only a part, of the legislation that is needed. In enacting S. 191 the Congress must be prepared to finish the job it is beginning, in order that what is done under S. 191 shall really make an effective contribution to the national health.

The Committee on Education and Labor will, I believe, be prepared to do its share in working out the additional legislation that is needed.

THE FEDERAL PAY BILL—COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

During the delivery of Mr. MURRAY's speech,

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to refer to the amendment proposing to increase the compensation of Members of Congress, which has been offered to Senate bill 1415. I mention this matter at this particular moment for the reason that I am compelled to leave in a few minutes, to be absent for several days. I am opposed to the amendment, and I wish the RECORD to show that I am. I understood there was a possibility that the amendment might be considered today, although it now appears that the possibility is remote. For that reason, I have asked that the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make this statement.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

During the delivery of Mr. MURRAY'S speech,

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, and I ask that the interruption appear at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, some time ago the Senator from Montana introduced Senate bill 555, which is known as the Missouri Valley Authority bill. It was first referred to the Committee on Commerce, where it received consideration, and that committee made a report on it. Then it was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and that committee made a report on the bill.

Now the bill has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for consideration by that committee. When the Senator who now has the floor returned from the London Conference I conferred with him in regard to holding hearings on the bill. The Senator suggested that in his opinion the hearings should be held in February. Inasmuch as that is beyond the time limit set by the Senate in the resolution regarding the reference of and report on the bill, I now ask unanimous consent that the time limit be removed, and that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be given time to hold hearings and to make a report on the bill at its convenience, after the beginning of the new session of this Congress.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a limitation was placed on the time within which the committee must make its report. What was that date?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think each committee had 60 days in which to consider the bill and make a report to the Senate on it. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry does not have time now, because of the coming of the holiday season, to hold the hearings and make the report within the time limit.

Mr. WHITE. I appreciate that; but in view of the previous action of the Senate, I am wondering whether the Senator would be willing to suggest a time limit on the new report.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no objection to that; but the Senator from Montana, who is the author of the bill, desires to have hearings held in the field. If they are held in the field, it will take some time to go to the States in interest. The Senator has suggested that the hearings be held in February. If they are held then, obviously it will be March before the hearings can be concluded and before the report can be submitted to the Senate.

I have no objection to a limit as of April the first or even March 15. I think that much time would be ample.

Mr. WHITE. Could not the limit be set as of March 1?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not think that would be feasible. This is the last committee to consider the bill, and of course it will proceed with all due dispatch to hold hearings and make its report. I do not know of any consideration which would make it necessary for the hearing and report to be made within any fixed period of time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate once fixed a time limit, it seems to me there should not now be a grant of unlimited time. If the Senator will fix some reasonably early date, I shall have no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. It would be rather difficult to do so. As a matter of fact, the time-limitation agreement was entered into by unanimous consent; the Senate did not act. The matter was simply presented to the Senate by a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, Mr. President, a unanimous-consent agreement, when agreed to, is action by the Senate.

I have no special knowledge of the matter; but inasmuch as the Senate once fixed a time limit, it seems to me we should not now extend the time in an unlimited manner.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me say just another word. The two reports which have been submitted on the bill are adverse, so the proponents of the measure are placed in a rather embarrassing position by having a limitation to a short period of time placed upon them in regard to further consideration of the bill. If the members of the committee are to have any chance to overturn the two adverse committee reports, it will take some little time and some evidence to do so. That is what we are requesting now. Inasmuch as I do not see any chance of holding hearings and making a report on the bill prior to, let us say, the 15th of March, I do not think the committee can be forced to make a report.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Montana will agree on the date of March 15, I will interpose no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask the Senator from Montana if he believes that such a date will be ample for the time being?

Mr. MURRAY. Offhand, I would not be able to say. I think that if it is agreed upon we will be returning later and asking for a further extension. I would suggest April 1.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggested that date, but the Senator from Maine thought that it allowed too much time.

Mr. WHITE. If on the 15th of March, or prior thereto, it appears that the work cannot be completed, there is no question that the Senate will grant a further extension.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is that agreeable?

Mr. MURRAY. If we want to go through the procedure of obtaining another extension later on, that will be satisfactory to me. It is understood that if we are not in position to conclude hearings and make our report by March 15 we will be entitled to a further extension of time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I modify my request by asking unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be given until March 15 to submit a report on Senate bill 555.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANKIN, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Mrs. ROGERS, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39 to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants

to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the request of various municipalities and hospital associations in my State of North Dakota, I wish to say that the people of North Dakota are wholeheartedly back of Senate bill 191, which we are now considering. I intend to vote for the bill and support it, and to do all I can to see that it is enacted into law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Senate bill 191, which is before the Senate, was introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the former Senator from Ohio, Mr. Justice Burton, and has been considered, I think, as carefully as any bill I have had anything to do with in the Committee on Education and Labor, and in the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, which met for 3 or 4 weeks with representatives of the different Government department and with the representative of the American Hospital Association. I think it is fair to say that the bill meets the approval of all on the technical side of the subject, including the medical profession, the Hospital Association, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and of everyone else, so far as I know, except the Social Security Board representative who attended the hearings and made the objections which have been presented by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. It seems to me that those amendments should be rejected, and I will discuss them as they come up, but first I wish to make a general statement regarding the bill.

I think the testimony on the subject of health shows that the United States probably is as well served in the matter of health, taking an average of the whole country, as any other country in the world, and that many advances in medicine have been made beyond those of any other country. It also shows, however, that that development is somewhat spotty; that in various sections of the country, and particularly in various rural districts, there is a lack of medical care as well as of hospital care, and it is desirable and entirely possible that by a comprehensive program we can fill up the gaps and give the American people the most comprehensive and satisfactory health service that exists anywhere in the world.

So the question we have to consider is: How shall that be done? It might be done in several ways. It might be done by the Federal Government assuming jurisdiction over the whole health problem. It might be done by the Federal Government building the hospitals which are needed. It might be done by the Federal Government taking over the medical service. In fact, the bill presented by the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Montana proposes in effect to set up a system of health insurance under which every employee and others would be required to pay into the Federal Treasury certain amounts, and the Federal Treasury would collect three to four billion dollars a year, from which it would pay all the doctors. I do not think the American people want the Federal Government to take over the entire medical-care problem of the United States, and I myself do not believe that in the end it would improve the situation. I think it would remove the initiative and the incentive to improve which has existed in the medical profession in the United States.

We might ignore the matter entirely. We might say that the States alone shall undertake the improvement of the health of their citizens. From a constitutional standpoint, that is the actual condition existing, that is the law, that is the spirit at least of the Constitution of the United States.

But we face this great difficulty that a good many of the States are poor and that all the States are limited in the revenue which they can collect. Today most revenue has to be obtained from personal incomes and from corporation incomes. Because of the fact that we have expanded Government activities in general until such a large percentage of the national income is taken in taxes—it will run, I think, at least 25 percent in the postwar normal period—the money cannot be obtained by the States except by taxing personal income and corporation incomes, and in those fields the States' ability is limited, because of the competition of other States, or for other reasons. They cannot successfully adopt those sources of income. So the poorer States particularly, and even the richer States, when they come to take on new activities find themselves short of money. They find that their existing revenues and the sources from which they come are devoted already to certain particular purposes, such as education, city services, and certain State services which have been assumed.

Health was not one of the subjects which the States started out to deal with on a comprehensive scale. It was not one of the subjects for which they have provided any tremendous amount of money. But health expenditures have always been spotty, if you please, in State and local expenditures. And the whole health care system has grown up like Topsy, a part of it is private and a part of it is public. I think two-thirds of all the hospital beds are private beds, that is they are in hospitals established by private organizations, not for profit, but denominational, charitable, and so forth, so provisions for medical care and for public-health service have grown up in a very spotty way without comprehensive planning. It seems to me that we should encourage the States to go ahead with such comprehensive planning, and that we should afford sufficient Federal aid to enable the States to undertake that course. That is the principle which has been established in a number of other fields.

I feel very strongly that there are dangers in that course. I believe that when we undertake that course we should hedge it about with certain restrictions. If we are to give the money to the States we should see that we retain just as little Federal control as possible, and make sure that the States have the initiative, the ability, the organization, and the power to develop the program which they think is most suitable to their respective needs. The plan should conform to the general purposes of the Federal Government, but it should be left to the States to work out the general purposes in the best possible manner. The Federal Government should not interfere and try to tell the States how they must operate the system for which we are giving them Federal aid. We cannot entirely wash our hands of the problem. We cannot give the States the money and say, "Do with it as you please." We must check on the general use.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In that connection, do I correctly understand that under the bill once a State plan has been approved by the Surgeon General no changes can be ordered by the Surgeon General for a period of 2 years?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. I shall presently come to the exact provision, but in general the provision is that the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council, shall lay down certain regulations to which the State plan must conform. The State then has the opportunity to submit a plan, and the regulations cannot be changed as against the State overnight. They can be changed in 2 years. At that time probably further requests for money will require a change to conform to the new regulations. If a Federal officer has the right to change his regulations every day, he can control the administration of the State plan. A State may submit a good plan, in accordance with everything on the books, and the Federal official may say, "Here is something I do not like. I will change the regulations, and I will not approve the State plan. I will make the State change its plan." Such a system would amount to a direct administration of each plan as well as each project. In the ultimate analysis, therefore, complete discretion would be left to the Surgeon General, which it seems to me would deprive the State of the initiative and the ability to administer its own plan.

In the bill we have tried to cure that defect. We have tried to say that once the regulations are made the Surgeon General may not change them, and must approve the plan if the State presents a plan in accordance with his regulations. If he disapproves it, the State may appeal and have a hearing before the Federal Hospital Board, in a formal way, to show that the State has complied with the regulations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance, then, the State sets up a minimum plan and the Surgeon General approves the plan. Once he approves it, everything else is left to the State, and the State still receives Federal aid.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but there is a second step in hospital administration.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may clear up one point in that connection?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Surgeon General or the Federal Hospital Board promulgate the regulations?

Mr. TAFT. The regulations would be written by the Surgeon General, but they would have to be approved by the Federal Hospital Board. Making regulations is largely a technical legislative problem; and we felt that inasmuch as it is not an administrative problem, it should properly be left to a board containing a number of experts.

Mr. KILGORE. Once the regulations are promulgated and the State submits a plan, if the plan is approved the Federal Goverment gives the aid; but does it check up to see whether the terms of the plan are carried out, and that the regulations are complied with in carrying out the plan? I was not clear as to what the Senator from Massachusetts was discussing.

Mr. TAFT. What happens is this: After the general State plan is approved, providing for the construction of hospitals so that hospital service will be available to everyone in the State, priorities are established in order of need. A hospital of first priority applies directly through the State government for a particular project. That project is approved by the State and forwarded to Washington for consideration by the Surgeon General. He must then see that the project is in accord with the State plan previously presented to him. He may disapprove the project. If he disapproves it, the applicant has a right to appeal to the United States circuit court of appeals to prove that the project conforms with the plan. That, again, is with the idea of limiting the discretion of the Surgeon General. If the court finds that the project is in accordance with the plan, the particular project is entitled to the money. Then construction of the project is started.

The provisions with respect to supervision of the construction are found on page 37. If the Surgeon General finds that the State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions of section 623 (a), or with the regulations, or if he finds that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they were allotted, or if he finds that any assurance given is not being or cannot be carried out, or if there is substantial failure to carry out the plans, he may then stop further payment of funds on the application, in which case the applicant again has an appeal to the court, to show that it has actually complied and that the Surgeon General is unfair.

Our attempt is to make the administration a matter of law, so far as possible, and not of discretion. I do not anticipate that there will be many appeals, either to the Federal Hospital Board or to the court; but there is the right of appeal, and the Surgeon General acts with that knowledge.

No matter how the plan may work out, I feel confident that the whole thing will be on the basis of law and that the attainment of the purposes of the Federal Government will be assured with just as little individual discretion and just as little interference with the operations of the State as possible in attaining the ultimate aim of the legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The bill definitely gets away from the danger of a Federal grab bag, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Originally it was left to the discretion of the Surgeon General to distribute the funds to the States in any manner he might deem advisable. We have written in a specific provision establishing a percentage calculation, as will be seen from the report on the bill, allotting Federal funds to the various States under a certain formula, so that discretion is removed from the Surgeon General.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. We castigate and flagellate ourselves over Federal grab bags, but there are also private grab bags and municipal grab bags. A hospital building is not a hospital. There must be something behind it besides the bare structure.

Mr. TAFT. Just as the Federal Roads Administration prescribes specifications for roads, so the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Advisory Council, will prescribe standards for the construction of hospitals; and if such standards are departed from, either in the plan submitted or in carrying it out, he may withhold funds until the fault is corrected.

Mr. KILGORE. Is there no provision for further supervision to see that the standards are lived up to?

Mr. TAFT. I shall discuss that question if the Senator wishes to have me do so.

The bill does not purport to deal with the question of maintenance of hospitals, or the provision of medical care for the indigent. The bill is purely a construction bill. We realize that the other problem is coming before Congress. In one way or another we shall have to deal with the question of some assistance to give more complete service to those who are indigent and unable to provide it for themselves. Of course, many of the States provide such care. The general question of hospital maintenance or standards of hospital maintenance has not been very extensively considered because, as I say, private hospitals supply more than two-thirds of all the beds. Very few States license hospitals. We have required in this bill that as a part of the plan the States shall provide standards of hospital maintenance and operation, which must be written into the State plan. We further provide, on page 28, as follows:

> (d) If any State, prior to July 1, 1947, has not enacted legislation providing that compliance with minimum standards of maintenance and operation shall be required in the case of hospitals which shall have received Federal aid under this title, such State shall not be entitled to any further allotments under section 624.

In other words, the plan must state the minimum standards of operation for hospitals, and before July 1, 1947, the State must enact a law putting such standards into legal effect in the State; but we have left the standards of maintenance entirely in the hands of the individual States. We have felt that if the Federal Government were to undertake to prescribe standards of operation and maintenance for hospitals it would be operating the hospitals. There would have to be a Federal inspector in every hospital to check up on the standards of maintenance; and from a practical standpoint the Federal Government would have to take over the operation of the hospitals, which we feel would be extremely unwise.

We feel that some further action should be taken later on to provide money for the maintenance of hospitals in a few places—although, frankly, I am rather optimistic that under the present Blue Cross plan, hospitals can in most cases manage to pay their own expenses, or, where they cannot, that the Federal Government or the local or State governments can conduct the operation themselves. At least we have not yet reached the point of determining whether hospitals can be maintained and how they shall be maintained.

In this bill we require that unless the maintenance plan is shown to be effective, Federal money with which to build a hospital cannot be obtained. That is a defect in the bill, and it can be cured only by going on to deal with the general problem of State aid or Federal aid for medical care.

Mr. President, in general we have tried, therefore, to throw as much initiative on the States as possible, so as to remove as much discretion as possible from the Federal administrative officials. This job is not primarily an administrative one. We have tried to prescribe in the proposed statute, so far as we could, the rules with which the States must comply, because in the hospital field such rules are very technical. To some extent we had to delegate to the Federal Hospital Council the power to prescribe standards. We did so, but we ask them to act now, and we refuse to permit them to change the rules for 2 years so that the States may know where they are and may make their plans.

So what we have tried to do is, first, to get away from too much delegation of congressional power to the administrative boards, as some of the social-security laws have done, and also to leave as much discretion and power as possible in the hands of the State governments themselves.

In the third place, I think all this aid must be in reasonable amounts. It is quite true that the completion in 10 years of the program which has been presented would require more money than is provided for in the bill. We have provided a 5-year plan calling for an expenditure of $75,000,000 a year. That will be sufficient to enable the project to be started. It will afford the tremendous advantage of inducing every State to make a comprehensive hospital plan for itself. As the Senator from Alabama said, I think probably that is the first great accomplishment we may hope for from the bill. If every State does that, the States will thus be required to take an interest and a responsibility, if they wish to receive this money, and they will be given an incentive to tie together all the loose ends of the hospital system, to

include public and private hospitals, and then to decide whether additional hospitals are needed, and if so, where. We accomplish that, no matter how large the appropriation may be.

I hesitate to commit the country to too large an appropriation, because no one knows what our budget will be. Frankly, Mr. President, if the Congress were to enact all the measures which have been recommended to it, our budget would be close to $26,000,000,000, if the appropriations requested by the Army and Navy are what I think they will be. That would mean there could be no tax reduction of any kind under the system we have recommended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator agree that, regardless of what it costs, it would be a better investment than the giving to England of $4,400,000,000?

Mr. TAFT. I agree entirely.

Mr. President, if we approach the health problem from a State-aid basis, on the theory that we are going to help the States fill up the gaps in health service, where such exist, it seems to me we can do a good job with a total amount of $400,000,000. Personally, in that field and in some other fields I think we can afford an expansion over the existing system in an amount up to $1,000,000,000. I do not think we can do so, however, if we are going to spend $10,000,000,000 on the Army and the Navy. If we do that, I do not see how we shall be able to obtain the tax money needed in order to pay the bills which will be incurred. But certainly the expansion of social service is of greater interest to the people of the United States, it seems to me, than are any other projects, national or international, which we are undertaking.

I think, in this field, we should make our start moderate. We should not start out on a tremendous program, when it still is experimental in nature. In my judgment, we should see how far this money will go, before we branch out on something much larger.

I should very much regret to see the program proposed by the President enacted, for it would cost, as I have said, between $3,000,000,000 and $4,000,000,000. I think the desired result can be achieved along the general lines proposed by this bill.

I may say, so far as this bill is concerned, that even those who are in favor of health insurance are satisfied to have this particular problem handled in this particular way. So the issue is not directly raised on this bill, but certainly it is the beginning of what I hope may be three or four additional bills on health services which will present a comprehensive health program to the Nation.

Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Montana has not presented his amendments; but, as I have read them, it seems to me that in every case they propose to increase the power of the Surgeon General of the United States and to decrease the power of the States. They propose to make the discretion of the Surgeon General of the United States broader, so that he can exercise discretion arbitrarily, without being subject to the observance of rules. I think it would be most unfortunate if those amendments were adopted. I think they would largely change the character of the bill. I hope they will be rejected.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in support of the arguments of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Ohio. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, while I was not on the subcommittee, I did hear a good deal of the testimony which was offered in connection with the bill. I wish to go on record as being heartily in favor of the bill as presented, and I commend the subcommittee for doing such a splendid job in presenting the subject to the Senate in a practical form.

I wish to say further that, inasmuch as I am the son of a physician, and therefore am acquainted with a great many men in the medical profession, I have tried to follow as carefully as I could the discussions in regard to the Wagner bill and in regard to the measure now under discussion, and my physician friends to whom I have submitted this bill in its revised form give their enthusiastic approval to this program, which provides that we take our first step in the health picture in developing medical centers and hospitals. Let me also say that in the case of friends of mine who are engaged in administrative work, especially in my own State, I find that they give approval to the program providing for local and State responsibility, as the Senator from Ohio has so well pointed out.

Mr. President, I am most happy to endorse the bill and to commend the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from Wisconsin too, for the splendid job they have done in preparing and presenting the bill to the Senate. I am heartily in favor of it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to refer to a matter which I overlooked. The bill, as we have heard, offers Federal aid through the States, under State plans, to private charitable hospitals not operated for profit. That is a departure from some principles. Some of those hospitals are denominational in character; others are purely charitable. Ordinarily I would not be in favor of such a grant; but the hospital situation is peculiar. If we undertake to confine hospital aid to public hospitals, in effect we freeze the present hospital system where it is. It has performed a tremendously helpful service, incidentally relieving the States and cities of enormous expense which they would have had to meet if they had operated the hospitals as general hospitals. I feel that in order to permit that system to continue to grow as it has grown, in order that the private system may grow alongside the public system, we are justified in extending Federal aid to private hospitals as well as to public hospitals, in cases in which the State has surveyed the situation and has approved the construction of a hospital or of an addition to a particular hospital in a certain section. It seems to me that in that event it is perfectly proper that Federal aid be extended to such private hospitals as well as to public hospitals. Otherwise we shall gradually make public the entire hospital system in the United States, but at much greater expense and, I think, with discouragement to people who are charitably inclined. For years the establishment and conduct of hospitals has been the aim of charitable people who wish to give their money to such institutions, and take pleasure in doing so. Their donations give to the administration a certain independence which is not always present in public affairs.

Therefore I think the extension of Federal aid to private hospitals is justifiable, although I would not like to extend it to some other fields. Particularly, I myself have felt that in the case of education, inasmuch as the State has undertaken to educate every child, we should not extend aid to private schools. Nevertheless, in this case I feel that the provision of public aid is justified.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me point out that, of course, the aid proposed is Federal aid to nonprofit private hospitals. No private hospitals run for profit are included.

Mr. TAFT. Of course not; and if a hospital ceases to be a nonprofit hospital, the money granted to it will come back to the Government. I think we have fully protected that feature.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Are amendments to Senate bill 191 now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are in order.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask that the amendments which I have heretofore submitted, and which have been printed, be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 10, after the word "appropriated", it is proposed to insert "out of the fund established under section 636."

On page 22, line 2, after the word "appropriated", insert "out of the fund established under section 636."

On page 22, line 6, before the word "for", insert "from such fund."

On page 41, between lines 7 and 8, insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 636. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to deposit for each year in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States proceeds of taxes, duties, imposts, or excises in an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for such year under this title. Amounts deposited in such fund shall be available for expenditure only pursuant to appropriations made under authority of this title. Any amounts remaining in the fund after the expiration of the period for which such amounts are available for expenditure shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as each of the amendments applies to the same proposition, I ask that they be considered en bloc and acted upon in that manner.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator has said that all the amendments pertain to one proposition.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I think it is wise for the Senator to have them disposed of as one amendment. I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri will be considered as being one amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the amendments which are now offered en bloc will be referred to by me as one amendment. The amendment can best be understood by a brief explanation, after which I shall address myself to the grounds on which the amendment is offered.

The bill itself, in section 611, page 18, authorizes the appropriation of the sum of $5,000,000 in order to assist States in carrying out the purpose of section 601 (a). Section 601 (a) has as its purpose the inventorying of existing hospitals, to survey the need for construction of hospitals, and to develop programs for construction of such public and other nonprofit hospitals as will, in conjunction with existing facilities, afford the necessary physical facilities for furnishing adequate hospital, clinic, and similar services to all the people of the several States. The amendment proposes to insert, in line 10, page 18, immediately after the word "appropriated", the words and figures "out of the fund established under section 636."

On page 22 of the bill, which is under the title "Part C—Construction of Hospitals and Related Facilities"——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot find section 636 in the bill.

Mr. DONNELL. There is no section 636 as yet. It is to be included by my amendment. I shall come to that point in a few moments.

On page 22, in line 2, the amendment proposes to insert immediately after the word "appropriated", the words and figures "out of the fund established under section 636."

Again, on page 22, where there is provision in the bill for further authorizations to be appropriated for such construction the sums provided in section 624, the amendment proposes to insert in line 6 immediately after the word "appropriated," the words "from such fund."

Answering the Senator from North Dakota, the amendment proposes that on page 41, after line 7 and immediately following section 635, a new section be added to read as follows:

SEC. 636. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to deposit for each year in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States proceeds of taxes, duties, imposts, or excises in an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for such year under this title. Amounts deposited in such fund shall be available for expenditure only pursuant to appropriations made under authority of this title. Any amounts remaining in the fund after the expiration of the period for which such amounts are available for expenditure shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. President, it will be observed that under the terms of the bill in its present form these various authorizations, aggregating $380,000,000, may be payable from any funds in the possession of the Treasury of the United States, whereas under the proposed amendment the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to deposit for each year in a special fund proceeds of certain specific receipts of the United States Government, namely, taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, in amounts equal to the aggregate of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for such year under this title.

The effect of the amendment is that the amounts deposited in the fund shall be available for expenditure pursuant only to appropriations made under the authority of the bill, and also that any appropriations made under the authority of the bill must be paid solely out of such fund. Any amounts remaining in the fund after the expiration of the period for which such amounts are available for expenditure, shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

It will be observed, therefore, that on the one hand the bill permits the payment of the $380,000,000 thereby authorized to be appropriated out of any funds of the United States of America, whether derived from fines, forfeitures, taxes, bond issues, or what not, whereas under the amendment the moneys payable under the bill, if the appropriations shall be subsequently made, can be paid only from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises.

There may be an immediate question in the minds of some Senators as to why the term "taxes, duties, imposts, and excises" arises, and why it is that the proposed amendment undertakes to restrict the payment of the moneys authorized to be appropriated from those four sources, "taxes, duties, imposts, and excises."

The question is entirely proper, Mr. President, and it leads up to the fact that the words to which I have referred are those which are used in section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, the first clause of which reads:

The Congress shall have power:

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—

Namely, the four components which are referred to in my amendment—

to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Then, proceeding, the section says:

But all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

So, Mr. President, the amendment which I present this afternoon is designed to require payment of the funds authorized to be appropriated by Senate bill 191 solely from the types of receipts mentioned in the opening clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, "taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." I shall refer more extendedly to the reason why I propose to limit the sources from which the appropriation shall be made to these specific funds of the United States.

I advocate the adoption of the amendment which has been submitted, on two grounds, first, that such an amendment is essential to the constitutionality of the bill; second, that such an amendment is advisable from the standpoint of sound public policy. With the permission of the Senate, I shall address myself to those two propositions, and first as to the essentiality of the amendment from the standpoint of the constitutionality of Senate bill 191.

As has been correctly and clearly stated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the bill proposes to grant Federal aid to States for hospital construction. The question at once arises, whence is derived the constitutional authority to enact this bill into law?

I hold in my hand a copy of the Constitution of the United States, and a search of that document from one end to the other, will disclose that authority to legislate for the authorization of appropriations for the purpose of Federal aid to the States for hospital construction cannot be found in any of the powers of Congress set forth in the Constitution, unless such authority is contained in the first clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, namely, the clause which I read a few moments ago.

Mr. President, that is the clause and the only clause in the body of the Constitution which contains the term "general welfare of the United States." It is true that the preamble to the Constitution contains, among other things, mention of promotion of the general welfare, the language of the preamble being:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Notwithstanding the language which I have read as contained in the preamble to the Constitution, it should be observed that the inclusion in the preamble of the phrase "promote the general welfare" does not confer on Congress any legislative power.

In the case of Jacobson against Massachusetts, reported in 197 United States Reports, at page 11, Mr. Justice Harlan, delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

Although, therefore, one of the declared objects of the Constitution was to secure the blessings of liberty to all under the sovereign jurisdiction and authority of the United States, no power can be exerted to that end by the United States unless, apart from the preamble, it be found in some express delegation of power or in some power to be properly implied therefrom.

Citing Story on the Constitution, volume 1, section 462. The learned Justice also said:

Although that preamble indicates the general purposes for which the people ordained and established the Constitution, it has never been regarded as the source of any

substantive power conferred on the Government of the United States or on any of its departments.

There sits before me this afternoon an eminent and distinguished Senator of the United States, whose long service in this body entitles him to the confidence and respect which he enjoys. On the 21st day of June 1937 this distinguished Senator, who is now the minority leader in the United States Senate, the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], uttered these significant words with respect to the preamble to the Constitution:

That the preamble of the Constitution has nothing whatever to do with the powers conferred on Congress by that document is beyond question. Nor is there anything in the records of the proceedings of the Federal Convention which in any way indicates that any of the members of that Convention had any intent that the preamble was to be taken into consideration in determining the powers conferred on Congress by the Constitution. On the contrary, the sole object of the preamble was merely to declare that the then existing form of government was not sufficient for the interests of the people, and was merely a declaration of the necessity for establishing a more definite form of government than then existed.

The distinguished Senator from Maine concluded:

The preamble did not create any power.

The language thus used by the distinguished Senator from Maine finds ample corroboration in various utterances of courts and of writers. I refer particularly to Professor Willoughby, professor of political science of Johns Hopkins University, in his well-known work on constitutional law of the United States, in which, at page 62, paragraph 37, he employs this language:

That the preamble may not be resorted to as a source of Federal authority is so well established as scarcely to need the citation of authorities.

Again, the same author, on page 97, paragraph 61, says:

Among the purposes enumerated in its preamble for the securing of which the Constitution is ordained and established is the promotion of the general welfare. That the preamble may, in certain cases, be resorted to for the purpose of determining the meaning of ambiguous provisions in the body of the instrument, but that it may not be viewed as itself a source of Federal power has been already pointed out.

So, Mr. President, I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the preamble to the Constitution of the United States vests in Congress no power whatsoever to legislate with respect to the general welfare of the United States.

Inasmuch as the power to enact the pending bill must therefore be sought elsewhere than in the preamble, we search again in the body of the Constitution for that power. I repeat, Mr. President, that unless the power to enact this particular legislation be derived from the clause which I have read in section 8 of article I of the Constitution, such power is not existent.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the power to enact the bill, if it be derivable from any source, can be derived only from clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, it is important that we have clearly in mind the contents of the clause. I read it again, because it is important to remember its exact language:

The Congress shall have power

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The clause which I have read is frequently termed the "general welfare clause." However, inasmuch as the power granted by that clause is the power to tax, it is in my opinion far more appropriate to term the clause, as I shall, "the taxation clause" of the Constitution of the United States.

The first question to arise in considering the applicability of this clause of the Constitution to Senate bill 191 is, Does the subject matter of Senate bill 191, namely, provision for (a) the development of programs for the construction of hospitals, and (b) Federal aid to the States in the construction of hospitals in accordance with such programs, come within the category embraced by the term "general welfare"?

Mr. President, it is interesting to note historically that profound differences of opinion have existed as to the scope of the term "general welfare," the question being as to whether the term "general welfare" is confined to the other powers which were granted to Congress and subjoined below and following the taxation clause, or whether the term "general welfare" is not so confined.

In the case of United States against Butler, decided in 1935, the opinion in which is written by Mr. Justice Roberts, there occurs at pages 65 and 66 the following language bearing on whether or not the term "general welfare" is confined to the subjoined powers which follow the taxation power. Said the learned justice in that case:

Since the foundation of the Nation sharp differences of opinion have persisted as to the true interpretation of the phrase.

The phrase, Mr. President, being to "provide for the general welfare of the United States." Continuing with the observations of the jurist:

Madison asserted it amounted to no more than a reference to the other powers enumerated in the subsequent clauses of the same section; that, as the United States is a Government of limited and enumerated powers, the grant of power to tax and spend for the general national welfare must be confined to the enumerated legislative fields committed to the Congress. In this view—

Continues Mr. Justice Roberts—

the phrase is mere tautology, for taxation and appropriation are or may be necessary incidents of the exercise of any of the enumerated legislative powers. Hamilton, on the other hand—

Says Mr. Justice Roberts—

maintained the clause confers a power separate and distinct from those later enumerated, is not restricted in meaning by the grant of them, and Congress consequently has a substantive power to tax and to appropriate, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

Continuing, the learned Justice said:

Each contention has had the support of those whose views are entitled to weight. This Court has noticed the question, but has never found it necessary to decide which is the true construction. Mr. Justice Story, in his commentaries, espouses the Hamiltonian position. We shall not review the writings of public men and commentators or discuss the legislative practice. Study of all these leads us to conclude that the reading advocated by Mr. Justice Story is the correct one. While, therefore—

Said the Justice—

the power to tax is not unlimited, its confines are set in the clause which confers it, and not in those of section 8 which bestow and define the legislative powers of the Congress. It results that the power of Congress to authorize expenditure of public moneys for public purposes is not limited by the direct grounds of legislative power found in the Constitution.

Mr. President, among the very distinguished authors is one who has been well known to many members of the bar here and throughout the United States. I refer to the distinguished Charles Warren, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, author of The Supreme Court in United States History, The Supreme Court and Sovereign States, and various other works. In his work upon The Making of the Constitution he has this to say with respect to the matter of whether or not "general welfare" as used in the taxation clause to which I refer is confined to the powers which are subjoined below and follow the taxation clause. After referring to Judge Story, he said:

Who—

That is to say, Judge Story—

after disposing of the theory that the general-welfare clause vested an independent and distinct power in Congress, adopted, himself, the following interpretation: That the power to levy taxes was granted for the purpose of paying the public debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare—

And then I call attention, Mr. President, particularly to this—

that Congress may lay a tax in order to pay for anything which it can reasonably deem to be for the common defense and general welfare; that so long as the object is one of "general" as opposed to "local" welfare, Congress may tax and appropriate money for it; and that Congress is clothed with the power of determining what is the common defense and general welfare.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Am I correct in assuming that the purport of the Senator's argument is that this program could not be financed either by the assumption of or creation of a debt or by deficit financing? Is that the purport of the Senator's argument?

Mr. DONNELL. I intend to follow the remarks which I have made with an argument along those lines. I am glad the Senator was good enough to interpolate that inquiry at this time, because

it points up the matter to which I shall come in a little while. I thank the Senator for his interruption.

Mr. SMITH. That would mean that we have to tax currently to pay for a program of this kind?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. President, in the case of *Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U. S., 601, 645), the Court said:

> Whether wisdom or unwisdom resides in the scheme of benefits set forth in title II,—

The Court was referring, I may say, to the social security legislation—

> it is not for us to say. The answer to such inquiries must come from Congress, not the courts.

Then on page 645, the Court said:

> When money is spent to promote the general welfare, the concept of welfare or the opposite is shaped by Congress, not the States. So the concept be not arbitrary, the locality must yield.

So, Mr. President, I point out that under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States it seems quite clear to me that the courts have held that "general welfare" is not confined to the specifically enumerated items which are subjoined below and follow the taxation clause, but may include other matters which the wisdom of Congress may determine to be included within the term "general welfare."

I remind the Senate, however, that upon this very proposition there have been great differences of opinion between very eminent counsel, and that although, as I have indicated, I think the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the "general welfare" is no longer to be considered as merely to be embraced within the subjoined enumerated powers to which I have referred, nevertheless it is only within recent years that there seems to have been a comparative agreement upon that proposition. Indeed, the distinguished Senator from Maine, whom I quoted a few moments ago, when he addressed the Senate on June 21, 1937, had this to say:

> If the Supreme Court should ever be so constituted that the majority of its members would construe and interpret the phrase "To lay and collect taxes * * * and provide for the * * * general welfare of the United States" as conferring on Congress broad and unlimited discretionary power (1) to impose taxes and appropriate money for the general welfare of the United States, or (2) that Congress has the power to enact legislation providing for the general welfare of the United States, separate and independent of the taxing power, and that such powers are not qualified or limited by the subjoined enumerated powers conferred by the Constitution, then the powers of the Federal Government would be unlimited, and Congress could enact any legislation which it might deem or pretend to be for the general welfare of the United States. In other words, as stated by Madison, it would be a "government without any limits at all," and Congress would have the power to enact legislation concerning "everything, from the highest object of State legislation down to the most minute object of police."

So, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there has been in years past a very great and profound difference of opinion as to whether or not the term "general welfare" could under any possible theory include an item for hospital construction, such as this.

In view, however, of the holdings of the Supreme Court in recent years, the subject of the construction of hospitals throughout the Nation is in my opinion included within "general welfare" as the term is used in the taxation clause, provided Congress determines it to be so included in "general welfare." Indeed, Mr. President, my understanding is that "general welfare" is anything, whether included or not included in the subjoined enumerated powers to which I have referred, which are set forth subsequent to the taxation clause, which is for welfare of national as distinguished from local scope. Provision for construction of hospitals throughout the United States can therefore, in my opinion, be made under the taxation clause of the Constitution.

But, Mr. President, if this be true there still remains a very fundamental series of questions. In the first place, does the first clause of section 8 of article I of the Constitution contain a distinct, separate power to provide for the general welfare, or is the reference to "general welfare" merely descriptive of one of the purposes for which Congress was granted the power to lay taxes?

Mr. President, as pointed out more than a century ago by Mr. Justice Story, it had been maintained by some that in said clause of section 8 of article I, the words "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises" constitute "a distinct substantial power" and that the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" constitute another distinct and substantial power. The Supreme Court of the United States, however, speaking in 1935, in the Butler case, to which reference has already been made, disposes of this contention. The Supreme Court says this:

> The view that the clause grants power to provide for the general welfare independently of the taxing power, has never been authoritatively accepted.

After some intermediate language, there follows this:

> The true construction undoubtedly is that the only thing granted is the power to tax for the purpose of providing funds for payment of the nation's debts and making provision for the general welfare.

The Supreme Court thus denies that the taxation clause, namely, the first clause of section 8 of article I, grants power to provide for the general welfare independently of the taxing power. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I say that the Supreme Court of the United States, speaking in the Butler case in 1935, thus denied that the taxation clause grants power to provide for the general welfare independently of the taxing power. The Court further stated, as Mr. Justice Story points out, that if the view that the clause grants power to provide for the general welfare independently of the taxing power were adopted—

> It is obvious that under color of the generality of the words "to provide for the common defense and general welfare," the Government of the United States is in reality a government of general and unlimited powers, notwithstanding the subsequent enumeration of specific powers.

A few moments ago reference was made to the work by Mr. Charles Warren on the making of the Constitution. I quote the following from this work, at pages 476 and 477:

> In the early years following the adoption of the Constitution a few statesmen who advocated extreme, nationalistic power contended that the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" constituted a separate, independent, and substantial power of Congress, and were not to be construed as integrally a part of the power to lay taxes. Such an interpretation has long been demolished—the final blow to it being given by Judge Story, in 1833, in his Commentaries on the Constitution. For to use his own impressive words:
>
> "The Constitution was, from its very origin, contemplated to be the frame of a national government, of special and enumerated powers, and not of general and unlimited powers. This is apparent, as will be presently seen from the history of the proceedings of the Convention which framed it; and it has formed the admitted basis of all legislative and judicial reasoning upon it, ever since it was put into operation, by all who have been its open friends and advocates, as well as by all who have been its enemies and opponents. If the clause 'to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States' is construed to be an independent and substantive grant of power, it not only renders wholly unimportant and unnecessary the subsequent enumeration of specific powers, but it plainly extends far beyond them and creates a general authority in Congress to pass all laws which they may deem for the common defense or general welfare. Under such circumstances, the Constitution would practically create an unlimited national government. The enumerated powers would tend to embarrassment and confusion, since they would only give rise to doubts as to the true extent of the general power, or of the enumerated powers."

Mr. Warren concludes the quotation from Judge Story, and then proceeds:

> Story conclusively established that the words "to pay the debts, etc.," meant precisely the same as if they read in order to pay the debts, etc.," and that payment of debts, etc., was to be construed as merely descriptive of one of the ends and purposes for which Congress was granted the power to levy taxes. It is unnecessary to discuss this further, as Story's reasoning is everywhere now accepted.

Mr. Warren concludes with this paragraph:

> The second interpretation, however, has been the one on which Congress has, in practice, long acted, though it is contrary to what, as above explained, was probably the intention of the delegates. The subsequent practice of Congress has gained most of its strength from the support given to it by Judge Story, who, after disposing of the theory that the general welfare clause vested an independent and distinct power in Congress, adopted, himself, the following interpretation: That the power to levy taxes was granted for the purpose of paying the public debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare; that Congress may lay a tax in order to pay for anything which it can reasonably deem to be for the common defense and general welfare; that so long as the object is one of "general" as opposed to

"local" welfare, Congress may tax and appropriate money for it; and that Congress is clothed with the power of determining what is the common defense and general welfare.

Mr. President, I take it from what has been read that it is obvious that the view of the Supreme Court in the Butler case, that the taxation clause does not confer power to provide for the general welfare independently of the taxing power, is established beyond peradventure of doubt.

There has recently been published a very interesting book. It is only one of the so-called Hornbook series, but I sometimes need something in the nature of Hornbook law. The writer, Prof. Henry Rottschaefer, who is professor of law at the University of Minnesota, has this to say, under the heading "Provision for the general welfare of the United States." I quote from page 173 of this work, which was published in 1939:

The provision that the taxing power may be used to provide for the general welfare of the United States has recently become the subject of considerable judicial discussion. The attempt to give that general-welfare provision the status of an independent power under which the Congress would be permitted to enact any character of legislation to provide for the general welfare of the United States has been explicitly repudiated.

He cites the Butler case, and then continues:

It is merely a specification of one of the purposes for which Congress may lay and collect taxes and for which it may appropriate the moneys raised by taxation, and constitutes a limitation thereon.

Mr. President, a while ago I referred to the work by Mr. Willoughby on the Constitution of the United States. I quote from page 97 of that work, in paragraph 61, where the writer says this:

Among the purposes enumerated in its preamble for the securing of which the Constitution is ordained and established is the promotion of the general welfare. That the preamble may, in certain cases, be resorted to for the purpose of determining the meaning of ambiguous provisions in the body of the instrument, but that it may not be viewed as itself a source of Federal power has been already pointed out. However, the phrase "general welfare" is also used in the body of the Constitution, namely, in article I, section 8, which provides that Congress shall have the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

Professor Willoughby continues:

Determined and repeated efforts have been made by those anxious to magnify the powers of the Federal Government, or to support the constitutionality of specific proposed or enacted measures of Congress, to have this provision construed as a comprehensive grant of power to the United States to take any action which, conceivably, may aid in the common defense or promote the general welfare of the people of the United States. The adoption of such a construction by the Supreme Court has been repeatedly urged upon it, although it is evident that, were it accepted, the general government would at once become one whose powers would be without any effective limits.

In substance, those who have urged that this broad interpretation should be given to the words in question have argued that the construction of the clause in which they occur should be that Congress is given the power to lay and collect taxes, etc., and also as a distinct grant of power to provide for the general welfare of the United States; in other words, that the effect of these latter words is not to be limited to a statement of the purposes for the attainment or promotion of which Federal taxes may be laid and collected.

Professor Willoughby further says:

Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution, published in 1833, states the correct doctrine upon this point, which is that the words "to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" are by way of limitation of the granted taxing power of Congress rather than a grant of a distinct power. He says (par. 919): "A power to lay taxes for any purposes whatsoever is a general power; a power to lay taxes for certain specified purposes is a limited power. A power to lay taxes for the common defense and general welfare of the United States is not in common sense a general power. It is limited to those objects. It cannot constitutionally transcend them."

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], to whom I have referred this afternoon, speaking on June 21, 1937, in a most interesting and comprehensive review respecting the general-welfare clause, had this to say:

As I understand it, the contention of the President and other administration spokesmen is that Congress not only has the power to tax and appropriate money for the common defense and general welfare, but that independent of the taxing power and the appropriation of moneys for such purposes, Congress also has the power to enact legislation for the general welfare, without regard to the subjoined enumerated powers conferred on Congress in article I, section 8, or any other specific power conferred. In other words, it is their contention that to provide for the "general welfare" constitutes a power in and of itself and is not limited or qualified by the taxing power or by any of the subjoined enumerated powers. If the framers of the Constitution had any such intention, which the records of the Federal convention would seem to refute, then they did not create a government of limited powers, but one of unlimited powers, for if Congress has the power to enact any legislation which it may deem necessary for the general welfare, it necessarily follows that its power is unlimited.

So, Mr. President, I submit that from the recent opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States it is clear that section 8 of article I of the Constitution does not confer upon the Congress a separate and distinct power to provide for the general welfare, but that such power is merely adjacent to and a part of the taxing power.

In the course of Madison's discussion of the general-welfare clause, to which I comend the attention of the Senate, and which in large part is set forth in the most interesting address by the Senator from Maine on June 21, 1937, the history of the adoption of that clause is developed. In my judgment, it throws light upon the real meaning thereof.

Mr. President, thus we have seen that in the first place it would appear that, under recent opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the general-welfare power is of such nature, or may be such if Congress so determines, as to include the power to construct hospitals, as embraced in Senate bill 191. But we also find, as I have attempted to indicate, that the courts have distinctly held that there is no such power to legislate for general welfare, but that the power of Congress with respect to general welfare arises, as the Supreme Court has said in an opinion appearing in 297 U. S., from language which can be described as "words which were intended to limit and define the granted power to raise and to expend money."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I have listened to the reading of the decisions of the Supreme Court and to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, it has occured to me that in the decisions nothing was said about capital improvements. In other words, a hospital, the construction of which the Senator says is a perfectly proper thing for the Federal Government to consider under the general welfare clause, is a capital asset which will last for 10, 15, 25, or perhaps 50 years. If that be true, could not the Supreme Court very properly rule that such as asset need not be paid for all in 1 year; in other words, that it might not be necessary to raise sufficient taxes to pay for the whole hospital in 1 year?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, let me say that in the Constitution I find no difference between expenditures for capital assets and expenditures for current outlays. In either event the basis on which such expenditures would be made in the current instance would be on the theory that they are for the general welfare; and under the section of article I of the Constitution to which I have referred this afternoon the only source from which funds to be spent for the general welfare may be obtained, insofar as the general welfare power is not included in the subjoined enumerated powers, is from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises. As I have said, I see no distinction between the case of capital assets and the case of currently consumed assets.

Mr. President, the fact that provision for hospital construction and for Federal aid to States in connection therewith can be made under the taxation clause does not, however, answer a highly important question which then arises under the Constitution. That question is, Does the Constitution permit expenditures for this purpose to be made from any source whatever, or only from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises? Of course, I assert that this question can be answered finally only by the Supreme Court of the United States. However, I submit, first, that although provision may be made under the taxing clause for any general-welfare activity, nevertheless, if provision be made for any purpose, subject to the powers granted under the general-welfare clause—for instance, for State aid for the construction of hospitals—which is not included in the powers of Congress which are enumerated in the provisions of the Con-

stitution subsequent to the taxing clause, the expenses of such projects can be paid only from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; and in the second place, any general-welfare law which depends for its validity on the taxation clause, as does the hospital bill, must contain a provision to the effect that the outlays made under it can be made only from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

Mr. President, I think I might add to my reply to the remark of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and also to the remark of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who referred to the proposition that by construction means that expenses of this kind must be met from current receipts. I think my answer to that point is correct, with the following limitation: To my mind, there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent an acquisition of taxes, imposts, duties, and excises which has already occurred from being placed into a fund and utilized for such a purpose, even though such acquisition does not occur in the year in which the expenditure is made.

In other words, Mr. President, if today there is on hand in the Treasury of the United States $500,000,000 which can be segregated and can be shown to have come from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises there is no reason why that money could not be set up as the fund from which expenditures could be made next year or the year after or the year after that for such hospital construction. So to the two distinguished Senators I say that I desire to modify to the extent which I have indicated the answer I gave a little while ago to the Senator from New Jersey. In other words, to my mind—and I hope I make my position clear—in regard to expenditures for a type of general welfare activity not enumerated—for instance, something in addition to the power to regulate interstate commerce or establish post roads, and so forth—I do not find anywhere in the Constitution a requirement that expenditures for such other type of general welfare activity—for instance, hospital construction—must be made from funds which come in during the year in which they are expended.

My point is that not one dollar can legitimately be expended under the Constitution of the United States for the type of general welfare activity illustrated by hospital construction unless the source of those funds shall have been from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises. I trust I have made my position clear to the two Senators who interrogated me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in connection with the subject he has just been discussing?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator's argument be correct, under what provision of the Constitution is authority to be found for the building of the large dams, such as the Coulee Dam, which are primarily for flood control? Perhaps authority for them is to be found in a different provision of the Constitution. Let me also ask where the money for such expenditures comes from.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have not examined into the specific illustration mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not know whether such dams were constructed under the theory of the general-welfare clause. It may be that they were constructed under the theory that their relationship to commerce brings them under the commerce clause of the Constitution. However, I would undertake to say that if it is once established that authority for such expenditures can only be supported on the ground that they are for the general welfare, then to my mind it is clear and conclusive, under the first clause of section 8 of article I, that such expenditures can be made only from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

I cannot answer the specific question, because I do not know the theory of the particular legislation, nor have I studied it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The next clause of the Constitution reads as follows:

> To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

Does the Senator believe that a bond issue could be made, to pay for such hospital construction, and that the bond issue could be retired by use of funds from taxes, duties, imposts, and excises?

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator from New Jersey has put his finger on a very pertinent question, and one as to which it is very difficult to make an answer with absolute certainty. I think I should say with frankness that there is a decision—I was coming to it a little later; it is the decision in the case of *United States* v. *Kay* (89 Federal Reports, 2d series, p. 19) and following—in which the court uses this language:

> In taxing and making appropriations for the general welfare, Congress is not confined within the scope of the delegated powers but must merely act in furtherance of general or national as distinguished from local purposes.

Citing *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S.):

> And the power to borrow can be subject to no other or greater limitation.

I shall discuss that case a little further within a few minutes, because I think it is of some importance.

To my mind, however, Mr. President, the expenditures from receipts of a bond issue would not be expenditures made from the collection of taxes, duties, imposts, or excises. I do not pretend to say what the holding of the Supreme Court will be on this subject. The Court has the power to decide as in its wisdom shall be proper. But to my mind, if there were to be sold today on the open market of this country $500,000,000 worth of United States Government bonds, the moneys derived from such a sale would not be derived from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, and the mere fact that payments were made later in retiring those bonds does not answer the proposition that the Constitution says that expenditures for general welfare may be made solely from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises.

So, Mr. President, without attempting to say what the Supreme Court of the United States would say upon the subject, to my mind the language of the Constitution is clear, convincing and unanswerable that expenditures for the type of general welfare not embraced within the subjoined enumerated powers, cannot be made from the proceeds of bonds, or from any other sources except, and only, taxes, duties, imposts, or excises.

Mr. President, doubtless there are illustrations of instances in which Congress has authorized the expenditure of moneys on the general-welfare theory without requiring that such expenditures be made from the collection of taxes, duties, imposts, or excises. I have not made a study of all the statutes pertaining to the subject. Indeed, I have not gone into them for the purpose of determining how the particular items were financed. As I see it, that is not the question. It is true that an interpretation placed by Congress on even a constitutional provision is strongly persuasive, and especially is it persuasive of the opinion of the National Legislature. But, Mr. President, I am not informed with reference to any time when the point now presented was urged with regard to any of these specific items of legislation. The mere fact that under the stress of an emergency, or because of a particular reason, Congress may have authorized an expenditure for the general welfare of moneys not derived from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, cannot and does not satisfy the mandatory requirements of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, to my mind, in order that the pending bill may be brought within the provisions of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution of the United States, it is essential from a constitutional angle that there be included in it a provision in accordance with the amendment which I have offered. As I have already indicated, the amendment is as follows:

> SEC. 636. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, to deposit for each year in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States proceeds of taxes, duties, imposts, or excises in an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for such year under this title. Amounts deposited in such fund shall be available for expenditure only pursuant to appropriations made under authority of this title. Any amounts remaining in the fund after the expiration of the period for which such amounts are available for expenditure shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. President, it may be suggested that this type of amendment is one which should be contained in some character of general fiscal legislation. I have no quarrel with the proposition that it would be well to provide expressly that the Secretary of the Treasury shall keep his receipts in separate funds so that we may know exactly how much money is received from taxes, from duties, from imposts, from excises, and how much is received from other sources.

But such general fiscal legislation would not cover the situation which exists in connection with each specific piece of legislation as it arises. It would not be practicable to set forth in a fiscal statute a requirement that only from the taxation fund which is created may payment be made for these items and types of general welfare, because in connection with each instance, or many instances, a controversy might well arise later as to whether or not the items were appropriated on the theory of general welfare, or on the theory of their influence on interstate commerce, or on some other constitutional basis of power.

In order that we may not know with definiteness and security whether or not a particular appropriation is to be paid from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, it is essential that the specific piece of legislation itself contain a requirement which will remove beyond peradventure any question as to whether or not the particular appropriation is one which is based upon the type of general welfare not included in the subjoined enumerated clauses to which I have referred.

So, Mr. President, it is obviously necessary in each specific type of legislation to set out those provisions if the legislation is to be enacted.

Mr. President, at the outset I referred to the fact that upon the constitutional ground and upon the ground of sound public policy, this amendment is important and should be adopted. Unless it be adopted it would be possible for the funds to be paid out, even though not derived from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises. The amendment is important from the standpoint of sound public policy, because of the sound business judgment which it incorporates.

We hear much concerning deficit financing. We have all become familiar with the vast expenditures which have been made and which have to be paid out of moneys received from selling bonds. Members of the Senate will recall that during the fall of this year, to wit, on September 28, 1945, in connection with the full employment bill then being considered, there was adopted by the Senate in the proportion of 82 yeas to no nays, an amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) to the full employment bill That amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That any program of Federal investment and expenditure for the fiscal year 1948, or any subsequent fiscal year when the Nation is at peace, shall be accompanied by a program of taxation over a period comprising the year in question and a reasonable number of years thereafter, designed and calculated to prevent during that year any net increase in the national debt (other than debt incurred for self-liquidating and other reimbursable expenditures) without interfering with the goal of full employment.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. GEORGE) expressed himself upon the amendment at page 9137 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when he said:

But surely there is not a man alive who can defend this bill against the open assault and attack that it is a bald proposal for deficit spending, unlimited deficit spending, if he is not willing to provide that at the time when the President makes the proposal to spend in order to provide work, he shall likewise be asked to submit a program of taxation over a reasonable period of years that will liquidate the debt.

Mr. President, I cannot see how anyone can vote against the amendment. In my judgment, it would be reasonable to provide for a system of taxation which would currently liquidate the debt, provided Senators have any faith that this bill will produce full employment, because if it does produce full employment there will be a base of taxation which will care for the debt.

Mr. President, the matter of deficit financing is, to my mind, fraught with tremendous dangers to this country. We already have an indebtedness of approximately $260,000,000,000. The bill now pending before the Senate provides for further expenditures on the part of the Government. I am not criticizing the bill or its ultimate purpose. I am not proposing to defeat it, but to amend it in order to bring it within the terms of the Constitution of the United States. The bill proposes to add to the present outlay of the United States approximately $380,000,000. We all realize, of course, that it is not at all improbable that after the proposed expenditures are authorized, further calls will be made upon Congress for the maintenance of the hospitals which will be constructed pursuant to the terms of the pending bill. The bill does not contain any provision for maintenance of the hospitals, but it is easily possible that because of the vast number of hospitals which will be constructed throughout the United States, local conditions will make it impossible in many instances to maintain the hospitals without financial aid on the part of the Government, and that you and I, Mr. President, during our term of office in the Senate, may be confronted with a request for expenditures and appropriations by Congress in order to maintain those hospitals. But be that as it may, this bill is but one of a series of bills which have been or will be introduced involving the expenditure of vast sums of money. The education bills which are now before the Committee on Education and Labor—that committee being the one which has reported to the Senate the pending bill—are illustrations of the legislation which is being proposed, and which will involve, if enacted into law, the expenditures of enormous sums of money.

Mr. President, are we going to continue indefinitely our expenditures of huge sums of money? Are we going, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio fears, to proceed further without budgeting our expenses? Are we going to continue year after year to expend money without providing for taxation to meet the expenditures?

Mr. President, I undertake to say that, first, on the constitutional basis, and, second, from the standpoint at least of giving a good example in the matter of deficit spending, just as by a vote of 82 to nothing the Senate gave a good example to that effect on the full employment bill, this amendment is entitled to support.

I referred a moment ago to the decision in the case of United States against Kay, in Eighty-ninth Federal Reports, second series. I shall not burden the Senate with the details of the decision. It was a criminal case, in which certain fraud was charged against the defendant under the Home Owners' Loan Act, and the constitutionality of the act was assailed. The lower court, that is to say, the circuit court of appeals, sustained the sufficiency of the act, and said:

In creating this governmental agency and investing it with the described functions, Congress relied on its power to tax, borrow, and appropriate public money. The power "to lay and collect taxes * * * and provide for the * * * general welfare of the United States * * * is explicity conferred—

Citing article I, section 8, clause 1, of the Constitution of the United States—.

and necessarily contains the implied power of appropriation.

Then the court employs the language which was suggested by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey:

The power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States" is granted without express limitation. * * * In taxing and making appropriations for the general welfare, Congress is not confined within the scope of the delegated powers but must merely act in furtherance of general or national as distinguished from local purposes. * * * And the power to borrow—

As I quoted a few moments ago—

can be subject to no other or greater limitation.

Mr. President, I communicated with the Office of the Attorney General of the United States with respect to the briefs which were presented to the court in this case, and I have them either here or in my office. I have made a search of the brief of the appellee in the case, the United States Government, and I have failed to find any reference to the borrowing power being suggested by counsel for the United States Government. I might be in error in that conclusion, but I have not thus far found any reference to it.

I submit, however, that there is grave doubt in my mind as to whether the Home Owners Loan Act involved any borrowing whatsoever by the Government of the United States. The Home Owners Loan Act provided for the issuance of bonds for certain purposes, but those purposes were for the exchange of the bonds for mortgages, and apparently for the sale of bonds to derive money with which to buy in foreclosed property, and purposes of that type.

So, Mr. President, the proposition I present with respect to the Kay case is threefold. In the first place, the decision is not one of the court of last resort. In the second place, so far as I have thus far observed, the question as to the borrowing power of the United States is not involved in the case. In the third place, I have failed to find that the point was raised by the counsel for the United States. So it seems to me that the observation of the court, "and the power to borrow can be subject to no other or greater limitation" is obiter dictum—not necessary to the decision—and I find no support whatsoever for the proposition that the power to borrow negatives in any way the mandatory requirement of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, requiring that the purposes of general

welfare not included in the enumerated powers shall be paid for from taxes, imposts, duties, and excises.

I should like to say, in passing, with respect to the case of Kay against the United States, that a writ of certiorari was granted by the Supreme Court of the United States to the defendant in the case, and the case on appeal on certiorari is reported in Three Hundred and Third United States, at page 1 and following. On page 6 the Supreme Court said with respect to the constitutional question:

> Petitioner's main argument is that the whole scheme of the statute is invalid; that Congress had no constitutional authority to create the Home Owners Loan Corporation—to provide for the conduct of a business enterprise of that character. There is no occasion to consider this broad question as petition is not entitled to raise it. When one undertakes to cheat the Government or to mislead its officers, or those acting under its authority by false statements, he has no standing to assert that the operations of the Government in which the effort to cheat or mislead is made are without constitutional sanction.

So the question of the constitutional point in the case is not decided by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Butler case, in Two Hundred and Ninety-seven United States, to which I have referred, is so clear as to the fact that the power with respect to the general welfare is merely a power under the taxing clause, to which I have referred, that I deem it unnecessary further to argue the proposition that the power to provide for this type of general welfare cannot be financed save only by "taxes, imposts, duties, and excises."

Mr. President, in concluding these remarks I submit, first, that the proposed legislation, which has behind it the most earnest effort, the most profound desire, to benefit the sick and the suffering throughout the United States, should have appended to it and enacted with it a clause which will make it constitutional beyond any peradventure of doubt, a clause which will provide that this expenditure, which is an illustration of the general welfare which is not included in any of the subjoined, enumerated powers, such as those relating to post offices, post roads, interstate commerce, or others, shall be constitutionally incurred, and shall not violate the terms of the Constitution. On that ground I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Then, Mr. President, as indicated, I urge adoption of the amendment on the broad ground of sound public policy, on the proposition that we must come to a point when we shall give up unlimited deficit financing by the borrowing of money, hundreds of millions upon hundreds of millions of dollars, and return to a point where we shall keep our expenditures within our receipts. From that standpoint the amendment requiring that these funds shall be paid only from "taxes, duties, imports, and excises" should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the several amendments of the Senator from Missouri, which the Chair understands are to be voted upon as one amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understood the junior Senator from South Carolina was to speak at this time. If he is not, and the amendment is to be voted on now, I wish to discuss it briefly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in the pending bill I am very much interested, because I think it provides for what is badly needed at this particular time.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor it was a pleasure to me, as it is at this time, and as it has been in the past, to say a good word about what the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has been doing in regard to this particular legislative proposal. He introduced the bill, and he has worked faithfully in committee for its adoption.

In rising to speak for the passage of the bill, I wish to assure my colleagues in the Senate that few legislative proposals have, within my memory, received such thorough-going and intensive study. In the very beginning the committee was aware of the far-reaching importance of the bill, and spent weeks studying its various provisions. We called in technical experts to advise us on the practical results to be expected from its enactment. As we continued to study the bill we became much better informed as to the hospital needs of the country and made many changes in order to produce a useful and workable piece of legislation.

When the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and former Senator Burton introduced the bill last January 10, it was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, it was to me then just another piece of health legislation. It was not until hearings were held on February 26, 27, 28, and March 12, 13, and 14 that I realized we had before us a bill that differed in many respects from the usual type of health legislation. There appeared before our committee a large number of authoritative witnesses, 23, I believe, to be exact. These witnesses represented what I might classify broadly as the producers and the consumers of health services. They represented the hospitals of the Nation, organized medicine, public-health officials, labor and farm groups, and ordinary private citizens.

The fact that, without exception, all these witnesses, representing a cross section of America, spoke in favor of the objectives in this bill was in itself extraordinary. Seldom, if ever, have I seen so large a group of witnesses from so widely divergent walks of life so much of one mind on any legislative proposal. While this unanimity of opinion was extraordinary, we do not have to search far to find the reason. We all know that the desirability of a high standard of health is not controversial. We also know, however, that the various means of achieving this objective may be of a highly controversial character.

The question might reasonably be asked why it is necessary for the Federal Government to assist in the construction of community hospitals when it has not done so heretofore except on occasions of emergency. There are, I think, several reasons why such aid is necessary. Let me go back for a moment and review briefly the development of hospitals in this country. We find that prior to the turn of the century there were relatively few hospitals. Only the sick poor were ever hospitalized and this act of charity was performed almost solely by various governmental and church agencies. After the turn of the century, however, all health care took on a more scientific complexion. New discoveries in medicine required hospital facilities for their application. As medical practice became more effective, it likewise became more popular and in greater demand. The number and quality of hospitals increased accordingly. Where did these hospitals come from? Who paid for them? We find first that the Federal Government has always maintained a number of hospitals for the care of specific beneficiaries. For a long time the State governments have maintained a number of hospitals. These were and still are, with few exceptions, primarily for the use of patients suffering from long-term illnesses, such as mental disease and tuberculosis. The counties and cities, too, are the owners and operators of a large number of hospitals. These are by and large for the use of the sick poor whose care has been accepted as an obligation of organized society. All the institutions I have just mentioned are built and maintained from tax moneys—Federal, State, and local.

There is another great group of institutions not included in those I have just mentioned. They are the ones, Mr. President, to which you and I and our families and our friends go when our family physician says we must. It is to this group primarily that the 20,000,000 persons insured under the Blue Cross plans look for hospital care. I refer to what is known as the voluntary nonprofit hospitals. These care for private and indigent patients alike. They perform a community function which would otherwise of necessity have to be performed by Government. Yet no Government money, either Federal, State, or local, goes into their construction and relatively little for their maintenance. They have been built entirely from the contributions, large and small, of local citizens. In the years past, this method has worked reasonably well in communities of average or better wealth. As we all know, however, there are many communities of less than average wealth which have never been able to afford any kind of hospital. With the passing of the years, many changes have occurred which have directly affected our machinery for the administration of hospital care. Let us see what these changes are. In the first place, as the practice of medicine has become more and more scientific, doctors have drifted away from communities which have no hospital. I will say for the information of the Senate that at one time a whole county in my State did not have a physician. Their training requires a hospital in which to do their work. As a result, many, indeed, I am told a great many, communities throughout the country have an insufficient number of doctors.

It is true that the war has exaggerated this condition, but it was true before the war and it will certainly continue to be true after the war unless by some means modern hospitals and health centers are made available.

The second great change occurring in this country which has affected the construction of hospitals is the change in our economic structure. We now have fewer wealthy individuals who are willing and able to make large contributions toward building a local hospital. The average wage earner continues to be as generous as ever in making small contributions to this cause, but funds from this source are proving inadequate even in the more opulent communities, and more and more do we find these communities looking to the Federal Government for some assistance. I should point out that the operation of a hospital is not a business in the ordinary sense. Even without netting a profit it is with the utmost difficulty that the cost of hospital care can be kept within the reach of the average wage earner. When hospitals wear out, there is no depreciation fund from which they can be rebuilt. When this happens, Mr. President, your town and mine finds itself in a difficult position. It must either raise the money for a new hospital by local subscription or it must look to the Government. Between the two, local effort and Federal help, as provided in this bill, most communities will be able to provide themselves with a hospital, without which modern health and medical care cannot be obtained.

Still another important change has occurred which affects the need for hospital facilities. For years almost every governmental and private agency throughout the land has, in one way or another, been teaching the value of health. This teaching is now bearing abundant fruit. We have developed an appreciation of health in this country never before equaled. Our people know that good health is to be attained through positive effort and that poor health is not always an act of God. We now have millions of men and women in the armed forces who, for the first time in their lives, have had adequate hospital and medical care and it has been, I am proud to say, the finest in the world. We cannot expect them to forget these advantages when they return to private life, and, indeed, they will not do so. We have thousands of young doctors now in the armed forces, soon to be returned to civilian life, whose entire education and experience have been built around a modern hospital. They must have a place to work if we are to have adequate medical care in this country.

I wish to make it clear that, in my opinion, the people of the United States are not looking to the Federal Government to assume their health problems. On the contrary, I think this is a matter which the people prefer to attend to themselves. But they do need some help and they are looking to their Government to provide it, if only in small measure. I think this viewpoint was aptly expressed by one of the witnesses appearing before our committee in behalf of a great farm organization. This witness stated:

> As you know, I think rural people, as a rule, are the last to want to go to the Government for help, and I share that feeling. I feel that the less we have to depend upon Government, the better we are off, but on the other hand, I think it is the choice between some help from Government for some of these things or going entirely without them, and that is what rural people are facing now, and it is for that reason that it strikes me that this bill does that very thing.

In reporting this bill your committee has taken the position that the provision of adequate hospital and health facilities is a part of a State's health program and a primary right and responsibility of the State. States' rights are therefore fully protected under this bill. In no sense of the word does the bill propose a Federal hospital program. Instead, it is merely an extension of the grant-in-aid principle long since established as the most effective and democratic method of administering Federal-State health programs.

It is true, of course, that the funds authorizd under this bill are but a small part of the total needs of the Nation. This was pointed out by several witnesses who appeared before our committee. This fact, however, in no wise detracts from the value of this legislation. On the contrary, we all know that a little help in time of need goes a long way and usually returns values beyond all proportion to the investment. I have seen this principle demonstrated in my own State of South Carolina. Several years ago a foundation set up by the late James B. Duke undertook to improve hospital care in North and South Carolina through financial assistance to hospitals. A little help was given here and there toward the construction of hospitals where badly needed and for the improvement of others. Financial help to the extent of $1 a day for each free patient cared for was given to many of the hospitals in my State. While this represented a minimum of aid to any one hospital, the beneficial results have been outstanding. Over the years during which this help has been forthcoming the quality of hospital service in South Carolina has attained a very high level. This influence has been felt particularly in the smaller hospitals in rural areas.

While this valuable aid from the Duke Foundation has enabled us to achieve an excellent quality of hospital service in South Carolina, it has not, of course, been sufficient to give us enough hospital facilities. We are not a wealthy State, and this fact is reflected in our over-all lack of hospital facilities. We have only about two general hospital beds for each thousand of our citizens, or less than half what I understand we should have. To make matters worse, these are heavily concentrated in three or four of our larger cities. Consequently, there are many areas in my State which receive very little in the way of hospital care. People in my State suffer from this lack of hospital care. Only 35.7—United States Bureau of the Census Reports, 1943—percent of the babies born are delivered in hospitals, while the average for the country is 72.1 percent. Both our maternal and infant death rates are higher than the national average because of this lack of care—United States average, 1943, 2.5 maternal deaths per 1,000 births. South Carolina, 4.4. United States average, 1943, 40.4 infant deaths per 1,000 live births. South Carolina 55.1. The needs in my State, I know, are duplicated in many other States and in some areas in all States, and we now have before us a paradoxical situation. We have, on the one hand, progressed in the science of medicine to a point where very few diseases of mankind are beyond the cure of modern medicine. We have without question the best trained doctors and finest equipment to be found in the world today. We proudly admit to being the wealthiest and most powerful Nation, and yet, on the other hand, we have vast areas and millions of people to which these health benefits are denied. Mr. President, this condition is intolerable in our country today, and it is up to us to do something about it. We do not have here the whole answer, but I think we do have embodied in the proposed legislation the first and most important step toward making this country also the healthiest Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate will not let the opportunity pass to enact into law the measure which is now pending before it. I urgently request that the bill be passed as quickly as possible in order to give to the people of this Nation proper hospital care.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] proposes a departure from a legislative practice which has been followed since the beginning of the Federal Government. The practice has been to make appropriations for any purpose out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. In other words, appropriations have been made out of any moneys in the Treasury, no matter how they came into the Treasury, whether by taxation or some other means. The Senator from Missouri evidently doubts the constitutionality of appropriations made in the past for the activities of such agencies as the Bureau of Education, the Department of Labor, many of the activities of the Department of Commerce, particularly under the Bureau of Standards, the Public Health Service, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Mines, activities of the Department of Agriculture relating to such matters as soil conservation, activities of the Bureau of Fisheries, the Children's Bureau, the Smithsonian Institution, and agencies engaged in the relief of suffering.

Only last week the Senate passed an appropriation bill for UNRRA, providing money for the relief of people who are not even citizens of the United States, who live beyond the confines of our own country and are citizens of far distant lands. Yet if the pending bill is unconstitutional without the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, surely the

UNRRA bill and many other measures to which I have referred providing for other activities of the Government are certainly unconstitutional.

Emergency relief appropriations made during the depression, when we poured out millions of dollars for the relief of individual citizens, appropriations for vocational rehabilitation for reforestation and the promotion of timber crops, for the education of the blind, for the promotion of agricultural extension work, for bounties for sugar producers, and for the promotion of welfare work in connection with maternity hygiene and infant care are in the same category.

I could name any number of activities for which we have appropriated money, and for which we have been appropriating money throughout the years. If the pending bill requires the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to make it constitutional, certainly all the appropriations we have made through the years have been unconstitutional, which I am not willing to admit.

In some cases we even appropriate money to make loans. I realize that some of the REA cooperatives may in some way come under the commerce clause, but most of the REA cooperatives operate solely and entirely within a State, do not cross State lines, and therefore do not operate in any way in interstate commerce. For some years we had the old agricultural seed loans. Today we make loans to farmers under the Farm Credit Administration. With respect to some of those loans the Government not only receives back the money which it loans, but it receives a higher rate of interest than the Government has to pay for money which it borrows. It seems to me that there is no reason at this late date, 150 years after the beginning of the Government, when we have been doing all these things to raise this question in connection with a hospital bill. Such appropriations as I have referred to have in the past been made from moneys not otherwise appropriated, whether they came from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, sales of surplus property, penalties and forfeitures, or from whatever source.

If the extraordinary change in procedure advanced by the Senator from Missouri is a good thing, I do not contend that long precedent to the contrary should alone prevent its adoption at this time. But, Mr. President, the proposal is absolutely untimely and as unwise as it is untimely.

In the first place, even if for the sake of argument we admit the soundness of the Senator's theory—which, of course, I do not admit—the amendment has no place in this bill. The suggestion deals solely with the power to appropriate and the procedure to be followed in making appropriations. This bill is not an appropriation bill. It is merely an authorization bill. If the Senator from Missouri wishes to offer his amendment, it seems to me that he should offer it to a bill making appropriations, because he proposes to limit the funds from which certain appropriations may be made. Furthermore, his proposal should be general in character. He does not solve the problem which his amendment presents by merely seeking to attach his amendment to this one hospital bill, a bill which is urgently needed to assist the people who are in such great need of medical and hospital care; and I, for one, am unwilling to have the Senator make a guinea pig out of this particular bill, in his endeavor to accomplish a major constitutional reform.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if it is not a fact that at the present time services are being rendered, not only by hospitals but by various public developments throughout the United States, through the use of money which was appriated in appropration bills passed by the Congress last year under similar circumstances?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct. Those appropriations have nothing to do with interstate commerce. They come under the general-welfare provision of the Constitution. The Senator from South Carolina is an able and a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, and he knows of innumerable appropriations, under which money is now being expended for public projects, which come under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that there is now pending before the Appropriations Committee a bill which the distinguished acting chairman of the committee expects to present to the Senate sometime this week. In that bill provision is made for the appropriation of a large sum of money to be used by the States and municipalities for engineering work and surveys for schools and hospitals. The bill has passed the House of Representatives. I may say that last year, under another measure, Federal funds were used in the State of South Carolina for the survey and construction of hospitals.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the proposal of the Senator from Missouri could not in any event merit the serious consideration of this body unless and until two conditions had been met:

First. I think the Senator must admit that what he proposes is somewhat revolutionary as a matter of fiscal policy. That being so, it would seem imperative that Government officials charged with the administration of laws relating to receipts and expenditures should have been consulted and their views obtained at hearings before the committee considering any such proposal. Extended hearings were held on the pending bill. The Senator from Missouri participated actively in those hearings. I do not recall that any suggestion was made at that time for the taking of testimony on this very important subject. So far as I recall, the Senator first raised this question at the meeting of the Committee on Education and Labor called to complete committee action on this bill, and an amendment having the same purpose as the one he now offers was then defeated. Why does not the Senator seek a thorough examination of this question by both the legislative and executive agencies concerned, and not further delay the enactment of this sorely needed legislation?

Second, the proposal should not, under any circumstances, receive the serious consideration of the Senate unless and until the Senator from Missouri can convince the Members of the Senate that he is on sound constitutional grounds—in other words, that the Senate and the House of Representatives have been doing all these countless unconstitutional things throughout the years. The Senator from Missouri has certainly not convinced me.

I do not propose to enter at this late hour an extended constitutional argument with him, but I do wish to call attention to one or two matters which I think will be of interest to the Senate.

In the first place, over a period of a century and a half and more, the constitutional question here presented has never been seriously raised; and what little authority there is is against the position of the Senator from Missouri. In the case of *United States* v. *Kay* (1937 C. C. A. 2d Cir., 89 Fed. (2d) 19), the circuit court of appeals held that the constitutional power of Congress to borrow money was subject to no other or greater limitation than the power to tax and make appropriations for the general welfare, and hence Congress must act merely in furtherance of general or national purposes, as distinguished from local purposes. In other words, so long as we act in furtherance of general or national purposes, as distinguished from local purposes, there is no limitation on the power to tax and no limitation on the power to borrow money. The case to which I have referred, and which was referred to by the Senator from Missouri, involved the constitutionality of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, and while the decision was vacated on other grounds in the Supreme Court, the issue involved here was not considered by that Court. The decision of the circuit court of appeals has been cited with approval in two district court decisions. I can find no case to support the contention of the Senator from Missouri. In view of this state of the law, I hope the Senator will not press his amendment, but will leave the determination of this issue to another time, and preferably to another forum. In this case I do not see how the Senator from Missouri can hope to have the Senate take a position contrary to the position the courts have established and also contrary to the position taken by the Senate for 150 years.

In this connection, I call attention to the fact that the borrowing power granted by the Constitution is expressed in terms which leave no room for limitation. The Constitution gives to Congress the power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States." The natural inference is that the Government may borrow money for any purpose for which it may spend money.

Finally, even admitting for the sake of argument that fundamentally the contention of the Senator from Missouri is sound, I think he is seeing a ghost where there is no ghost. As has been stated, his contention is, in short, that appropriations for the general welfare must be made from the proceeds of taxes, duties, imposts, and excises. I am sure the Senator from Missouri has carefully looked into the amounts of Government receipts from these sources. Doubtless, other Senators will be interested in the figures. In the Budget for 1946, page A2, the figures show that receipts from income taxes, excise taxes, and customs duties are as follows—social-security taxes are not included:

Estimated, 1946	$37,868,430,000
Estimated, 1945	41,932,890,000
Actual, 1944	40,377,143,079

In other words, Mr. President, we are talking about authorizing an appropriation of $75,000,000; and even if we adopt the position urged by the Senator from Missouri, we would have to exhaust receipts amounting to more than $40,000,000,000 before we would find ourselves unable to obtain the $75,000,000 for hospital construction.

Considering the proposal of the Senator from Missouri in its most favorable light, it would seem clear that by no process of reasoning could it possibly be held, under current conditions, that any constitutional question is raised on the issue presented by the Senator from Missouri, until appropriations for the general welfare exceed a total of from thirty-five to forty billion dollars, because until the total receipts from the sources indicated are exhausted, it must be assumed that appropriations are constitutionally made and, hence, are taken from constitutional sources.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate longer at this time on this proposal. As I have said, surely before adding this kind of an amendment to this one bill, this matter should be thoroughly considered. The court decision which we find is contrary to it. The entire practices of the Senate and House of Representatives throughout 150 years are contrary to it. This is no time and no place to change the policy and to set any kind of precedent of the sort which would be set by the adoption of the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri, which, by unanimous consent, are being considered as one amendment.

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and I propose, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, in lines 14 to 17, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out all of the present language and substitute the following:

SEC. 622. Within 6 months after the enactment of this title, the Surgeon General, after consultation with the Federal Hospital Council and with the approval of the Administrator, shall by regulation prescribe—

On page 28, lines 9 to 12, inclusive, strike out all of the present language after "hearing" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

If such Council determines that the plan or modification complies with the provisions of such subsection, it shall advise the Surgeon General of its determination and the Surgeon General shall thereupon review his previous determination and shall approve or disapprove such plan or modification in accordance with a determination by the Administrator.

On page 38, line 18, after "Administrator" insert the following:

The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report for transmission to Congress a full report of the administration of this title, including a detailed statement of appropriations and disbursements. Such report shall include a record of consultations with the Federal Hospital Council, recommendations and determinations of the Federal Hospital Council, and comments thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana desire to have the amendments considered as one, at one time?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. They are divided into three parts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, they will be so considered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make a few remarks on these amendments?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I am interested in the amendments. I had similar ones which I wished to offer, and I intended to do so, until I discovered that the Senator from Montana would offer these.

Let me state my reasons for favoring the amendments. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] recently commented on the fact that we are departing very far from the formula used in the past. I think we are getting further and further away from the formula of administering Federal Government funds under Federal control. In this bill it is proposed that the Surgeon General, a Federal official, who is to be responsible for the program, shall issue regulations, if approved by a committee of eight and also by the Administrator. The first part of the amendments goes to that point. In other words, the Surgeon General must submit the regulations, for approval, to the General Hospital Board which is to be appointed by the Administrator, and he also must submit them to the Administrator, for approval.

The purpose originally of providing for a board was to obtain advice. I should like to invite attention of the proponents of the bill to the statement made by the President's Committee on Administrative Management in its recent survey. The statement is as follows:

For purposes of management, boards and commissions have turned out to be failures. Their mechanism is inevitably slow, cumbersome, wasteful, and ineffective, and does not lend itself readily to cooperation with other agencies. Even strong men on boards find that their individual opinions are watered down in reaching board decisions. When freed from the work of management, boards are, however, extremely useful and necessary for consultation, discussion, and advice; for representation of diverse views and citizen opinion; for quasi judicial action; and as a repository of corporate powers.

That was the opinion of the committee which was appointed by the President to study Government management. It is borne out in the report of the Brookings Institution which was issued at approximately the same time, or shortly thereafter.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, and joined in by the Senator from New York, seeks to remedy that feature of the bill by which we first cast responsibility for managing a sum of money and then prescribe regulations. Regulations are merely provided under which Federal money shall be spent with the advice, under the amendment, of the board and the administrator. It is then the responsibility of the officer to whom reference has been made to see that the money is spent by the various States in accordance with the advice which is given.

I think we are departing rather far when the Congress empowers a person to appoint an administrator, and then in turn requires such administrator to appoint a board, and then gives to the board power to veto the action of the person who has been appointed and confirmed. That is what the amendment strikes at.

Mr. President, I assert that we in Congress have been self-flagellating and self-castigating long enough. We have held all too often that Government officials were not capable of managing business. We have assigned their functions to other persons who were not as responsible to the people as were the officials who had been appointed by the executive department and approved by the Senate, and for whose action the Senate and the Executive are held responsible. All too frequently we have said that Government officials were not proper persons to be assigned the duties which were contemplated because, as it was thought, there might be associated with them some taint of a political nature. But, Mr. President, how do we pass laws? Is there not a political taint connected with persons who pass laws? What is there so tainted about politics in connection with the operation of government? The democratic form of government is founded on two political parties. Why must we go outside and seek other—shall we say—dollar-a-year men who can in one short session upset the work of full-time men?

It has been urged by the Senator from Ohio that these men who are to be appointed must be professional men. Will anyone say that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the United States is not an eminent man in his profession? If he is not an eminent surgeon he should not be the Surgeon General.

I believe, Mr. President, the time has arrived when Government money must be spent under the system which was provided by the founding fathers, and under the jurisdiction of the persons selected by the representatives of the people. I do not believe we should try to slough off responsibility by establishing some kind of a veto board.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am indebted to the Senator from West Virginia for his very sound argument in support of the amendment.

In my opening remarks today, I pointed out that I am supporting this pending legislation. For many years I have been advocating legislation of this character. I was appointed chairman of a subcommittee which studied the problem of hospital construction some years ago, and I introduced in the Senate a hospital bill which was passed by the Senate but which died in the other House. So, I wish it to be made clear that I have a consistent record of supporting legislation of this character. I supported the pending bill and gave every aid which I could to the subcommittee in its handling of the bill, and participated in the executive hearings of the full committee, as well as voted in favor of reporting the bill to the Senate. However, in doing so I made several reservations. I think the bill as it has been reported to the Senate, containing as it does a provision which places control in the hands of a board or a committee which should be exclusively advisory in nature, is a very serious mistake. The bill in its present form reads in part as follows:

SEC. 622. Within 6 months after the enactment of this title, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council and the Administrator, shall by general regulation prescribe—

The language then proceeds to describe the general regulations under which the hospital program shall be carried out. I consider that provision of the bill to be a very serious mistake. It is the first time that a bill has been presented to the Senate which undertook to place in the hands of a local committee such power and control over the administration of an act. It is in conflict with——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator say "local committee"?

Mr. MURRAY. I meant to say a State committee.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the committee is appointed by the Administrator. The committee is selected for a particular purpose. The members of the committee are Federal officers just as much as is the Surgeon General himself. The mere fact that they do not serve full time is the only possible distinction which could be made. Otherwise they take an oath and have the obligation of a Federal officer.

Mr. MURRAY. What is the purpose of providing in the bill that they shall have the approval power? If the committee is to be an advisory one, why is it necessary to take control out of the hands of the Administrator and place it in the hands of the advisory committee?

Mr. TAFT. The committee is not an advisory committee. The committee is to be given the job of approving permanent regulations. Perhaps that would be its principal work. It might require 30 or 60 days to complete its work. In effect, the committee writes the law in the detail and to the extent to which it is enabled to write it. Of course, the whole matter is very complicated. The committee does not have to perform administrative functions. It approves regulations under which the States write their plans. The committee has one other function. If the State plan is rejected by the Surgeon General, the State has a right to be heard before the committee. That is certainly a reasonable proposal. Several years ago the State of Ohio lost $1,300,000 because the Federal Security Administrator in a certain instance refused arbitrarily to allow that amount. He disallowed it because some complaint had been made. However, there was no provision for an appeal; so a bill to reimburse the State of Ohio was introduced in Congress. Congress passed the bill, but it was vetoed by the President.

However, Mr. President, so far as administration is concerned, this board or committee does not perform such a function. It is merely an advisory board. It is not an administrative board, and it will not attempt in any way to limit the administration of the Surgeon General. I may add that the whole intent of the bill is that the Federal Government should not administer the hospital matter. All the Government does is to provide the money under certain conditions stipulated in the law and in the regulations.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Unless I misread the language, the committee does not make regulations.

Mr. TAFT. It approves them.

Mr. KILGORE. As drafted, the bill requires the Surgeon General to make regulations subject to the approval of the committee and the Administrator, who is the Federal Security Administrator.

Mr. TAFT. The Surgeon General himself is one member of a board of nine. Of course, it is contemplated that he shall do the preliminary work. He will draft the regulations. The other members of the board will approve the regulations or amend them, or do with them whatever they wish to do. It is usual to have all regulations of the Surgeon General approved by the Federal Security Administrator who is the superior officer. I do not think that is so important in this case, but it is a customary check which is exercised in connection with regulations made by minor bureau officials. It is customary to have the head of the department approved them, just as it is customary to have regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has said that the action of the Board is not administrative, that it is entirely advisory. It seems to me that is an inconsistent position. In sending his message to the Congress a short time ago, the President pointed out that—

In carrying out this program, there should be a clear division of responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government. The States, localities, and the Federal Government should share in the financial responsibilities. The Federal Government should not construct or operate these hospitals. It should, however, lay down minimum national standards for construction and operation, and should make sure that Federal funds are allocated to those areas and projects where Federal aid is needed most. In approving State plans and individual projects, and in fixing the national standards, the Federal agency should have the help of a strictly advisory body that includes both public and professional members.

Mr. President, that is exactly what I want to see accomplished under the bill, that the Hospital Council shall be a strictly advisory body, and shall not undertake to control the administrator. As the bill stands, that is exactly what it does, and it is in violation of every principle that should be applicable in connection with a case of this kind.

Mr. President, I have received letters from important sources which have studied this matter. I have here a letter which I received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He says:

I agree fully with the views you have expressed on the proper role of an advisory council of citizens who would not be full time officers or employees of the Federal Government. On this general subject, may I refer you to my testimony on S. 1285 and S. 1297, bills introduced by Senators MAGNUSON and KILGORE, for the creation of a National Research Foundation.

I also have a letter from Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This is what he says:

The bill would provide Federal aid to the States for a survey of existing hospital facilities and for the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals in accordance with State plans and programs. No doubt can exist regarding the need for such a program, and the CIO presented compelling arguments before the Education and Labor Subcommittee for the enactment of such legislation.

The administration of a Federal-aid program, however, should rest with a responsible Government official and the line of authority and responsibility be clearly defined. The proposal in S. 191 to assign administrative functions and powers to a part-time advisory council whose members cannot be held responsible to the people of the country through the usual channels of Government represents a dangerous departure from democratic principles and procedures and one which we very much hope the Senate will refuse to adopt.

I also have a letter from Mr. William Green, following the same line.

Mr. President, I do not think it is an answer to the objection to say that this Council is not administrative. As a matter of fact, it is a Council set up for the purpose of controlling the Administrator. The Administrator, under the provisions of the bill, would not be able to present his general regulations unless they were previously approved by the Federal Hospital Council.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit that the amendment is proper, and I am sure that if the Senate will give it the consideration to which it is entitled, it will be supported and adopted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to read these words, found on page 38 of the bill:

In administering this title, the Surgeon General shall consult with a Federal Hospital Council consisting of the Surgeon General, who shall serve as chairman ex officio thereof——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Federal Hospital Council is to be an advisory

council, but in addition to its duties in advising it will also have two other functions. One will be to approve the Surgeon General's regulations, which set up the broad, general standards for the State plans.

Its other duty, which will not be advisory, will be in a case where a State may feel that the Surgeon General has acted arbitrarily, or has not for some reason which is not a good reason approved a State plan. Then the State will have a right to appeal to the Council, and the Council will act then as an appellate body. Except for those two duties, the duties and functions of the Council will be advisory.

The Council will be just what its name implies, a Federal Hospital Council. The men who sit on the Council will be as much servants and agents of the Federal Government as is the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service himself. The men who sit on the Council will be named by the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration. We may well know that before the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration names a single one of these men, he will consult with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and no doubt be largely guided by his recommendations. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service will be a member of the Council, will be the chairman of the Council, and will have a vote. Of course a majority of the Council will rule, five out of the nine. To overrule a decision of the Surgeon General, five out of eight would have to vote against him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on behalf of of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Bierl, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service;

Rear Adm. William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service;

Rear Adm. Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service; and

Rear Adm. George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward L. Burke, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont;

Charles F. Rouse, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina, vice James O. Carr, resigned; and

Adrien W. Maher, of Connecticut, to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut, vice Robert P. Butler, term expired.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the Chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the Clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Lee to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Patterson to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc..

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be forthwith notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 10 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

FOR THE TERMS EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 1952 TO BE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS

William E. Lee
William J. Patterson

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Jack A. Hall, Eleele.

MISSOURI

Bernice W. Stites, Barnhart.
Andrew P. Drury, Bloomsdale.
Laura M. Leach, Martin City.
M. Vernon Davis, Newton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, today we would magnify Thy holy name with honor and truth. Above the voices of the world, amid the hate and greed of the aftermath of war, O help men to dream again the dreams of other years. In humility let us go frankly into the impartial examination of ourselves, and not hesitate to stand for the betterment of our country, fulfilling the obligations of good citizenship. Keep us from the stony heart, our tongues from unkind words, and our ears open to the forceful voice of Thy wisdom.

O Master, give us a rich portion of Thy spirit that all we do this day may bear the mark of Thine approval. From all idols we would turn to high ideals that will swing us into their own glory. Walking with Thee, we would catch Thy footstep and learn to love all things beautiful. Blessed Lord, open the way that we may know the unseen power that moved the holy men of old—the belief that this is God's world and He will remove it to the fulfillment of His own kingdom. In the name of the Messiah who has come to redeem the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 7, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Current Revenue Act of 1945," as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today and tomorrow, after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House on both days for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the special order heretofore granted the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] on Monday next I be permitted to speak for 30 minutes and during such time yield to other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include an address by Dr. W. L. Orr.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with certain remarks which I hope to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the Bulwinkle bill I be permitted to include certain relevant excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sun Setter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution introduced by the Hennepin Board of County Commissioners of Hennepin County, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALLAGHER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISCHARGE OF SERVICEMEN—A DEFINITE TIME SCHEDULE FOR RETURN OF ELIGIBLE VETERANS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. I take this opportunity to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Sun Setter which I am placing in the RECORD under permission previously granted. This voices the feeling of the men stranded on Palawan Island and emphasizes the importance of establishing definite dates and then keeping to the schedule in the return of these men. I do not see how a more accurate picture of the feelings created, the feelings of despondency and longing and bitter disappointment, could be given than is indicated in this editorial.

It also emphasizes the importance of getting those veterans eligible for discharge and those with long overseas service back from the Pacific and the Atlantic theaters of war quickly as well as on schedule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the morning press reports that the vote of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organization on whether or not the headquarters of the United Nations will be in the United States is to take place by the middle of the week; but reports over the week end indicate that there is some uncertainty among the Members about voting because there is lacking an official statement on the part of the United States as to its desires in the matter. Naturally the United Nations want to have an official expression to indicate that the headquarters will be welcome here.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the leadership to the fact that on the 5th of September I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 75 which proposed that the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the site of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America. In view of the pendency of this question in London by the middle of the week, I hope the leadership will call for immediate consideration of the resolution.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION CAPITAL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by him at the annual banquet of the State Veterans of Foreign Wars at Lansing, Mich., Saturday, December 8, 1945.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include newspaper articles in each.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Missouri) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and include a resolution, quotations, newspaper items, and editorials.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the law passed by Congress to speed up voluntary enlistments for the long-range job of occupying Germany and Japan and other duties has brought splendid results. Thirty-eight thousand men volunteered in the month of September, and in the month of October more than 79,000 men enlisted. For November the figures will be considerably more than 100,000 enlistments.

There are still many men in the service, who entered to win the war, and they ought to be discharged. Reports continue to come in from the Pacific and European theaters that high-point men have not yet been transported home. This situation is most undesirable, and I urge that every effort be put forth by this Government in the weeks that lie ahead to bring home the men who were responsible for the victory that we have attained. The Congress should insist that this be done.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include quotations and excerpts from committee hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL FINANCE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday morning I found a $1,000 bill. Here it is. Anbody who can prove claim to this bill can have it. But I want to say that this bill is now like a lot of other thousand-dollar bills that will be printed by the Federal Government, it will not be worth the paper it is printed on. Why? Why do I make that statement? It is just because I want the Congress to realize, that if you keep on spending you only aid to make the dollar bill a worthless piece of paper.

If you look at the Treasury statement of December 4, you will find we are in debt $266,625,000,000. You have got to

stop spending. You must stop squandering. If you spend for those things that were suggested here a minute ago, if you spend for the $4,400,000,000 you are going to be asked to give Great Britain, if you are going to give $5,000,000,000 to the Russian Government, you have got to know where the money comes from. You are going to have to tax your people back home. All of you Members of Congress ask your constituents if they want to pay more taxes? You know now that their answer will be "No." Ask your constituents if they want our country to go into bankruptcy, because of reckless congressional spending, I am sure they will say they do not want our country a bankrupt nation. Therefore, you Congressmen should stop a lot of reckless spending for things that should be deferred to a later date.

Be careful, be frugal, be economical in your spending. This means each of you.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the legislative platform of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ITALY PROPOSED AS MEMBER OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me perfectly obvious that the site of the capital of the United Nations Organization should be in its birthplace, namely, in California.

May I say in this same connection that I earnestly hope that when the United Nations Organization meets the United States will propose the admission of Italy as a member of the United Nations Organization. My reason is that the people of that country have suffered perhaps more severely than anyone else as a result of the fighting back and forth through their country. I do not believe the Italian people willingly followed Mussolini in this war. I believe they are a peace-loving nation. I know they are trying to establish a democratic government in that nation. I believe it would be of tremendous help to them if they were admitted to the United Nations Organization at an early date.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced today on the subject of surplus property.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post on price control, and an address by Chester Bowles before the National Association of Manufacturers.

BAD BARGAIN WITH BRITAIN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, patriotic Americans everywhere are saddened this morning to learn of the tragic accident that happened to Gen. George S. Patton on yesterday when his car collided with a truck, injuring him in such a way as to render him practically paralyzed.

General Patton is one of the great soldiers of all times. When the history of this war is written, and all the camouflage is stripped away, there will be few men in the history of this Republic who will stand out in a class with General Patton as a military genius, as a man of force, courage, patriotism, and determination, a leader of men who never sent a soldier where he was unwilling to go himself.

May God grant him a speedy recovery.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein an editorial.

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN SPOUSES

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4857) to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to cut the red tape surrounding the law as it is today and expedite the admission to the United States of thousands of alien brides who were married to our soldiers while the latter were serving abroad in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War. It also includes very few alien men who married our servicewomen as well as including the alien minor children. This bill provides that these alien relatives shall not be excluded from admission to the United States if they are found to be afflicted with physical or mental defects which would serve to debar them from permanent admission to the United States under the mandatory provisions of the law. That means you might have a case of a wife with a tubercular spot on her lungs. That wife does not waive examination on the other side, but is examined by immigration health officer and report made to board of health in locality wherever she goes and is supposed to be taken care of on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, all this legislation does is to waive certain possible medical defects of wives of the GI's?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is all it does. But it expedites their admission to this country. Instead of making application on this side, all of the necessary filing of papers will be done on the other side. Therefore, the matter will be expedited in that way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any of the several clauses of section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, excluding physically and mentally defective aliens, and notwithstanding the documentary requirements of any of the immigration laws or regulations, Executive orders, or Presidential proclamations issued thereunder, alien spouses or alien children of United States citizens serving in, or having an honorable discharge certificate from the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War shall, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws and if application for admission is made within 3 years of the effective date of this act, be admitted to the United States: *Provided*, That every alien of the foregoing description shall be medically examined at the time of arrival in accordance with the provisions of section 16 of the act of February 5, 1917, and if found suffering from any disability which would be the basis for a ground of exclusion except for the provision of this act, the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall forthwith notify the appropriate public medical officer of the local community to which the alien is destined: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not affect the duties of the United States Public Health Service so far as they relate to quarantinable diseases.

SEC. 2. Regardless of section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, any alien admitted under section 1 of this act shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant as defined in section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924.

SEC. 3. Any alien admitted under section 1 of this act who at any time returns to the United States after a temporary absence abroad shall not be excluded because of the disability or disabilities that existed at the time of that admission.

SEC. 4. No fine or penalty shall be imposed under the act of February 5, 1917, except those arising under section 14, because of the transportation to the United States of any alien admitted under this act.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of this act, the Second World War shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941, and to have ceased upon the termination of hostilities as declared by the President or by a joint resolution of Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] both have special orders to address the House for 30 minutes today. Having conferred with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I ask unanimous consent that the order thereof be reversed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be transferred to Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UNRRA APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 266, making additional appropriations for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan.

RESCISSION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4407, an act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, insist on the disagreement of the House to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan.

READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCE FOR ALL VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. RANKIN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.
WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, report that the conferees have been unable to agree.

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749), to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, and agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RANKIN, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Joseph Lieb, national director of Amvets and a newspaper article.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by a constituent.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had to address the House today may be put over until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGION SAYS OPA RULES OPERATE AGAINST VETERANS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RECORDING AND RELEASING OF LIENS ON MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAILERS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1212) to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from West Virginia to make a short statement on the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has for its purpose the authorizing of a fee of not to exceed 50 cents for the releasing of liens on motor vehicles and trailers operating within the District of Columbia. At the present time we require a fee of 50 cents for the recording of the lien but not for the release. Most of the States require a fee for both recording and releasing. We believe that in the District of Columbia it is meritorious to have this small charge. It is not out of line with what the States are doing; in fact, it is smaller.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say it will make a very substantial addition to the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; and the District revenues of necessity should be increased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and

trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, is hereby amended to read:

"SEC. 12. The fee for recording liens or assignments or releases of liens upon a certificate shall not exceed the sum of 50 cents for each lien or assignment or release of lien on each automobile contained in the instrument."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EFFECTUATING THE PURPOSES OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the chairman of the committee to make a statement on this bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this proposed legislation, which has passed the Senate and which we have considered in the full Committee of the District of Columbia of the House, is to remove certain disabilities of those who are minors in the District of Columbia; and we would make a resident eligible for a guaranty of a loan under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and also the minor spouse, or the wife of such veteran, so as to enable these individuals to qualify for loan benefits paid under the national act, or to qualify for any other or secondary loan made in conjunction with the act.

In the second place, we would authorize and provide for building and loan and savings and loan associations to invest in Government-approved veteran securities, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Perhaps it ought to be said that this legal disability of infancy has already been removed in a dozen or more States, and such removal is contemplated in another half dozen States in the very near future.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct; Arkansas, Connecticut, Kansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Michigan, Georgia, and Wyoming have already passed such measures, and other States are proposing that similar action be taken.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from West Virginia did not make any explanation of the provisions of this bill on page 2, starting with line 22, which authorizes any building and loan association to make unsecured loans for property alterations. That is general substantive law; in other words, it has no effect whatsoever, as far as I can see, with reference to veterans who are in their minority.

In other words, this is general legislation which I think should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency, inasmuch as it changes the general law with respect to loans, both secured and unsecured.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say in answer to the observation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this measure came to the House District Committee after having been passed by the Senate of the United States, and we believe that as it now stands or is operative, the building and loan associations within the District, unlike other financial and lending institutions, would be able to make unsecured loans and loans which are junior to another mortgage under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Replying to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, this applies only to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, I suggested that at the beginning of the explanation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The bill refers only to residents of the District of Columbia, but here, it seems to me, you are slipping in a measure which on its face appears to only refer to veterans of World War II who are in their minority, but this has a rider on an altogether different subject. This bill would permit secured or unsecured loans on property up to the amount of $2,000, which would be a general change in the banking laws applying to the building and loan associations of the District of Columbia. I do not feel that this type of legislation should be passed unless there is really a hearing on the subject or unless there is a better explanation than has been made heretofore.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After all, it is within the province of any State or local jurisdiction to determine at what rates these can be made. That is not governed, of course, by Federal statute. This happens to be Federal jurisdiction. It does not amend general jurisdiction. It makes a change in a local matter and it it only a local matter.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I say that the States of Texas, Nebraska, Missouri, and Massachusetts at the present time have passed legislation which allows the situation just as we propose to have it within the District of Columbia. We know there is going to be an increased impetus in home repair activities and we have attempted to aid the veterans who want to receive those loans.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is speaking about veterans again. This has no reference whatever to veterans. It is a fundamental change in the banking laws of the District of Columbia. In his original explanation, the chairman of the District Committee did not even mention that that was being done by this bill. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to object.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to continue to urge this legislation today but I shall cooperate with the leadership of the House and withdraw the bill temporarily.

TAXATION OF ROLLING STOCK OF RAILROADS AND OTHER COMPANIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1278) to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation which has passed the Senate has to do with the taxation of certain rolling stock of railroads and other companies operating within the District of Columbia. I think it is important to say that the railroads themselves are not in opposition to this legislation. It will bring in certain revenues that are needed and follows the pattern of taxation as it applies to these companies within our States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the rolling stock of railroad companies, refrigerator-car companies, parlor-car companies, sleeping-car companies, tank-car companies, express companies car-renting companies, and all other companies owning parlor, sleeping, dining, tank, freight, or any other cars which are operated or run over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District of Columbia, shall be deemed to be located in said District for purposes of taxation, whether or not the individual units are continuously in the District or are constantly changing, and such property shall be reported, assessed, and taxed within the time, and at the rates prescribed by law for the reporting and taxation of other personal property in the District of Columbia.

(b) Such rolling stock as is primarily located in the District of Columbia shall be reported and taxed at its full and true value on the last day of the calendar year preceding the tax date.

(c) Such rolling stock as is not primarily located in the District of Columbia shall be reported and taxed in the manner following:

(1) Every railroad company operating rolling stock over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District shall report to the Assessor of the District of Columbia the various classes of such rolling stock so operated by such company whether owned by it or any other railroad company; the number of miles traveled by each class of such rolling stock within the District during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total number of miles traveled by each class of such rolling stock on all lines over which such company operates during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total full and true value of each class of such rolling stock owned by such company on the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date; and such other facts and information as said Assessor may require. The taxable portion of the rolling stock of each such company shall be determined by applying the mileage traveled in the District by the various classes of such rolling stock operated in the District by such company to the total mileage traveled by the various classes of such rolling stock on all lines over which such company operates, and the tax shall be assessed on that portion of such rolling stock owned by such company on the last day of

the calendar year next preceding the tax date. The mileage and value of the rolling stock owned by such company which is permanently located outside of the District of Columbia shall not be included in the computation of such assessment.

(2) Every parlor-car company and sleeping-car company owning parlor and sleeping cars (except those owned by railroad companies and described in paragraph (1) of this subsection) which are operated in the District over or upon the tracks of any railroad or terminal company, shall report to the Assessor of the District of Columbia the total number of miles traveled by all such cars, and also the miles traveled by such cars within the District, during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the total full and true value of all of such cars so used as of the last day of the calendar year next preceding the tax date; and such other facts and information as said assessor may require. The taxable portion of the value of the cars owned by any such company and used within the District shall be determined by applying to such value the ratio between the mileage traveled by such cars in the District and the total mileage traveled by such cars within and without the District.

(3) Every car company, mercantile company, corporation or individual (other than railroad, parlor-car and sleeping-car companies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) owning or leasing any stock cars, furniture cars, fruit cars, refrigerator cars, meat cars, oil cars, tank cars, or other similar cars, which are run over or upon the line or lines of any railroad or terminal company in the District of Columbia, shall furnish to the Assessor of the District of Columbia, on forms prescribed by said assessor, a true, full, and accurate statement, verified by the affidavit of the officer or persons making the same, showing the aggregate number of miles made by their several cars over or upon the several lines of railroad within the District of Columbia during the calendar year next preceding the tax date; the average number of miles traveled per day within the District of Columbia by the cars covered by the statement in the ordinary course of business during the year; and such other pertinent facts and information as said assessor may require.

Every railroad company whose lines run through or into the District of Columbia shall annually furnish to the said assessor a statement showing the name and address of every car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual (other than railroad, parlor-car and sleeping-car companies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection) whose cars made mileage over its tracks in the District of Columbia during the calendar year next preceding the tax date, and the total number of miles made within the District of Columbia by each during said period.

It shall be the duty of the said Assessor to ascertain from the best and most reliable information that can be obtained and from said statements the number of cars required to make the total mileage of each such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual within the District of Columbia during the period aforesaid, and to ascertain and fix the valuation upon each particular class of such cars, and the number so ascertained to be required to make the total mileage within the District of Columbia of the cars of each such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual within said period shall be assessed against the respective car companies, mercantile companies, corporations, or individuals. The valuation thus obtained shall be the full and true value and shall be the taxable portion of the cars owned by any such car company, mercantile company, corporation, or individual and used within the District of Columbia.

(d) All of the provisions of law relating to the filing of returns, assessment, payment, and collection of personal property taxes in the District of Columbia shall be applicable to the companies described in the foregoing subsections.

(e) Any individual, partnership, unincorporated association, or corporation aggrieved by any assessment of taxes made pursuant to the provisions of this act may appeal therefrom to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia in the same manner and to the same extent as set forth in sections 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 of title IX of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, and for other purposes", approved May 16, 1938.

(f) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the taxable year beginning July 1, 1945, and each taxable year thereafter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include certain newspaper articles and telegrams.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the chairman? This bill as I understand, has something to do with the movement of coal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This bill deals with the taxation of rolling stock of the railroads in the proportion as they have mileage in the District of Columbia, and insofar as they haul coal in and out of the District of Columbia it would relate to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is as I understand it, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I made that explanation in the beginning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry I did not hear it. As I understand, it affects interstate commerce, that is, commerce between the States. This morning there appeared before the House Committee on Labor Mr. John L. Lewis, who testified and, among other things, in substance, said that the difference between serfdom and freedom was the right to enter into contracts. No doubt many of us will agree with him that the right to enter into voluntary binding agreements is one of the signboards of a free nation, but while he made that statement the substance of his further remarks was that he did not believe that any man, woman, or child, nor for that matter—and these are my words and not his—twenty-five or fifty million of them, had the right to enter into contracts with would-be employers. The inference seemed to be that he was opposed to the open shop; that if he had his way he would insist upon a closed shop and the check-off. His attention was called to the fact that the unions, in some instances, denied membership to individuals because the union had what it considered an adequate number of individuals in that particular trade or occupation in that city; hence it did not need to admit them; that if it did admit them, they would come in competition with the members of the union who had before been admitted to membership. It follows, therefore, an American citizen who wanted a job, even though he was a veteran, could not obtain or hold one unless he first paid tribute to and joined a union. Even a veteran has found himself in that situation; out of a job because the union would not admit him to membership. Down in southwestern Michigan and elsewhere throughout the country they have A. & P. stores. They sell groceries to the folks who need them. But the teamsters' union—that is an affiliate of Dan Tobin's union—has called a strike and will not deliver groceries to these A. & P. stores. The teamsters' union has not a single member in these stores, nevertheless, they refuse to move merchandise in interstate commerce from one city to another to deliver to an A. & P. or any other store where the employees, exercising what I had always thought was their American right to seek and hold a job wherever they could find one refuse to join either the teamsters' union—they are not doing any teamsters' work—or some other union designated by the teamsters' union. Saturday came this wire:

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building:

We the undersigned employees of the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. supermarket at Benton Harbor, Mich., are being coerced to join a union. The AFL Teamsters Union has stopped deliveries to our store since December 1 because a majority of the employees will not apply for membership in their organization. Without merchandise we will be forced to close our doors within a few days. Have we no choice but to comply with the union demands?

Sophie Haldy, Monroe F. Damon, R. C. Banyon, Clark Walker, Eleanor Horndasch, D. Akright, Ken Pinch, Martha Ast, Jean Miller, Mary Kramer, Elsie Campbell, Adah Kalinger, Helen Robinson.

Now there is a question for this Congress to answer: What remedy are you going to give not only to these clerks in these stores throughout the country, not only what remedy are you going to give to them, but what remedy are you going to give to their customers who cannot get groceries because the union will not deliver the groceries from the central warehouses to the stores?

The only reason they will not deliver them is because the people working in the stores do not desire, do not want to join the union and pay tribute to that particular union or to any other union.

Do you see what we have built up here or permitted a group to build up in the United States because of the legislation which we have adopted and which grants special priveleges to members of organized labor to discriminate against some forty million independent workers—You talk about the Ways and Means Committee originating and formulating tax legislation; here are outside organizations, top organizations which imposes upon every individual or seeks to impose on every individual in the country who must work for his living, a tax of so much for initiation fee and so much a month as tribute before he can work at a job. There is no justice, nothing American in that procedure. Yet the Congress does nothing to end it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTING SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE AND FIREMEN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker. I call up the bill (H. R. 3995) to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the chairman of the committee give a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for the repeal of section 3 of Public Law No. 151 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. You will recall that when we had the general pay increase legislation before the House covering firemen and members of the Metropolitan Police within the District of Columbia there was considerable discussion in connection with the pay of certain marine engineers, who are attached to the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. These men are individuals who had by experience and schooling to perfect themselves in a very hazardous and detailed job. I said at that time to the House, and particularly to the Members who were interested, that if we found an inequity was being exercised in connection with these few individuals we would correct it at a later date.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. This is the bill we had up, and the gentleman stated at that time that an effort would be made to correct an injustice.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. The gentleman is giving the situation as it exists.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia," approved July 14, 1945, is repealed.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of the first day of the calendar month in which it is enacted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that this concludes the labors of my friend the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia as chairman of that committee, as he succeeds to a larger responsibility in the form of the chairmanship of the House Committee on the Civil Service. Here and now I want to pay a testimony to his labors in behalf of the people of the District of Columbia. He has worked early and late addressing meetings, assessing and appraising sentiment here, and doing those things that he thought and the committee thought were in the interest of this, our Nation's Capital.

You know so well that it is a very thankless job. It is the kind of thing for which you get very little credit at home. It is the kind of thing for which you too often are subjected, as Shakespeare once said, to the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.

I think the District of Columbia and the Members of this House owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the gentleman from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, the chairman of this committee, for the fine and splendid labor he has performed for the people in the Nation's Capital. He has also relieved the Members of this House of much of the drudgery that goes along with that chore in behalf of the Nation's Capital. He is eminently deserving of that tribute.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the statement just made by our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in relation to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. As chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia he has had a very hard and difficult task to perform during the period he has been chairman. He has fulfilled his duties in a very statesmanlike and effective manner. The District of Columbia and the city of Washington will always be indebted to him for the type of leadership he has given to the people of this area during the several years he has been chairman of this committee. We all know what a hard task faces any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. All the members of that committee make certain sacrifices, and they are all entitled to commendation for their willingness to make the sacrifices that service on that committee calls for. This particularly applies to the chairman of the committee. Every Member of the House by experience knows the value of a chairman. A chairman with tact and judgment accomplishes difficult things in what appears to be an easy manner. That is so because he does those things that he ought to do within his committee and with reference to all members of the committee. The members of a committee where a chairman is tactful and exercises good judgment have confidence in him. They know his word is his bond. They know that a tactful chairman will not do anything that might constitute what in the common parlance of the day is termed "cutting a sharp corner." These are some of the reasons why Chairman RANDOLPH of the District Committee has had the confidence of the members of his committee. That feeling, in turn, is transmitted to the Members of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from West Virginia has put through District legislation time after time on District day in comparatively few minutes. That illustrates convincingly the confidence reposed in him by the members of his committee and the confidence that the House as a whole has in him as chairman and in the other members of the committee. I remember back during my years of service in the House of Representatives we approached District day with a feeling of hesitancy because we knew that any kind of bill was going to encounter the opposition of a small group within the House and that they could operate in such a manner that there would be difficulty in obtaining the passage of even one bill relating to the District on District day. Today we have seen three bills acted upon in a few minutes. As I remember, five bills were acted upon last time and went through in 15 or 20 minutes. That is the type of service that the gentleman from West Virginia has given to the District of Columbia. The District, I know, will always remember that service.

The leadership in the House of Representatives on both sides, the Speaker, myself, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] have always cooperated with the chairman of the District Committee and the members of the committee. We have given him permission to call up legislation on days other than those set aside for the handling of District business, and have enabled such legislation to be passed by unanimous consent. That is a procedure which I do not believe existed except in recent years. I know during my 5 years as majority leader that I and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] have cooperated in every way possible with the Committee on the District of Columbia because we realized our responsibility and wanted to get legislation passed as quickly as possible. The relationship between the District of Columbia and the Congress has been very cordial during the past 5 years. I regret very much to note every once in a while, and I do not say this in any critical sense, except to make the observation that one of our Washington newspapers tries to rekindle conditions that existed some years ago when one or two Members of the House, who are not at present Members, seemed to have a pet hobby in venting their feelings against the District of Columbia. I hope that paper will realize that during the past 5 years, at least, there has been an entirely changed situation. I hope it will realize that, and instead of trying to bring about discord between the Congress and the people of the District, they will try to promote mutual understanding and respect. The District Committee has been able to function effectively because of the confidence the House has in the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the members thereof. The leadership has tried to do everything possible to increase and promote that cordial relationship between Congress and the District. So far as I am concerned, that condition and that policy will continue to exist under the new chairman. I hope there will not be this constant irritating editorial that we

read every once in a while, which appeared in a newspaper not long ago, trying to create the impression that we think we are greater than the law itself, directing it against the entire Congress. The editorial was based on an unfortunate thing that happened. The man against whom the editorial was directed is one of the best men in this House; yet the paper used it as an attack against the entire Congress. I say this in no critical sense, but from a constructive angle. The entire record for the past 5 years has been one of complete cooperation on the part of the House of Representatives toward the District of Columbia in its problems, as evidenced by the Committee on the District of Columbia being able to get legislation passed speedily and expeditiously. That is what counts.

As majority leader of this House, and I know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] will agree in my statement, we will cooperate with the new chairman of the committee in every way possible. But let the understanding be mutual, and let the mutuality of understanding increase. Members of the House want to perform their duty to the best of their ability for the District of Columbia and the city, and I hope we will have no future recurrences of these irritating editorials which are based upon inaccurate premises, and which the evidence does not justify.

Again, let me congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for the outstanding service he has rendered while he has been chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, the gracious and too generous expressions of my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the able majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] cause me to take the floor for a moment to express the very genuine appreciation which I have in my heart for the fine cooperation which has been exemplified through so many years toward the Committee on the District of Columbia, and myself, by the membership of the House of Representatives.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke, I recalled the helpful work which he, in large measure, and other minority members on the committee, have given. While listening to him I thought that during the almost 7 years I have been privileged to be chairman of the District Committee, that we have had no partisanship whatsoever in the committee itself. I think the House appreciates that such a condition existed. We have worked for the best interests of the District of Columbia and its people.

When the majority leader spoke of the responsibility of this Congress to the District of Columbia, I remember that for myself, during almost 13 years as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, the responsibility which I felt toward the Nation's Capital. I think, in large measure, that feeling is shared also by the membership of this House.

I again thank these two gentlemen who have spoken such kindly thoughts. I am not fully deserving of their expressions. It will be my continued purpose to cooperatively work with my good colleagues in this body, and I ask you for assistance and aid to our very fine friend from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], who will assume District Committee chairmanship duties. I am sure he will do a very splendid job.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is a work of supererogation for me to get up here following the distinguished and eloquent remarks which have just been made by the majority leader, and also by the very able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; but I think I would be remiss in what I believe to be my obligation to my colleagues, particularly with reference to the District of Columbia, were I to fail at this auspicious moment to pay what I consider to be a condign tribute to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia who is now retiring, after serving the District of Columbia so well. As chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles the District of Columbia finances, I am in a position to say authoritatively to my colleagues in the House that the association of the two committees has been most harmonious and cordial. The District of Columbia has been singularly fortunate in having had the benefit of such able men as have so willingly served on the District of Columbia Committee chairmaned by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

I know that the citizens of the city of Washington are grateful for the services rendered in such a capable manner by the gentleman from West Virginia. I know the people of his district and of the great State which in part he serves are likewise appreciative of his services, because they recognize that work done in behalf of the Nation's Capital in a sense is work done directly for the Nation and to that extent in behalf of West Virginia.

Now the gentleman from West Virginia goes to another assignment as chairman of the very important House Committee on the Civil Service where he will continue to render outstanding service.

The loss of the District of Columbia is the gain of all the Federal classified personnel in the United States Government service. The service he has rendered on the Civil Service Committee is outstanding. Likewise he has been a great friend of the classified personnel in the Federal Government.

I am very happy to know that the Board of Trade of the city of Washington in a banquet given tonight is presenting to him a scroll in recognition of their gratitude for the services rendered by Mr. JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

So, on behalf of my committee, the District of Columbia Subcommittee on Appropriations, I wish to thank Mr. RANDOLPH for the unselfish and exceptionally devoted work he has performed for the city of Washington. I know that I speak for the citizens of the Nation's Capital when I express to him goodwill and Godspeed and a fervent wish for his attainment of great success in his new assignment and profound regret that we no longer have him serving as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee.

We know that his successor, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN] who has already served so well in behalf of the District of Columbia, will follow in his footsteps; and we welcome him to his new portfolio.

The gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, is a remarkably gifted young man. He is a statesman of scholarship, courage, magnetic personality, and sincere patriotism.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia may be permitted to speak for fifteen additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that means it will be 20 minutes before the Bulwinkle bill is called up.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, though a nation speak with the tongues of men and of angels and willfully break its official promises, persistently shirk its official duties, and deliberately contribute to the destruction or distress of an impoverished, persecuted, perishing people, it becomes as "sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal." Under this premise, to what has Great Britain reduced herself by her long-continued lethal violation of the promise, commemorated by the Balfour Declaration, to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people? What verdict should be rendered against Britain for having made a heartbreaking mockery of her mandate from the League of Nations to transform this lofty promise into a praiseworthy realization?

If Britain should be tried in a court of conscience either for what she has done or failed to do in this matter, she would deserve to be convicted as an accessory to the brutal murder by Hitler and his minions of hundreds of thousands of innocent Jewish men, women, and children during the last 6 years. In the foregoing answer and throughout this address the word "Britain" or "British" should be understood to mean the British Government or the officials who administer British affairs, and in no instance should it be construed to mean the rank and file of the British people, who are blameless concerning Palestinian policy.

Subject to the strict application of this prefatory limitation, let us briefly consider the rights of the Jews to Palestine and the conduct of Britain, which has made it as impossible for the possessors of these rights to enjoy them as it is for a leopard to change its spots or for a man to number the days of eternity. From time immemorial title to land has been the most important requisite for its

possession. Therefore, the question immediately arises: "Have the Jews a title to Palestine?" The answer is, "They have"; and it is the most ancient, famous, and indefeasible title the world has ever known. Almost 1,900 years before Christ, the Lord personally appeared before Abraham and granted unto him and his seed after him all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. The Canaan of 1,900 years before Christ included all and more than the Palestine of 1,945 years after His birth.

The seed of Abraham includes every Jew that breathes the breath of life. Consequently every Jew has title to an undivided interest in Palestine. This title from the infinite is as superior to any of which finite man is the author as the omnipotence of our heavenly Father is superior to the impotence of His earthly children.

As eternity exceeds time so the longevity of this remarkable grant exceeds that of any other to be found upon the historic scroll of twice 3,000 years. It was not for a decade, not for a century, not for a millennium but for an everlasting possession.

According to Lord Byron, "A thousand years scarce serve to form a state." But in half a century less than this supposititious period the Jews, fortified with their divine title, aided by providence and led by the Lord's anointed, made Palestine one of the world's most famous countries, its kingdom one of the world's greatest governments, and Jerusalem, its capital, one of the world's most coveted cities.

Under Solomon the Hebrew kingdom attained the zenith of its influence and power. Recognition of its splendor, like the sight of the tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, "reached to the end of all the earth."

Subsequent to Solomon's death the entire realm of Jewry was divided into the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of Judah. The first comprised 10 tribes; the second only 2—those of Judah and Benjamin. The kingdom of Israel, after many centuries of turmoil, was overwhelmed by the Assyrians in the eighth century before Christ. Thereafter those who had composed this kingdom vanished from history and became known as the lost tribes.

The people of the kingdom of Judah demonstrated extraordinary powers of survival by withstanding wars, invasions, sieges, and battles without number until the year 70 of our Lord, when the Romans overran Palestine, utterly destroyed Jerusalem, sowed its soil with salt, dispersed the Jews, and made them wanderers on the face of the earth. From then until now they have had no national home.

During the intervening centuries man's inhumanity to man has murdered millions of the Jewish people and made countless other millions of them mourn.

On the 2d of November 1917, when the First World War was raging like a tornado, Great Britain sorely needed Jewish money, Jewish loyalty, and Jewish manpower to save her from annihilation. In that time of stark necessity she pledged herself through her spokesman, Lord Balfour, as follows:

> His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object.

Within 5 years after the date of the Balfour declaration it was unqualifiedly endorsed by 52 nations, including our own. In March 1919 President Wilson vigorously proclaimed his approval of its principle. Every subsequently elected President of the United States has emphatically voiced his support of the declaration, or the objective it was designed to achieve. The Democratic and Republican Parties, by the unanimous action of their respective national conventions last year, also became endorsers of the long overdue Balfour-British promissory note to the Jewish people.

This note has long been in the notorious dishonor of shameful repudiation by its maker. And the two greatest of all political parties, five Presidents of the United States and the more than half a hundred nations that endorsed it, whether for humanitarian accommodation or through selfish expectation of political reward, are in equal dishonor because of their having supinely acquiesced in Britain's indefensible repudiation.

For a few short years, under the policy announced by Mr. Balfour and later confirmed by the League, Jews from many parts of the world were permitted to enter Palestine and make it their home. These newcomers to the land of their forefathers promptly established industries, improved highways, reclaimed wastelands, and in many other commendable ways helped to promote the Palestinian welfare to an astonishing degree. But in 1922 before the League mandate became operative, Jewish immigration into the Holy Land encountered Arab opposition which many believe to have been incited by British interests. This opposition eventually became so clamorous that Britain began to issue white papers relative to the Balfour Declaration. The first of these was limited to the purpose of clarification. The second, which was issued in 1930, reduced the latitude of the implications of the declaration to the dissatisfaction of both the Arabs and the Jews.

In April 1936 Arab terrorists, with probable secret British support, organized riots against the Jews which continued with varying degrees of intensity until after the Nazis launched their war against Britain and France in 1939. In May of the latter year Britain, to the regret of her friends, the delight of her foes and the irreparable injury of the Jews, issued a third white paper which, except for the provision that 75,000 of the Jewish race might enter Palestine within the following 5 years, repudiated the Balfour Declaration and renounced the Palestinian mandate which Britain had received from the League of Nations. This last white paper even the conservative Mr. Churchill stigmatized as a plain breach of a solemn obligation of the British Commonwealth.

In view of this outspoken condemnation by Mr. Churchill it is not surprising that the prominent late Lord Wedgewood declared in Parliament: "The whole British administration in Palestine is against the Jews." It is not difficult to understand why other eminent Britons have charged that the anti-Semitism of the British officials who rule Palestine has been surpassed only by that of the hated Hitler himself.

Although the United States never approved the devastating white paper of 1939, she has nevertheless deplorably failed to exert her full influence in behalf of the redemption of the Balfour pledge. Even the Congress has not been faultless in this matter. For example, the effort of the House to discharge the duty of translating into reality the platform declarations of the two major political parties in favor of the establishment of a national Jewish home in Palestine has, during the present session of the Congress, been limited to a single hour's debate, which was productive of no action.

For many years, Britain has resorted to the deadly device of investigation as a substitute for the performance of her Palestinian obligation to the Jewish people. For example, the Shaw Commission investigated the cause of the armed riots against the Jews. The Peel Commission made an investigation in 1936 and the following year recommended a plan which although it was both unsatisfactory and unjust to the Jews was, as a matter of necessity, accepted by the twentieth Zionist Congress, which was held in Zurich in August 1937. This plan Parliament and the Arabs promptly rejected.

The Woodhead Commission made an investigation in 1938, and proposed three plans for the partition of Palestine, none of which was acceptable to those concerned.

In addition to the foregoing, the question of providing a haven for Jewish refugees was included in the consideration of the Evian conference in 1938, and also in the Bermuda conference in 1943. These various conferences and inquiries were supplemented last year with an investigation by Dean Harrison of the University of Pennsylvania. His report contains an appropriate, timely warning to the effect that further delay in providing a refuge for the despoiled and destitute of the Jewish people will mean still more suffering and death for these helpless victims of misfortune.

And why has Britain, one of the greatest nations of all time, and for generations the favored nation of the United States, so reprehensibly broken her promise, neglected her duty and evaded her responsibility regarding the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine? Please consider the following facts and then formulate your own answer to this inquiry.

Thirty-nine days after the date of the Balfour declaration, General Allenby and his British Army entered Jerusalem as conquering heroes of the First World War. A little later scientists investigated the Dead Sea which is but 14 miles from Jerusalem. The investigators made the astounding report that in and under

that mysterious body of bitter water, which is supposed to cover the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah, are accumulations of magnesium, bromine, potash, and various other salts and elements that are worth the astronomical sum of a trillion two hundred billion dollars—a value greater than that of all the gold that has ever been mined since the morning of creation.

Since the promulgation of the Balfour Declaration it has been discovered that under Palestine's neighboring countries of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia are reservoirs of crude oil greater than any others in the world. From Bagdad—the ancient, glamorous seat of the caliphs and the present capital of Iraq—a giant pipe line extends across Palestine to Haifa, the most important Palestinian port on the Mediterranean Sea. By means of this line vast quantities of oil have been made available for commercial utilization. Palestine, by virtue of its situation, is the only practical outlet for the oil from these Middle Eastern countries. Therefore, the government that controls Palestine will largely control the oil from this region and greatly profit by its exploitation.

The Jews who were permitted to enter Jerusalem before the Balfour Declaration was abrogated, in cooperation with their kindred who were already there, established manufactories in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv which they operated with such unusual efficiency and success that the British are charged with having concluded that drastic restrictions on Jewish immigration are necessary in order to protect British manufacturers against Jewish competition.

The events of the recent World War emphasized anew the historic fact that Palestine is the most strategic land on the globe. It is the connecting link between Asia and Africa and, by reason of its long Mediterranean shore line and its excellent seaport of Haifa, it is the gateway to Europe and the countries of the Western Hemisphere for the important commerce that originates in northeastern Africa and southwestern Asia.

The Almighty, speaking of Palestine under another designation, said to the prophet Ezekiel, it "is the glory of all lands."

According to Revelation, in Palestine will be fought the last great decisive battle at the end of the world.

Could it be that the reason for Britain's long-continued, shameful refusal to grant the Jews refuge in their homeland is to be found in her cupidity for the fabulous material resources, the surpassing geographical domination, and the sacred historic places of Palestine augmented by an irresistible fascination to be on the scene of the last and most momentous of all earthly battles before it begins?

It is one of Britain's evasive contentions that she fears the establishment of the promised national Jewish home would provoke the Arabs to make war against her, and that consequently she must continue to protect the Arabs against Jewish encroachment. There is no justification for this contention. The Arabs could no more wage war against Britain, or any other world power, than a mouse could wage war against a lion.

The Arabs have no title to Palestine. They are simply squatters upon land to which the Jews hold title from on high. Until the created miraculously become greater than the Creator, neither that title nor any right under it can be transferred to the Arabs even by the mighty government of Great Britain. And without title the possessory rights of the Arabs to Palestine will forever continue to be subordinate to those of the Jews.

But the thoughtless may argue that the Arabs, as well as the Jews, are descendants of Abraham, and that consequently they have a right to share the Abrahamic inheritance. This argumentation would be erroneous for the following reasons:

Ishmael is the connecting link in the relationship between Abraham and the Arabs. Isaac is the connecting link in the relationship between Abraham and the Jews. Ishmael was the illegitimate son of Hagar, the Egyptian concubine. Isaac was the legitimate son of Abraham and his wife Sarah. Under the law, an illegitimate cannot inherit from his putative father. Therefore the Arabs have inherited from Abraham no title to any part of Palestine.

Furthermore, just before Abraham died, as recorded in Holy Writ, he "gave all that he had unto Isaac. But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had"—and these sons included Ishmael—"Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son unto the east country." Thus it appears that, according to Abraham's last will, only Isaac and his posterity—the Jews—should ever possess the Holy Land.

But there are many other reasons why Britain should promptly annul the infamous white paper of 1939 and redeem the pledge of the Balfour Declaration without further appeasing the undeserving Arabs to the irretrievable loss of the deserving Jews.

The Arabs have vast areas of homeland. In Asia alone they have a million two hundred thousand square miles of territory, much of which is practically uninhabited. For 18 centuries and 75 years the Jews have been as destitute of a national home and land as the Saviour was of a place whereon to lay His sacred head.

The present entreaty of the Jews is simply for an increase of their meager privileges and possessions in the land of Palestine—the area of which has, in modern times, been reduced to 10,155 square miles. Judging the future by the past, to increase the Jewish population of Palestine would be to confer great benefits on the Arabs who are there, by encouraging them to form habits of industry and thrift and generally raise their standard of living.

It should be constantly remembered that the Jews seek to increase their acquisition of additional Palestinian land from Arab claimants solely by means of lawful purchase and never by means of unlawful ouster and seizure.

During the recent World War, when it appeared that Rommel and his Nazi warriors would overrun Egypt, neither the Arab King of that country nor any other Arab leader contributed arms or men to the Allied cause.

While the Nazis were sweeping everything before them in Europe, Arab soldiers in German uniforms helped Hitler to win his battles and trample liberty and humanity under his feet.

Amin el Husseini, a former Mufti of Jerusalem, in cooperation with other Arab leaders, in the name of Allah urged the Arabs of the Middle East to support Hitler instead of the Allies, on the alleged ground that this abominable anti-Christ was a direct descendant of the Prophet Mohammed.

It is recorded that in Syria and Lebanon during the Second World War the Arabs not only rejoiced over Axis victories, but daily chanted the sacrilegious nonsense, "Only Allah in heaven, only Hitler on earth."

On the other hand, the Jews unhesitatingly, patriotically and effectually supported the Allied cause throughout the recent war. In similar manner the Jews of Britain have supported her in every war she has ever fought with another power. The Jews of the United States have made an equally brilliant record of loyal and courageous service to this land in every crisis in its history.

And for what else are Britain and America debtors to the Jews? To answer this question completely would require a much longer time than anyone is ever permitted to speak in this forum; while an audience would require the patience of Job in order to listen to the long narration. Suffice it to say that mankind is indebted to the Jews for the Holy Bible—the foundation of the faith of the righteous of all the world.

Among the countless contributions which the Jews have made to the general welfare, the sublime Psalms of David, the "wild seraphic fire of Isaiah," and the matchless epistles of the Apostle Paul have, by promoting righteousness, providing hope for the hopeless and supplying comfort for the disconsolate, been worth more to humanity than all the ransoms ever paid for captive kings.

It was Moses—a Jew—through whom God gave us the Ten Commandments. It was a Jew who preached the Sermon on the Mount—the sublimest discourse on human conduct that ever emanated from earthly tongue or pen. It was the divine Jew who gave us the priceless hope of the cherished assurance:

> I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall be live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

It was the same divine Jew who, by his agonizing death upon the cross, provided redemption for the whole wicked world and opened wide the portals of paradise to all mankind.

Our age-old obligations to the Jews for great material wealth, patriotic service, social benefits and spiritual blessings, have been greatly augmented by recent events which remind us of the observation of the eloquent Senator Zebulon Vance that "the Jew is, beyond doubt, the most remarkable man of this world, past or present." Only a little while ago a number of eminent Jews corroborated

the truth of this assertion by contributing immeasurably to the solution of the problem of utilizing atomic energy—the most important achievement since the Resurrection.

Notwithstanding the indispensable service rendered by many non-Jewish scientists in providing the answer to the riddle of atomic energy, it is nevertheless true that without the mathematical formula supplied by one of the greatest thinkers of all time, the celebrated Jewish Dr. Einstein, or without the aid of the profound knowledge and the tireless endeavor of the famous Jewish doctors, Lise Meitner, Franz Eugen Simon, Robert Frisch, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Niels Bohr, and Prof. Rudolf Peierls we would still be without the atomic bomb; and without the atomic bomb Japan would still be unconquered; American young men would still be fighting and suffering and dying to subdue her and free the world from the curse of her murderous aggression.

But regardless of all the debts of gratitude owed to the Jews, Britain recently refused a request made by President Truman for the prompt admission to Palestine of a hundred thousand of the needy Jewish people of Europe. The President's request was accompanied by an offer on behalf of this country to provide transportation to the Holy Land for these victims of Axis persecution. Britain's refusal of that request and her counter suggestion for still another investigation of the Palestinian question have caused sorrow in millions of Jewish hearts similar to that which Herod caused by the murder of the little children of Bethlehem, of which it was said:

> In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.

In view of the desolation and death the Jews have suffered because of Britain's failure to fulfill the promise of the Balfour Declaration, there should be no acquiescence in her attempt further to delay the discharge of her duty to the Jews by substituting still another investigation for action and relief. What is there to be investigated? Is it necessary for Britain, either alone or in cooperation with the United States, to inquire into the validity of the title to Palestine which God granted to the Jews? Is it necessary to inquire whether Britain should now honorably redeem or dishonorably continue to violate the pledge of the Balfour Declaration? Is an investigation necessary to prove that multitudes of destitute Jews will die of starvation during the approaching winter unless they are promptly provided a home? Does anyone doubt the self-evident truth that Palestine is the only place in which this home can be established in time to save the perishing Jews from the dissolution of the grave? Manifestly investigations are needed for none of these purposes.

Britain's past inaction at least suggests the probability that she will improve the time of the delay in which this Government has acquiesced, not in rescuing Jews from starvation, but in endeavoring to determine how Palestine can be most advantageously utilized in the international game of power politics in which as many as five great nations are obviously and desperately playing for unlimited stakes.

The Allied War Crimes Commission has reported that 5,300,000 Jews vanished from their European homes during the Second World War. Hundreds of thousands of these were put to death by torture too excruciating for description. From babes in arms and prattling little children to the aged and helpless, who were tottering toward the grave, Jews of every walk of life were subjected to Nazi extermination by every conceivable agonizing means from burning to starvation.

There is abundant evidence to justify the belief that if Britain had faithfully performed her promise to facilitate the establishment of a national home for the Jews, a million of those whom the Axis nations murdered during the last 6 years would now be not only alive but in the enjoyment of happiness, prosperity and peace in the Holy Land.

During my membership of 16 years in the Senate and 9 years in the House I never until today voiced a word of criticism of Britain. Through all these years if was my pleasure to improve every available opportunity to support measures designed to protect her against her enemies, and in every other possible way promote the welfare of her people. But Britain's perverse neglect of her duty to the Jews and her recent shocking conduct in helping the Dutch to slaughter the Indonesians as a punishment for endeavoring to gain their independence are outrages too intolerable to deserve exemption from bitter condemnation.

The headlines in the daily papers concerning Britain's deadly attack on her recent allies in Java tend to convince the American people that British political philosophy, moral conduct, and habits of forcibly depriving the peoples of foreign lands of their liberty have undergone little, if any, reform since English troops fired on American patriots at Lexington on the 19th of April 170 years ago.

For a short time after the recent British election, progressives in this country rejoiced in the belief that the new government would promptly inaugurate programs of sweeping reform. But unhappily all expectations of an improvement of the imperialistic policies of the old regime and all hopes for the performance of the Balfour-British promise to the Jews have completely vanished away.

It may well be doubted whether Mr. Churchill who, regardless of his conservatism, is one of the greatest of British statesmen of all time, would have slandered either Britain's honor or his own by seeking the additional delaying Palestinian investigation which Mr. Bevin has requested. Certainly under Mr. Churchill Britain could not have gone farther on her headlong imperialistic way in Java than she has gone under her recently elected statesmen—leaving behind her irresistibly advancing armed forces a long trail of devastation, brutality, and bloodshed such as she left in America at the end of the Revolutionary War; such as she left in South Africa at the end of the Boer War; such as she has left in India ever since the days of Warren Hastings; such as she left in Ireland for hundreds of years to her undying disgrace and to the unrelenting indignation of all mankind.

Britain, like the United States, has professed her support of the good neighbor policy. The time has come for both these great English speaking countries to demonstrate that they do not intend to exclude the Jews from the benefits of this policy.

Henceforth, as frequently as it becomes my privilege to vote on a question of this country's lending aid to Britain, I shall be tempted to manifest only as much of the good neighbor policy as Britain is, at that time exemplifying in her treatment of the Jews, the Indonesians, or any other people who may happen to be at her mercy.

It is my sincere hope that Britain will, not only for her own sake but also for the sake of the world, beware of her danger in this revolutionary age in which governmental policies are being universally tested in fiery furnaces of public opinion as they were never tested before. In this extraordinary time the exploited, the oppressed, and the destitute of all the earth are restlessly breathing the inspiration, the hope and the determination for freedom—freedom of thought, of speech, of worship, of action and, above all other things, freedom to govern themselves and enjoy the fruits of their own achievements instead of toiling, creating and fighting for others from the cradle to the grave.

In these circumstances, England, with a homeland the size of a postage stamp on the map of the world, holds in subjection countless millions of human beings—the great majority of whom are thousands of miles away from her shores. Only by the most exemplary official conduct and the most humanitarian and sagacious administration of her foreign affairs will she have a chance to maintain control of her vast colonial empire even for the next 10 years. This day, aye this very hour, she has a golden opportunity to make a beginning in the right direction by instantly withdrawing from her participation in the war against the Indonesians to prevent them from gaining their independence, by immediately abrogating the disgraceful white paper of 1939, and discharging, both in letter and spirit, the obligation of the Balfour Declaration, to the end that the long-suffering Jewish people may have a national home in the land which the Almighty promised them for an everlasting possession.

The voice of the United States is, at the moment, the most persuasive in all the world. Let that voice instantly speak like the trumpet of an archangel against additional British conferences or investigations designed to delay relief for the Jews, and urge the immediate establishment of the promised national home in Palestine to which all the persecuted of this illustrious race may flee for refuge as to the shadow of a great rock in a weary land in time of stress and storm. Thus let the United States discharge its manifest duty of helping to enable great numbers of the deserving destitute of God's chosen people to find homes in the Holy Land—the land of Jewish origin;

the land made famous by the stirring events of sacred history; the land glorified by the prophets; the land immortalized by the holy life, the divine love, and the sacrificial death of the Saviour of the world.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, you are now considering H. R. 3995, a bill to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the White House Police, and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. Personally, I do not know whether this is the right legislation to pass under present day conditions, when everybody is striking for more money, higher salaries. You will soon have a bill here asking for an increase in the salaries of all the Government employees. Two months ago you passed a bill giving them the greatest increase that was ever given at any one time. Probably you will get a bill in the next week or so asking for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress. Yes; 50 percent, if you please. You are now having the labor unions all over the United States striking because they cannot get a 30-percent increase in wages. It is poor policy to pass this bill today, poor timing, poor judgment, notwithstanding the merits of all.

You have hundreds of thousands of men not working because of strikes. Is it the time to be bringing up legislation of this character in the Congress when you are trying to keep the prices of commodities down so that people can buy them? Try to curb inflation. I think you are in a very serious position trying to handle the requests of everybody who comes before the Congress. You must know how to say "No" or "bust". I question very much whether you are doing the right thing for the police force. I question whether you are doing the right thing for the Government employees. I question whether you are going the right thing for Members of Congress. You are the ones who have to decide it. It seems to me when you are trying to hold prices down you should not go so far toward inflaming the country by passing all these bills. You do not help; you do hinder stabilization. The situation is just this: This country of ours is in bad shape. Are you going to make it any better? Are you helping conditions by passing this legislation when the Treasury statement shows you are over $266,000,000,000 in debt? Last week you passed a bill for $1,350,000,000 for aid to foreign countries under UNRRA, while if you had passed a bill authorizing $500,000,000 to the Red Cross and let them go over there and feed the people of Europe, you would have done just as much good as by having it extravagantly handled by appropriating $1,350,000,000. It was extravagant legislation for the American taxpayers.

The State Department made an agreement with Great Britain last week, providing it is approved by the Congress, to give Great Britain $4,400,000,000. For the first 5 years you give that money for no interest at all. After that, you charge them 2 percent interest. Let us look at the situation as far as helping those countries is concerned. I want to help them if we can. But can we help them? Great Britain owes us six and a half billion dollars from the First World War and they have not paid it. They never will pay it if they can get out of it. Great Britain owes us $23,000,000,000 on lend-lease. This agreement which the State Department tried to make with the British Government in Washington last week is going to forego that $23,000,000,000. Who ever heard of such a raw deal for America? We have spent in the various provinces of Great Britain $1,150,000,000 in building airports and places for us to use in the war. That is not included. That was our own expenditure on their territory which they will get more benefit from than we will. If we loan this money to Great Britain the understanding is that they are going to put the amount of money they subscribed into the Bretton Woods Bank. That is part of the deal. Russia is coming here for more just like it. How far can we go on these deals? I say to you, stop, look, and listen, ere it is too late. Will the Congress get some real business sense? You better begin to look after the United States?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I indicated quite clearly when I objected before that I had no objection to the bill as it is now before the House, insofar as its provisions relating to veterans of World War II are concerned. My objection was merely to the provisions in this bill which changed the banking and building and loan association laws with respect to the District of Columbia in general.

I have talked the matter over with the chairman of the District Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia—and I may add parenthetically at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I served on this committee several years ago under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague. I know of no Member who has been more indefatigable and earnest and sincere in his efforts to have enacted into law those measures which are in the interest of the citizens of the District and in the interest of the country as a whole or who more enjoys the respect of the Members of the House because they know they can depend on anything he supports to be at least worthy of the most serious consideration. Mr. Speaker, to repeat, I talked the provisions of this bill over with the gentleman from West Virginia and he is going to offer amendments which will meet my objection.

This being his last day of service as chairman of the District Committee, I personally want to see him bat 1000 percent today, and I take pleasure in withdrawing my objection on the understanding that he will offer the amendments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. At this moment we have not had the opportunity of putting them in writing. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to offer the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Servicemen's Readjustment Enabling Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. (a) The disability of minority of a resident of the District of Columbia who is eligible for guaranty of a loan pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. L. 284) and of a minor spouse of any such resident (when acting jointly with such resident) is hereby removed with respect to the incurring of any obligation all or part of which is guaranteed under the provisions of said act or in conjunction with which a secondary loan is so guaranteed, and with respect to the exercise of the rights of ownership in any property acquired with the proceeds of any such obligation, including the right to sell, convey, lease, encumber, improve, or maintain the same and to further obligate himself incident to his exercise of such rights.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any building association or building and loan association or any savings and loan association, incorporated or unincorporated, organized and operating under the laws of the District of Columbia, or any Federal savings and loan association whose main office is in the District of Columbia, may invest its funds in: (1) Property-improvement loans insured or insurable under title I of the National Housing Act; (2) loans to veterans of World War II when guaranteed in whole or in part by a loan guaranty certificate issued under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 including, without limitation, such loans as are unsecured and such loans as are junior to another mortgage or lien upon the security; and (3) other secured or unsecured loan for property alteration, repair, or improvement or for home equipment: *Povided,* That no such unsecured loan not insured or guaranteed by a Federal agency shall be made in excess of $2,000: *Provided further,* That the total amount loaned or invested and held in unsecured loans not insured or guaranteed by a Federal agency as provided for under this subsection at any one time shall not exceed 15 percent of the association's assets.

SEC. 3. Any building association, building and loan association, or savings and loan association organized and operating under

the laws of the District of Columbia, is authorized to lend money to veterans of World War II and others upon the security of a first deed or trust or first mortgage upon real estate, to be repaid in monthly or quarterly payments to be applied first to interest and the balance to principal until the indebtedness is paid in full, and without subscription to, or ownership of any shares, and such loans shall be known as direct-reduction loans. Direct-reduction-loan borrowers, and all persons assuming or obligated under direct-reduction loans made or held by such association shall be members of the association, and at all meetings of the members of the association, each borrower or each obligor upon a direct-reduction loan shall be entitled to one vote as such member.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

Amendment offered by Mr. EBERHARTER:

Page 2, line 15, strike out the colon and all of the balance of line 15, down to and including the parenthesis after "2" on line 16.

Page 2, line 21, strike out the semicolon after the word "Security" and insert a period; strike out all the balance of line 21 and the balance of page 2, down to and including the period on line 5, page 3.

Page 3, line 9, strike out "and."

Page 3, line 10, strike out "others."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the amendments which are proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania are agreeable to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Our only desire is to facilitate and assist veterans of World War II in the matter of these loans. We desire to change no basic law. As far as I am concerned this is agreeable to me.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to explain the bill now that it has been amended. It is as clear as mud at the present time with so much taken out of it. That leaves section 3 of no value to certain veterans, does it not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; we are just striking out the words "and others" in section 3. It was the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in assisting veterans in the District of Columbia in connection with these loans for the repair of houses, and so forth, that the advantages should not be given to all others within the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. I figure that the words "all others" include the veterans of World War I, and I thought perhaps they would be precluded by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. RANDOLPH. They would not.

Mr. STEFAN. I wanted to protect all the veterans. The bill is rather confusing as amended, but if the veterans of World War I will be protected under the amendment just offered by the gentleman, I am satisfied.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I may say that this bill amends the basic laws so that the veterans of World War II may obtain the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1945.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That goes to the veterans of World War II, and I refer to the act of 1945. There would be no rights taken away from the veterans of World War I.

Mr. STEFAN. That is all I wanted to be sure of.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

DECEMBER 7, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Georgia my resignation, effective at midnight, or December 31, 1945, as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Fifth District of Georgia.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT RAMSPECK.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 75.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS INVITED

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 75 unanimously, the House of Representatives gives to the United Nations an official and hearty expression of welcome to place the headquarters of the new world organization in the United States of America.

As I stated in my remarks earlier today, the United Nations' Preparatory Commission sitting in London will vote by midweek on item No. 1 of its executive committee proposals which recommended that the headquarters of the new world organization be placed in the United States. The press reports this morning indicated a hesitancy on the part of some members of the Preparatory Commission to vote since there has been "lacking an official statement of the United States desires on a UNO site."

Adoption of the resolution should settle any uncertainty on that score, and I feel certain that it represents the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States in saying:

That the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the site of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

This resolution was introduced in September following the unanimous action of 44 of the Nation's 48 governors in adopting a similar statement when meeting at Mackinac Island. The only reason congressional action has not been taken earlier, it may be said, is that shortly after the resolution was introduced, a subcommittee of the Preparatory Commission voted overwhelmingly to place the headquarters in the United States, and it was here thought that any formal action by the Congress might be considered out of place as dealing with a matter already acted upon by UNO.

In the past 2 weeks, however, representatives from various communities of the United States appearing before the Preparatory Commission in London have reported that some of the Commission's members were under the impression that the headquarters were not wanted in the United States. When the press, this morning, carried such a suggestion, with the vote of confirmation pending this week, it occurred to me that an official statement should be made at once, and could be made by the adoption of the resolution which I had introduced.

Upon consultation, I found that the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the Speaker the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] were of the same opinion, provided immediate action was agreeable to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That committee was just adjourning its session when I reached the committee room and presented the matter to the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. The chairman immeditely placed the resolution before the committee, which promptly and unanimously voted approval.

The action of the House of Representatives now in passing the resolution by unanimous consent adds further to the wholehearted character of the invitation extended, and will be appreciated, I am sure, by the members of the United Nations Organization and its Preparatory Commission.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss any particular site. I merely wish to say that there are many suitable places in this vast country for a headquarters, and to the one that the United Nations chooses, the United States bids a hearty welcome in the earnest hope that such a location will contribute to the great purposes of the United Nations Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up House Resolution 429 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with this matter, I would like to make an announcement which will probably be of some interest to the Members of the House. That is in respect to the so-called labor bills that have been programed for tomorrow. These bills will be called up in the order in which they have been set down for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] to be in turn yielded by him as he sees fit.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before the House makes in order consideration of the so-called Bulwinkle bill, which has some technical aspects that I shall not attempt to touch upon because they can be better explained by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and by other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. There are, however, some general observations that are of interest to the House and upon which I would like to touch.

This is a bill that directly affects every business in every district represented in the House. Over a period of 50 years, as a matter of convenience, rates have been worked out between the railroads and the shippers by a system that is sometimes referred to as a conference system, or as a system by agreement. Roughly the situation is this: For instance, if I may take a personal example, I live in Kansas City, Mo. There are half a dozen railroads operating between Kansas City and Chicago. From time to time it becomes necessary or desirable to revise the rates on a certain commodity. The members of the railroad association meet and discuss the situation and try as best they can to arrive at an agreement. If they arrive at an agreement of what the new rate will be, shall we say on wheat, they send out notices to interested shippers. That is published in a trade magazine that all railroad traffic men and all shippers read, and the shippers are given an opportunity to come in, to be heard and to protest, if they wish to, and usually, 9 times out of 10, the shippers and the railroads come to an agreement. The rate is then filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and unless a protest is filed and entertained by the Commission and taken cognizance of, the rate becomes effective within 30 days. I can say as a practical matter that it is very seldom that a protest is filed.

Of course, in the aggregate there have been a large number of protests filed, but many, many more rates are accepted without question. No one ever supposed for a moment that this system was illegal. As a practical matter it was the only approach to the rate-making problem between the railroads and the shippers. The railroads would first get together and talk over a rate and then bring in the shippers. But suddenly, along in 1942, when we had some speech-making lawyers in the Attorney General's Office it became apparent from some speeches that this policy which had always been accepted and recognized was under scrutiny. It also became apparent—and bear in mind this is not the administration of Attorney General Clark I am talking about; I am talking about the Biddle administration—that in the midst of the war effort in 1942 the Department of Justice was contemplating the indictment of the railroads under the antitrust statutes. This procedure was stopped by a certificate issued by the Chairman of the War Production Board under the authority of the act and the authority that the Congress had given him, on the grounds and for the reasons that such an action on the part of the Department of Justice would be inimicable to the war effort and highly dangerous and consequently that, of course, brought an end to any criminal prosecution under the antitrust statutes.

Then the Department of Justice in a round-about move, cut off from criminal prosecution, started a civil action by injunction in Lincoln, Nebr. I have forgotten the number of defendants, but it included all of the western railroads, a lot of the individual defendants, I think perhaps two or three hundred, shipping bureaus and what not.

The reason this matter is before the Congress now is because it is highly necessary that the Congress enunciate its policy with respect to fundamental policies of Congress. In the first place we, of course, have jurisdiction of all antitrust matters that affect commerce passing between the several States. In addition and in connection with it we must also examine the Transportation Act as amended in 1940 and the avowed purpose of that act:

It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions; all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy.

We must determine whether and to what extent these rate-making functions shall be excused from and exempt from the terms of the Antitrust Act. It is a misnomer to say that they are to be exempted from the Antitrust Act. That is not correct. If the railroads, if the traffic bureaus, if the rate-finding conferences violate in any way the criminal statutes they of course are as indictable as anyone else. What we are attempting to do here is to say to the railroads and to the shippers, "You can sit around the table as you have for 50 years and work out your rates in a manner that is satisfactory to the roads and the shippers but which in the last analysis must be satisfactory to and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission."

In other words, in an ordinary case where the term "price fixing" is concerned, the interested parties sit around, secretly or otherwise, and arrive at a price, and that is the end of the matter; but in the instant case, where the rate bureaus agree on a rate which is accepted by the shippers, it is true they do it by concert and they do it by agreement, but it is certainly not within the meaning of the usual term "conspiracy" for the very reason that it is done openly. Furthermore, no matter what rate they agree on, it is still subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Commission can always, and frequently does, turn down such a rate. So it is a little hard to see how that necessary practice which has grown up can be called a conspiracy.

Furthermore, as a practical matter, with this complex system of transportation that we have, everything has to be done to effectuate the easy flow of commerce. For instance, suppose you want to go from Washington to St. Louis, we will say, on the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad. You can pick up the timetable and you will see that a certain train runs over the Chesapeake & Ohio. You get in that Pullman. When you get to Cincinnati you are at the end of the Chesapeake & Ohio system, but without any disturbance to you and without getting out of your berth you suddenly find yourself picked up by a New York Central train and taken on into St. Louis.

That does not happen automatically. It can be done only by agreement and concert between the railroads, who must meet and decide how much of that revenue the Chesapeake & Ohio shall keep,

how much the New York Central shall keep, what sort of arrangement shall be made for switching that Pullman car in the city of Cincinnati, and a thousand and one details that go to make up smooth travel.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. It was not quite clear to me whether the gentleman intended to say or did say that even if these agreements were approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission under this bill, yet if they were in violation of the antitrust laws those making the agreements could still be prosecuted?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I tried to make that clear. I certainly intended to say that. Of course, this bill does not exempt or excuse any individual or any railroad or any shipping association from a violation of a criminal statute. All the bill we are considering today does is to provide that railroads and traffic bureaus may get together and enter into agreements as to their procedure, and then the plan of procedure is filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. This, incidentally, is considerably more protection that we have today, because under the present system it is carried on on an informal basis between the railroads and the shipping bureaus and they do not file their agreements of association, or agreements of procedure, with the Commission. All they do now is file the rates. Under this bill they will file their plan of agreement with the Commission, which must approve the plan. After the Commission approves the plan of agreement, an affirmative act on the part of the Commission, the new association which is created by the agreement can begin to function and to file its rates.

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, if the agreement which was made in contravention of the antitrust laws was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that would certainly immunize the railroads from being sued for a violation of the antitrust laws. If the conditions set by the Interstate Commerce Commission were lived up to and were approved, they would be immune from suit.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. According to my understanding of the gentleman's question, if I understand the question, I do not believe I can agree with him. In other words, does the gentleman mean that assuming a subsequent rate-making agreement should be entered into between the railroads or the shipping bureaus which was illegal and which was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, it would exempt that railroad or that association from prosecution?

Mr. O'HARA. I am not speaking of illegality. I am speaking of the agreements being in contravention of the antitrust law. It is my understanding that this bill immunizes those railroads which violate the antitrust laws under the agreement if it were approved.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. No; I cannot agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. The Attorney General said so and so did the attorneys for the railroads.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota is correct, then the railroads cooperating with the Interstate Commerce Commission could wipe out the law, which, as I understand it, they cannot do. Such action would not relieve them from prosecution.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Of course. The gentleman from Kentucky is quite right, as I understand the law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Provided it is not in contravention of the law.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Provided the agreement into which they have entered is a valid, legal, and lawful agreement and not in contravention of the criminal statute.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is a very important distinction. The fact of the matter is that the Government has two broad general policies. One is found in the antitrust law and the other is found in the Transportation Act which undertakes to set up a system of transportation and provide for its regulation.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly in the performance of that second function, that which is done by the carriers involved, should not subject them to prosecution or action for the same action that has been approved by reason of the performance of the other function.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman from Indiana is absolutely right. The distinction I am trying to make is this—that under this bill before us for consideration today, if it becomes law, it will be lawful, of course, for those associations to meet and form agreements, but later if they should overstep the criminal statutes in the fixing of tariffs, then the statute which we are enacting today would not excuse them for their criminal acts. This act merely provides legal sanction for what has been going on informally for 50 years between the railroads and the shippers with this additional precaution and safeguard, and that is that these agreements of association now must be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. That has not been the practice heretofore.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I understand this act seeks to make lawful the agreement reached by the shippers and the railroads in regard to rates. Do I understand the gentleman to say that for some act on the part of the railroads in reaching these agreements that the criminal laws might reach out and become effective against the railroads even though the agreements under this act would be legal? Is that the distinction?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. May I say in reply to the gentleman's question that this act provides it shall be legal for the railroads and the traffic bureaus to meet and to discuss these rates which the Government at the present time in the lawsuit filed by Mr. Biddle in the Lincoln claims is totally illegal.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That practice is perfectly permissible. That is, Congress says by this act that it is perfectly proper and they are encouraged to meet and to form associations for the purpose of agreeing on these rates which must be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. But this act would not relieve them if they went completely outside the policy set up herein and entered into some side agreement or some agreement which was clearly a conspiracy and in restraint of trade.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman does not mean to say that any act done by the railroads or by the shippers in arriving at this legal agreement, which becomes legal because of this act—that none of those acts would be subject to prosecution by the Federal Government, does he?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Does the gentleman mean as long as they stay within the legal field?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I mean acts that are performed in reaching a legal agreement. The gentleman says the agreement is legal because of this act. Does he say that some of the acts performed by the railroad in reaching the legal agreement, when it is legalized by law, that they could be prosecuted for that?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Does the gentleman mean that they cannot be prosecuted for any acts?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Any act leading to the consummation of this legal agreement.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I say they can always be prosecuted for an illegal act.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I cannot follow the gentleman's reasoning.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I call attention to the fact that on page 13 of the report, under "Approval of agreements will not permit violations of Interstate Commerce Act," in the second paragraph there is this language:

> It is important to note in this connection that in the case of a rate association, or any similar joint organization, it is not the rates or other collective actions resulting from the association procedures that the bill contemplates will be submitted by the carriers to the Commission for approval. What is to be submitted in such case is the basic agreement setting up the association and defining the nature and scope of its activities and its mode of procedure. While the approval of that basic agreement by the Commission operates to relieve the parties thereto from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to any action taken thereunder, so long as it is taken in accordance with the agreement and such terms and conditions as the Commission may attach to its approval, it should be noted that the application of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act and other laws is unaffected by the granting of relief from the antitrust laws.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. In other words, the agreement which we are authorizing by this bill to be filed is tantamount to articles of association, or bylaws, or the paper writing that brings them together.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In the light of what the gentleman has just read and what the gentleman himself stated, I understood the gentleman to say that the railroad might be prosecuted under the criminal law for some acts performed in reaching that agreement which you say this act authorizes.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] and myself are talking about two separate things. The bill that we are taking up today has nothing to do with rates, except indirectly. This is a bill that provides that the associations may get together and form their associations and file an agreement. The act I was talking about, which might occur in the future if the railroads or the shipping association were guilty in their rate negotiations at some later date of conspiring in restraint of trade, would still be subject to the criminal statutes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is a different phase of it. I think I understand what you are saying.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. That is precisely what I mean.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thought you meant that any act performed in arriving at that agreement, if that was illegal under criminal statutes, they could still be prosecuted, even though under this act the agreement would be made legal.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. When the gentleman first interrogated me, as I understood him, I thought he was asking whether or not it was my position that these agreements, when entered into, would give the rate bureaus a whitewash as far as any future action was concerned with reference to rates.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No. My question went to acts that might be in violation of the criminal statutes in arriving at the agreement. That is the point I was making.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I am sorry, but I must yield some of my time, and I must finish.

If the Members will look at the report which has been filed, they will see the longest list of supporters for this legislation that I have ever seen for any bill since I have been a Member of the House. I dare say you will find your own chamber of commerce, you will find shipping boards and bureaus in your own district, you will find various trade associations in favor of it. As a matter of fact, the only person or association I know who is opposed to it is the Governor of Georgia, Governor Arnall. Governor Arnall sent a wire to the chairman of the subcommittee, to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]——

Mr. GOSSETT. I was going to remind the gentleman that the Department of Justice is opposed to it.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. If the gentleman can make anything out of what the Department of Justice says in this report, the gentleman is better than I. I do not want to use the phrase "double talk," but it is ambiguous, at any rate.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I cannot yield further.

Getting back to the leading opponent of this legislation, Governor Arnall sent a wire to the gentleman from North Carolina, chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. He did not send it to me.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Or to the committee and asked that his opposition be recorded. It was recorded in the record. The committee notified him that he could appear, but he was unable to appear. He wanted hearings a month or so later. All we know about the Governor, however, is the telegram that appears.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I cannot yield further because I already have more requests for time than I can grant.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has made a misstatement that should be corrected.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman in his own time can state his position far better and more eloquently than I.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman does not care to have the facts stated properly that is something for him to decide.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. I ask the membership at any rate to skim through the index of the hearings. There you will get an idea of the associations that are favoring it. I also may say that it has the unanimous approval of all of the railroad brotherhoods. As a matter of fact I have one wire that was delivered to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee since we were here from George M. Harrison who is the head of the Brotherhood of Railroad Clerks, in which he states:

> Practical considerations warrant enactment of your bill, H. R. 2536. The public interest is adequately safeguarded by the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act relative to suspension or approval of any collective arrangement instituted.

There are adequate safeguards here. This is a bill that merely seeks to effectuate a policy which has been in practice and which has worked well for the past 50 years. Furthermore, it is more earnestly requested by the shippers' association than by the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri reserves 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as are most bills coming from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee dealing with the intricate matters of regulation of carriers, this bill is rather technical. However, I believe that the issue here involved can be presented so that without understanding all of the details there can be a clear understanding of the real issue.

Let us go back over a little history. When the railroads were first being built they were, of course, built by private individuals as a matter of private initiative. Most of them were built originally to carry passengers and not freight. At the outset, if you wanted to ship something on a railroad, you went to the railroad agent, he took a look at your package and told you what he would charge you to carry it. That developed a system of competition, free competition, unregulated, that began to develop many abuses, discriminations, and preferences.

As the railroads developed, it became necessary to bring about fair regulation by Federal authority, so the Interstate Commerce Act was passed by the Congress of the United States.

We set up the Interstate Commerce Commission to apply that law and to regulate the carriers. It is the theory of the regulation of public utilities that there shall be a constant revision of rates downward in the interest of the public. I think it is likewise elemental that you cannot have in respect to a utility that complete freedom of competition that existed when the railroads were first built and at the same time have governmental regulation. When you undertake regulation, then you say to the public, "We are going to fix the rates; we are going to determine by rule and regulation how this operation shall be carried on."

After the ICC was created, the matter of working out rates became most important, and as we have progressed in our development of transportation we discovered as a practical matter that instead of having the Commission, on its own initiative, undertake to fix every rate, and rates involving competitive situations, it would be much better and much more effective if the initiation were left to the carriers themselves. They get together in these various bureaus, or conferences, or whatever they may be called in any given locality, to determine what the rates shall be and to determine other matters. This is subject always to the superior authority of the Government vested in the Commission and subject always to the right of any individual or party to that agreement to vary from it upon notice to the Interstate Commerce Commission if it so desires to do, and further subject, of course, in its individual action to the superior governmental position and domination of the Commission itself.

That system has worked very well. It has suited the purposes of the shippers. It has suited the purpose of the consuming public. It has suited the purposes of the carriers themselves.

Let me just point out to you one matter. Do you suppose that the New York Central Railroad could determine the kind of a car coupler it wanted to buy unless all of the railroads used the same sort of a coupler?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in other words, the New York Central car, when it starts across the country, has to hook on to the car of some other railroad or railroads. So all of the railroads, when they get ready to decide what sort of a car coupler they are going to

have, of necessity must agree on one kind of a car coupler, then use that one.

There are five different railroads or routes between St. Louis and Kansas City over which one may ship. Would it be in keeping with the declared governmental purpose of the regulation of those carriers if one of them would have one rate for that route and another one some other rate? Is it not absolutely necessary that those rates be adjusted and fixed at the same level? That is what has been done subject always to the control of the ICC.

Everyone thought that was perfectly legal, proper, and in the public interest until somebody in the Department of Justice came up with the suggestion that those agreements are in violation of the antitrust law. They are not so in violation at all, in my opinion. Some may contend that the Government will win that suit out at Lincoln, Nebr. I do not think the Government can win it.

But since suit has been filed, since the contention has been made, it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to say definitely what the policy is and to provide the terms under which we shall continue the regulation of the carriers that will be affected by this legislation.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Is it not true that in the absence of this legislation we presently have we would have an intolerable situation?

Mr. HALLECK. No carrier could tell where he stood. While I think that the court should decide against the Government, the court has decided a number of things differently from the way I would have decided them. So certainly this is the time for the Congress of the United States to resolve the proposition and say definitely what the effect of the statute shall be.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that where you have two competing railroads, we will say, going from Washington to Pittsburgh, the B. & O. having a shorter mileage than the Pennsylvania, that they both sell tickets at the same price? As a business proposition, the line having the shorter mileage could outsell the other railroad. I see nothing wrong with that sort of competition so long as they compete. It is right they should have the same rate, or one would be practically put out of business; is that not a fact?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is the competitive situation that has been cared for in the making of rates, and certainly if that were not followed we would have confusion and chaos on every hand.

Mr. RICH. That follows the same reasoning the gentleman applied to Kansas City.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. We all recognize the purpose of the antitrust laws. It is to prevent in those areas where competition should be maintained agreements that are against the public interest in the way of price fixing, and so forth. But this is not in that sort of a field. This is in a field where the Government has undertaken to fix the rates and supervise the whole operation, where we have created an authority to apply the statutes that we have enacted. This bill clearly reserves to the Interstate Commerce Commission complete authority and control over these agreements that are to be made. Any one of them, at any time, is first of all subject to the approval of the Commission. Secondly, if at any time the Commission, either on its own initiative, or by complaint made, determines that an arrangement or an agreement entered into should be changed, the power is in the Commission to effect that change.

Some question was raised about the immunizing effect of this proposal. Let me put it this way. It is designed to immunize the making of these agreements in compliance with our declared transportation policy as applied by one agency of the United States from a prosecution by another branch of the Government of the United States for doing the very thing approved by an agency of the Government, the Interstate Commerce Commission, created by and administering the law enacted by the Congress. My memory may not serve me quite correctly, but back in some earlier days did not one branch of the Government, the NRA, say to the oil companies, "You get together and stabilize prices." They thought they were doing it in compliance with a governmental policy only one day to wake up and find themselves being prosecuted for having done the very thing that an agency of the Government asked them to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it always has been my policy to give the Members of the House an opportunity to pass on any important proposed legislation. I have not opposed and I am not opposing this rule, but I feel duty bound to call attention to a few matters that should be of interest to all those who may later have the chance to vote on this bill. I know the rule will be adopted, and, in view of what has been going on, I believe the bill will pass.

Personally I regret exceedingly that I am obliged to take the 5 minutes that have been given me, because I have confidence in the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who reported the bill. I think he is a sound, well-informed legislator. He has been my friend for many years, and I know he constantly strives to do the right thing by the country, and especially the people of his own district, and more power to him. But in this instance, after mature consideration, I sincerely feel that the railroads have done fairly well under present conditions. Only yesterday I read that they have $1,350,000,000 more working capital than they had in 1939, this notwithstanding the fact that they have paid back interest on many of their bonds and have paid dividends on many stocks on which heretofore dividends were not paid.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. May I say, first, that I am a member of the committee that has brought out this bill. In view of the statement the gentleman made about the railroads doing very well as to their obligations, let us not get the impression that this is a bill to take care of the railroads. It is a bill to review the agreements between the carriers and the shippers. In the gentleman opposing the bill on the ground that it will benefit the railroads if at the same time it will benefit the general public and everybody involved?

Mr. SABATH. If I thought it would benefit the general public I would not stand here and say a word about it, but I am fearful that this proposed legislation has been urged and recommended by the officers of the various railroads, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and many others who are always seeking additional advantage. Knowing the efforts that have been made, the lobbying that has been done, and what I have been subjected to in the interest of this bill by some of my best friends, naturally I should be for the bill, but I cannot honestly be for it because I feel that it is not in the best interest of the public.

The railroads now control one-half of the trucking, or perhaps 40 percent, but it is in the making for them to control the rest of the trucking, so they will have all the facilities; they will have the railroads, they will have the trucks, they will have all transportation under their control, and they will be given the privilege of setting their own rates at whatever they feel like charging. It is said that the Commission will have the right to pass upon whether these rates or agreements are within the law, but you know how long it would take before action would be taken to change the rates or to make the railroads realize they have overstepped the pledges and promises they have given to the people under this bill.

We have not only the protest of Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia, strong editorials in newspapers, a strong attack by former Special Assistant to the Attorney General Arne C. Wipend, but also the adverse recommendation of the Attorney General.

The banking interests favor this proposed bill, which pleases the Republican leaders; all of which makes me fear and satisfies me that the bill cannot be in the interest of the general public.

Unfortunately, when there is any bill in the interest of the railroads, like the land-grant bill, we go ahead full speed and pass it.

Anyway, I hope those who have endorsed this proposed bill and are sponsoring it, and who allege it will accomplish good for the general public, may find they are right and I am wrong.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) with Mr. ZIMMERMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there evidently is a little misapprehension as evidenced by the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois caused largely possibly by the fact that the gentleman has not studied the bill or the report. Let me remind the Committee that conferences between the carriers have been carried on for 50 years or more. Let me show you the necessity of these conferences. Consider the simple matter of services first. I may want to buy a ticket from here to San Francisco. I may go over three railroads. Somebody has had a conference, because I can go to the ticket office and buy a ticket all the way through. Somebody has had a conference because if there had not been a conference I would have to go to the station here in Washington and buy a ticket, let us say to Chicago. Then at that station I would buy another ticket, and probably somewhere else along the line I would have to buy still another ticket. It makes no difference whether these conferences have been for services or rates. These questions have been gone into during the years by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which by the way is not an executive branch of the Government, but is an arm of Congress because Congress realized that it would not have the time to go into this nor the means to go into it, but established the Interstae Commerce Commission as our agency to go into these questions.

Suppose we were to take the idea advanced by those gentlemen who may oppose the bill. I do not know what they are going to say, but they will stand up and tell you that these conferences are absolutely ruinous to the country. That will not do. The clerk of this committee gave 10 days' notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of these hearings. People came from all parts of the country—shippers, paying their own expenses from California and Washington, and from every State in the Union, because they realized the necessity for this legislation. They knew that those who would claim that these conferences were in violation of the antitrust laws, proposed nothing in its place. If nothing else was proposed, and the whole thing was wiped out, chaos would result in the entire country, both in the passenger and freight service, the railroads, motor carriers, as well as coastwise shipping.

Not only did those shippers come, but every railroad and every utility commission of every State in the Union was represented here. A number of the individual railroad or utility commissioners came here in person, from Arkansas, Mississippi, Washington, Oregon, and all parts of the country. Do you think for 1 minute those men would have come here to support a bill which would absolutely ruin their States? Assuredly not.

Who else came? Representatives of the agricultural commissioners of the United States, representing all the farm commissioners of every State in the Union. Do you think that organization would have endorsed a bill which would have ruined them? Surely not. They know what they are doing. The truckers came. You will say they are interested parties, but they are not any more interested than the shippers. You will say the railroads are interested, but they are not a bit more interested than are the shippers.

Those are the people who came here in support of the bill. The hearings were open to anyone. There is not a member of that subcommittee, consisting of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], representing the minority, and I, representing the majority party, who would have denied a hearing to anybody. It was advertised in the papers, yet I have read in some of the papers that some were refused a hearing. That will not do. To be frank, I wanted some of them to come, because I really wanted to examine them. But they did not come.

I failed to mention that the Interstate Commerce Commission is supporting the bill. Now, let us analyze the personnel of that Commission, just to see who compose it.

I am taking the southern member of that commission: Dr. Splawn, of Texas. Does anyone dare say he would sell out his State? J. Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina. Does anyone say he would sell out of his State or the South? Rogers, of Tennessee. Does anyone think for a minute that he would sell out Tennessee and the Southern States? Alldredge, of Alabama. Does anyone think he would? You know as well as I know that these men, as well as the others are men of high character, men whom we put there, who were put there on the agency of the Congress. In addition to that, I may mention another gentleman of whom I am very fond, Commissioner Lea, who was born in my district in North Carolina, who knows the South and the southern people. This is what I want to give to you, that when you hear this talk you can think about who supports it. What was the reason and the necessity for it? Because there were two suits, and I may say to you that before suit was started back in 1942 I introduced a bill calling it, if you please, the legalizing of rate conferences, before anything was done about the same time a bill was introduced in the Senate. Joseph P. Eastman, who was to my mind one of the greatest commissioners we have ever had, testified before the Senate Committee, and here is what he said:

> I am wholly convinced that if the carriers of the country are to respond to the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the Interstate Commerce Act, and if the rate structure is to be reasonably free from unjust discrimination or undue preference and prejudice, as simple and consistent as may be reasonably stable and sufficient for the financial needs of private ownership and operation, the carriers must be in a position to counsel, confer, and deal collectively with many phases of the matter and that while the ultimate right of individual action should be scrupulously observed, it is desirable that such action should not be taken without prior notice to fellow carriers and shippers and an opportunity for them to express their views.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Gladly.

Mr. WALTER. Is there anything in this legislation to prevent the Department of Justice from scrutinizing agreements in order to determine whether or not the antitrust laws have been violated?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The bill, as drawn, provides that these conferences that have been in existence can continue to be in existence if as they call it the "agreement" beforehand is filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and under their rules and regulations they proceed in the conference.

I may say to the gentleman also that the Commission is well qualified, having had past experience in dealing with this subject, to lay down the rules as to how these conferences shall be conducted and agreements entered into. If they follow the agreement which has been submitted to, and which has been approved by, the Interstate Commerce Commission, then they are absolved from any violations of the Antitrust law; but if they go beyond that, they are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself seven additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the whole act is drawn on a regulated conference; and I may say to the gentleman further, because I know that many have not had the time to read the hearings, that Mr. J. Van Norman, an attorney of 40 years' practice, said and reiterated that he did not like these unregulated conferences. Mr. Van Norman was and has been attorney for the southern governors in their rate cases, and he supports this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the Members that in our national transportation policy which this Congress adopted in 1940, and which, to my mind, is the greatest declaration of transportation policy that the Government or any State has enacted, there is stated the following:

> It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service, and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions—all to the

end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy.

This is the beacon light which must guide the Interstate Commerce Commission if this bill is passed; this is the guide is must look forward to.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to talk about some of the things I have read, namely, one or two telegrams to the effect that you are destroying the States in this and other things. But not one of these men has dared to come up here and propose anything in its place. Would you gentlemen who oppose this measure abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission? If you do not have conferences, then tell this Committee what you would have in their places. If you do not have conferences, then tell this committee what will happen to the transportation systems of this country. Oh, it is easy to stand up here and speak and say that you will be ruined. The country will not be ruined. The conferences will be regulated.

I would like to speak and go back to the time when they had this rate competition which proved destructive to the Nation. But the Congress itself has seen fit to establish a national policy—a policy for its own agency and for the people of the country. The bill is safe. The bill is sound. Ask any man who differs what you would have in its place.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 19 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I should like to point out that never since I have served on that committee has there been a bill of major importance which has received more unanimous endorsement from all of those who would be affected by its provisions than the present bill. Most bills which come before our committee are controversial and have adherents on both sides of the question involved. The bill, H. R. 2536, now under consideration, has had practically universal endorsement and acclaim on the part of those who would be affected by its provisions, namely, transportation users, carriers, and those governmental agencies, both State and National, who are concerned with the regulation of transportation.

The two Federal agencies, that is, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation, which have to do with the regulation of transportation, appeared before our committee and each gave strong endorsement to this measure.

Commissioner Joseph B. Eastman, now deceased, and who during his service as a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce Commission always showed a great interest in protecting the rights and interests of the public, in his testimony on S. 942 before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in 1943, said:

It must be clear to any reasonable man that a carrier cannot respond to all the duties imposed by law if the individual carrier acts in a vacuum. It is a situation which, under all the conditions, plainly calls for consultation, conference, and organization and for many acts of a joint or cooperative character * * *.

I am wholly convinced that if the carriers of the country are to respond to the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the Interstate Commerce Act, and if the rate structure is to be reasonable, free from unjust discrimination or undue preference and prejudice, as simple and consistent as may be, reasonably stable, and sufficient for the financial needs of private ownership and operation, the carriers must be in a position to consult, confer, and deal collectively with many phases of the matter, and that while the ultimate right of individual action should be scrupulously preserved, it is desirable that such action should not be taken without prior notice to fellow carriers and shippers and an opportunity for them to express their views.

Commissioner Clyde B. Aitchison, testifying for the Interstate Commerce Commission at the hearing on this bill—see page 13—referred to the existing provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act under which antitrust law relief is granted in the case of certain types of actions, and then said:

But there are other important matters as to which in the public interest there should be collective action, that are not specifically covered by any provisions for exemption. We may mention the conferences and agreements looking to provision of car service, mine ratings, and the pooling of cars, and rules for car interchange; the avoidance of wastes due to the excess of competitive zeal in provision of service or use of wasteful routes; the adoption of contsruction and operating standards and rules; uniform accounting practices; weighing and inspection of freight; imposition and collection of demurrage; uniformity of classifications for freight, and rules applicable thereto, such as bills of lading and packing requirements; and lastly, the whole field of cooperative rate initiation and maintenance.

In recent years the legislative and economic trends have been toward a greater uniformity in the rate structure of the country, and for a more stable basis for competition between the various carriers of the same or of different types. The initiative often should be taken by the carriers themselves, after conference with their patrons. Collective conference, consideration, and agreement, subject to Commission approval, will facilitate these processes.

The carriers should be permitted to do collectively and fearlessly that which the law as expressed in the Interstate Commerce Act requires of them, in the large way contemplated by the spirit of the whole act and in conformity with the national transportation policy. But they should be permitted to do this in a manner consistent with the public interest, openly, fairly, without coercion, and so as to preserve the essentials of private enterprise within the permissible bounds of the law. Therefore, in permitting them to act collectively, proper safeguards should be set up to prevent reprehensible practices through the joint action of carriers or their organizations. We find such safeguards have been provided in the Interstate Commerce Act wherever, as in section 5, the Commission has been empowered to give approval to an arrangement which otherwise would be counter to the antitrust acts of a State or the Federal Government. That its approval will have a dispensatory effect as to an important act of Congress will lay an additional heavy responsibility upon the administrative agency charged with these duties. But it is a responsibility which should be lodged with the Commission under appropriate directions from the Congress, for Congress itself cannot well consider or deal with the details of these intercarrier arrangements. As has been pointed out, the Commission already has many like duties. We note that responsibilities similar in kind were lodged with the Maritime Commission under the Shipping Act of 1916 (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 814) and with the Civil Aeronautics Board (U. S. C., title 49, secs. 492–494).

Director Johnson, of Defense Transportation, who is also a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, stated—page 391—that without attempting "to evaluate the various factors which contributed to the magnificent record of wartime transportation," he felt justified in expressing the opinion that "the task could never have been performed adequately in the absence of machinery and procedures for joint and collective action among the various carriers." He expressed the view—page 392—that "no one who is familiar with the history of regulated transportation can offer any valid dissent" to the object of the bill. He stated further that:

Rate bureaus and similar carriers organizations have existed and functioned for years. They have in general the full support of shippers, regulatory commissions, and regulated carriers alike. They are in my opinion a creature of necessity. I cannot conceive of the regulated carriers of the country conforming to the duties and obligations imposed upon them by the Interstate Commerce Act unless they are in a position to consult, and deal collectively with many phases of the matter.

The two largest Federal Government users of transportation, namely, the Army and the Navy, have given their full endorsement to this legislation.

Admiral Mitchell—page 388—after referring to the "enormous Navy tonnage" handled by the railroads and motor carriers, stated that "the joint agencies and committees provided by the railroads as well as the motor carriers, which organizations permitted the Navy to deal with such carriers in groups or as a unit, immeasurably expedited and simplified the Navy's wartime transportation problem."

This, he said, made it possible for rate adjustments, car service and equipment matters, tracing armed guard movements, diversions and special service restrictions to be handled with carrier organizations which represented all or a substantial group of carriers; that "this enabled the Navy to treat the Nation's carriers as an integrated transportation system."

He added that in his judgment "the job could not have been done in any other way, and I am pleased to pay deserved tribute to the carriers and their representatives for a cooperative, patriotic, and effective effort."

General Gross—page 389—characterized the rail system of the country as being "utterly indispensable to the war effort," and stated that in his judgment the success of the railroads in meeting the unparalleled demands of the war was due to cooperative action between them that closely approached unification. He said:

We had a close approach to a national transportation system; and I give credit to the railroads' formation of the Association

of American Railroads and the various machinery that they adopted—regional in character—in order to exercise that unity of effort.

State regulatory commissions and their national organization, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, were represented in the hearings, strongly favoring the passage of the bill.

Frederick G. Hawley, general solicitor, National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, testified in part as follows:

In the view of the association, H. R. 2536, now before this committee, provides the necessary regulation of carrier and freight-forwarder agreements, and it then provides, rightly, that such agreements, when carried out in accordance with such regulations, shall be free of the threat of anti-trust-law violations.

All of the carriers affected by the provisions of the bill were represented at the hearings and urged its passage. The railroad brotherhoods came before us and likewise urged the passage of the bill.

John T. Corbett, representing the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, testified:

The provisions of the bill H. R. 2536 have been given the consideration of the national legislative board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and have requested that I inform the committee that the bill has been approved by the organization and that the brotherhood respectfully requests that this committee and the Congress shall give this legislation favorable consideration and that the bill may be passed.

Today we are in receipt of a telegram from George M. Harrison, head of the Railway Labor Executives, reading as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *December 6, 1945.*
Hon. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE,
House office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Practical considerations warrant enactment your bill H. R. 2536. The public interest is adequately safeguarded under provisions for Interstate Commerce Commission review, suspension or approval of any collective arrangements instituted.
GEO. M. HARRISON.

Shippers organizations from every one of the 48 States, the National Industrial Traffic League, the National Association of Shippers Advisory Boards, and the Associated Traffic Clubs of America petitioned the committee on the individual Members of Congress to enact this legislation.

Mr. John B. Keeler, president of the National Industrial Traffic League, a national organization of shippers with members in all parts of the United States, stated in the hearings—see page 200:

As president of the League I am in active touch with representatives of shippers throughout the United States. I know the issues upon which they differ and those upon which they agree, and I say to this committee with all the sincerity and earnestness at my command that the shippers of this Nation strongly endorse the principles and objectives of the Bulwinkle bill and they are going to do everything they can to see that these are adopted.

Chambers of commerce from all the 48 States likewise favor the bill. Mr. Charles R. Seal, the transportation director of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce—page 304—who was speaking also for the North Atlantic Ports Conference of which he was chairman:

If legislation such as proposed by this bill is not passed, and thereafter the present rate-making procedures of the railroads and other carriers should be caused to be condemned under the antitrust laws, I can think of nothing that would have a more destructive effect upon the interests of the shippers of the country, or be a greater disservice to them or a greater interference with the carrying out of the transportation policies of the Congress and compliance by the carriers with the requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act.

There is convincing evidence in the hearings not only that the various types of joint organizations maintained by the carriers are necessary to enable them to meet the commercial requirements of the Nation, but also that they are indispensable to the requirements of the national defense.

The great national farm and agricultural organizations and a great many of their State affiliates expressed themselves strongly in favor of the bill:

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is a conference body representing 4,600 farmer cooperative associations organized under Federal and State statutes who are engaged in marketing the products and purchasing the production supplies of 2,300,000 members.

Members of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives are large and important shippers and receivers of agricultural commodities and farm supplies, and are, therefore, directly and substantially interested in the maintenance of adequate, efficient, and economical transportation via all types of carriers.

The provisions of H. R. 2536 have had the attention and consideration of the transportation committee of the national council, composed of traffic officers of cooperative associations. After several months devoted to canvass of membership and discussion, this committee early in July reached certain conclusions and made specific recommendations, which then were submitted to and unanimously approved by the executive committee of the council, who directed the transportation committee to represent the council before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

We believe the principal purpose of the Bulwinkle bill is to provide express statutory recognition of a traditional procedure of handling of proposals by either shippers or carriers for changes in rates, rules, or regulations under appropriate control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This procedure has been developed by the carriers over a period of many years, and in actual practice conferences and associations have been established providing a system of advance notice to interested persons and a forum for discussion, hearing, consideration, and cooperation between shippers and carriers on proposed rate changes before they are published in tariff form. After any changes are published and filed the regulatory powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission can be invoked.

After suggesting certain provisions, and which have been adopted by the committee, he further said:

We believe that the enactment of the Bulwinkle bill, with the safeguards we have proposed, would be in the interests of the members of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and shippers and receivers of agricultural commodities and farm supplies.

Thousands of individuals, both large and small users of transportation, have urged the Congress to pass the bill.

Against this overwhelming sentiment for passage, the committee heard only two individual voices raised in opposition. The Governor of Georgia sent a telegram to the clerk of the committee, in which his opposition to the bill was based on conclusions not justified by any of the developments brought out in the extensive hearings of the committee. The Attorney General of the United States sent a letter in which he objected to certain language in the bill, some of which was subsequently changed, by amendments made by the committee, but in the conclusion of which he very fairly and properly said, and I quote:

I say this in full recognition, of course, of the fact that the proposed legislation presents important questions of public policy which only the Congress should decide.

I believe that this House, as well as the Attorney General, realizes that this is a problem for the Congress.

Let us analyze the reasoning which underlies the overwhelming support the bill has received. For half a century the railroads, and later, the motor carriers, of this country have conducted certain phases of their business, notably, the rate-making phase, through the so-called conference method. This conference method amounts simply to a shipper or a carrier suggesting a new rate or a change from an old rate. The shippers and carriers affected by the proposed new rate or change from the old rate sit down around a conference table and discuss the matter. Out of such discussion comes the rate changes generally to be charged, with the all-important reservation in the public interest that any carrier may take independent action and not be bound by the determination of the conference; at the same time, preserving to any shipper or carrier the right of appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Whatever rate may be established by this conference system is then published in tariff form and any party, either the proposing shipper, or another shipper who has an interest in such rate, or any other carrier affected by such rate, may object to the Commission by so little effort as a penny postal card and be given a hearing before the rate becomes effective.

Such procedure has been in use for upward of a half century and no substitute has ever been found which would more adequately protect the shippers and receivers of freight.

Because the system has been so fair and has resulted to the mutual benefit of shippers and carriers, its preservation by means of the legislation here before us is the reason for the practically unanimous support given to this bill.

Let me point out one more feature of the bill by referring to the language it contains in section 2 of the amended bill, and I quote:

(2) Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers, may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is

not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5)) if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (8) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to enable it to grant its approval in accordance with the standard above set forth in this paragraph.

The proponents of the bill—these thousands of shippers, all the carriers affected, the railroad brotherhoods, the great farm organizations, the Federal and State regulatory commissions—all thought, and still think, that the conference system is not in conflict with the national transportation policy declared by Congress. At the same time, the proponents of the bill and your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce realize that a possible conflict exists between a strict or technical interpretation of the antitrust laws and the declaration of transportation policy, but only so far as the technical side of the question is concerned. This question, we feel, should be resolved on a basis that protects the interest of the large and small shippers of the United States, ever bearing in mind that their interest and the public interest is protected by the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act giving it jurisdiction and which this bill does not change, to the end that we will continue to have a sound transportation system, through the passage of this bill.

There has been some public discussion by persons now and formerly associated with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice which might lead the public to believe that the carriers will escape some regulations presently imposed by law if this bill passes. Let me point out that quite the contrary is true. The conference method is not now subject to any regulatory authority under existing law. Today, only the results obtained through the conference, and not the system under which the conferences operate, are regulated by law. This bill would place rate bureaus and other carrier conference systems under regulations by the Interstate Commerce Commission, if their deliberations are to be exempt from the operation of the antitrust laws.

Passage of H. R. 2536 will give the Commission authority to regulate these conference systems from their inception, all the way through their deliberation, as well as the resulting rate or other agreement. Under the terms of the bill, if the Commission does not give approval or after giving approval, subsequently withdraws approval, the antitrust laws are to have full force and effect. Because governmental authorities dealing with transportation, and shippers throughout the country realize that the carriers of this Nation must, in order to provide the most efficient transportation service, enter into joint services, share joint facilities, publish joint charges—that literally, these carriers must conduct themselves as they have for the past half century by conferring and cooperating with one another and with shippers, that these conferences and practices should be under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and when approved by the Commission, should not be subject to attack from any other source—they all favor passage of H. R. 2536.

The antitrust laws, after the passage of this bill, will still apply to the business of transportation except in those instances where the Congress has found through its agent, the Interstate Commerce Commission, that the application in a particular instance would place an obstacle in the way of the development and operation of an efficient national system of regulated transportation. The passage of this bill merely makes possible the carrying out of the declared policy of the Congress and should have the approval of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to compliment the gentleman upon his splendid presentation on an ordinarily uninteresting and technical bill. I know of no bill coming before the Congress in recent years that has been more thoroughly and more understandably explained than this bill, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], the author of the bill, and the ranking minority member the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]; and I hope we may have more presentations of that type. The gentleman from New Jersey has made an argument, rather than delivered a speech.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the pending legislation, H. R. 2536, should not be enacted. I make this statement with full realization of the fact that an ostensibly strong case has been built up in the hearings and in the report of the committee for the enactment of the bill. Transportation rates and legislation and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating thereto represent a subject matter of so complex a nature that there is oftentimes a disposition on the part of those who are not specially trained in the study of such problems to act without questioning the judgment of those who have had such training and who have specialized in their study and attempted solution. This class of specially trained persons is largely engaged in employment of the type which is benefited by whatever is done to improve the financial status of our common carriers. Such interested persons usually furnish most of the evidence adduced upon hearings such as were held in connection with the pending bill or assist in the preparation of evidence submitted by other individuals whose interests are not selfish but who are not fully advised as to all the issues involved before they are induced to declare their positions. It does not, therefore, impress me as being conclusive argument in favor of such a bill, that there has been skillfully developed an apparently strong case in favor of its enactment.

Beneath all of the wealth of words which have been placed in the 419 pages of hearings on this bill and beneath the plausible language of the skillfully prepared committee report, I seem to find one outstanding purpose, and that purpose is to defeat certain actions instituted by the Federal Government and by the State of Georgia based in large part upon alleged violations of law by certain railroads of the United States. I recognize the good faith of many of those who feel that those actions should be defeated, although I do not agree with them. Even if I felt that they should be defeated, I do not believe in the enactment of any legislation to absolve anybody from responsibility for violations of the law by the simple expedient of exempting them from the provisions of the laws they are alleged to have violated. I think that in the pending suits of United States against the Association of American Railroads and others, instituted in the District Court of the United States in the District of Nebraska, and of the State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and others, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, the game should be played out according to the rules as they existed at the time they began.

I desire to cite a portion of the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this bill which, together with other statements made in the report, justifies the statement which I have just made. It reads as follows:

A few years ago, however, certain officials of the Department of Justice, in speeches delivered in various parts of the country and in other ways, began to question the legality under the antitrust laws of the cooperative activities carried on by the carriers through various joint organizations, and more particularly through their rate associations. Late in 1942, when the country was in the midst of the war and dependent to a great extent upon its transportation system for the successful prosecution thereof, the Department of Justice took steps toward securing indictments under the antitrust laws against various railroads and motor carriers because of activities conducted by them through certain of their rate associations. Its efforts in that direction were temporarily stayed as the result of the issuance on March 20, 1943, of certificate 44 by the Chairman of the War Production Board under the act of June 11, 1942, entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes." Subsequently, however, the Department instituted a civil suit under the antitrust laws against various western railroads and others, which raises questions as to the legality of railroad rate associations and other types of joint agencies maintained by railroads. The legality under the antitrust laws of certain rate association activities has also been brought into question in a suit recently brought in the Supreme Court by the State of Georgia against numerous railroads.

These developments have caused grave concern among all those having direct interest in transportation, who see in the situation a threat to long-standing practices

in the transportation industry that were developed in cooperation with the shippers and have proved their worth. This concern is evidenced by the views expressed by the shipping and business interests of the country, and by governmental authorities, during the hearings on this bill.

It is, I think, manifest that the principal purpose of the pending bill is the exemption contained in paragraph 8 of carriers from the operation of the antitrust laws when agreements to which they are parties have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I do not believe that the proponents of the bill will seriously question that statement. The Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Tom Clark, in a statement which he submitted to the committee by its request which appears on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the hearings, indicated strongly his opposition to the bill as written. His full statement is worthy of attention by every Member of the House, although it was given little if any weight by the committee. For the RECORD, I desire to quote the following portions of his statement:

Another important policy question is presented in that the enactment of the bill would render all carrier and freight forwarder agreements, entered into with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, exempt from the antitrust laws. Under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, carriers are already relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to agreements for pooling, divisions, mergers, acquisitions, etc., if approved by the Commission. H. R. 2536 is framed in such broad terms as to permit the extension, under agreements approved by the Commission, of the immunity with respect to the making and carrying out of all other agreements. And such immunity under such approved agreements would apply not only to the carriers, parties to the agreements, but also to undefined "other persons."

The policy question, therefore, arising under H. R. 2536 is whether to afford the railroad, motor-carrier, water-carrier, and freight-forwarder industries such an opportunity for obtaining exemption from the antitrust laws. The question of establishing a precedent, inviting other groups to demand machinery for immunity, is also presented.

The Antitrust Division has made an extensive investigation of rate conferences, rate bureaus, associations, and other combinations in the transportation industry. This investigation discloses that through numerous rate bureaus and associations a Nation-wide system of private rate making has developed in the transportation industry resulting, the Department believes, in the absence of competition among competing carriers. There have been, the Department believes, numerous violations of the antitrust laws.

As a result of this investigation the Department has instituted an action (*United States* v. *The Association of American Railroads et al.*, in the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska) to enjoin the combinations, alleged to consist of railroads, associations, and bankers, from violating the antitrust laws through preventing rate reductions and in coercively imposing higher rates and fares for the western district than for comparable services in the eastern district, in preventing individual carriers from improving the railroad service, in suppressing technological improvements, and in hindering and preventing the development of motor vehicle and other modes of transportation competitive with the railroads.

The State of Georgia, in the decision of the Supreme Court (*State of Georgia* v. *The Pennsylvania R. R. Co. et al.* (324 U. S. 439, 65 S. Ct. 716), has obtained leave to file a suit in that Court, seeking to enjoin private combinations in the industry from fixing noncompetitive rates, charged in the bill of complaint to be discriminatory against the State of Georgia, its ports, and its people, resulting in holding Georgia's "economy in a state of arrested development."

It is suggested that H. R. 2536 should be carefully considered by the Congress in relation to these suits.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman be so kind as to put the entire letter of the Attorney General in the RECORD?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the entire letter from the Attorney General is printed on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the hearings. I am quoting for the purposes of my speech the portion of the letter which it occurs to me contains the substance of his observations and recommendations.

I am, of course, particularly interested in the suit instituted by the State of Georgia. Many of us in the South and West have hoped that through the institution of this action relief may be obtained from freight-rate discriminations that are intolerable.

I think it is generally recognized that the enactment of the pending bill would cut the ground out from under the basis in law upon which the allegation of the State's complaints has been founded.

It is impossible for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to read at this time for your information, a statement of the allegations made in this suit or the opinion of the majority of the Supreme Court rendered on March 26, 1945, in connection with its assumption of jurisdiction in the case, and yet I feel that every Member of this House, before he votes upon the pending bill, ought to read that opinion.

It is insisted by the proponents of the bill that the pending measure was introduced on March 8, 1945, before this opinion was rendered. However, it was not introduced before the suit had been instituted by the State of Georgia and the quotations from the committee's report clearly indicate its purpose to destroy the bases, not only for this suit but for others of like kind.

In order that the country, as well as Members of Congress who are interested, may be advised as to the nature of that suit, I am herewith inserting in the RECORD, under permission granted me in the House, extracts from allegations and prayers of the suit, and from exhibits attached thereto.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I know the gentleman wants to keep the record straight.

Mr. TARVER. That is my purpose.

Mr. BULWINKLE. More than a year before any suit was instituted I introduced a bill.

Mr. TARVER. The bill introduced by the gentleman more than a year before any suit was instituted was not in the same form, I am advised, as the bill which is now receiving consideration.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But it applied to rates.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, yes; it was applicable to rates, but it did not have as its primary purpose the destroying of jurisdiction of the courts to consider the suits which have been instituted by the United States and by the State of Georgia.

I am inserting in the RECORD parts of the petition and of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Georgia case.

They are as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA, COMPLAINANT, VS. PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD CO. ET AL., DEFENDANTS—IN SUPREME COURT, UNITED STATES, OCTOBER TERM, 1944

EXCERPTS FROM MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BILL OF COMPLAINT AND BILL OF COMPLAINT

(5) All of the defendants have, using therefor some 60 rate bureaus, committees, and other rate-making agencies (see exhibit 1 attached hereto and made a part hereof, and reference thereto prayed), by contracts, combinations, agreements and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States, monopolized part of such trade and commerce and have so fixed the charges on transportation to and from the State of Georgia as to prefer the ports of other States over the ports of Georgia, and have thus, and by their rates and practices, exacted from the State of Georgia as owner of State institutions, and from shippers in Georgia who are under the sovereign protection of said State, charges for transporting, as common carriers, commodities, which charges are unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, and preferential to localities, ports, and shippers outside of Georgia, to the disadvantage and prejudice of the State of Georgia, its ports, and shippers therein who ship commodities in commerce among the States.

(6) All defendants, conspiring, combining, confederating and agreeing jointly, using therefor the agencies named in exhibit 1, here again referred to and made part hereof, adopt rates and charges for transportation of commodities among the States that are accepted as binding on each rail carrier engaged in such commerce. Any proposal to change the charges for transportation in such commerce must be considered and acted on by some of such agencies, with power in the highest thereof finally to decide what such charges may be. While a single line has the nominal right, which some of the southern defendants have, as herein later shown, exercised in some cases, to make rates themselves, no line can change joint through rates without the approval of the agencies created by defendants to direct what these rates shall be. The effect of this conspiracy is unjustly and oppressively to increase and augment the said rates and prices, and to counteract the effect of free competition on the facilities and prices of transportation, and to establish and maintain arbitrary rates, and to prevent any one of said defendants from reducing such arbitrary rates, and thereby exact and procure great sums of money from the State of Georgia and the people of Georgia in commerce among the States.

Defendants by such conspiracy have put into effect and kept in force upon the several lines of railroad the rules and regulations and rates and prices for moving, carrying, and transporting freight fixed and established by the association, and have declined and refused to fix or establish and maintain

or give on their railroads rates and prices for the carrying of freight based upon the cost of constructing and maintaining their several lines of railroad and the cost of carrying freights over the same, and such other elements as should be considered in establishing tariff rates upon each particular road, and the people of Georgia and the State of Georgia have been compelled to and are still compelled to pay the arbitrary rates of freight and submit to the arbitrary rules and regulations established and maintained by the association, and have, for more than 10 years, and still are deprived of the benefits that might be expected to flow from free competition between said several lines of transportation and communication, and are deprived of cheaper rates that might be reasonably expected to flow from free competition among the defendants and that the trade, traffic, and commerce in such region of country, and the freight traffic in connection therewith, have been and are monopolized and restrained, hindered, injured and retarded by the defendants by means and through the instrumentality of such conspiracy, and the agencies named in said exhibit 1.

(7) The southern defendants, with lines wholly, or principally in the South, generally are dominated and coerced by the northern defendants, and therefore, even when the sourthern defendants desire, they cannot publish joint through rates between Georgia and the North when the northern carriers refuse to join in such rates. The southern carrier defendants, to the extent that they serve directly or over a dominated line, as to rates on some commodities, make joint through rates between points in Georgia, and that part of the territory in the North to which they have the power, and to the limited territory controlled by them, have, as to some commodities, made their rates and charges the same for like mileages as the northern defendants make rates in the North. As to other rates, even when the southern carriers could act independently, they refuse so to do, and join their co-conspirators in the illegal combination heretofore described.

(8) Illustrative of instances where southern defendants have established rates from points in the State of Georgia to destinations in Illinois Freight Association Territory, by virtue of their control of delivering carriers in that territory, which are lower relatively, than rates on the same commodities to destinations in official territory served by strictly official territory lines, are rates on textiles, carload; drugs and medicines, carload; chemicals, carload; wine, carload; harness and saddlery, carload; and scrap paper, carload.

(9) All the defendants, by reason of the joint actions and agreements aforesaid, have the power to, and do, prescribe, on some commodities, rates and charges for transportation in commerce among the States, between points in the North and points in Georgia, which, as to the Georgia shipments, are, on commodities rated first class, approximately 39 percent higher than charges for like distances on the same commodities between points in the North. As to some commodities, defendants have jointly conceded rates free from discrimination, or less unjustly discriminatory, than those on the first class, and on some commodities not competitive with commodities owned by shippers in the North, lower rates per mile. On some special commodities the Interstate Commerce Commission has prescribed rates on a parity. There remains, on many classes and commodities, rates much lower for like distances, between points in the North than is exacted on shipments between such points and points, ports and localities in the State of Georgia.

(10) The defendants, by virtue of their illegal combination, make rates on the principle that charges for transportation should be determined by considering only the factor of what the traffic will bear.

(11) There is located in the State of Georgia the ports of Savannah and Brunswick, which are of such size and character as to permit boats to enter and transport commodities in interstate and foreign commerce thereto and therefrom. Defendants, by their rates and practices, give preference and advantage in rates on domestic traffic to and from the North Atlantic ports of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and other related ports over the ports of Savannah and Brunswick, to the injury and prejudice of the sovereign State of Georgia and to the citizens therein. Illustrative of this, on shipments from Alton, Ill., in official territory, to Baltimore, Md., the first class rate is $1.68 per 100 pounds, while to Savannah, 6 miles less in distance, the rate is $2.39.

* * * * *

(14) Illustrations of the unlawfulness of the practices and rates of defendants appear from an exhibit attached hereto and made part hereof, in the form of a table, marked exhibit 2. This exhibit shows rates between Georgia points and points in the North and in official territory, for substantially the same distances, and is illustrative of the general situation, and reference thereto is prayed.

(15) The cost of transportation in the South is probably less, and certainly no more, than in the North, a fact recognized by some of the defendants and adjudged by the Interstate Commerce Commission in fixing or prescribing rates on the same commodities on a parity in both territories. Defendants have voluntarily, and also under orders from the Interstate Commerce Commission, extended to points in the South in the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina, the rates and practices used in the North. Some illustrations of this are shown in exhibit 3 attached hereto and made a part hereof, and reference thereto is prayed.

* * * * *

(18) All such actions, doings, and pretenses of the said confederates, defendants herein, are contrary to equity and good conscience, and tend to the manifest injury and oppression of complainant, both as a shipper and as a sovereign State. In consideration whereof, and foreasmuch as complainant is remediless in the premises according to strict rules of the common law, and can only have adequate relief in this court as a court of equity, where matters of this nature are properly cognizable and relievable, complainant respectfully prays:

(1) That defendants, their agents and employees, be enjoined from demanding or collecting rates or charges for shipments to or from Georgia, higher than are, for like distances, on the same commodities, contemporaneously maintained and applied between points in official territory.

(2) That it be decreed that rates and charges between points in Georgia and her ports and the North are, and for the future will be, unjust, unreasonable, and prejudicial to complainant and shippers and ports therein, and unduly preferential of points and ports in the North and of shippers and traffic therefrom and thereto, to the extent that the rates from and to points and ports in the State of Georgia and points and ports in the North exceed, or may exceed for like distances, those contemporaneously maintained and applied to and from points and ports in the North.

(3) That complainant have judgment for its damages and also one for the use of shippers shipping commodities to and from Georgia under the unlawful rates exacted of them, and to that end an accounting be had under the direction of this court, of the amounts of such damages.

(4) That a permanent injunction be issued against the defendants and each of them, and any and all of their agents, rate bureaus, assistants, and employees, restraining and forbidding the defendants and each of them, and any and all of their said agents, bureaus, assistants, and employees from conspiring and confederating in the establishment of rates and charges exacted of the State of Georgia and of the citizens thereof.

(5) The complainant further prays that such other and further relief be granted as equity and justice require and which to the court shall be deemed proper.

EXHIBIT 2

[Present rates in cents per 100 pounds]

	From—			
	Atlanta, Ga.		New York, N. Y.	
	Miles	Rates	Miles	Rates
Wine, carload (minimum weight, 40,000 pounds), to Grand Rapids, Mich	772	86	772	68
Lead pipe, carload, to Grand Rapids, Mich	772	86	776	54
	Macon, Ga.		Philadelphia, Pa.	
Work clothing, carload, to Chicago, Ill	817	156	814	112

	From—					
	Chicago, Ill.		Atlanta, Ga.		Macon, Ga.	
	Miles	Rates	Miles	Rates	Miles	Rates
Work clothing, less carload:						
To Hopkinsville, Ky	369	84	362	106		
To Jackson, Tenn	478	104			464	118
	Atlanta, Ga.		Endicott, N. Y.		Boston, Mass.	
Shoes, carload, to Chicago, Ill	728	116	696	99	977	117

EXHIBIT 2—Continued

[Present rates in cents per 100 pounds]

	From—			
	Griffin, Ga.		Baltimore, Md.	
	Miles	Rates	Miles	Rates
Canned vegetables, carload: To Chicago, Ill.	772	62	767	47
	Milledgeville, Ga.		Baltimore, Md.	
To Winston-Salem, N. C.	359	49	360	42
	Atlanta, Ga.		Philadelphia, Pa.	
Drugs, carload, to Lima, Ohio	601	87	618	54

Comparison of first-class rates from a southern and an official territory origin to a destination in the latter territory equidistant from the 2 origins, and the differences in such first-class rates

[Present rates in cents per 100 pounds]

From—	To—	Miles	First-class rates
Atlanta, Ga.	Chicago, Ill.	731	210
Newark, N. J.	Fort Wayne, Ind.	727	152
Difference			58
Atlanta, Ga.	Chicago, Ill.	731	210
Danville, Ill.	Washington, D. C.	733	151
Difference			59
Atlanta, Ga.	Chicago, Ill.	731	210
New York, N. Y.	Fort Wayne, Ind.	734	152
Difference			58
Atlanta, Ga.	Youngstown, Ohio	769	213
Manchester, Mass.	Columbus, Ohio	769	152
Difference			61
Macon, Ga.	Chicago, Ill.	819	223
Trenton, N. J.	Danville, Ill.	819	163
Difference			60
Atlanta, Ga.	Madison, Wis.	854	227
Milwaukee, Wis.	Jersey City, N. J.	844	167
Difference			60
Augusta, Ga.	Rockford, Ill.	961	243
Watertown, Wis.	Petersburg, Va.	964	173
Difference			70

EXHIBIT 3

COMMODITIES ON WHICH DEFENDANT SOUTHERN CARRIERS HAVE VOLUNTARILY OR UNDER ORDER OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCN COMMISSION, EXTENDED TO DESTINATIONS IN THE BORDER SOUTHERN STATES OF KENTUCKY, TENNESSEE, VIRGINIA, AND NORTH CAROLINA, RATES AND PRACTICES USED IN THE NORTH

Commodities on which southern rail defendants have established rates from points in the State of Georgia to the Ohio River cities and Virginia cities (border points between official and southern territories) to be the same, mile for mile, as the rates applied to these border points from origins in the North:

Manufactured iron and steel, CL and LCL.

Lead articles, viz: Pipe, sheet lead, etc., CL.

Wine, CL.

Paper and paper articles, viz: KD boxes, CL; bags, CL; wrappings, CL; tablets, school blank forms, LCL.

If after Members have given consideration to these allegations they will examine the opinion of the majority of the Supreme Court, they will find that its decision to assume jurisdiction is not based upon any alleged illegality in the publications by railroads of joint freight rates, the terms of which have been agreed upon in a legal way with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but upon allegations relative to the existence and operation of a conspiracy in restraint of trade, resulting in serious injuries to the economy of the State of Georgia, motivated, as the State insists, by a desire "to counteract the effect of free competition on the facilities and prices of transportation, and to establish and maintain arbitrary rates and to prevent any one of said defendants from reducing such arbitrary rates and thereby exacting and procuring great sums of money from the State of Georgia and the people of Georgia in the commerce among the States."

With regard to these allegations, the Supreme Court makes the following significant declaration in its majority opinion:

If the allegations of the bill are taken as true, the economy of Georgia and the welfare of her citizens have seriously suffered as the result of this alleged conspiracy. Discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers. They may cause a blight no less serious than the spread of noxious gas over the land or the deposit of sewage in streams. They may affect the prosperity and welfare of a State as profoundly as any diversion of waters from the rivers. They may stifle, impede, or cripple old industries and prevent the establishment of new ones. They may arrest the development of a State or put it at a decided disadvantage in competitive markets. Such a charge at least equals in gravity the one which Pennsylvania and Ohio had with West Virginia over the curtailment of the flow of natural gas from the West Virginia fields. They are substitute fuels to which the economy of a State might be adjusted but discriminatory rates fastened on a region have a more permanent and insidious quality. Georgia, as a representative of the public, is complaining of a wrong, which proven, limits the opportunities of her people, shackles her industries, retards her development, and relegates her to an inferior economic position among her sister States. These are matters of great public concern in which Georgia has an interest apart from that of particular individuals who may be affected. Georgia's interest is not remote; it is immediate. If we denied Georgia as parens patriae the right to invoke the original jurisdiction of the Court in a matter of that gravity, we would whittle the concept of justiciability down to the stature of minor or conventional controversies. There is no warrant for such a restriction.

It thus appears, as I have already indicated, that the real objective of the pending bill is not the permission to railroads, and other common carriers, to establish upon a reasonable basis joint freight rates, but to permit the carrying on of conspiracies of the type against which the State of Georgia has justly complained, without regard to statutes of United States which would penalize them for so doing, by exempting them from the operation of those statutes.

That is a proposal to which I cannot subscribe and against which I must raise my voice, even if it meets with the approval of every other Member of Congress.

It is said, of course, that agreements of the type which are to be exempted from the provisions of the anti-trust laws must be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission over a period of many years has permitted to continue the injustices of which the State of Georgia complains which complaints are general throughout Southern and Western States. While it has recently given some evidence of intending to move in the direction of the correction of these injustices, I am not willing, as a Member of Congress, to divest the courts of jurisdiction over actions which have been instituted by the Federal Government and State of Georgia and which carry with them some promise of remedy in order to rely again and for all the future upon the wisdom and fairness of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

CASE OF STATE OF GEORGIA V. PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD CO. ET AL.

As part of my interest in the general problem involved, I wish to point out that soon after the institution of the suit of the State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad and other lines, the attorney general of the State of Georgia, Hon. T. Grady Head, who instituted the suit in behalf of the State, was kind enough to confer with me concerning it and concerning some of the problems involved in it, and to request advices from me as to my thought with reference to the subject matter.

On November 16, 1944, after examining the documents he had left with me in the case, I addressed to him the following letter:

NOVEMBER 16, 1944.

Hon. T. GRADY HEAD,
Attorney General,
State Capitol, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR GRADY: I have examined your motion, brief, and bill of complaint in the matter of the *State of Georgia* v. *The Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.*

You, of course, know I am deeply interested in the correction of the freight-rate-discrimination situation which militates so strongly and so unjustly against the interests of our people, and that anything I may say with regard to this action is motivated by my desire to be helpful, and is intended as constructive criticism. It goes without saying I

would be intensely gratified if you are able to prosecute this action to a successful conclusion.

I wish to point out, however, that our national transportation policy (act Sept. 18, 1940, ch. 722, title I, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 899) declares, among other things, that it is the policy of Congress "To promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices, etc."

This declaration of policy and all of the legislation carried on the statute books dealing with interstate commerce bases the formulation of rates upon what may be determined to be just and reasonable, and likely to foster sound economic conditions. In existing law some differences in transportation charges not based entirely upon mileage are expressly authorized, as you know, such as in cases where competition with water routes is involved and where transportation is being had for export. It is, therefore, manifest that it has not been the purpose of Congress to provide for the regulation of freight rates upon a purely mileage basis. Whether such type of regulation would be sound from the standpoint of justice and reason is another question, but the Supreme Court, of course, is bound by the intent of Congress as it has been manifested through legislation and could not act on the basis of its own opinion as to what would constitute proper methods of freight-rate regulation.

It is noted that in your bill of complaint you emphasize the fact, which I think can be clearly established, that the rates charged in so-called southern territory for transportation into official territory are unreasonable and unjustly discriminatory, and are not based upon the cost of carrying freight over the same. This, I think, is the gravamen of your complaint, and yet I do not find that the prayers set out in your bill of complaint are adjusted to these allegations.

Your prayers, if I understand them correctly, seek to restrain the defendants from demanding or collecting rates or charges on shipments to, or from, Georgia higher than are for like distances on the same commodities contemporaneously maintained and applied between points in official territory. This, so far as the prayers of the bill are concerned, puts the demand of the State entirely upon the basis that rates should be adjusted according to mileage only, and that, I think the Supreme Court will probably hold, has not been manifestly the express legislative intent.

I desire, therefore, to submit for your consideration the possibility of modifying the prayers of your bill so as to seek relief against arbitrary and unreasonable discrimination, not based upon capital investment or cost of transportation or other factors which should be logically considered in accordance with the national transportation policy above referred to in the determination of freight rates.

To do this would necessarily involve more specific allegations as to capital investment and transportation costs and the tonnages of various types of freight moving in commerce over the several railroad systems concerned, but it seems to me that if there is to be a reasonable prospect of securing relief, allegations and proof of this type will be indispensable.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours truly,

M. C. TARVER.

These suggestions were to some extent followed in subsequent amendments to the State's petition.

I received from the attorney general under date of November 22, 1944, the following reply:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
Atlanta, Ga.

Hon. M. C. TARVER,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: Yours of the 16th received, and I appreciate the consideration you have given our bill and the suggestions you have made.

Frankly, we are reviewing the language of our bill, and our prayers, and are considering decisions in preparation of our brief. Your suggestions are timely and are in accord with the conclusions we had about reached.

We have not decided as yet what we may do as to further amendment. In any event we will keep you advised of any amendment and will furnish you copies of the brief when completed.

It may be that we will have occasion to be in Washington around the 11th of December, since under the rule the railroads must answer on this date. If we are, I hope that I shall have some opportunity to talk with you.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

T. GRADY HEAD.

I had subsequent correspondence with Hon. Claud Shaw, assistant attorney general of Georgia, relative to the same subject matter. I have, therefore, been vitally and intimately concerned with this case since its inception and I certainly shall not vote now while that action is still pending to destroy the very basis upon which the State of Georgia seeks relief from intolerable conditions which directly affect the welfare of all our people.

I make these statements in order to demonstrate the fact that there has been no lack of interest on the part of Georgia's congressional delegation in endeavoring to bring about by all available means correction of the injustices, not only to Georgia but to the South and West which exist in our national freight-rate structure.

As I have already stated, I do not feel that litigation in the courts is the sole basis for hope for remedy. I feel, however, that it is of very great importance and that this is especially true with regard to the pending cases, particularly that of the State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad et al. I do not know, nor can anyone anticipate, what the final result of that litigation may be, and I am, as indicated in the correspondence which I have quoted, in some doubt as to certain features of the case and certain types of remedial action sought. I do not believe, however, that that, or any other avenue of possible relief ought to be abandoned, and I consider it distinctly unfair that consideration should be given by Congress to relieving the railroads by legislation of responsibility for any violations of existing laws of which they may have been guilty.

In this connection I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received under date of May 11, 1945, from the Governor of Georgia, Hon. Ellis Arnall, and of my reply under date of May 12, 1945:

Hon. M. C. TARVER,
Washington, D. C.:

I feel it my duty to acquaint you with the following facts concerning the fight to bring about fair freight rates to the people of Georgia and the South. The Interstate Commerce Commission continues to play politics in its effort to protect the railroads in charging discriminatory and unfair freight rates to our people. The legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission, headed by Commissioner Splawn, has advised Chairman LEA of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that it favors the Bulwinkle bill now pending in Congress, which would legalize conspiracy, monopoly, discrimination, and fraud in the fixing of freight rates by common carriers. The Bulwinkle bill, which is advocated by the ICC, will effectively nullify the decision obtained from the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.* It will permit the ICC to continue to run interference for the vested cartel control of the railroads in the transportation field. It is almost unbelievable that a supposedly responsible impartial governmental agency, quasi judicial in nature, should undertake to bring about the passage of a bill in the Federal Congress that will defeat the rights of the people to a competitive free enterprise transportation system and will favor the railroads in all hearings before the ICC. I believe that I speak for the people of Georgia, who are completely disgusted with the ICC, which is clearly a tool of the railroads. Its domination by them is now recognized by every schoolboy. The ICC should either rectify immediately the injustices in transportation rates or resign as a public duty. The protective and paternal attitude of the ICC toward the railroads, toward conspiracies and monopolies in the transportation field must be curbed if we are to afford economic opportunities to the people of the South and West. America has come upon peculiar times when the discredited ICC would have Congress legalize conspiracy, fraud, and crime against the people of America. I respectfully urge you to vigorously oppose the railroad-sponsored Bulwinkle bill. Regards.

ELLIS ARNALL,
Governor of Georgia.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 12, 1945.*

GOV. ELLIS ARNALL,
State Capitol, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR GOVERNOR: I have your day letter of May 11 and wish to assure you that I shall very strongly oppose the passage of H. R. 2535 introduced by Congressman BULWINKLE.

It is patently an effort to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al.*, and its enactment by Congress is unthinkable.

Yours truly,

M. C. TARVER.

I do not wish to be understood as vouching for the accuracy of every statement made by the Governor in his telegram. It is possible that the Governor, like many other officials and individuals, may have in the heat of pleading a cause in which he is deeply interested gone further than some persons who have studied the subject matter would feel justified in doing. I do not yield to the Governor of Georgia sole credit for what has been accomplished in endeavoring to remedy the freight-rate situation and I feel I

have demonstrated by what I have said that any credit for what has been accomplished must in fairness be widely distributed among the hundreds of public men and private individuals who have worked together with the same general objective. I do recognize the fact, as I feel that any impartial person must do, that the aid of the Governor of Georgia in this fight has been of very great value in bringing the facts of the freight-rate situation forcefully to the attention of administrative, legislative, and judicial authorities. Even if he loses the suit which he has instituted in the Supreme Court, the increase in public information as to the cause involved will have amply justified the efforts he has made.

I hope he will not lose that suit, and so far as I am concerned I shall not contribute anything toward his losing it by voting for the enactment of legislation which in my judgment has for one of its main purposes the destruction of the very basis in law upon which that suit was founded.

RÉSUMÉ OF VARIOUS PROBLEMS AND CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS WITH REGARD TO FREIGHT RATES

It is a mistake on the part of anyone to assume that all problems relative to freight rates are affected by the pending bill or that congressional action in passing or defeating the pending bill will definitely and for all time determine how these problems will be dealt with and whether remedial action to correct injustices will ever be obtainable. I say that without disparaging the importance of the pending measure. The procurement of proper action with relation to all the problems involved is a matter of such complexity that it may hardly be solved by the enactment of any type of Federal legislation since, as a matter of absolute necessity, a great deal depends upon the action of administrative and quasi-judicial authorities charged with responsibility for the enforcement of acts of Congress in accordance with the legislative intent.

These problems have attracted my deep and conscientious interest throughout the period of my congressional service and I have sought in numerous ways to contribute to their solution by all means which lay within my power. I have not sought to publicize my efforts along these lines, and I know many other Members of Congress who have been similarly diligent but who have not felt it necessary to publicize their activities either in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in the public press.

For many years Members of Congress from agricultural areas have been seeking remedial action in the matter of freight rates on agricultural products. The cost of getting the farmers' products to market is not borne altogether by the consumer, but, whether he realizes it or not, oftentimes comes out of the return to him from the market of the proceeds of his labor. I was privileged to assist in passing in 1938 the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which in section 201 (A) to 201 (D), inclusive, of title 2 makes the following provision now contained in title 7 of the United States Code, section 1291, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make complaint to the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products, and to prosecute the same before the Commission. Before hearing or disposing of any complaint (filed by any person other than the Secretary) with respect to rates, charges, tariffs, and practices relating to the transportation of farm products, the Commission shall cause the Secretary to be notified and, upon application by the Secretary, shall permit the Secretary to appear and be heard.

It has been my privilege as chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations to participate in the provisions of funds in agricultural appropriation bills passed subsequent to the enactment of that act for carrying out the provisions made therein. I think it will be interesting in this connection to quote the following from a publication known as USDA gotten out by the Department of Agriculture under date of November 26, 1945:

Savings of well over half a billion dollars in the freight bill of American farmers during the last 6 years are largely the result of work done by the Transportation Rates and Services Division of the Marketing Facilities Branch, Production and Marketing Administration. The excellence of this work has won the praise of such men as H. K. Thatcher, president, National Association of Commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture, and Representative MALCOLM C. TARVER, chairman, subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

I think it will also be of some interest to the agricultural population of the country to quote the following from the hearings had before my subcommittee in connection with the 1946 agricultural bill:

FREIGHT RATES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. TARVER. We come now to the item for "Freight rates for farm products." The table at the top of page 127 will be inserted here.

(The table is as follows:)

Appropriation act, 1945		$78,762
Budget estimate, 1946		69,200
Change for 1946:		
Overtime decrease	−$9,495	
Other decrease	−67	
		−9,562

Mr. TARVER. There is no change sought in the appropriation.

We would like to know what you have been doing for the farmer in adjustment of freight rates.

Mr. KITCHEN. We think, Mr. Chairman, we have a very interesting story to tell on this item. The committee knows that transportation charges are very important in the marketing of farm products. They constitute probably the largest single item of cost. Let me illustrate by citing one chief example that we like to give as to accomplishment under this item.

TEN PERCENT RATE INCREASE PETITION

In 1942 the railroads petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission for a 10-percent increase in rates to offset wage increases. We intervened in that case. The I. C. C. decided that the carriers should be allowed an increase of 6 percent on processed agricultural commodities and 3 percent on basic agricultural products. Soon afterward, it appeared from the financial reports of the railroads that the increased rates with the increased volume of business due to the war would not be justified, so we petitioned the ICC to reconsider its decision. A hearing was held. The ICC suspended the order until December 31, 1943. It was later suspended until June 30, 1944, and again until December 31, 1944.

Last December we petitioned that the order be set aside entirely.

Hearings were held, but this time the order was suspended for a full year, until December 31, 1945.

Now, those actions, we estimate, saved about $75,000,000 a year in freight transportation. We handle a large number of these cases in the course of a year. Of course, farmers, and even cooperative associations, are not equipped themselves to appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission in behalf of adjustments in freight rates or charges. The object of this item is to assist them in that regard.

NUMBER OF CASES APPEALED

Mr. TARVER. In how many different cases did you appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission in the last fiscal year?

Mr. CROW. In 16 formal complaints, 21 investigation and suspension dockets, and 12 finance dockets, a total of 49 before the Commission involving rail carriers; and 6 actions involving motor carriers.

Mr. TARVER. Were you as uniformly successful as in the case to which you made reference?

Mr. CROW. We won nearly all of them. We can summarize best with this one figure. During the past 5 years, which is the life of this provision, we have won enough cases and negotiated with carriers enough rate adjustments to bring total benefits of about $500,000,000. We spent about $300,000.

Mr. TARVER. That is a very interesting statement. My question was directed to the last fiscal year, for which I should like the same specific information.

Mr. CROW. It is not in the form to give you this past fiscal year by itself. I have the dates when actions took place, the actual savings, and the accumulated savings to date.

Mr. TARVER. Will you furnish it for the entire period of time during which the authority has been in effect, and then specifically for the fiscal year 1944 and for the first half of the present fiscal year?

Mr. CROW. Yes.

(NOTE.—Subsequent to the hearings, it was found that to compile the data separately for the fiscal year 1944 and the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1945 would be impossible in time to have it appear in the printed hearings. Therefore, the data submitted in response to the above request show the information for the calendar year 1944 and cumulative for the period during which the program has been in effect.)

SAVINGS AS RESULT OF ACTIVITIES

Mr. TARVER. You estimate that through operations of the act $500,000,000 in freight rates have been saved to the farmers of the United States?

Mr. CROW. Yes; and I have it itemized to $400,000,000 in cases where we can actually measure the benefits in dollars and cents for the individual cases.

Mr. KITCHEN. There is a break-down, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. I think it would be interesting to have this in the record.

Mr. KITCHEN. It shows the type of cases we participated in.

Mr. TARVER. At the same time, the total appropriations that have been made to finance the program by Congress.

Mr. KITCHEN. That is right. The appropriation for 1945, including overtime of approximately $9,000 is $78,762.

Mr. HERRELL. The total amount available for this program since its inception in 1940 is $389,732.

The gentleman from Georgia, Congressman RAMSPECK, in remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 20, 1945, has summarized some of the efforts of southern and western Representatives in Congress to secure relief from discriminatory freight rates for the southern and western areas of the United States, including information as to the formation in 1939 of what was known as a freight equalization group, House of Representatives, with the objective of securing the enactment of legislation "for the purpose of devising a just and more equitable rate structure," and adopting resolutions calling upon the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce "to hold hearings and to make a searching study of the interterritorial freight rates and to report thereon so that legislation to correct the situation may be considered at this session of Congress." The Representatives from Georgia who were members of the executive committee of this group were Congressmen Ramspeck, Cox, Brown, Vinson, Owen, Whelchel, and myself. Subsequently hearings were had before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, at which experts on freight rates were heard in behalf of the contention which we made with reference to discrimination against the South and West in the freight-rate structure, and, based upon these hearings, provisions were inserted in the Transportation Act of 1940 intended to remedy the situation. A quotation from those provisions is as follows:

TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1940

AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 3

Section 5 (a), paragraph (1) of section 3, of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (which prohibits the giving of undue or unreasonable preferences or advantages by carriers subject to part 1), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this part to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatever: *Provided, however*, That this paragraph shall not be construed to apply to discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any other carrier of whatever description.

* * * * *

"(b) The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed to institute an investigation into the rates on manufactured products, agricultural commodities, and raw materials, between points in one classification territory and points in another such territory, and into like rates within any of such territories, maintained by common carriers by rail or water subject to part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, for the purpose of determining whether said rates are unjust and unreasonable or unlawful in any other respect in and of themselves or in their relation to each other, and to enter such orders as may be appropriate for the removal of any unlawfulness which may be found to exist: *Provided*, That the Commission in its discretion may confine its investigation to such manufactured products, agricultural commodities, and raw materials, and the rates thereon as shippers thereof may specifically request be included in such investigation."

As the result of this legislation and investigations conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission under their authority, recent action by the Commission has been obtained which at least carried with it the promise of partial remedy of the discriminations of which we have so long complained. It is, I think, unfair to the Interstate Commerce Commission for anyone to take the position that their recent decision providing for the partial correction of freight-rate differentials between what is known as official territory and other areas in the United States was brought about as the result of legal actions which were pending and were intended to secure corrective action through the courts. I believe that the whole history of the incumbent administration has demonstrated its purpose to bring about through orderly channels the correction of injustices in our national freight-rate structure. Support for this policy was proclaimed by President Roosevelt and is, I think, adhered to by President Truman. The efforts of southern and western Congressmen and of the governors of the several States that are directly affected to have the facts with regard to this subject matter correctly appraised by the Interstate Commerce Commission have not been without very considerable effect. The correction of the Nation-wide situation as to unjust freight rates has not depended and will not depend, in my judgment, upon the actions of any individual whether Governor or Congressman or President, but will be dependent upon inttelligent and cooperative action of all of those who are interested. I do not believe that the Interstate Commerce Commission should be vested with authority to exempt carriers from compliance with the provisions of the antitrust laws so as to permit them to engage in conspiracies of the type of which the State of Georgia has so justly complained in its action against the Pennsylvania Railroad and other lines. At the same time, I feel that the Interstate Commerce Commission may, and probably will by the exercise of the powers vested in it under existing law, go far to finish the job which it has begun to bring about correction of these inequities and I do not join with those who abuse the Commission or attribute to it a purpose to utilize its power for the oppression of certain geographical areas in the United States.

The attitude of this administration toward this problem is evidenced by the following article from the Atlanta Journal of December 8, 1945:

TRUMAN FAVORS EQUALIZATION OF RATE STRUCTURE

WASHINGTON, December 8.—President Truman said Friday he favored an equalization of the freight-rate structure.

He told his press conference that he spent much of his time as a Senator fighting for a rate structure on freight movement fair to all sections and that he still felt the same way about it.

He made this comment when asked about pending litigation growing out of the Interstate Commerce Commission decree of early this year calling for rate adjustments.

The questioning reporter asked the President if he would make "any comment on the northern Governors' suit to set aside the ICC freight-rate decision."

Mr. Truman asked if that was the one that breaks up the combinations. The questioner replied that he meant "the suit that involves the class-rate ruling of the ICC rather than the Antitrust Act.

The President said he was not familiar with the suit but that he wanted a freight-rate structure in this country that is fair to every section of it.

He doesn't like, he said, the structure that has been in effect in the country, with different brands of territory rates in different parts of the United States.

He concluded that he had spent most of his time in the Senate trying to break this.

RATE STRUCTURE UNFAIR TO SOUTH, CLARK SAYS

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., December 8.—The present differential in the Nation's freight-rate structure is "an unfair blow" at the economy of the South, United States Attorney General Thomas C. Clark asserted here.

Furthermore, declared the high Federal official, a victory by the State of Georgia in its suit against the railroads would make it possible for the South to enjoy "the benefit of free and fair play in the making of railroad rates."

Clark addressed the Alabama State Bar Association last night.

I certainly hope that the Congress by action on this bill will not undertake to destroy the chance not only of Georgia, but all other States of the Union, particularly in the South and West, to secure relief from intolerable conditions.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present; a quorum. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I realize that many of my colleagues are very busy, but it is unfortunate that only 101 Members of Congress are present to consider such an important bill; not to hear me speak, but for the consideration of the bill. I want to say to you briefly, in analyzing this bill, that its effect is to immunize and exempt from the operation of the antitrust laws the railroads of this country. Its ultimate purpose, I believe, would be to bail out the railroads who have been sued in the case referred to by the gentleman from Georgia, commonly known as the Georgia suit, now before the United States Supreme Court, and also the so-called Nebraska case, brought against the American Association of Railroads and various railroads.

I should like to say that we have had a magnificent transportation system developed under the existing laws, under the guidance and restraint of the antitrust statutes of this country. I intend to read to you in the course of my remarks a few of the allegations of the

conspiracies that have been charged in these suits. It is my contention, and I do not think it can be denied by any member of the committee, that this bill would take out of the provisions of the antitrust laws of this country any agreement, either as to tariffs or otherwise, which have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. If they have been approved, then I maintain, and I think that is the intention of the author of the bill and it is the construction that has been placed upon it by the Attorney General of the United States, such favorable action or approval by the ICC removes the question of any antitrust suits.

I have opposed this bill. I want to be perfectly candid and frank with the Members of the House. I was the only member of the committee to vote against this bill when it was reported out. One of my reasons was that I felt we were entitled to be advised by the office of the Attorney General—and I made a motion requesting that we be so advised before we reported the bill and also what the ultimate effect would be upon these pending suits of the bill and the amendments to the bill, and what such amendment ment, that amendment being susequent to the original opinion of the Attorney General.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman knows I have only 10 minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I know, but I want to correct the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman says I have said something that is not correct, of course, I will yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want the gentleman to remember that it was stated to the gentleman that the amendments were solely those suggested by the National Industrial Traffic League, a league of shippers.

Mr. O'HARA. That does not have anything to do with my statement. I said I asked for the opinion of the Attorney General and it was refused by the vote of the committee.

The first thing which bothers me in the consideration of this bill is, Do you believe that the antitrust laws of this country have been a good thing in our free enterprise and competitive system? My answer is that they have been excellent. I believe the antitrust laws of this country have been of tremendous benefit in builing up our great transportation system and our great private enterprise system.

Another question I asked myself, and which I answer in the negative, is, Do you believe we should whitewash the railroads and not make them subject to the antitrust laws? My answer must be that if we are going to have antitrust laws they should apply to all the industries of the country.

A further question which presents itself to me, and I must say I feel very strongly about it, is this: If the antitrust laws were good for this country for some 50 years or longer, will they not be good for this country for the rest of our existence?

I do not believe in immunizing or picking out one segment of industry. If you are going to immunize the railroads from the operation of the antitrust laws, why should not the manufacturers of automobiles or the public utilities or many other business enterprises be entitled to ask for the same exemption?

Just last week we presented a 50-percent increase in rates to the railroads of this country that carry Government property, under the land-grant bill. I am not scolding about it, but that is just what we did. I voted against it but a majority of the House thought that should be done.

Another question that presents itself to me is whether I have enough confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission to give it the power to pass upon the question of antitrust law violations. That is what we are asked to do, because the Commission will have to pass on them.

I sat briefly with the committee, for a couple of days, and heard the testimony of Mr. Atchison. I asked him about the way the freight rates were handled and who protected the public. I gathered the impression from him that the Commission was overworked. Speaking very frankly, I do not have enough confidence in the Commission to turn over to it the question of determining whether there have been violations of the antitust liaws and to let it decide whether it should or should not O. K. these agreements. I think that is somethink that should be left up to the Office of the Attorney General.

I do not agree with the statements which have been made that simply because these two suits have been brought the railroad traffic of this country or the rate making will be dislocated. It has not and will not so result.

Sure, they are sweating under those suits. Let me read to you from the Nebraska suit which is against the Association of Railroads. Here are some of the things which do not have to do with freight rates but which affect that part of the country. I am reading from the complaint filed in the United States Court for the District of Nebraska, Lincoln Division. One of the things they are charged with as having entered into a conspiracy is as follows:

(a) To impose upon shippers in the western district freight rates which are higher than those fixed by defendents and their coconspirators of comparable service to shippers in the eastern district.

(d) To prevent the construction of spur tracks for shippers and receivers of freight in the western district, and to deprive said shippers and receivers of freight of competitive transportation services and rates to and from their places of business.

There are 22 allegations of separate conspiracies which do not have to do exactly perhaps with the question of making freight rates, but which seriously affect the people of Nebraska and the people of that section of the country and the States surrounding Nebraska.

Here is another point:

(f) to deprive shippers of perishable products of competitive transportation rates and services by retarding delivery, by railroads capable of more expeditious service, of perishables consigned to points in the eastern or official district from points in the western district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I want to call your attention to the suit which was filed in the United States District Court by the State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and other defendants. This is a matter which affects the State of Georgia, and you gentlemen are saying this is something that the Interstate Commerce Commission should pass on.

One of the charges is as follows:

The conspiracy complained of in these sections, particularly sections 9 through 16, applies with equal force to all four counts enumerated in this bill of complaint.

9. All of the defendants have, using therefor some 60 rate bureaus, committees, conferences, associations, and other private rate-fixing agencies (see exhibit 2 attached hereto and made a part hereof, and reference thereto prayed), entered into and engaged in unlawful and wrongful contracts, combinations, agreements, and conspiracies in restraint of trade and commerce among the several States, and have monopolized a substantial part of such trade and commerce, and have fixed and established by concerted action and collusion arbitrary and noncompetitive rates and charges for transportation of freight by railroad in said trade and commerce, and have so fixed the rates and charges on transportation to and from the State of Georgia as to prefer the ports of other States over the ports of Georgia, and have thus, and by their rates and practices, so unlawfully and wrongfully fixed and established, exacted from the State of Georgia as owner of State institutions, and from shippers in Georgia who are under the sovereign protection of said State, charges for transporting commodities, which charges are unjust, unreasonable, arbitrary, noncompetitive, and favorable to localities, ports, and shippers outside of Georgia, and to the disadvantage, harm, hurt, prejudice, and injury of the State of Georgia, its ports, and shippers therein who ship commodities in commerce among the several States.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Should this bill pass, a suit such as the State of Georgia has instituted could not be brought thereafter in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Not if the agreement had been approved, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia. If those agreements or arrangements have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, you could not bring such suits.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. And a suit such as was instituted by the State of Nebraska could not be brought to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. O'HARA. It could not.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Is it not true that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has such a

law as we are talking about which was passed here the other day?

Mr. O'HARA. That was in the organic act, as I understand it. That is true. I believe the same is true of the Maritime Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to disagree with a statement made during the discussion of the rule on this bill by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and the inference he left about the passage of the bill. Like myself, the gentleman comes from one of the largest shipping sections of America, where railroads, busses, truckers, waterways, pipe lines, and all sorts of transportation emanate. I wish to take exception to the statement the gentleman made, which is entirely in error. From that section of the country I have found only one single case of a small shipper who has taken an adverse position against this legislation. Practically all of them wholeheartedly endorse the enactment of the legislation.

I hope this House will pass the bill by an overwhelming majority, in order to remedy some of the conditions that have prevailed in the past in the rate structure that has been established.

This is a bill of the highest importance. Its importance is such that millions of shippers, and I say that deliberately and advisedly, sent their representatives here to appear before the committee. But even more significant than the very great numbers of those represented at the hearings, is the fact that every single interest and group which took the trouble to come here to give us the benefit of their views, is squarely behind this legislation. And so in respect both to the number of those supporting the bill, and their complete unanimity, we have here a record that in my experience and observation is utterly unique.

I should like to indicate to the House some of the factors which have produced this extraordinary interest in this bill and the united support which it has received.

Substantially every person engaged in interstate commerce in this country, and we have today, of course, a very much widened concept of what interstate commerce is, has a vital interest in railroad transportation. Every shipper, large or small, is vitally concerned not only with the measure of his own rate, but with the measure of the rate paid by every competitor, wherever he may be located.

Now these people do not sit on the side lines while their freight rates are fixed. They are not just interested spectators as they are perhaps to the determination of the price of steel, or of coal, or the price of electric current. They are not spectators, they are right in the game. It was stated many times at the hearing that the man who purchases railroad transportation probably has more to say, and is permitted to participate more actively in a determination of what his rates shall be, than the purchaser of any other service or commodity which is sold in this country.

The forum in which the shippers participate most actively in the rate-making process is the so-called railroad-rate conference. The procedure followed by these rate conferences or bureaus has been worked out between the railroads and the shippers over a period of many years and is now the subject of a formal agreement between them.

The shippers are not willing to secure rate changes only through laborious proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to learn of changes proposed by the railroads only when such changes become an accomplished fact through filing with the Commission. The public wants to be able to secure rate changes through direct negotiation with the interested carriers acting as a group. The shippers have sound reasons for that position. It was established in the hearings before the committee that on the average about three-fourths of all the shipper requests for rate reductions which are filed with the rate conferences, are granted—page 99.

Of course, it would not be feasible and the shipper could not afford to present his views to every individual railroad. He insists that the railroads must sit as a group in considering all rate proposals, and they do so, but the rate action is taken not by the bureau but by the responsible officer of each railroad, and each railroad reserves the right to take independent action when it desires to do so, and it frequently exercises that right.

The shipper not only wants to negotiate with the carrier over the measure of his own rates, but he wants to have advice in advance, and long before any change is made, of every proposal for a change in rate—whether such changes affect his own rates, or those of his competitor. He insists on an opportunity to be present when any such changes are discussed and to support them, or to oppose them, as he thinks proper.

For some 25 years now these rights have been assured to the shippers by a formal agreement between the railroads and the National Industrial Traffic League, which is a Nation-wide organization embracing in its vast membership individual shippers and industries and trade organizations representing every line of business engaged in shipping. This, in brief, is the rate conference procedure and it is a method tested and proved by time and experience for dealing with the railroad rate structure, the most sensitive, complex organism in our national economy.

If the action taken by the carriers through the rate bureaus after full discussion and negotiation with the shippers, pursuant to the agreement with the League, is not satisfactory to the shippers, they have full opportunity under the machinery provided by the Interstate Commerce Act to seek the suspension of any such rates to keep them from ever becoming effective, or if they do become effective, to obtain a change in such rates through a hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Through these methods the shippers do constantly and effectively participate in the railroad-rate procedures. The rates and the rate relationships are so vital to the business of everyone using railroad transportation that substantially every shipper has equipped himself to take full advantage of the opportunity to take his part in the work of the rate conferences. He is either himself skilled in rate matters, or he belongs to some organization which maintains a rate department to represent him in rate matters. The result is that the average shipper knows exactly what he wants in respect to railroad rates and service, and within fair and reasonable limits knows pretty well how to go about getting it. It follows, naturally, that anything which affects the opportunity of a shipper to participate in this rate-making procedure touches a subject which is as familiar to him as every other feature of his own business. That is the reason there was such a tremendous representation at the hearings on this bill and such an outpouring of views on the subject. But that is not at all the most extraordinary feature of the hearings on this bill.

The most extraordinary thing is that every man who came to Washington to express his views on the subject, and some of them spoke for hundreds of thousands of shippers, large and small, declared his enthusiastic support of the bill. The exigent nature of the bill, which precipitated this flood of witnesses upon the committee, arises from the fact that the rate conference method is threatened by certain proceedings now pending under the Antitrust Act. For the reasons I have stated, the shippers feel that they are a part of the historical method thus assailed. It has been developed with their full cooperation and participation, and they insist upon its preservation. The testimony left no doubt that the small shippers especially would simply have to give up their participation in the rate-making process and the negotiation of rates with the railroads if they had to deal separately with each of the railroads. They could not afford to do so. The shippers think the purpose of this bill to subject these activities to regulation is admirable, but their fundamental interest is to sustain the substance of the present method of rate making.

In short, therefore, it is because the great body of shippers are in a real sense expert in the matter of freight rates, and because, practically without exception, they favor the present procedure that you have the unique situation here of everyone who is experienced in this field being represented at the hearings, and everyone present speaking with one voice in support of the measure.

But the necessity of conference and cooperation among the shippers goes far beyond the making of rates. For more than 50 years Congress, by progressive steps, has been seeking to create a national system of railroad transportation. The experience during the war period is proof of the very high degree of success which has attended that effort. Although the railroads fight vigorously among themselves for traffic, they con-

stitute, in the movement of that traffic, a highly coordinated and integrated national system.

We have but to visualize the handling of an average shipment to realize that it can be accomplished promptly, efficiently, economically, and to the satisfaction of the public, only through the very close cooperation of all of the participating carriers. A shipper at San Francisco, for example, delivering a carload of freight to any railroad serving that city, knows that by that single transaction, and moving under a single bill of lading, the shipment will be delivered in the East or South, or any other place in the United States, through the joint efforts of 5 or 15 railroads, on a through schedule which is so definite that the shipper knows substantially where his shipment is at all times. For the service the shipper will pay a single charge collected by the carrier who makes delivery at destination. The shipper may have transit privileges at many points, or the privilege of diversion or sale in transit at intermediate points if market conditions warrant. The application by the many carriers involved of a single rate for the entire service, the interchange of the shipment at agreed points and upon agreed terms, the standardization and exchange of the equipment, the correlation of schedules, the inspection and delivery of freight, are all matters which of necessity must be worked out by conference and agreement if the public is to be given the service which it demands and is entitled to receive. It will interest the Members to know how much of the business must receive such joint service. Eighty or 85 percent of the freight traffic in this country is not local to a single line, but is so-called interline traffic, that is, it is handled by more than one line. See testimony of Walter Franklin and Harvey Johnson. One of the witnesses, the vice president in charge of traffic of the Pennsylvania Railroad, testified that the railroads participate in 884 routes available for the movement of traffic between Chicago and New York alone. The Baltimore & Ohio, for example, participates in 161 such routes, the Pennsylvania in 179 such routes, and the New York Central in 299 routes between those two points. The existence of hundreds of routes between only two of the thousands of points in this country show the complexity of the rate and service situation which has grown up in this country.

Of course, it is perfectly obvious that two railroads which participate in the handling of traffic for a single charge must confer and agree upon what that charge shall be, and as I have said, the record shows that about four-fifths of the traffic is traffic of that character. It is made clear by the witnesses, and, of course, it is perfectly manifest, that if the New York Central changes the rate or service over one of these hundreds of routes in which it participates with other carriers between Chicago and New York, it must immediately give consideration to a corresponding change in rates and service over all the other routes in which it participates between the same points. To do so it must, of course, consult with the carriers who join with it in handling traffic over those routes.

Now, the point that I want to stress, and, of course, it is obvious, is that if these railroads are to work together as a national system and to handle the traffic as it should be handled, they must constantly confer together both as to matters of rates and matters of service. So far as I know, there is no one who does or could doubt the necessity for joint action between the railroads through conference and discussion. It was necessary in handling the pony express, it will always be necessary, and in ever greater degree. It is made necessary by the physical facts—by the very nature of the business. It is made necessary by the demands of the shippers. It is made necessary by the law of Congress. Only one sensible question is open. In what manner is this joint action to be achieved, and in what manner is it to be regulated? Either the railroads must now unmistakably be authorized to confer without supervision, as they have done in the past, and it must be said that the shipping public which is most familiar with the result is satisfied with the result, or there must be some administrative determination of the extent to which conferences should be permitted, and the manner in which it should be carried out.

This bill would make it the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to supervise and regulate the rate conferences and all other arrangements or agreements between the carriers for joint action. Certainly the Interstate Commerce Commission is the agency which should do the job. If anyone has any doubt about the esteem in which the Interstate Commerce Commission is held by the shippers of this country he should examine this record. Witness after witness representing big shippers and small shippers expressed their confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission. But the point I particularly want to emphasize is that since question has been raised as to the legality of cooperation between the carriers, and a great degree of cooperation is clearly necessary, someone must determine the extent to which and the maner in which such cooperation is to be permitted. This bill does not approve or sanction any conduct, it simply designates the Interstate Commerce Commission as the body which shall determine whether any particular action should be permitted, and only if it is authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission acting as the administrative arm of this body would such action then be free from the prohibition of the Sherman Act.

Now actually all this bill does is to provide for a specific approval of action already required by this Congress. Congress has directed that the railroads operate as a national system. The whole purpose of the bill is to prevent the frustration of that congressional mandate by some overly enthusiastic application of the antitrust laws.

Let me make that perfectly clear. In 1940 the Congress wrote a declaration of policy into the Interstate Commerce Act and directed that all the provisions of that act should be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out that declaration of policy. The gist of that policy is to direct the Commission and the railroads to take such action as shall be necessary to develop, coordinate, and preserve a national transportation system. That is a clear-cut, positive, direction binding upon all of the railroads. It represents the will of Congress. This bill simply means, in effect, that any act of a railroad in conferring and cooperating with another which is found to be necessary to carry out the statement of congressional purpose to which I have just referred, shall not be prevented or punished under the earlier law, the Sherman Act. In other words, in 1940 we directed the carriers to do certain things in the public interest. We are now authorizing the Commission to hold, upon full investigation and consideration, that those acts which the railroads must do to carry out that direction of Congress they may do, free from the penalties of the Antitrust Act. In other words, the test or standard of lawfulness in this bill is not some new or different concept of what is in the public interest. It is the concept which has already received the approval of the Congress and the public and written into the law of the land.

The Government cannot have it both ways; we cannot have our cake and eat it. We cannot have a national system of transportation which can exist only through the fullest cooperation and coordination, and at the same time isolate every railroad and forbid it to confer with every other. The two concepts are irreconcilable. This bill will permit the railroads to do those things, but only those things, which we have declared in our statement of policy in 1940 must be done, and otherwise the Sherman Act will be left in full vigor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this is very important legislation. It was my good fortune to be a member of the subcommittee which heard the witnesses who appeared in favor of this legislation.

If you will refer to the first 15 pages of the hearings, you will find a list of over a hundred witnesses who appeared before our committee. In addition, we must have had close to a thousand communications from all sections of the country endorsing the legislation which we have now before the House.

I want to call your attention to a few sections in the Transportation Act of 1940 which, in my opinion, the Department of Justice overlooked when they declared that the joint conferences of the various associations were in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Paragraph 1 of section 1 of the act reads as follows:

> It shall be the duty of every common carrier subject to this part to provide and furnish transportation upon a reasonable request therefor and to establish reasonable through routes with other such carriers, at

just and reasonable rates, fare charges and classifications applicable thereto; and it shall be the duty of a common carrier by railroad subject to this part to establish reasonable through routes with common carriers by water subject to part 3, and just and reasonable rates, fare charges, and classifications applicable thereto. It shall be the duty of every such common carrier establishing through routes to provide reasonable facilities for operating such routes and to make reasonable rules and regulations with respect to their operation, and providing for reasonable compensation to those entitled thereto, and in case of joint rates, fares, or charges to establish just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof which shall not unduly prefer or prejudice any such participating carrier.

That is part of the law Congress enacted to guide the Interstate Commerce Commission in regulating railroads. How would it be possible to establish any kind of system of through routes or establish joint rates or fares unless these railroads were allowed to get together and confer with one another relative to establishing or carrying out the intent of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act?

There are many provisions of the law relative to various other activities of railroad and truck transportation and water carriers which makes it imperative that the interests of the railroad or water carrier or trucker be allowed to get together and promulgate and establish as the law intends through routes, fares, and rates.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Are not the transportation companies permitted to hold these conferences now under the present law?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. My understanding is that the Department of Justice has claimed that they are a violation of the Sherman antitrust law. In other words, before they can get together to hold these conferences they have got to set up the machinery for these conferences; and I understand—I am no lawyer, but as a layman—I understand that was the basis of the contention of the Department of Justice that they were in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. HARE. As I understand the law the Department of Justice has a right to express an opinion as to whether they are in violation of the antitrust law, but the Department of Justice does not have authority to say they are in violation. I think that is a matter for the courts to decide. I do not know all there is to know about this bill, but as I understand it, the purpose is to take the authority out of the Department of Justice for expressing an opinion as to whether these conferences are in violation of the law and lodge with the Interstate Commerce Commission the authority to say whether they are in violation or whether they are not.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I do not believe that is so. I will leave that up to the chairman of the committee to answer.

Mr. HARE. I am only asking for information.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] to answer that question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The purpose is to permit these conferences under regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission to be held.

Mr. HARE. As I understand it now, the Department of Justice has the right to inquire and express an opinion as to whether they are in violation of the antitrust law or not, but it does not have the authority to say whether they are absolutely in violation of the law.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Was the gentleman here in 1938?

Mr. HARE. No.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Many gentlemen now Members voted for the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to permit the carriers, and I refer to the air carriers, to confer just the same as we are doing in this act. The same thing applies to foreign shipping.

Mr. HARE. They have the right to do that now?

Mr. BULWINKLE. They have that right without the Department of Justice walking in and saying: "You gentlemen are violating the antitrust laws."

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I do not know that there is any necessity to say anything in addition to what has already been said in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, but in the hope that I may say something that will clarify the situation, as I understand it, may I call to his attention the fact that it has not been decided by any court that conferences of the character provided for in this bill are illegal. There are two cases pending at the present time, one instituted by the State of Georgia, the other instituted by the Attorney General, referred to as the Lincoln, Nebr., case; but neither of those cases has as yet decided the particular question which is the subject matter of this bill. The issue, as I understand it, is this: The Sherman Antitrust Act, if it were not for the existence of our National Transportation Act, would give the Attorney General jurisdiction to set aside conferences and agreements of the character mentioned in this bill as being contrary to the provisions of the Antitrust Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, by reason of the passage of the National Transportation Act, which contains a statement of national policy for transportation, it is very clear that conferences of this kind can be held under the provisions of that act; in fact, it would be impossible to carry out the provisions of that act without conferences of this kind. For upward of 50 years this practice has been carried on. Shippers and rail carriers would sit around the table and agree or disagree. If an agreement was reached, it was presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval of the rates agreed upon. The Commission thereupon would approve or disapprove. During all that period of time until August 1944, no question has ever been raised in any legal proceeding that I have any knowledge of attacking the validity of such conferences. They met with the knowledge of the Interstate Commerce Commission. They met, you might say, under its supervision; and to a certain extent it might properly be said with its approval. Therefore it would seem now as if it is appropriate in view of the fact that this question has been raised by these two suits, to do as the Attorney General has suggested, for Congress to decide the policy which it wishes to have pursued. In recent years the Congress has acted and determined with respect to air carriers that the policy that we are asking the House today to adopt in this bill is a proper policy. The same is true as to shipping by water.

Mr. HARE. I understand that. That is the reason I am asking the question. If the Congress has gone on record formally expressing its intention with reference to air carriers, why would courts not be justified in taking that law into consideration in actions now pending, and let us wait until we find out what the court says about it? The Court may be able to say, regardless of the opinion of the Department of Justice, that in view of the former action by Congress, it would not take a special act to exempt the railroads from the operations of this particular law. I cannot see why we should anticipate what the action of the Court will be and attempt to legislate in advance of finding out whether the law has been violated. If the Court finds the law or the intention of the Congress has not been violated the passage of this bill now would then have to be repealed, and I am wondering why we cannot await the decision of the Court.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I think the gentleman will agree with me that if it were left until such time as the Court would make a decision, there might be a long interim between the present and that time which might be considerable, especially if the case is carried to the Supreme Court, during such time it would be unreasonable to expect that any representative of a railroad or shipper organization or anyone else would sit down together and endeavor to confer as has been the practice for upwards of 50 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

If the carriers and shippers do not sit down and confer as to rates and routes, and so forth, I will say to the gentleman that the result during the interim period until the courts decide the question would be chaotic from the standpoint of transportation and the rights of shippers of this Nation. I do not believe that if the policy is right, and I believe it is, that this Congress, who in the final analysis has the responsibility of fixing that policy, should sit by the side lines and wait until there is a decision. Con-

gress should act and fix the policy that should be pursued so that courts and everyone else might know the intent of Congress.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. HARE. I think the gentleman has made reply to my inquiry, but I am not exactly in accord with his conclusions. However, I appreciate the clarification he has made.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. I feel certain that if the gentleman from South Carolina will give the matter the careful and studied consideration that was given it by Joseph Eastman, whose standing as a protector of the public interest is well known and recognized, and if he will also give consideration to the testimony of that distinguished citizen of South Carolina, Director Johnson, of the Office of Defense Transportation, and also a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, he would more readily be able to understand the force of the views I have expressed.

Mr. HARE. I can appreciate that, and I have very high regard for the opinion of both the gentlemen to whom the gentleman has referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill gets its primary impetus from the two suits heretofore referred to, the Georgia case in the Supreme Court and the Nebraska case pending at Lincoln. It seeks to absolve the railroads from wrongs of which they say they are not guilty and of which they have not yet been convicted.

This bill has occasioned the greatest campaign of propaganda I have seen in this country since the Utility Holding Company Act of some years ago. I am not imputing bad faith to the gentlemen who have worked so diligently for this bill both in and out of Congress, but I do say that it is a smoke screen to contend that there is any move on foot now to destroy all rate-making conferences.

In my opinion, this bill would be used for vastly different purposes from that conceived by those who wrote it and by the gentlemen of the committee who reported it. I remember incident to the debate on the Transportation Act of 1940, for which I voted, an act which placed water carriers under the Interstate Commerce Commission, that we were assured and reassured that that act would not be used as a weapon for eliminating water competition, and that it would not give any additional advantages to rail traffic as opposed to water traffic. Yet I hold in my hand a decision of the Supreme Court as of June 14, 1943, in Baltimore & Ohio Railway Company et al., appellants, against the Inland Waterways Corporation et al., defendants. In that opinion the Court held that by virtue of the Transportation Act of 1940 the railroads could impose a duty on wheat moving into Chicago by barge as opposed to wheat moving in by rail. The railroads frankly admitted that the purpose of imposing an 8-cent per hundred pounds additional charge on wheat shipped in by barge was to force the wheat off the barges onto the rails. They did that notwithstanding the assurances given time and again to this Congress that it could not be done, and they did it under the Transportation Act of 1940.

The railroads of this country—a $24,000,000,000 industry—with their interlocking financial empires in the Northeast, constitute the greatest concentration of economic power ever seen on the face of the earth. This bill would simply deliver into their hands additional weapons and additional power. It would close the courthouse door, so to speak, to prosecution of railroads for violations of the antitrust acts.

This bill assumes in the beginning that the Department of Justice is going out on witch hunts regularly. Among the many ingenious pamphlets written and distributed in support of this bill was one, The Roads Cannot Serve Two Masters, alleging that the Department of Justice was working in conflict with the Interstate Commerce Commission in the matter of transportation, and that the Department of Justice would at infrequent intervals bring harassing and disturbing suits against the railroads.

I am not willing to say that the Department of Justice would indulge in such a practice. A good many speaking for this bill have called the roll of those who they say favor this legislation. I venture the assertion that not 1 percent of those who have gone on record and who have written Members of Congress supporting this legislation understand it or have any idea what it will do. As evidence of the careful and widespread campaign put on by the roads for this legislation, I know that many people in my district, many of my best friends, have written me letters advocating strongly the passage of this bill. No one wrote against it. But these friends failed to realize that this bill would exempt the railroads from prosecutions for violations of the antitrust acts and would give into their hands additional economic power and make them the virtual czars of all transportation in this country—water, rail, air, and whatnot.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman is making a very interesting and informative statement as is his custom when he discusses measures before this House. Would the gentleman care to say what effect this legislation, should it become law, would have on the fight that for the past several years has been made by the gentleman from Texas and many others of us from the South and Southwest for equalizing freight rates? That is a matter that I am sure many Members of Congress, as well as our constituents, are especially interested in and would like to have discussed.

Mr. GOSSETT. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. There is no way of knowing, but I have grave fears that if and when this bill should become law, in some way or other the roads would squirm out from under the effect of the decision made by the Interstate Commerce Commission on May 19, 1945. This decision has not yet gone into effect. I am afraid that all rates on all forms of freight will go up in the very near future, and we will have no recourse in the matter of freight rates or their equalization. We may have a grossly discriminatory freight-rate structure fastened upon us in perpetuity.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Do I understand the gentleman to say if this bill were to become law, the Interstate Commerce Commission would permit rate increases to go into effect regardless of anything else save and except the passage of this bill?

Mr. GOSSETT. I did not say that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. GOSSETT. I said I was very much afraid, and I have no way of proving it and nobody knows what will happen if this bill passes, that the railroads would become all-powerful and no recourse could be had against them in the courts.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does the gentleman distrust the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think it is composed of a group of very able men, but I do not think they can deal adequately with all these problems, particularly if we give the railroads additional economic power. May I say to the gentleman that 95 percent of the rates have not been passed upon by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This so-called western agreement which is the basis of the suit in Lincoln, Nebr., concerning which something has been said, never was filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission but was concealed from them until it was discovered by a Senate investigating committee. It was clearly in violation of the Antitrust Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman.

Does not the gentleman know that 90 percent of all these conferences are for reduction of rates and that no rate is raised unless it is passed upon by the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I do not know that. I want to read in conclusion just three lines from the United States Attorney General who was not permitted to testify before this committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to answer that. When the gentleman says that, he knows it is not true.

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I do not know that. I said he was not permitted to testify.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman knows it is not true that he was not permitted to testify because you can see by the letter of the Attorney General which is in the record that the Attorney General was notified of the hearing and, furthermore, I spoke to him about it and he wrote a letter instead of appearing before the committee.

Mr. GOSSETT. I understand that you had a motion before the committee to

defer the hearings in order to invite representatives of the Department of Justice to testify and the motion was defeated.

Mr. BULWINKLE. As the gentleman from Minnesota said, he wanted to find out what the Attorney General had to say about it and I said to him as I say to you that the Congress of the United States is the policy-making branch of this Government and not the Department of Justice.

Mr. GOSSETT. I wish to quote from the letter of the Attorney General appearing in the record:

> I believe that the passage of the bill as presently written would tend to reverse the policy of Congress established heretofore of preserving a broad area for the play of competitive factors in the determination of transportation charges.

Mr. Chairman, I recently had a price placed upon my head, so to speak, by the political action committee of the CIO, because I condemned them as being a selfish-interest pressure group striving to obtain unfair economic advantages through political pressure. I now condemn the Association of American Railroads for exactly the same thing. They have spent millions to get this bill passed by Congress. This bill will further enhance their tremendous economic power. This bill decreases rather than increases the protection to which the people are entitled from gigantic monopoly and domination in the transportation field by the Association of American Railroads.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. With reference to what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] said about Congress being the policy-making branch, is it not a fact that the Congress has prohibited certain action by statute, and this bill proposes to say that the railroads can do anything they want to, and the statute does not apply to them as long as it is agreeable to the Interstate Commerce Commission? In other words, in effect, it takes from the Congress the policy-making power and puts it in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman is substantially correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to being interested in the rate structure of this country, and eliminating discriminatory practices that have prevailed over the past 50 years, I yield to no person.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. PACE. How does the gentleman calculate that this series of railroad bills we are having—this is the third or fourth we have had in the past 3 or 4 years—granting all these special rights, repealing the land-grant rates, how does the gentleman feel that that contributes in the slightest to the elimination of the discrimination which you and your people and my people feel so deeply?

Mr. HARRIS. I recognize the fact that the gentleman from Georgia is just as much interested in the rate problems as anybody in this country. I cannot agree with him, however, that by permitting the confusion to run in this country as we have permitted for the past several years, it can ever do anything but continue to give us chaos in our transportation system.

Mr. PACE. May I ask the gentleman another question? In his service on this committee, in consideration of these special grants we are making to the railroads, why does he not exact some promise that they are going to eliminate this discrimination?

Mr. HARRIS. I get the gentleman's point. I have two or three things I wanted to say and the time is very limited, but in answer to the gentleman's question, the gentleman is familiar with the discussion which brought about the Transportation Act of 1940. The gentleman participated in that debate. I was not here at that time and did not have that privilege, but I have studied the question quite a bit.

This Congress established a policy, and the gentleman well knows the policy that was initiated in that declaration. Among other things it provides for equality of rates. In carrying out that policy initiated by the Congress, which the gentleman from Georgia participated in, the Interstate Commerce Commission over the past 2 or 3 years has been endeavoring to work out a plan as to how we may coordinate our transportation system and do just what the Congress said should be done under this policy.

Now, what happens? In May of this year, as was stated by the gentleman from Texas, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued a decision in which it attempted to carry out the very thing the gentleman is speaking of at this time. What do we find? We find in doing that, that we run right into another policy, established by this Congress, wherein it provides that the Department of Justice on the other hand may prevent the railroads from doing what the Interstate Commerce Commission says they must do to carry out this policy. That is what we have here. It is just a matter of whether or not we are going to clarify it, whether or not we are going to say at one and the same time: This is what we want you to do, but if you do it we are going to prosecute you for it. That is the whole issue. The Members can draw their own conclusions. I am one of those who try to feel that this whole difficult problem, this complex problem should be approached in a calm, sound, and sane attitude, because if there is anything in this country that is complex it is our rate structure. I am sorry I do not have the time just to briefly mention the fact that the present Attorney General had every opportunity, as did the Governor of Georgia, to appear before the committee and give the committee the benefit of any information they might have on this very difficult problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2536, to my mind, does nothing more than rectify an inequity. Personally, I hold no brief for the motor carriers, the railroads, or the inland water carriers, but I do believe, and sincerely believe, that all carriers should be treated alike, and that these rates should be fair to the shippers as well as carriers.

All this bill proposes is to apply to the carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act practically the same law that now applies to ocean carriers and air carriers.

The following organizations are supporting this proposed legislation: American Farm Bureau Association, Pennsylvania Association of Cooperative Organizations, Pennsylvania State Council of Farm Organizations, and National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

In 1916, 29 years ago, Congress passed the Shipping Act, and as late as 1938 Congress also passed the Civil Aeronautics Act. Both of these acts require the carrier to file with the regulating agency concerned any agreements among themselves, and each governmental agency is required to approve such agreements unless they are unfair or unjustly discriminatory. As the law now stands with respect to ocean carriers and air carriers, such agreements, when approved by the Maritime Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively, are relieved from the operations of the antitrust laws. This bill merely extends that same provision to other carriers. There was not a single word of testimony given at the hearings on this bill why one carrier should be treated any differently than another—there could not have been.

Another important point must be kept in mind, we are not dealing with one type of transportation alone. This bill covers all transportation that is subject to the constant regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including motor carriers, railroads, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders.

Before closing, I would like to direct your attention to the testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of this House by Col. J. Monroe Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect and the utmost admiration. In speaking of the wonderful record the carriers of this Nation made to our war effort, he said:

> The task could never have been performed adequately in the absence of machinery and procedures for joint and collective action among the various types of carriers and among the carriers themselves. * * * There is no activity in America any more important to the United States as a Nation than its transportation.

This is all the more reason why we should treat all our carriers alike.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, division of responsibility is always likely to cause trouble and it is such divided responsibility which brings about the necessity for passing the Bulwinkle bill.

The Department of Justice is charged with responsibility for enforcing the antitrust laws. The Interstate Commerce Commission is responsible for the administration of those regulatory laws relative to common carriers doing an interstate business. In the course of such administration the ICC is responsible for the proper application of certain principles declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, to be "the national transportation policy of the Congress."

That policy in brief seeks to provide for reasonable regulation of transportation in interstate commerce with efficient service and nondiscriminatory charges, adequately to meet the needs of commerce for a national system of transportation by various modes now operative.

It is natural that there should have grown up over the years a considerable number of joint organizations set up by the railroads, water and highway carriers, to deal with situations which, as a practical matter, require joint action by two or more carriers. These various organizations have become a necessity and if they could not be continued, it is certain that the needs of commerce throughout the country, including the postal service and national defense, could not be adequately met.

This bill will wipe out the confusion and uncertainty growing out of the present situation where two different agencies of government have to administer and enforce two different and possibly conflicting principles of public policy.

In the interests of reconciling and harmonizing the conflict which has grown up in the important field of transportation, I trust the bill will pass.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I find it a personal hardship on myself to oppose this bill because of the personnel handling the bill originally. I am somewhat comforted, however, by the Holy Scriptures:

> For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.

That is my persuasion in this matter. This is not a new or unknown subject to this House of Representatives. Many years ago Congress interested itself in the discrimination in freight rates and transportation activities throughout the country and appointed a Commission to investigate the matter. That commission spent about 3 years making the investigation. All three of the members found it a fact that there was serious discrimination made in different sections of the country. Two of the members of that Commission recommended legislation on the subject. One, acknowledging the discrimination to exist, thought that it might be handled through the Interstate Commerce Commission; nevertheless, nothing was ever done, and nothing has ever been done up to this date except the pronouncement made by the Interstate Commerce Commission after these suits had been brought, the one by the State of Georgia and the other by the United States of America.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that back in 1940, before the gentleman was a Member of this body, under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], we had this investigation in the southern rate cases. The southern governors brought a case before the Interstate Commerce Commission long before these suits were brought, and that is what the Commission handed down.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to reflect on any member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think they are all good, great men; but, as was suggested a while ago, it is physically impossible for them to supervise and approve or disapprove all of the great freight-rate structure in this country.

I want to say to you that these suits do not charge as a basis upon which they are brought and prosecuted that there have been conferences among the railroads of the country simply, but the charge that they have conspired together to interfere and to oppress certain sections of this country and the transportation interests thereof, as well as the people themselves who are shippers throughout the country, and that they are stifling and restraining trade.

Let me read to you just a line from this opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to the Georgia case referred to by the district judge in what we call the Lincoln, Nebraska, case. This comes after the War Production Board in order to allow a free and undisturbed flow of goods in interstate commerce had issued a ruling that would almost exempt the railroads from the Sherman antitrust law.

The Supreme Court said:

> We have considered the argument that certificate No. 44 of the War Production Board, issued by the Chairman of this Board, protects this alleged combination from the charges contained in the bill.

That certificate approved joint action, but does not allow conspiracies in restraint of trade and transportation.

RE H. R. 2536

This is a bill to relieve transportation companies, inclusive of railroads, busses and other transportation facilities, from liability, criminal or otherwise, under the Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton Act. It would permit transportation companies to enter into agreements as to freight rates and charges. No doubt this legislation originated on account of the fact that the United States Government had evidence sufficient to justify procedure against violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

We have passed an act relieving insurance companies from responsibility to answer to or observe the provisions of our antitrust laws. In another instance, I believe, a similar step was taken with respect to other business. Now we come to whittle away this guaranty against monopoly and trust agreements by making lawful that which, without this bill, would have been unlawful under the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

It is urged that this may well be done in safety because the Interstate Commerce Commission is to supervise or look into such agreements as may be made between and among carriers, and that therefore we should not look with any apprehensions on this lifting of such agreements out of the scope of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

Two things particularly have happened in the last short while which no doubt give rise to this proposed legislation. These are the suit to which the State of Georgia was allowed to become a party through the action of the Governor of that State, and another the suits of the United States against several railroads operating in western territory for violation of the Sherman antitrust law. This kind of legislation is, to say the least of it, peculiar, and I believe one will have to go further and say that it is significant.

We might inquire what influences set in motion this proposed bill. I am not able to say of my own motion or to state as a fact of my knowledge the probabilities in this respect. I am asking some questions.

Mr. Arne C. Wiprud, attorney for Robert Young and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway interests, made a speech before the Delta Nu Alpha Transport Fraternity, in New York, on December 5, I think, in which he warned that monopolies in the railroad and other transportation fields had restricted the development of public transportation, suppressed technological advancement, supported high rates, increased the cost of transportation, and protected inefficiencies. This is a considerable indictment and is quite significant when made by an attorney for a railway company or those interested in railway facilities. He stated that this had been disastrous to the industry itself and to the Nation. He charged, moreover, that the monopoly practices had been promoted by J. P. Morgan & Co., and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., banking houses, which he said had exploited railroad after railroad in all parts of the land. Said he:

> In cynical disregard of law, particularly the Federal antitrust laws, these railroad banking houses went about their business of sacking the railroads; that their victims, large and small investors, who often lost their all; farmers, small businessmen, and the public, which pays the transportation bill, have protested in general. No force—

Said he—

> of Government itself, has been strong enough to stop their destructive rule.

It was urged that the abuses of these bankers have not ended, but still prevail. It is charged that these bankers are blamable for the saddling upon these railroads of a debt amounting to 60 percent of their capital by always increasing their debt instead of reducing it. It is charged that the scheme of financing always increases but never reduces the

aggregate of railroad debts, forcing railroad managements to suppress improvements, curtail services, and to seek higher and higher rates—all to the end of preserving this unsound scheme of financing, thereby insuring a continuous and profitable income to the bankers.

If rate increases prove insufficient to pay the interest charges on the bonded debt, the railroad goes into bankruptcy, and the investor pays through the loss of his investment. Is it true that these are the manipulations which have caused many railroads to go into the hands of receivers and loss to the investing public whose stock becomes worthless and who are left out in the cold by a reorganization? It is said that more progressive railroad managements, independent of Morgan & Co. and Kuhn, Loeb, have reduced their debt and restored their financial soundness.

Mr. Wiprud said also that the scheme of collusive railway rate making had been established under the banker rule of the railroads to support unsound railroad capitalizations; and that this operated through the Association of American Railroads and the Western Commissioner Plan, with the bankers holding ultimate authority. This is not all he charges, but goes further and says that private rate-making conferences, patterned after those in the railway field, have been established by motor and water carriers. That agreements have been entered into by the organized rail carriers and the organized motor carriers. That motor carrier rates have been forced up to the level of rail rates, and that water carrier rates arbitrarily related to rail rates.

He states that an agreement between the Railway Express Agency and the domestic air lines provided that air express rates should be at least twice rail express rates, and that these rates, by all modes of transportation, were illegally raised to an artificially high level, without regard to the actual cost of transportation.

He further says that the failure of the railroads to get new equipment affects the whole transportation program of the banker-ruled railroads, and is one of planned scarcity and high price; that their monopolistic controls have drained carriers' revenues, through financial exploitation, restricted the development and use of modern transportation equipment, retarted air freight transport, hindered the operation of motor carriers, obstructed the building of pipe lines, and fixed rates in all fields of transportation.

Now, he comes to the bill which is proposed to be accepted by the Congress, and his warning is this: That continuation of the transportation monopoly would destroy the last vestige of private enterprise and would bring on public ownership. He makes particular reference to H. R. 2536, which would exempt the roads from the antitrust laws, and which he warns would perpetuate monopolistic rate making by each form of transportation, and even go further and permit the private rate making to cover all forms.

Mr. Wiprud charges that, although this bill would block the pending antitrust action against the railroads, those in authority would not want to hear testimony on the serious charges by the Government and by the State of Georgia of conspiracy by carriers, bankers, and others, notwithstanding the bill would legalize monopolistic and trust agreements, sought essentially by bankers who had oppressed and retarded the operation of railroads in the country on a sound basis.

The question, therefore, presents itself as to whether these charges by an attorney for railroad interests are well founded. He makes a prediction and it is this: That if this bill becomes a law the private companies, operating public services in all fields of transportation covered thereby, will raise rates to still higher levels, with greater abuses than have existed in the past.

With reference to the supervisory control seemingly undertaken, he has this to say:

> No regulatory agency could police such a gigantic combination, and that the bill would prove to be the legislative road to economic serfdom.

He says that the Nation is at the crossroads with respect to its transportation policy, and asks this question:

> Which shall it be, monopoly and strangulation or competition and progress in an expanding economy?

The question might also be asked: "Who are to be the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, 1 year, 5 years, 10 years, or 20 years from now? What will be their attitude toward sound, competitive freight charges? How far will they look into the question of who is profiting by the concerted agreements, certainly calculated to have a tendency to saddle upon this country a freight-rate structure that would impede, if not strangle, the progress the people of the Nation are entitled to expect?"

One may superficially inquire as to why an attorney for the Chesapeake & Ohio interests should make the charges as to these conspiracies, designed to bring under the control of large bankers many of the railroads of the country, with the power to strangle development, prevent improvement of road beds and rolling stock, and in the event of the failure of a railroad, resulting in bankruptcy, reorganize these roads and take from the small investors, the stockholders in the road, not only the dividends that might otherwise accrue by the stock itself. Has anybody heard of these things occurring? Does our experience from a historical point of view convince us that such things will occur? They have occurred, and often. We have seen the stock in railroad companies rise high and, without any apparent reason, descend to such a low point as to break the small investors of the country who had put a larger part of their means in stock. And we have seen these bankruptcies and reorganizations and the results that followed.

It is not hard to understand why Mr. Wiprud would call the attention of the country, and of the Congress, if you please, to the situation to which he has pointed, because of the very reason that he represented the railroads and not the bankers who manipulated and brought about the results which he has so graphically called attention to; not as imaginative consequences, but as a proven result in many, many cases. Looking at it from his point of view, he has ground to predict that the Nation is at the crossroads with respect to its transportation policy. And he has a right to inquire, "Which shall it be, monopoly and strangulation and stagnation or competition and progress in an expanding economy?"

If influences of the nature described can bring about legislation making lawful these monopolistic and trust agreements and lifting such agreements from the operation or effect of the antitrust laws of the United States, it is not very speculative to fear that figures and representations may be made to a supervisory controlling authority seeming to justify unconscionable freight rates to be saddled upon the economy of this country.

It has always been marvelous that discriminations have obtained in carrier rates against certain sections of the United States, or that these discriminations should be allowed to continue. At one time I lived in Winston-Salem, and my office was over a wholesale fruit dealer's place. Many of his commodities moved from Florida, and the freight-rate structure and manipulation was such that he was charged very much more in freight levies for the shipment of commodities from Florida to Winston-Salem than was charged for the same shipments to pass through Winston-Salem on to Roanoke, Va., and back to Winston-Salem. His freight actually moved through Winston-Salem on to Roanoke and back to Winston-Salem. In order to get his perishable goods earlier, he induced some of the railroad employees on the yard to allow him to unload the car at Winston-Salem, which car was carried on to Roanoke empty and back; and when this was found out or discovered by railroad authorities, he was prohibited from continuing that custom. This was the result of a manipulated freight structure. It was an example of discriminations made which in itself was a small item, but was only indicative of what was going on all over the country and with respect to large shipments.

I think it is to be regretted that any effort should be made to allow one to violate a law which has stood the test so long as the Sherman antitrust law has. I think we had better maintain the Sherman antitrust law with its integrity. It has been a great protection against the disposition of some to demand and receive unconscionable concessions in the way of charges for goods and transportation. I think we had better let it have its legitimate effect. The pretext offered is too dangerous.

Incidentally, but in connection with the subject, I have just read a statement by the President in regard to discriminations as among the several territories of the United States in transportation

charges and freight rates. I quote the statement I favored:

Here again, Mr. Truman was not familiar with the situation—

Referring to the subject of freight rates—

but expressed his desire for a freight-rate structure in this country that is fair to every part of the country. He spent most of his time in the Senate trying to break up discriminatory freight rates, he added.

The Congress, years ago, had so much interest in and concern about discriminatory practices that a commission was appointed to go into the subject, which was done fully and very intelligently. A majority of this commission recommended legislation correcting the evil which was found to exist. One member thought it might be controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but acknowledged the discriminatory practices. The Interstate Commerce Commission didn't do anything about it, so far as I know, until after suits were brought and indictments threatened by the Attorney General's office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STARKEY].

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words in support of the prompt enactment of H. R. 2536. I do not believe anyone has any greater interest than I have in maintaining the integrity of the antitrust laws. I am against combinations and trusts which result in high prices and permit the strong to dominate the weak. But in my zeal to protect the people against unholy alliances in business, I hope to exercise the common sense and judgment that should be exercised by us, as Members of Congress.

This bill does not exempt anyone from the antitrust laws. I measure my words when I make that statement. By the enactment of this bill we do not excuse anyone from the real intent and the actual purpose of the antitrust laws. Read the bill and you will find that all it does is to permit railroads, truck lines, and shippers to cooperate together in doing what Congress has already told them they must do. You will find that this bill would authorize only such agreements as are in furtherance of the national transportation policy, and then only after the Interstate Commerce Commission so finds that it is in the public interest.

Now it is only reasonable that there should not be attributed to one law a meaning which would prevent the observance of another law. Certainly the antitrust laws should not be so construed as to prevent anything necessary to carry out the purpose of the Interstate Commerce Act.

You will see from reading this bill that unless a proposed agreement is in furtherance of the national transportation policy, as we have written it into the Interstate Commerce Act, its approval must be denied. In case of any agreement not in furtherance of the national transportation policy, the antitrust laws apply with full force and effect. By the terms of this bill no individual or company is excused from the antitrust laws, yet anyone and everyone is permitted to do what is necessary to observe the Interstate Commerce Act.

The adoption of this bill will display the kind of statesmanship we need in times like these. I come from a great transportation center. St. Paul is one of the gateways through which the lifeblood of the Nation flows. My people are unanimously in favor of this bill. They have confidence in our judgment, and I have confidence in their judgment.

The testimony of Mr. G. H. Shafer, who is an expert on the subject, and who represents one of the largest shippers in my district, as well as the Association of Commerce and many other traffic leagues, convinces me that this is meritorious legislation. Mr. Shafer very aptly stated before the committee—and I quote:

Large shippers, such as the ones I represent, could more nearly cope with the situation that would result from the elimination of the present rate-making methods. The thousands of small shippers, however, whose business does not justify the maintenance of traffic departments, would be next to helpless, and none should be subjected to the confusion that would result.

In my opinion, the very purpose of the antitrust laws was to protect the weak against the strong; and unless this legislation is passed we are not only defeating the purpose of antitrust laws but likewise the purpose of the Interstate Commerce Act. If we are to have a national system of transportation, as Congress declared in the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act, it is inconceivable that this result can be obtained through the operation of several hundred privately owned corporations unless they are permitted to have conferences, hearings, and understandings between the various privately owned transportation corporations and all of the directly interested parties, namely, shippers, business, and cooperative organizations. I am satisfied that the public interest is best served by the continuation of past practices in regulations and rate making.

I know that the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, which speaks for 1,364 farmer cooperative organizations in Minnesota, with more than 390,000 members, would not testify in support of this bill if it meant higher freight rates or improper combinations or trusts. Shippers who pay the freight, railroad labor, truck lines, railroad companies, and everyone directly concerned with transportation support this bill. What more assurance do we want?

I am going to vote for this bill, and I hope it will be passed by the House with a very great majority.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, have I any time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am sorry; I wanted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I hope you will consider the fairness, energy, and patience with which the committee studied this legislation before reporting it to the House for passage. From the time it came to the committee it commenced to eliminate, so help me, the very arguments that have been advanced here today, and all except one committee member reached the same conclusion, which made it almost unanimous when voted out. We have hundreds of railroads in this country and they have grown into one great system, as you know, so far as shipping is concerned. It is impossible to establish rates that are fair and equitable without conferences. We have come to the point where we must pass this legislation sooner or later or we will be face to face with an impossible situation. What is the use of waiting until the lawsuits now pending are resolved? We cannot know how long that may take. If this law had been passed in time, we would not have these lawsuits in the country today. We do not pass laws to have lawsuits, and we should not withhold this legislation just to protect the growth of lawsuits, if we can resolve correctly by legislation the situation that causes them as we can here. We can get these handicaps out of the way so that necessary shipping agreements can be made without technically violating either the Clayton Act or the Sherman antitrust law and go forward. That is the purpose of this act. The gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, talked of the bill being complex. It is not complex. It is very simple. The first proposition is this: The carriers go to the ICC. Is there anything complicated there? Second, they there apply for approval of their agreements made with one another. Third, the ICC is authorized to approve, except such agreements as are prohibited, agreements they find equitable and proper. Those are the three things that the bill does.

Is there anything confusing or involved there?

The only antitrust relief in this bill is that which it is necessary to have in the bill if carriers are to get together as they must get together and do now get together apparently, but if they do so in such fashion as to strike against the purposes of the Antitrust Act, do you not suppose it will be apparent when the matter is considered by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Certainly it will.

If there is any way in the world to get this snarl out of our transportation system, let us do it. It has grown into a two-headed proposition now, and we cannot forever go forward with two heads. They must be merged into one. We have an agency of this Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission, that passes on this sort of thing. This bill here today arises from the very causes that resulted in the creation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the first place. We cannot help it if this legislation ruins Governor Arnall's suit and the others. We want to ruin them if it can resolve the issues correctly, which it does and will, and will have to do.

It is a strange thing that nobody came to the committee while it was holding its hearings to appear against the Bulwinkle bill, and that they should appear now.

Rates are made commodity by commodity and between point and point. Think what a maze, what labyrinth, they present. There is another element, too. Agencies have to get together to have agreements as to rates. Whenever the ICC can go to the source of shipments as provided in this bill and not have to wait to pass on them when brought forward commodity by commodity, between point and point in the rates, but can bring the whole agreements, and review those agreements in their entirety, then we are getting to the elimination of the chaos threatened. It clears the road for the way to eliminate freight discriminations we in the South and West have been seeking to eliminate. It gets down to one point of authority. This should have been done 20 years ago.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, some of us liberals are having a terrible time explaining how we are going to vote for this bill. I am going to take this time to say how I resolve my thinking. It is sort of a privilege like explaining a vote, and I appreciate the time.

There is quite an analogy between this situation and the one against which I protested when the insurance legislation was here. However, I think there is this distinct difference. The Interstate Commerce Commission has from time immemorial been set up as a body to fix the rates for railroad traffic. I did not think we had any such body in the case of the insurance legislation.

I have read the hearings. (This is for back home.) I read them last night, so I worked hard. I think the members of the committee have carried out certain suggestions which were made by the Commission, that it be granted the power to go in and supervise and examine the activities of these rate associations, to investigate whether or not they are carrying out the power which is given to them. Also, individuals are left free to act independently if they do not agree. To that extent, it seems to me that in the interests of orderly freight rates I have to decide this question in support of the pending legislation.

I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding me an opportunity to explain. Of course, people say, "Never explain. Your enemies will not believe you and your friends do not need it." I have made that mistake in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5a. (1) As used in this section the term 'carrier' means any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III, or any freight forwarder subject to part IV, of this act, and the term 'antitrust laws' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914.

"(2) Any carrier, party to an agreement (other than for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction to which section 5 is applicable) between or among any two or more carriers may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (3) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to enable it to grant its approval in accordance with the standard above set forth. The Commission shall by order terminate its approval of any such agreement, previously approved by it, or modify any terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, if it finds such action necessary in order that the standard above set forth may be complied with. No order shall be entered under this section except after notice and opportunity for hearing, and the effective date of any order of termination shall be postponed for such period as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship. The Commission shall not approve any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless under the agreement reasonable opportunity, in the light of the matter involved, to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in such determination.

"(3) Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under paragraph (2), and other persons, are hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement, and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement in conformity with its provisions and in conformity with such terms and conditions as may have been prescribed by the Commission.

"(4) Any action of the Commission under this section in approving an agreement, or in denying an application for such approval, or in terminating its approval of an agreement, or in prescribing the terms and conditions upon which its approval is to be granted, or in modifying such terms and conditions, shall be construed as having effect solely with reference to the applicability of the relief provisions of paragraph (3)."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 5a. (1) For purposes of this section—

"'(A) The term "carrier" means any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III, or any freight forwarder subject to part IV, of this act; and

"'(B) The term "antitrust laws" has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914.

"'(2) Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5)) if it finds that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy declared in this act, the relief provided in paragraph (8) should apply with respect to the making and carrying out of such agreement; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to enable it to grant its approval in accordance with the standard above set forth in this paragraph.

"'(3) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited to matters relating to transportation under joint rates or over through routes; and for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are carriers of one class.

"'(4) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which it finds is an agreement for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction, to which section 5 of this act is applicable.

"'(5) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless it finds that under the agreement opportunity to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in such determination.

"'(6) The Commission is authorized, upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to investigate and determine whether any agreement previously approved by it under this section, or terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, is not or are not in conformity with the standard set forth in paragraph (2), or whether any such terms and conditions are not necessary for purposes of conformity with such standard, and, after such investigation, the Commission shall by order terminate or modify its approval of such agreement if it finds such action necessary to insure conformity with such standard, and shall modify the terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted to the extent it finds necessary to insure conformity with such standard or to the extent to which it finds such terms and conditions not necessary to insure such conformity. The effective date of any order terminating or modifying approval, or modifying terms and conditions, shall be postponed for such period as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship.

"'(7) No order shall be entered under this section except after interested parties have been afforded reasonable opportunity for hearing.

"'(8) Parties to any agreement approved by the Commission under this section and other persons are, if the approval of such agreement is not prohibited by paragraph (3), (4), or (5), hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to the making of such agreement, and with

respect to the carrying out of such agreement in conformity with its provisions and in conformity with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Commission.

"'(9) Any action of the Commission under this section in approving an agreement, or in denying a application for such approval, or in terminating or modifying its approval of an agreement, or in prescribing the terms and conditions upon which its approval is to be granted, or in modifying such terms and conditions, shall be construed as having effect solely with reference to the applicability of the relief provisions of paragraph (8).'"

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the recent confusion so caught me by surprise that I do not have my thoughts together, if I were able to have any thoughts. I was quite amazed at the gentleman from Arkansas when he said he wanted to eliminate confusion. Quite the contrary, he has just brought about confusion so far as I am concerned, especially in regard to the reasons and the necessity for this measure. The attitude that my friend from the great State of Arkansas has taken is contrary to his way of thinking heretofore. According to what little education I got when I grew up, I was taught that there were three independent departments of our Government, the republican form of government, consisting of the legislative, judicial, and executive. I was taught that the legislative body, of which you and I are members, had the function to make laws and not to interpret them and that the interpretation of the laws fell clearly within the province of the judiciary. If we pass this law, it occurs to me that we would be going far afield in our functions here and would be invading the province of the other separate and independent departments of the Government, a thing I have always been against and a thing that must be prevented in toto if our Government is to remain a representative democracy. Then, again, I am confused because the last speaker who spoke in behalf of this measure said that we were only passing what the Congress passed a few years ago, I believe he said in 1940, and we would be carrying out the principles of the antitrust statutes. As I grew up on the milk of the fundamental principles of democracy of the Democratic Party, I learned two things, first, that monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade should be prohibited by the antitrust laws of our country; and, second, that the doctrine of States' rights should remain inviolate. Both of these fundamental principles have been the basic principles of the Democratic Party. Today, we are confronted with a bill which says, as I see it, it is going to make special interests immune from the antitrust statutes, regardless of what the last gentleman said who spoke in behalf of this measure.

I am sorry that I have not had the time to study this bill. A few of my constituents have written me letters and a few telegrams. I have received communications from close personal friends, people whom I would like to follow. If there were any doubt in my mind, I would follow their wishes. A few weeks ago I received a number of letters from service clubs in my district asking me to support this bill.

I have not seen it. I had not looked at it. I could not tell them what I was going to do. After I received a letter from one of the secretaries or the manager of that service club, I noticed by the press that a certain railroad lawyer, agent, or man had appeared before the service club that day and spoken on the Bulwinkle bill, and at the conclusion of his remarks the service club passed a resolution endorsing it, and agreed to write their Congressman to support it.

In the first place, any measure that seeks to destroy the effectiveness, the enforcement of the antitrust statutes of our country, stinks within my nostrils.

If this bill seeks to do that—and to save my life, I cannot see any other reason under high heaven for it other than to immune a great corporation, a competitive business——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. To save my life, I cannot see why this Congress should legislate, if I am correct in that. If that is the purpose, then why not just write off the statute books the antitrust statutes? Let us repeal them so that the special interests will not be coming in here to ask these special favors.

Did it ever occur to you why this measure is here? It is another reason why this measure stinks within my nostrils. I noticed on the filing of this bill that it was introduced in this House on the 8th day of March, 1945. The Georgia antitrust suit was filed in the year 1944, and was tried in March 1945, and judgment rendered.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, sir. I decline to yield. The gentleman refused to give me time on general debate, I could not get any time, so I want to take it all. You will please excuse me.

They rendered judgment in that Georgia case some few days after this bill was introduced in the Congress.

It will be recalled that the Nebraska case, in which you have heard that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not even know the rates, let alone approve them, and that they were alleged to be discriminatory, and it was set out how they were discriminatory. It was filed in the year 1944. Now, when has it come down to this, that a great legislative body shall step over and say, "Yes; we passed that law. We passed the antitrust statute, but now we want to judicially ascertain what that law means. We do not want to let the Supreme Court pass on it."

If you pass this law and it becomes effective, then you are depriving the Supreme Court or any other court that might hereafter want to pass on the facts, such as in the Nebraska case and the Georgia case, the right to hear and determine and pass judgment on the facts of that case. To my mind, that is going far afield.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I will have to yield to my Christian friend from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate the generosity of my friend from Texas. I understood the gentleman to say that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not know anything about the rates and had made no approval, or had no jurisdiction of the rates in the Nebraska case.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a part of what I said. There was one clause in the gentleman's statement I did not say. I said it had been alleged on the floor and not denied by the proponents of this bill that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not pass on the rates that were involved in that suit, and that the sponsors of this bill had not denied that statement on this floor.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman know what the fact is? I am asking for information.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not. I was not there and I did not state it as a fact. I stated it was alleged on the floor by a speaker that they did not approve them, they did not oppose them, they did not know of them.

Mr. PRIEST. I think it should be brought out, and that is the reason I asked this question. If any agreement is entered into and the rates put into effect that have not been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, then the antitrust laws would apply just as if it were some private corporation somewhere and not a Government-regulated entity.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true unless you pass this piece of legislation, but if you pass this piece of legislation you are going to deprive the judiciary of the right to hear and determine even the facts in that case. If a court of final resort gets it after the law is enacted then, as a fundamental principle of law, you deprive that court of the right to hear, determine, and pass judgment on it.

So, Mr. Chairman, if rates were agreed upon in a conference by the shippers and transportation companies, and are approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a governmental agency set up for that purpose and directed by law to pass on and promulgate, establish, and regulate rates, then the transportation companies would not violate the antitrust statutes set up today.

The Interstate Commerce Commission being a governmental agency operating under the Government and for the people, who are the Government, its acts would be binding unless an abuse of its discretion was shown in its acts; and that is all in the world this bill seeks to do, except to state, in the final analysis, that the antitrust laws shall not apply to such rates. They do not apply now, except when it can be shown that accident, mistake, or fraud was used by the Interstate Commerce Commission in promulgating such rates as agreed upon; and I do not believe that this body wants to tie the hands of the enforcement branch of our Government to the extent that they could not go into court and

show corruption on the part of any governmental bureau or agency. To do so would be bringing a bureaucratic government into totalitarianism insofar as it were applicable to that particular branch of the Government, and I do not believe this Congress intends to pass such legislation.

For that reason, I cannot see the necessity of this legislation, unless it is for the purpose of tying the hands of the enforcement branch of our Government in case accident, fraud, or mistake were shown on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission in approving the rates agreed upon in conference by the shippers and carriers; as it has been held by the Supreme Court of our land that a Government agency functions in behalf of the interest of the people, and promulgating the rates to be charged, that such rates charged and agreed upon, would not be within violation of the antitrust statutes, unless bad faith was shown in the agreement reached. And for that reason I cannot see to save my life why we should pass this piece of legislation, unless it is for the purpose of tying the hands of the courts in the two cases that have been filed, one of which has been tried and judgment rendered.

If that is the purpose of the bill, then the bill is wrong and should not be passed. I believe that each tub should set on its own bottom, and the courts should have the right to hear and determine in those two cases, without interference by the legislative branch; and then it will stand or fall on the merits of the case. If the Government is right and the defendants have violated the law, then, like individuals as well as other corporations, they should be called upon to atone for a violation of the law of the land.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in what I say this afternoon I am trying to be useful in getting information for Members of the House who are not on the committee reporting this bill, if I can, for I am in confusion myself. I have not had an opportunity to study this bill. Unfortunately, that is the situation with most of the Members of the House, and we need help, especially on one or two points.

I recognize that dealing with rates and dealing with the necessity to maintain the general policy which is embodied in the antitrust laws run into some difficulty. That is especially true with regard to railroad rates and with regard to agreements generally among transportation companies. As I understand the policy that has been adopted with reference to our Government, there is general legislation dealing with agreements in restraint of trade and with reference to industries and activities that are not controlled by some special agent of the Government like the Interstate Commerce Commission. Maintenance of competition and prevention of discriminatory and oppressive practices are the basic policy. I hope members of the Interstate Commerce Committee follow me here, because I know that is where we need help. When the Interstate Commerce Commission was created, as I understand it, it was understood that the railroads were not to be in competition as other businesses were. I believe that is true. It was recognized in the very nature of things that these agencies engaged in transportation were not expected to maintain competitive rates and to that degree the general policy of the antitrust law would not apply, as I understand it; and that there is a peculiar need that these agencies that are engaged in a sort of copartnership business in transportation of freight should be privileged to talk over the matter in which they are working together. For instance, you start out with a piece of freight to be carried from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific seaboard. You do not want to ship it to the end of one line and then make a contact with the next line to ship to the end of that line, and so on; but in order for the avoidance of that to be possible, as I understand it, these people who are engaged jointly in the transportation of that article from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific seaboard should get together and talk the thing over and enter into some agreements. With regard to competing railroads, railroads that are in the same country paralleling, for instance, as I understand the policy of the Government as agreed on, it is that they will not be engaged in rate cutting; in other words, competition is not to control the rates that are to be charged by these railroads that are serving the same area; so you pretty well eliminate the objective of antitrust legislation through creation of this agency of control and the denial of opportunity to engage in competition except in quality of service, and so forth.

I do not know where and at what point there is the necessity for the general policy of the antitrust law to come into operation in order to protect the shippers of this country. The shippers in my part of the country, who have written me, every single shipper, as I recall, has asked me to support this bill. They are not of the type who usually are determined with regard to their business by something that is said to them at a service-club luncheon as one of my friends who has spoken has mentioned. They are usually using their own judgment, looking after their own interest in matters of this sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for six additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will in a minute. I want to be sure to concentrate attention and discussion to the point where we need help. I do not know much about this. That is the tragic thing about this piled-up volume of things to be done here. I believe I indicate what three-fourths of the Members would like to have in the way of information.

Mr. LEA. There is an underlying thing involved here that has been overlooked, and that is the antitrust suit is directed in an attempt to penalize an agreement whether it is just or unjust. Four railroads can get together and agree upon a rate that everybody would acknowledge is a just rate, yet if this prosecution is based on the law, they are guilty. The mere fact that there might be an agreement subjects them to a penalty, even though they may agree on a just rate as well as an unjust rate. That means you would penalize all agreements between railroads whether they are good or bad.

What we really want to do in reference to railroad rates is to give just rates to the shippers of this country. That is what we want. Is that not what we are after? We leave to the Interstate Commerce Commission all the power that they have now in reference to any rate involved, yet we protect the shipper.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let me ask for information, and that is all I am trying to get: Does the power of this bill, do the provisions of the bill, permit the philosophy and the strength of the antitrust law to enter the situation where these common carriers go beyond the scope of what the gentleman has stated is desirable?

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I answer that?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Pardon me just a minute, please. I believe most of us recognize the necessity to permit these agreements among the transportation agencies which are necessary for them to do their job best, but I believe all of us do not want regulatory control to be operative beyond the point where that necessity does not extend. I believe really that is what the House wants to know about.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is exactly correct. The bill provides that instead of just turning loose and taking off the antitrust laws from any agreement or any meeting of the minds of the railroads, trucks, or whoever it is, it permits them only to meet under the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That is the first part of it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, perhaps the House would not agree to turn over everything absolutely to the judgment of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I was going to finish. We do not turn everything over to that agency. As to anything beyond that the carriers, whoever they may be, are still under the provisions of the antitrust laws.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the author of the bill, if some time soon in the discussion under the 5-minute rule it will be made clear, if this legislation is enacted, that the antitrust laws will become operative at the point where I have indicated?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Here is the crux of the whole thing in the report:

Under the standard in the bill Congress entrusts to the Commission the tasks of

applying to particular cases the general formula which Congress finds is determinative of the public interest and directs the Commission to determine whether the advantage to the public interests through furtherance of the national transportation policy are such as to outweigh the disadvantages to the public interests intended to be guarded against by the antitrust laws.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to discuss just a little further the issues raised by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS. I recognize the fact that the first thing most of us think about in this legislation is how does it affect our antitrust laws. I asked that same question. That was the very first question in my mind when this bill was presented. We all know that we do not want our antitrust laws disturbed unless there is something in the antitrust laws, by the very nature of the way it works, that will prevent justice from being maintained. Contrary to the thinking of a great many people this does not throw our antitrust laws out the window altogether so far as the railroads are concerned. What it does is this: It permits railroads, trucking companies, water carriers, and all forms of surface carriers to meet together with shippers and associations for the purpose of discussing how just rates may be provided. When these groups get together and determine in the best interest of their own business of transportation and serving the people, in serving the public interest, they decide what can be done on through shipments and through rates. They do not enter into agreements as to rates. That is not the purpose of this legislation at all to interfere with that. They enter into an agreement with reference to the procedure as to how these through shipments may be provided in the public interest, and at that point the agreement, if and when reached, is submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If there is any objection on the part of anyone, even a citizen who has no interest in any particular shipment whatsoever, the shipper, or whoever he may be, can go to the Interstate Commerce Commission and object to that agreement as to procedure. When at that point he objects then the Interstate Commerce Commission will hold hearings and go into the matter to determine openly and publicly as to what is the best interest of the public.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman give us an illustration of the kind of procedure he has in mind?

Mr. HARRIS. For instance, we have a shipment destined for San Francisco, Calif. It may be necessary to go by railroad for a certain distance, perhaps then by water for a certain distance, and then by truck for a further distance. Unless the shippers are permitted to sit down with the carriers and talk about how these rates can be provided on a just and equitable basis, we can never come to any determination as to what rates they may be charged. If they are not permitted to do that—and, understand, that has been permitted for probably 50 years; that is the way our whole rate structure has been built up during all this time—then the rate has to be made on the railroad to the destination where the railroad carries it, then there must be another rate for as far as the water carrier takes it, and a still further rate for the distance the truckers carry it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If what the gentleman has stated to illustrate his point is done, would that be held to be in violation of the antitrust laws now?

Mr. HARRIS. Insofar as the agreement that the ICC approves is concerned, it would not be held in violation of the antitrust law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. On page 6 of the report there is this statement, which I hope clarifies the situation, and it is a fact:

The bill leaves the antitrust laws to apply with full force and effect to carriers, so far as they are now applicable, except as to such joint agreements or arrangements between them as may have been submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by that body upon a finding that, by reason of furtherance of the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act, relief from the antitrust laws should be granted.

That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Since the gentleman from Texas made reference to me a moment ago, I shall be delighted to yield to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. In case the Interstate Commerce Commission approves those rates, it is a governmental agency which is setting them up, and it would not violate the antitrust law, anyway. A decision in the gentleman's home State with which he is acquainted clearly and definitely reaches that conclusion.

Mr. HARRIS. I have a great deal of confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think they have some very able men down there. I do not believe the Interstate Commerce Commission will ever approve any agreement that actually is in violation of any of our antitrust laws.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The Interstate Commerce Commission approved everything in the case on which the Governor of Georgia based his allegations in bringing suit.

Mr. HARRIS. The Governor of Georgia had an opportunity to appear before the committee on that matter.

Mr. RIVERS. I am talking about that case. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] said this thing is made for the purpose of obviating the findings in that case. Is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. I would not want to state just what the gentleman from Alabama had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Arkansas has taken the floor to clarify the situation because in listening to the debate I have been led to the conclusion that there is considerable confusion as to just what this measure seeks to accomplish. If I understand the situation, it merely relieves the railroads from the provisions of the Antitrust Act whenever a group of them get together and fix through rates at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. It is not only to protect the railroad companies from the operation of the Antitrust Act but also to protect the shipper.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, my friend from New Jersey is right. This must be a pretty good piece of legislation because shippers all over the country are asking for it. Farm organizations are asking for it. I daresay there is not a Member of the House of Representatives who has received any appreciable number of communications in opposition to this legislation. But, like everything affecting the railroads which comes before this body, it has become more or less a football for the political gymnast to kick around.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It is not incomprehensible and inconceivable that the people who pay the freight would want to put their neck in a noose and put themselves in a position to be victimized by the railroads if they are to be looked upon as monsters? Would that not be a ridiculous assumption?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, to vote against this measure in order to protect the shipper is assuming that the shipper does not know his own business and does not know what he wants or what is good for him. It is a reflection on his intelligence. For instance, if it is desired to establish a through rate from, let us say, Los Angeles to New York, there may be three railroads involved. Obviously, it would be necessary for the three roads to get together and discuss the matter. Let us say the Union Pacific from San Francisco to Omaha, the Chicago North Western from Omaha to Chicago, and then the Pennsylvania, the B. & O., or the New York Central Railroad, or some other railroad running from Chicago to New York—the representatives of the three railroads may be able to get together if we pass this law and establish a through rate as directed

by the Interstate Commerce Commission without violating the antitrust laws. When they have established such rate, they present their findings to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If approved by that body, it goes into effect. As the law stands today, if the railroads obey the mandate of the Interstate Commerce Commission, they immediately lay themselves open to prosecution under the Antitrust Act. There is the whole thing in a nutshell. Today, the railroads have two supervisory bodies—the judiciary and the Interstate Commerce Commission. Of course, a situation like that is an anomalous one and inevitably must lead to friction and confusion. I hope this legislation will pass unanimously because there is a crying need for it all over the country, as the letters you have received from your constituents attest. I, for one, shall have considerable satisfaction in voting for it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking some questions because I find myself, together with some other Members of the House, I imagine, in some confusion. I ask to be corrected as I go along by someone. In the first place, at the present stage of the game, as I understand it, what the bill provides is that the carriers are relieved from prosecution under the antitrust laws insofar as the calling of a meeting or entering into a conference is concerned. But they are not relieved as to any of the results that may flow from that conference. That is, if the result of that conference is to fix a certain schedule of rates, the Department of Justice is left just as free after the passage of the bill as it is now to bring suit to try to show that those rates are discriminatory, unfair, unreasonable, and in violation of the antitrust laws.

No. 1, I want to know whether I am correct in that distinction or not.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield. I would like to have some member of the committee tell me whether I am right or wrong.

Mr. THOM. I think you are wrong. Section 8 of the bill says that, first, if an agreement is made to regulate rates by conferences, and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the makers are exempt from the Sherman antitrust law. Secondly, that their rates in pursuance of that agreement are also exempt from the Sherman antitrust law.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am obliged to the gentleman, because I understood the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to mean precisely the opposite. In other words, then, the results of the conference are exempt from the antitrust law the same as the conference is exempt.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. LEA. The rates are not exempt from prosecution if they are subject to the antitrust law.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. They are not?

Mr. LEA. They are not. But, for instance, if railroads agreed on rates and they were approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the railroads could be prosecuted just the same, unless this law was passed, notwithstanding the approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A criminal prosecution would lie just the same, and the Attorney General would not have to prove that the rates were unjust.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, what the bill will do is to say that the rates resulting from the conference will be exempt from the antitrust law, if approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, whereas, at present that is not the case?

Mr. LEA. A prosecution is based on the mere agreement; not whether it is just or unjust under the law.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I understand.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Just reading the language itself, if the approval of such agreement is made, the makers and other persons are hereby relieved from the operation of the antitrust law with respect to the making of such agreement and with respect to the carrying out of such agreement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. With respect to the carrying out of such an agreement. I am obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The agreement you are talking about is the agreement to set up the machinery.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the point I was trying to get at.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is all this bill does. It permits a meeting of minds.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I just interrupt the gentleman to ask whether the bill does or does not mean that the results of that meeting of the minds are exempt from the antitrust laws?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No. Just a minute. Let me tell the gentleman. The carriers are in the same shape then that they are now. They are under the Interstate Commerce Commission which passes upon the lawfulness of the rates.

Mr. THOM. Read section 8.

Mr. BULWINKLE. On page 13 of the report, in the second paragraph, to which I referred some time ago—I will not take the time to read it—that will give you a full answer to the whole proposition.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask another question, because this has disturbed me very much. I would like to ask whether, if this bill is passed, there will not be danger of pressure being brought to bear under one of these agreements, upon some carrier to prevent that particular carrier from filing an application for lower rates or increased service. May I go a little further and say that it is my understanding that the basis of the Department of Justice suit against the western railroads is on the ground that pressure was brought to bear to try to prevent certain roads from filing lower rates. What I want to know is, if that point were proven against a group of railroads in connection with a suit of that kind, whether this bill would exempt them or whether it would not.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. The basis of the suit in Lincoln, Nebr., was never filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, but was even concealed from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes. We are very much interested in this.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. What I wanted to say in answer to the gentleman's question was that the economic pressure is frequently brought on shippers and roads alike to prevent their questioning rates before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Less than 5 percent of the rates are ever questioned there for various and sundry reasons, economic pressure being one of them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is what I am worried about.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may answer that question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. By all means.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman cite a case in which economic pressure was brought to bear to prevent anyone from filing a protest?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that I am honestly seeking information; I am not trying to prejudge a case here.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am trying to get at what the gentleman asks. The bill contains this language:

> The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless it finds that under the agreement opportunity to act contrary to the determination arrived at through such procedure is afforded to each party to the agreement which did not concur in such dtermination.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to ask the second part of my question again, if I may, in reference to the Lincoln, Nebr., case.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman from Texas to say that this suit at Lincoln, Nebr., was brought directly by the Department of Justice?

Mr. GOSSETT. My statement was that the basis of that suit was the so-called western agreement, that the western agreement was never filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission but was rather a secret agreement between certain shippers and the railroads and was held by the Department

of Justice at least to be in violation of the Antitrust Act.

Mr. STEFAN. That was filed by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and is similar to the Georgia case.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to ask this question: If that be true that the rates in the Nebraska case were never filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission would this bill have any effect on the continuance of that case? Can the gentleman from North Carolina inform me?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It will not affect that case.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Then that case will be proceeded with to its conclusion?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is a matter for the courts to determine. I cannot tell the gentleman what the courts will do.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further in reference to that Nebraska case?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to ask another question, if the gentleman will pardon me for not yielding. I wish to ask the gentleman from North Carolina: Assuming this bill were passed and assuming the Department of Justice brought a suit and attempted to prove that under one of these agreements pressure had been brought to bear upon a certain carrier to try to prevent that carrier from independently applying for a lower rate, or for the provision of additional service, or something like that, would the provisions of this bill prevent the Department of Justice from bringing such action?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It would not.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under the bill, the Department of Justice could still bring such action?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; this is a guarantee of it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I now yield further to the gentleman from Nebraska if he wishes me to.

Mr. STEFAN. I merely wanted to clarify the Lincoln, Nebr., case, because it has been set for trial for March. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee, is absolutely right, there is nothing in this bill to prevent the continued prosecution of that case.

I may also add that it is a case very similar to the Georgia case which eventually will be decided in the Supreme Court and may have some effect on the Nebraska case. I do not think this bill will prevent the prosecution of the Nebraska case.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. It is my considered opinion for what it is worth that if this bill is passed both the Nebraska and Georgia suits will become moot. I do not see why the Supreme Court would not so hold.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. We have the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina that that would not be the case.

Mr. O'HARA. I disagree with the gentleman from North Carolina, that is all.

Mr. BULWINKLE. This bill has nothing to do with that case.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ZIMMERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers, pursuant to House Resolution 429, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 277, nays 45, answered "present" 1, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

YEAS—277

Adams	Clevenger	Goodwin
Allen, Ill.	Coffee	Gordon
Allen, La.	Cole, Kans.	Gore
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, Mo.	Gorski
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Graham
Andresen, August H.	Cooper	Granger
Andrews, Ala.	Courtney	Grant, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.	Cox	Grant, Ind.
Angell	Cravens	Green
Arends	Crawford	Gregory
Arnold	Cunningham	Griffiths
Auchincloss	Curtis	Gwynne, Iowa
Bailey	D'Alesandro	Hagen
Baldwin, Md.	Daughton, Va.	Hale
Barrett, Wyo.	Davis	Hall,
Bates, Ky.	Delaney, John J.	Edwin Arthur
Beall	D'Ewart	Hall, Leonard W.
Bell	Dirksen	Halleck
Bennet, N. Y.	Dolliver	Hancock
Bennett, Mo.	Dondero	Harless, Ariz.
Biemiller	Doughton, N. C.	Harness, Ind.
Bishop	Doyle	Harris
Blackney	Drewry	Hartley
Bolton	Durham	Havenner
Boykin	Dworshak	Hays
Bradley, Pa.	Earthman	Healy
Brooks	Elliott	Hedrick
Brumbaugh	Ellis	Hendricks
Buck	Ellsworth	Henry
Buckley	Elston	Herter
Buffett	Engel, Mich.	Heselton
Bulwinkle	Engle, Calif.	Hess
Bunker	Ervin	Hill
Burgin	Fallon	Hoch
Butler	Fellows	Hoeven
Byrne, N. Y.	Fenton	Hoffman
Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher	Holifield
Campbell	Flannagan	Holmes, Mass.
Canfield	Flood	Holmes, Wash.
Cannon, Mo.	Fogarty	Hook
Carnahan	Fuller	Hope
Case, N. J.	Gallagher	Howell
Case, S. Dak.	Gamble	Jarman
Chapman	Gardner	Jenkins
Chelf	Gary	Jennings
Chenoweth	Gavin	Jensen
Church	Geelan	Johnson, Ill.
Clark	Gifford	Johnson, Ind.
Clason	Gillespie	Jonkman
Clements	Gillette	Judd
	Gillie	Kean
Kelley, Pa.	O'Brien, Ill.	Sheppard
Kelly, Ill.	O'Brien, Mich.	Sikes
Kerr	O'Konski	Simpson, Ill.
Kilburn	O'Neal	Simpson, Pa.
Kinzer	O'Toole	Slaughter
Knutson	Outland	Smith, Maine.
Kunkel	Patrick	Smith, Ohio
LaFollette	Patterson	Smith, Va.
Landis	Peterson, Fla.	Smith, Wis.
Lanham	Phillips	Spence
Lea	Pittenger	Springer
LeCompte	Plumley	Starkey
LeFevre	Price, Ill.	Stefan
Lemke	Priest	Stewart
Lesinski	Rabaut	Stigler
Link	Rains	Stockman
Luce	Ramey	Sullivan
Ludlow	Ramspeck	Sumner, Ill.
McConnell	Randolph	Sumners, Tex.
McCormack	Reed, Ill.	Sundstrom
McCowen	Reed, N. Y.	Taber
McDonough	Rees, Kans.	Talbot
McGehee	Resa	Talle
McKenzie	Rich	Thomas, N. J.
McMillan, S. C.	Richards	Tibbott
McMillen, Ill.	Riley	Tolan
Madden	Robertson, N. Dak.	Towe
Manasco	Robertson, Va.	Vursell
Mansfield, Mont.	Rockwell	Wadsworth
Martin, Iowa	Rodgers, Pa.	Walter
Martin, Mass.	Roe, Md.	Wasielewski
Mathews	Rogers, Fla.	Weaver
Michener	Rogers, Mass.	Weichel
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, N. Y.	West
Miller, Nebr.	Rowan	Whittington
Mills	Sadowski	Wickersham
Monroney	Sasscer	Wilson
Morrison	Savage	Wolcott
Murdock	Schwabe, Mo.	Wolverton, N. J.
Murphy	Scrivner	Woodhouse
Murray, Tenn.	Shafer	Woodruff, Mich.
Murray, Wis.	Sharp	Zimmerman

NAYS—45

Abernethy	Huber	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Hull	Pickett
Beckworth	Johnson, Luther, A.	Poage
Bonner	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Bryson	Kilday	Russell
Camp	King	Ryter
Combs	Kirwan	Sabath
Cooley	Lyle	Sparkman
Feighan	Mahon	Tarver
Folger	Marcantonio	Thom
Forand	Neely	Thomas, Tex.
Gibson	O'Hara	Thomason
Gossett	Pace	Trimble
Hare		Whitten
Hobbs		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Voorhis, Calif.

NOT VOTING—109

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	Patman
Barrett, Pa.	Gerlach	Pfeifer
Barry	Granahan	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Ploeser
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Powell
Bland	Hand	Price, Fla.
Bloom	Hart	Quinn, N. Y.
Boren	Hébert	Rabin
Bradley, Mich.	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Brehm	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rizley
Burch	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Robsion, Ky.
Carlson	Johnson, Calif.	Roe, N. Y.
Celler	Jones	Rooney
Chiperfield	Kearney	Schwabe, Okla.
Clippinger	Kee	Sheridan
Cochran	Keefe	Short
Colmer	Kefauver	Snyder
Corbett	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Kopplemann	Stevenson
Curley	Lane	Taylor
Dawson	Larcade	Torrens
De Lacy	Latham	Traynor
Delaney, James J.	Lewis	Vinson
Dickstein	Lynch	Vorys, Ohio.
Dingell	McGlinchey	Weiss
Domengeaux	McGregor	Welch
Douglas, Calif.	Maloney	White
Douglas, Ill.	Mansfield, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Eaton	Mason	Winstead
Eberharter	May	Winter
Elsaesser	Merrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fernandez	Morgan	Wood
Fulton	Mundt	Woodrum, Va.
Gathings	Norrell	Worley
	Norton	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Wood against.
Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Larcade against.
Mr. Short for, with Mr. Cochran against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Boren with Mr. Latham.
Mrs. Douglas of Illinois with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Kee with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Bender.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Elsaesser.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. VOORHIS of California changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in two instances, and to include a letter.

Mr. GOSSET asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Arne C. Wipurd.

Mr. SADOWSKI and Mr. KEFAUVER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the National Delegates Conference of the General Motors Department of the UAW.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions passed by the Farm Bureau of Winneshiek County, Iowa.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. J. P. Taggert, president of the Ohio State Bar Association.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three newspaper articles.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include comments upon the severe shortage of penicillin in his congressional district during a grippe epidemic.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the special order I had to address the House today be transferred to Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR UNRRA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on House Joint Resolution 266, providing additional funds for UNRRA.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE RESCISSION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4407, reducing certain appropriations.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will these conference reports be the first order of business tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If they are reported it is the intention to call them up the first thing tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, some months ago, in September I believe it was, the many people of this country who genuinely believe in the efficacy of our two-party system were both encouraged and surprised when the Republicans gave out the startling announcement that they were going to get themselves a platform at long last.

That was news indeed.

There were many people, of course, who were surprised, to say the least of it, at this Republican confession that they had not had a program all these years. Perhaps it was but natural for some to wonder what they had been doing for the past 10 years of unparalleled world crises, when myriads of problems, both domestic and foreign, pressed for solution, when the fate of civilization hung in the balance.

Perhaps some of the more credulous of the rank and file Republicans felt pretty put out to learn that the leadership of their party plainly considered the platforms of 1936, 1940, and 1944, as meaningless nothings—with which, by the way, the majority of Americans agreed at the time. No one likes to be played for a sucker and he can get pretty sore when he finds out that he has been deliberately nicked three times in the same old shell game.

Everybody agreed it was high time for the Republicans to change their ways. So last September, when this announcement came it was a source of genuine delight that the Republicans had had a change of heart, that they were going to reform. You know, it is always a good thing to see a hardened old sinner hit the sawdust trail.

And, Mr. Speaker, as they would say down in my country, it was a bright profession, too.

There was to be no more of this double talk, no more weasel words, no more of this business about not letting the right hand know what the left was doing. No, sir. It was going to be above board and the cards would be face up on the table.

Yes, sirree. Believe it or not, the Republican high command was going to come out for something and quit beating around the bush. The party wheel horses were going to come out into the open and operate so all could see. They had turned over a new leaf; there were to be no more subterfuges, no more devious dodges on every issue. Yes; they were going to say what they meant and stand by it.

For instance, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, whom we all love, gave a public statement on September 14, and I would like to read some of that statement to you. He said:

> We plan to set before the country a definite and a concise statement of the aims and objectives of the Republican Party. We plan to do this in such a manner as will leave no room for questioning as to where the Republicans stand on the issues before the country.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the country was startled. Nothing like this had been heard from the Republican Party for many, many a day. It was a radical change from tradition; in fact, it was but little short of political revolution. Everybody held their breath and could hardly believe their eyes and ears.

Yes; in their own good time, the Republicans were going to give us a platform that meant something, and it was going to be something that would blow the Democrats out of the water.

Then, in a press interview after President Truman gave his liberal, comprehensive, concise 21-point reconversion and the peace-prosperity program, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts sideswiped that and in so doing further excited our curiosity about this great Republican platform that was in the making.

He said:

> People won't fall asleep when they read it. It will be no 2-hour proclamation, and everyone can understand it.

After these press interviews the world stood by breathlessly and waited while the best brains of the Republican Party cooked up their high explosives on the front burner and promised us their atomic bomb from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, I know you know, and I believe our friends who are not privileged to be in Congress will understand, how we Democrats felt all this time, having to sit here quietly and helplessly while our utter doom and annihilation was being plotted behind closed doors by the high moguls of the Republican Party who, by

the way, are experts at anything having to do with destruction.

I tell you it was a harrowing, nerve-racking experience. The anxiety was so great that some of us could hardly sit still.

We waited, and we waited, and we waited. But finally the fateful day came, and after the most incredible travail and labor the Republican Party gave birth.

The anxious world wanted to see it immediately, but before they would let vulgar eyes be cast upon the offspring they called a secret caucus in this Chamber and let the inner circle of the clan see it. They gave it their hopeful blessings. And then the whole impatient world was permitted to look.

To say that the world was astounded is to put it mildly, for instead of it being a fresh, sweet, lusty, promising youngster, as we had been told, it looked exactly like its Old Guard daddy, dressed up in a newly phrased paper baby dress.

From end to end the country was paralyzed—with laughter. The joke was on us, but it was so good that we did not mind the long wait and the long anticipation.

Mr. Speaker, it was the most colossal hoax since Hoover's rounding of prosperity corner.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will just give me time to give this monstrosity an orthodox birth, then I will gladly yield.

As if to get it out of Washington as quickly as they could, it was hurriedly bundled up and taken out to Chicago, there to be exhibited to a great national gathering of the clan.

But they were not fooled, either. You know, the first fellow that came up to take a look, took one look and backed off and really made an unkind remark. He said, according to the newspapers: "The mountain labored and brought forth a not very forthright mouse."

Then the second came up and peeked over. He backed up and said: "It left me cold."

Then they began to pass by. The next one said: "It looks wishy-washy."

The next one looked and said: "Yes, and it looks vague."

Then another really slew the young fellow. He said: "It is a pussyfooting conglomeration of words."

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate today if we on this side of the aisle extended our sympathies and condolences to our lovable colleagues across the aisle. It must have been most humiliating. The big-wigs at Chicago actually did not want to own the little thing.

It would, perhaps, come with some political taste for a Democrat to express disappointment that the platform offers no real "clean-cut choice" for the American people between fundamental political concepts, as the two-party system is supposed to do.

Therefore, I would like to read an editorial which does make that suggestion. I read from an editorial in a great independent newspaper, the Washington Daily News, of December 6:

> The document is a sorry apology for a program. It is still wordy, wordy, and wordy, and most of the words are "weaselly." Eighty percent of its pledges could be made consistently—and more convincingly—by President Truman. It is a jumble of vague promises, shabby phrases, glittering generalities and vacant viewings with alarm.
>
> Reading this so-called statement of aims and purposes, you find it hard to see any difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic—except that the Republican Party is out of power. And quite likely to stay there, if this is the best it can offer.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, you have read this now famous document, and so have I. I have it here. It really is remarkable. It begins with a hair-raising preamble, picturing the issue before the country as between radicalism, exploitation, and regimentation on the one side, and home rule, liberty, and protection of the American way of life on the other.

I notice my distinguished friend here in very faint applause, my distinguished Republican friend from Iowa. May I say to him, if that were the real issue, our great two-party system would be in grave danger of destruction, because all the American people, even the Democrats, are united in support of home, liberty, and protection of the American way of life.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield since he has referred to me?

Mr. GORE. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the gentleman to know that I think that is the issue, wrapped up in a few words. I also note that for the first time for quite some time the gentleman and the Democratic Party, or the New Deal Party, whatever you care to call it, have taken more notice of that clean-cut program of the Republican Party than any other program we have got out for a good many years. Certainly there must be something in there the gentleman does not like and his party does not like or he would not spend so much time criticizing it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman for his very kind contribution. It is true that as a Democrat I like it, because 80 percent of it is an endorsement of the programs of a great Democratic administration. It is true also that we Democrats, as well as the country, have recognized it. You know, what a great political party does, what either of our great political parties does, the official actions they take, are tremendously important to this country because it is through the workings of those two parties that the American people can express their choice. But, Mr. Speaker, it is just as significant, and sometimes more tragically so, when either of the parties fails to live up to its responsibility.

Yes; we have taken note and we recognize this so-called new platform for all it is worth—exactly nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says he believes that is the issue. I see he is running true to Republican form, waging militant battle against a straw man. When I found this big bogy man, this vicious straw man in the preamble, I rested back in my chair to enjoy reading how my colleagues would go through the customary Republican gymnastic routine of gallantly knocking down the straw man and literally tearing him to pieces.

But, you know, they were not quite up to form. I was as surprised as many other people were to see that, in the extreme exertions of shadow-boxing, they succeeded, not in knocking down the straw man, but by dodging all the issues, they succeeded, I believe, in knocking themselves out of any real hope of bettering their political fortunes in 1946.

True, in the very next paragraph, they promise to give to the people the "clean-cut choice," which the gentleman has just said he thought this offered. But beyond that, they bogged down. After that promise, all they did, if you read it, was two things: Either to endorse the programs of a Democratic administration or to straddle and dodge the issues. For instance, they say, "We endorse the United Nations Organization for international peace." Well, so do we. The only difference is it was under the leadership of a great Democratic President, one of the greatest men ever to live—it was under a great Democratic Secretary of State whose name, as long as the annals of this Nation last, will grace the records of our foreign policy—it was under a great Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress that we took the leadership and responsibility in organizing the United Nations Organization. To be sure, we had valuable Republican assistance and for that we are grateful and have expressed that gratitude many times. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no "clean-cut choice" between the real McCoy and a "me, too."

Yes; they had plenty of chances to take a stand. Let us see where they were faint-hearted and where they were bold. After deploring some imaginary desertion of high, lofty principles, and after viewing with alarm some possible embracement and endorsement of foreign ideologies, they really succeeded in putting their foot down. It is strange, of course, for the Republican Party to officially put their foot down and stand there. But here is where they have done it. Yes, sir; with audacious courage and inspired leadership they say: We favor a "strong, solvent, free America." And that is where everybody is supposed to shout "hurray."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true that the Democratic Party put its foot down on this FEPC issue?

Mr. GORE. For one thing, the Democratic Party put its foot down on that issue in its platform. For another, it has put its foot down through the statements and the messages of two great Democratic Presidents, and the House Labor Committee has favorably reported it. A discharge petition to bring the bill to the floor of Congress is lying on the Speaker's desk. It requires 218 signatures. There are 157 signatures on the discharge petition—I just looked at it—and only 50 of them are Republicans,

and the Republican Party, too, endorsed FEPC in their platform.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further on that same issue?

Mr. GORE. I wonder if the gentleman himself is in any position to question me on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I think so. I have been against it all the time from the beginning to the end, and I still am. What I was wondering was: What has the Democratic Party done to enact legislation giving force to the utterances of its great leaders and Members of the House who advocate it?

Mr. GORE. I have just outlined to the gentleman the steps that have been taken. I am wondering just what steps his party has taken.

I now yield to the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that in the vote in the Committee on Rules there were six votes to bring out the FEPC bill. Four of them were cast by Republicans, which four constitute the entire representation of the Republican Party on that committee. Six Democrats out of eight voted against giving the House a chance to act on the legislation. Furthermore, I may say it only requires you to get one of six other Democrats and the legislation will be here immediately. As one who is for the FEPC, and is doing everything he can to see that it passes this House before we adjourn next June, I hope the gentleman will cooperate in getting that additional vote in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman brings up an amusing piece of horseplay, which is typical of the way his party tries to hide their real intentions. The deciding vote on whether that would come out of the Rules Committee did not reach here until late in the afternoon. The members of the gentleman's party, whom he boasts now as voting to bring it out, were clearly in the majority. They could have voted any time that day or the day before to bring it out. But they procrastinated, and they were the happiest four men under this Dome when the other man got here and tied up the vote. They could then vote for it, in full assurance that their votes would amount to nothing, except to hoodwink supporters of FEPC. But I doubt if the ruse was very successful.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is only guessing and sidestepping. Why do you not try to get three Democratic votes anytime next week on the Committee on Rules and bring the bill to the floor?

Mr. GORE. Let me ask the gentleman a question. How come your party ducked and dodged the question of universal military training in this so-called platform?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does your party stand on it?

Mr. GORE. How does my party stand on it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the gentleman has read the recommendation of the great President of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You have never had the courage to bring it before your caucus to see how the Democrats of the House stand on it.

Mr. GORE. We do not have to bring it to the caucus. It is members of the gentleman's party who have resorted to delaying tactics.

Oh, the gentleman's party is for a strong and free America. Yes. His party is for the flag and home and kindness to dumb animals, but when it comes down to a real question of making America strong, it falters and becomes noncommittal. It is not a question whether we will have an army or a navy or an air corps. It is not a question of whether we will have continued scientific research. We are all for that. The question before the American people is how to raise and train a reserve of trained men, which the gentleman's party endorses, but does not dare say how. How does the gentleman's party stand on that? I know the answer; firmly on the fence.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us finish one problem at a time. Let us go back to the FEPC. Will you or will you not give us those three votes next week?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York, author of the FEPC bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. We all know what the situation is in the Rules Committee. There is a petition on that desk, and the Republicans have been lagging behind. If the minority leader leads the parade down to that desk and gets his followers to sign that petition, we will have FEPC before the House. Let us stop this bluffing on that proposition.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I believe there is not a single Republican in the House from the State of Pennsylvania who has signed that discharge petition. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not know what the rules of the House are now, but I think formerly petitions were secret. I will tell the gentleman I will be glad to cooperate with the majority leader any time he wants to unite to get the legislation to the floor through the discharge petition.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There is nothing to prevent my observing those signatures.

Mr. GORE. Now, I must go on to some of the big issues before the country on which the Republican Party has just dodged the opportunity of taking a stand and giving to the people "a clean-cut choice," which they promised.

As I read on here, I see another grand and noble statement that must have challenged the basic courage of the old guard progenitors. I want to congratulate them, I want to congratulate my Republican colleagues for standing so bravely on the burning deck and saying, "We oppose those who would destroy us." Well, who would not? That is the kind of thing the gentleman's party comes out strongly for. If there is a material issue which they seem emphatic about, it is that they want to reduce taxes. But what do they do? They follow that with a beautiful statement that for the people they favor subsistence aid, unemployment compensation, conservation, international relief, shelter and medical care, and hospitalization; and for the veterans—yes, they are for the veterans, they favor rehabilitation, education, training, homes, farms, businesses——

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? What soldiers are you talking about?

Mr. GORE. And also aid for the orphans and widows, to say nothing about expenditures for the large Army, Navy, and Air Corps.

You know, I think that when the Republican caucus reached this point in the reading of this platform which the high moguls of the party had cooked up for them behind closed doors, it would have been highly in order to have recognized the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], to have asked this oft-propounded question: "Where are you going to get the money?"

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman, the minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. I am just wondering if the gentleman should not give the Republican Party credit for at least trying to do something constructive. We all make mistakes. The gentleman must remember we had only 90 days in which to get it up.

Mr. GORE. But the gentleman and his party has had a very long time to get up a program. What have they been doing for the past more than 12 years? No; time is not the difficulty with the gentleman's party.

It was the gentleman's own keynote speaker out in his recent Chicago convention, Governor Green, of the gentleman's home State of Illinois, who laid down the gauntlet to his party, who flung out the challenge to its pussy-footing leadership when he said:

> No party can be all things to all men.

A long time ago, Mr. Speaker, I think the attitude of the people toward such fence straddlings was prophesied. I like to read Revelation. You can find there a parallel to many present-day situations. So I turn over to Revelation, the third chapter, the fifteenth and sixteenth verses. I will read them to you. It would be good for the gentleman's party leaders if they would take it to their bosom. Here it is:

> I know thy works, that thou art neither cold or hot. I would that thou wert cold or hot; so, then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for—how much more time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. GORE. Two minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts; he is always generous.

There is another issue before the country on which our colleagues on the other side of the aisle ducked the chance of taking a "definite and concise" stand, as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] promised, and thereby offering the people "a clear-cut choice," another Republican promise. That is the question of labor-industrial strife. In concealing rather than disclosing how they really stand on this question, the Republican platform carefully, very carefully, put as much sugar on one side as the other, so both sides, I suppose, would attract the maximum number of flies. About as close to the labor question as they got was to declare that "demands by either side must be kept within the bounds of reason and fairness." They may as well have said, "All that glitters is not gold, but do not quote us."

I would like to go on, time permitting, and tell how this so-called new platform either dodges issues or endorses Democratic administration programs, but it would only be repetitious.

It was early last fall, when this first promise came out that the Republicans were going to get themselves a program that amounted to something, that a distinguished columnist, their friend, wrote in his column that he thought it was a good idea. But he warned that the platform must—and I read:

> Be more than an endorsement of the Constitution, the flag, mother love, and kindness to dumb animals. If it is going to be any good—

He said—

> it will have to say something, and if it does not say anything, then they might as well go play poker.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, it looks as if our Republican colleagues are going to have a busy social season because about all this masterpiece of evasion says is this:

"We're against taxes,
We're against sin.
We're against keeping
The Democrats in."

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AMERICA NEEDS A FOREIGN POLICY NOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the American people are deeply concerned with regard to our policy toward other nations of the world, both with regard to our allies, as well as our former enemies. This is because we either have no foreign policy or, if we do have, few seem to know what it really is. We need a general, understandable, clear-cut policy with respect to the nations of the world. It should be said, too, that before we can solve our domestic problems, we must have a better understanding of our foreign problems.

At the price of more than 1,000,000 American casualties, we brought to a victorious conclusion the most terrible war the world has ever known. American people everywhere and of every class, creed, and color joined in bringing victory to our country, that cost, as I have said, millions of lives, as well as grief and suffering from which we cannot recover for years to come. All this, to say nothing of the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Due to the lack of a forthright and a clear, understandable foreign policy, we are a long way from winning the peace. We can win the peace if we have the will to do so, as we did in winning the war. The first feeble steps that have been taken toward the formation of a United Nations Organization are not adequate, because our policy toward other countries is inconsistent, unpredictable, secretive, not understandable, and weak.

The American people are confused. They could not be otherwise, because from all sides confusion and contradictory statements concerning our foreign relations are emanating from the press, from the radio, from foreign diplomats, and from our own administrative and congressional leaders.

Only lip service is being given to the policy of "covenants or agreements openly arrived at." Right now, more than any other time in the history of America, it is essential that we work together as a unified nation and that we know precisely to what broad policy we are committed. The people of America have a right to know as definitely as can be determined just what agreements have been made with foreign nations. The present unrest in the whole world, which is aggravated by our lack of a clear and open foreign policy, is an excellent breeding ground for further misunderstanding. We must prevent another catastrophe. To do so, America must assume its rightful place of leadership in foreign affairs. The present attitude with regard to foreign countries appears to "drift with the tide." If that sort of thing is permitted to continue, then our country is likely to become a pawn in the hands of those foreign countries who are now conducting, and will continue to play, power politics."

The present disagreements, confusion, and dissension within our own administration ranks is illustrated by the events of recent months that finally culminated in the resignation of Patrick J. Hurley and of Gen. William Donovan. They only illustrate the misunderstanding and disagreements right in our own Government.

No one seems to understand our position with respect to the countries of the Middle East that are seething with discontent, treachery, and power politics. Our statesmen must determine and decide soon whether we are to be concerned with the Indochinese, and if so, to what extent. What about India, where we have thousands of American troops? Are we expected to help the British solve her problems in the Near East? What is our position in Iran?

The American people are deeply concerned with regard to relations between the Communist and the Chiang Kai-shek governments in China. Heretofore we have recognized the national government of Chiang Kai-shek. The inflammatory conditions in China become extremely important when we realize that we have our armed forces over there and can be drawn into active fighting as a result of any incident. The American people ought to know immediately about our policy in China, and whether it is to be backed by armed forces, or do we intend to pull out as soon as we can.

We still seem to be indefinite with respect to Poland and Finland. We are not even clear as to Germany. Then there is Japan. Are other countries to be involved in her control during the postwar period?

All of these matters and many more ought to be explained and cleared before we become still more complicated.

Also we have the question of loans and credits. Our administration has made promises of billions in loans, credits, and materials to other countries. What are those promises? How far can we go in extending credit and loans without impairing and weakening ourselves? It appears we are committed to make loans to Britain, Russia, France, and South American countries. Our people should at least know the amount of these loans and for what purposes they are to be used.

The American people are entitled to have a clearer understanding of our objectives before agreements abroad are made. We and our allies seem to have different interpretations as to the meaning of the Potsdam Agreement, but we ought to know definitely with regard to our commitments under the Potsdam Agreement with respect to Germany and our other former enemies.

Our Secretary of State is a great American, but I do not believe that he, together with those he has selected as his advisers and associates, can or should, alone, define a policy strategy that will commit American agreements with other nations of the world. In any event, no real foreign policy has thus far emanated from the State Department or the White House, and, as I have suggested, personnel in the State Department are having plenty of disagreement among themselves.

We cannot expect other nations of the world to have the highest respect for us when secondary foreign diplomats argue among themselves and practice deceit against each other. The American people ought not to be held to account for disagreements within a department of government that might cause trouble with nations in the outside world.

One of the chief sources of our difficulties in formulating a clear and open foreign policy arises from the fact that we have too many radical officials acting

in advisory capacities who want to make America over and who were formerly connected with some of our war agencies and have since been transferred to the State Department. So, among other things, the State Department must clean house. This is one of the first steps needed toward the beginning of working out a foreign policy.

We should have one agency of the Federal Government, namely the State Department, designated as the agency through which all other departments of government should operate in the realm of foreign affairs. At the present time we have innumerable officials from almost every department of government with a finger in the foreign affairs of our country. Sometimes these officials take action and make promises without the knowledge of the State Department. This situation must not continue to exist.

We are in a most critical period of our history. Decisions and agreements made now will definitely determine the future of our Nation with respect to the nations of the world. We need the advice and counsel of the best minds in our country. We need wisdom of men and women who have a profound desire to save a united America and its representative processes, and who will work unselfishly toward the goal of a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the war is over now. I urge that the President immediately call a conference of the leaders of Congress, representing both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. We should invite representatives of labor, industry, business, education, and church groups to confer with him regarding the establishment of an open foreign policy which should then be made known to the people of this country and to the nations of the world. This nonpartisan approach will remove the foreign policy of the United States from petty politics. It must be done before America can be effective in world leadership.

In order to trust and have confidence in our diplomatic officials, our people must be told in clear, understandable, and simple language how the United States stands with respect to the significant foreign issues of the day. Likewise, there must be a direct statement to the nations of the world, including our allies during the war, with regard to the problems that have come out of this world struggle. It must not be a policy of expediency. There was some excuse and reason for a policy of expediency during the war, but we should be very sure that in peace negotiations and understandings and agreements that a policy of expediency does not become one of servility.

War-stricken countries of the world look to America to feed their hungry, starving millions and to provide shelter and other necessities for the destitute. They look to America for the exercise of the type of leadership that will guarantee freedom to the people of the world. If America is to assume the responsibility she has accepted in world leadership she must remain strong within. America must adopt a clear, consistent, predictable, frank, and open foreign policy. Such a policy must, of all things, be a real American policy for American people.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow's calendar appears a very dangerous bill, H. R. 3937, the Arends bill, designed to destroy much of labor's civil liberties and give the unscrupulous employer advantages so great that it would be a simple matter to destroy large sections of the labor movement.

This is a bill sired by malice and foaled by ignorance. It is the delight of those labor baiters inside and outside the Congress who wish to reduce our working men and women to the old status of servants of a master, who believe it is wrong that those who toil for a living should have a real voice in determining the conditions of their labor and the economic and social welfare of their families.

Unfortunately and mistakenly it has been espoused by some sincere people who think it might alleviate the present discords in labor-management relations. These people, I fear, know little of labor-management relationships. They mistakenly blame labor for most of the current unrest so prevalent in our Nation and believe that repression will cure all our difficulties. They do not understand that sound labor-management relations must be built on mutual confidence and voluntary cooperation. Nor do they understand that much of the current unrest is due to wrong policies on the part of management and the Congress.

The average worker today is in a great state of insecurity and fear. His take-home pay has been drastically reduced. His standard of living has suffered seriously. Unemployment looms as a dangerous menace—8,000,000 workers on the bricks by spring, according to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. According to the employers' research organization, the National Industrial Conference Board, the decline in factory pay rolls this fall has been the most rapid in our history. In the face of declining wages and declining pay rolls, the worker looks to Congress for help. What does he get? He feels like the poor dog in the Mother Hubbard jingle.

The manufacturers have gotten to Congress first, and for the worker the cupboard is bare. Business Week and United States News tell us the current labor unrest and strikes do not bother employers. The tax bills of the past couple of years have taken care of them. They are guaranteed a profit through tax refund provisions, whether their plants make profits or not.

But what about the worker? His just and temperate proposals have been kicked about so that they are either buried deeply in some committee file, or changed beyond all recognition. Take two examples:

The President asked for certain emergency additions to the unemployment compensation laws. The Senate passed a bill embodying some of the recommendations but omitting the most important—the payment of a maximum of $25 a week for 26 weeks to eligible war workers. About one-third of the employees of this country would have been eligible for this sum. But bad as was the Senate action, the House dealt the workers an even worse blow. The Ways and Means Committee has buried the inadequate Senate bill so deep it would take a battalion of Seabees equipped with bulldozers to dig it out.

The second example is the full employment bill. Here is a bill that would give the worker some hope that respectable jobs will be available at all times, that he will not have to depend on leaf-raking projects, or garbage-can charity as proposed during the last depression by General Hurley. But what happens? First the Senate waters the bill down. In the House the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reports out a measure that resembles the original bill about as much as Satan resembles St. Francis. The present feeble measure is as likely to stop a wave of unemployment as a dam of twigs and loose sand would be to stop the Mississippi in full flood.

And still we wonder why American workers are restless. Their pay is cut, their needed legislative reforms discarded, and the biggest corporations in America are refusing to bargain.

So what does Congress do? It brings forth the Arends bill to curtail civil liberties and to act as a powerful club in the hands of unscrupulous employers, a weapon which any employer could use to ruin any union.

And how does Congress bring out the bill? From a committee that has no business interfering in labor-management relations, without hearings, and under a rule that, if permitted to stand, challenges the rights and prerogatives of every member and every committee of this House.

Let us see how this bill came before us. Over the protests of labor leaders and thoughtful citizens in all walks of life the Seventy-eighth Congress passed the Smith-Connally bill. Our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt vetoed the bill, warning that it would result in more, not less, industrial strife. But Congress overrode his veto.

The predictions of Franklin Roosevelt and others were correct. So badly did the Smith-Connally bill operate that one of its authors introduced a bill to repeal it. Since the original law under the guise of emergency wartime legislation had come from the Military Affairs Committee, the repealer was sent there. But were certain members of that committee content merely to repeal a law which experience had shown to be unworkable? Not at all. Under the inspiration of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the able Republican Party whip, the bill was amended to strike at labor's civil liberties and to provide a medium for employers to destroy unions. I will discuss these details shortly. But for the moment I want to analyze the committee's action.

One would normally assume that on a bill so far-reaching in its effects on the

functions of unions and on labor-management relations, some opportunity would be given for those interested to testify. But were hearings held? Not at all. The majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee calmly assumed they knew more about labor relations than students of the problem, leaders of employers' or labor organizations members of the Labor Committee, or other Members of the House who have particular knowledge of the problem. The committee proceeded without benefit of advice and the majority of its members, in their wisdom, brought forth that monstrosity in labor-management relations now before us—the Arends bill.

But did they stop there? Not at all. The chairman of the committee and the author of the rider persuaded the majority of the Rules Committee to give them a rule which in effect sets up the Military Affairs Committee as the sole arbiter of labor legislation in this House.

Under the rule which will come before the House tomorrow, all points of order are waived on the contents of the bill and on any amendments which may be submitted by the Military Affairs Committee. Think of that parliamentary situation. A committee brings out a bill over which it properly has no jurisdiction and then by consent of the Rules Committee reserves the right to add any amendment it desires. And all of us have heard rumors that the plot from the beginning has been to add sections to the bill even more repressive to labor than the provisions it now contains. What kind of legislative procedure is this?

Not only because I am opposed to the bill, but equally because I deplore this affront to sane and orderly parliamentary procedure and threat to the jurisdiction of every committee of this House, I sincerely hope this rule is voted down tomorrow.

But now to the bill itself, or rather the Arends riders, as no one, so far as I know, objects to the original bill.

First, let us consider section 3 of the bill, aimed at preventing political activity of any description on the part of labor organizations.

The Smith-Connally Act prevented contributions by labor organizations to candidates or committees in any general election in which Federal officials were to be voted for. In the opinion of many people, including myself, this provision was a flagrant violation of basic American rights. Repeatedly we have recognized by law that the worker as an individual has little power. The Congress has encouraged workers to band together for their mutual strength. More and more legislative problems loom important to the labor movement and there is every reason the members of organized labor should desire to take concerted action in political campaigns. And surely no one would seriously argue that any individual worker could match the political contributions running into thousands of dollars made by individuals like the Pews and the du Ponts. Only by pooling his resources can he obtain equality.

But does the committee recognize this just desire on the part of American working men and women? Not at all. On the contrary the committee proposes a law so drastic that many of us are convinced it strikes at the constitutional guaranties of free speech and a free press. It proposes not merely to prohibit contributions by unions during a general campaign, but to prevent any contribution or expenditure by a union during any primary or general election.

Let us see where this proposal, if enacted into law, would lead. It would mean that no union could expend so much as a postage stamp to inform any of its members about the record of any Congressman. It would mean no union paper financed by union funds—and they all are, save the occasional racket sheets financed by certain industrialists and politicians for their own interest—could run the records of Members of Congress and indicate support for, or opposition to any candidate. It would mean no union could invite a candidate to address its meeting, as union funds were being used for hall rent.

Need I go on? I could, as the ramifications of the provisions are infinite. But I am sure the above examples show you the preposterous lengths to which the majority report of the Military Affairs Committee is attempting to lead you. They ask you to deprive labor organizations of an opportunity as free Americans to comment on our records or to hear our views expressed. What the founding fathers must think of Congressmen who foster laws in such utter violation of the Bill of Rights.

Last week many Republicans refused to sanction a paragraph in their new statement of principles denying the right to unions to participate in elections. I trust those Members will help defeat this bill, with its vicious attack on labor's political rights.

And now to section 4, designed by labor baiters to crush unions. This section is misunderstood by many fair-minded men who do not realize the dangerous implications of its strike penalties.

The proposed law reads as follows:

> In the event of any strike, or concerted failure or refusal to work during the life of a collective-bargaining contract which includes a no-strike provision, the employer shall be relieved of any obligations under the contract, and the labor organization shall lose its status as a bargaining agency for a period of 1 year. Any such labor organization which is party to the contract may be sued in its own name in any Federal district court in which any of its officers may reside, or be found, and shall be responsible in damages to any party injured as a result of the breach.

It is apparent that many evils are contained in the foregoing provision. The use of the words "concerted failure or refusal to work during the life of a collective-bargaining contract" brings back to life the common law doctrine of conspiracy. That is, while it is lawful for one man to quit work, it is unlawful for two or more to quit work in concert. The conspiracy laws were the dread of workers in the nineteenth century. Now it is proposed to turn back the clock for one century and again use this vicious theory against workers.

Also, the section is written so that a violation of the agreement by members of the union party to the agreement, no matter how insignificant the violation may be, nor how small a minority of union members may be involved, the employer is relieved of "any" obligations under the contract. The inequality and injustice is manifest in the language which provides that a labor organization shall lose its status as a bargaining agency for a period of a year when it is guilty of a breach of contract, but an employer does not lose his business or status when he violates the agreement. To deprive a union of its status as a bargaining agent is to destroy its efficacy as a union, but no similar penalty or effect results to the employer. Are we to infer that Mr. Arends and his supporters have different standards for unions and employers?

The last sentence of the above-quoted paragraph is more significant than it appears on its face. In providing that labor organizations may be sued for damages for breach of contract, the proposed enactment is merely restating what is the law now. All parties to a collective-bargaining agreement are liable to civil damages for breach of it. But the malicious intent back of the provision is to be found in the use of the word "any" in connection with "party injured as a result of the breach." By so broadening the provision, a strike by bakery workers in a small bakery found to be in breach of an agreement may not only subject the union to payment of damages to the employer of the bakery workers but to an additional payment of damages to a hotel, retail grocery, or other similar customers who suffer damage through nondelivery of bread.

But more important than all else is the implied repeal of section 5 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which now limits "responsibility of officers and members of associations or their organizations for unlawful acts of individual officers, members, and agents."

Prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, employers brought suit against unions for the purpose of destroying their treasuries and thus rendering them ineffective. Damages were also recovered against officers and individual members. The most classic example of recovery of damages of that nature is the Danbury Hatters case. To overcome that broad responsibility, the Norris-LaGuardia Act includes the following provision:

> No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association or organization participating or interested in a labor dispute, shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, such acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

The proposal of the House Military Affairs Committee impliedly repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act and imposes a liability upon unions for any act constituting a breach of agreement, whether the breach of agreement results from authorized or unauthorized acts, or whether the

acts were participated in or not participated in directly by the union, or whether they were ratified or not ratified by the union.

And let us face an issue squarely here. You will note I earlier stated a minority of a union could strike, or an unauthorized strike take place, and if this bill were law the union would lose its bargaining rights and its officers could be sued for damages. What an opening for unscrupulous employers.

The pages of labor history are replete with examples of employers who have either goaded their men into striking or in extreme cases have planted agents inside the union to instigate untimely strikes to discredit the union. The records of the War Labor Board will show you how often an employer will stall on grievance procedure or flout the terms of a contract until all or part of a union's membership will walk out in disgust or desperation.

Time after time union leaders hold their members on the job in such instances, but the actions of some managements cause rank and file members to take matters into their own hands.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] put the story of the Kelsey Hayes strike into the RECORD only a few weeks ago. It was in many ways a misguided action on the part of some workers, but in the minds of many people it was the management which was clearly at fault. But were this bill law, the union at that plant would have lost all its rights, due to a trick on management's part.

The LaFollette Committee on Civil Liberties unearthed many cases where employers have planted men inside unions to instigate untimely strikes. These men pose as great agitators, blow up ordinary grievances into major issues—with the employer, of course, helping—condemn the union officials as milk-toast leaders, and inflame the men until they walk out. Then if this bill were law the union would lose its rights because of the employers' actions.

But such things would not happen, some of you say. I say they have happened and can happen again and again. I am not saying all employers would take such steps, but I am saying there is always a small percentage of employers who would welcome such an opportunity. And I am equally certain no fair-minded person, cognizant of the possibility, would want to vote for the Arends bill and thus indirectly sponsor this most vicious of all tactics of labor-management disputes.

And may I again remind you that with the carry-forward-carry-back provisions of the excess-profits tax still in operation next year, many employers do not care whether they operate all the time or not. What an opportunity the tax law plus the Arends bill would give the labor-hating employer to crush unions.

I have reserved for discussion the language in the proposed enactment pertaining to the no-strike provision. A straight construction of that language would render the section inoperative if the agreement did not contain a specific no-strike clause. It should be noted that the second sentence in the section which deals with damages applies regardless of whether or not the agreement contains a no-strike provision. But there are rules of law which permit courts to indulge in interpretation and construction of laws and to read into provisions "intent" and "implications." For instance, judges opposed to labor can very well read into the proposed law an implied no-strike pledge. Courts can very well say, and many of them will say, that the very fact an agreement was entered into governing wages, hours, and working conditions, constituted an implied agreement not to engage in stoppages of work, or to exercise other economic pressure during the life of the agreement. In other words, the agreement itself is a no-strike pledge.

Not until the Supreme Court of the United States will have construed the law will we know definitely whether the provision proposed by the House Military Affairs Committee is applicable only to those agreements which contain a specific no-strike pledge. From the foregoing, it will be observed that the provision is not only dangerous to the rights of labor, but it may destroy the very existence of trade unions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe a bill more vicious in intent, more prejudicial in effect, more repugnant to American principles has ever been brought on the floor of the House.

It destroys our basic American concept that government should not take sides in labor-management disputes. It clearly favors the most unscrupulous of employers and discriminates against labor unions. It violates the Bill of Rights. It is a big stride on the road toward repressive governmental control of all economic groups, be they employers, labor, or farmers.

I sincerely hope that tomorrow this House will vote this bill the death sentence it so richly deserves. I hope we will never again be called upon to take action on a measure brought before us in a manner so devious, by those who hate labor. I hope that labor legislation brought before us in the future will be properly presented, and fairly considered in committee. I hope that any further legislation will come up at a time when passions are not heated and when we can calmly recognize that labor-management relations are human relations, and that cooperation will obtain much greater results than repression.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, permission was heretofore granted me to speak for 10 minutes today. I ask unanimous consent that this special order be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN SERVICE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a broadcast by Col. Albert L. Warner regarding General Hurley's resignation and the vital importance of developing an adequate foreign service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk about reorganizing the Foreign Service at the present time. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think it very dangerous today to place in the State Department too many activities because so many of the trained men have left the Department.

The broadcast by Colonel Warner is as follows:

When Patrick Hurley, resigning as Ambassador to China, denounced the foreign service career men of the State Department, he raised an inquiry which may go beyond the immediate object of his anger.

"I'm not attacking professionalism in Government service," Mr. Hurley said at the National Press Club. He mentioned the professionals of the Army and Navy, Generals Marshall, MacArthur, and Eisenhower; Admirals King, Nimitz, and Spruance. In them professionalism paid off with dividends beyond reckon to the American people, said Mr. Hurley. But the former Ambassador, his voice booming, and the ribbon of his glasses shaking with the emphatic nod of his head, said, "Who among the career men of the State Department measures up to these persons in the other branches?"

The fact of the matter is that the Government has never given to the career service of the State Department either the unbiased selection, or the education, or the authority and prestige necessarily given to the fighting forces of the Nation. It brings up the question of whether there should not be at least a graduate school for prospective career men in the State Department, equivalent to West Point or Annapolis.

It brings up the question, too, of whether our career men have been selected too much from one stratum of society—people of wealth with a taste for social life. Despite regulations, low pay can cause a trend in this direction.

Furthermore, it should be asked whether those who have fully earned distinction in the foreign service are given the authority which is their due.

In the War and Navy Departments, the people who actually run the services are career men, the Army Chief of Staff and the Navy's Chief of Naval Operations. They do it under the general supervision of the Secretaries of War and Navy, who take care, as well, of all civilian affairs of the Departments. But career men in the case of the military run the career service.

In the case of the State Department, it is a periodical if not continuous fashion, to suspect the diplomatic careerists. Practical politicians or businessmen are injected into the situation.

There is no position in the State Department which remotely resembles the position of Chief of Staff in the War Department. Even in the field, businessmen and politicians often displace career men as heads of diplomatic missions. If we were to pursue the analogy, the Army, provided it copied the State Department, would be sending a politician or businessman as the field commander in the Pacific.

This may be overdrawing the case, but friends of the career service think it should reach into the highest councils of the State Department. True, former Under Secretaries of State William Phillips, Joseph Grew, and Sumner Welles were trained as career men. Career representation in the secretariat at present is small. But if the foreign service is to be directly and intimately controlled by the State Department com-

mand, and if, in turn, the career service leaders are to get the recognition required to maintain morale, consideration will be given to making the post of Under Secretary a well-paid key job for the top career man. It would be filled either on a permanent basis or by a periodic promotion of a careerist in the manner of the Army Chief of Staff.

In either event the office would be held by a man who has demonstrated his experience to cope with the problems of diplomacy in the field and a breadth of view sufficient to contribute to the making of major policy.

With these changes, career men might not have to be dodging the shotgun of a Mr. Hurley, and, also, a Mr. Hurley might not need to do any shooting.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURDOCK, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. MALONEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. LARCADE, for 5 days, on account of official business attending flood-control meeting in New Orleans.

To Mrs. DOUGLAS of California, for 4 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1610. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 119. A joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will have an executive meeting on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in room 247, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings to begin at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, December 11, 1945, on the bill (H. R. 4779) to enable debtor railroad corporations whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRANGER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2115. A bill relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals; with amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 4230. A bill to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 75. Concurrent resolution inviting the United Nations to locate seat of government in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 102. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification; with amendment (Rept. No. 1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4587. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1354. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War; with amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy submits its final report pursuant to House Resolution 465 (78th Cong., 1st sess.) (Rept. No. 1356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4861) granting a pension to James Thomas Lanpher; Committee on Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 4865) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Klein; committee on Pensions discharged and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4931. A bill to facilitate purchases of surplus property by veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4932. A bill to amend section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 4933. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national monument at Travertine Bridge, Gila County, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4934. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 4935. A bill to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation" (48 Stat. 980; title 18, sec. 420 (d), U. S. C.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4936. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

H. R. 4937. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4938. A bill to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4939. A bill relating to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 4940. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Old Saybrook, Conn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4941. A bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to develop and maintain a program of physical fitness for American youth and to provide jobs for war veterans; to the Committee on Education.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4942. A bill for the relief of Stanley C. Blattner and Vivian C. Blattner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 4943. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Gottlieb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4944. A bill for the relief of Gail E. Plinkett; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 4945. A bill for the relief of the estate of Roman D. Sepulveda; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4946. A bill for the relief of Alvin G. Patton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Ethel Guenther; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4948. A bill for the relief of Herbert C. Rockwell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1390. By Mr. KING: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., on Tuesday, October 30, 1945, relative to proposal for naval academy on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1391. Also petition to the Congress of the United States and the Federal Communications Commission, deploring the failure of many American broadcasting stations to perform properly the public service to which they are pledged; and deploring the excessive profits of many licensees, made at the expense of public service on licenses granted by the people; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1392. By The SPEAKER: Petition of director, American Civil Liberties Union, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to opposition to H. R. 3937; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1393. Also, petition of Local 75, UAW-CIO, petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to returning veterans to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Holy One whose sanctuary is the spirit of man, only from strands of penitence and purity and forgiveness can a garment of righteousness be woven for our selfish and willful hearts. We are grateful for the great glad tidings of the Advent month, that Thou hast worn our robe of human flesh, and that once again the one irresistible power in the universe smiles at us from a baby's face, while angels from the shining heavens sing of the eternal secret of peace through good will.

As we toil in the midst of epochal days, we humbly invoke Thy spirit's guidance as with a sense of awesome responsibility we face the thorny problems of our saddened and shadowed world. These are the gifts we ask of Thee Spirit Serene: strength for the daily task, courage to face the road.

"These are the sins we fain would have
Thee take away—
Malice and cold disdain; hot anger,
sullen hate;
Scorn of the lowly, envy of the great,
And discontent that casts a shadow gray
On all the brightness of a common day."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, December 10, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; and

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers;

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; and

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 75, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 10, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 119) to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

INVITATION TO LOCATE SEAT OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there has just been messaged over from the House of Representatives House Concurrent Resolution 75. I ask that the concurrent resolution may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

Mr. HILL. I inquire if the Senator from South Dakota is going to request immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. It was my intention to make a short explanation and then ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Dakota is a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I wonder if he has had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the chairman of that committee.

Mr. GURNEY. In answer I may say I not only had a chance to discuss it with him, but it was also considered by the committee, and I received permission to ask that it be considered on the floor of the Senate this morning, if I could get unanimous consent to that effect.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I was a little late in getting to the Committee on Foreign Relations because I had to attend first a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs and I did not hear the discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee, but, as I understand the Senator from South Dakota, the committee authorized him to call up the resolution and ask for action by the Senate at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator's statement is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the preparatory commission is now sitting in London and intends to vote tomorrow on a site for the United Nations Organization. Therefore, while this is a concurrent resolution and is not intended to do more than to convey the sentiment of both Houses of Congress, still it will be a semiofficial invitation that the United Nations Organization's capital be located in the United States.

I wish to say that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations this morning approved the concurrent resolution and authorized me to ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the resolution which was adopted by the House yesterday. I therefore express the hope that the Senate will concur in the resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted for House Concurrent Resolution 75, inviting the United Nations Organization to locate the seat of the Organization within the United States of America. This afternoon the Senate is about to adopt this resolution which was agreed to in the House yesterday. The concurrent resolution was introduced on September 5, 1945, by Representative CASE, Republican of South Dakota.

I am, indeed, happy that in a few moments this resolution will have been adopted by both Houses. For the benefit of the RECORD, however, I should like to note these facts.

On July 12, 1945, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, designed for the same purpose, namely, to invite the United Nations Organization to locate its headquarters in the United States of America. House Concurrent Resolution 75 is identical in wording with my own Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, submitted a month and a half previously. I spoke on the floor of the Senate on this subject on July 12 and also a week later on July 20, 1945.

May I call attention to the fact that this was long before the conferences had reached the final stage for the making of the decision as to where the seat of UNO was to be located? Today the decision hangs in the balance as to whether the seat of the Organization will be located on the free soil of America or on the strife-torn soil of Europe.

I humbly feel that if the Senate had taken action on my own resolution in the period following its introduction there would have been less doubt as to the final decision of the United Nations in this important matter. Instead, the Senate did nothing for 4½ months.

Representative CASE submitted his resolution on September 5, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported it on December 10, the same day that it was adopted by the House.

It is good that the resolution has now cleared both Houses, but I feel that I would be remiss in my responsibilities if I did not point out the fact that the unfortunate delay in acting on my own resolution has left the issue of the location of the seat of the United Nations Organization in doubt at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the House concurrent resolution.

The resolution was concurred in.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 124)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $111,630, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION (S. DOC. NO. 123)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation, amounting to $165,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ON CERTIFICATES FILED WITH HIM REQUISITE TO THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh report of certain certificates filed with him by the Chairman of the War Production Board for the period August 1 to November 30, 1945, at to the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, requisite to the prosecution of the war by any person or persons for which no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RELIEF FOR DISPLACED PERSONS IN EUROPE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present petitions signed by 8,600 citizens of Michigan, reading as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully petition the Government of the United States to reestablish postal, wireless, and banking services with Germany, Austria, and Hungary, and to allow relief shipments of clothing, food, and other necessities to save the lives of millions of people in Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

Mr. President, there is a very large movement among our citizens in the United States who are eager to be of direct service to the refugees and displaced persons in central Europe in meeting the awful problem of famine and the pressure of disaster which are confronted this winter in these distressed areas. These resolutions which I have presented refer particularly to Germany, Austria, and Hungary. The same sort of appeal has been made very earnestly by others in respect to other areas. I refer particularly to the Polish-American Congress in respect to the resumption of postal and parcel post service into the American-occupied zone in Germany, where so many Polish refugees are confronting desperate conditions which challenge every humane instinct which we possess.

I have discussed this matter at length with the State Department, and I am assured the Department is making urgent efforts to reestablish these postal and parcel post relationships. I think it is of very great importance that every emphasis be put upon the earliest possible resumption of these services. They offer a direct method of relief in respect to the terrible winter which is confronted by the people of all the countries of central Europe. The same reasons which impel us to hasten additional appropriations for UNRRA would seem to urge the Government to make every possible effort to resume these postal and parcels post connections so that our own citizens can make their own direct and voluntary contribution to this combat with tragedy and disaster which, as we all know, is confronted in such terrific degree in this part of the world this winter.

Mr. President, in the same connection I wish to refer to another even more important phase of this problem. One of the things which is of greatest challenge in the central European area—and particularly in the controlled zones in Germany—at the present time is the presence of literally hundreds of thousands of displaced persons and refugees who are not only pathetically homeless but who are virtually cut off from any sustaining nationality whatever. They are in effect what might be called stateless persons. They are innocent victims of a war which has made them men and women and pitiful little children without a country—yet constantly haunted with the fear of involuntary deportation to a status which they would consider worse than death.

Last summer serious question was raised that many of these stateless persons in the American zone in Germany were being involuntarily repatriated to sectors of Europe where they greatly feared for their lives if they were repatriated. At my request an investigation was made of this situation, and the net result was to indicate that there is substantial improvement. The fact remains that there are literally hundreds of thousands of these stateless persons who need something by way of official identification to protect them against involuntary repatriation, and to establish their rights to relief and to other human considerations.

General Eisenhower, in his recent testimony before a committee of the House of Representatives, defined a stateless person as being "any individual who does not want to return to his former area because of the certainty of persecution."

Mr. President, following World War I a similar situation was confronted, and it was met by the establishment of what came to be known as Nansen passports. The name came from the Norwegian Nansen, who was at the head of the official committee seeking to protect the rights of these refugees and these displaced persons.

The so-called Nansen passports, which were issued under the authority of the League of Nations, served a very useful purpose, as all students of that era know. In later years, after the emergency had passed, they were unfortunately exploited in some instances. In other words, it may be that the Nansen passports were used for too long a time following World War I. But there can be no question about the tremendously useful and humane and indispensable service rendered by these so-called passports in the years immediately following the war.

It seems to me that there is very great need today for the equivalent of the Nansen passports for the benefit of these refugees and these displaced persons. I know of nothing which presently could take their place, or offer an equivalent protection. I know of nothing we could do to more effectively put hope into hundreds of thousands of human breasts in these hapless areas which suffer the heaviest of postwar burdens.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, suggesting that the Department of State inquire into the advisability and feasibility of establishing the equivalent of the so-called Nansen passports, either under the authority of the United Nations Organization, or under the disposition of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugee Problems now existing, with headquarters in London.

I hope the matter may have early exploration. It seems to me, I repeat, that it offers a degree of hope to hundreds of thousands of these displaced persons

who otherwise confront a very bleak and hazardous prospectus. I may say that a similar resolution is being presented in the House of Representatives today by Representative LUCE, of Connecticut.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions and concurrent resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42), submitted by Mr. VANDENBERG, is as follows:

Whereas there are now in the areas occupied by Allied military forces many thousands of refugees, including persons who have been uprooted from their native areas to which they fear to return because of the probability of persecution for their political beliefs; and

Whereas following World War I, so-called Nansen passports were provided under the auspices of the League of Nations to meet the needs of such persons, and did meet those needs: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the State Department be requested to explore and promptly report on the subject of such refugees with a view to relieving immediately their present intolerable situation, either by means of appropriate international machinery within the existing framework of the United Nations Organization to legitimatize and register the civil status of, and provide cards of identity for all stateless persons who are now in any area occupied by any armed forces of a constituent member nation of the United Nations Organization, or, by giving sufficient and proper authority for the above purposes to the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugee Problems now existing with headquarters in London.

For the purpose of this resolution, a stateless person shall be understood to mean "any individual, free of criminal charges against him, who does not want to return to his former area because of the probability of persecution."

OFFICER'S STATUS FOR MERCHANT MARINE RADIO OPERATORS—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 1227, UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS, CIO

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted on November 16, 1945, by Local 1227, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO. The resolution is in support of Senate bill 1458, which was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in behalf of himself and me, to amend the definition of vessels of the United States and officers so as to include within the term "officers" chief radiotelegraph operator and assistant radiotelegraph operator.

I also ask to have printed with the resolution a copy of Senate bill 1458.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and Senate bill 1458 and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas marine radio telegraph operators in the American merchant marine perform a critically important function aboard merchant ships for which they are qualified by training and experience and for which they are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission; and

Whereas marine radio operators are the only licensed personnel aboard merchant ships which have not yet received official recognition of their proper status; and

Whereas marine radio operators are recognized as and accorded the status of officers in many foreign countries; and

Whereas recognition of officer's status was given during the war by the United States Maritime Service, which established officer's rating for marine radio operators; and

Whereas in over 150 collective-bargaining agreements held by ACA-CIO with shipping companies, the status of radio officers is recognized; and

Whereas the radio telegraph operator's devotion to duty has become a tradition of the sea and has been marked during the recent war by a heroic record of sacrifice and performance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local 1227, UERMWA, CIO, hereby goes on record in support of the principle of legislation providing officer's status for merchant marine radio operators, and calls upon you to support and vote for such legislation.

S. 1458

A bill to amend the definition of vessels of the United States and officers so as to include within the term "officers" chief radio-telegraph operator and assistant radio-telegraph operator

Be it enacted, etc., That Revised Statute, page 4131 (46 U. S. C. 221), be amended as follows:

"SEC. 221. Vessels of United States and officers defined: Officers to be citizens.

"Vessels registered pursuant to law and no others, except such as shall be duly qualified according to law for carrying on the coasting or fishing trade, shall be deemed vessels of the United States, and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels; but no such vessel shall enjoy such benefits and privileges longer than it shall continue to be wholly owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States or a corporation created under the laws of any of the States thereof, and be commanded by a citizen of the United States. And all the officers of vessels of the United States who shall have charge of a watch, including pilots, shall in all cases be citizens of the United States.

"The word 'officers' shall include the chief engineer and chief radio-telegraph operator, and each assistant engineer and assistant radio-telegraph operator, in charge of a watch on vessels propelled wholly or in part by steam, and no person shall be qualified to hold a license as a commander or watch officer of a merchant vessel of the United States who is not a native-born citizen or whose naturalization as a citizen shall not have been fully completed.

"In cases where on a foreign voyage, or on a voyage from an Atlantic to a Pacific port of the United States, any such vessel is for any reason deprived of the services of an officer below the grade of master, his place, or a vacancy caused by the promotion of another officer to such place, may be supplied by a person not a citizen of the United States until the first return of such vessel to its home port; and such vessel shall not be liable to any penalty or penal tax for such employment of an alien officer (Rev. Stat. 4131, June 26, 1884, ch. 121, par. 1, 23 Stat. 53; Rev. Stat. 4131, May 28, 1896, ch. 255, pars. 1, 3, 29, Stat. 188, 189)."

SHORTAGE OF TECHNICAL AND MANAGERIAL PERSONNEL—RESOLUTION OF ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by unanimous vote at the annual convention of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York on February 22, 1945. The resolution reads, in part, as follows:

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be urged to modify the present rulings in order to permit the deferment of college and university students who are preparing for service in areas of critical national need; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Director of Selective Service, and the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

The resolution is signed John M. Potter, secretary.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas during the next 5 years American industry will be severely crippled by a shortage of engineers, chemists, physicists, and other technical and managerial personnel; and

Whereas the flow of trained men into these important fields has long been cut off at its source by the operation of selective service; and

Whereas the lack of scientists and engineers is already delaying peacetime developments; and

Whereas the damage to our economy by this short-sighted policy will not be fully evident for at least another year; and

Whereas Canada, England, China, and Russia have all deferred engineering and scientific and other students from military service in the belief that such a policy advances their national interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Director of Selective Service be urged to modify the present rulings in order to permit the deferment of college and university students who are preparing for service in areas of critical national need; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Director of Selective Service, and the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS' UNION MEMBERS OF LOGAN COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago the members of the Farmers' Union of Logan County, N. Dak., comprising 335 members, met and adopted resolutions to the following effect:

First. Opposing universal military peacetime conscription;

Second. Advocating the Missouri Valley Authority proposal on the plan of the Tennessee Valley Authority;

Third. Recommending amendment of the GI bill of rights. since $2,000 is not enough for anybody to start farming under present conditions;

Fourth. Opposing additional loans to England or any other country, since the Government has about $300,000,000,000 of debt at the present time, and stating that we should first take care of our own people, including the veterans; and

Fifth. Opposing the sale of State and school lands in North Dakota to speculators and advocating that returning veterans be given the first preference.

The resolution is duly attested and signed by the resolutions committee, consisting of George J. Lubbers, of Burnstad, N. Dak.; Pius M. Reis, of Kintyre, N. Dak., and Martin Schwartzenberger, of Napoleon, N. Dak.

The resolutions were sent to me by John M. Gross, secretary, of Kintyre, N. Dak.

It was ordered in the resolutions that copies be sent also to Senator Young, Representatives William Lemke and Charles R. Robertson, and Gov. Fred G. Aandahl.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1523. A bill to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war; without amendment (Rept. No. 840); and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to preserve the status and perquisites of officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 841).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in two hundred and eleven and thirty-six one-hundredths acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 842); and

H. R. 2965. A bill to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 843).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4780. A bill to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, with an amendment (Rept. No. 844).

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced a bill (S. 1677) to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as follows:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on Immigration.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION HEARINGS

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings held before said joint committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, a concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

PAYMENTS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND IN CONNECTION WITH INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS—EXTENSION OF EFFECTIVE DATE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 201), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 77 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, shall become effective on July 1, 1946, or upon the date of completion of the reorganization of Congress as may be recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, whichever date is the earlier.

L. WILMOTH HODGES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPHINE BENHAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of Josephine Benham and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WILSON, conferees on the part of the Senate.

ALBERT E. SEVERNS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2335) for the relief of Albert E. Severns and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. CAPPER, conferees on the part of the Senate.

JAMES LYNCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2835) for the relief of James Lynch and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. CAPPER, conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SHIPSTEAD BEFORE LUTHERAN MEN'S COUNCIL

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Lutheran Men's Council at Chicago, Ill., October 28, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OFFICIAL INHUMANITY—ARTICLE BY THE EDITOR OF THE LUTHERAN OUTLOOK

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Official Inhumanity" by the editor of the Lutheran Outlook of November 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SLAVE LABOR IN EUROPE—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PAUL (MINN.) WANDERER

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Slave Labor in Europe," published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Wanderer of the issue October 4, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. EDGAR HOOVER BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at Miami, Fla., on December 10, 1945, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the fifty-second annual meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GREEN, OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE MEETING OF REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper account of the address delivered by Governor Green, of Illinois, before a meeting of the Republican National Committee, recently held in Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR DEVELOPMENTS SUPPORT MR. TRUMAN—EDITORIAL FROM HOUSTON (TEX.) CHRONICLE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Developments Support Mr. Truman," published in the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of December 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, By Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940; and

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson
Bilbo	Huffman	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Buck	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfill
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Carville	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wheeler
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Morse	Wiley
Green	Murdock	Willis
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Myers	Young
Hart	O'Daniel	
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

INQUIRY INTO ALLEGED DELAY IN DISCHARGING NAVY MEDICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for some weeks the Senate, and committees of the Senate, as well as individual Senators, including myself, have been giving much attention to the great abuse of authority on the part of the Army in holding and hoarding men in the medical branch of the Army. Indirect reference has been made to the Navy in that connection. I am prepared, after a study, to bring the situation in the Navy with regard to the hoarding of men in the medical branch to the attention of the Senate.

The disgraceful state of affairs concerning the hoarding of doctors by the Navy makes the Army policy in this respect, with all the glaring faults that have been discovered and made public, appear reasonable.

On January 1, 1945, with war all over the world at its full height, the Navy had 12,893 doctors. On December 1, 1945, 11 days ago, with no combat of any importance anywhere on the globe, the Navy had 13,299 doctors. With a state of peace prevailing, the Navy has increased the number of officers in its Medical Corps by 406, or 3 percent over what total war found necessary 11 months ago.

In my first comment on this subject on October 6, concerning the situation in the Army, the particular fact which attracted most attention was that on September 1, 1945, the Army had 46,017 doctors as compared with 45,511, the number in service on January 1, an increase of 506. However, the Army has moved at a fairly reasonable rate in its discharge of doctors since September 1. The Navy has done nothing of consequence.

By December 1, the Army had reduced the number of doctors in service to 32,600 as against 45,511 on January 1, 1945, a decrease of 12,911. The Navy actually increased its Medical Corps strength from January 1, 1945, to December 1, 1945. Under heavy prodding the Army finally got into action. The Navy is still indifferent to the welfare of this group of medical officers and indifferent to the need for their services in the communities from which they came.

The failure of the Navy to use any sort of common sense and make any kind of progress in the discharge of Medical Corps officers is as shameful an episode as can be found in the history of this country. In a long public life I have never known of a group of professional men being so shamefully abused as was being done by the Army and Navy in handling their respective Medical Corps, and is still being done by the Navy. I am introducing a resolution that calls for appointment of a board of inquiry by the Secretary of the Navy, to investigate the office of Surgeon General of the Navy, and any other offices which may be responsible for this continued abuse of authority.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to submit it out of order at this time.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 200) submitted by Mr. REED was received and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

Whereas on January 1, 1945, with World War II raging on all fronts at its full height, the number of doctors and surgeons on Navy rolls was, according to the Secretary of the Navy 12,893. The same authority reported that on December 1, 1945, nearly 7 months after VE-day and about 4 months after VJ-day, with all active fighting on all fronts having ceased, the number of doctors on the Navy's rolls was 13,299. The mere statement of these facts indicates an utter failure of the Navy Department to make plans for early discharge of unneeded and unnecessary doctors and surgeons. With a state of peace prevailing the Navy has increased the number of officers in its Medical Corps by 406, or 3 percent over what total war found necessary 11 months ago; and

Whereas from many sources, testimony of undoubted reliability has come to Members of the Senate indicating an incredible degree of incompetency, inefficiency, and general neglect on the part of the Office of The Surgeon General of the Navy in dealing with the return of the doctors and surgeons from the Navy service where they are not needed, to communities where the civilian need for proper medical attention is very great; and

Whereas from almost innumerable sources of information has come repeated statements that doctors and surgeons in groups as well as individuals are being held without need for them or work for them to do. The sum total of these statements shocks the confidence of the people in military organizations in general, and in the organization of the Medical Department in particular; and

Whereas as officers in the various types of service have passed through separation centers they have been urged by the Navy to take service in the Reserve Corps. This request has met with fairly good response except for the Medical Corps. It is reported that officers being discharged from the Medical Department are almost universally refusing to accept Reserve Corps commissions. Unanimously they allege neglect, abuse of power, inefficiency, and incompetency in assigning them for service, and, above all, savagely criticize the Surgeon General's policy of retaining them indefinitely to the detriment of both their personal welfare and the loss, to the communities from which they came, of their professional services; and

Whereas these matters have been given widespread publicity, and up to this time no adequate action has been offered to meet the situation by the Surgeon General of the Navy; and

Whereas what has been said herein concerning doctors and surgeons in the Medical Corps applies with equal or greater force to dentists. The number of dentists is much less than the number of medical doctors in the service, but the waste of their time and energies, and the deprivation of their service

to many communities, is perhaps more acute than in the case of medical doctors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of United States requests the Secretary of Navy to appoint a board of inquiry, which will proceed promptly and vigorously to inquire into the things complained of; to locate responsibility for the blundering and incompetency plainly exhibited since heavy fighting ceased, on the part of those responsible for administration of the Medical Corps; to recommend adequate action with those responsible and to take immediate steps to remedy the injury done to the doctors, surgeons, and dentists as individuals, and to the communities affected through inadequate and inefficient medical service.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the complacency of the Navy is beyond understanding. In recent months there has been much discussion of the hoarding of medical officers by both the Army and the Navy. No real action was taken by the War Department until Secretary of War Patterson took the matter into his own hands and personally directed a program that promises results. I am hopeless of results in the way of the discharge of Medical Corps men from the Navy until Secretary Forrestal takes the matter into his own hands as was done by Secretary Patterson.

In recent weeks I have received letters by the hundreds from medical officers from all over the world. These letters have come from Okinawa, Guam, Saipan, the Philippines, Hawaii, Japan, and other islands of the Pacific, and from the several areas of the European theater. I have been flooded with letters from medical officers, both in the Army and the Navy, stationed in this country. All these men tell me they are being held substantially without anything to do; their time is being wasted; they are being held away from their families. Naturally they all want to retutrn home, open offices, and resume their practices. Their communities need them.

There has grown up among these men a feeling of resentment against this official abuse that is so strong that if it were necessary to mobilize another Army and Navy now, the Medical Corps officers would have to be drafted. Voluntary enlistment would be negligible. To a great degree this feeling is shared by the whole medical profession. Mr. President, I have never known of a group of professional men who so bitterly resent the misuse of official authority involved in the failure to discharge medical officers since the war came to an end. To a great extent the feeling prevails throughout the whole medical profession and is not confined to men in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

I wish to take a few minutes to read for the RECORD, for the information of the Senate, extracts from some of the letters which I have received on this subject from men in the Medical Corps. One of the best known medical practitioners in the Middle West is Dr. Arthur E. Hertzler, of Halstead, Kans. Dr. Hertzler is the author of the book, the Horse and Buggy Doctor, which was so popular a few years ago. Dr. Hertzler writes to me concerning what I have heretofore said about the abuse of authority by the Army and Navy in the failure to discharge unneeded medical officers. Dr. Hertzler writes as follows:

You haint seen nothin'. I was at a naval base to make a speech a month ago. Seven docs, two patients. The aggravating thing to me is eight of the men did nothing.

P. S.—I am 75 years old and working 7 days a week. Maybe that accounts for my bad disposition.

I have received a letter signed by 15 medical officers in the Navy Medical Corps. Their names are necessarily withheld. All the doctors in both the Army and Navy ask that their names be withheld for fear of retribution by the Surgeons General of the respective services because of their giving information to Members of Congress. This letter reads in part as follows:

The Naval Medical Corps has been greatly overstaffed since the very beginning of the war, and even the poor administration at the top allowed hundreds of medical officers to stagnate in medical pools in the rear areas of the various theaters, while at the fighting front some men were overwhelmed with wounded. But now that the war is over the proposition that a group of healthy, young, screened, need more physicans per thousand than the general populace is so absurd as to be comical if it were not so tragic. Not only do civilians receive poorer medical care, but those doctors in the armed forces stagnate, lose their professional ability and interest, and worse than anything else finally come to a cynical attitude of "the hell with it all." But still the discharge rate of doctors remains miniscule, and published reports by the Naval Medical Corps are nothing more nor less than false. For instance, at one hospital in this area, 30 doctors are being held on duty who have 60 points for discharge and there is no military necessity involved.

If my recollection is correct, the number of points required for discharge of a medical officer from the Navy Medical Corps now is 53, so all these doctors would be entitled to almost automatic release.

From New York comes this letter:

Have just read about your wanting an investigation of the Army and Navy Medical Corps, and the reasons for the scandalous hold-up of discharges for our physicians. My advice is do not investigate the Army without the Navy, as that is even worse. At least the Army makes some come-back, but the Navy does not even give out any explanation, but goes on doing exactly as it wishes. Of course, the medical profession is well aware that neither the Army nor the Navy Medical Corps could possibly function without the Reserve Corps. Each war brings that out more clearly.

I quote now from a number of letters received from medical officers:

To be in my forty-fifth year, with nearly 20 years of medical work, which includes nearly 15 years of a specialty, my bachelor of science degree, my former commission in the Army, and now nearly 3 years in the Navy, with two of these spent "standing by," I now sit on an island in the Pacific eating C and K rations, reading, sleeping, and shooting at tin cans in the bay for the past 4 months.

They have something like 100 patients in this hospital, over 50 of which were ready for evacuation back to the States. The commanding officer would not permit them to go because it would cut his census and not look good on paper (Navy medicine?). The steamship *Consolation* was lying in the harbor and still is empty. The reason for keeping patients in tents with a shortage of supplies when they can be put aboard these hospital ships or flown back is beyond me.

As far as morale goes, there is none left. It was never very high all through the war, but it has hit a new low now. I doubt very much if the Navy is able to get enough Reserves of good training and character to join the Regulars.

From a lieutenant commander stationed in Florida comes this statement:

The Army is automatically discharging medical officers over 48 years of age, regardless of whether they have sufficient "points" or not. The Navy has no such provision; if it had, it would turn loose a few hundred and help that much. Now I have a suggestion to make. As you doubtless know, the Government deferred and educated thousands of medical students, giving them their tuition, books, and uniforms free, and in addition $54 a month. Now there are thousands of these young doctors in the services as first lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Army and Marines and as lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy. Why not pass a law requiring these young doctors to serve in the armed services as many years as they received free Government education. * * * Please do not use my name. I don't want to get in "bad" and be sent to a Pacific island.

Mr. President, I call especial attention to that comment in this letter, which I recently received. I have received over a thousand letters on this subject from men in the Medical Corps of both the Army and the Navy. In almost every one of them, with perhaps one or two exceptions in the case of men who seemingly were unconcerned with consequences of any kind, the men said, "Please withhold my name. I am afraid of retributions from the Surgeon General's Office or from my superior officers."

Mr. President, in connection with that point let me say that about 3 weeks ago, at the suggestion of the Secretary of War, I went to his office for a conference in regard to the further handling of the Army Medical Corps discharge question. Judge Patterson was very much alive to the situation. I told him I had been unable to obtain action in the levels of authority in the War Department below the office of the Secretary. So Judge Patterson himself is taking over the question. He has appointed a committee. A part of it is in Europe and another part is traveling all over the United States investigating this matter. I mention this subject for the reason that I told Judge Patterson of the fear of these officers regarding the taking of disciplinary action because they had written to a Member of Congress. Judge Patterson desired to use my files for the information of the committee he was appointing. I told him I should be very glad to have him do that if I could have an understanding with him—and he gave it to me—that no men who had written to me and whose letters I would make available to the committee would be embarrassed in the slightest degree because of writing such letters. The Secretary very freely gave that assurance; and, accordingly, I laid all my files before the committee appointed by Judge Patterson to investigate the Army situation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair).

Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, at the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the Surgeon General of the Army called back to active duty a distinguished physician from the State of Kansas, I believe, in order that he might help investigate this matter and make suggestions in regard to it, and in order to expedite the demobilization of doctors. Is that correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct; the Senator from Alabama has correctly stated the situation. In the course of my conference with Secretary Patterson for whom I have high respect and a very warm personal regard, the matter of the appointment of this committee came up. I asked Judge Patterson if I might suggest the name of a very competent doctor. He was very glad to agree to that. He asked me if the doctor would serve. I told him the history of the doctor. We have in Kansas a Dr. James B. Weaver, who is head of the orthopedic department of the Medical School of Kansas University. He organized an evacuation hospital unit, went to Europe with it, and served there for 38 months. When he returned to this country in October he came to see me and we talked about these matters. He stands at the very top of the medical profession in Kansas. So, by agreement with Secretary of War Patterson, I telephoned Dr. Weaver and asked him if he would end his terminal leave and aid in the investigation. He was willing to do so, and he is now out with Secretary Patterson's committee.

Senator HILL. He is now working on this matter; is he?

Mr. REED. Yes; he is working on this very question. I am very happy to say that I think Secretary Patterson is working vigorously in this connection. A part of his committee—one colonel and one lieutenant colonel—went to Europe. Another part of the committee selected by Judge Patterson himself—consisting of Lieutenant Colonel Weaver, the Kansas doctor of whom we have been speaking, a representative of the Surgeon General's office, and a representative of the Army Air Forces, together with a representative of the Inspector General's Office—is now touring this country in an airplane especially put at its disposal for that purpose.

What I am trying to do, I wish to assure the Senator from Alabama, who already has guessed my purpose, is to spur the Navy into doing as well as the Army is doing. I assure the Senator from Alabama—although he needs no such assurance—that I am going to follow up the Navy aspect of the matter until the Navy gets just as busy as the Army has gotten.

Mr. President, I now read a letter which comes from a doctor in a naval hospital:

I have been in the service for 3 years and 7 months, 21 months of which was spent in the South Pacific. Since returning I have been stationed as ward medical officer in the Charleston Naval Hospital. I have acquired 58-plus points. * * * I had charge of a ward which contained 13 patients. There were 5 doctors working on the medical staff (department). Immediately, following this announcement, the low-point men were ordered detached to other types of duty, so that by November 1, I have the care of two wards with about 90 patients and am told that I am essential and can be held 90 days. The other medical officer on medicine, taking care of two wards as I am doing, is a lieutenant (jg) recently out of an interneship. A week has passed and there is no indication that any reliefs are being ordered. Ships are coming in for decommissioning, but their doctors are being ordered to other duties, none to the hospital.

From a naval hospital in Florida comes this letter:

I am a physician 56 years of age, a veteran of World War I, and have been on active duty in the Naval Reserve since June 1944, having volunteered in March 1944 because of the need for doctors in the armed services.

I am writing for the older doctors in the Naval Reserve in my age group. We were not permitted to enlist until the spring of 1944 because before that time the Navy was not accepting enlistments of doctors who were more than 50 years of age. Therefore, according to the Navy point system for the release of doctors from active duty, we have not been in the Navy long enough to accumulate sufficient points for discharge even though we have been on active duty the maximum time possible since doctors of our age were accepted.

The Army is dicharging doctors over 48 years of age regardless of points but the Navy has no such provision at this time. We older doctors of the Naval Reserve feel that we should be given some consideration because of our age, as is given to Army doctors of similar age group.

From the wife of a marine dentist in the Navy:

My husband, a dentist, has been overseas 18 months with a marine division and for the last 2 months has been on a 3-hour-day schedule of dentistry. He was an instructor at the dental school before the war. The physicians attached to the same division also find it hard to work more than 3 hours a day.

From a lieutenant commander at Norfolk, Va.:

As you are interested in the release of Army doctors, perhaps you might take some interest in the welfare of Navy doctors also.

I assure you, Mr. President, that I am trying to do that.

They are being released much slower than Army physicians. The point value in the demobilization program is set at too high a figure and is releasing very few men, men who are sitting around with very little or no medicine on all the small stations and dispensaries here and overseas. Many of the Reserves are being held in hospitals while the Regulars are taking medical courses to enable them to take over the work.

The Regular Navy medical officers are in charge and want to get back to peacetime routine. As a result, the 40-hour week, or less, is being worked at almost all stations. This slows the work of demobilization, not only at the centers but at all the arteries feeding eligible men to the centers. Most of the Reserve would be willing to work extra hours and 7 days a week if they thought it would speed their return home. * * * You can easily check the figures mentioned in the Journal, AMA, in "Statistics of Navy Medicine," October 1945, available to you.

Mr. President, at no time in the history of this country, so far as my observation or reading is concerned, has there been so great an abuse of official authority, so much dumbness in connection with official administration, and so complete an absence of understanding of the need for medical service in communities scattered all over the United States, as are now being manifested by the Army and the Navy.

It is an axiom in the medical profession that normally there are approximately 125,000 active medical and surgical practitioners in the United States. More than that number of men are licensed to practice medicine, but many of them are old, have retired, are teaching, or are engaged to a limited extent in some kind of medical work. So the number of active practitioners, as I have said, is currently estimated to be approximately 125,000. At the beginning of the war the Army took 46,000 of those men; the Navy took 14,000. That made a total of approximately 60,000, or almost one-half of the active practitioners of this country, who were taken for military service. No one complained when they were taken into the service, nor were there any complaints made about it during the war. The members of our armed forces were given the most magnificent medical and surgical care that any man had ever been given in the history of all wars. God knows that all of us approved of it. But now the war has come to an end and combat has ceased. Why, in the name of Good, do the Army and the Navy hold physicians and surgeons when they are needed at home? They have not been held in the service for days only, but week after week and month after month they have been held while doing nothing. That applies to this country, to the Pacific, and to Europe.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 191) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to recur to the matter which is pending before the Senate, namely, Senate bill 191, the hospital bill, and I wish to address myself to the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As Members of the Senate, of course, know, the pending bill was introduced by the former junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and myself. We also, of course, know that the distinguished former junior Senator from Ohio was subsequently appointed to the Supreme Court and left the Senate for that purpose.

I wish to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] realized the conditions proposed to be remedied by the bill. He recognized the need for such a bill, and he went to work with that fine ability of his and his indefatigable industry, to do everything he could do in order to have the bill brought to the floor of the Senate in the best possible form.

As I said yesterday, the principles and objectives of the bill as reported are exactly the same as those embraced in the bill as originally introduced. But the bill has been very much improved in its mechanics and in the instrumentalities provided for furthering its principles and objectives. The Senator from Ohio, by helpful suggestions and amendments, made many contributions to the work of the subcommittee in improving the original form of the bill. He did much to make the bill what it is today. I think the subcommittee did an exceptionally fine job in framing the bill and in providing a pattern for proper relation as between the Federal Government, the States, subdivisions of the States, and nonprofit hospitals in connection with Federal aid to be given for construction of hospitals. I desire to pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio and express to him my appreciation for the tremendous contribution he made to this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the kind words of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I also appreciate the spirit in which he worked in trying to perfect this bill so as to make it accord with the principles of State aid and the proper limitations of Federal power, which I think and he thinks are essential to a proper working out of the Federal-State aid relationship, so that the States may retain the power which they should exercise. So, as I have said, I appreciate very much the kind words of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, the pending amendment proposes to change the provision of the bill conferring certain definite powers on the Federal Hospital Council. The Federal Hospital Council is made up of the Surgeon General as chairman and eight other persons appointed by the Federal Security Administrator, five of them technical men, three of whom must be familiar with the operation of hospitals, and the other three representative of the consumers of hospital services.

The bill provides that the Surgeon General may make certain regulations, which are to be permanent, having in effect the force of law. The regulations prescribe the rules to which the plans of the State must comply when it submits its plans to the Surgeon General.

I myself feel that the regulations should be written by Congress, but they are very technical, and it seemed impossible to work out the details in the bill. So, we provided that they should be made by the Surgeon General and approved by the Federal Hospital Council, largely composed, as I have said, of technical men. This is a legislative job, and it ought not to rest in the discretion of one man. So we provided that that particular quasi-legislative work should be performed by the Federal Hospital Council.

Now the Senator from Montana attempts to say it shall be performed by the Surgeon General, and the Federal Hospital Council shall be merely advisory; that one man in effect shall lay down the standards and prescribe the rules with which the State must comply.

The Federal Hospital Council has one other function which it is sought to change. We have provided that when a State submits a plan the Surgeon General shall determine whether it is in accord with the regulations which have been laid down. We have provided that if he finds the plan is not so in accord and the State is dissatisfied the State may appeal from his decision to the Federal Hospital Council. They approve the regulations, and they ought to know what they mean. They perform an administrative job and in effect, a quasi-judicial job. In all other respects, the Federal Hospital Council is merely advisory. When particular applications for particular projects are filed, on the question whether they conform to the rule as determined by the Surgeon General, there is an appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

I think it is very important that we do not give to a Federal official the unlimited discretion which was contained in the original bill and which to a certain extent the Senator from Montana desires to restore.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I want to say that no such unlimited discretion was contained in the original bill.

Mr. TAFT. It was not in the original bill and was not intended to be contained in that bill.

Mr. HILL. In the original bill this Council was called an advisory council, but that was rather a misnomer.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. In other words, in this respect there is no change in the bill now before the Senate from the original bill.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. While the original bill gave the Surgeon General much wider power in some respects it did subject him in almost every respect to the authority of the Federal Hospital Council. I think we have cut down some of the powers of the Federal Hospital Council compared to those contained in the original bill; but it seems to me vitally important if we are going to retain State control that the bill be drawn in such a way as not to delegate unlimited discretion to a Federal administrative official, because he may use the discretion—many of them have, while many others have not, and the present Surgeon General, I think, would not do so—in effect, to tell the States that they must conduct their affairs the way the particular Federal official wants the State to conduct them or he will not exercise the discretion in their favor or will exercise the discretion against their point of view. So, I think it very important to limit definitely the power of the administrative Federal official relative to regulation or to act arbitrarily toward the State.

I referred yesterday to a case where the Federal Security Board took $1,300,000 away from the State of Ohio, because Ohio did not operate the old-age-pension system in the way they wanted it done, and there was no appeal to the court and no appeal to any board. There was simply an arbitrary decision in that case of three men and primarily of one man.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In order that we may have before the Senate just what the original bill provided, let me read the provision in the original bill on page 3, subsection 3:

(3) Provide for carrying out such purposes in accordance with standards prescribed by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Advisory Council.

That is exactly what is proposed under the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. I feel very strongly that in these important basic matters of prescribing regulations the Surgeon General should be required to obtain the approval of this council of experts, who are Federal officials appointed by the Federal Security Administrator, who take an oath like other Federal officials do, and who serve perhaps not full time but as officers of the Federal Government. Furthermore, I believe that in cases where the Surgeon General rejects a State plan an appeal should be permitted to the Federal Hospital Council.

I therefore feel, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Montana should be rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it seems to me that everything sought to be accomplished by the sponsors of the proposed legislation can be accomplished without going to such an extreme as providing supervisory power in a council to control an administrative officer who is to be responsible for carrying out the program. The nominal responsibility for the program, of course, rests on the Federal Security Administrator and the Surgeon General. It seems to me that with advisory powers in this Council, everything can be accomplished that is sought to be accomplished under the bill. Such an extreme provision as that proposed, which is contrary to all previous experience in legislation of this kind, should not be permitted.

In addition to its first section, my amendment contains two other sections. On page 28, lines 9 to 12, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out all the present language after the word "hearing", and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

If such Council determines that the plan or modification complies with the provisions of such subsection, it shall advise the Surgeon General of its determination and the Surgeon General shall thereupon review his previous determination and shall approve or disapprove such plan or modification in accordance with a determination by the Administrator.

Mr. President, this amendment deprives the Council of power to reverse the Surgeon General whenever he finds a State plan does not meet with the Federal requirements. Of course, the Council still will have the authority to give the State a hearing, but if the Council disagrees with the Surgeon General, the matter then goes to the Federal Security Administrator.

Mr. President, that is the orderly procedure. Of course, the persons who will serve on the Council will be familiar with the problems, and their advice, as we judge from experience with other measures of this character, will be taken by

the Surgeon General, and the whole purpose of the legislation will be accomplished without going to the extreme contemplated by the bill as reported, which it seems to me, is a very unusual procedure.

By another section of the amendment it is proposed on page 38, line 18, after the word "Administrator", to insert the following:

> The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report for transmission to Congress a full report of the administration of this title, including a detailed statement of appropriations and disbursements. Such report shall include a record of consultations with the Federal Hospital Council, recommendations and determinations of the Federal Hospital Council, and comments thereon.

This provision of course is designed to insure consideration by the Surgeon General of the reports and advice of the Council. It will require a report to the Congress, in his annual report, of his transactions with the Council. This, of course, would insure consideration of the recommendations of the Council.

Mr. President, I submit that these amendments are absolutely necessary to protect the administration here in Washington, which will be responsible for the expenditure of large sums of money, and that it should not be subjected to the control of a council set up in the various States of the Nation.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the pending hospital survey and construction bill, Senate bill 191, and to urge the adoption of certain amendments to the bill.

Senate bill 191 contains some very striking defects, which have already been made plain to the Senate by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I agree completely with his criticisms of Senate bill 191, and I strongly urge the Senate to adopt the amendments which we have submitted. Each of them is sound and wise, each of them is necessary to make S. 191 good legislation.

The most important defect in the bill is that it divides administrative responsibility between the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service as administrative officer, and a part-time Federal hospital council consisting of private citizens serving on a part-time arrangement. Such division of administrative responsibility is unsound and unwise, it ought not to be left in the bill.

In his statement accompanying the committee report, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] said:

> Nominal responsibility for the program under S. 191 is assigned to the Federal Security Administrator and the Surgeon General. The Congress and the public may expect to hold them accountable for its operations. But a council which is independent of them could exercise the real control.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is the genius of our American democratic government that responsibility and accountability go hand in hand with power and authority. S. 191 does violence to this fundamental policy, since it would give to a part-time council large powers and no accountability.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget fully concurs in the opinion that the proposed administrative arrangement under S. 191 is bad.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a letter which I received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. It is the considered opinion of the American Federation of Labor, as expressed in the letter which I have received from Mr. Green, that the delegation of veto power over the Surgeon General to a council of the type provided in this bill would be unwise, unworkable, and contrary to the best principles of administration under a democratic form of government:

> OCTOBER 31, 1945.
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I am pleased to learn from press reports that the Committee on Education and Labor has agreed to report favorably S. 191, the Hospital Construction Act, introduced on January 10 by Senator HILL and Senator BURTON. The objectives of the bill are in accord with the health and social-security programs endorsed by the American Federation of Labor. We congratulate the sponsors and the committee on carrying such legislation forward.
>
> Our representative participated in the extensive hearings held on this bill by the committee and we are pleased to learn that certain amendments which we recommended then have been acted upon favorably.
>
> From the information presently available it would appear that the bill has been extensively revised and that it has been considerably improved. We are disturbed, however, by the report that the amended bill still contains provisions which appear to us as being of very doubtful wisdom. It is reported for example, that the Federal grants to States, political subdivisions, and nonprofit associations for the construction of hospitals are to be made under the administrative direction of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. With this we are in accord. Witness the fact that we propose just such an arrangement in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill (S. 1050), which the American Federation of Labor has sponsored. We understand, however, that in S. 191 the Surgeon General is to be aided by an advisory council in which the public has only a minority representation. We believe that in any such program public representation should be at least equal to—if not greater than—representation drawn from professional and technical groups.
>
> Further, it is reported that in the amended bill the advisory body consisting of part-time people is not merely advisory but actually has power to control and even to overrule the Surgeon General. There were such provisions in the original bill and it would appear that there are such in the amended bill. This is unsound legislation since it places the control of public funds outside of public officers. The American Federation of Labor vigorously advocates the use of representative advisory bodies, but it has never asked and does not believe in any proposal to place final public control of public funds anywhere except in the hands of responsible public officials. The American Federation of Labor believes firmly in the wisdom of the constitutional provisions that the executive power shall be lodged in the President and his subordinates. This makes for responsible government in our democracy. Anything contrary to it would weaken or destroy the democratic processes we have labored and fought so hard to preserve.
>
> Our reports on the provisions of the amended bill indicate also that the deficiency with respect to providing for the maintenance of hospitals and health centers in poverty-stricken areas has not been removed. Since the burden of so much of the evidence presented at the hearings on this measure dealt with the close relation between poverty and illness, it seems to us imperative that the bill should be amended to provide for maintenance of health facilities in areas of proven need. Otherwise, the program will tend further to concentrate construction of hospitals in areas of lesser need.
>
> We shall want to study very carefully the amended version of S. 191 when it is available. I hope, therefore, you will give careful and sympathetic attention to the questions I have raised and will take such steps as are necessary to assure that there is opportunity for full and careful consideration of the bill when reported out to the Senate.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WILLIAM GREEN,
> *President, American Federation of Labor.*

It seems to me that the A. F. of L. is justified in its objection to a council in which the public has only minority representation. I recommend that the public and professional representation be made equal among the eight appointed members. This is embodied in amendment No. 6, which the Senator from Montana and I have submitted to the Senate.

I should also like to call to the attention of the Senate the carefully considered opposition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations to the provisions for the establishment of a council which are presently contained in S. 191. On this point, Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, addressed a letter to me, in which he says:

> The proposal in S. 191 to assign administrative functions and powers to a part-time advisory council whose members cannot be held responsible to the people of the country through the usual channels of government represents a dangerous departure from democratic principles and procedures, and one which we very much hope the Senate will refuse to adopt.

I believe that is an absolutely correct statement.

The Washington Post commented editorially to the same effect on the bad administrative proposal in S. 191. In an editorial appearing on November 6, 1945, this newspaper said:

> We do not think that administrative powers should be split in this haphazard manner. To pass such a measure while Congress is voting power to the President to eliminate confusing administrative tangles would be a grave reflection on congressional judgment. With this obvious defect corrected, the bill will hold great promise of better care for the sick in the postwar years.

This unprecedented power given to the Federal Hospital Council has been defended on the ground that it is a quasi-judicial body. Two obvious objections must be raised against this defense.

In the first place, there is nothing quasi-judicial about the power to approve or disapprove the general regulations which the Surgeon General must prescribe under section 622. Yet S. 191 would give just such power to the Federal Hospital Council.

In the second place, there is no need for any quasi-judicial council, because the bill otherwise makes full provision for

judicial review. Section 632 (b)—beginning on page 37, line 12—carefully provides for judicial review whenever an applicant or any State is dissatisfied with the Surgeon General's action.

Thus, there is no defense whatever for the excessive powers of the Federal Hospital Council on the ground of its alleged quasi-judicial functions.

HIGH-QUALITY STANDARDS FOR MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF FEDERALLY AIDED HOSPITALS

Another defect of the bill deserves further emphasis. After hospitals are built with the help of Federal funds, the bill does not assure that they will be properly maintained or operated. The bill contains a provision that each State must provide "minimum standards, to be fixed in the discretion of the State, for the maintenance and operation of hospitals which receive Federal aid." But the bill does not give the Federal Government any real authority to see that these are high standards, fully in accord with the scientific knowledge we possess and up to the level of high-quality care that every sick person should receive. Since the Federal Government will be paying from 33⅓ percent in the richest State up to 75 percent of the construction costs in the poorest State, the Federal Government should be given greater assurance that the investment of Federal funds will be followed by high-grade maintenance and utilization of the Federally aided hospitals. Our second amendment would go a long way toward providing the assurance which the Federal Government should have that its funds will be used effectively.

FAILURE OF S. 191 TO HELP THE POOREST AREAS AND COMMUNITIES

Another major defect of S. 191—unquestionably the most important of all—results from the fact that S. 191 deals only with the construction of hospitals. It does not meet the problem of helping communities or families to pay the cost of maintaining or using the hospitals after they are built.

To be sure, the bills says that when the Surgeon General issues his regulations he shall prescribe that each State plan "shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for persons unable to pay therefor." And, later, the bill says that each State plan to be approved must "set forth a hospital construction program * * * which meets the requirements * * * for furnishing needed hospital services to persons unable to pay therefor."

But it is a grave question whether these provisions will have any useful meaning and until something is done to assure that the communities which are without hospital facilities have some way of paying for the hospital care that should be furnished to "persons unable to pay therefor."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the Senator's opinion as to whether, under the provisions of the bill, X-ray machines could be bought?

Mr. WAGNER. They could be bought.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator believes X-ray machines could be bought. Could beds be bought under its provisions?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And all the furnishings for a hospital?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator would call such items a part of the construction cost?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; they would constitute a part of the construction cost.

Indeed, these provisions which I have quoted from S. 191 are likely to have exactly the reverse effect from what many who have not thought about this problem might expect. Surely, it is sensible that Federal aid should not go to hospitals that could not be supported and used after they are built. I think that answers the Senator's question. Surely, it is sound to require that the future maintenance money shall be in sight before Federal aid is given for construction. Surely, it is sound that S. 191 also provides in section 625 (a) (C) that—

> The Surgeon General shall approve such application * * * if the Surgeon General finds * * * that the application * * * contains an assurance that the applicant will conform to the applicable requirements of the State plan * * * for furnishing needed hospital facilities for persons unable to pay therefor.

Obviously, the Surgeon General should not approve an application unless such assurances are given in the application.

But, we must ask ourselves the question: Which are the communities, among those needing hospitals, that cannot meet these requirements? That will be unable to give the required assurances as a prerequisite for Federal aid? That will not be able to get Federal aid for a needed hospital? Obviously the answer is that these will be the poorest communities—the very ones that need help the most; these are the ones that will have to be turned down.

This is a fundamental weakness of S. 191. This weakness results not from the content of S. 191 but from any attempt to consider S. 191 by itself—from any attempt to deal with the hospital construction costs without simultaneously dealing with the problem of helping people to pay the costs of hospital services. S. 191 must be accompanied by other legislation, or else it will result in great disappointments.

HEALTH INSURANCE IS ESSENTIAL

The only complete solution to the basic difficulty is to cover everyone under health insurance—including hospitalization insurance—so that hospitals will be assured the continuing income they must have if they are to serve the community, and so that every person in the community will be assured hospital care without fear or worry about the hospital bill.

These are the reasons why broad, comprehensive and adequate health legislation is necessary. These are the reasons why President Truman said in his message on a national health program that—

> I recommend that the Congress adopt a comprehensive and modern health program for the Nation, consisting of five major parts, each of which contributes to all the others.

If we enact S. 191—and I urge that it be passed, with the needed amendments—the Senate must know that it should go on, as quickly as possible to enact a sound system of health insurance. Otherwise, if it enacts only S. 191 by itself it will be sending a boy on a man's errand.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, in concluding I wish to emphasize:

First. We should improve S. 191 by incorporating the amendments which I have submitted jointly with the chairman of the committee [Mr. MURRAY];

Second. We should pass S. 191, with these amendments;

Third. We should appreciate that a hospital-construction program must be accompanied by a health-insurance program, so that needed hospitals—aided in their construction by the Federal Government—can be built in poor communities as well as in more fortunate areas; and so that the people of the United States can use the existing as well as the new hospitals in order to receive adequate hospital care;

Fourth. We should recognize that enactment of S. 191 is a logical first step in carrying out the President's program for national health;

Fifth. The Senate should turn at the first possible moment to consideration of the bill, S. 1606—which I introduced on November 19 for myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]—and which spells out the next legislative steps necessary to provide a modern health program for the Nation; and, finally,

Sixth. The Committee on Finance should hold hearings soon and act promptly on our bill, S. 1050—dealing with a comprehensive social-security program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose a veteran lives in a small town 100 miles away from a veterans' hospital, and suppose the pending bill is passed and signed by the President; then will the veteran have a choice between going to a local hospital and going to a veterans' hospital?

Mr. WAGNER. He must go to the veterans' hospital.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think the veteran should have a choice between the two? If the veteran prefers to go to the local hospital should he not be permitted to do so?

Mr. WAGNER. Another bill sponsored by the Senator from Montana and me gives a patient, including a veteran, the choice of the hospital he wants to go to and the choice of doctors. Under that bill the patient may determine that question for himself.

Mr. LANGER. Does the pending bill contain such a provision?

Mr. WAGNER. No; the pending bill does not.

Mr. LANGER. Which bill does contain such a provision?

Mr. WAGNER. The so-called Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill which is pending.

Mr. LANGER. As the Senator knows, I am very much in favor of that bill.

Mr. WAGNER. I know the Senator is in favor of it.

Mr. LANGER. But why should not the pending bill contain such a provision? Why should it not contain a provision permitting a veteran who wants to go to a local hospital to do so? Why should a sick or injured veteran who lives in a town which has a hospital, and whose parents live there, be compelled to go two or three hundred miles to be hospitalized, and his parents be obliged to travel that distance in order to visit him?

Mr. WAGNER. I will say to the Senator that that matter is not involved in this particular legislation.

Mr. LANGER. But does not the Senator think it should be involved?

Mr. WAGNER. I think it should be; yes.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator believe that such an amendment would be appropriate in connection with the pending bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that is a question for the sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator from Alabama is the author of the legislation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Alabama a question?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator from Alabama have any objection to an amendment to the pending bill leaving it optional with a veteran to go into a local hospital?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not believe we can deal with that question in connection with this bill. As the Senator knows, the Government has provided veterans' hospitals. I favor allowing a veteran to go to his local hospital if he prefers, and have the Government pay the bill. If a veteran in the Senator's home town needs hospitalization, and the veterans' hospital is 50, 75, or 100 miles away, unless the veteran requires treatment of a particular character which can only be given, or can best be given, at the veterans' hospital, I am in favor of allowing the veteran to go to his local hospital and receive treatment there, letting the Government pay the bill. I believe that in the end the Government would save money. At least it would save the cost of transporting the veteran to wherever the veterans' hospital might be, and returning him to his home. In addition, I believe that a further saving would result from the likelihood that if the veteran went to a local hospital he would leave the hospital sooner, thereby reducing the cost, as compared with the cost of caring for him in a veterans' hospital.

However, I do not believe that this is the place to deal with that subject. I believe that it is a matter which must be dealt with, not from the standpoint of this bill, but as a matter of policy. This bill is simply a bill to provide Federal aid for construction or enlargement of hospitals. It seems to me that the Senator's suggestion involves a consideration of the question of policy. My view is the same as that of the Senator. I would allow veterans to go to local hospitals; but we cannot deal with that question on this bill. We should have to know exactly what we were doing, and draft the proper language. I do not think we can deal with the question in connection with this bill.

Mr. LANGER. It is only plain, ordinary horse sense to allow a veteran to go to his local hospital, where his parents and relatives can visit him. Why could not an appropriate amendment be offered to the pending bill?

Mr. HILL. I do not believe that this bill is the proper place to deal with that question. The pending bill does not go into the question of maintenance and operation of hospitals. If the Senator will introduce a bill immediately on that subject, I shall be glad to help him. His views and mine are in accord. I understand that the Veterans' Administrator has been giving very serious consideration to this question. I do not know what the views of the Administrator are at this time, but I understand that he has been giving very serious consideration to such a proposal.

Mr. LANGER. If I were to have a bill drafted, would the Senator from Alabama join me as a cosponsor?

Mr. HILL. I shall be very glad to give consideration to joining the Senator. I should like to know more about the details of the proposal. However, the basic idea of the Senator strikes a very responsive chord in my heart. I have felt for some time that that is what we should do. For example, if a veteran had to have his tonsils removed, that would be a minor operation. Ordinarily a person who has his tonsils removed does not remain in a hospital more than 24 or 48 hours. It does not seem sensible to me to send a veteran 100 miles to a hospital to have his tonsils removed and then transport him back home, when he can get the same service in his home town. In my opinion, he could not only get the same service in his home town, but so far as the man himself is concerned, it would be better service. There is a psychological element in the matter of medical service. We know that medical service is a very personal thing. Very likely a man would be better satisfied to have his own home-town doctor, whom he knows, who has been his physician in the past, and perhaps has been his family physician. He has confidence in him. He would be better satisfied to have him perform the service than to go 100 miles away to a strange hospital and have a strange doctor perform the operation. However, I do not believe that we can deal with the question in connection with this bill.

Mr. LANGER. After the eloquent argument in behalf of the veteran, I still do not see why the distinguished Senator would not join in the sponsorship of such a bill.

Mr. HILL. It may be that I will join the Senator; but until I see the bill and know more about the method which the Senator suggests, I do not wish to give him a promise. If I should promise the Senator that I would join him, I would take him "for better or for worse, till death do us part." But I do not wish to commit myself without seeing the bill and knowing just what method is proposed.

Mr. LANGER. Being a minority Member on the other side of the Chamber, I know that the bill would have a much better chance of success if the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] were to join in sponsoring it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in full accord with what the Senator from North Dakota is proposing. But let me ask the Senator whether he has made any inquiry of the Veterans' Administration to determine whether or not what he suggests could be done under the present authority of the Administration.

Mr. LANGER. The Veterans' Administration will pay for hospital care only in a veterans' hospital.

Mr. MURRAY. It has been suggested to me that the Veterans' Administration already has the authority to do what is suggested.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that under existing law the Veterans' Administration can do the very thing which the Senator from North Dakota suggests. I am informed that at this time the Veterans' Administration is giving very serious consideration to the matter of allowing a veteran to receive hospitalization in his home town, or at some hospital which may be closer than a veterans' hospital.

Mr. LANGER. The only trouble is that the Veterans' Administration will not pay for such service unless the veteran applies ahead of time and obtains consent. The procedure involves a great deal of trouble and red tape. If a man suddenly becomes ill there is no time to go through the necessary procedure.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will pursue the matter further.

Mr. LANGER. I will prepare a bill and submit it to the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment is vital, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the yeas and nays are to be requested, would it not be appropriate to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITE. I withhold the suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has stated the position of the subcommittee against this amendment. I do not see fit to delay the Senate at this time by reiterating the argument which

the Senator from Ohio presented to the Senate.

As the Senator from Ohio stated, the function of the Council in approving the regulations which provide the general standards which must be met by the State plans is a quasi-legislative function. The regulations will be technical in nature. They are not of the kind that the Congress could very well write into the law. Since we cannot very well write the regulations into the law, we must delegate to some other authority the making of the regulations. Since that function is quasi-legislative, it was the thought of the subcommittee, which worked long and diligently on the bill, that this authority should be placed in the hands of the Council rather than in the hands of one person. The members who will constitute the Council will be Federal officials. They will be appointed by the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service will be chairman of the Council and will have a vote. To override any recommendation of the Surgeon General will require the votes of five of the eight members of the Council.

The amendment of the Senator from Montana was urged within the subcommittee. It was thrashed out by the subcommittee, pro and con. Extended consideration was given to it by the subcommittee and the subcommittee rejected it. When the subcommittee made its report to the full committee the distinguished Senator from Montana suggested the amendment, but the full committee did not see fit to accept it.

So the amendment has been considered and rejected by the subcommittee, and the full committee has rejected it. The amendment should now be rejected by the Senate, I feel very strongly. Therefore, I ask that the Senate reject it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, in lines 6 to 8, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out all of the present language of subparagraph (e) and substitute the following:

(e) General standards of construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation for hospitals of different classes and in different types of location.

On page 27, in lines 11 to 14, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out all of the present language of subparagraph (7) and substitute the following:

(7) Provide minimum standards (to be fixed in the discretion of the State) for the maintenance and operation of hospitals which receive Federal aid under this part, such minimum standards to be in accord with national standards prescribed by the Surgeon General with the advice of the Federal Hospital Council and the approval of the Administrator.

On page 31, line 19, after "622 (d)," it is proposed to delete the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That the Surgeon General shall not approve any such application for which (1) after consultation with the Federal Hospital Council, he finds that approval would be contrary to the purpose of this title, and (2) the Administrator concurs in such finding by the Surgeon General."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana desire to have all the amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment has already been fully discussed, and I do not think anything further need be said in connection with it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I hope the amendment will be rejected. The amendment was considered by the subcommittee and was rejected by it, and subsequently the full committee declined to incorporate the amendment in the bill.

To my mind, this amendment would very seriously hamper, if not defeat, the very purpose of the bill, for the reason that the amendment would have the Federal Government in Washington prescribe standards for the operation and maintenance of hospitals throughout the country.

The bill as now written provides that the States themselves shall prescribe minimum standards for the operation of the hospitals, but it certainly has studiously avoided making any provision which would place the Federal Government in the position of trying to control or dictate the operation and maintenance of public and private nonprofit hospitals throughout the country.

If the amendment were written into the bill, it would have the effect, I am afraid, of making the hospitals throughout the country unwilling to take any of the aid provided by the bill, because I assume they are not willing to surrender the operation of their hospitals to the Federal Government, and that is what is involved in the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I justified in understanding that the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are in accord regarding the amendment?

Mr. HILL. We are in full accord, and I will say to the Senator from Maine that the Senator from Ohio is as much opposed to the amendment as I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following additional subparagraph:

(h) General standards to assure that hospitals aided under this part are available to all practitioners in the community who are licensed in the State, in accordance with provisions necessary to safeguard the quality of hospital services.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that amendment has already been discussed. Its purpose is to make the hospitals open to all practitioners who are licensed in a State, so that no properly licensed doctor may be excluded from practice in the hospitals.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this matter was considered by the subcommittee which worked on the bill. We did not feel that the amendment should go into the bill, for the reason that under the bill we had sought to leave to the several States questions such as the ones embodied in the amendment. We had sought to avoid having the Federal Government attempt in any way to operate the hospitals of the country. We had simply sought to give to the States and their subdivisions and to private nonprofit hospitals in the States aid for the construction and operation of hospitals.

The question as to who shall be licensed within a State and who shall practice in a hospital within a State, your subcommittee felt, were for the States to determine, not for officials of an agency in Washington.

So, Mr. President, the whole theory of the bill is to leave questions such as the ones embodied in this amendment to the judgment and wisdom of the States. Therefore, I ask that the principle of the bill be sustained, and that this amendment be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in favor of the amendment. I do not believe the Federal Government should give a hospital a million or two or three million dollars of Federal money and then have a few men in the State say that a certain doctor may not practice in the hospital, although he is licensed to practice in the State. The State does exercise jurisdiction. The State does say that a certain doctor is licensed to practice if he qualifies by passing a certain examination. What possible objection could there be, unless two or three or four doctors who have a monopoly in a hospital in a town chose arbitrarily to exclude a particular doctor? Except for such a reason, what objection could there be to letting every doctor who is properly licensed practice in that hospital? If the Federal Government is going to give all this money, certainly no discrimination should be allowed on the part of a group of local politicians in a small town after the law has been passed and after the hospitals have received the money from the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send forward another amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period, and add the following: "except that in States having less than 12 persons per square mile, it shall not exceed 1 per 20,000 population."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. It may be a good one. It may serve a good purpose.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to hear a further explanation of the amendment. Would it prevent the construction of hospitals in some of the smaller communities?

Mr. MURRAY. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that sparsely settled sections of the country shall be entitled to have established medical centers. In those sections the population would be thin. Under the present language of the bill certain sections of various States in need of health centers or hospitals would not be able to obtain them.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, when the Senator referred to hospitals, nothing was said about their size. There are many counties in my State which do not have 20,000 population, but nevertheless there should be a small hospital in each county. I much prefer to have the funds available on the bed basis. If the amendment would prevent the beds being allocated accordingly, I would be opposed to it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this amendment does not apply to hospitals. The bed basis, of which the Senator from South Dakota has indicated his approval, remains exactly the same. The amendment applies only to public health service and not to hospitals.

Mr. GURNEY. With the explanation which has been made, I have no further objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "Five" and insert in lieu thereof "Four."

On page 38, line 25, strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

On page 39, line 1, strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "four."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have all the amendments considered as one amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; because they all relate to the same subject.

Mr. President, the bill in its present form provides that of the Federal Hospital Council "five of the eight appointed members shall be persons who are outstanding in fields pertaining to hospital and health activities, three of whom shall be authorities in matters relating to the operation of hospitals, and the other three members shall be appointed to represent the consumers of hospital services and shall be persons familiar with the need for hospital services in urban or rural areas."

The purpose of the amendment is to balance the Council by allowing a larger representation to the consumers of hospital services. There should be an equal number of persons on the council who will represent the consumers of hospital services. By providing for four of the eight appointed members to be persons of outstanding reputation in the fields pertaining to hospital and health activities, two of whom shall be authorities in matters relating to the operation of hospitals and the remaining four to represent the consumers of hospital services, there will be a balanced council which will look out for the interests of the public and prevent domination by those who are interested only in hospitals.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with reference to the pending bill, and then with reference to the pending amendment.

I had the privilege of serving on the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation. I agree with the statement which was made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Ohio that this measure received most careful consideration by the subcommittee. Several weeks were consumed in considering the bill. We went over every detail of it. We had the benefit of consultation with persons who are expert in the hospital field. They were drawn both from those in the Government service and those not in the Goernment service but who, because of their activities, are familiar with hospital work and are generally familiar with the hospital situation throughout the country.

I believe that the committee amendment is a compromise, as all legislation is usually a compromise, between two extremes, namely, on the one hand those who would like to see the program completely dominated and controlled at the Federal level, and on the other hand those who want to see no Federal control whatever. I think the compromise is a workable one. I believe that I am correct in stating that the workability of the measure as proposed in the committee amendment is acknowledged by nearly all those who assisted the subcommittee in helping to draft the proposal which was ultimately adopted by the full committee. The one exception was the representative from the Federal Security Agency who sat with us.

I believe that one of the great advantages which will result from the enactment of this bill is the survey which will be made presumably in every State in the Union—or in nearly every State—of hospital needs and requirements. It is true that we have heard voluminous testimony from those who know most about this problem. I believe that all of us will concede that a great step forward will be taken by having surveyed the entire hospital situation within every State, and a program formulated and designed ultimately to meet the hospital needs of both rural and urban areas in every State in the Union.

I likewise believe that in the construction features of this measure we have retained for the Surgeon General a sufficient amount of supervisory or administrative power to make certain that the funds which may be ultimately appropriated will be spent in conformity with the desire and the intent of the act. At the same time we have endeavored to do all that we could do in order to stimulate the States to assume their full share of responsibility. We have also attempted to give them, through the construction features of the bill, sufficient power to enable them to undertake the primary responsibility of carrying out the intent of the act, and spending the appropriations which Congress may subsequently provide.

I heard all the arguments with respect to the various amendments which have been offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana. I could not support those amendments in the subcommittee, I could not support them in the full committee, and I am not in a position to support them on the floor of the Senate, because I feel that their adoption would change the nature and the character of the measure which the subcommittee and the full committee have recommended to the Senate in the form of the committee amendment, and that if there were to be substantial changes in the measure as reported by the full committee we would have, not the bill which has been worked out after so much care, but we would have a bill which was entirely different in scope and in character. So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment now pending will not be adopted.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that I am very happy to have had a small part in helping to work out this measure. I wish to pay the highest tribute to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is chairman of our subcommittee, and who has handled the bill on the floor of the Senate, for the zeal, intelligence, and tact with which he presided over our meetings in the committee and the manner in which he has handled the bill on the floor of the Senate. I also wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for the very constructive and helpful attitude which he has shown toward this project from the beginning. In mentioning these two Senators I do not wish to overlook the other members of the subcommittee. They were all very active and very helpful.

I trust, Mr. President, that the bill will pass the Senate and will pass the House, and that we may take this long step forward in meeting one aspect of the problem of hospital care in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment is under consideration at the present time, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment, on page 26, line 18, after the words "creed, or color", to insert the words "and for employing any doctor licensed to practice in the State where the hospital is located."

Mr. President, if the bill is passed as it is we will have the situation of a man going to a hospital in the town where he lives and being unable to employ his own family doctor if such doctor is for any reason barred from practicing in that hospital.

Mr. President, we have had this situation in North Dakota. This is not something I am just grabbing out of the blue. Under the bill, if a man goes to a hospital and wants a certain doctor to take care of him, he may not be able to get the doctor he wants. I believe any one of us going to a hospital should have the right to select any physician he desires to take care of him. That is especially true where Federal money is being appropriated to build and maintain hospitals.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate has already rejected the proposal embodied in the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota when it rejected an amendment of similar purport offered by the Senator from Montana. I certainly hope the Senate will see no reason to reverse its former action.

As I stated at the time the amendment of the Senator from Montana was before the Senate, it is a question pertaining to the operation of the hospitals. Who shall practice in the hospitals, and the other matters pertaining to the conduct of the hospitals, we have sought in the bill to leave to the authority and determination of the States, and not have the Federal Government, through this bill, invade the realm of the operation and maintenance of the hospitals.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In this very bill, on page 26, line 16, it is provided that the hospitals which get the benefit of the bill must meet "the requirements as to lack of discrimination on account of race, creed, or color." So the Government is already saying to a State hospital, "There must be no discrimination." If that be true, why should not a black man or a yellow man be permitted to say, "I want the doctor who has always taken care of our family"?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. The money will be fairly distributed. But so far as saying whether Dr. Jones, Dr. Smith, Dr. Jackson, or Dr. Brown should practice in a particular hospital, we left that to the States. We feel it is a matter which should be determined by the States and not by authority here in Washington.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator may call it usurpation of State power, but in the bill it is provided that before a hospital can get Federal assistance it must provide that there shall be no discrimination as to race, color, or creed. Why is it wrong to go a step further and say that if there is a colored man in the hospital and he wants a colored doctor, he shall be allowed to call in his colored family physician?

Mr. HILL. The subcommittee, in working out the bill, felt that, insofar as it was possible, we should leave the responsibility and the authority for the operation of the hospitals to the States, and not try to assume all the responsibility in Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was kind and generous in his remarks about the distinguished Senator from Ohio and myself. I should not want the Senate to feel that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin prompted me to say what I am about to say, but in my remarks hitherto on the different amendments, and in my remarks on the bill as a whole on yesterday, I emphasized the work which had been done on the bill by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Diligently the subcommittee has worked many hours, day after day, and week after week, trying to perfect the bill and bring it to the Senate in the best possible form, giving as best we could a pattern for the right relation between the Federal Government on the one hand, and the State governments and their subdivisions and the private nonprofit hospitals on the other, where financial need requires the Federal Government to render financial aid.

I should be loath to see the bill passed without paying tribute to the Senator from Wisconsin as a member of the subcommittee. He brought to the work of the subcommittee all his fine legislative experience, all his exceptional ability, and his devoted industry, and he proved most valuable in the work of the subcommittee in framing the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], who also are members of the subcommittee, were at the time carrying many burdens, they had many other committee meetings on urgent and important matters, but they also rendered great assistance in working out the bill. I express my appreciation to them, as well as to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am supporting the bill, I think it is one of the best bills brought forward in a long time, but I wish to make one comment. A short time ago we ratified the United Nations Charter adopted at San Francisco. That document is either a great, immortal document, or it is a worthless scrap of paper. It is one or the other. In that Charter we said that there should be no future discrimination anywhere on the earth because of race, color, creed, sex, or language. Yet, Mr. President, there is pending before us today a bill which provides that a colored man lying in a hospital, if it be in a State which prohibits a colored doctor practising in the hospital, cannot call in his colored physician.

I shall vote for the bill, but I shall vote for it under protest. I feel that anyone who voted for the Charter drawn up at San Francisco, in which we said we were going to have no more discrimination, and then votes for a bill such as this, is not consistent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, although for reasons stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate it is my firm opinion that no appropriation can be validly made for any of the purposes contemplated by Senate bill 191 except from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises, I have concluded to, and shall, vote for the bill. My reasons are twofold:

First, I am heartily in favor of the objectives of the bill.

Second, on reflection, I am in agreement with a statement made yesterday by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with respect to the amendment proposed by me, which amendment, in one sentence of his statement, is referred to by the Senator as "the suggestion." That statement is as follows:

> The suggestion deals solely with the power to appropriate and the procedure to be followed in making appropriations. This bill is not an appropriation bill. It is merely an authorization bill. If the Senator from Missouri wishes to offer his amendment, it seems to me that he should offer it to a bill making appropriations, because he proposes to limit the funds from which certain appropriations may be made.

In connection with the quoted statement of the distinguished Senator from Alabama I have concluded that insofar as voting upon this authorization bill is concerned I should rely upon the presumption that in the subsequent bill by which shall be made the appropriations authorized by S. 191, the appropriation will be made solely from those funds mentioned in the first clause of section 8, of article I of the Constitution, namely, taxes, duties, imposts, or excises.

In voting for S. 191, however, I expressly reserve the right to vote against any appropriation pursuant thereto unless such appropriation be made solely from taxes, duties, imposts, or excises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there are no further amendments to be offered, the question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read a third time, the question is, shall it pass?

The bill (S. 191) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire first to inform the Members of the Senate that it is not now my present intention to submit any amendment to the pending bill providing for the increase of congressional salaries to $15,000. I had announced that I expected to do so, and I thought I would, but in the last day or two there have been careful, and I think authoritative polls taken, which indicate there would be a majority of the Senate against attaching the congressional amendment to the present pay bill. I do not know whether it is of interest to Senators, but on this side of the Chamber there would have been a majority of about 15 in favor of attaching such an amendment, and on the other side of the Chamber a majority of about 25 against attaching such an amendment.

I have believed continuously that the suggestion of the President of the United States was correct, that we should act upon the compensations of all the various Federal officials and employees at the same time, but when it appears that the Senate is otherwise inclined it would be a futile act to present such an amendment, and I would be very reluctant to have the Senate vote against the increased compensation to Members of Congress.

Likewise, Mr. President, I may say to the Members of the Senate that for the same reason I am not presenting any amendment providing for the increased compensation of judges, Cabinet members, and the policy-making officials of the Government. Many Senators have expressed to me their opinion that there should be no increase of such compensation until we were ready at the same time to take action upon congressional increases.

As Senators perhaps will recall, the President had suggested an increase of $10,000 in the salaries of the important officials of the Government. The National Planning Association, after action by its committees, has recommended an increase of congressional salaries to $25,000. But I found hardly any sentiment for increasing congressional salaries to a larger sum than $15,000, and I might say, I talked, I think, with a majority of Senators.

Mr. President, it is my opinion, however, that whenever the issue of congressional salaries and the salaries of judges and Cabinet members, is raised by itself, there will be a substantial majority of the Senate in favor of such a measure.

Likewise, Mr. President, as a part of this bill I had expected to offer an amendment setting up a retirement annuity system for Members of the Congress and the other officials of the Government, but the House Civil Service Committee has just reported a retirement bill to the House, and I believe it is expected it will pass the House momentarily. That bill, I assume, when it comes to the Senate will be referred to the Civil Service Committee, and we then can consider that issue and perhaps report a bill to the Senate early next week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I seek to clarify the statement made by the Senator from California relative to a poll which he said was taken, which shows that there was a majority of 15 Senators on the other side of the aisle in favor of the proposal to raise congressional salaries, while a majority of 25 on this side of the Chamber opposed such an amendment. If the Senator did take such a poll were not the replies based upon the fact that the majority on this side of the aisle at least was voting not to take up the Federal employees' bill with such an amendment as the Senator described attached? Was not that the question involved? The expression of sentiment was based on the method proposed, rather than the question of increase in salaries. Am I not correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think that probably is a fair expression of the sentiment of the majority side and likewise of many Senators on the minority side. I might say to the Senator that I tried to make that clear.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not clearly understand it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did not mean to indicate that a majority of Senators do not favor an increase in congressional salaries. I think a substantial majority of Senators favor such an increase whenever it comes before the Senate on that issue alone.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not want to take issue with my distinguished colleague from California over the question whether there is or is not a majority favoring an increase. All I wanted to do was to clarify—and I appreciate the fact that the Senator has now done so—that the poll which he took on this side of the aisle related to the procedure by which an increase was proposed to be made by way of amendment to the Federal employees' salary bill. I ask the Senator if that is not correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish further to clarify my remarks. There was no intention on my part to say anything in criticism respecting the conclusion reached by any Senator that he did not want to consider the increase in congressional salaries in connection with the pending bill. So far as my own opinion is concerned, I think we should act upon all these raises at the same time, but, of course, others may have a much better reason than I have for reaching a contrary conclusion, and certainly one can reasonably hold to either side of such an issue.

Mr. President, when Senate bill 1415 was reported from the Civil Service Committee it provided for a 20-percent increase for all Federal employees and some Federal officials. In many cases that would bring the compensation of employees and officials above $10,000 a year. Many Senators have expressed to me again the thought that we should not undertake to do anything which would increase the compensation of any official or employee above $10,000 until we were ready to act upon the general group. Consequently, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have the pending measure amended by the language which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from California that there is an amendment pending. Before offering another amendment the Senator would have to withdraw the pending amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I withdraw the pending amendment, which I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. DOWNEY. I now offer the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, between lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The foregoing provisions of this act shall not operate to increase any basic rate of compensation of $10,000 or more, or to increase any basic rate of compensation to a rate in excess of $10,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Carville	Green
Ball	Chavez	Guffey
Bankhead	Connally	Gurney
Barkley	Donnell	Hart
Bilbo	Downey	Hawkes
Bridges	Ellender	Hayden
Brooks	Ferguson	Hickenlooper
Buck	Fulbright	Hill
Bushfield	George	Hoey
Byrd	Gerry	Huffman
Capper	Gossett	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Kilgore	Murray	Tobey
Knowland	Myers	Tunnell
La Follette	O'Daniel	Tydings
Langer	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Lucas	Radcliffe	Wagner
McClellan	Reed	Walsh
McKellar	Revercomb	Wheeler
McMahon	Robertson	Wherry
Magnuson	Russell	White
Maybank	Saltonstall	Wiley
Mead	Shipstead	Willis
Millikin	Smith	Wilson
Mitchell	Stanfill	Young
Moore	Taft	
Morse	Taylor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber during a portion of the remarks of the Senator from California.

Do I correctly understand that he has withdrawn all his amendments except the one now pending?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I have a suggestion to make to the Senator. In consultation with other Senators I am now preparing a proposal which will, on a graduated basis, give to the Federal employees an increase equivalent to the increased cost of living since 1941.

Let me say to the Senator that I am unalterably opposed to his proposal, which would make a flat increase of 20 percent, giving an increase of $2,000 to those with salaries of $10,000, and an increase of $300 to employees with salaries of $1,500.

The amendment which I have in mind is very difficult and complicated, because it involves consideration of nearly 18 classification brackets. Because of the fact that the Senator would not allow hearings which were requested by members of the committee, thus preventing them from having the advantage of assistance from the Civil Service Commission and other agencies in the preparation of this amendment, I ask the Senator if he is willing to defer consideration of the pending bill until tomorrow, or perhaps day after tomorrow, so as to give an opportunity to Senators interested in a graduated scale, and not a flat scale such as the Senator proposes, to prepare an amendment. Although it is very difficult properly to prepare such an amendment, I believe it can be prepared. We are also preparing a schedule showing the exact effect of the graduated scale. If the Senator is willing to accede to my suggestion, I for one will be prepared tomorrow, or day after tomorrow, to go forward with the submission and discussion of the amendment providing a graduated basis.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I feel reluctant to let the bill go over until day after tomorrow, but if it would accommodate and satisfy the Senator from Virginia to defer its further consideration until tomorrow, I would not object.

Mr. BYRD. I will say frankly to the Senator that I believe that the Civil Service Committee should give further consideration to the proposed legislation. When the time comes for discussion of that subject, I wish to explain to the Senate exactly how the bill was reported from the committee. It was approved by only half the membership of the committee, 5 out of 10. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] stated that he was misrepresented in the vote which he cast, because he was not in favor of a 20-percent increase. Therefore, the bill does not even have the approval of a majority of the members of the committee who voted. It had the approval of only half the committee, in the first place; for in the committee the vote in favor of the measure was 5 out of 10. However, one of the five Senators who voted for it was the Senator from North Dakota, who is here, and can speak for himself. If it develops that the bill as now drawn does not have his approval, then of course it would have received the approval of only 4 out of 10 members of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make my position very clear. My position is that employees in the lower salary brackets should receive an increase of 8, 9, or 10 percent; employees in the middle brackets should receive a very small increase; and employees in the $10,000-salary bracket should receive no increase at all.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if he approves of the flat increase voted for by the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I am entitled to a certain amount of consideration. I do not know whether the Senator from North Dakota is saying that I improperly voted his proxy.

Mr. LANGER. I am not saying that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall yield when I am ready to yield.

I wish to state that I have in my files an unlimited proxy in writing from the Senator from North Dakota, and he attached no condition to it, either orally or in writing. As a matter of fact, the Senator had told me that he did not favor the increase in the case of workers in the $10,000 salary bracket or in the case of workers in the $5,000 salary bracket; and the Senator from Virginia knows that I said I would not vote the proxy of the Senator from North Dakota for the increases recommended by the President because, although the Senator had given me an unqualified proxy in writing, I knew what his general sentiment was. So all I did vote his proxy for was the 20-percent increase.

Mr. President, if there was any misunderstanding between the Senator from North Dakota and myself, the amendment which I am asking to have adopted by unanimous consent would cure it, because I am asking that the effect of the bill be limited to salaries under $10,000 a year, and I understand that is what the Senator from North Dakota wishes to have done. I do not believe action has yet been taken on that amendment. I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the amendment which would limit the effect of the bill to salaries under $10,000, and would not undertake to raise any salaries which are in excess of that amount.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I simply wish to repeat what I said. The Senator from North Dakota authorized me on Monday, as I recall, to state that he was absent from the Chamber and that he did not favor a flat, horizontal increase of 20 percent. That is what I have done. I think the Senator will confirm that statement.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. This bill does authorize a 20-percent flat increase. That being the case, if the Senator from North Dakota did not favor such an increase then only 4 out of 10 members of the committee favored the bill. One member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], was absent because of illness. He did not take any part in the votes on the bill during its consideration in the committee. I believe that the Senator from Vermont would not have voted for the flat increase, because during all the time I have been associated with him, he has always voted for larger increases in the lower brackets than in the higher brackets. Whether he would do so now, I cannot say. I can only say that the Senator from North Dakota authorized me to state in his absence, that he did not favor the 20-percent flat increase for which this bill provides.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, again I wish to make the RECORD correct. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was fully apprised of the nature of the bill, and he gave me his proxy in writing, and I have it in my possession.

Moreover, Mr. President, let us go back a little. The only basic increase which we have seen fit to give our Government employees since 1927 was granted late last spring. In the Senate and in the House of Representatives for 5 long years we helped to increase farm profits and corporate incomes and industrial salaries, but until 5 years after the beginning of this inflation we never took a step to increase the basic compensation of Federal workers. It was only on July 1 of this year that we first gave Federal employees a single basic increase, although the cost of living, by increasing 33 percent, had decreased their wages by that self-same amount, until in Washington there were workers—and are workers—living on the edge of insolvency and insecurity and on subsistence salaries, and I know about it because I have talked to them.

Then, Mr. President, last fall we gave true overtime to the workers for the first time. In reality it amounted to nothing, because very little overtime was paid after that act was passed. We gave a basic increase of 15.9 percent, but that basic increase, at the suggestion of the Senator from Virginia and at the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa—and I have no doubt they did it sincerely—was graduated so as to give the employees in the upper brackets practically no increase. Every month the Government of the United States is losing hundreds of the best men in its service. Are we designing to increase inefficiency? Perhaps we are, because those workers are receiving at least 25 percent less in real purchasing power than they received in 1941. Why did it work out that way, Mr. President? It worked out that way because, under the Little Steel formula,

we were held down to an increase for the Federal employees of 15 or 16 percent. We did not grant that much increase equally. We provided for an increase of 20 percent for those in the salary bracket from $1,200 to $2,400; 10 percent for those in the bracket from $2,400 to $4,600; and 5 percent for those in the bracket from $4,600 up. The final result for those in the $7,000, $8,000, or $9,000 brackets was that such a worker had, and still has, a 1.9 percent increase in his basic salary over his 1927 or 1941 salary. Thus the effect has been to cut the pay of those employees by the equivalent of 25 percent.

I say that, if the Senate wishes to be penny-wise and pound-foolish, that is a good way to do it—namely, to cut the living out of the hearts of the employees of the Government. The best of them are leaving. They are leaving every month. It is not only the spectacular persons, about whom we read, who are leaving; but men in the $5,000, $6,000, $7,000, $8,000, $9,000, and $10,000 brackets are leaving the Government service. Every administrative chief in Washington declares that the Government would be far more efficient if some higher salaries were paid, if at least to the men in the upper brackets sufficient salary were paid to give them as much buying power as they had in 1941. How can we expect them to remain in the Government service when their real purchasing power has been cut by 25 percent? And if they do remain in it, how can we expect to have efficiency and satisfaction in the Government service?

If I am properly apprised by what the Senator from Virginia has said, he wishes to increase the aggravation which we now have. He wishes to give the major part of any increase to the workers in the lower brackets, leaving the salaries of those in the upper brackets far below the cost-of-living standard.

Mr. President, I am glad to accommodate the distinguished Senator and to allow him until tomorrow to prepare and present the amendment he has in mind; of course, I am. But while I have this audience, I wish to make plain one other issue between me and the opposing Senators, namely, that the only basic increase which any of the Federal workers have received, except in the case of custodial employees and some other employees in the lower brackets, has been the 15.9 percent increase. Yet in spite of that, the average annual straight-time earnings, including that 16 percent, have increased by 21.3 percent. What causes the difference, Mr. President? It arises from three or four factors. First, within-grade promotions have raised the salaries of perhaps 20 percent of the workers a sufficient amount to affect the whole average by 2 percent. In 1942 the custodial employees received an increase to a minimum of $1,200, and their increase was sufficient to raise the average another 1 percent. Promotions into upper groups, slightly increasing the proportion of men in the higher brackets, and what we term "upgrading"—perhaps giving a worker more than he was legitimately entitled to—amounted to another 2 percent. All those factors together amounted to 5.3 percent. On the whole those factors probably did not affect more than 25 percent of the workers. But the distinguished Senator from Virginia—and I do not say that he does not have certain reason on his side—wants to count those increases as a diminution by 5.3 against any contemplated raise. In the first place, it seems plain to me that if a man works 3 years, 5 years, or 10 years, and earns a promotion, or within-grade employment, it should not be counted against him when we are trying to provide compensation designed to meet the increased cost of living. If a man has five additional years of experience and is more efficient, he is entitled to more pay, when because of a man's experience and his increased efficiency he has received under the law an increase in salary to say, therefore, that we should not increase his salary now under the general rule, is to draw an inaccurate conclusion with regard to the facts.

In any event, Mr. President, I have talked to many employees in the upper categories who have had no increases granted them since 1941. Their real purchasing power has been reduced at least 25 percent. They have been required to conform their living standards to their salaries, pay premiums on insurance policies, maintain children in colleges, and make payments on their homes. By having allowed their purchasing power to be reduced by 25 percent, we have passed over them a bleak and black cloud.

I know there is one other group of workers whom we have treated even worse than we have treated the group to which I have referred. I refer to the Congress of the United States. We are trustees dealing with ourselves in a delicate matter when considering the subject of fixing our own compensation. If we want to solve the problem by making the Congress a rich man's club, or by forcing Senators or Representatives to earn extra money, or to keep on the payroll as secretaries members of their families, very well. But as custodians of the public money I do not believe that we should use our power to relegate Federal employees to an inferior wage station, and there is no organization or editorial writer in the United States of whom I know who does not think that we are being very dilatory and very foolish in not providing for the payment of salaries which will hold capable men on somewhat the same basis as that which is recognized in connection with compensation paid to industrial employees.

Mr. President, I know very well—and the President knew also—that we cannot pay $150,000 a year to any Government employees, even though some of the big insurance companies pay salaries of that amount. But when General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration comes before us and tells us that the Veterans' Administration is handling more insurance than three or four of the largest insurance companies combined, and is dealing in highly technical and important matters in which there may be gains or losses running into the millions of dollars, and we cannot even work out a salary basis of seven or eight thousand dollars a year, so as to obtain the type of executive needed for the performance of that character of work, perhaps that is good business. I know some of the opposing Senators believe that it is. They think that it is possible to force those employees to live on the lower salaries, and that we should not recognize them but instead, perhaps, we should punish them; but every Cabinet officer and the head of every agency of the Government will tell us that they are steadily losing employees who were engaged in highly important work. They are able men who cannot be replaced for the same salaries they had received, because of the higher salaries which private industry is willing to pay. Within the past few months there have been 15 or 20 spectacular cases of able men leaving the Government service in order to go into private industry at greatly increased remuneration, and for each one of those whom we hear about there are probably 25, 50, or a hundred whom we do not hear about because they are in the lower salary brackets.

I should like to read a portion of some correspondence which I have in my hand. It was written by Mr. Bell on the occasion of his resignation, and addressed to the President and to the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Bell, as Under Secretary of the Treasury, was probably charged with the greatest financial responsibilities and faced the greatest financial difficulties of any man in our fiscal history. I understand that men who are familiar with his handling of the interest problem, the refunding of Government obligations, bond sales, and various Treasury transactions, say that he did an outstanding job. He was dealing not in billions of dollars but in hundreds of billions of dollars. He worked 10, 12, and 15 hours a day, and received only $10,000 a year. He used up his savings, and when inflation arrived we did not raise his salary sufficiently to enable him to meet the increased cost of living. Finally Mr. Bell resigned and went into an ordinary sized bank where no one complained of his receiving two, two and a half, or three times the salary he had received in his prior position of infinitely greater responsibilities and duties. Yet, the Congress of the United States allowed conditions to develop which meant inevitably that Mr. Bell would leave the Government service.

Mr. President, I should like to read from Mr. Bell's letter. I think it will be interesting and will illustrate certain other points of the controversy between the distinguished Senator from Virginia and myself with regard to this bill. After a paragraph or two Mr. Bell said:

> I entered the Treasury by appointment to the office of Treasurer of the United States in October 1911. After passing through various grades I was appointed Assistant Commissioner of Accounts in 1924 and Commissioner in 1931. In September 1934 the President appointed me Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which position I held until March 1939. In March 1935 I was made Assistant to the Secretary, in addition to the duties of Acting Director of the Budget, and was placed in charge of all fiscal and financial matters of the Treasury. In January 1940 I was appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury, which position I still hold. From July 1940 to March 1945, I also performed the duties of Acting Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

During all these years I have had very pleasant associations with officials and employees not only of the Treasury but of the entire Government service. I have come to have a great deal of respect and admiration for Government employees and their attitude toward their jobs. Certainly, they do not get the credit they deserve for the good work being accomplished. There isn't an office in the Treasury that doesn't continuously work overtime, and yet no complaints are ever heard, and very few requests for overtime pay. I think this is a marvelous record and, in addition, shows an appreciation on the part of employees of the importance of their job, and manifests their loyalty to their Government.

Mr. Bell's statement, in expressing tribute to the employees of the Treasury, was so vitally different from some of the generalized charges which have been made against inefficiency and favoritism in governmental agencies that I thought I would make a personal investigation. I happened to know a few persons in the Treasury, and I talked to them. I was told—and I believed it—of long hours of overwork, intense interest in their jobs, and the accomplishment of very remarkable results. I looked up the figures of the Treasury Department and I found that the increased number of personnel in the Treasury Department, as in every other agency of the Government, was far less than the number required to take care of the increased business during the past 4 years. Oh, yes; it sounds startling to say that the personnel of some agency has increased 10 percent, or 25 percent, or 50 percent, if we do not state to the public that the agency has increased its business 50 or 100 percent.

I carefully investigated the Post Office Department in which there has been the greatest percentage of increase in personnel of any of the large governmental agencies. I found that the Post Office Department has done a most remarkable job in handling tremendous additions to its normal work, with a correspondingly smaller number of employees.

Mr. President, Mr. Bell in resigning also wrote a letter to the President, and I want merely to read one paragraph of it. That paragraph is as follows:

During my service as Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget and later as Under Secretary of the Treasury I have had the opportunity of closely observing the workings of the entire Federal service, and I have been impressed with the loyalty and efficiency of the Federal career employee, and I know that many of them are remaining in the Federal service at a real personal financial sacrifice. I have, therefore, been strongly sympathetic with your effort to better their position.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD the entire correspondence relating to Mr. Bell's resignation, printed in chronological order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 29, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hereby tender my resignation as Under Secretary of the Treasury, to become effective December 31, 1945.

I am very grateful to both you and the late President Roosevelt for the opportunity given me to serve in this capacity during the past 6 years, 4 of which were among the most, if not the most, critical in our history. These recent momentous years complete a total of more than 34 that I have served in various grades as an employee of my Government. I feel compelled now to take advantage of other opportunities which have been offered me in the field of private employment.

During my service as Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget and later as Under Secretary of the Treasury I have had the opportunity of closely observing the workings of the entire Federal service, and I have been impressed with the loyalty and efficiency of the Federal career employee, and I know that many of them are remaining in the Federal service at a real personal financial sacrifice. I have, therefore, been strongly sympathetic with your effort to better their position.

I am most sincerely appreciative of the kindnesses you have shown me and count it a real privilege to have served under you.

Please accept my best wishes for your continued good health.

Faithfully yours,

D. W. BELL.

NOVEMBER 29, 1945.

Hon. FRED VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am transmitting herewith my resignation as Under Secretary of the Treasury, to become effective December 31, 1945.

You will recall that when you became Secretary I contemplated resigning in the fall to enter private business, but when the Victory Loan drive was announced for November and December I decided to defer action until that drive was over. As it will have been completed by the end of December, I feel that I should tender my resignation as of that date.

I entered the Treasury by appointment to the Office of the Treasurer of the United States in October 1911. After passing through various grades I was appointed assistant commissioner of accounts in 1924 and commissioner in 1931. In September 1934 the President appointed me Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which position I held until March 1939. In March 1935 I was made Assistant to the Secretary, in addition to the duties of Acting Director of the Budget, and was placed in charge of all fiscal and financial matters of the Treasury. In January 1940 I was appointed Under Secretary of the Treasury, which position I still hold. From July 1940 to March 1945 I also performed the duties of Acting Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

During all these years of service I have had very pleasant associations with officials and employees not only of the Treasury, but of the entire Government service. I have come to have a great deal of respect and admiration for Government employees and their attitude toward their jobs. Certainly they do not get the credit they deserve for the good work being accomplished. There isn't an office in the Treasury that doesn't continuously work overtime, and yet no complaints are ever heard, and very few requests for overtime pay. I think this is a marvelous record and in addition it shows an appreciation on the part of employees of the importance of their job and manifests their loyalty to the Government.

I find it difficult, indeed, to sever my connection after all these years. I would like to say that any success I have had in the Department has been due to the loyal conscientious support which I have received from officials and employees with whom I have had the pleasure of being associated. No one could have had a finer and more efficient group with whom to work than I. I am confident that they are all fully competent to carry on the work in which I have been so much interested during the past several years, especially the work of the Fiscal Service.

I shall look back on the time I have spent here with pleasant memories and shall always have a warm spot in my heart for the Treasury.

I am also reluctant to sever my connections with you as we have had a very pleasant and friendly relation since the late twenties, when I first met you as a Member of Congress. I have been one of your many admirers and stanch supporters in the many responsible positions you have held throughout the Government, and I want you to feel free to call on me at any time I can be of help in the problems here in the Department.

Best wishes and kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. BELL.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, December 4, 1945.

Hon. DANIEL W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAN: In accordance with your request I have forwarded your letter of resignation to the President. In so doing I have indicated to him, as I already have to you, that the Government has suffered an irreparable loss.

It is not my thought to dwell at length upon the subject, but I can say in all sincerity that in my judgment your career in public service is without parallel in accomplishment in the history of our country, and should be and is an inspiration to those who know that there is no earthly reward comparable to the feeling of well being that must go with the knowledge of a job well and faithfully done.

With you go my very best wishes for continued success.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 5, 1945.

Hon. DANIEL W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BELL: I have no recourse but to accept your resignation as Under Secretary of the Treasury. The realization that the public service is to lose so faithful and outstanding a servant is saddening to me.

Your distinguished career in Government service, dating as it does from 1911 and ranging as it has from the relatively minor position you filled as a youth through such responsible positions as Commissioner of Accounts, Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, and finally the position as Under Secretary of the Treasury from which you have felt yourself impelled to resign, is an inspiration to all.

I realize and sympathize with the motives which brought about your decision to leave Government service. You have the supreme satisfaction of knowing that in the eyes of your friends, and they are legion, you occupy an unrivaled and enviable position—that of one who has endeared himself to many without one whit compromising the high principles he brought to public service.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I apologize for interrupting the Senator at this moment—and I do not wish to stop his discussion, and I should not attempt to do that—but, again, as happened a few days ago, there is to be an executive

meeting of the Atomic Bomb Committee, with a most important witness present, and I personally feel that it is very necessary to be at the committee meeting. I wonder if any agreement could be reached between the Senator from California and the Senator from Virginia as to whether or not this matter might at least, so far as any action is concerned other than on the amendment now proposed by the Senator, be put over until tomorrow—until the Senator from Virginia could expect to file his graduated-scale amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know how vitally interested the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Iowa are in the bill, and if they desire to leave the Chamber to attend a committee hearing—they are on the committee—I would not even want to go ahead with the argument and the presentation of my testimony in their absence. But I should not want the pending business displaced in any way, except upon the understanding that we could renew our consideration of the bill by noon tomorrow.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator from California that under normal ordinary circumstances I would not think of making a request of this kind, and seek to leave the Chamber for a committee meeting, but it happens that this particular meeting—and perhaps one or two others which will follow in the next week or two—are highly important, and I feel very deeply that the members of the committee should be present.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am glad to accede to that, and desist from any further argument or consideration of the bill at this time, but I would make a request of the distinguished Senators. Without the presentation of these amendments we had expected that we should be able to entirely dispose of the bill in either 1 or 2 days, so I am wondering if the distinguished Senators could not place their committee meetings on the atomic-bomb matter so that they would not come tomorrow or the following day.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The meeting today and the one day before yesterday, or yesterday, whenever the agreement was reached, were just a little beyond the control of the committee. They had to be held at the time when the witnesses were available and we had no control over that. That happens to be the situation today. I am not at all certain that that situation will exist as to any of the meetings hereafter. I may say further that, so far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the Senator's proposed amendment limiting the increases to salaries not over $10,000. That, I understand, is the proposed amendment, that no salary shall, by any of this increase, go over $10,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Or affect any salary that is over $10,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say that I myself have no objection to the amendment, but I would personally appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia could have time to perfect his amendment, with the understanding that meanwhile there would be no final action taken on any matter, and no votes on the bill, until tomorrow at least.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from California will accede to the request that the bill may be temporarily laid aside until tomorrow. I personally have no possible objection to the amendment which I understand is pending, but I think that if the bill is to go over it should go over with all pending amendments, because other Members of the Senate might have different ideas from mine with respect to the particular amendment. So I entertain the hope and express the hope that if the bill is to go over—and I hope it will—there will go with it the pending amendments.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to the agreement. I wish to say, however, that if we shall proceed with the consideration of the bill tomorrow it certainly will be hoped that the consideration of the bill will not be interfered with or broken. We are confronted with the situation that this bill is the unfinished business, and at different times it has been laid aside for other bills. That is not a very satisfactory way to proceed. It puts Senators in such a position that it is difficult to know what is the business before the Senate. Tomorrow, if we proceed with the bill, I certainly hope the Senator will be prepared to continue with it until it is brought to some final conclusion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I join with the Senator from Alabama in the hope he has expressed. I have not been happy about the situation which has existed in the Senate during the last few days, when at one time or another three separate bills have been the pending business of the Senate and have been shuffled around to the point of confusion, I think, to all of us. I hope that if the bill goes over it will be taken up tomorrow and will be proceeded with until it is concluded.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have been consulting with the legislative draftsmen, and they do not think they can prepare the amendment I am to propose, in the form in which it should be, before day after tomorrow. It is a very complicated amendment. It takes in 16 different classifications of the civil service, and the effort of those who desire to offer the amendment is to have a graduated increase, to give the larger increase to the smaller brackets, and the smaller increase to the larger brackets. So I am going to ask that the bill be deferred, without losing its place, until day after tomorrow.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if a unanimous-consent agreement can be made that if the bill goes over until day after tomorrow it shall not then be displaced by any other business until we have disposed of it, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I hope that will be satisfactory to all, because I think it lends nothing to the credit of the Senate to have a bill brought before us and made the unfinished business, have it laid aside, and another bill substituted, and then have a third bill come along and supplant both of those which had previously been before the Senate. I think that when we lay the pending bill aside it should be with the understanding that we will take it up at a definite time, with the full understanding that when it is again taken up, it shall have the exclusive attention of the Senate until finally disposed of.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, does this require unanimous consent? If so, I shall object. I have made my schedule otherwise, and have been here to vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So long as no time is fixed for a vote, it does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, could I request of the Senator from Virginia, if he thinks it proper, that he apprise me by letter tomorrow morning the general nature of his amendment, so that I may be preparing my data?

Mr. BYRD. I shall do that if I can, but I again call the attention of the Senator from California to the fact that had he permitted hearings, and had he not very early closed the hearings and reported the bill—as I shall show tomorrow—after he had promised the Senator from Virginia to have certain witnesses heard, this difficulty would not have arisen.

A matter of this kind should be worked out in committee. This is a very intricate and difficult question. It is a question involving, directly and indirectly, 3,000,000 employees of the Government, and it should be worked out in the committee. But it was the action of the Senator from California which precipitated the situation which now confronts the Senate.

Let me say—and I speak in all candor—that I have been a Member of the Senate for nearly 13 years, and I have never known, until the occasion to which I have referred, of the chairman of a committee refusing to permit—as in this instance—four members of a committee to summon witnesses to be heard on a matter that was pending before the committee.

In this instance the hearings were arbitrarily closed by the chairman by the use of proxies. Only two of the votes were cast by Senators present at the time. Three of them were by proxy. We are told since that, while the Senator from North Dakota had given his proxy, he did not know, nor did he intend, that his proxy would be voted for a bill providing for a flat increase in salaries. So, under the conditions, I think I am justified in making the request at this time, since I did not have an opportunity to examine the civil-service representatives, to examine the legislative experts, and to work this matter out in committee, as should have been done, because of the arbitrary action of the chairman.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I dislike very much to be drawn into a controversy with any Senators on matters of this kind. We are living in really a dreadful age, our responsibilities are rather fearful, and I think we should attempt to be as accurate and tolerant as we can be.

Let me unequivocally and categorically say that the records of the committee do not at all support the statement the distinguished Senator from Virginia has just made.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. DOWNEY. Not yet. The Senator wanted to present to the committee two kinds of evidence of witnesses. He never gave the slightest intimation to the chairman—I challenge him to find it in the record—that he desired to take time to prepare an amendment along the lines of which he is now speaking.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; not now, Mr. President.

The Senator stated he wanted to do two things. He wanted the committee to go into an investigation of what I term "regional wage discrimination." The Senator has been discussing that matter for many years. I do not know whether he finally found a neophyte in the Senator from Iowa, but so far as I know there has never been one Senator on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads or on the Civil Service Committee whose mind was not conclusively made up against discrimination in Federal wages according to a standard of living, and in a prior argument I cited the vote of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to that effect, and read from the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], made on the floor. The overwhelming majority of the membership of the committee did not want to hear that matter because they had conclusively reached an opinion on it.

As chairman of the committee, I think I have the right to say whether the committee shall go into a laborious investigation of an issue which has already been considered 10 or 15 times by the Senate itself, and upon which every member of the committee, including the deans of the Senate, have made up their minds. So I stated that the chairman was not willing to delay action on this bill, which is so vitally important to Federal workers; that I was not willing to have it go over till next spring or winter for an investigation of that matter to be made.

Likewise, the distinguished Senator from Virginia stated to the chairman in three or four different forms that he wanted to call before the committee important officials from the Government to testify as to why they were not more rapidly decreasing their personnel. While the colloquies are somewhat ambiguous, it is very plain that I stated to the Senator finally that I would be glad to call before the committee all the Cabinet heads for him to cross-examine. I thought he had asked permission to do that at least, and I had said that I would be glad to have the Cabinet members called before the committee. Instead of that, as we were about through with our hearings, the Senator from Virginia suggested that he wanted to call before the committee the head of every agency in Washington. His language was sweeping and unequivocal. The Senator from Iowa in a letter he wrote me said that the Senator from Virginia limited that request by saying he wanted to call 30 or 40 heads of agencies.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOWNEY. But my remembrance is that the Senator's language was unequivocal; that he wanted every agency head whose salary was to be increased called before the committee.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I never made such a statement as that at all. I had a list of those I desired to be heard, and the Senator would not even do me the courtesy to read the list. I never said I wanted to summon before the committee the head of every agency in Washington.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will read it tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. It was in executive session.

Mr. DOWNEY. No.

Mr. BYRD. Let me read what the Senator said.

Mr. DOWNEY. One minute and then I will yield. What I refer to is in the record. It was taken down by a reporter and it is printed.

Mr. BYRD. Get the record.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will tomorrow. The Senator said he wanted to call the head of every one of the agencies. The letter written by the distinguished Senator from Iowa corroborates that. I will have the statement with me when we proceed again tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. This is what is in the record:

Senator BYRD. May I interrupt?

Certainly we ought to get into the question of whether or not they are going to reduce any of these employees.

There have been less than 100,000 of the nonindustrial workers who have been reduced on October 1, althought the war with Germany was over in May, and the war with Japan was finished in August.

I have no intention of voting for a large increase, unless some efforts are going to be made by the heads of these agencies to reduce their personnel forces away beyond what they have done or show signs of doing.

I will make a motion to the committee to summon the head of every department and ask that head of the department concerning his plans to reduce his exorbitant and unnecessary personnel now existing in the Federal Government.

I think that is perfectly proper and legitimate, that this committee attempt to reduce it by establishing a ceiling. I think we should do what we can in making any reasonable reduction of those bloated bureaucracies that we have.

This is what the chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BYRD, the Chairman will be very happy to call before the committee any Cabinet heads you would like to have here.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the distinguished Senator repeat that statement?

Mr. BYRD (reading):

The CHAIRMAN. Senator BYRD, the Chairman will be very happy to call before the committee any Cabinet heads you would like to have here.

Senator BYRD. I will furnish a list.

The CHAIRMAN. I will be very happy to do that. Several of them are already slated to be here to discuss the bill and, of course, they will be available for questioning.

Senator BYRD. I have no desire to delay it at all, but I know that there are many Members of Congress who want some assurance that there is going to be some elimination of these unnecessary employees that exist in the thousands and hundreds of thousands as of this date.

When I made the motion, Mr. President, which was supported by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], who were present, and whose letters are in the report complaining of this procedure, the Senator from California defeated that motion to summon these witnesses, whom previously he had agreed to summon, not only in the hearing but in personal conversation with me in the presence of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is regrettable that two Senators have to indulge in this sort of controversy on the floor, but the Senator is constantly making inaccurate and, I think, unfair remarks. He has seen fit to indulge his feelings against me in the public press, so I feel I am entitled to reply.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to say that I gave nothing to the public press except a copy of the letter which I wrote to the Senator, which is included in the report of the committee. That is all I have given or said to the press. The Senator cannot point to anything I have said or given to the public press, except this official letter which is now a part of the record of the Senator's own committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say, as the Senator has himself read, that my agreement with him was to call before the committee any Cabinet heads he desired. He never furnished me with any list and never offered to furnish me with any list. We called before the committee six important witnesses, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson; the Attorney General, Mr. Clark; Mr. Batt of wide experience in industry and the War Production Board; General Flemming; General Bradley; and Mr. Bowles. There we had six men, two from the Army, two from industry, two from out of prior public life. I think the Senator was present perhaps on two occasions, although I endeavored to accommodate every meeting to him. He did not ask one single relevant question of any one of those six important witnesses whose experience covered a great part of the Government, except Mr. Clark. He asked Mr. Clark some innocuous questions about the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia was not even present when Mr. Clark testified. The Senator from California is totally wrong in what he is saying. There were only two Cabinet heads present while I was there.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I stand corrected. I meant to say Mr. Anderson.

Mr. BYRD. I did ask Mr. Anderson, as the Senator will find if he will read the testimony, what reduction he expected to make, when he expected to make it, and other details about his Department, and I asked the same thing of General Flemming. They were the only two witnesses there when I was present who had to deal with this matter. The Senator knows that he held these meetings day after day when other Senators, including myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] had to attend important meetings of the Atomic Bomb Committee, important meetings of the Naval Affairs Committee, and of the Finance Committee. I was able to attend only two sessions of the Senator's committee meetings. The committee had only six meetings on a bill involving $1,000,000,000. That is what this bill involves directly or indirectly, if passed in its present form. It will cost to the Government $1,000,000,000 each year as a permanent salary increase. The committee had only six meetings. At the last meeting there was only one witness. He was Dr. Bush, the scientist. I attended every meeting I could attend. The first meeting was on November 2 and the bill was reported on November 15. There were only two casual executive meetings held. The bill was not even read for amendment, as is usually done.

The fact that the Senator offers an amendment today shows the lack of consideration that was given to the bill, because that amendment should have been put on the bill in committee. But the Senator was so precipitous and so anxious to get the bill to the floor of the Senate in the form in which it was that he did not even think about placing in it an amendment providing that the 20-percent increase should not apply to employees whose compensation is such that the increase would make their salaries higher than those received by Senators and Representatives. Later, when he thought of it he, of course, knew that he could not increase the salaries of the civil-service employees in excess of the salaries paid Members of Congress. Therefore he submitted this amendment which provides that the bill shall not operate to increase any salaries to over $10,000.

I want to say, Mr. President——

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further now. The Senator has imputed certain statements to me, and all I am trying to do is to clarify the record. I want to say that the chairman of the committee wanted to call before the committee, so the Senator from Virginia could cross-examine them, Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Patterson. First the Senator from Virginia asked me twice to put over committee hearings, which I did at his request. I thereupon made an engagement with most of the members of the committee and Mr. Patterson and Mr. Forrestal to attend a committee meeting. The Secretaries had very considerable difficulty working out their agendas. They agreed to come. I then found that the Senator from Virginia could not be present, and, with much embarrassment, I told the Secretaries that we could not hear them. I again arranged an appointment for those two Cabinet members, and again hardly a single member of the committee could be present. I again would have attempted to have those two Secretaries appear before the committee, but members of the committee gave me clearly to understand that they could not attend more than perhaps one meeting a week from then on. The distinguished Senator from Virginia wanted to call before the committee all of the agency heads and department heads.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I emphatically deny that. The Senator is making a statement which is not true.

Mr. DOWNEY. It would have taken months to have carried on such an investigation.

As chairman of the committee I took another fact into consideration. The Senator from Virginia is chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which is charged with the duty and responsibility of investigating personnel needs in the various agencies of the Government, and is given funds to conduct such investigations. I thought that we could save a great deal of work by using the records of his committee, instead of calling before our committee 25, 50, 75, or 100 agency heads, which would have been an interminable task. As I shall show tomorrow, I knew that it would be almost impossible to perform in a period of less than 6 months such a task as he suggested.

I obtained records of the hearings before his committee. During the whole of the past year the distinguished Senator from Virginia called before his committee representatives of not to exceed four agencies, I believe. Over a period of a whole year he called the UNRRA officials; he called Mr. McNutt; he called Arthur Flemming, and perhaps representatives of one or two other groups. That was what his committee did in discharging its responsibility in connection with these various matters.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I merely wish to state that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has been engaged—and I think more or less effectively—in preparing a plan of reorganization. At the request of the committee the information was available with respect to the reorganization, and the plan was prepared and delivered to President Truman. It was a colossal task. The Senator has endeavored to infer that the committee has not been at work. It has worked hard. Hearings were not necessary with respect to the reorganization. I will furnish the Senator a copy of the plan if he desires it. Hearings had been held previously. The background had been obtained. At the request of the President the committee worked diligently in order to prepare a plan of reorganizing 1,151 bureaus. The plan was delivered to the President a short time ago.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator clearly indicated that he wanted to call each of the agency heads before our committee and go into an inquiry as to their present "bloated bureaucracy," as he expressed it, and into an investigation of what they expected to do in the future. I consulted with distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee, and I found that for months most able and conscientious Members on both sides of the aisle had been investigating those very problems. I found that in Washington literally thousands of men were working almost every day at calculations as to their present employees and their future needs. I found that the Appropriations Committee might take several days with a single group. From what I knew of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and other members of the Appropriations Committee, I believed that they were doing a first-class job.

I do not underestimate the desire of bureaucracy always to grow and expand. I do not underestimate the difficulties of the Bureau of the Budget and of the Appropriations Committee, as well as of Congress. But it seemed to me entirely irrelevant for me, with my comparatively humble committee, with no funds, to call before the committee the various agency heads and start an investigation as to their present and future personnel needs.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to say anything that would be offensive either to the Senator from California or the Senator from Virginia; but I confess that I do not quite see the relevancy of the discussion as to what took place in the committee, what witnesses were called and what witnesses were not called, and whether witnesses were examined or not examined, to the simple question whether the pending bill is to be temporarily laid aside, to be proceeded with day after tomorrow.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader is well made, and so far as I am concerned I have no desire to pursue this sort of discussion. I do not think it gains anything for anyone.

Mr. President, as I understand, the bill will go over until day after tomorrow, at noon, and then will be taken up.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it may be that the bill can go over until day after tomorrow; but I do not wish to commit the Senate at this time, for the reason that the deficiency bill may be ready for consideration day after tomorrow, which will be Thursday. The deficiency bill contains items which must be acted upon

before the Congress takes a recess. Many of the items are urgent, and some of them are of an emergency character. If the deficiency bill is ready it may not be possible to proceed with the consideration of this bill on Thursday: There may be some other bills of an emergency nature with which the Senate will have to proceed. So at this time there is no way to have any binding agreement or commitment that this bill will be proceeded with day after tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Is not the bill before the Senate the unfinished business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. And it can be displaced only by a privileged matter.

Mr. HILL. It can be displaced in one of two ways, either by unanimous consent, which temporarily lays the bill aside for the consideration of some other matter, or by a motion to proceed to the consideration of some other matter.

Mr. WHITE. But in the normal course, and without the intervention of some such circumstance as the Senator from Alabama suggests, the bill would continue to be before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The bill would continue before the Senate until finally disposed of, unless it should be disposed of in one of the two ways suggested. But I did not wish the Senator from California to feel that he had any positive commitment that, come what may, his bill would absolutely be proceeded with on Thursday. Perhaps other matters may be considered to be more urgent and more of an emergency nature.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has just entered the Chamber. We were discussing the possibility of the deficiency bill being ready for consideration by the Senate, and its effect upon the consideration of other legislation. I wonder if the distinguished Senator can inform us what the prospects are?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, we had hoped to get through the proof today, but there will be several witnesses tomorrow morning. I very much hope that we can get the bill before the Senate some time on Thursday. I do not know just exactly when, but I am doing my best. We have had a great many witnesses before the committee, more than the usual number. We have had to give them a hearing, but we are hoping to get through with the bill on Thursday.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator mean that he hopes to report the bill on Thursday? If so, will the Senator try to obtain consideration of the bill on the same day?

Mr. MCKELLAR. In that event unanimous consent would be required for consideration of the bill on Thursday.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In all probability, then, it will be Friday before the bill can be taken up.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It may be.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, can the distinguished Senator suggest how long a time may be required by the consideration of the deficiency bill?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I believe it can be disposed of in a day. I do not anticipate that its consideration will require a long time. There are a great many items of appropriation in the bill, but the committee has gone over the items very carefully, and I hope that we can report a bill which will not involve much controversy.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following recommendations:

"A. That the United States member of the control committee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is hereby requested, by appropriate resolutions or agreements, to secure favorable action by that committee or by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Council to attain the following objectives:

"(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of a recipient country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

"(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in a recipient country, to retain title to all motor-transport equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

"B. That the President is hereby requested, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplies and services."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39 to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39, and concur therein.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what was done regarding the employment offices? Was there no difference between the House and Senate?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The conference report on that subject was adopted a week or 10 days ago, and the time was fixed at 100 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of the urgency of passing the deficiency bill, I ask unanimous consent to report the bill, if it is ready to report, on next Thursday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I correctly understand that there will be available to Senators a print of the bill showing its full contents? I think that is highly essential.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will further yield, let me say that I cannot state that the report will be printed by that time, because if we do not agree on the report until 2 o'clock on Thursday, let us say, it would be impossible to obtain a print of it that day. But the print would be ready the next day.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as I have said, I believe it is highly important that a print of the bill be made available to all Senators because the bill contains many items about which we shall wish to know. Will the bill itself be available in complete print?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course it will be.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will it show each item contained in it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not wish to make a misstatement in that connection. I shall ask the expert if all the items will be in the bill when it is reported. Of course, I understand they will be, and, of course, we shall have a copy of the bill as reported; but it will not be printed and on the desks of Senators until the next day.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say to the Senator that this particular deficiency appropriation bill is a very important one because it affects many items of appropriation, particularly those relating to rivers and harbors.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it does.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I, for one, and many other Senators, I believe, wish to know just what is the basis of the appropriations contained in the bill. I have no desire to delay consideration of the bill, but I think we should know very fully its contents.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator that so far as the rivers and harbors items are concerned, the appropriation for them will be in a lump sum, anyway.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I understand, however, that the report will show the items contained in the rivers and harbors appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I say that I think the report should be before us or should be available to us, so that we could know what would be affected in our particular States.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we are permitted to report the bill on Thursday, in any event the Senator would have it on Friday, so he would be that much to the good.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then may I have an understanding with the able senior Senator from Tennessee that the appropriations on rivers and harbors will not be passed upon until the report is before the Members of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, it cannot be and will not be.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I also have an understanding that no vote will be taken on the appropriation until we have had an opportunity to examine the bill, with the report before us?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not without the Senator's consent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe I had the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the Senator had the floor and he yielded to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I had no objection to yielding, but I wished to have a correct understanding of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee that I shall not object to anything which he considers imperative, because I know the very heavy responsibilities which he carries. Nevertheless, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that we have been struggling with the Federal pay bill for many long days, and now the work has gone into weeks, and several times we have laid it aside for the consideration of other matters. I think there is at least a substantial chance that if the Senate will devote Thursday to consideration of the bill without interruption, it may be possible to dispose of the bill at that time. I am wondering whether the Senator can accommodate us at least to the extent of not bringing up the deficiency appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere in any way with consideration of the Federal pay bill which the Senator from California has in charge. As he knows, that is not my purpose in making the request which I have made.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know that.

Mr. McKELLAR. But, as the Senator knows, final action on several appropriation bills has been deferred probably longer than it should have been. Conference reports on two appropriation bills have been adopted in the last few minutes. This deficiency appropriation bill is the last one, and it should be passed before we adjourn. I do not wish to take any chances regarding its passage. I wish to get it before the Senate as soon as possible.

Of course, I have no desire to interfere with consideration of the bill to which the Senator from California has referred. I do not know how long consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill will take. Of course, no one in this body can tell that. But so far as I am concerned, I should think it could easily be disposed of in 1 day.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator must realize that if he, with his great prestige and influence, is worried about the passage of the measure to which he has referred, I, who am a comparative neophyte in the Senate, should be much more worried about passage of the Federal pay bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, I would not say that about the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator from Tennessee will agree to an understanding that we can proceed on Thursday with further consideration of the Federal pay bill and that if we have not completed its consideration by Friday he can proceed with consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, that will be most acceptable.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to having that course followed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to state a twice-told tale, but I know of no manner of assuring the Senate at this time, on Tuesday, that no matter what develops, the Senate will proceed with consideration of the Federal pay bill on Thursday. Some other matter which would have to be taken up on Thursday might arise in the meantime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not wish to object. I merely wish to have an opportunity to see the items which are contained in the report in reference to the rivers and harbors appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee is agreed to.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California where we are. I think that by now probably the atomic bomb has blown up over in the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator compliments me too highly by asking me that question. I have no idea where we are or where I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we have been over this matter so many times that I think we have an idea where we are. The business pending before the Senate is the Federal pay bill of the Senator from California. That bill will continue to be the pending business in the Senate until it is finally acted on or until the Senate either agrees to lay it aside, or, on a motion, agrees to proceed to the consideration of another bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe I understand that situation. However, as I said a moment ago, I think it is important for those of us who are

members of the Atomic Bomb Committee to attend its session this afternoon, and I wonder whether we have reached agreement that this matter may go over until Thursday noon.

Mr. HILL. I understood from the Senator from California that he was not going to insist on having the Senate proceed further with consideration of the Federal pay bill this afternoon. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. As I have said, that is correct. It seems to me that we can gain in the logic of presentation by waiting until the Senator from Virginia presents his amendment. At least, we shall have a concrete issue before the Senate when he does present it, and then we can begin to discuss it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, is the Senator from Virginia given until tomorrow noon to present his amendment, which is highly technical, or is he given until Thursday noon? That is the only question in my mind.

Mr. DOWNEY. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I have agreed to postponement to Thursday noon.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And no final action will be taken on the bill or on the amendment until Thursday noon?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. But, Mr. President, of course, the Senator must understand that it may be necessary for the Senate to proceed with the consideration of other matters when that time comes.

TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 122, and for that purpose that the unfinished business, the Federal pay bill, be temporarily laid aside until consideration of the joint resolution is concluded.

The joint resolution authorizes the appropriation of $160,000,000 in order to move Government-owned houses from places where they are presently located to other places where they are more urgently needed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 122.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I trust that I may have the attention of the able minority leader for a moment or two.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, which reported the joint resolution. He has asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside—of course, that is the Federal pay bill of the Senator from California—and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution to provide housing for World War veterans. I believe that the matter is now better understood by the Senate; and if the Senator from South Carolina will again make his request, I think there is a good chance that the request will be agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Since I voiced my objection, I have made some inquiries concerning the measure and I am prepared to withdraw my objection. I do withdraw it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to know how long consideration of the joint resolution will take.

Mr. MEAD. I think it will consume no more than a few minutes.

Mr. President, I join in the request for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment, at the top of page 2 to strike out:

SEC. 502. To carry out the purposes of this title V, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, any funds made available under title I of this act are hereby made available, and there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $160,000,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 502. (a) To carry out the purposes of this title V, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, any funds made available under title I of this act are hereby made available, and for such purposes there is also authorized to be appropriated the sum of $160,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein authorized to be used for the purposes of this title shall be used to construct any new temporary housing.

(b) Upon request of the National Housing Administrator, any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of structures or facilities (including lands, improvements, equipment, materials, or furnishings) which are no longer required by such agency and which, in the determination of said Administrator, can be utilized to provide temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or for single veterans attending educational institutions, in accordance with this title V, may, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, transfer such structures or facilities to said Administrator, without reimbursement, for such use.

(c) Without regard to the provisions of any other law, but subject to the removal provisions of section 313 of said act, said Administrator may transfer, for such consideration and subject to such terms and conditions as he deems feasible under the circumstances, any temporary housing (intact or in panels suitable for reuse) under his jurisdiction to any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, for use or reuse in producing temporary housing for families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or, in the discretion of the Administrator, for single veterans attending educational institutions.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. (a) To carry out the purposes of this title V, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, any funds made available under title I of this act are hereby made available, and for such purposes there is also authorized to be appropriated the sum of $160,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein authorized to be used for the purposes of this title shall be used to construct any new temporary housing.

"(b) Upon request of the National Housing Administrator, any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of structures or facilities (including lands, improvements, equipment, materials, or furnishings) which are no longer required by such agency and which, in the determination of said Administrator, can be utilized to provide temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or for single veterans attending educational institutions, in accordance with this title V, may, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, transfer such structures or facilities to said Administrator, without reimbursement, for such use.

"(c) Without regard to the provisions of any other law, but subject to the removal provisions of section 313 of said act, said Administrator may transfer, for such consideration and subject to such terms and conditions as he deems feasible under the circumstances, any temporary housing (intact or in panels suitable for reuse) under his jurisdiction to any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, for use or reuse in producing temporary housing for families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or, in the discretion of the Administrator, for single veterans attending educational institutions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think that an explanation should be made of the joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of $160,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall be glad to make a very brief explanation.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself were members of a subcommittee which drew amendments to the joint resolution. I believe that any person who will study the facts and conditions which exist in the United States at the present time in regard to housing, and will examine closely into the problem of providing housing for ex-servicemen, they will find a necessity for the authorization contained in the measure.

By December 31, 1946, it is hoped that there will have been discharged 10,000,000 more of the men and women who are now in the armed services of the United States. It is needless for me to say that a great many service men and women, some of whom were married before the end of the service, some of whom married while they were in the service, and some of whom will marry after they return from the service, will require housing facilities, and that this Nation should do everything possible to see that such facilities are supplied. If already there were ample housing facilities in the United States, a different question would confront us.

On October 1 we found that more than 2,000,000 families in this country were "doubling up" and living together. Because of the normal increase in population during the next year, and the volume of housing that will cease to be available, we will be called upon again to endeavor to solve the problem. At the present time the Government has approximately 100,000 houses which are not in use. Do not Senators believe that it would be a good thing to appropriate the necessary funds for the purpose of moving houses from where they are not now needed to places where ex-servicemen may use them? They might be needed at universities or colleges, or in various communities. The housing question is a very serious one at the present time because of a serious shortage in housing facilities. During the war it was not possible to do any great amount of building. Many houses have depreciated and have become so dilapidated that they can no longer be used.

As we all know, Mr. President, there are a great many houses in the United States in such a condition that they should not be occupied. We do not want to encourage our ex-servicemen, especially, to take the left-over houses in the United States, and not provide any new houses for them to move into.

For these reasons this joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. He made a very lengthy speech in the Senate with regard to the matter. The bill will not take care of the entire housing situation, but it will help to do so.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will see fit to pass the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator tell us what happened with the housing bill providing for an appropriation of approximately $35,000,000? Has the bill been passed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am unable to answer the question, but my understanding is that the bill was brought before the subcommittee and was taken into consideration by it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I believe that bill is now in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have rather reluctantly agreed to this program. It is proposed to take 100,000 temporary units, which were built by the Government during the War, and move them to other places where there is greater need for them. It will cost $1,900 to move each house and reestablish it at the new location. So the removal and reestablishment of 100,000 units will cost $190,000,000. As the Senator from South Carolina has said, 2,000,000 families are doubling up today, and when this program is completed there will still be 1,900,000 families doubling up. So it is being proposed to spend a great deal of money to accomplish but little. Yet that is all we can do.

The joint resolution makes it clear that none of the funds to be used for the purposes of this title shall be used to construct any new temporary housing. So what we are asked to do is the only thing that can be done. It will cause a draft to be made on the scarce building materials which are available for the use of private builders in the construction of permanent houses. What makes one hesitate is the fact that we are asked to spend $190,000,000 for houses which will not last more than 5 years, and probably should be torn down at the end of 2 years. Yet the situation is an extremely serious one. We can at least take the edge off of it by providing 100,000 new homes.

While I do not like to spend huge sums of money for such a temporary purpose as is being suggested, nevertheless I think that perhaps it should be done. I think we should recognize that in so doing, however, we will interfere to a certain extent with the construction of new homes because today there is a shortage of labor as well as a shortage of building material, and it will require labor to build houses. We hope that the shortage will soon be ended and that the interference with private construction will not be great.

I believe, Mr. President, that the situation is so serious that we should do everything we can do which will not interfere with the rapid development of the building industry and the construction of permanent homes. I think that probably we have no alternative but to spend the money. It has been estimated that 3,000,000 families will be living doubled up at the end of 1946. There is also a fair amount of doubling up at the present time, and there always is. The only permanent way to meet the situation is to provide for the construction of permanent houses.

So, Mr. President, I repeat that I rather reluctantly agree to the expenditure of this huge sum of money. It will not do more than to take the edge off a tremendous demand for housing.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to commend the able senior Senator from Ohio for the interest he has taken in this temporary legislation, and also for the interest he has taken in the permanent legislation, which will make a very notable contribution to the solution of the problem before us.

I wish to say that, in addition to the utilization of temporary family dwellings, as provided by the joint resolution, the best possible use is to be made of all the facilities and equipment which may be under the control of the Army and Navy by permitting it to be transferred to the National Housing Administration, and they in turn transferring it to State or local bodies, or to colleges or universities.

Furthermore, the joint resolution provides, so that there may be no legal technicalities interfering with the transfer, that the property may be transferred without reimbursement. So it is an attack on the problem by using every bit of the critical material which is available, and by devising a system for its use.

I wish to express my gratefulness to the able Senator from South Carolina, who is presenting the measure, and hope it will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with everything the Senator from Ohio has just said, and what the Senator from New York has said. The joint resolution will do only a litle bit, but that little bit will help a great deal. I believe great benefits will be derived from the passage of the legislation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the joint resolution, it merely amounts to freezing all Government houses, so that they cannot hereafter be declared surplus and disposed of under the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It freezes them so that they will no longer be under the administration of the Surplus Property Disposal Administration. They cannot be sold. Now the Senator is asking, by the joint resolution, to make them available only for the use of veterans, through State governments, communities, or colleges, or universities.

In that connection let me ask whether, under the terms of the joint resolution, the houses could be transferred to non-tax-supported educational institutions, such as religious colleges or any other institution of that character where veterans happen to be in attendance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The houses could be moved any place where veterans could use them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The proposal is not restricted to tax-supported institutions?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am interested in another phase of the proposal. It has

been indicated that it is going to cost about $1,900 a house to move the houses and set them up again. Is not that rather excessive? It seems to me that is something like half the cost of the house originally.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That covers the cost of moving and equipping them, digging the foundations, and everything. Of course, it varies in amount according to where a house is moved from and where it is moved to, taking into consideration digging the foundation and everything else.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the only thing about the matter which seems to me to be out of line. I very much favor the general objective of the bill, because we have had a great many problems in our State along this line. We have some of the housing there, and veterans have been very much discouraged because the property is being declared surplus and sold, and their priority is not the highest priority. I think this measure, while it affords relief to only a small number, comparatively, is wise legislation, and should be enacted promptly.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I have not read the joint resolution and analyzed it thoroughly, but I should like to know whether, by the transfer of these houses under the ownership of the Government, to various communities at any point where the veterans will occupy them as homes, a house so owned becomes the property of the institution to which it is moved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That would be left to the National Housing Authority in the administration of the emergency housing program. The houses are turned over to them to dispose of, to get as much out of them as possible, and to let them go for the use of veterans.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator means it is left in the discretion of the Administrator as to whether he should give title to these houses to the various institutions to which they are moved?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This all reverts to the Lanham Act, and the Administrator is given the right to enter contract with local housing agencies, State or political subdivisions, educational institutions, and so forth, whereby agreements are made to operate, manage, and remove after the emergency in accordance with section 313 of the Housing Act of 1940.

Mr. BILBO. The houses are supposed to be occupied and used exclusively by veterans. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. BILBO. If there is no longer any demand on the part of the veterans for their use, what becomes of the property then?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It goes back under the Lanham Act again, and the Housing Authority or the agency with whom it contracted disposes of the houses through the proper channels, under the law which now exists.

Mr. BILBO. Under the laws of some States, once a house is constructed or placed upon a tract of land, it becomes real estate, and the property of the man who owns the land. Unless there is some previous agreement about a right to remove, if houses are put on land belonging to a college, or denominational school, or parochial school, or State school, they become the property of the institution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, but under the Lanham Act the National Housing Agency may enter into a contract to take care of that situation, and on page 3, line 2, of the joint resolution the Housing Administrator's transfer power is subject to the removal provisions of section 313 of the Lanham Act.

Mr. BILBO. In other words, the whole question of ownership, future ownership, and disposition and control, and final disposition is, to a large extent, in the hands of the Administrator. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to ask if the Senator has any information which assures him that when these houses are moved and set up in the different localities the veteran is really going to be satisfied with what is offered him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That will have to be left to the National Housing Authority and to those with whom the Administrator enters into contracts—cities, subdivisions, and State universities and colleges.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator has no information showing that what has been done up to date is acceptable to the veteran, has he? This is the point I have in mind: Suppose we spend these millions of dollars and move this great number of houses in accordance with the plan proposed, and then the veteran feels that the house provided for him is not a fit place in which to live. Has the Senator assurance that he will feel that it is a fit place?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the Senator's information, I may say that from investigation it is found that at the present time veterans need houses. A great many are attending colleges and universities and schools where at the present time there are no houses in which to live, and they cannot get hold of material with which to construct houses. The Government has these houses built, and it is just a matter of moving them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. To clear up the matter the Senator from New Jersey has in mind, I asked a question in the hearings which may interest him.

Mr. HAWKES. I should be very much interested in it.

Mr. TAFT. I asked this question of Mr. Blandford:

> Has anybody made a careful survey to see that these people do want this type of housing, that they would not rather live with their families than live in some kind of temporary house for 2 or 3 years, or that they would not rather double up?
>
> I wonder if there has been a real study of the problem on the site, on the spot.

Mr. LANHAM, the chairman of the House committee, interrupted me and said:

> I may say, Senator, that the veterans and servicemen in the city in which I live held a mass meeting just this last week asking for an amplification of this very provision in order to get these houses to live in.
>
> Senator TAFT. Most of them don't know the difference between what is a temporary house and what is a permanent house, and I just wondered whether we might spend all this money and then find some of them empty, the way we have before.

Mr. HAWKES. That was exactly the point I had in mind.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Blandford made this answer:

> We will watch very closely, but I have no doubt at all that this amount of housing can be filled up. We are filling up our war-housing supply in communities where there has been pressure, and we have a lot of outstanding requests from cities that just don't have a penny to put out on this.
>
> Senator TAFT. I think a survey would show you it was needed, but I just wondered.
>
> Mr. BLANDFORD. They are pretty well familiar with our temporary housing. We have had units in 600 or 700 cities.

He said later that they had no difficulty in filling them. The place where they had difficulty in filling houses was where a plant was supposed to be established and then the plant was not put there. The dormitories were not always acceptable. Certainly the testimony of the housing officials is that there is a much greater demand than is needed to fill the 100,000 temporary houses.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Ohio, because what he has said covers the very point I had in mind. Apparently an experiment has been made and the authorities have found that the plan works all right.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say, further, that they assure us that when they start, if there is any let-up in the demand they will stop. I think the Housing Administration is not very anxious to do what is projected. As I myself suggested, they do not like to spend a great deal of money on housing that is to be only temporary, and I think we can count on them, the moment there is any indication that the houses are not in active demand, to stop, and not proceed further with this moving program.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to add just a word in connection with the matter under discussion. Yesterday I received a letter from the president of Rutgers, at New Brunswick, N. J., in which he said there was a great demand from GI boys to come to Rutgers and take the course which it offers. He asked me the specific question whether some of the houses in nearby camps could not be made available, either in the camps themselves or by being moved to the vicinity of Rutgers, so the GI's could live in them while taking the training. I speak of this letter as an evidence of the interest shown in housing for the GI's while taking training.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I will say that I have

received letters from universities and colleges all over the country, among them Princeton University. Each college or university seems to need a couple of hundred houses at the present time to provide for the boys who are coming back. The program would be in operation for 7 or 8 years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought it might be of interest to the junior Senator from New Jersey to have it appear in the RECORD that I brought to the attention of the committee the fact that the exising law does not make provision for housing for single veterans. The committee adopted an amendment which makes it possible for some of this temporary housing, or other facilities, which may come under the jurisdiction of the National Housing Administration, to be made available at educational institutions for single veterans. We already have at the University of Wisconsin a trailer village which has been moved in, but under the existing law that can be used only for married veterans. I might say to the Senator from New Jersey, however, that that trailer village has proved to be very acceptable, and if the university knew where it could get any more, it would, on the basis of its present experience, endeavor to obtain them. It hopes, of course, to be able to get some of this temporary housing because there is a tremendous deficiency of housing, not only in the communities, but also, as the junior Senator from New Jersey points out, so far as the educational institutions are concerned.

While, as has been said over and over again, this really is only a drop in the bucket, so far as the potential demand is concerned, if we can provide temporary housing—and this seems to be the only method whereby we can make any housing quickly available—it may tend to meet the most urgent situation, and in the meantime, we hope that the more permanent construction program will get under way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It seems to me that the amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin suggested, and which the committee adopted, is in itself so important that the one feature providing housing for single veterans who want to go to college, or to return to college, would justify the passage of the joint resolution.

I know that at the University of Alabama and at Alabama Polytechnic Institute and at other colleges and schools there is a serious shortage of housing. I have received many requests and, I might say, many pleas from the heads of these institutions, to do something to enable these boys who want to come back to school and complete their college education to do so by providing some kind of housing, so they may live at the college or university and be properly domiciled while they are carrying on their studies.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish further to assure my able colleague, the Senator from New Jersey, that there is a real genuine demand for this legislation. It was taken up at the conference of mayors now in session, and today I received the following telegram from the president of the conference of mayors:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 11, 1945.*

HON. JAMES MEAD,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building:

The United States Conference of Mayors in annual conference assembled has just enacted the following resolution:

"Whereas legislation is now pending in the Congress of the United States providing for a housing appropriation of $190,000,000 for the purpose of making available 100,000 temporary family units; and

"Whereas in many cities of the country the housing situation is so critical as to require the immediate use of such temporary units even though it is recognized that such temporary units provide no final answer to the housing shortage and that their need and use is due entirely to an emergency condition; and

"Whereas it is urgent that no delay occur in making emergency family housing units available: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the United States Conference of Mayors petition the Congress to enact the pending legislation at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

"Resolved, That such temporary housing units as may be turned over to the cities be operated and administered by the city housing authorities or other appropriate agency of the municipal government to the end that the municipal authorities, which are closest to the problem, may insure that the people most desperately in need of housing are provided for."

It is desired that this be brought to the attention of the Senate.

F. H. LAGUARDIA,
President, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, meetings are being held all over the United States at which this subject is discussed. They are constantly being called to our attention.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to join with the able Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee that reported the joint resolution, and who is supporting it. I have recently returned by air from California where there is a particularly serious situation in respect to the matter of housing. The situation is serious throughout the State, and particularly so in Los Angeles. The feeling is that while the proposal contained in the joint resolution is in the nature of a temporary expedient, yet, as Cleveland once said, it is a condition which confronts us, and not a theory.

As the chairman of the subcommittee pointed out, it will take a good many years to obtain the permanent construction we need in order to relieve the housing situation throughout the country. The passage of the joint resolution will, however, provide some shelter for a considerable number of veterans returning from the Army, and who are urgently in need of shelter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

"Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes,' approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes."

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate resume consideration of House bill 3603, usually known as the ship sales bill. That bill received considerable discussion and consideration last Thursday.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Does the request require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required to lay a bill aside temporarily, but a motion to take up another bill is in order.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator from Maryland make a motion, or ask unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland asked unanimous consent.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to proceed with that bill tomorrow or today?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is my intention to proceed today. I do not know what we can do this afternoon, however. Some Senators who are especially interested in the bill did not know that it was proposed to take it up this afternoon, and I would rather hesitate to press for a vote this afternoon on any matter connected with the bill. It is my desire that we vote on it tomorrow, however, or on as much as can be.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I may suggest that if the Senator's request is granted, if the Senator desires to discuss the bill further, or desires to discuss any amendment, or if any other Senator desires to discuss the

bill or any amendment, I think it would be very unfortunate to have that discussion take place this afternoon. But if there will be no further discussion we can take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I had in mind that I might talk for 3 or 4 minutes expressing my complete dissent from the bill, but I have no great desire to do so this afternoon.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator desires to consume only 3 or 4 minutes I assure him that, so far as I am concerned, I shall accommodate him in every way possible to make sure that he does not consume more than the 3 or 4 minutes until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I might become so interested in the subject that I might run over that time. I am not willing that the bill should come to a final vote without expressing my complete disapproval of it.

Mr. HILL. I can assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, he will have every opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able floor leader on the other side of the aisle whether it is the intention now to take up the amendments to the bill? If so, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

If consideration of the amendments is to go over until tomorrow, however——

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from California that I do not think we could have a vote this afternoon, and certainly none, if there is controversy respecting any of the amendments.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is a controversy on the pending amendment. I know there are Senators who wish to discuss it.

Mr. HILL. Unless Senators want to discuss the pending amendment or discuss the bill—that is, unless someone at this time desires to discuss the bill or some feature of it—I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would think it better under those circumstances to discuss the amendment tomorrow prior to the vote. Otherwise we will be discussing the amendment this afternoon and tomorrow both.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will say to the Senator from California that I think that procedure would be the most satisfactory way of handling the matter. We cannot get very far this afternoon. It is probably better to begin at 12 o'clock tomorrow and try to push it through to a conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Maryland if it is definitely understood with the acting majority leader that the Senate will proceed to consider the bill, and that it will not be sidetracked again?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. As I understand, if my request is agreed to, the bill will have the right-of-way. It is certainly our desire and intention to continue without interruption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The only reason for my insistence is that I know how anxious the Senator from Maryland is that the bill be passed, and how important it is that it should be passed. Even this week's delay has meant a great deal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will do everything I can to make sure that the bill continues before the Senate tomorrow, in the hope that we may finally dispose of it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator from Washington that I will not voluntarily yield to any displacement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

James M. Smith for appointment as Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

Frank D. Norton for appointment as an administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrian W. Maher to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles F. Rouse to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward L. Burke to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Adrian W. Maher to be United States attorney for the district of Connecticut.

Charles F. Rouse to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Edward L. Burke to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont.

IN THE NAVY

TO BE VICE ADMIRALS IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Bernhard H. Bieri
William H. P. Blandy
Richard L. Conolly

TO BE VICE ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, TO CONTINUE WHILE SERVING AS CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

George F. Hussey, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Homer E. Williams, Calera.
Mabel G. Matlock, Irvington.
Leigh V. Burch, Seale.

ARKANSAS

Ibrie D. Trice, Roe.

CALIFORNIA

Helen L. Hellwig, Bodega Bay.
Jeanne E. Merian, Valley Ford.

ILLINOIS

Cornelia Runyan, Colona.
Betty B. Page, Lovejoy.
Myrtis P. McCluskey, Maunie.
Harold E. Young, Mounds.

KANSAS

Doris M. Ralston, Lincoln.

MONTANA

Martin P. Browne, Lambert.
Bertha Paulson, Sandcoulee.

NEBRASKA

Maud M. Young, Belvidere.
Fred A. Ott, Hooper.
Helen Queen, Macy.

NEW JERSEY

William L. Mongan, Berlin.

NEW YORK

Walter Sweazey, Myers.
Maud M. Humble, Oswegatchie.

OKLAHOMA

Hazel E. Wilson, Fittstown.

WYOMING

E. Kathleen Galloway, Winton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our most loving Father, Thou who art touched with a feeling of our infirmities, who hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin, let us draw near, that we may receive mercy and grace in the time of need. In Thy holy presence our souls take delight and we pray Thee to establish the works of our hands. Grant that the ministry of the Manger Child may make us more sacrificial, more sympathetic, as we move among our fellow men. With fervent minds and sincere hearts, we would seek those things that will honor Thee and bless our country, and to this service we dedicate ourselves. Grant that our people may claim Thy sway and faithfully carry forward those blessings which are the greatest conceived by thought of man. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION BILL

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I announce to the House that the conferees on the reorganization bill have come to an agreement this morning. If approved by the Congress, this reorganization bill would give President Truman the wide powers he sought to bring about efficiency and economy in the swollen wartime Government. It is, in truth, a reconversion bill in the transition of Government from its war to peacetime functions.

Both the Senate and House conferees were anxious to grant to the President broad powers without sacrificing the obligations of Congress. I believe that the bill which has been approved will grant the President the tools he needs and still preserve the prerogatives of Congress.

The conference bill contains few exemptions, and in this respect follows the policy laid down by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

NAVY DEPARTMENT AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATTERSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news items.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from Pvt. Joseph L. Lockhard, Williamsport, Pa., who was at Pearl Harbor on the morning of the disaster.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include an article which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle Supplement of December 9 entitled "Sheepshead Bay (Brooklyn) Maritime Training Station," and in the second instance to insert an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the annual dinner of the Bronx County Bar Association entitled "The Party Responsibility in a Democracy."

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] had a special order today, but, owing to illness, he has asked that the special order be canceled as of this date.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PFC JACK MACNIDER, USMCR

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BIEMILLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LET'S BRING THE BOYS HOME

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about the case of the son of Gen. Hanford MacNider. But I do know Hanford MacNider. He was a brave and worthy soldier in the last war and has acquitted himself excellently well in this conflict.

However, if the Members would stop jumping on individual cases, and come up here and sign petition No. 9 on the Speaker's desk to bring out my bill to release from the service, at their own request, all men who have served 18 months or more, or who have dependents at home to look after, or who desire to return to school, you would be doing something that would make you welcome at home for Christmastime.

But if you keep on delaying, when you go home this time and the mothers, fathers, and wives of the men in the service confront you and you tell them you have done nothing to help get those boys out of the service, as Gov. Bob Taylor said about the defeated politician, you will come back here "with a hole in your vanity and your pride in a sling."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

RELEASE OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have many requests from people in my district who have sons in the service and who are desirous of having them come home and go to school, many who want to get out on account of sickness, and wives who want the fathers home to help with the home. I agree that if the Members would sign the petitions which are on the Speaker's desk and we get legislation here that will get our boys out of the armed service at the earliest possible moment, it would be a mighty fine thing. The fathers and mothers, wives and families, could then rejoice in having their sons return and go to school and maintain their home life. We should not criticize some individual because he wants his son to go to college. That is inherent in the life of any man or woman. Every father, every mother, every wife, every child want their loved one to be with them at home. They do not want their boys over on some lonesome island doing nothing and worrying because he cannot come home. Remember, there is no place like home. They also want them to improve their minds. I think the more education we can give them and the quicker we can let them out of the Army back into the schools, the better it will be for our Nation, for our families, for the peace and contentment of our country as a whole. This is vital to our national security at home and abroad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

STATELESS PERSONS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. LUCE addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EATON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a short address given over the radio Sunday morning.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent addressed to the Congress.

DISCHARGE OF MEN FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, without taking any part in the controversy over the release from service of General MacNider's son, which, in my opinion, was rank favoritism, I should like to give you a report which the Army has just sent to the members of the Military Affairs Committee, in which it shows that they released, since May 12—VE-day—3,634,000 men. I understand also that over 1,000,000 men have been released from the Navy. This is close to 5,000,000 men in about 6 months who have been released under the point system of discharge from the armed services.

It is easy enough to introduce a resolution asking that everyone who has blue eyes be allowed to discharge himself from the Army, or everyone who has served 1 year to come back from the Army, but the point system that has been devised by the War and Navy Departments is one of the most efficiently functioning discharge systems, operating as it does on an individual basis, that has ever been promulgated. For my part, although I would like to see all the boys home, I hope that no half-baked plan will be adopted by this House to change the present system. With 5,000,000 persons already discharged under the point system, it would be rank injustice to those already discharged, as well as those awaiting discharge by points, to change the rules in the middle of the game.

Such resolutions as that of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] seeks to change the rules in the middle of the game without regard to the effect it would have on the millions of boys and girls who are anxiously computing their points and awaiting their turn for discharge. Many of these members are overseas, having had combat experience, and with points above or near the present point level for discharge.

UNEMPLOYMENT OF RETURNED VETERANS BECAUSE OF STRIKES

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend by remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr Speaker, I desire to read for the benefit of the membership a telegram from Governor Gates, of Indiana, calling attention to a problem that probably is general throughout the country and which must be met.

The telegram reads as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *December 10, 1945.*

Hon. ROBERT A. GRANT,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

A great many veterans who have taken employment since being discharged from the armed forces now find that their employment has ceased due to strikes that have been called in various plants. In most instances these veterans were not even members of the union. Under the present Federal law, these veterans cannot revert to their readjustment allowance of $20 per week which had been paid to them prior to accepting employment. The unemployment-compensation division has asked for an opinion from the Attorney General of the United States on this vital question, but has received no answer. I desire that you try to get a ruling at once from the Attorney General of the United States as to whether these men can be placed again on the readjustment rolls. If not, then there should be emergency legislation at once, so that these men can draw the amount to which they would have been entitled had they not taken employment. This is vital, and affects hundreds of veterans in our State.

RALPH H. GATES,
Governor of Indiana.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 198]

Barrett, Pa.	Gearhart	Pfeifer
Barry	Gwinn, N. Y.	Ploeser
Boren	Hand	Quinn, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Randolph
Brehm	Hartley	Rayfiel
Brown, Ohio	Healy	Reece, Tenn.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Resa
Carlson	Hinshaw	Rizley
Combs	Hook	Robinson, Utah
Crawford	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Curley	Jackson	Schwabe, Okla.
Dawson	Johnson, Okla.	Sheridan
De Lacy	Kearney	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	Keefe	Stevenson
Dingell	King	Taylor
Dolliver	Larcade	Tolan
Domengeaux	Latham	Vorys, Ohio
Douglas, Calif.	Lewis	Weiss
Doyle	McGlinchey	White
Ellis	Maloney	Winstead
Elsaesser	Merrow	Winter
Fogarty	Morgan	Wolcott
Forand	Mundt	Wood
Fuller	Murphy	
Gardner	Norton	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR MORE EFFICIENT DENTAL CARE FOR NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 417, Rept. No. 1357), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of S. 715, to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE RESCISSION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39 to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 39, and concur therein.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4407) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 32 and 39: Rescinds $11,799,313,000 of the appropriation Air Corps, Army, 1942–46, instead of $12,166,313,000, as originally proposed by the House, and $11,313,313,000, as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations this morning presents two conference reports. Both of them are complete agreements as to the two bills—the rescission bill and the UNRRA appropriation bill.

Taking up the first of these bills, the rescission bill, there was only one difference between the two Houses, and that related to the amount to be rescinded of funds available to the Army Air Corps.

The House originally proposed a rescission of $12,166,313,000. The Senate reduced that amount by $853,000,000, or to $11,313,313,000.

Failing to agree on the matter at the first conference, the House, on December 3, adopted the recommendation of its conference committee to agree to $367,000,000 of the $853,000,000 which the Senate had proposed to restore.

The Senate rejected this proposal, but at the further conference, held yesterday, the Senate conferees agreed to accept the reduced amount, namely, $367,000,000, giving up the difference of $486,000,000. In other words, the amount of the rescission pertaining to the Air Corps becomes $11,799,313,000, or $367,000,000 less than the House originally approved.

This winds up perhaps one of the most difficult tasks with which the committee has had to deal in this session—in connection with one of the most remarkable bills ever reported and passed by the House of Representatives.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to digress from the subject immediately under consideration. I regret still more to burden the House with a personal matter but it is a matter which I have no choice but to answer.

I have endeavored to get in touch with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] in order to advise him that I would reply this morning to a statement relating to me which he made on the floor when I was not present. I phoned his office repeatedly but received no reply. I therefore raised the question of a quorum in order to secure his presence on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, early in the war a bill was passed in the House, by unanimous consent, providing for a set-up in the District of Columbia consisting of a director, a stenographer, and a statistical clerk, at an annual cost of something like $17,000 per annum, to study the parking situation in Washington. In response to that legislation the Committee on Appropriations brought in an item providing the money; the money was appropriated; and the set-up operated for 1 year.

It is the testimony of the District of Columbia officials themselves, in the hearings before the committee last month, that nothing was accomplished in that year. The Committee on Appropriations has not recommended any further appropriations for the purpose and no appropriations have been made for the last 3 years.

Mr. Van Duzer, whose office is in charge of vehicles and traffic in the District of Columbia, is one of the best qualified and most experienced men in this field to be found anywhere. He has handled this problem as efficiently as it could have been handled by any such set-up as the one proposed costing $17,000 a year, and which accomplished nothing during its 1 year of operation.

It has been said here on the floor that this set-up was provided to meet an emergency; however, the proposal before the committee and the House was to provide a permanent agency consisting of a director, stenographer, and a statistical clerk to start with, to do what Mr. Van Duzer has been doing all these war years when the war emergency was at its peak.

The lack of need for such a permanent sinecure is shown by the fact that no Member of Congress and no private citizen has appeared before the committee asking for this appropriation since the set-up was abolished in 1942. There has been absolutely no demand for it.

In the hearings on the bill this year, no Member of Congress or anybody else appeared before the committee recommending the item. The hearings on the subject are confined to one brief page of the transcript, and the testimony was that the set-up had operated for 1 year, had accomplished nothing, that its duties would be to look after the installation of additional parking meters and additional parking lots, and that it would be a permanent agency for all time to come. This testimony is to be found on page 790 of the hearings, as follows:

MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING AGENCY

Mr. CANNON. An additional $5,000 is requested for a motor-vehicle parking agency. How do you expect to use that $5,000?

Colonel ARTHUR. That will be for a director, a stenographer, and statistical clerk.

Mr. CANNON. What staff do you have now?

Colonel ARTHUR. None.

Mr. CANNON. How is it operated?

Colonel ARTHUR. The agency was nonexistent during the war years. In 1942 Congress decided to eliminate the appropriation because of the war and the agency at that time went out of existence.

Mr. CANNON. What staff do you have there; none at all?

Colonel ARTHUR. No, sir; none at all. This is an agency which, by law was created for the purpose of studying and trying to find a solution of the parking problem in Washington.

Mr. CANNON. What amount do you have for it in your 1947 budget?

Colonel ARTHUR. Approximately $17,000.

Mr. CANNON. Is it to be a permanent agency or merely a temporary agency?

Colonel ARTHUR. It is a permanent agency which was created by Congress in 1942.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You have some kind of a set-up now that attempts to regulate traffic and that sort of thing, have you not?

Colonel ARTHUR. That is the Department of Vehicles and Traffic of the District of Columbia government, but this is an act of Congress passed in 1942 creating a separate agency to handle only the parking problem as distinguished from the traffic problem.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When was it set up?

Colonel ARTHUR. In 1942.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Have you accomplished anything?

Colonel ARTHUR. No, sir; because funds were appropriated for only 1 year, and during the year nothing was accomplished because of the war, and following that first year Congress eliminated the appropriations to continue that agency in existence during the war, and this is to reactivate it, to try to find as soon as possible some solution to this parking problem in Washington.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. To recommend the building of garages or the setting aside of parking lots, or what?

Colonel ARTHUR. I do not know what they are going to recommend, but in all probability it would be a combination of street parking, the installation of additional parking meters, and probably the purchase of additional parking lots.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it proposed to be a permanent agency?

Colonel ARTHUR. It is a permanent agency established by act of Congress, three members of the agency to be District and Federal Government employees, and four members to be appointed from the citizens of Washington.

This is all the testimony offered and all the attention given the subject. No interest was shown by any citizen of Washington or any Member of Congress during the entire hearings on the bill extending over several weeks.

Moreover, there was little interest on the floor when the amendment was offered. Only 15 minutes' debate was asked outside of the committee, and part of that was devoted to an entirely different subject. In brief, the proposed appropriation had such little justification that no one appeared before the committee in its behalf in more than 3 years, and it was rejected unanimously by the subcommittee and was not so much as mentioned in the whole committee. And when the amendment was offered on the floor only 17 Members voted in favor of it.

During the debate, however, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] in response to a statement which I made in justification of the committee's position in rejecting the appropriation, said:

I do not think that is a true statement.

I did not hear the gentleman's remark at the time it was made. He was not near the microphone, and there was the usual confusion on the floor, and his remark completely escaped me. I did not know anything about it until I read the transcript about 11 o'clock that

night. It was then too late to get in touch with him, so I held it out as I took for granted that he had not seen the transcript and would not want it to go into the RECORD in that form. I withheld it merely to be submitted to him for correction on the following day.

The next day, as a member of the conference committee, appointed by the Speaker to meet with the Senate conferees on the rescission bill, I was in conference on the Senate side with the Senate conferees all morning and past the noon hour. In my absence the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] made the following statement on the floor:

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the consideration of the appropriation bill the gentleman from Missouri and I engaged in a colloquy over a certain item in that bill, during which he made inaccurate statements, with which I took issue. Upon reading the RECORD today you will find the entire colloquy has been deleted. As far as this House and the public is concerned, it just did not happen.

I recognize the gentleman from Missouri as being a colossus of parliamentary maneuver and procedure. He wrote the book. I also recognize the fact that the gentleman from Missouri in this instance has adroitly and again in typical manner clothed himself with the mantle of parliamentary protection. But I want to say here and now that I am going to watch, and watch very eagerly, to see whether or not that colloquy is put back in the Appendix of the RECORD where it is supposed to be put, because I serve notice on him and on anybody else that I do not need anybody to take my remarks out of the RECORD, nor do I need anybody to correct them. I think this practice of deleting another Member's remarks without his consent or permission is something which should be stopped immediately. Let the gentleman from Missouri dare attempt to cross out a single letter or strike a single word from what I have just said. I put him on guard against any such transgression of my privileged field. He may have the power of knowledge of all the rules, regulations, circumventions, short cuts, curves, and manipulations of parliamentary conduct, but he does not have the power to stay my own voice and my own expression. That power belongs to me, and me alone, and I intend to keep it without his aid or assistance.

Perhaps the incident is unimportant, but the principle involved is of the utmost importance. The RECORD should reflect only what takes place on this floor and not what some Member would like for it to reflect in his favor.

Yes; let us keep the RECORD straight.

Again, I did not know anything about this statement until after the House had adjourned. It was not called to my attention by either the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] or anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, here is the situation. I did not at any time or in any way violate any rule or practice of the House, either written or unwritten. The procedure followed is the procedure followed every day in withholding remarks for revision, a procedure fully warranted by the rules and practice of the House.

On the contrary, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] violated both the written and unwritten law of the House as well as the rules of fair play and good sportsmanship. His statement on the floor impugning my veracity was unparliamentary. His failure to modify it in the correction of his remarks made his intention unmistakable.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wonder if the gentleman put his remarks in and left out the other gentleman's remarks. That did not occur, did it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It did not. Beginning from the point where he made the statement, I omitted his remarks and the rest of my remarks also, because I thought, naturally, that he would not want to put the statement in the RECORD in that form. We frequently make statements on the floor and later, when we read the transcript, desire to put them in more parliamentary form. Statements made under stress of debate frequently read differently when reduced to print from what we had intended them to mean at the time they were spoken.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] evinced no interest in this item during the time it was under consideration in the committee. He did not appear at the hearings in behalf of the appropriation. He did not mention it to any member of the committee, so far as I am aware. At least his interest was never called to my attention.

When the bill came up on the House—one of the most important bills of the session—he did not discuss any of the vital provisions of the proposed legislation. He confined his attention to this one minor item. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] said at the time, in offering the amendment, it was a matter of relative unimportance. Yet, when the Member in charge of the bill responded for the committee, in a matter in which he had no personal interest to serve, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] exploded in a torrent of abuse. He did not debate the merits of the proposition, he merely took refuge in calling names.

As everyone knows, it is always the custom in attacking a Member of the House on the floor to notify the Member attacked in advance. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] gave no such notice. He knew I was absent in conference. In my absence he made this vicious attack without notice or affording an opportunity for reply.

Furthermore, he was not content with his tirade on the floor, but he doctored the RECORD. None of the remarks in the above quotation from the RECORD after the sentence beginning "Let the gentleman from Missouri dare attempt to cross out a single letter or strike a single word" were actually uttered on the floor. That sentence itself was not uttered on the floor. After the gentleman's remarks were returned to him by the reporters he took his pencil and wrote in all that follows. He did not say it on the floor even in my absence.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] says in the remarks above:

The RECORD should reflect only what takes place on this floor and not what some Member would like for it to reflect in his favor.

And then the gentleman immediately proceeds, deliberately, to write in with his pencil what did not take place on the floor and what he desires the RECORD to reflect in his favor.

The gentleman had no special permission to revise or extend his remarks in the RECORD. But even if he had asked and secured permission, his remarks would have been in violation of the rules of the House, as shown on pages 316 and 319 of Procedure in the House of Representatives, as follows:

For purposes of revision Members may withhold reporters' notes on speeches delivered in the House, even though such notes include colloquy with other Members, and have 30 days in which to correct and return to reporters not withstanding objections of others participating in colloquy.

And in the same connection:

Under leave to print, a Member may not insert matter which would be out of order if uttered on the floor.

Citation—Hinds' Precedents—V, 7004, 7005, 7008.

Under leave to print, a Member may not criticize Members of either House or insert matter in any way reflecting on their honor, dignity, or good faith.

Citation—Cannon's Precedents—VIII, 2513, 2519.

The scurrilous charge that a Member, any Member, would attempt, or propose to attempt, to unwarrantedly change controversial matter, is not permissible in an extension of remarks, even when permission is specifically secured for the extension—which was not secured in this case.

Far be it from me to desire to "stay," as the gentleman said, the gentleman's "own voice" under such circumstances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not greatly concerned about this particular infraction of the rules. It is, of itself, a minor incident. But, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the attacks being constantly made upon Members of the Committee on Appropriations, both on and off the floor, because of their attitude on applications made by Members of the House for funds from the Public Treasury. Someone—someone—must make some slight effort to protect the Treasury. One of the official agencies provided for that purpose under the rules is the Committee on Appropriations.

It may be said, in view of the proceedings here from year to year, that unless that committee protects the national funds, they will not be protected. Continuously, every day, almost every hour, attempts are made to secure funds from the Federal Treasury which should not be paid out. Interests and organizations all over the country are paying large salaries and maintaining extensive lobbies here in Washington, for the sole purpose of diverting money from the public revenue to their private and personal interests.

Of course, it is pertinent to inquire whether this committee or any member of this committee is always justified in interpreting the motives and purposes of these applications for public funds. But members of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, which handled this bill, have been here for a long time—some of them for many years. In that time they have grown rather adept at spotting the wolf who approaches the door of the Treasury asking for hand-outs under the guise of public benefactions. The members of

the Committee on Appropriations have nothing to gain by opposing appropriations. We would rather go along with our colleagues.

But, Mr. Speaker, if all the applications for appropriations made in one year alone were granted, the Nation would be bankrupt at the end of that year. That is a solemn and factual statement. Somebody, sometime, somewhere, must screen these applications for money. The United States Treasury, bottomless as some may consider it, would not supply a fraction of the appropriations asked for in Congress in any one year. But opposition to unwarranted expenditures is a thankless task, and I have been surprised to the point of astonishment, even in the last few weeks, when men with whom I have been happily associated here in the House for many years, have called me sharply on the telephone, have stopped me on the floor with furious accusations, merely because the committee has denied some appropriation they wanted for their constituents or their friends. The duties of a member of the Committee on Appropriations are arduous. It completely monopolizes a member's time, if he attends to his job. He has little time left either for his personal affairs or for his district. These committees meet continuously for weeks. When these last three bills were under consideration in the House I did not leave my office any day, either weekdays or Sundays, until after midnight. But, having accepted membership on the committee, I have consistently opposed every appropriation the committee voted to oppose, and I shall continue to do that, although I think that the men here in the House must realize that it is a poignant experience to have to lose friend after friend, simply because we cannot go along with them in securing the appropriations they think they ought to have. They make personal matters of failure to report their appropriations when there can be nothing personal about it.

We come in here reluctantly to deny appropriations, and disappointed colleagues take the matter up as if we had offered them a personal affront. I trust that the majority of this House—and the Members of the House are fair, taken as a whole—will deal with our many shortcomings in that respect as charitably as possible. Our desire is to go along with the Members of the House on every appropriation we can possibly approve. If we make any mistakes, it is because we have approved more appropriations than we have denied.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated in his statement regarding the $5,000 item to implement the parking program in Washington that every member of the subcommittee voted against that appropriation. The gentleman meant the Subcommittee on Deficiency and not the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the subcommittee in charge of the bill. When this matter came before us every member of the subcommittee, and they are the older members of the Committee on Appropriations, voted against it. It is not the decision of any one man but the decision of the entire subcommittee.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman stated further that no one appeared before your committee in favor of this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman call anyone before that subcommittee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; the committee never calls anyone before it except the representatives of the Department. But it always invites, and it always welcomes, and it always hears any Member of Congress or anyone outside of Congress who desires to be heard on any item or estimate before the committee. Many Members and many others appeared before the subcommittee in behalf of other items in this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee to the fact that the Subcommittee on District of Columbia appropriations, of which I am the ranking minority member, is very much in favor of an appropriation for the creation of any agency which would take care of the automobile parking situation in the District of Columbia. I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]. I have felt that after the war we should appropriate money to implement that agency. I therefore want to be on record in favor of that item. I hope some agency to take care of this parking emergency, which is very serious in the District, will be set up.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Nebraska is one of the most valuable Members on the Committee on Appropriations. It has been my pleasure and my privilege to cooperate with him many times on many important appropriations. I am sorry he finds himself in such a small minority on this occasion.

As has been said, the subcommittee voted unanimously against this proposition. When it came up in the whole committee no one mentioned it, including the gentleman from Nebraska who was present. When it came on the floor only 17 Members voted in favor of it.

We are making provision for the problem which he mentions. We have one of the best qualified men who can be secured. Mr. Van Duzer is doing everything that can be done. The appointment of another man with an office and assistants at $17,000 per annum, to install additional parking meters and secure additional parking lots permanently and perpetually, would not further its solution.

But the merits of this particular item are of secondary importance in this discussion. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] did not debate the merits of it. He simply rose and proceeded to abuse the Member in charge of the bill. And later on he continued that abuse in the absence of the Member without giving notice. That is the specific matter I am discussing at this time.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. I do not know what the facts are concerning the gentleman's colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. I assume the gentleman from Missouri is stating a fact and I do not want to get into that; but when the gentleman referred to his not having deleted the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] or any other Member, that is where I come in.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I have not made any such statement.

Mr. BENDER. Then I beg the gentleman's pardon, because I followed the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] shortly after he had spoken on the floor of the House and I offer testimony that the gentleman did delete my remarks that I had made on the floor in colloquy with the gentleman. I have nothing personal against the gentleman, I respect the gentleman, and I think the gentleman is doing a good job as chairman of this committee; but the fact of the matter is that my remarks were deleted. I later consulted the stenographer who took the remarks and I have the remarks that I had made and that were deleted from the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; the newspapers carried it. The gentleman I suppose gave it to the newspapers, but the gentleman's remarks were deleted under the rules of this House.

Mr. BENDER. The newspapers were here at the time I made the remarks and they carried them the day the remarks were made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; they were quoted verbatim, and I never knew the newspapers to quote verbatim without they got the quotation from the Member.

Mr. BENDER. The remarks I had made on the floor were quoted by the newspapers the following day.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; they evidently had the gentleman's transcript because I never knew them to take verbatim notes. They must have been furnished by the gentleman from his own notes.

Mr. BENDER. I have made my statement; they were deleted by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They were deleted under the rules of the House. The gentleman rose and said he wanted to ask a question. Then he proceeded to make a stump speech.

Mr. BENDER. But the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yielded to the gentleman to ask a question; not to make a speech.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is making stump speeches all the time. If we make stump speeches here it is all right with me and as far as I am concerned a rebuke from the gentleman from Missouri is a caress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman interrupted me to ask a question. I yielded to him to ask a question. Instead he made a speech. I

said I yielded to him for a question and under the rules of the House I properly deleted it. In my long experience with the gentleman from Ohio he has never interrupted me except for the purpose of partisan criticism.

Mr. BENDER. Begging the gentleman's pardon for interrupting him, when the gentleman yields to me, irrespective of what the question is, as a Member of the House I am entitled to have my remarks in the RECORD. If I want to delete them I want the privilege of deleting them. It is not the gentleman's prerogative to delete my remarks when he yielded to me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I did not yield to him for the remarks he made. I yielded to him for a question. I told him at the time if he wanted to make a speech he could secure recognition to make it in his own time.

Mr. BENDER. I beg the gentleman's pardon again. No such comment was made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The comment was made.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman was discussing the flood-control provision of the bill I asked several questions about the Federal responsibility in the matter of the construction of flood-control dams and the gentleman from Missouri answered all the questions, but later I found that they were not in the RECORD. Will the gentleman tell me why they were not in the RECORD?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not recall the occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I did not make any comments. I only asked questions and the gentleman gave the answers.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will be glad if the gentleman will notify my office in connection with what bill and at what time they were made.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was the last bill we had up here for consideration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that legitimate criticism of the Committee on Appropriations is highly desirable. But abuse and vindictive resentment over the failure of the committee to approve appropriations desired is not only an imposition on members who are making a feeble attempt to discharge a duty wished off on them by the House, but is calculated to have a far-reaching effect of serious import to the Nation. If the House does not support the committee, if you continue to kick around the members of the committee and abuse them here on the floor and off the floor because they oppose questionable appropriations, we are going eventually to begin to dodge and flinch. We are, unconsciously perhaps, going to begin to slight the task.

And let me say there was never a more inopportune time to discourage economy.

There was never a time when the importance of the denial of unnecessary appropriations was so great as it is today. If we hope to balance the Budget, if we are to begin to pay off the national debt, if we are to maintain the integrity of the credit of the United States, if we are to protect the Government bonds which are in the hands of every citizen of the United States, we must begin to deny some of the appropriations asked on this floor.

We earnestly appeal to you, to protect the committee when it finds itself in a position where it must deny appropriations. At least give the committee the benefit of the doubt when it submits a unanimous report—or abolish the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may I say that these two conference reports are so innocuous from the standpoint of the House, and the differences between the House and the Senate having been resolved in a way that it is not injurious to the public Treasury, to such an extent that I have been able to sign both reports, I therefore feel that they should be supported.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unless somebody else desires to be heard, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION BILL, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration participation bill, 1946, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"'In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following recommendations:

"'A. That the United States member of the control committee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is hereby requested, by appropriate resolutions or agreements, to secure favorable action by that committee or by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Council to attain the following objectives:

"'(1) That all trade agreements and all barter agreements of a recipient country with other nations, together with satisfactory information on all exports from, and imports into, such country, whether for governmental or private account, will be made available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

"'(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

"'(3) That the Administration, if it determines such a course to be desirable, will be permitted, during the period of its operations in a recipient country, to retain title to all motor-transport equipment supplied by the Administration and will also be permitted to route such equipment and to direct the use of the fuel and lubricants supplied by the Administration.

"'B. That the President is hereby requested, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supples and services.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 266) making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision requiring utilization, to the extent possible and practicable, of domestic agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus.

Amendment No. 2: Substitutes for conditions (A) (1), (2), and (3), and (B), as proposed by the House, the conditions attached to the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, as passed by the House, the principal differences being (1) that conditions (A) (1), (2), and (3), and (B) are not expressed in the form of a limitation, but as a request of the United States member of the control committee of the

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to secure favorable action of such committee or by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to attain acceptance thereof; and (2), that (B), in lieu of denying funds or commodities to countries not permitting representatives of the press and radio of the United States free rein with respect to UNRRA activities, requests the President, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio for reporting without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplies and services.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as the conferees have shaped it, is not widely dissimilar from the resolution as it passed this body on November 1, 1945. The amount of money is the same—$550,000,000. That amount exhausts existing authority to appropriate. No further appropriation for the purpose can be made until the bill which passed this House recently and which is now in the Senate passes the Senate and becomes a law. In other words, we have appropriated every dollar that can be appropriated under the authorization.

The House attached a number of conditions to the resolution, all of which the Senate eliminated. One requires the utilization to the extent possible and practicable of domestic agricultural commodites determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus. The Senate struck out that provision and the House conferees have yielded, because it is pretty much a case of locking the barn door too late. The money has already been spent.

The remaining provisions, four in number, we have restored to the bill, phrased as are their counterparts in H. R. 4649, the new UNRRA authorization bill, which passed the House on December 6, 5 days ago.

Briefly, these four provisions deal with—

First. Information as to international trade of recipient countries.

Second. Enablement of UNRRA personnel by recipient countries to carry out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement.

Third. Retention of title to motor-transport equipment, the routing of such equipment, and direction of the use of fuel and lubricants supplied by UNRRA.

Fourth. Opening of doors by recipient countries to representatives of press and radio of the United States with respect to UNRRA activities.

There are two essential differences between the original and substitute provisions:

One is that observance is not made a condition precedent to the availability of the appropriation. Effectiveness is made to rest upon the success of efforts to be made by the United States member of the control committee of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The other has reference to our press and radio representatives. The provision now proposed reads:

That the President is hereby requested, through appropriate channels, to facilitate the admission to recipient countries of properly accredited members of the American press and radio in order that they be permitted to report without censorship on the utilization and distribution of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration supplies and services.

That expresses the latest recorded judgment of the House on the matter, as do, in fact, all of the substitute provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of clarifying the situation with reference to UNRRA, because I am not satisfied in my own mind that when the new legislative authorization has come to an end and the money has been appropriated and has been expended that is necessarily the end of UNRRA. So I think it is incumbent on us to know precisely what we are doing by this permissive language.

In the first place, we have here substituted permissive language for the mandatory language we adopted heretofore in connection with the $550,000,000; in other words, none of the $550,000,000 could be expended until certain conditions were complied with by the UNRRA organization. The language that is carried here now is, of course, entirely permissive.

But let us not forget that in the first place this language constitutes a recommendation by the Congress. I think it is a solemn recommendation, and I apprehend that the UNRRA representative on the control commission will have due regard for that recommendation.

Secondly, that recommendation requests that the UNRRA representative by whatever means at hand make certain representations to the recipients of UNRRA relief, to attain certain objectives, and those recommendations are four in number:

First, information with respect to agreements; second, with respect to safe conduct so that the operation of the distribution of relief can be examined and investigated and a report made; third, with reference to the title to motor vehicles; and finally, the admission of press representatives to the recipient countries.

This is a recommendation to our representative on the UNRRA Control Council. We are asking him to request that these objectives be attained if possible. I fancy that in due time there will be a report, and there should be a report, as to whether or not those objectives have been attained.

There is a little more here than meets the eye. Let us assume a condition in some of these distressed countries similar to that which happened in the last crop year. Some countries in the Old World had a drought condition which was probably the most aggravated in 100 years. We are gambling now upon a crop. We are gambling upon the fact that by means of labor on the land the wheat, rye, barley, and other grains may be produced in abundance to alleviate their distress. But let us assume that after the legislative authorization comes to an end there is still aggravated distress of enormous proportions elsewhere in the world. I rather fancy that the people of the United States speaking through Congress will not look with a jaundiced eye on the needs of the rest of the world. So we will have to look forward into the future a little bit and I believe that the recommendations by which we hope to attain several objectives will be responded to in the form of some kind of report to the Congress. We shall know then whether there is some cooperative spirit in the countries whose previous attitude has been so freely ventilated here on the floor of the House. So this is something more than merely a face-saving device. I think there is enough substance here to bring to the Congress a report of the type of cooperation our representative on the UNRRA Council is going to get in the immediate future. I am happy, therefore, that this language has been adopted and will look forward rather eagerly to the time when an extended report can be made to the Congress as to whether or not that necessary cooperation is forthcoming.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, following the observations of the gentleman from Illinois, I want to make a few observations with respect to other aspects of UNRRA activities. The conference report which we are now considering providing for $550,000,000 takes care of the balance of the original authorization of our contribution toward UNRRA. This money has already been allocated and is going into particular countries. The bill which the House passed the other day in very fine shape is now in the other body. It is an authorization bill and unless we make some appropriation as provided in that authorization bill of at least several hundred million dollars before we take an adjournment for Christmas, I am afraid there is going to be a serious disturbance in the activities of UNRRA that will be most unfortunate. I would like to see the full amount appropriated but it does not necessarily have to be the full amount.

The second bill has as its primary objective the bringing of relief to China, Italy, Austria, Hungary, and to other countries that are not covered very much by the $550,000,000 appropriation that we are considering now.

I make these few observations because if there is any disturbance or interference it will mean that the human beings we are trying to help will suffer for some weeks. Not only will the cause of humanity be hurt, but our own national interest will be affected. We do have a national interest involved here. We are a big, powerful country, but we need friends among the other countries no matter how small they are.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Can the gentleman inform the House as to how much of the $550,000,000 has already been expended or allocated?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that practically all of the $550,000,000 has been committed or obligated.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. And it is imperative that we get some more money into the kitty right now in order to keep the program moving along?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; it is very important in relation to Italy. There is more at stake and I am sure you discern it as well as I do because Yugoslavia is right across the Adriatic. Above all, we have to try to sustain the people of Italy.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It is true, is it not, that starvation is the mother of communism?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; of communism and anarchy. The gentleman has interpreted my mind correctly.

Further, China is involved here. Therefore, we must have the second UNRRA authorization. While I would like to see the full amount, it is not necessary. We have to appropriate several hundred millions of dollars before Christmas until after we come back. Then the Committee on Appropriations will have time to conduct hearings and look into the matter. I have taken the floor to call to the attention of my colleagues the importance of the noncessation of UNRRA activities, not only for humanitarian reasons, but from the point of view of our own national interests.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think under the circumstances the House is entitled to a little picture of just what the situation is.

Down through the 31st of October, out of $1,284,000,000, UNRRA had shipped in goods $637,000,000. They had laid out programs of how they were going to provide shipment for the balance. Those programs had in mind using it all by the first of the year. However, in the period down to the 1st of November, they had not made shipments in line with their estimates. They had, however, in November, $245,000,000 of shipments out of $250,000,000 estimated. That reduced the backlog of funds available quite considerably. They are estimating shipments in December of over $300,000,000, which might reduce their funds available, after this item which is being now considered, of $550,000,000, to about $600,000,000. That amount will easily carry them to the 1st of April, if they have good management. There really is no point to their cry of woe. After the 1st of March all shipments should be of nothing but food. They have been sending a lot of farm tools and tractors to places where they never have been used and never can be used effectively. If they would show a little better judgment on that, they would help their own position.

I hope the membership has read the article in the morning paper about the Palace of Zog, where it tells of the enormous quantities of UNRRA supplies upon the wharves in Albania. That gives us a little better idea of some of the things that UNRRA needs to do to clear up the picture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO REPEAL WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT AND ABOLISH THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 407 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3937) to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board. All points of order shall be waived against any provisions of the bill or to amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, this being a very important matter before the House, that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 199]

Barry	Domengeaux	Larcade
Bell	Douglas, Calif.	Lea
Boren	Eaton	Lewis
Brehm	Elsaesser	Maloney
Brown, Ohio	Gardner	Merrow
Buckley	Gearhart	Morgan
Byrne, N. Y.	Gillespie	Mundt
Carlson	Gwynne, Iowa	Murphy
Clark	Hand	Norton
Coffee	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Combs	Harris	Ploeser
Crawford	Hartley	Randolph
Curley	Healy	Reece, Tenn.
Dawson	Hébert	Rizley
De Lacy	Hinshaw	Robinson, Utah
Delaney, John J.	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
	Jackson	Roe, N. Y.
Dickstein	Kearney	Schwabe, Okla.
Dingell	Keefe	Somers, N. Y.
Dolliver	King	Stevenson
Stockman	Vorys, Ohio	Winter
Sumners, Tex.	White	Wood
Taylor	Wickersham	Woodrum, Va.
Voorhis, Calif.	Winstead	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a report from the Bureau of the Budget on centralization and coordination of Federal statistics. In view of the fact that the extension will be slightly in excess of the amount allowed, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a letter from the president of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis relative to establishment of headquarters for the United Nations near St. Louis, Mo.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TO REPEAL WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT AND ABOLISH THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on, of course, I shall yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and also yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is not of my making. I have reported it and am calling it up for consideration only because I have been so directed by the Committee on Rules.

It is one of the most vicious rules ever submitted to the House, and if it should be adopted it would come to plague the House for many years.

The rule waives all points of order against any provision in the bill and against any amendment that may be offered by the Committee on Military Affairs, which committee does not have original jurisdiction of labor legislation. The bill was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs without the holding of any hearings, and no opportunity of a hearing was afforded to representatives of the A. F. of L., the CIO, railroad-labor organizations, the United Mine Workers, or to some of the sane industrialists and to those who desired to be heard in opposition to the drastic provisions of the bill.

Not only the rule but also the bill is vicious. It is before us because the arch enemies of labor are urging and forcing action, notwithstanding that

every effort is being made by the President, Congress, industry, and labor to bring about a peaceful adjustment of differences to the best interest of all and the country. Personally, I urged and pleaded that no action be taken at this time on this ill-considered legislation, but the few gentlemen who are the opponents of organized labor have taken advantage of conditions which I know not only the country but they, themselves, later will deplore.

The bill aims to restrict organized labor because, in the last Presidential election campaign labor organizations became active in the interest of the people and their own interest, and supported President Roosevelt and those candidates who were friendly to the New Deal, to progress, and to labor. Some of the unions made an assessment of $1 on its members to conduct an educational campaign and were extremely successful in their efforts and, if I recall correctly, collected approximately $340,000 throughout the United States. The bill before us aims to stop their activity in the future and restrict any assessment upon union members, even though the amount may be only $1, which would prevent them from enlightening the people and bringing home real truths and facts. Oh, yes; Mr. Speaker, the bill would also restrict the banks and corporations from making assessments, but it does not restrict their officers, directors, or stockholders from contributing large sums of money to Republican campaigns.

It is generally known that the du Ponts individually, and through their families, have contributed $200,000, or nearly as much as all the moneys collected by the unions. It is reported that the Pews have contributed almost a half-million dollars to the coffers of a Republican campaign fund, and many others have similarly, directly and indirectly, contributed from $25,000, $50,000, and up to $100,000. But there is nothing in the bill which would preclude them from contributing to political campaigns. However, a majority of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs considers it dangerous for a laboring man to contribute $1 for himself and family to a campaign fund and by their action in reporting this bill say it must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, the second vicious provision in the bill is section 4, which provides that if there should be a strike, or failure or refusal to work on the part of any union employees to work during the life of any collective-bargaining contract, the employer shall be relieved of any obligation and the labor organization of which the employees are members shall lose its status as a bargaining agency for a period of 1 year. Further, such labor organization may be sued in its own name in any Federal district court and shall be responsible for damages not to the employer but to any party injured as a result of the breach of the contract. This is a most far-reaching provision and whereby nearly any person who in any manner may suffer inconvenience by reason of the stoppage of work or a strike may sue. The real purpose of this provision is to bankrupt and destroy every labor organization.

Mr. Speaker, if sanity and reasoning judgment prevails, the rule will be defeated, as it properly should be.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished chairman has designated this rule as vicious. The rule is not written just as I understood the rule would be written when I voted to report it, although, as written, the rule is much more liberal than the rule which I understood was reported.

I can think of only one instance in which a broader and more liberal rule could be written, because all this rule does is to bring the bill H. R. 3937 before the House for consideration for amendment under the 5-minute rule. There are only two exceptions from the usual rule in this rule, and they are both liberalizing; that is, the rule makes in order any amendment which the Military Affairs Committee desires to offer, whether it be germane to the bill or not. In addition to that, the rule waives all points of order against anything in the bill as reported. The only more liberal rule that it would be possible to grant would be one waiving all points of order against everything in the bill and waiving all points of order against any amendment that anyone desired to offer to the bill, all other rules of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. That is the most liberal rule that could possibly be drawn.

Mr. SABATH. This rule, however, waives all points of order against any provision in the bill and against any possible amendment that the great Military Affairs Committee desires to offer and may offer. This rule does exactly what I have stated.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. On the rule?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under this rule jurisdiction of any committee of this House is transferred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The Committee on Military Affairs can offer any amendment and it will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is correct so far as offering amendments is involved.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend has been a member of the Rules Committee for many years. Will my friend enlighten the House as to whether or not in all the years he has been on this committee he has ever seen a rule of this kind reported by the Rules Committee giving to any committee of the House such great power?

Mr. MICHENER. My candor compels me to say that I cannot at the moment name any such rule. That does not mean, however, that no such rule has been granted, because many strange things have happened in the House during my service.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may have the attention of the membership because I have just a little time and I wish to say a few things about this situation. I do not believe there is one of us who has not been conscious of a great demand throughout the country for Congress to give some attention to the matter of the stabilization of industrial relations, labor-management relations. For a long time I have felt we should respond to that demand in the best interest of the country.

The labor committees of both the House and the Senate have been criticized on many sides for inaction in dealing with any of these problems. In that situation the Military Affairs Committee having brought about the passage of the War Labor Disputes Act was called upon to repeal that act and in connection with the repealer certain amendments were offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Many approved of the objections but attacked the method being used to get action. That measure then came to the Rules Committee after being reported by the Military Affairs Committee. I think it but fair to say that at that time because of the fact the labor-management conference was in progress action was delayed. Later on, however, some of the members of the Rules Committee having observed that the labor-management conference was coming to no real conclusion about any of these difficult problems sought action in the Rules Committee. The rule was voted out and I supported it. It seemed to me that action should be had on the bill. The rule permits amendment.

Just a week ago Monday after this rule had been reported the President of the United States sent to the Congress a message recommending action along certain lines that he outlined. The matter went to the Labor Committee for consideration. A bill, which may or may not be good, was introduced. Yesterday the Labor Committee began hearings. When that development came about I said publicly and privately to anyone who would listen that in my opinion action on this matter that is here today should be held up until reasonable opportunity should be given to the Labor Committee to see what might be accomplished. I understand that the Military Affairs Committee, by official action, desired that the bill be not called up at this time.

I do not understand that the Labor Committee is limited in its consideration to the matters suggested by the President. For myself, I hope that the Labor Committee in its consideration, pays some attention to action designed to bring about mutuality of obligation of contracts, yes; and to the elimination of willful violence and unlawful destruction and seizure of property, to the maintenance of law and order. These are things that I believe they should properly consider, and, as far as I am concerned, should favorably consider. I do not see how anyone can contend that contracts should be broken with impunity or that we should not seek to provide for law and order. I do not know what they are going to consider, but, as I said, I thought that action on this matter

should be held up pending action to be taken by the Labor Committee, or a reasonable time had been allowed for that action.

It follows from that I am sorry this matter has been called up today. Had I had my own way about it the matter would not have been called up today.

But let me say that since it has been called up I am going to vote for this rule. I do not know what is going to transpire in connection with its consideration. Under the rule any germane amendment is in order, any amendment to strike out any part of this bill will be in order or to add anything which is germane. I do not know how much of it will be left when the House gets through or what may be added. I do not know whether it is intended that we proceed with the consideration of the measure at this time or not. But in respect to the obligation that confronts me and my conscience, as a Member of this Congress, answerable to the people I represent and my State and Nation, the choice coming to me today, I am going to vote for this rule.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the gentleman were informed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that he is not going to call up this bill after the rule is adopted, would the gentleman then vote for the rule?

Mr. HALLECK. I have understood that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is going to make such announcement. It is not up to me to tell the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs what he ought to do. But as far as I am concerned, I would vote for the rule anyway because that would at least provide that consideration of the bill is in order at sometime.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, of the 15 minutes I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, except when applied to the Rules Committee, this is extraordinary procedure. Here you find the chairman of the Rules Committee appearing in charge of a resolution which that committee has reported and to which he is opposed. I feel constrained to say to my chairman that so long as I remain on the committee this is the last time that such a farcical proceeding as this shall be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I am accused this morning of being responsible for the placing of my friends on my left in the frying pan of the leadership of those on the right. I am told that the pan is red hot and that it is producing results. I regret this very much. I should think that the Members of this House would embrace their first opportunity to declare themselves in the open on so important a question as is being presented.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to embarrass anyone. The Military Affairs Committee reported the bill in question. It came to the Rules Committee for a rule making consideration in order and that committee granted the pending rule. The chairman of the Committee on Rules did not see fit to call it up for consideration, so as a member of the committee I gave notice that after seven legislative days following its filing I would move for its consideration. That is why this resolution is here at this time. I should like to say to you, my friends, that unless you embrace this opportunity to enact what might be called labor legislation, you will have none other for a long time to come, unless the antiracketeering bill which is supposed to follow this bill may be called labor legislation. There is not a Member of this House who does not recognize that statement as representing the true facts; not one.

So, my friends, you will be given the opportunity to stand up and publicly declare your position on this question. This thing of talking one way and performing another comes to an end at this hour, and no disrespect is meant to anyone by that statement. I declare to you that it is my belief that the security of this country is in jeopardy. The behavior of labor as regards strikes, and that of the Government in dealing with the problem, has been shabby beyond all description.

The responsibility is yours. Your people back home have been pleading to you to meet what they believe to be your responsibility. Are you going to do it, or are you going to find some excuse to run out on the proposition?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded and successfully won the greatest war in human history. In that effort we have ground through the mill by votes of this august body all told more than 15,000,000 men, 250,000 of whom sleep under foreign soil. My committee obtained jurisdiction of this legislation on a bill that came from the United States Senate and was referred to it by the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. And correctly referred to it.

Mr. MAY. Absolutely correct. It was a bill known as the War Labor Disputes Act. We passed it. It resulted because of elections authorized under the bill in a tie-up of the National Labor Relations Board activities, and they requested that we repeal the one provision relating to the holding of elections to authorize strikes. The Department of Labor requested that we repeal the legislation. We heard the National Labor Relations Board—every witness that they wanted to offer. We heard the Under Secretary of Labor. I asked the Secretary of Labor to come before the committee, and he did not come. I think I should say in fairness to the Secretary of Labor that it was Cabinet day and he could not appear, but sent his Under Secretary.

We held hearings on these questions at length in the original consideration of the National War Labor Disputes Act. Any charge, even by the dean of the House, that there have been any shotgun methods about this is simply an error I am sure not intentional.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. No; not now. I am sorry.

Mr. SABATH. When will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I will yield to the gentleman when I finish my statement.

Let us see what this bill does. Is there anybody on the floor of this House who does not believe that when a man enters into a contract he ought to live up to it?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Why do not the corporations?

Mr. MAY. They have to live up to it. They are solvent and responsible.

This bill does only three things. It extends the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act to meet the objections filed by the Attorney General of the United States when he held that it applied only to the corporations, and did not apply to the labor groups because they are non-profit organizations. It makes the law apply to both of them alike. Is there anything wrong about that?

When you become a candidate in your district, would you like to have a labor leader appoint 5 labor men in each precinct and equip them with a pocketful of money to pay them $50 a day to go out and fight you? If you do, then vote against this rule.

Another thing it does is to provide that where a labor group injures the property of its employer by violence or where the employer shuts down and deprives the men of their work, both of them are equally liable and subject to suit in the District Court of the United States where the injury occurred.

Should you keep your contract if it provides that you will not strike? In every one of the contracts that were presented before my committee there was a provision stating that they would not strike. We covered that in this legislation.

The other thing is a provision that the jurisdiction of the court is the place where the injury occurs, or that it may be at the headquarters of the employer or of the employees. Is there anything wrong about that?

Let me say this: I am not a prophet, but I predict that if this rule is defeated you will never hear of the legislation the President asked for between now and Christmas. If this rule is adopted, I propose to keep my word with the leadership when I promised that if the Committee on Labor would have hearings I would hold up the bill temporarily to give them an opportunity to be heard. As a matter of courtesy from my committee to another standing committee, as a matter of congressional courtesy, and as a matter of honest dealing and truthfulness, I think I ought to withhold action, at least until the labor committee has an opportunity to either act or refuse to act.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs reporting the bill in question.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is this bill called the Arends bill?

The SPEAKER. That is not a statement of a point of order. This bill is H. R. 3937.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am not now going to direct my attention to either the merits or demerits of this bill. First, I want all the Members to know I had nothing to do with bringing this bill up here at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago, when H. R. 3937 was before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, I offered various amendments to the bill. Two of these amendments were adopted before the bill was reported out and will be before us today for consideration, if the present rule is agreed to.

At the time these amendments were offered in our committee, some question arose as to whether our committee rightfully should consider labor legislation. Recalling, as most of you do, the inactivity and passiveness of our House Labor Committee in years past, I felt that the only machinery at hand to get labor matters on the floor for discussion and debate, regardless of what fate any bill might meet, was via the opportunity coming before our committee when we considered legislation to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act.

Frankly, I have long held the conviction that something must be done in an effort to help straighten out present-day labor-industry differences. I felt that responsibility rested on the Congress to do something. Most every Member I recently have talked with when asked if he thought something should be done about the problem always end up by saying "Yes; something must be done." When I next asked "Whose responsibility is it to do something?" they have answered by saying "It's the duty of Congress."

Up to the time this bill was acted upon by our committee, no indication had come from the President of the United States that he wanted legislation placed on the books in order that he might deal with the ever-pyramiding number of strikes which have been and are today slowing down our whole reconversion program. What the public has long felt and what I am sure most Members have believed, and what the President has now decided must happen, is that action be taken by the Congress. The President requested specific legislation. A bill was introduced to implement the President's wishes. This bill was referred to the Labor Committee of the House.

After this took place, our Military Affairs Committee in executive session, decided that in fairness to the Labor Committee, we should give that committee a reasonable length of time to report out a bill and get it to the floor for action. Regardless, however, of the wishes of the Military Affairs Committee, a rule bringing our committee bill before us is today called up for consideration. I insist that those who are responsible for bringing up this rule at this time should have given—in accordance with the desires of our Military Affairs Committee—more time to permit the Labor Committee to act and to then see what legislation, if any, the Labor Committee would bring before us. I believe such would have been both proper procedure and the fair thing to do.

Since, however, the rule making H. R. 3937 in order, is before us, I am of course going to support that rule. I think the majority of the House want this whole matter discussed and debated. I feel it is our responsibility as Representatives to face this problem boldly and fearlessly and at least make every possible effort to write constructive, helpful legislation. This can be done.

As to the amendments I introduced, if any Member feels they fall short of accomplishing what you desire to see written into the law, or if you feel they go too far, then let us fix them up so they will do what the people want, what the President wants, and what I believe the majority of Congress wants; namely, to make effective some legislation that will gear our great industrial machinery into full speed ahead. We can no longer delay against the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, through any efforts I have previously made or am now making, my only objective is to help solve the difficulties that lie before us. I do not carry the torch for or against either labor or management. Shortcomings lie on the heads of both. If one party, be it either industry or labor do wrong, let us try to help them do right. Just as the rank and file of labor are honest, patriotic American citizens, so do I likewise believe that the majority of industry and management are fair and honorable people. This is not a one-sided question. Things cannot and dare not go on as we witness them today. If America is to remain economically strong, if we are to have good jobs with good wages, if industry is going to be permitted to run its own business and operate at a profit, then it is high time we get started on such a program. Let us not have anyone say that Congress was not willing to do its best to help adjust these all-important and vital matters.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was not so long ago that I stood here and spoke against the original Smith-Connally bill. I spoke against it not merely as a mattter of labor legislation but as a problem facing management also. If our free enterprise means anything, I fail to see how you can divorce labor and management. When we tried to do it in the Smith-Connally bill, you know what happened. The reason the bill ever came anywhere near this House again today is because there was an almost unanimous demand for its repeal. I agree that the bill originally belonged in the Committee on Military Affairs as it is now described. I agree that its repeal could well be before the Military Affairs Committee. But I disagree that in repealing that bill they should take absolute labor legislation and put it into the bill and bring it before us from that committee. I am speaking now as a member of the Labor Committee who has been consulting with my friends in management. Do not forget that I sit on the board of certain companies and am an officer of what I think is a fairly important company. I think both management and labor are agreed that hasty legislation in this regard is going to be only a boomerang against both of them, just as the original Smith-Connally bill was.

The Labor Committee is now holding hearings on what we might call the President's bill for an adjustment of this situation. I spent yesterday in the Midwest. Out there labor and management are trying to solve their own difficulties. In one particular instance it looks as though labor and management might give us the pattern for the kind of legislation we should have here. As a member of the Labor Committee, we are going to take sufficient time to hear all the story from both management and labor. I agree with my colleagues, particularly my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, that, since the proponents of this measure have themselves admitted it should not be brought up at this time, we should vote against the rule.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman tell us how long those hearings will continue before the Committee on Labor?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly speak on behalf of the committee in that regard. It was the consensus of opinion that we should hold them sufficiently long to hear everybody, but that we should try to end them as speedily as possible. That is all I can tell the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman really believe that the Committee on Labor will report out a bill?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I really believe that the Labor Committee will report out a bill.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Before Christmas?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I would not say whether it will be before Christmas or in the early part of January.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman assure us it will be this side of doomsday?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A fact that is before this House which needs restatement, is that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has announced that he will not call up this bill today, if the rule should be adopted.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I think it is obvious to everyone that the proponents of the bill have said it is ill-advised to bring it up now. All I am asking is to sustain that point of view and vote down the rule at this time. If the Labor Committee does not bring out any legislation, it is obvious the rule can be brought up again and action can be taken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did not the Labor Committee yesterday hear John L. Lewis and Eric Johnston both testify that they did not want any legislation?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, how do you expect to get it out of the Labor Committee?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Those are only two people.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says that if the rule is cast down it may be brought up again. I would like to inform the gentleman that the group he represents does not happen to be in control of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not know which group the gentleman thinks I represent. All I know is that I represent the Republican Party in my district and I represent my constituency. I represent no other group.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If they are not going to give the Congress a chance to consider this bill, even if they vote for the rule, what is the point of bringing up this rule? We do not just want to "shadow box."

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. That is exactly the point I am trying to make. I should like to see the rule defeated.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, having reference to what was just said by the gentlewoman from Illinois, the situation presented here today is the result of action taken in contravention of the expressed determination and desire of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I think that is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a nice kettle of fish today. My good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] deplores the fact that this matter was called up and I share that view. My esteemed friend and neighbor, the minority whip the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], indicated that he did not ask that this be called up. The chairman of the Military Affairs Commitee now assures us here on the floor that it will not be called up.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I said that I would not call it up for a reasonable length of time as a matter of courtesy to the Labor Committee. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the gentleman in all fairness, is he going to call it up today?

Mr. MAY. I am not going to call it up today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well; that answers the question.

Mr. MAY. But if the gentleman wants to know I will tell him when we will call it up; it will be next Tuesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can then say to the House without any fear of contradiction that this bill will not be called up today. Then why send one of these rules roaming out in space somewhere to come back at some unstated time? If they will assure me here and now that they will call the bill up today I will vote for the rule. If it is not going to be called up today I shall vote down the rule. Has it not always been the custom to call up a rule and then immediately consider the bill to which it applies.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman's hand. If the rule is adopted, then if no member of the Military Affairs Committee will call it up I will move to call it up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the gentleman has no authority to call it up; he is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. Now, let us get this clear. The only person——

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.

Mr. SHAFER. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee I will call it up.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if order is established, for the benefit of the membership of the House, I will yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and everybody acquainted with the rules by which we prceeed is familiar with the fact that the only person who can call up this bill is the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. He said very emphatically that he would not call it up today. What is the haste then about this rule? Why not defer it until the day he proposes to call it up? If he rules to call it up next Tuesday—a week hence—that will be soon enough to give this rule consideration.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield. I will vote for the rule if the bill is called up today. I am opposed to the bill in its present form. I am not going to see this folly committed without at least raising my voice after the paradox that has been created by the enactment of the Smith-Connally Act in 1943. So what is the sense of approving a rule today when we know that at that point we put a period and the bill will not be considered in this Chamber?

I now yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman just referred to a paradox. The paradox is that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is trying to put the Republicans in a red-hot frying pan. He now holds the red-hot frying pan. Let him hold it and let it burn him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have lived on this earth nearly 50 years and have not yet jumped into any frying pan, and certainly not in the 13 years of my service here.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Six months ago, when we had under consideration a bill with reference to expenses, it was said that a vote on that rule would be considered a vote for the bill. A lot of the Members do not want to vote for the bill in its present form.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

Let us do the sensible thing today. Let us vote down the rule. Since a motion to recommit does not lie against a rule, our only hope is to vote it down and wait until we get ready to call up the bill. That will be soon enough.

Let us consider for a moment the import of the bill which is covered by the rule. It seems to me that we here propose to repeal one bad law by enacting another which may be a greater evil than the first.

It reminds one of Amnon, the son of David, who ravished his sister Tamar and then dismissed her. Whereupon she said, "This evil thing in sending me away is greater than the other that thou didst unto me."

It is so generally agreed that the Smith-Connally Act should be repealed. It was born out of emotionalism. It was opposed by labor. It was not wanted by management. Hostilities ended nearly 4 months ago, and yet the NLRB has no choice except to conduct strike votes when strike notices have been filed and still ask the question, "Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime as a result of this dispute?"

When one stops to consider that the war is over and there is no war production, this is, indeed, one of the paradoxes in our legislative history.

So there is general agreement that the Smith-Connally Act should be repealed, but the difficulty lies in the rider which the Military Affairs Committee wrote into this bill, which would take away the bargaining rights and make labor organizations subject to court action.

There are many reasons why I cannot support that proposal.

First. In the first place it can be nullified so quickly by simply omitting any arbitration or no-strike pledge from a bargaining contract.

Second. It is a piecemeal approach to the problem. There is today clamor for a modification of the Wagner Act to make it a two-way street. The proposal before us is but an aggravation of the whole problem and would make things worse rather than better.

Third. This proposal was adopted by the committee at a time when emotionalism was in the air. It was a condition similar to that of 1943 when the Smith-Connally Act was adopted and surely we shall not want to make the same mistake.

Fourth. In the fourth place I can think of no sumptuary legislation which is capricious and punitive in character that has ever done any good. In that connection let me read what Eugene G. Grace, president of Bethlehem Steel Co., said in a broadcast on December 4, 1945, over the American Broadcasting System. He said:

> The job of revising present labor laws is up to the Congress. I believe Mr. Truman is sound when he urges Congress not to adopt any repressive or coercive measures against either side; that is, against either labor unions or industry. Not only should no new coercive laws be passed, but to the extent that present laws are unfair to either side they should be corrected.

Fifth. In the fifth place not only the country but management and labor as well seek something constructive and is there anyone so bold as to say that the provision contained in this bill is constructive and conducive to good feeling?

Sixth. In the sixth place you cannot indict millions of decent God-fearing laboring men for the derelictions of a few at the top. Do not forget that when bargaining rights are taken away, this punishment also includes the rank and file who in so many cases have not been responsible for capricious action on the part of their organizations.

Seventh. In the seventh place it should be pointed out that only 10 days ago this House approved a recommendation which I offered in the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations which denied the further use of funds for the enforcement of the Smith-Connally Act. That provision can be found on page 13 of H. R. 4805 which passed the House and is now pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The language of that proviso reads as follows:

> NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
>
> Salaries: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries", $354,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated in title IV, Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1946, or of any other funds appropriated to the National Labor Relations Board for the fiscal year 1946 hereafter shall be used, except for the discharge of obligations incurred up to and including the date of approval of this act, by the National Labor Relations Board in any way in connection with the performance of the duties imposed upon it by the War Labor Disputes Act (50 U. S. C. App. 1501–1511), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and other items otherwise properly chargeable to appropriations of the National Labor Relations Board for miscellaneous expenses and printing and binding, and the National Labor Relations Board shall return to the Treasury all funds appropriated to it under title IV of the National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1946, for the performance of the duties imposed upon it by the War Labor Disputes Act, less all sums actually expended and obligations actually incurred in the performance of its duties under the War Labor Disputes Act up to and including the date of approval of this act.

You will note that this proviso includes all the duties imposed upon the National Labor Relations Board with respect to the War Labor Disputes Act and for practical purposes is sufficient to terminate the further enforcement of the Smith-Connally Act. Therefore, it must be said with respect to the first two sections of the bill covered by the rule that we have already taken partial action. Why, then, the hurry in adopting a rule when it is not proposed to call up this bill today? It would be far better if Congress would dispassionately view this whole problem and then consider constructive and well-rounded action.

Eighth. Finally, it should be pointed out that a bill in pursuance of the President's recent message is now pending before the Labor Committee of this House. For anyone in this body to say that it is not possible to secure constructive over-all legislation to meet the present problem of industrial unrest is, indeed, to confess the incapacity of this body to deal with this problem in proper fashion. I, for one, do not propose to make that kind of a confession.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the settlement of the strike situation throughout the country is the major problem now facing the Government of the United States. Never was there a greater demand in the history of our country for products of all kinds than there is now. The public is eager to buy automobiles, clothing, furniture, equipment, machinery, lumber, and every other commodity. Yet, industry is at a standstill, our economy is being seized by a creeping paralysis.

Without production, goods will continue to become more scarce. With a tremendous buying power available, to add to the scarcity of goods is but to invite inflation. If we have little or no production, we will have little or no national income. This means that Federal tax collections will fall off at the very time when it should not happen.

The administration, with its sizable majority in both Houses of Congress, has a tremendous responsibility in this strike situation. It is interesting to observe that all of the leaders, who are playing such an important part in work stoppages today are the very same men who, by their own words, claimed credit for the election of the Roosevelt-Truman ticket in 1944. I call your attention to the activities of such men as R. J. Thomas, Walter Reuther, Phil Murray, August Schoole, Julius Emstake, and Harry Bridges. These men are the prominent leaders of the political party that elected our present administration.

At the present time, 12 of our Midwestern States are tied up with a truck strike. Hundreds of towns that are not served by railroads are being denied food, other necessities, and Christmas merchandise. Who is leading this strike? Is it some resident of those 12 States? It is none other than the national chairman of the labor division of the Democratic National Committee, Daniel Tobin.

It is very significant to note that the vast majority of old-line labor leaders and heads of unions, who throughout the years have brought great gains to our working people, are conspicuously absent from these striking activities. Countless thousands of labor union officials are placing the welfare of the public first and are refraining from causing trouble in this critical period in our history. Millions of working men and women, many of whom have a just cause for complaint, are today anxious to stay on the job in the public interest. Those patriotic men and women want the Nation to be reconverted to peacetime industry. They want our boys brought home and discharged. They want production resumed to avoid inflation. Unless order is brought out of chaos among our striking unions, all labor will suffer, both organized and unorganized.

I have faith in the integrity, honesty, and patriotism of the rank and file of the workers of America. They are suffering from a situation that is not of their own making. The longer the delay is in meeting the present situation, the greater the danger is that some unwise action will be taken. Very, very few of the men and women of America who work, even among those who are now out on strike, are Communists. Far be it from me to even intimate such a thing. The majority of union officials are not Communists. Some of them are. There is a great danger that some of the bitterest foes of communism will be used by the Communist influences to further the Communist program. The Communists of the country are making a desperate effort to control those unions which, in turn, control the transportation and communication and other vital portions of our economy. It is the duty of the Government to protect our honest laboring people and labor officials from the attacks of such groups.

In a brief but authentic article in the Saturday Evening Post for December 1, Stanley High has written, "Our Communists are so sorry they were good boys." I wish to quote a few paragraphs from Mr. High's article:

> With the unanimity peculiar to Communist "democracy," delegates of the American Communist movement met in New York City on July 28, and, on orders from the world Communist enterprise, shed their widely advertised devotion to national unity, ended their policy of cooperation with capitalist-democratic America, and, under cover of the phrases of freedom and progress, militantly returned to their first love, the business of disruption.
>
> Thus the curtain was rung down on one of the best acts which the Communist Party puppets in this country have ever staged. For several years, during which Soviet Russia stood in sore need of American military and economic succor, the Communists have been among our most fervent evangels of everything that was good and true and beautiful. * * *
>
> For the same unpropitious reasons that prompted them to stage that act, the Communists have now called it off. The instrument of their devotion to America, to its national unity and progress, was the Communist Political Association. At their recent convention they liquidated it. The author of that policy was their veteran and

lately loved leader, Earl Browder. They liquidated him. As a contribution to the national well-being, the Communist Party had been dissolved. They resurrected it. The Communist leader who had most steadfastly opposed the pro-American policy was William Z. Foster. They elevated him to Browder's position.

They laid the foundations for a postwar program of three major objectives. The first is to prepare the Communists of America to take decisive advantage of those postwar economic dislocations and disturbances which they now eagerly anticipate and, if they live up to their record, can be counted on to promote.

The second objective, aimed to facilitate the first, is a militant revival of Communist penetration into strategically important positions in the American labor movement and a militant revival of agitation among Negroes and the unemployed.

The third objective is to intensify the Communist effort to establish Soviet Russia, in the mind of all progressive Americans, as the chief source of postwar economic and political liberation, to establish also Soviet Russia's policies, aims, and ambitions as an ideal for America and other nations—as the only guarantee of a people's triumph against the forces of reaction. * * *

The latest orders to the Communists of the United States came, therefore, via Paris and a Frenchman, one Jacques Duclos. * * *

The Duclos article examined American communism's then-current party line at great length, and at great length condemned it because it was aimed "to make democracy work within the framework of the present system." That, Duclos said, is "a false concept of the ways of social evolution in the United States." He condemned it because it gave support to the Browder principle that "we do not want disaster for America, even though it results in socialism." That principle, according to Duclos, "swerved dangerously from the victorious Marxist-Leninist doctrine." * * *

The true doctrine, said Duclos, is the old one that "socialism cannot be achieved without the conquest of power." The Communists of the United States, as their "necessary reply," must return to that doctrine. There must be a "countermanding" of the policy of "peace between the classes" and a new policy based upon the "opposition of force to force in the solution of internal problems."

The Communists are not the friends of the working men and women of America. They may pose as such and thus advance their revolutionary program. It is the duty of the Government to provide for the functioning of unions in such a way that the labor leaders are the servants and not the masters of those who toil. The workers of America should never become pawns in the hands of leaders of any alien philosophy.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I agree fully with the statements made that the discord existing between management and labor in this country today and the development of a feasible constructive program to bring concord and peace to management and labor are matters of very great concern and the most important problem now before the country and the Congress.

The proposed rule makes in order the consideration by the House of H. R. 3937, known as the Smith bill, and reported to the House some time ago by the Military Affairs Committee. The immediate question before us is shall we adopt or reject this rule? In my opinion an overwhelming majority in this House, like myself, would welcome an opportunity to consider a constructive measure that would bring management and labor together. This is what is known as a "gag" rule. It has been described by a number of Members, Democrats and Republicans, as one of the very worst gag rules ever brought before the House. In fact one of the leaders of the Rules Committee stated that in his more than 20 years of service in the House that no such gag rule in all that time had been submitted to the House to make in order a bill such as the bill that we have under consideration. This gag rule would not permit any Member of the House to offer amendments. The only way an amendment may be offered to improve the bill would have to be offered by the Military Affairs Committee. The Military Affairs Committee is not supposed to sponsor labor legislation. This committee deals with an entirely different subject. They have been trained and are experienced in legislation relating to the Army. However, during the war they brought out a bill as a war measure. It was passed by the House and Senate, vetoed by the President, and then passed over the President's veto.

Many of us who opposed that bill as being unwise were severely criticized in some quarters. I thought the legislation was unwise and voted against the bill as finally submitted to the House. Now after a year or more of trial Congress has been urged by management as well as labor to repeal that act. Some businessmen in my district who criticized me when I voted against the bill are strongly urging me to vote to repeal it. The bill before us, introduced by Mr. SMITH, proposes to repeal certain important parts of that act. He was one of the authors of that bill. His present bill, among other things, repeals the provisions of that act in effect making legal any strike where a majority of the members of the union affected voted in favor of a strike. In effect, making it legal to vote against governmental agencies and in defense plants that were building ships, making guns, airplanes, and other implements of war. It did not work out well. We had 33⅓ percent more strikes under that act and much more discord than we had had in management and labor before the bill was passed. We had 3,000 strikes during the year before the act was passed, and 4,000 strikes the year following the passage of that act.

The bill before us is not necessary to repeal that provision of the law. Some time ago Congress provided in an appropriation that none of the money could be used to supervise and hold elections on request for strike votes and there is no need of the bill before us to correct that situation.

Now, what else is contained in this bill? It prohibits contributions by corporations as well as labor unions for or against candidates for President or for Members of the House and Senate. This, of course, does not take away the right of officers or stockholders of a corporation or the right of officers or members of labor unions to make individual contributions to candidates in a primary or convention or in the final election, but we do not have any such elections until the summer and fall of 1946. This provision of the bill does not aid in any way the situation that the country now faces. If legislation is necessary, it is needed now to meet present conditions. There is no program or plan submitted in this bill to meet the present industrial disturbance or the discord between management and labor, and the gag rule that we are urged to adopt prevents any Member of the House from submitting such a program.

There is another provision in this bill giving a right of action to industry and labor where they have a contract not to strike or not to have a lock-out, but this provision is so loosely drawn that there would be no way to make it effective. It could not reach any contracts already broken or the contracts that might be broken before this bill should finally become law, and under this gag rule no Member of the House could offer an amendment to improve this section of the bill, and it provides no relief for the present conditions about which we hear so much complaint. We have been amazed to hear that the proponents of this bill and this rule state that they have agreed that in the event this rule is adopted making the Smith bill in order, that the bill will not be brought up for consideration. In all of my years of service in the House I have never before seen a rule brought in that was such a complete gag rule on a matter of this kind. Furthermore, I never did hear the proponents of a bill or a rule state that in the event that the rule was adopted the bill would not be brought up for consideration. Why, then, adopt this rule?

I believe that a constructive and effective program can be worked out and should be worked out that will eliminate much of the discord and confusion in the Nation between management and labor, but this cannot be done under this gag rule. They say they are not going to bring this bill up even though we adopt the rule, because the President has submitted a program to Congress on the labor-management situation, and a bill has been introduced to carry out the President's proposal, and this bill has been referred to the Labor Committee of the House. They have already started hearings and have announced that they will expedite action and submit a bill to the House at the earliest date possible. The Labor Committee is the proper committee to investigate and report on a matter of this kind. They have the power and right to accept parts of the President's program and reject other parts, and to revise the whole program, in the interest of management as well as labor and to protect the public interest. There is no way to prevent them from bringing forth such a bill as their committee may agree upon.

To adopt this rule and take up the bill before us under the gag rule we might add confusion to the whole situation. This problem requires the very best throught and experience, the highest degree of statesmanship and patriotism of both bodies of Congress, and when a bill

does come to the House from the Labor Committee there should be no gag rule to prevent the Members of the House from offering amendments and to work out the very best bill possible.

President Truman and his administration are in control. Whatever measure is passed can be effective only insofar as the President and his administration give the measure their active and wholehearted support. As one Member of Congress, I am willing to have the President's program fully and fairly considered so that he and his administration will not have an alibi in the event that a constructive and effective program is not worked out.

The recent attitude of the workers in the Ford plant and in some other plants indicate that a majority of the workers begin to realize that management and labor must cooperate together—each one respecting the rights of the other, and that discord and strikes and lock-outs hurt both management and labor. Present conditions are delaying reconversion. If the people of this country can get together there are great possibilities for an unusual period of prosperity ranging all the way from 2 to 10 years, according to proper cooperation. There are more than $100,000,000,000 in savings. The needs of the people of this country and of other countries for homes, all the equipment for homes, a thousand and one other articles and services, expansion of business enterprises, run into many hundreds of billions of dollars. The American people do not want management or labor to throw away these great opportunities. We must constantly keep in mind that the American people as a whole and their welfare must be taken into consideration. This Nation and 140,000,000 people are bigger than any group in any activity in this great Nation.

Feeling as I do about this obnoxious gag rule, the ineffectiveness of the Smith bill to meet the situation that now confronts the Nation, and desiring that the President's program, even though it may not be adopted, has a chance to be considered by the Congress on its merits and under such a rule as will permit amendments, a free discussion, and consideration, I shall cast my vote against the rule now before us.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this rule should be adopted regardless of the controversy which has arisen as to whether or not the bill will be brought on if the rule is adopted. The adoption of the rule will be at least the first step toward serving notice on irresponsible and law-breaking labor leaders that they are rapidly creating a condition in this country which is inimical and destructive to labor, both organized and unorganized, as well as the general public. Defeat of the rule would probably give them aid and comfort.

As I have said before, the people, through their government, during the past 10 years have disarmed themselves of practically all legal rights, and placed legal arms and ammunition in the hands of labor leaders for the protection and advancement of labor's cause. We have now come to a point where certain labor leaders have turned these legal weapons upon both organized and unorganized labor, and the general public, solely to enrich their treasuries. It is a matter of sheer necessity for Congress to take at least some of these weapons from labor leaders if labor and the general public are to survive with a free government.

In considering this rule and legislation thereunder, it is not the people nor the Congress which has set such machinery in motion, but the lawless, law-defying labor leaders themselves have set this machinery in motion. When labor leaders break their contracts voluntarily entered into, to the detriment, hardship, and suffering of the public; when these same labor leaders disregard all laws, human rights and their own obligations under powers extended to them, then these powers must be curtailed.

In my district in the last few weeks the necessity of this kind of legislation has been amply demonstrated, and conditions obtaining there exist all over the country.

About 6 months ago the teamsters' union approached the Standard Grocer Co., a little wholesale grocer concern in my district, with plants in three cities, Holland, Grand Rapids, and Muskegon, which is just outside of my district, and told them that their 34 employees would have to be unionized if they wanted to stay in business. The union officials were assured that this company had no objection to their help being unionized, but stated that, of course, this would be a matter for the employees to decide, and also as to which union they would wish to become affiliated with. About 3 or 4 weeks ago members of the International Teamsters Union not only began picketing the warehouses of this company, but interfered with withdrawals of merchandise from these warehouses and all trucking and deliveries to and from the company's plants, with the apparent intention of strangling the company, and thereby causing it to compel its employees to unionize.

In this dilemma the Standard Grocer Co. contacted me for advice. I immediately took it up with the Labor Conciliation Board, which sent an investigator to the Standard Grocer Co. The company practically placed itself in the hands of the Conciliation Board, and under its guidance and instructions facilitated the holding of elections of its employees, one of them in the labor hall, on their affiliation with the union. The election was properly held and all of the employees, 100 percent, voted that they did not wish to join any union. That closed the matter, and the teamsters union was without any rights of interference with these men or the Standard Grocer Co. Mr. Colvin, of the Labor Conciliation Board, immediately thereafter informed me that the matter had been amicably settled, and there would be no further trouble.

Nevertheless, a day or two later the Standard Grocer Co. informed me that they were still being picketed, their delivery trucks interfered with, and warehouses were being picketed so that they could not remove merchandise therefrom without for every removal going through a costly replevin proceeding in the courts. The union also sought to boycott the company in getting merchandise from producers and jobbers. After a few more contacts with the Labor Conciliation Board, I was informed by that Board that the actions of the teamsters union were every one of them in violation of law but that if the teamsters union chose to flagrantly violate the laws and all human rights, the Conciliation Board was just as helpless as the Standard Grocer Co. In other words, law-abiding citizens could be deprived of their property, their business, their livelihood, and all their rights without color of law or right, by domineering, outlaw, and lawless labor leaders.

A few days later the Holland Motor Express, which operates about 180 pieces of rolling stock, and theretofore had made deliveries for the Standard Grocer Co., was accused by union racketeers of having broken the picket line and serviced the Standard Grocer Co. Although this was positively denied by the Holland Motor Express, racketeer labor leaders managed to have a strike declared against the Holland Motor Express Co., which threw over 50 men out of work.

The owner of the Holland Motor Express, becoming discouraged at dealing with and being at the mercy of these racketeer labor leaders, then announced that he would liquidate his $350,000 business, and in that way get away from racketeer labor domination. Thereupon the union employees of the Holland Motor Express who had in the first instance met and voted against the strike but had been threatened with expulsion from the union unless they complied then held another meeting and sent me the following telegram:

> Highway drivers and warehousemen at Holland, Mich., now out strongly desire to return to work; we feel that one Tom Burk has been the main obstacle to our working by taking an unreasonable and groundless attitude to employer and employees; the future interests of the men require his immediate elimination from authority.

It is such pernicious sabotage of labor by the Tom Burks that this legislation seeks to curb.

Now, it is true that both of these companies are comparatively small companies, but nevertheless these flagrant violations of all human rights and constitutional liberties by irresponsible union labor leaders are apparent and are taking on increased acceleration all over the United States. Legislation such as the May-Arends bill has no other objective than to prevent lawlessness. It is not anti-labor, and under the open rule other amendments can be offered, aimed only at the Tom Burks, the James Haffas, and the Tobins, who are effecting a paralysis, not to mention a restraint of trade all throughout the Middle Western States, and as we all know, even here in Washington, in violation of law.

The streetcar strike in Washington is only another evidence of this disregard for law. Such legislation should be considered with calmness and determination, and if confined to the lawlessness of

which the above described is an example, is not antilabor, but prolabor; and is designed, if labor cannot clean its own house, to help labor in eliminating irresponsible and destructive influences which eventually will undermine not only labor but the entire country.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, if I thought a vote for this rule would help solve the problem of management and labor, I would support the rule. It will do no such thing. It has been described as a "phony" rule. I do not believe I ever saw one like it. The rule says there shall be no amendments to a proposed bill, if considered, unless such amendments are submitted by the Committee on Military Affairs. It provides further, however, that particular committee may offer any amendment whether it relates to the subject matter of the bill, or not. Then the proponents say further they are not going to bring the proposed bill at this time, and do not know when—if at all—they will bring one up for consideration. Then why the rule?

Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is a shadow-boxing affair. It solves nothing. It does nothing. It is submitted that no hearings were even held on the important sections of the bill to which this rule relates.

Mr. Speaker, we have brought to a successful conclusion the most terrible war the world has known. The American people were united in that effort. It is a sad situation when we find groups quarreling immediately after that war is over.

It is deplorable that management and labor have failed thus far in coming to agreement. Labor, management, and the public are suffering because of it.

Mr. Speaker, the committee responsible for labor and management problems, so far as legislation is concerned, should have been giving attention to this matter during the past several weeks. If they had done so, some of the difficulties we face may have been averted.

This Congress should submit legislation that will, among other things, put labor and industry on the same basis with respect to their responsibility, not only to themselves but to the American public. They ought to be able to work out their own problems without legislation; but since they are unable to do it, then Congress should immediately enact legislation fair and reasonable to both labor and industry and at the same time protect the rights of the American public, that are not only neglected but are required to suffer.

This is a real shadow-boxing affair. The bill under the rule before us, which admittedly will not even be considered, does not solve the problem. Let us get legislation that will solve the problem before the present serious situation gets out of hand.

This Congress has a responsibility with regard to this problem. I call upon the leadership of this House to assume that responsibility, and do it now.

Let us do it in a sane, sensible manner. The thing you are attempting to do today will not help anyone, and the majority of the membership of this House knows it. It will not stop strikes, and you know it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the request for this rule comes before us concerning a bill that contains two important sections purporting to control or regulate labor unions, which was passed out of the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member.

Not one word of testimony was heard by our committee on these sections of the bill. I made an earnest plea with the chairman and the members of our committee that hearings be held on these proposals. My request was flatly denied.

Labor-management relations are complicated, very complicated. Only one who has had experience can realize that.

There seems to be a general misconception on the part of some Congressmen, as well as the public, that we can solve industrial conflicts by the mere passage of a law. It should be clearly kept in mind that no law can outlaw strikes. Men may quit their work at any time. We can no more require them to work against their will than we can force a plant to remain open or a farmer to harvest his crop against the will of the owners of the plant or farm.

We may, by judicious and well-considered legislation, regulate labor-management regulations so as to minimize work stoppages and other industrial disputes. In the case of public employees and public utilities we may, perhaps, enact more stringent regulations. But if anything of that sort is done it must be by well-considered legislation. No half-baked or half-considered or hastily drawn legislation will do the job to which the American public is entitled.

The legislation sought to be brought before us did not have any consideration in the way of hearings. Only by having evidence on the various circumstances under which the regulations may come into effect, how it would operate and on whom, the results of the proposed rule on various situations to which it will be applied, and other matters, can we arrive at a balanced judgment as to what, if any, legislation to enact as to the responsibilities of parties to collective bargaining contracts. On the face of it, the regulation suggested could deprive thousands of workingmen of their collective bargaining right for a whole year, because of the hot-headed action of a small minority of the union's membership.

If we believe in the private-enterprise system it is better that these matters be worked out by the parties through experience. Older experienced unions and labor leaders never break their contracts. The Railway Brotherhoods or the United Mine Workers never strike while their contracts are in effect. They have been disciplined through experience and their leaders would never allow them to violate a nonstrike contract clause while the contract was still in force.

The other proposed provision in the bill is that labor unions shall not be allowed to contribute toward political campaigns. Two years ago we enacted a similar provision, which we were told would do this. That act was drafted without hearings, like this one. We see the result of this hasty ill-digested legislation. The authors now assure us that they have made this provision airtight, although that is what they thought 2 years ago. Hearings might have produced something which would meet the evil complained of, but this type of hodge-podge, star-chamber, ex parte legislation will not do the job.

If we want legislation that will help solve this problem we had better have it preceded by hearings and full consideration, otherwise it will disappoint everyone and solve nothing. This request for a rule should be denied.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to speak on the rule may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman include in that request those of us who have already spoken?

Mr. MICHENER. May I suggest that the gentleman make his request that all those who desire to extend their remarks be permitted to do so at this point in the RECORD, so that the debate will be all together?

Mr. SABATH. I will do so again on the suggestion and advice of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have never heard so many apologies for legislation as we have listened to in the last few minutes. I have been informed by a member of the Committee on Military Affairs that the only hearings on this bill were in connection with sections 1 and 2. On sections 3 and 4, which represent the Arends amendments, and which include amendments to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, no hearings have been held.

The proponents of this legislation did not need a war for them to bring in repressive bills of this kind, because our recollection goes back to the fact that they introduced this kind of legislation long before the war broke out in Europe. As to the wisdom of it, you remember what these gentlemen told you about the Smith-Connally Act, but no sooner was it passed than they themselves were the first ones to deplore the provisions in that legislation.

Regarding the frying-pan situation which my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, brings into this debate, I would like to ask my Republican friends on the left of the aisle to remember that the author of this bill, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], told us when the first Smith bill was brought before the Committee on Naval Affairs that he did not have a single industry in his district. So he is in no frying pan. He has no problems of industry and he does not have to consider the effect upon the sentiment of the electorate in his district if a bill like this passes because he has none of the problems of industry that you and I have in

our districts. So the frying pan for him would be very cool and not uncomfortable, but not so for many others.

Members of the House, this is a bill to create general open-shop conditions and to destroy collective bargaining. It should be designated as the open-shop bill, because you can call it by no other name. I hope my friends on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democratic side of the aisle will evaluate this bill for its proper worth when they vote upon this rule, which, in the last analysis, would surrender the rights of every committee in this House to the Committee on Military Affairs for an indefinite period, because they told you they will not bring the bill up today, and they do not say when the legislation would come before us.

For that reason, in order to protect the rights and prerogatives of all the committees of this House, and also because the purpose of the legislation is to destroy collective bargaining, we should vote down this rule by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am in a perfect good humor. I voted for the Smith-Connally bill and I voted for the antiracketeering bill and I am ready to vote for any constructive labor legislation that is conceived in Congress and not written in rancor and anger.

Neither proposition in this bill goes to the heart of the question now concerning the people of this country. I was somewhat amused at my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge Cox, in his hilarity, and at times rather vindictive sort of spirit, when he turned in gloating glee to this side of the Chamber and said, "I have a red-hot frying pan and I have you Republicans in it, and I am going to render you out here today. You jump through the hoop or there will not be a drop of grease left in any of you."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Not now. I love you, but I want you to be quiet just now.

Then, my good friend, ANDREW JACKSON MAY, from my sister State of Kentucky, got up. I thought he was going to oust this board here that we all pound on a little bit. Then he lets the cat out of the bag. He says, in effect, "I want the rule, but I am not going to do anything with it. I do not know that I will ever do anything with it."

A measure is now before the Committee on Labor, and I assume they will discharge their duty and, in response to the request of the President of the United States, bring in here a bill that will meet the present situation. If they do, I will vote for it. The Committee on Rules can give us the kind of a rule that will give us all a chance to express our opinions on it. On a measure so important, every Member of this House should have the opportunity to help write a constructive, fair measure that will protect the rights of all our people.

Let us beat this phony rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the red-hot frying pan into which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said he had been accused of placing the Republicans does not bother me any, for, had I been inflammable, the fires which have been built under me and over me during the past few years by the Communists, the PAC and its political lieutenants, would long ago have burned me to a crisp.

Nor does the threat of a red-hot frying pan disturb many of our people, because ever since the New Deal took over most of them have been scorched one way or another by a New Deal rule, regulation, or directive.

If there is anyone in this House who does not know that an overwhelming majority of the people are demanding remedial legislation, some sort of a solution to the present numerous labor disputes which are bringing widespread unemployment, I would like to see that gentleman arise in the House and acknowledge his lack of information.

I should like to see that gentleman tomorrow at lunch, where I will gladly pay for it, but I do not believe many will avail themselves of the offer.

Mr. SABATH. I will be with you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] said, the question before us is: Does the House desire to consider legislation designed to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to lessen the number and intensity of strikes?

No sophistry, no quibbling as to the parliamentary situation will fool the people. If the House is in a parliamentary tangle, that is due either to its own lack of diligence, ability or leadership. The only answer to that is, if we have snarled ourselves in a maze of red tape, then it is up to us, to our leaders, to untangle the situation.

We may attempt to deceive ourselves that some specious excuse will pass muster, but it will be only self-deception. The people know the issue: Does this House have the courage, does it have the inclination, to take up consideration of legislation which will aid in solving the strikes which are interfering with reconversion? That is the issue; that is the demand of the people.

When this rule comes on for a vote, I cannot vote against it. I know of no reason which would justify a vote against the rule. If Members of the House wish to decline to discuss the issue, to sidestep and evade by voting down the rule, it is all right with me. I do not propose to follow that course.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the voices of the proponents of this legislation are but the echoes of the same voices that reverberated through the halls of Congress at the close of the First World War.

These present-day disciples of doom are artfully planning the return of an era that brought in its wake the election of Warren G. Harding as President. A man who at one time in his colorful career boasted that a dollar a day and a pair of overalls was enough for any workingman.

Labor and the laboring man, in the great struggle just ended, has again won back some of the social and economic rights to which he is entitled as a reward for the great contribution that made possible the victory we attained. Shall we in the words of the Great Commoner, William Jennings Bryan, once more "press down on the brow of labor this crown of thorns"; shall we again "crucify him on a cross of gold"?

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said, "The ills of democracy are best cured by more democracy."

As an exponent of the Jeffersonian theory of government I would that the spirit of this great American might abide with each and every Member of this Congress as we begin consideration of legislation that so vitally affects so many millions of our people.

I wonder what the great Sage of Monticello would say, were it possible for him to be with us today, to witness the arrogant and arbitrary action taken by a small group of willful men, both Democrats and Republicans, who by their vote in committee have indicated their intention to emasculate and sabotage all that labor has gained under the leadership of our late lamented Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, no subject is so inflammatory or controversial that it cannot be discussed openly on the floor of this, the greatest deliberative and democratic assembly on earth—free of closed committee sessions and gag rule.

There are, today, as in the days of Jefferson and Hamilton, two major lines of political thought in our Nation. The Jeffersonian theory on which the Democratic Party was founded is predicated on the idea that if the mass of our common people are prosperous and happy they will form the basis for a sound economy and a prosperous Nation.

In contrast we have the Hamiltonian theory to which our Republican friends, on the left of the center aisle, pay homage. This theory is predicated on prosperity beginning at the top. They hold that enough crumbs will trickle down from the rich man's banquet to let everybody exist, even if he is not prosperous or happy. This theory has never worked because it runs counter to the laws of supply and demand. Under it, too many people are deprived of their potential purchasing power—a power which you will agree is the basis for lasting prosperity.

I hesitate to classify this small group of dissident Democrats as having any kind of political theory. It is my personal belief that if they were suddenly transported from below the Mason-Dixon line to the rock-ribbed State of Maine they would overnight become bosses in the Republican Party. If one of them should happen to stray over into the adjoining State of Massachusetts he would at once "thumb his nose" at the Lodges and the Cabots because in his own opinion he would not need divine intercession.

Mr. Speaker, the war may be over in Germany and Japan, but it is plain it is only beginning in the Halls of Congress. There is no room in the American political picture for two conservative parties. Since the reactionaries are "ramrodding" the boys from the back of the old GOP elephant why should any group of so-called Democrats ride the donkey in the election parade and the elephant down Pennsylvania Avenue? Except for a brief interlude, occasioned by the appearance on the scene of the great "Teddy" Roosevelt and the late lamented Wendell Willkie, the Republican Party, as such, has never had a liberal idea since the great "Abe" Lincoln talked about a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

It is a matter of record that not a single piece of outstanding labor legislation has been placed on the statute books by the Republican Party. Their record has been one of opposition. It is significant that this legislation, H. R. 3937, is sponsored by a Republican Congressman from Illinois, aided and abetted by a group of labor-hating Democrats who would wreck the Democratic Party to attain their own selfish ends.

It might be well to remind my Democratic colleagues at this time that the Democrats have never won a national election when they tried to steal the Republicans' thunder. They have always won when they went to the people with a liberal program. They have always won when they had the united support of organized labor. If the Democratic Party can stay liberal it can win again in 1948 as it has won since 1932 under the leadership of the world's greatest liberal.

Should our party falter or deviate in the least in the weeks and months ahead from its present high estate as a defender of the common man, there will be an exodus of the faithful out of the Halls of Congress in 1946 and out of Washington in 1948 that will rival the exodus out of Egypt. I fear there will be no one left who will think enough of us to dry up the waters of the Potomac to let us cross over on dry land.

We know we never can go back to normalcy, either as a Nation or as a political party. Nations go forward or go down. Political parties progress or they perish. The Democratic Party has seen pass into political oblivion the Federalists, Whigs, Know-Nothing, Greenbackers, and Populists. Defeat this legislation and you will continue to witness the "twilight zone" of the Republicans.

Never before have I assumed the role of a political prophet. I know I will be criticized by some of my colleagues for making this speech at this time. My excuse for so doing will be the excuse offered by the prisoner who was yanked up before a magistrate charged with throwing a brick through a plate-glass window. When the squire asked him why he did it, he said, "Yer Honor, at the time I thought it was the proper thing to do." Mr. Speaker, I still feel it is the thing to do.

This legislation, H. R. 3937, drafted as it was behind the closed doors of the Military Affairs Committee, smacks too much of wartime controls in peacetime. It is punitive legislation, aimed at the destruction of labor's inherent right to bargain collectively. Just another spoke in the wheel this vicious crowd is building to roll us into another situation where we can be "hexed" by another group of Ohio witch doctors from the "little green cottage on K Street." So we can again be silenced by another "Cal" Coolidge and finally be left as we were once before, in a "hock shop" by another Hoover.

When legislation aimed at a permanent solution of the basic problems of labor relations can be brought to the floor of the House through the regular channels of the House Labor Committee it will receive my serious consideration. This "hysterical hybrid" proposed here, like the Missouri mule, can take little pride in its ancestry and even less hope in its posterity. The "sophisticated jackasses" who drew it did such an adroit job that no amendment could possibly improve its downright mulish viciousness.

Mr. Speaker, my reaction is one of contempt. I hope my colleagues will so view it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, there are certain aspects of this rule which I think the House should know. First, we have heard the announcement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, that he will not call up the bill today, even though the rule should be adopted. I call to your attention the fact that the rule provides that immediately upon its adoption it shall be in order to call up the bill, H. R. 3937. So that in not calling the bill up immediately we are constrained to inquire what is the reason for the delay? I question no one's motives, but I must discuss what will happen if the rule is adopted. What is the plan behind the delay? In the rule we find the following language:

> All points of order shall be waived against any provisions of the bill or to amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs.

That means that the Committee on Military Affairs may convene at any time and direct the offering of any antilabor amendment. It may direct the substitution of the Norton bill in the place of the language in H. R. 3937. In other words, by adopting this rule and giving this power to the Committee on Military Affairs we will provide the antilabor forces with a blackjack which will be held over the heads of the Committee on Labor and over the heads of the Members of Congress. Thus, by adopting this rule we will make it possible for the Military Affairs Committee to bypass the Labor Committee.

Second, let us examine H. R. 3937, the bill this rule makes in order. My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has stated that it would destroy collective bargaining. It goes further than that. It provides as punishment in the event of a strike, that labor shall lose its right to continue as a collective-bargaining agent. This means that American labor will be subjected, union by union, to the conditions of "yellow dog" contracts. We will be going back to the days of the "yellow dog" contract which Congress made illegal.

The language of section 4, of the bill will do away with the National Labor Relations Act. It will destroy the Norris-LaGuardia antiinjunction law and it will reestablish and impose on American labor "yellow dog" conditions. Now I am sure that even certain gentlemen of this House who want some kind of antilabor legislation are not ready to go so far as to make in order by voting for this rule a bill which would impose on American labor the conditions of a "yellow dog" contract which this Congress abolished several years ago.

We cannot escape this issue involved in this rule. If we vote for the rule, we are voting to subject labor to "yellow dog" conditions.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a more far-reaching provision in section 4 about the right to sue labor in United States courts. It is a loosely prepared thing. That is an indirect way of trying to incorporate labor, which would be the death note of all labor rights.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Exactly. It is a step toward Fascist control of American labor.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let it be known to all the membership of this House that there were no hearings on the Arends amendments, section 313 of the bill and section 4 of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Having regard to the fact that if the rule is adopted and the bill is sometime brought up for consideration and the provisions with respect to the observation of contracts are subject to amendment and change, will the gentleman agree with me that if a contract is to mean anything it must be binding on both parties as to agreements made?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Let us stop this talk about mutuality of agreements. Let us be realistic. What is the real cause of these strikes If you get down to rock bottom, the cause rests with those corporations that are today bloated with profits and refuse to pay a living wage to American workers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it grieves me very much to see the distressed state of mind of my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. I grieve very much for them in their predicament today.

The best thing to do, as I see it, is to defeat the rule, and if, perchance, the rule be adopted, and a motion is made to go into Committee of the Whole, for the House to refuse to do it, and to defeat such motion.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's solicitude, but he need not bother to worry about grieving for me.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is something the gentleman has no control over. I am the one who has control over my feelings.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 5 minutes remaining to me to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, we have certainly heard some ingenious arguments advanced against the rule by a regular phalanx of distinguished speakers, headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

I want to say that the talk about a frying pan is besides the issue. There is no effort to put anybody on the frying pan, either on the majority or on the minority side. There is a duty that every Member of this House has, regardless of which side of the aisle he sits, and that is to consider legislation and vote the way he thinks is right and in accordance with the public interest.

But, to brush aside some of the cobwebs that have crept into the arguments, I recall the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was quite disturbed because he thinks this legislation is what he calls shadow-boxing, and because this bill will never be called up if the rule is adopted. I am authorized to say on behalf of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], that in the event this rule is adopted the bill will be called up not later than Tuesday next.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has no control over that. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has no control over that. It goes into the hands of others.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield. I state merely the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I decline to yield. I do not have time.

This legislation is not antilabor legislation, it is antistrike legislation; it is legislation that is directed at a condition that has brought about a well-nigh paralyzed condition in this country. The transit company operating in Washington, to all intents and purposes is on strike today. The only reason you can get a bus is because the Government has seized it and is operating it; but as far as the contract existing between the transit company and the employees, a contract which provided for no strikes or work stoppage until June 30, that contract is dead today so far as operation is concerned except for the Federal Government's seizing the system and operating it. The union broke its contract, yet it is the transit company which is penalized.

Let me say to my good friends of the minority that there are seven States in the Midwest every one of them exclusively represented by Members both in the House and in the Senate by the minority, with the exception of Missouri, and perhaps Minnesota, where not a wheel has turned in the trucking industry on the highways since November 15. I recall that the day the rule was passed we could not even put in a telephone call to the city where the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee lives, because all the long-distance operators were on strike, and because the operators in Washington on a sympathy basis would accept no calls.

This is the pattern, Mr. Speaker, which France experienced prior to the break-down that led to its abysmal defeat in 1940. The seizing of transportation and the paralyzing of transportation facilities such as telephone and telegraph systems, and trucks, and transit systems is a part of that plan that came from France and was fomented by the leaders that brought France to her knees in 1940.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Would the gentleman agree with me that if this rule is voted down, millions, or hundreds of thousands now on strike could construe it to mean that Congress is in sympathy with their strikes and that they can depend upon Congress to condone whatever they might do?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I say to the gentleman that would certainly be my interpretation; and I say further that there are other people besides the general public who deserve protection, and those are the members of the unions themselves. There are 215,000 helpless members, employees of General Motors, the majority of whom would rather be earning money today and buying their daily bread and presents for their children at Christmas than to be out on strike.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. No; I do not yield.

This is a battle primarily between leaders for power, and not for the good, by and large, of the membership. There is no dispute that cannot be ironed out and straightened out if reasonable men sit down together. This May bill may not be the alpha and omega of labor legislation, but bear in mind that this is a flexible rule that will permit the Military Affairs Committee in its discretion to bring in other amendments, if such they find necessary, to supplement this bill, and to say to the country that we are going to stop this chaotic condition which is paralyzing this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SABATH. I desire to ask unanimous consent that Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for all Members?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; all Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the rule. It makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3937 which penalizes labor organizations for striking during the life of a contract which stipulates that no strike shall be called while the contract is in force. Contracts should be binding on both the employer and the employee. If the employer violates his contract he is responsible in damages. No concrete cases covering contracts in recent years have been cited where the employer wilfully ignored or repudiated his contract. Spokesmen for labor loosely charged that employers had violated their contracts. If they have any amendment to the pending bill that will penalize employers for violating solemn contracts, I will support the amendments, but loose and unsupported charges that labor organizations are justified in repudiating their solemn contracts which contain a no-strike pledge during the existence of the contract, to the effect that employers have at some time in the past violated their contracts, are not only unreasonable but are without merit. There is no occasion generally for legislation to compel employers because they can be made to respond to damages. Damages cannot be recovered from the workers. Hence, the penalty of the pending bill that labor shall lose its bargaining power for a year.

I assert that there is no defense for any labor organization to repudiate and ignore its solemn contract which contains a no-strike pledge by striking during the existence of the contract. Moreover, if employers violate their contract, the remedy is to penalize them. Two wrongs never make a right.

Another argument has been submitted in opposition to the rule. That argument is that the President's recent recommendation that there shall be no strike for a period of 30 days while investigations are being made so as to protect the public and so as to ascertain the facts is now being considered by the Committee on Labor. Spokesmen of labor denounce this legislation. They oppose it. They charge that it destroys bargaining and that it makes slaves of workers. The Committee on Labor has not reported in years any legislation that has been opposed by the spokesmen for organized labor. The alleged argument therefore, for the defeat of the rule on account of labor legislation being considered by the Committee on Labor, falls of its own weight. I am profiting by my experience. The Members will forfeit their right to vote for sound legislation with respect to labor if they await the reporting of any constructive legislation by the Committee on Labor. For my part I intend to support legislation to

prevent unjustifiable strikes whenever and wherever the opportunity presents and in the future as in the past I will do my best to make and to promote opportunities for the consideration of such legislation. I want to be fair between employer and employees. I think the same yardstick should apply to both.

In the third place, it is urged that the rule should be defeated and that no action should be taken in haste. Well, certainly there has been no haste. We have awaited the labor-management conferences. After weeks they adjourned. Nothing was accomplished. Strikes are multiplying. The public is being punished. Strikes are called without excuse and without reason.

How long will it take Congress to catch up with the country? The country knows that it is in the grip of unparalleled strikes. Congress must know no less. We have had ample opportunity to consider. It is time for action. For my part, while the circumstances under which we consider the rule are unfortunate, I shall support the rule, and I will continue to promote and support legislation to prevent unjustifiable strikes and to provide equality of treatment for employer and employees. The public must be considered and the public has been long-suffering and patient enough. The excuse that action now would be hasty is utterly without foundation. We have delayed too long passing legislation to curb and prevent strikes in violation of solemn contracts. It is time for action.

ANTILABOR LEGISLATION IN DISGUISE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we are at peace, but the Committee on Military Affairs reports a bill (H. R. 3937) curtailing the right and freedom of labor unions to engage in elections through the medium of contributions. By amendment it goes further, prohibiting contributions, solicitation of funds, and assessments levied on members in connection with any Federal election. Finally, it declares any contribution made "in connection with any political convention or primary election held to select candidates for any political office" to be unlawful.

The very fact that Military Affairs assumes sovereignty over a question which properly comes within the province of the Committee on Labor is reminiscent of Fascist technique. In order to restore reactionary elements to power, it is first necessary to blame labor and then, gradually, to throttle its voice and to kill its influence. This is how it began in other countries, slowly and unobtrusively, but as it gathered momentum, it brought disastrous results to the world. I trust that impatient legislation, such as proposed by this bill, will not win our approval. It is by such legislation that even good men are led to opinions and decisions that have unforeseen and dangerous consequences. In the light of this warning, let us examine H. R. 3937 carefully.

It is called a bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board.

The emphasis on the need for abolishing war legislation now that the emergency is over is superficially appealing. However, the language is misleading. Buried in the main body of the bill are provisions which have nothing to do with the relaxation of wartime controls. They are ill-concealed efforts to hamstring labor. There are none so blind as those who have not read the story of Little Red Riding Hood and the wolf in sheep's clothing. Here it is in modern dress.

Though section 3 of this act curtails the activities of national banks and corporations as well as labor unions, in the matter of contributing to political campaigns, it is obvious that the principal objective is labor. Only through the collective financial resources of organization can the worker make himself heard. Individually, he is lost. On the other hand, wealthy men, apart from their corporations, are in a position, personally, to make heavy contributions to political campaigns. By this influence, they wield a power which is denied to the workingman. Any effort to restrict his organization is a body blow. Unlike the wealthy man, he has no other recourse. Legislation broadening the application of the Corrupt Practices Act to stifle his sole means of expression—the union—is annihilating. In Great Britain, labor is not only organized, it is a vocal power unfettered by prejudicial legislation. In the United States, though not a political party in itself, it should not be denied the opportunity, the incidental opportunity, of contributing to political campaigns. After all other groups and other individuals do.

Existing law excludes labor unions, knowing that they constitute the largest and most representative group within the Nation, knowing also that the union is the only instrument through which the common man is in a position to make himself heard.

The proposed law, looking backward, would destroy this and hand our country back into the hands of predatory minorities, highly organized and with underground wealth to press their claims. Such unseen power is, and always has been, beyond the control of the Corrupt Practices Act. It would be much better to devote time and effort to the elimination of this evil than to snipe at the open efforts of the laborer to bring his case before conventions and to the people. We do not have to fear what we see and know. It is the backstage manipulations which are a threat to our democracy.

The proposed bill is one-sided in its oblique attack even while pretending to be all-inclusive. It throws in the words "banks" and "corporations" to give an appearance of objectivity. The sponsors of the bill know that the political lobbies and activities of corporations, for instance, will scarcely be touched by this legislation—but the unions will.

The unions are engaged in a struggle for better working conditions, social security and a fairer share of industry's profits. In this battle for economic survival, they have the right to campaign for their humane objectives, to compile the records of legislators on labor laws, to disseminate this information to the people, and to back up their spokesmen in the legislative halls of the nation.

Unions have done much to increase the political awareness of our people, and intelligent awareness is the bedrock of democracy. The leaflets and booklets, telling people how to register and vote, distributed by the millions through union organizations, have done much to transform our people from passive tools into active and informed citizens. These booklets are an education for the voters as to primaries and elections and as to the powers and duties of city councils, of state legislatures, of the Congress and of the President. They give the workers information on minimum health, recreational and dietary needs, they educate him on the dangers of inflation, they stress the need for slum clearance, better schooling for all, and the responsible part which each citizen must play in shaping cooperation among the nations to avoid the catastrophe implicit in another war. They bring labor's interest in living conditions to the people and help to make them articulate. Without this where would the common man who is the blood and bone of America be? The Republican and Democratic parties have nothing to equal the informational services of the union. It might be to their advantage to try and catch up. Blocking it will serve no useful purpose. It might even encourage the viewpoint, held in some quarters, that the people are ahead of Congress in their thinking. Conscious of our responsibilities, we would be ill-advised if we acted in a manner that might prove such an allegation. Passage of H. R. 3937 would undermine public confidence in us and betray the rank and file of American workers.

To go on, section 4 of this bill nullifies the right of labor to collective bargaining as provided by the Wagner Act. It provides penalties against a labor organization or its officers for damages that might accrue to any party as a result of a strike. Here we have a unilateral decision, which blithely ignores the other side of the picture. Labor must be penalized, but not management. It is all right for the employer to proceed as he did in the good old unfettered days of 1929, but labor must be prepared to turn back the clock on progress and forfeit the gains which rescued him from industrial feudalism. Having seen the light of day, he must be prepared to have himself put back into the darkness again. It occurs to me that certain reactionary elements of industry see in the problems of reconversion a golden opportunity to pick labor as the scapegoat and in the ferment of the period manage to repudiate and cancel all the progress which labor has fought for and won since 1932.

They expect labor to bend the knee, while the most flagrant violation of contract by an employer is permitted without penalty and without giving labor any opportunity to protect its interests.

Failure or refusal to work on the part of the employees under this bill shall constitute loss of status as a bargaining agency for the union to which he is affiliated, for a period of 1 year. This provides a penalty against the employee for refusal to work without any hearing before a constituted body and does not provide any penalty against the employer, who has created a lock-out

against labor. Such a formula is manifestly discriminatory.

Collective bargaining is here to stay, and the Congress, I am sure, will not sabotage this Magna Carta of American labor. Our course is set for progress, not retreat.

By voting against H. R. 3937 we shall hold to our forward course.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] made some statements during his argument in behalf of this rule that I can by no means concur in. In the first place he referred to strikes in Midwestern States. I would like for someone to point out to me anything in this bill that will end the strike that he refers to. I do not want to address myself to the bill, however, as I am opposed to it in its present form, but I do want to say a word in reference to the rule. Even if I was in favor of the bill I would not be in favor of the rule. I am going to read the objectionable language in the rule:

> All points of order shall be waived against provisions of the bill or to amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs.

No one can challenge the statement that if this rule is adopted the Committee on Military Affairs can offer any amendment it desires no matter whether it is germane to the language in the bill and it will not be subject to a point of order.

If the Committee on Military Affairs instructs the chairman to offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause in the bill and substitute language that will provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway or for a Department of National Defense or even for an appropriation for some specific purpose, under the language that I have just quoted such an amendment would not be subject to a point of order. They would not even have to strike out the language in the bill but offer amendments thereto concerning legislation the jurisdiction over which does not even lie with the Military Affairs Committee and the Chair would be compelled to overrule any point of order.

It has been stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] that he has the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that if this rule is passed he will ask recognition to call up the bill next week. Why the delay? The claim has been made that an emergency exists and that legislation of this character should be passed. If that be true, then it should be called up immediately, not next week. The rule should be defeated, because it provides for the consideration of legislation that is extremely dangerous and in its present form will cause more harm than good.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the Smith-Arends bill besides providing for the repeal of the War Labor Disputes Act, undertakes to write legislation on three subjects, none of which come within the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee. Without the benefit of expert knowledge the committee endorsed these three proposals without holding hearings on them to enlighten the membership of the House. These three proposals are:

First. To penalize a labor union which has violated a no-strike pledge in its contract.

Second. To give United States district courts the right to entertain suits for damages resulting from breach of no-strike provision.

Third. To amend the Corrupt Practices Act, so as to prohibit political contributions from labor unions and corporations.

Let us analyze these proposals in order.

If a labor organization violates its no-strike pledge, it is to lose its status for 1 year as a bargaining agency and the employer is to be relieved from the obligations of his wages-and-hours contract for 1 year.

If this penalty is to be enforced, what profit results to the employer? Will he, as soon as he is relieved from his contractual obligations, reduce wages and alter hours to suit his monetary interests? If he does, can he recruit a labor force? Is it not likely that once the defaulting union is divested of authority, another union will invade the field, to seek designation as a bargaining agent for the current year, while the former contracting union is under sentence of ouster? There will then be two unions to deal with and this usually leads to labor chaos.

It is to be noted that this provision is one-sided, in that it sets up penalty for the union that does not maintain its contract, but nothing is stipulated about punishment of the employer for violating his obligations.

The bill has made no provision for weighing the equities of the situation. Under its clear language, the employer is to be relieved of any obligations under the contract even though the strike or concerted failure to work may have resulted from the unfair labor practices of the employer.

It gives to the employer the right forthwith to invalidate his contract for 1 year, in the event of any strike or concerted failure or refusal to work, and says nothing about the employer being required to show that the action of the men was authorized by the union or ratified by the union. A wildcat strike in which men disobeyed the orders of their officials, it seems to me, could be the occasion of taking away from innocent members of the union who were opposed to the actions of their fellows, the rights of a wage contract. Why punish alike those who broke the contract and those who held out for the sanctity of the contract?

Admitting my desire to see to it that a contract once entered into is obeyed, I call attention to the sensible and effective penalty that is under consideration in the proposed new agreement with the Ford Motor Co., that an employee found guilty of fomenting, instigating, or giving leadership in an authorized strike shall be fired and, furthermore, shall be fined for each day that he so absents himself. An umpire is to decide who is guilty.

Offhand, I should say that the negotiators of this contract are displaying a wisdom of how to deal with the authors of unauthorized strikes that we might emulate.

If one thus envisages all the trouble and discontent that will arise from the suggested penalty, is it not apparent that labor unions will take the obvious step hereafter of not signing a contract with a no-strike clause in it, and if this happens—and it is not unlikely that such a course would be adopted—you have canceled the good that would come from the restraining influence of no-strike clauses in thousands of future contracts.

When we come to the provision about damage suits, let me say that the bill grants nothing to the employer which he does not have under the present law. Under existing law, labor unions are suable in their own name in industrial States and are responsible in damages to parties injured by a breach of contract. A labor union has no peculiar sovereignty relieving it from the obligations of the general law of contracts and all legal and equitable remedies are therefore available to employers. See *Kiser* v. *Amalgamated Clothing Workers* (169 Va. 574); *Labonite* v. *Cannery Workers* (197 Wash. 543).

Is not the net result of this bill, then, to take the case for damages against a labor union from the State courts of the county where the breach of contract occurred to the forum of the United States district court? Where are the States-rights men who have been continuously telling us that too much power is being concentrated in the Federal Government, resulting in the weakening and the destruction of home rule and local self-government?

I want also to point out that in the lawsuit which is to be instituted as a result of contract breach, there being no requirement that it be shown that the acts of the strikers were sanctioned or ratified by the union, we are going squarely against the spirit and purpose of section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, reading as follows:

> No officer or member of any association or organization, and no association or organization participating or interested in a labor dispute shall be held responsible or liable in any court of the United States for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation in, or actual authorization of, acts, or of ratification of such acts after actual knowledge thereof.

When we come to the campaign-contribution clause, let me quote an editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal, a Republican organ published at Akron, Ohio:

> Nor can we approve of the clause that would restrict union activity and contributions in political campaigns.
>
> Most union members are citizens, and if they want to throw their weight around in an organized way for certain candidates, we don't see but what they have the right to do so. Business and industrial organizations have always had their say in politics.

Analysis of this bill, therefore, leads to the conclusion that it is a slipshod piece of work and that it will provoke trouble and dissatisfaction because it ignores principles of equality in dealing with the relations of labor and capital.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are now considering House Resolution 407, for the consideration of H. R. 3937, a bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act, to abolish the National War Labor Board, and to place the responsibility of a no-strike provision in a collective bargaining contract on the employer or the employee respectively that breaks such a contract.

This legislation cannot be harmful to anyone and it should do great good for the country at large at a time when contracts are being broken which contain no strike pledge, when men are compelled to remain out of work who would like to work, because some of the labor leaders lead them away from doing the thing that is right, honorable, and just. When the time comes in our national life when I make an agreement with another individual, and that agreement is not worth the paper it is written on, I am considered no good by all my fellow men. If a number of us would go together and agree to do a certain thing, and we jointly break that contract, are we any better? I fear that we are leading this country into a very serious and precarious condition on account of the laws that have been passed and the refusal of the Administration to enforce other laws. The time is here when men who have created the private enterprise system and who give jobs and create jobs for many to work at good pay, are being so harassed and humiliated and damned that very few people want to go into business today and those who are in business want to get out. The workers today are faced with the problem of loyalty either to their employer or their labor union. A worker who is faithful to his employer probably is prohibited from having a job unless he joins the labor union, because this Administration has fostered laws of that kind and made them the laws of the land. When a man is compelled to join a labor union he has to pay tribute to that labor union, and when he knows in his own heart he would rather work than lay off, even though the labor union has a contract with his employer the man is forced to quit his job because he belongs to that labor union. He is coerced when he tries to work when the labor union says he must strike.

Now under such compelling conditions as that, do you not believe it wise for us to pass this resolution and pass this bill, H. R. 3937 and place the responsibility for a contract squarely up to the management or the employee and let the courts determine who is the responsible person in breaking this contract? Certainly I do.

When men are working for an employer and they sabotage their employer, calling him all manner of evil names, do everything to offend him, how can there be loyalty of an employee to an employer? On the other hand, if the employer does not treat the employee properly and give him the advantages he should have in this job, he can refuse to work for him and go to some employer who will do the right thing.

We are getting in a very bad and serious condition in this Nation so far as labor and management are concerned, and I fear we are on the road to ruin unless we change the laws. Here is an opportunity to do it so that it will not injure or harm anyone. I think there are many labor leaders who are not interested even in the membership of their own union but solely are interested in all the graft they can get from the leadership which they maintain. I know of certain contracts that are being let today where the labor unions demand 25 percent tribute before they will sign a contract, and I know of some contracts where the management offered them 25 percent but the labor unions would not sign up unless they got 33 percent tribute. This in itself increases the cost to the consumer and pays tribute to the heads of the unions. Is it right, is it honorable, and is it just?

I was surprised to hear it said on the floor today that if this resolution passes the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee would not bring the bill up today. It seems to me when the Speaker of the House and the majority leader have such power over the chairmen of their committees that is the same kind of rule we tried to defeat in this world war just ended. That seems to me to be coercion of the worst sort. Now they give us as their excuse that they want the Labor Committee to bring out legislation such as has been proposed by the President. I have no idea that the Labor Committee as composed in the House of Representatives will bring such legislation as that to the floor of the House before we adjourn for Christmas. The Labor Committee is not composed of men who would bring such legislation to the floor, and I base my assertion on the fact that the Labor Committee has not brought any legislation here that the labor unions do not want, and the labor unions do not want any legislation, as I view it, that is for the best interest of the country, the best interest of labor unions, and the best interest of management. There is no desire on the part of the radical labor leaders today to do anything but rule or ruin. As I said before, this is what happened to France when she fell a few years ago. Are we now going to permit our country to be ruined in the same manner?

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is up to you. I implore you to vote for House Resolution 407 and let us try to correct a great wrong that has been going on in this country under the administration of the New Deal for the past 12 years. It is time to call a halt. It is time to give consideration to our country rather than every thought to the whims of the radical labor leaders. Let me say to you Members of Congress that there are many people today belonging to labor unions who will not continue to support legislators who want conditions to exist as they are now and have been existing for the past 12 years. I hope you will support those people and vote for this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN Mr. Speaker, this resolution calling for a rule on H. R. 3937 should be defeated. I am unalterably opposed to this legislation.

I opposed and voted against the original so-called Smith-Connally bill with the conviction that it was impractical and would breed industrial dissention throughout the country. Events taking place since the passage of that bill have proven that my position then was correct.

The sponsors of this bill are arguing on the premise that this legislation will cure all industrial disputes, and further, that organized labor is wholly at fault for the serious strikes throughout the country today.

To solve the present industrial unrest throughout our country it is necessary for management to confer and bargain with labor in an effort to arrive at a just wage scale so the average worker can meet the present high cost of living which has so unreasonably advanced in the last few years.

The major strikes which have been taking place since VJ-day were brought about because management has refused to sincerely confer and bargain with the representatives of the worker so that he and his family can meet this condition. In the major industries in my area the take-home pay of the average worker has been reduced one-third since VJ-day, but living costs continue to rise.

The tax bill which this Congress passed over President Roosevelt's veto, and which the late President called "a tax bill for the greedy rather than the needy" is greatly responsible for the industrial unrest today. The after-war provisions of that bill has fortified large corporations to such an extent that today they can afford to go on a sit-down strike and ignore labor's demand for higher wages.

The passage of H. R. 3937 will breed industrial dissention, throughout the country. This bill is an effort to drive the opening wedge to rob organized labor of its progress over the last 50 years—it will eliminate collective bargaining and further separate labor and management from a goal of peace and harmony.

By mutual cooperation and good will, labor and management cooperated during the recent war and won the greatest war in all history. By cooperation, reason, and compromise, labor and management can get together. This some cooperation can continue and enable America to win the greatest peace problems in all history.

This bill, and all similar antilabor legislation should be defeated, so industrial peace can be reestablished throughout the country.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker. I have long held to the principle that we should exercise caution in this period in the Nation's history when we are having great difficulties in making adjustments from war to peace.

The condition of the country today and its attitude against labor in this strike period naturally gives to the Members of Congress grave concern. We all have a responsibility to those who employ, to those who work, and particularly to the public at large. It is my profound belief that we will best serve the country if we will move cautiously on legislation.

We must not take from labor rights which they have gained, and we must at the same time see that labor gives to their employers, and the employers and

labor together give to the public proper treatment.

I am going to vote for this Resolution No. 407 because I believe it entirely wrong to deny the Congress the right to have the bill brought to the floor. I serve notice here and now that unless there are important amendments offered that will materially change the bill, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, naturally, no American citizen wants unrest and dissention; nevertheless, this is America and among the things our men fought for were not only that a world might be made safe for democracy but, also America. Democracy gives to a man the right not only to say what he wants to, when he wants to, but also the right to stand together with his fellow citizens and demand the things which he should have. Any attempt to take any of these things away from American workers is winning the war for Hitler. The passing of this rule would do this.

This Capital today is boiling with antilabor legislation. The most vicious bills ever to be introduced are now ready for the floor of Congress. We now have one called for by our Commander in Chief before the Labor Committee, Such a drastic piece of legislation should have been suggested to the labor-management conference by Mr. Truman himself. The fact that it came close upon the heels of the labor-management conference seems to indicate that our President did not have faith in that conference to begin with. The least Mr. Truman could have done was to have called in representatives of the A. F. of L., the CIO, the Railway Brotherhood, and management, and discussed it with them first. Instead, it came from the White House this past Monday as a complete surprise to everyone. And now we find pressure being put on to rush it through the Labor Committee. That is all this discussion is for. Even if I were for the bill, I would be totally opposed to any haste. The men of the American armed forces did not fight for antilabor legislation. They did fight hoping for full employment and for fair employment. The President of the United States has repeatedly called for full employment and for fair employment, over the past month. There has been no effort at all to rush through either of these two bills. In fact, the so-called full-employment bill about to be reported out by the House committee is a farce. If the House committees had paid as much attention to Mr. Truman's full-employment, fair-employment, and health-insurance bills as it is paying to antilabor legislation, then there would be no need for any discussion of labor disputes. The labor disputes of this country are due to the fact that the committees of this House have been on a strike against people's legislation since VJ-day.

I said that these antilabor bills were uncalled for and I would like to go to the record. In every major labor dispute in this Nation there has been a cooling off for more than 30 days. In the auto dispute, the unions withheld action for more than 60 days while they made offer after offer to negotiate and to arbitrate. The companies have refused public negotiations and have even refused to come to Washington at the request of the Government. In the steel dispute the companies themselves broke off negotiations in October and it is now December. The Secretary of Labor has twice invited interested parties to confer with him, the unions have accepted, but the companies have refused. Therefore, such proposed legislation is ridiculous antilabor legislation. The responsibility of our administration is to deal with management. It has refused so far to deal with either management or unions.

Generally speaking, this legislation denies the basic right of labor to strike. It will force American workers to work. It will prevent them from getting together their forces to strike if necessary. To compare it with the Railway Labor Act is ridiculous because the Railway Labor Act has not operated for the best interest of workers. Railroad workers' wage scales are much lower than wage scales in other industries.

There are many seasonal industries in America. Some of them in various sections of the country do not operate for more than 30 days at a time. Put this bill in operation and American workers—notably in the canning industry—would be chained to the wheels of economic slavery. Furthermore, there is not an industry in America that does not have peak periods. Putting this bill in operation during the peak periods of any industry would kill the workers' chances for any advancement because the technique of a successful strike is to strike when production is at its peak, or about to enter into its peak period.

There are also a couple of jokers in this deck. Even if Superman were the Secretary of Labor, it would be impossible to bring about a successful conclusion in 30 days. The 30-day period does not mean the entire dispute period. The dispute can go on for many, many days before it reaches the Secretary of Labor. Who is going to guarantee when the Secretary of Labor will get the dispute? Another joker is who is going to guarantee that after the dispute is settled management cannot start another dispute and bring about another 30-day cooling-off period? Just how many 30-day periods are there in a year?

And, coming back to where I started, why all the rush? Full employment is much more important than this vicious, reactionary, un-American, Hitlerized antilabor legislation. We have stalled around with full employment for months. The present watered-down bill that is coming out of committee is filled with so much double-talk that the New York Times had to call up a New York Congressman and ask him if he knew what the bill was all about. Even though this Congressman was a member of the committee that drafted the bill, and incidentally is filing a minority report, he confessed he could not even understand the English in which the full-employment bill is written.

The public wants to know whether this is a good bill—all the public has to do is to watch those who are in favor of it and those who are against it and they will see lined up the same old vanguard of those who would go back to the good old days. If we must have a bill, let's have one that will force management to come to Washington when invited by the Secretary of Labor and to sit down and negotiate. If this bill goes through we might as well pull down the Stars and Stripes and run up the swastika.

I am against the rule.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not take the floor today to make a plea for labor. Labor has always found a way, soonor or later, to protect itself, and all down through the ages, it has made steady progress. It will not, it cannot be turned back or long be hampered in that progress. I address myself particularly to the authors and supporters of this bill, H. R. 3937, and I sincerely hope I may convince them of their short-sightedness in writing into law such a measure as this.

Regardless of the intention of the authors of this bill and the committee, it can properly be termed "A bill to prohibit or make impossible the writing of a no-strike clause in labor contracts."

No sincere representative of labor would urge the signing of a contract, nor would the intelligent membership of a union accept such a contract when they knew that the result of such action might be the suspension or dissolution of their collective bargaining agent, as well as subjecting themselves, as members thereof, to suit for damages.

No lawyer would advise his client to sign a contract where its corporate existence might be canceled for a year and where each stockholder would be compelled to take his part of the product manufactured and personally negotiate for its sale. Then why in the name of common sense does anyone expect that labor would accept such a condition when there is an escape hole as big as a barn door—merely refuse to include in a contract a no-strike clause.

Less than one-half of 1 percent of members of labor organizations have ceased work in violation of no-strike clauses in their agreements. And most of these stoppages have not been by action on the part of the union, but by voluntary action on the part of the members.

To make all labor unions subject to the provisions of this bill would make it next to impossible to renew labor contracts or to come to agreement or new contracts.

The unions would, of necessity, have to refuse to agree to a no-strike clause or to arbitration of any unforeseen controversy. They would have to attempt to write into an original contract the details of every conceivable controversy that might arise.

No one can foretell the number of strikes that would occur because of failure, caused by necessity under this bill, to reach an agreement. I can say it is my positive opinion, based on years of experience in negotiating labor contracts, that the number of stoppages of work would be 1,000 percent higher than under contracts where no-strike clauses are agreed to.

It is a difficult and nerve-wracking task to have a meeting of the minds of

parties concerned even on the most simple contracts. There are days and weeks of quibbling over a few words in a particular clause. I am satisfied that every lawyer Member in this House, every businessman who is a Member of this House, will recognize that it would be next to impossible to reach an agreement where it is attempted to cover every conceivable question. The irony of the whole thing is that under the provisions of this bill you would have innumerable strikes over problems that would never materialize.

The losses sustained by employers, the losses in productivity, would outweigh hundreds of times the amount any employer might recover by passage of such a proposal as this.

This is a time for clear thinking for the welfare of our country, rather than a time to satisfy our hatreds and prejudices toward certain individuals who might or might not be connected with labor organizations.

If the advocates of this measure are successful in its passage, they are sowing the wind, but, unfortunately, all of our people, our whole economic system, will reap the whirlwind.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, since the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], said that even though this rule is adopted he would not call up the bill for consideration, I shall vote against the rule.

While I am in favor of dealing with problems of labor and management, I believe that President Truman's message which is now before the Labor Committee should be considered before any legislation is acted upon.

THE PASSAGE OF H. R. 3937 WOULD HAVE LAID THE FOUNDATION FOR FASCISM IN AMERICA

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the elimination of free labor unions is one of the first and most important steps toward the fascistic melding of big business and Government into a state of totalitarian marriage.

In 1920 the Italian Confederation of General Industry, which is an organization of big Italian manufacturers and industrialists paralleling our National Association of Manufacturers, contributed 25,000,000 lire to the Fascist Grand Council. Strikes had been occurring in the factories of Milan and Turin. Backed by industrialist funds, Mussolini marched on Rome.

The first payment Mussolini made to his financial supporters was a decree abolishing all labor unions in Italy. From that time on organized labor unions ceased to exist and organized opposition to fascism gradually weakened. The labor-union leaders were liquidated and the common people were leaderless and helpless.

What happened in Germany? In 1923 Hitler received his first big money from Fritz Thyssen, the head of the steel trust. Nazism started to grow on the funds of the Krupps, the Kirdoffs, the Borsigs, and other rich manufacturers and financiers of Germany. In 1933, with this backing and the acquired backing of the Junkers—Prussian landlords and militarists—Hitler took over. How did Hitler repay his backers? He made Thyssen Minister of Economics and confiscated the treasuries of the trade unions first, and then abolished all labor unions in Germany. The labor leaders of Germany were liquidated. Again, organized opposition to the wealthy steel and armament makers was strangled, Thyssen lowered the wages, lengthened the hours, and big business started preparing for war behind the Fuehrer's fanatical leadership.

The Perrones, Poglianis, Agnellis, and Olivettis of Italy—the Thyssens, Krupps, Borsigs, and Siemenses of Germany. The leading industrialists were in the saddle. Their voices dictated prices, wages, and hours, and labor no longer could engage in collective bargaining; labor was no longer free; labor was enslaved and totalitarianism was safely in charge of Italy's and Germany's economy.

Is that what the labor haters want in America?

Do you want to put an end to the freedom of free collective bargaining between employees and their employers?

Do you want to try to solve by a punitive law against labor unions the complex and complicated differences which can only be solved by the mutual good will and concessions of those directly concerned?

Do you want to use a punitive law to do what Mussolini did with castor oil and the dagger?

Do you want to stealthily and slyly cut the heart of free collective bargaining out of the breast of labor and obtain the same result Hitler and his storm troopers accomplished with gun and club?

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion H. R. 3937, the Smith-Arends bill, is the most dangerous antilabor bill brought before this House since the ill-conceived Smith-Connally bill was brought forth in hate and frustration by the same committee. I voted against the Smith-Connally bill at that time and prophesied that it would increase strikes instead of stop them. I intend to oppose the Smith-Arends bill, when it is proposed, and I make the prophecy now that should H. R. 3937 become a law no labor union will sign a no-strike-clause contract, the settlement of industrial strife will no longer take place around the conference table, but will revert to the conditions that obtained before the Norris-LaGuardia and the Wagner Acts was passed. Strikers and strikebreakers will again meet in armed conflict. Lives will be lost and the production of goods will be denied the people of America. The war against fascism overseas which we have won will be lost at home, and the bloody job will soon have to be done over to preserve the freedom of labor as well as industry here at home.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we would all like to see an end to labor stoppages. We would like to see a better way to settle disputes between employees and their employers. But that better way will have to continue to develop slowly in the future as it has in the past. It cannot be forced by the passage of punitive, repressive legislation aimed at either the associations of employers or labor.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 3937 in its present form; however, I do not want to take the responsibility of preventing this bill from coming to the floor of the House for consideration.

The President's conference between members of industry and the leaders of organized labor which recently closed failed to find common ground upon which the disputes between labor and industry could be settled. The President has turned to the Congress and placed the responsibility upon us to try to pass legislation that will be fair to both industry and labor; legislation that will help to compose their differences, speed up reconversion, and make it possible for labor to be continuously employed at high wages.

This bill is the first opportunity for the Congress to consider legislation for this purpose. I do not feel, when the people from one end of this country to the other are calling upon Government leadership to attempt to solve the problem, that I should take the responsibility of saying that this legislation shall not have an opportunity to be considered on the floor of the House.

Countless thousands of laboring men would like to see a condition develop where strikes would not occur so often, which prevents them from earning a livelihood to take care of themselves and their families; countless thousands of farmers and little businessmen throughout the Nation are also appealing to the Congress to do something to try to develop a formula of legislation that will bring about a better understanding between labor and capital so that business may forge ahead with steady employment for labor and a market for farm products.

I am voting for this rule to permit H. R. 3937 to be considered by all of the Members of this House, also to give the Members of the House an opportunity to amend the bill by adding to or striking out sections which seem too drastic one way or the other.

I would like to have an opportunity to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act which is generally referred to as the Smith-Connally bill. This bill affords that opportunity.

There are parts of the bill which, in my judgment, go too far toward restricting and abridging the rights of labor. Amendments could be offered to correct or delete that portion of the bill and doubtless would be carried on the floor of the House.

I simply take these few minutes to explain my position on this legislation, and to again state that even though I will not vote for the bill in its present form, and unless it is substantially amended, I do feel that it may offer an opportunity to develop legislation that would be beneficial to business, agriculture and labor. For, unless we enact legislation that is fair and beneficial to all three of these great segments of our economy, in the end we have failed. Labor, agriculture and business must be brought into closer partnership than ever before because we cannot stand another depression. We cannot carry the running expenses of government and keep our Nation sound financially unless the men and women engaged in all of these

three great industries find full employment, reasonable profits for business and a strong and prosperous agriculture.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, typical of the almost complete absence of common sense and rational thinking in the handling of current industrial relations problems, is the farce that has been conducted on the floor of the House this afternoon. For many days we have been led to believe the Military Affairs Committee would submit to debate on the antilabor legislation which it has spawned after great and intensive deliberation. Now this miserable monstrosity, the Arends bill, is, for all practical purposes, denied legitimacy by its own father, the Republican whip.

Grabbing off newspaper space for weeks under the pretext of a promise to repeal the Smith-Connally Act, the GOP leaders were really seeking to ram through a measure which has but one excuse for getting onto paper and that is a violent hatred for labor unions.

The same men who conceived the Smith-Connally bill are the men who are seeking to put over this Arends measure. I think it is safe to say there is not a man in the House who would oppose repeal of the Smith-Connally bill. The men who fought the bill at the time it was before the House predicted what a tavesty would result from its passage. But, the men who succeeded in getting it on the statute books were the first to denounce the labor union which abided by its provisions and acted in accordance with its mandates. Now it is to be repealed, we are promised, but not in a forthright, honest manner—but in a sneaky, back-door attempt to ring in a more violent and less-promising antilabor law.

At a time when labor and industrial and political leaders throughout the country are urging the need for speed in reconversion, we have the time of this House taken up with this type of assault on honest working men and women. To add insult to injury we are now told that the House must adopt this rule on the Arends bill this afternoon, but the bill will not come before the House for consideration. What sort of chicanery is this?

The father of this legislation, the Republican whip, expresses his belief that the measure should not be considered at this time. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee tells us the bill will not be brought before the House even though the rule on it is adopted. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] tells us he is not disposed to have the House consider the bill. All this while the honorable Members argue that the Smith-Connally Act should be repealed.

If there is honesty and good judgment in their approach to the problem, then why not a forthright repeal of the Smith-Connally Act? Why is there any need of delay? Why the subterfuge?

The reason for this type of conduct can only be a fervent hope that this time an effective way can be found to throttle unions through legislation which will be cloaked in high-sounding phrases—intended to sell the idea that the legislation will promote harmonious industrial relations. Such a backhand slap at the working men and women of the United States is bound to fail.

The working men and women of the United States are at the moment endeavoring to obtain increases in wages. They have a God-given right to try to better their positions in life. The leading publications which serve the businessmen and industrialists of the country admit the need for these increases and predict they will be granted eventually. Yet, some industrialists, safely shielded from financial concern by the action of this House, refuse to recognize that natural fact and seize the opportunity which we provided for them to wreak their unholy vengeance on labor unions. Because we have provided them with every financial protection they are determined to wage war on the unions until they are successful in bringing them to heel.

When the Smith-Connally bill was before this House it was plain as day that it was fostered entirely by a wave of bitterness and passion. Sensible men predicted more harm than good would result from its enactment, but the proponents of that measure were interested only in burying the knife in Labor's back—regardless of the harm which might result from their actions.

The same frenzied, confounded activity is apparent again. The hate which sired the Smith-Connally bill now brings forth the Arends bill. It is evident from the language used in this bill that its author reached out for every word and phrase that could possibly be tagged with an antilabor purpose.

This legislative body is serving no good purpose when it considers such legislation. The lofty purpose of this great legislative assembly is being thwarted, and this Congress is being turned into a weapon to beat down the natural aspirations of the backbone of the United States—the working men and women of the country.

Hate and viciousness breed their kind. Insistence on the passage of legislation such as this is a considered attempt to prove to one class of our people that it has merited rebuke. Resentment will follow in the wake of such action just as surely as the dawn follows the night. Men who have for years denounced the New Deal, arguing that it fostered class warfare; these men, in sponsoring this type of legislation, are deliberately setting one class against another. They are warning one group of our people that it is not favored; that it will be punished if it attempts to assert its rights as free people. The Arends type of legislation will foster hatred and its sponsors will one day sadly regret the momentary advantage they gained for their industrial overlords.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I think the rule which would place in order H. R. 3937 should be voted down. Everyone concedes that this legislation was prepared hastily while many Members were of ill temper. During my experience in Congress I have never seen any good come from legislation which was enacted under conditions such as exist today.

Admittedly, the hearings on the bill were scant and, as I understand it, there were no hearings on some parts of the bill. I think this is repressive legislation which would, in effect, repeal the National Labor Relations Act and take away from labor the right of collective bargaining. I have letters from several manufacturers expressing this opinion concerning this legislation, so let us defeat this rule today and calmly consider any legislation that should be passed after the Labor Committee has had an opportunity of giving both sides an opportunity to be heard.

I recall that, in the heat of passion, we passed the Smith-Connally bill, and now most everyone concedes that the law has not been a success and that it should be repealed. This bill is much more drastic and derogatory to the interest of the workingman than the Smith-Connally bill, so let us not again make the same mistake.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of legislation that will be fair to industry, labor, and the general public. I do not believe that H. R. 3937 meets those requirements, but I do believe that this Congress should have the courage to face the issue and debate the question freely and openly. For that reason I shall vote for the rule.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, generally, I have been persuaded to vote for every rule in order to bring legislation before the Congress and have it decided there, but in this instance I justify my refusal on the ground that this legislation is not a repeal of the War Labor Disputes Act. The Military Affairs Committee has attempted to enact legislation in connection with it.

This type of legislation belongs to the Labor Committee, of which I am a member. I feel that the members of the Labor Committee know something of the problems of labor and management—that is their function—whereas, other committees are not so well qualified to speak on these matters or to write legislation concerning them.

The original bill, known as the Smith-Connally bill, was enacted at a time of war hysteria and the results were shown immediately, for it was inimical to both labor and management, as I pointed out at the time the bill was debated. Not only that, it has cost the taxpayers in this country many hundred thousands of dollars to carry on the voting under the National Labor Relations Board's supervision.

The Labor Committee now has before it the Norton bill. The hearings being held on it should be extensive enough to give every member of the committee the necessary facts on this type of legislation. The Labor Committee should not be coerced or pressured into bringing out any legislation in haste and should not be prevented from holding sufficient hearings to enable learning all the facts.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I believe House Resolution 407 should be enacted by the House of Representatives. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has served notice that he will not call up H. R. 3937 even if the rule is granted until the Committee on Labor has had reasonable opportunity to report the Norton bill. The granting of the

rule, therefore, does not involve approval of the May-Arends bill. The rule's adoption is merely notice to the country that Congress is mindful of the need for legislation which will speed reconversion by stopping strikes before they begin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. The gentleman from Missouri made a statement that has left doubt in the minds of some as to whether or not if this rule is passed it would be within the province of any Member of this House to ask that the bill be taken up.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will pass on that point when it is reached.

The Chair thinks that is a correct position for the Chair to take at this time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, Mr. SABATH asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, is the vote that is about to be taken on the rule or upon the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The vote about to be taken is on the rule itself.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 200, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

YEAS—182

Abernethy	Cox	Hill
Allen, Ill.	Cravens	Hobbs
Allen, La.	Crawford	Hoeven
Andersen, H. Carl	Cunningham	Hoffman
	Curtis	Holmes, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Dondero	Hope
Andresen, August H.	Doughton, N. C.	Jarman
	Drewry	Jenkins
Andrews, Ala.	Durham	Jensen
Andrews, N. Y.	Dworshak	Johnson, Ill.
Arends	Earthman	Johnson, Luther A.
Arnold	Elliott	
Baldwin, Md.	Ellis	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Barden	Elston	
Barrett, Wyo.	Ervin	Johnson, Okla.
Beckworth	Fallon	Jones
Bell	Fernandez	Jonkman
Bennett, Mo.	Fisher	Kerr
Blackney	Fuller	Kilburn
Bland	Gamble	Kilday
Bonner	Gathings	Kinzer
Boykin	Gibson	Knutson
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	Lanham
Brooks	Gillette	Lea
Brown, Ga.	Gillie	LeCompte
Bryson	Goodwin	LeFevre
Buck	Gore	Lyle
Buffett	Gossett	McGehee
Bulwinkle	Grant, Ala.	McKenzie
Burch	Grant, Ind.	McMillan, S. C.
Burgin	Gregory	Mahon
Camp	Gwinn, N. Y.	Manasco
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne, Iowa	Mansfield, Tex.
Chapman	Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Chelf		Martin, Mass.
Chiperfield	Halleck	Mason
Church	Hancock	May
Clevenger	Hare	Michener
Cole, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.
Colmer	Hays	Mills
Cooley	Hébert	Monroney
Cooper	Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.
Courtney	Hess	Norrell
O'Hara	Robertson, Va.	Taber
Pace	Rockwell	Talbot
Patman	Roe, Md.	Talle
Peterson, Fla.	Rogers, Fla.	Tarver
Peterson, Ga.	Rogers, Mass.	Thomas, N. J.
Phillips	Russell	Thomason
Pickett	Sasscer	Trimble
Pittenger	Schwabe, Mo.	Vursell
Plumley	Shafer	Wadsworth
Poage	Short	Weaver
Price, Fla.	Sikes	Welchel
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	West
Rankin	Slaughter	Whitten
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Ohio	Whittington
Rich	Smith, Va.	Winter
Richards	Stefan	Wolcott
Riley	Stewart	Woodruff, Mich.
Rivers	Stockman	Worley
Robertson, N. Dak.	Sumner, Ill.	Zimmerman
	Sumners, Tex.	

NAYS—200

Adams	Geelan	Morgan
Angell	Gerlach	Morrison
Auchincloss	Gillespie	Murdock
Bailey	Gordon	Murphy
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Murray, Wis.
Barrett, Pa.	Graham	Neely
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Beall	Green	O'Konski
Bender	Griffiths	O'Neal
Bennet, N. Y.	Gross	O'Toole
Biemiller	Hagen	Outland
Bishop	Hale	Patrick
Bloom	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patterson
Bolton		Philbin
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Powell
Brumbaugh	Hart	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Havenner	Quinn, N. Y.
Bunker	Hedrick	Rabaut
Butler	Heffernan	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Henry	Rains
Byrnes, Wis.	Herter	Ramey
Campbell	Heselton	Ramspeck
Canfield	Hoch	Rayfiel
Cannon, Mo.	Holifield	Reed, Ill.
Carnahan	Holmes, Wash.	Rees, Kans.
Case, N. J.	Hook	Resa
Celler	Howell	Robsion, Ky.
Chenoweth	Huber	Rodgers, Pa.
Clason	Hull	Rogers, N. Y.
Clements	Izac	Rooney
Clippinger	Jennings	Rowan
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Ryter
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ind.	Sabath
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Sadowski
Corbett	Kean	Savage
Crosser	Kee	Scrivner
D'Alesandro	Kefauver	Sharp
Daughton, Va.	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Davis	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Dawson	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
De Lacy	King	Smith, Maine
Delaney, James J.	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
	Kopplemann	Snyder
Delaney, John J.	Kunkel	Sparkman
	LaFollette	Spence
D'Ewart	Landis	Springer
Dingell	Lane	Starkey
Dirksen	Latham	Stigler
Douglas, Ill.	Lemke	Sullivan
Doyle	Lesinski	Sundstrom
Eberharter	Link	Thom
Ellsworth	Luce	Thomas, Tex.
Engel, Mich.	Ludlow	Tibbott
Engle, Calif.	Lynch	Tolan
Feighan	McConnell	Torrens
Fellows	McCormack	Towe
Fenton	McCowen	Traynor
Flannagan	McDonough	Vinson
Flood	McGlinchey	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	McGregor	Walter
Folger	McMillen, Ill.	Wasielewski
Forand	Madden	Welch
Fulton	Mansfield, Mont.	Wigglesworth
Gallagher		Wilson
Gardner	Marcantonio	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gary	Mathews	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavin	Miller, Calif.	Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—50

Barry	Eaton	Maloney
Boren	Elsaesser	Merrow
Brehm	Gearhart	Mundt
Brown, Ohio	Hand	Norton
Cannon, Fla.	Harris	Pfeifer
Carlson	Hartley	Ploeser
Clark	Healy	Randolph
Coffee	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Combs	Horan	Rizley
Curley	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Dickstein	Kearney	Roe, N. Y.
Dolliver	Keefe	Schwabe, Okla.
Domengeaux	Larcade	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas, Calif.	Lewis	Stevenson
Taylor	White	Wood
Vorys, Ohio	Wickersham	Woodrum, Va.
Weiss	Winstead	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Randolph against.

Mr. Boren for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Stevenson against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Taylor.

Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.

Mr. Healy with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Brehm.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Elsaesser.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Gearhart.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ANTIRACKETEERING BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 406 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation", approved June 18, 1934. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, once more I have the unpleasant duty of calling up a resolution dealing with an antilabor bill. This is House Resolution 406. It is a fair rule and I shall not criticize it. It is an open rule and makes in order the bill H. R. 32 known as the Hobbs bill, a companion bill to the one for which a rule was before us a little while ago and which the majority of the membership saw fit not to grant.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, surely.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman think he is justified in the

statement he just made as to the relationship between the bills?

Mr. SABATH. It is also one of those antilabor bills; yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is an anti-racketeering bill, is it not?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the bill actually provided what the title denotes, I would be for it, but this is not the case. This bill goes beyond anything that could possibly be construed as fair legislation and may I say for the benefit of the membership of the House that the House has twice voted for the bill without the membership really having a chance or opportunity to familiarize itself with the provisions of it. Let it be said to the credit of the other body, however, that on both occasions it used better judgment than did the Members of the House. I am very pleased to observe that the Senate does not act as hastily as do some House committees at times, and I hope it will continue to do so and will consider only fair legislation and legislation which is to the interest of the country.

As I understand it, the proponent of this bill, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], contemplates offering an amendment to strike out title II, which is the proper thing to do.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is not desirous of striking out title II, but the Judiciary Committee by unanimous vote agreed that an amendment striking out title II should be offered.

Mr. SABATH. Well, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], being such a fine, pleasant gentleman and my friend, I thought I would give him credit for coming to the conclusion that provision should be eliminated. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, naturally the credit also should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will act as it did in this instance and will give a little more careful consideration to bills that are pending before it. At times the Committee on the Judiciary has been a little hasty, but in view of the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, perhaps it is beginning to realize its duty and responsibility to the country and to the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If title 2 is stricken, title 3 would also have to be stricken out because it refers to section 2.

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member would get a copy of this bill, read it and digest it thoroughly in order to see how far reaching its effect would be. Of course, there are some members who are not lawyers, who do not know the distinction between a misdemeanor and a felony, but most of the Members who are lawyers appreciate the distinction.

This bill attempts to make a felony out of a misdemeanor. It would make it a crime for a man to talk to a nonunion driver or to drivers who bring in goods, merchandise or other things into the black market. For the protection of the people of New York and other sections some of these union men have stopped these black market dealers from unloading foodstuff that have not been properly examined or inspected, and consequently have been charged and accused of violence.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman point out to the House where in the hearings it appears that black marketeers were stopped by these labor leaders with such lofty ideals?

Mr. SABATH. That information came to me because of the fact that those persons were not given the opportunity to appear before the Committee on the Judiciary when this bill was being considered. If you, sir, will tell me that any recognized, lawful, legal labor organization had the opportunity and the privilege to appear before your committee when this last Hobbs bill was reported, then I have nothing to say. But they were not given an opportunity to appear before your committee, and that is what I object to. I will restate again and again that I am in favor of equal opportunity being given to the proponents as well as the opponents of legislation to appear before legislative committees to be heard, and the Members should have the privilege to vote upon legislation according to their conscience and wisdom.

I do not want to take up too much time because I want to again yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, who, I know, is my real friend at times. I want to give him the opportunity and the privilege to speak for 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, with pleasure.

Mr. COX. I should like to say to my distinguished chairman that I am very glad to see him get lots of pleasure out of the management of a bill which he opposes. This is the last time, let me promise the gentleman, that this farsical procedure shall ever be enacted again.

Mr. SABATH. All right. If you want to know and if the House wants to know why I performed this unpleasant duty to call up a rule on a bill I do not favor, I will tell you confidentially. Now let us keep it in confidence, and it is this: When I give a rule to the gentleman from Georgia or to the gentleman from Virginia, invariably the opponents do not obtain any time to be heard. So in order to protect the minority in their right to voice their opposition, I extend to them the time necessary to the exercise of that privilege.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will protect them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I have reported this measure——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman, having called my name, yield to me.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has stated that when I handled a rule I was unfair in the division of time. Will he please cite one instance?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, now, you know the last bill you had I got 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As long as the gentleman has yielded to me, I want to state that I propose to assist the gentleman from Georgia in seeing that there are no more of such unethical performances as a man presenting a bill which he is supposed to be for and making a speech against it.

Mr. SABATH. I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Georgia state that my action in presenting and opposing this rule is unethical, and that they will cooperate in the future to prevent me from reporting rules on bills to which I am opposed. Of course, I appreciate that both of the gentlemen have been in close cooperation on other legislation and it is because of such cooperation that I have been forced to the unpleasant duty to fight and oppose rules that the gentlemen, in conjunction with some Republican colleagues, have forced through the Committee on Rules. Invariably such action has been on bills against the aims and policies of the administration and the interest of the Democratic Party, of which the gentlemen are members, and which under all the rules of party cooperation, you should support.

I know the Members of the House will be with me because they believe in fair play. The gentleman from Virginia as I have stated always assists the gentleman from Georgia. That is nothing new. The gentlemen are of one mind. If they would represent the people at large throughout the United States and the interests of the Democratic Party as well, they would not be of that one mind on all legislation that is detrimental to American labor, which has demonstrated beyond any doubt its patriotism and its loyalty to our country, and which has given more than any other group toward bringing about victory in the last war.

For fear that I may say something that might be unpleasant, I shall conclude, Mr. Speaker, and reserve the balance of my time. I yield 30 minutes to my genial friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], but first yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, of the 15 minutes which the gentleman has so kindly yielded to me I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, I am glad for my friend to have all the pleasure possible out of his use of his chairmanship to fight a resolution reported by his committee.

Mr. SABATH. I am assuming my responsibility.

Mr. COX. The gentleman will probably learn at the next meeting of his committee that he is but one member of that committee. I mean no disrespect to the gentleman, but there should be a limit somewhere to a practice of this character.

My friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, would seem to regard a farmer or other producer who had escaped the watchful eye of these highwaymen in transporting his produce as being engaged in black-marketing. In other words, if a farmer takes his produce, the product of the toil of himself and his family, to New York and gets by a goon without being held up or robbed, he is in the black-market business.

The sole purpose of the bill which the pending rule is intended to make in order is to undo the outrageous opinion of the Supreme Court in the Teamsters Union case, where that Court legitimatized highway robbery when committed by a labor goon.

Gentlemen speak of limited hearings on the question here dealt with, whereas the exercise of proper diligence would have disclosed that heretofore the Judiciary Committee conducted full and extended hearings and that there is a record of these hearings which is full of instances where honest people trying to make their way in life were held up by this gang of robbers and made pay tribute. It is in the endeavor to break up this racket that legislation is proposed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to my friend.

Mr. SABATH. I called up the rule, sir. May I ask whether the gentleman can really state there were hearings held on this bill this year?

Mr. COX. I do not remember the number of the document, but I have it in my office.

Mr. SABATH. I mean on this bill this year.

Mr. COX. I do not know about this year, but heretofore this House has adopted this identical measure and it died at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. SABATH. That is all the same.

Mr. COX. That is the record.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is an astounding picture to see at this late date in the history of our country that we should begin to find some opposition to the passage of a law to stop those who through their ingenuity, trickery, and force of combinations have found a way to defeat the law. To me, it is amazing. I do not know what the people in Chicago, Ill., regard as a violation of personal or property rights or a violation of statutory laws. But upon reading this bill, I find it prohibits robbery or extortion. The gentleman from Illinois says that he is opposed to that prohibition.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman read the entire provisions of that paragraph?

Mr. BARDEN. Why, certainly, I will. It will only tend to embarrass the gentleman more. The paragraph reads as follows:

> Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

I am surprised that the gentleman's face is not red. My good people have produced and shipped their commodities to the big markets of the East. One of the greatest offenders and violators of the section just read is the city of New York. Time after time I have had my people call me and tell me that their trucks had been dumped and their drivers beaten up, their money taken, their goods destroyed. I took it up with the police of New York City. They said they would try to look after it. I even took it up with the mayor of of the city of New York and apparently it met with the approval of some higher-ups. This law will not inconvenience, will not harm, will not incarcerate one single honorable, honest, decent man in America. Now, let somebody challenge that statement.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Briefly, if you want to challenge that statement.

Mr. SAVAGE. A gentleman who is on strike for better working conditions could be an honest gentleman.

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, do not talk to me about that. Do not talk to me about the man on strike. If he were an honest gentleman, he would not commit such offenses as robbery or extortion while on strike or off strike.

Mr. SAVAGE. I challenged your statement.

Mr. BARDEN. Stopping my man, an American citizen, who has grown or purchased a truckload of potatoes or farm produce from running on the highways that he helped build, using gas on which he has paid taxes, stopping him and clubbing him over the head and turning over his produce, destroying his property, extorting money. You tell me that is within the rights of any man? Not in this country.

Mr. SAVAGE. I say these are just good, honest men who are on strike.

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, let us be honorable, decent men. America did not start off or grow great with that kind of lawless business. The fact that a man is on strike certainly does not license him to be an outlaw.

Mr. SAVAGE. I am talking about good honest men on strike.

Mr. BARDEN. Good honest men do not commit robbery. They do not commit burglary. They do not beat up innocent people. They do not extort money. Good honest men do not do those things. I do not know where you think you get that kind of people, or people who think they can qualify as being good or honest and yet commit the offenses just referred to.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. No; I do not yield. That fellow has put my blood pressure up already. I regret that I am impatient, but I come from a free people who deeply resent abuse and mistreatment. I come from a section of the country that is largely rural. When those people go to sleep at night they sleep with the satisfaction and with the belief that the Congress of the United States and the legislative bodies of their States have made laws that will protect them and their property, their families, and their rights. He gets up in the morning and runs into somebody that is advocating or attempting to destroy the very things that he has produced in order to provide a living for his family. The crimes this bill seeks to stop have since the beginning of time been against the laws of God, against the laws of man, and against the laws of decent society. Let us do our duty and write this law on the statute books.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, frankly I cannot understand why organized labor is exercised about this legislation. When the telegrams and the usual propaganda started pouring in on my desk, I took the trouble to write to some of the senders thereof in order to inquire of them what their opposition was to this specific legislation. One of the advisers of a labor group wrote to me and said that his group was opposed to it because under this bill the President of the United States was authorized to order out troops in order to break strikes. This is perfectly absurd. From there on, to the kind of responses that indicated just sheer nonsense and ignorance, all sorts of excuses were made. However, I am firmly convinced that if the workers of this Nation knew what the problem was, to a man they would be for this legislation.

Now, let us look to the need for it. I do not know whether any committee ever held any more extensive hearings than our committee held on this measure. The hearings consist of 429 pages. Of course, we did not hold any this year. This is not unusual because the problem is the same as it was when the legislation was first introduced. The testimony would be the same and the practices sought to be curbed are continuing.

At the outset I want it distinctly understood that the legislation under consideration is designed to meet one situation and one situation alone. It is not the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to interfere in any way with any legitimate labor objective or activity.

I would like to call the attention of the House to an editorial that appeared in the New York Times recently. Thurman Arnold, than whom the workers of this Nation never had a better or more sincere friend, appeared before the Judiciary Committee and made a very lengthy statement of conditions as he found them while he was an Assistant Attorney General. As a result of his statement, this

is what the New York Times published editorially:

Thurman Arnold's long recitation of abuses and the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the teamsters' union shows that such legislation is now needed badly.

Yet spokesmen for unions who should themselves be urging such legislation to purge their own ranks of racketeers and to stop practices which tend to bring decent unions into discredit are instead opposing such legislation and talking extravagant nonsense about it.

Let us see what the situation is. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court in the famous Local 807 case by a very strained construction, if you please—set aside a decision of the circuit court of appeals which sustained the conviction of two members of an A. F. of L. local—Local 807, New York—who were guilty of practices that even the majority of the court frowned on. Let us look at what the majority said in discussing the facts:

In its decision there was sufficient evidence to warrant a finding that the defendants conspired to use and did use violence and threats to obtain from the owners of these over-the-road trucks $9.42 for each large truck and $8.41 for each small truck entering the city.

Let us see what the Chief Justice said in his minority views:

Respondents who are members of a labor union—

They are members of a labor union; that is the only claim they have to union activity, they belong to a union—

Respondents who are members of a labor union were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Antiracketeering Act. They or some of them lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey through New York, forced their way on to the trucks and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $8.41 for a small truck.

There is no dispute as to the facts.

Do they constitute robbery? The gentleman from Illinois makes much of the definition in the bill. My distinguished friend from New York [Mr. CELLER], who opposed the bill in the committee, made much of the definition of robbery; but I say to both of these gentlemen that that definition is the definition of robbery contained in the New York Code, and the Code of New York defines the acts sought to be curbed as a felony. Are they still continuing these practices?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. WALTER. I wish to read part of a letter I received from a farmer friend of mine in whom I have the greatest confidence, one of the most substantial residents of my district. Here is what he wrote to me under date of December 3:

A fellow farmer and grower who has a large truck hauls some of our crop to the larger city markets. While on a trip to New York a helper approached him in the city. He hired him by the hour. After unloading, the helper suggested a short-cut to the tunnel entrance. This led them through a slum district where a group of men surrounded the truck and the helper turned him over to them. They demanded he pay $30 fine or else.

Is that a legitimate labor activity? To vote against this bill puts the stamp of approval on vicious racketeering.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield me some time?

Mr. SABATH. Earlier in the debate I yielded the gentleman time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has yielded the gentleman from Michigan 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. I was not aware of the fact.

Mr. SABATH. If I did not, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I approve and endorse every word just uttered by the previous speaker the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason for every law on the statute books. Before a law is enacted, a majority of the Congress is convinced that there is some necessity for it. Of course, mistakes have been made, but the point I am making is that the Congress, after consideration and deliberation, does not pass a law without a reason.

This so-called antiracketeering bill is not a new proposal. It has been before the House on at least two other occasions and, after careful consideration, has passed the House by an overwhelming majority. It has never passed the Senate, and as I recall has always reposed in a Senate committee pigeonhole after reaching that body.

Is there a reason for this bill? Is there a wrong being done to our citizens which should not be permitted?

The answer is definitely "Yes."

More than 2 years ago a bill was introduced to remedy the evil. Yet the practices on the part of certain members of labor unions sought to be corrected have continued. We are told that every day many, many farmers and truck drivers are prevented from entering New York City and other metropolitan areas because of the activity of certain individuals who are in truth and in fact committing extortion and highway robbery. These particular individuals claim immunity from law applying to other citizens. On the ground and for the reason only, that they are members of labor unions and as such are not amenable to the same law that applies to the individuals who are not engaged in an organized labor union activity.

To put it another way, it is claimed that a badge or card showing membership in a union, is a passport permitting the holder to force his will upon legitimate pedestrians on the highway—even to the extent of extorting money from him. In furtherance of this purpose, these truck drivers and farmers are robbed, threatened, and beaten if they do not comply with demands that they become members of the union or pay tribute to these union members who waylay them in the public highway.

A decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, rendered in 1942, makes this amendment to the law necessary if the rights and liberties of our people are to be assured. In that Supreme Court case there seems to be no dispute about the facts, but the decision as to the law was not unanimous. In his dissenting opinion, stating the facts, Chief Justice Stone said in part:

Respondents, who are members of a labor union, were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Antiracketeering Act. They, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $8.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the truck and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service.

Mr. Speaker, how can anyone justify such conduct on the ground that these men were engaged in a lawful union activity?

Extensive hearings have been held before the Judiciary Committee, not at this session of Congress but in the previous session. Further hearings will develop no new facts. I think that is conceded. Certain representatives of organized labor appeared before the committee and testified against this bill. They did not dispute the claims as to the treatment being accorded these truck drivers and farmers as described by Chief Justice Stone. They did fear, however, that any legislation aimed at this admitted evil might be construed in some way so that the rights of organized labor to strike would be impaired. As a member of the Judiciary Committee I participated in those hearings and heard this testimony. As a member of the Rules Committee I again heard the representatives of organized labor who appeared before the Rules Committee, and not one of them in any way justified any of the acts which this bill is aimed to correct.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to my chairman for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. SABATH. I am not going to make a speech. The gentleman says that labor representatives were permitted to testify before the Rules Committee?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is correct. I know what he has in mind. The Rules Committee only hears Members of Congress or those connected with the Government. A number of the Members of Congress who represent and speak for organized labor in the House appeared before the Rules Committee, and it was to them I was referring. They are honorable gentlemen, believe thoroughly in organized labor, and always support legislation advocated by organized labor and can be counted upon to oppose any legislation to which the lead-

ers of organized labor object. None of these worthy gentlemen attempted to justify any of the alleged extortions and robberies committed by men in the name of the union. However, they do oppose this bill because they fear it might in some way impede legitimate strikes. Evidently, they feel that it is better that 99 guilty escape rather than 1 union aim be frustrated. In my opinion this bill will not interfere with legitimate strikes. It is not so intended.

Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed bringing unnecessary labor regulatory legislation to the floor. So often we have been told that labor is going through its "growing pains" and that everything will be better by and by. Well, it has been 3 years since the Supreme Court decision and these conditions are getting worse instead of better. The unions themselves have had ample opportunity to clean their own house of these robbers and extortionists. Yet, they apparently refuse to undertake or complete the job. Ample time has been given, yet nothing has been accomplished. Consequently, it necessarily follows that it is the duty of the Congress to protect its citizens and the people who use the highways in interstate commerce. Remember, this proposal applies to interstate commerce only. The Congress has no other jurisdiction. There are State laws which are adequate, if the local enforcement officers did not yield to certain groups, or, it might be better to say, who are not afraid of these groups, politically or otherwise.

I represent a district adjacent to Detroit and Toledo, and I know of my own knowledge that these violations of laws have taken place and that farmers delivering milk and poultry and other products by truck into city districts have been interfered with in carrying on their necessary and lawful vocations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentelman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. In the gentleman's State of Michigan, is there not a law which would make the crimes of robbery and extortion a felony?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes, just the same as there is similar law in the State of New York. Parenthetically, let me remind the gentleman that the definition of robbery and extortion, as found in this bill is taken from the statutes of the State of New York. There has been and will be so much talk about what constitutes robbery and extortion, that it is well to remember that the New York definitions are being used in this bill. Every State in the Union, including Michigan and New York, should enforce its laws. However, if interstate commerce is being interferred with, and if the farmers and truckers, who take food into New York from the surrounding territory and States, must submit to the treatment outlined by Chief Justice Stone, then it seems clear that it is the obligation of the Congress to furnish national protection in these interstate operations.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The question has been raised about the lack of representation of labor before our Judiciary Committee. I have been glancing through the printed hearings, and I find that there were eight prominent representatives of labor who appeared before our committee at considerable length, including Mr. Joseph Padway, general counsel of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; several representatives of organized labor's testimony appears in the printed committee hearings. I repeat, none of them condoned the crimes charged. Yet, none of them wanted the Congress to attempt to do anything about it. And, if I recall correctly, none of them promised to assume the obligation of seeing to it that union men would be penalized for indulging in any of these unlawful practices. Mr. Padway, the counsel for the American Federation of Labor, always makes a good and a convincing speech from his standpoint. He is a fine lawyer and is capable of protecting the interests of his clients in a thoroughly competent manner. In this particular case, he was at great disadvantage, because opposing any law, the purpose of which is to prevent admitted racketeering and unlawful acts, is not only an unpleasant task, but a most difficult one. Mr. Padway appeared as an advocate for a client. He made the best of a poor case. Mr. Speaker, labor can and should purge itself of these offenders.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is not this bill limited to interstate commerce alone?

Mr. MICHENER. Certainly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman is well aware that this proposed statute grew out of the so-called Teamsters Union case in New York. The teamsters union, presided over by Mr. Daniel Tobin, was very much incensed at what the local labor union had done in New York, and he suspended the charter of that local labor union in New York so they could not function. According to that, labor has purged itself.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Tobin is not only to be congratulated but thanked for taking such action. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who always is interested in and effectively defends organized labor, in season and out of season, then admits that conditions in New York are bad, that the facts contained in Mr. Justice Stone's opinion are true, and that Mr. Tobin, as head of the teamsters' union, suspended a particular local union for carrying on these unlawful racketeering practices. But it is true that these same acts are still being committed by members of organized labor unions throughout the country. In these circumstances, I call upon the organized labor leaders to follow the example set by Mr. Tobin and use all means necessary to purge organized labor of these parasites, gangsters, extortioners, and robbers who are bringing discredit and disgrace upon legitimate organized labor.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he said that this practice is continuing into this present year; is that right?

Mr. MICHENER. Why, there is no question but what it is continuing right along and, the committee is told, at the rate of about 100 a day at the tunnels in New York alone.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to have a response from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. Did not the gentleman say that those conditions were still obtaining in New York and other places?

Mr. WALTER. Of course they are. The iniquitous part of it is, that the tribute is being levied against men who are members of A. F. of L. locals other than the one in New York.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would this apply to those conditions in a number of other States where they meet and overturn the milk trucks and do other things like that?

Mr. MICHENER. This bill applies to interstate commerce only.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I know, but where it is in interstate commerce would this apply?

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, if robbery or extortion were committed. The labor union member would be given exactly the same consideration as is accorded any other citizen in like manner offending.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has been asserted here that perhaps this bill was cooked up in a corner. If you will look at the printed hearings you will find it covers 429 closely printed pages.

Mr. MICHENER. There is no question but that hearings have been held. To claim otherwise is a mere subterfuge. The hearings were not held this week or last week, but they were held on the same subject matter and bill, and the same people appeared who would appear again if additional hearings were held.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. There is nothing in this bill dealing with persons connected with organized labor as such. It is just an attempt on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to bring in a bill that will prevent this type of robbery in interstate commerce.

Mr. MICHENER. That is all there is to it. The only way labor is involved is that if these offenders belong to the union, and by robbery or exploitation collect a day's wage—a union wage—they are not exempted from the law solely because they are engaging in a legitimate

union activity. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how any union man can claim that the conduct described by Mr. Justice Stone is a legitimate union activity. I have confidence that most of the rank and file of labor and my congressional district will so claim.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Just one other point on that. It does not apply to labor unions alone, it applies to any group of men that are interfering with interstate commerce, whether they be labor unions, farm organizations, or anybody else.

Mr. MICHENER. Why, of course. All are treated alike and no group is given special permission to violate the law. Labor should not ask for such exception.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If they commit these crimes of robbery and extortion?

Mr. MICHENER. Certainly, but the only people opposing this law are some leaders of organized labor. Remember this, "it is the wounded bird that flutters." If this bill would not prevent labor unions from doing some of these things, then organized labor would not be here fighting this bill.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the gentleman a question? I am really looking for information, and am not criticizing anything the gentleman has said. I address my question to the point of whether or not the bill is restricted to interstate commerce. I notice the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is in the well. I call his attention to line 3 on page 2 of the bill, to the following language "or between points within the same State." May I ask what interpretation is placed upon that? As I read it, that means intrastate commerce and not interstate commerce.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman is familiar with the Schechter case, what is commonly known down here as the "chicken case," and some other cases following it, he will find that interstate commerce may apply even to a man who is raising poultry on a farm, if that poultry is to be shipped to a city across the State line. In such a situation he is in some cases held to be engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. DOYLE. I am familiar with that case. But with this language it would apply to trades within the State itself.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order that I may make a suggestion?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in line 5 there is a disjunctive which changes the sentence.

Mr. MICHENER. Title II of the bill will be stricken out. That title was included at the request of the Office of Defense Transportation and at the personal solicitation of President Roosevelt's Director, Mr. Eastman. It has reference to war activity only and is no longer necessary as a war measure. Title II is most comprehensive and does restrict certain organized labor activities in time of war only. Possibly, much of the labor opposition to this bill is aimed at title II, and it is well for the Members to keep in mind this elimination in appraising the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken more time than I intended. The bill will be thoroughly analyzed and explained during its consideration.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain telegrams and newspaper articles.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, national policy is never static. We go forward or backward. Let us consider for a moment how we got where we now are and where we are going. A knowledge of where we started—of where we are—may give us some idea of our destination.

Some time back the Congress passed an antiracketeering law. If there is anyone in the House who does not believe in outlawing racketeering, that is his privilege. Let him stand up and be counted. If he thinks the bill which will be considered, if the rule is adopted, is not designed to end racketeering, let him give his reasons. He can believe as he likes. The antiracketeering law contained a proviso which stated that it did not apply to the recognized practices of labor unions. Then, as outlined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], a case arose in New York and finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States. On the 2d day of March 1942, the Supreme Court, with one dissenting vote, held that because of that proviso the Congress did not intend to prevent racketeering of any kind except that practiced by the Dillingers and it legalized what the dissenting Judge characterized as highway robbery if practiced by members of labor unions. Let me repeat. That decision was handed down on the 2d day of March 1942. Two days later an amendment to that act was offered by me to strike out the proviso. It never received any consideration. But after a delay of some months the Committee on the Judiciary reported out the so-called Hobbs bill, which with a multiplicity of words would, had it been enacted, have accomplished the same purpose. That bill was adopted here by a two-thirds vote and went over to the other body, and there it lies buried ever since. So here we are today. Insofar as the Supreme Court of the United States is concerned, it is legal for the members of a union which heretofore followed the practice of holding up truck drivers, farmers, and individuals who might have a load of produce destined for the city to hold them up and require them to pay the fee mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. That is legal today and it will continue to be legal unless legislation of this kind is adopted. Those Members who want to stand up and be counted on a roll call as favoring that sort of practice will have an opportunity of registering their approval. Now, where are we, you say, and where are we going? One step further and test my logic in your own mind.

In Michigan today, in the cities of Holland, Benton Harbor, and St. Joseph, all in Michigan, the same union affiliates, the teamsters, refuse to deliver groceries to the A. & P. stores until the clerks in those stores, even though they have voted unanimously that they do not want to join the teamsters' union, or any union, sign on the dotted line and pay a fee into the union treasury. The result is that the A. & P. and other stores can not supply not only the people who lived there and who did not go to war, with needed food, but the returning veterans and their families cannot obtain groceries because, lo and behold, the clerks in the stores have not yet come across and paid their dollars to the teamsters' union. The four freedoms? Where are they? Now, I want to go one step further and this is what I want you to test. Is there any reason to believe that the teamsters' union, if successful in this extortion, in this hold-up of the clerks, will not take the additional step and say to you, to me, to all of us: "If you want to trade at the A. & P. store, you will have to sign our blue card or our green card and pay dues as a customer because if you do not we will not deliver groceries to the store." If the teamsters' union, under Dan J. Tobin, can compel the citizen using a public highway to pay tribute, can force the clerks in the store to come across with the dollars, as a condition precedent to the delivery of groceries to that store, force them to pay monthly dues to join the union, is there any reason why they cannot say to the citizens who want to purchase groceries, "You, too, must join up"? You kick in.

You can argue all you wish. There is not a single individual in this House who does not know that the practice as today followed in Michigan, in the cities elsewhere, and as described by preceding speakers, is extortion—not pure, but simple and highway robbery.

Attached hereto is a self-explanatory statement of the ministers of Holland as published in the Holland (Mich.) Evening Sentinel of December 8, 1945:

THE UN-AMERICAN WAY

We believe that in labor there is dignity.

Individually and unitedly we have sought to increase the public's recognition of that dignity. We have always advocated the cause of labor in its upward climb to the fuller life.

We could do no less and be worthy of our Christian precepts.

It is this interest in labor's welfare that prompts us to speak out against the union's violation of inherent American rights as evidenced by the Standard Grocer Co. case and the Holland Motor Express ultimatum.

Moral issues are involved which make it within our province to be concerned. It is the flagrant disregard for individual freedom to vote as one wishes that we cannot help but protest.

We feel that we are not alone in being disturbed by the union's actions. The entire community is aroused by the arrogance which has been displayed. All right-thinking, democratically minded people should be concerned.

To our way of thinking the principle of organized labor has too much in its favor to be sabotaged by unwarranted tactics. There is something too good in the union concept

to be trifled with by petty agents who would put their own personal prestige above the true cause of labor.

For the present, the employees of the Standard Grocer Co. prefer not to become unionized. They came to this decision in an election duly conducted according to Federal regulation. This being their right, their wish should be respected.

Throwing up a picket line in resentment against their action is a poor way of advancing the union's cause. For these employees are not without dignity and integrity. They have spoken as human individuals, with a mind and a will of their own. They just want to be left alone, to enjoy the "certain inalienable rights" guaranteed to them by their country's Constitution.

We have waged war against those on the outside who were hostile to these "inalienable rights." Why, then, should we have to put up with any hostility against these rights from within our midst?

It would seem that what the outside union officials are interested in is a "victory" to please their selfish pride. We cannot see any grounds, either moral, economic, or social, for spitefully insisting upon such a hollow victory. The injustices they are working are not, in our opinion, the acts of reasonable men.

Our purpose in giving public expression to these sentiments is to let the responsible union leaders know that ruthless insistence upon affiliating with a union against a group's wishes is not the American way of winning converts to a cause. It certainly is not the moral way, and that means it is not to Holland's liking.

We commend and support all those who are subjected to this unwarranted coercion and who are standing against it. If the issue has to be drawn on the field of "prestige," then let it be the prestige of your integrity that wins out over that of the agent's vanity.

Finally, we believe the conditions warrant our publicly asking the question: Why must we tolerate these un-American forces? Is it the law that gives the right to work harm in furtherance of arrogant, peevish motives? Then, should there not be laws to correct such injustices?

HOLLAND MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr CELLER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield me some time?

Mr. MICHENER. I am advised I have only 7 minutes left. I do not have the time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I yield back my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MICHENER. I am sorry. All the time I have has been allotted.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I certainly intend to vote for this rule, and I hope it will be on a roll-call vote, because I want to see every Member in this House go on a record vote to see just who wants to be recorded as supporting racketeers and extortionists. This is not an antilabor bill, unless some ill-advised labor-union leaders have an extremely guilty conscience. This bill is an amendment to an act approved June 18, 1934, to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation. Its intent is clearly stated in section 2, which reads:

Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

It provides for punishment by imprisonment for not more than 20 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or both.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that anyone, be he a member of a union or the president of a union, who would disapprove of the enactment of this legislation automatically places himself on record as condoning racketeering, coercion, and violence to personal property. I do not. And it has been shown, Mr. Speaker, twice before since I have been a Member of this body that the vast majority of this House does not condone it, either, because we in this House have passed this same bill on two separate occasions at least. Why it has been permitted to die in the Senate is beyond reasonable comprehension.

Also, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with one statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] this afternoon, when he said that "we are in a nice kettle of fish." I have heard more pseudo excuses this afternoon advanced to salve the conscience of those who voted against the preceding rule. True, we did have a legislative travesty enacted here this afternoon. The Military Affairs Committee properly reported a bill which had been referred to it by you, Mr. Speaker. The Rules Committee, over the obvious opposition of its chairman, nevertheless, according to the newspapers, sent us the previous rule by a vote of 6 to 2. The chairman of the Rules Committee refused to bring it on the floor and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] had to exercise his prerogative as a member of that committee to force it on the floor after seven legislative days had elapsed. We had the disgusting spectacle of the chairman of the Rules Committee taking the floor not only in his own behalf as a Member of this body but in his official capacity as chairman of the Rules Committee in opposition to a rule which his own committee had voted out and which it was, therefore, his duty to support on this floor or else keep quiet in his role as chairman. Then we had the experience of seeing the chairman of the committee which reported this bill and who solicited a rule thereon stating that if the rule was adopted he would not call that bill up this afternoon. True, that rule was unusual in its character in that it waived all points of order against any amendment which might be offered from the Military Affairs Committee itself, and itself only. Presumably other Members of the House would not be stopped from offering amendments, but they might then be subject to a point of order if not germane to the bill itself. Many Members who voted against that rule did so for these two reasons. Some voted against the rule because the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, stated that the reason he did not intend to bring the bill up this afternoon was because since his committee had reported the bill and the rule had been turned out of the Rules Committee, the President had caused to be introduced a bill following his own recommendations which has been referred to, and is now under consideration by, the Labor Committee.

Theoretically this was an easy out and certainly it was for some of the more timid of the newer Members of the House. What they fail to realize, however, is that in the 7 years I have been in this House the Labor Committee has not only failed to report any legislation suitable to cope with the present unfortunate labor-management controversies in this country, which have been prevalent for years, but in fact, according to the newspapers, the chairman of that great committee at one time stated that no labor legislation would be reported out of her committee except over her dead body. I hope that newspaper statement was untrue because it certainly was unworthy of such a splendid Member of this body. And so, I, for one, have no faith that the Labor Committee, now that this rule has been defeated, will bring out in the foreseeable future any legislation remedial in character and worthy of intent to cope with the present situation in this country, with which the American public, which suffers the most, is getting more and more thoroughly fed up.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me point out this fact to you. As you well know, the American people are readers of headlines. The public is not versed in and cares less for parliamentary procedure, as an excuse. A vote against the previous resolution was a vote in favor of the continuation of strikes and will be so regarded by labor. The press of tomorrow will, undoubtedly, come forth with glaring headlines "House refuses to consider labor legislation." Those who voted against that resolution will have to answer to the folks back home. Those who voted for that rule will be applauded by the folks back home. They were willing to stand up and be counted in favor of the consideration of remedial legislation to deal adequately with the No. 1 problem in the minds of the American public today. And we have exactly the same situation facing us in this present rule. Those who vote for this rule—as I intend to—vote to abolish racketeering insofar as it affects the movement of commerce. Those who vote to defeat this rule will have to salve their conscious when it comes time to explain to their constituents why they condone highway robbery, extortion, and racketeering.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield the remainder of my time, 7 minutes, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith an amendment which I propose to offer to the Hobbs bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my very great appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] for the time he has given me.

While I am not of sufficient stature or importance in this body as my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], if I might borrow his mannerisms I would appreciate it if the House would give a little attention to what I have to say, because I am setting out an amendment which I intend to offer in all good faith when this bill comes to the floor.

I also have at the desk now about 30 copies of the amendment, and if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] or members of the Committee on the Judiciary or other Members would like to see it at this time, I would be glad to have them get it out of this envelope.

I shall propose an amendment which shall be offered as a substitute to the Hobbs bill. Let us understand that the Hobbs bill is in itself an amendment to existing law, the antiracketeering law; so that an amendment to existing law is not only germane, but, in my opinion, it is the logical way to reach this issue.

The nature of my amendment, then, because it is a substitute, does not touch top, side, or bottom, any of the provisions of the Hobbs bill. I propose to add a new section to existing law. If any of you have the committee report on the bill before you, you will find existing law set out on pages 11 and 12. At this time, so that the record may show it, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the amendment which I propose to offer to this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The amendment which I propose to offer reads as follows:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu therefor the following:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the act entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation,' approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 979; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 420a–420e), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows."

Section 1, add a new subtitle entitled "Definitions," and a new section, numbered 7, all reading as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 7. The following definitions shall be binding upon all courts in construing this act:

"(a) The term 'the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee' shall not be construed so as to include the payment of money or the transfer of a thing of value by a person to another when the latter shall use or attempt to use or threaten to use force or violence against the body or to the physical property (as distinguished from intangible property) of the former or against the body of anyone having the possession, custody, or control of the physical property of the former, in attempting to obtain or obtaining such payment or transfer.

"(b) The term 'the rights of a bona fide labor organization in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States' shall not be construed so as to ignore, void, set aside, or nullify the definitions set out or the words used in or the plain meaning of subsection (a) hereof."

How, to analyze the amendment a little, I propose that we amend existing law by adding a new section. Section 1 of this amendment adds a new subtitle entitled "Definitions," and a new section No. 7, all reading as follows. You have those sections in existing law and this is a new section:

The following definitions shall be binding upon all courts in construing this act:

(a) The term "the payment of wages by a bona fide employee"—

And for your information, that is in existing law and was the basis of the Supreme Court's opinion—

shall not be construed so as to include the payment of money or the transfer of a thing of value by a person to another when the latter shall use or attempt to use or threaten to use force or violence against the body or to the physical property (as distinguished from intangible property) of the former or against the body of anyone having the possession, custody or control of the physical property of the former, in attempting to obtain or obtaining such payment or transfer.

(b) The term "the rights of a bona fide labor organization in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States—

And that is in existing law—

shall not be construed so as to ignore, void, set aside, or nullify the definitions set out, or the words used in or the plain meaning of subsection (a) hereof.

What I am trying to do if I can is in a sense to find out whether there are reasonable men on this issue in this House. I have used language which strikes directly at the use of violence of the kind described in New York City, and which I am perfectly willing to accept is continuing. If that is the purpose of this legislation, however, then if you read the Supreme Court opinion in the teamsters' case you will find it turned upon a construction of the language in existing law which states "not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee."

If we put a construction into this statute which states that a bona fide payment of wages from an employer to an employee shall not include wages or the transfer of a thing of value which is obtained by violence or the threat of use of violence, then we reach the situation we are attempting to reach and that we all desire to reach, but we do not write new law.

In all deference to my friend from Alabama—and I am not concerned about his motives, I do not challenge his motives; I do not come into the well of this House for the purpose of challenging motives at any time—there is reason for labor to believe in reading some of the language which is found in the Hobbs bill that it could be used for the purpose of defeating legitimate organizing activities of labor.

I also point out that the Hobbs bill—and I raised this question in the Seventy-eighth Congress—is a complete substitute for existing law. It strikes out of existing law section 4 on page 12, which reads:

Prosecutions under this act shall be commenced only upon the express application of the Attorney General of the United States.

I hope I may obtain unanimous consent under the 5-minute rule for at least five additional minutes to further discuss this amendment, so that the Members may understand its effect. In any event, I shall request such unanimous consent notwithstanding the fact that the last time I did so it was denied me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the membership of this House knows that I do not condone or encourage racketeering. I have always been against any and all such wrongs.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill because I think it goes altogether too far. It makes a felony out of a misdemeanor and then provides for imprisonment up to 20 years and/or a fine of $10,000 for just stopping a truck. Those provisions are altogether out of line and not really same; consequently, I am opposed to such punishment as provided in this bill.

I feel that organized labor, whether it is the American Federation of Labor, CIO, the railroad organizations, as well as the mining leaders, all oppose this bill as presently written, and it is on behalf of them that I speak because I know they do not condone racketeering and they are endeavoring in every way possible to eliminate it. They have succeeded, in my opinion, and I hope within a short time there will be no such complaints as have been referred to here today.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that hearings were held on the subject matter during the last Congress, nearly 2 years ago, at which time certain present Members were not Members of the House, and I do not think those hearings bearing on the then or previous existing conditions should be used for the purpose of passing any law at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 108, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—259

Abernethy	Arends	Bennet, N. Y.
Adams	Arnold	Bennett, Mo.
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Blackney
Allen, La.	Baldwin, Md.	Bland
Andersen, H. Carl	Barden	Bolton
	Barrett, Wyo.	Bonner
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Boykin
Andrews, Ala.	Beall	Bradley, Mich.
Andrews, N. Y.	Beckworth	Brooks
Angell	Bell	Brown, Ga.

Brumbaugh	Hale	Peterson, Ga.
Bryson	Hall,	Phillips
Buck	Edwin Arthur	Pickett
Buffett	Hall,	Pittenger
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Plumley
Burch	Halleck	Poage
Byrnes, Wis.	Hancock	Price, Fla.
Camp	Hare	Priest
Campbell	Harless, Ariz.	Ramspeck
Canfield	Harness, Ind.	Rankin
Case, N. J.	Hays	Reed, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Hendricks	Rich
Chelf	Henry	Richards
Chenoweth	Herter	Riley
Chiperfield	Heselton	Rivers
Church	Hess	Robertson,
Clark	Hill	N. Dak.
Clevenger	Hobbs	Robertson, Va.
Cole, Kans.	Hoeven	Robsion, Ky.
Cole, N. Y	Hoffman	Rockwell
Colmer	Holmes, Mass.	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooley	Holmes, Wash.	Roe, Md.
Cooper	Hope	Rogers, Fla.
Corbett	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Courtney	Jennings	Russell
Cox	Jensen	Sasscer
Cravens	Johnson, Calif.	Schwabe, Mo.
Crawford	Johnson, Ill.	Scrivner
Cunningham	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Curtis	Johnson,	Sharp
D'Alesandro	Luther A.	Short
Daughton, Va	Johnson,	Sikes
Davis	Lyndon B.	Simpson, Ill.
D Ewart	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Pa.
Dirksen	Jones	Slaughter
Dondero	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Doughton, N C.	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Drewry	Kean	Smith, Va.
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, Wis.
Earthman	Kilburn	Sparkman
Eberharter	Kilday	Springer
Elliott	Kinzer	Stefan
Ellis	Knutson	Stewart
Ellsworth	Kunkel	Stigler
Elston	Landis	Stockman
Engel, Mich.	Lanham	Sumner, Ill.
Engle, Calif.	Latham	Sumners, Tex.
Ervin	Lea	Sundstrom
Fallon	LeCompte	Taber
Fellows	LeFevre	Talbot
Fenton	Luce	Talle
Fernandez	Lyle	Tarver
Fisher	McConnell	Thomas, N. J.
Flannagan	McCowen	Thomas, Tex.
Folger	McGehee	Thomason
Fuller	McGregor	Tibbott
Gamble	McKenzie	Towe
Gary	McMillan, S. C.	Trimble
Gathings	McMillen, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gavin	Mahon	Vursell
Gerlach	Manasco	Wadsworth
Gibson	Mansfield, Tex.	Walter
Gifford	Martin, Iowa	Wasielewski
Gillespie	Martin, Mass.	Weaver
Gillette	Mathews	Weichel
Gillie	May	West
Goodwin	Michener	Whitten
Gore	Miller, Nebr.	Whittington
Gossett	Mills	Wigglesworth
Graham	Monroney	Wilson
Grant, Ala.	Morrison	Winter
Grant, Ind.	Murdock	Wolcott
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Griffiths	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Norrell	Worley
Gwinn, N. Y.	Pace	Zimmerman
Gwynne, Iowa	Patman	
Hagen	Peterson, Fla.	

NAYS—108

Bailey	Delaney,	Heffernan
Baldwin, N. Y.	James J	Hoch
Barrett, Pa.	Delaney,	Holifield
Bates, Ky.	John J	Hook
Biemiller	Douglas, Ill.	Howell
Bishop	Doyle	Huber
Bloom	Feighan	Hull
Bradley, Pa.	Flood	Izac
Buckley	Fogarty	Jenkins
Bunker	Forand	Kee
Butler	Fulton	Kelley, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gallagher	Kelly, Ill.
Cannon, Mo.	Gardner	Keogh
Carnahan	Geelan	King
Celler	Gordon	Kirwan
Clason	Gorski	Kopplemann
Clements	Granahan	LaFollette
Cochran	Granger	Lane
Cole, Mo.	Green	Lesinski
Crosser	Hart	Link
Dawson	Havenner	Ludlow
De Lacy	Hedrick	Lynch
McCormack	Outland	Ryter
McDonough	Patrick	Sabath
McGlinchey	Patterson	Sadowski
Madden	Philbin	Savage
Mansfield,	Powell	Sheppard
Mont.	Price, Ill.	Sheridan
Marcantonio	Quinn, N. Y.	Snyder
Miller, Calif.	Rabaut	Spence
Morgan	Rabin	Starkey
Murphy	Ramey	Sullivan
Neely	Rayfiel	Thom
O'Brien, Ill.	Resa	Torrens
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, N. Y.	Traynor
O'Konski	Rooney	Welch
O'Toole	Rowan	Woodhouse

NOT VOTING—65

Andresen,	Gearhart	Ploeser
August H.	Hand	Rains
Barry	Harris	Randolph
Bender	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Healy	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hinshaw	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Jackson	Rce, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Keefe	Somers, N. Y.
Clippinger	Kefauver	Stevenson
Coffee	Larcade	Taylor
Combs	Lemke	Tolan
Curley	Lewis	Vinson
Dickstein	Maloney	Vorys, Ohio
Dingell	Mason	Weiss
Dolliver	Merrow	White
Domengeaux	Mundt	Wickersham
Douglas, Calif.	Norton	Winstead
Durham	O'Hara	Wolverton, N. J.
Eaton	O'Neal	Wood
Elsaesser	Pfeifer	Woodrum, Va.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rizley for, with Mrs. Douglas of California against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. Boren for, with Mr. Randolph against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Healy against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Brehm.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Coffee with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. FULTON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks at this point on the bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think that privilege is abused where granted. It appears to me that the extension of remarks should appear in the discussion of the bill. I am not going to object this time, however.

Mr. SABATH. I am doing it upon the request of many Members. It is not something I am doing of my own accord.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe the Chair should entertain the request at this time for Members to extend "at this point in the RECORD" their remarks on the bill when the bill has not been before the House. If Members desire to extend their remarks on the rule that is another matter. Is that the request of the gentleman from Illinois, that Members may extend their remarks at this point on the rule?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

H. R. 32 DEAD HAND OF THE PAST

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of legislation entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," we detect the first Trojan horse of the antilabor campaign.

A casual reading of H. R. 32 is fairly convincing. It gives the impression that it is motivated by the highest regard for the general welfare. It recalls the days when armed gangs like Dillinger's held up business and terrorized community life. It inspires in all of us the resolve that such depredations shall not be permitted to disgrace our Nation again. Impulsively, we are apt to agree with the broad objectives of this bill.

Closer examination reveals that the original act was approved on June 18, 1934. H. R. 32 seeks to amend the original on certain particulars.

The purposes of the present bill as stated in the report are, first, to prevent interference with interstate commerce by robbery or extortion, as defined in the bill, and, second, to prevent interference during the war with the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail in interstate or foreign commerce.

Section 2, therefore, has no present meaning, unless someone hopes to take advantage of a technicality. It is section 1, dealing with interstate commerce during peace, with which we are presently concerned.

The original statute of 1934 came under examination of the Supreme Court in United States against Local 807, and because that august body found a wide latitude of interpretation due to the loose and general wording of the measure, the sponsors of H. R. 32, of which I am not one, seek to tighten up on its applications.

The validity of the instructions given in the lower court was the point considered. However, the Supreme Court said, considering the broader aspects of the case:

> The original bill was susceptible to the objections that it might include within the prohibition the legitimate and bona fide activities of employers and employees. As the purpose of the legislation is not to interfere

with such legitimate activities but rather to set up severe penalties for racketeering by violence, extortion, or coercion which affects interstate commerce, it seems advisable to definitely exclude such legitimate activities.

As the typical racketeering activities affecting interstate commerce are those in connection with price fixing and economic extortion directed by professional gangsters, we have inserted subparagraphs (a) and (b), making such activities unlawful when accompanied by violence and affecting interstate commerce.

The above is a quote from a letter sent by the Attorney General to the House Committee on the Judiciary and contained in the Supreme Court's opinion.

The substitute was agreed to by both the House and Senate without debate when assurances were given that the approval of organized labor had been obtained. Thereafter, while the bill awaited the signature of the President, Senator Copeland submitted a report in which he referred to S. 2248 as 1 of 11 bills which had been enacted "to close gaps in existing Federal laws and to render more difficult the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types."

The account of the legislative proceedings obviously does not provide specific definition of "wages," "bona fide employer," or "bona fide employee," as those terms are used in section 2 (a). But it does contain clear declations by the head of the Department which drated the section and by the sponsor of the bill in Congress, first, that the elimination of terroristic activities by professional gangsters was the aim of the statute; and second, that no interference with traditional labor-union activities was intended.

It may be true that professional rackets have sometimes assumed the guise of labor unions, and, as the circuit court of appeals observed, that they may have "covered their practices by the pretense that the tribute collected was pay for services rendered." And it may also be true that labor organizations of good repute and honest purpose can be misdirected and become agencies of blackmail. Nevertheless, Congress plainly attempted to distinguish militant labor activity from the other and to afford it ample protection.

The Supreme Court further said:

We have expressed our belief that Congress intended to leave unaffected the ordinary activities of labor unions. The proviso in section 6 safeguarding "the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof," although obscure indeed, strengthens us somewhat in that opinion. The test must therefore be whether the particular activity was among or is akin to labor-union activities with which Congress must be taken to have been familiar when this measure was enacted. Accepting payments even where services are refused, is such an activity. The circuit court has referred to the "stand by" orchestra device, by which a union local requires that its members be substituted for visiting musicians, or, if the producer or conductor insists upon using his own musicians, that the members of the local be paid the sums which they would have earned had they performed. That similar devices are employed in other trades is well known. It is admitted here that the "stand-by" musician has a "job" even though he renders no actual service. There can be no question that he demands the payment of money regardless of the management's willingness to accept his labor. If, as it is agreed, the musician would escape punishment under this act even though he obtained his "stand-by job" by force or threats, it is certainly difficult to see how a teamster could be punished by engaging in the same practice. It is not our province either to approve or disapprove such tactics. But we do believe that they are not "the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types" at which the act was aimed, and that on the contrary they are among those practices of labor unions which were intended to remain beyond its ban.

The act of 1934 was directed against gangsters, yet the case brought before the Supreme Court in October 1941 involved a labor union. The decision by the circuit court of appeals, reversing the convictions of the defendants, was affirmed.

H. R. 32 was inspired by that decision. It seeks to plug up loopholes so that this time organized labor may be brought to bay.

Let us look at the state of the Nation. Where are the gangsters of 1934? Dead, or in jail. What then is the real target of this legislative double-talk? Labor. Behind the smoke screen of legal verbiage the opponents of organized labor are trying to prepare an ambush.

I contend that there is no need for this bill.

Criminal law and the activities of law-enforcement agencies, particularly the FBI, are sufficient to cope with any outbreak of gangsterism. H. R. 32 is not primarily concerned with this possibility. It is using this argument to cover up its real intent, and that intent is to discredit and weaken the organizations developed by workingmen for their economic protection.

As such, H. R. 32 should be defeated.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this is another ridiculous threat against democracy. It is the more ridiculous because it comes from the great proponent of States rights. Extortion and robbery are crimes in all 48 States. Ample State laws and police are provided. Why then, gentlemen of the States' rights school, do we need Federal legislation? This is a notorious work; it is antilabor. I am against the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address of Hon. Meier Steinbrink, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, at memorial services of Brooklyn Lodge 22, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, on December 5, 1945, at Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, before the convention of New Jersey real estate appraisers, at Atlantic City, N. J., December 7, 1945.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from the Secretary of the Navy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be allowed to address the House for 20 minutes, at which I invite the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to be present in order to hear what I have to say in answer to the remarks he made concerning me today when I was not on the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on House Resolution 407.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and a letter pertaining to the housing shortage.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of State calling for free and unfettered elections in Poland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from Charles A. Smith, of New Jersey, endorsing a bill which I introduced regarding the bringing back of the bodies of two unknown servicemen from the Pacific and Atlantic theaters of war, and also to include a very beautiful poem which he wrote entitled, "The Stilled Unknown."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a serviceman and his mother.

Mr. BENDER and Mr. LEMKE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the end of the war has left the world trembling—trembling not so much from the horrors that have been survived, as at the terrifying potentialities ahead.

This time we are entering the postwar era without any false sense of security. We have no illusions that this was the war that ended all wars. Nor are we settling back to relax on the presumption of peace in our day.

On the contrary, we seem to be gripped by a feeling of terrible urgency—of the paramount importance of taking steps in defense of the Nation, defense against the awful possibilities of military warfare in an atomic age. Consider, for example, the major current political issues. What to do with the atomic bomb, universal military training, collective security, unification of the military forces, responsibility for Pearl Harbor, our relations with the rest of the world.

There is clearly a growing conviction of the sheer necessity for the nations of

the world to cling together in the perilous venture into the atomic era. But there is also bewilderment and confusion as to how that can be done. We are well nigh overwhelmed by the magnitude of the task.

One consequence of this feeling of urgency is that everyone is offering his solution, and we have more plans than we know what to do with. But this is all to the good. As long as we can break through our chronic inertia and maintain a democratic crossfire and exchange of ideas, there is hope for mankind. Consequently, I feel impelled to add my voice to the chorus, and to indicate what in my opinion is the fundamental step that we must take in the interest of national defense.

The fundamental requirement, as I see it, is that we must achieve and maintain a full employment level of activity in this Nation. I feel that this will contribute to national defense in two ways. One, it is fundamental to national preparedness. Two, it is fundamental to the prevention of world conflict.

The term "preparedness" immediately raises two issues. There are always those who argue that preparation for war will precipitate war, that only disarmament and a complete relaxing of our defenses will convince the world that we really believe in peace.

This, however, is a superficial way of looking at the problem. Disarmament can contribute to peace only when agreed upon multilaterally and enforced through an effective international organization. And military armaments are in any case only a small part of a Nation's defense. To be prepared means, as I shall point out later, to have all of our vast resources mobilized and on tap ready for use. The surest way to invite aggression and to provoke armed conflict is to relax our defenses and display internal weakness to the world. Only a strong, united, well-equipped, well-prepared nation can make an effective bid for peace.

Question has also been raised as to whether it is possible to be prepared in this modern world, or whether atomic warfare has rendered preparedness obsolete. You know the attitude, "There is no defense against the atom bomb."

Again I think this is a hasty and panicky way of reacting, and that once we have collected our wits we shall realize that although the bomb has indeed revolutionized warfare—indeed our whole civilization—still it has not yet replaced other methods of waging war. I do not pretend to predict what a future war would be like, and I do not think there is yet any man who can do so. Nevertheless I do foresee a number of alternative possibilities which would require us to be fully alert and prepared on land, on sea, and in the air. The bomb might strike first in lightning, blitzkrieg style, and be followed up with an invasion by ship and by parachute, in which case it would be vital that we have at our immediate disposal all of our weapons for repelling such an attack. More than ever before, time would be of the essence.

Perhaps even more likely is the possibility that, because of the real and awful danger of retaliation, the bomb would be held back as a last resort, or, indeed, that it would never actually be used. Perhaps, somewhat in the fashion of poison gas, it would simply be held as a psychological weapon or threat in a grandiose war of nerves. The fact that the bomb has already been dropped does not lessen this possibility, because as soon as the production technique becomes common world knowledge—and there is widespread agreement that this will be soon—the danger of retaliation will become a new and potent retarding influence. Consequently, as long as we do not know what role the bomb will actually play, military preparedness has to mean essentially what it has meant before. To assume that it is futile to take precautions is simply to court disaster.

This brings me back to my main issue—what comprises national defense, and how is it tied up with full employment? I have said that there are two aspects to national defense—preparedness and prevention. Let me discuss preparedness first, partly because I want to leave the more important to the end.

In the first place, I want to point out that preparedness is more a matter of basic resources than it is of tanks, and planes, and howitzers, and destroyers. And it is more a function of a strong, well-trained, adaptable civilian population with high morale than it is of soldiers in uniform who have learned how to march and to manipulate instruments of warfare. Both World Wars have taught us that in the end it is production and supply lines and the will to fight that achieve victory.

In the future, however, we will not have the time to muster our forces that we have had in the past. In the war just ended both our production record and our enormous and well-trained armed services were remarkable achievements. Nevertheless, they both required more time to put together than we shall ever have again.

Consequently, national preparedness requires that we keep all of our resources constantly alerted by utilizing them to the full in productive peacetime pursuits. This means nothing short of a full employment level of production.

There are three basic categories of productive resources—manpower, raw materials, and capital equipment, including technical know-how.

MANPOWER

How can our manpower, that is, our whole population, he kept alerted for whatever demands may be made upon it in a national emergency? There are at least three aspects involved—physical and emotional fitness, training, and morale.

Unemployment does its greatest damage to the youth of the Nation. The stunted bodily growth and physical ravages wrought by the poverty and privations associated with mass unemployment are vividly demonstrated in the Army physical records of this war which indicated that 40 percent of the 22,000,000 men of military age—between eight and nine million men—are unfit for general military duty. These, gentlemen, were the children of the great depression.

And the loss is not only in terms of combat troops. It has been estimated that the loss in war production because of sickness and disability amounted to 600,000,000 man-days annually, or 47 times the amount of time lost through strikes and lock-outs of all kinds during 1943.

No less appalling and destructive to the strength of the Nation is the stunted and warped emotional development caused by unemployment, and recorded in innumerable sociological and psychiatric studies and surveys during the depression. This is the consequence of the emotional insecurity generated in a home dominated by joblessness and dependence upon charity for subsistence. Marital conflict, loss of respect for parents, lack of recreational opportunities, dreary physical surroundings, social ostracism—these lead to restlessness, resentment, vagrancy, drinking, juvenile delinquency—in short to a general demoralization of American youth. And this happens in the early formative stages which largely determine character and personality traits.

Gentlemen, we cannot restore physical and emotional health in 1 year of military training, no matter how constructive. If we are to keep America strong, we must give our children the kind of home and social environment which produces strong bodies and sound minds. And this requires full employment opportunity.

Essentially the same point can be made with respect to training. In this complex technological world of ours, preparedness requires a nation of scientifically trained people—and the kind of training that takes more than a year to acquire, and which embraces many more fields than are covered in military training. We must have a population equipped not only with understanding of intricate mechanical equipment, but also of abstract scientific theory, and possessing managerial and organizational abilities, experience and insight into economic and social problems, political acumen, and the artistic and literary skills which are indispensable to mass education and enlightenment through radio, movies, and the press. The point is, gentlemen, that we cannot hope to make the most effective use of our tremendous resources unless we develop the necessary skills through full and constant utilization of these resources, and unless we provide our youth with the maximum of vocational, educational, and cultural training.

But depressions have a seriously destructive effect upon this cultural heritage. Widespread unemployment interrupts the education of a great many young people. A large proportion have to drop out of school to help support the family, particularly in the higher levels. And even at the primary and secondary levels, standards and facilities are greatly reduced as school funds are diverted to relief needs or dry up as a result of tax delinquencies and shrinking tax bases. Youth who are weakened and dulled by malnutrition and disease and unhappiness at home are not receptive students. And perhaps the most relevant point of all is that in the long

run none of this training for participation in modern living will be of much avail if young people are not given an opportunity to exercise in useful production the skills which they acquire.

Then there is the question of morale. Do I have to remind you of the part that morale played in Britain's valiant stand against invasion, or the responsibility of lack of morale for the downfall of France? And what about our own part in victory? This has been aptly summed up by Rabbi Opher in his testimony on the full employment bill before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. I quote:

> It was the faith of the American people, both on the battle front and on the home front, that this was a struggle for the preservation of democracy; it was our faith in human worth and dignity which produced the almost miraculous turn of the tide of the war and frustrated the Nazi pagan conspiracy against the moral foundation of our civilization.

At the same time, I think you will readily grant that morale is not easily come by, and that once achieved, it must be carefully nurtured and preserved. And that is why I say to you that the surest way to break our national spirit and to destroy the Nation's will to fight for our democracy and freedoms is to allow mass unemployment and depression again to break the bodies and spirit of the individuals who comprise the Nation. The people will not continue to have faith in democracy if it fails to give them freedom and opportunity and self-respect and the means of subsistence. If they are permitted to go hungry and cold and to suffer the indignities and social ostracism that accompany unemployment, they will renounce our system. National unity will give way to frustration, radicalism, discrimination, violence, and resentment. Under the stress of a national emergency this rebellion might well break out into open revolution. Furthermore, gentlemen, there is a crucial ethical, social, and economic principle involved here. Let me ask you quite frankly, if our system fails to give freedom and opportunity and subsistence to millions of its citizens, is it worth fighting for?

RAW MATERIALS

Stock piling of strategic raw materials is accepted as an important method of modern warfare. But it is not nearly so effective in maintaining an adequate amount of materials as keeping open the supply lines in peace as well as in war. Indeed, if we developed the full potentialities of our resources by combatting monopoly, by opening up backward regions of the country through projects for irrigation, navigation, flood and erosion control, power development, and so forth, by equalizing freight rates and expanding technical research, fewer raw materials would be critical in times of national emergency. Obvious examples are aluminum, steel, magnesium, and materials for synthetics.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

It is hardly necessary to point out how essential it is that all of our scientific and technical information should be translated into the most modern and efficient capital equipment, and in sufficient volume to make possible maximum quality and output. There should be no bottlenecks in productive capacity, no obsolete equipment, no shelving of patents, no restriction of output. The channels through which manpower and raw materials blend and flow into finished goods and services must be kept free and open and wide if we are to be a fully prepared nation.

This is full employment in its broadest sense—full utilization of all resources—raw material, capital equipment, and technical know-how as well as manpower. And it will be possible only if producers can count on adequate markets for their output; only if profit prospects are sufficiently attractive; only if the incentives for monopoly restriction are eliminated; only if consumers, who are largely workers, have enough purchasing power to buy the products of capital; in sort, only if there is full employment opportunity throughout the economy.

PREVENTION

Gentlemen, I have been discussing national preparedness. I have pointed out that in this atomic age it is no less essential than it has always been for a nation to be fully prepared in the event that it must wage war. But what I want to stress even more today is that the virtue of preparedness lies even more in the influence it has in preventing war. I repeat, only a strong, united, well-trained, well-equipped, well-prepared nation can make an effective bid for peace.

I think it is obvious why the greater emphasis must be placed on prevention. War has always been incredibly cruel and destructive, but atomic power has made the world even more vulnerable than before. Now it is not merely destruction that is at issue, but, in all likelihood, sheer survival.

Paradoxically, the bomb has made us weaker in relation to other nations, and at the same time has made them weaker in relation to us. This is because no nation can now rely for ultimate victory on superior potential productive resources. Much greater importance now attaches to those resources which are already mobilized and available when the lightning strikes. There is now such a fortuitous element in the whole picture, and all nations alike are in such mortal danger, that prevention of war becomes not only eminently desirable, but absolutely vital and necessary. It is as paramount as life itself.

Now the prevention of armed conflict between nations is a tremendously involved problem, and I cannot begin to do it justice in the very few minutes left me. But I do want to underscore the principle that of all the factors involved, the economic factor is the most primary and fundamental, and the economic problem is one of achieving full production and employment in the leading industrial nations of the world, and especially in the United States.

One of the chief causes of war is totalitarianism, and totalitarianism will develop even in the so-called democracies unless freedom and opportunity and full production are assured through full employment.

Another major cause of war is imperialism, and imperialism will not be eliminated from the world until full production and employment become real throughout the world. We must prevent nations from exploiting others by making it possible for them to support themselves, and in an interdependent world this requires a full employment level of activity and international exchange in the richest and most powerful nations. We must prevent backward nations like China, India, and the Latin-American countries from being exploited by helping them to build themselves up industrially, and this requires a full-employment level of exports and imports of capital, goods, and services throughout the world. We must remove the impulse of other nations to insulate themselves against depression in America, and this can be done only by eliminating depression in America.

The only defense against the atomic bomb itself is to enable nations to work and live together peacefully, and this they can do only on the basis of full production, full employment, and rising standards of living throughout the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR CHINA POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, now that the resignation of Gen. Patrick Hurley and the smoke generated by it has had a chance to settle, I think it is time that we look at our foreign policy and see if we know what it is. On October 10 and 30 of this year I made two speeches in the House expressing my concern about our boys in China and the Far East and also about our country becoming involved in the Chinese internal situation. I also made the statement that I did not know what our postwar policy in the Far East was. I still am not too sure.

My purpose in taking the floor at this time is to present my views on the troubled situation confronting us. I will do so by presenting the facts as I see them and without becoming personal, calling names, or dragging herrings across anyone's path. There is nothing to be gained unless we do consider the present Chinese puzzle in this manner.

In the first place General Hurley is to be commended for the fine job he has done as our Ambassador to China during the actual war period against Japan. His orders—given to him by President Roosevelt—were precise, to the point, and as follows:

First. To keep China from collapsing.

Second. To unify, replenish, and regroup Chinese military forces for the purpose of continuing the war and thereby saving American lives.

Third. To bring about the greatest possible degree of unity.

These three objectives were always kept in mind by General Hurley. I do not know how many Americans realized it at the time but during November and December 1944 China was so close to be-

ing out of the war that only luck kept her in. The only reason why Japan did not force China to quit last December was because she had overextended her lines with too few troops and too little in the way of supplies and material.

Had the Japanese foreseen the ease of their conquest of southeast China and concentrated sufficient strength to follow through, China would have been defeated, all our forces would have had to evacuate the country, the Hump traffic would have had to be discontinued and our work on the Ledo Road gone for naught.

That this did not happen was not due to any one man—either Chinese or American—but only to the stupidity of the Japanese. This luck did allow us time to reorient ourselves, to exert greater efforts and eventually, to contribute in some measure toward the shortening of the war. Lt. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer did a great job as the China theater commander; Mr. Donald Nelson laid the ground work for a Chinese WPB; and General Hurley contributed untiringly of his efforts to promote good will between the U. S. S. R. and China and, within China, to unity between the Central Government and Yenan.

There is no doubt, in my mind, that General Hurley had much to do with laying the ground work for the Soong-Stalin Treaty of last August which further strengthened the government of Chiang Kai-shek and which I think was a good agreement for both countries.

Since the surrender of Japan the situation in China has deteriorated to a great extent. Within a few days after Japan's collapse we sent in the First Marine Division to Taku and Tientsin and followed this by sending the Sixth Marine Division to Tsingtao and elsewhere in Shantung and also the Seventh United States Fleet under Admiral Daniel Barbey. Why all these elements were sent to north China was not made clear to the American public in the beginning and, as near as I can find out, they were acting under orders of the joint chiefs of staff and, I believe, without the knowledge, in the beginning, of the State Department. This indicates to me that liaison within the top reaches of the Government is not very close. It points up the need for such a top-level relationship between the State, Navy, and War Departments which, incidentally, was one of my recommendations to President Roosevelt on my return from China last January. Later, as public questioning increased, it was stated that we were bound by our commitments to the Central Government of China to help disarm the Japs and that our forces would be withdrawn very shortly.

However, reports out of China stated that by January 1, 1946, only 6,000 of our soldiers would remain in that country—showing a good sized withdrawal of our China theater personnel—but that 53,000 marines and undisclosed thousands of naval personnel would remain for an indefinite period of time. This did not stop the clamor for the withdrawal of our men but only increased suspicion that we intended to continue to intervene in what many of us considered to be purely a Chinese internal problem.

Then, on November 21, Secretary of State Byrnes issued a statement as follows:

> The United States Government will keep armed forces in north China until it has carried out a pledge to the Japanese Government to effectuate the surrender of all Japanese troops in China and transport them to their homeland.

The question arises, Why was this statement made 3 months after Japan's surrender? Furthermore, what was so secret about it that kept it from being made public immediately after it was agreed to? It appears to me that had the latter course been followed the American public would have accepted it, the reasons for our pursuing such a policy would have been understood and the present disquieting situation avoided. It must be understood that our China policy, until Japan's surrender, was clear and above board. Our postwar policy, then, and our reason for sending marines and naval personnel into north China is to disarm Japanese troops there. The next question is, How many Japanese troops are there and how long will it take to disarm them? I have tried to find out the approximate number of armed Japanese but I find no agreement on the total. According to a letter from Tientsin to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch it is stated that:

> General Ho Ying-chin, Commander in Chief of the Chinese Army, announced on October 30 that except for remnants at Hopei and Shantung, 90 percent of the Japanese troops have been disarmed in the Chinese theater.

In the New York Times of November 30, the following statement is made:

> General Ho Ying-chin, Commander in Chief of Chinese field forces, said all Japanese forces in China had been disarmed with the exception of 100,000 in Hupeh and Shantung Provinces.

On December 7, the Chinese News Service, an agency of the Chinese Government, stated that:

> General Ho Ying-chin, Commander in Chief of the Chinese Army. * * * declared that of all the Japanese troops in China over 60 percent has been completely disarmed.

Later, in the same story, General Ho asserted "that this work"—disarming of the Japanese—"will be completed within this month." In the Washington Post of November 29, General Hurley is quoted as saying there are still one to two million Japanese in China. Whether or not they are all armed is not stated. The same newspaper on November 25 said there were 300,000 Japanese soldiers and civilians in north China and on November 27 it carried another story which said there were 3,000,000 Japanese soldiers and civilians there. On November 27 I also found out from an authoritative personal source that there were 500,000 armed Japanese soldiers and 800,000 Japanese civilians there.

The Pathfinder, a national weekly, states in its issue of December 5 that Secretary of State Byrnes "estimated 300,000 Japanese soldiers and 30,000 of their civilians remain in north China." The United States News for December 7 states "The first task of General Marshall will be to aid in disarming the 1,000,000, Japanese who still are in China."

It is hard to reconcile all these figures and they exemplify, by their disparity, the confusion of mind which exists in this country. In my opinion, the number of Japanese soldiers who need to be disarmed numbers between 100,000 and 500,000. In line with our signed agreement with Japan on August 16, we have to keep our pledge to disarm these soldiers. I feel, though, that a definite date should be set whereby these soldiers should be disarmed and our boys on their way home. That they all should have been disarmed before this is obvious but our pledge must be kept. It is my understanding that we will not have anything to do with repatriating Japanese civilian personnel so, under these circumstances, the task of disarming Japan's soldiers should not take our 53,000 marines too long.

There has been a great deal said about communism in China, in our State Department, and Russia's position in China. These questions should all be considered in the light of facts and not innuendoes. General Hurley in discussing the Communists in China stated there might be some among them who look to Moscow for guidance, but he thought most of them were just reformers—outs who wanted to be the ins.

"The only difference between Chinese Communists and Oklahoma Republicans," he said, "is that the Oklahoma Republicans are not armed."

There are other differences which should be noted such as the fact that the Chinese Communist Party has its own laws, currency, tax system, and government and also that while the leaders like Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh, Chou En-lai, and others are Marxist Communists, the great mass of the people in the areas under their control are, as General Hurley puts it, "reformers" in an agrarian sense.

In the matter matter of Russia and its position I should like to quote a news story on General Hurley's Press Club speech carried in the Washington Post issue of November 29, 1945:

> Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who thinks the American people deserve more information about foreign affairs, yesterday told the story of his 1944 conference with Marshal Stalin in the Kremlin. He said the interview convinced him that, in Stalin's opinion, the Chinese Communists were not Communists at all.
>
> The position of both Marshal Stalin and Foreign Commissar Molotov, Hurley said, was that Russia was not supporting the Chinese Communist Party, that she would support the government and leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and that she desired more harmonious relations with China.
>
> General Hurley said that when he reported all this to the Chinese leaders in Chungking, they could hardly believe it. Then T. V. Soong, China's Foreign Minister, went to Moscow and in August there was solemnized a 30-year treaty in which Russia agreed to support Chiang Kai-shek's government and agreed further to get out of Manchuria and recognize China's sovereignty there.
>
> "In all justice to Stalin and Molotov," Hurley said, "I must state that not for one moment while I was in China did they ever break their word with me."

The Soong-Stalin treaty of August 14 certainly was a pledge of outright support to Chungking and was anything but welcomed by the Chinese Communists. According to the press, it would appear that the Russians in Manchuria are pursuing a double course of assisting the Chinese Communists and hindering the entry of Kuomintang troops. It is extremely hard to get a really accurate picture of affairs in Manchuria, but on the basis of late reports it seems to be shaping up as follows:

According to the Christian Science Monitor of November 29, the Russians are withdrawing from Manchuria on schedule. About the charges that the Russians are stripping the country of machinery and leaving the field to the Chinese Communists, this paper states the Russians are making no official answers. Whether these charges are true or not, I do not know, as Chungking itself has said nothing official concerning them.

The New York Times of November 30 makes the following statements:

> The Moscow radio said tonight that Russia has "consented" to a Chinese request that it defer "for some time" withdrawal of Russian troops from Manchuria.
>
> The broadcast * * * said China had asked for the postponement because "the Chinese Government was encountering considerable difficulty in transferring troops to Manchuria owing to the presence of Chinese non-Government troops in some places."
>
> The Russians, according to the broadcast, had planned the withdrawal of troops by December 12, in accordance with the Russian-Chinese treaty of August 14, by which Russia recognized China's sovereignty in Manchuria.
>
> The radio reported the Chinese as saying that their Central Government "would not be able by that date (December 12) to transfer its troops and organize a civil administration in Manchuria, and said the Russian acceptance of the request was greeted with great satisfaction in China.

The Washington Post of December 2 carries the following statement:

> Meanwhile, Chungking got a great lift from the official announcement of a new Soviet agreement under which the Russians will delay until January 3 their withdrawal from vital Manchuria.
>
> This 1-month postponement will give the Chungking government time to send administrative personnel and troops into strategic cities of Manchuria ahead of Chinese Communists.

It would appear, therefore, on the basis of these press reports that the letter, if not the full spirit, of the Soong-Stalin treaty is being carried out in regard to Russian withdrawal from Manchuria.

In the matter of Communist sympathizers in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department I can only say on the basis of a short personal acquaintance during my mission to China for President Roosevelt last year with Messrs. George Atcheson, Arthur Ringwalt, Fulton Freeman, and others whom I met in the Embassy at Chungking that they are high type, conscientious, patriotic Americans. The implication that these men have fallen down in their responsibilities is an impression that I do not share, because their interests have first and foremost been in our country's behalf.

Personally, I have every confidence in them and until proved otherwise I am delighted that we can continue to have the use of their valuable and outstanding services in the State Department. In their behalf and on my own personal responsibility I ask that you withhold your criticism until they have had their day in court.

There has also been some adverse comment about our military leadership in China. Our Chinese theater commander, Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, has done an outstanding job there. We are extremely fortunate in having a man of his caliber and understanding in this particular spot. I know there has been some criticism of his activities in China's postwar situation, but I think it is only fair to state that he is acting under the orders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and not on his own responsibility.

It is interesting to note in this respect that on December 8 Gen. Douglas MacArthur, after a 2-day top secret Tokyo conference with Admiral Spruance, Pacific Fleet commander; Vice Admiral Barbey, of the United States Seventh Fleet; and General Wedemeyer announced that recommendations would be made to the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding "repatriation of Japanese troops in China and allocation of resources." I suppose the "resources" refers to the disposition of American troops and material in China. Is it possible that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been making our foreign policy in China and elsewhere rather than our own State Department?

General Wedemeyer has been criticized by certain elements in this country and in China because he has not replied to a communication received some weeks ago by General Chu Teh, commander in chief of the Chinese Communists which protested American intervention in China. His answer stated his position quite clearly when he said "By direction of my Government, I deal only with the Central Government of China. My Government does not recognize any other government in China." In this he is correct.

When questioned about the presence of a United States liaison group at Communist headquarters in Yenan which supposedly implied recognition of the Communist government he stated that the group was there when he came to China and that its job was to report on Japanese operations and facilitate the return of American fliers forced down in Communist and Japanese held territory. He added that he had not removed the group with the end of the war because such a move "might be misinterpreted" by the Communists. Had General Wedemeyer been in favor of all-out intervention against the Communists he would not have adopted this sane and sound policy in this instance.

About the position of the United States in China we recognize only the Chungking Government of Chiang Kai-shek. This is the government recognized by Britain, the U. S. S. R., and every other country carrying on relations with the Chinese Republic and this should continue to be our policy. Through Ambassadors Gauss and Hurley and Generals Stilwell and Wedemeyer we have done our best to bring the Kuomintang and the Communists together. This we should continue to do but not through the device of armed intervention. To uphold Chiang and his government we are helping to disarm Japanese troops, we have transported Koumintang troops by sea and air to Shantung, and we have sent in Marines to hold certain areas until Kuomintang troops could get there and take over.

Just who was directly responsible for all this I do not know for sure. Certainly no Ambassador had that much power and certainly General Wedemeyer was not acting on his own authority. The Secretary of State denied any knowledge of the use of marines in North China in mid-August so the only place where this authority could have come from would be the Joint Chiefs of Staff here in Washington. This, of course, brings our new Ambassador to China, Gen. George C. Marshall, into the picture. Somebody, somewhere, made a recommendation to Washington as to what our policy in China should be. General Marshall knows—or can find out—who made the recommendation from the field. He knows, I am sure, far more about the Chinese situation than many China experts and I feel he will look into this situation without fear or favor and will do his best, as always, for his country and his people. He is well acquainted with Stilwell, Wedemeyer, and Hurley; he has an open mind, and he will not be swayed by friendships but by facts. Able, friendly, and with tremendous prestige he will serve us well.

The appointment of Gen. George C. Marshall as our new Ambassador to China is, in my opinion, the best possible choice this country could make. He has been given, not only the most difficult but also one of the most thankless jobs in the world. His appointment shows how important we consider China and how difficult of solution the Chinese problem is. His prestige, courage, and common sense will all be needed in the greatest degree. Perhaps the problem is not capable of solution; but if we have any one man who can unlock the key to the Chinese puzzle, that man is General Marshall.

The post of Ambassador to China not only holds the key to Sino-American relations but it also, in my opinion, holds a part of the answer to the question of Russo-American relations as well. It must be remembered that Manchuria, where the crux of the present situation seems to lie, was where World War II started in September 1931. Let us hope that this territory will not also mark the beginning of World War III.

I have great confidence that when General Marshall studies the situation in China he will make recommendations looking forward to the withdrawal of American troops by a definite date and that he will propose an American policy toward China based on good will, tolerance, and mutual understanding.

The American people must be kept more fully informed of our foreign policy so that they may know in what direction

we are heading. The American Congress, especially the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, must also be informed. I know that the State Department confers frequently with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and on occasion with the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, but that is not enough. The entire membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee should meet at regular intervals with the Secretary of State or his Under Secretary so that we may know what our policy is, and not, as is the case at present, only when some specific legislation is before us for consideration.

If this is done there will be less drifting and more positive and, I hope, more popular approval of our foreign policy in these extremely difficult times. Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be as objective and as impartial as I could in the time allotted me today on this subject. In this respect I have spoken for no group or party and for no person except myself. I am interested only in my country, our people's welfare, and a permanent and just peace.

I have spoken on China primarily, but we should remember that the Chinese situation is tied to the rest of Asia. The ferment in China is being repeated in Indonesia, Indochina, Burma, India, Iran, Syria, and elsewhere. What we need is not so much a Chinese policy as an Asiatic policy, because fundamentally the issue is the same through that continent.

The real issue in China, in the minds of the American people, is intervention. We have two choices, either intervene all the way or get out by a definite date. If we decide to intervene, which I pray we do not, we must be prepared to maintain armed forces in China for years to come because the present situation will not, of itself, be cleared up overnight.

We must act promptly to clarify our foreign policy so that we may know, as far as possible, just what is going on, why it is being done, and what we expect to accomplish. We must not develop an "iron curtain" of our own. We must continue to uphold America's traditional China policy of nonintervention in her internal affairs. The settlement between Chungking and Yenan is a diplomatic problem with which our troops in China should have no concern. Russia and the United States should offer its good diplomatic offices to stop the conflict, but we should not, under any circumstances, participate in it. We must not allow a situation to develop again, in China or elsewhere, where the force of public opinion becomes necessary to bring the true story into the open. There has been no need for secrecy in this instance, and the results achieved by our confusing postwar China policy should serve as a reminder to us that the truth and the truth only will satisfy the American public at home and the American boys who are being forced to do an unpleasant job in north China today.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his very splendid and informative statement to the House. I think it is most timely, and on questions concerning which the American people have a great interest at this moment. I do not know of anyone who can speak with greater authority than the gentleman from Montana, he having been a representative of the late President Roosevelt in a special capacity in China.

Does not the gentleman believe that the people of the country should at the first possible moment have a clarification of our foreign policy in the Far East; and not only that but a statement as to what our military policy is and when we can expect to move the United States Marines out of China and out of the Pacific?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman is absolutely correct; he is a former marine like myself, and we are both very much interested in the 53,000 marines as well as the countless thousands of naval personnel and other servicemen in north China. They do not understand why they are there when the war so far as they are concerned, so they thought, is over. There is a great deal of discontent in the minds of many people because they likewise have not been informed, and it is to be expected that this discontent will continue until our foreign policy is clarified and at the first possible opportunity these boys brought home.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am delighted to.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to get the benefit of the gentleman's opinion as to what the results would be in case unity is not developed in China and this internal war goes on and grows in intensity not only so far as China is concerned but also so far as our national interests are concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I believe it would be against our national interest. I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, that we set a definite date and get our boys out of China by that date. I think, furthermore, that the agreements made between this Government and the Central Government of China and the Japanese Empire in August should have been publicized at that time so that the boys who are over in China now would know why they are there, and so that the American public at home would likewise know what is going on.

As far as the internal situation in China or any other country is concerned, it is none of our business. It is purely a Chinese situation which the Chinese themselves must clear up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman admit that it is of vital importance to our country for generations to come that the friendship which exists between China and America be cemented as closely as possible?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I certainly do, but that friendship will not be implemented through the dispatching of expeditionary forces to China.

Mr. McCORMACK. My question to the gentleman transcended that and went further. Assuming that unity is not accomplished in China by forces within China and civil war continues and grows in intensity, what position is our national interest in that event?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I think it would be the best policy for us, along with Russia and Britain, to use our good offices to the best of our collective ability to get these groups together because all of us, especially this country, want to see a unified China, a strong China. We want to see China become the bastion of peace in the Far East.

Mr. McCORMACK. Had the gentleman any idea as to what steps would be necessary or any idea as to what proceedings could be taken to bring that about?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As I said before, the question of unity is purely an internal problem which the Chinese themselves will have to settle in their own country, just as we settle our own problems in this country. We would not want other people to come over here and interfere in our internal affairs. The Chinese have just as much right as we have to be treated in the same way. After all, they are civilized people.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question about that and no one takes issue with the gentleman on that, but I am very much concerned to get the gentleman's opinion, as I consider him an authority on the Chinese question, at least as far as I am concerned, as to the importance of a unified China in relation to the national interests of the United States, not only today but 50 years from now.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It would be the best possible thing that could happen, I may say to the gentleman, and it is the hope of all of us that the Chinese will be able to get together and settle their differences in their own way and bring about a unified China, because China, to be the great power which this country has constantly advocated over the past 4 or 5 years, must achieve unity.

Mr. McCORMACK. That leads up to what I had in mind asking the gentleman. Is it the gentleman's opinion that our country should do everything we possibly can to accomplish this? Let us go beyond the question of unity. We will assume unity does take place within China. Should we do everything we possibly can to help China build up its national economy?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is for the best interests of the United States, it is consistent with our own national interests, to try to build up in Asia a sound China, not only from the standpoint of unity of its own people but from the economic angle, is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. There is a big economic and business field in China and, of all the nations in the world, China looks upon us with the greatest degree of friendliness. We have proved to them that we admire them, that we respect them, that we want to help them, and I think that the Chinese would be willing to work with us in the development of their country because outside capital and outside nations are going to have to help China as the Chinese have neither the resources nor the wealth to do this by themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. After 8 years of pain and suffering in its war with Japan, does the gentleman think that China is going to go back to being a consumer nation again?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Yes, I do; for a certain number of years, because it is going to take a long time for China to build up her own industries.

The Chinese, for example, are talking about the so-called Savage Dam in the upper reaches of the Yangtze, and they are talking about 10,000,000 kilowatts of electricity a year being generated by it. But they have a lot of difficulties to overcome before they can build that dam and before they can put in a transportation system which will transport the necessary raw materials to the factories they hope to build in its vicinity. For a number of years China is going to be a consumer nation, and that is where this country comes in, because we can supply the goods which the Chinese need.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman says is correct, regarding the building up of a healthy economy, but my intent in asking the question was this: Does the gentleman think that the Chinese will permit any other nation or nations to put them back into the forced status of a consumer nation that existed before the present war?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was my question.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The only reason she will be a consumer nation for a few years to come is because she cannot help it.

Mr. McCORMACK. But she will not permit herself to be forced back?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. We might as well recognize that fact, and the world might as well recognize it, too.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as the present division within her own country at this time is concerned, it is unfortunate, but there is a close friendship between the people of China and the people of America, as a whole; is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. By reason of that friendship which has been manifested so many times by the people of both countries, is it the gentleman's opinion that we should do those things which we are capable of doing for the people of China to cement that friendship so that it will last for countless generations?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Absolutely.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if we do that within the next comparatively few years, after we are dead and gone the future generations of America will bless and thank us.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the other hand, if we do not use the right policy now and an opposite direction is taken—in other words, disappointment, disillusionment, the road to unfriendliness and then what results, hate—some future generations of America might curse us.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That is right. The distinguished majority leader indicates by his question a keen sense and sound knowledge of China and its needs. The big thing as far as this country is concerned is the development of this friendship along economic, social, and cultural lines.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the exchange between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] concerning the FEPC legislation, I made the statement that information that had come to me led me to believe that none of my Republican colleagues from Pennsylvania had signed the FEPC petition. I am now informed that my colleagues from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. CORBETT] did sign that petition, and I am very glad to state that to keep the record straight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the Hobbs bill, H. R. 32.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HEALY, for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. HESS, for December 12, on account of official business.

To Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'HARA, for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAND, for 2 days, on account of illness of son.

To Messrs. HARRIS and WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for today and Wednesday, on account of official business.

To Mr. DOLLIVER, for Tuesday and Wednesday, December 11 and 12, 1945, on account of official business.

To Mr. COMBS (at the request of Mr. PICKETT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; and

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 12, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m., on Friday, December, 14, 1945, the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the bill (H. R. 4479), to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

858. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a request for the releasing as public information the reports on the following projects: Sitka Harbor, Alaska; Aguadilla Harbor, P. R.; Boston Harbor, Mass.; Ponce Harbor, P. R.; Sandy Bay, Cape Ann, Mass.; Appomattox River, Va.; Skagway Harbor, Alaska; Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill.; Valdez Harbor, Alaska; Richmond Harbor, Calif.; Honolulu Harbor, T. H.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

859. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate for the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (H. Doc. No. 384); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 417 Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 715, an act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 1357). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 815. An act for the relief of Ogden & Dougherty, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 831. An act for the relief of James Alves Saucier; without amendment (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1077. An act for the relief of Oscar S. Reed; without amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1081. An act for the relief of Aftab Ali; without amendment (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1101. An act for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima; without amendment (Rept. No. 1362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1142. An act for the relief of Florence Barrows; without amendment (Rept. No. 1363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1158. An act for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1231. An act for the relief of Paul E. Tacy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1294. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1296. An act for the relief of John A. Hatcher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1323. An act for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1360. An act to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1361. An act to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 1370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1448. An act for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; without amendment (Rept. No. 1371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; with amendment (Rept. No. 1372. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4752. A bill for the relief of J. G. Sullivan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4797. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to determine the claim of Lewis E. Magwood; without amendment (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1492. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building No. 141 at the United States naval repair base, San Diego, Calif., on May 1, 1945; without amendment (Rept. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4949. A bill to establish as a separate branch of the national defense a force to be known as the Air Forces of the United States, to create a Department of the Air Forces, and to provide for continuous integration of the functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces through the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4950. A bill to establish as a separate branch of the national defense a force to be known as the Air Forces of the United States, to create a Department of the Air Forces, and to provide for continuous integration of the functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces through the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4951. A bill to make certain labor practices and boycotts unlawful; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4952. A bill granting an increase of pension to children of persons who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 4953. A bill to confer on the district courts of the United States jurisdiction of certain proceedings involving support for children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4954. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4955. A bill to establish a national natural resources policy, to create a natural resources council, to provide for a natural resources inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 4956. A bill to permit the naturalization of foreign seamen who served on American-owned vessels for a period of at least 3 years while the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution favoring prompt inquiry by the United States State Department into the question of affording stateless persons immediate relief by legitimatizing their civil status and their right to become self-sustaining citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in determining eligibility for discharge, those members of the Army who received the Arrowhead Decoration for participation in the D-day invasion of Normandy should be credited with five additional points; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4957. A bill for the relief of Herman Gelb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4958. A bill for the relief of Edith Joyce Crosby; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4959. A bill for the relief of Alex Oshanyk; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1394. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution by the Niagara Council, United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers, CIO, in opposition to any interference with the Rent Control Act, as it now stands; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1395. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 329 residents of Butler, Pa,. and vicinity, being sympathizers and wives of men now in the armed services of the United States, urging the speedy discharge of husbands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1396. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of Common Council of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., urging the removal from China of boys serving in the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1397. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Steelworkers of America, district No. 7, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to FEPC and rent and price control; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, early in the morning our song shall rise to Thee. Help us Thy name to sing, help us to praise! Help us to toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal.

Only when our vision is cleansed and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting. Like tillers of the soil who stand reverently with bowed heads listening to the music of holy bells, as swings the sun his noonday sword, we pause to become spiritually aware of silvery notes from a pealing belfry no mortal eye can see nor ear hear. Send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with an unruffled kindness that is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 11, 1945, was

dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On December 7, 1945:

S. 1493. An act to authorize the head of the postgraduate school of the United States Navy to confer masters and doctors degrees in engineering and related fields.

On December 10, 1945:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the Senate.

On December 11, 1945:

S. 684. An act for the relief of Ida M. Raney;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells;

S. 801. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Hannon and Eleanore M. Hannon;

S. 998. An act for the relief of Gregory Stelmak;

S. 1017. An act for the relief of Charlie B. Rouse and Mrs. Louette Rouse;

S. 1064. An act to authorize the discharge of midshipmen from the United States Naval Academy by the Secretary of the Navy because of unsatisfactory conduct or aptitude;

S. 1117. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey Casa Dorinda estate in Santa Barbara County, Calif., to Robert Woods Bliss and Mildred B. Bliss; and

S. 1122. An act for the relief of Charles Bryan.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 11, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; and

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, THE EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS (S. DOC. NO. 127)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Executive Office of the President, Executive Mansion and Grounds, amounting to $1,650,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION AFFECTING AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 128)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision affecting an existing limitation on an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 125)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency, amounting to $191,900,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE—OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN (S. DOC. NO. 126)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Alien Property Custodian, amounting to $101,200, in the form of an amendment to House Document No. 360, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT ON PARIS CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I returned from Paris, where I had been attending the annual conference of the International Labor Organization as a governmental delegate nominated by the Secretary of Labor and appointed by the President of the United States. I crossed the Atlantic and returned on a troop transport, thus being afforded an opportunity to pick up at first hand many details I am glad to have about the redeployment program. I talked with several groups of our soldiers in France; the vigor of their questions and their sensible responses in our give-and-take were such as to inspire in me great confidence in the future of this Nation and in the possibility of a long period of peace and prosperity.

Members of the Senate will recall that the ILO is an association of nations, created in 1919. It has nearly 50 members, including all the great nations except the U. S. S. R. Besides this horizontal membership of national governments there is a unique form of vertical membership; both management and labor take part in all ILO decisions. At this Conference Mr. Robert J. Watt was the American workers' delegate, flanked by advisers from the major areas of trade-unionism. Mr. James David Zellerbach, also with a rounded staff of advisers, represented the American employer. Miss Frances Perkins and I were the governmental delegates. Among our technical advisers were Miss Katharine Lenroot, who is well known to the Members of the Senate, and Mr. Carter Goodrich, who has long and ably represented this Government at important ILO meetings, and Mrs. Mary Norton, chairman of the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives.

The meeting this year had unusual interest for me because of the way in which the ILO handled three questions of grave political rather than technical importance. As Senators know, the basic purpose of the Organization is to promote improved labor standards and social security in all countries; to eliminate substandard labor conditions, which often constitute an obstacle to progress in nations of the highest standards. In the accomplishment of these aims, the ILO is a technical organization and that is how it wishes to be considered. But its long history has infused it with profound political wisdom, and it is on this that I wish first to report.

At the Paris meeting a few weeks ago the ILO admitted into membership an exenemy state, Italy. The problem of reabsorbing a friendly people—but one formerly misguided by pernicious leadership—into the family of peace-loving nations, will arise elsewhere and more than once in the foreseeable future. But for the ILO the future is already here; indeed, it is past. This most delicate problem has already been met, and met first, and met with most consummate statesmanship by the ILO. I had the honor of taking part in this many-sided job, and wish to report to the Senate the words I used in a plenary session of the Conference to urge the readmission of Italy into ILO membership:

> The question before us is the readmission of Italy. Our aim is to unite peoples and not to divide them. The International Labor Conference has today the opportunity of taking leadership in bringing about a unity of peoples; it must take that opportunity. In this I speak for the Government of the United States of America, but I am sure that I speak also what is in the minds and hearts of the American people. We do not condone the acts of the Fascist Government of Italy, the destruction of free trade unions, the withdrawal from this Organization, the events of June 1940 or the opposition to the troops of the United States. We condone nothing; but the present Italian Government and the great masses of the Italian people have themselves repudiated these acts. As the Potsdam Declaration states, Italy has freed herself from the Fascist regime and has made great progress toward the reestablishment of democratic government and institutions. The Italian people have respaded the soil of their land, and in that renewed soil the ideals of the International Labor Organization will be more able to flourish. The Italian application for readmission to the Organization is in itself a sign of that growth.
>
> The Italian Government declares that it needs the help of the International Labor Organization in order to solve the social problems of the country on democratic lines. The American people are eager that such help should be given, and membership in the Organization will help Italy toward sound and democratic growth and Italy and the Italians' entry in this spirit will bring strength into the Organization.

A few days later I had an opportunity to go to Italy, where I was able, at first hand—as well as one can in a very brief visit—to confirm what I had stated at the Paris Conference, namely, that the

gound is well prepared for the reflowering of Italian democracy. Members of this body may be interested to know that I was received by his Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in company with Mr. Harold Tittman, and other Americans. The Pope addressed the following kind words to our group, before which, in private audience, it was possible to exchange views and opinions on various topics of common interest:

We extend a very hearty welcome to you, distinguished representatives all of your country, though in various fields of service. One field, however, it would seem, attracts you all, and in that field the honorable Senator here has attained recognized authority. We are thinking of the field of international relations and international law.

It is a question of immense, vital importance at all times, but especially today, when so many noble, praiseworthy efforts are being made to establish a firm and enduring peace between the peoples of this world. For it is international law that must make secure and defend the life of that peace; but an international law which recognizes its foundation in that natural law written by God in the conscience of every man, and from it derives ultimately its binding force. The alternative is the law of the stronger; and then the defenses of peace will collapse under the first attack launched by those for whom might makes right.

Hence, all men sincerely desirous of peace will pray that the Holy Spirit may illumine the minds of the leaders and legislators of nations, and strengthen their hands to set the longed-for peace squarely on the basis of God's law. It is our daily prayer, welling up from a heart filled with love for all men. God grant it. As an expression of that same love, we implore Heaven's choicest blessings on you and on all who are near and dear to you.

The second action of political interest was the conference's unanimous vote to reject the credentials of the Argentine worker delegate and of his adviser. The ILO constitution presupposes political liberty and requires that governments name worker delegates after consultation with free trade-unionism. The credentials committee of the conference felt that constitutional requirements had not been complied with in the case of the Argentine workers, and, in this vein, submitted its report to the conference. By a vote of 119 to 0, in which governments, employers, and workers took part, the report was adopted. The ILO has been in existence more than a quarter of a century; credentials have often been preliminarily questioned; but this is the first time that a doubt has survived, after inquiry, to the point of excluding a designated representative.

What struck me most in this procedure was the open and above-board method by which it was accomplished and the fact that the ILO has machinery permitting it to take action of this sort with a seeming lack of effort. This ease of operation is not to be mistaken for irresponsible operation. As I look over a plenary session of the ILO I recognize faces that are now well known to me—faces of men and women who have been engaged in international negotiation for more than 25 years: Sir John Forbes Watson, British employer; Leon Jouhaux, French worker; Edward Phelan, acting director of the office; not to mention our own Americans, who have been active in the ILO for nearly 10 years—Frances Perkins, Robert Watt, Carter Goodrich. These people understand international relations conducted under the public eye, and know how to use a tested mechanism of international organization. The quiet disbarment of the Argentine workers according to law made a deep impression on me.

The third political job of the ILO was to take a position on its own status and possible relationship to the United Nations Organization. At the last ILO Conference, in Philadelphia, 18 months ago, the United Nations Organization was only a vague plan in the minds of a few. At the Paris Conference, the first since Philadelphia, the mature ILO took the decision to seek affiliation with the youthful UNO. To prepare itself to do this, it took measures to amend its constitution, to sever the loose ties that still bind it to the League of Nations, to provide a means—if need arises—of autonomous existence during the period of its severance from the League and its affiliation with the United Nations Organization. All of this is, of course, not final since a large majority of member nations must ratify these ILO decisions before they can go into effect. The Senate of the United States will have to take action, and I am informed that proper measures are being taken to present the Paris proposals to this body.

Concerning the proposals for constitutional change, I made the following statement before a plenary session:

Thus, there is a projected mutual relationship and thus the International Labor Organization stands in the world today in exactly the same position of leadership in which it has always stood, a nucleus for international, world-wide, united action in recommending standards of life for the betterment of all men. The International Labor Organization, with its 25 years of pioneering effort, retains that entity and dignity which should guide nations in their actions for the attainment of a better world. My point is this. The International Labor Organization has much to offer and it freely gives that which it offers. When it joins its effort with the United Nations, it will come not as a petitioner, but it will come as an invited guest, worthily contributing much to its new associates.

So much for the political or, at least, nontechnical work of the Conference. I shall discuss the technical items rapidly. Under the able direction of Miss Katharine Lenroot for the United States, work toward the drafting of a convention to protect children from working too young, and to protect the health of youth, made good progress. Mr. Ralph Bunche, of the Department of State, brilliantly represented this Government in the committee on employment relations in dependent territories; this work, too, seems to be approaching the convention stage.

The last technical subject on the agenda concerned the maintenance of high levels of employment during the period of reconversion—though I have the impression that the committee realized the difficulty of distinguishing between full-employment policies in general and those appropriate only to a period of reconversion. Miss Frances Perkins served on the employment committee and offered as an American contribution the idea that any plan for full employment must proceed on the basis of rounded knowledge of the important facts, such as present or anticipated volume of consumption, employment, national income, investment. This idea was incorporated in the Conference resolution on employment. Unemployment is one of the great problems of this century. I do not expect the ILO, single-handed, to solve it. On the other hand, if it is solved, I think the ILO will have played a large role in helping to gain mastery over this great evil.

Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, of the House, as the Senate may know, was a member of the delegation. Her chief work was on the governing body of the ILO office, a subject that is beyond the scope of my report. At the Conference she did, however, with Mrs. Clara Beyer, of the Department of Labor, serve on the Committee on the Application of Conventions. I think I may speak for Mrs. NORTON when I say that her work on this committee made us both realize sharply how few ILO conventions have been ratified by this body. I hope we shall be able to do more about them in the future.

The United States contribution to the ILO is approximately half a million dollars annually. Besides this, we appropriate money to maintain liaison. For the current fiscal year, $15,000 was appropriated. Mr. John S. Gambs, the very competent secretary of the delegation, told me about some of the economies that needed to be made in order not to exceed the sum available. All who flew the Atlantic paid about $400 out of their pockets each way. For a large Nation the representation allowance was most niggardly. Indeed, many justifiable and minimum costs of this Conference to this country were met by private payments and by an ingenuity that should have been free to operate in other areas. Even if the situation were considerably improved, it could still be argued that, per dollar expended, this country would be getting a great international bargain in the ILO.

I wish, finally, to call attention to the vigorous program of the ILO during the next year. Tripartite international committees on coal and on inland transport have recently met in London to consider the human problems in the development of these industries. Others on steel, oil, metal-working will meet next year. A technical maritime conference was concluded in Copenhagen last week. Next spring, probably in Seattle, the maritime conference will be resumed, but this time with power to adopt draft conventions. An American regional conference will be held in Mexico next April. Next September the regular, annual conference will be convened in Montreal. A committee on further constitutional revision will meet in January, as will a committee to consider international public works. The ILO is on the job, it has a vigorous past, it has a promising future.

PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, since I first was privileged to take my seat in this body more than 4 months ago, I have listened closely to nearly every word of debate spoken on this floor. I have not presumed upon the Senate to voice my opinions on matters in which I considered my colleagues a great deal better informed than I am.

During that time of personal silence there has been growing in my mind the steadily reinforced conviction that we are overlooking in one instance, at least, a most vital subject. Generally, too, in every discussion bearing upon the peace, prosperity, and continued security of our beloved land, very little has been said about one matter which I believe to be of vital, if not of paramount importance.

This opinion, concerning what to me is a glaring omission, is shared by a vast group of the men and women not only of my native State of Nevada but also of the entire West and the Territory of Alaska.

I refer to what I consider the almost forgotten industry—the mining industry.

Mr. President, we recently created a committee to deal with the problem of the atomic bomb. That was as it should be. Possession of the secret of the atomic bomb weighs heavily upon the minds of all entrusted with our defense.

We have the atomic bomb. We probably will have atomic power which would be as great a blessing to mankind as the atomic bomb is horrifying.

Regardless of what the committee, the Senate, or the Congress decides relative to the ultimate disposition of the secret of the manufacture of that awe-inspiring weapon of total destruction, we must remember one thing:

If it were not for our mining industry we could never have had the atomic bomb, nor could we look forward to the potential benefits of atomic industrial power regardless of the knowledge of our scientists.

Without the prospector and miner we would not have had uranium. It was uranium which made possible the creation of the most destructive weapon mankind has ever known, and it will be uranium which will make possible the transforming of that weapon into a boon for mankind.

If we do not continue to protect our mining industry by developing to the fullest extent all of our known deposits of uranium and other minerals, possessions of the secret construction of the atomic bomb will avail us nothing.

If we do not continue to seek new deposits of that and other little-known and rare minerals to supplement the admittedly known existing supply, we cannot hope to develop atomic energy for industrial uses.

Mr. President, not only have we been lax in our efforts to safeguard our primary interest in our mineral resources, but also we have been equally lax in our efforts to protect almost all of our natural resources.

We have been profligate in the expenditure of our natural resources, particularly our minerals. Many of us seem to feel our mineral supplies always will be adequate.

That may be, but only provided we seek to discover where God had secreted the wealth he placed in our deserts, mountains, and plains.

In any discussion of mining it seems to me we should give first consideration to the men who discover the deposits of ore—the prospector, whether he be a bearded veteran of the desert with a string of burros or a highly educated geologist equipped with the most modern of instruments.

If we fail to encourage the prospector, we close the door on future discoveries which some day may well prove a deciding factor in the survival of our Nation.

We should encourage every phase of mining from discovery to the final step when the ore the prospector discovered and the miner took from the bowels of the earth is converted into a finished article. It matters not whether that finished product is a rifle, airplane, atomic bomb, or a saucepan, skillet, sleeping car, sewing machine, or automobile.

Mining is one of our basic industries and in no discussion of peace or war should its importance be minimized, much less ignored.

Elmer W. Pehrson, Chief of the Economics and Statistics Branch of the Bureau of Mines, recently determined by a comprehensive study that, while we are far from exhaustion of the mineral resources which are basic to our industrial economy, in the field of what he terms "important," subsidiary minerals, exhaustion is so well advanced that we no longer can drift along embracing the philosophy that the earth always will provide.

That so-called, easy-going philosophy seems to be well typified in the recent decision of the Department of the Interior to withdraw public domain from mineral entry.

Withdrawal of such public domain from entry means prospectors are barred from the area just as surely as if barbed-wire fences and armed guards were placed over the area.

It should be clear that only by prospecting can valuable deposits be discovered. Instead of discouraging prospectors, we should encourage them.

If necessary, bonuses should be paid those who discover deposits of uranium and other rare minerals, or minerals of which our known supply is dwindling.

Naturally, the Federal Government should reserve the right to purchase the ore bodies so discovered or, in cases of emergency, to take over through condemnation, if necessary, mines producing such vital ores.

Liberal prices for gold and silver would serve as an incentive to send prospectors into the arid desert wastes and the inaccessible mountains. Deposits of baser metals and nonmetallics would be sure to follow, for no prospector, even if he sought gold and silver, would disregard a deposit of any other ore.

Mr. President, much has been said in the past few months regarding the European cartels. Opinion is almost unanimously in opposition to such cartels, and yet what has happened? Today, this Government is encouraging at least one foreign cartel to the detriment of our own basic mining industry. I refer to the purchases by our Government of foreign quicksilver at high prices. Such purchases are forcing our American quicksilver industry to early and complete extinction, while aiding the formation of an Italian-Spanish cartel, which pours badly needed American dollars into the treasury of the Franco regime, upon which the State Department is known to be looking with a decided lack of confidence.

I wish to refer to official studies which show the lamentable state into which our vital mineral resources have been allowed to fall. It is estimated that only 3 percent of originally known commercial reserves of mercury or quicksilver remain in this country.

Mr. Pehrson says of this vitally important mineral:

> This metal presents an interesting illustration of the relation of production and price. Production reached a peak as far back as 1877 when the United States was supplying most of the world. Since the last war we have been heavy importers, yet the stimulus of high war prices—over four times those of 1877—has brought forth a surprisingly large output in the last few years.

That shows what can be done.

However, now we seem to be willing to allow that surprisingly large output to go begging. We seem to be willing to allow the recently developed quicksilver and mercury mines to close. We seem to be willing to aid a foreign cartel and a foreign regime, which our State Department views with suspicion, at the expense of an American industry which would not only provide us with a badly needed mineral but would also give work to literally thousands of returning servicemen.

Briefly, the situation which faces us in many ores which are necessary to maintain not only our peacetime economy and the American standard of living but also to guarantee a reasonable security against future wars is serious.

Studies show that the commercial reserves of copper, zinc, tungsten, manganese, bauxite, vanadium, gold, lead, and silver, as well as mercury, are far below the 50-percent mark. To be exact, all are below the 40-percent mark.

To demonstrate more specifically just what we are up against in regard to commercial reserves, let me quote figures from the United States Bureau of Mines which show that if every mine in the Nation could continue to produce at the annual average rate for the prewar years of 1935 to 1939, inclusive, all our chromite would be gone in 1 year. The same is the case with our known supply of nickel.

Our antimony, tungsten, and platinum supply is placed at 4 years, while we have enough known mercury and asbestos to keep the mines working on the prewar production levels for 3 years, but our manganese would be gone in 2 years.

Vanadium supplies are estimated as sufficient for 7 years, our bauxite will last 9 years, all of our silver will be gone in 11 years, with lead being depleted in 12 years, and our gold in 14 years.

That is a serious situation, to say the very least. In my opinion, those figures

alone should indicate that our Nation should hesitate no longer. Now is the time to act. We must discover new sources of supply. We must encourage prospectors to go into the hills and deserts seeking to discover new ore bodies with which to bolster our waning resources.

Even in the case of copper, zinc, and vanadium the situation is anything but encouraging. Our known copper supply is equivalent to only 34 years on the basis of prewar production, while our zinc will be gone in 19 years.

In arriving at the estimates of the length of time before mineral reserves of our Nation will be exhausted, it is well to remember such figures are based on what is known as a diminishing return. In other words, as an ore body nears exhaustion, the amount of minerals removed in mining decreases or becomes of poor quality. That naturally slows the process of mining. Some mines might become so depleted, or the ore body so poor in quality, that it would be necessary to halt operations entirely because of economic considerations. In other words, it would not be profitable to mine out the entire existing vein. In other mines the operation would be slowed to such an extent that the annual production would be reduced. The figures I have presented are arrived at on the assumption that it would be possible to continue mining operations on the same scale and at the same speed as during the period of 1935–39. It also must be remembered that in some cases even now we are importing some of these minerals, and those imports may be expected to be increased with a consequent growing reduction in mine production.

It seems to me it behooves us to employ every possible means and pursue every practical step not only to conserve and develop our natural mineral resources and every other resource, but also seek to rebuild our reserves.

If that is done, we in our lifetime will reap tremendous benefits, but at the same time we will be building for our children and our children's children a priceless heritage of permanency for our progeny.

Mr. President, we have heard much about full employment in the last few months. We passed a bill in the Senate which expressed the agreed-to opinion that every man and woman who desire a job should have an opportunity to work. By passing that bill, the Senate subscribed to a theory that it is the duty of the Federal Government to do all in its power to see that those who desire to work have opportunity to be gainfully employed.

There is no better field of employment than in the mining industry. Records over the years show that when mining prospers, the Nation prospers, and thousands upon thousands of jobs are available. Back nearly half a century ago, when the Nation was far smaller in population than it is today, the extraction of minerals from the earth—actual mining and nothing more—gave employment to half a million men. Through the years the mining industry continued to grow as the Nation grew, and by 1923 more than 1,000,000 men were employed in extracting minerals from the earth.

But then we began to forget the mining industry. A few voices were raised in defense of that great basic industry, but for the most part they were voices crying in the wilderness. There were few who heard and fewer who listened when efforts were made to aid the industry, which slipped further and further into the limbo of the forgotten.

By 1943, in spite of the war and the hue and cry for more and more minerals, it still was a forgotten industry, with extraction of minerals alone requiring the services of only 660,000 workers.

If we could raise the level of employment in the mining industry to the 1,000,000 mark, a great part of the unemployment problem of the Nation would be solved. If we employed 1,000,000 men in the extraction of minerals from the earth, the mills and smelters and the industries which utilize the ores would employ at least triple that number, on a conservative estimate. Unemployment would be greatly reduced, especially when it is considered that there is not a single industry which would not benefit through increased employment in mining and affiliated industries. Miners with a steady income would become heavy spenders; that is the tradition. There would be an ever-mounting demand for every type of article manufactured in this Nation.

During the war years it probably was necessary that matters pertaining to mining be referred to committees considering associated or interlocking questions. Now that hostilities are at an end, I believe that every bill and resolution remotely concerning the mining industry should go to the Committee on Mines and Mining. Such bills could, if necessary, be referred to other committees, or to a joint committee, with the Committee on Mines and Mining represented.

The Committee on Mines and Mining has been more or less inactive, largely, I am sure, because of wartime conditions. But the committee is composed of men from States where mining and mines are of paramount importance. It is composed of men who have made and will continue to make a study of the needs of miners and the mining companies. They know about that industry, the most basic of all our industries, aside from agriculture.

I now have pending before the Committee on Mines and Mining a resolution calling for an investigation into all phases of the mining industry. That resolution, when it comes before this body, will be a starter toward rehabilitation of the mining industry. The investigation which it asks will, I am confident, uncover ways and means for rebuilding the mining industry and our national prosperity.

It is my hope that before too many days elapse, this body will see its way clear to recognize the seriousness of the situation which confronts this Nation in regard to its basic mineral reserves. Now is the time to act. We must encourage men to seek new ore deposits.

We must not have a forgotten industry. Mining must resume its rightful place as the foremost of American industries.

PETITION

Mr. TYDINGS presented a resolution adopted by the Maryland State Teachers Association, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 181) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their systems of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PREFERENTIAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOR VETERANS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution signed by Mr. C. C. Campbell, third district commander, and Mr. C. E. Leistikow, acting adjutant of the third district, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Kansas, Parsons, Kans., praying for preferential employment rights for veterans.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution to eliminate the inefficiency of title 4 of the Readjustment Act of 1944 and to strengthen the Veterans' Preference Act

Whereas the provisions of title 4 of the Readjustment Act of 1944 have not been invoked by the United States Employment Service to the extent that special veterans' service has been established to meet requirements of the local communities; and

Whereas this act can be properly administered only by veterans or persons sympathetic with the veterans' welfare and with the intent of the law; and

Whereas the transfer rule in civil service operates to nullify all veterans' preference; and

Whereas the intent of the act is to afford special preference to veterans: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Third District, Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in session assembled at Parsons, December 2, 1945, That we strongly urge and respectfully request that all local veteran employment representatives be immediately placed under the direct control and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Employment Service and that it be made mandatory that all veterans' representatives and councilors be veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That the civil-service regulations be amended to the end that the veterans receive preference in fact rather than theory; and be it still further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Secretary of Labor, the legislators of Kansas, the national legislative chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the press.

C. C. CAMPBELL,
Third District Commander.
C. E. LEISTIKOW,
Acting Adjutant.

HARLAN COUNTY RESERVOIR ON REPUBLICAN RIVER, NEBR.—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS CITY (KANS.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the national legislative affairs committee of the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce expressing the views of that organization upon certain matters of national interest, particularly Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River in Nebraska.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the national legislative affairs committee of the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, That—

Whereas we are informed and understand that the House of Representatives has approved a deficiency appropriation bill carrying $122,275,000 for flood-control and navigation projects, including funds for the Pick-Sloan plan in the Missouri Valley; and

Whereas we believe that such deficiency appropriation should be forthwith enacted; and

Whereas it is necessary, in order to obtain efficiency from the flood-control and flood-protection work in and about the two Kansas Citys, that work should be commenced upon the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska; and

Whereas the committee is informed and believes that the inclusion of an item of $2,000,000 for the purpose of commencing work on the Harlan County Reservoir would permit the commencement of the work on that important project at this time and would directly aid in securing the greatest advantage from the flood protection that has been planned for the Kansas Citys; and

Whereas heretofore and in 1941 an appropriation was authorized for the Harlan County Reservoir and the money was heretofore available for construction, but the construction was delayed on account of the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That action be urged by the Senate and the House for the final and immediate approval of the deficiency appropriation carrying $122,275,000 for flood-control and navigation projects, together with an additional item of $2,000,000 for the purpose of commencing work on the Harlan County Reservoir on the Republican River in Nebraska; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the board of directors of the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce for its immediate consideration with the recommendation that the same be adopted and copies be forwarded to appropriate Members of the House and Senate of Kansas and Nebraska, and to the department of governmental affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

LOUIS R. GATES,
Chairman, National Legislative Affairs Committee.
RALPH PERRY,
President, Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND COUNSELORS OF BURLEIGH COUNTY (N. DAK.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD four resolutions adopted by the board of directors and counselors of the Burleigh County (N. Dak.) Farmers Union relating to certain legislation. The resolutions are signed by Frank Slag, president, and Mrs. Owen McIntyre, secretary.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are many thousands of bushels of grain which cannot be marketed because of the lack of availability of boxcars to ship out the grain; and

Whereas this condition is costing the farmers thousands of dollars and untold hardships: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Burleigh County Farmers Union and the county counselors insist that the boxcars be made available within the next 20 days; and be it further

Resolved, That if necessary legislation be enacted to equalize the distribution of boxcars; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator BURTON WHEELER, of Montana, and to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and CLYDE REED, and to the Bismarck Tribune and the Bismarck Capital.

FRANK SLAG, *President.*
Mrs. OWEN MCINTYRE,
Secretary.

Whereas the shortage of passenger-car tires is more acute now than during the war; and

Whereas the farmers find it difficult to do the necessary traveling; and

Whereas we understand there is a stock pile of new tires which could be released from the warehouses to the retail stores; and

Whereas we understand there is about 400,000 passenger tires in the hands of the Department of Commerce which could be declared surplus and made available to the wholesalers and retail sellers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Burleigh County Farmers Union and the county counselors insist upon immediate release of all tires at once; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Senator MILTON YOUNG, and to Representative CHARLES ROBERTSON, Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, and to the Bismarck Tribune and the Capital Publishing Co.; and be it further

Resolved, That the present price ceilings on tires be maintained.

FRANK SLAG, *President.*
Mrs. OWEN MCINTYRE,
Secretary.

Whereas the so-called joint plan of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corp of Army Engineers for the development of the Missouri River places final control and authority far removed from the people; and

Whereas the joint plan would favor flood control, irrigation, navigation, and reclamation over development of electric power; and

Whereas the joint plan would create red tape and "buck passing" between the field and Washington, and between bureaus and departments in Washington; and

Whereas under the joint plan development of electric power would be neglected; and

Whereas electric power is the only development from which a majority of the people in the State and basin can profit; and

Whereas only a small percentage of the people in the State and basin can be benefited from irrigation, reclamation, flood control, and navigation; and

Whereas the power which would be developed would be sold at wholesale; and

Whereas wholesale distribution of power would mean the power companies would get the benefit, instead of the people; and

Whereas the people could not build expensive trunk lines to the dam or switchboard to receive the power; and

Whereas the MVA bill S. 555 provides for total development of the river; and

Whereas the MVA bill S. 555 provides for single control close to the people not in far away Washington; and

Whereas MVA bill S. 555 would tend to eliminate "buck passing" and red tape the people responsible would maintain headquarters in the valley; and

Whereas under MVA bill S. 555 the maximum electric power would be developed; and

Whereas under MVA bill S. 555 electric energy developed would be distributed over trunk lines built by MVA so all the people could get low-cost power through their municipal government REA lines, etc.; and

Whereas under MVA bill S. 555 all the people in the State and in the basin could then receive the benefit of the electric power which is the only portion of the development all the people can benefit from: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers joint plan is inadequate and not in the best interests of all the people and would favor a small minority; and be it further

Resolved, That MVA bill S. 555 is in the best interests of all the people and is a full development, flexible program; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Burleigh County Farmers Union and the county counsellors oppose the joint plan and go on record favoring the passage of MVA bill S. 555; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WILLIAM LANGER, to Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, and to Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma; and to Representatives WILLIAM LEMKE and CHARLES ROBERTSON; and to the Bismarck Tribune and the Bismarck Capital.

FRANK SLAG, *President.*
Mrs. OWEN MCINTYRE, *Secretary.*

Whereas we understand the voluntary enlistment of men into the armed services has exceeded the number of men required monthly, by the Army to maintain the announced size of our peacetime Army; and

Whereas we see no future need for drafting of men; and

Whereas we need all available manpower on the farm; and

Whereas we see no need for peacetime conscription: Therefore be it

Resolved, The board of directors of the Burleigh County Farmers Union and the county counselors insist that selective service be discontinued at once and present quotas be canceled; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose peacetime conscription with all our strength; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG; and to Representatives WILLIAM LEMKE and CHARLES ROBERTSON; and to the Bismarck Tribune and the Bismarck Capital.

FRANK SLAG, *President.*
Mrs. OWEN MCINTYRE, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1618. A bill to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 845).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1551. A bill relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 846).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of R. W. Wood; without amendment (Rept. No. 847).

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2154. A bill for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee; without amendment (Rept. No. 848).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2333. A bill for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels; without amendment (Rept. No. 849).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 215. A bill for the relief of Virginia Packard; without amendment (Rept. No. 850);

H. R. 3052. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague; without amendment (Rept. No. 851);

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich; without amendment (Rept. No. 852);

H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage; without amendment (Rept. No. 853); and

H. R. 4116. A bill for the relief of M. R. Stone; without amendment (Rept. No. 854).

REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill dealing with the national registration of firearms. I suggest it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as suggested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 1678) providing for the registration of firearms, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CLAIM OF JOSEPH MRAK—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, through inadvertence House bill 2887, for the relief of Joseph Mrak, was referred to the Committee on Claims. The bill properly belongs in the Committee on Immigration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the nature of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am advised that this is a special bill for the relief of one person. It provides for the cancellation of a warrant of arrest and deportation.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the proposed action agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Claims?

Mr. RUSSELL. The chairman of the Committee on Claims has no objection to the proposed action. The Committee on Immigration very clearly has jurisdiction of the bill.

Mr. WHEERY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC COUNSEL FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 202), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor hereby is authorized to employ an economic counsel to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $5,640 per annum from January 1 to June 30, 1946.

INVESTIGATION OF THE USE OF TEXTILES BY THE ARMY AND THE NAVY

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 203), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the use of textiles by or under the supervision or direction of the Army of the United States and the Navy in the U. S. A., and in occupied territories, with a view to ascertaining whether textiles are being utilized to the fullest extent practicable, and, if not, means of increasing such use. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

MATTHEW MATTAS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "$8,500" and the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what this is?

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a private-claim bill.

Mr. WHITE. The conferees have fully agreed?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RUFUS A. HANCOCK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
HOMER A. RAMEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move the adoption of the report.

The report was agreed to.

POSTWAR PROGRAMS OF DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN PARTIES—ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the postwar programs of the Democratic and Republican Parties, delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner in Denver, Colo., on December 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEMISPHERIC COOPERATION FOR WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR OF PERU

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by His Excellency Pedro G. Beltran, Ambassador of Peru, at a meeting of the Pan American Society of Massachusetts and Northern New England, Inc., on November 14, 1945, at Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

MRS. TRUMAN'S RIGHT TO PRIVACY—EDITORIAL FROM INDIANAPOLIS COMMERCIAL

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Commercial of December 1, 1945, concerning Mrs. Truman's right to privacy and her disinclination to hold press conferences, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING FOR MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES—STATEMENT OF MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made on the subject of housing for middle-income families, by Msgr. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on December 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORAL OF PEARL HARBOR—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Moral of Pearl Harbor," from the New York Times of December 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZATION—LETTER FROM SOLDIERS IN MINDANAO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on demobilization, addressed to the Congress by certain American soldiers stationed in Mindanao, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOSSETT in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on behalf of the Committee on Commerce, on page 35, after line 7, to insert a new subsection (e).

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Huffman	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stanfill
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Taylor
Carville	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Tobey
Connally	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McKellar	Tydings
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hart	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, last Thursday there was considerable discussion as to the general provisions of the bill, and also as to certain specific features. I shall not take the time of the Senate by repeating statements made by me at that time unless I am requested to do so. I shall ask approval of the pending amendment, but before doing so I wish to refer for a moment to the general situation.

Everyone knows that at the beginning of this war our shipping facilities were grossly inadequate. We passed the Act of 1936, and endeavored vigorously and continuously to expedite the building of ships. Why did we do so? Because for a long time the need for shipping was greater than the supply. I have been in charge on the floor of the Senate of probably 40 or 50 bills in connection with the operations of the Maritime Commission. Several time I was asked the question on the floor of the Senate, "Since we are building an enormous fleet of ships, what are we going to do with them after the war is over?"

The answer was not a difficult one. We had to build every ship that was necessary. No one would say that we should not manufacture guns, train armies, or build battleships because we would not need them in peacetime. We had to service in shipping the world, and consequently we had to try to expedite in every possible way the construction of ships. We built about 6,000 ships. The statement was often made at the time that if at the end of the war we did not need all of those ships after they had served their purpose, if we had to sink the surplus ones in the bottom of the sea that loss would be immaterial in comparison with the pressing present need which we had for them.

Now that the war is over we find ourselves in possession of a merchant marine approximately three times the size that will be needed for peacetime purposes. What are we going to do with it? The obvious thing to do is to try to dispose of the ships not needed by the Federal Government, and that is the purpose of the bill.

When we attempt to dispose of them, we may follow one or more courses. We may say, as we attempted to do after the first World War, "Let us authorize the Maritime Commission or some other agency to dispose of these ships on the best possible terms." Or we may do as we have attempted to do in this bill, namely, provide a basis upon which the ships can be sold, with the provision that if they are not sold within a reasonable time—which we fix at 2 years—the ships not disposed of and not needed by the Federal Government shall be placed in a reserve fleet.

If my memory is correct, after the First World War we did not attempt to provide by legislation any method or yardstick by which the surplus ships should be sold. What was the result? Those in the industry, realizing that the United States Government had a large fleet of ships hanging over the market, were naturally somewhat at a loss to know how to negotiate, and on what basis to buy. That is the situation today. Today we possess half the ships in the world; we control the market; and if those who wish to purchase ships have no feeling of assurance that someone else may not purchase them on a better basis, or if they have no assurance that the ships will not be dumped on the market at some later date, in my opinion such a belief would have a deterrent effect upon prospective buyers. But if, under the terms of the bill, the purchaser can buy with a feeling of assurance that other ships are not to be sold to other purchasers on a more favorable basis, and that if the ships are not disposed of within a period of 2 years they will be taken off the market and placed in a reserve fleet, the prospective purchaser will have some feeling of confidence that the market will be protected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that ships may be sold to foreigners on a basis of 25 percent down. Is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct. The bill provides that ships may be sold to foreigners on terms no better than those available to citizens; and there is a provision that they may be sold to citizens on the basis of 25 percent down, so it is possible to sell them to foreigners on that basis with some qualification.

Mr. TAFT. So a credit of 75 percent would be extended to foreign nationals or foreign governments, as the case might be?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any estimate as to how many of the ships are to be sold abroad, and how many hundreds of millions or billions of dollars of credit will be extended to foreign nationals?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, it is very difficult to form any satisfactory estimate of the number of ships which will be sold or of the credits which will be extended. The bill provides that, first of all, we will try to sell to citizens. If we cannot sell to citizens, we will charter to citizens; and if we cannot do that, we will try to sell to foreigners.

Mr. TAFT. There are estimates as to the possible size of the American merchant marine. I wonder if there is any estimate as to the number of ships to be sold abroad?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is a very difficult estimate to make. Various estimates have been made as to the merchant marine which we shall need after the war. The estimates range between 17,000,000 and 20,000,000 tons. At present the Federal Government has about 50,000,000 tons, so approximately 30,000,000 tons can be used partly for defense purposes, partly for scrap, and partly for sale to foreigners. That is a rather speculative estimate, because it is very difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy what we shall need.

The House of Representatives gave this subject very careful study. The members of the Senate Committee on Commerce, which has devoted much time to

the subject, realizing that we control the entire market, came to the conclusion that instead of leaving the authority to sell in the hands of an administrative officer of the Government, with unlimited discretion, it would be better for the Government and better for the industry to attempt to fix a price and to provide that if the ships cannot be sold at that price they will be taken off the market. That may be an erroneous view, but it is a conclusion reached by the House of Representatives after giving the matter very careful study and it is the conclusion reached by the members of the Senate Committee on Commerce. That is the theory and the underlying principle of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or has he concluded?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have concluded.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what the Senator from Maryland has said prompts me to make a statement about the situation.

I am opposed to the bill in toto. The bill professes to be an aid to this Government in the disposition of ships not needed by us in our commercial activities. With that purpose I am in complete accord.

Then, in my view, this bill undertakes so to circumscribe the authority, so to limit the activities, and so to subordinate the judgment of the Maritime Commission with respect to what ships should be sold and the prices at which they should be sold that the purpose of the bill is defeated.

Mr. President, at other times we have faced situations in which it was necessary to move in sale or charter ships of the United States not needed for the commerce of the United States. In the 1916 Shipping Act there was a provision for the disposition of our ships; but that act contained no such limitations upon the authority and discretion of the Shipping Board as are to be found written into this bill with respect to the authority and discretion of the Maritime Commission. In 1920 we again wrote legislation relative to our shipping, and under that legislation we gave to the Shipping Board authority to sell or charter ships. But we wrote into that law no provisions similar to the ones which are to be found in the pending bill. In 1936 we repealed the 1928 Shipping Act and we wrote other legislation, and in it we gave authority to the Maritime Commission to sell vessels not needed for the commerce of the United States. But in that act we do not find any such limitations upon the discretion, authority, and action of the Maritime Commission similar to the provisions written into the pending bill.

This bill runs counter to the history of the United States in the last 30 years in the maritime field. The only reason I can see for the bill, Mr. President, is a desire of the Maritime Commission to escape the responsibility and the exercise of the authority which heretofore we have vested in that body. There have been written into the pending bill, terms and conditions under which these vessels must be sold which make us dizzy when we attempt to read them terms and conditions which make the professed purpose of the legislation impossible of attainment.

Mr. President, I wish to say one other word. I venture the prediction that this bill, if it is enacted and goes into operation, will tend to retard the sale of vessels which we do not want. It will tend to retard the chartering of other vessels which we do not want to operate ourselves. It will move directly in the opposite direction from the one we have pursued for 30 years in the maritime field, and it will work toward the accomplishment of purposes of which I do not approve.

The United States has these ships to sell. The whole world will want ships. We are going to be the seller. Somewhere there must be a buyer. When a person enters into a trade with respect to the sale of any article, there is always a difference between the seller's view of what he should receive and the buyer's view of what he should pay; and somewhere, by the means of exercise of judgment and discretion, there must come a meeting of the minds in regard to the terms and conditions of the transaction.

But in the pending bill, by removing from the Maritime Commission the obligation to exercise discretion and responsibility, we are undertaking to substitute for its discretion and responsibility a statement of the terms and conditions under which such sales may be made and we are undertaking to establish the rigidity of law in place of the exercise of sound discretion by a regulatory body. I say such a procedure will hinder the sale of vessels and will add to the long lines of ships tied up on the Pacific coast—in Puget Sound and elsewhere—and we shall find an increasing number of ships tied up in the Gulf of Mexico, on the James River, and on other tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay, and at various places in the northern territory. Mr. President, I say that the result of the enactment into law of the pending bill will be that more and more ships will remain unsold, and will be tied up and rotting at docks or rotting at their anchors.

The only way to move the ships is to trade with the rest of the world and to vest in someone in this Government—and I have no hesitancy in saying that it should be the Maritime Commission—authority and discretion in the matter, and to compel it to take the responsibility and to meet the conditions as it views them.

Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. HART addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHITE. I yield first to the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the fact is that the House of Representatives and the members of the Senate Commerce Committee, after a long and careful study, have reached a conclusion entirely different from the views of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. But the shipping interests of the country have not reached a position different from the one I have stated.

The trouble with the bill is that it is written for the Maritime Commission, but not in the interest of the disposition of ships which will be surplus.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. When we realize the gigantic and colossal task of the Maritime Commission, we understand that its job is not comparable to that involved in the general disposition of surplus property. The Commission will have to create a market. I wonder whether the Senator from Maine realizes that when the market which he has in mind began to function, the Commission would have to trade and dicker on every ship which might be for sale. Would that be good for the industry?

Mr. WHITE. I question whether the Commission would have to dicker on every ship. It would depend entirely on the conditions and upon the extent to which we needed the ships or could use them. If we do not want to retain ships, if they are 9-knot or 10-knot ships which will never be useful to this country in our coastwise trade or our foreign trade, then we should get rid of them at whatever price the Maritime Commission can obtain. If that practice is not followed, the harbors and streams of this country will be choked with decaying ships.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Without in any way commenting upon the argument of the distinguished minority leader, or as to the value of the suggestion which he has made, let me say that it occurs to me that in years gone by there has been a great deal of criticism from this side of the aisle about the abdication by Congress of its duty to write the laws of the country and delegating blank-check authority to commissions and executive departments. I am not quarreling at all with the Senator's analysis, and he may be entirely correct in his view that what he suggests is the best and most expeditious way of handling the problem; but I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that his proposal runs quite counter to the general philosophy, which has been expressed so vigorously on this side of the aisle, to the effect that Congress is abdicating its rights and powers to the executive departments of the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Connecticut at all. We are recognizing that this matter is not a governmental or legislative one in any degree. The sale of ships is a matter of barter; it is a matter of trade. It is a matter of finding a seller who has something that he wishes to dispose of, and a buyer who desires to acquire it. In legislation we cannot write out the terms of trade. The terms must be flexible. The last legislation which was enacted on the subject was written when the party of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was in full control, and when a leader of the Senator's party was in the White House. I am trying to conform the situation to

what I think is plain common business sense. If the Senator will read the proposed legislation, he will grow dizzy in trying to figure out what 80 percent means here, what 31 percent means somewhere else, what 60 percent means at another place, and what 50 percent means at some other place in the bill. They are all limitations which have been placed in the bill. They are limitations on the authority and capacity of the Maritime Commission to go into the world market and trade and sell that which we wish to sell.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator may be entirely right, but——

Mr. WHITE. I know I am right, but I also know that I shall not prevail. [Laughter.]

Mr. McMAHON. I have attempted to make some study of the bill in the limited time at my disposal, in view of my duties as chairman of the Committee on Atomic Energy, and I find it very difficult to understand and to follow it.

Mr. WHITE. No one can follow it.

Mr. McMAHON. My point is that the Senator from Maine must recognize that in the way in which our Government has been organized, occasions arise when the Senate and the House cannot write into proposed legislation detailed regulations and detailed rules.

Mr. WHITE. I would not quarrel with the Senator for a moment with respect to that statement. The statement is all the more true in respect to dealing with commodities which we desire to dispose of, which we do not want, and which will serve no useful purpose to the Nation.

Mr. President, most of the ships covered by the bill are Liberties. I assert that a buyer's market can only be found over the world for those 9- or 10-knot ships. A 9-knot ship will be worth very little in the competitive trade of the world when other nations begin to construct and operate combination passenger-cargo ships. Most of these surplus ships have been turned out according to general plans and specifications. In the building of them no account of the character of trade in which they were to be used was taken into consideration. They were constructed without reference to whether they were going to Liverpool, Southampton, or any other port. They were turned out precisely as would be a ship which would run from a port in the United States to Bermuda, or to some other port in the Caribbean area. No thought was given to the type of cargo which the ship was to carry. The first consideration to be given in the wise and proper handling of ships is that they should be constructed so as to handle the cargo which they are destined to carry. We did not give such consideration in connection with the building of these ships. We have hundreds upon hundreds of ships which should be sold for whatever they will bring to the coffers of the United States. They will never be sold unless our regulatory body has the liberty and courage to take advantage of opportunities to sell such ships as the opportunities present themselves. This bill so circumscribes our regulatory body that the flexibility of authority and action to which I refer cannot be exercised.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the vast magnitude of the situation probably involves ships costing $10,000,000,000. It reminds me of the suggestion which was made, as I recall it, when a dictator was selected in Rome.

Mr. WHITE. I am not going back that far.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The language was videat ne quid respublica detrimenti capiat.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator's Latin is as poor as his logic.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will give the English translation which the Senator from Maine does not need. It means the dictator should see to it that the republic should suffer no harm. Here are ships costing $10,000,000,000. Does the Senator feel that if we were to attempt to sell all those ships the Maritime Commission should not have the benefit of some standard or yardstick, but should handle each case on its own basis? During the war we sold a number of ships. We did so with the implied if not the express obligation that some form of adjustment should be made with those who purchased the ships.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator referring to the provision with reference to the transfer of outstanding ships for new ones? If so, I may say that that is another provision which will make increasingly difficult, if not impossible, the transfer of ships to desiring purchasers.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is referring to something which I did not have in mind. The bill provides that those who bought ships during the war at a higher price than the ships will be sold for under this bill, will be entitled to a readjustment. That is a fair and equitable proposal. But if we established a price for each individual ship——

Mr. WHITE. That will not be done unless the Maritime Commission wishes to proceed on that basis. Under the 1916 act, the 1920 act, and the 1936 act, the Shipping Board had authority to advertise, survey, and appraise vessels and sell them on private competitive bids. That made it possible for a buyer to negotiate, trade, and buy. But I cannot see anything to the pending bill but a drag on the possibilities of disposing of these ships.

Mr. President, I sum up and sit down with the final statement that I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, when I first approached this subject I had the same viewpoint as that of the distinguished Senator from Maine. I wondered where there was any exception in the Surplus Property Act which took surplus ships out of the category of property to be sold. After a brief study I soon found that there were many good reasons for that being done.

I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Maine. Before doing so, however, I would recall for him a point of history which he seems to have overlooked.

Following the First World War we had a surplus of ships. There were many ships which were not adapted to use in any particular trade, but which had been built merely for the purpose of aiding in winning the war. We all recall the many scandals which were associated with charges made against the Government in connection with the disposal of those ships. We had a chaotic condition for several years following the war because of some ships which had more or less been given away, as it was claimed, and there was a huge surplus of ships upon the market. Those were some of the conditions which prevailed after the First World War which this bill seeks to avoid. The bill has been under careful study, as the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said, for a long time, both on the part of the House and our own committee.

It is quite correct to say that the bill is exceedingly complicated. I believe that everyone who has worked on it wishes that it could have been simpler. However, in the light of present circumstances it represents the best that can be done. If the bill contains any imperfections as it may be the question is, what else is there to be done? If the bill is defeated by the Senate, as the Senator from Maine wishes to have done, my question is, What shall we do next?

Mr. WHITE. I think the answer is perfectly simple; we would proceed to function under existing law.

It is true that after the last war we had a surplus of tonnage. We probably built during that war 10,000,000 tons of shipping at a cost of three or three and a half billion dollars. Of course, the situation is more serious now than it was then, but we did sell a substantial number of ships under the flexible provisions of that law; and I am telling the Senator from Connecticut and all other Senators that if they bind this thing up with the red tape of legislation the result will be to slow up the sale of these ships and they will not move on the markets of the world, which is where they will have to be sold, in large part, and not here in the United States. I believe that to be true. We can proceed best, in my opinion, by giving to the regulatory body the same authority, the same flexibility, the same right to exercise judgment, and the same obligation to take responsibility that has rested in the Maritime Commission since 1936.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me to ask the Senator from Maine a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. A moment ago the Senator from Maine said that these ships could be sold at public auction. Suppose they were. If these ships should be sold at public auction throughout the years the chances are that they would be sold for varying amounts, and would not the Senator, if he were a potential purchaser, feel better satisfied if he knew that when he bought a ship he was buying it at a price determined by a formula and that the Government was not going to sell any cheaper?

Mr. WHITE. I suppose I would.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is not that a factor?

Mr. WHITE. I think it is entirely a minor consideration. The question is whether the United States is going to

sell these ships and get money instead of the ships becoming decaying hulks along our waterways.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. We want to encourage people to buy the ships, and in this bill we fix a formula; the ships will be sold according to that formula, and if they are not sold in 2 years they will be put in reserve. Does not that give considerable protection to the purchaser?

Mr. WHITE. A formula is fixed that no one can understand. I have heard no one interested in this proposed legislation who has had the temerity to stand up and say that he fully understands the terms and conditions and functioning of this piece of legislation. I confess I do not.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Will the Senator listen patiently while I try to explain it?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; if the Senator will not do it the way he did a few days ago when he cajoled me into acquiescence and then talked for 4 hours.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I regret my garrulity, but I was constantly being asked questions. I assure the Senator I shall not go into detail. We fix a formula, we fix a standard, and that is subject in the case of each ship to definite modifications. For instance, a credit of 5 percent a year is allowed for service. That would seem to be reasonable. Furthermore, if a ship has been in war service an additional credit of 3 percent is given in the discretion of the Commission, and furthermore if a ship is not in class a credit is allowed for what is necessary to put it in class. Those are all suitable credits. Then, in order to get away from such a condition, which might be possible, that these various credits might exhaust substantially the whole amount of purchase price, we have attempted to fix a floor. I will try to explain the floor, if the Senator desires, but I am sure he is familiar with it. We have fixed a floor of 35 percent of the domestic war cost in regard to ordinary ships, 31½ percent in the case of Liberty ships, and 42 percent in the case of tankers.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Certainly.

Mr. HART. I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Maine point out some of the features of the bill which are not clear to him.

Mr. WHITE. I would have to start at the first page and go to the last one if I should attempt to do that. I have been waiting patiently to hear it explained, and I have reached the definite conclusion either that the explainers cannot explain or that I cannot understand.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask the Senator from Maine a question. I have just made a statement as to the price and as to the credits. What is there vague or indefinite about that?

Mr. WHITE. On page 27 there is a provision which reads:

> In no case shall the prewar domestic cost of any type of vessel be considered to be greater than 80 percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of the same type.

That is an arbitrary provision without any relation to what the actual prewar cost is or what the price should be.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Would it relieve the Senator to know that the 80-percent provision raises a more or less academic question because in every instance the domestic prewar cost has not been up to 80 percent of the war cost. So it is not a practical factor, the provision probably could be eliminated without any practical effect.

Mr. WHITE. In the next paragraph there is a reference to 50 percent and in the same paragraph there is another reference to 60 percent. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I believe, has an amendment pending proposing to change 60 percent to 75 percent, and I think he has another amendment to change 75 percent to 100 percent.

Then on the next page there is a reference to 5 percent of something else, on the next page a reference to 35 percent of the domestic war cost, and then a reference to 31½ percent, and then a reference to 42 percent, and on the next page I see a reference to 25 percent of something else. So it goes all the way through.

Perhaps I ought not to tell this on the floor of the Senate of the United States, but I am reminded of the story I am about to relate. I had a grandfather who, according to usual standards, was a good man. When he was a young boy he had a nurse who taught him a prayer which was a revision of the old prayer uttered by children which runs—

> Now I lay me down to sleep;
> I pray the Lord my soul to keep.
> If I should die before I wake,
> I pray the Lord my soul to take.

His nurse made that over and one night he astonished and shocked his good Quaker mother by giving her this version:

> When I lay me down to sleep,
> I curl myself up in a heap;
> If I should die before I wake,
> It would puzzle the devil to pull me straight.

That is my trouble with this bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me say to the Senator——

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will say it and not put it in the form of a question, very well.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is there anything very difficult in setting a sale price at 50 percent of the prewar construction cost?

Mr. WHITE. I am all bound up in a heap about it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is the Senator at all confused when the statement is made that 5 percent a year shall be allowed for service? He can readily understand that 5 percent a year means 5 percent a year, and if a ship has been in war service an additional 3 percent is allowed in the discretion of the Commission.

Mr. WHITE. I come back to my fundamental proposition that instead of vesting the responsibility in the regulatory body which has been established now for more than 30 years, instead of giving them authority, instead of placing the responsibility for action and for judgment upon them the bill undertakes to substitute for the power of the regulatory body, for the authority of the regulatory body, for the judgment of the regulatory body, an unusual formula and standards which are confusing. I said a moment ago that they were confusing to every Member of the Senate. I congratulate the Senator from Maryland that he has found two Senators who assert they understand them.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHITE. I yield the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator from Maine were buying a ship I imagine he would rather buy it on the realization that he was buying it in a fixed market rather than having to buy in a shifting market. It seems to me the stability of the business is promoted when each purchaser, or prospective purchaser, knows that he can buy at a certain figure, and that no one else can buy at a lower figure. It seems to me that makes for stability. does not disrupt the market.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Certainly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Maine that even if we go back to his premise, if we leave the Maritime Commission in the same position in which it is now, we will still have to do something. Under the present law the only way the Maritime Commission can dispose of ships is by competitive bidding, and that would mean that whoever was a member of the Maritime Commission at the time would feel it incumbent upon him, as the Senator from Maine said, to dispose of the ships. That would mean complete instability in a world merchant marine. It would mean that some Americans who wanted a ship in a hurry, who had the money with which to buy it, could come forward and bid high, so much per ton. It would mean that a year or two later, when some of the ships, as the Senator says, were lying at anchor, perhaps in some of our harbors, competing foreign ship interests would come forward and bid 5 percent above what the American bid. After all, there is much freight which does not need to move over 10 knots. There are many commodities useful to the world that can move at 5 knots. It would mean complete instability not to specify some authority like that the Maritime Commission now has, or to give the Commission authority to dispose of the ships in an orderly manner.

Mr. WHITE. I am saying that the alternative is flexibility in the law and in the authority of the Maritime Commission, or a standardization and sale of all these ships at practically the same price, and one who asserts that that should be done and who declares that should be the policy of the United States, advocates a procedure which would dry up the opportunity for sale.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senator were a prospective purchaser, would he not rather buy a ship at a fixed price than merely take his chances of haggling and working out some kind of a deal?

Mr. WHITE. It would all depend on how badly I wanted the particular ships that were offered.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is it not more orderly to have a fixed price?

Mr. WHITE. No; it is not.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. When the Senator goes into a store to purchase, would he

not rather have a fixed price than merely haggle about the price?

Mr. WHITE. No, indeed. I might want a ship very much and be willing to pay a substantial price, or I might be perhaps an indifferent or reluctant purchaser, and I would not take the ship unless I could get it at a price which was reasonably satisfactory to me. It is not possible to write into law provisions which will reach into the future and determine a fair and equitable price to purchasers, a price in which purchasers will be interested.

Instead of addressing his inquiries to me, from now on I suggest that the Senator address them to the Senate as a whole.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me ask one further question. The Senator is a purchaser, let us assume. He said that if he wanted to buy a ship and wanted it very badly, he would pay what he thought was a reasonable price for it. Would not the Senator feel a little better satisfied if he realized in buying that someone who was in competition with him in trade was not coming behind him and buying a similar ship at half the price he paid?

Mr. WHITE. Then the proposal is simply to freeze the price and say to the world, "Take each and every one of these ships at this price, or you do not take it at all." That is not the principle of barter and sale, and if that principle is applied in a world of competitive trade, it will not be possible to sell the ships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is exactly what we do not want to do in some cases. We want to lay up some ships. If we have to dispose of more than 4,750 ships, aggregating 50,000,000 dead-weight tons, by competitive bidding, most of them are going into the foreign markets, and our merchant marine will be right back where it was in 1923 and 1924, after the last World War. We want to lay up some ships.

Mr. WHITE. I entirely disagree with the Senator. I think that if we have any regard for our competitive position in world trade, we had better get rid of the slow ships just as fast as the Lord will let us get rid of them. We should facilitate the turning in of the 9- and 10-knot Libertys for the high-speed Victory ships, just as fast as we can, and the provision proposed to be written into the law will not facilitate the turning in of ships, but will retard it.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Maryland would let me ask the Senator from Maine a question.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes, if the Senator from Maine will answer; but I cannot guarantee that he will.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Rhode Island has been very tolerant and has left me very much alone; so I yield to him.

Mr. GERRY. One of the questions which has been worrying me is that if the standards which are set forth in the proposed legislation are so complicated that even the Senate cannot understand them, I am wondering if, in the sale of the ships, some legal questions will not arise as to the construction of these standards, so that it will be very difficult to decide whether good title can be passed under the law. In other words there will be another hampering influence in the sale of the ships if the standards are so complicated that legal questions are continually arising as to what has to be done in order to pass title.

Mr. WHITE. In my opinion, every maritime lawyer in the United States will be employed in connection with sales of ships, or attempted sales of ships, under the provisions of the bill, and there will be a smaller and smaller number of people throughout the world who will have the temerity to enter into negotiations and to be interested in purchasing ships.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island that, after all, the references in the bill to 50 percent and 5 percent and 3 percent, are only for a certain, definite purpose. I think the Senator from Maine has been excessively modest and self-depreciatory. He certainly knows what 50 percent of cost means, he knows what 5 percent means, he knows what 3 percent means. These statements have particularity, quite definitely so.

A frank answer to the question of the Senator from Rhode Island is, it seems to me, that laying down definite standards and definite percentages, which are defined, I think, quite clearly, is likely to prevent litigation rather than promote it.

Mr. GERRY. As I look at the bill, I am doubtful if merely laying down those standards entirely covers all the legal questions involved, as to how the standards are to be applied, and the construction to be placed upon them in connection with the terms of sale.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I cannot forecast what points might arise, but those who are familiar with the shipping business tell me it is not difficult to estimate 50 percent of the prewar cost. It is not difficult to find out how long a ship has been in service, and to allow 5 percent for such service.

Mr. GERRY. I wish it were as simple as the Senator from Maryland thinks it is.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. A very definite statement is as to the time of delivery of the ship. That is not a very involved matter to determine the basis for arriving at the 5-percent allowance.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Maryland has repeatedly asked me if I knew what 50 percent of something meant. Ordinarily I would say "Yes," but in this particular case I have to say "No," because it is 50 percent of prewar cost, to be determined by the Maritime Commission, and which in any event shall not exceed 80 percent of the prewar domestic cost.

I do not know what the Maritime Commission is going to find the prewar cost of any vessel the United States now owns to be, and I do not know how it will ever be possible to apply the 50 percent to an unknown quantity and obtain a definite answer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not unknown. The exact cost of all these ships is filed at the Bureau of Internal Revenue for taxation purposes. It is in black and white.

Mr. WHITE. The bill does not say anything about the exact cost filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It says the prewar cost as determined by the Maritime Commission, and there is no obligation, as the provision stands, for the Maritime Commission to accept the Internal Revenue figures or the figures of anyone else. They have a flexible amount, which can move up or down in the judgment and discretion of the Maritime Commission. Then Senators say that I ought to know what 50 percent of that is. I simply do not know.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is a provision further on with regard as to valuations by the Internal Revenue. However, Mr. President, those who are familiar with the shipping business tell me it is not difficult to estimate the cost of a ship as of January 1, 1941. Perhaps they are wrong in that assurance, but those who are quite familiar with the operations of the business tell me there is no particular difficulty involved. That particular question was not raised in the hearings, so far as I know.

Mr. WHITE. In view of what has been said to me and written to me about this proposed legislation, I suspect there are many questions which were not raised in the hearings. I suspect the committee has not heard some of the things which have been said about the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is quite possible, but the committee devoted a great deal of time to the subject and heard a great many witnesses. Doubtless we have not heard everything on the subject.

Mr. WHITE. I am keeping just as quiet as I know how, but I want it to be understood by everyone that I am against the pending legislation, and if I have made that plain, that is all I want to do.

Mr. HART. I wonder if the Senator is against the proposed legislation because he thinks there is not to be an auction held for getting rid of these ships?

Mr. WHITE. I do not care whether the Commission gets rid of them by auction or by what method. I want to see it made as easy as possible for these ships, which the Maritime Commission believes are not commercially valuable to the United States, to be gotten out of the possession of the United States and to get some money back for them.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. But the Senator does not want the market to be held up while people are holding back in buying thinking that in the end the Government will junk all the ships, or practically give them away.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator thinks people are holding back, just wait until this bill is passed and the Senator will learn something new about "holding back."

Mr. HART. The Senator from Maine has repeatedly said that these figures which he has difficulty in understanding amount to fixed prices. The bill is very simple in that respect. That is not the case. All the figures amount to is a floor—nothing else.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to ask the Senator from Maryland, who is sponsoring the bill on the floor of the Senate, if the members of the Committee on Commerce were unanimous in recommending this bill? Was there any difference

of opinion respecting it in the Commerce Committee?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The vote to report the bill was unanimous. There was difference in regard to certain aspects of it, but when it came to reporting the bill the vote was unanimous.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to bring out this point: What consideration did the committee give to the situation which will arise in the event the ships are not sold under the formula which is established in this bill? After the full knockdown price is obtained, everything having been taken off for service allowances, and so forth, suppose the ships are still floating idly in the water and no one has bought them. That is what the Senator from Maine is talking about.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill provides that if they are not sold by a fixed date, which is about 2 years in advance, they are to be taken completely off the market, and are to go into a reserve fleet, and the market is thus protected from having this big fleet of ships hanging over it all the time.

Mr. HAWKES. What is to be done when the ships are placed in the reserve fleet and there is no use for them? I agree with what the Senator from Maine has said respecting the rotting of ships. I remember very well after the last war seeing many of the vessels which were built but not used tied up in the Hudson River for months and months and months, and rotting. The Senator from Maine is talking along the line of business with which I am thoroughly familiar, and that is, if a company of which I am the head has an article that the public does not want at the price put on it, then I fix a different price, say, a 40-percent greater discount, to encourage the buying of the article. I still have the power the following day or the following week to change that price and finally make it fit the ideas of the buyer and the buying conditions and the demand or lack of demand in the market. I think that is what is disturbing the Senator from Maine. Is that correct, I ask the Senator from Maine?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is correct, so far as he goes, but I could enumerate a great many other things.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that the Senator could enumerate many other things. But I wonder whether the Senator's committee, the Committee on Commerce, has gone any further in connection with what this body might do to insure the best sale of these ships.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not call the committee my committee.

Mr. HAWKES. No. On that point I am addressing myself to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator was looking at me.

Mr. HAWKES. I addressed the question to the Senator from Maryland, but I looked at the Senator from Maine for inspiration.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, we can do one of two things.

Mr. HAWKES. I did not quite get my point over to the Senator from Maryland. I wonder if the Senator from Maryland had in mind any further action by which this formula could be adjusted so as to assure sales if the formula now prescribed in the bill should fail to do the job.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I started to say in answer to the Senator from New Jersey that we can do one of two things. We can simply say that these ships are on the market indefinitely, hanging as an incubus over the market, and if they are there indefinitely anyone who buys a ship may have a realization that he is subject to the threat that the market is going suddenly to collapse, and consequently ships will be sold to his competitor at a price so low that competition between them will be almost impossible for him. So what the committee has attempted to do is to fix a time limit of 2 years.

The Senator asked me what is going to happen to the ships when they go to the reserve fleet. I cannot answer the question. Some may be scrapped. Perhaps 2 years from now Congress in its discretion may decide upon different policy. I do not know. But if it does, the policy should be equitable toward those who had already purchased ships. Certainly, however, it seems better that there should be some time limit, rather than to have no time limit at all.

Mr. HAWKES. May I say to the Senator that I am as desirous as he is of dealing equitably with all parties in the sale of ships, but at the same time I do not think, with a problem involving several billion dollars' worth of ships, that we can hope to have complete equity all along the line. I think the Senator from Maine, in his statement that under one condition he would be willing to pay a great deal more for a vessel than he would under another condition, is logical and sound.

I want to ask the Senator from Maryland another question. In section 8 of the bill, I believe, the Maritime Commission is authorized to accept vessels as trade-in for new vessels. Is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Under certain conditions; yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Under certain conditions. In that respect there seems to be something which is based on sound business principles, and I think the Government of the United States is the biggest business in the world. The bill provides that a man who has a vessel cannot trade it in for a new vessel at a greater price than the original purchaser of that vessel from the Government paid for it. Is it not true that the value of anything you or I have in this world does not depend on what we paid for it at a specific time? Suppose I bought a ship from the Government for $150,000, and operated it for a certain length of time, and the Senator wanted to purchase it, and that it was worth $600,000 to the Senator, and I sold it to him for that price. Suppose it has a value very greatly in excess of $150,000 at the present time. Is there any reason why the Senator should not be allowed the true value of that vessel on the market in trading it in for a new vessel from the Maritime Commission?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that his question is not a very simple one. The trade-in is brought forward to offer some special inducement. Let me give a concrete illustration. Suppose at some time in the past a man has bought a ship from the Government for $100,000. He now comes forward and under the provisions of this bill wants to buy a vessel which cost $500,000, and he offers a ship he has previously purchased as a trade-in. He says, "That ship, though I bought it from the Federal Government for $100,000, is now worth $250,000, simply due to enhancement of the market, not due to any improvement in physical condition of the ship. I ask the right to trade this vessel in for $250,000." Of course, in that event he would make $150,000 at the expense of the Treasury. That might be reasonable, but it seems to me it is not quite reasonable for a man who has bought a vessel from the Government to come forward at this time and simply say, "I am entitled to a profit in this succession of transactions." He may have another outlet for his ship.

Mr. HAWKES. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the ship is worth more than he can get for it as a trade-in, he can probably sell it at a profit to someone other than the Government.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes; but the Maritime Commission also has the right to say it is not worth more. Why limit it to the cost money originally paid to the Government? The Senator has left my question. My question involved the man who bought that ship for $150,000 and sold it to you or me a year or two ago for $600,000 or $500,000. The price he paid for it was $150,000, but its true value as determined by rules which govern such matters may be much greater. That is so in every walk of life in the United States that I know of. If I had bought a house when someone wanted to sell it for $20,000, and if the Senator were willing to pay $80,000 for it, he would not tell me that I should not sell it for more than $20,000. Let us not forget that one of the criticisms of the Maritime Commission in this body about a year ago was that it had bought back, at greatly increased prices, ships which it had sold. I remember one case in which, if I correctly recall the figure, it sold a ship for $35,000, and bought it back for $150,000. Why was not the rule which the Senator is discussing a good rule in that instance? I do not agree that when the ship was sold back to the Government the Maritime Commission should not have paid the man from whom the ship was bought more than he or the original purchaser paid for it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There was much criticism of the Maritime Commission of the United States Government generally because it bought ships back at prices greatly in excess of what the Government had sold them for. This provision is aimed at blocking such transactions. After all, our policy is to sell ships. The Government does not want to acquire other ships. We want to get out of the shipping business.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that quite well.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Therefore it is not our policy to go into the general trading business in ships. If a shipowner wishes to sell to someone else at a profit, that

is his own business; but he should not be able to sell to the Government at a more or less artificial profit. We feel that he should not be allowed to trade in a ship for more than he paid for it. Under the circumstances I do not believe that that is an undue hardship.

Mr. HAWKES. I am deeply sympathetic with what the Senator is trying to do, but I am asking if the Maritime Commission would not have the power, in its good business judgment, to say, "We do not want old ships, and we cannot allow you as much as you think you ought to receive." But why limit the price to the original price, which might be altogether out of line with current values and conditions? That is the point I am making.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There may be some merit in the point. However, we contemplate a program of liquidation, and not a program of acquisition. I feel very strongly that it is perfectly reasonable for the Government to say, "We would rather not have the ships, because we are trying to get out of the shipping business. But if you want to trade them in, we will take them at the price at which we sold them to you. If, however, you want to dispose of them otherwise, that is your business."

Mr. HAWKES. That is not the point. The Senator is not saying, "We will take them at the price at which we sold them." The Senator is saying, "We will take them at the price at which the Government sold them to John Jones." John Jones may have sold them to the new owner, who is operating them.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The case the Senator has in mind is that of a new purchaser of the ship who wishes to enter into the transaction.

Mr. HAWKES. The new owner.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. He has other ways of disposing of the ships if he wishes to do so. I do not feel that he should expect the Government to become involved in a transaction carrying with it a more or less artificial profit. I realize that there is some merit in the point the Senator is making, but in order to try to avoid what in the past has been a source of very serious criticism, the drafters of the bill said, "We are not going to leave that door to special profits open." A shipowner does not have to trade in the old ship. He can sell it to anyone to whom he wishes to sell it. I believe that in a spirit of caution we should avoid in this bill what has been a source of a great deal of trouble and criticism in the past.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish the Senator would give the point a little consideration, because he may have some idea which will cure what I consider to be a defect and an unfair provision in the bill.

While I am on my feet, let me say that I am deeply conscious of the difficulty of enacting legislation to accomplish the desired objective in such a way as to be satisfactory to all the people of the United States. There is no question that there will be criticism in connection with the disposition of these ships, no matter how it is done.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from New Jersey knows that we can follow one of two courses. We can try to fix a price. We control the market, and we can more or less determine what the market is. We can try to fix a price and place everyone on the same basis, and also provide that the ships shall not remain indefinitely on the market, or we can leave the matter wide open to negotiation. In the opinion of the House of Representatives, which gave this matter a year of study, if I am correctly informed, and in the opinion of the Senate Committee on Commerce, which has examined carefully into the matter, we had better try to have a fixed-price basis applicable to everyone, rather than throw the whole price structure wide open. That conclusion may be wrong, but it is a deliberate opinion, reached after the most careful consideration by the House of Representatives and by the Senate Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HAWKES. If the Government were flexible enough to adjust itself to conditions as we go along, I should be very heartily in accord with the objectives which the Senator is trying to accomplish by having a fixed price. But I am a little concerned about having a fixed price which does not fit the buyer's mind and conditions. Furthermore I am concerned about having a great many ships left over, and having to sell them abroad, or do something else with them that we should not have to do.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator knows what happened the last time we tried to dispose of ships on the market. I do not mean to say that the policy of not having a fixed price was entirely responsible; it may be even a nonsequitur; but, during all those years there was hanging over the market the possibility that those ships would be dumped on the market. Perhaps a few people would like to see them dumped, because then they could obtain them for a song.

Let me mention one illustration. I helped to liquidate and later became director of a successor company which had 20 ships for which it paid approximately $500,000 apiece. We sold them for $10,000 apiece, or 2 percent of their cost. Why? There might have been a number of reasons, but one reason probably was that during all that time there was a mass of ships hanging over the market. No one knew when the Government would become tired and disgusted with its policy of selling ships and throw the ships on the market for disposal at any figure.

The Senator from New Jersey knows, from his long and successful experience in business, that one of the things about which a buyer is apprehensive is that something will be dumped on the market in such a way as to control the market. We are trying to avoid that danger. I believe that the step which we have taken is proper. I cannot imagine an orderly and satisfactory liquidation of these ships costing $10,000,000,000; if we have no standards, if we have no particular basis set up for negotiation, but each ship is subject to negotiation and bargaining. In that event what will happen? Just as sure as fate the Maritime Commission, or any other board operating on the theory advanced by the Senator from Maine a little while ago, would attempt to lay down yardsticks of its own. That would seem to be satisfactory, but how would the purchaser know that the Maritime Commission would not change its mind and come to the conclusion that the ships ought to be marked down to one-half or one-third of the former price? He would have no feeling of assurance that even standards established by the Maritime Commission would stand. But if the standard is fixed by statute, and if the Maritime Commission has no discretion to lower the standard, and furthermore, if after a certain period of time the ships are taken off the market, I think the buyer will have a greater feeling of assurance than if he had to take a chance on what he could get by negotiation on every point.

Mr. HAWKES. I agree absolutely with the Senator that every buyer of ships would feel very much more comfortable if he knew that ships would not be dumped on the market a little later to compete with him at one-half or one-quarter of his price. Do not misunderstand me. I am not unsympathetic toward what the Senator is trying to do; but I wonder if there is not some way of providing a little more elasticity in the bill. I have been a Member of this body only a short time, but I have learned one thing, and that is that Congress does not quickly correct things that go wrong.

I have in mind something which the Senator may wish to think over. Would it be possible to set a period of time in which the Maritime Commission would be bound by the floors which we establish, and then leave it to that body to determine, after a stated period of time, whether it be 1 year, 2 years, or some other period, whether the basis should be changed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I believe that the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey has a great deal of merit, and is entitled to thoughtful consideration. But let me ask him a question. A little while ago he stated that if he were a prospective buyer he would feel a little more comfortable—I believe that was his expression—if he knew that the ships would not later be sold at low prices.

Mr. HAWKES. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Suppose we inserted a provision similar to the one the Senator has suggested, and suppose it applied for 1 year, with the understanding that thereafter it would be supplanted by a provision enabling the sale of the ships at a lesser price. Would not that create a certain feeling of unrest in the minds of the purchasers?

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say that I do not know, of course, for what length of time such a provision should apply, but it seems to me that if it applied for a period of 2 years a purchaser who wished to go ahead in this rapidly moving world would do so, and the Maritime Commission would continue to keep in mind the intent of Congress not to have something sold for 50 percent or 25 percent as much to someone else 2 years from that time, and the Maritime Commission still would have the power to determine just what adjustments of price should be made.

Let me say to the Senator that I have been in business for a great many years. At times we had large amounts—at one time we had $4,000,000 worth—of material which we did not know what to do with. The people did not want it. Patterns were out of date and various other changes had occurred. We had to adjust things month by month until we found a point at which the market would absorb that material. I agree with the Senator that that was a case of merchandise moving into consumption, whereas in the pending bill we are dealing with a durable-goods fixed investment. So conditions are somewhat different. But if some flexibility along the lines I have mentioned could be provided for in the bill, it would be more acceptable to me. Of course, I have in mind the necessity of making several other corrections or changes in the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I think there is some misapprehension. Some Senators seem to think there can be no competition whatever in the matter of the sale of these ships. Although there is a floor and really a fixed price and the ships are of few designs, nevertheless there are a great many ships of each design and there is a decided difference in the quality of the ships.

Mr. HAWKES. I realize that.

Mr. HART. The first bidder, the man who himself wishes to acquire a ship and who gets in his bid at once for the ship he picks out, is undoubtedly competing with all the other prospective buyers.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Connecticut has said.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Jersey in connection with his suggestion that it would be advisable to have a 2-year period—

Mr. HAWKES. I offered that merely as a suggestion.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; and the Senator proposed that after that period of time it might be wise to provide for a different scale. Of course, that suggestion has considerable merit. But let me inquire whether it is not better for us to make arrangements for 2 years at this time, and thereafter, in the light of developments, to attempt to define a new policy, if at that time one is found to be necessary. I am apprehensive that if today we attempt to forecast the basis on which we should operate 2 years from now, we may get into considerable difficulty. Certainly we do not now have the experience which we shall acquire during the next 2 years, and today we are very much in the dark regarding the basis on which we should function 2 years from now.

It seems to me much better to say, "Here is a 2-year program, and this is the way the ships shall be sold in that period. No one will get any preference; everyone will be treated on the same basis. If the ships are not disposed of, they will go into the ship reserve." If that were done, then at the end of 2 years if Congress decided that some other plan would be the fair and equitable way to handle the matter, such a new plan could be adopted.

But unless we attempt to do a great deal of rather wild guessing, I do not see any way by which we can attempt to determine what our policy should be 2 years from now.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have great confidence in the Maritime Commission, and I have great confidence in Admiral Land. Of course, Admiral Land may not always be able to serve. But it seems to me that if we could provide for the operation of a thermostat, so to speak, the Maritime Commission would be able to determine what in its judgment would be the best thing to do. I am not saying that it should be ordered to reduce prices; but I am saying that if after 2 years the ships are not sold, perhaps the Maritime Commission should have authority to reduce the price sufficiently to result in their sale. I should like to have established in this instance the same kind of opportunity to feel the market and meet the market and sell the goods which occurs every day in the industrial and business world of the United States.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course.

Let me ask a question of the Senator from New Jersey, whose experience has certainly been most wide. Perhaps I am wrong, but my guess is that the Senator does not attempt to forecast 2 or 3 years in advance the costs in the business in which he is interested. Is it not very much better to say, "Here is a 2-year program which we hope will take care of the matter. What will happen after 2 years we do not now know"?

I do not know how we could draft language today which would enable us to forecast what would be necessary 2 years from now in regard to the sale of these ships.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, it may be that the Senator from Maryland is entirely correct and that such a forecast cannot be made.

I will say to the Senator from Maryland, for whom I have a high regard, that if I could believe that if, 18 months or 2 years from now, after Congress had brought to its attention the fact that the Government was stymied in regard to the sale of these vessels, and that it was going to have a great many of the vessels left on its hands, although they should be put into use and could be sold at a certain figure, the Congress then would submit the problem to one of its committees, which would promptly report adequate legislation, and that such legislation would be quickly enacted, I would not have these questions in my mind.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, Mr. President, none of us can forecast exactly what course future legislation should take or what future conditions in connection with the market for the disposition of these vessels will be. But we must rely upon future Congresses to have sufficient wisdom to handle the matter properly at that time. That would seem to me to be the proper way to proceed.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I have submitted these points in order to obtain the judgment of the Senator from Maryland regarding them. I shall wait and see what comes from them at the time when the bill comes to a vote. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. When the bill was formerly under discussion, the Senator from Rhode Island claimed that in certain particulars the bill favored foreigners, in comparison with citizens of the United States. The Senator from Maryland was unwilling to to adopt that view In that connection, I ask him whether section 12, which we did not then discuss, is another illustration—it is, from my own point of view—of how, under this bill, foreigners will receive advantages which will be denied to the citizens of this country.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I should not think so. Section 10 has generally in mind the following situation: Suppose a person who buys one of the vessels subsequently charters it to the United States Government. Of course, if the vessel is lost the owner will be entitled to compensation from the Government for the just value of the vessel. However, if the owner attempts to follow up that transaction with a second transaction—in other words, if he attempts to purchase a second vessel—section 12 simply provides that he must then enter into an agreement that if the first vessel is lost, the basis of compensation will be under the then existing law—in other words, the pending bill—and not under a previous one.

Allow me to explain what I mean. This bill provides for the sale of ships at a lower price. If an owner leased a ship to the Federal Government and it has been lost, and he wishes to continue transactions with the Government, he should be satisfied to receive in compensation for the ship which has been lost what the market is bringing for such a ship under this bill. I think that would be reasonable.

Mr. GREEN. Is the Senator speaking of section 12 of the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. I was speaking of section 10.

Mr. GREEN. I have found it difficult to follow the Senator's argument, but I must say that it has not been much more difficult than it has been in connection with other matters. But, as it happened, he was talking about a section to which I had not referred.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I admit that I misunderstood your reference. I did not realize that the Senator had referred to section 12. I thought he had in mind section 10.

In regard to section 12, I will say that personally I do not like it. However, I was voted down in the committee. When these ships are sold I should personally prefer that there be no recapture clause on behalf of the Federal Government. I do not think that clause is likely to be invoked, and so I believe the question is more or less an acedemic one.

Mr. GREEN. I have asked whether the language does not favor the foreigner over a citizen of the United States.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator may be correct.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I may suggest to the Senator that it seemed to those of us who favored it that some provision should exist with reference to the Government in the case of an emergency. It seems that there was no way of providing for it, and while I was in favor of including the clause to which reference has been made, I was well aware that the foreign owner would be immune from the provisions of the act. But there is no other way by which to look after the possible future needs of the Government in the case of an emergency.

Mr. GREEN. Then does not the Senator from Connecticut agree that the bill, so far as this particular language is concerned, favors a foreigner over an American citizen?

Mr. HART. I think it possibly might favor him in the case of certain emergencies.

Mr. GREEN. But it does favor him under those conditions.

Mr. HART. I think it may.

Mr. GREEN. The bill favors him. I am not saying whether the circumstances will be such that he will be favored, but the bill, by its provisions, favors the foreigner over the American citizen.

Mr. HART. I think my answer is responsive. It might confer some benefit upon a foreigner who did not wish to turn in his ship.

Mr. GREEN. In other words, the American ship would have to be turned in, but the foreign ship would not have to be turned in.

Mr. HART. That might occur.

Mr. GREEN. And there is a responsibility which attaches to the American purchaser of a ship which does not attach in respect to a foreign purchaser.

Mr. HART. I will grant that there is a possibility of it.

Mr. GREEN. Possibilities always affect values, do they not?

Mr. HART. I doubt that the provision to which the Senator refers will have much effect.

Mr. GREEN. An American citizen who purchases a ship is under a certain contingent liability, is he not?

Mr. HART. I assume that the Senator means there is a certain cloud on the title of the purchaser.

Mr. GREEN. Exactly.

Mr. HART. I think that could occur, but it is more important that the Government be protected than it is to leave this provision out of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. I do not understand the Senator from Connecticut in his statement that a cloud on the title could possibly occur. The cloud exists on the title when the purchase is made. The cloud may clear later, or may descend in a deluge. But the cloud is on the title when the purchaser buys the ship, is it not?

Mr. HART. I think that the Senator is getting into weather conditions that need not concern us very much.

Mr. GREEN. I think they should concern us a great deal. This is one illustration of how the American citizen is to be placed at a disadvantage, when purchasing ships, in comparison with the foreigner. It is one of those phases of this very confusing legislation to which I object. I understand that the Senator from Maryland, who has charge of the bill, agrees with me that the bill would be better off without containing section 12. I wonder whether he would be willing to accept an amendment striking out section 12.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I was entirely frank with the Senator from Rhode Island. Personally, I think it would have been better to have left the section out of the bill. I do not think it will do much harm, but it might create some continuing restriction or cloud on the title. Personally, I was opposed to it. In view of the fact that the committee voted for it, and definitely instructed me to report the bill with the section in it, I am reluctant to accept an amendment which would eliminate it. I think it was put into the bill perhaps out of abundance of caution. I do not believe that even the most optimistic individual believes that within 5 years this provision will be utilized.

Mr. GREEN. It is inconsistent with other provisions of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the Senator's statement should be modified. When he says that foreigners are being preferred throughout the bill it should be remembered that there is some reference to other qualifications. In reading carefully the bill the Senator will see that an American citizen is given preference in many ways. For example, he is given a preference as to purchase. There can be no chartering whatever to foreigners, unless an amendment which has been suggested, and which applies only to a limited extent, should be applicable. There are many restrictions being placed upon the foreigner which are not being laid upon the citizen.

Mr. GREEN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Maryland to the inconsistency between section 12 and section 6 (b). Section 6 (b) reads as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States, except in accordance with subsection (a), or upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States, but where the vessel so sold is being transferred to foreign registry and flag, the mortgage securing the unpaid balance of the purchase price and interest thereon shall contain provisions according to such mortgage the priorities over other liens and encumbrances accorded such mortgages on merchant vessels under the laws of such registry and flag.

Omitting the latter part of subsection (b), it reads:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States, * * * upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States.

Section 12, in its terms, violates that section. It seems to me that, although the Senator from Maryland has undertaken to take charge of this bill on the floor, he should not be obliged to defend inconsistent provisions, and refuse to accept an amendment which would correct them.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The section to which the Senator has just referred was inserted for this purpose: When we sell to a foreigner, of course we are going to draw up a mortgage, and this provision is designed to make assurance double sure that though we draft the mortgage, we also will be entitled to all the benefits of a law as to mortgagees in that foreign country. That would seem to me to be a reasonable safeguard. We want to be sure, when we take back a mortgage on a ship, that we are not holding a mortgage which would not have the benefits of the law in the particular country concerned, should it be necessary that the mortgagor would get into their courts.

Mr. President, this is an additional protection, and there is no reason why we should not have it. The language may not be absolutely necessary, perhaps, but it is simply an affirmation of our intention to do everything we can to see that when we accept a mortgage we will make every reasonable effort to get the benefit of all the laws of the foreign country.

Mr. GREEN. That may be the object of those who drafted the bill, but certainly the provision of the bill itself goes much further than that, and the courts, and I think the Senate of the United States, should regard the language as submitted rather than the Senator's statement of what the intention of the language may be. The language certainly provides that a ship cannot be sold on terms or conditions more favorable than those on which it is sold to a citizen of the United States, a very proper provision.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let us take the alternative. Suppose we sell a ship to a foreigner and take a mortgage. Do we not want to be sure that the mortgage has all the validity, as to priority, and what not, that it would have in the particular country concerned?

Mr. GREEN. Certainly.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is all this tries to do.

Mr. GREEN. I think it does a great deal more. It is another of the blind provisions of the bill. I have had limited experience in the Senate, this being the beginning of my second term, but I do not remember any bill presented to the Senate which is an example of worse drafting than the bill before us. If the Senator from Maryland takes the position that he will agree to no modifications of the bill, then I do not see the use of this discussion. The only thing left to do is to propose amendment after amendment when the bill comes up for amendment, and debate them in turn as they arise. We are trying to perfect the bill by this discussion, but apparently the bill is so imperfect that the Senator in charge of it hesitates to accept any correction lest he may have to accept a mass of them. In view of that fact, I shall not make other criticisms.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I may say to the Senator from California that I was about to bring up the committee amendment, unless he has something special to offer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely desired to make an inquiry as to whether that was the pending business.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is the pending business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Huffman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capper	La Follette	Taft
Carville	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Walsh
Fulbright	Millikin	Wheeler
George	Mitchell	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Gossett	Murdock	Wiley
Green	Murray	Willis
Gurney	Myers	Wilson
Hart	O'Daniel	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EFFECTUATION OF PURPOSES OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944 IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 14, to strike out all after the word "in", down to and including "(2)", in line 15; on page 2, line 20, to strike out all after the word "security", down to and including the word "assets", in line 4 on page 3; and on page 3, in lines 8 and 9, to strike out the words "and others."

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BILBO, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HOEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few moments the pending amendment, and unless some other Senator desires to speak on the subject, I shall ask for a vote.

Irrespective of what may be the general conclusion which we reach in regard to the bill, I believe that this amendment, should receive favorable consideration. The amendment in short is this: The bill provides for sale and charter to citizens. It also provides for the sale of certain types of ships to foreigners, after citizens have been given a priority. There is no provisions in the bill for chartering any ship to foreigners. However, before the bill was reported from the committee we were requested by the State Department and by others to agree to a limited chartering power . The committee was favorable to that suggestion, but did not place such a provision in the bill. The committee directed me to offer the amendment on the floor of the Senate as a committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator personally favor the amendment providing for chartering to foreigners?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not favor chartering to foreigners generally, and I would certainly vote against such a provision. But let me explain the very abbreviated scope of this particular amendment.

Under the terms of lend-lease, probably 600 ships passed to various Allied Nations. On March 2 those ships will have to be returned to us by those nations unless we make new arrangements. The bill before us would permit foreign nations to purchase some of those ships. The State Department has urged that an additional power be given, in the discretion of the President of the United States—and it is so specified in the amendment—to charter those ships, not on the old basis of lease-lend, but according to the ordinary methods by which ships are chartered.

In substance, the situation is this: At this time we have some rather intricate international problems to solve. With respect to the relatively few ships which are involved, unless some other arrangement is made, we shall be required to say to Russia or to Great Britain, "Return the ships to us on March 2 next." The State Department would prefer that the President be given power, under certain conditions, to charter some of the ships. It is not a very big matter, but I believe that psychologically it is of real importance. At this time, while we are in so many intricate negotiations, it would be wise to give the Executive and our State Department as wide a range of authority as possible.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under such an arrangement foreign countries would be able to charter the ships, while Americans would be forced to buy. While the foreign nations were using those ships for a time, they would be able to build newer, faster ships, and then turn the old ones back to the United States. Would not that be grossly unfair to American shipping interests?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is possible in connection with any chartering policy. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that if there were any proposal by which foreigners could charter generally, I would be basically and fundamentally opposed to it. However, in the present situation there are special circumstances to be considered. The number of ships involved is not very large and nearly all of them are of old types. Furthermore, tankers are expressly excepted under the terms of the amendment. Under those circumstances I believe that we should go along with the State Department. I do not believe we should say to the State Department, "No matter how much you may want this authority at this particular time, you cannot have it, although the number of ships concerned is small." I believe that we ought to go along with the State Department.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is is not true that 660 ships are involved?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Approximately 600 ships are involved, and the equalization feature might include 50 or 60 more. It might involve 660 ships. I do not know whether the foreign nations would want to return them, buy them, or charter them. Let me emphasize the fact that some of the ships are Liberty ships, and others are very old. I cannot see how this relatively small number of ships, even though they might be chartered by foreigners, could constitute any serious menace to us in our competitive program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, 660 ships is not a small number. Secondly, American shipping interests will be under tremendous handicaps in competition with the shipping of other lands, because we pay higher wages and have higher costs all along the line. If American shipping interests are to have any of these ships, they will be forced to buy them. Why should we, even to a very limited degree, deliberately place our own people under a handicap by offering the people of other lands something that we do not offer our own people?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I believe the Senator is somewhat in error. We do permit our citizens to charter ships. We permit them to charter practically any kind of a ship except tankers. They have the right to buy or charter, even before we sell to a foreigner. So the very limited right proposed to be given, applying to only a relatively few ships—660 ships may seem like a large number, but relatively speaking it is not so large when we consider the whole picture—is very much less in scope than the rights and opportunities given to our own citizens to charter.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator says that he is opposed to the general chartering of ships to foreigners, but that within a limited scope he favors it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I favor it to the extent provided by the language of the amendment because we confront a practical question. On March 2 something must be done about those ships. I do not know what foreign nations will wish to do with them. The amendment would expressly give the President of the United States the power to charter some of those ships to foreigners, if he should see fit to do so, not under a continuation of the old lend-lease arrangement, but on terms no better than are available to our citizens. I am laying stress on the matter merely because under the circumstances, when we are so desirous of working out our international problems

as well as we can, if the State Department and the President believe that this provision would give them a certain amount of leeway, I feel that it would not constitute any great imposition on our shipping industry, and that we ought to accede to the request.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would not the same purpose, in a general way, be accomplished by selling them under very liberal terms?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It may be; but let me be somewhat specific. Suppose that on the 2d of March we were to say to Russia, which I believe has 124 of the ships, "You have had these ships under lend-lease. They have all been used in the interest of a common cause. The ships are not of very great value. On March 2 you pay us what we think the ships are worth, or send them back." We would have a perfect right to do that, but I do not like the idea of doing it at this time, when we have an urgent request from our State Department not to do it.

Mr. BRIDGES. For a long time we have been engaged in the process of giving things away. As the Senator knows, I have been in favor of lend-lease, and I am in favor of going to the relief of the needy, and rehabilitating some of the foreign countries. But I believe there is a limit. I do not believe that we should deliberately use American money to put certain classes of people in foreign nations into unfair competition with Americans.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. In this case Americans can either purchase or charter; and they can charter ships which would not under any circumstances be available to foreigners. It is a matter of opinion. I feel that under the circumstances we ought to go along with the suggestion of the State Department.

Mr. BRIDGES. Take the Senator's example of Russia. He stated that on a certain date we should be able to allow Russia to charter these ships. Suppose we should say, "On that date we will sell you these ships at a certain price, and we will arrange liberal terms with you for their sale." When they pass out of our hands, we are through with them. I cannot see the object of chartering when we could accomplish a somewhat similar result by sale.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is a great deal of force in what the Senator from New Hampshire says, but under the circumstances I prefer that leeway be given to the President and to the State Department.

Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from California desires to speak at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me ask whether the Senator from Maryland has yielded the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I was about to ask for action on my amendment, unless there is to be further discussion of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to discuss it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Very well; I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we discussed this amendment the other day. I think it is an important amendment; and even though in discussing it at this time I must repeat some of the remarks I made the other day, I feel that I should do so.

It seems to me that the amendment is a fundamental one. I do not believe a case has been made for chartering these vessels to foreign nations. I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland, the very able chairman of the subcommittee, that this matter was discussed in the full committee. I have gone along with the administration and have supported it in its measures for world-wide cooperation and for the UNRRA.

It seems to me we should examine this matter carefully and see whether it is necessary that we adopt this policy. The proposal to charter vessels to foreign countries was made before the House committee. To go back a little historically, let me say it is my understanding that at one time the State Department requested that such vessels be chartered to foreign nations on an unlimited scale. Now, the State Department has modified its request to the extent of asking that the chartering be limited to the 600 vessels now under consideration. The fact of the matter is that we shall never have a better market for the sale of these ships than we have today or, at least, at the time when the agreement expires, on March 2. If we are to sell the ships, I believe they should be sold at that time. If they are not sold at that time, I believe we shall find that they will be used by foreigners for a period of 1, 2, or 3 years, and then will be returned to us. When that is done, they will be tied up, as other Members of the Senate have pointed out, in various of our harbors and rivers. By that time we shall find that during the period when foreign nations were chartering our ships and using them, they were building faster and more modern vessels of their own which would enable them to compete with us and to take trade on the high seas away from us.

I think it is far better for them to be able to replenish their depleted merchant fleets—we all admit that they are depleted—by purchasing these vessels now and keeping them, rather than by using them under charter for a few years and then returning them to us; for if the vessels are chartered in that way and finally are returned to us, eventually we shall find ourselves in the possession of some outdated vessels, and the foreign nations will have more modern fleets than we shall then possess. I think it important that we keep the American merchant marine the most modern and the fastest merchant marine in the possession of any nation in the world.

The fact is that the terms on which foreign nations will be able to purchase these vessels are very favorable. They are on exact parity with the terms which will be offered to American citizens for the purchase of the vessels. Foreigners can arrange to purchase the vessels by making a 25-percent down payment, and many foreign nations have assets which could be used for such purposes. Certainly if we permit them to charter the vessels now, they will not purchase them. As a result, the ships ultimately will come back on our hands.

For that reason, I am strenuously opposed to the proposal made by the Senator from Maryland. I think it is most unsound, and I do not believe the Senate should merely take the word of the State Department. I know Mr. Clayton is very much interested in this particular matter, but I think the Senate of the United States has some responsibility of its own, and I am not willing to follow the State Department blindly in this regard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I concur in everything the Senator from California has so ably stated. I think he has done an excellent job in presenting his case, and he has done it in a very simple and direct manner. The issue has been drawn, and I hope we can have a record vote on the amendment. I think the amendment should be rejected, and on it I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Huffman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capper	La Follette	Taft
Carville	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
Gerry	Moore	White
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Gurney	Murray	Willis
Hart	Myers	Young
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I again ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. This bill provides for the sale of ships to citizens. It provides for the chartering of ships to citizens after they have been given an opportunity to buy. The bill also contains a provision to the effect that certain kinds of ships may be sold to foreigners. There is no provision in the bill for any chartering to foreigners. However, the State Department discussed the matter with the committee, and the committee reached the conclusion that it should adopt this amendment which provides, under certain conditions, for chartering to foreigners. The amendment was not incorporated in the bill, but I was directed to offer it as a committee amendment.

During the war a number of ships were turned over to our allies under terms of lend-lease at rentals which were more or less nominal. On March 2 all those ships will be returned to us unless other arrangements are made in connection with them. The bill contains a provision permitting foreigners to buy those

ships. The State Department, however, is very desirous that in addition to the right to buy approximately 600 ships which are now held by foreign nations under lend-lease, the President shall have the power to charter them if he sees fit to do so. In other words, putting it concretely, on March 2, instead of saying to Russia, for example, "You have approximately 120 ships. You must either return those ships to us or buy them at the price which we set," the State Department would like to have the President be given power to approve the chartering of those ships if he sees fit to do so. In that event, the matter might be considered in connection with other matters now before this Government.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the amendment relate only to ships already in the possession of other nations?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It relates only to ships which are in the possession of other nations, with a proviso which might cover possibly 50 or 60 ships more. Norway, for example, may have lost more heavily during the war than did some of the other Allied Nations. So in the chartering of ships, not only could the ships now in possession of Allied Nations be chartered, but Norway, for example, might be permitted to charter a sufficient number to bring her ships up to her prewar average with other Allied Nations.

Mr. BYRD. Where is that provided for in the bill?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is in the amendment which I have offered on behalf of the committee. It begins in line 4 on page 2 and continues into line 14.

Mr. BYRD. Is there a limit to be placed on the number of ships which may be chartered to nations which do not now have possession of ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am told that the maximum number which would be involved would be approximately 50. In other words, if other nations than those now having 600 should want to charter ships, there would be an addition of about 60 ships, or 10 percent of the total.

Mr. BYRD. Where is that covered in the amendment? In other words, what limitation is placed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The limitation is set forth in the reference to percentage.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator read it so that I may understand what it means? I do not understand it now.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I may say that the language is not very simple. I read as follows:

> The dead-weight tonnage of vessels chartered under this subsection to any chartering nation (and its nationals) at any time shall not exceed such percentage of the tonnage under charter or defense aid transfer on September 1, 1945, to the member nation which has suffered the largest merchant ship war losses, as the tonnage of war losses of such chartering nation is to the said war losses of such member nation, except that the amount chartered hereunder to the chartering nation may in any event be equivalent to the tonnage of vessels under charter or defense aid transfer to such nation on September 1, 1945. Charters of vessels under this subsection——

Mr. BYRD. I throw up my hands!

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, along the lines discussed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], some time ago about the preference, if we put it that way, given to the foreigner over the American in the matter of chartering alone, I invite the attention of the Senator from Maryland to the section relating to the chartering. The Americans are bound by section 5 (a) and 5 (b), so far as chartering is concerned, and is it not a fact that the Americans are also bound by section 5 (c), whereas foreign charterers are not bound by section 5 (c)?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think that would be so. We will have to assume that these ships, 600 or 660, as the case might be, would, in the discretion of the Maritime Commission, with the approval of the President of the United States in each specific instance, may be chartered, on terms which, however, are not to be more favorable than the terms on which they can be chartered to our own citizens.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator advise us as to what would be the financial return to our Government if the ships were chartered? What would we get in financial return?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The provision in the bill is that ships shall be chartered at not less than 15 percent of what is referred to as the statutory sales price. If the Senator wants me to explain what the statutory sales price is, I shall do so.

Mr. HILL. Is the 15 percent all, or is it for 1 year?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is annually.

Mr. HILL. In other words, then, if we charter one of these ships to a foreign country, for each year, such country has the use and possession of the ship under the charter it pays us 15 percent of the estimated sales value of the ship?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct. Many feel they would not want to charter under those circumstances but would prefer to buy.

Let me say to the Senator from California, there is provision that foreigners cannot charter on terms more favorable than those accorded to our own citizens.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Maryland has misunderstood the question, because he said it was a question of the sales price. I think possibly the Senator from Maryland had in mind that it was the statutory value.

Mr. HILL. Is it statutory value or the sales price?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me see the language the Senator has in mind.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that what I am trying to get at is the difference in the financial return to our Government between the chartering of a ship and the outright sale of a ship. My next question, if the Senator answers the first one, is asked in an effort to ascertain what the financial return would be to our Government where a ship was sold outright to a foreign government. That is what I am trying to get at—the difference in the financial return.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The provision in the bill is "15 percent of the statutory sales price." The Senator knows what 15 percent means. If the Government collects 15 percent for several years, the Senator can readily see that would be rather a substantial amount. The general opinion of those who have given this matter careful consideration is that the 15 percent is such a high rate that it will have rather a discouraging effect upon chartering rather than buying, and that runs all through the bill.

Mr. HILL. When we sell a ship, what kind of terms do we give the foreign government which may purchase the ship?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If we sell the ship, then we require a payment of 25 percent in cash.

Mr. HILL. Of the statutory sales value?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; at least 25 percent after the adjustment is worked out, then the mortgage would be for a period of not longer than 20 years, calling for annual amortization payments each year.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know how much the Government would get? Twenty-five percent is paid in cash?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; and the Government collects the remaining 75 percent in 20 equal annual payments.

Mr. HILL. If they had to pay 15 percent for every year the ship was chartered, it might be we would get more for chartering a ship, if the charter were to run for several years, than if we sold the ship.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is entirely true, and that is one reason why we fixed the rate fairly high, because all the way through the bill we are trying to get people to buy ships, whether they are citizens or noncitizens. We thought that fixing the charter rate fairly high would have a discouraging effect.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says the payment is 15 percent. Are there any expenses we have to bear? Do we have to recondition the ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The charterer gets a bare boat, and that, for instance, he has to pay all expenses, other than ordinary wear and tear.

Mr. HILL. Is there any expense on the Government of the United States for reconditioning the ships, or paying charges, or for depreciation, or anything of that kind?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; not depreciation.

Mr. HILL. Suppose something has to be replaced. Who would do that—the Nation which chartered the ship, or would this Government have to do it? Suppose it became necessary to install a new engine or boiler?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. In case of ordinary wear and tear, I should think the Government would have to pay.

Mr. HILL. Then the 15 percent is not clear?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; it is not clear, because it would be subject, more or less, I take it, to the usual arrangements of a charterer.

Mr. HILL. The 15 percent is based on approximately 35 percent of the cost?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Which means the statutory cost with a ceiling.

Mr. HILL. That is the statutory price?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is, 35 percent of the war cost.

Mr. LANGER. There are other deductions besides the 25 percent. Do not forget that.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that we have fixed the full price at 35 percent, and nothing can be below that. It may very well be—to answer the question of the Senator from Virginia specifically—15 percent based upon 35 percent of the war cost.

Mr. GREEN. May I ask the Senator whether it is not true that under certain conditions it would be less than 15 percent?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No, it would not be less than 15 percent. There is no provision that it can be less than 15 percent as to general operations.

Mr. HILL. So far as the statutory sales price is concerned, the base is the same, is it not, whether there is a sale or a charter?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; the base is the same. There is no difference whether a vessel is sold or chartered. The Senator knows how that statutory sales price is reached.

Mr. HILL. I cannot say that I do, but I shall not ask the Senator to explain it now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In keeping with the question the Senator from Virginia asked, What about the cost of drydocking the ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If it were ordinary wear and tear the owner would have to pay; otherwise, the charterer would have to pay.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In relation to the point raised by the Senator from Alabama, it seems to me that the question is not how much of a return we will get either from chartering or from the sale of these vessels to foreigners, because if they are solvent and if their credit is good we will be paid, and I think they will, if they are solvent, buy from us as soon as the ships are put on the market. If they are not solvent, they are going to pay us with their own money neither the charter hire nor the purchase price. They will be paying us with the money we will have to advance. So I think that is more or less of an academic question.

It seems to me the real problem is as to our long-term maritime policy, and the long-time maritime policy, as a matter of good judgment, it seems to me, hinges on whether they will have these vessels and use them and keep them, or whether they will use them only long enough to wring them dry, so to speak, and then return them to us, and in the meantime, perhaps with our own money, build a modern fleet of vessels that can compete with us a decade from now.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The argument which the Senator makes applies to any policy of chartering. So far as feasible, we have tried to discourage chartering and to encourage purchasing. Just a few moments ago I cited a special reason why this amendment was asked for. The State Department desires that this action be taken. The State Department desires that when in negotiation with these various nations, the President shall have the power, if he sees fit, to charter one or more of these vessels, instead of selling.

The Senator from California says they might buy them. Perhaps they would. If that is the case, the question is more or less academic. However, we would still have the advantage of the psychological effect, for whatever it is worth, of the President having this power.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, as I understand, he told the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that we are selling the ships for 35 percent of the prewar domestic cost. I call attention to line 6, on page 28, where we have this provision:

> If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel is not in class, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the cost of putting the vessel in class.

From what is this subtracted if it is not the statutory price?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, that is the only fair thing to do. Suppose there are three ships and one is in class, one is not in class because it is inferior to class, and one is a little bit above class. All these provisions do is to provide that there shall be an equalization in order to put the one ship in class. That I think is not an unreasonable feature.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. If that be true, does it not also follow that by the terms of each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) on page 28 and paragraph (4) on page 29, 35 percent may be subtracted from prewar domestic cost?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is a statutory price for these ships. Let us say there are three or four ships before a prospective buyer for consideration. One is in class and one is not in class. It is certainly not unreasonable to say that there may be different prices placed on them, or, in other words, if a certain ship is not in class, a sufficient amount should be allowed, or expended, to bring it up to class, whatever that may be. A vessel may have features that are above class. If a ship is very much below class we are not going to recondition it because we will have more ships, probably, than we can dispose of. But if it needs only a moderate amount of expense the work may be done. What is going to happen is that we will take up the ships which are in class and dispose of them before we undertake to dispose of the others. A ship may be so far out of class that it would not pay to recondition it, and it will not be reconditioned but will probably go on the scrap pile.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator said that there are cases where a ship might be sold above the 35-percent ceiling. Can the Senator give me the citation in the bill to line and page showing that it could be sold for more than the 35-percent floor?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I recall no specific statement by me on that point.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator stated that the Department of State has desired that there be a provision of the type described which, I understand, would authorize the chartering of any of these vessels to foreign nations or the nationals of such foreign nations. I did not, however, understand the Senator to state—perhaps he did so while I was out of the Chamber—the reason which was assigned by the Department of State for its desire? What reason has been assigned by the Department of State for its request or for its position?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not think the Department of State was very specific. Consider the general condition which exists today. We have in mind various matters for adjustment based upon negotiations with foreign powers at this time. The State Department believes that if the President had the power to charter these vessels such authority would be of advantage during these negotiations. That is about as specific as we can be. The Senator can readily see that when various matters are under consideration in negotiating with a foreign country the more talking points we have the better we can operate. That is about all.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, during the last few days we have had no difficulty whatever in passing two or three bills appropriating several hundred million dollars out of the Treasury. Now when we have before us one bill by which we hope to get a little money into the Treasury, we seem to be having a great deal of difficulty in securing action upon it.

The able junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has very briefly and most concisely stated his case against the amendment. In doing so he said he thought it was a highly important matter and that it really touched the fundamentals. With that I cannot agree, because the amendment is simply an exception to the rule of no charter to foreigners. I do not think it is important because of the small scope of its dimensions. It relates to only a few hundred ships, poor ships, of the lowest quality, perhaps, of any of our ships, which are now in the hands of foreign nations; but so far at least as some of the smaller European nations are concerned, it means a good deal to them.

The cost to us will be extremely small. The Maritime Commission has reported repeatedly to the committee that it does not want these ships back next March. If they do come back to the Commission next March they will simply constitute

that many more old and inferior ships to be cared for until such time as they acquire a scrap value.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted. It means little to us, and it will probably aid in our negotiations with certain foreign nations.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. A short time ago I asked the Senator from Maryland whether under any circumstances the charter hire could be less than 15 percent per annum, and he stated categorically "No." I beg to read from section 5, subparagraph (d), on page 32 of the bill:

(b) The charter hire for any vessel chartered under the provisions of this section shall be fixed by the Commission at such rate as the Commission determines to be consistent with the policies of this act, but, except upon the affirmative vote of not less than four members of the Commission, such rate shall not be less than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price (computed as of the date of charter).

So if we should adopt the proposed amendment, and if four members of the Commission should agree, they could fix the rate at 5 percent or any other amount less than 15 percent.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is entirely correct. I thought I had noted that exception in discussing the matter with the Senator from Rhode Island, and also the one in regard to passenger vessels, where a different arrangement can be worked out. It is possible for four members of the Commission to provide for a lower charter rate, but I thought the Senator had reference to operations generally under the bill. The Senator is entirely correct on that point.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I look at this picture, having sat in the committee and heard Admiral Land, I can agree that there is not much difference between the two propositions. But I remember distinctly Admiral Land saying, "We do not want those ships back. We have enough. It would simply mean difficult problems for us."

The State Department now asks for additional authority to be used apparently, in trying to solve some international problems. My difficulty is this: Admiral Land is going out of the picture; he has another job, a good paying job. Who is now going to run the show? If we give the President the authority we do not know who is going to do the job. But, after all, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] said, only 400 or 500 relatively poor ships are involved. That is the evidence. There are only a few really good ships involved.

On the one hand, we have the proposition of accepting 15 percent of the sales value in cash and 15 percent every year until the purchase price is completely paid. That means less than 7 years. On the other hand we have a provision for 25 percent down and—what is it—20 years in which to complete the payments?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Twenty annual payments; yes.

Mr. WILEY. It seems to me to be six of one and half a dozen of the other as to how to get the money into the Treasury in the quickest way. But I am seriously concerned about who is going to be on the job to see that only such deals are made as are proper.

There is a provision contained in the amendment which would be of benefit to certain small nations such as Norway, which at the beginning of the war was the third largest maritime nation. Norway lost a tremendous number of ships during the war. I do not think there will be any trouble about chartering ships to Norway, because her credit is good, and furthermore, as I understand, she has gold with which to pay. But there might be a small country, such as Greece, having a few of these ships, which could not raise the necessary cash, but which could raise 15 percent with the hope that by engaging in intercoastal trade they eventually could obtain the money with which to make the other payments. I can conceive of such a situation. I can understand that the State Department might take the position that the making of such a deal may sweeten the existing situation so that it could iron out a few of the differences which exist.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator say that he would do anything which would get the money into the Treasury in the quickest way? Did I correctly understand him to make that statement?

Mr. WILEY. I did not clearly understand the question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understood the Senator to say that he did not think there was a great deal of difference between the proposals, but that he was inclined to the one which would get the money into the Treasury of the United States the quickest.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not by any means think that a long-time charter proposition would get the money into the Treasury any more quickly than would an outright sale?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator must understand that the bill provides that if a purchaser pays 25 percent down he has 19 or 20 years in which to pay the remaining 75 percent. That is a long-time sale. Whereas the charter provision is that 15 percent a year shall be paid until the total amount is paid. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. WILEY. So I say we are probably running up a blind alley on that proposition.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. If I correctly understand the charter provision, a foreign country could terminate the charter practically at any time, at the end of any year.

Mr. WILEY. I am not familiar with the exact provisions; but let me tell the Senator what Admiral Land said——

Mr. HAWKES. I am talking about what the bill provides.

Mr. WILEY. In answer to a similar question he said, in effect, "My idea is that if any foreign country makes two payments, it has then paid enough so that there is no question about wanting to pay the balance." Substantially that was his statement. Fifteen percent a year would be 30 percent in 2 years. If the transaction were a sale, approximately the same amount would be paid in a 2-year period. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. HAWKES. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Twenty-five percent down plus another 5 percent would make exactly 30 percent.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me ask the Senator a question. If he were a foreigner chartering a ship, and he knew that he had to have speed, the first thing he would do would be to build ships with the necessary speed, and ships of the type he desired. At the first possible opportunity he would dump the chartered ships back onto our Government, would he not?

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is partially correct. But let me say that there are a number of other elements in this equation. First, foreign nations have not the materials. Second, they have not the credit. Third, they have not the ability. Most of it has been ruined. The Senator refers to speed. Aside from Great Britain, it will be years before any foreign nation can build any great number of ships. I believe that that is substantially the testimony. Other nations are practically entirely wiped out on the sea. That applies to China. It applies to the islands of the Pacific, and to practically all the European nations except possibly Norway and Sweden.

I remember, after the last war, going down the Hudson River and seeing hundreds of ships tied up, absolutely rotting. That is what Admiral Land had in mind when he said that we do not want all the ships we now have. I believe we have 6,000 of them. It is my understanding that we are trying to sell 2,000, keep 2,000 for a possible emergency, and in some way dispose of the remaining 2,000 to our citizens.

We have a tremendous surplus of materials. Ships are like powder in that they deteriorate rapidly. When I saw that Admiral Land had a clear vision of this problem, I said, "Thank God, we have him." A few days later I learned that we did not have him. My problem is, Who will be big enough to handle this job so that America will get what is right?

Mr. HAWKES. Apparently the Senator agrees with me that what we wish to do is to get these ships out of our system, so to speak, and have them stay out to as great an extent as possible, over and above those which our own people need.

Mr. WILEY. We need 2,000 for our merchant shipping. That has been definitely decided. We need 2,000 of the best ships to be laid up for any emergency which may arise, so that we will not be caught again, as we were caught this time, without an adequate merchant marine. That leaves 2,000 or more ships

which we might well dispose of. As I have said, ships deteriorate very rapidly. That is why members of the Committee on Commerce believe that they have arrived at an equitable basis, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Maryland. The bill provides what the percentage shall be.

But there is another element. The State Department sees in the picture an added instrumentality to effectuate peace. When we are thinking about handling surplus goods which are of no particular value to us, if we can get 15 percent a year, in 6 years they will be practically paid for. Admiral Land says that we do not want the old ships. Other nations have them and need them. They are their lifeblood, and if we cannot sell them, he believes that we should charter them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I thought I understood the Senator to say that ships chartered to foreign operators could be utilized in our coastwise trade. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. WILEY. Not at all.

Mr. WHITE. Then let me ask the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Maryland a question. In the charter of ships by the Maritime Commission to foreign nations is there an option to purchase?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Maryland will have to answer that question.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not believe that up to this time any contracts have been drafted, but I doubt very much whether such a provision would be incorporated. I believe that the arrangement would be an ordinary straight charter.

Mr. WHITE. I was not at all sure whether such a provision was in the charter or not.

Mr. WILEY. I see no reason why it could not be incorporated in the contract.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It could be included.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say that ships chartered to foreigners could be utilized in our coastwise trade.

Mr. WILEY. I did not intend to make such a statement, and I do not believe I did.

Mr. WHITE. Probably the Senator did not. I simply did not hear him accurately.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question: Does the 15-percent provision in connection with chartering to foreign operators, whether they be in the United States or whether they be outside, give any advantage to the foreign operators over American operators and owners?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not know whether I can answer that question categorically without further information from the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Could American owners and operators charter at the same 15-percent rate?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. The provision calls for at least 15 percent, and it applies only to the few ships which foreign nations now have. However, under existing law, our citizens can charter practically anything we have.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand, this provision would not place the American operator, owner, stevedore, or drydock at a disadvantage?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. On the contrary, the amendment attempts to grant a power which is very small in comparison with the rights and privileges of the domestic operator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me ask one further question: Could any ships chartered by foreigners be used in the territorial waters of the United States, in the intercoastal trade, or trade through the Gulf?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I certainly assume not. That subject is covered by existing statutes. There is no specific provision in this bill, but I cannot conceive of such vessels being so used, unless our laws on the subject were changed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would this bill in any way change those laws?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Is it true that the American charterer of a ship would pay, in addition to the 15 percent, one-half of the cumulative net voyage profit in excess of 10 percent per annum? If that be true, as I am informed it is, is it not true that the American citizen would pay more than the foreign charterer of a ship?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is no provision in this bill on that subject. During the war we have had limitations upon profits in excess of 10 percent. Under certain conditions the excess profit from various operations must be returned, but that has been more or less a part of the general war program. I think it would be a little difficult for us to try to work out in many respects a peace program and compare it with our operations during the war, when our ships were pooled, and when nearly all the ships were operated by the Government through various companies as agents.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I believe that the import of the question of my colleague was whether or not American shipping interests would be under any handicap in favor of foreign interests. Is the Senator aware of any such handicap?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not know of any such handicap.

Mr. TOBEY. Whatever it applies to, do we take second best? Is some foreign country on top, and are we on a lower stratum?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; this has reference only to the relatively few old ships in the possession of foreign nations. Throughout the bill, the provisions for purchase by noncitizens are all junior to the rights and opportunities of our own citizens. Our own citizens would have the right to buy or charter before there could be any opportunity for foreigners even to purchase. That is true in regard to the provisions of the bill generally.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The question seems very simple to me. With respect to the ships now under lend-lease, if any American operator wishes any of them or all of them he has priority. As a practical matter, probably there will not be a single bid. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] has pointed out, most of them are old ships which we do not want back. All this amendment would do would be to allow the Maritime Commission the flexibility which the Senator from Maine mentioned, either to sell or charter. Whether Admiral Land is in charge of the administration, or whether Mr. McKeough, against whom some Senators voted, is in charge, or whoever is in charge, first of all he will try to sell the ships. If he cannot sell them he will try to charter them, and he will charter them at the best price that can be obtained. Some countries can pay more than others. In any event, we will receive 15 percent, and if the ships were chartered for a period of 3 years, that would bring as much money into the Treasury of the United States as though they were sold outright. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Washington quoted the Senator from Connecticut as saying that the Maritime Commission had stated that we do not want the ships back. Would we not be less likely to get them back if the transaction were a sale than if it were a charter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that is true. All we are doing is to make the chartering operation permissive, through the Maritime Commission, subject to the approval of the President of the United States. I must assume that the Maritime Commission wishes to sell as many ships as it can. We can either give the Maritime Commission the authority both to sell and charter, or we can say, "You may only sell the ships." According to the testimony of those who should know, that would mean that the bulk of the ships would have to be returned. Most of them are ships which we do not need and cannot use. When the war was just beginning in Europe, many old river boats and small craft were gathered up and sent to the Baltic and the North Sea. Some of them were old when they reached there. Many of them even had difficulty crossing the Atlantic. Now they can be used by Russia, Great Britain, Norway, Greece, and other countries in some of the inland waters and in the Mediterranean Sea. None of them will go into world competition, so far as we can determine. Some of the countries need them. Some of the countries cannot pay for the vessels and some countries would like to charter them. They can charter on the basis of 25 percent, according to the equities of the case.

We cannot lay down a hard-and-fast rule, but we can say that they shall not be chartered on terms more favorable than those which can be obtained by American citizens. That is all we can say.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Washington if it is not a fact that, so far as the chartering of such vessels to citizens of the United States is concerned, section 5 (c) of the committee amendment, which provides that "the provisions of sections 708, 709, 710, 712, and 713 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable to charters made under this section," is binding on charters to American citizens, but is not binding on charters to foreigners. When we examine the Merchant Marine Act referred to, we find that section 709 (a) reads as follows:

SEC. 709. (a) Every charter made by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of this title shall provide that whenever, at the end of any calendar year subsequent to the execution of such charter, the cumulative net voyage profits (after payment of the charter hire reserved in the charter and payment of the charterer's fair and reasonable overhead expenses applicable to operation of the chartered vessels) shall exceed 10 percent per annum on the charterer's capital necessarily employed in the business of such chartered vessels, the charterer shall pay over to the Commission, as additional charter hire, one-half of such cumulative net voyage profit in excess of 10 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the cumulative net profit so accounted for shall not be included in any calculation of cumulative net profit in subsequent years.

So that provision does not apply to foreigners.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The reason for that provision is that when the Maritime Commission charters a vessel, it still is owned by the United States Government and, accordingly, the Maritime Commission can enforce a limitation as to the amount of profit which can be made on the operation of the ship by American citizens. However, if a ship is chartered by foreigner, we could not enforce such a limitation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I simply wish to point out that in that event Americans would be under a disadvantage.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the Senator is assuming that in chartering our ships to foreigners, the Maritime Commission, whoever its members might be, would make a charter under ridiculous terms and would not be alive to the situation, and that on such a charter a foreigner would be able to make more profit than an American would, if chartering similar vessels. I cannot assume that to be possible, regardless of the personnel of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not even with McKeough there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; not even with McKeough there, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it is rather difficult to consider these matters at this particular moment without bearing in mind the fact that we have reference, more or less, to wartime conditions. I think everyone will agree that it will be desirable for us to study our whole maritime policy, give it careful consideration, and revamp our legislation on a peacetime basis.

As the Senator knows, in this measure we tried, as far as possible, to get away from anything which did not seem to be strictly relevant to the question of the sale or charter of these ships. But I believe, and I am sure the Senator from California agrees with me in this opinion, that now we should begin to consider our entire maritime policy, with the idea not only of giving it fresh consideration, but possibly changing it in whatever ways peacetime conditions may seem to require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland, on behalf of the committee, proposing to insert a new subsection in the committee amendment, on page 35, after line 7.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland whether the language in both the amendment and in the bill could not have been simplified.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. So far as the language in the amendment is concerned, I have discussed it with several draftsmen, and they seem to find some difficulty in phrasing it simply because it is what might be called a progressive comparison. I think the intent of the amendment is very clear, but I am not particularly proud of the language.

Mr. BYRD. I venture the assertion that no Member of the Senate, with the possible exception—I say "possible"—of the Senator from Maryland, understands this amendment. I say that when an amendment is prepared in this complex and confusing manner any Member of the Senate is justified in voting against it, and I intend to do so, just as a protest against the presentation to us of an amendment which no one can understand.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is the part to which the Senator from Virginia objects what might be called the additional equalization feature? I have stated its purpose. The rest of the language seems quite simple.

Mr. BYRD. I object because I cannot understand the amendment. Perhaps my failure to understand it is because of the character of my mental processes; but, at any rate, I do not understand it, and no Member of the Senate can explain it to me. I do not think any Member of the Senate can rise from his seat now and explain it to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] on behalf of the Commerce Committee.

The amendment offered by Mr. RADCLIFFE on behalf of the committee is as follows:

In the committee amendment on page 35, after line 7, insert:

"(e) Any vessels (except tankers) owned by the United States which on September 1, 1945, were bare-boat chartered or otherwise transferred as defense aid by the War Shipping Administration to any member nation of the United Nations under authority of the act entitled 'An act to promote the defense of the United States,' approved March 11, 1941, as amended (55 Stat. 31), and vessels (except tankers) available for sale to noncitizens pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of this section may, when authorized by the President, be bare-boat chartered by the Commission to any such nation (hereinafter referred to as 'chartering nation') or to nationals of such nation, for operation under the laws of such nation. (The dead-weight tonnage of vessels chartered under this subsection to any chartering nation (and its nationals) at any time shall not exceed such percentage of the tonnage under charter or defense aid transfer on September 1, 1945, to the member nation which has suffered the largest merchant ship war losses, as the tonnage of war losses of such chartering nation is to the said war losses of such member nation, except that the amount chartered hereunder to the chartering nation may in any event be equivalent to the tonnage of vessels under charter or defense aid transfer to such nation on September 1, 1945. Charters of vessels under this subsection shall be at such rate and on such commercial terms as the Commission determines to be appropriate in the circumstances but not at rates or on terms more favorable than those prescribed under sections 5 (a) and (b) of this act for charter of vessels to citizens. After enactment of this section no vessels available for charter under this subsection may be chartered to persons who are not citizens of the United States as defined in section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, except under the provisions of this subsection."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. Under the circumstances I am obliged to withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and will vote. I vote "yea." I am not advised how either of the two Senators to whom I have referred would vote if they were present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senators from New York [Mr. MEAD and Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], are detained at important committee meetings.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], are detained on official business at various Government departments.

I wish to announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business, as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is detained at a hearing of the Pearl Harbor Investigation Committee.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—28

Chavez	Huffman	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Downey	La Follette	Reed
Eastland	McKellar	Saltonstall
Ellender	McMahon	Smith
Fulbright	Magnuson	Taylor
Hart	Maybank	Tunnell
Hayden	Murdock	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Murray	
Hill	Myers	

NAYS—36

Austin	Gurney	Russell
Ball	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hoey	Stanfill
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Tobey
Buck	Knowland	Tydings
Bushfield	Langer	Vandenberg
Byrd	McClellan	Wheeler
Capper	Millikin	Wherry
Carville	Moore	White
Gerry	Revercomb	Willis
Green	Robertson	Young

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken	Ferguson	Morse
Andrews	George	O'Daniel
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Bankhead	Gossett	Pepper
Barkley	Guffey	Stewart
Brewster	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McCarran	Wagner
Capehart	McFarland	Walsh
Connally	Mead	Wilson
Cordon	Mitchell	

So the amendment offered by Mr. RADCLIFFE on behalf of the committee to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment at the end of section 4 it is proposed to insert a new subsection to read as follows:

(d) Any citizen engaged in the Alaskan trade of the United States having the qualifications set forth in subsection (a) hereof may make application to the Commission for the construction and purchase of a vessel of special design to be used on any service, route, or line in the Alaskan trade not included in the provisions of section 501 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. If the Commission determines that there is no war-built vessel available for sale suitable, or which can be converted under this act to make it suitable, to meet the needs of such service, route, or line in the Alaskan trade and that the construction thereof would aid in carrying out the purposes of this act, and approves such application by affirmative vote of four members, it is authorized to construct a vessel of special design, approved by it, and sell such vessel to the applicant under the terms and conditions of this act, including section 8: *Provided, however*, That no provision of this subsection shall apply after December 31, 1947.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not have the same difficulty in understanding this amendment that it had in understanding the previous one. I will try and make it very simple.

Under the provisions of the pending bill there will be available ships for all the American operators who operated under the Maritime Commission during the war, and who used either their own or Government-built ships.

The three steamship companies operating to Alaska used their own ships during the war. Their combined fleet consisted of 23 ships, 9 of which were sunk. All the ships are now old. The youngest ship is 17 years old, and the average age is 25 years. Of the ships which will be subject to disposal by the Maritime Commission, whether this bill becomes law or not, none are adaptable to the Alaskan trade. In other words, the Alaskan ship operator is not in position to buy, nor can he under any circumstances buy any of the available ships which will be disposed of under this bill, or by the Maritime Commission.

All the amendment proposes to do—and it is limited to the Alaskan trade—is to make it permissible for the Maritime Commission, upon a showing by the Alaskan operators, to construct or alter a ship which is suitable and adaptable to the Alaskan trade, and sell it to those operators under the same terms and conditions as are prescribed with reference to other operators, and to other ships which will be disposed of under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. President, the Alaskan situation is a difficult one. If the Alaskan operators should be required to construct new ships at present construction costs—and new ships must be constructed because of the deterioration which has taken place in the Alaskan fleet by loss during the war, or the pounding which the ships received—it would probably be necessary to increase the freight rates to Alaska from 80 to 90 or possibly 96 percent. According to prewar figures, there are approximately 60,000 people in Alaska. In 1940 the water freight rate to Alaska amounted to more than $8,000,000. It can readily be seen how much this amounts to per person.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. How many operators are engaged in the operation of vessels in the Alaskan trade?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are three main operators and about 16 small operators who operate from port to port in Alaska.

Mr. BRIDGES. What percentage of the total business is done by the three main operators?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Offhand, I should say that they handle about 90 percent of the business from the States to Alaska.

Mr. BRIDGES. What are the names of the operators to whom the Senator has referred?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Alaskan Steamship Co., the Alaskan Transportation Co., and the Northland Transportation Co.

Mr. BRIDGES. If, without going the whole distance in regard to the Senator's amendment, those operators can purchase ships from the Maritime Commission, why should they not refit their own ships so as to make them adaptable to the Alaskan waters without putting that obligation on the Maritime Commission before the ships are sold?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I have said, the average age of the present ships plying between the States and Alaska is 25 years. The youngest ship in the entire fleet is 17 years old. Required is a combination passenger and freight carrying ship. In the pending bill we do limit the tonnage from 2,000 tons for disposal to 1,500 tons. That will give to the small Alaskan operator an opportunity to buy what is called N3 ships, which are very small and are used in operations between the various ports. But it does not meet the problem at all.

The Alaskan operators are in foreign competition because despite the $8,000,000 freight load which was carried by the three major lines to whom I have referred, and the tonnage carried between ports, more than one-third of the total freight carried to Alaska in 1940 was carried by the Canadian Pacific Railroad and the Canadian National Railroad.

At the present time freight rate hearings are being held in Seattle for the purpose of increasing the freight rates on freight shipped from the United States to Alaska. The Department of the Interior and the people of Alaska are opposing any increase because the rate is already excessive.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It has been our traditional policy for at least a hundred years that the coastwise trade of the United States—and that includes trade to Alaska—should be carried in American ships, and that foreign ships should not be permitted to enter that trade. I am curious to know under what authority and under

what recent provision of law Canadian vessels are in that trade.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canadian vessels may go from a foreign port to an Alaskan port.

Mr. WHITE. They go from Vancouver——

Mr. MAGNUSON. From Vancouver and Victoria and Prince Rupert to Alaska, and the people in the East have been shipping over the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National to those Canadian ports.

Mr. WHITE. I did not recall the conditions. If I may ask one more question, would this provision, if it should be adopted, give to a vessel built under the terms of present legislation a construction differential subsidy?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would to those in Alaskan trade, upon a showing to the Maritime Commission that there was no other ship available for that trade, or no other ship adaptable for that trade.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Have we ever subsidized our intercoastal trade on the Atlantic coast or on the Lakes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No.

Mr. TAFT. Why should we do it, then, for shipping between this country and Alaska?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because we are in foreign competition.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why we are in foreign competition. No foreign ship can run between Seattle and Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But one-third of the coastwise trade to Alaska is handled by the Canadians.

Mr. TAFT. From Canada.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From Canada, yes, but it merely goes in transit from Canada. Half of the heavy trade on the Vancouver docks intended for Alaska originates in the eastern part of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but it seems to me we are asked to depart fundamentally from the whole principle that has governed American intercoastal shipping, and I do not think we should do it through an amendment which has not been considered by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This has been considered by the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Has the committee recommended it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee made no recommendation on it. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I have been practically living and sleeping in the committee with this amendment. I am there every day. It has been considered by the Maritime Commission, and considered by everyone concerned. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, a construction subsidy in intercoastal trade, has never been a part of our maritime policy, but we are in foreign competition, and the rates are now excessive, and unless this is done, I do not know how we are to supply Alaska. I do not know how a person living in Alaska will be able to stand the situation. They can hardly stand it now. The provision is merely permissive. A showing will have to be made.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the bill does not purport to deal with the construction of new ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Is not the bill expressly confined to the disposition of old ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Did not the Senator in charge of the bill state that we would later consider the whole question of the extent to which we would subsidize the construction of ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, but because of the emergency of the situation I am bringing the matter up now, and I assure the Senator that there is an emergency, and that all the facts and all the information we can get, and facts of my own knowledge, indicate that this action is necessary. That is why I am so anxious to have the amendment adopted. I do not know what we are to do with the old ships now in the Alaskan trade and how we are going to supply Alaska unless some such amendment as this is adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Under the bill would it be possible for the Commission to carry out the project of building a floating salmon cannery for the Alaskan canning fisheries, which was started by the RFC?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the Senator from Ohio is talking about.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that in Seattle the RFC has been financing the reconstruction of a boat into a floating salmon cannery, to help in the salmon fishery off the coast of Alaska, that the construction was partly completed, and has since been stopped. I may be wrong about the agency. I wondered whether under the proposed amendment the RFC could go on with that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Complicated as the bill is, I do not think it includes canneries.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has indicated that he talked about this matter to members of the committee. Did it come to a vote in the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not bring it to a vote because the committee is very familiar with it, and furthermore, of course, the committee was reluctant, as the Senator from Ohio pointed out, to depart from a historic policy.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator has just said, I take it, means he did not press it to a vote because he was fearful of the outcome of a vote in the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know that I was fearful of the outcome, but inasmuch as the committee was anxious to get the bill to the floor of the Senate, I did not want, in effect, to hold up the committee, because I knew I would have to explain the matter in any event. I am sure the members of the committee will agree with everything I have said on the floor, but whether or not we should make this departure for the benefit of a situation which exists in Alaska, an intolerable situation which grows worse and worse every day, I do not know. I cannot think of any other solution. If a construction subsidy is necessary, we are going to have to do it anyway, sooner or later, and I think we should do it now.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have a good deal of sympathy with the Senator from Washington. I know something about the Alaskan situation, having made voyages to Alaska twice in my life, but I confess I dislike to see broken down a traditional policy of the United States which is against the subsidizing of vessels in our domestic coastwise trade. I do not know where the limits of departure from our precedents will be if we once start on that road.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. I, too, am familiar with the situation, and it is a bad one. The Senator from Washington might well have said that one of the difficulties lay in certain inability under which the two lines of which he speaks suffered, so that they were not able to engage in winter trade. The trade is altogether summer trade, and, unlike the Canadian lines, which went to the West Indies, the ships to which he refers had pretty much to lie up in the winter, consequently their freight rates were very high.

The situation undoubtedly is a bad one. My suggestion to the Senator is that, instead of a construction subsidy, the solution might better be through the ownership and operation of a special line between our ports and Alaska somewhat similar to the Panama Steamship Co. line.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a further word about the situation. I repeat, I have great sympathy with the people of Alaska in their desire to have better transportation than is now afforded them. But I confess I become a little restive under what our Canadian neighbors have done to us in the past in the shipping field.

Of course, we have heard about the preferential tariffs of Canada. I do not know about the situation at the moment, but there was a time not so long ago when Canada offered a preferential tariff on all goods that entered Canada by way of Canadian sea or river ports. That was a direct, overt, open, notorious effort to grant further discriminatory tariffs against goods transported in vessels coming up to our northeastern ports, unloading at New York or Boston or Portland, or some other city, then moving into Canada by rail.

That was not all that was done. I remember a further incident, because I spent considerable time working on it some years ago, and introduced a bill dealing with the subject. It must have been 20 years ago. It was interesting to see what Canada did to us in conjunction with Australia. Goods originating in the United States, we will say at Buffalo, would move to Seattle or to San Francisco by American railroad and then move by American vessel to Australia. When the goods reached Australia and duties were assessed upon them by the Australian Government, that government included in the cost to which the tariff rate applied the cost of the rail transportation from Buffalo to our Pacific ports. But if the same goods had crossed the line from Buffalo to a Canadian port, then

moved up to Vancouver by Canadian rail, and then moved on by Canadian ships to Australia, the cost of the rail haul in Canada was not included in the cost of the goods to which the duties were to be applied.

There are other instances, but those were two specific instances which came immediately to my mind of discriminations directly against American business and American ships by our Canadian neighbors. In all ordinary circumstances I would be found willing to give them quid pro quo, if that is the correct term.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It has been somewhat difficult for members of the committee to consider this matter and pass on its intrinsic merits. We realize the serious situation which exists as to the Alaska trade and we realize that something must be done to help in that situation. But the members of the committee were confronted with several obstacles. One was the fact that so far as possible we were trying to keep out of the bill everything except what pertained to the sale or chartering of ships. That was one feature. Another was that the adoption of the amendment would mean a departure from our traditional policy as to subsidies. Some of us at least felt that this was a matter which required very careful study before any action should be taken.

Personally I should be delighted to do anything suitable to help work out a solution, but I feel, if we are going to make such a far-reaching departure from our customary policy, that the matter should be examined carefully from various other angles. I do not know whether we should give any consideration to Puerto Rico or Hawaii or other countries with respect to which a similar point might be presented. It may very well be that the situation as to them is totally different. But some of the members of the committee—and I believe there was no vote taken on the subject—felt that before taking this plunge, before taking any action whatever, we should attempt to go into the whole situation more carefully.

I wish to assure the Senator from Washington that I shall be glad to do anything on earth I can that is reasonable to help work out a plan to alleviate the plight in which the people of the west coast find themselves, especially those of the State of Washington and of Alaska. If a bill is filed with that objective in view it will be studied carefully, I am sure, and so far as I have anything to do with it, its consideration will be expedited. But the obstacles I referred to seemed so serious that we hesitated to give relief although it was obvious that relief was needed very badly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if his amendment contemplates the building of new ships by the Maritime Commission and then their sale at a substantial discount below the actual cost, as we propose to sell the surplus ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The sale of the ships would be on the same basis, or in the same ratio, as that applying to the sale of a new ship which was built during wartime.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, it is proposed that the Maritime Commission now build a new ship and sell it to a shipping company on Puget Sound or the Pacific coast at, let us say, 35 or 40 percent of cost, or whatever the yardstick is which is provided by the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On the same basis as new ships are now being sold. There are several new ships being sold on exactly the same basis.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Washington that, if the amendment prevails, I shall try in some way to get an amendment of the same character adopted in respect to farm machinery. I understand that in Africa and in other places the Government has a great many combines which it is proposing to sell as surplus material. If there are not sufficient of them to supply the farmers I shall propose an amendment providing that the Government build combines and sell them to the farmers of the Midwest at 35 percent of the cost.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that his comparison is ridiculous. We are talking about three lines which are supplying one of the greatest Territories of the United States. All we are asking for Alaska is the same consideration that every ship operator in the country is receiving. The ships which were used in the Alaskan trade during the war are old; they are worn out. Nine such ships were sunk. The operators are in such a position that they cannot buy ships as other operators can. They are not engaged purely in intercoastal traffic. They are in foreign competition. In addition, the United States Army built a large port at Prince Ruppert, a supply depot. That will be turned over to Canada. That port has one of the finest facilities for handling freight in America. From Prince Ruppert cargoes can be barged to Alaska through the inland passage. Unless some relief is provided our shipping will be completely eliminated from the Alaskan trade. If the Senator from Iowa wants that to happen, very well.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Washington that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All we are asking is help for Alaskan shipping.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If we are going to adopt a philosophy of this kind and subsidize this particular business with new ships at a fraction of their cost, at Government expense, then certainly those who produced the food in the Middle West for this war, who wore out their machinery and now have none, and who cannot obtain replacements, are certainly entitled to have combines and tractors and other farm machinery built new by the Government and sold to them at 35 percent of the cost.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa knows that that is the way we are disposing of new vessels under the bill. There are many new ships being sold. We only ask for Alaska the opportunity to buy them on the same basis as other companies buy them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those were new ships which were constructed as a part of the war effort, and are now in fact surplus.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those are not the new ships which it is now proposed in peacetime to construct by way of a specific benefit to some shipping line. There is a vast difference between the new ships that are on hand, which were produced as a part of the war effort, and which we must dispose of, and the new construction of ships as a direct subsidy to some company for its operation. That is my idea.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Intercoastal trade is not the only thing involved. The Alaskan trade is somewhat in a twilight zone between our foreign competition and purely intercoastal operations. The amendment only makes it permissive that the Maritime Commission, upon a proper showing, may do this. I do not know that any new ships will be provided for the Alaskan trade. We have to prove our point in order to obtain any. But I do know that if the Alaskan trade cannot operate except under excessive rates—or, for that matter, the Puerto Rican trade or the trade of any of our other Territories—Congress will be obliged to subsidize them sooner or later anyway.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Washington that under certain circumstances and in certain instances, when all the facts are shown, I might not at all oppose a reasonable and proper and businesslike subsidy to the international shipping operations of this country if it becomes necessary to do so in order to keep our bottoms on the high seas, to keep our food moving, and our general industry alive. We have done it before when we had to do it. We may have to do it again. But if we are to adopt that philosophy of subsidy as an economic policy, then I should like to see it discussed as an over-all shipping picture, and not start out piecemeal with building ships for this one and not for that one. The South American trade can just as well ask for the same consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All I can say is, of course, that there is no necessity for it in the other trades because there are hundreds of new or practically new ships available to them. There is no ship available for the Alaskan trade, unless something is done by way of altering a ship. The situation up there is acute. It is intolerable. The Maritime Commission does not know what to do in respect to the rate hearing before them, because there seems to be justification under the arithmetics of the operation of those lines perhaps to raise the rates. That would make the situation even worse. Of course water transportation is the only way we have of reaching Alaska. Canadian competition is even greater than it was prior to the war. At that time Canadian ships handled one-third of the trade to Alaska.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. There was a time when I thought I knew something about our shipping laws, but I have not been a member of the Commerce Committee for several years, and one loses his contacts and his touch. Since the discussion arose I have been sort of groping around in my mind to recall a provision which I thought was in the law. I wonder if the Senator has considered the meaning and the authority of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. I read a bit of it:

SEC. 509. Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission for aid in the construction of a new vessel to be operated in the domestic trade—

Then, omitting the exception, it proceeds:

If such application is approved by the Commission, the vessel may be constructed and sold to such applicant under the same terms and conditions as are provided in this act for the construction and sale of vessels to be operated in foreign trade, but no construction subsidy shall be allowed (except for the cost of national-defense features which shall be paid by the Commission).

Then it proceeds and specifies the terms and conditions of payment by the purchaser of the vessel. I assume that section is still the law, and as this section bears on it, I wondered if the Senator had taken that problem up with the Maritime Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment would, in effect, make the exception for the Alaskan trade referred to in that section. The language of my amendment was drawn by the Maritime Commission itself.

Mr. WHITE. Apparently under that section anyone engaged in the Alaskan trade could make application now to the Maritime Commission for aid in the construction of a vessel to be engaged in that trade. It strikes me that the Senator's amendment is not necessary, but that there is authority and there is hope for him under section 509.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Maritime Commission construes that section to mean that no construction subsidy should be allowed.

Mr. WHITE. That is what it says, that no construction subsidy should be allowed. But there are very reasonable terms of payment provided for, and there is the authority for the Maritime Commission to build a ship for an American applicant.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And with a long-time payment.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But we do not want to ask for anything more than other operators are receiving, and we want to limit the terms, of course, to what the other operators are entitled to. I think the Senator from Maine is correct in his statement. Frankly, I did not like to bring this amendment into a ship-disposal bill, but the condition is, as I said before, not only acute, but is bad, as the Senator from Connecticut has said. We have simply got to find some way out.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. As suggested by the Senator from Maryland, this matter came up in the committee. I believe every member of the committee was sympathetic toward the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Washington. We felt a special case could be made for it. I personally feel that when we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars to pay the obligation which we feel we owe to the Philippines, we should not neglect that great outpost called Alaska. It has contributed vast wealth to this Nation in gold and furs and salmon. The committee felt, however, that the amendment was not at this time appropriate.

Let me say to the Senator from Washington that I feel that there are ships which, by the expenditure of a little extra money, could be converted under the terms of this bill so that shipping companies could buy them on the 35-percent basis. I believe that that avenue has not been thoroughly explored.

On the other hand, with Alaska on the air route of the world, with increased travel by air, and undoubtedly the increased settlement which will take place there, as well as the increased facilities, it seems to me that the Government of the United States cannot afford to let Alaska down. I am glad to say to the distinguished Senator that after the passage of this bill I should like to see further consideration given to that thought. I feel that he will find Senators on both sides of the aisle sympathetic toward the proposal. It is a serious question. We owe an obligation not only to Alaska, but to the west coast, and to our own shippers who wish to use American railroads rather than Canadian railroads. It is a matter which calls for thorough study. Personally I feel that there are sufficient ships. If it can be shown that there is not an adequate number of ships which could be converted for the Alaskan trade under the terms of the pending bill, I am sure that the Senator will have a favorable hearing before the appropriate committee and before this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Downey	Hoey
Ball	Eastland	Huffman
Bankhead	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Barkley	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Bilbo	Fulbright	Kilgore
Bridges	George	Knowland
Brooks	Gerry	La Follette
Buck	Gossett	Langer
Bushfield	Green	Lucas
Byrd	Gurney	McClellan
Capper	Hart	McKellar
Carville	Hawkes	McMahon
Chavez	Hayden	Magnuson
Connally	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Donnell	Hill	Mead
Millikin	Robertson	Tydings
Mitchell	Russell	Vandenberg
Moore	Shipstead	Wagner
Murdock	Saltonstall	Walsh
Murray	Smith	Wheeler
Myers	Stanfill	Wherry
O'Daniel	Taft	White
O'Mahoney	Taylor	Wiley
Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah	Willis
Reed	Tobey	Wilson
Revercomb	Tunnell	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, inserting a new subsection at the end of section 4 of the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

It appears to the Chair that the "noes" have it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

OPENING OF PALESTINE FOR FREE ENTRY OF JEWS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate following today's session I may report from the Committee on Foreign Relations the so-called Palestine resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, authority is granted.

Subsequently, Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44), and submitted a report (No. 855) thereon:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended, and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they

may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, in line 18 of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following before the period:

and that in carrying out the measures of this act, nothing shall be done to hinder or restrict lawful, independent steamship operation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I think the substance of that amendment is contained in the bill as it stands, but I shall not interpose objection to the amendment. I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 32, at the end of line 18, it is proposed to insert the following after the period:

No application by an American citizen for the charter of war-built vessels under the jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission shall be rejected for the purpose of (A) denying lawful operation of any kind or (B) restricting or eliminating competition in ocean shipping in the foreign trade of the United States.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I think that point is safeguarded by the bill, but I shall raise no objection to the amendment, and I am willing to agree to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. What action was taken on the amendments offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 32, in line 13, it is proposed to strike out the word "dry-cargo."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this amendment would strike out the word "dry-cargo," and in effect the amendment would make it possible for the Maritime Commission to charter both tankers and dry-cargo vessels. It would be purely permissive for the Maritime Commission to do so.

The bill itself is very clear on the subject, by pointing out that the Maritime Commission first has the obligation of making the sale; and it is only if the Commission is not able to make the sale and if it finds that it is sound public policy to charter, that the Commission shall be authorized to do so. Without the adoption of this amendment, the hands of the Maritime Commission would be tied, and it would not be able to charter tankers.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, this matter has been controversial. The House of Representatives decided against the chartering of tankers. However, I am willing that the amendment should be taken to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37 of the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out all of lines 20 and 21 and through the comma in line 22, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) (1) If, prior to December 31, 1946.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that the purport of the amendment is to extend the time, which is now limited to 90 days, for trading in old vessels for the new vessels. The amendment would extend the time to December 31, 1946.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the determination of the time in which the vessels shall be traded in is more or less a matter of arbitrary choice. It is entirely agreeable to me that the conferees consider the matter, and I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48 of the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the entire section 12.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this subject was discussed earlier in the day, and at that time the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland said that individually he had no objection to the amendment. Similar action was taken in the House of Representatives, and I trust that the Senate will act in the same way, inasmuch as adoption of the amendment is agreed to by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the language of the committee amendment as it now stands probably does impose some restrictions upon the initial sale or subsequent sale of ships. I am agreeable to the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 31, in lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to strike out the words "ability, experience, financial resources, and other."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by striking out those words we would make the provision consistent with subsequent provisions in regard to foreign corporations. If the amendment is adopted, the language will read as follows:

If the Commission determines that the applicant possesses the qualifications necessary—

And so forth. That would give the Commission broader power than it would have if the restrictions were included.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I think that the word "qualifications" is entirely broad enough to cover the situation, and I will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, was the last vote on the bill as amended?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The vote was on the committee amendment as amended. We have now reached the point of voting on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There has been a great deal of confusion in the Senate this afternoon. Several Members of the Senate have been absent in attendance on various committees. Will the Senator from Maryland explain to us what the bill is designed to do? Will the Senator give us a 5-minute explanation of what is being done with $10,000,000,000 worth of property?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I hesitate to consume the time of the Senate after my previous statements on the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. Five minutes is not very much time to consume in explaining what is being done with $10,000,000,000 worth of ships.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will gladly do what the Senator from Nebraska requests. Mr. President, we found ourselves at the end of the war in possession

of approximately 58,000,000 tons of ships. We needed all of them during the war. We built ships as fast as we could build them. The question which now confronts us is, What shall we do with all of our ships, since it is quite obvious that we have many ships which we will not need for our own purposes? The pending bill attempts to make arrangements by which the ships may be disposed of.

The bill was pending in the House for a long time. After it came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Commerce it was amended, but the philosophy of the bill has not been changed materially. The bill attempts to establish a standard by which the ships may be disposed of.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator point out the difference between the House version of the bill and the bill in its present form.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I shall come to that.

Mr. President, the bill merely attempts to provide a method by which these ships can be disposed of. In providing such method it seemed best to the committee to lay down a yardstick, or a standard which might be followed. The members of the committee were appalled at what would take place when these ships were placed on the market with no restrictions whatever being placed upon the Maritime Commission or any other agency as to selling prices. In other words, if the Maritime Commission were allowed to sell ships in whatever way it saw fit, results might follow which would appall us. The Maritime Commission does not want such blanket authority. It has been decided to lay down a formula by which the ships may be disposed of. If the ships are not disposed of within 2 years they will then go into the reserve and will be taken off the market.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that we are about to enact a statute which contains certain provisions by which ships may be sold, and that there is not to be left to the discretion of the Maritime Commission the matter of how to make deals or sales?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Not entirely, because much still remains within the discretion of the Maritime Commission. However, we do attempt to set up and provide for certain allowances which may be made. Of course, a tremendous amount of discretion is still left within the Maritime Commission. But we have attempted to lay down a yardstick which we think should be followed in sales or charters.

Mr. WHERRY. In the Senator's opinion, is the yardstick so rigid that it will block the sale of ships, or cause them to be tied up longer than necessary? What is the opinion of the Senator with regard to that matter?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is my opinion that when prospective purchasers realize that by following a definite yardstick no one will be enabled to buy on any better terms than another and that at the end of 2 years, if the ship is not disposed of, it will go into a reserve, there will be a greater inclination to buy. The entire market in the United States Government. We feel that a yardstick should be established, and that is why we have laid one down.

As I have already said, we have made some changes in regard to specific provisions of the bill, but those changes do not affect the general philosophy of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the Senator is planning for the disposition of approximately $10,000,000,000 worth of ships.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The sum is approximately that much. Of course, some of the ships which we will not need will be disposed of, and some will be placed on the scrap pile.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, if, for example, John Smith and I get together on a deal we can buy one of the ships by paying a small percentage——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Twenty-five percent. Twenty years will be allowed in which to amortize the remainder of the payments.

Mr. WHEELER. And we will be allowed to buy at what price?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That will depend somewhat on the ship. We have tried to go back to prewar costs and have taken 50 percent of that figure. Of course, that figure is subject to deductions, such as 5 percent for the time the ship has been in service, and 3 percent, in the discretion of the Commission, for war service. There is, however, a floor which is about one-third of the war cost of construction.

Mr. WHEELER. Are persons correct in informing me that some of these ships have not yet been completely built, and are still in the course of construction?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; the bill would apply to any ships now in the course of construction. There is a provision with regard to that matter.

Mr. WHEELER. In other words, we are already building ships of which there is a surplus, and after building them it is proposed that we sell them for 50 percent of what it cost to build them. Would the Government not save money by stopping the construction of the ships?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill does not apply to ships to be built in the future.

Mr. WHEELER. Are we building ships at the present time which will be declared surplus the minute their construction is completed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Allow me to read the provision of the bill to which I have reference. It comes under the head of "Definitions" on page 26:

(b) "War-built vessel" means an ocean-going vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more, owned by the United States and suitable for commercial use—

(1) which was constructed or contracted for by or for the account of the Commission during the period, beginning January 1, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945; or.

Mr. WHEELER. So that some ships the construction of which was contracted for before September 1, will be built and then declared surplus. We will then sell them for 50 percent of what they cost.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I understand that not to be the policy of the Maritime Commission. The policy of the Commission is most emphatically to discontinue the building of ships wherever possible. It is the policy of the Commission not to continue construction. I do not wish to be categorical about it. It may be that the construction of some ship is nearly finished and should be completed, but officials of the Maritime Commission have assured me that they are discontinuing the construction of ships in every way feasible. I would say that some ships which are nearly built will be completed.

Mr. WHEELER. Under the language of the bill which the Senator has read, any ship which, before September 1, was ordered by the Commission to be constructed will be declared surplus after construction of the ship has been completed, and then the ship will be sold for 50 percent of its original cost.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is so, subject to the practical qualification I have just mentioned.

Mr. WHEELER. What information is available with reference to the number of contracts for the construction of ships which have been canceled, and how many ships, the construction of which was contracted for shortly before September 1, will be completed and then sold for 50 percent of cost?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I do not have the data available so that I can give the Senator an answer, but Admiral Land and other officials of the Maritime Commission have assured me that they have been slowing up the construction of ships for a long time as fast as feasible I cannot tell the Senator how many ships are so involved, but a slowing-up process has been taking place for several months.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me that the Senate should have some facts with reference to the number of ships the construction of which was ordered in July or August of this year, and has not been stopped. What is being done? The committee should have information on that point.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is my definite impression that there are no such ships, but I do not wish to make a positive statement until I have received the figures on that point from the Maritime Commission. I do, however, emphasize the fact that for a long time construction has been slowing up. The Senator probably realizes that a large part of the money which was allocated for the construction of ships has been withdrawn. I can only say to the Senator that the slowing-up process has proceeded as fast as possible.

Mr. WHEELER. For the Commission says that it is slowing up construction as fast as possible, does not mean much. It seems to me that Congress should have definite information with regard to how many ships were ordered to be constructed in June, July, or August, how far the construction has proceeded, and whether or not construction has been stopped and canceled.

We have not anything except a general statement that they are slowing up. It seems to me the committee and the Congress should have definite, positive information, because if we turn the whole matter over to a bureau and they simply say, "We are slowing up," without any specific information, that does not give the Congress any basis upon which to proceed. I am opposed to giving these commissions power to go ahead and order

ships up to September 1, and then the minute they are built, sell them for 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Maritime Commission is impressed with the urgent need of disposing of these ships. I know that, and I know it is acting accordingly.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; the Maritime Commission has been impressed with the idea of giving some of the shipbuilders cost-plus, practically, on the ships, and they cost the Government entirely too much money by reason of that fact. I have had any number of letters from people who worked in the plants and shipyards in San Francisco and Seattle and other places informing me of the waste which occurred and saying that they were told that the more they laid down on the job the better it would be liked. It has always seemed to me that the Commission was pretty lax in some of its dealings with the shipbuilding companies. Some of them coined money during the war, made millions of dollars out of shipbuilding contracts. I think the Commission has been extremely lackadaisical in the way it has conducted this matter. I think that before we vote for a bill of this kind we should have positive information as to what they are doing, and not leave it to general statement that there is a slowing down.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I was cautious in my statement. The statements made to me and to other members of the committee have been much more definite than what I said, but I hesitate to be very explicit, because I am not sure that I recall at this moment exactly what was said by them.

The Committee on Commerce has been in close touch with the Maritime Commission in regard to this whole matter, and the so-called slowing up to which the Senator referred a little while ago has been pressed by our committee in every way that has seemed to be possible. As a matter of fact, the vast appropriations made for ship construction have been set aside, showing very definitely what our new policy is.

I cannot tell the Senator exactly how many contracts were canceled, but I know there were very few.

Mr. WHEELER. What is the policy laid down in the bill with reference to the trading of vessels?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There is a provision by which ships can be traded in under certain conditions which are set out, but I think the point which the Senator has in mind primarily is what limit there is. The ship or ships traded in cannot exceed 33⅓ percent of the purchase price.

Mr. WHEELER. Of the purchase price?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of the ship which is to be sold. In other words, the idea is to get out of shipping instead of into it, and consequently the bill provides that if ships are offered in trade, under the conditions set forth, the allowance made for them shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the purchase price.

Mr. WHEELER. Of the purchase price from whom?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, because the distinguished Senator from Montana is discussing with the Senator from Maryland the same thing I was discussing this morning, I should like to interrupt at this point. Unless this defect, as I consider it to be, is cured, I shall positively have to vote against the bill. The provision to which I refer is section 8, on page 39, line 11. It is the provision which deals with the allowance to the owner who trades in an old ship for one of the new ships.

Under section 8, a man who wants to trade in an old ship and get a new one can be allowed only the amount the original purchaser paid to the Government for the ship. If he bought it at a time when the Government was anxious to sell the ship, and sold it for $100,000, and it afterward became worth a million dollars, and the new owner sold it to someone in the shipping business for a million dollars, the bill says that in trading it in for a new ship he cannot be allowed more than the $100,000. That is the equivalent of saying that if one bought a home or a business or anything else when no one wanted it, and it afterward became worth a great deal more, he could not get any more for it than what he paid for it.

My point is that we are professing to want to improve our merchant marine and have nothing but the finest, fastest, most up-to-date ships, and, in general, to have a merchant marine of which we can be proud. Lest we cannot get a sufficient number of purchasers for cash, and I do not believe we can, we are encouraging the man with an old ship to turn it in for another one. Then why is not the fair value of the ship that is to be turned in the value which would be placed on the ship as it is at the time it is turned in? Then, if you please, limit the allowance to 33⅓ percent.

I wish to offer an amendment. I tried to present it to the Senator without saying this on the floor, to ascertain whether the Senator would accept the amendment to his bill. The amendment is on page 39, to strike out lines 11 through 19, which read:

> In any case where the vessel tendered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall not exceed the price paid the United States therefor plus the depreciated cost of any improvements thereon. No vessel may be exchanged under this section which pursuant to the terms of any charter with the United States has been restored to condition by the United States, or for the restoring of which pursuant to the terms of such charter a cash allowance has been made to the owner.

Mr. WHEELER. Suppose I bought a ship for $100,000 and subsequently sold it to the Senator for $500,000. The Senator would not be able to get the one-third allowance figured on the $500,000.

Mr. HAWKES. I would not be able to get any more than one-third of the $100,000, if I understand the bill correctly.

Mr. WHEELER. On the other hand, if I bought the same kind of a vessel from John Smith and paid $1,000,000 for it, I could get an allowance of one-third of a million dollars.

Mr. HAWKES. That is my understanding, providing John Smith did not buy the vessel from the United States Government.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have an idea that such an amendment would be almost impossible to administer, because of the great difficulty of sorting out bona fide sales from sales which were made to take advantage of the loophole which the amendment might leave in the law.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me that if we figure on the fair value of one ship, we should be able to find the fair value of all ships.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a question. Why would it be difficult to administer? In the first place, a ship has to be appraised anyway. It might not be worth $100,000, but it has to be appraised. It might be no good at all. Why would it be more difficult to appraise it in connection with the true value?

Mr. President, I am not trying to get anyone anything by this amendment; I am trying to get a square deal for everyone, to get people to turn in ships in order that we may have a fine merchant marine, and so that we may handle the matter on the basis on which an average American would handle it.

Mr. HART. I think I recall hearing the Chairman of the Maritime Commission say that the difficulties of administration under the method proposed would be too great, and that he feared repercussions and accusations, perhaps similar to the one presented by the Senator from Delaware the first day of the consideration of the bill, an incident which happened after the other war.

Mr. HAWKES. I said on the floor this morning that I did not believe that, any way we figure this matter out, or any way it is administered, it will be possible to escape accusations and much criticism. I do not think this undertaking can be administered without criticism and accusation. But I believe if we try to administer it with fair regard to the rights of all groups and classes of people we will receive less criticism that will stick than we would otherwise.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think there is a real merit in what the Senator has said. But the bill is one for the sale of ships, not for the acquisition of ships, and not for the purpose of accumulating ships.

Mr. HAWKES. If I may interrupt the Senator, let me say that the bill is one for the sale of ships, yes, but is not one of its prime purposes the building of a first-class, up-to-date merchant marine, to consist of the finest vessels that can be obtained?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Then if this procedure conducted on the basis of equity and fairness so that old vessels can be turned in for new vessels, and old ships junked, are we not stimulating the merchant marine?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Certainly. There may be some instances of the kind the Senator has in mind, but the idea is to try to sell ships, get rid of them, and not accumulate them. Some people have thought that the trade-in provision is too liberal, others too light. But it seemed to the committee that it was desirable to avoid a situation where a profit would be made on a ship which the Government has sold. Then there would be administrative difficulties involved such

as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] referred to a little while ago.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I cannot understand that there would be any administrative difficulties, if a fair value were placed on the vessels. If an honest appraisal were made there would not be any difficulty. If one vessel is appraised at a certain price they could all be appraised at the same time. I cannot conceive how there would be any criticism of that. I can understand that, perhaps, someone might complain, "Well, you bought the vessel from the Government for a hundred thousand dollars, and therefore it should not be worth more than $100,000." But, on the other hand, if I buy a vessel for a hundred thousand dollars and sell it to John Smith for $1,000,000, and the one who buys it from me for a million dollars receives an appraisal of one-third of a million dollars——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will say to the Senator from Montana that he may have another opportunity, and sell it to someone else. There is nothing in the bill to preclude such a right or opportunity. But so far as dealing with the Government is concerned, there was rather a definite feeling that there should not be a profit made on ships sold by the Government and then sold back to the Government.

Mr. WHEELER. If that is the policy then it ought to be applied to every ship that is sold by the Government, regardless of whether it comes into the hands of a second purchaser or into the hands of a third purchaser. As I understand that is not what the bill provides. I may be wrong in that respect. My understanding is that if I buy a vessel from the Government for a hundred thousand dollars and sell it to John Smith for a million dollars, John Smith not having bought it from the Government, but having bought it from me, the provisions of the bill would not apply to him. So it seems to me to be clearly an unfair proposition, because the one who bought it from the Government can sell it to John Smith for more money than the amount he paid the Government.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me read the language:

> In any case where the vessel tendered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall not exceed the price paid the United States therefor plus the depreciated cost of any improvements thereon.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is talking about a ship acquired from the Government. If I sell it to John Smith, he does not acquire it from the Government. That is the difficulty. He acquires it from me. In that respect the provision does not deal equally.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It does not say "acquired by him from the United States." It says "acquired from the United States."

Mr. WHEELER. But the man who has the vessel did not acquire it from the United States. He acquired it from me.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator in that case is the original purchaser from the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. If I am the original purchaser, very well, but if I am not the original purchaser, but the second or third purchaser, then I am in a different position from that of the one who purchased it directly from the Government in the first instance. The language as the Senator has read it certainly can be interpreted to mean that if the vessel was acquired from a second person, who did not acquire it from the Government——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think the language would cover both instances.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not agree with the Senator. I think if that is what is intended, then the language ought to be changed.

At any rate, Mr. President, it seems to me that a great many things must be discussed in connection with the bill, and the hour is late. It should like to have some information from the Commission as to how many ships which were ordered in June, July, and August have not been completed, and whether they are proceeding and completing them and then are going to sell them for 50 cents on the dollar. I think it is perfectly proper that the Senate have that information. The hour is late and there is not a quorum present. We ought to have some more information on that subject before we vote on the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. In the hurry of accepting amendments I understand the Senator accepted an amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], which would permit the chartering of tankers.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I told the Senator that that had been a very controversial matter and I was willing that it should go to conference. The House was opposed to the chartering of tankers, and I was willing to carry it to conference where it could be considered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But I think the Senator will agree that I am correct in saying that in committee it was definitely decided to eliminate the tankers from all chartering, and I am a little at a loss to understand why the Senator accepted the provision for such chartering now. In view of that, Mr. President, I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Wyoming will not insist upon that point. If there is any specific provision which he would like to discuss I shall be very glad to have him do so. In regard to chartering tankers, there was much difference of opinion. The subcommittee had one view and the full committee had another, which was shown by a very close vote. Under the circumstances, after consultation with some committee members, it seemed to me to be a matter which might be reasonably taken to conference, due to the fact that there had been—I will not say shifting of the vote, but a close vote, which had appeared by one result in the subcommittee and another result in the full committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I feel that this is such a reversal of what was decided in committee that I for one am not prepared to discuss it on the floor at this time, and I know other Senators are not. I feel the matter should be referred to the committee to consider this point and other points which have been brought up by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Wyoming, that the bill should be recommitted to the committee, because certainly I am going to offer an amendment in connection with vessels which are to be traded in, and I am going to argue it, and if I cannot succeed in having it approved I shall vote against the bill. I may not vote against the bill if we give the matter careful consideration. I want the Senate to know that the very thing I am talking about was considered very carefully by the House committee and was in the House bill as it came to the Senate, if I am correctly informed, and was deleted by the Senate committee. I will leave this question to every fair-minded man in the Senate to decide. If he were in business and were going to buy a ship, and he had a ship which he bought for $600,000, even if someone had bought it from the Government for $50—if he paid $600,000 for that ship and wanted to trade it for a better ship, so as to make for himself a better fleet, in order to build up this wonderful merchant marine, I ask if there is any Senator present who would be willing to accept $50, simply because some man originally paid $50 for the vessel?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the Senator is correct. Let me add that if the amendment to which I have referred is included in the bill I shall be forced to vote against the bill. Otherwise, I should have voted for it.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Unless the bill is recommitted to the committee I shall send to the desk an amendment which I shall offer, and have it read. I shall discuss it, and I shall expect other Senators to discuss it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has raised a question regarding an amendment which was accepted by the chairman of the subcommittee. At this point I wish to read into the RECORD two telegrams which I have received.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment was accepted by the whole committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am speaking of the amendment which I offered today.

At this time I wish to read into the RECORD two telegrams. Let me preface the reading of the telegrams by saying that during the time this question was before the Senate committee we had before us Senate bill 292, which was a companion bill to the House bill. We had been

considering both bills. However, these telegrams would apply to either bill.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 7, 1945.*
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building:

Your amendment to S. 292, which provides that American operators may charter American oil tankers, in our opinion assures employment for American seamen and should be adopted in the interest of the American merchant marine. We hope that it will be concurred in.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The second telegram reads as follows:

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *December 7, 1945.*
Senator KNOWLAND,
Care Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organization, composed of 60,000 seamen affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, heartily approve of your amendment to Senate bill 292 allowing chartering of oil tankers to American operators. If bill passes without your amendment, it will result in foreign tankers being chartered by operators and thousands of American seamen who sailed these tankers all during war will face severe unemployment and will be a burden on the taxpayers.

HARRY LUNDEBERG,
President, Seafarer International Union of North America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems evident to me that it will be impossible to conclude action on the bill tonight. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has made a motion which is pending, to recommit the bill to the committee.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator wish to dispose of that motion before we take a recess? If the Senate should take a recess, his motion would not be prejudiced. It would be in order tomorrow as well as now.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to have the motion disposed of tonight.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not quite see how the Senator from Wyoming can be taken from the floor in this rather summary way.

Mr. HILL. I did not mean to take the Senator from the floor in a summary way, but I do not think we can vote tonight on the motion to recommit the bill; and since we cannot vote tonight on the motion, I think we should go into executive session.

Mr. WHITE. Why can we not vote tonight on the motion to recommit?

Mr. HILL. It is now nearly half past 5. I anticipate that the motion will call for a yea-and-nay vote. I do not see how the Senator from Wyoming would lose anything by having the motion go over until tomorrow. It will be the pending question before the Senate when we reconvene tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the question is a little different than that stated by the Senator from Alabama. It is not a question of going back to the regular order. The Senator from Wyoming has made a statement relative to the action of the committee, and he feels that because the committee took a certain position the bill should be recommitted. Of course, we can vote on the motion of the Senator from Alabama. I am not sure whether his motion would take precedence over the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, but I do not see why we cannot dispose of the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. If the bill ought to go back to the committee, we might just as well decide it tonight as tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. I would expect the yeas and nays to be requested on the motion.

Mr. WHERRY. We are not asking for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. I did not think it would be possible to have a yea-and-nay vote at this late hour in the afternoon. I do not see how the Senator from Wyoming would lose a single thing so far as his motion is concerned, by having it go over until tomorrow. His motion will be the pending business when we meet tomorrow, and we can have a vote tomorrow as well as this afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, at 12 o'clock tomorrow, if the regular order is demanded, we must return to the pay bill.

Mr. HILL. For that matter, at any time during the consideration of the pending bill any Senator could have demanded the regular order. But let me say to the Senator from Ohio that this afternoon I talked with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] who is in charge of the pay bill. It was understood that so far as he was concerned we would continue with the pending bill until we had concluded action upon it. I do not believe that the Senator from Wyoming would lose a single thing by having his motion pending and letting it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this question involves the decision of the committee being reversed by the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I feel that that is a matter which requires prompt attention. I have no intention of asking for the yeas and nays, but I do ask that the motion be acted on now.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems to me that before a motion to recommit the bill is acted upon we ought to have a quorum present. Although the Senator from Wyoming might not ask for the yeas and nays, the distinguished Senator from Maryland might do so, or other Senators might request the yeas and nays. Having arrived at the hour of practically half past five, with a motion before us which will very likely require a quorum call, to be followed by a yea-and-nay vote, if the Senator were about to lose something by having his motion go over I could understand the Senator's insistence on voting today. But the motion is subject to debate. We might have a quorum call, and there might be debate on the motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the only interest I had in the matter was that the Senator from Wyoming should not lose any of his rights. It seems to me that when he made the motion to recommit the bill he was entitled to have it acted upon without any intervening motions taking him from the floor or displacing the motion to recommit, which is pending before the Senate.

It is a matter of indifference to me personally whether the motion is disposed of tonight or not; but I think it is for the Senator from Wyoming to say whether he wishes a vote on his motion tonight.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that, so far as I am concerned, I will do everything I can to insure that he has a vote on his motion. The Senator from Wyoming recognizes the fact that we are in a parliamentary situation in which any Member of the Senate may, at any time while this bill is under consideration, today or tomorrow, demand the regular order. But in view of my conversation with the Senator from California, who is in charge of the pay bill, and who has agreed with me that we should continue consideration of this bill until it is finally disposed of, I cannot conceive that any Senator would demand the regular order. So I believe the Senator can feel that he will have a vote on his motion to recommit when we convene tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It seems to the Senator from Maryland that the action taken by him was a suitable one under the circumstances after consultation with some of the members of the committee. Possibly it was not. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that if he feels very strongly on the subject there are various ways in which the Senate can have before it for determination the question as to whether or not tankers shall be chartered. I will gladly go along with the Senator from Wyoming in any reasonable effort which he thinks desirable to give the Members of the Senate an opportunity to pass upon that question. The Senator from Wyoming is a member of the committee. He knows how hard we worked over this bill. It is rather drastic to recommit the bill because of an attitude in regard to the handling of one particular amendment. If he wishes to have me cooperate with him in any way which is proper so that the Senate may have an opportunity to vote on the question of chartering tankers, that is entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not feel that the motion is drastic in any way. With all due respect, I feel that the action of the Senator in reversing the action of the committee on the matter of chartering tankers was somewhat drastic.

I ask for a vote on my motion.

Mr. HILL. Frankly, Mr. President, I have the feeling that if the Senate takes a recess at this time, it may be possible for the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Maryland to get together and iron out any differences which they

may have; or, as I have said, if they do not agree and do not get together, certainly it will be possible and it will be in order the very first thing in the session tomorrow to consider and to vote on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. But I hesitate to suggest that we have a quorum call and a yea-and-nay vote at this time in the afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. If a vote is not had at this time on the pending motion, which is a motion to recommit, will it be the disposition of the Senator from Alabama immediately to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. My disposition will be immediately to move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business and consider the nominations on the calendar, and then to move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. And it would not be the intent to have further action taken today on the pending measure?

Mr. HILL. Of course not.

The motion of the Senator from Wyoming would then be the pending question before the Senate at the commencement of the session tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, although I do not know whether that course is agreeable to the Senator from Wyoming, so far as I am concerned it is agreeable to me.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Arthur A. Quinn, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Smith to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank D. Norton to be administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters, Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the postmaster nominations.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations of Selective Service and Army nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations of Selective Service and Army nominations.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Elmer F. Kelm, of Chanhassen, Minn., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Minnesota, in place of Arthur B. Reynolds.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Francis Joseph Corr, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. Walter Abner Huntsberry, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Herbert Spencer Jordan, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from November 22, 1945

Lt. Col. Stuart Adams Hamilton, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

To be colonel with rank from December 1, 1945

Lt. Col. Barnwell Rhett Legge, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Edward Mallory Almond, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Charles Paul Stivers, Infantry (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Oliver Lincoln Haines, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Oscar Irvin Gates, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Percy William Clarkson, Infantry (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Robert Chapin Candee, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Yarrow Daniel Vesely, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Lee Saunders Gerow, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Shuey Earl Wolfe, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Jack H. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of the United States naval mission to Peru, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The following-named colonel of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary service, from the 29th day of November 1945:

Karl S. Day

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

James M. Smith, to be Assistant Chief, Research and Statistics Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, with compensation at the rate of $6,230 per annum.

Frank D. Norton, to be administrative officer, District of Columbia headquarters, Selective Service System, with compensation at the rate of $5,600 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Quartermaster Corps

Lt. Col. Donald McKechnie Ashton.
Lt. Col. Stewart Darden Hervey.
Capt. Daniel Russell Taylor.
First Lt. George Cornell Abert.

To Finance Department

Maj. Ralph Arthur Koch.
Maj. Roy Silverman.
Capt. Meyer Abraham Braude.

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Charles Allen Carroll.
First Lt. Aleck Francis MacDonald.

To Field Artillery

Second Lt. Philip Barrett Toon.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Kenneth Ross Hagen to be major, Medical Corps, subject to examination required by law.

Robert Weston Boal to be major, Medical Corps.

Lewis William Kirkman to be major, Medical Corps.

Dean Schamber to be major, Medical Corps.

Daniel Hedgcoxe Cahoon to be captain, Medical Corps.

Douglas Hall to be lieutenant colonel, Pharmacy Corps.

Maurice William Hylden to be first lieutenant, Pharmacy Corps.

Luther Weltmer Evans to be major (chaplain), United States Army.

ADDITIONAL PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, CONFIRMED

The nominations of Charles Llewellyn Gorman et al. for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were transmitted to the Senate on December 5, 1945, and which appear in full at the end of the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with name of Charles Llewellyn Gorman on page 11471, and ending with the name of Forest Vernon Bockey on page 11474.

POSTMASTERS

MAINE

Arthur A. Sprague, Liberty.
Ois C. Brackett, Rangeley.

PENNSYLVANIA

Frank A. Chesaro, Brackenridge.
Homer C. Wheatman, Unionville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the Lord of life, we would ever be of the company of trusting souls, for all such are near Thee. We praise Thee that there is a light which blinds even the open sky, a language that is lovelier than that which falls from human lips, and a music which surpasses the sweetest of all earthly sounds. O Father, Father, we hear Thy word: Love suffereth long and is kind, love never faileth.

"When the last day is ended
And the nights are through,
When the last sun is buried
In its grave of blue,
When the stars are snuffed like candles
And the seas no longer fret,
When the winds have lost their cunning
And the storms forget,
When the last lip is palsied
And the last prayer said,
Love shall reign immortal
While the worlds lie dead."

We thank Thee for the wondrous love and devotion of the Man of Nazareth who, while we were yet sinners, lived and died for us. In His holy name, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution, United Nations invited to locate seat of government in the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 191. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 874) entitled "An act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1457) entitled "An act for the relief of Josephine Benham" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WILSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2335) entitled "An act for the relief of Albert E. Severns" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2835) entitled "An act for the relief of James Lynch" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4407. An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 453) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective as of the close of December 31, 1945, the Committee on Postwar Military Policy, created by House Resolution 465, Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress, is abolished, and its files and records are transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Postwar Military Policy was established by House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress on March 28, 1944. This was a resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. On yesterday I dropped into the hopper the final report of the activities of the committee, House Report No. 356 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, which is available if you are interested in it.

The committee had many interesting hearings, the last of which was the full and complete hearings on universal military training. These hearings have been widely used as more or less of a text book on the subject, presenting as they do the arguments pro and con on that subject.

You may be interested in knowing that the committee, although in session two full years, conducting many hearings, had allotted to it the total sum of $32,000, $16,000 of which goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to compliment the gentleman from Virginia and say that as far as I can recollect this sets a precedent when a select committee of this House is set up and could go along, if it so desired, throughout the entire Congress, but comes in here and says it has completed its job and desires that its files be turned over to a standing committee, and returns to the contingent fund the balance of the money it has not spent. I hope other committees will recognize this precedent and do the same thing in the future.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I, too, want to add my word of commendation to the committee, which has been given $32,000 and handled its affairs for 2 years and still is able to return to the Treasury $16,000. It seems to me that is a precedent, and it cannot go unrecognized, so far as I am concerned, because it is so seldom that anything like this has ever happened here. So I congratulate the chairman and his committee with all my heart. I know the taxpayers of this country, every one of them, will thank him for that very splendid report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I agree with the gentleman from Virginia that these war controls should stop. I have today introduced a resolution to declare the war at an end. Every enemy that declared war on us, or on whom we declared war, has surrendered. It seems to me that the longer we draw this thing out, the more friction is springing up all over the world. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that we should terminate the actions of this committee; and I think we should also pass a resolution to declare the war at an end and get our servicemen home, and get back to looking after American affairs.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I also want to commend the gentleman from Virginia on the economy he practiced in his special committee, but more especially upon the fine work he has done. I am a member myself and I have personal knowledge of the splendid work of the chairman. I am sure, too, that I express the feeling of every Member of the House on both sides when I say we regret his resignation as a Member of Congress, because I do not know of anybody who has rendered more distinguished service in this House.

The thing I want to mention particularly is that in addition to the exhaustive hearings the gentleman held on the very important and much discussed subject of universal military training, he conducted exhaustive hearings on the question of the unification of the Army and Navy into a separate over-all command, with equal and coordinate branches of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. I cannot express it quite so well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in referring to the new May-Vinson bill introduced a day or two ago when he stated that that impressed him, as it does me, as being a kind of "muddying-the-water" bill. I am very hopeful that an appropriate committee will consider this question of unification of the Army and Air Corps and Navy and report a bill in order that we may stop some of this inexcusable and indefensible overlapping and duplication of services in the Army and the Navy, and also perhaps prevent another Pearl Harbor, and so that we can have a little more unity and a little less jealousy between these two great Departments. They all constitute the fighting force of this country. The Joint Chiefs of Staff did a fine job in the recent war. That principle should be extended and enlarged as well as become permanent law. These three branches should be unified, correlated, and coordinated into a single supreme command that would insure success in any emergency. The three branches should be equal and coordinate but there is no justification for the present duplication and lack of supreme over-all military authority. The May-Vinson bill will mean three military departments instead of two as at present when one is what we need. That would only add to the confusion, lack of supreme authority, duplication and terrible waste of money.

The prime consideration of the people of the United States is national security and they want our armed services, Army, Navy, and Air Corps, to get along and do teamwork. I am sure there is not a Member of this House who does not want to see the Air Corps receive the recognition it deserves. It has been a stepchild too long, but at the same time I hope the committee that is considering these various bills will soon report a bill back to the House so there can be full and fair discussion of the entire subject.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say in reply to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] that if we had established an independent air force 20 years ago, when Gen. Billy Mitchell tried to get us to establish one, in my opinion there would have been no Pearl Harbor disaster, and the Japanese never would have even attacked, much less taken, the Philippines.

We do not want such a thing to occur again, and if it takes the May-Vinson bill to give us an independent Air Force then I am for it. I am not willing to see the Air Force hampered in the future, as it has been in the past.

I want to express my regret at seeing the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] leave Congress. His services here have been most valuable, and his retirement will be a distinct loss to the Nation.

He goes with our regrets, but he carries with him our best wishes for his future happiness and prosperity at all times.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the report on this resolution sets forth the activities of the committee. It is brief. I ask unanimous consent that I may include the committee report as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

POSTWAR MILITARY POLICY

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy, submitted the following final report:

The Select Committee on Postwar Military Policy was established by House Resolution 465 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session (March 28, 1944), and continued by House Resolution 55, Seventy-ninth Congress. Pursuant to the resolution, the committee organized and adopted as agenda. (See Rept. No. 1645, 78th Cong., 2d sess.)

On April 24, 1944, the committee convened and conducted hearings on the proposal to establish a single department of armed forces. The hearings continued through May 19, 1944, and are available in printed form in the office of the committee. During these hearings the committee received the testimony of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Director of the Budget, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and many officers of the several services as well as interested citizens and Members of Congress. At the conclusion of these hearings, the committee filed its report (H. R. 1645, 78th Cong., 2d sess.). Because of the critical situation in the war, the committee did not make definite recommendations but stated in its report:

"The committee does not believe that the time is opportune to consider detailed legislation which would undertake to write the pattern of any proposed consolidation, if indeed such consolidation is ultimately decided to be a wise course of action," and so forth.

The committee did not pursue its consideration of this subject for the reason that the matter was taken up immediately on the conclusion of hostilities by the legislative committee of the Senate having to do with the subject.

On August 22, 1944, the committee conducted hearings on surplus material and on November 21, 1944, opened hearings on scientific research and development. These hearings continued through January 29, 1945, and are in printed form. On November 24, 1944, the committee filed an interim report (Rept. No. 1923, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), and on May 2, 1945, the committee filed a report on research and development (see Rept. No. 505, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) which made definite and specific recommendations. Following this report there was introduced and passed in the House legislation to carry out the recommendations of the committee.

On June 4, 1945, the committee opened hearings on the subject of universal military training. These hearings continued daily through June 19, 1945. They were full and extensive. Many witnesses were heard pro and con, including the Secretaries of the armed services, many of the officers of the services, many citizens and organizations favoring and opposing military training. The hearings comprise two volumes and have been widely circulated. On July 5, 1945, the committee reported to the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 857, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) recommending immediate consideration by the appropriate legislative committee and the passage of appropriate legislation putting into effect a system of universal military training.

The Military Affairs Committee of the House is currently conducting hearings on this subject.

The Committee on Postwar Military Policy feels that its mission has been substantially accomplished. Whatever else remains to be done in the field covered by the committee is now properly cognizable by the appropriate legislative committees of the House.

Therefore, the committee is of the opinion that it should be disbanded and that its files and records should be turned over to the Military Affairs Committee of the House and that the funds remaining to its credit should be covered back into the contingent fund of the House.

The committee respectfully recommends that this action be taken.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN CHINA

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 443) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession relative to sabotage of our foreign policy in China and to give full information in his possession relative to the resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley as Ambassador to China.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that was just tabled was one I introduced requesting the Secretary of State to send us all the information in his possession regarding the resignation of General Hurley and all information in his possession regarding the sabotage of our foreign service. The statement that the secretary of our Foreign Affairs Committee filed contains information from the Secretary of State on General Hurley's resignation and other material.

Mr. Speaker, while this information will be a part of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, my request that General Hurley be called to give information to the House has not been granted, still I should hope that General Hurley would be called before the full Committee and we be given an opportunity to interrogate him to try to get the information, also that we should receive information regarding the so-called foreign-service officers who were supposed to have sabotaged our foreign service. We should be allowed to see the letters sent by them to the State Department. I am very strongly of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that an investigation should be made regarding our foreign policy to see if the foreign-service officers in the field receive instructions as to what our foreign policy really is. It is very difficult for our foreign-service officers if the United States does not have a settled foreign policy. Today I feel we do not have a foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during my absence, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the statement that he attempted to get me in my office during the morning, but was unable to do so.

I was in my office until a quarter of 12 and received a number of calls up to that time, but I did not receive any from the gentleman from Missouri. At that time I had to go downtown to attend to a matter of official business. Upon my return there were quite a number of calls which had been made for me during my absence, but no call from the gentleman from Missouri was listed. However, by reason of a special order I have for this afternoon during which time I shall take occasion to answer the gentleman's remarks of yesterday. I notified the gentleman personally on the floor yesterday that I would do so. I called his office and notified his secretary that I would do so, and I again extend another invitation to the gentleman from Missouri to be here this afternoon during the special orders and I shall answer him and enlighten him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances—in one to include an article from the Tennessee Law Review and in the other an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean.

LACK OF SHIPPING FACILITIES TO RETURN VETERANS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House of Representatives have received, and are continuing to receive, bitter communications from constituents in the armed services overseas, complaining that they are unable to obtain discharges to which they are entitled because they are unable to get on a boat to come home. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has appointed a subcommittee to investigate the whole question of overseas transportation for American soldiers, sailors, and marines.

This subcommittee will start hearings in the Naval Affairs Committee room in the Old House Office Building tomorrow, Thursday morning, at 10 o'clock. In order that this inquiry may be as thorough and complete as possible, all Members of the House who have received complaints of this nature are invited to appear at these meetings, or to send in a summarized statement of the complaints that they have received, so that reports may be obtained from the Navy Department, the War Department and the War Shipping Administration on all such complaints.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extent his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain correspondence.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from communications he received with respect to the status of the United States Marines in China.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a set of resolutions adopted by the Decatur County (Iowa) Farm Bureau.

FOREIGN BROADCAST INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service has been monitoring foreign broadcasts for this Government during the war. It is being liquidated almost immediately. This organization has been part of the Federal Communications Commission. Its demise is due to House action in rescinding part of the FCC's national defense appropriation which was allocated for this monitoring activity.

The War, Navy, and State Departments depend on this monitoring of foreign broadcasts to give them vital intelligence pertaining to the most critical parts of the world. There are certain areas, such as Russia, the Balkans, China, the Dutch East Indies, and Argentina, where radio broadcasts, monitored by FBIS, provide exclusive, significant information. Due to poor communications and the lack of normal means of gathering intelligence in such parts of the world, monitoring of radio broadcasts makes available quickly and economically a great deal of intelligence almost impossible to secure from other sources.

It is short-sighted and actually dangerous to national welfare to eliminate this important source of information at such a time. Every other principal power in the world has a monitoring service of much greater relative size than the United States. If we are to know what is going on in this world we cannot neglect this. If this country hopes to participate on even an equal basis in international affairs with Russia, Great Britain, and the other major powers, it is vitally necessary to continue this monitoring.

We can only secure full value from national defense expenditures if we are fully advised what conditions must be faced. The cost is only $100,000 per month. The amount of money involved in operating an adequate foreign broadcast monitoring service is a mere pittance compared wth the value of the material intercepted. It is my firm hope that an arrangement to save this monitoring activity will be made in some part of the Government.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that Congress will shortly consider a large loan by this Government to Great Britain.

Before Congress considers this transfers of assets, first the President should present a genuine plan to balance the Budget of the United States within 2 years.

Secondly, the dollars for this loan, and similar foreign loans, should come only from funds raised by the sale of long-term bonds to individual investors for that specific purpose.

Mr. Speaker, constructive affirmative action on these two proposals should precede House consideration of any British loan or other similar transactions.

SHIPMENT OF LUMBER TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES SHOULD BE STOPPED NOW

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the housing situation in this country is becoming more critical every day. One of the main problems is lack of materials. Legislation is being proposed to allocate materials and put controls on the building industry.

If our Government really wants to do something to help the building industry and help the returning veterans to have homes, we should see to it that the export of lumber is stopped now.

Seven hundred and fifty million board-feet of lumber have been exported to foreign countries during this year. Lumber is still being shipped abroad, much of it for maintaining export relations.

Seven hundred and fifty million board-feet of lumber would have built seventy-five or one hundred thousand badly needed dwelling units. It is up to Congress to see to it that no more lumber is exported to any country during the acute emergency that now exists in our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received by him from Walter W. Generazzo, national president of the American Watch Workers Union.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement regarding the Alaskan Highway.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a small businessman.

FOREIGN LOANS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank loaned France $500,000,000. That may be all right. It was a loan, and I am hoping possibly it will be a good loan. But you are going to be requested very shortly to pass upon a loan of $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain. Under the terms as outlined by the State Department I deem it a poor loan. I want to say that it is about time that we do business in a businesslike way. If we are going to look after America we should not grant the loan to Great Britain as was requested by the State Department. It contains a gift of thirty-two billion remaining due us in lend-lease. It contains a no-interest-for-5-year provision, and then if Great Britain claims that in any year she cannot pay interest then she will be relieved of interest payment. If there was ever a loan proposed that was unbusinesslike, that is it. Just remember, we have $265,000,000,000 of indebtedness. Further, you are going to be requested to take care of many things in this country of ours, and you cannot look after the wants of the rest of the world in granting unbusinesslike loans and keep America solvent. It just is not possible. It is about time that we do business on a sound business basis. You cannot increase our national debt by billions at a time to those nations who do not respect their obligations to the United States. Remember Great Britain owes us from the First World War about $6,500,000,000. She has had her hand out to us ever since I have been in Congress. She is taking us for a ride. It is time for Britain to do her own financing on a sound business basis with our Government. We are not going to loan money to her with my consent to buy up her railroads, her coal mines, and her public utilities in order to socialize Great Britain. We are destroying America for the rest of the world and I am not a party to such action. I think our public officials should see the results of their folly and that they should see what a deplorable condition they are putting our Treasury in and unless they stop it, we are bankrupt. Taxpayers, do you approve?

TIRES FOR VETERANS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include some telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROOKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I am about to present a resolution granting $20,000 additional for expenses for the Small Business Committee of the House. Before doing so I desire to make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, that the previous question on the resolution be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, all I want is the gentleman to yield to me to offer an amendment without debate. If he will bring it up and yield to me to offer an amendment to raise the sum to a sufficient amount to operate on, I will not engage in debate at all. I feel that he should first give us that opportunity. If he refuses to yield, why, of course, that is a gag rule he is presenting, and I shall be compelled to object to it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have no authority from the Committee on Accounts to yield to the gentleman for an amendment, and therefore I cannot do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PATMAN. I object.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Role No. 202]

Bailey	Granger	Poage
Barry	Hand	Rains
Boren	Harris	Reece, Tenn.
Brehm	Hart	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Fla.	Healy	Roe, N. Y.
Carlson	Hess	Schwabe, Okla.
Celler	Horan	Shafer
Chelf	Jackson	Somers, N. Y.
Clark	Kearney	Starkey
Coffee	Keefe	Stevenson
Cole, N. Y.	Larcade	Sumner, Ill.
Colmer	Lewis	Taber
Combs	McGlinchey	Taylor
Curley	Maloney	Traynor
Dawson	Merrow	Vorys, Ohio
De Lacy	Mundt	White
Dickstein	Murdock	Whitten
Dingell	Murphy	Wickersham
Douglas, Calif.	Norton	Winstead
Gearhart	O'Hara	Winter
Geelan	Peterson, Ga.	Wolcott
Granahan	Pfeifer	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res.

454), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 294, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and continued by House Resolution 18 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 64 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the select committee appointed to study and investigate the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $20,000, in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available for conducting said study and investigations, including expenditures for the employment of experts, investigators, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as I stated when I presented the resolution, I was doing so by the direction of the Committee on Accounts. The Committee on Accounts was one of the first committees organized in this House. It dates back to 1803. It was set up for the purpose of auditing and controlling the contingent fund and other expenditures of the House. It is your representative. It occupies the same position in relation to the House as the Comptroller General occupies in relation to the executive branch of the Government.

The situation that confronts us here today is that the dispute over the amount of money that the Select Committee on Small Business should have was developed by the Select Committee on Small Business itself. You have all had experience with reference to pressure from the outside, organizations writing and wiring you to do this and do that, but this pressure originated with a select committee of this House, asking people throughout the country to bring pressure to bear upon you, stating that your Committee on Accounts was sabotaging this committee by not giving it all the money it desired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will yield now, but I will not yield further until I finish my statement.

Mr. COX. Am I correct in understanding the gentleman to say that this Committee on Small Business is responsible for starting the propaganda with small business people throughout this country to have them high-pressure Members of this Congress to overthrow the Committee on Accounts as to what I consider the liberal amount it has allowed?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not going to yield further until I make my statement.

This select committee was set up by the House on December 4, 1941.

The resolution provided as follows:

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the national defense program in its relation to small business in the United States with a view to determining (1) whether or not the potentialities of small business in the national defense program have been adequately developed, and, if not, what factors have hindered such development; and (2) whether or not adequate consideration has been given to the needs of small business engaged in nondefense activity, or engaged in the transition from nondefense to defense activity; and (3) whether or not small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials, in which there is a shortage, or in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sale, or purchase of said materials.

The resolution provided for no limitation of expenses, but it did provide that the expenses would have to be approved by the Committee on Accounts. That provision is in every resolution you pass providing for an investigation.

This is what happened: For this particular committee the Committee on Accounts has appropriated a total of $137,500. That is from the time it was set up. It actually started operating about January 1, 1942. Nearly 4 years have passed since that date. A month ago the funds of the committee were running low. The chairman asked the Committee on Accounts for a hearing. He and other members came before the committee and we asked him what amount he suggested. He wanted $134,000 to last him for the rest of this Congress, $3,000 less than he had received since the committee was set up 4 years ago. That was his maximum. Then he stated that the minimum was $98,000.

It was shown that the average expenditures of the committee since it was set up had been a little over $4,000 a month. There were only 2 months when expenses exceeded $5,000. The gentleman asked for this amount because he said he wanted to expand his committee. He stated very frankly that he wants to employ lawyers and additional investigators. This committee has never had a lawyer with the exception of 2 months since its inception.

Those 2 months were October and November 1944. When he came before the committee and we desired to know why he wanted lawyers during those 2 months, he stated it was for the purpose of investigating the independent oil situation. The committee called his attention to the fact that for 10 years or more we have had a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce whose duty it is to investigate the oil situation and that we give them money to do so. He went into the field over which another committee had jurisdiction and hired two attorneys to do so. He also stated very frankly at that time that they wanted to go into the situation with reference to taxes as it affects small business. I immediately objected to that because we have a committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which we have had for years and years and which committee does that very job and we give them $75,000 a year to do it. It is a permanent committee. Why should the Small Business Committee, a select committee, go into the field of investigating taxes when we have a committee to do that? It so happened that a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was in the room when the gentleman made the statement. The member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was there on another matter and as soon as he got through he went out and protested against the Small Business Committee going into the field of investigating taxes, which he had a right to do. So far as I know, they dropped the idea of investigating taxes.

You have a Small Business Committee in the Senate. Just the other day they published a statement in the RECORD showing the number of employees they have assigned to them from the executive departments. They had 10. Outside of four, all were above the $5,000 bracket, but the others were stenographers. The Smith committee, which was set up for the purpose of determining whether or not the administrative agencies were going beyond the law, has been continually looking into the small business feature of the OPA. There was on the pay roll of the Small Business Committee during the month of November a stenographer at $2,400, an investigator at $6,000, another investigator at $4,800, a secretary at $2,400, a stenographer at $2,400, an investigator at $6,000, a chief investigator at $7,200, a clerk at $3,300, a secretary at $2,400, a part-time messenger at $260, and an executive assistant at $6,600.

They were on the pay roll during the month of November. They have been paid. The salaries amounted to $3,646. But aside from that, they also received the benefits of the Ramspeck Act.

The question arose before the Accounts Committee after they heard members of this select committee, was whether or not we thought the committee ought to expand now when most of its work has been connected with the Office of Price Administration. The conclusion of the committee, after voting on several propositions that were placed before the committee, was that a majority did not think it should expand now, that the actual fighting is over, and the OPA is slowly getting rid of many of its activities, such as rationing, and so forth. We felt that if they went along on the same basis as they were going along we could give them $20,000 and then when that was spent they could come back before the committee for more. As soon as that matter was disposed of, the information as to the amount leaked out. That was the time the propaganda went out to the country which resulted in all you ladies and gentlemen getting the telegrams as well as the letters saying the Committee on Accounts was sabotaging the Small Business Committee. Now you have the situation where the committee that was set up to represent you, to try to protect the contingent fund of the House, has acted. They voted this

amount, then directed me to report the resolution to the House. I repeat this committee will have enough money to go along for 5 months at the rate they were going in November.

This committee or subcommittees of the committee have traveled all over the country, they have held meetings in different sections of the country, and I notice that almost every place they held a meeting was in the district of some member of the committee, but no objection was made to those expenditures.

I have all the figures here for the expenditures of this committee from the day it was set up and, as I told you before, they have never spent $5,000 in one month with the exception of two, and its expenditures for salaries last month were $3,646.

Your Committee on Accounts feels that this amount is sufficient. The chairman of the select committee does not. He wanted me to yield for an amendment to increase the amount. I have no authority from the committee to increase the amount or to yield. In order to expedite consideration of the resolution, just before the quorum call I asked unanimous consent that the previous question be considered as ordered. The chairman of the select committee objected. Now it is up to you to determine whether you want to stand by the committee that you set up to do a job for you, or yield to pressure the result of the select committee's action. It is up to you to decide whether you are going to stand by your committee or let the select committee overrule your committee. That is the issu before us now. I do not know of anything more I can say, but I feel that the Accounts Committee has been fair to this committee.

In conclusion I might add that we witnessed something this morning that was almost unprecedented. The gentleman from Virginia took the floor and offered a resolution to disband his committee and turn back into the contingent fund $16,000 of the money granted to his committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman remembers in 1933 and 1934 I was chairman of a select committee to investigate what was known as the guardianship racket, involving dependents of veterans of World War I. We were given so much money and a job to perform. We performed that job and made a report just like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] did, and asked to be discharged and turned back money.

In 1935 and 1936 I was chairman of the committee to investigate large-scale buying and selling which resulted in the passage of the Robinson-Patman law. We made a report that we had performed our duty, asked to be discharged, and turned back money. There are two cases where I was chairman of select committees that did the same thing.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from Texas, and also for the information of the House, that to show my friendship for the gentleman I was the one who introduced the resolution for the so-called chain-store investigation. I was named chairman; became seriously ill. I was told I could not come back here for several months. So I sent for the then Speaker, Mr. Byrnes, and I asked Mr. Byrnes to appoint the gentleman from Texas [WRIGHT PATMAN] as chairman of the committee to make the investigation under the resolution that I introduced. When I introduced the resolution we felt that we could get through with it in 2 or 3 months, but it went on for a long time.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not true that the gentleman is well pleased with what we did?

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly I was.

Mr. PATMAN. It resulted in the passage of a law setting up fair trade practices. Then we asked to be discharged and returned money to the Accounts Committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I was pleased that the gentleman did. I was glad the investigation was made. It was thorough. If I did not think it should have been made I never would have offered the resolution myself. But that has nothing to do with this resolution, and the question before this House is whether or not this House is going to support the committee that it has set up to protect the contingent fund and other expenditures of this House. That is the issue before you. Regardless of my personal feeling—and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] knows that I am just as much interested in small business as he is—I am here following the instructions of the committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to make an observation, not to offer any amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman promised me 10.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE FUNDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I must necessarily be brief on these points I shall decline to yield until I have finished.

As I said a while ago, I have been chairman of two select committees of the House of Representatives before this, each one of which turned back money after securing the passage of laws that would correct the evils that we were told to investigate and report on. So, as much as I commend the statement of the gentleman from Virginia this morning, and I do commend him, it is not unprecedented because it happened at least two times that I know of between 1933 and 1940.

Now, regarding the funds for this committee, may I say that we have found the gentleman from Missouri very, very hard to deal with. Every time we would send over an account for another member of the committee it was an ordeal to get the money from that committee. Almost invariably I was called up about this and about that. As a matter of fact, it was so much of an ordeal that for the years I have been chairman of the committee I have not presented one account for personal expenses. I was not able to assume that expense but I would rather pay it than to go through the ordeal I would have to go through in order to get approval of the chairman of the Accounts Committee.

Mr. Speaker, when the resolution extending our Small Business Committee was passed in January the question was asked, "How much will it cost?" I frankly said it would cost between $85,000 and $100,000 a year, and I asked the membership when they voted for the resolution to vote for it with the knowledge we would ask for that amount.

We went before the Accounts Committee after its passage and that committee gave us less than one-half the minimum figure we asked to get along with, doing without lawyers, doing a lot of the work ourselves, working holidays, nights, and at all other times. We have struggled along under that condition. I hope the House will not expect us to continue to do that. Is it unreasonable to ask that we have one lawyer to help us? All other committees have lawyers. Why should we not have one? We cannot do the effective job you want us to perform unless we have able assistants.

This $20,000 is scuttling the committee. That is the result. We cannot operate and we cannot keep the staff of good people like we have when you vote them insecurity like that. We must give them some security, that is all we ask for. We need to keep a good staff like we have. They are doing a splendid work.

The parliamentary situation is this: The gentleman from Missouri refused to yield for me to offer an amendment to make this $75,000 instead of the $20,000, which, after consultation with the minority and majority leaders and others in this House, we believe is a reasonable amount. Since he has refused to yield to me for the purpose of offering this amendment he is insisting upon a gag rule and I am asking you to vote down the previous question which means voting down the gag rule. When you vote down the previous question I will offer the amendment which I hope you will adopt.

The gentleman from Missouri, sincere as he is, and I do not question him in that regard, has always opposed this committee. He opposed it being established in the first place. He said the Senate had a committee, let it do the work. Do you want to take the responsibility of telling your constituents that the House is not sympathetic with the needs of small business and to go to the Senate on the other side of the Capitol in order to get their problems ironed out over there? That was the sincere argument offered by the gentleman from Missouri, but the House did not agree with him. When the House did not agree with him, then the amounts have been cut down and kept down, and we have been dealt with in such hard fashion that it has been very difficult to get

pay for the people that we want the money to go to. I do not believe the House approves of that.

The Senate has a similar committee that has spent much more money than we are spending, and I challenge anyone to cite a better record than our committee has. We have done it by putting our personal efforts into the matter. We are asking for much less than the Small Business Committee should spend. Is that too much? Of course it is not, if we are going to have a Small Business Committee to look after the problems of small business.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE PRAISED BY SMALL BUSINESSMAN

During this period when the very life of the Small Business Committee seems to be hanging in balance here in the House, with the result depending entirely upon the action that the Members will take, it is particularly gratifying to me to receive expressions from small businessmen and groups of small businessmen throughout the Nation.

After all, these expressions of confidence and hope for our continuance are what count as far as I am concerned—they are expressions from those for whom this committee was created.

I sincerely hope that we shall not have to advise these small businessmen that the House of Representatives has suddenly become so economy-minded that it refuses to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the committee to continue its work even on the scale to which it has been limited in the past—that, in effect, the committee is being throttled or starved out of existence.

I think we should either make certain that a committee has an appropriation sufficient to insure its operation on a scale commensurate with the duties for which it was intended or we should take it off the books completely. There should be no pretense of being for small business on one hand and on the other hand slowly killing off the small businessman's means of being heard here in the House—and being heard anywhere else in Government, as he has been enabled to be heard through the use of the committee. Let us once and for all bring this issue out in the open and record ourselves either for or against. The small businessmen of our Nation and their organizations are entitled to know just where we stand.

I think my colleagues may be interested in a telegram which was addressed to me as chairman of the Small Business Committee from a small businessman in New York. I can see no reason nor motive for this man sending us this telegram except as a sincere expression of the continued need for a congressional committee to whom he can come with his problems. I quote his telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 8, 1945.*

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As president of a small corporation with eight employees I do hope that the House will appropriate sufficient funds to permit your committee to continue the very effective work it has done in behalf of small business. Of all the Government agencies with small business in their names or among their objects yours is the only one I have found that really tries to get to the source of the many difficulties of small business and to correct them without tying up the small businessman with red tape and questionnaires. When the smallness of the committee's staff is considered the results obtained are quite remarkable. I know of no instance in the Government where so few have done so much for so many small enterprises and it is my observation that the public gets more per dollar expended by your committee than any other Government agency designed to help small business. I hope you get an adequate appropriation for carrying on your good work.

STEWART N. CLARKSON ASSOCIATES, INC.,
STEWART N. CLARKSON.

We have received a considerable number of letters commending us for our work but I picked out the above telegram as the typical feeling among a great number of small businessmen—not from the standpoint of a particular case and a particular solution, but the need of a medium here in Congress where these small businessmen can come in confidence and in the knowledge that any and all problems, if worthy, will receive individual attention if necessary.

What reason other than service well rendered could have prompted a message such as the following from an entire small industry, through their representatives, when they came to the committee for help a year or more ago:

The 1-day hearing before your subcommittee has done more to clarify our problem and the attitude of the Government agencies interested in our industry than 6 months spent in calling upon these agencies, writing them letters, and supplying them with masses of information.

That is indicative of the need for a committee for small business.

In regard to the statement about pressure, may I say that I had nothing to do with it unless it was the statement I gave to the representatives of small business when it was known that $20,000 only would be allowed. I said that that would be in effect scuttling the committee, and I now reiterate that statement. In effect it would be scuttling the committee because you cannot keep people on the pay roll with so little security as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the situation: When this war started 70 percent of the contracts were let to big-business enterprises. We made this country small-business minded. The Army set up a committee for small business, as did the Navy and the Maritime Commission, and we began to spread these contracts. Through the help of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] we put upon the statute books the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act and gave them the authority for prime contracts, and we scattered these contracts all over the country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to point out at the outset that when the Congress began trying to do something for small business I was chairman of an unofficial committee set up for that purpose; then the gentleman introduced his resolution, and I became a member of the official committee. I was privileged to serve on that committee. As the gentleman has pointed out, it has accomplished a lot of good things. I would like to say this also, that while the gentleman and I on various policies of Government find ourselves in disagreement, that does not in any way minimize my solicitude for the operations of the Small Business Committee nor my statement here that the gentleman, as chairman, has not always done exactly everything I wanted him to do, and I would not have done everything he wanted me to do if I had been chairman. But, by and large, I am convinced that the Small Business Committee has operated to the benefit of small business, and to the benefit of the best interest of the country, and it ought to remain in full force and vigor.

Mr. PATMAN. This committee is a nonpartisan committee. Every report we have made has been a unanimous report. It is not partisan in any sense and will not be partisan now if the House supports it.

Let me tell you why an executive agency cannot help and support small business. You take the Smaller War Plants Corporation, they are restricted in their recommendations going through the Bureau of the Budget. They can find out something that is fundamentally wrong, hurting and destroying and injuring small business, but they cannot come out with a statement or go to Congress with it. They have to make their recommendations through the Bureau of the Budget, and nobody else.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PATMAN. In that way only a select committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate can properly represent small business in this transition period when they are needed so badly. Here a while back surplus goods were put on sale. You got all kinds of complaints. The big department stores and chain stores would pay $1.60 for an item that your independent merchant would pay $2 for in competition; 20 percent less, and 40 percent less sometimes. We took that matter up with the proper people in the Department of Commerce and got it changed. That is just one instance of dozens and dozens of cases where we have come to the aid of small business and helped them in their struggle for existence. Today we have plenty of problems to deal with. We must continue to be on the alert. I do not believe this House can afford to say that we are willing to depend upon a committee of another body and that we are not going to have a committee of our own; and if you are going to have a committee, I plead with you to support that committee. Give them the money that we said we would give them when we authorized their existence. Either give them money for support or abolish the committee. If you do not want the committee, that is all right; but if you do want it, let us give them the support and aid and assistance that that committee needs.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. I want to say this to the gentleman's committee, in all fairness to the Members of this House, if it were not for the Small Business Committee established in this House in 1941, I doubt if there would be any small business people left in America.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. I ask you to vote down the previous question which, in this case, is a gag rule; and when you vote down the previous question, I expect to offer an amendment for $75,000 to run us far into the next year, which I hope you will vote for.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The inquiry is this: As the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, I have always had the chairman yield to me half of the 1 hour. I think that is true in regard to every committee. I know that the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman MAY, of the Committee on Military Affairs, yields the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] half the time. The same is true of all committees. The question I would like to ask is this: Is there anything in the rules that would make the chairman of the Committee on Accounts yield half the time to the ranking minority member of the committee?

The SPEAKER. There is nothing in the rules that would require him to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-two minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that if he had asked me to yield for 30 minutes he would certainly have received it. His request comes too late.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for 14 years, as well as other committees, and that courtesy has always been extended. I was wondering why you were making an exception in regard to this.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me ask the gentleman this: Will he yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] on his side, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] on his side. Also to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] on this side, who is opposed to the measure?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. If the gentleman tells me who to yield to, I might as well let him keep the time and let him yield himself.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman never indicated he wanted any time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will take care of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM]. I hope that the gentleman will take care of his side. How much time does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] want? They have all been speaking on the gentleman's side, but no one has spoken on this side.

I agree with those unconditional terms, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. No terms have been offered yet. Just a moment. The Chair wants this understood. No terms have been offered, unconditionally or otherwise.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am in a most embarrassing position, having promised to both sides. I would like to see the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], a member of the committee, recognized. He asked for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will grant him sufficient time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], a member of the committee. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has also asked for time. He is a member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Missouri desires to stay in control of the time, he had better yield the time without any conditions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman apparently was not there. That is a very unfair statement.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has made some rather unfortunate remarks. He said that we had not held any hearings except in districts represented by members of the committee. We have not had any hearings in my district nor in the district of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. As far as I know, the only two districts in which we have had hearings which were represented by members of the committee were in the city of St. Louis, where a member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], resides, and I certainly do not think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] would say that the city of St. Louis is not entitled to some consideration in connection with small business. We also had hearings in the city of New York, where the gentlemen from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL and Mr. KEOGH] reside. Our hearings have been held where we could get the best information on the problems under consideration.

What can be more important to the Members of this House than seeing that small businesses are given a fair break? That is one of the great problems we have before us right now. Our economic life will collapse if we do not nourish and foster small business. The Members of the House are entitled to have a committee that will investigate the problems of small business and who will sympathetically look into the problems of individual small businessmen. If any of you would go by the committee offices you would find five men there who are working very, very hard upon reports, complaints, inquiries, and matters brought them by Members of Congress. Further, the various small business associations, trade associations, and small businessmen all over the United States have learned to come directly to this committee to see about their problems. They get real service from the staff of our committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the gentleman that it seems to me the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has indicted the committee and accused it of not accomplishing anything.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will tell the gentleman what the committee has done. We have had hearings on the matter of lumber, on lumber problems, that resulted in the creation of a joint committee so that the matter could be handled expeditiously by OPA, WPB, and other agencies. We have had hearings and made reports on meat packers, stoves, processors, and automobile dealers, which resulted in the passage of the Murray-Patman bill that enabled the automobile dealers to stay in business. We have had hearings on soap, motors, fats and oils, linen, trailers, and textiles. We have made many, many reports to the House. If you ask any small businessmen what they think of this committee, you will get your reply.

May I say further that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been accused of propagandizing small businessmen. The only thing the gentleman from Texas did was to issue a release telling the truth, that this committee could not operate on $20,000 and give satisfactory service. He reported exactly what the Committee on Accounts had done. If it ever comes to the place where the chairman of a committee cannot issue a news release telling the truth, then we are in a mighty poor plight. I am sorry that anyone thinks he should be criticized for that.

Furthermore, there is not in the House of Representatives a more vigilant man working for small business than the chairman of this committee. All of us have worked hard. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], when he was a member of the committee, worked hard and rendered an outstanding service.

They talk about using the committee for the benefit of the members. There is not one member of the staff of this committee who lives in the district of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and for that matter, not one member of the staff lives in the State of Texas. We have on this staff a man from Florida, one from Alabama, and one from Missouri, and he was employed before President Truman was elected. We have one from Wyoming, and one from Kansas. These men have been selected from all parts of the country and they know the problems of small businessmen in those sections.

Just as an example, I asked them, "How many cases have you been handling down there a week on this staff?"

They say they had 80 requests for help on individual cases per week from Members of Congress as an average and over 300 cases which come in by correspondence or as a result of personal visits from small business. We have heard a lot about the need of additional help and staffs to help us Members of Congress. Here we have a staff who are taking a

big load off our shoulders. This money will be largely used for payment of the salaries of these capable men. Let us not deprive ourselves of this valuable tool.

I do want to clear up one thing, however. The chairman of the Accounts Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], has always been accommodating in giving us a hearing. He has treated us with every courtesy. I have an idea that he would not be too adverse to seeing the committee have additional funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, is there any rule of the House to prevent the chairman of the Committee on Accounts from yielding to the ranking minority member 2 minutes if he has the other 58 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The time of 1 hour is entirely in the control of the gentleman from Missouri. He may yield to whom he desires.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to my friend from Illinois that if he had asked me for time he would have received 30 minutes. Never at any time when a resolution of this kind was presented has the gentleman asked me to yield 30 minutes. I certainly will be fair.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I have 2 minutes now?

Mr. COCHRAN. As soon as I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I will save you 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. No; 2 minutes is all I want.

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope the gentleman will not take offense.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I have 2 minutes now?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I will give the gentleman 2 minutes now. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Will the gentleman yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not want the time taken out of this time because I do not have much time left.

The SPEAKER. The time is running fast. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it must be obvious to all of you by this time that if I had not been opposed to the position of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, I am certainly opposed to it now. I hope the House votes down the previous question. I understand that another resolution will be offered raising that amount to between $60,000 and $75,000. I hope this amount will be granted. In fact, I know from the present temper of the House that it will be. We all admit there has not been anything derogatory said today against the work of the Committee on Small Business. I have heard no objections to it. They say they require this added amount of money. I believe the special Committee on Small Business is doing a splendid job. Let us not shackle their work. I hope this small additional amount that they are requesting is allowed.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Are we, the minority members of the Small Business Committee of this House, to understand that we are going to be gagged and not be permitted to talk on this subject today?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is solely up to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised at the attitude taken here in reference to the Small Business Committee. I want to say that the chairman of the Committee on Accounts [Mr. COCHRAN] is doing the fair, wise, and honorable thing with this committee, the same as he does with every committee that comes before the Committee on Accounts and who asks the committee for funds. There certainly never was any time that he wanted to scuttle the Small Business Committee nor is there any member of the committee that I know of who wants to scuttle it. It is the opposite—we want to help and continue it for the benefit of small business. The situation is just this. Since the Small Business Committee was formed in 1942, we appropriated $137,500 to the committee. Up to November 15, they spent $132,826 and had on hand $4,647. Now, they ask as a minimum $98,000. We gave them in January $45,000. We decided to appropriate $20,000, which would give them about 6 months continuous operation from November 15, the same rate as they have been spending ever since this committee was formed, or the amount of $4,200 a month. When you do that and you find out that they can continue this committee for 6 months from the time that they asked for this money, that would be until May 1 at least. In April, they could come to the Accounts Committee and ask for more money and they will continue it on the same basis for spending on which it has been operated. As I said before, and I want to reiterate, the committee does not want to scuttle the Small Business Committee. It wants to help it. But, gentlemen, there comes a time in the operation of business or government when certain things have to be done—that is, economize in running our Government, and that time is here. The Committee on Accounts is trying to operate for this Congress and do a good job and do it in a sensible, businesslike way. I am sure that the only thing Congress ought to do is to support the Committee on Accounts in trying to handle the affairs of the Small Business Committee. I assure you, so far as I am concerned that we will not in any way hamper the work which they are doing if they do it in the same manner as they have heretofore been doing it up to this time. Here is another point. The OPA has been one of the thorns in the flesh of the Small Business Committee in the work that they have been doing recently. On the 30th of June, that will expire and you will have an opportunity to determine whether you are going to continue the OPA or not. If they do not continue the OPA, then it will not be necessary to spend as much money for the continuation of the Small Business Committee. Goodness only knows I want to help small business, but when I get letters and telegrams from all over the United States and they read like this:

> We understand that Congress is about to scuttle the House Committee on Small Business by not giving them a large enough appropriation to work with.

Such propaganda is not the truth.

Whoever sent that word out tells a falsehood. It is not a fact at all. I think if you will leave the Committee on Accounts and the Small Business Committee alone we will handle the job, and do a good job, for the Congress and also do a good job for the small businessmen of this country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield for a question.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is certainly one of the foremost Members of this House who seeks to protect the Treasury of the United States; he is likewise a good businessman. Does he not recognize that in the operation of this committee, just as in the operation of his business, some assurance of what is going to be available in the future is necessary in order that a real program can be laid down and carried out with efficiency?

Mr. RICH. I will answer that by saying "Yes; I do." I think this committee is giving every consideration to that question when you figure that they are allowing the Small Business Committee to continue spending for the next 5½ months at the same rate it has been spending since it was formed. Does not the gentleman believe that at the end of 5 months they can again come before us if they need additional funds and we can then determine how much additional funds they need? Certainly that is the case.

I hope the gentleman will give the Committee on Accounts credit for trying to do a good, hard, disagreeable job, as well as trying to help the Committee on Small Business. There is no reason under the sun why they should not come in here 5 months hence if they need more funds, and I believe the Committee on Accounts is very fair in the amount it has allowed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not the issue come on the vote up or down of the amount allowed?

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. CHURCH. Then why be afraid of that vote?

Mr. RICH. I think the vote is going to support the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. This committee has done a good job. We will take care of small business. If they do not, then I lose faith in the Members of Congress who care nothing for the Treasury or taxpayers of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our committee got as much consideration before the Accounts Committee when we asked for funds as we are getting today when we ask for time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. No; not at the present time.

Mr. RICH. That statement is not correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, if this committee is allowed only $20,000 we might as well abolish the committee.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] said that the committee has not done anything. If he will look at the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was set up by legislation sponsored by this committee and the Senate committee, he will see that a great job was done for the small manufacturing plants throughout the country. If he will look at the three branches of the services, the Navy, the Army, and the merchant marine, he will find that when this war started you could not talk to anyone in those services about giving a contract to a small businessman, but by the work of this committee and by the work of the Senate committee before the war ended each one of those services were letting many contracts to small business concerns. Oh, we do not have to apologize for what this committee has done for the small businessmen of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Further in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], I think it might be suggested that the Small Business Committee offered certain amendments to the Surplus Property Disposal Act which were adopted by the House of Representatives. If they had been retained in that act to passage we would have had a much better situation today than we currently have.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Yes. If I may make one further statement, mention was made by the chairman of the automobile dealers' hearing which we held a few days ago. Mr. Bowles was going to cut their discount 4 or 5 percent. After we had hearings before our committee; after the automobile dealers were able to present their side of the case, Mr. Bowles cut his figures in half and the discount was only 2½ percent. That will mean millions of dollars to the small businessmen of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I think, as the chairman has stated, the committee has done a good job. I just wanted to know whether any member of the Committee on Accounts has accused your committee of extravagance.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Not that I know of.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know of any reason why the Committee on Small Business should not continue its efficient and able discharge of duty in the future just as it has in the past?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I may say that while I have voted opposite to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of this select committee, probably more than any Member of the House, I must admit that on this committee he has done a good job for small business, and the committee has always acted in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman's committee has not been accused of extravagance, I personally do not see any reason why the House should be stingy or niggardly about giving the committee money to go on with the job.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman should point out that this committee serves something like 80 Members of the House and 235 members of small business weekly in helping solve their problems, whereas the Senate committee serves a much smaller number of Senators and yet they get about $300,000 a year. I will put our record against theirs any day, any time.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The Senate committee gets three times what we get, yet our Small Business Committee every week handles requests from 80 Congressmen and 300 inquiries from businessmen throughout the country.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not a fact that our committee has offered the small business group of this country the only forum to which they can appeal?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wish to call attention to the fact that the gentleman's committee in the work it did on the renegotiation of contracts for small businessmen during the war achieved results that were worth many times what they have spent.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that the Small Business Committee submitted to the Accounts Committee an itemized program covering approximately $93,000 and that committee gave us $20,000 instead of the $93,000?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In my district I have over 400 small manufacturers that look to this committee as one contact here in Congress through which they can get some relief.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Let me say this final word to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RICH]. He suggests that we should go on from month to month. We all know how hard it is to keep good employees today. We have some splendid men on our investigation staff and I ask any businessman how we can hope to keep them working on our committee when we can only tell them that their job is safe from month to month? As a businessman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RICH], should realize that that cannot be done and he should stand by this committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to certain remarks about the chairman of the Committee on Accounts and the members of that committee. I have had the privilege of serving on that committee for several years.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman has expressed the opinion that he is opposed to all select committees of the House?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will come to that later and will answer for myself then.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman can put me in the same category as not only opposing them but voting against every one of them.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman from New York was a little fast on the trigger. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that we have committees in the House doing a job for the Congress. Many committees in the House, and I refer to special committees, including the Patman committee, are taking the work away from committees already set up to do the job. We talk about combining committees in order to save money. All we are doing, as I see it from day to day, is creating more committees, providing more Government agencies at the expense of the taxpayers back home. I am for the small businessman, but I believe better results could be obtained through the regularly established committees of the House.

I will answer the gentleman from New York now. If I had my way about it I would not spend one dollar for any special committee work. I would spend the money in the committees now set up by the Congress that are permanent committees.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the very point I make. I say that I would be willing to properly staff the standing committees rather than set up select committees.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think the time is going to come when we will have to staff the standing committees with proper investigators to do a good job here in Congress.

However, there are now about 34 special committees. There is a duplication of work going on every day by special committees, overlapping the work of permanent committees here in the House.

I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Accounts in reference to this work. We are not Bolsheviks; we have hearts the same as the rest of you. I have never been criticized so severely as I have by the information put out that we were sabotaging this committee. I am not satisfied with the Patman committee as some of the rest of the Members are, and I am going to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] one question, and this is it: Why is it that most of the telephone calls that he made from his committee are into the State of Texas? I fail to find one into the State of California where my people think we should be given some help also.

Mr. PATMAN. I will be very glad to answer it. The gentleman has asked a very fair question. It so happens that we have an understanding in our committee that each member will look after first, and particularly, and especially his own area. I look after the southwestern area; the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the southeastern area; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], the St. Louis area; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], the Springfield and Chicago areas; the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Pacific coast area; the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] the Mountain States and adjacent area; and the gentlemen from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL and Mr. KEOGH], the New York area. In a similar way we divide the work up and we think it has worked out very well.

If the gentleman will compare my personal calls for the committee, he will find my personal calls compare favorably. They are not excessive. I filed an account with the Accounts Committee. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] called me up and asked me about them and I justified every one of them. The committee approved every one of them. The gentleman is on that committee.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Why did not the gentleman bring that up at the time? If there is anything wrong with them, bring me back before the committee and I can justify them.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The reason I asked that is because most of the telephone calls were made by the gentleman. The calls of the other members of the committee do not seem to appear.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman must not have been on the Accounts Committee very long.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have been on the Accounts Committee for some time.

Mr. PATMAN. You see, each member puts in his own account for telephone calls.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I want to join the gentleman in expressing the belief that if the House throws down the gentleman from Missouri, JACK COCHRAN, and his committee, it will commit a very serious blunder. We are being given here today a fine demonstration of Government by propaganda. Except for the propaganda that has gone out and the high pressure to which Members have been subjected, there would not be a handful of Members of this House voting against JACK COCHRAN's resolution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to finish my statement, please, and then if I have any time left, I will be glad to yield.

I want to say further that when the Small Business Committee came before our committee they were given ample time to state their case. They stayed there until all questions were asked and answered. I say further, If anybody says at any time that this gentleman sitting in the chair, physically unable to defend himself against those kinds of remarks—and I refer to the gentleman from Missouri, JACK COCHRAN—turned away members of that committee at any time, it is a dirty lie, and I am just that frank and I have the guts to back it up.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], a member of the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure and responsibility of being a member of the Small Business Committee of this House since its inception in 1941. I was a member of the unofficial minority committee prior to the establishment by resolution of this committee. I think I know something about its history. I think I also know something about its fiscal history. When the statement is continually made here that the committee has only spent some average of $4,200 per month on its activities, I say to you that is the answer to my repeated contention that the committee has never performed its fullest possible service. The reason it has not performed its full service is because it has never been allowed an adequate amount of funds to do so. With the funds they have had the committee has done extremely well. You may disagree with my personal views. You may disagree with the personal policies of the chairman. You are entitled to that. The fact remains that the committee has done a tremendous amount of good, and it has been the one place in America where small business could go and find a true friend and a helping hand.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There is no better champion of the OPA than the gentleman from Texas, yet he is leading the fight in this committee to investigate the OPA. It sounds peculiar to me.

Mr. PLOESER. It may, but it does not sound peculiar to me.

There have been some statements made here that I want to challenge. It was said here that the Small Business Committee went out on a tax-hearing program. The Small Business Committee of the House during the early part of this year went out to investigate the postwar financial problems of small business, and if the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, or any other Member of this House, can give full consideration of the financial problems of any business without hearing something on the subject of taxation, then he is a wizard whom I have not yet recognized. The financial problem of every business, small and large, is involved heavily in the subject of taxation. Whatever information we obtained on the subject of taxation was turned over to the Committee on Ways and Means of this House. It was sifted out of the general mass of information on the subject of postwar financial problems, and it is a wholly unfair statement that this committee was trying to usurp the powers or the prerogatives of any other committee of this House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And the committee has appreciated the note of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means thanking the committee.

Mr. PLOESER. That is right. The Committee on Ways and Means, I am sure, realizes the value of the help that they have been able to get.

There has been one other thing emphasized here. I want to repeat it. It has been emphasized that you must not turn down your own Committee on Accounts. May I ask this House whose committee the Small Business Committee is, if it is not your own? By implication it is inferred that the Committee on Accounts is your own but the Small Business Committee is, goodness knows whose. The Small Business Committee of this House is as much your own committee as is the Committee on Accounts, and was established by your own resolution, and is now operating in the most critical economic period of America. It has never been needed more than now. This attempt to destroy the House Small Business Committee is a direct disservice to competitive enterprise.

I say to you, no matter what your personal feelings may be in this matter, I would hesitate, if I were you, before I would vote to disband this committee. The budget that this committee needs, I think, is about $96,000. The $75,000 program, as far as I am concerned, is inadequate and a compromise. I am willing to go along on it, but I am not willing to go along on a $20,000 program, which to me is a vote to disband this committee.

There have been a good many votes so far in the Accounts Committee relating to finances for the Small Business Committee which have already hamstrung the committee. It has never had an adequate budget, and we are now asking for one which, in my opinion, is not quite adequate, but I am willing to accept as a compromise, $75,000.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have suported the theory of the need for the Small Business Committee, and as long as it serves the purpose for which it was created, I feel it should have the support of Congress and the necessary appropriations to permit its continuation.

The Small Business Committee has been of great service in dealing with the problems of the small businessmen

and has rendered excellent service to me as the elected representative of small business in my congressional district.

I am strongly in favor of the committee being given an adequate appropriation to carry on its work.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] if he wanted any more time. He said he did not have anyone else he desired to yield to. The opposition has had as much time as those in favor of the resolution. I have been fair. I was not asked to yield half of the time until nearly half of the time had been yielded by me, part of which I consumed myself. I want you to know that this is not the Cochran resolution. It comes from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Was there any time when the Small Business Committee appeared before the Committee on Accounts that we did not give them all the time they asked for and try to treat them as courteously and as gentlemanly as it was possible for our committee to do?

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly not. They had a fair hearing.

Mr. RICH. They said we did not give them any time. I say that is not a statement of fact.

Mr. COCHRAN. We gave them all the time they wanted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think we ought to keep the record straight. There was no suggestion about the matter of time. There was reference to the consideration accorded the Small Business Committee before the Accounts Committee as being somewhat like the consideration involved in the handling of the time here today. That might involve many factors having to do with considerations other than just how much time might have been given before the Accounts Committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I ask the gentleman if there is anyone on his side who is a member of the Small Business Committee and who has not had an opportunity to talk, that wants 3 minutes right now?

Mr. HALLECK. I have not heard of any, no.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. May I suggest to the gentleman that the select committee is not interested in time before the Accounts Committee, but rather in getting sufficient money to do the job the House has directed it to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is not my resolution. I was directed by the committee to report this resolution. I did not offer this motion in the committee. As chairman of the committee, I am following the directions of the committee and I am with the committee on its majority vote. I am not saying what occurred in the committee.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I understood the gentleman a while ago when he said that we did not give time in the committee. He explains it differently now. If I misunderstood him I beg his pardon. However, there was no disposition on the part of the committee to do anything that was not the right or gentlemanly thing to do.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know who made the statement the gentleman refers to, but I know he did not make a correct statement if he said he was not courteously treated.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. It seems to me it is unusual and would appear to the small businessmen of America to be unusual if they read of Congress appropriating $1,350,000,000 to UNRRA yet quibbling about the small sum of a few thousand dollars to be given for the benefit of small business. For that reason I am going to vote for the larger appropriation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I say that as a small businessman I have had many telegrams during my term here in favor of the Small Business Committee. I have directed many problems to the Small Business Committee. That is one of the few select committees that make regular accounts of their progress.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I say to the gentleman from California that a representative of small business organizations in California came to my office the other day and told me he was advised we were not giving the Small Business Committee any money. When I explained the situation to him he apologized for taking up my time and said he was absolutely satisfied with what the Accounts Committee was doing.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Am I right in assuming that if the motion for the previous question——

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICHENER. The Chair determines that. Some things the gentleman from Missouri can determine, but the Chair has some privileges left.

Mr. Speaker, am I right in assuming that, if the motion for the previous question is voted down, it will be within the discretion of the Chair to recognize some Member to offer an amendment to the resolution, which is now before the House, either lowering the amount or increasing it, and that that is the only possible way in the present parliamentary situation that the House can express itself as to differences in the amount to be allowed this committee?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation.

The question is on the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COCHRAN) there were—ayes 30, noes 181.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Strike out the words and figures "$20,000" wherever they appear and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. MANASCO submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDING ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation", approved June 18, 1934.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 32, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] for 1 hour.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman from New York use some of his time?

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I do not know that I shall use the 5 minutes because I have had a great many requests for time

and I did discuss the bill at some length when the House passed it 2 years ago. Furthermore, I am advised that when the jury is with you it is not a good idea to talk too much. I anticipate that this bill will pass by substantially the same vote that it received 2 years ago, which was 270 to 107. At least that is my hope. There are one or two points that have already been made that I wish to emphasize, some illusions that I wish to dispel.

This bill has been labeled an antilabor bill. That is not true. It is not antilabor in purpose or in fact. This bill is designed simply to prevent both union members and nonunion people from making use of robbery and extortion under the guise of obtaining wages in the obstruction of interstate commerce. That is all it does.

It is the function of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, and it is the duty of Congress to protect interstate commerce. That is the object of this bill, and there is not any other.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Do I understand correctly that the committee will offer an amendment striking title II from the bill?

Mr. HANCOCK. I understand the author of the bill intends to offer such an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is made necessary by the amazing decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the United States against Teamsters' Union 807, 3 years ago. That decision practically nullified the antiracketeering bill of 1934. In effect it legalizes in certain labor disputes the use of robbery and extortion, two crimes which are recognized as serious in every State in the Union and in every civilized country whether made use of by union men, nonunion men, professional racketeers or plain hoboes. In effect the Supreme Court held that it was the intent of Congress and the meaning of that act that members of Teamsters' Union 807 in New York City were exempt from the provisions of that law when attempting by the use of force or the threat of violence to obtain wages for a job whether they rendered any service or not. In my judgment that is a gross misinterpretation of the law and a distortion of the intent of Congress. Of course, it was never the intent of Congress to legitimize crime; nevertheless, the decision of the Supreme Court in the teamsters' case will be the supreme law of the land until the Supreme Court reverses itself, which is not likely, because five of the members of the Court who made that astounding decision are still members of the Court, or until Congress acts to correct and supersede the decision and adopts a new law written in clear and unmistakable language. That is all this bill does. We think a mistake was made by the Supreme Court, we are attempting to correct it through enacting a new law which will accurately and definitely reflect the attitude of the Congress, the general public and the honest, law-abiding members of labor unions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman state for the record, please, whether or not this bill would change the present statutes insofar as they define robbery and extortion or conspiracy to commit either of those crimes?

Mr. HANCOCK. The bill contains definitions of robbery and extortion which follow the definitions contained in the laws of the State of New York. It would change no State statutes, but the Supreme Court decision, if allowed to stand, might affect State courts in construing those laws.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then it would in effect change the present Federal laws insofar as the definitions of robbery and extortion are concerned.

Mr. HANCOCK. So far as I know—the gentleman from Alabama will correct me if I am wrong—that subject is covered only in the so-called Copeland Act of 1934. I think the gentleman from Alabama has improved that law by making it more definite and certain. The courts of the States of this country have tried thousands of cases of robbery and extortion. They know what those crimes are.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will yield further, I am concerned whether or not this bill would change the definition of robbery and extortion and conspiracy all over the United States.

Mr. HANCOCK. Only so far as interstate commerce is concerned, that is all. It does not have any effect whatever that I can see upon the statutes of the individual States, because, as I said a moment ago, it is the sole power and duty of the Federal Government to regulate and protect interstate commerce.

I think the appended editorial from the Washington News of December 8 well summarizes and interprets the bill we are considering:

PASS THE HOBBS BILL

The Hobbs bill is coming up again in Congress. This time it should become law. It is not, as some union lobbyists would have you believe, an antilabor measure. It is a measure to protect honest labor and the public.

The bill is a proposed amendment to the Federal Antiracketeering Act. It says simply that whoever obstructs interstate commerce by robbery or extortion shall be held guilty of a felony.

This amendment is needed because of a 1942 Supreme Court decision. Union teamsters had been waylaying out-of-State trucks as they entered New York City, and, by threats and physical beatings, compelling the truckers to pay day's wages to local union drivers whose services were neither wanted nor needed. In some cases the local drivers, after collecting the tribute, refused to do any work for it. These facts were proved in a Federal district court.

But the Supreme Court held, in effect, that Congress had not meant the Antiracketeering Act to punish such conduct by a labor union or its members. Chief Justice Stone, dissenting, protested that the decision's reasoning "would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime." The then Justice Byrnes, who wrote the decision, observed that it did not place such activities "beyond the reach of Federal legislative control."

This was a plain invitation to Congress to enact an amendment such as the Hobbs bill, in which the word "whoever" would remove all question that Antiracketeering Act penalties are meant to apply to all persons, including union officers or members, if they practice robbery or extortion.

In April 1943 the House passed the Hobbs bill by a 270 to 107 vote, but it died for that session in a Senate Judiciary Committee pigeonhole. Now, in a few days, it will go before the House once more. Its repassage there seems certain, and it should not again be smothered in the Senate.

No Member of Congress should be deluded into believing that a vote for the Hobbs bill is a disservice to unionism. It is a service. Honest workers do not need or want racketeering to be a specially protected exclusive right of organized labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention very emphatically to the same solemn pledge I made the House in 1943 when this bill was up for consideration before. If any man, woman, or child in the whole wide world can show how this bill would affect in the slightest degree any honest member of organized labor or any other honest individual, I will offer an amendment to cure that defect or else I will vote against the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am asking this question for information. It has been said by some opponents of this measure that if in the exercise of legitimate union activities in connection with organizing a group of persons or individuals who are not members of a union a truck, for instance, may be stopped, which truck is engaged in interstate commerce, then they would be subject to the penalties imposed by this act. In other words, they would be accused of attempting by threat, force, violence, or intimidation to extort money, whereas the intention may be only to convince the nonunion person that he ought to join the union. If the gentleman will clarify that I think it will be helpful.

Mr. HOBBS. There is not a thing in the world to that statement. Title III of this bill exempts from the operation of this law any conduct under the antitrust statutes, under the NLRB Act, under the Norris-LaGuardia statute, the Railway Labor Act, the Big Four that have been termed the Magna Carta of labor. In addition, that cannot be seriously contended except as just a window dressing in opposition to this bill because there is nothing clearer than the definitions of robbery and extortion in this bill. They have been construed by the courts not once, but a thousand times. The definitions in this bill are copied from the New York Code substantially. So there cannot be any serious question along that line by the gentlemen from New York who are the leaders of the fight against the bill.

Let me point out that when you are striking, when you are picketing, when you are organizing a labor union, or engaging in any legitimate labor function, then you are operating under some one of

those four laws that are specifically exempted in this bill by title III. Aside from that there is absolutely nothing farther from the mind of any proponent of this bill than to hurt labor. Did we amend this bill when the Teamsters' Union struck in Washington? Not at all, no matter how much it hurt. It was not highway robbery. They were exercising their legitimate right to strike. The same thing is true of all the other legitimate activities of Labor, and I resent just as bitterly as you or anybody else does the aspersion cast upon organized labor that robbery and extortion are legitimate activities of organized labor. You do not believe that, I do not believe that, nobody does.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], the gentleman should point out that the taking must be an unlawful taking.

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SUMNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill does strike and strikes hard at organized labor. I say that with due deference to the views expressed by the gentleman from Alabama and with due deference to the views expressed by other members of my committee. It is significant that the present antiracketeering law contains this escape clause which is to be found on page 12 of the report. It is part of section 6 of the present law and reads as follows:

Provided, That no court of the United States shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such manner as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States.

If the proponents of this bill mean what they say, namely, that they do not wish to curtail legitimate activities of labor, then why not say so and leave section 6 as it is?

Read the provisions of the current bill and you will find that proviso is deliberately eliminated. Why? It was eliminated to hurt labor. The courts, if we pass this bill with that proviso eliminated, would have to construe that the so-called Hobbs bill actually does impair, actually does diminish, actually does destroy the right of labor to strike, the right to boycott, the right to picket, and does impair all of those rights which have been achieved by labor over the years with blood and sweat and tears. Only because of those rights have we achieved the high standards of living of the laboring men and women in this country of ours. That is to be destroyed at one full swoop. Why do they not leave that proviso in the pending bill? Why is it taken out? If they intend not to interfere with the legitimate practices of labor why do they not leave that language intact? If we take the language out of the bill, then that is tantamount to saying to the courts, and particularly with reference to the definitions contained in the bill, that striking and boycotting and picketing is robbery and is extortion. Those crimes are so broadened in definition as to embrace fair and decent acts of labor.

Mr. HANCOCK. Where does the gentleman find that language?

Mr. CELLER. I will get to that in a moment. I will ask the membership of the House to read very carefully in the present bill the definition of robbery and the definition of extortion.

Just as we are against sin, just as we are in favor of the Ten Commandments, we are against the crimes of robbery and extortion, but we are not against these crimes as they are defined in this bill. Those definitions are so broad as to permit one to drive a coach and six through them. Robbery and extortion may mean striking, picketing, demanding higher wages, boycotting.

Thus the term "extortion" is defined in the pending bill as "the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right."

The present law already declares a felony the activities of a person who "obtains the property of another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of force or fear, or under color of official right."

H. R. 32, the pending bill, declares felonious the activities of any person who "commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of section 2."

The present law already on the books declares felonious the activities of any person who "commits or threatens to commit an act of physical violence or physical injury to a person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to violate section (a) or (b)."

H. R. 32 declares to be felonious the activities of any person who "conspires with another or with others, or acts in concert with another or with others to do anything in violation of section 2."

The present law declares to be felonious the activities of any person who "conspires or acts concertedly with any other person or persons to commit any of the foregoing acts."

H. R. 32 applies the term "robbery" to the "unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property" against the will of another person "by means of actual or threatened force or violence or fear of injury."

The present law makes felonious the activities of any person who "obtains" or "attempts to obtain" money or other valuable considerations "by the use of or attempt to use or threat to use force, violence, or coercion."

In general, therefore, when we discuss the instant bill we are not discussing the question of whether or not we are to have an antiracketeering law. We already have one which contains all of the substantial protections against racketeering which are needed, or, indeed, which this bill offers. When we discuss the Hobbs bill what we are discussing is what changes should be made in the present antiracketeering law.

There are courts which have held that whenever workers seek to bring about a wage increase or other adjustment of their working conditions by a strike, however peacefully conducted, they are attempting to "force" their employer to grant the wage increase or grant the requested adjustment of their working conditions.

There are courts which would hold that since a union's sole method of inducing an unwilling employer to grant wage increases is the economic weapon of the strike, then the very posing of the demand by a union to the employer is a "threat" of "force."

Attorneys familiar with the decisions of the courts on question of picketing will recall that there are courts which have held that picketing, however peacefully conducted, is by its very nature an attempt to force the employer into action which he is not willing to take. It is on this basis that many courts have in years past granted sweeping injunctions against concededly peaceful labor activity.

Attorneys familiar with the decisions of the courts on charge of "violence" in labor relations can tell of the implications to labor in a statute worded as is the instant bill. There are courts which, in injunction cases and in disorderly conduct cases, have held name-calling or use of such terms as "scab" to constitute "force" or "violence." Whatever may be your views as to whether such name-calling should properly be considered disorderly conduct under local ordinances or statutes, it should be kept in mind that the pending bill is defining conduct which would become a felony, punishable by imprisonment up to 20 years, or by a fine of up to $10,000, or both.

This problem has another aspect. It is generally recognized that some, if not all, labor disputes are unfortunately marked by heated tempers on both sides. It is unfortunately true that in some instances in the heat of labor disputes there will be minor altercations on the picket line. There will be occasional scuffles between partisans. And truly criminal conduct which may occur in the course of these altercations and scuffles is of course punishable by local disorderly conduct statutes or ordinances or other local laws. Under the Hobbs bill every such altercation is automatically raised to the level of a Federal offense—a Federal felony the punishment for which may be as high as 20 years in jail or $10,000 in fine.

Nor is that all. Those dangers are not even limited to the persons who may take part in the strike or in the picket line and certainly not to the persons who may be actually involved in the altercations or in the name-calling or other incidents which under this bill would become felonius.

Section 3 of this bill makes equally felonious the conduct of those who "conspire" with or "act in concert" with others to commit the acts which are prohibited by the bill. Now, if a strike is

"force," within the meaning of the other sections of the bill, then obviously not only the strikers are guilty of felony but all those who voted for the strike at the union meeting. Indeed all those who are members of the union may be involved, since by their membership in the organization they may be found either to have "conspired" or to have "acted in concert" with strikers. By the same token, all of the workers on the picket line, and indeed all of the members of the union, may be found to have "conspired" or to have "acted in concert" with the individual or individuals who may have become engaged in an altercation found to constitute a felony under the bill.

All of these are not merely hypothetical dangers. They are not speculation. These are dangers which are found in the kind of construction which courts have in the past given to certain words in connection with their application to labor-relations problems.

True, we have come a very long way from the kind of approach which is reflected in such interpretations. We may assume that there are very few today who would side with the courts of the first two decades of the nineteenth century which found the mere existence of a labor organization to constitute an unlawful "conspiracy." The fact is, however, that applied to specific strike situations and other specific labor-relations problems brought to the courts, there are many decisions now on the books and there are many judges now on the bench whose outlook may quite definitely be expected to result in holdings of the kind that have been outlined above.

It is reasonable to assume our national legislators do not believe that legislation directed against "racketeering" should be directed against a strike for higher wages or a picket line in support of such a strike. Certainly that was not the intent of the Congress which enacted the 1934 Antiracketeering Act. We doubt that the supporters of the pending bill would be willing to assert that this is their intention today. Yes; these are the results.

So that many of the acts which accompany strikes, legitimate acts which accompany boycotts and which accompany picketing, come within the purview of this very, very wide definition of "robbery," this very wide definition of "extortion," and we must be careful before we leap into this egregious error.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] said that the purpose of this bill was to correct a difficulty that arose out of the so-called case of the teamsters' union local in New York. That teamsters' union was guilty of the vilest kind of offenses, and I hold no brief for that teamsters' union. But what happened? Daniel Tobin, as I said yesterday, the president of the International Teamsters Union, not only cracked the knuckles of that Local 807 in New York, but suspended its charter, and in that way purged the International Teamsters Union of the vile offenses of which this local was guilty. I take off my hat to Mr. Tobin because of what he did in that regard, and I defy any one to point out a repetition of anything that that local has done since that Supreme Court decision came down.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. On yesterday I read a letter from a farmer, dated December 3, 1945, in which he complained about his neighbor's son being compelled to give up $30 under threats of physical violence. On yesterday afternoon I talked with a processor from the city of Bethlehem who informed me that he was no longer shipping articles to New York by truck but was shipping them by train because he was compelled to kick in, if you please, $10 for every load of his materials that went into the gentleman's city.

Mr. CELLER. I am quite sure that upon strict analysis of those cases mentioned it will be found that there are no guilty acts at which the gentleman can point, similar to those of which the teamsters' union was guilty. Teamsters are doing a good job and have done a good job. They have been purged. I respect the good faith of the gentleman from Pennsylvania but I should like to see the details of those cases. I am quite sure the conclusions reached by the gentleman will be entirely different.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. A moment ago the gentleman said the threat of a strike came within the definition of extortion. This bill merely prohibits the wrongful use of force or threats. That cannot apply to a threatened strike because strikes are lawful, they are not wrongful. I wish the gentleman would show me a case to verify the wild statement he made a moment ago.

Mr. CELLER. The statement I made is far from wild. The gentleman himself has been guilty of a number of wild statements in his defense of his position here on the floor with reference to this bill. I am willing to do anything in my power to prevent robbery and extortion, but when you tie robbery and extortion to the legitimate activities of labor, I am going to protest.

Further, you place penalties on these legitimate activities of labor that go up to 20 years in jail and up to $10,000. If you look at the antitrust penalties against employers you find that they are only $5,000 or 1 year in jail. This bill has direct relation to the antitrust laws, the Clayton Act. Examine those acts and see what you do to the malefactors in organizations like the National Manufacturers' Association and the United States Chamber of Commerce. You treat them rather gently if they are guilty of these offenses involving the antimonopoly statutes. You inflict a penalty of only $5,000, but on the laboring man you inflict a penalty of $10,000 or, in the alternative, 20 years in jail. If that is not a harsh and unjustifiable penalty, I would like to know what is.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Statements have been made both yesterday and today with regard to racketeering in the city of New York. I think any person who knows anything about New York City knows that for the past 12 years we have had an honest police administration that has been warring on racketeering and rackets, and we have had honest and capable district attorneys. Any person in the city of New York who feels that he is being made the victim of a racket or extortion or assault or robbery can get, and has been able to receive, adequate protection when he goes to the police authorities or the district attorney's office.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. No; I will not yield. My time is running short.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman like to have a quorum call?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, I will take a quorum call. The gentleman cannot frighten or threaten me with a quorum call. The gentleman is rather impolite when he makes that assertion or statement. I will yield to the gentleman in due course if he will just be patient.

This bill is merely a substitution for the existing antiracketeering act. It is not an attempt to introduce for the first time on our books antiracketeering legislation. We already have an antiracketeering law. The important thing to consider in connection with this bill is what changes are being sought to be made in the existing law. The responsible labor organizations condemn the practices which constitute racketeering. Labor has taken vigorous steps most frequently, with the aid of Government prosecutors, to cleanse its ranks of racketeering elements. Labor opposes the bill not because labor opposes antiracketeering legislation but because this bill is not in any respect an antiracketeering measure. It is a strike-breaking bill. It is a time bomb with a false label. It is a booby trap aimed at labor, only wrapped up in silken terms. This bill, while purporting to replace completely the existing antiracketeering acts, repeals the language of the original act and recasts it in terms of labels such as robbery and extortion. The term "extortion" is defined in the present act and the same is true with reference to "robbery." In general, therefore, when we discuss the instant bill we are not discussing the question of whether or not we ought to have an antiracketeering law. We already have one, and it contains all the substantial protections against racketeering which are needed.

Very significantly there is ripped out of the present statute by the instant bill the so-called section 6 which seeks to protect labor in its legitimate activities of striking, boycotting, and picketing. That is ripped out of the section. It is very significant. The deletion would have very significant serious repercussions—repercussions which you gentlemen ought to consider very, very carefully. The provisions now in the law, that is, this section 6 which I read a moment ago, were inserted by the representatives of the very agency of the Gov-

ernment entrusted with the duty of enforcing the legislation, the Department of Justice. That Department said unless section 6 were inserted legitimate activities of labor would be seriously affected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this bill contend it is intended to maintain law and order and to protect farmers and truckers in the peaceful pursuit of their work in bringing their produce into the centers of population in some sections of this country.

I yield to no Member of this House in my desire for the maintenance of law and order. During the period of unlawful possession of other peoples' property by sit-down strikers I conferred with the late William P. Connery, then chairman of the House Committee on Labor, and our committee met and denounced sit-down strikes. Mr. Connery expressed our views and the views of the Committee on Labor on the floor of this House.

This proposed law is an acknowledgement by its proponents that law and order has broken down in the sections of the country they represent. Is it true that the very people who elect them to Congress to make laws also elect State, county, and city law-enforcement officers who are weaklings who fail in their duty to enforce law? Do they elect judges who fail in their duty to impose proper penalties for law violation?

Every State, city, and county in the United States has ample State and local laws to meet this situation. It is difficult to understand why Members of Congress, whose entire records as national legislators have been based upon the principle of State's rights, now stand up here and attempt to fasten upon the Federal Government the responsibility of enforcing local law in every city, village, and hamlet in the Nation. This is not a Federal Government function. I would be ashamed to stand here on the floor of Congress and admit that I represented such a district.

I have the honor to be a Member of Congress from one of the large cities of our Nation—San Francisco. Unlawful interference would not be tolerated by our law enforcement officers. Not only are our farmers and truckers protected in their lawful pursuits of bringing their produce to market, but they have been strongly supported and encouraged by the city of San Francisco. We have built a large central farmers' market and in the last election, just 1 month ago, the people by an overwhelming majority voted to enlarge and improve that market where people of all walks of life go to procure fruits and vegetables fresh from the farms and orchards.

This body of 435 Members represents every section of the United States. There is not a State or county or municipality which is not in a better financial position to enforce law and order locally than is the Federal Government. The war has placed a debt of $275,000,000,000 on our National Government. Many States and communities are absolutely free of debt and have large treasury reserves. Why should these Members of Congress impose the employment of another army of Federal tax-eaters on this Government to enforce a law of this kind.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been sadly misrepresented. I would like to take a little time to explain what, in my judgment at least, the bill does and what it does not do. Back in 1934, this Congress passed an antiracketeering law. Briefly, it made it a felony to obtain personal property from another by violence or by threats of violence if it affected interstate commerce. The law had what turned out to be a very important exception.

It provided it did not apply to wages obtained from a bona fide employer by a bona fide employee. In 1941 that statute came before the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the United States against local 807 of the teamsters' union. The facts in that case were not disputed and here is what the facts were in substance: In the city of New York is the Washington Market, which is probably the largest fruit and vegetable market in the world. The market is under the control of this local 807. It was the practice of members of that union to post themselves at the bridges and at the Holland Tunnel. Here would come a farmer, say, from North Carolina with a load of vegetables. The union members would stop him at the bridge and a member of the union would say, "Move over, buddy; I will drive you down to the market." This farmer would say, "No, thank you; I know the way down."

The union member would say, "Buddy, you had better move over and let me take you down there." Then he would collect $7 or $8, depending on the size of the truck. Sometimes the union member would drive the truck down to the market, sometimes he would not. When the farmer arrived at the Washington Market, here would come another member of the union and he would say, "Brother, I am going to help you unload." The farmer would say, "No, thank you; I have my boy to help me unload."

The union member would say, "You better let me help you."

And that meant an additional fee.

The consequences of your refusal were first, your cargo would be labeled "hot cargo" and that market was organized so that it meant that your produce would not be handled. That is, if you were lucky. Sometimes you would be beaten up and your truck overturned.

Those were the facts in the case, and nobody disputes them. The Supreme Court in that decision held, considering the exception I have referred to, that the Congress did not intend the antiracketeering law to apply to activities of organized labor. I will not go into the opinion written by Mr. Justice Byrnes. There was a strong dissenting opinion written by Mr. Chief Justice Stone.

There has been some talk here of how this would affect the legitimate activities of organized labor. There is nothing to it, Mr. Chairman. Many of the Members of this House have been prosecuting attorneys. Here is what a prosecutor would need to allege and prove to get conviction under this law if this bill becomes law:

First, they would need to prove that the activity complained of in some way affected interstate commerce; second, they would have to prove that there was an actual, not a theoretical, taking of personal property; third, they would have to prove that the taking was by violence, by personal violence, or by actual threats of personal violence; and then, fourth, they would have to prove that the acts done—they might be violent, they might take something, but the Government would have to prove in addition that the acts done did not come within the exceptions set out in title III.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield briefly.

Mr. WELCH. May I ask my friend if it is possible that law and order have broken down in the great State of Iowa to the extent that the State, county, and local officers cannot enforce law?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Let me say to my friend from California that law and order have not broken down in Iowa. The things that were done in New York would never be tolerated for one minute in Iowa; do not think they would. But Congress has the duty under the Constitution to protect interstate commerce.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Not at the moment.

We had extensive hearings on this bill. One of the witnesses was Thurman Arnold, at that time Assistant United States Attorney General. Here is a statement he made on page 402 of the hearings—here is what he said:

> And I am going to make a rather extreme statement, but I think, nonetheless, it is true. I think today, under the Federal law, there is no right in the farmer which labor is bound to respect, there is no right in the consumer which labor is bound to respect, and the independent businessman has no right which labor is bound to respect. In other words, labor's pressure on these three groups is independent of any law whatever. It is entirely up to the will of the particular labor union.

On the next page you will find this statement made by Mr. Arnold:

> In other words, independent businessmen all over the United States are completely at the mercy of any organized labor group.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. A few days ago the same thing that happened in New York City occurred in the city of Des Moines, within the great State of Iowa. Here is an editorial that will be read later disclosing that very situation, which this bill would remedy. The

gentleman from Minnesota will read the editorial later.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Of course, the State law prohibits robbery and extortion. Unquestionably State indictments could have been returned against the members of this union. The fact is, however, such indictments were not returned. It is a break-down of law enforcement reminding the Congress of its duty to protect interstate commerce by the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have been amazed and disappointed at the attitude of certain labor leaders in regard to this proposed legislation. Many of them have labeled this as antilabor legislation. That is not true. This bill simply would protect interstate commerce from robbery and extortion, no matter by whom these crimes were committed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time in an effort to keep the record straight, because I find it necessary to take issue with some of the statements made by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. I happen to be a farmer in California. A lot of our produce is hauled into the city of San Francisco. The man who drives the truck, who hauls our fruit and produce into San Francisco, must belong to the teamsters' organization or he must pick up a member of the teamsters' organization, carry him on the truck to the point of unloading and pay him for all the time that the truck is in the city of San Francisco.

The farmers of the four counties I represent have been forced on many occasions, while hauling their own produce in their own trucks, to pick up members of labor organizations at the city limits of San Francisco, carry them on the truck to the point of unloading and back again to the city limits and pay them their wage for that period of time. This must be done in spite of the fact that the man who is thus paid does no work as far as driving or unloading the truck is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I say that is wrong. That is the sort of policy we must stop. Every farmer who hauls produce into the city of San Francisco or into any other large metropolitan area should be permitted to haul it in on his own truck and unload it himself without paying tribute to any organization of any kind.

I recall a time, back about 1938, when milk in the San Francisco milkshed was declared "hot" and the members of the teamsters' union refused to haul the milk for dairymen. Because the farmers' milkers declined to join the dairy workers' union, a secondary boycott was declared, and the teamsters left the milk to spoil instead of hauling it to the city for processing and bottling. As a result of such high-handed action the public went without milk and the farmers lost money. This ridiculous policy was carried so far in one instance in southern California that a farmer who fed his cows hay that was declared "hot" because it was hauled by a nonunion truck driver also had his milk declared "hot" and the teamsters' union refused to haul the milk.

This bill seeks to prevent the legalization of highway robbery and extortion and I hope it will be passed by a heavy majority.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. I have lived in San Francisco since before the gentleman was born, and I feel safe in saying that farmers bringing their produce into the city of San Francisco have not been interfered with by teamsters or anybody else. Moreover the city of San Francisco has provided a great free farmers' market in the geographical center of the city, where farmers can sell direct to consumers their own products, without interference. I resent the statement because I think my colleague has been misinformed. Law and order has not broken down in San Francisco.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, regardless of how long the gentleman has lived in San Francisco, I must take issue with him again, because I know of hundreds of farmers in the four counties I represent who have been forced to pay the tribute that I referred to in my previous remarks, and if factual information is needed, I will be glad to obtain it for the gentleman who represents San Francisco. However, nothing I have said would imply that law and order had broken down in that city.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago, while the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was speaking, I was very much interested to hear him make the statement that Mr. Danny somebody or other cracked the knuckles of a union and had taken away the charter of a union called No. 807. I was especially interested in that in view of the conversation I had over the telephone this morning with a friend of mine in Pennsylvania who has a big string of trucks. I told him this bill was up, and I asked him if he was still paying for milk to enter New York City. He said he was paying $11.63 for every truck going through the tunnel to Local 807 to get a man on his truck. I asked him, "Do your people not belong to the union?" "Yes," he said, "they do; they belong to the American Federation of Labor Truckers Union of Allentown, Pa." I said, "Well, do you need those men?" He said, "Of course, I do not need them." He said, "It ties up my trucks and I lose a return load." I said, "Why do you not ask for a little bit of protection against these hold-ups?" He said, "I consider my 20 Mack trucks too valuable to be burned up."

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his observation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] was correct in the statement he made.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I am very much in favor of this bill. I voted for it on a previous occasion and expect to vote for it again. I have great respect for the gentleman's legal judgment, so I would like to ask him if he feels that this legislation that we are considering would reach the sort of case that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] just related to the House?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do. I think it will reach it.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. Any other question?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. It might help the gentleman from New York to know that some of us out in the country know something more about New York as far as conditions are concerned than he does, because some of my neighbors are paying as much as $90 a load to take produce in and get out alive in their trucks. They paid $90 a trip.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. I call the gentleman's attention to section 6 of the committee's report, the proviso. I understand the committee claims that this bill will only apply to the illegitimate or law-breaking activities of any person, including labor unions. If that be true, why did the committee strike out the proviso in the present law and leave it out? May I have an answer to that question? Why was it stricken out?

Mr. HANCOCK. What proviso is that, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. DOYLE. The proviso, which reads:

> That no court of the United States shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such manner as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States.

Mr. HANCOCK. We thought it would better safeguard the statutes which the various labor people are interested in, namely, the Clayton Act, Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Railway Labor Act, and the Fair Labor Practices Act. We are explicit. That language is too general, and we thought it better to make this bill explicit, and leave nothing to the imagination of the court.

Mr. DOYLE. Is not this language that I have read more explicit than your title III?

Mr. HANCOCK. No.

Mr. DOYLE: The ordinary public does not understand title III. This is very plain.

Mr. HANCOCK. Title III was entirely satisfactory to all of the labor leaders that appeared before the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I will say that title III does not give the protection that the labor leaders have sought, and that the labor leaders are opposed to it the way it is worded. It is an escape clause that appears in four different statutes: The Railway Labor Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Clayton Act, and the National Labor Relations Board Act. But it does not provide for any defense that any legitimate labor workingman may have against prosecution under this act unless those escape clauses are specifically placed into the so-called Hobbs bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I consider this one of the finest speeches I ever made in the House.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, on record vote of 259 to 108, the House adopted the rule bringing before the House and making in order the antiracketeering bill, H. R. 32. I voted for the rule, and I arise in support of the bill.

We have heard it said that this bill is antilabor, would destroy the labor unions, take away the right to strike, and interfere with collective bargaining.

There is no such language or provision in the bill, and I am at a loss to understand how anyone could put any such interpretation on this bill. If I believed that these statements were well-founded in fact, I, too, would oppose this bill.

The Supreme Court has held time and again and in a very able and considered opinion by Chief Justice Taft that labor has the constitutional right to organize, and to strike; and Congress has from time to time reaffirmed this right by legislative enactments as well as the right of labor to bargain collectively; and Congress has set up machinery to effectuate these purposes and to protect labor in these rights. Furthermore for many years the two great political parties have from time to time in their platforms conceded the right of labor to organize, strike, and bargain collectively. This too has been affirmed by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and other employer groups.

I think I can very properly be classified as a friend of labor and as desiring always that they have full protection of their constitutional rights and freedom of action in exercising these rights.

The recent labor-management conference appointed by the President, made up of outstanding leaders in industry and labor, apparently agreed on one thing and that is: the right of labor to organize, strike, and bargain collectively, and private enterprise be preserved. I think it was well said by at least one of the leaders of labor that these rights are a part of the private enterprise system of this country; but as I understand this bill, it in no way interferes with such principles or policies. It seeks to protect interstate commerce from robbery and extortion. The Federal Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. Congress has by appropriate action through the years set up a regulatory system protecting interstate commerce and at the same time protecting the public. It is, therefore, incumbent upon Congress, when it appears necessary, to pass such legislation as is proper to protect interstate commerce.

Our Judiciary Committee, expressing approval of this bill, held extensive hearings covering nearly 500 printed pages of testimony. There appeared before the committee all of the leading farm organizations expressing strong approval of this bill, and many leading public officials of the Nation and those engaged in industry and commerce, likewise approving the bill. There were also some of the outstanding leaders from the ranks of labor. They were critical of the bill. I have received only one request from a person living in my district to vote against this bill while on the other hand I have received scores of letters and wires urging me to support it.

The farm groups pointed out how outrageously the farmers in various sections of the country were being treated by what they called racketeers. Certain organized groups in the various large cities of the country would engage in the practice of stopping and holding up farmers' trucks. The products of the farms were being trucked from New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and hundreds of these trucks were held up when they approached the city limits of New York and especially the Holland Tunnel. These racketeers would, by threats and many times by assaults and other acts of violence, force the farmer to move over and give some alleged teamsters' union man the wheel to drive the truck into the city and they would exact from the farmer $8.41 for a small truck, and $9.42 for a larger one. The evidence showed that many of these men after collecting their $9.42 or $8.41, as the case might be, would then abandon the truck. If the farmer refused their demands he was forced to submit by being put in fear of his life and in many cases by actual physical assaults of a serious character. These so-called union teamsters terrorized the farmers going into New York City and other cities with their produce, and I regret to say that this condition obtained when trucks handling farm produce as well as defense materials during the war were held up.

The evidence also shows that much larger sums were collected—even as high as $30 a truckload. These farmers and workers appealed to the city and State authorities but were unable to get any relief. The evidence showed that this pattern of racketeering was followed in San Francisco, Philadelphia, and many other cities of the Nation. This situation, according to press reports and other information, has continued.

CONGRESS TAKES ACTION

In order to protect thousands of American citizens in their constitutional rights, and to prevent these acts of robbery, assault, and extortion, Congress passed an amendment to the antiracketeering law in 1942. Notwithstanding this act of Congress these unlawful acts continued in New York City and throughout the Nation. A number of them were indicted in one of the United States district courts of New York. Twenty-seven were convicted. They appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States and although these acts of violence to farmers and other truckers showed utter disregard for the constitutional rights of these farmers and truckers and violation of the constitutional and statutory laws, under the Interstate Commerce law, the Supreme Court wrote one of the most remarkable opinions that was ever written by that Court. It stated in effect that although the defendants had on numerous occasions committed robberies and extortions, yet, by reason of the fact that they belonged to a teamsters' union they were exempt under the law from prosecution and punishment. That opinion was generally condemned.

Chief Justice Stone submitted a dissenting opinion in which he stated, in effect, that common-law robbery and related crimes could be indulged in as a mere pastime under that decision.

The Supreme Court had ignored the clear mandate of the Congress of the United States against racketeering and had licensed these men to commit these crimes simply because they belonged to a union. They were permitted to go free, unwhipped of justice.

But it has been stated by the opponents of this bill that Mr. Tobin, head of the teamsters' union, has rapped the knuckles of these offending members and taken away the charter of this particular union. However that may be, this racketeering conduct has continued in New York City and throughout the Nation.

Under this state of the case it becomes necessary for Congress to amend this antiracketeering law and spell out and draw a map for the Supreme Court, to clearly indicate that it never was the intention of Congress to legalize robbery or extortion whoever might commit such offenses.

BILL LIMITED TO RACKETEERS, ROBBERY, AND EXTORTION

This bill does not limit punishment merely to those who belong to labor unions for committing robbery and extortion. It includes any group whether they be farmers, truckers, industrialists, or workers. The original act set forth its purpose as follows:

An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violation, threats, coercion or intimidation.

The bill before us provides:

The term "robbery" means unlawful taking or obtaining personal property from the owner himself or his property from another over the protest of such person and against his will, by means of actual or threatened force of violence or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his personal property or property in his custody or possession.

No labor union in my district favors robbery or extortion to carry on its business to my knowledge.

This was the very thing that was happening in New York and other parts of

the country. These persons, under alleged right as members of an organization, were unlawfully taking or obtaining the trucks or the money of farmers and truckers by means of actual or threatened force or violence or fear of injury.

The word "extortion" as defined in this bill means the obtaining of property from another with his consent but induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force or violence or fear.

The definitions of robbery and extortion set out in this bill are the same definitions set out in the New York State code of laws and are defined in substantially the same way by the laws of every State in the Union. Of course, it does not apply to any case where personal property of another person is taken lawfully, without force or violence or fear of injury.

This bill merely makes clear robbery and extortion. In order that there might be no mistake in interpretations and innocent people may not be wrongfully punished, title II of the bill provides that "whoever obstructs, delays, or affects commerce or the movement of an article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony." So it is up to the Government to prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the person charged under this antiracketeering bill has committed either robbery or extortion before such person can be convicted.

But some of our labor friends say that some judges or some district attorneys might use this law as a cloak to punish innocent people.

We must assume that the average Federal judge is honest, and that the average juryman of the citizenry where the offense is committed is honest, and that they will not convict the defendant unless guilt has been established by the evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. This law will be no different from that of murder, rape, kidnaping, arson, theft, and so forth. No doubt there have been some cases, because of unfairness of the judge or the overzealousness of the prosecuting attorney, where some innocent person has been convicted. We cannot, however, repeal our laws against murder, rape, kidnaping, arson, theft, and so forth because some court may some time convict an innocent person. These offenses are obnoxious to the American people and the crimes of robbery and extortion have been condemned by honest men and courts throughout the ages. The man who commits these crimes has violated the laws of God and man. These crimes are not confined to racketeers in the labor movement. We have many instances where one group of farmers has taken possession unlawfully of the trucks of other farmers and overturned the trucks and destroyed the produce of the others by violence and fear and prevented the trucks moving in interstate commerce. They, too, were racketeers. And in one of the great States of this Union there were what was known for many years as the "night-riders." These men were organized to destroy the tobacco beds and the tobacco of other farmers, and would assault and beat and sometimes kill the objects of their unlawful purpose. They went in the nighttime in disguise to some tobacco grower's farm and some tobacco growers were actually killed. That State passed a very rigid law against "night-riders" and the courts convicted those whose guilt could be established.

I could recite other groups that acted as the racketeers have been doing and are now doing in New York and many other cities of the country. The money and other property of citizens were obtained through extortion, by the wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I do not have the time. I regret very much that I cannot yield to the gentleman from New York. He has already used 15 minutes in opposition to the bill.

LAW AND ORDER

This is America. We have the finest and best Constitution ever devised by man—protecting the life, liberty, and property of our citizens.

Each of the 48 States has adopted the Bill of Rights and other provisions of our Federal Constitution. This is government of law, established by the people themselves. I know of no country that affords so much protection, that insures so much of happiness and promises more liberty and freedom, than our own Federal and State Constitutions. These laws have been administered by officials of our own choosing. I do not say that our laws are perfect or have been administered intelligently or at all times fairly, but we do provide a way whereby laws may be amended or repealed and other laws substituted therefor, and we can remove our public officials. We can do this by the use of the ballot, not with the billy or bullets.

There should be "equal justice under law." That is the legend engraved in marble over the Supreme Court of the United States. People cannot be happy, prosperous, or free without law and order. I am very much opposed to robbery, extortion, and lawlessness on the part of any farm organization, labor organization, industrial organization, or on the part of any individual or group. I do not believe that any lawful organization can best serve its ends through lawlessness and violence. However large the organization may be, the American people as a group are still larger, and I do not believe that any organization serves the interests of its members in permitting any of the group to engage in racketeering, lawlessness, or intimidation. In the end they are bound to lose the good will and support of the American people.

Many of the labor leaders and members of the unions in my section are active in religious, school, and welfare activities. They believe in law and order. The great industrial, agricultural, and labor problems cannot be settled by violence and lawlessness. I cannot conceive of any responsible labor leader entertaining any other opinion.

I wish to reiterate that I cannot believe that a bill denouncing robbery and extortion can or will interfere in any way with the legitimate purposes and aims of labor.

THE MAGNA CARTA OF LABOR PRESERVED

Title II of this bill was cut out as it is a war measure. Labor was considerably concerned about that. But they have no cause for worry if the Senate will follow the action of the House.

Title III of this bill has been substituted for title II—there are only two titles to the bill. Title III is now title II in the bill and this title preserves expressly the so-called big four—the magna carta of American labor. These are: The Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914; the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act; the Railway Labor Act; and the National Labor Relations Board. This bill does not disturb these four acts.

The House passed a bill containing these provisions in 1943 by a vote of two to one. The Senate took no action and it was allowed to die in the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The indications are that instead of this bill losing popularity with the people it has increased, and I am sure on a roll-call vote it will be adopted by 2½ or 3 to 1. Of course, I do not mean to intimate in my speech that all those who are opposed to this bill believe in robbery or extortion. I am quite certain, however, that those who are opposing it have no just foundation for their fears.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the Lord commanded the people to love one another. He took the Ten Commandments and condensed them into two, the latter of which was "Love thy neighbor."

Mr. Chairman, in the war a larger percentage of labor and the sons of laboring people served in the Army, the Navy, and the Marines than any other class.

In the field of industry they took no-strike pledges and they gave us the highest production there ever was. There are and have been some people in some countries of the world who have raised the red flag and declared for a class struggle and state that there cannot be any effective political or collective bargaining and that classes were natural enemies of each other. These are the followers of Karl Marx and so forth. But, my friends, this bill is a declaration of war on organized labor or lack of trust in them and a declaration of the class struggle as vicious as any red advocate ever conceived. I know this bill was not taken from the constitution of Soviet Russia because Soviet Russia has a little conscience for the common man. The only place that it could have come from was the constitution of national socialism as advocated by Adolf Hitler. I want to say further that there is more racketeering on the heels and coattails of the Members of Congress in Washington than there is in the whole labor movement of the United States. It is about time that these people who are talking about home rule against the New Deal on account of these Federal laws and the bureaucracy would be a little consistent and not try to socialize the laboring classes of this country.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot these days about the rights of different individuals and groups of individuals in a community, but little or nothing about their obligations. The so-called Hobbs bill is designed to make assault and battery and highway robbery unpopular. Its purpose is to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation. It seeks to impress upon individuals who happen to hold a card of membership in some organization or other that there are obligations to recognize that other people may have certain rights. It has passed the House before by an overwhelming majority.

I never have heard any sane, legitimate objection to the Hobbs bill. As a sample of what we do hear, let me quote the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who yesterday used these words—page 11840 of the RECORD:

> This bill attempts to make a felony cut of a misdemeanor. It would make it a crime for a man to talk to a nonunion driver or to drivers who bring in goods, merchandise, or other things into the black market.

In common law pleading we would call that something akin to a departure. I allege that a man has converted to his own use my horse and he replies that his grandmother is a fine woman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I think the gentleman has overlooked the fact perhaps that in Illinois highway robbery is a misdemeanor, that is, in Chicago.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman. This is an example of a ridiculous and fantastic substitute for a legitimate argument. There is no reference to a black market in this RECORD.

Let me quote from the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Stone in the famous case of United States against local 807—page 7 of committee report:

> Respondents, who are members of a labor union, were convicted of conspiracy to violate the Anti-Racketeering Act. They, or some of them, lay in wait for trucks passing from New Jersey to New York, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threats of beating the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or their employers of a sum of money for each truck, $9.42 for a large truck and $8.41 for a small one, said to be the equivalent of the union wage scale for a day's work. In some instances they assisted or offered to assist in unloading the truck and in others they disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service.

Does he make any reference to a black market?

Further, the Chief Justice has this to say:

> It is no answer to say that the guilt of a defendant is personal and cannot be made to depend upon the acts and intention of another. Such an answer if valid would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime.

A man, with his truck, taking food into the city of New York, is set upon by two or more men, who beat or threaten him with serious bodily harm and thereby compel the payment to them of a day's wage. It is admitted that in some of the instances these stick-up men disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service. The man pays the money to save himself and his property. He does not feel that his assailants are fit men to be trusted with the driving of his truck with its load of food and rejects their offer of service. It is not clear to me how anybody could find in these facts and circumstances an honest relationship of employer and employee, voluntarily entered into between the assailant and the assailed.

Certainly this situation calls for correction.

It is said that we have been fighting for the "four freedoms" everywhere in the world, of which two are freedom from fear and freedom from want. This statute proposed is of universal application. It is designed to make these "four freedoms" applicable not only to Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea, but everywhere in the world, including the Holland Tunnel.

This so-called Hobbs bill should be passed.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, there are in general three kinds of bills that come before the House having to do with matters affecting organized labor. In the first place, and all too seldom, we sometimes get a bill that is honestly designed to try to improve the functioning of the collective bargaining machinery and to help constructively labor and management in the job of trying to iron out their difficulties without stoppages and conflict. The reason we seldom, I say, get legislation of that kind is, I believe, twofold. It is because, in the first place, we have certain Members of the House as well as groups in the population who, instead of attempting to analyze the problems that labor, management, and, more important, the Nation as a whole, are confronted with, are just mad at labor and so they attempt to do something they believe is going to put a crimp in labor, or put labor in its place, or something of that sort. On the other hand, some of the rest of us may from time to time be guilty of being for or against a measure not because of our analysis of the merits of the measure but because we find that labor as an organized entity is for or against the measure. Now, that is a good reason, but not necessarily a sufficient one. For my part, it seems to me if a man is going to do his job in this Congress correctly, he has got to make it very clear that he is going to do the best he can on every measure and not be for it or against it because some group tells him to be; that he will think his way through the issues independently and not base his action solely on what somebody tells him he should think.

To be a little more specific, I am going to say, as I have already said heretofore on this floor, that the proposal of the President of the United States for appointing fact-finding bodies in connection with labor disputes belongs in the first category of the legislation that I am going to outline in just a moment. In that category is the constructive type of legislation, which attempts to improve and strengthen the processes of collective bargaining. While I do not personally believe that the President's proposal itself is adequate, I think it does require careful consideration by the Labor Committee, and I hope it is going to get it. It corresponds to the last step in the Railway Labor Act rather than the whole Railway Labor Act, and I believe it important to give consideration to conciliation, mediation, the settlement of grievances, and other things of that kind which always have preceded the appointment of fact-finding boards.

The second kind of bill we sometimes get is a bill deliberately designed to do positive harm to the labor movement—not to cure effectively any difficulty, but a bill whose passage would actually do damage to one of the most essentially democratic movements in the whole world. Remember the first movement of every dictator that ever got in power, no matter what kind, was to eliminate free labor organizations and substitute state-controlled organizations for them.

I believe myself that section 4 of the bill the House refused to consider on yesterday belongs in the category I have just mentioned and if adopted by the Congress, the so-called Arends amendment would have put into the hands of every employer in this Nation a whip whereby he could goad a group of workers to go on strike; then if a contract had previously been signed he could deprive that whole union of its collective bargaining rights for a year. It seems to me that is utterly unequitable, ill-conceived, and completely unfair.

There is a third kind of bill which sometimes comes before the House and that is the kind of bill we have under consideration at the moment. This is a bill which may be resisted and opposed by labor officially, but when one attempts to read the bill with care it just is not possible to find in the bill the dangers that are alleged to be there.

I am going to vote for this bill on the understanding that title II is going to be stricken from the bill. That is, I will vote for it unless something happens to it before we get through. Sometimes things do happen to bills like this on the floor of the House, you know. It has proven rather difficult in the past to keep somebody from getting up and offering amendments to bills of this kind that would render it utterly impossible for a Member like myself to vote for it. But assuming that the bill remains with titles I and III in it, as I presume will be the case, I am going to vote for it.

I have one or two simple reasons for that. In the first place, I know that organized labor does not stand for the kind of abuses that have been mentioned on this floor in the arguments in favor of

the passage of the bill. I know that labor knows that to the extent those abuses exist its own cause is terribly damaged. Therefore I cannot follow the argument that says: "But we do not want a law passed saying those things shall not be lawful." It seems to me if that be true, and particularly to the extent that the abuses are not taking place, if they are not, then no harm can be done in passing a law which says that no person in the United States shall have the right by means of robbery or extortion to deprive somebody else of his physical or financial well-being.

In the next place I should like to ask one or two questions of the author of the bill or the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. In the first place I would like to ask this question: Assuming that the bill is enacted into law and assuming thereafter the leader of a labor union walked into an employer's office and said to the employer; "Our men are not getting enough pay; we want higher pay; we want to bargain with you for higher pay and unless we can get somewhat better compensation than we are getting now there is liable to be a strike." Is it possible, if this bill is passed, that under those circumstances a court could say that that was an attempted extortion?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is very difficult to say what a court might say, but it would not be extortion.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So that such an act would not be covered by this bill?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that with the provision in the bill which says that nothing in the act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect the National Labor Relations Act, and since the National Labor Relations Act was passed for the express purpose of protecting the right of collective bargaining, it appears to me it would be utterly impossible to construe this bill as affecting the collection of union dues or the collective-bargaining activities of a labor organization. If I am wrong about that, I would like to have somebody advise me.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Our distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] pointed out the elements that it would be necessary to prove in order to make out a crime and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that a mere threat does not constitute a crime. There must accompany that threat an unlawful taking.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. And certainly demands for higher wages or attempts to collect union dues are not unlawful acts by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I may say to the gentleman from California that insofar as I can understand this bill, there is not a thing in it to interfere in the slightest degree with any legitimate activity on the part of labor people or labor unions, unless somebody thinks it is legitimate for them to rob and extort. If that is their notion, then this bill covers that activity.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Nobody believes that. My understanding of the bill coincides with that of the gentleman and I am taking the bill as I read it.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. May I add that the gentleman, in my opinion, is exactly correct and takes the proper position in his questions.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. I am just trying to make the record absolutely clear. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a further question. In subsection (c), page 2, there is the word "wrongful." Does that word "wrongful" apply to the entire section?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes; it qualifies the whole section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I represent a district in which the trucking racket has been prevalent. I know of no phase of labor activity which has brought the labor-union cause generally into greater disrepute. If this measure is successful in wiping out this abuse—and I hope it will be—it will perform a real service, rather than a disservice, to the future of organized labor in America. Hence, I am voting for the bill and I urge its enactment.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, this act seeks to do only one thing—to strengthen the law against robbery and extortion. You can't read anything more into it. It should be passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill because I think it will help to clear the good name of the honest rank and file of labor throughout the United States. Labor has been brought into disrepute long enough by the actions of a few labor racketeers and gangsters in the big cities. Laboring men generally are among our finest and most respected citizens. They do not approve of robbery and extortion by anyone. They are against it anywhere and any time. And something should be done in order to protect the truck operators who are trying to deliver food into the various big cities of our Nation to feed the millions of people in our cities. Truck drivers have been beaten up and sent to the hospitals. Some of them have been killed by these labor "goons" and racketeers in New York and other cities. Not only have the farmers who have been attempting to deliver food supplies to the big cities had their trucks turned over and been unmercifully beaten up, but the same harsh treatment has been dealt out to the men carrying union cards—union truck drivers from other jurisdictions—seeking to get into these cities with their cargoes.

During the war it was called to the attention of the Congress and the public that military supplies could not be delivered to the piers in New York City to go to the men that were risking and giving their lives to defend this country, because these racketeers were exacting a toll of from $8.41 to $9.43 per truck before they could drive down the streets of New York to deliver much-needed war equipment going to the boys on the European battle fronts. I discussed this same bill fully with hundreds of the laboring men in my district during the last campaign. You will recall we passed this same bill before the last congressional election, but it did not pass the Senate. That is why it is again before us.

Some of us were labeled as being against labor because we voted for this bill. To the credit of the splendid laboring men in my district not one of them complained of my vote. My laboring ment do not endorse robbery or extortion.

The union men in my district out in Illinois, members of the teamsters union, would not do what is being done by certain racketeering members of the union in New York, in Detroit, in Chicago and other big cities. They do not believe in this sort of practice, and they, in my judgment, would like to see this cancerous growth cut out of organized labor—this cancerous growth that is being publicized occasionally in the newspapers all over the Nation which unfairly besmirches labor throughout this country. Every Member who votes for this bill today is voting in the best interest of organized labor and in the best interest of the farmers and in the best interest of the union truck drivers who do not happen to live in certain jurisdictions in New York, in other cities, and who feel they have a right to drive down the public highways and streets that have been builded by the public's money.

Mr. Chairman, sworn testimony by witnesses called before the Judiciary Committee here in Washington proves that in the State of California and in Chicago, Detroit, Scranton, Pa., and New York that racketeers in the teamsters' union held up as many as a thousand trucks a day in some instances demanding that truckers coming into the city where such local Teamsters' Union had jurisdiction would have to pay $9.42 for a large truck or $8.41 for a small truck before they would be permitted to drive down the streets of the city to deliver their truckloads of merchandise whether it be farm products or manufactured goods or whether the truck driver in many instances was a union or nonunion driver.

One of the main traps in New York City was at the mouth of the Holland Tunnel, a thoroughfare carrying a great deal of truck transportation. The sworn evidence shows that labor racketeers at the point of a gun or with the threat of a blackjack would mount the truck and demand payment before the delivery of goods could be made. Most of the frightened truck drivers naturally paid off. Those who did not were beaten up, many

of them sent to the hospitals, in some instances killed, and often their trucks were turned over in the streets. The Federal Government prosecuted and convicted 27 in New York. They apparently had such a wide influence that when their cases came to the Supreme Court, on a majority decision of only one member of the Court, the opinion of Justice Byrnes was approved liberating these men under that decision. All other members of the Court dissented violently, one, Chief Justice Stone, going so far as to say in substance "that the decision had the effect of legalizing, in certain instances, robbery and extortion."

This act is intended to apply only to a citizen who is guilty of robbery or extortion. Pains have been taken in the drafting of this act to exempt all common carriers, meaning railroads and trucking concerns in their legal and legitimate work. It exempts from the Act every piece of labor legislation written on the statute books from the beginning, up to the present time which was intended to protect collective bargaining and the laboring man in his legitimate rights under the law.

No one can truthfully say that this act is intended to be used against labor in any way. It is aimed only at those in any walk of life who have taken to themselves the right to commit robbery and extortion. Of course, there are comparatively few men in the teamsters unions even in the big cities, who have carried on this nefarious practice. None of the teamsters unions, outside of just a few cities, would think of carrying on this unlawful practice and it is my opinion that all of them will approve of this law which will stop such practices when it finally passes the House and Senate.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Before the gentleman starts, if he will yield, may I call his attention to the fact that the Hobbs bill actually eliminates the provisions of section 6 of the present law? I wish the gentleman would address himself to that particular item.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has asked me regarding section 6 of the law. As I understand from the members of the subcommittee who had responsibility in drafting the bill, it was the deliberate purpose to eliminate section 6. It was section 6 on which the decision of the Supreme Court that has been under discussion turned. Under the law as it was then, which includes section 6, of course, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered this holding, and I quote from the decision:

> As we have said, the jury was bound to acquit the defendants if it found that their objective and purpose was to obtain by the use or threat of violence the chance to work for the money but to accept the money even if the employers refused to permit them to work.

It was the purpose of the Judiciary Committee to prevent the rendition of that sort of decision by any court in the future, so the language upon which that holding was based was eliminated.

There is no mention of labor in this bill. This bill is directed against robbery. It is against anybody waylaying farmers bringing their produce to market, for instance, and robbing them, forcing them to turn over their money on demand or be beaten up and have their produce dumped out in the streets, and things like that. These people were not trying to break a strike or interfere with any closed-shop arrangement. There probably was no strike. They were driving their own vehicles loaded with their own products, on their way to market. The contention seems to be that because these hijackers happened to belong to a labor union, robbery by them ought not to be punished. I do not believe that any good service is rendered organized labor by resisting an amendment to the law under which this conviction was reversed. If section 6 were to be restored, as is to be attempted by amendment, the state of the law would be worse than at this time. It would be, in effect, a legislative approval of the judicial construction by the Supreme Court.

The behavior of labor these days, of which many people do not approve, is not because its members are basically worse than any other group, as some people seem to think. The explanation that the other fellow and his crowd is meaner than me and my crowd will not stand up. Labor has come into great power mighty rapidly. It is very difficult for anybody or any group to possess great power without its abusive exercise. There never was a time more dangerous for organized labor than now. It would not be a peculiar thing if labor should resist restraint and be contemptuous of public opinion. In such a situation, the brakes are as essential as the accelerator.

I say there is nothing peculiar about it. This attitude that obtains with regard to labor now obtained with regard to management 18 years ago. At that time management was controlling in this country. It was arrogant. I had been studying things like that and I did my best to warn those in control then of the danger of their policy. In 1928 I said in this place, I quote:

> Those who are pressing this movement are not true friends to their own interest.
>
> They are getting the country ready for a great swing back.
>
> The thing which is happening now has not infrequently occurred during the almost 2,000 years of the history of our system. It is the phenomenon of the swinging of the pendulum. The Bible speaks of people who have ears to hear but hear not, and eyes to see but see not. Captains of industry, they have ears, but hear not the warnings of history. They will not heed.

They lost the support of public opinion. The pendulum swung in the other direction.

If I am any judge that identical thing is happening with regard to labor right now. One of the things that is responsible for the losing of the support of public opinion is the sort of conduct which this bill seeks to stop. The swinging of the pendulum from one extreme to the other is a most dangerous thing to happen in a democracy. When government becomes the instrument of dominant antagonistic groups instead of being the protector with impartiality of all the people, that government cannot survive as a democracy. Abusive exercise of power brings its own retribution, but often the whole people suffer.

You are all familiar with what happened to government when control of governmental policy swung from patrician to plebeian and from plebeian to patrician, it was not long before both came under the oppressive domination of those contemptuous of the rights of each of them. We think such a thing cannot happen in this country. It is happening. These deep lines of cleavage are reaching down to the foundations of this Government. I am talking about a mighty serious thing that is happening in our country's life. I do not want to see a swing-back to management. I want to see a swing to the middle, a government fair where basic rights are secure. The right as a citizen of the country peacefully to proceed along a public highway, carrying his produce to market is a sacred right.

Those individuals who would disregard that right are enemy to any group with which we are identified. We have to avoid that in America. We have to try to see what is the right and fair thing in this country. This trend that we see in this country now, this swinging from one extreme to the other, is like the phenomenon of the swinging of a pendulum. Any country boy who can swing on a grapevine sees it and knows it. It is the observation of the common people embodied in such expressions as "the darkest hour is before the dawn" and "one extreme follows another," and that sort of thing which is going on just now. When I see people in the name of organized labor resisting such legislation as is here proper, I know they are not spokesmen for my people at home, and I hope I am not being misunderstood. I said the same thing right here in the well of this House 18 years ago, and management would not heed. I am trying to be useful now not to any group as such but to the whole people, to the permanence of our whole society. You cannot afford to stand here, at least I do not think you can, as friends of labor, and I do not question that, and even appear to try to justify the things that have been done by these people who are a disgrace to organized labor which ought to be the first people to denounce and to bring to punishment individuals who in the name of organized labor would beat up or attack a farmer who works through the long days and who is hauling his produce to market. Public opinion is not in an attitude to tolerate even the appearance of condoning. It is stated that steps were taken to discipline the New York City local. It is also stated here that this sort of robbery is going on now in many sections of the country.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Does the gentleman know of a single State wherein this has happened that they did not have laws in each case to handle it?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; that is right. But I know some States seem to be so dominated by that bunch of gangsters and the political strength which

they seem able to command, that those States will not do their duty.

Mr. PATRICK. Is the gentleman opposed to States' rights?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; I am not opposed to States' rights; but I am not willing to go so far in supporting States' rights that gangsters of one State may rob citizens of another State engaged in interstate commerce. Do States' rights include that? I ask you.

Mr. PATRICK. That is just one State. That is happening in that State.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am sorry I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman asked a question and I was endeavoring to answer it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am sorry I do not have time to yield further to the gentleman. It is a poor time to stand up for States' rights on the side of a bunch of gangsters like this. I do not believe it is right. I do not believe it will get you anywhere. I do not believe it serves the legitimate interest of honest labor which stands or falls in the approaching test of strength, dependent upon whether in that test it has or does not have the support of public opinion. These gangsters whom this bill seeks to suppress are worth legions to those whom labor will face in that contest. I believe that. I am certain of it. I do not pose as a champion of labor or any other group. I do hope to be, I do try to be, the champion as I have opportunity, of the right. Neither labor nor any other group, taking the long view, and that is what we have got to do now if we keep off the rocks, ever can have any interest that is in conflict with the general interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, in my 2 minutes I would like to read an editorial which appeared in the Dawson Sentinel, Dawson, Minn., just the other day and which I believe bears upon the subject before us. This editorial was written by Mr. B. N. Gimmestad, a man whose word can be relied upon and is respected in his community. May I state at this time that had the people of America suffered in dead in proportion to the number of boys that that small community gave to America, our losses would have been at least a million killed rather than the 250,000 who gave their lives for our Nation. The editorial reads as follows:

IS THIS A FREE COUNTRY?

Last week a Dawson farmer was sent to Des Moines, Iowa, to pick up some machinery needed to complete the installation of corn driers at the local elevators. The trucker made the trip without mishap or difficulty with Iowa labor groups. He loaded his truck with his shipment and then he was told by labor representatives that he not only had to unload the truck and take it back to Dawson, 300 miles away, empty, but he also had to join the local truckers union and pay dues amounting to $32 before they would permit him to leave with his truck. And this is a free country where free enterprise is encouraged. Any other organization or individual attempting such action would have been promptly jailed and charged with highway robbery and in addition would probably have to answer additional charges of threatening, intimidation, and interference with commerce. It is incidents like this which make one wonder just how far some can go with racketeering methods without being made to account for their actions.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will pass. It is aimed at racketeers, not honest laboring men of unions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this legislation which is now before the committee was carefully considered by subcommittee 3 and was thereafter carefully considered by the full Committee of the Judiciary. This is not the first bill of this character which has come before the House. Previously, a similar bill was here. It was passed by the House; it went over to the other body and that was the last we heard of the bill. I learned that the measure died in the committee in that body.

It has been said by some of those who have spoken upon this bill that this is an antilabor bill. To my mind this is a bill that protects the honest laboring people in our country. There is nothing contained in this bill that relates to labor. This measure, if passed, will relate to every American citizen.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. In just a moment. When I get a little further along I will gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

I refer to the above for the reason that I know of instances which have come to me personally since some of these outrageous things have happened over the country, where men who were laboring men, members of the American Federation of Labor, members of the CIO, who were the victims of these outrageous attacks. Those laboring boys were living out in the country, and raising garden vegetables, sought to truck their own produce into the large cities. They were stopped, they were driven out, they were required to submit, they had to pay tribute to others in order to enter the city. Some of those who participated in those crimes against their fellowmen were racketeers, and some of those were members of labor unions. All of them were violating the law.

Let us return for just a moment to the provisions of this pending bill. This bill, as you know, is made necessary by reason of the Supreme Court decision which has been mentioned, but I wish to refer only to two of the sections of the present pending bill and I believe that will help clarify this situation which now exists before the membership of the House. I refer to clauses (b) and (c) of section 2.

The body of section 2 reads as follows:

SEC. 2. Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

Subparagraph (b) of section 1 defines the term "robbery." Some mention was made a little while ago by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania with respect to robbery. Robbery is defined in every State in the Union by the State legislature. Let us see what the provisions of this section of the pending bill provide with respect to robbery:

The term "robbery" means the unlawful taking—

And remember this, unlawful taking, it must be unlawful—

The term "robbery" means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property, from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

Subparagraph (c) refers to extortion:

(c) The term "extortion" means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right.

On either one of those sections, mark you, there must be an unlawful act on the part of the perpetrator.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to express my appreciation for the very splendid statement the gentleman has made in reference to this bill. Cannot the gentleman state that the definition of robbery and extortion put in this bill is that followed by the codes and statutes generally throughout the Nation, in all the jurisdictions of the various States?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is precisely correct. It is practically the same as the statutes in the different States of the Union.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. This applies only to interstate commerce, does it not?

Mr. SPRINGER. It applies to interstate commerce.

Mr. GRANGER. It would not affect a farmer who picked up produce within his own State and delivered it within his own State? That would be intrastate commerce?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. What is interstate commerce? Is a farmer who crosses the State line with his own property engaged in interstate commerce?

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no doubt but that he is engaged in interstate commerce when he crosses a State line.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. A transaction within a State may be interstate commerce if it oppresses and interrupts seriously or in a substantial way goods moving from one State to another?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. That has been defined by judicial decisions.

My understanding is that the distinguished gentleman from Alabama will offer an amendment to strike title II from this bill, which brings me now to title III.

Various Members who have spoken during the day have mentioned that this is antilabor legislation. I state that there is nothing in this legislation which relates to labor. Labor is not mentioned in the bill. It applies to every American citizen.

Now, let us see how labor is protected under title III of this act or proposed bill now before the Committee, and I read that section:

TITLE III

Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect either section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, or an act entitled "An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, or an act entitled "An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes," approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or an act entitled "An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1935."

Mr. Chairman, there is expressly excluded from the provisions of this bill the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Railway Labor Act, and the Fair Labor Practices Act. Those who state that this is antilabor legislation find that the very provisions which they claim are within this act are expressly excluded from the terms of this legislation. Labor organizations are not affected by this bill. This bill refers only to the individual who violates the law, and the sacred rights of other American citizens.

We must further remember that this bill applies to every citizen under the American flag, whoever he may be, wherever he may live or to whatever organization he may belong. All labor in my State want the protection of this legislation. In that entire section of our country there have been no overt acts of extortion, or robbery, as defined in the pending measure. Such acts have been confined to the large cities. New York is one city in which these acts have been, and are now, very common. Such practices must be stopped. Our people must be made secure by law. They are entitled to that protection. The people as a whole look to Congress to give them that protection—we must not fail them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is designed to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threat, coercion, or intimidation. It is brought before the Congress under and pursuant to the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States. The necessity for this measure grows out of the misconstruction placed upon the antiracketeering law enacted in 1934 by what is popularly known as the Byrnes opinion in the case of United States against Local 807.

Let us get right down to what this bill is designed to do. In response to the statement that it is a booby trap, I have this to say: It is a trap for a man who is boob enough to go out and undertake to trample the rights of American citizens under his feet and commit highway robbery and interfere with them in their right to market their products across State lines. Properly, Congress could, if it so desired, occupy the whole field with respect to legislation affecting interstate commerce, but we do not choose to do that. It is true that the statutes of most States denounce robbery and extortion as crimes but this act is peculiarly appropriate because these offenses many times are committed at State lines and may, in the perpetration and consummation of the crime, cross and recross State lines.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not yield, so the gentleman might as well possess his soul in patience.

Let us go back to the origin of this inhibition that we are undertaking to invoke here in the protection of the rights of the people of this country. The first law we had on this subject was expressed in four words, "Thou shalt not steal." Now, larceny is bad enough because it is the unlawful carrying away of the property of another for the purpose of depriving the true owner thereof, but robbery is a more heinous offense for the reason that it not only involves the deprivation of a man of his property, but it may cost him his life, because it is accomplished by threats and force and violence, and many times the death of the man robbed and for that reason the law of my State, and of most of the States of the Union, thus defines murder in the first degree:

Murder in the first degree is any murder perpetrated in the attempt to commit a robbery, a burglary, and arson, or a rape.

I can conceive of but few more serious offenses than that of taking a man's property from him with a blackjack or at the point of a gun.

Here is what the United States Supreme Court considered in the case of United States against Local No. 807 and its members who were charged with robbery and coercion:

Section 2 of the Federal Anti-Racketeering Act provides that "any person" who, in connection with or in relation to any act affecting interstate commerce or any article or commodity moving in such commerce, obtains or attempts to obtain by use or threat of force, violence or coercion, the payment of money, "not including, however, the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee," shall be guilty of a felony.

Congress, at the insistance of certain labor leaders, undertook to exempt the payment in good faith of wages to an employee from the operation of this law, but the Supreme Court went beyond the intention of Congress, as expressed in the act of 1934, and libeled Congress and libeled the labor unions of this country. The Supreme Court in the Byrnes opinion said it was the intention of Congress to sanction common-law robbery. The Supreme Court in the Byrnes opinion said that it was the accepted practice of labor unions to resort to robbery and coercion and intimidation, and I deny that charge. I know personally many of the 50,000 organized workers of my district, and there is not one of them that brings himself within that condemnation of this opinion. They are law-abiding, upright, God-fearing, loyal American citizens, and I spurn the aspersion that some who undertake to speak out of turn for the working people of this country cast upon them. I have not had any protests from my people against this legislation. The people down in my country do not believe in robbery, and I do not believe the people you represent believe in robbery.

Then this opinion goes on further and states:

The legislative history of the act shows that it was intended to suppress terroristic activities of professional gangsters, and not to interfere with traditional labor union activities.

The exception is not limited to those who had acquired the status of employees prior to the time when they obtained, or attempted or conspired to obtain, the payment.

Think of that. Here was an exception that applied to men who were actually in the employ of an employer. The Supreme Court extended its provisions to apply to men the man robbed had never seen prior to the time they held him up on a public interstate highway and robbed him of his property.

Strikes are made by the employees of employers, but these robberies were committed by men whom the owner of the truck and the produce had not only never employed but had never seen before.

Let us illustrate what we are proposing to stop by this measure we are now considering.

Here comes a farmer with a load of produce—milk, butter, eggs, vegetables, potatoes, things he has raised and produced upon his farm. He owns that property. Into it has gone his toil and his sweat, and that of his wife and children, some of whom accompany him. As they near a State line in going to market to sell that produce a thug they never saw before or a coterie of thugs comes up to the truck and says, "Here, stop your truck." The farmer says, "Why, I do not want to stop my truck. I am going to market." The thug says, "Yes; but you stop your truck." The farmer asks, "Well, what do you want?" The thug, "I want $9.42 if it is a big truck or $8.41 it it is a little truck."

The farmer says, "I don't want to pay it. I don't need your help." The thug says, "Yes; but if you do not pay me I will knock you in the head and knock your child or your wife in the head." Maybe it is the man's wife who is with him. Then, in fear, not wishing to be mutilated or perhaps killed, and not desiring to see his wife and child killed, the farmer pays the money.

Outrages like this are what this law is aimed at. I wonder what it is that so deranges the thinking of a full-grown man that he would get up here and say that any man, or any set of men, anywhere in this land have the right to commit robbery.

I have always been taught that a curved line is the beautiful thing in art

but that a straight line is the beautiful thing in morals and in good conduct. We are just undertaking to draw a straight line here, not capable of misinterpretation or distortion, between the right which belongs to the man on his legitimate mission to market and the misconduct of a robber who undertakes to take away from him his property at the point of a gun or with a blackjack on a public thoroughfare of this country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I will not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There have been complaints that in the case of strikes an attorney has gone in and asked an operator for something like $15,000 or $20,000 as a shake-down to stop a strike. Is there anything in this bill about that?

Mr. JENNINGS. Not a thing. This does not have a thing in the world to do with strikes.

This bill by express terms leaves in full force and effect every law upon the statute books passed for the protection of the legitimate rights of labor. If there were anything in here to the contrary I would not support this bill. The bill is one to protect the right of citizens of this country to market their products without any interference from lawless bandits.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, because of the limited time I have in closing this debate I would prefer to have no interruptions, and I shall decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that the sole and simple purpose, the single purpose, of this bill is to do the best we can to protect interstate commerce and free the highways and streets of this country of robbers. I want to answer the distinguished gentleman from New York and others who have contended that this outrageous travesty on justice does not still continue by saying that it does—beyond debate. Every night, and every day cases like the one described in the letter of December 3, 1945, read you by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], are disgracing our Nation. This was going on when the Supreme Court decided the Local 807 case. May I say first, that I have had more than 1,000 letters and telegrams from organizations of farmers all over the United States saying that the condition now is even worse than it was in 1943 when we passed this bill before, for the simple reason that then they were charging only the price of a day's union wage, $8.41 for a light truck and $9.42 for a heavy truck, whereas now they not only charge those fees for chaperoning farmers on city streets, to save their lives, but in addition they charge from $30 to $56 as an initiation fee into the union, which the farmers never get the privilege of joining.

These opponents of this bill tell us that the streets of New York are clean and free of racketeers, and that nothing like racketeering ever happened in New York. Well, there were 27 of them convicted in New York in the Federal court. There may never have been 1 convicted in a State court or a city court of New York, but there were 27 of them convicted in the United States court under the Copeland Act. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court says:

> There was sufficient evidence to warrant the finding that the defendants conspired to use and did use violence and threats to obtain from the owners of those over-the-road trucks $9.42 for each large truck and $8.41 for each small truck that entered the city.

You will find it on page 3 at the top of the page in the report on this bill. The opinion is set out in full.

Chief Justice Stone said the same thing in his dissenting opinion. And then he wrote his classic sentence: "Such an answer if valid would render common law robbery an innocent pastime."

Hon. Joe Eastman, then head of the Office of Defense Transportation, told me that his examiners reported 1,000 trucks a night being held up and robbed in various cities of this Union from Los Angeles to Seattle, across through Milwaukee and Chicago, and through Scranton, Pa., which was another hot spot, Philadelphia, and New York, and over 100 a day at the New York end of the Holland Tunnel. He was there begging as a witness in 1943, pleading the cause of defense transportation, and called attention to the numbers and numbers of trucks loaded with shells and guns for our Army and Navy which were held up and robbed by those goons at the mouth of the Holland Tunnel.

These authorities prove that racketeering was bad enough in 1943 to cause our faces to be set like flint against it. It is worse now.

So the question is: What are we going to do about it? We are going to do the same thing that we did 2 years ago, of course.

But before I conclude I want to answer some of the questions that have popped up in this debate. They say, "Why do we leave out section 6?" The reason we left out section 6 of the Copeland Act is the same reason we left out every word of the Copeland Act. We wiped the whole thing out and substituted a bill that cannot be misunderstood. The reason that some of you who voted for the Copeland Act are against this bill is because you know it is so clearly expressed that it will do the job it is meant to do, which is to prevent interference with interstate commerce by robbery or extortion. That is all we are shooting at. Those words have been construed a thousand times by the courts. Everybody knows what they mean. Therefore, we decline to become involved in a mass of language which the Supreme Court in the Local 807 case held was not sufficient to support a conviction.

I want to call attention furthermore to the fact that if we had left in title VI or any other part of the Copeland Act with all its phraseology burdening down the Supreme Court, we would have exactly the same situation we had in the Local 807 case, requiring the turning loose of everybody who had ever been convicted in New York State.

I call your attention to this question of California. California, here I come, paying my humble respects to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. If any of you look at the hearings, there are 429 pages of them, you will see beginning on page 54 and extending through the next 7 pages, pictures of valleys choked with lemons and oranges and asparagus which could not be unloaded from the trains and so were being dumped by bulldozers and steam shovels, filling the valleys of California. We had before our committee a California union man for whom his union passed the hat and paid his expenses to come here and tell our committee, "For God's sake, do something to help us union men in California."

Now I want to say just a word about the law of this case. They ask: Why is this bill written the way it is? I will tell you why, because the most distinguished lawyers that labor can employ, some say at $50,000 each per year, came before our committee, men like the Honorable Joseph A. Padway, came down to testify before us. I asked him: "If this bill were rewritten so as to outlaw interference with interstate commerce by robbery or extortion would you favor it?"

He said: "Why, certainly I would; any honest man would favor that."

So we rewrote the bill. This is not the bill upon which we held hearings. We held hearings upon a bill very much like this old Copeland Act would be if you adopt the LaFollette amendment which is to be offered. That was the bill we held hearings on; but when Mr. Tuttle, of New York, and Mr. Carson, general counsel of another union, and all of labor's chosen spokesmen said that if we rewrote the bill and preserved the rights under the four branches of labor's Magna Carta—and we did so—and if we would just limit it to interference with interstate commerce by robbery or extortion they would all be for it, we rewrote the bill in its present form. Well, they have not said a word since, they have not come here and inveighed against this bill, because they knew that they wrote it themselves. They knew that title I and title III were rewritten at their dictation in our committee room, virtually. That is why they have not been here.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, crime is crime, no matter who commits it. Robbery is robbery and extortion is extortion, whether or not the perpetrator has a union card in his pocket. We beg of you not to be misled by specious pleas for emasculating amendments. May we not thank you in anticipation of the same overwhelming majority you gave this bill in 1943?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the pending bill is long overdue. The House passed an identical bill in the Seventy-eighth Congress. It was not acted upon in the Senate.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Antiracketeering Act of 1934. The amendment is made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States against Local 807, March 2, 1942.

The Court in that case decided that the statute was not applicable to members of labor unions and the Court really invited Congress to clarify the statute.

There can be no question about the constitutionality of the bill. Congress is vested with the power to regulate interstate commerce. The bill is to prevent a repetition of the physical violences by members of labor unions on those engaged in interstate commerce. It is to prevent a repetition of the assaults and attacks upon the drivers of trucks with produce entering New York City and similar cases. It punishes extortion and robbery no matter by whom committed. It pronounces the acts of those who assault and extort from the operators of trucks engaged in legitimate interstate commerce crimes with penalties.

There have been wanton assaults upon the operators of trucks by members of labor unions. No excuses have been offered for their crimes. They are exempt from Federal prosecution because of a technical defect in the antiracketeering statute. The objectives of the sponsors of labor unions and organized labor are without merit. It is time for labor to clean house. The Antiracketeering Act should be strengthened and clarified. The pending bill will provide for punishing racketeers who rob or extort. There is no justification for labor unions opposing the bill as it constitutes no invasion of the legitimate rights of labor. Robbery and extortion by members of labor unions must be punished. Labor unions owe that much to the public. In demanding the protection of laws, labor unions should urge that those engaged in legitimate interstate commerce be protected from robbery and extortion.

Mr. RESA. Mr. Chairman, offenses against persons and property which the pending bill would make punishable are already punishable under existing laws of the several States. They can be prosecuted more effectively under the laws of the States than they could be under this bill if it became a law. No prosecution for robbery, extortion, physical violence, or the conspiracies or attempts mentioned in the bill could be successful in the absence of evidence that the crime charged obstructed, delayed or affected commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce under the definition of commerce provided in the bill. An examination of the decisions of the courts will show that in many cases the proof of the fact which would be a condition to conviction under this bill would be difficult. No such impediment stands in the way of conviction under the applicable laws of the States.

If we undertake to multiply offenses punishable under Federal laws which are also punishable under the laws of the States we shall have to multiply also the personnel and organization charged with the duty of prosecution. This is another instance of objectionable duplication by the Federal Government of the functions and activities of the States. It is objectionable because it destroys that efficiency and economy in government which can be achieved only by a sound and rational distribution and exercise of powers and functions within the framework of the principles of our Constitution.

Sometime somehow government, both State and Federal, will have to be made more efficient. Sometime somehow its cost will have to be brought within the limits of the ability of the people and our economic system to sustain it. The enactment of this bill would be a step away from the achievement of these objectives.

For these reasons in addition to those which may be found in the provisions of the bill which are easily susceptible of harmful misinterpretation I find it necessary to vote against H. R. 32.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 979; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 420a–420e), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 1. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'commerce' means (1) commerce between any point in a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and any point outside thereof, or between points within the same State, Territory, or the District of Columbia but through any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce within the District of Columbia or any Territory, and (3) all other commerce over which the United States has jurisdiction; and the term 'Territory' means any Territory or possession of the United States.

"(b) The term 'robbery' means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property, from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

"(c) The term 'extortion' means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right.

"SEC. 2. Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 3. Whoever conspires with another or with others, or acts in concert with another or with others to-do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 4. Whoever attempts or participates in an attempt to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 5. Whoever commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

"SEC. 6. Whoever violates any section of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 20 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or both.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, assuming amendments are adopted to that part of the bill that has been read up to now, assuming that title II is stricken from the bill, at the end of the reading of title III will it be in order to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the whole bill as then amended?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 2, after the word "right", on line 21, insert a new subsection to be designated as "d."

"(d) The terms 'property', 'money', or 'valuable considerations' used herein shall not be deemed to include wages paid by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee."

Add another subsection to follow the new subsection (d) to be designated (e):

"(e) No court of the United States shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such manner as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, all I do is to add the main provisions of section 3 and section 6 of the present statute. Section 6, as has been read, simply provides that no court shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such manner as to impair or diminish or in any way affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States.

If the proponents of this bill mean what they say, and if they want their promises to square with performance, why not affirmatively say that you do not want to interfere with the legitimate rights and activities of labor? But the author of the bill deliberately deletes from the present statute by the pending bill the legitimate right of labor to strike, to picket, and to boycott. Say what you mean, that is all I am asking you to do, and if you do not say what you mean the conclusion is inescapable that you do not mean what you say.

If the protestations of the Members who favor this bill are to mean anything at all and are not to be as useless as water running down a drain, then accept my amendment by which you will say deliberately and without peradventure of doubt that you do not intend to interfere with the legitimate activities of labor.

Mr. Chairman, I did not draft the provisions of my amendment out of thin air. Where do they come from? They come from section 6 of the present act. Where does section 6 come from? That comes from a suggestion made by the Attorney General way back in 1934. Attorney General Cummings said then:

> The original bill was susceptible to the objection that it might include within the prohibition the legitimate and bona fide activities of employers and employees. As the purpose of the legislation is not to interfere with such legitimate activities but rather to set up severe penalties for racketeering by violence, extortion, or coercion, which affects interstate commerce, it seems advisable to definitely exclude such legitimate activities. (See H. Rept. No. 1833, 73d Cong., 2d sess.)

The Committee on the Judiciary followed the admonition of the Attorney

General and inserted into the present act section 6 because the Judiciary Committee of the House did not wish to harness and chain the legitimate activities of labor.

For that reason I ask that my amendment be accepted if the proponents of the bill really mean what they say.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as usual on this issue the distinguished Member is very amusing, and if we had never heard that amendment before, it might sound plausible. But we have heard it, substantially offered in the same words:

> The terms "property," "money," or "valuable considerations" used herein shall not be deemed to include wages paid by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee.

That was the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] as shown on page 3277 of the RECORD of April 9, 1943. There the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said:

> Justice Byrnes erroneously decreed that the payment of money, which to my mind was protection money, was in that case a legitimate and sanctioned activity under the Copeland Antiracketeering Act and set up a relationship between employer and employee in a bona fide manner.

He says that Mr. Justice Byrnes erroneously decreed that. With proper and profound respect for the distinguished Senator, Justice, and present Secretary of State, I agree. Why does the proponent seek to put words into the pending bill that would invite another writer to fall into the same error? The answer is plain. He seeks to render the bill abortive since he knows it has too much merit to be defeated. He knows that the bill as drawn would purge even New York streets of racketeers. The racket is too big and good a graft to be stopped, so the racketeers demand such action of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. That proviso would render it necessary, if this bill accomplished its purpose, for the Supreme Court to annul its opinion in the case where they emasculated the statute before.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course it would. Such words have already been passed on by the Supreme Court in the Local 807 case, and passed on exactly in a way that meets with the approval of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], although he, himself, admitted that the decision was erroneous.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Would the gentleman care to comment on the second part of Mr. CELLER's amendment?

Mr. HOBBS. With pleasure, sir. It is substantially the same as section 6 of the Copeland act which caused the error into which the Supreme Court fell when the majority opinion was rendered in the Local 807 case. Labor's top-flight lawyers wrote title III of the pending bill as an acceptable substitute.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Inferior courts trying a case of this sort in the present state of affairs would be bound by the decision that the gentleman has just referred to which is now the judgment of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; that same decision that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] says was erroneous, if his amendment were adopted, would be binding upon all the inferior courts of the land.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the circuit court of appeals decision in the second circuit in New York?

Mr. HOBBS. In the Local 807 case?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; since this case, decided over a year ago, involving the motion-picture industry, in which some officials of the union, Mr. Browne and Mr. Bioff were involved and subsequently convicted. In another trial in which they appeared as witnesses the alleged co-conspirators were convicted of extortion for taking money from the motion picture industry, racketeering, under the existing antiracketeering law. Then that conviction was confirmed in the circuit court of appeals. That case was extortion. The men were punished and they are in jail, and yet here you are eliminating the very safeguards that labor had under the Antilabor Racketeering Act. You are aiming at extortion but you are hitting at everything.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman, of course, knows a great deal better than to say what he is saying. We say that you have not made the highways and the streets of your city free from racketeering. We say that you have never punished anybody for the racket for which the members of Local 807 of the Teamsters Union were convicted. That is what we are saying, and we are not to be taken off by you on "a snipe hunt" because of the Browne and Bioff conviction under another statute or of an entirely different kind of crime.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The streets of New York are much cleaner than any other city, even the gentleman's home town.

Mr. HOBBS. It pleases the gentleman to jest, for were I to take the gentleman seriously my reply could not accord with the rules of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are several maxims—I call them for want of a better term—of the American Government. One of the basic principles is that our Government, set up back yonder, of which we are now so proud, is based upon that eternal principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. The bill as presented here without the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York seeks only that one thing—to treat all American citizens alike. If it is right for the gentleman from New York to rob and to extort, then it would be as much a right for me to rob and extort. That is all in the world this bill does. It makes all American citizens amenable to the same act. To save my life, I cannot see how any honest man can object to all American citizens being treated exactly the same way. That is all we are asking to do in this bill.

Robbery has been defined throughout the existence of courts. Wherever jurisprudence has had its sway robbery and extortion have been defined. There is no use defining those terms because they are so well defined that their definition now is a matter of common knowledge.

If I did not happen to know that the gentleman from New York is not serious in regard to these amendments, if I did not happen to know that he does not believe in them, I would become offended at him; but knowing that he personally does not believe in them, that they are offered only through him as the mouthpiece of somebody else, I object to them.

The first one does not mean anything in the world. It is just rehashing something that is already in the bill. The second part of his amendments, however, is like giving a horse a bundle of oats but tying it up so high that the horse can never reach it. In other words, if the second part of his amendment is adopted, then, as the gentleman from Alabama said, it will sabotage this bill by placing back into the bill that which the Supreme Court erroneously—according the gentleman from New York, and I think he is correct in that statement—held to be lawful. Until we overcome that erroneous decision, which the author of the amendment himself says was erroneous, that will be the law.

I am not an enemy of labor. God knows I love labor. I love the dignities of labor. I know what it has meant to humanity. I know what it has meant to civilization, I know what it has meant to the wealth of the land; but when I say that I am speaking of honest labor, I am not thinking of dishonest labor.

Five members of labor unions told me in connection with this bill—when it was passed before—"Sam, if you had not voted for it, we would not have voted for you." That is what they think about it. Do not tell me that the rank and file of organized labor are against this bill. They came into the ranks of organized labor honestly and for the purpose of getting together and working mutually for their own benefit. Do not tell me they are not law-abiding citizens and do not and will not support the racketeers, who have made this bill necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Texas has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, to adopt the amendments offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York would result in an action that would be tantamount to doing nothing, because the language of the amendment is designed to retain the law in its present status. There is no question about that.

Let us see what the Supreme Court said about the section that the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] are aimed at. In discussing the practices that we think ought to be curbed the Supreme Court said:

It is not our province either to approve or disapprove such tactics. But we do believe that they are not "the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types" at which the act was aimed, and that, on the contrary, they are among those practices of labor unions which were intended to remain beyond its ban.

Did the Congress of the United States, when the act of 1934, the Copeland Act, was passed, intend that these acts should be beyond legislative control? There is nothing in the debate to indicate it. There is nothing in the committee report to indicate it. There is nothing in the proceedings before the committee that the Congress intended to aim only at types they describe as the "Kelly and Dillinger types." By the language contained in its opinion, the Supreme Court of the United States indicated very clearly it was up to the Congress to decide whether or not these practices should be continued. I suggest to you, if you reject the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York, you will indicate very clearly that you are opposed to those practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday someone said that the minority Members were placed on a hot seat or in a frying pan. Maybe they were. But how would you like to have been sitting on the hot seat for 5 years—like we have been over on our side. In the one instance, we have the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] proposing legislation to permit the colored people to vote and also to enact FEPC legislation. Then we have counterproposals on the part of Members from the Southern States proposing that we enact antilabor laws, or at least that is how it is so construed. If we are not careful, you gentlemen of the minority will be able, with good grace, to go to the people and tell them that the majority party in the House of Congress are not capable or are unwilling to put into effect an administration program. We have heard a lot about Communists and communistic elements trying to destroy this Government For 5 solid years I have listened to distinguished orators, on this side of the aisle particularly, who have maligned in every way the President of the United States. They have been guilty, and I accuse them of it at this very hour, of circumventing and destroying the confidence of the people of the United States in the supreme law of the land.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. No; I will not yield at this moment.

Mr. RIVERS. I think you should because a South Carolinian wrote that decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Since when has Justice Byrnes become a culprit? When has Justice Black or the former Governor of Michigan become so low that they can be accused of everything? Only on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] made an accusation that ill becomes the legal profession of this country.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. The only way to get decisions off the lawbooks that in the judgment of the people who wrote the laws are erroneous is through legislative action, is it not?

Mr. GRANGER. That is what I wanted to come to. Some lawyers of this House are the most reactionary group on earth. We never can get a change in the direction of judicial decisions unless it is done by a court who determines what the law is—and the Supreme Court makes the final determination.

Mr. COX. That is a very profound statement. I wonder if the gentleman would yield to examination?

Mr. GRANGER. No, I do not yield. The gentleman who has just interrogated me is one of the gentlemen to whom I have been referring. Perhaps he does not like to be in that category.

Mr. COX. I presume the gentleman refers——

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. The gentleman could not contribute anything that would be of very much interest to me.

Mr. COX. I may say to the gentleman that I was not hoping to get any information.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is we have two parties on this side. We have great love for each other. We speak in glowing terms of the great progressive platform, but the test of any political party is whether or not it has the imagination and the will to put it into effect. I have always been a party man and I have tried in most cases to follow my party leadership, but now I despair. We have those who care little for anything the party advocates. They will neither lead nor be led. As a result the administration's program bogs down and our leadership is left defeated and humiliated. We have absolutely proven that we, as a party, are unable or unwilling to carry into effect a progressive program. The party cannot be progressive with a millstone around its neck.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the names of Members seeking recognition: Messrs. HAVENNER, BIEMILLER, PATRICK, MARCANTONIO, RIVERS, SABATH, and COX.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I will take my time under the 5-minute rule after this amendment is disposed of. I ask that my name be stricken from the list.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I wish to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will add the name of the gentleman from Texas to the list.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that the debate on the pending bill has failed to deal with one of the most important reasons why organized labor is opposed to its enactment.

At the risk of oversimplifying this issue, I would like to give the following illustration of its effect, if I understand it, upon the closed-shop agreements which have been established, by collective bargaining, between the teamsters unions and the merchants and dealers in farm produce in the great cities of this country.

The farmers of the country contend that they should have the right to haul their produce from their farms to the cities and deliver it in their own trucks to the produce dealers and merchants and warehouses in the cities. But in most of the cities of America the teamsters unions have, through collective bargaining, entered into closed-shop contracts with these produce dealers and merchants and warehouse proprietors to do all of their hauling for them. Obviously, if the farmers are permitted to haul and deliver their own produce to these mercantile establishments and warehouses, the effect of collective bargaining, closed-shop agreements between the merchants and warehouses and the transportation unions would be nullified, and a system of open-shop transportation would be established instead.

This would be fatal to collective bargaining in the field of truck transportation.

The proponents of this bill assert that it would have no injurious effect upon legitimate labor unions, and profess to be concerned only with racketeering and extortion. They would, inferentially, brand everyone who opposes the measure as sympathetic with extortion and racketeering.

This sort of argument is, of course, too preposterous for serious consideration. What the bill really does is to classify as racketeering any effective effort by labor unions to insist that closed-shop agreements which have been arrived at through years of collective bargaining shall not be destroyed by open-shop competition from areas outside of the areas where these closed-shop agreements are in effect.

There is widespread opposition, Mr. Speaker, among the members of labor organizations in the district which I represent, to the provisions of this bill, and this opposition is based upon long and careful consideration of the effect which its enactment would have upon the institution of collective bargaining, which

is the Magna Carta of organized labor in this country.

I have today filed with the Clerk of the House petitions signed by approximately 2,500 members of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's, Local 10, of San Francisco, urging the Members of Congress to defeat this bill. The signers of this bill are not members of the teamsters union. Indeed they are affiliated with another major labor organization. But they realize that the effect of the bill would be crippling to collective bargaining, and they have sent these petitions across the continent to beseech this Congress not to weaken the great boon which a previous Congress bestowed upon the men and women of labor in America, when it established by law the institution of collective bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, is all the time to be taken by the left-wingers?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that time has been fixed and the gentleman from Minnesota was not standing up to be counted.

Mr. KNUTSON. I just want the RECORD to show the situation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I heard the gentleman from Minnesota ask if all the time was to be taken up by left-wingers. The parliamentary inquiry is, What is the meaning of the term "left-winger"?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to two or three little things in connection with this bill. There is nothing to get excited about. The soundness of our party system will not be impaired by this legislation. However, there is one matter to which I wish to especially call attention and that is every Congressman in speaking for the bill, states, "We are not after labor at all." Why do they protest so on that point?

Now, let us examine that a little bit. We have been here long enough to know who in this House represents and has had the opportunity to study the problems of labor in this country. We can see the position they are taking. There are a few Members who have been denominated as labor baiters, people who are not very kind to the wage earners of this Nation. Those are the only two groups I believe who have made any great study of the probable consequences of this measure.

If you are going after labor or are supporting the interests of labor you have reflected and studied this over. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee this afternoon was asked on the floor of Congress about this very sort of thing. He stood right over there at the majority table and answered that there is no telling what a judge will decide. Now, nobody knows that better than do the laborers in this country. He was also asked by someone over here why the proponents have thrown away the first draft of the bill, or struck it out, and the gentleman read from a decision of the United States Supreme Court and replied that it was to get by such decisions and to defeat decisions like that that the change was to be made by this bill.

What was that decision? It was a decision in which the court holds, in substance, that if a contractual relationship is involved, because of the contractual dealings between the defendants and complaining witnesses the law shall not be applied as presently written.

That reveals why labor is opposing this legislation. The representatives of labor know how unfair judges, how unfair biased district attorneys can be. This is no indictment of the great majority of judges and district attorneys. Any man who has been sent to jail on account of a strike in which he did not participate to do penance, who was charged with disorderly conduct or assault and battery when not even there, knows the danger that lies in this sort of legislation.

If you gentlemen can convince me that any State in the Union in which these depredations to which reference has been made has not adequate laws to convict people for robbery and for every one of the things set out here, I will vote for this bill.

The matter of States' rights is involved here. One reason given for departing from States' rights is to preserve individual rights, but in this case you offer a bill which violates States' rights and also violates individual rights. You are transgressing both. Thus no excuse remains for this legislation. The individual rights of the men who work throughout a Nation of 133,000,000 run a great deal higher than the rights of the comparatively few who are the inspiration for this bill. We are simply burning the house down, if we pass this into law, to get rid of a few rats. We never right a wrong by passing a law that may be used as a prong and prodder by a special group for its special benefit.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman for or against the bill?

Mr. PATRICK. If the gentleman's deductions are so blunt that he cannot reach a conclusion, I cannot help him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I think it well to underline certain fundamental facts in the debate on this amendment. First of all, I think we ought to recognize thoroughly that those of us who are for the amendment and against the bill in its present form are the victims of a very good press agent trick. It is a cute trick to label a bill an antiracketeering bill and hence infer that any opponent of the bill is a person who therefore favor racketeers. But let us look at the true situation.

Obviously there is no one in the House who favors racketeering. I am sure that I do not favor racketeering and I would not accuse any Member of the House of such a position. Those of us who are opposed to the bill in its present form are genuinely fearful that the bill as it now stands can be used, as previous speakers have intimated, to infringe upon the legitimate rights of labor unions. I will add my voice to those we have heard earlier that where there is a clear case of extortion or robbery—I do not care if the individual belongs to a labor union or not—he is guilty and should be prosecuted. But in that respect I would like to point out that in Justice Byrnes' decision, which has been talked about so much—and I recognize as a layman, I am sticking out my neck in invading that haunt that lawyers like to consider their private preserve, namely, the interpretation of legal decisions—but I think there ought to be a point made about that decision that I do not think has previously been called to your attention. The decision says that under the existing law had the prosecutor handled the case correctly many of those who were involved in the case could have been convicted by the jury. I quote:

> And in several cases the jury could have found the defendants either failed to offer to work or refused to work for the money when asked to do so.

In that instance they are guilty under the present law. But as Justice Byrnes points out in his opinion, what happened was that the prosecutor in the case came in under the French theory of justice. He proceeded upon the theory that people were guilty until they were declared innocent instead of the American system that people are innocent until they are declared guilty. If you read Justice Byrnes' opinion carefully it rests in no small degree on the wrong procedure of the Government prosecutor. I maintain that there is sufficient Federal law under the Antiracketeering Act as it exists today, and certainly plenty of State law, to get at the individuals who are guilty of the kind of crimes that have been discussed on this floor today. In good faith the gentleman from New York has offered an amendment, and will later offer another, to protect the rights of labor. If either is adopted I will vote for the bill. I repeat that we are simply trying to protect the legitimate rights of labor organizations. We fear, for example, under the bill as it now stands, that a simple, unfortunate altercation on a picket line—and we all know that human beings are frail and when tempers are hot some trouble may develop—under such a situation you may send a man to jail for 20 years or fine him $10,000. May I further point out, gentlemen, that that is double the penalty of the antitrust laws. The law proposed for labor is much harsher than that applied to monopolists who are guilty of restraint of trade.

I hope those who have been protesting their honest concern for labor on this floor will prove it by voting for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the name of the former Mr. Justice Byrnes has been brought into this debate, concerning a decision he wrote on the antiracketeering act while he was a member of the Supreme Court. Among other things, this decision held that under the Lindbergh Act it was not unlawful for certain representatives of labor unions to hold up interstate shipments of farm produce and extort sums of money from the drivers in order that the shipments might enter the Holland Tunnel and be delivered at their respective destinations in New York.

As one member of the bar, I disagree with the reasoning in this decision. I call the procedure referred to in this case, by the individuals involved, nothing short of hijacking, intimidation, extortion, and out-and-out highway robbery. My friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] says that lawyers cannot get together and that we are all reactionaries. It does not take a lawyer to see that when a farmer from South Carolina sends a truckload of cabbage or beans to New York, he has a right to deliver his cargo without being molested by anyone, whether or not they are members of labor unions.

The Hobbs bill which we are considering clearly, unmistakably, and unequivocally protects interstate commerce from procedures of this nature. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], always on the side of destroying States' rights and who always champions the anti-poll tax, antilynching, and the iniquitous FEPC bills, now, with frenzied tones, says that the Federal Government has not the right to protect interstate shipments from this out-and-out highway robbery. I say to him that the State of New York has done nothing about this type of hijacking. Many other States in the Union have failed to protect interstate commerce from such Dillinger tactics. He complains that the right of the State should extend to the protection of this commerce. He forgets that we have maintained throughout that it was, and still is, the right of the States to defend one against being lynched, to handle the voting question, and to say what the Federal Government can do with respect to the police powers within its borders. His defense of States' rights today is a glowing and brilliant paradox.

I want the farmers of this Nation protected from hijacking, robbery, and assault when they deliver milk from New Jersey to New York, or produce from South Carolina to New York. They have had no protection under the laws of the State of New York. The Hobbs bill protects them with the armed might of the Federal Government.

This is the third trip this bill is making to the body at the other end of the Capitol. I hope that on this occasion, when we pass this bill with a resounding majority, our colleagues on the other side will sense the righteous cause with which the farmers of this Nation are armed, and say to racketeers everywhere "that no longer will they intimidate and coerce the weak; no longer will they obstruct and retard, or attempt to obstruct and retard, the orderly transportation of persons and property in interstate or foreign commerce; we, too, are determined to be on the side of law and order."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is an honest, patriotic, and well-meaning man. I do not think he would want to hurt the feelings of anyone. But he does feel, in making a charge against the party, that the party has failed to act as speedily as urged by the President, not that I agree with all that the President has recommended, but he feels that the Democratic Party should live up to the principles, promises, and pledges it has given to the people. The gentleman is grieved that there are some men on the Democratic side who, instead of cooperating, aiding, and assisting in carrying out the wishes of the party and the interests of the masses—that there are some here who are too reactionary in their views, and charge and assail everything that is progressive as communistic. The gentleman from Utah feels that by his statement today he will be able to bring about greater harmony and cooperation in the Democratic Party in the interest of legislation that the country demands and the President has recommended, and that should be passed.

I was quite pleased and surprised, Mr. Chairman, that so many of these reactionary gentleman who are always opposing any labor legislation are so friendly to organized labor today because they say they are in favor of the bill because they want to protect organized labor. Knowing their past, I doubt very much whether they are sincere as they try to make us believe. Who is, Mr. Chairman, actually against this legislation? Every labor organization in the United States. We admit that the railroad organizations in this country of ours are composed of patriotic men and every one of these organizations is fearful that this legislation, if enacted, will affect their standing and their future for which they have fought so many years. Mr. Green, president of A. F. of L., the CIO, and, in fact, every organization, has gone on record against this provision of the bill. Not that they are in favor of racketeers. No; they are trying to stop all unfair tactics. I know that Mr. Tobin, president of the International Teamsters Union has expelled or suspended a New York local again when charges were made.

In conclusion may I call attention to the gentlemen from Iowa and a few others of the activities of the farmers when, in 1932 and several times since, they overturned hundreds of trucks bringing milk to dairies in Chicago because their demands for higher prices were refused. At that time I did not hear any demand for legislation that would provide 20-year imprisonment or $10,000 fine for these violations as this bill does. In fact this bill provides for such imprisonment if some person would charge that he fears that some act may be intended against him.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the sections that I feel should be eliminated from the bill. They are as follows:

(b) The term "robbery" means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property, from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

(c) The term "extortion" means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear or under color of official right.

SEC. 2. Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce, by robbery or extortion, shall be guilty of a felony.

SEC. 3. Whoever conspires with another or with others, or acts in concert with another or with others to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

SEC. 4. Whoever attempts or participates in an attempt to do anything in violation of section 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

SEC. 5. Whoever commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of secton 2 shall be guilty of a felony.

SEC. 6. Whoever violates any section of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 20 years or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the time allotted to me, and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, despite the attempts of the proponents of this legislation to have the country believe that the issue is whether or not we believe in racketeering, the fact, nevertheless, remains that an examination of this bill will conclusively prove to any honest person that this bill is aimed at the legitimate activities of labor, particularly when labor finds itself in a strike or in any struggle. What does this bill do? The answer is found on pages 11 and 12 of the report. These pages had to be printed pursuant to the Ramseyer rule. An examination of pages 11 and 12 will show that this bill, which is in effect an amendment to the existing Antiracketeering Act, removes from the Antiracketeering Act two safeguards that labor has had against the use of the Antiracketeering Act as an antilabor device.

One is that an act shall not include situations involving the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee. This proviso in the existing law is eliminated by the bill before us. Then this bill also removes the proviso of section 6 in existing law which reads:

Provided, That no court of the United States shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such manner as to impair, diminish or in any manner affect the

rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof as such rights are expressed in the existing statutes of the United States

Why is this proviso repealed?

What is the answer of the author of the bill as well as the other proponents of the bill to that question? Their answer is that if we do not remove this particular proviso we cannot aim at the alleged situation which they have described with regard to the transportation of farm products into the city of New York and other cities. If you are really interested in dealing with that particular practice, then why did you not just redefine your definition of extortion so as to hit specifically that particular practice with which you say you want to deal? Oh, no; you do not do that, you do not go after just that particular practice; you leave the field now wide open for the prosecution of labor for any activity in a period of strike or struggle, and you leave labor wide open to prosecution for any activity under the guise of aiming at the elimination of one particular activity. That is the trick in this bill and that is why those of us who believe in the protection of organized labor are opposed to this bill. Do not give us the argument: Are you for robbery or are you against robbery? I am against beating my grandmother too, but I am for protecting organized labor against this kind of legislation supposedly aimed at one specific situation but actually aimed at all of labor's legitimate activities whenever labor is engaged in a struggle to protect its rights.

Let me say this to the membership: If you think it is popular to bait labor, just go ahead and do it. If you want to follow some of the Members in this House who will stand up here and wave their arms and point to the American flag and beat their breasts and bring down calumny and lies on the organized labor movement, go ahead and follow them, but remember that the American people are essentially a democratic people, that the American people have learned a lesson from this war. They know that this war was a war against fascism, the same fascism that destroys the labor movement. They know that destruction of labor's rights is fascism. Is that the course you are seeking to follow in the Congress of the United States? If you want to impose domestic fascism against the American workers——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If you want to invoke the domestic Fascist pattern against American labor, if you want to follow what was done against the labor movement in Italy by Mussolini, and in Germany by Hitler, go ahead and do it; but the American people will not follow you, because their sons have fought against fascism and they will not tolerate fascism in America, whether you attempt to do it through the Hobbs bill or through the May-Arends bill or through any other antilabor bill, including the proposal that was submitted in the President's message.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I inquire how many amendments have been sent to the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There are four amendments at the desk.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to get into this debate, but after listening to my colleague from New York, I am constrained to make a few remarks.

This amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is exactly the same amendment that was offered to the Hobbs bill during the last session when the bill was passed by this House; and I repeat now what I said to you at that time. At a meeting between the Maryland delegation and the Maryland CIO they told us that they were opposed to this amendment because if the amendment were adopted it would nullify the Hobbs bill entirely and its enactment would be useless.

I am against this amendment and I am for the passage of this bill.

In answer to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] who criticized the gentleman from Virginia for his position on labor due to the fact that he had no industry in his district—I have the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Bethlehem Fairfield Shipbuilding Co., the great Glenn L. Martin airplane works, the Rustless Iron and Steel Co., Bendix Aviation, and a great many others I could name, all of them organized. But I do not hesitate to stand up here on the floor and say to those people: "You have got to obey the laws of this country if you are going to have organized labor."

This bill would not have been presented to the House if organized labor had recognized law and order in striking and in establishing their rights, as they have a right to do. Everyone can remember the taxicab strike in the city of Baltimore, which does not pertain to this bill, where cabs were overthrown, bricks thrown through the windows endangering the lives of people, innocent victims. Those were the tactics of organized labor which you people support outright and which organized labor sanctioned. The leaders were locked up and put in jail for participating in those activities. Yet you stand here on the floor of this House and say they did not do it or they did not know anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, labor has a right to strike, but when labor perpetrates that sort of thing, they are going far beyond the bounds of reason. Certainly, I do not take the position that labor has not the right to organize or to strike, but when they do so they should abide by the laws of the land and the laws of decency. If they had done that, we would not have this legislation before the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass the House overwhelmingly as written.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. Any person or persons who shall, during the war in which the United States is now engaged, knowing and willfully, by physical force or intimidation by threats of physical force, obstruct or retard, or aid in obstructing or retarding, or attempt to obstruct or retard, the orderly transportation of persons or property in interstate or foreign commerce, or the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, or the orderly make-up, movement, or disposition of any train, railway or highway vehicle, airplane, or vessel, on any railroad, street, highway, airway, or waterway, or elsewhere in the United States, which is engaged in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce or in the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both such fine and imprisonment; and the President of the United States is hereby authorized, whenever in his judgment the public interest requires, to employ the armed forces of the United States to prevent or remove any such obstruction to or retardation of the passage of the mail, or the orderly transportation or movement of interstate or foreign commerce, or the transportation of troops, munitions, or war supplies in any part of the United States whether by air, motor, rail, express, water, or otherwise. For the purpose of this paragraph the United States shall be deemed to include all Territories and possessions of the United States.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 3, line 15, strike out "Title II" and on page 4, line 18, strike out "Title III" and make it read "Title II."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I have a perfecting amendment to title II. Would it be in order for me to offer that amendment at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. A perfecting amendment may be offered before the vote on the amendment to strike the section.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 3, line 16, and line 17, after the word "shall" strike out the words "during the war in which the United States is now engaged."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I think the language of this amendment is abundantly clear. While it is true that the United States is engaged in war at the present time in a technical sense, we have every reason to hope that the war will end de jure as well as de facto. This is a meritorious piece of legislation, and there seems no occasion for limiting its effectiveness to this statutory and now somewhat hypothetical war period.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect either section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, or an act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932, or an act entitled "An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes," approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or an act entitled "An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1935.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Strike out under title III on page 4, lines 19 to 25 inclusive, and on page 5, lines 1 to 8 inclusive and substitute the following:

"No acts, conduct, or activities performed in connection with objectives which are lawful under section 6 or section 20 of an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, or under an act entitled 'An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932, or under an act entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt disposition of disputes between carriers and their employees, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1926, as amended, or under an act entitled 'An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate or foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes,' approved July 5, 1935, shall constitute a violation of this act."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that you have just heard is the so-called Joseph Padway amendment. Joseph Padway is the general counsel for the American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor has indicated that it will accept this bill but only on the condition that you adopt this amendment that you just heard, which I have offered. It embodies affirmatively and definitely the defenses that anyone would have when he is accused of a violation of the so-called Hobbs Act.

I am going to repeat what I said on this floor some time ago with reference to this amendment. It is one thing to say that the Hobbs bill does not repeal certain laws. It is quite another thing to say that the substantive provisions of these laws are to be considered or included in the Hobbs bill. Title III as now written in the Hobbs bill may just as well say, "Nothing in the Hobbs bill shall repeal or modify the White Slave Act, the tariff act, and the income-tax law." My amendment says that conduct, acts, and activities which are lawful under the four statutes mentioned in title II shall not constitute a violation of the Hobbs Act. In the wording of my amendment, I actually embrace within the Hobbs Act and make part of it the substantive provisions of these four statutes. When a prosecution is had under the Hobbs Act as now written, without my amendment, title III will have no effect at all. If a worker is charged with violation under the Hobbs Act and he attempts to justify his conduct by asserting that he did not violate the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Clayton Act, or the Railway Labor Act, or the National Labor Relations Act, the court could very properly state, "This is not a prosecution under any of these statutes. This is a prosecution under the Hobbs Act. If you are guilty of violating the Hobbs Act, you must be punished, and there are no exceptions provided for you in the Hobbs Act, since the exceptions appearing in these other acts have not been included, have not been incorporated, in the Hobbs Act."

If you read title III of the Hobbs Act, you will clearly see that you do not incorporate those escape clauses of those four other statutes. All title III says is that nothing in this Hobbs Act shall be construed to repeal or modify or affect those various provisions of the four acts that I have enumerated. If you want to give the protection that you aim to give, then affirmatively state as I indicate in my amendment that you are offering these defenses to anybody who is accused under the Hobbs bill.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is another good laugh. Two years ago the same amendment was offered by the same gentleman, who made substantially the same speech, and I had the pleasure of rising in opposition. I then said:

To snatch a child from the path of an onrushing automobile is not only lawful but praiseworthy in the highest degree. But suppose that while so engaged the rescuer recognizes the child as one that he planned to kidnap and then does so; would he be innocent of kidnapping? Because a man is engaged in the perfectly lawful conduct of striking is he guiltless if he commits rape? Picketing is lawful, but does that mean that a picket because he is so engaged should not be punished for stealing if he does so while picketing? The right of collective bargaining is guaranteed by law. Does that give collective bargainers the right to commit murder?

These questions answer themselves. They also answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. Therefore, we ask that his amendment be voted down, as usual.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu therefor the following:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the act entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation', approved ed., title 18, secs. 420a–420e), be, and it is June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 979; U. S. C., 1940 hereby, amended to read as follows:"

Section 1, add a new subtitle entitled "Definitions" and a new section, No. 7, all reading as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 7. The following definitions shall be binding upon all courts in construing this act:

"(a) The term 'the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee' shall not be construed so as to include the payment of money or the transfer of a thing of value by a person to another when the latter shall use or attempt to use or threaten to use force or violence against the body or to the physical property (as distinguished from intangible property) of the former or against the body of anyone having the possession, custody, or control of the physical property of the former, in attempting to obtain or obtaining such payment or transfer.

"(b) The term 'the rights of a bona fide labor organization in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States' shall not be construed so as to ignore, void, set aside, or nullify the definitions set out or the words used in or the plain meaning of subsection (a) hereof."

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I explained yesterday that I am here attempting to make a good faith, bona fide effort to resolve this problem. I was asked yesterday, "Who gave you this amendment?" No one gave me the amendment. I did not get it from a trucking association. I did not get it from a farmers' association. I did not get it from any labor organization. It is an attempt in good faith on my part to prevent a reoccurrence of what happened in the Supreme Court opinion.

That opinion turned on the proposition that relations between a bona fide employer and a bona fide employee, which were excluded by the operation of the act, could be so construed as to include the acts which took place in this particular instance. If you construe those words so that they apply only to the relationship between an employer

and a potential employee or a man having the possession of the property of an employer or another person, you limit the situation to the relationship such as those which arise in this trucking situation. I am very firmly convinced that in its present form, and I will not vote for the bill in its present form, that under section 2 and section 3 there are covered relationships other than those which arise in this trucking situation. I think they are broad enough to cover a discussion between employees as to whether or not they shall join a union. Those things are often accompanied by heated discussions which might be called coercion and they would affect the right of labor to organize. We say, "It is not the intention to do that." But I am also firmly convinced that this law, being as it is the last expression on the subject, would be an implied repeal of any other protections that presently exist.

I do not make the argument to you that there is no need for Federal legislation because for years we have said where there were corruptions in the conduct of elections in local communities where the local authorities and the prosecuting authorities did not act the Federal Government had a sufficient interest in that to step in. Factually, if that kind of situation exists, of course, they have the right to step in. But let us understand a few things. When I use the words "intangible property as distinguished from tangible property" and simply put in a definition in the existing law, I am attempting directly to protect against the possible property characteristic inherent in the use of property which a man might say he lost if his plant was struck. Of course, there is an element of coercion in strikes. It is the only right that labor has. I am not going to stand in the well of this House and affect that right in any way, nor have I affected it in any way. But I am also not going to vote in this House for language which I am convinced can be construed against the organizing activities of labor.

You talk about section 6 of existing law being out. Section 4 of the existing law is out, and section 4 is the provision which says that only the Attorney General can institute these actions. Section 4 gives a protection from any activity of an antilabor district attorney in some sections of the country because he cannot proceed until he comes back to the Attorney General. For some reason that is unknown to me, the Hobbs bill leaves that section out. I pointed that out in the Seventy-eighth Congress, and you can draw your own implications as to what those reasons may be.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman, of course, understands that the district attorneys in these various districts bring these actions and each and every district attorney is subject to direction by the Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Of course, I understand a great many things about the Federal practice. I even practiced in the Federal courts once. I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] make an argument something like that the last time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. No; I do not. I simply say I heard you make the same kind of argument.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I decline to yield. I simply state for the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I heard him make the same argument.

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe every former United States attorney in Congress knows what I am talking about.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I am glad to hear that. I am awfully glad to know all about that. I also know that in the case of election frauds it is the customary practice to refer all these actions to the Attorney General, but that otherwise the district attorneys are not limited unless there is an express provision of law or a custom existing in the Attorney General's office which makes them limited as to actions they can bring, the grand-jury investigations they can conduct, or the way they conduct themselves. So I cannot vote for this legislation because the implications of its possible abuse by antilabor district attorneys are to me so plain. On the other hand, I believe no one can successfully rise here and say I am failing to reach the situation that is inherent in these large city markets that can be reached under the legislation and the amendment which I am proposing. It preserves the existing law and there is no reason for getting away from existing antiracketeering law.

As a matter of fact, under the guise of reaching racketeering you have written a piece of legislation that as far as racketeers are concerned is not as good as the Copeland Act which is on the books.

Let me now say just one more thing to the Members on my side of the House. I am trying to do something to unify the people of this country, I am attempting to cut down the causes of conflict between the man who works in the factory and the man who works on the farm. There will be no progress in America until that is done. For you people over here on the Democratic side who profess to speak for labor—I do not say that I know all of labor's wants, but I know something about the hardships of labor and I have pleaded for labor in country towns where it was at the risk of my physical being to step into those towns and defend labor, and I did not have to stand in big cities to do it where the doing of it is popular, not politically or physically hazardous.

What I am trying to say to you, my Democratic friends, is that you will not have progress in America, progressive action, American radicalism, until you unite the man on the farm and the man in the factory; and these activities of this particular type of union do more to drive the farmer away from labor than anything that could happen. There is nothing wrong in the interest of labor to vote for legislation which strikes at those activities which are particularly offensive to actual working farmers.

If you mean it over here on the Republican side that you only want to protect your farmers, and if you are not interested in letting southern Democrats write a law, which in my opinion as a lawyer can be used to deter and hinder union organization in the South, then vote in support of this amendment, if you mean it. But remember, if labor goes down, then your farmers and small-town businessmen will suffer; not the owners of vast corporate wealth who want this Hobbs bill to hit all labor; not, I assure you, to help farmers.

If I am wrong I have got to take the responsibility with labor, and I am willing to take it, for my amendment hits the things which labor itself decries, but—and mark it—only that and nothing more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Let me say that the gentleman from Indiana was kind enough yesterday to show me this amendment, and I have had an opportunity to go over it very carefully. It is my judgment that should the Committee adopt it we would then have marched up the hill and marched down again, because the law would be exactly the same as it is now.

What was the situation before we passed the law originally? Prior to 1934 every State in the Union had laws against robbery and against extortion. The purpose of the antiracketeering law was to create the Federal offenses of robbery and extortion if those crimes interefered with or affected interstate commerce.

In this Local 807 case there was no dispute whatever about the facts. Had you or I or any person in this country done the things that were proven there we would have been guilty unquestionably under the Antiracketeering Act of 1934. Why then did the Supreme Court reverse the case involving this labor union? Because they read the statute and there were certain words in there which they construed to mean that the Congress did not intend the statute to apply to organized labor at all. That is the decision; that is all the decision is.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana would leave those words right in the law and it would constitute an open invitation to the Supreme Court to decide that case the same, if it should come before them again; in fact, if they believe in stare decisis over there—about which I sometimes wonder—they would be obligated to affirm their decision because the Congress had in effect affirmed the statute which the Court had construed a certain way. In addition to that there are some other provisos in here which purport to make a sort of change in our notion of robbery. Intangible property is spoken of. Robbery is the taking of tangible property away from some person, or things from per-

sons by violence or by threats. The violence must be at that time.

The amendment offered by the gentleman does not mean a thing. If you are opposed to the bill, defeat the bill if you want to, but let us not kid ourselves by putting in this amendment because if we do we will have accomplished nothing to right the wrongs about which we have been complaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. It seems to me that the amendment is intended to get at the thing we are all anxious about. If it be subject to any criticism, it should be perfected, but I do not think the amendment should be rejected because what we are trying to do here is to avoid physical violence to a person or physical violence to his property. I am sure that is all any of us has in mind by changing the law.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment for the reasons announced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] and for the further reason which he dwelt on only a bit. The Hobbs bill would knock out the Copeland Act completely and would substitute only the prohibition against robbery and extortion. The Antiracketeering Act is designed and was designed to do a great deal more than that. For instance, it would prohibit such things as price fixing, such things as restriction of territory, such things as limiting a man in the kind of business he might do, if enforced by threats and intimidation. To remove prohibitions against that sort of racketeering is merely to accomplish a correction of the Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the Copeland Act, which seems to me to be burning down the house in order to cure a very small defect in the house. It does not seem to me that is the intelligent way to do the job. The way to get at this problem is at the point the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is trying to hit and I think he has done so. If there is any defect in his effort, let us do it by perfecting his amendment rather than destroying the whole structure that has been built up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am for the pending amendment, and after listening to the calm and rational debate here this afternoon I have come to the conclusion the question is, the only question, and the remedy sought in this legislation is the correction of an erroneous opinion of the Supreme Court.

Is it the province of this body to follow the Supreme Court and correct all of its erroneous decisions? If the Judiciary Committee will join me in that I will ask that committee to correct the erroneous decision of the Supreme Court when it held that a farmer could not eat his own wheat that he had planted 7 months before the Congress passed an erroneous law.

If we are going to do that, let us do it in the intelligent, simple way that the LaFollette amendment attempts to do it by simply telling the Supreme Court it is wrong. If you want to go a little further, let us get a good instructor in English, and a good book on English, give it to the Supreme Court in order to teach it to read and understand the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the Nation has a headache. There are strikes and more strikes. I know that there will be many more headaches as a result of the war. In the reshuffling of 15,000,000 civilians from wartime to peacetime, from war production to civilian production—in the refitting of 12,000,000 veterans into civilian life, from war destruction to civilian production—we have no right to expect anything but a headache.

The false notion of permanent and lasting prosperity when we were engaged in permanent and lasting destruction never had any place in the minds of intelligent people. The readjusting of these 15,000,000 civilian war workers and 12,000,000 veterans is a gigantic task. It will require patience, intelligence, integrity, and ingenuity. Arbitrary and unjust action will not help the situation, but make it worse.

I know that some of these strikes are justifiable, others are not. I have a suspicion that some of these strikes are agitated and caused by persons who are not interested in the American form of government. These wish to bring about chaos and confusion and then destroy us. They prefer a dictatorship. They spurn democracy. They are not all employees; among them are employers.

I know and you know that there are many cases where the workers are receiving less than a living annual wage. It is easy to compare the wage they got before the war and that they are now receiving. Such a comparison is not only unfair but dishonest.

We hear the enemies of labor shout from the housetops, "Look at the high wages they are getting." But these do not tell you that the dollar is worth only 50 cents in purchasing power. They do not tell you that in many cases the present wages paid are not more than sufficient to pay the rent on a decent place to live in, let alone fuel, clothing, and food.

They do not tell you that many of the so-called white-collar workers are in actual want because of low salaries and wages. To these it is all right to have high ceilings for everything, but low ceilings for agriculture and labor. They want cost-plus for industry and cost-minus for the farmer and the laborer.

There are two evils confronting America today. On the one hand are those with foreign ideologies. Their object is to give the shirt from the back of America to foreign nations. Their motto is "Everything for foreigners, but nothing for our own." They are opposed to the veteran, the farmer, and the laborer getting their due. They love to bask in the smiles of foreign rulers and foreign representatives.

These are ably assisted by another crowd with foreign ideologies. This crowd has the ideology of dictatorship. They prefer not only that labor but all of us be ruled by gun and club, by a centralized government—à la Stalin. They wish to bring about, through strikes and disorder a complete collapse.

On the other hand, we have those who would go back to the Dark Ages, who prefer working slaves to working freemen. These forget that it was free labor that produced not only food, clothing, and the implements of war for our own Army and Navy, but for the armies and navies of half the world. In no nation did the individual worker produce anywhere near that of the American farmer and laborer.

These "backward looking" people would now have you believe that labor is solely responsible for the crisis that confronts this Nation. They are loud in their protests against strikes, but they forget that some of these strikes are caused by employers as well as by employees. They are totally dumb to the millions upon millions that some of the cost-plusers and lend-leasers made. This after taxes had been paid. At least they never raised a whisper against those who were again making millions out of the blood, tears, and agony of an insane world.

On every corner they yell "inflation." They tell you that labor must be kept down to a subsisting wage or we will have inflation. In their ignorance they accept casual statements as gospel truth. They assume that high prices are the cause of inflation, when even the inhabitants of a madhouse know that high prices are the result of inflation and not the cause. They ought to know that if high prices were the cause of inflation, that then we would have inflation whenever we had a crop failure.

We have inflation. It was caused when we plunged this Nation $300,000,000,000 into debt. It was caused when we printed over six times as much money as we ever had before. This for the lend-leasers and the cost-plusers. The present per capita circulation is $28,049,136,408 as against $5,700,000,000 at any time prior to World War II.

Again, we are told by those who see only one side and blame labor for all strikes that it is none of labor's business how much these corporations made during the war. Our answer is that it is not only labor's business but the American people's business as well. It is our business because in readjusting the difficulties that both the employers and laborers face, we must know what the facts are. Both the employees and employers have a right to live. That is the least they are entitled to, and the new wealth created each year by employer and employees must be justly and equally distributed.

I am opposed to this bill because it is aimed at labor. I am opposed to it because I am confident it will, like the Smith-Connally bill, cause more strikes and prevent none. Labor consists of 65 percent of our population. Any legislation that will solidify them, make them feel that they are being discriminated against, will do more harm than good. It will make things worse, not better.

Labor and management, I think, will agree on this.

I know that I am in a minority, but I am just as proud of the votes I have cast with the minority on this floor as I am of those I cast with the majority. The minority is generally right, although it may be a question which minority. I know I was right when I voted against the Smith-Connally Act. Time has vindicated that vote.

It is surprising that no request has come out of the recent conference of labor and management for either labor or management regimentation. The evils in some labor organizations are already beginning to be corrected. The great majority of laboring men will not long follow orders given by irresponsible leadership—by leadership that would destroy rather than create.

I am opposed to this bill because its purpose is to have the Federal Government assume the policing power that belongs to the respective States. The enforcement of law and the maintaining of order is strictly a matter for the States—not the Federal Government. I am opposed to this bill because it is unconstitutional. Under the Constitution the policing power within a State is given to the State. When I make that statement I am fully aware that when we again get a Supreme Court that can read the Constitution and can understand it, then that provision of the Constitution will again be upheld.

If there are criminals among the laboring people, and I know there are, the same as among other people, it is the duty of the State to enforce the criminal law. If the Governor of New York is incompetent to enforce law and maintain order, let the people elect one that will. If the mayor of New York is unwilling to enforce law and maintain order, it is the duty of the Governor to do so. It is not the duty of the Federal Government.

It has been suggested that one State will not enforce the criminal law for citizens of a sister State. I doubt that. If true, then that is an amazing situation. I do not believe that the Governor or any court in any State in this Union will knowingly permit criminals within its borders to prey upon innocent people from sister States. I do not believe that this law is necessary, and I do not believe in surrendering the sovereignty of my State because another State neglects to enforce its criminal law.

I am opposed to this bill because, if persisted in, it will ultimately establish a dictatorship here in Washington not only over labor but over all of us. History repeats itself; we never seem to learn. We always enslave ourselves by first enslaving others. In hysterical moments we become intolerant. We surrender our better and calm judgment to emotion. The time has arrived for sober reasoning. The time has come for us to build a greater and a freer America, not for a few, but for all.

Turn to the pages of history and you will find that dictatorship is always preceded by regimentation and concentration of power. That is as true in modern history as in ancient history. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin all became dictators because the people slept at the switch and permitted concentration of power. They permitted their hatreds and desires and their emotions to run away with their better judgment.

Our Government is no exception. Already throughout the Nation there are millions of protests against the ignorance and the abuse of power by a little bureaucracy established here in Washington. The worst offender is the OPA. It lacks not only common decency, but common sense. It has served no useful purpose. Like the proposed law it is not a native of America—it is imported. May I, therefore, suggest that we face all these issues with patience, with vision and justice. That we first get all the facts and do not act overnight. There is one thing splendid about the American people: they will not be driven by a lash or dictated to by a gun and club.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAFOLLETTE) there were—ayes 56, noes 174.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934, pursuant to House Resolution 406, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAFOLLETTE moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions that that committee report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu therefor the following:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the act entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation,' approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 979; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 420a–420e), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows."

Section 1—add a new subtitle entitled "Definitions" and a new section, numbered 7, all reading as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 7. The following definitions shall be binding upon all courts in construing this act:

"(a) The term 'the payment of wages by a bona-fide employer to a bona-fide employee' shall not be construed so as to include the payment of money or the transfer of a thing of value by a person to another when the latter shall use or attempt to use or threaten to use force or violence against the body or to the physical property (as distinguished from intangible property) of the former or against the body of anyone having the possession, custody, or control of the physical property of the former, in attempting to obtain or obtaining such payment or transfer.

"(b) The term 'the rights of a bona-fide labor organization in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof, as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States' shall not be construed so as to ignore, void, set aside, or nullify the definitions set out or the words used in or the plain meaning of subsection (a) hereof."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAFOLLETTE) there were—ayes 62, noes 164.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas (at the request of Mr. SHEPPARD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD of today immediately prior to the reading of the bill for amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—JOHN W. L. HICKS AGAINST GEORGE A. DONDERO

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Elections No. 3 I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 455) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of John W. L. Hicks, contestant, against GEORGE A. DONDERO, contestee, Seventeenth Congres-

sional District of the State of Michigan, be dismissed, and that the said GEORGE A. DONDERO is entitled to his seat as a Representative of said district and State.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and to include some remarks on full employment and OPA.

Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a brief editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "America, Russia, and peace."

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL and Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from one of his constituents with regard to watches.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article from the American magazine by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, and in the other a pamphlet from the United Maritime Workers Union of America.

Mr. DE LACY (at the request of Mr. SAVAGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made last night.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Admiral W. J. Carter, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, concerning a radio broadcast by Drew Pearson.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 9 I addressed a communication to Hon. Will Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, asking for certain information. I repeatedly phoned the State Department for an answer but none has as yet been forthcoming. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include that letter and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

GEORGE O'HARA

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

MATTHEW MATTAS

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas.

RUFUS A. HANCOCK

Mr. McGEHEE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock.

CLARA BLACK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Clara Black, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "appropriated", down to and including "killed" in line 8, and insert "to the estate of Harry Leon Black, of Alhambra, Calif., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of said Harry Leon Black, as the result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGURDUR JONSSON AND THOROLINA THORDARDOTTIR

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 314) for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks by printing an article from the Wall Street Journal.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

"WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES"

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the rapid rise of the national debt and the burden of taxes are causing people to think more and more beyond the immediate problem of combating the inflationary effects of Government spending, to the longer postwar problem of carrying a greatly expanded and expanding public debt.

Secretary Morgenthau, on his return from a tour of the Mediterranean battle area in 1943, reported that he found soldiers worried over the growing debt and fearful that "they'll have to fight the war and pay for it, too." Well, Mr. Speaker, their worst fears are to be realized.

Treasury officials, in presenting their tax program to the Ways and Means Committee in October 1943, took cognizance of the postwar debt problem by stating:

After the war the Federal Government may well need to have a surplus rather than a deficit, if postwar inflation is to be avoided. But in the face of heavy interest charges, a surplus could be obtained only by continuing wartime tax rates for years or by neglecting urgent expenditures for public works, public health, and education.

We hear on every side expressions of concern by businessmen, investors, and even by great numbers of plain people. People are being influenced in their habits of saving and spending by their apprehensions.

For several New Deal years we were told by international-minded economic theorists that the fears of our rising Government debt were greatly exaggerated.

One of the arguments most commonly advanced in support of this view was that a public debt, internally held, is no real burden, since we only owe it to ourselves.

Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, enlarged on this point as follows:

The burden of interest is not of itself a burden because the interest goes back to the economy, increases income, and therefore increases our ability to pay taxes.

In May 1939, the President, in a public address, appeared to voice this same philosophy when he said:

And when this week you see all the crocodile tears about the burden of our grandchildren to pay the Government debt, remember this: our national debt, after all, is an internal debt, owed not only by the Nation but to the Nation. If our children have to pay the interest on it, they will pay that interest to themselves.

This crazy school of thought was led by Lord Maynard Keynes and Prof. Harold Laski, special British pleaders for favors from other nations, and meddlers in our American affairs.

Prof. Alvin Hansen, the leading American disciple of Keynes and Laski, has asserted that "a government debt internally held is so different from an ordinary personal or business debt that it could hardly be called a debt at all."

Carried to its logical conclusion, what that argument seems to add up to is that it makes no difference how high the debt goes so long as we owe it to ourselves. Or, having borrowed, it should be possible, on the theory, to cancel the debt without harm, since we would, after all, only be canceling it to ourselves.

Of course, no one believes such absurdities. Those who assert or imply that a debt owed to ourselves is no burden do not mean to be taken too literally.

Professor Hansen has admitted that "nobody knows how great an internal debt a nation could manage—without repudiation or uncontrolled inflation—because the test has never been made."

He also said:

Safe limits [to the debt] will be determined primarily by the level of the national income. Other governing factors are the kind of taxation levied to service the debt, and, of course, the wisdom of the public investment and public expenditures made.

The acceptance of such qualifications, however, seems to put the whole argument on an entirely different basis.

It is perfectly true, as Professor Hansen has indicated, that "the sums collected in taxes to pay interest on the public debt are not, so to speak, thrown into the ocean; instead, they are returned at once to the community." But on the basis of that argument bank robbery would be no crime; banditry would not be wrong; because the funds stolen would still be extant in the national economy. The thieves would simply transfer purchasing power from others to themselves by force.

But this is far from telling the whole story. Though collectively speaking the payments of taxes do come back to the people in the form of interest, they do not come back to the same people—at least, not in the same proportion. What from a national standpoint may appear to be no more than a mere bookkeeping balancing of debits and credits of taxpayers and bondholders becomes for the individual an intensely personal matter of (a) giving up money in taxes to pay (b) in interest.

The individual taxpayer finds little comfort in the fact that in the national accounting the taxes he pays are balanced by the interest someone else receives. What disturbs him is that his taxes are going up. In this way political pressures are generated against increasing taxes which, if the debt is too heavy, may force continuous borrowing and thus lead to uncontrolled inflation.

The proposals that we give away billions of dollars to other nations is bound vastly to increase our national debt, if we indulge them.

Mr. Speaker, Britain led the procession in the default of honest First World War debts owing to us. Britain, headed by Lord Keynes and Harold Laski, now leads the line of nations which are not requesting, not asking, but which are demanding that we hand over to them more billions piled upon more billions; billions for which the American wage earners, the American farmers, American white-collar workers, American professional people, and American business people must sweat and toil and sacrifice and plan far into the future to pay, if we permit ourselves to be seduced into handing out those billions to the other peoples of the world. At this point will someone please rise and point out any nation which has asked itself, "How can we ever repay these billions to the United States?"

Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder just what moral right we of this day, in this Nation, have to create debts to be paid by the sweat, by the toil of numberless generations to come, while we hand this money out, not by the hundreds of thousands, not by the millions, not by the hundreds of millions, not by the billions, but by multiplied billions?

The press of Thursday, December 6, carried a report that American and British negotiators have agreed that the United States will lend Great Britain $4,400,000,000. We are to receive 2-percent interest—if Britain does not decide to default the interest It is true, Mr. Speaker, that that great British economist, Lord Keynes, has said bluntly we should be glad to make this four or five billion dollars a gift to Britain, and that Britain could not only not pay the principal back, but could not undertake to pay any interest on it. I dare say there is not a Member in this House that does not realize fully that if we make this so-called loan to Great Britain we will never get a dollar of it back. It will be defaulted like the other billions which Britain owes us have been defaulted. But Britons have been perfectly frank about this matter. Lord Keynes and others have said that Britain cannot repay this debt. They have come to us not for a loan but for an outright gift. In the very hour when they are attempting to interfere with our aviation companies, and when they are planning and plotting to close us out of foreign markets, they are asking for us to give them four or four and a half billions of dollars, and a thousand ships, and voluntarily to relinquish a lot of our foreign markets. The British spokesmen have not been backward, bashful, or even hesitant, in saying that we should do all these things for Britain and be thankful for the chance.

I hazard the opinion there is not a Member of this House who can doubt, if we make this gift—this so-called loan—which is exactly in the same category of lend-lease—which was never intended to be paid back, and never will be—that Russia will immediately be crying out to high heaven that we must lend her $6,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000, or $10,000,000,000 or else she will claim we are lining up with Britain to make war on Russia sometime in the future.

France wants billions in gifts from us. Poland wants billions in gifts from us. China wants billions in gifts from us. There is no reason why, as a matter of logical conclusion, every bankrupt nation in the world, Ally and Axis alike, should not come to the United States and demand a handout of a billion or two billions or ten billion dollars if we make this gift to Great Britain. It would seem that some of us are soft-headed enough to fear that because some other nations demand that we give them these billions, we will be considered hard-hearted if we do not do so. Now at this point there is a question I would like to propound to this House: Suppose we give Britain this four and a half billions. Suppose 2 or 3 or 4 years from now Britain comes back and says "We're broke. All the arguments and all the reasons which justified that other four and a half billion dollar gift now justify another of the same size." What will we do then—hand out another, and another and another bunch of billions, world without end, amen? Now, honestly, what is the answer to that?

Now let me ask another frank question each one of you can answer for yourselves in your own sense of logic; if we make this camouflaged gift of four and a half billion dollars to Britain, will Russia, Communist Russia, the Russia which has thus far flouted every ideal for which we fought and spent in this war, the Russia which has consistently and persistently refused to cooperate with her allies who came to her rescue when her former ally double-crossed her and invaded her—will that Russia come forward with a demand for ten billions or six billions? We already know she is now set to do so the minute we grant this gift to Britain. She will demand ten billions or six billions on the ground that she has suffered more than Britain; that she put more men and more money into the war than did Britain; that we will be guilty of favoritism if we deny her; that to deny her would be to serve notice on the Russian people we are conspiring with Britain to assail Russia next. Any sensible student of affairs could stand on this floor this hour and present every argument and the very arguments Russia will advance for a gift of ten billions or six billions. All right, what will we do then, when that demand comes? Will we prepare to give away more billions which belong to posterity—more billions which they must sweat to redeem—or repudiate? Each of you face that question frankly, and each for yourself make your own conscience give you the answer you must find sooner or later.

Where and when is this handing out of American energy, American sweat, American goods and service ever to stop?

Mr. Speaker, we have put forth the greater part of the money to fight this war, and a lot of men and women besides. It was a war which was not of our making. The American people hoped and prayed it would never come. There is no earthly reason why we should undertake to repay all of the war damages everywhere else in the world, and to support all the other peoples of the world henceforth.

Who is there in this House who doubts that in a couple or three years Britain will be back asking for another four or five billions—and if she gets this $4,500,000,000, why should she not?

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to give Britain this money at a token rate of interest, which is included merely to fool the American people once more—to lead them into doing this unwise thing in order that the Socialists in Britain may finance their socialistic program. France has already socialized her banks—report in the Times-Herald of December 4. We know that, if we lend this money to Britain, under these proposed conditions which are to camouflage a gift, then we will be hounded by other nations who will come demanding that we hand out gift money to them as well.

Have we forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that in this war we spent $250,000,000,000, while Great Britain spent $100,000,000,000 and Russia spent $100,000,000,000 and the other allies $250,000,000,000? I take that estimate from an editorial in the New York Times of March 4, 1945.

Have we forgotten that the war debt of the United States is $200,000,000,000, while the war debt of Great Britain is

$50,000,000,000 and the war debt of Russia and all the other Allies is $250,000,000,000? That, too, is from an editorial in the New York Times of March 4, 1945.

Have we forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that before we are through with the commitments which have already been made we will have a public debt of more than $300,000,000,000?

Have we forgotten, Mr. Speaker, those early days of the New Deal when Lord Keynes was over here helping us run the United States? Mr. Leith-Ross was over too. A lot of Britishers came over from time to time led by Lord Keynes, whose chief thesis was that the course which would cure the depression in the United States was deficit spending. Lord Keynes went so far as to write an open letter to the President of the United States about this matter. I have a very strong opinion that if any outstanding American economist undertook to write an open letter in the London Times to the King of England about how Britain should run her affairs, he would be bluntly told that Britain could run her own affairs without any advice from impudent Americans.

In this letter which Lord Keynes wrote to the President by way of the New York Times on December 31, 1933, he said:

> Thus, as the prime mover in the first stage of the technique of recovery, I lay overwhelming emphasis on the increase of national purchasing power resulting from governmental expenditure which is financed by loans and is not merely a transfer through taxation, from existing incomes. Nothing else counts in comparison with this.
>
> Governmental loan expenditure is the only sure means of obtaining quickly a rising output at rising prices. * * *
>
> The set-back American recovery experienced this past autumn was the predictable consequence of the failure of the administration to organize any material increase in new loan expenditure. * * *
>
> In the field of domestic policy, I put in the forefront * * * a large volume of loan expenditure under Government auspices.

The Honorable Alf Landon pointed out in his Chicago speech of October 19, 1936, that Keynes was advocating, in fact Mr. Landon said Keynes had stated, that if only the United States Government would spend $400,000,000 a month it would prime the pump and all would be well.

Arthur Krock, the columnist of the New York Times, on June 5, 1934, stated:

> The British economist (Keynes) is credited with having persuaded the President to step up greatly what is called inflationary spending. * * * He is a believer in the theory * * * that (a) spending money about the country increases purchasing power; (b) that this increase must be effected before recovery can come; and (c) that therefore it is economically unwise to pay any attention just now to economies or the balancing of the Budget.

In confirmation of what Mr. Krock observed, I want to quote a footnote from a volume entitled "Financing American Prosperity." J. M. Keynes is therein quoted in an article entitled "The United States and the Keynes Plan," in the New Republic of July 2, 1940, as follows:

> He (Keynes) refers to the failure of the deficit spending to produce anything like full employment in the United States, and ascribes the failure to the gigantic powers of production of a modern industrial State. Coupled with institutional factors which tend to encourage accumulation and retard the growth of consumption when incomes increase, this means that an unprecedented output has to be reached before a state of full employment can be approached. The full industrial and agricultural capacity of the United States may well exceed 1929 by as much as, or even more than, 1929 exceeded 1914. * * * The conclusion is that at all recent times investment (and public) expenditure has been on a scale which was hopelessly inadequate to the problem. * * * It appears to be politically impossible for a capitalistic democracy to organize expenditure on the scale necessary to make the grand experiment which would prove my (Keynes') case * * * except in war conditions.

Mr. Speaker, Alvin Hansen who, as I have pointed out, is one of the foremost American disciples of Lord Keynes' deficit-financing system of spending nations back into prosperity, has long advocated in this country deficit spending on the basis that the debt does not mean anything. He helped Lord Keynes persuade the late President Roosevelt that the debt did not matter because "we owe it to ourselves," as President Roosevelt said.

I want to propose a new, and I think a much more logical thought in connection with this Keynes theorem. That is that we owe it to ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to realize now that if we start to give away billions here, billions there, and billions other places, we will bankrupt ourselves and put our posterity so deeply in debt our descendents will have to repudiate that debt—as Great Britain repudiated her First World War debt.

I wonder, and I think some other Members of this body must wonder, why, if Lord Keynes could see that deficit spending was such a fine thing for the United States of America, why he does not now propose deficit spending for the socialists to carry out their program in England, instead of wanting us to give them the money. He was very certain deficit spending was just the thing for the United States to practice. His criticism, as we have seen from the words I have quoted, is that we had neither the courage nor the foresight to spend enough. We should have spent more than we did spend. We should have come into the war with a bigger debt than we did have. But what a singular thing it is that Lord Keynes, this brilliant British economist, now finds that deficit spending is not a good thing for his own country. He must come to the United States of America and demand—not ask, mark you—not even politely request—but demand, that we give them $4,500,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 so the Socialists can socialize industry in England without having to plunge into deficit spending.

Let me recommend to the British people, and especially to the British Government, that, according to their own most noted economic authority, if the British Government—the British socialistic government—will just spend enough money which it will borrow from its own citizens, and will spend that money fast enough, why, England will spend herself back into prosperity, and will be able to clean up her war devastation without a bit of trouble. At the end of that time Britain may have a national debt of two or three or four hundred billion dollars—but she will merely owe the debt to herself, according to Lord Keynes. This would seem to be the course Britain should pursue. I am amazed, and gravely disappointed, that Lord Keynes has not urged his plan upon his own country. He certainly painted a glowing picture of how the United States could romp right out of the depression by just spending enough deficit dollars, without any regard for when, if ever, we were going to repay them to those from whom we borrowed—our own citizens.

Now, if Britain will follow Lord Keynes' formula, with Lord Keynes and Harold Laski and a few of the other boys to guide the spending, Britain should be able to deficit-spend herself out of bankruptcy. But, Mr. Speaker, Lord Keynes and Mr. Laski do not prescribe any such course for Great Britain. Instead, Lord Keynes comes over here and arrogantly demands that the American taxpayers dig up another $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 and make Great Britain a present of it—a free gift.

At this juncture let me point out that in the very hour in which Britain, through Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax, were seeking this gift of four and a half billion dollars from the people of the United States, Prof. Harold Laski, in a speech in New York—Washington Times-Herald, Saturday, December 8, page 2, column 6, reference to Capehart speech in United States Senate—was saying, I quote:

> "The United States is headed for serfdom," and a government "dominated by businessmen cannot be trusted."

Within the last month the Dean of Canterbury has been over here declaring that the United States will be a socialistic nation within 2 or 3 years.

Certainly the arrogance and effrontery of these British spokesmen is matched only by their incredible gall in demanding that we shell out billions to them and be thankful for the privilege.

It was to have been foreseen—indeed, some of us did foresee in this country before the war—that as soon as the war was over the program to have the United States repair all of the war damage and set the whole world back on its feet would be just as bitter and intense as the program to get us into the war in the first place.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that any American who will care to assert that America has not already done more than her fair share in this World War is unworthy to be an American and ought to go to some other country to live.

I want to sound a grave warning to the American people.

Just as sure as the sun rises, if we make this gift, concealed as it is under the form of a so-called loan, to Britain, we will either have to give Russia five, six, or seven billion under the same conditions, or else further increase whatever suspicion, distrust, not to say enmity may exist in Russia against us now. If we make this gift, concealed as this so-called low-interest loan, to Great Britain, Mr.

Speaker, we will make an enemy of every nation in the world to whom we may refuse a similar gift, because every last one of them will see plainly that Britain came over and played us for fools successfully. They will move into the line of seekers and demand that we hand out more billions to them.

Mr. Speaker, the American people cannot work hard enough, they cannot sweat enough, they cannot toil enough to pay out all these billions to other peoples of the world and keep their own Nation solvent.

Back in the days of the war when Winston Churchill—who is now being taunted and abused by the socialists of England—was Prime Minister, he said that he had worked and dreamed to get America into the war. He offered to the British people blood, sweat, and tears. Mr. Speaker, Lord Keynes and the other British schemers who have talked some of our own officials into consenting to this gift are endeavoring to pass over to us just as much of the blood, sweat, and tears as they can. If anybody in this House believes the British Government or the British people will feel the slightest gratitude, he just does not know the phychological effect of unpaid debts upon the debtors.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the unconcealed attitude of Lord Keynes and the rest of the British spokesmen is that for some reason we owe it to Britain to give them these billions. They assert again, as they did after the First World War, that in some way we owed it to them to fight this war for them; to pay for this war for them; to rebuild the shattered economy of every nation, big and little, who was in the Allied sphere. When we get that job well under way, they will demand that we rebuild the Axis economies, because they will become plague spots in the European economy if we do not do so.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what has happened to the proud British spirit? I wonder what is happening to the patriotism and common sense of our leaders in this country that they are trying to give away $4,500,000,000 of our overburdened taxpayers' money. They know that the moment this Congress passes this gift, camouflaged as a loan to Britain, that we will have demands from all the other countries in the world, including China, which will amount to tens of billions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, when, in heaven's name, are we going to stop squandering the money of the American people? These are not the dollars of those negotiators which are being given away. These are not the dollars of Mr. Truman or the administration that are being given away. These are not the dollars of this Congress that are being given away. We are considering here giving away billions piled upon billions of dollars of those who follow the hot, dusty corn rows on the prairies of Iowa and Nebraska, of those who work in the forests of the Northwest felling trees, of the men and women who work at lathe and loom, in field and in mill, to produce the goods and services which must redeem these dollars we are giving away.

I say to you, sir, that never has history seen such a spectacle as a nation like Great Britain interfering with our world transportation plans by air; arrogantly asking us to forego our foreign markets; demanding a thousand ships; setting up a socialized government, which is the first step from a democracy to communism—and then having the arrogance to say that we finance all of it for them.

It may be heresy, it may be a dreadful thing for any American to dare think about his own country—certainly the custom under the New Deal administration was not to think about the welfare of America at all—but I am going to raise my voice and cry again and again—when in God's name are we going to begin to think about the United States of America? When are we going to begin to refute these never-ending demands and refuse to make these enormous gifts? We must begin to consider whether or not we have the moral right to commit our posterity to any such debts, and how we are going to produce the goods and services to redeem these billions of dollars in gifts—because redeemed they must be in American goods and services.

Mr. Speaker, the depression of the thirties was the direct result of the First World War. Every economist worthy of the name admits that fact. It struck the United States of America because we spent about $29,000,000,000 worth of our capital in governmental and private loans in that war. When we quit sending goods to other nations on credit because we found they were not going to pay the bills, we found ourselves suddenly faced with no foreign markets and millions of idle workers in America.

Mr. Speaker, who is there on this floor today who does not realize that when we stop sending abroad goods on credits, which will never be liquidated, and when we demand some return for our goods and services from these other nations they will again stop buying from us?

Who is there who can doubt that the only nation which pretends to look out for America at all must be America?

The Communists, and fellow travelers, and the "pinkos" may brand me as an isolationist if they choose. Undoubtedly they will, because they brand any American who dares to have a thought or a kind word for the United States as an isolationist. But I am going to raise my voice to try to help arouse the American people against this business of giving away all we have to other nations. We will go into another depression that will make the depression of the thirties look like a pink tea if we continue to give away billions piled upon billions of dollars of our goods and services to other peoples.

I want America to do her fair share toward helping to alleviate the suffering of war-stricken peoples of the world, but I believe only a sound, solvent, free America can help the rest of the peoples of the world to help themselves.

Apart from the danger of inflation getting out of control, one of the worst features of a mounting debt burden growing out of these enormous gifts is the scramble of different groups of taxpayers to shift the taxes to other shoulders. What emerges is a tax system based more upon political expediency than upon sound economic considerations, with constantly rising taxes.

Taxes thus levied have the effect of limiting savings and private investment and enterprise. As long as a rising debt means more and more taxes of the kind that penalize success, it is a serious mistake not to recognize that increasing debt—whether "owed to ourselves" or to someone else—is a burden upon the economy. It is a burden because it discourages incentive and risk-taking, without which the system cannot advance.

Professor Hansen is well aware of these dangers. He stresses the need for preserving economic incentives. It is all, he contends, a matter of how the taxes are distributed. "Here," he concedes, "is a problem that has got to be solved." But this, as one commentator has remarked, is not just a problem; it is the problem. It is, indeed, the crux of the whole question of debt.

We do not live in a dream world. We have to take account of how human beings actually behave. We have to bear in mind that a big national debt sets up debtor-creditor relationships which constitute in effect a redistribution of wealth, with profound influence upon the rate of national economic progress.

A rapidly rising debt almost inevitably gets into the banks, with consequent inflationary expansion of credit. It has posed in all countries the problem of controlling the inflationary forces, leading in turn to increased regimentation and overhead control of the entire economy. Practically speaking, the bigger the debt, the stronger the forces leading toward inflation or a managed economy, or both.

I have read some points in an analysis which I believe we must consider.

It should be realized that expansion of either public or private debt is bad if it is too rapid, or if the money is squandered.

There are, however, two principal differences in the nature of public and private debt.

The interest on private debt is a burden assumed voluntarily in expectation of a profit. The interest is distributed automatically more or less in proportion to capacity to pay.

In the case of public debt there is always controversy as to who is to pay the taxes. Taxes are thrust upon the taxpayer without his individual consent. The taxes are to pay for Government expenditures for which he has no comparable sense of responsibility or consciousness of benefits received. The whole thing is political. The result is resentment, opposition, and contention.

In a system of private capitalism substitution of public for private debt is in itself an extremely disquieting sign. Failure to recognize these fundamental distinctions in formulating public policies can be disastrous.

As we all know, there is a place for use of both public and private credit.

The question is in large measure a relative one, in that while moderate increases of public debt in proportion to real wealth and income may not be harmful, and may serve a useful purpose, a large and rapidly rising debt is almost certainly a burden and handicap; and public apprehensions on this score ap-

pear entirely justified. The growth of this debt will make more difficult the problem of postwar readjustment. Maybe the country can carry the debt, but at what cost in inflation and regimentation remains to be seen. It depends upon how many other expenses we load onto the budget, and whether we can achieve, despite the retarding influence of the tax burden, the expansion of productive activity.

The achievement of the goal of successful postwar reconversion requires finding practicable solutions for such difficult transitional problems as termination of war contracts, disposal of Government surplus property, and so forth, so that industry can go ahead and employ people. It means working out a tax system that will stimulate and not stifle incentive. It has got to be worth while striving to make money, to save it, and to invest it in hopes of a profit.

But one thing is sure: If we follow Lord Keynes and Professor Laski and give Europe billions and more billions we will become a nation of serfs, because we shall have impoverished ourselves. If we follow any such fatal system of giving away all we have we shall, as the Dean of Canterbury boasted, go socialistic, because the people will become disgusted with the Government which pauperizes them.

Let us consider the welfare and the future of America for a change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain communications and excerpts.

Mr. RANDOLPH (at the request of Mr. DOMENGEAUX) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from a magazine.

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. CRAVENS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE BRITISH LOAN—OPPOSITION MOUNTING

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I heard with interest the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and it clearly indicates there has developed, and properly so, an intense opposition to the so-called British loan which amounts to $4,400,000,000, including $650,000,000 for lend-lease in transit.

The Members of the House of Representatives, and I am sure the Members of the Senate, cannot be persuaded to forget Great Britain's well-known default the last time. Once bitten, they are twice shy. They cannot forget the irritations, the grief, and the name-calling, such as "Uncle Shylock."

Credits to Great Britain in 1914 to 1918 totaled over $4,000,000,000. By funding arrangements, then as now, the interest charges were fixed considerably below what the United States had to pay for the use of that money to the American taxpayer. I significantly read from a statement sent to our State Department by the British Ambassador, Sir Ronald Lindsay, on June 14, 1938:

I am directed to express the appreciation of His Majesty's Government of the assurance that the Government of the United States is fully disposed to discuss any proposals which His Majesty's Government may desire to put forth in regard to payment of this indebtedness. His Majesty's Government will be willing to reopen discussions on the subject whenever circumstances are such as to warrant the hope that a satisfactory result might be reached.

That is just the kind of "bunk" that we are going to get again after we ask England some time in the future to refund her indebtedness to us. She thumbed her nose to us the last time and she is going to do the very same again. There is an old saying: "When the feast is over, the guest departs." The feast is now over. The agreement has been consummated, and Lord Keynes and Lord Halifax are about to depart. They got what they wanted relative to the loan. Now, belatedly, we are asking Britain for concessions. The concessions, I am sure, will not be forthcoming. Why? Well, we have shot our bolt. We have given up our bargaining powers. We are now asking for the commercial use of airfields exchanged for destroyers during the war, at Bermuda, the Bahamas, British Honduras, and Newfoundland, and in the Caribbean. Britain has been treating our aviation industry in the most arbitrary manner. One of our companies reduced the fare to London and the British retaliated by cutting their landings down from 5 to 2 a week. For these and other reasons, some of which I shall set forth, ratification of the proposed British loan, I hope, will be very hard sledding in this Congress.

This Anglo-American agreement is so full of escape clauses, weasel words, and abacadabra as to permit Great Britain to do anything she pleases after she receives the money. The promises to pay are loaded with ambiguities. The qualifications practically nullify the apparent pledges. The double talk is bound to lead to misunderstandings and charges of bad faith and, as they were the last time, Anglo-American relations will be poisoned again. I ask you to read the so-called amazing escape clauses as to the payment of interest in that agreement. It is filled with claptrap and mumbo-jumbo.

It takes a Sabbath-day's journey to go through the waiver of interest clauses, and after you have perused it, takes all the wisdom of Athena to determine exactly what it all means. Those conditions and those very unusual phrasings were put in there deliberately by the British negotiators, because when it comes to trading and financing and making agreements as to trade and finance the British can out-fox us. In that regard, they are as covetous as a sponge that greedily drinks in water but returns very little unless squeezed.

The United States will have to pay more than 2 percent to raise the money for the loan, pay it to the American taxpayer. Britain will have to pay incidentally not 2 percent, as has been publicized generally, but 1.62 percent. So that even if Britain pays its obligation entirely, it will cost the American taxpayers upward of $2,000,000,000 more to lend the money than the United States will get back from Great Britain.

Remember Great Britain pays us 1.62 percent. Any GI who wants to borrow money from the Government does not pay 1.62 percent, he pays 4 percent. Despite all this, in London we are accused of putting the screws on Britain. Already we are on the spot and, like the last time, the critics are not waiting. The London Economist is quoted as saying that the terms are cruel. The London Economist accuses us of exploiting Britain's need and calls the agreement a bargaining victory over our best friend.

Britain's plight—

Says the London Economist—

is due to the fact that she fought the war the earliest, the longest, and the hardest, and for that it charges we are to pay $140,000,000 annually for the rest of the twentieth century.

One would imagine Britain fought the war alone. This of course is only the beginning of the criticism which will be leveled against us twice every year when some payments are in order. For the rest of the twentieth century we are going to get a ribbing and we are going to be accused again of being Uncle Shylock.

"Love thy neighbor, but cut not down thine hedge."

That is a good saying. It is well to love your neighbor, but sometimes it is fatal to go too far, and in this loan to Great Britain we are going very far and we are cutting down our own hedge. The debt will be like a millstone around our own necks. It will cause no end of irritation and trouble. We shall be the wiser in the end, but also the loser. The wisdom will come too late.

There is no definite agreement in this Anglo-American loan proposal that Great Britain will dissipate the very irritating sterling area bloc pool which so blatantly and outrageously discriminates against American trade and American traders. That sterling area bloc pool amounts to about $16,000,000,000 or $17,000,000,000. Take the case of India, for example: India sold us vast quantities of strategic materials during the war, such as manganese and sisal. As a result India has a balance of trade against us. She acquired something like 1,500,000,000 American dollars; but she could not use it to buy American goods. Britain seized and placed into the sterling area bloc pool 1,500,000,000 of American dollars. The Indians want to buy our goods with these dollars, but England says: "No; we cannot let you buy American goods. You can only buy British." An Indian supply mission came over here for the purpose of buying American goods but Britain would not let the supply mission buy more than something like $9,000,000 a month. India has the dollars which Britain filched from her and locked up—dollars India should use to buy our goods. What a boon it would be for American trade if those dollars would be unfrozen and there could be purchased for Indian consumption $1,500,000,000 worth of American productivity—but Britian says "verboten."

What holds good for India holds good for Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Egypt, and the various countries in the Levant, but those countries are precluded from buying our wares because of the sterling area bloc pool. The pledge should have been given that Great Britain would dissolve that sterling area bloc pool which seeks to jostle off the international sidewalk all American traders.

Imperial trade preferences are not even mentioned in the Anglo-American pact. This system likewise has a very deleterious effect on American trade and traders because within the British Dominions there is tariff preference given one to the other, which preferences are denied American trade and traders.

Greece, for example, is seeking a loan of $44,800,000 from Britain and presently a Czechoslovakian mission is arranging for a loan from Britain in the announced sum of 25,000,000 gold pounds. If England is stone broke, how can she make these loans to Czechoslovakia and to Greece unless the money we turn over to her is so used? It appears that Great Britain intends to get all the gravy and all the good will by making favorite trade treaties with Czechoslovakia and Greece at our expense and with our money. The United States will again be the loser.

England borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1941 $425,000,000. There has been disbursed $390,000,000, leaving a balance out of which she can draw upon of $253,265,000. We never hear a word about that. We never hear that we lent Britain heretofore those many millions of dollars. She gave security to the RFC and at the present moment there are about $895,000,000 worth of securities held by the RFC. Over and beyond that Britain has huge free and clear assets in the United States which include $2,500,000,000 in gold and bank balances and $1,100,000,000 in negotiable securities and investments, a total of $3,600,000,000. War secrecy has kept these facts under cover, but now we, the opponents of this Anglo-Saxon arrangement for a loan of over $4,000,000,000, have a right to ask that Britain unbury and disinter these assets, and we have a right to ask why that $3,500,000,000 of heretofore hidden assets, as well as the assets that the RFC has as security for the balance of a loan, should not now be turned over to the United States Treasury as security for this new loan of $4,400,000,000.

When the bill comes before this House, there will be lots said with reference to the hidden assets that Great Britain has in this country. The question will be asked, Why should not those assets be used to bolster up and secure this vast loan?

I spoke a moment ago about India. Several of my constituents in New York have sought visas and passports to go to India for trading purposes, but to my amazement I discover that the Agent General for India no longer has the right to issue visas to anyone who heretofore has not been to India. So the representatives of large companies in New York and elsewhere who want to open trade negotiations in India cannot go to India unless their application is first sent to the Home Department in Delhi and from Delhi sent to Downing Street. Why, it would take 7 or 8 months or a year before you could get a visa to go to India—if at all. These difficulties are set up to discourage and finally prevent American traders going to India. Britain does not want to have established cordial trade relations with India. They want to keep our merchants out of India, just as they want to keep our merchants cut of Egypt, out of South Africa, out of Palestine, out of Syria, out of Lebanon, out of Iraq, out of Iran. They want to keep us from competing with British merchants. They set up against us irritating, artificial trade barriers against us all over the world. And sad to relate, we take it—without remonstrance, save as I and others in Congress offer protest.

Nonetheless and despite all these trade proscriptions, the authorities in power have come forward very willingly to give this loan to Great Britain.

The marine-insurance companies will irretrievably suffer by this loan. I have received many complaints from the marine-insurance companies stationed in New York.

They find that the goods that will be purchased out of the moneys loaned to Great Britain will have conditions attached, namely, that the insurance must be taken out in London regardless of the origination of those goods. Those marine-insurance companies who heretofore have had the right to insure those goods will no longer have that right.

This loan need not be paid until the year 2000. The interest to be paid, as I said before, is less than the service charges in turn paid to American taxpayers for the use of money. I repeat, that the clauses providing for waiver of interest payments are wide enough to permit a B–29 to fly through without touching the sides. In addition, one would need some sort of magic code to interpret the real meaning of the escape clauses. This loan will be used to support not only British socialism at home, but British imperialism abroad. There is no concrete limitation whatsoever on the use of any of our lend-lease war materials. Our Thunderbolts, our tanks, and our machine guns are being used and will continue to be used to maim and strafe innocent citizens in Dutch Indonesia, in French Indochina, and supposedly independent Siam. That lend-lease material can still be placed by Britain in the hands of Indian and Japanese troops in subduing independence movements in colonial areas, despite the pledges of the Labor Party to encourage self-determination of subject peoples. The moneys can be used and are being used and will be used and our lend-lease material can be used, is being used, and will be used to enable Britain to continue to tear-gas and V-bomb her way into Palestine villages and settlements, there to kill innocent men, women, and children. The moneys can be used to support General Montgomery's cruel refusal to permit Jews fleeing new Polish pogroms to enter the British zone of occupation. Montgomery has cast them back across the border. I have great admiration for General Montgomery, but he acts under cruel British orders. If Jews attempt to cross the border, they meet with our lend-lease guns and bullets. They want to go home to Palestine where a colonial policy again supported by lend-lease guns seals the borders of Palestine against refugees.

So it is well, I will tell my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], to make the speech he made today. I hope others will follow soon so that there will be an accumulation of indignation against what is being done, namely, giving $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain and getting practically nothing in return.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

REVISION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker—

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall move it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

I am sure if Omar Khayyam had known the distinguished, able, and resourceful gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] he would not have written those lines or, at least, would have revised them and deleted them from the Rubaiyat.

I notice that the gentleman from Missouri is not on the floor at this time, although I served notice on him yesterday personally; I again served notice when I received permission to address the House Tuesday, by calling his office, that I was going to address the House in connection with his remarks, and I again served notice this morning. I am not going to make a grandstand play by making a point of no quorum in an effort to get the gentleman on the floor under the guise of an audience. What I have to say will stand on the record and what I have to say will not be changed, or revised, or deleted.

I want to say that I have a full appreciation at this time that I come before you quaking in my boots and trembling with fear and trepidation with the full knowledge that I am only a David of parliamentary procedure, and I dare face the Goliath of parliamentary action. But I find much solace and much comfort in the published reports of the first and original fight between the David and the Goliath, and I have much hope in the outcome of this little discussion at the moment. I am most mindful that it was about this time of the evening a little more than a year ago that the gentleman from Missouri accomplished one of his greatest parliamentary maneuvers when he walked onto the floor of this House, with 10 Members present, and got points of order waived against the consideration of the so-called Fair Employment Practice Act, a most controversial issue, an issue which tore this House asunder in its further discussions.

I recall that it was just at this time of the evening the resourceful gentleman from Missouri, acting, yes, within his rights, hewing to the line of parliamentary procedure, did get the points of order waived. I think the RECORD and discussion which followed after that clever maneuver will indicate just ex-

actly to what ends the gentleman will go to accomplish his own purpose, oh, yes, always staying within the law, if you please; but he will make a mistake some day.

Now, to the point at issue. May I apologize at this time for keeping you at such a late hour, but I have no alternative. As I said the other day, the question involved on the minor matter of a $5,000 appropriation for a District of Columbia parking agency is of relative unimportance, but the most important thing is the fact that what occurs on this floor is not necessarily what appears in the RECORD, which is supposed to be an accurate description of what takes place here.

I am not alone in criticizing the gentleman from Missouri for deleting or changing remarks, again staying, of course, within the limits of parliamentary procedure, because after he spoke yesterday two gentlemen rose and objected. One, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], objected that his remarks had been deleted, and what did the gentleman from Missouri do? Stripped by the gentleman from Ohio and exposed to the gaze of this House in the nakedness of his position, he immediately seeks refuge behind the flimsy, transparent cloth of parliamentary technicalities, and tells the gentleman that he yielded for a question and he proceeded to make a stump speech.

Since when is the gentleman from Missouri the high and mighty and the authority to delete any other Member's remarks and to decide after he yields to the gentleman that he only yielded for a question? We have to take his word for that. Again, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] objects and informs the gentleman from Missouri that he deleted remarks which were a question. What does the gentleman from Missouri do in that instance? He says casually, in an off-handed way, "I do not recall the question." Of course he does not recall it because he does not want to recall it.

Now to get the chronological order of the statements which he made on this floor yesterday and to follow them through, I am merely taking what has appeared in the RECORD. I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri actually made these statements on the floor yesterday. He allegedly made them because he had 24 hours to revise his remarks. I think most significant the practice, where the reporters give a Member his remarks to revise and then resubmit to him the proof and the remarks, that both are handed back to the reporters. Today I attempted to get the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I learned that he did not return them. So I do not know what he said. I will have to take only his written word, or rather, his avowed written word.

The statement which he made on this floor yesterday does not drip of inaccuracies, misstatements, and misleading generalities, it is saturated with them. It is saturated with them. The gentleman hangs himself with his own rope, as you shall see.

To dispose of the small matter of the District of Columbia appropriation which I discussed, the gentleman said on the floor at the time that the reason that bill was introduced was because some Member of this House went down one night and could not get a place to park his automobile. Of course, that is not true. I say that is not a true statement.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star, entitled "Case History," which sets forth the true facts in the case and gives to the gentleman from Missouri the foundation that what he said was not true, and I again use the words "not true."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. That editorial is as follows:

CASE HISTORY

In 1940–41 the municipal government and the Public Roads Administration shared expenses of a traffic study, costing fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, which resulted in a number of recommendations. One was for the creation of an agency to plan the acquisition of land and other facilities for off-street parking.

Legislation for this purpose was passed by the Senate in January of 1942, after former Senator Burton and a subcommittee had gone into it thoroughly. In February Chairman RANDOLPH, of the House District Committee, arranged to have the bill considered under a unanimous-consent agreement and it was approved by the House after Mr. RANDOLPH urged its passage as a very necessary undertaking which should be no longer delayed.

The bill became law and the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency was set up and given the money to operate. After 10 months of existence, the agency was deprived of operating funds by the House Appropriations Committee on the theory that such activities should be suspended during the war.

Yesterday, when the deficiency bill was under consideration, an effort was made by Chairman COFFEE of the District Appropriations Subcommittee, and Chairman HÉBERT of the District Traffic Subcommittee (who has been holding hearings on the parking situation) to have an item for $5,000 inserted in the bill to finance the work of the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency. It was defeated, 53 to 17, on the contention by Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee that there was no reason for a separate parking agency; that William A. Van Duzer was the "greatest traffic expert available" and should be able to take care of the parking situation, and that the legislation was merely the result of a complaint by a Congressman who could find no place to park his car when he went to a theater one evening.

Mr. CANNON's objections were based on irrelevant inaccuracies which had little bearing on the question at issue. The important thing, however, is that they were enough to kill the amendment and that Mr. CANNON has given a very good answer to the question about why nothing is being done in Washington to solve the parking problem.

The gentleman says:

It has been said on the floor that this setup was provided to meet an emergency. However, the proposal before the committee or the House was to provide a permanent agency. At no time in the discussion was the word "emergency" used except the emergency for the necessity of an appropriation to hire a director.

Misstatement No. 1 of the gentleman from Missouri who prates about wanting to stay within the RECORD and within the parliamentary rules of procedure. Well, let him stay within the rules of parliamentary facts.

Again quoting from the gentleman from Missouri:

In the hearings on the bill this year, no Member of Congress or anybody else appeared before the committee recommending the item.

In the next paragraph he inserts an excerpt from the hearings before his committee whereby General Arthur, the Assistant District Engineer, did appear in behalf of the appropriation and states that he is in favor of it and is there present, certainly not to get something for the gentleman's district back home, but to get this particular $5,000 item.

Yet the gentleman has the effrontery to tell you that nobody appeared and then inserts these remarks before the committee which I shall again ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to be printed at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Then he says:

This is all the testimony offered and all the attention given the matter.

"This is all the testimony offered and all the attention given the matter." Yet, on Thursday, November 29, when this matter came before the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said:

It was suggested—

And, mind you, he had changed his remarks again because he said in connection with this matter that a Member put this bill in because he could not get a place to park. Now, he revises his remarks and he shifts the responsibility in true Cannon fashion.

He says:

It was suggested in the committee that some Member of Congress had gone downtown to a show some night and being unable to find a place to park his automobile came up here the next morning and indignantly introduced a bill to appoint this commission.

Yet in his remarks he says, after inserting the colloquy before his committee:

This is all the testimony offered before his committee.

So where does he get the statement that he blames on the committee that it was understood that some Member of Congress could not get a place to park? These inaccuracies are indicative of Mr. CANNON's procedure. I will let you draw your own judgment as to what you can believe and as to what you cannot believe. Here is another inaccuracy again. He says, and I quote from him talking about my appearance on the floor:

I did not know anything about it until I read the transcript about 11 o'clock that night. It was then too late to get in touch with him—

Meaning me—

so I held it out as I took it for granted that he had not seen the transcript and would not want it to go into the RECORD in that

form. I withheld it merely to be submitted to him for correction on the following day.

At the same time, he makes this statement in connection with my address concerning him:

I did not at any time nor in any way violate any rule.

Again:

I did not know anything about this statement until after the House had adjourned.

That was 24 hours—the next day, and he had not come to me yet. Now if he did not know I had appeared on the floor that morning, and if his intention was as was stated here to submit the transcript to me to change, why did he not do it in 24 hours? That is the $64 question for him to answer. And you can judge for yourself what was in his mind and what he was going to do if I had not called attention to the fact that he had doctored and altered the RECORD arbitrarily and again, I say, within his own rights because in my original remarks I recognized the gargantuan stature in parliamentary procedure of this gentleman, because I made the remark that I also recognized the fact that the gentleman from Missouri in this instance had adroitly and again in typical manner clothed himself with the mantle of parliamentary protection.

He charges I said he violated the rules of the House. On the contrary, as I have just read to you, I showed you how clever he was and how adroit he is in protecting himself. You gentlemen of the House who have had experience with the gentleman from Missouri know exactly his methods of operation and exactly how he will protect himself and keep within the law at all times.

Another statement he makes in referring to me:

He did not debate the merits of the proposition but merely took refuge in name-calling.

If the gentleman will refer to the RECORD, page 11188, he will find in my original address before the House that I discussed the merits of the bill and at no time did I resort to "name calling," as he puts it.

Describing me, he said:

The gentleman exploded in a torrent of abuse.

The gentleman shows an utter lack of knowledge of me if he thinks what I said was a torrent of abuse. I was very restrained. He should really hear some abuse; and if he repeats this, he is going to hear plenty of it.

Here is one thing, Mr. Speaker, I have to plead guilty to and humbly so. The gentleman says:

After the gentleman's remarks were returned to him by the reporters he took his pencil and wrote in all that follows.

I will say to the gentleman from Missouri in the words of Shakespeare:

You teach me and I teach you,
And I will better the instruction.

I did write in because I wanted to reemphasize what I said. I did not alter what I said. I repeated what I said in better words, as I thought.

Then the gentleman in his tirade of yesterday—and it is nothing more nor less than a tirade—goes on to point out that for the purpose of revision a Member may withhold a reporter's notes of speeches delivered in the House even though such notes include colloquy with other Members and have 30 days in which to correct and return to the reporters notwithstanding objections of others participating in the colloquy.

Of course; I said he was within his rights. I keep repeating that; but the gentleman would have you think that I was not within my rights. I was definitely within my rights to call attention to the fact that the gentleman had withheld the colloquy; and the point that I was trying to make and which I make again now, and repeat again and again, is that the RECORD which goes out to the people of this country the next day is the record of what they think has happened on the floor of this House; and any parliamentary maneuver whereby a Member can hold out his remarks in order to delude, to decoy, to mislead, or to cause the people who read the RECORD to believe that something did not happen, I do not believe is giving a true and accurate record.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] told me only a few minutes ago that he referred to the speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] later that day; but, as far as that record shows, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] did not make any speech or ask any question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], with the result that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] was referring to something in thin air.

Another amazing statement: The gentleman repeatedly referred to the fact that the committee was unanimously opposed to this appropriation. As a matter of fact the subcommittee on the District of Columbia was heartily in favor of the appropriation and were never called before the committee to express themselves. I again repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this matter of the District appropriation is really of no importance at the moment, but I think it is of utmost importance, however, when the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee attempts to override what the House has done in its own wisdom in legislative matters; and Mr. CANNON's subcommittee has repeatedly done so, has repeatedly taken the legislative authority out of the hands of this Congress by, if you please, cutting off the water, by cutting off the money. If the Congress passes a law and says that such and such a thing shall be done and authorizes an appropriation, that subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is the proper subcommittee to say "Yes" or "No", whether the appropriation should be given, and not Mr. CANNON's deficiency committee.

Be that as it may, when the gentleman from Missouri rises and challenges my sportsmanship it causes me to smile. Of all the people to challenge the sportsmanship of any Member of this House! His record speaks for itself. I feel that what I am expressing here today in connection with this gentleman's operations in parliamentary maneuvering is an expression which many Members of this House—and I am sure they would like to be standing in the well with me at this particular time taking him to task. Innumerable Members have come to me since this matter arose and have told me that I was absolutely right. I do not know whether the gentleman would be amazed if he knew the opinion that his own committee holds of him. If he does not know it he should find it out, and indeed he will be enlightened.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana has consumed 20 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on full employment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BAILEY (at the request of Mr. KEE), for Thursday and Friday of the present week, on account of important business.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 191. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities and to authorize grants to assist in such construction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4407. An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 13, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m., on Friday, December 14, 1945, the Special Subcommittee on Bank-

ruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the bill (H. R. 4479), to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

860. A letter from the secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1946; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

861. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the eleventh report of the Attorney General covering the period from August 1, 1945, through November 30, 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

862. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

863. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the twenty-fifth national report, Disabled American Veterans (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 454. Resolution providing for the further expenses for conducting the study and investigation of the national-defense program in relation to small business in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1118. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1381. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1382. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1580. An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization; with amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. S. 1363. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or destroyed as the result of water damage occurring at certain naval and Marine Corps shore activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITE: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 455. Resolution relative to the contested-election case of John W. L. Hicks versus George A. Dondero; without amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 3389. A bill granting a pension to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. S. 176. An act for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. S. 845. An act for the relief of Mabel Fowler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. S. 905. An act for the relief of Harold E. Bullock; without amendment (Rept. No. 1386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. S. 1129. An act for the relief of Willie H. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. S. 1338. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Eli L. Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 1389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; with amendments (Rept. No. 1390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Guarino; with amendment (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Thurber; with amendment (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of Joseph O. Mello and Antonio Mello as next of kin of Michael O. Mello; with amendment (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Joseph Tarantola and Ida Tarantola; without amendment (Rept. No. 1394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of James Sherry; with amendments (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Venacio Cadiz Llacuna, In Sun Kwon, Sang Woon Kim, Matias Simon Miguel, Sabas Lagac Teanio, the legal guardian of Benjamin Ramelb, and the legal guardian of Santiago Sabado; with amendments (Rept. No. 1396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brisbin, and the legal guardians of Wynona Gene Brisbin, Nelda Elaine Brisbin, Gwendoline Louise Brisbin, and Jacqueline Nadine Brisbin, minors; with amendment (Rept. No. 1397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir; with amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 443. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to give information regarding the resignation of Gen. Patrick J. Hurley and the sabotage of our foreign policy in China; without amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4960. A bill to require labor organizations to incorporate and file annual financial reports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4961. A bill to provide flying pay for persons in the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4962. A bill to amend section 80 of the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for 10-year terms of office for justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4963. A bill to create an enemy property commission, to provide for the disposal of certain enemy property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4964. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain customs officers and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4965. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4966. A bill to extend the educational benefits provided for veterans of World War II by part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to widows of such veterans; to the

Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 4967. A bill to provide for operation of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4968. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4969. A bill to provide for operation of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has recently been engaged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious or racial refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the current session, relative to the Full Employment Act, for the use of said committee; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Samuel Valente; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4971. A bill to permit Mary J. James to file an application for and to receive a monthly family allowance under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Stoddard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Robert B. Zimmerman; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 4976. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Fortunato; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Ebrecht; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 4978. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Carrie A. Hoover; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 4979. A bill for the relief of Mrs. L. L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1398. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of S. 1171, the Ball-Hatch bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1399. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Murray-Patman full employment bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1400. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the seaman's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1401. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of H. R. 32, the Hobbs bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1402. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of H. R. 2788, the Gwynne bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1403. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Chavez-Norton bill for a permanent FEPC; to the Committee on Labor.

1404. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Pepper-Hook 65-cent minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1405. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., protesting the enactment of H. R. 3937, the Arends bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1406. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Kilgore-Forand unemployment insurance bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1407. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of the Wagner-Dingell social-security bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1408. Also, petition of 2,500 citizens of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of a better GI bill of rights; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1409. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Emergency Council for the Dissolution of the Rankin-Wood Un-American Committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1410. Also, petition of the Emergency Council for the Dissolution of the Rankin-Wood Un-American Committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1411. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Michigan Older Boys' Conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to atomic power; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for a hallowed moment we step aside from the crowded highway to seek the garden of the soul where Thou keepest tryst for us at the cool of the morning hour. Often when we think Thee far away Thou art by our side unrecognized.

In the overwhelming sense of Thy goodness, O God, may all our selfish desires and all our petty egotisms vanish away. Humble us and forgive us, that we may enter into unity with Thee and may become in some measure the instruments of Thy peace. Into Thy hands we commit our spirits in life and in death, which Thou hast told us is but the swinging gateway to a richer realm of vaster service. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on December 12, 1945, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) granting permission to Charles Rex Marchant, Lorne E. Sasseen, and Jack Veniss Bassett to accept certain medals tendered them by the Government of Canada in the name of His Britannic Majesty King George VI.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2737) for the relief of Clara Black.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black;

H. R. 4407. An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate letters from the Chairman of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice and the secretary of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending March 31, 1946, which, with accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

Petitions of several citizens of the city of New York, praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 40, requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A petition of several citizens of New Orleans, La., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for peacetime universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN (for Mr. ANDREWS), from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

S. 1649. A bill to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.; without amendment.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 4649. A bill to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 856).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1679. A bill to authorize additional compensation for work performed on a legal holiday by employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1680. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide more liberal rates of increased pension for single amputations due to service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1681. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1682. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products, until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1683. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sufronia Andrus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1684. A bill to authorize the Federal Public Housing Commissioner to setile the claims for overtime compensation of certain persons who were employed in connection with the University Homes project; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. MORSE each submitted an amendment, and Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART) submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RETURN OF SERVICEMEN AND CONDITIONS AMONG TROOPS ABROAD

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have received a number of letters from servicemen overseas complaining about the delay in getting them home, and also commenting on conditions at the places where they are stationed. I should like to have some of these letters printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1303 A. A. F. BASE UNIT,
A. P. O. 884, P. M.,
New York, N. Y., November 25, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I've always admired you for your intensely conscientious regard for the rights of Americans. Perhaps you can give me answers to two or more questions.

Recently, rioting has broken out over different parts of India; it is trouble that has been brewing for quite awhile between the English and Indians. Unfortunately, we Americans are classified as being British Allies in this coming uprising.

A few days ago Americans were killed and a goodly number injured in Calcutta, and in the future this strife will spread. You will agree that any American life lost in such a useless manner is criminal. And yet there has been no real effort to evacuate this theater as soon as possible apparently.

On VJ-day some 227,000 troops were in the India-Burma theater. Now, some 3 months later, only 93,000 personnel have left. At this rate another 4 or 5 months will be consumed to repatriate us.

Is this trouble being hushed up in Washington? It seems to me that we are sitting on a keg of political dynamite which may explode any day.

Will you kindly justify our being so slowly withdrawn from this territory? Is it that we are to help the British?

Hoping you can give the answers to these, I remain.

Respectfully yours.

KALAIKUNDAH AIR BASE,
A. P. O. 493, C. B. I., INDIA,
November 29, 1945.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator From Montana,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: Perhaps I am not conforming strictly to the War Department's wishes by writing to you while I am still in uniform, but I believe that you should know a few facts concerning the Army's policy in redeploying troops to the United States from the India-Burma theater. Please do not regard this as a personal gripe, as there are thousands of GI's in this theater in the same predicament.

At present, I am assigned to a class IV unit, composed of China theater troops which have been declared as surplus by the War Department. By the orders of the War Department, we are to be redeployed to the United States via India. In the process of our redeployment to the States, we have been intercepted by the India-Burma theater and held at this air base for over a month, doing absolutely nothing, and we have prospects of staying even longer. This has been done for reasons unknown to us.

Our supposition is that we are being held here for the express purpose of closing the India-Burma theater. We hardly think it is a square deal that we should close another theater after closing our own.

During our redeployment to the States, our mail from home has been discontinued and returned to the States. Furthermore, we have been advised that we will not receive any mail until our eventual return to the States, because it would be too much trouble. Consequently, none of us have heard from our homes since the middle of last October. In event sickness or death occurred in our families, we would not find out about it for months.

Another point worthy of mention is the recent shipment of approximately 200 Indian students from Calcutta to the University of Chicago. We GI's would like to know why this shipping space on a troop transport, so valuable to us, was used to bring foreigners to our schools when so many of us GI Joes want to get back to American schools ourselves. It also seems odd, that at various times, ships sailing from Calcutta to the States have advertised in Calcutta newspapers for civilian passengers.

A recommendation endorsed by GI's in this theater is a bonus to be paid enlisted men, who served overseas, equivalent to the 5 cents a mile, and per diem subsistance paid all officers who came overseas. This sum was paid to officers to reimburse them for the money they were supposed to have paid out for traveling and living expenses incurred during the trip. However, such expenses were paid by the Navy, leaving the officers a net profit of approximately $1,000 each way to this theater.

I realize that I can expect no answer from you as no mail is delivered to us, but knowing your past record and the fine work which you have done, I know that you will do whatever is possible to remedy this situation.

Sincerely yours.

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD PORT BATTALION,
APO 70, November 22, 1945.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: For some time I have debated whether or not to write to you. I realize that your mail is very heavy and that you might not be able to read this letter. But I am taking a chance and even adding clippings which give the sentiments of the men over here. Enclosed also is a clipping which features your interest in our predicament. Believe me, we need some help, and soon, over here.

Perhaps you recall that we have met on several occasions at meetings in Great Falls. My father is John L. Goff, of Valier, Mont., for whom you have already done a great deal. For this we are both grateful.

As to my own career—after completing medical school the Army called me away from my eye residency in Philadelphia and assigned me to a general hospital in the

States. In August I was sent over here to the Philippines and at the present time I am assigned to a unit here at base M, San Fernando. My work consists of taking sick call every day for 1 hour, and that is all. Any good enlisted man could do this job, but, no, I do 1 hour's work daily and draw $325 a month. And there are hundreds of doctors like me who are just as miserable and as useless. Believe me, it's disgusting, when I could be in Montana doing a much-needed job in an area with a critical shortage of doctors. The medical men in this Army have been thoroughly mishandled. I am an eye doctor, and here I am doing nothing but first aid, while just a few miles away are three hospitals needing eye men. Damn such efficiency! And my case is only one of many.

My next bone of contention is this: When the ASTP program was organized in 1942 they would not give any aid to me, but damn well called me up when my medical school was finished, and thereby interrupting my training. Now the boys finishing ASTP get all the education, worth between $5,000 and $10,000, and, in addition, are given one point for every month in medical school. Thus, on completion of their training they have 36 points before doing any actual service with the armed forces. What a lousy stinking deal for the rest of us. Now, none of these men can go overseas to replace us because they have in excess of 30 points. I think that it is a damn injustice. But it is typical of Army inefficiency. Please see what you can do about this injustice.

Now something more general about our base. An army base supports, or should support, combat or other units. But this base supports nothing at present and merely exists for itself and for the convenience of the general who needs men under him in order to keep his nice, easy, lucrative job. There are, at this base, enough officers who want to stay in the Army to operate it efficiently—or at least what the Army calls efficiently. It's really a joke. All we do is have "beautification week," "clean-up week," or "good citizenship week," and the latest is the "best driver campaign." We build fences, remove and replace palm trees or perform some equally ridiculous mission. All this takes manpower and taxpayers' money and eventually it will all be waste. The pay-off is that the official bulletin recently requested an officer or enlisted man who was an icthyologist to report to headquarters—believe it or not, the general is building himself an aquarium at the reported cost of $5,000. Still another idiotic episode is that, for the past 5 weeks, he has had a major buying hay for eight horses at the cost of $3,500. The horses, one of which recently died, are for show to the important guests. Oh, yes, he is also building an aviary. There aren't 10 officers out of a hundred who have a good 3 hours' work to do each day. One lieutenant colonel has the big job of taking a census of the number of troops in the various companies for which the Army is paying him the sum of $550 monthly. Multiply this by 10,000 and you will see the figures start to rise for our taxpayers. However, these examples are typical of the 50,000 headquarters of the Army where work is being manufactured just to hoodwink the American people and especially Congress. So why are we kept in? Just for the pleasure of the generals who don't want to give up their little kingdoms. Because the Army won't admit how much they have wasted manpower continually and almost fatally. Please, Senator WHEELER, don't let them hoodwink you. The only men who really know what is going on are the ones who are here at the scene.

Talk of demobilization is really a lot of words for the American people to read about. Action is characteristically slow if at all. The reenlistments of both officers and men is sufficiently high to allow all the men who have no desire to make the Army a career to return to civilian life.

There is a lot of thinking going on over here, Senator WHEELER, among the doctors, dentists, lawyers, and others who resolve, that if action isn't forthcoming soon from the present legislative body that there will be some changes made as soon as we get home. A common saying over here is: No boats, no votes. I, for one, intend to make myself heard in the State of Montana when I return, favorably or otherwise. We're tired of all the talk and no action.

Thank you very much for listening, Senator WHEELER. I would appreciate a reply to this letter.

Very truly yours.

MERCHANTVILLE, N. J., *December 8, 1945.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: Recently I read in the paper of the controversy you and Senator CONNALLY engaged in over the destruction of Army equipment in Australia. I don't know what happened there, but I do know what happened in India, Tezpur, India, anyway.

Soon after the war ended all surplus communications equipment, transmitters, receivers, compasses, etc., were thrown in a pile and run over with a Cle-track. The same treatment was accorded 180 brand new hack watches. One of the navigators in our squadron whose watch wasn't working just right attempted to trade it in for one of these new ones, but was turned down. Of course, the Army wouldn't give any of the watches to the GI's. Does big business run the Army, too, as it seems to everything else? Because the way we figured it out the watches were destroyed solely so as to prevent any inroads on the watch market back home.

One more question: Why hasn't some Congressman had enough gumption to get up in the House or Senate and demand that as a prerequisite to the large loan about to be made Britain that the British immediately withdraw all troops and equipment from Java? The peoples of the Far East, the Indians especially, had been expecting great things from the United States at the close of the war. Instead, no one in Washington as much as raises his voice in favor of the independence of these peoples.

What was the war fought for anyway? The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" aren't worth the paper they were written on—if they ever were written down—and the Indian people, for one, are already beginning to realize it. The Indian people are kind, friendly, and mild, but even they can stand only so much. Before long they will associate the silence of the United States on the question of Indian independence with acquiescence of British rule of India. This would indeed be a calamity for us.

Respectfully yours,

H. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL,
An Ex-GI.

ECONOMIC AND PRODUCTION GOALS OF FARMERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of economic and production goals of farmers, delivered by Senator GUFFEY before a farmers' conference at Altoona, Pa., on December 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POTSDAM DECISIONS—EDITORIALS FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Christian Century, dealing with the Postdam decisions, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Huffman	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Carville	La Follette	Stanfill
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. WHERRY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM—ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, after conferring with the majority and minority leaders, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and having obtained their consent, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the beginning of the session, the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, which deals with the Palestine problem, and that I may be

permitted to address myself to the resolution when it is taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I present the conference report on H. R. 4129, which is commonly referred to as the reorganization bill, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Reorganization Act of 1945'.

"NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this Act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"(c) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this Act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 per centum in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

"REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

"(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

"(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions, as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified in the plan, he has found that such transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function specified in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

"OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

"SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

"(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of transfers, consolidations and coordinations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than four years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition;

"(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any function or agency transferred, consolidated, or coordinated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer, consolidation, or coordination for use in connection with the transferred, consolidated, or coordinated functions, or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

"(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

"LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

"(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or

"(3) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(4) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(5) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or

"(7) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office.

"(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board.

"(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.

"(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.

"(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

"(f) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the

plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1948.

"TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) for the purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

"(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"DEFINITION OF 'AGENCY'

"SEC. 7. When used in this Act, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

"MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, change or designation of name or title, disposition, winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency, referred to in section 3 or 4, shall be deemed a 'reorganization'.

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed, in respect of or by any agency or function transferred to, or consolidated or coordinated with, any other agency or function under the provisions of this Act, before the effective date of such transfer, consolidation, or coordination, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer, consolidation, or coordination had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested functions in the agency from which the transfer is made under the plan, such functions shall, insofar as they are to be exercised after the transfer, be considered as vested in the agency to which the transfer is made under the plan.

"(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term 'regulation or other action' means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization under the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such reorganization takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization so effected, or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

"UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this Act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 11. If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

"(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 .', the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

"SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, ten calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

"SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

"(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

"(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

"(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

"(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
CARL A. HATCH,
ABE MURDOCK,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.
CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CLARE HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object; this, I take it, is the conference report on the reorganization bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed unanimously?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; it is.

Mr. WHITE. Have the minority members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate approved the report?

Mr. MURDOCK. They have.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the able Senator who has presented the conference report briefly outline what changes have taken place in conference on the reorganization bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator ask specific questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. How does the bill as it came from conference differ from the bill as it was passed by the Senate?

Mr. MURDOCK. The bill, as it came from conference, differs from the bill as passed by the Senate in the exemptions retained in the conference report. Some of the exemptions contained in the bill as it passed the Senate were eliminated entirely, and others were placed in a class which, in the event they are contained in any reorganization plan prepared by the President must be set forth separately and must not be included on any plan which also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency. I read from the language of the report:

> No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency.

In other words, the conferees felt that with respect to the agencies, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration, if the President wanted to reorganize in any way one of those agencies he must do so separately and according to the language just read. He cannot submit to Congress anything in a plan affecting any one of those agencies if it involves a reorganization which does not affect that particular agency. The conferees felt that with respect to those agencies Congress should have the right to pass on them separately and exclusively and thus avoid combining them with numerous other agencies.

The agencies which were wholly exempted in the conference report are the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board. The only way that any of the agencies just named can be reorganized or affected by reorganization is by the addition to them of some other agency, some other bureau, some other personnel, or adding to the functions they already exercise. But nothing can be taken away from them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Specifically, for my own information, I wanted to find out what agencies had been eliminated from the bill as passed by the Senate. For instance, the Maritime Commission, and I think several other agencies which were inserted in the bill by the Senate have been stricken out by the conferees.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Maritime Commission went out and the land banks, the Federal Power Commission, and one or two other agencies. We were unable to get the House conferees to agree with respect to them. We were successful, however, respecting the ones which I have named, in agreeing that any reorganization of them must be brought before Congress separately.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was held in committee and have not had the benefit of the Senator's statement. Will he be good enough to repeat the status of FDIC under the conference report?

Mr. MURDOCK. The FDIC is included in that category of agencies which cannot be reorganized if the plan in which they may be affected provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency, but they are subject to reorganization in a separate and exclusive plan. The House conferees were unwilling to agree to their entire exemption, along with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board, but did agree to exempt them from any reorganization plan that involves a reorganization which does not affect such agency. So, if the President sees fit to reorganize the FDIC he must send up a separate plan dealing with FDIC alone.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, for instance, if there were an attempt to close the FDIC into, let us say, the Comptroller's office, what would the situation be?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would say that the President could, under the bill, send up a plan which would transfer the FDIC to the Comptroller of the Currency or, let us say, to the Federal Reserve System, but nothing else could be included in that reorganization not affecting the FDIC. So the Congress has the right to pass exclusively on the question whether or not it wishes anything done with the FDIC or any other agency included in this category.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator tell me on what possible theory the SEC is considered to be more sacred from tampering than the FDIC?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot explain that, but I am sure the Senator understands that in conferences of this kind there must be an attitude of give and take. The Senate conferees felt that they did the best they possibly could in the matter, and we are hopeful that the Senate will agree to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator that in conferences an attitude of give and take is necessary; but I am not prepared to agree that any give and take is justified in connection with the status of the FDIC, which is the steel beam under American confidence in the fiscal system of this country. I am very much disappointed that the House of Representatives should have insisted upon any sort of license to manipulate the FDIC. Without any reflection upon the able Senator from Utah and the service which I know he has rendered—and I know that his sympathy is with the FDIC—I am unable to vote for a conference report which allows any latitude in respect to the FDIC, because I think it is the No. 1, triple A agency of the Government which ought to be exempted.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am in full agreement with the Senator as to the very distinguished record which that agency has made, and I would have much preferred to have exempted it entirely, but that was impossible in the conference and our insistence on exemption of FDIC, in my opinion, would have precluded a reorganization law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator tell us what was done with the amendment which I offered, and which was adopted by the Senate, prohibiting any change in legislation enacted by the Congress since the first of January of this year?

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not understand the first part of the Senator's question.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking what was done with the amendment which I offered, which is section 5 (e), I believe, which provided that no change should be made in a reorganization plan contrary to a statute enacted by the Congress since the first of January of this year.

Mr. MURDOCK. We were able to get the House to agree to the following language, which is in the report on page 4:

> (e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

The language which the Senator offered to the conference in the way of an amendment was very seriously considered by the conference but ultimately rejected.

Mr. TAFT. The language read by the Senator, which was adopted by the conferees, covers the matters which I had in mind, except that it does not cover the fixing of powers within an agency. Let me cite an example of what I have in mind. The other day we had before us for consideration the hospital bill, and we passed it, with the provision that the Federal Hospital Council should have final authority over the Surgeon General on the question of prescribing regulations with which the States must comply. That was attempted to be changed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senate voted down the proposal and made that power final. It seems to me that the day after this act is passed, under a reorganization plan the President could reverse that action and take away that power within the agency from the Federal Hospital Council and give it back to the Surgeon General.

I realize the difficulties which the Senator had, but I believe that if any reorganization plan should be submitted deliberately reversing an action of that kind which the Congress had just taken, even though there were other important things in the plan, I would feel called upon to oppose it. I hope the President will feel that he should not in any case reverse any action taken by the Congress since January 1, even with respect to the fixing of powers within an agency which is not now covered by the amendment, because I believe it would endanger the success of the entire plan if he should do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator that when the Congress has deliberately taken certain action it would be inconsistent for the President, having approved such action, to interfere with it by reorganization. However, I invite the Senator's attention to this factor, which was the basis of the objection of the House conferees to the intra-agency reorganization which would be precluded if the language suggested by the able Senator had been included in the bill: The House conferees pointed out that in nearly every appropriation bill there are many intra-agency distributions of functions which are given of necessity little attention by the Congress, and that if the language which was suggested by the Senator had been included, whatever was done in any of the appropriation bills would be a prohibition against the President interfering with or changing anything in the way of functions which had been prescribed in an appropriation bill. The House conferees felt that such a provision would be too restrictive.

Mr. TAFT. If we should see fit to place legislation in an appropriation bill, I do not see why it would not be like any other legislation. I quite agree that if it were merely a restriction on the use of funds for a year, it would be quite proper to change it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The difficulty we had was in finding language which would fit that kind of a situation.

Mr. TAFT. I appreciate what the Senator has done.

Mr. MURDOCK. We did everything we could to try to meet the views of the Senator. The Senator knows what my attitude was on the floor of the Senate toward his amendment. I thought it was a reasonable amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is it correct to say that under the existing parliamentary situation a motion a recommit the bill to the conferees would not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House having already agreed to the report, such a motion would not be in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So it is impossible to move to recommit. Therefore, if Senators wish to object to the conference report, the only course left is to vote down the conference report, which would permit of a new conference. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A further conference could be asked.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I am left with no alternative to voting against the conference report. I am very sorry to be compelled to take that position. I realize that the able Senator from Utah has probably done everything within his power under the existing circumstances to obtain an agreement with the House. However, if the Senate were to take this action, perhaps the House might realize more definitely how deeply some of us feel about this matter, and might reconsider. I have the total conviction that there is nothing so important at this uncertain moment of flux in the economic life of America as that the American people should continue to be able to sleep at night in respect to the sanctity of their banking system and the security of their deposits. If it had not been for the total and magnificent confidence which the American people had in their banking system and the sanctity of their deposits as a result of the operations of the FDIC during the past 12 hectic years, God only knows what would have happened in the United States. We are still in the throes of the same economic uncertainty. The one thing which the American people are sure of is that their bank deposits are safe. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has been magnificently operated and has made a superb contribution to American confidence during these difficult days. I know of nothing more important, as a matter of fundamental psychology, than that it should be removed from any possibility of suspicion that it is going to be manipulated into some sort of a different status or a different organization; and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to ask the Senate to vote "no" on the conference report, under those circumstances.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that this matter was a subject of discussion among the conferees, and I hope the Senator realizes that two classifications are provided for. One forbids touching in any way certain designated boards or agencies, and the other implies that there may be possible improvements or strengthening of some boards, and, if so, it provides that each must be handled under a separate recommendation by the President, not under a general plan. I was willing to have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation included in the second class, with the understanding that if the President sends to Congress a plan regarding the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, it can be acted on separately. But by adopting such a provision we do not exclude it from the possibility of improvement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, some of the agencies are given full protection; some are given half protection. I will ask my able friend the Senator from New Jersey to indicate to me any agency to which the conference report gives full protection, which is as remotely important to the American psychology of individual security in these days as is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. SMITH. I agree absolutely with the Senator's implication. I know of nothing more important, and in the conference I took the position that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should come under class 1, the class of agencies to be entirely exempted. But there were arguments on the other side. Inasmuch as the President would have to give the Congress his full reasons for suggesting the reorganization of such agencies and inasmuch as there was a desire to have the possibility of reorganization made as broad as possible, I thought it might be wise to cover the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the report and to provide that it should be left open to strengthening and improvement. We all agree regarding its value and importance in the period of reconstruction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has said that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is put in this twilight zone by the conference report in order to leave it open to strengthening and improvement. Of course, any plan which might be proposed for reorganization would be offered in the name of improvement and strengthening. That is not the point. The point is that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is so fundamentally important in this continuing period of economic flux in America, so fundamentally important to the confidence of the American people in the security of their bank deposits, and the only source of the absolute feeling of security which they now have respecting any phase of their economic life—I say it is so important that we should not invite even an argument over some form of reorganization which is alleged to be in the interest of improvement. There is no justification on the record, Mr. President, for contemplating that this particular agency can be reorganized by way of improvement, because it has been 100 percent successful in every objective to which it has been directed. Furthermore, it has been operated at a minimum of expense, with a maximum of success, so that it now represents a billion-dollar asset to the Federal Government. It is in a position to repay every penny which ever was put into it. It has a record which defies comparison with that of any other instrumentality of the Government; and if some instrumentalities are to be set to one side as totally free of any danger of any manipulation, I submit this is the agency of all agencies which belongs in that classification.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator have any objection to taking the powers of examination from the Comptroller of the Currency, let us say, and giving them to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not sure whether I have any objections. I realize the argument which can be made

for consolidating the examinations of banks; but I know of no advantage to be gained from that particular procedure which remotely would compensate for the danger to the confidence of the American people in the security of their bank deposits which would result from opening even a back door to an assault upon the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator's whole argument is predicated, as I understand it, on the assumption that the President of the United States would have some reason to injure an agency for which he voted, which was sponsored by the administration to which he belonged, and in which, in my opinion, his interest is just as sincere as is the interest of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree that undoubtedly the President has that interest. My argument is not predicated upon the premise the Senator has indicated. My argument is premised on the fact that this conference report does identify half a dozen agencies of the Government which are considered to be so important that they must be in a preferred class, but the conference report does not put the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in that preferred class.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for this question——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield again to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly the Senator knows the distinction, without my elaborating on it here, between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I certainly do know the distinction, and the Interstate Commerce Commission does not for an instant measure up to the importance in the intimate life of the American people today which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has.

Mr. MURDOCK. I admit that. But its functions are entirely different. They are quasi legislative and quasi judicial; that is true.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. As soon as the Senator from Utah has concluded, I shall yield to the Senator from California. I am yielding to the Senator from Utah at the moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator from California has something more important to say, I shall be glad to subside.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from California as soon as the Senator from Utah has concluded.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the distinction which was made was not carried through to its logical conclusion with reference to some other agencies. But that is the distinction which was made in regard to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is exclusively and wholly an executive or administrative agency, rather than one with quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative powers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator say that the Securities and Exchange Commission is in that classification?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; it has certain quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is a far stretch of the imagination for me——

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not question the statement the Senator has made, namely, that today no agency of Government is more closely related to the individual citizen than is the FDIC. But I think it is a little unfair to assume that the present President of the United States would do anything to injure or interfere with the great record which has been made by the FDIC. We should not forget in our debate that the FDIC is a creature of the Roosevelt administration; that a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress may be depended upon to protect this great and important agency from any real or even imaginary injury. I know of no law enacted during my tenure of office in Congress from which I get more comfort and take greater pride in than the law which launched the FDIC. I assure the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I will be constantly on the alert for any plan affecting this agency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me stop the Senator there. I am making no such assumption as he implies. But I may say that when we do not put the FDIC in the top classification where it is exempt from reorganization, but in a lower classification where there is an invitation to some sort of reorganization, we are taking from it the maximum protection which we are giving to other agencies. My argument is not based in any way whatsoever upon any lack of confidence in the President. It is based solely on the proposition that so long as we have any categories, the FDIC is entitled to be placed in the top category.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in view of the very emphatic and determined position which is being taken by the Senator from Michigan, and the extent to which the debate is proceeding, I am reluctantly compelled to call for the regular order of business.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. The conference report cannot be set aside, can it, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only point to which privilege attaches is the presentation of the report. The determination of it is not privileged. The Senator from California has a right to demand the regular order.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator from California will not insist upon his demand. This is a very important report, and it must be disposed of before the recess.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I must admit that I am in a very embarrassing position. For about 10 days the acting majority leader has been requesting from time to time that the Senate lay aside consideration of the Federal pay bill. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has notified me that he will attempt to proceed with the deficiency bill late this afternoon, and unless some agreement is reached not to continue with consideration of the Federal pay bill, I believe the proper thing to do under all the circumstances with which the Senate is now familiar, is to proceed with consideration of the bill at this time. The Senator will remember that I endeavored to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Virginia, our acting majority leader, and other Senators, by agreeing that the Federal pay bill might be put over until noon today. I thoroughly understand the jeopardy I am in, but I most assuredly think that the Federal pay bill has rights. If I can now force consideration of that bill I shall attempt to do so. Of course, if for some reason of its own the Senate wants to take a different viewpoint, the responsibility is off my conscience.

Mr. HILL. So far as the agreement was concerned to postpone consideration of the Federal pay bill until some time today, I do not think I was a party in requesting that that be done. I believe that the Senator from California acceded to the wishes of the Senator from Virginia. The conference report will have to be disposed of before there may be any recess. It has been under consideration already for approximately 40 or 45 minutes. I certainly hope that the Senator from California will permit the Senate to proceed to final action on the report.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I think that the Senate of the United States is placing itself in a dubious position by trying, through one method or another, to impede consideration of the Federal pay bill. If it is desired not to proceed with its consideration, I shall be willing to wait until a quarter after 1 o'clock. The Senator from Michigan has assumed a strong position with regard to the conference report. I have no way of knowing how much time consideration of the report may consume. The Federal pay bill has been on the Senate floor for a very considerable period of time, and the conference report has only just been presented to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator will acquit me of any purpose to interfere with his program.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to say immediately and very emphatically that I desire to give the Senator from Michigan, as well as other Senators, full latitude in arguing the very important matter which has been discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am willing to present my objections to what I consider to be a very vital weakness in the conference report.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am certain that within a very few days if only the Federal pay bill is before the Senate we will not have a quorum. I know that the distinguished leaders will keep a quorum

present in order to dispose of the conference report. However, we owe the million and a half or two million employees of the Government the obligation of acting upon this bill. I am not anticipating what any Senator will do, but I do know that the bill has been before the Senate for at least 10 days.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How many employees did the Senator state?

Mr. DOWNEY. I said a million and a half or two million.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; I am speaking in behalf of 60,000,000 bank depositors in the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Allow me to say that so long as the conference report is pending its rights are certainly not being imperiled.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Rule 27 provides that "the presentation of conference reports shall always be in order." I think the conference report has been presented. Am I correct in understanding that the conference report has been presented, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been presented, and the presentation of a conference report is always in order.

Mr. TAFT. The rule further provides that "when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put, and shall be determined without debate." I raise the question, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No motion has been made. If it is made, it is entitled to be voted upon.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report. That motion is not debatable, Mr. President, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. When a conference report is taken up by unanimous consent, is there any need for a motion of the kind which has been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report has already been brought before the Senate for consideration, but the regular order has been called for. When the regular order is called for, a motion may be made to proceed with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in this connection. I want to subscribe, if I may be privileged to do so, to the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I believe that if there is any agency of the Government which is entitled to complete exemption under the reorganization proposal, it is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I may also say, Mr. President, that for the life of me I cannot understand the reason for the treatment which has been given by the conferees to the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission belongs in the same category with the other agencies which have been exempted, and yet it has been left naked to the winds. I cannot understand what motivated the conferees in according such treatment to that agency unless it be that the agency has been active in protecting the consumers of this country.

Mr. President, I find myself in a position where I must oppose the conference report on the grounds stated.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the only answer to the Senator from Wisconsin is that both Houses of Congress have acted on the reorganization bill. Congress wants reorganization, and if the conferees on the part of the Senate had taken the position that they would not deviate from the Senate's position, of course, there would be no reorganization.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the conferees on the part of the Senate had taken the position that some logic should be applied in the treatment of these various agencies and had required the House conferees to return to the House and request that a separate vote be taken on the proposition in that body, I think they would have been in a much better position than they are now in.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will always be willing to underwrite the logic which motivates the actions of either House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I will not be willing. I would prefer to be in a position where I felt that the Senate conferees had been willing to make a fight for the position of the Senate to the point of forcing the House conferees to take the matter to the House for a separate vote, than to permit a situation to arise which might result in a perfectly illogical determination of what agencies of the Government are to be excluded from the proposed legislation and what ones are not to be excluded. The Senator cannot find logic in the treatment which has been accorded the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MURDOCK. I might not find logic which would be satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin; but his implication that the Senate conferees did not make a fight is incorrect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They did not make a fight to have the conferees on the part of the House take the proposition back to the House for a vote.

Mr. MURDOCK. Because the House conferees assured us that it would be futile to do such a thing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They always do that.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, the Senate conferees caved in before they made a last-ditch fight.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think it is fair to say that there was any caving in. We made all the fight we thought was justified in the light of the ultimate objective of getting a reorganization bill.

Mr. President, every Senator can stand on his feet and make a plea for some agency of government that should have been exempted. We went through that for 20 days here on the floor. The same thing is true of the debate in the House of Representatives. Now, if we have got to go through that same debate and same argument again on the conference report, my claim is that there will be no reorganization in the executive department.

I hope that the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I find myself unable to vote in favor of the adoption of the conference report. The reason for my position in this matter has been very extensively stated on previous occasions but in order that there may be no possible misunderstanding as to the basis on which I shall be unable to vote for the report and shall vote against it, I call attention specifically to one portion of the report. It is provided on the first page of the conference report:

> In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following—

And on page 4 of the conference report, included in the language which is to be inserted, is the following:

> SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

Mr. President, I shall be unable to support the conference report for the reason that in my opinion the language which is thus proposed to be inserted violates the Constitution of the United States of America as a delegation of legislative power to the President.

I shall not undertake to argue extensively this proposition. My position upon the matter is clear and is set forth with the best clarity of which I am capable in previous reports of the debates upon the reorganization bill. I do not care to go over the argument again, but I wish once more to refer to section 1 of article I, of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Likewise I refer to the language which appears in the case of Field against Clark in a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States from the lips of Mr. Justice Harlan, in One Hundred and Forty-third United States Reports, page 649:

> That the Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the Senator say as to this constitutional question: Congress had the power to create these departments, which it did, for when the Constitution was first adopted they did not exist. Since it had the power to create them originally and has the power to abolish them entirely, does it not have the power to supervise their reorganization and to authorize the President, as a ministerial matter, to reorganize them and change their functions?

Mr. DONNELL. The question asked by the distinguished Senator from Texas raises again the proposition which was presented here extendedly some few weeks ago, namely, that this bill, in the first place, does not set up standards by which the President shall act which are sufficiently definite or clear to save it from the prohibition contained in the constitutional provision I have read.

It is true that Congress had a perfect right to create these various agencies, and by like token, inasmuch as the right to create them rests in Congress, the right undertaken to be delegated by this bill cannot be delegated to the President of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If Congress should pass an act authorizing the President of the United States on the 1st of next January to abolish the OPA, would that be constitutional?

Mr. DONNELL. I should say that that would involve a statute or the repeal of a statute and would be clearly a violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I am not familiar with all the details of the creation of the OPA, whether or not by regulation, whether or not by statute, or what the provisions are, but I undertake to say and to repeat that where Congress has within itself power to create an agency, and has created it, it cannot delegate to the President of the United States the power to repeal the legislation which the Congress has itself enacted.

I have cited on other occasions a number of decisions of the Supreme Court and one of the upper or appellate courts—the Circuit Court of Appeals—on this proposition. I have referred also on this floor to the statement in the report of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate concerning the provision of the bill, setting forth that the contemplated reorganization would take effect unless it was disapproved by one House of Congress, and I have cited the fact that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate in its report has itself not once, but at least four times, definitely and clearly in express language stated that the procedure thus proposed is a delegation of legislative power.

Mr. President, we have no ability, no power to transfer to the President the duties which rest upon the shoulders of Congress. We have not merely powers, Mr. President, we have responsibilities. The exclusive law-making power of our Government is possessed by the Congress of the United States and not by the President of the United States, and no action which this body, or both Houses of Congress, can take can legitimately, legally, or constitutionally delegate that power or responsibility to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I trust my position in this matter is clearly contained within the records of the debates. I shall not argue it further, but I wish to make it perfectly clear that, upon sound ground, as I see it, that the legislation proposed as set forth in the conference report violates the Constitution of the United States, as constituting a delegation of legislative power, I shall decline to vote for the conference report.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that under the provision of the proposed statute, if it be enacted, it will be possible for the President to prepare and transmit to Congress measures which will have the full force and effect of law, setting aside, repealing, or altering existing provisions of law which have endured already, perhaps, for a hundred years, in some cases, and if Congress does nothing whatsoever with respect to the proposed plan of reorganization, it will become effective. If that is not a delegation of legislative power to the President it seems to me it is impossible to find or imagine an instance in which a delegation of power would occur.

I stated a few moments ago, Mr. President, that there are no adequate standards provided by the bill by which the President of the United States shall be governed in the proposed preparation and transmittal of a reorganization plan. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], now presiding over the Senate, will doubtless recall that if the President shall find, in substance, that the reorganization plan which he prepares will conduce to the orderly transition from war to peace conditions, his reorganization plan may be drawn and will become effective if every Member of Congress shall go to sleep, shall go home for the Christmas holidays, or lock up his office and take no action whatsoever.

Mr. President, as I see it, no Members of the Senate, so far as I know, are opposed to the reorganization of the governmental agencies known as the executive agencies. I see sitting in the Senate Chamber this afternoon the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has valiantly presented to the Senate and to the Nation the importance of further economy in National Government and the importance of reorganization. I recall now, as I did a few days ago, that the distinguished Senator from Virginia has totally and exactly reversed himself from the position which he took in 1939 on this question of delegating power to the President. He very frankly stated to the Senate a few days ago, in substance, that he is doing so from a consideration of desperation, as he put it, at the inability, in his judgment, to procure a reorganization unless the powers proposed to be vested in the President by the bill shall be so vested in him.

Mr. President, I insist today, with all the vigor and earnestness within my power, that considerations of expediency should never be permitted to overcome or overwhelm us in the performance of the duties which every Member of the Senate has sworn or taken affirmation to follow and support. I undertake to say that the proposed legislation provides no adequate standards, provides nothing which, by the strongest stretch of the imagination, it seems to me, can constitute an adequate standard by which the President shall be governed. The proposed legislation leaves it to the President to prepare a plan which may set aside statutory enactments of the Congress over a century of time. Under it the plan so prepared shall become effective, not conditioned upon approval by Congress, but conditioned upon nondisapproval by Congress, a plan under which, as I have said, every Member of Congress could go to sleep, or lock up his office, or go home and do nothing for the remainder of his term, and still the provisions of the statute would become binding law in the United States.

I say such a plan as that is clearly violative of the Constitution of the United States; that it amounts clearly to an attempt to delegate to the President a legislative power, and constitutes, clearly, as the Committee on the Judiciary, composed of some 17 Members of the Senate, said at four different places in its report, a delegation of legislative power; and I quote verbatim from the report, I think.

I submit, Mr. President, that it is a clear violation of our constitutional duties to enact the legislation as it is set forth in the conference report. Therefore I shall be unable to support the report, although I am for reorganization. I am for a reorganization which shall be prepared, perhaps, by the President and transmitted to Congress. I have no objection to that. Perhaps it may be prepared by Congress, but certainly it should be a reorganization which will not go into effect unless it shall have first received the affirmative approval of both Houses of the United States Congress, in which exclusively, under the Constitution of the United States, the entire legislative power of our Government is vested.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as one of the conferees on behalf of the Senate, I feel that I should make a statement in view of the debate which has proceeded this morning.

Let me say that when the legislation upon reorganization was first started, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the legislation, I took the position that any reorganization should be written into a bill in complete form, and presented to the President. I held to that position for some length of time. However, I was told by some of my elders of the Senate that it could never be done, that it was not workable, that reorganization could never be obtained if that method were pursued. I gave way to the views of those who had dealt with the subject longer than I had.

If proof ever were needed of the correctness of my advisers, it has been afforded here this morning. Every Senator has his own view, particularly as to what agencies of the Government should be reorganized. I shall not debate this

morning that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should be or should not be reorganized. The fact is that I hold to the view stated by the Senator from Michigan. I shall not debate the subject whether or not the Federal Power Commission should be exempted totally. But I do say to the Senate that the Senate conferees met day after day upon the bill and earnestly supported the bill that was passed by the Senate. I further wish to say that if the conference report shall be voted down and returned to conference, I do not believe we will get a bill on reorganization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should not want to have that happen. I respectfully suggest to the Senator that if the conference report shall be voted down and a new conference sought, and the House conferees are asked to take this one item back to the floor for a separate vote, I do not see how they can resist the request, and I should be willing to abide by the result.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator refers to the one item in which he is interested. The Senator from Wisconsin is interested in another item. The Senator from Missouri says he cannot support the report because it provides the feature of double veto by the Congress upon the report.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Not the question of double veto; it is the fact that the bill does not reserve to the Congress the right first to approve the plan before it shall become effective. I do not regard as particularly important, from the standpoint of constitutionality, the question whether the disapproval of one House or the disapproval of both Houses shall be that which shall prevent the act from going into effect. My point is that the plan which shall be presented by the President should not go into effect unless it first receives the approval of both Houses of Congress by joint resolution of the two Houses.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think I understand the position of the Senator from Missouri quite well.

If we go back to conference and obtain one change, or obtain two changes, there will still exist opposition to the bill. In my opinion, therefore, Mr. President, it comes down to this: The Senate conferees have done the best they could to bring forth a bill for reorganization which would be passed by the House of Representatives, and we hope would be passed by the Senate. We have met time after time in the conference. I myself had to give up something in the bill which I urged very strongly and thought was necessary, and which I know would be an improvement to th bill. That was the feature that a proposed reorganization plan could not stay in committee longer than 10 days, and would then automatically come to the floor of the Senate. I could not get an agreement on that proposal. But I signed the report—why? Because I believe the bill is of sufficient scope to permit reorganization and to permit the Congress to protect the people and to protect its own position when the plan of reorganization comes back to Congress for us to pass upon.

In summary let me say that I do not think recommitting the bill to conference will help. I further say that if the report is rejected by the Senate, the House having accepted it with provisions in it which the House did not want to accept, but which the Senate had placed in the bill—I say that if it is rejected we shall have taken a step which I believe will mean an end to the reorganization of the Federal agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Shipstead
Carville	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 4129. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is detained at an important committee meeting.

I wish to announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business as heretofore stated.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—49

Bankhead	Hart	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Radcliffe
Buck	Hoey	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Carville	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Lucas	Smith
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Tunnell
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Fulbright	Magnuson	Walsh
George	Maybank	Wheeler
Gerry	Mead	Wiley
Gossett	Mitchell	Willis
Green	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—23

Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Bridges	Knowland	Taft
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Capper	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	Millikin	White
Ferguson	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Cordon	Saltonstall
Andrews	Glass	Stanfill
Bailey	Hatch	Stewart
Brewster	Huffman	Taylor
Briggs	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	McFarland	Tydings
Butler	Overton	Wherry
Capehart	Pepper	Wilson

So the conference report was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to call for the regular order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I withhold it for a moment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows, of course, what would be the effect of his request for the regular order, namely, that the ship sales bill, which has been under consideration now for several days, would be sent back to the calendar. I hope the Senator from California will not request the regular order, but will give us an opportunity to conclude consideration of the ship sales bill. I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] have been in conference with respect to the bill, and that neither one of the three will desire to speak for more than 5 minutes, if the Senate is given an opportunity to proceed with the consideration of that bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reluctantly I must decline to accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from California, in justice to myself, that yesterday afternoon, when I talked to the Senator along about 3 o'clock, I thought he agreed that we would have an opportunity to finish action on the ship sales bill early in the session today.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I did not so understand any statement I made. I regret it if I was ambiguous or if the Senator misunderstood me. I will say to the Senator that I understood from the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], that there is considerable doubt whether the deficiency appropriations bill will be before the Senate before Monday. I think that will give us ample time in which to dispose of the Federal pay bill and also the ship sales bill.

I may say that I think the program is understood, namely, that the Senator from Virginia is to present to the Federal pay bill an amendment which will embody his ideas, and after he has explained his amendment it is my intention to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I do not believe I shall occupy the floor of the Senate in discussion of the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from Virginia or in discussion of my own amendment more than 1 hour, and I think the question can easily be settled upon a vote either on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia or on the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I shall offer. Of course, I have no way of knowing how long the Senator from Virginia will address the Senate in the presentation of his thoughts or how long any of our other colleagues will address the Senate in presenting their views on these matters. But if we begin now to work on the Federal pay bill, I think there is no reason why we cannot conclude action on it this afternoon.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am not sure the Senator from California has accurately stated what I told him. I wish to make a statement at this time about the deficiency appropriations bill. I have no desire to interfere in any way with action on the Federal pay bill; but the Senator from California will recall that I received permission to report the deficiency appropriations bill if we were able to report it today. We received permission to leave it with the clerk. If it is reported today, it will be in order for the Senate to consider it tomorrow. We have been working on the bill for several weeks. It contains a great many items—in fact, more than I have ever before known to be in a deficiency bill since I have been in the Senate. I do not think the bill involves any controversy; and if we are able to have it reported this afternoon, I should like to have time tomorrow to have the Senate consider it. I hope its consideration will not take over an hour, because there is not much controversy about it, in my judgment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say that I have already agreed with the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee that, so far as I am concerned, I shall make no objection to having his bill heard immediately, whenever he desires to present it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I join in the hope expressed by the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from California will not insist at this time upon the regular order, which will mean the consideration at this time of the pay bill. We have shifted these bills back and forth during the last 10 days, from unfinished business to a place somewhere in the rear of unfinished business. I think it has not been a creditable performance, so far as the Senate is concerned. I do not think it has reflected credit upon the legislative processes of the Senate. I do not suppose anyone is more definitely hostile to the ship-sales bill than I am; but here we are with that bill well toward the end of its consideration before this body. From all that I can learn about the situation, I feel quite assured that it will ultimately be disposed of one way or the other within a reasonable time this afternoon. It seems to me—and I say this with great respect to the Senator from California who proposes that the Senate proceed otherwise—that it is in the interest of the orderly conduct of our business that we hold our hands to the plow and go to the end of the furrow with the particular bill which has been before the Senate for so long. When we have concluded action on it, I assume we then shall be in a position to take up the Federal pay bill, and I hope for a speedy determination of it.

But if at this time we suspend consideration of the ship-sales bill and turn our attention to another bill, I think we shall add confusion and legislative delay, and I think we shall create some doubt in the public mind regarding whether we know what we are doing.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I agree with what the distinguished Senator has said, namely, that once we have put our hand to the plow, we should go to the end of the furrow before we leave it. We started on the Federal pay bill long before we started to consider the ship-sales bill. I tried to be courteous and I yielded to Senators two or three times upon representations—which I know were made in good faith, but which were not carried out—that action on the bill would be finished within a certain period of time.

Mr. President, I shall be frank with the Senate and with the acting majority leader. I have received very good information that when the deficiency appropriations bill and the ship-sales bill are out of the way, it will no longer be possible to obtain the attendance of a quorum in the Senate. I have no doubt that there are Senators who would be very glad to avoid having to pass upon this wage question by not having a quorum present. But I desire to say it will be against all my resistance if that happens. If my bill goes down, I shall attempt to see that the ship-sales bill, at least, is not considered in front of it. I may not be able to accomplish that.

Let me say that we waited 4 or 5 years before we raised the basic pay of the Federal workers. For 4 or 5 long years we, the Congress of the United States, helped to work out plans by which the greatest corporate profits which ever have been made were accumulated, plans by which the farmers were protected, plans by which industrial workers were protected. But it was not until the spring of 1945, 4 years after the cost of living had begun to mount, that we got around to attending to an increase of the basic salaries of Government workers.

I wish to say that what I am requesting for the Government workers is nothing more than what has already been granted by 25 or 50 great industries; it is nothing more than General Motors has already offered.

In other words, in the substitute which I am about to offer for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] I am doing nothing more than attempting to bring the wages of Federal workers up to the present standard of living. So far as I know, no one in industry objects to that plan. Justice delayed is justice denied. There are hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who will face bleak and insolvent conditions at Christmas. So far as I am concerned, I shall do everything I can do in order to drive this bill through before we leave for the holiday adjournment, and I shall not yield for anything. If Senators wish to displace my bill, I shall go home and rest easily.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from California has been so patient and generous that I hesitate to say anything at this time. What has been said by the Senator from Maine and by the Senator from Alabama with regard to disposing of the proposed ship-sales legislation is obviously correct and I shall not dwell upon it. However, I have talked with several Senators and I know of only two or three Members of the Senate who will discuss the bill, and not one of them has told me that he will talk longer than 5 minutes. I cannot guarantee what may develop; but I assert

to the Senator from California that, so far as I can now judge from the appearance of things, we can vote quickly on these matters.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, though not so wise as Ulysses was, I am like Ulysses in that my ears are stuffed with cotton and I shall no longer listen to the song of the siren. I shall not yield any further. There is cotton in my ears.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator will insist on the regular order.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will be so much like St. Paul that he will yield to no one, and will drive his bill just as hard as he possibly can do so. I may say further that I shall be here to help the Senator dispose of the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to my distinguished friend from Alabama that I shall take his advice.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a ranking member of the minority on the Civil Service Committee, I wish to say that I believe the distinguished Senator from California is absolutely correct in his position. The Federal pay bill has been delayed time and again. Any member of the committee who attended the hearings and listened to the testimony offered by poor Federal employees knows that this legislation has long been needed. I am here to help the Senator in every way I possibly can.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California withdraws his amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not desire to have any other of my amendments presented. I understand that it is now the desire of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to offer an amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I did not understand that the Senator from California was offering a substitute for my amendment. I suggest that he offer an amendment to his own bill, and then I may offer a substitute for his amendment. After he offers his amendment I can then determine whether I wish to offer mine.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Virginia asked me to allow this matter to go over until noon today so that he would have time in which to prepare and present his amendment. I think that the logical and orderly procedure is for the Senator to carry out his program.

Mr. BYRD. I did not make any agreement to that effect. I understood the Senator from California would stand on his bill. He proposes to offer another bill. I think that when he offers his substitute for the pending bill I will then be in a position to determine whether I wish to offer my amendment. The Senator has not taken me into his confidence and I do not know what kind of a substitute he proposes to offer.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia prefers the procedure which he has suggested, I have no objection to it. I therefore send forward the amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning on page 1, it is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 16 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) the first sentence of section 405 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "Each of the existing rates of basic compensation set forth in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 40 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 30 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $1,200 per annum."

(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading "Crafts, protective, and custodial service" in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 90 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 97 cents an hour."

(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

Grade 1, 92 to 99 cents an hour.
Grade 2, $1.07 to $1.15 an hour.
Grade 3, $1.23 to $1.31 an hour.
Grade 4, $1.38 to $1.54 an hour.

(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Sec. 2. Section 602 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words "section 405 of this act", wherever they occur in such section, a comma and the words "as amended."

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in section 503, each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional compensation computed as follows: 40 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 30 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $1,200 per annum."

(b) The first sentence of section 521 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Each officer and employee in or under the judicial branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional basic compensation computed as follows: 40 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 30 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $1,200 per annum."

(c) Sections 502 and 522 of such act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words "by reason of the enactment of this act" the words "or any amendment thereto."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator from California offering the amendment as a substitute for the bill, or as an amendment to the bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am offering it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is a substitute for everything except section 5, which is the last section of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator offers it on his own responsibility, and not in behalf of the Civil Service Committee. Am I correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Virginia has performed a valuable service in suggesting the kind of amendment he has suggested. I think it shapes up very well, indeed, the issues and the controversy which exist between me and some other Senators who are opposing the bill.

The Senator from Virginia suggested that he was going to present an amendment which would abrogate the basic raise of 16 percent which was given the employees last spring, go back to the basic rates which existed prior to the new law going into effect July 1, and then give certain increases. I think that is a very excellent form for the bill to take, because I think it makes the issue very clear to Senators.

In the amendment which I am offering to the Senate I am following the same form followed by the Senator from Virginia, so that we can all clearly understand the difference in our two proposals. I might say that, speaking first in a general way, and later with more detailed qualifications, the proposal I am making in the amendment would tend only to bring the Federal workers up to the present higher cost of living standard as compared with that of 1941. In reality the increases which are provided for in my amendment will do nothing except assure to the Federal workers the same real purchasing power they had in 1941.

On the other hand, the Senator from Virginia by his amendment would accomplish the same result for the workers in the lowest groups, but in the upper groups——

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia has not presented any amendment, nor has he made any announcement as to what he intended to offer in conjunction with his colleagues, except to say that he opposed the 20-percent flat increase. I hope the Senator from California will wait until the Senator from Virginia offers an amendment before he attempts to discuss it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may be in error, I may be confusing newspaper reports and other statements——

Mr. BYRD. No statement has been made, I assure the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may be confusing newspaper reports and other statements with the statement the Senator made on the Senate floor, but I thought he did indicate the general nature of his proposal.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is mistaken. I said I favored a graduated increase. I did not say what kind of a graduated increase.

Mr. DOWNEY. Then, Mr. President, to make the controversy clear, assuming the newspaper reports of usually credible columnists are correct as to the nature of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. BYRD. I do not like to interrupt the Senator again, but no newspaper correspondent or newspaper reporter has been authorized by me to say that the Senator from Virginia is in favor of any specific ratio of increase. I assure the Senator that is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that may be correct, and it may be that I am misinformed as to the ideas presently existing in the mind of the Senator from Virginia, but if I am in any respect in error, of course the Senator from Virginia will correct me.

Mr. BYRD. Would it not be better to let the Senator from Virginia say what is in his own mind, instead of the Senator from California trying to say it, or repeat something from the newspapers which was not authorized?

Mr. DOWNEY. It undoubtedly would have been better, I think, under all the arrangements that were made on the Senate floor, for the Senator from Virginia to have carried out the agreement we made, and for him to have presented——

Mr. BYRD. May I say——

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me finish, please; it would have been better for him to have presented his amendment which he had taken time to prepare.

Mr. BYRD. I was entirely willing to present the amendment on the assumption that the Senator from California would stand by his own bill, on which he held hearings, and which was reported by him in the name of the Civil Service Committee. Now that the Senator from California has changed his bill, I think I am entitled to know what changes he proposes; otherwise I have no way of knowing whether I desire to offer a substitute or an amendment. I think the proper procedure is clearly indicated in this matter.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I have already said, the proposal contained in the amendment I present does nothing more, in the main, than assure to every Federal worker an increase which will restore to his wages the real buying power they had in 1941.

I have been furnished with a list of perhaps 25 or 30 wage increases which have been given in the United States since the Japanese war, and if my information concerning them is correct—and I feel reasonably confident it is correct—every wage increase so far has at least given the workers a sufficient increase to meet the increased cost of living.

Many of the wage increases which have been given have run 5, 10, 15, and I think even 20 points in percentage above the amount necessary to bring the workers back to the level of the increased cost of living. There have been wage increases in the oil industry, in the textile industry, in printing, in the lumber industry, and in numerous other industries, and, as I have already said, every one of those adjustments, according to my information and my interpretation, provides a much better standard for the worker than was proposed in my original bill providing for a 20-percent raise and than is proposed in the amendment.

I am informed, I think credibly, that the offer made by the General Motors Corporation to its electrical workers and to its other workers is designed to bring their wages up to that standard of the cost of living. In other words, Mr. President, I am only submitting to the Senate a formula which has been almost exactly duplicated by the General Motors Corporation in its offer to its employees. The employees have not yet accepted the offer, and if and to what extent it will be raised by the General Motors Corporation, of course, I have no idea, but as it stands, the offer of General Motors is almost exactly the same as the formula proposed in the amendment.

Mr. President, the effect of the pending amendment is to eliminate the basic raise which was made last spring, and to substitute upon the then existing wages the percentages of increase set forth in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murray
Ball	Hart	Myers
Bankhead	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Carville	La Follette	Stanfill
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Walsh
Fulbright	Mead	Wheeler
George	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Green	Morse	Young
Guffey	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the past few moments I have been trying to figure out the exact effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from California, but I am afraid that my efforts have been a complete failure. I certainly would be very loath to vote on this particular amendment or on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] until I had seen it.

I should like to say a few words regarding the general situation. I have not been on the committee, and I have not been deeply involved in the debate or in the problem which is before us but I have been interested in the general question of wages and salaries. With the confusion which exists with respect to this amendment, it seems to me that the bill should be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

One further consideration impresses me. The other day the Senator from California made out a very persuasive case for the increase of certain Federal salaries On the other hand, I know many Federal employees who are well off at their present salaries. It seems to me that there ought to be a selective consideration of the question of raising Federal salaries if we are to do anything as substantial as is now proposed, which would cost the Government between $500,000,000 and $1,000,000,000, according to various estimates which have been presented.

Only yesterday I received complaints from Ohio to the effect that some Federal employees are now receiving salaries which completely upset the State scale and make it more or less impossible to hire employees for the State and local governments. The appeal made here is largely in behalf of Federal employees in Washington. Of course the Washington situation is a peculiar one. Hundreds of thousands of people have rushed to Washington to get jobs, creating a shortage in housing facilities available in Washington. They have had much higher living expenses than they would have had if they had stayed at home. Washington is probably the worst place there is in that respect, and undoubtedly there are many hardship cases here.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Byrd	Knowland	Revercomb
Carville	Langer	Robertson
Donnell	Lucas	Russell
Downey	McClellan	Smith
Gerry	Mitchell	Taft
Gossett	Morse	Thomas, Utah
Hart	Murdock	Tunnell
Hawkes	Murray	Vandenberg
Hayden	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Young
Hill	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BILBO, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. STANFILL answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BALL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. SHIPSTEAD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to explain that several members of the Appropriations Committee have been in attendance at the committee in trying to complete consideration of the deficiency bill. It was because of their presence at the committee that they were delayed in arriving in the Chamber.

PERSONAL STATEMENT CONCERNING SHIP-SALES BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a statement relating to yesterday's proceedings?

Mr. TAFT. I would prefer not to yield.

Mr. BYRD. What I have to say will take only 2 or 3 minutes. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator merely desire to correct the RECORD, or to make a statement?

Mr. BYRD. I wish to make a statement, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Very well; I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, yesterday a colloquy took place between myself and the Senator from Maryland. From a reading of the RECORD it might appear that the Senator from Virginia was impliedly criticizing the efficiency with which the Senator from Maryland was handling the bill then pending, the so-called ship-sales bill. I may say, Mr. President, that that was not the intention of the Senator from Virginia. I have great affection and regard, as well as a very high admiration, for the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I do not know of any more diligent, industrious, or able Member of the Senate than is the Senator from Maryland. What the Senator from Virginia was complaining about was the manner in which the ship bill, and the amendment to it which was then pending, had been drafted. I wish merely to read one paragraph of the amendment in illustration of the reason for the objection which was made by me. What I am about to read is a portion of the amendment which had been offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee, and which was later rejected. On page 2, beginning in line 4 of the amendment, the following language was set forth:

> The dead-weight tonnage of vessels chartered under this subsection to any chartering nation (and its nationals) at any time shall not exceed such percentage of the tonnage under charter or defense aid transfer on September 1, 1945, to the member nation which has suffered the largest merchant ship war losses, as the tonnage of war losses of such chartering nation is to the said war losses of such member nation, except that the amount chartered hereunder to the chartering nation may in any event be equivalent to the tonnage of vessels under charter or defense aid transfer to such nation on September 1, 1945.

What I have read constitutes one single sentence, beginning in line 4 and ending in line 14 on page 2 of the amendment. In reading the language, one may think he knows what it means until he reaches approximately the middle of the sentence, when he finds that he does not understand it at all. I believe, Mr. President, it would require a half dozen Philadelphia lawyers in order to determine, if they could do so, what the language which I have read means, and each one of them would reach a different version.

Mr. President, I believe that bills to be introduced in Congress should be written in plainer language than the ship-sales bill has been written. There is no reason in the world why such a clause as the one which I have read should be prepared. I exonerate completely the Senator from Maryland. I know that ordinarily Members of the Senate do not actually write bills. I make the observation that bills should be written on Capitol Hill by our legislative drafting employees. They are able, conscientious, and absolutely trustworthy. But during the past few years we have fallen into the custom of accepting for introduction bills which have been prepared by employees of various governmental departments having a particular interest in the enactment of the legislation. I believe that was one of the difficulties experienced in connection with the ship bill, which, in itself, is one of the most difficult, confusing, and vexing pieces of legislation that has ever been presented to the Senate.

Instead of criticizing the Senator from Maryland, I wish to commend him for the explanations which he gave of the bill.

Mr. President, if necessary, the Congress should require that bills to be introduced in either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be prepared either by Members of the Congress or by the employees of the legislative drafting bureaus of the Senate and of the House. I think it is a bad practice to permit the various agencies of the Government to write their own version of legislation and send it to various Members of Congress to be introduced. Much of the legislation which is thus prepared is unintelligible and hard to understand.

I arose to express my high estimation of the splendid capacities of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before the quorum call I expressed the opinion that because of the amendment which was offered by the Senator from California, and the substitute for it which will apparently be offered by the Senator from Virginia, it is clearly apparent that no one is supporting the committee version of the bill. It seems to me, therefore, to be proper to recommit the bill, together with the amendments, to the Civil Service Committee for further consideration and study.

There is another reason why such further consideration should be given. The proposal is for a flat increase. If we are going to spend $500,000,000 a year in increasing the salaries of Government workers, it seems to me that we should make the increase a selective one. The Senator from California made an excellent case for certain employees in Washington whose salaries should be increased. On the other hand, there are sections of the country in which Federal employees are among the best paid employees of those communities. No difficulty is experienced in getting persons to take such Federal positions. I think that some kind of selective consideration should be given to the question of who should be raised and who should not be raised. After all, the Washington situation is an extraordinary one. Hundreds of thousands of people were rushed into Washington to occupy Federal jobs. The Government wanted them, and they came to Washington. Their coming resulted in swamping the housing facilities of the city and creating such a housing situation that rents, regardless of control, went up so high that they have now become higher than in any other section of the country, and have created a special war situation which is not typical of the entire Nation. It seems to me that careful consideration and study should be made of the entire subject.

I understand that the chairman of the House committee which will handle the matter has announced that the House will not take up the subject until sometime next spring.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is the Senator from Ohio suggesting that he himself favors discriminating with respect to the wages paid Federal employees in the various localities of the United States because of differences in the cost of living?

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe that it will be feasible to do so. I think there are some classes of employees who deserve an increase and who can make out a case for an increase, whereas on the other hand, there are other classes who cannot do so. I do not think we should base the percentage of increase on what is required in Washington under wartime conditions. That is the point which I was trying to make.

Mr. DOWNEY. In order that I may clearly understand the Senator, let me inquire if he is suggesting that we should pay a stenographer in a certain pay classification in Washington more than we should pay a stenographer in a similar classification in Toledo, Ohio, for example, or in some other city in Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that would be feasible. I think something could be said in favor of it, but I think it would be almost impossible to work it out. It probably could be handled by grading employees outside of Washington at

lower levels, or by grading employees in Washington at higher levels, and I have no doubt that that is now done to some extent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is the distinguished Senator from Ohio aware of the fact that the statistics indicate that the increased cost of living has been only a fraction of 1 percent greater in the larger towns than in the smaller towns?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and I have not believed the figures. The statistics are very uncertain. They represent only spot checks made here and there, and are not complete. Regardless of the OPA statistics, or the Bureau of Labor statistics, it is fairly clear to me that in certain places of the country living conditions are much worse than they are in other places.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I admire the Senator's judgment and high order of intellect. If he is not suggesting that there be some sort of discrimination in wages based on high cost of living, what is he suggesting?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from California has stated certain extreme cases. Why? I do not know why the committee should consider them, because there are many employees, even in Washington, who are receiving more than they are worth. I know of many persons who, if in private business, would not receive anything like the salaries they are receiving in Government service. I know some who came from college, and when they entered the Government service drew $5,000 or $6,000 a year, who in private employment could not have made more than $1,800 or $2,400 when they started. I feel very certain that if the Senator will actually make an investigation of the hardship cases to which he has referred, he will find special circumstances which can be dealt with by salary increases in certain fields where increases are needed. But there has been no such study. As I understand, the committee made no study whatever, and obtained no information from the survey groups who make a practice of studying personnel problems and general wage rates, as well as classification problems. Their help was sought when we started to establish the classifications, but it has not been done in the last 2 years that I know of.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. While the Senator may know some men who in his opinion are worth only $1,500, but who are receiving $5,000, let me say that there are less than 3 percent of all Government employees in the fortunate position of receiving in excess of $5,000. I should like to add that the proportion of employees in the Government receiving that kind of salary is substantially less than the proportion in private industry. As a matter of fact, I was very much startled to learn that only about 1 out of every 2,000 employees was classified in the top brackets, receiving $3,000 or more.

Mr. TAFT. However, the Senator is proposing to raise those in the higher brackets just as much as any others. He is proposing to raise everyone, according to the last amendment, 30 percent over what he was getting a year ago, even if he receives $9,000 a year. Am I not correct? Do I read the Senator's amendment correctly?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is correct, except to the extent that there are no raises provided by the bill which will bring any salary about $10,000. But I should like to say to the distinguished Senator—and I have heard him emphasize this very point, so I am sure it will strike sympathetic ears—in reality I am not trying to raise anybody's salary in real buying power. My only effort is to have all Federal employees paid, in real buying power, at least as much as they received in 1927 and 1941. By our allowing the wages of Federal employees to remain where they are, with the cost of living having increased, those in the higher brackets are now receiving 25 percent less in real buying power than they received in 1941.

Mr. TAFT. I was not dealing with that question. I was dealing with the question whether an automatic increase in all groups in the Federal Government should be made, thus increasing the permanent governmental budget, as I understand, by more than $500,000,000 a year, or whether we should begin to discriminate a little, find out who is entitled to an increase and who is suffering hardship, and reduce to some extent at least the tremendous cost of the proposed increase.

I agree with the Senator that to the extent there has been a permanent increase in the cost of living, salaries, at least in the lower groups, should be increased to that level—and probably those in the higher grades. To that extent I agree with the Senator. But before we arbitrarily do that for everyone, it seems to me a study should be made to ascertain whether some of those groups are not already getting more than they are entitled to, and whether we cannot in some way reduce the total cost, while recognizing the general principle.

Let me say another thing about the general principle. If the increase is to be permanent—and it is to be permanent, and will probably last forever—we should be fairly sure that the increase in the cost of living will be permanent; and we are not perfectly certain of that. Personally I think it will amount to at least 25 percent. The Government says now it is 33 percent. There may be some reduction in that percentage. I agree, however, that there is to be some permanent increase, yet I am not perfectly certain it will be 33 percent.

I shall vote for an increase—I am not saying I will not—but I think there should be some discrimination, and more complete study of the whole situation, to see how the objective can be accomplished with a somewhat less total cost to the Federal Government than is involved in the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think that in simple fairness, while the study is being made, we should allow this increase, and set a definite date, 6 months or 8 months or 10 months from now, when it will terminate? The hardship cases the distinguished Senator from California has mentioned are not isolated cases. There are many of them all over the country.

Mr. TAFT. I am not prepared to say what I would do under those circumstances. But that has not been the proposal. We have provided definitely for a temporary increase in the legislative employee field, which will be good until a certain date, and is understood to be temporary. If some such proposal should be made, I would not have so strong a feeling that we should be sure before we step. But that has not been the proposal up to date.

I think for another reason a more complete study should be made. As a matter of fact, all these employees have received an increase very recently. They are better off than they were, and I think we should have time to consider the matter carefully before we act.

Furthermore, we face today a tremendous difficulty in our budget figures. We do not know what the budget is going to be.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator has just made the statement that some of the employees got an increase. I should like to have him name who they are.

Mr. TAFT. We passed an act——

Mr. LANGER. We passed an act giving them an increase, and the President took off overtime, and the take-home pay of these employees is less today than it was before we passed the act.

Mr. TAFT. I do not take much stock in take-home pay. That seems to rest on the theory that one should get the same pay for working a short time as for working a long time, and I do not think that is sound. Personally I see no reason for a complete Saturday holiday in Washington. I think it is absolutely unsound, if the Senator wants to know my theory. Perhaps that is one way in which we could reduce the cost, namely, by increasing the amount of work the employees did by having them work at least half a day Saturday, and having fewer employees. But certainly we should do something, and I think the committee has some responsibility. Now they are recommending such an increase in salaries that the total represents a tremendous amount. There will be fewer employees here and there.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Since the Japanese war there has already been a substantial reduction in the Federal pay roll, both in number of employees and in amount of salaries. We have made provision for the Bureau of the Budget to put personnel ceilings on the number of employees, and we have our Appropriations Committees to work that out.

I should like to call the following figures to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio: The total pay roll for employees in continental United

States for the fiscal year 1945 was $7,327,000,000. The estimated pay roll for the next fiscal year is only $4,248,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, those figures do not greatly impress me. In fact, they impress me rather unfavorably, since they show such a tremendous amount to be spent in the next fiscal year, when we are past the war. Of course, the war bureaus are to be cut down. I question whether any agency of the Government which was not a war or strictly an emergency agency has cut its number of employees since the war ended. In fact, they are all proposing to increase the number. It seems to me it is just one big problem, and the Federal Government must make a reasonable effort to present a budget of what the pay roll is to be after the war. There has not been a suggestion of how great a reduction in the number of employees the Government is going to make. No budget has been presented. Neither the President nor the Secretary of the Treasury has afforded us any idea of what the postwar budget will amount to. I have added the figures myself, and I find that, if the President's recommendations are enacted into law, the budget will be very close to $26,000,000,000 a year—which is all the present tax system yields—without any further reduction of any kind, and imposing a very heavy burden on many people in the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator's remarks certainly have no application to the pending issue, because there were presented to the committee most careful calculations, coming from the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and other agencies of the Government, as to the number of employees the Government would have by next July. Those figures are being and have been worked over.

The Senator from Ohio says he is not impressed by a cut of almost one-half in the Federal pay roll. I do not know what would impress the Senator. I suppose if I had said it would be down to 10 percent of what it was last year, the Senator would have made the same remark.

Mr. TAFT. No; I would not. The Senator from California mentioned, as I remember, a pay roll of over $4,000,000,000 a year for Federal employees, and I say that that did not impress me. If that is as far as we can go by the first of next January, then I say that the Government departments and agencies are grossly overstaffed, that there will be a tremendous number of extra employees around, more than necessary to do the work, and that I am not impressed by such a figure. If the Senator suggested $2,500,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 I would say that was a fairly reasonable figure.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In the month of July we had what would be an annual equivalent of Federal payments for employees in continental United States, $7,969,000,000. The figures that are being worked out show that by next July that amount will be cut in half. Let me point out to the distinguished Senator——

Mr. TAFT. The figure was $4,200,000,000, as I understand?

Mr. DOWNEY. Four billion two hundred and forty-eight million dollars, representing a reduction of almost one-half.

Let me also say that a large part of that is for expenditures in the Post Office Department. Last year the Post Office Department of the United States showed a profit of $150,000,000, which went into the Treasury of the United States. Yet, in the figure $4,248,000,000, the expenses of the workers in the Post Office Department are included. Let me add that if it were not for the right of free mail accorded to our soldiers and what we term "penalty" or "franked mail" which is sent free by governmental representatives, the Post Office Department would show a huge profit. I throw this out for whatever it may be worth: In my opinion, the cheapest service afforded the people of the United States is that which enables them to send a letter across the continent for 3 cents. If our postal service were in the hands of the Western Union or the telephone company, it would probably cost a dollar or two dollars to send a letter across the continent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REED. While the Senator from California is on his feet referring to the $150,000,000 profit which the Post Office Department made last year, I hope he will permit me to correct the figure and make it $112,000,000. But the Post Office Department is now running at a rate which will mean a deficit of about $100,000,000 through this fiscal year. That, however, has nothing to do with the matter under consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my point is that the total $4,200,000,000 Budget figure for the first of next July is not extraordinary. It does not impress me. In any event, it is admitted not to be what the postwar figure should be. We have never had any estimate of what the postwar Budget would look like. We cannot get it from the Secretary of the Treasury. We have no basis on which to figure. Yet we are constantly increasing governmental expenses, although we do not know whether we can raise by taxation the amount which will be necessary to pay the bill. I do not say that we do not have to go ahead and do some things, but I do say that when we are going ahead with a project which may increase the Budget from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 a year we should thoroughly investigate the whole business and see whether we cannot find some way to reduce the total over-all expense at the same time that we take care of the proper demands of the employees. I merely suggest that a study should be made of the situation. The House apparently is going to do it, and there is no reason why the Senate should pass on this question without doing something in the way of investigating at the same time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator must be familiar with the fact that more than 2 years ago the so-called Byrd-Langer amendment was adopted. It provided that every month each department shall make a report to the chairman of the Civil Service Committee. It is also submitted to the Comptroller of the Currency. Department after department reports to the Byrd committee. So we have a double check on the situation. The number of employees has been going down, steadily down, all the time. I do not see what a further investigation could possibly disclose, or what more the Comptroller of the Currency can do than he is doing, or what more the Director of the Budget can do than he is doing in getting rid of surplus men and women employees.

Mr. TAFT. I say that they have not done that. Of course, there has been a large reduction. Many of these employees were making munitions during the war and other things directly connected with the war. They were working in arsenals. They were engaged in work that could have no possible object except in time of war. Of course, there has been a reduction in their number, and there should be. But in the current fiscal year we are still incurring a deficit of $35,000,000,000, for a single year, adding that much to the public debt. So far as I can see, for the fiscal year 1947 we shall have a deficit of probably $15,000,000,000. Certainly we are not doing anything extraordinary in the way of getting Government expenses back to normal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator to suggest what else can be done. Each month the Comptroller of the Currency and the Director of the Budget have submitted to them by the heads of the departments a report of the number of employees they have, and an investigation is being made whereby the Director of the Budget can arbitrarily remove from the pay roll any employees he finds are not needed. Congress, upon the recommendation of our committee, has given those officials that power. What else could be done?

Mr. TAFT. Permit me to make one suggestion. I suggested I saw no reason why office workers should have a complete Saturday holiday. I see some reason why in the case of industrial plants there should be a Saturday holiday; but I never have seen why office workers should have a Saturday holiday. Suppose we say, "We will give you this much more but you will work as everyone else does. You will work in the way civilian office workers work. You will work, as they do, Saturday morning and we will increase your compensation. We will then cut down by 10 percent the number of employees, because of the longer work week." I do not know whether that is a practical plan.

Mr. LANGER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that during the war

the same office workers were working all day Saturday. They had no time to go shopping. The health of many of them was impaired as a result.

Mr. TAFT. I always thought that was unreasonable also. I never could see why they should not have had a Saturday half holiday.

Mr. LANGER. They did not have it at all during the war. Now, for the first time since the war began, they are getting a few hours off.

Mr. TAFT. No; they are getting all day Saturday off.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that that is being done in industry after industry all over the United States of America.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is a great mistake so far as office work is concerned. It is not being done in ordinary downtown office work in Washington, or in many other cities. It is being done in the case of many of the office employees of industrial concerns, but it is not being done generally, and I do not see any reason why it should be. I merely suggest that that is one method we might try in an effort to cut down the ultimate total cost of this particular bill. The discussion arises on my contention that adding to the present confusion is the fact that both the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee have offered completely different plans from that approved by the committee and for that reason we should recommit the bill to the committee to consider further what plans should be adopted, and to see whether other things might be done which the committee could at least recommend, whether within their jurisdiction or not, which would reduce the overall cost of this increase.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I place some figures in the RECORD?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. DOWNEY. I want to say in the first place that I know that many Senators are honestly impressed with the very general statement that has been made concerning the overwhelming number of Federal employees. It is my own opinion, after several weeks of careful investigation, that the increased personnel in the departments in Washington, eliminating the Army and Navy, about which I know nothing, is far less than one would have expected, and far less in proportion than the increased amount of business done by those agencies.

I have heard repeated remarks made by Senators—and I know they were made in good faith—referring to what they termed a million employees of the Federal Government outside continental United States. In the first place, the figure of 1,000,000 is too high. The number is 850,000. Of that 850,000, 733,000 are in the Army, and most of the remainder are in the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means they are civilian employees in the Army?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; civilian employees, and I am about to explain what they are. I think that more Senators have said they did not see how they could vote for this pay bill because of the great volume of personnel, and they mention the figure of 1,000,000 employees who are supposed to be abroad. I have discussed this subject carefully with the Army representatives. Of the 750,000 employees of the Army outside continental United States, one-third of them are being paid by occupied countries. In other words, the conquered governments are paying for one-third, and they are nearly all citizens of the conquered governments. Ninety percent of these employees are not citizens of the United States. Another one-third are being paid by our allies on reverse lend-lease. They are on our pay rolls, but being paid by the governments of our allies. The other one-third, comprising principally coolie labor in the Pacific area, are being paid coolie wages. They cannot be paid by our Government more than the prevailing wage in their own country, and probably the maximum amount they are receiving is $20 a month.

In weighing this bill I do not think there is any equitable reason for thinking about the employees of the Army and Navy outside continental United States.

I want to add that the overwhelming proportion of the increased personnel in the Government is in the Army and Navy. Again, I cannot express any opinion as to whether the War Department and the Navy Department are wasteful of their manpower. The figures indicate that in June 1943 the emergency war agencies had reached their peak. In October 1945 they were down to 86,000, or about one-half the peak number. I understand that at the present time the figure is between 50,000 and 60,000. The emergency agencies are rapidly passing out of existence.

Between June 1939 and the present time the old-line agencies have increased 36 percent in personnel. According to the figures I have, the Post Office Department increased by 50 percent, but on an investigation of the Post Office Department I find that about 50,000 employees have been substitute carriers and other employees in that class, who were not carried on the pay roll 4 or 5 years ago. They cost the Government only a few dollars a month each. They are now carried on the Post Office pay rolls. In addition, the Post Office Department lost 50,000 of its best workers through the draft. It was necessary to employ 75,000 submarginal workers to take their places, and they were not able to do one-half the work that was done by the former employees. In spite of all those handicaps, the business now being done, and which has been done for the past year by the Post Office Department is far above the percentage represented by the increased number of employees.

The Senator says that none of these agencies are releasing employees. The Post Office Department is not. The Post Office Department is now employing more men than it employed in June.

Mr. TAFT. I have not even suggested a criticism of the Post Office Department.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is the largest agency outside the Army and Navy.

Mr. TAFT. What are the figures for the 1st of next July? Is any reduction proposed by the 1st of next July?

Mr. DOWNEY. By next July the Post Office Department expects to get back to practically the same number of employees that it had 4 or 5 years ago. On the average, the Post Office Department has carried one letter a day to every one of our soldiers and sailors. It has had to handle about 11,000,000 such letters a day, and it has handled them without any charge. As I previously stated, I had understood that last year the Post Office Department operated at a profit of $150,000,000. I was corrected by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Probably his information is accurate. He gave the figure $112,000,000.

It is true that presently the Post Office Department is operating at a deficit; but I think perhaps the prognostications of the Senator from Kansas as to what the deficit may be for this fiscal year are too pessimistic. However, I have no desire to enter into a debate on that question. So far as I am concerned, I feel that the employees of the Post Office Department have done a fine job. The largest increase has been in that Department.

The charts which I have distributed show the increases and decreases in every department—the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and so on. I have made a very careful investigation, and I find that the increased number of personnel does not nearly correspond to the increased amount of business.

Mr. President, I do not wish to hurt the feelings of any Senator or any Member of the House, but by far the greatest increase in percentage, considering the amount of money being spent for personnel presently as compared with 1941, is in the Congress of the United States. During that period of time our disbursements have gone up about 70 percent. I do not believe that that is any reason to condemn us. In my own office my business has increased from 150 to 200 percent, and my girls have often had to work until 6 or 7 o'clock in the evening, and sometimes all day Saturday and Sunday. But if my office is handling from 150 to 200 percent more business I cannot very well criticize myself or the Senate because our disbursements are comparatively the highest in the United States.

The Senator from Ohio has been very courteous. Before I conclude let me say this: I believe that we should attempt to approach these problems a trifle more calmly. I find that among 50 percent of the American people there is the folklore that Senators reach their offices about 10 or 11 o'clock every morning, have a good lunch, go to the floor of the Senate for a few minutes, and then play poker or golf for the rest of the day.

Mr. TAFT. I take every opportunity to destroy that notion.

Mr. DOWNEY. In my opinion, Senators individually are the most heavily burdened and drudging workers that I know of. Nevertheless, the impression is abroad among 50 to 75 percent of our people that we are overpaid, that we are slackers, and that we do not attend to our duties. I believe that that impression springs from a quality of the human heart which many of us have. When we make generalized statements about the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, or the Post Office Department, I

believe that many times we are falling into the same sort of unhappy error into which many of the American people fall with respect to Members of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. This bill does not cover the Post Office Department, does it?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; it does not.

Mr. TAFT. Is it anticipated that the same increase will be sought by Post Office employees?

Mr. DOWNEY. Opposition Senators have suggested that instead of counting the mere cost of this bill, we ought to calculate the amount for the postal employees and the wage-board employees. I think that is the provident thing to do.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of raising salaries and wages substantially, to the point reached in percentage by the permanent increase in the cost of living. I should say that that would certainly be 25 percent, and possibly somewhat higher. I do not think there will be any permanent decrease. I do not see how there could be any great decrease in present prices.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. In the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California they were speaking of the number of employees. On November 11, 1918, which was Armistice Day following the last war, there were 917,000 employees. That included the war workers. The day Mr. Roosevelt took office, on March 4, 1933, there were 555,000 employees. In October this year there were 2,643,881 civil-service employees within this country, and outside the country there were 733,792 civilian employees, making a total in October, 3 or 4 months after the war with Japan was ended, of 3,377,673, as compared with 555,000 when President Roosevelt took office, and as compared with 917,000 on Armistice Day following the First World War.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to make clear an interpretation of the figures which the Senator from Virginia has given. My figures are not quite the same as his, but generally speaking they are the same. The figure I have, representing the total number of employees for all agencies, both in and outside the United States, on September 30, 1945, is 3,360,000. That is approximately the figure which the Senator gave. Almost exactly a quarter of those, or 850,000, are principally employees of the Army and Navy outside continental United States, costing us almost nothing. Of the remaining number, about 70 percent, or a total of 2,200,000, were in the Army and Navy, 443,000 were in the Post Office Department. The total figure for those in all other agencies of the Government is 594,000, which is 36 percent more than the figure of 5 years ago. Stripping the figures down to the old-line agencies——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. We have always had an Army and Navy. The Senator from California is stripping them entirely in his comparison. With what year is the comparison made?

Mr. DOWNEY. June 1941.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is referring to civilian employees of the Army and Navy.

Mr. BYRD. We have always had civilian employees in the Army and Navy. If the Senator wishes to make a comparison, let him add them in both instances.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not start this particular controversy. My only point was that it seemed to me that when such a tremendous cost is involved we should not arbitrarily say that everyone shall have an increase of 20 percent, or any other increase, without studying how we can reduce the total cost. No consideration has been given to that problem, and I think we could well afford to recommit the bill to the committee for that purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to suggest one further thing. There is a certain advantage in Government service which does not exist in other services. A very typical case came to my attention the other day. A man who had been in the armed forces had returned home. He had become a very excellent automobile mechanic. He wanted a job. I said to him, "It seems to me that any of the automobile companies would be willing to pay you $10 a day. You could make probably $3,000 or $4,000 a year as an automobile mechanic." No; he wanted a Government job at $1,800, if you please. Why? I suppose he figured that he would be set for life. He would have that much money for life, and he could be assured of an income. For all practical purposes, he would have permanent tenure, which does not exist in private industry. If he were in the Government service and a depression should come along, he would still retain his job. So, in spite of the fact that he could earn more in private industry, a position in the Government service appealed to him more strongly. There are some advantages in Government service which do not exist in private industry, and I believe that it is fair to take that factor into consideration.

Mr. President, there is another reason why I think we ought to postpone the question of wage increases, and particularly salary increases. I felt very strongly on the question of the amendment proposing to increase the salaries of Members of Congress. Today in this country a tremendous struggle is under way as to what wages shall be. I do not know what they ought to be. I am perfectly confident of one thing, and that is that we cannot increase wages in industry without increasing prices, and that if we have a general increase in all wages, we shall have a general increase in all prices before we are through; and to the extent that wages are increased above the cost of living, that increase is just as much inflation as would be an increase in prices. It is bound to bring about the increase in prices which we all wish to avoid.

That struggle is being fought out, and properly so, and it should be fought out in each industry and in each case and with reference to the particular groups of employees who are involved in the disputes. I do not think the Government should take a position in favor of a 10 percent or 20 percent or 30 percent salary increase for its employees and thus set an example which all others would follow. I do not think the Members of Congress could increase their salaries 50 percent and not have every working man in the United States feel—and properly so—that he must be entitled to a similar increase. It can be said that some of them have already received increases greater than the increase in the cost of living. The increase in average factory wage rates has been approximately 42 percent since the beginning of the war, as compared with the 33 percent increase in the cost of living. But that does not make so much difference. If we increase the salaries of Government employees 30 percent, that percentage will be seized upon as a figure which sets an example for every other possible wage or salary increase.

We can point out that Senators and Government employees have not received any increases over certain periods of time, and we can make various arguments on that basis. Nevertheless, if we grant Government employees any salary increases at this time, that action will be bound to have a substantial effect on the struggle which now is being waged throughout the country. I do not think we know enough about what that increase should be to be justified in setting any example here by way of stating what the percentage of increase in Government salaries should be.

So, Mr. President, I feel very strongly that we should wait until next spring before we do anything in regard to increasing the salaries of Senators. I think Senators are clearly entitled to at least a 25-percent salary increase simply in order to take care of the increase which has occurred in the cost of living. Of course, many men working in industries may be entitled to a greater increase because their capacity to produce has increased, whereas it is difficult to demonstrate that the productivity of the civilian employees of the Government has increased in any way. So it seems to me that if their case for an increase in their salaries is to be justified, it must rest simply on ground that there has been an increase in the cost of living. I think we shall do far better, as a government, to say, "We will not undertake to lay down a rule. We will permit every industry by means of collective bargaining to work out the proper solution of its own particular problem, and we will not try to establish a scale or set an example in the way of an increase in the salaries of Government workers which immediately will be seized upon, it seems to me, as an argument for increases in other fields. For instance, if we grant a 10-percent increase in the salaries of Government workers, laboring people may feel that that increase reacts to their disadvantage in view of the fact that they may believe they are entitled to a 30-percent increase. On the other hand, if we grant a 20- or 30-percent increase in the salaries of Government employees, industrial employers may ob-

ject because they may say their employees should not receive more than a 10-percent increase.

In view of the fact that within the last 6 months we have granted a salary increase to Government workers, I think we can well wait another 6 months or a full year before another increase in salaries is given.

In any event, Mr. President, I would vote against any increase, and certainly I would not be willing to vote for the increase proposed in the bill.

We have two other measures which I cannot analyze at this time. I do not know how much of an increase they propose. I have seen tables covering the increase proposed by the amendment of the Senator from California. I have seen tables covering the increase proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Virginia. Frankly, I cannot analyze them quickly enough to determine just how much of an increase they would grant. But I do feel that altogether, and taking everything into consideration, it is clear that the bill should be recommitted to the committee. If that is done, then, after the bill is further considered by the committee and subsequently is reported to the Senate and is considered by the Senate, if it then contains provision for an increase in the salaries of Government employees in accordance with the increase in the cost of living, I shall be glad to vote for a bill substantially complying with that principle.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has said practically everything I could possibly say on the pending subject, and no doubt he has said it a great deal better and more forcefully than I could have done. I simply wish to make a few observations at this time about the situation.

First, Mr. President, I wish to have the Senator from California understand that I did not say or, at least, I did not intend to say, that there will be a deficit of $100,000,000 in the Post Office Department this year. What I intended to say and what I hope I did say was that at the present rate of operation, the deficit in the Post Office Department this year will be approximately $100,000,000, as against a $112,000,000 surplus, as I recall the figures, for the operations during the last fiscal year.

Mr. President, I think Members of Congress should have higher salaries. Our expenses have increased; our work has increased. But I am unwilling to vote to increase my own salary or that of any other Member of Congress so long as the Government is being operated on a deficit basis. Of course, I believe that the expenses and the burdens of Members of Congress, of both Houses—I know it is true in the case of Members of the Senate—have increased. Our expenses have increased to a point where I, at least, am not able to live within the salary which I as a Senator draw from the Government. I am one of those Senators who maintain two homes. I maintain a home in Washington and one in Kansas. Our salaries are insufficient to pay our expenses in maintaining two homes and also to pay our other expenses. I do not think the quality of legislators would be increased in the slightest by increasing the salaries paid to them. I do not belong to the school of those who believe that in places of distinction the salaries paid necessarily constitute a factor which influences the quality or character of the men who seek such places. But in all fairness, men who take these places, even if they ask for them—and all of us did—should receive salaries which at least suffice to pay their expenses.

The amount of my official salary does not happen to be of vital importance to me because, fortunately, out of a lifetime of effort and accumulation, I have an income outside of my senatorial salary. I know, however, that some of the most earnest and effective Members of the Senate do not have such incomes, and they necessarily must rely entirely upon their senatorial salaries to meet their expenses. To those men my heart goes out; I do not see how they do it. Some Senators who are in that position are on the floor of the Senate at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator mean to imply that membership in the Congress should be denied to any person who does not have sufficient outside income, either from savings previously accrued or from outside work which he does while serving in the Congress, to enable him to meet his expenses while serving in either this body or the House of Representatives?

Mr. REED. I do not quite understand the question of the Senator from West Virginia. I ask him to repeat it, please.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to know whether the Senator from Kansas means to imply that membership in the Congress of the United States should be denied to any citizen of the United States who, either because he had not previously acquired sufficient assets or because he would not obtain outside earnings while serving as a Member of the Congress would be unable to meet the expenses which he would incur while serving in the Congress?

Mr. REED. No. My answer to the Senator from West Virginia is that we talk about sacrifices made during the war, but very few people in the United States, other than the families who contributed men and women to the armed forces, have made any real sacrifices. Most of our people had a great deal of inconvenience, yes; but sacrifices, no.

I think it is not asking too much of the Congress to request it not to increase the salaries of its Members so long as the Government is operating on a deficit basis and so long as the Government has to borrow the money with which to pay the salaries of Members of Congress and the salaries of all other Government employees.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator begs the question. I should like to have an answer to it. I do not disagree with the Senator in regard to the matter of raising salaries, but I simply wonder if it is and has been the policy of the Senator from Kansas and of other Members of this body to adopt the view outlined in my question in regard to membership in the Congress. I have heard so much argument on the floor of the Senate along that line that sometimes I feel that possibly that is the policy of the Senate of the United States, or at least of a majority of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I can say this much to the Senator from West Virginia: I think the Congress of the United States, and I know the Senate of the United States, is more parsimonious with itself when it comes to dealing with its salaries and operating expenses than it is in dealing with the salaries or expenses of any other branch or department of the Government.

I was glad that the Senator from California decided not to offer an amendment which would have brought the question of congressional salaries to a vote.

I wish to close this phase of my remarks by repeating that I think the salaries of Members of Congress are presently inadequate. I think they should be adequate. But I hesitate very much to advocate or agree to an increase of our salaries so long as it is necessary for the Government to borrow the money with which to pay its expenses.

Now, I wish to discuss the question of the civil-service employee whose pay would be raised perhaps 20 percent by enactment of the bill reported from the committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is chairman. I think some of our friends in the Senate emphasize too much the so-called hardships which Government employees undergo. Any group of employees who work 8 hours a day for 5 days a week, who have 26 days' annual leave with pay, who have 8 holidays a year, who receive 15 days' leave with pay if they are sick, certainly can have no case at all for relief, insofar as their working conditions are concerned.

To reduce it, Mr. President, to an hourly basis, when, under the proposed program, we take the working days of the year and deduct from them the annual leave and the holidays, we find that civil-service employees work on an average of 5 hours and 36 minutes a day. I refuse to believe that any group of workers, in the Government or anywhere else, who are working on an average of 5 hours and 36 minutes per day, are being overworked.

There is an indefinite factor which is worth referring to and given a little consideration. I have been informed by the press that the Government employees in Washington will be given a 3-day Christmas holiday. If we take into consideration the Sunday preceding, it will be 4 days. Almost every time anything of an unusual nature occurs in Washington such as a parade on Constitution Avenue or Pennsylvania Avenue, the employees of all Government departments take another holiday or part holiday. If that much time, which is an indefinite factor, is deducted, the average workday would be less than 5½ hours. So much for the

subject of working conditions. I now come to the question of salary.

Mr. President, the work of the Federal employees engaged in clerical and routine work is not hard. I have no doubt that such workers find difficulty in living under conditions which obtain in Washington at this time, and yet, Mr. President, the salaries which that class of employees receives for the work which it does exceeds the pay of employees in private institutions throughout the business life of Washington where similar work is being performed.

When the Senator from Ohio refers to persons who can earn more money outside Government than they can within the Government, that may be true. I have made no survey in that regard. However, I have discussed the matter with many persons and have found that almost universally the salaries paid by private industry in offices, in stores, and in retail and wholesale establishments—I am speaking of salaries paid by private employers in Washington—are less than those paid the low-bracket Government employees whom we are discussing. As I have said, our Government employees have, I believe, the best working conditions of any class of employees of whom I know, so far as hours of work are concerned. I do not know of any other employees who are paid annual salaries, even those within the lower brackets, who work so few number of hours during the week or month or year as do the Government workers.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio that I would be glad to see Government employees receive more money than they are now receiving. However, I want them to do more work for the money which is paid them. There is no reason why an office worker should have two holidays a week, or have Saturday off, unless we are trying to spread the work and have as many employees as it is possible to have.

Mr. President, I have been in civil service longer, I believe, than any other Member of the Senate, and almost as long as any Senator has been a Member of the Senate. It is impossible to spread work and increase salaries at the same time. If Government workers wish greater salaries, my answer to them would be, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, instead of working 40 hours a week, let them work 45 hours a week, and let them be given a half day off on Saturdays. Give them an increase of 12½ percent in their pay. If their hours of work are increased 12½ percent, give them a 12½-percent increase in their wages and decrease proportionately the total number of persons employed. That makes sense. That gives the employees more money and it does not overwork them. No sociologist or economist who has ever given a thought to this subject has ever found any reason in the world for limiting the hours in a workweek except for two reasons. The first one is that the length of the workweek imperiled the health of the worker. Certainly that factor is not even remotely on the horizon in this case. The other reason is that of spreading the work. However, we cannot spread work among a greater number of persons and at the same time increase their salaries.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I cannot say that I am persuaded by the argument which the Senator has made. But it at least has interested me. I would be further interested in knowing, if he were the dictator of our policy, how much vacation he would give employees of the Government each year. Would he give them any vacation at all?

Mr. REED. I give my own employees 2 weeks. The Senator knows that the postal workers receive only 15 days' leave of absence. They do not receive 26 days as do other Government employees in Washington.

Mr. DOWNEY. Would the Senator pursue that policy even though it resulted in increasing the number of unemployed persons throughout the Nation?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to bring an extraneous matter into this discussion, but I believe that the entire basis of economy, whether private or Government, is production. There is no way by which we can consume unless we produce. In all economic adjustments there should be recognized some relation between the cost of production in the form of wages, and the production of the commodity itself, if it can be measured in that way. Of course, Government work cannot be measured in that way.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to state to the Senator a fact, which I do not know will either interest him or influence him, and perhaps it is not even relevant. But it is expected that 18 months from now almost all the male workers in civil service will be veterans of this and, to a lesser extent, of the First World War. Perhaps 60 percent of the total number of the remaining workers will largely be the typists and stenographers who engage in work not ordinarily performed by men. It is now clearly indicated that we will not be able to find the number of jobs in civil service for perhaps anywhere near the number of veterans who are already endeavoring to find suitable jobs of every kind and cannot find them. Would the distinguished Senator feel that we were doing too much for the boys who spent 2 or 3 years away from their homes and careers in the fox holes, by giving them 26 days of vacation each year? Does he think we are doing too much by trying to spread jobs?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want to be a demagog on this floor. I have voted, as I believe every other Senator has voted, for very liberal provisions in behalf of veterans, with respect to their pay and their allowances, and for the GI bill of rights, as well as other measures which were advanced in their behalf. I do not want any hypothetical question raised at this time that some years from now we will drag in the veterans in a way which has nothing to do with the pending bill. I do not think the veteran who came out of the war whole, and has gone into Government service, would ask for a higher rate of pay than is being paid to men in civil life who are doing a similar type of work.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, all that the pending bill proposes to do is to lift civil-service workers to the cost-of-living standard and place their compensation on a parity with what industry is paying its workers.

Mr. REED. That is the Senator's view of it. It is not my view.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know what my amendment provides. I am merely asking for an increase sufficient to bring the wages of Government workers up to a level where they can meet the cost of living.

Mr. REED. Is the Senator referring to the pending bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is practically all that the bill would do.

Mr. REED. And it is to be in addition to the pay which was granted during the present session of this Congress.

Mr. DOWNEY. The bill perhaps lifts the compensation of a few workers in the lower category above the cost of living. But it does not go even far enough to lift proportionately the compensation of the workers in the higher brackets up to the increased cost of living.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this bill comes before the Congress at the most inopportune time. In the first place, as the Senator from Ohio so very forcefully pointed out, we are in a period of economic confusion. I believe, that because of encouragement, perhaps, contained in the President's statement of some months ago, which was a far more liberal one than it should have been, hopes have been held out for higher increases to industrial workers than are probably possible of realization. For the Congress to increase Government salaries by any fixed percentage, and raise all employees from top to bottom without regard to what they do, and without regard to their conditions or the relation of their salary to the cost of living, is a mistake. It is not only a mistake in and of itself, but I fear it is tremendously confusing. The very pendency of this bill is confusing the entire labor-wage situation.

Finally, Mr. President, the Senator from California knows, from the conversations we have had, that in my opinion the debt of nearly $300,000,000,000 which this country will face before we come back to the balancing of our budget is the most important factor existing in our whole financial and economic structure. Unless within the next 3 or 4 years we can manage to balance the budget, to take care of the interest and the service charges upon that debt, establish our credit, and bring our expenses within our revenue, the talk now being indulged, and all the ideas about raising salaries, will be futile. If we continue deficit spending without care, or apparently without reason, the credit of this country will be disturbed to the point that our debt will get beyond our credit capacity to control it, and our bonds become impaired in value because of a lack of faith in the Government. In that event the most awful catastrophe imaginable will overtake this country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. In a moment I shall be glad to yield.

I said some time ago, Mr. President, that I came here with the firm intention of doing all I could, through my votes, to preserve the credit of the Government. I did not want to vote for any appropriation unless it could be demonstrated that it was immediately necessary.

Mr. President, we cannot continue to vote $500,000,000 for airports, $500,000,000 for highway programs, four or five hundred million dollars, perhaps, for one bill, and a hundred million or a hundred and fifty million or two hundred or two hundred and fifty million in some other direction—it is impossible to continue on that road without utterly weakening our national credit, and that would be the worst disaster to the salaried people that could be imagined.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wished to ask the Senator whether in his opinion it is not more important to increase the salaries of our Government employees than to lend England $4,400,000,000, and to lend Russia several hundred million dollars?

Mr. REED. I do not know yet how I shall vote on the loan to Great Britain, but I find myself slipping, and may vote for it.

The Government of the United States owes fair treatment to its workers. I owe fair treatment to those who work for me, and every employer is under the same obligation. In my opinion the United States has not failed in according its workers fair treatment.

In my home town, in the town in which the Senator from North Dakota lives, in the town in which the Senator from South Dakota lives, in the town in which the Senator from Iowa lives, the Federal workers are the best paid, where they do work comparable to that performed by private workers. That is true all over the country, with the exception of the postal workers in the large cities. We have had difficulty in keeping the postal salaries in large cities and the postal salaries in the smaller towns from coming in conflict with each other. It is a difficult problem. But there is not a Senator in this Chamber who lives in a city of less than 50,000—and I live in one of less than that number—who does not know that the Government employees are the best paid workers in the city, considering comparable employment in private business.

We are not treating our employees badly. The Senator from California made quite a point about one case a few days ago, that of Mr. Bell. It is very true there are some men in the Government service who remain in it perhaps out of public spirit, perhaps because they have been in it a long time, at lesser salaries than they would be paid in private employment if they were doing the same work in private employment. That is the class of employees in the Government service who generally receive from $7,000 to $8,000 up to the maximum, whatever it may be. That is not exceptional.

Men leave private employment in one place and go to private employment in another at an increase in salary. There is something about Government work which is attractive. It is steady, it is continuous, it is not subject to the fluctuations which are found in private employment, there are long vacations—too long, I think—short hours, and sick leave. All those things tend to make Government work more attractive.

In the city of Washington the Government can always get employees in the clerical lines, because such employees receive greater salaries, as a rule, than those in private employment. It would be folly, of course, to say that there were no exceptions, but as a rule the employees in the Government offices in Washington doing clerical work receive more than they could get for doing the same kind of work for private employers.

Mr. President, the situation surrounding the pending bill is one of almost indescribable confusion. The Senator from California brought a bill to the floor. The Senator from Virginia is to offer quite an extensive amendment, perhaps in the nature of a substitute. I understand the Senator from California may perhaps modify his own bill to a material extent.

A motion to recommit the bill should not come from the Senator from Kansas or the Senator from Ohio, but I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Ohio that not only the best way but it seems to me the only way this question can be intelligently handled is by recommitting the bill to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may call for a quorum?

Mr. MEAD. It is not necessary.

Mr. LANGER. The bill now pending is a very important measure, and we would like to have a quorum present.

Mr. MEAD. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Green	Morse
Ball	Gurney	Murdock
Bankhead	Hart	Murray
Bilbo	Hawkes	Myers
Bridges	Hill	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Capper	Kilgore	Reed
Carville	Knowland	Revercomb
Chavez	La Follette	Robertson
Connally	Langer	Russell
Donnell	McClellan	Shipstead
Downey	McKellar	Smith
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Ferguson	Mead	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Millikin	White
Gerry	Mitchell	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed the bill which is now before the Senate, and I explained my position with reference to it as it was reported from the Civil Service Committee. I am now going to speak against a motion to recommit the bill, or the substitute, to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is a motion pending to recommit the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no motion pending to recommit.

Mr. MEAD. If my colleague from Iowa had waited, I was about to add "in the event that such a motion is made." I heard the statement made by the able Senator from Ohio, as I hope my distinguished colleague from Iowa did, and I intend to deal with it a little later.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we have before us a substitute measure which may give some inspiration to a motion to recommit the bill. In order to bring before the Senate a question which will be properly before the Senate, I suggest to the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee that he withdraw his amendment and reinstate the bill as reported to the Senate by the Civil Service Committee, so that we may all know what is before the Senate and what the provisions of the bill are.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. While I am confident that the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have presented would be more acceptable to the Senate, and I myself would prefer to press it, in view of the practical impossibility of having the attention of Senators long enough to explain it, I have a sense of discouragement in having them understand what it is, and I therefore think the suggestion of the Senator from New York is well taken. Consequently, for the present I will withdraw the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am well pleased with the action taken by the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee, because there has been confusion in this body, but if we return to the bill as reported by the committee we shall have before us a copy of the bill as reported. We shall have before us a report from the Committee on Civil Service, and we shall have the benefit of that explanation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Did the Senator from California withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from California stated that he would withdraw the amendment. I understand that he will probably go through the proper parliamentary procedure to do so when he has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has a right to withdraw his amendment, and he has done so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, as I understand, the state of the RECORD at the moment is that the RECORD shows

that the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from California has now actually been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we are now considering the bill as reported by the Committee on Civil Service. We can properly follow that bill, because we have a printed copy of it before us. We have an explanation of the bill before us in the report which the Civil Service Committee has submitted with the bill.

Mr. President, this is a very simple measure. It calls for an increase of 20 percent over the existing wage level. That is a very simple issue. It was well explained by the able chairman of the committee. The cost-of-living feature which prompted the majority of the committee to report the bill favorably to the Senate is likewise easy to understand. That too was dwelt upon at great length by the chairman of the committee.

The application of the 20-percent yardstick maintains a differential in the various classifications in the civil-service categories, from the top to the bottom. If there are Members of the Senate who feel that the 20-percent increase is not sufficient, or is too much, they have an opportunity to offer amendments to increase or reduce that figure. But, Mr. President, I do not believe that we ought to adopt the ancient device of recommitting the bill to the committee for further consideration and study. That device was used in the first Congress which was assembled in this building. It has been used in every subsequent session of every Congress that has ever been held.

This bill was introduced in accordance with parliamentary procedure. It was referred to the appropriate committee. It was considered by that committee. Hearings were held by the committee. Witnesses were summoned from the rank-and-file to the grade of Cabinet officer, and after the hearings were held, the committee voted in executive session to report the bill to the Senate, and the bill was reported to the Senate and placed upon the calendar in the regular way.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In connection with that statement, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that extensive hearings were held last spring upon the pay bill which we then passed. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and other Senators desired to have a considerable higher increase than was then allowed. We did approve the provision for overtime pay, in addition to an increase in the basic allowance. There was a full study of the pay scale at that time, and I believe that a majority of the committee then stated that whenever overtime pay was done away with it would be the disposition of the committee to bring in a bill which would increase Government salaries above the cost-of-living standard.

Mr. MEAD. That was my understanding, Mr. President. Overtime payments have been eliminated, which in my judgment is another justification for the immediate consideration of this legislation. If we send the bill back to the committee I am not sure that there will be any greater interest in it, or that any greater number of Members of the Senate will be concerned over it than is the case at the present time. In fact, I believe that this is the appropriate time. I believe that as a result of several days of discussion there is great interest in the bill. Therefore I hope it will not be recommitted, and that we may proceed to reconsider the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has been brought into this debate. The Civil Service Commission has approved the bill. I remember when it was always necessary—or at least helpful—for the Civil Service Commission to recommend or approve legislation having to do with wages and working conditions of the personnel employed by the United States. After all, it is the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission to recruit personnel for the various departments and agencies of the United States. They know how difficult and expensive that operation is, because of the rapid turn-over in Government employment. They know more, perhaps, than any other agency of the Government about the difficulties which beset them in the proper recruitment and organization of Government personnel. We have the approval of the Civil Service Commission of the bill which has been reported by the committee. Moreover, the President of the United States favors the principles contained in this bill. In my judgment that is an added reason why the Senate should not recommit the bill to a committee which has already given consideration to it.

Mr. President, other arguments have been advanced. It has been suggested that we wait until next year, to find out what the Budget will be. I think it will be a source of great encouragement to an underpaid typist, stenographer, or clerk when he is told to wait until we know more about what the budget is to be before we allow him sufficient salary to keep body and soul together.

It has been suggested that it is inopportune to raise wages now, and that we should put it off until we balance the Budget. I think that would be marked encouragement to the poor people of the District of Columbia who are working for Uncle Sam at salaries which in my judgment are inadequate. It is proposed that we tell them to wait until some time in the future, until we can balance the Budget, before we take care of them.

Mr. President, not very long ago we repealed the excess-profits tax. We did not say to the corporations, "You must wait until we balance the Budget, or until next year, when we know how much it is going to cost to operate the Government." Not long ago we reduced the taxes on corporations. We did not say to them, "You must wait until we balance the Budget." No. But we use that argument now, when it applies to the lowly paid wage earners employed by the Government of the United States.

Not long ago we talked about lending foreign governments billions of dollars, and evidently we are about to do it. But we are not going to say to those governments, "You must wait until we balance our Budget. You must wait until we know how much money we shall need next year." Oh, no. We use that argument only when it applies to the poor devil who works for the Government of the United States.

Just a few days ago we rescinded appropriations of $52,000,000,000 which we had already made for the conduct of the war. Less than half a billion dollars will be required to cover the entire cost of this bill for a whole year, and before that year is up the personnel will be reduced in many instances. Perhaps the total reduction will absorb a great percentage of the cost of the bill. But if the war had lasted another week we should have spent a great deal more than we would spend for the cost of this bill for an entire year.

Mr. President, I am for the consideration of the bill which is now before the Senate, a bill with which we are all familiar, a bill which has been reported to this body by the proper committee. I really believe that it would be a serious mistake and that we would be inconsistent with ourselves and our record if we were to send the bill back to the Committee on Civil Service. So I am appealing to the Senate now, in the event that a motion is made to recommit the bill, to vote down the motion and proceed in an orderly manner to consider the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Civil Service. If there is anything wrong with that bill, we shall have ample opportunity to correct it. If it is insufficient in the increases which it proposes, we can modify it. So I appeal to the Senate to consider the bill which has been reported by its own Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hart	Mitchell
Bridges	Hawkes	Morse
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Murray
Capper	Hill	O'Daniel
Carville	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Huffman	Radcliffe
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Downey	Langer	Taylor
Gerry	McClellan	Tunnell
Gossett	McKellar	White
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Guffey	Mead	
Gurney	Millikin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senator; and Mr. BALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. VANDENBERG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HILL. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergent at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. BANKHEAD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to propound an inquiry to the Senator from California. As I understand, he has withdrawn his substitute which he offered this morning. Am I correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Does that mean that the amendment which the Senator had pending will be reinstated?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I make no statement on that point. I have withdrawn my amendment.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to send forward, and to have lie on the table, two amendments which are being proposed by myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], who are members of the Civil Service Committee. I ask that the amendments and a table in explanation of their objectives be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments submitted by Mr. BYRD for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART were received, ordered to lie on the table and be printed, and the amendments and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BYRD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, viz: On page 1, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) the first sentence of section 405 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: 'Each of the existing rates of basic compensation set forth in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 36 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $4,600 per annum.'"

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BYRD, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, viz: Beginning on page 1, line 9, strike out all down to and including line 16 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading 'Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Service' in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: *'Provided*, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 88 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 93 cents an hour.

"(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

"Grade 1, 88 to 95 cents an hour.

"Grade 2, $1.01 to $1.09 an hour.

"Grade 3, $1.17 to $1.23 an hour.

"Grade 4, $1.31 to $1.45 an hour.

"(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"SEC. 2. Section 602 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words 'section 405 of this act,' wherever they occur in such section, a comma and the words 'as amended.'

"SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: 'Except as provided in section 503, each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional compensation computed as follows: 36 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $4,600 per annum.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 521 of such act is amended to read as follows: 'Each officer and employee in or under the judicial branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional basic compensation computed as follows: 36 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $4,600 per annum.'

"SEC. 4. Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words 'by reason of the enactment of this act' the words 'or any amendment thereto.'"

TABLE I

Rates on June 30, 1945	Present rate (Public Law 106) effective July 1, 1945	Proposed amendment 36-18-9 percent over June 30, 1945, rates	Percentage increase, proposed amendment over present base rates under Public Law 106	Percentage increase, proposed amendment over June 30, 1945, base rates[1]
$1,200	$1,440	$1,632.00	13.33	36.00
1,440	1,704	1,915.20	12.39	33.00
1,620	1,902	2,127.60	11.86	31.33
1,800	2,100	2,349.00	11.43	30.00
2,000	2,320	2,576.00	11.03	28.80
2,300	2,650	2,930.00	10.57	27.39
2,400	2,760	3,048.00	10.43	27.00
2,600	2,980	3,284.00	10.20	26.31
2,900	3,310	3,638.00	9.91	25.45
3,200	3,640	3,992.00	9.67	24.75
3,500	3,970	4,346.00	9.47	24.17
3,800	4,300	4,700.00	9.30	23.68
4,600	5,180	5,644.00	8.96	22.70
5,200	5,810	6,298	8.40	21.12
5,600	6,230	6,734	8.09	20.25
6,000	6,650	7,170	7.82	19.50
6,500	7,175	7,715	7.53	18.69
7,000	7,700	8,260	7.27	18.00
7,500	8,225	8,805	7.05	17.40
8,000	8,750	9,350	6.86	16.88
8,500	9,275	9,895	6.68	16.41

[1] Percentages indicated reflect the aggregate of increases under Public Law 106 and the proposed amendment, but do not reflect within-grade increases or promotions.

Table I (above) shows results of a 36-18-9 percent pay-increase formula when applied to the Federal compensation rates as of June 30, 1945.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator decides to start his speech this evening, I am wondering how long he is likely to proceed. It is now almost 5 o'clock. I do not know but perhaps the acting majority leader is now ready to move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I expect to cover this subject at some length. I expect to begin by giving a history of this type of legislation and lead up to where we are at the present time. I will consume some time. I have no objection, if it is desired, to have the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe that it is the wish of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], that the Senate proceed for a while longer. I think we might continue for a while and allow the Senator from Iowa an opportunity to begin his speech before we take a recess.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well.

Mr. President, I approach this point in the consideration of the pending bill with some confusion in my mind. The confusion is especially heightened because, as a member of the Committee on Civil Service, I have had a little to do with the proposed legislation, as well as the legislation which became effective last July 1.

At the outset it may be stated that we are dealing here with a very substantial sum of public money. The pending bill, in the form in which it is now before the Senate, involves a potential expenditure, in addition to the expenditures which we are now making for public salaries, of a sum somewhat in excess of $1,000,000,000 a year. The bill does not specifically apply to any persons except those within the classified civil service. As I understand, the amount of money involved will be approximately $600,000,000 a year.

Most of the various documents now lying on the desks of Senators, and under various authorships, begin with the proponents of the measure in its present form prefacing much of the assumption of the cost of this bill as contained in their literature upon the premise or allegation that the number of employees on the Federal pay roll will have been reduced by next July to 2,000,000. The number of employees on the Federal pay roll today, considering those under the Wage Board, is between three and three and a half million. According to one statistical sheet which I have received and which was allegedly compiled from Government sources, the Federal pay roll for the fiscal year of 1945 is $7,327,000,000. In any event, the amount is in excess of $7,000,000,000.

While the pending bill applies only to those who are in the classified civil service, I think it has been amply demonstrated and admitted by both sides of the controversy that whatever is done for the classified civil-service employees will

of necessity be extended to the public employees in other branches of the service until all the public employees will receive substantially the same percentage of increase that is provided for in the pending bill. Therefore, if the experience of the past means anything, I think we may say that, in this bill, we are dealing with a 20-percent increase across the board on $7,000,000,000, because that is the 1945 fiscal pay roll.

I think it is fair to say that that amount has been reduced somewhat by small reductions in public personnel. But the figure still stands roughly at $7,000,000,000 annually. If, during the course of public administration, because of the legislative attitude, and governmental pressure, we grant an increase to this great segment of the public employees, it is certain that the increase will be applied to the other segments as well. That will mean $1,400,000,000 if the Government continues to employ substantially the same number of employees that it employs now.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I think the Senator is in error in his last statement, in that he has not taken into account the fact that practically all overtime has been done away with. In July the overtime, on an annual basis, was a billion, seven hundred million dollars. While the overtime was not nearly so great in the last fiscal year, when we had a total pay roll of over $7,000,000,000, the doing away with overtime alone will reduce the total cost to the Government by approximately 25 percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from California, Mr. President, that at the same time we did away with the overtime, by the bill taking effect the 1st of last July, we increased the pay of the classified employees, and I may say to the Members of the Senate that we are now preparing to increase the pay of postal employees in accordance with some general understandings which were had last spring, and that the increase effected by the bill which went into effect on July 1, amounted to 15.9 percent. So that the overtime that was taken away, decreasing the amount of actual dollars the employees received, was offset in great measure by the increase in base pay that was granted in the law which went into effect the 1st of July. The amount is still somewhere in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000. I think it is of little consequence, because I have at least five sets of statistics in my files, each compiled by allegedly capable and responsible governmental agencies, no two of which agree in their figures within about 7 percent. In addition to that, the committee of the Senator from Virginia on reduction of nonessential Federal expenditures has compiled statistics directly from Federal bureau and agency heads themselves, and those statistics do not coincide, accurate as the sources may be, with these other statistics, by a few percent. They all add up, however, to the fact that this pay-roll bill is going to cost somewhere between six and a half billion and seven billion dollars as it now stands. The measure proposed, in the form in which it is before the Senate at the moment, proposes a 20-percent increase to the classified employees, which will automatically, and in the very course of political and public events, be extended to the other employees of the Government. If it is given to the classified employees, it should be given to the other employees of the Government. Public morality and public responsibility would demand that that be done.

Mr. President, that is what we are dealing with, a bill involving increases in excess of a billion dollars a year, at a time when we have just ended the greatest financial and human effort this Nation and the world ever saw, and when we should be getting back to some kind of a basis of public and private financial sanity, when this Nation of ours, which has been built upon that principle, should go forward and reconstruct itself for that glorious tomorrow to which so much lip service is rendered, but to which so little support in the Halls of the Congress and in the minds of administrative officials apparently is being given.

Last spring the question of the pay of public employees was a very pertinent one. It was recognized that the public employees had not been given increases commensurate with the increases in similar lines of activity in other employments, that no substantial increase had been given to the employees since 1941, and that some consideration should be given to them. At that time we had hearings before the Committee on Civil Service. The Senator from California then, as now, was zealous to see that what he in his opinion thought was justice was done.

The committee had what I thought were some extremely harmonious meetings. Serious attention was given to the subject, with a realization that there was a problem, and at that time, because of the restriction imposed by the Little Steel formula, the committee was confined within certain limits so as not to violate the 15-percent increase laid down in the Little Steel formula and the "hold the line" policy.

It was recognized at that time that the cost of living probably had risen in the neighborhood of 30 percent, because that was developed by the evidence, and there was no dispute about it, except in the case of private figures. There was no disputes as to the cost of living in governmental figures, those of the Civil Service Commission, and even of the employee groups themselves. Based on the limitation of the Little Steel formula and, with this knowledge of the increase in the cost of living, the committee did give an increase that amounted to approximately 15.9 percent in the aggregate.

I will say to the Senator from California that it was recognized at that time that probably a more substantial increase should have been given in order to bring the compensation of Federal employees up to a point that would meet the increase in the cost of living. But I shall have to dispute the statement of the Senator from California that it was understood, or agreed, or even contemplated at that time, that the increases later to be considered would bring the salaries up to a point above the cost of living increase. It is my recollection, though I have no particular record of private conversations at that time, that the general sense of the committee was that we should sometime after the first of the year, when the restriction of the Little Steel formula should be removed, then seriously consider a readjustment of the Federal-pay scale, in an attempt reasonably to approach, under all conditions, the increased cost of living as a factor in the pay scale and pay roll of the Federal Government. The degree of the increase, or its amount, according to my recollection, was not specifically discussed, nor did I have any firm idea of what it might be. The bill went into effect the 1st of July, and it has been in effect since.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wonder if the Senator would allow me to interpolate that since that 16-percent raise was a graduated raise, it did raise those drawing above $8 000 only to the extent of 9 percent of their basic salaries. I would like to have the record made complete.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is entirely correct, but I may say that in considering the wage adjustment at that time, as I recall—and I cannot speak for any other member of the committee, and do not intend to commit any other member of the committee—the whole philosophy of that increase in salary was that neither at that time, nor in considering wage increases in the future, was a basic readjustment of Federal wages to be considered. Rather were we considering the human, equitable readjustment of wages in this emergency period to meet the living costs, the living necessities created by the unusual situation of war, and all the economics that go with it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. All I want to emphasize is that we did recognize at that time that the cost of living had increased approximately 30 percent. I personally believed then it was up 33 or 35 percent, but we used the figure 30 percent, which was then the official figure, and we were only giving a basic rate in the higher brackets of 9 percent, which, of course, resulted in the increase in the upper brackets still being something like 22 or 23 percent below the increased cost of living, which, of course, meant that much of an actual cut in real purchasing power.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will come to that point in a moment. I say again that what I have stated was my understanding of the philosophy of the legislation passed at that time and of its intents and purposes and what we were trying to arrive at. It does little good at this time to say what this or that Member said, but there was a divergence of opinion in the committee, and yet I think a harmonious unity of opinion was reached eventually.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I, and I believe the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], in trying to approach this problem made some suggestions about a graduated scale of increase. Because of the fact that the fiscal year began the 1st of July, the time was then so short that something had to be done rather drastically, and perhaps roughly, so far as any analytical studies were concerned. The proposal was therefore made, in order to meet this situation and so the increase could begin on the first of the fiscal year, that a 20-percent increase be given on the first $1,200 of salary, with 10 percent on the overplus of $1,200 to $4,600, and that 5 percent on salaries over $4,600 be given.

The theory of that increase, Mr. President, as I understand it—and certainly I will say, as I know I intended it—was that the impact of the cost of living in these days of unusual economic turmoil comes upon the necessities of life, comes upon the needed food, the needed clothing, the needed schooling, all the things that go into the necessities of life for the little man; and by the little man I mean the one in the low salary brackets, who spends from 90 to 100 percent of everything he can earn on the necessary costs of living. Everything he earns as a rule goes for food, clothing, shelter, medical supplies, and the other necessities of family life or individual life. Therefore, when the cost of living goes up beyond the point where he is normally able to meet it, it rises above the level of what he is already spending and he does not have the surplus money to meet it, nor does he have the excess salary to absorb it.

Let me show how it worked out. Under the legislation which became effective on the 1st of last July, the employee who was receiving $1,200 was increased to $1,440, I believe. Will the Senator from California correct me if I am in error? I believe we fixed a minimum of $1,500 in that measure.

Mr. DOWNEY. One thousand four hundred and forty dollars.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not read the law recently—that is, in the last few days—but it was my recollection that no salary was to be under $1,500.

Mr. DOWNEY. One thousand four hundred and forty dollars became the minimum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Anyway, the one who theretofore received $1,200 received $1,440, or a $240 increase. Remember that we were giving this increase to meet the increased cost of necessities, the increased cost of living. It was not a basic wage adjustment. It was not made on the basis of a survey between grades in the public service to see whether this grade was getting the correct pay in comparison to that one, or a survey to evaluate the services and see whether the pay was too much or too little.

An employee who received $1,200 was given a $240 raise. On his salary above $1,200 he received an increase of 10 percent on all the overplus of his salary up to $4,600. That gave the employee who received $4,000 $220 on the first $1,200 and 10 percent on the next $2,800, or $280 more. So he received an increase of somewhere between $400 or $500. That increase was a dollar increase. That increase was money in his pocket with which he could buy more food needed for his family, or with which he could buy food at higher prices.

The employee in the bracket from $7,000 to $7,500 received an increase of 6 or 7 percent—perhaps it was six and a fraction percent. The employee who received $7,500 was given a 7.5-percent increase. Seven percent on $7,000 is $490. The employee whose salary was $7,000 received roughly $500 more in his pocket with which to pay for the necessities of living, the food and clothing which he and his family had to buy.

An employee who received a salary of $9,000 was given an increase of $640. He received 6.53 percent increase on his salary. He got a little bit more by way of increase than the employees whose salary was $7,000, in order to meet the necessities of life.

This was not done to readjust the ratio in the pay scale between what he was doing, and what another employee down the line or up the line from him was doing, but to meet the cost of living, to meet the emergency situation, to meet the increased prices. That was the situation with respect to the measure which became effective July 1 last.

TRANSFER TO TEXAS OF LAND AND PERSONAL PROPERTY IN LIMESTONE COUNTY

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar, S. 1471, Calendar No. 791, which should have immediate consideration, by reason of the fact that failure to pass the bill heretofore is delaying action in taking care of certain incapacitated persons in the State of Texas. The bill has the approval of everyone concerned, including the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and was approved unanimously by the committee and was reported to the Senate. The urgency in the matter is due to the fact that the bill must go to the House of Representatives in order to be passed before Christmas. It concerns a parcel of land in Texas which is owned by a Texas corporation, which desires to transfer it to another Texas corporation under the control of the Board of Control, which handles all eleemosynary institutions in the State of Texas. These institutions are overcrowded, and the jails are filled with poor unfortunate individuals who cannot be taken care of properly.

Passage of the bill is necessary because the Texas corporation which originally owned the land transferred it to the Secretary of Agriculture, as a trustee, to hold in trust, for the purpose of rehabilitating farm families. The Secretary of Agriculture was unable to perform that function, and later the war came on and he permitted the use of the property for prisoner-of-war camps. Now it is unfit for the original purpose, and all parties concerned, including the War Department, the Surplus Property Custodian, the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and all members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have agreed that the bill should be passed giving the Secretary of Agriculture permission to transfer the property to the State of Texas.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the bill applies only to a piece of property in the State of Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And the bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and has the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct. It meets with entire approval.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that the bill has been considered by all members of the committee, on both sides of the aisle, and that they all feel the same way about it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is true. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1471) to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, convey, grant, and quitclaim unto Texas Rural Communities, for subsequent use by or transfer to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State Board of Control, for the benefit and rehabilitation of convalescent or handicapped residents of the State of Texas, all right, title, claim, interest, equity, and estate in and to the real and personal property comprising the Mexia Colony project of Farm Security Administration, Limestone County, Texas, presently administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as trustee under an agreement of transfer, dated October 31, 1939, with Texas Rural Communities.

SEC. 2. Such transfer by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be subject to any legal rights existing by virtue of any lease or other agreement by the Secretary, his successors or representatives, as such trustee.

SEC. 3. Any such transfer shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under such agreement of transfer of October 31, 1939.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Iowa for yielding.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. BYRD. Very few Senators are in the Chamber, and I should like to have more Senators hear the Senator's speech. Would it be in order to make the point of no quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make the point of no quorum at this time. It is now nearly half past 5. If it is agreeable to the Senator from California, I should like to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Iowa is making a constructive and valuable statement on this subject. It ought to be heard by as many Senators as possible. I agree that it would be well to take a recess at this time, with the hope, at least, that more Senators may be present tomorrow to listen to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield so that I may move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia, for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the foreign service of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur A. Quinn to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Chaplain Luther Deck Miller (brigadier general, Chief of Chaplains), United States Army.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Emil J. Koch, Warner Springs, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

FLORIDA

Neil H. Connell, Weirsdale, Fla., in place of T. F. Connell, retired.

GEORGIA

Carr McLemore, Surrency, Ga., in place of E. S. Brindle, retired.

ILLINOIS

Lucille G. I. Johnson, Malden, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Robert L. Ryerson, West York, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IOWA

Ralph L. Zearley, Garber, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

LOUISIANA

Enolia T. Ordoyne, Larose, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Mary E. Burbank, Maplewood, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Earle S. Treend, Gobles, Mich., in place of Earl Hudson, removed.

MISSOURI

Harvey H. Reynolds, Cairo, Mo., in place of R. L. McKinney, resigned.

Irvin P. Swift, Delta, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Christena Ramsey, Novelty, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

NEBRASKA

Salem Abraham, Ainsworth, Nebr., in place of E. D. Collins, retired.

William G. Hoffman, Bladen, Nebr., in place of F. B. Householder, transferred.

NEW YORK

Josephine E. Morrison, Lake Pleasant, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane M. Phillis, Fombell, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clarence C. MacKenzie, Hatboro, Pa., in place of A. C. Winner, deceased.

Lillian J. Biggerstaff, Hunkers, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George R. Frey, Kutztown, Pa., in place of R. D. Stein, killed in action.

Grace F. Brant, Plumville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Verna Heppe, Sheppton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

David J. Scales, Jr., Susquehanna, Pa., in place of E. J. Holleran, deceased.

TEXAS

Lula M. Winfough, Darrouzett, Tex., in place of M. L. Beck, resigned.

Roy L. Nickels, McAdoo, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mary Newman Lemmons, Pantex, Tex. Office became Presidential April 1, 1945.

Bernice E. McCoy, Prairie Lea, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John F. Dickinson, Riviera, Tex., in place of L. H. North, resigned.

Reid B. Horney, Robstown, Tex., in place of O. T. Kellam, resigned.

Viola I. Havenhill, Twitty, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Lora M. Antoine, Chelan Falls, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WISCONSIN

Carrie Vos, Kansasville, Wis., in place of A. H. Vos, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Arthur A Quinn, to be comptroller of customs for customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

Maude R. Phelps, Clarksville.
Mary E. Cavey, Ilchester.
Ethel Goddard, St. Marys City.

OREGON

Margery A. Kron, Garden Home.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, hold us to the realization that tomorrow we shall be judged by a generation which has the right to the inheritance of our faith today. Ours is a declared responsibility of good government, and herein we must match our faith against all difficulties. While nations are in turmoil and disquiet is sweeping our business world, while restlessness is running through human ranks with easy contagion, and trembling hearts are passing down into the valley where lie the long shadows of sorrow, O infinite Father, show our country the way to deliverance. O grip its thought with a passionate patriotism, that unhappi-

ness in the home, hatred in the task, and madness in the street may be no more. Holy Spirit, faithful guide, kindle in us a new conception of our religion that will embody all the principles of the dignity of the human soul. Hear our humble prayer for Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1152) entitled "An act to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BILBO, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. HOEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthews Mattas; and

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Post Office Department.
5. Interstate Commerce Commission.
6. Interim International Information Service.
7. National Archives.
8. Office of Price Administration.
9. Petroleum Administration for War.
10. Selective Service System.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a broadcast by Ken Miller over radio station KVOO, Tulsa, Okla., and in the other a letter from Ferdie Deering, editor of the Farmer-Stockman, and an item appearing in the Daily Oklahoman.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each an article.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Facing Winter appearing in today's Washington Post.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address delivered by Mr. Henry Morgenthau and in the other an editorial from the New York Enquirer.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE WAITS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEICHEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN BROADCAST INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, as I pointed out yesterday, is being liquidated as a result of House action in rescinding part of FCC's National Defense Appropriation. The demise of the FBIS is dangerous to the National Welfare and will create a major gap in our means of fathering world-wide intelligence.

The present organization of FBIS contains listening posts at Guam; Kauai; Portland, Oreg.; Washington, D. C.; and London. Each site has been carefully selected to obtain optimum reception. Each station has elaborate engineering facilities which have taken a long time to perfect. The staff contains highly trained linguists, engineers, and transmitter experts whom it would require months and years to train to their present level of efficiency. If FBIS is liquidated, this physical plant and trained personnel will be scattered to the four winds.

The intelligence gathering agencies of this Government require foreign broadcast monitoring. Some time after FBIS goes out of existence, a similar monitoring service will have to be recreated. The disadvantages of allowing the present organization to die, only to start a new one several months from now, are obvious: First, the initial dollar cost of setting up a new organization will be at least three times as much as the cost of operating the present going concern during the remainder of the fiscal year. Second, the present sites with their facilities and complicated lease arrangements will be dismantled. Third, the highly trained personnel of FBIS will no longer be available.

In addition to all those reasons why it is false economy to scuttle FBIS, there is this all-important one: During the long period when there will be no monitoring, this Government will be without some of the most important intelligence available concerning international affairs.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

WHEN DID WAR END?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a sailor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which was sent with a letter to the Committee on Foreign Affairs from the Secretary of State be a part of my remarks today. I understood yesterday that it would be inserted in the RECORD when the resolution was tabled. There is nothing secret about them. Already that information has been made public

but I feel that it should be a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I shall make in the Committee of the Whole upon the bill S. 380, I may include as part of my remarks the bill H. R. 4181, some comments thereon, and such editorials and figures as may be pertinent to my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two speeches, one by B. C. Forbes, and one by himself at the recent meeting of Investors League in Chicago.

AIR-MAIL POSTAGE

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAGEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain tables showing that our national debt and obligations amount to over $620,000,000,000 at the present time. That is not including the proposed loan. I also ask unanimous consent to include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent statement by J. Henry Scattergood.

TIME FOR ACTION ON PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee by a vote of 17 to 1 yesterday adopted a resolution providing for, first, unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine within its absorptive economic capacity; second, an eventual democratic commonwealth; third, a Jewish national home.

This should be a ringing summons to the House Foreign Affairs Committee to adopt forthwith an identic resolution so that there can be compliance with the Palestine planks in both the Republican and Democratic platforms.

Significantly, General Montgomery, a brave soldier and distinguished general, under British orders is turning back across the border Polish-Jews fleeing pogroms. Thus, on the one hand, Britain cruelly refuses to receive the refugees, and, on the other hand, forbids them going to the one place where they can live in safety and dignity—the one place where they are not unwanted—Palestine.

Britain is guilty of deepest depravity and inhumanity in her treatment of Jews and her perfidy on Palestine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

ATTACKS ON COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include certain excerpts from the RECORD and from newspaper publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury and other governmental departments, at the direction of the President, are out propagandizing the public and molding the Congress into shape for the approval of an additional so-called loan of $4,400,000,000 to England. The Keynes-Morgenthau international monetary and financial scheme, euphemistically called Bretton Woods, was rammed down Congress' throat on the ostensible ground that it was needed to form one of the main pillars of the peace structure and to make loans to foreign nations. So far as I know, ours is the only Government which has acted as though it might believe this.

Having inveigled the Congress into approving the scheme England and the other countries shrewdly delayed to accept it. Why? Because this put them in a bargaining position to force Congress to approve additional loans to them. Lord Keynes and his UNO crowd, with the support of the administration, are virtually telling the Congress that unless it gives assurance of furnishing them with additional loans to those provided in Bretton Woods they will not sign the Bretton Woods agreement.

This appears to be the dilemma Congress now is in. To refuse to approve these loans would almost be tantamount to wrecking the main part of the foundation of the peace machinery and cause the whole thing to go smash.

The promoters of these loans are exploiting to the limit this abnormal situation in which they have placed Congress as a bargaining weapon to force the United States to underwrite their economies, and socialistic economies at that, not temporarily but permanently.

How many more billions is it expected our taxpaying public will furnish to keep this "one world" business going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made last Sunday by Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, a very powerful and timely speech on the necessity of further appropriations to continue UNRRA, in order to save countless thousands of lives of unfortunate persons during the coming winter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL and Mr. WALTER asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

BALTIC REFUGEES

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I made an appeal from this floor, and subsequently addressed a communication to His Majesty's Swedish Government, that they not turn over to Russia a group of 167 Baltic nationals who had escaped to Sweden. The American press was subsequently full of ghastly pictures, depicting the scenes of German nationals and these Baltic nationals attempting self-destruction to evade return to Russian-occupied territory.

At this time I refer only to those of the Baltic races, especially the Lithuanian groups, and I appeal to Secretary Byrnes from the floor of Congress that in his meeting with the Russians and the British at Moscow this week this problem be reexamined as part of his agenda and that steps be taken from now on to examine with greater exactitude the transporting back to Russia of the nationals of Slavic and Baltic ancestry and middle Europe. Especially do I have reference to Poles and Lithuanians, whose return to Russia is an order of execution after a sentence of death.

REORGANIZATIONS IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"Short title

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Reorganization Act of 1945.'

"Need for reorganization

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this Act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"(c) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this Act, shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 per centum in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

"Reorganization plans

"SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

"(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

"(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions, as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified in the plan, he has found that such transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function specified in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

"Other contents of plans

"SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

"(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of transfers, consolidations and coordinations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than four years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition;

"(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any function or agency transferred, consolidated, or coordinated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer, consolidation, or coordination for use in connection with the transferred, consolidated, or coordinated functions, or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

"(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

"Limitations on powers with respect to reorganizations

"SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

"(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or

"(3) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(4) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(5) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or

"(7) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office.

"(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board.

"(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.

"(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.

"(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this Act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

"(f) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1948.

"Taking effect of reorganizations

"SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

"(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"Definition of 'agency'

"SEC. 7. When used in this Act, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

"Matters deemed to be reorganizations

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this Act, any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, change or designation of name or title, disposition, winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency, referred to in section 3 or 4, shall be deemed a 'reorganization'.

"Saving provisions

"SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed, in respect of or by any agency or function transferred to, or consolidated or coordinated with, any other agency or function under the provisions of this Act, before the effective date of such transfer, consolidation, or coordination, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer, consolidation, or coordination had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested functions in the agency from which the transfer is made under the plan, such functions shall, insofar as they are to be exercised after the transfer, be considered as vested in the agency to which the transfer is made under the plan.

"(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term 'regulation or other action' means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization under the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such reorganization takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization so effected or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

"Unexpended appropriations

"SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this Act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"Printing of reorganization plans

"SEC. 11. If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

"(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term 'resolution' means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 .', the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

"SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of ten calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, ten calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

"(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

"SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed ten hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

"(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

"SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

"(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

"(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

"(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

"(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CLARE HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
CARL A. HATCH,
ABE MURDOCK,
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the con-

ferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as agreed to in conference is generally similar to the bill as passed by the House. A number of clarifying amendments and changes in phraseology have been made which it is not necessary to explain. A few important substantive changes from the House bill have been made, however, and these changes are stated below.

EXEMPTED AGENCIES

The agencies exempted from the act in whole or in part are exactly the same under the conference agreement and the House bill, with the following exceptions:

Railroad labor and retirement agencies: Under the House bill (sec. 5 (b)) no reorganization plan could affect any provision of the railroad retirement acts or subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act or the Railroad Labor Act, nor could any plan affect any agency functioning pursuant to, or functions being performed pursuant to such acts, except functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue not related to subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Under the conference agreement (sec. 5 (b)) in lieu of this provision the Railroad Retirement Board, National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board are placed in the same exempt status as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, so that no reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any of these agencies, but the provision does not prevent the transfer to one of such agencies of other agencies or functions.

Corps of Engineers: Under the House bill (sec. 5 (d)) no reorganization plan could abolish any civil function of the corps or of its head or vest any such civil function in any agency outside the control and jurisdiction of the War Department, except under a separate plan not involving reorganizations of other agencies. Transfers to the corps of other agencies and functions were not subject to this limitation.

Under the conference agreement (sec. 5 (c) no reorganization plan may provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such corps or its head with respect to any such civil function.

Civil Service Commission: Under the House bill (sec. 5 (c)) no reorganization plan could provide for a reorganization affecting the Civil Service Commission, except under a separate plan not involving reorganizations of any other agency, but the prohibition did not apply to the transfer to the Civil Service Commission of other agencies and functions.

Under the conference agreement (sec. 5 (d)) this exemption of the Civil Service Commission is removed.

Quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions: Section 2 (h) of the Senate amendment contains a provision not found in the House bill providing that no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under the act shall have the effect of, divesting any quasi-judicial agency of the means, right, or power to exercise independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the performance and effectuation of its quasi-judicial, investigative, or rule-making functions.

In lieu of this provision the conference agreement (sec. 5 (a) (6)) includes a provision in the bill to the effect that no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under the act shall have the effect of, imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which vested prior to the taking effect of the reorganization; but this prohibition is not to prevent the abolition of any such function.

DEAD LINE ON TRANSMITTAL OF PLAN

Under the House bill (sec. 5 (e)) no reorganization could take effect unless the plan was transmitted to Congress before July 1, 1948. The Senate amendment (sec. 4 (d)) made this date July 1, 1947. Under the conference agreement (sec. 5 (f)) the date is made April 1, 1948.

SAVINGS RESULTING FROM REORGANIZATIONS

Section 2 (c) of the House bill stated that it is the policy and expectation of Congress that the transfers, consolidations, and abolitions contained in each reorganization plan shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative cost in the agency or agencies affected by the plan.

Section 3 of the House bill provided that the President, in his message transmitted with the reorganization plan, should state to such extent as he deemed practicable approximately the reduction of expenditures, if any, which it is probable will be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the plan.

The above-referred-to provision of section 3 was not contained in the Senate bill and is omitted under the conference agreement. The House provision in section 2 (c) above referred to did not appear in the Senate amendment. Under the conference agreement (sec. 2 (c)) it is provided that it is the expectation of Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under the act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

DECLARED PURPOSES OF ACT

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided that the President shall determine what changes in the reorganization of the Government are necessary to accomplish certain-named purposes. One additional purpose contained in the Senate amendment, but not in the House bill, is retained under the conference agreement (sec. 2 (a) (1)). It is "to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace."

CONTENTS OF PLANS

Under both bills, when the President found that the consolidation of the whole or any part of an agency or of its functions with any other agency or its functions was necessary to accomplish one of the purposes of the act, he could include such consolidation in the reorganization plan. The Senate amendment (sec. 3 (a) (2) and (3)) added "coordination" to the provisions with respect to consolidation, and the conference agreement (sec. 3 (3) and (4)) accepts this addition.

The House bill (sec. 4 (2)) provided that the plan might include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency; but the compensation so fixed should be at a rate not in excess of $12,000 a year and confirmation by the Senate was required in the case of appointments at over $9,800 a year. The Senate amendment (sec. 3 (b) (5)) fixed the highest permissible compensation under the plan at $10,000 and the conference agreements adopts this change. The Senate amendment provided for Senate confirmation of all appointments of heads of agencies or (except for appointment under the classified civil service) in the case of appointments as a "policy maker" or at a rate of compensation in excess of $5,000 a year. The conference agreement (sec. 4 (2)) is the same as the House bill except that it is provided that, when the appointment (regardless of rate of compensation) of a head or assistant head of an agency is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The House bill and the Senate amendment both provide for the abolition of the whole or any part of an agency if such agency does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the plan will not have, any functions. The Senate amendment adds a parenthetical clause listing the circumstances under which the absence of the functions may occur which reads as follows:

"(by reason of reorganizations under this act or otherwise or by reason of termination of its functions in any other manner)."

This provision, which was also found in the Reorganization Act of 1939, was omitted from the House bill and is also omitted under the conference agreement on the ground that it is purely surplusage and adds nothing to the bill.

PROHIBITIONS ON REORGANIZATIONS

The Senate amendment (sec. 2 (1)) provided that no plan should contain any provisions increasing the term of office beyond that provided by law for such office. The House bill did not contain this provision. It is retained under the conference agreement (sec. 5 (a) (7)), although even without the provision the bill does not authorize any such increase.

The conference agreement (sec. 5 (e)) adds a prohibition, not found in the House bill, which is a modified version of a provision of the Senate amendment. This provision of the conference agreement provides that if, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under the act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies. It also provides that if, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under the act shall have the effect of, abolishing such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

The Senate amendment (sec. 2 (e)) contains an express prohibition against consolidating with any executive department any other executive department or all the functions thereof. Under the conference agreement this is omitted as surplusage, being fully covered by other provisions (sec. 5 (a) (1) of the bill as agreed to in conference) prohibiting transfers of an executive department or all of its functions.

CARTER MANASCO,
JOHN J. COCHRAN,
WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
CLARE HOFFMAN,
GEORGE H. BENDER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed the reorganization bill on October 4, 1945. On November 19, 1945, the Senate struck all after the enacting clause and inserted the Senate reorganization bill.

Under the conference report the bill, as agreed to, while it may have been an entirely new bill, emphasizes only matters that were agreed to by either or both of the Houses. No new matters except clarification of provisions are embraced in the conference report.

The bill, as agreed to, retains not only the form but the substance of the bill as it passed the House. Where retained, the additional matter embraced in the Senate bill is included at the appropriate place in the House bill as passed.

PURPOSES

The purposes and objectives are set forth in section 2. They include not only the language of the House bill but clarifying language of the Senate bill. The purpose includes a modification of the so-called Martin amendment. The conference report expresses the hope that the reorganizations will result in an overall reduction of administrative costs of not less than 25 percent. The provisions contained in the objectives of the House are retained. Economy is mentioned and emphasized. Revenues are given their proper place. Not only agencies but functions may be abolished.

PLANS

The plans as passed by the House are preserved.

The substance of the so-called Taft amendment in the Senate is retained. It covers measures passed after January 1, 1945.

QUASI-JUDICIAL AGENCIES

Agencies were urged to be exempted because they were quasi-judicial. An amendment was included in the Senate bill that stipulated that no reorganization plans should divest a quasi-judicial agency of its power to exercise independent judgment. It has not been the view that the transfer of an independent agency to a department would deprive such agency of its quasi-judicial functions. The only case cited was the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was not deprived of its quasi-judicial functions. But to preserve the principle, the proposed language to prevent divesting such an independent agency of its quasi-judicial functions is retained in the conference report. It is believed that the provisions protect any agency with quasi-judicial investigative or rule-making functions that may be transferred.

EXEMPTIONS

The Senate and the House bills treated exemptions by a different method. The House bill provided the exemptions named. The Senate bill excluded them from the definition of an agency. The substance of the House bill was retained. The Senate bill did not include the Civil Service Commission and the Veterans' Administration among its exemptions. It did include the Maritime Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal land bank. The conference report retains the Veterans' Administration, but does not include as exceptions the Federal land bank, the Federal Power Commission, the Maritime Commission, or the Civil Service Commission. The Senate, I repeat, had declined to include the Civil Service Commission. The House, I emphasize, had rejected not once, but twice, the exclusion of the Maritime Commission. This Commission constructed more than 6,000 ships to win the war. They have expended multiplied billions of dollars. Now that the war is over, it can certainly do no harm when the matter of combining the whole Army and the Navy is under consideration to take a look at the Maritime Commission. The Federal Power Commission only has a small number of employees. Its quasi-judicial functions are preserved. All admitted that the Federal land bank should never have been included in the first instance. No one assigned a cause for including it. In the conference report, Federal land banks are not exempt. The conference report, therefore, with respect to exemptions is an improvement on either the Senate or the House bills. The categories of the House bill are retained with the one exception of the Civil Service Commission. The conference report agrees that the provision of the Senate bill in substance exempting the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers should be substituted for the House provision that called for a vote up or down.

DATE

The conference report provides that all reorganizations must be submitted by April 1, 1948, rather than July 1, 1948, as provided by the House bill, or July 1, 1947, as provided by the Senate bill.

TITLE II

Title II of the bill as passed by the House, identical with title II as passed by the Senate, is retained in the conference report. This title is for the benefit of those who oppose the reorganization. As best the matter can be devised by parliamentary procedure, the rights of the opposition are protected. A vote is assured.

CONCLUSION

The Reorganization Act describes the standards, authorizes the President to submit plans, and it takes both Houses to pass the reorganization bill. Having authorized the President to make the reorganization, the Senate and the House bills both provided that it would take a concurrent resolution of both Houses to nullify the reorganization. The conference report so provides. The purpose of reorganization is emphasized. The objective is to reduce administrative expenditures, promote economy, abolish functions, and to increase efficiency within governmental revenues. Adequate machinery for the submission of plans to accomplish the objectives are provided. I am familiar with all of the reorganization acts passed. The last act was passed in 1939. The conference report is the most effective and the most efficient reorganization bill ever passed by Congress and should be promptly approved.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of every committee that has considered a reorganization bill for the executive departments, whether it was a standing committee, a select committee, or a joint committee, that has been set up since the Coolidge administration. I feel that the conference report that is presented here today, contains language that will give the President all the power he needs to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. It has few restrictions.

The President, in a special message to the Congress, asked for this legislation. The Congress has responded in such a way as to put the President on the spot. The responsibility now rests with the President.

Let no one tell you that it is not a tremendous job, and if the President is to succeed he must have as advisers the best minds that are available. In my opinion, Secretary of State Byrnes and Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, members of the President's Cabinet, should certainly be able to render outstanding service to the President in connection with this great task. Then there is the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay Warren, who knows as much about the executive branch of the Government as any man I have ever come in contact with. All three of these gentlemen have served on reorganization committees that I have been a member of.

I took the liberty of sending to Mr. Warren a copy of this bill as finally agreed upon and asked him to go over it carefully and let me have his reaction. Mr. Warren was a member of the 1932 Reorganization Committee. He was a member of the committee that considered the 1937 and 1939 bills. For the information of the House I include as part of my remarks the letter I received from Mr. Warren. It follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, December 11, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: I have complied with your request and have carefully gone over H. R. 4129 (reorganization bill) as agreed upon by the Senate and House conferees. In my opinion, this is the best and strongest measure on reorganization that has ever been passed by the Congress. It is a much better measure than the unlimited, but unconstitutional, authority granted to President Hoover, and to the unlimited authority given to President Roosevelt in the early part of his administration. It is vastly superior to the compromise act of 1939. The present measure clearly shows the close study that has been given it by the committees and conferees, and it refutes the statement we often hear made that Congress does not carefully consider the language and effect of legislative proposals. The interests of not only the departments and agencies of the Government, but of the people at large, are adequately protected by the detail listing of standards and limitations with which the bill guides and controls the President in his exercise of the powers granted.

It is my opinion that when the bill becomes a law, the President will be given the opportunity to do a magnificent job for efficiency and economy in government.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

In conclusion let me say that your conferees reached an agreement with the Senate that enabled us to bring back to you a bill which as the report shows is generally similar to the bill as was passed by the House. We have performed our duty and I for one anxiously await recommendations from the President that will not only increase the efficiency of the executive branch of the Government but will also provide for economy.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, when the bill H. R. 4129 was pending in the House, I offered an amendment which sought to exempt the Maritime Commission from the operation of the bill. The amendment was defeated.

I thought that it should have been adopted, and explained that the amendment would exempt the Maritime Commission.

I explained that under the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, the United States Maritime Commission has broad regulatory powers over carriers by water engaged in carrying commerce between the United States and its island possessions. These functions are similar to and patterned after the functions which are exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission. For example, the Commission enforces a statutory prohibition against the granting of rebates or using other discriminatory or unfair methods by carriers so that shippers and competing carriers may be protected from unjust treatment. Common carriers by water are required to file for the Commission's approval their agreements and schedules concerning rates, competition, and pooling and are forbidden to indulge in such unfair practices as false billing, false weighing, giving of preferences, allowing persons to obtain transportation at less than regulatory rates and unjust insurers not to give competing carriers favorable rates of insurance. The Commission is also empowered to determine whether rates are unjustly discriminatory between shippers or ports or unjustly prejudicial to exporters. It may enforce just and reasonable regulations relating to handling, storing, and delivering property. It may suspend filed rates and in their place fix just and reasonable maximum or minimum rates. It may prescribe just and reasonable classifications, tariffs, regulations, or practices.

In the field of foreign shipping the Commission is charged with determining whether or not conference agreements filed with the Commission are just and reasonable.

Under the Shipping Act, 1916, the Maritime Commission has broad regulatory authority over persons carrying on the business of forwarding or furnishing wharfage, dock, warehouse, or other terminal facilities in connection with common carriers by water.

The duties are very similar to those performed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and are far more important because here we are dealing also with conferences in which foreign shippers participate and we may need to protect American commerce. I ask the adoption of the amendment.

When the bill was considered in the Senate, it exempted the Maritime Commission from the provisions of the bill.

Conferees were appointed and, as chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I, joined by other members of my committee, sought to have the House conferees accept the Senate amendment. We attempted to convince the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment for the following reasons:

The Maritime Commission conforms to the prinicple of exception set out in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee on this bill, in that it is an independent establishment—an arm of Congress—exercising quasi-judicial powers and powers legislative in character. Wherever privately owned and operated transportation systems and public utilities are regulated in this country it is by this form of agency—the commission form. The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates interstate domestic transportation. The Maritime Commission regulates ocean transportation. The execution of the policy of the Merchant Marine Act is committed by Congress to the hands of the Maritime Commission, the policy of the Merchant Marine Act, which must be consistent over a long period of years to be effective. Its members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. These appointments are made with the purpose of maintaining the Commission independent from political influence and are staggered so that only one term ends in any one year. Not more than a majority of the commissioners may belong to any one political party, thus the Commission is kept free from the changing policies or direct influences of a particular administration. Its functions are among others quasi-judicial—or judicial—and legislative in the matter of regulation of ocean carriers. It may award damages or "reparation" for past injuries and may prescribe rates or practices for the future legislative functions. It reports directly to Congress and is required to make direct recommendations for legislative change if it finds such change desirable. The Supreme Court, in *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602), in describing another independent establishment, at page 625, states:

> Thus, the language of the act, the legislative reports, and the general purposes of the legislation as reflected by the debates, all combine to demonstrate the congressional intent to create a body of experts who shall gain experience by length of service—a body which shall be independent of executive authority, except in its selection, and free to exercise its judgment without the leave or hindrance of any other official or any department of the Government.

The Maritime Commission is, as the Supreme Court said in Humphrey's Executor against United States, supra, "charged with the enforcement of no policy except the policy of the law." The policies which it applies are determined by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

Ocean transportation was first effectively regulated by Congress when it established the United States Shipping Board in 1916 as an independent agency, of which the Maritime Commission is a direct successor. The agency continued independent until the present time, except for a short period from 1933 to 1935, when the Shipping Board was placed under the Department of Commerce as a bureau. It is generally recognized that the short period when it was not independent was an unhappy one in which there was confusion of policy and consequent damage to the merchant marine. That experience was one of the reasons for reestablishing the Shipping Board as an independent agency under the form of the Maritime Commission in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. The administration of that act by the Commission as an independent agency has been recognized as successful and there is no demand from the maritime industry, from shippers, or from the public to impair the independence of the Commission or to have it placed in an executive department, where functionally it does not belong.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, under the act of 1887, was originally placed in the Interior Department and within a year thereafter the Secretary of the Interior himself recommended that it be made an independent agency, and Congress made it an independent agency forthwith and it has remained such ever since.

The conferees failed to accept the views advanced by the members of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and filed a conference report which does not exempt the Maritime Commission from reorganization.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries met today, considered the conference report, and decided that it would acquiesce in the report, and would appoint a special subcommittee to cooperate in working out a reorganization which would be in the best interest of the merchant marine, in the promotion of commerce, in the building of trade, in saving money for the taxpayers, and in carrying out the objectives of the legislative. The committee hopes in this way to be constructive and the committee will welcome every opportunity to help in carrying forward the program of the President and to help the committee in charge of the pending legislation.

The committee will not resist the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today may be transferred to Monday, December 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the reorganization bill and that my remarks be inserted just before the approval of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request, my remarks to follow those of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to, before final action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT-PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 449 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of S. 380, an act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of a very important bill; consequently the Committee on Rules granted a request for a full day to be given over to general debate on the bill. It will be taken up under the 5-minute rule tomorrow.

I say this is an important bill and is urged by the President; moreover, it has been urged by many people who believe that we must and should provide full employment for the American laboring man. That was the title of the original bill. This bill does not include the word "full" employment but aims to carry out the recommendations made to provide full employment.

About 5 months ago the various representatives of industry, aided by some gentlemen here in Washington, proclaimed to the world that there would be from eight to ten million unemployed as soon as the war ended and the war plants closed. Knowing something about what was going on in the way of propaganda by large and even some small industries, I came to the conclusion that those reports were made for the purpose of scaring the laboring men and the returning soldiers so that when they came back they would be ready to accept any and all employment or work at much lower wages than they were entitled to receive and in many instances on which they and their families could not exist. So I gave the matter some study and made an investigation. A few weeks thereafter I made a speech over the radio, not here on the floor of the House because at times anything I say is not taken seriously by certain people who, however, should give some consideration and pay attention to good advice that is given. In my radio speech I called attention to the fact that there was no danger of great unemployment and I am greatly pleased and gratified to know that I was right. In fact there is a shortage of labor now in nearly every section of our country. You can take the newspapers, scan over the want ads and you will find hundreds upon hundreds of advertisements asking for labor of all kinds.

I hope that all the industries and all the employers will obtain all the needed labor they require; on the other hand, I hope that all the employees, all of the wage earners and all of the American people will be able to obtain positions and receive a pay that they can live and exist on.

This bill is brought in as Senate bill 380. That means, the Senate having passed this bill, that it came to the House and was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that has worked hard and held hearings for many, many days. The President and many of us thought that they were slow in proceeding with their deliberations and action. But later we learned that that committee, in their desire to bring in a bill that could be approved by the House, a bill that would aim to do what the President recommended, namely, provide full employment naturally, for the purpose of bringing about harmony and an approval of their work, deliberated for many weeks, and finally recommended a bill which is embodied in the Senate bill. So today we will not consider the Senate bill but will consider instead the House bill which has been substituted for the provisions of the Senate bill.

Some of my friends of labor thought that the Senate bill should have been adopted as reported, with few amendments. Others again differed. Of course, honest men will differ. They cannot always agree on all points. So I was originally for the bill that was recommended by the President, as reported. I cannot help but feel that the committee has done a splendid piece of work by trying to harmonize and bring in proper provisions, though perhaps not as urged originally for full employment, but the aims of the bill seem to me to be toward bringing about full employment. In view of the various viewpoints on the part of many honest and sincere men and women who advocated the bill H. R. 2202—if I am not mistaken, that was the number—I feel that they have been given an opportunity, and that they themselves came to the conclusion that perhaps in the interest of obtaining early legislation they recommended that the rule be granted on the Senate bill 380 as amended by the House committee. But in view of the fact that they still feel that some of the provisions should be changed and made stronger, the Committee on Rules granted an open rule. It is not one of those wide rules that would permit any and every amendment, such as was granted on the Smith-May-Arends-Connally bill, whether germane or not, but it is an open rule that will permit, when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, the offering of amendments that some Members feel should be embodied in this bill. I hope that if any of those amendments will improve the bill they will be adopted.

In view of the fact that legislation is after all a compromise, we, in this instance, I feel, should recognize that we cannot at all times have our way and must yield to the judgment and convictions of other well-meaning and honest men. Of course, I know there are some people who dislike any kind of a bill that would provide for any organization or anything that may aid the cause of labor, but this bill is not a bill merely to aid the cause of labor, it is just as much a bill in the interest of industry as it is for labor. I have no fault to find with the provisions because after all we must recognize and should realize that it is for the best interests of our Nation that both industry and labor should be aided and should cooperate. I hope that by the adoption of this bill and by other sane legislation we can bring about, and we should try to bring about, the elimination of the strife that is now existing.

Of course, industry wants to make all the money it can. They have acquired enormous surpluses; they have made tremendous profits and still they want to increase their great profits and wealth, but when it comes to granting a little increase to the wage earners so that they can exist, not to accumulate great wealth but to earn sufficient money to decently and properly provide for themselves and their families, immediately there is a hue and cry that they are demanding exorbitant increases in wages, when in fact, when we take into consideration that during the war thousands of these men were working overtime and were obtaining a high wage, and that today they are not working overtime but are working shorter hours, and that the envelopes that they bring home to their wives—I hope all of them do, although they are not very fat—the wives find it mighty hard to get along on the reduced portion they contain, because the wages they are bringing home are less in many instances by 30 to 35 percent, this notwithstanding the fact that the cost of living has been going up and up. Only this morning I observed in the newspaper that the cost of living has gone up 39 percent. I say to those who give out that information that the cost of food, the cost of living outside of the rents, because they were holding down the price, has gone up by 55 to 60 percent.

In view of these conditions I feel that it will inure to the benefit of industry if they would be fairer than they have been and show a disposition to do justice to the men who have not been enriched by the war and who have not accumulated a substantial bank account. There is no real opposition to the bill. I know it will be fully explained by the chairman of that committee, who has devoted a great deal of time to its consideration, as have the many able members of his committee.

They have had the bill before them, as I stated, and heard evidence and studied it. They have heard the arguments pro and con. Naturally, they are bound to be in a much better position concerning

a knowledge of the provisions of the bill than I am. Consequently, in order that they may have as much time as possible in general debate, I shall conclude my remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of S. 380, a bill allegedly for the purpose of providing full employment. The rule provides that general debate upon this measure shall be confined to 1 day. Actually this bill is not S. 380, but instead is an entirely new bill written by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee labored for many weeks in the consideration of this legislation and has brought in a very much divided report. I see here that a minority report has been filed on the measure, and also a statement of separate views has been filed. So that the committee in reporting this measure has been very much divided, just as it was divided in its consideration.

This bill, as I have read it, and as I heard it discussed before the Committee on Rules, is filled with pious platitudes but actually does nothing as far as assuring full employment is concerned except to provide a few choice political plums for some of the favored few. Actually this bill gives to the President and to the Congress no authority which the President and the Congress do not already have. The bill simply provides for the creation of a Council of Economic Advisers to the President. Three of these councilors would be appointed, each to receive $15,000 a year, with a total of $345,000 to be appropriated for the use of the Council. Of course, that, as many of you understand, I am sure, is simply the first year's appropriation. A little later on, after this new Council is created, there will be many reasons why, as the gentleman from North Carolina so well knows, the Council will need greatly increased funds.

If this measure becomes law, a new agency of Government will be created by a Congress which has pledged the people to materially reduce the number of Federal employees and the number of governmental agencies.

This bill also provides for the creation of a new joint congressional committee by a Congress which recently established another joint congressional committee to study and find methods by which the present number of committees in Congress may be drastically reduced. In other words, by this legislation we set up a new governmental agency downtown and a new committee up here on Capitol Hill. To do what? Well, to just do the very things the Government already has the right to do; to study, if you please, all of the various factors entering into employment, or the lack thereof, in this country, and to then report to the whole Congress for all of us to do something about it.

This bill actually does not guarantee full employment. It just talks about lifting the level of employment—or the need for a high level of employment. Of course, everybody in America I have ever heard say anything about the subject, regardless of political party, regardless of economic position, are all for a high level of employment. Everyone wants that. That is a desirable situation. But I am not at all certain legislation of this type will be of any benefit in getting it.

I think that most of my listeners know that sometimes there is a great interest in getting any kind of a bill out on the floor of the House. So this bill was reported. I believe most of you know that the real reason why this measure is here is because there is a belief in administration circles that if any kind of a measure is adopted—and it is one of those "any kind" of measures, as the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee so ably pointed out just a few minutes ago—if any kind of a measure is adopted, then the bill will go to conference between the House and Senate; and the conference committee, which, of course, will be controlled by administration forces, will move to substitute the Patman bill, which is very broad in its implications and very definite in its commitments; the Patman substitute bill, which was defeated in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments at the time this particular measure was adopted. So I believe that in the consideration of this bill we should not overlook all of these different factors.

I urge every one of you to read the committee report on this measure. I am sure it will be quite interesting. I believe you will be interested in comparing the original bill, S. 380, which appears here as stricken out, with the provisions of the new bill substituted by the House committee.

Mr. CHURCH. The original S. 380 is not shown in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Not the original S. 380 as introduced in the Senate, but rather the bill which was passed by the Senate and sent to the House. The conference would revolve around whether the original Senate bill is to be accepted, whether this House version of the bill is to be considered and adopted, or whether some entirely different measure is to be substituted for both of them.

I yield to the gentleman from California, as I promised.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman has stated that in his opinion the present bill is merely a pious expression and does not accomplish anything toward solving the problem. Would the gentleman be willing to go along and support a strong bill that does accomplish some good?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I certainly would not support any measure that obligated the United States Government to guarantee full employment, because it is something that this Government cannot do. Neither can the gentleman, neither can the Congress guarantee full employment. And I want to say further to the gentleman if he would go along with some of us in this Congress and vote for measures that would provide the right kind of economic climate here in America we would be doing more toward assuring full employment than any other thing that might be done or accomplished by this Congress.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman believe that the people of this country should wait until we get into another depression before we try to do something to solve our difficulties?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I do not believe that; nor do I believe in the passage of a lot of wild-eyed legislation, some of which has been proposed and supported by the gentleman from California, that will bring on and guarantee that such a depression will come. I hope we can have the good sense and sufficient judgment not to enact legislation on this floor which will bring on another depression, for if we get a balanced Budget, and a little common sense, and get away from deficit spending another depression will not be necessary in this country.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield further.

Mr. OUTLAND. If the gentleman will check the record of the vote on the bill, S. 380, in the other body he will notice that many members of his own party voted for it. They do not seem to take the same view the gentleman does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes; the bill, S. 380, as passed by the other body was not anything like the proposal the administration submitted to the Congress; and you now have the administration coming here asking us to pass just anything to save face for the time being and, if you please, to send the bill to conference where they can work their will with their own tools.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that this bill does not do anything definite except appoint two commissions?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It appoints three commissions at $15,000 a year, and creates a new joint committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Talking about the full employment bill, we have several million not working now simply because they do not want to work, despite the fact many jobs are available.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand we have three or four millions of people who are not now working. I also notice the advertising columns of our newspapers are full of ads offering employment and asking for workers. Seemingly, industry is unable to get them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply wish to make an observation, that the bill as passed by the Senate may be designated as a mere prayer. The bill reported to the House by this committee can be described as a left-handed prayer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would describe it, if the gentleman from New York will permit, as a sort of pious platitude.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am puzzled about this whole thing. I thought the New Deal had solved the problem of unemployment long ago. We were told it had. Were it so sure of its cure, would it be here now suggesting a new remedy for unemployment?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I presume it is here because there is a desire on the part of some to mislead the people just a little further and just a little longer, and to convince them something is being done for them, when, in fact, nothing helpful is being done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. The bill S. 380, which this rule makes in order, was introduced in the Senate in February 1945, if I remember correctly. A like bill was introduced into the House at the same time by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Extensive hearings have been held on both bills. Finally, S. 380 passed the Senate after being materially amended. After further hearing, and after the receipt of a letter, addressed to the majority leader by the President, demanding action on the part of the Expenditures Committee, that committee has reported S. 380 with one amendment; that is, the Expenditures Committee struck out everything after the enacting clause in the Senate bill and proposes a new bill as a substitute. Apparently there is no opposition to considering the Senate bill and the House substitute in the House immediately following action on this resolution.

When the House goes into the Committee of the Whole for this consideration, the House amendment to and substitute for, the Senate bill will be read under the 5-minute rule as an original bill, that is, all germane amendments to the substitute will be in order and a vote will come on the substitute before any action is taken on the Senate bill. If the substitute prevails, then the Committee's work is done. If the substitute, as amended, is voted down, then the bill as it passed the Senate will be under consideration and subject to amendment.

That is, both the House bill and the bill as it passed the Senate will be before the Committee. There is a broad field for action and this rule does not contain limitations which are sometimes objectionable.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the resolution go even further and permit the introduction of other amendments that might entirely change either the original Senate bill or the House bill, so that we may come out of the Committee with an entirely different bill from what is presented here?

Mr. MICHENER. Maybe I did use clumsy language. All I wanted to say was to impress on the membership that full opportunity will be given to amend the Senate bill or the House bill in the discretion of a majority of the committee operating under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, more misinformation has been given to the public about S. 380 and its predecessors than any other legislative proposal in recent years. The people have been led to believe that if Congress would pass a bill providing that there should at all times be full employment for everybody in our country, that that objective could easily be obtained and made possible, merely by the waiving of a legislative wand expressing the hope in the form of a resolution or bill declaring a policy. A declaration of policy has no vitality unless implemented by law. The original bill does not assure full employment. The Senate bill does nothing of the kind. The House substitute is just like the other two in this respect. The people, however, have listened to propagandists who have adopted the slogan "the full employment bill." I am receiving mail from certain organizations asking me if I am opposed to full employment and indicating that anyone voting against the administration-endorsed bill is opposed to full employment of all of our people. Nothing is further from the truth. The measure now before us does not insure full employment. No bill has been introduced or considered by a committee or by Congress that would guarantee full employment at all times. The people have been fooled if they think otherwise.

All are agreed that there should always be as near full employment as possible in our country. To tell the people that the Government is going to furnish jobs, at fixed union wages, to everybody all the time, is to promise a financial and economic impossibility. I yield to none in the efforts I will make to assure legislation that will, in keeping with the American way of life, provide proper employment for those who are unemployed through no fault of their own.

I am opposed to socializing America and ruining the free enterprise system. We have done pretty well as far as we have gone. Our country is the envy of the world today, and it is sheer folly to abandon what we have and try some communistic, or Fascist scheme that has never worked anywhere it has been tried. Yes, I am for full employment, but I am opposed to the method suggested by that group which evidently feels that there is no limit to our financial resources. I still cling to that philosophy which advocates self-help, rather than help yourself, the Federal Treasury is bottomless. There is still room for the words "economy, industry, and thrift" in the American vocabulary. Let us get down to earth, face facts as they are, and appreciate that the world and the Federal Treasury do not owe all of the people a like living regardless of personal endeavor and individual effort.

This bill is going to pass the House in some form. It will go to the Senate and then to the conference committee where the final bill will be written. Much depends upon the conferees. I not only hope, but believe that the House conferees will be men of such integrity, such courage, such ability and, last but not least, such tenacity that the position taken by the House will not be lightly abandoned and will be insisted upon. Compromise is a two-way street. Too often there appears to be an upper House and a lower House in the conference committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we are here allegedly considering S. 380 under this resolution. In the beginning we had before us H. R. 2202. Now, what we really have before us is an abortion. No one knows exactly what is meant by the measure which was finally reported out of committee. I hold in my hand a book containing hearings entitled "The Full Employment Act of 1945." What a travesty. This book is almost the size of the Sears, Roebuck catalog, and I am sure it will not prove as useful.

This is all very confusing. The Rules Committee in its report says: "We have before us Senate bill 380." The book containing the committee hearings indicates that we are considering H. R. 2202. What are we considering? Who knows?

Those who were the most vocal and bitter opponents of the full employment bill are now the chief proponents of this misconception. I know Christmas time is approaching, and that it is in order to give presents, but I heard someone say, some time ago, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts." This package is nicely wrapped with a beautiful ribbon around it, and all the other trimmings, but what do you have inside the package? A dud.

In discussing this bill today no one will have to get permission to speak out of order, because the whole thing is out of order, and it will be difficult to determine what the score is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did not the gentleman offer an amendment to amend the title of the bill?

Mr. BENDER. Of course.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What was that?

Mr. BENDER. It is in the RECORD. Frankly, this is not a full-employment bill. This bill creates three jobs at $15,000 a year and the only purpose of it is to save face for the administration. They wanted a bill; any kind of a bill. It is a collection of words, and as the gentleman from Ohio says, pious phrases that mean absolutely nothing.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, for whom I have great admiration, yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I yield to my good friend.

Mr. PATRICK. I want to ask the gentleman if the proposed law which carries his apprehension were to take the shape he feels it should take, whose face could it possibly save?

Mr. BENDER. The administration's. All we have here is the title "Full employment bill." And no more.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has been a very valuable member of the committee. The gentleman has stated that this pending bill is an abortion, and charged bad faith, and the gentleman has also called this bill a fraud; is that not correct?

Mr. BENDER. That is absolutely correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, we are today considering S. 380 as amended—the so-called full employment bill. I am frankly disappointed that this bill does not give specific recommendations that will truly endeavor to solve the unemployment problem. In my opinion, this bill, as amended, is a conglomeration of words—or merely reading material—which will not give employment. I was hoping among other things the bill would give full recognition to the sad plight of the aged people who are seemingly the forgotten group of our Nation.

Recently, we passed legislation that granted a gift of over a billion dollars to citizens of foreign nations. Is it not time we considered the American people? We talk about giving our returning soldiers jobs. Where are these jobs going to be found if we continue to force our aged people to work in order that they may have the bare necessities of life? The younger groups must have jobs in order to again be established in civilian life. Is it not a better plan to permit our older people to retire in order to give their places to the younger class? Thousands upon thousands of our aged people are innocent victims of circumstances. Their savings are gone, due to conditions which were beyond their control.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that we immediately take definite action to give recognition and assistance to our aged people in this way give to our returning veterans the jobs to which they are justly entitled.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I get no great satisfaction out of going through the motions of considering a bill all day today and probably tomorrow that is admittedly a gesture toward the problem that was posed to the committee here and on the Senate side. I quite appreciate that it offers only a brief statement of policy, a method of achieving an objective within the framework of the free-enterprise system, the creation and authorization of an economic report, a committe of economic advisers, and a joint committe to whom all this material must ultimately be referred. The bill is so loosely drawn that it occured to me on examination it could have been compressed within two or three pages.

I expect on tomorrow to offer a substitute which may or may not commend itself to the good graces of the Members.

I agree with what the gentleman from Ohio said a moment ago that employment is the fruit of production, and that production, after all, is the result of an economic condition and an economic atmosphere that is conducive to production. This only scratches the surface. The substitute I propose to offer tomorrow would call for the creation of a Commission on National Inventory to consider not only the items that are presented in this bill but to consider, in fact, every item and every factor in our economy that will have some bearing upon it.

Unemployment is a result, not a cause. It is the result of the imperfect operation of our industrial machine or our farm economy. If our economic machine functions normally, we have no especial difficulty in this field. When it is out of gear, our problems become acute.

But what makes the economic machine break down? Scores of answers have been made to that question over the years. In the main, we do not have comprehensive knowledge of all the factors that are involved. After all, I believe we have to know just what the condition and the position of the country is.

Within 3 or 4 weeks, if you notice the newspapers, you will observe that all the stores will start holding what they call E. O. Y. sales, meaning "end of the year" sales. The purpose, of course, is to reduce their stocks and to prepare for the making of a new inventory. They must count the goods on the shelf and the cash in the bank, and ultimately render a report to the stockholders. The annual inventory and resulting balance sheet is in the nature of a picture of the business with its assets, liabilities, difficulties, and prospects. If that is good business for business, why is it not good business for the biggest business in the world—our Government?

It seems to me it is the responsibility of this Congress to report to the stockholders, known as the citizens of this Republic, so that they may know precisely where we stand. I think we ought to have an over-all picture. We ought to know something about balancing the Budget even though it is on a cyclical basis. I think we ought to have a clear expression now of what our commitments and indebtedness are. Is there a single Member of this body or any other body that knows to what we are committed today? We have been freely authorizing such obligations as the Bretton Woods agreement, we have been freely authorizing and appropriating for UNRRA. We are going to have a loan proposal in here one day soon, and then in turn there will follow other suppliant countries for our largesse. The Committee on Appropriations after the first of the year will be grinding out enormous appropriations. It is a fair question to ask you, Is there anybody in this Congress, or in the whole country for that matter, who has an adequate idea of the inventory position of the United States?

Our national resources have been depleted. We have been taking copper out of the ground. We have been expending the fertility of our soil. We have been dissipating the iron-ore resources in the Mesabi and the Vermilion Ranges of northern Minnesota. Is there a single soul today who has any notion as to what an inventory of the United States of America would show?

Then, in addition, there is this whole question of credits. There are surpluses that are not moving as expeditiously as they should. It is only in proportion as we get a picture that we can set up incentives by way of appropriate and intelligent tax legislation, appropriations of money, the determination of an amortization program for our whole debt structure, the field of research, the utilization of the patents that our experts are bringing from Germany and elsewhere at the present time, and the development of new processes in industry.

All those I think are indispensable if we are going to take a look at this plant that we call the United States of America and then develop an atmosphere and out of that atmosphere get production which in turn becomes the source of employment.

Finally, it seems to me that this Congress could create one new agency that I would like to call the "Office for the Demobilization of Defeatism." If there is any indispensable ingredient in this whole economic picture it is the dispersion of the defeatist attitude that you find in a good many sections of the country that feel that the apple-seller days are coming back again. What a shameful confession to make on the part of a single intelligent citizen of a great Republic that has been untouched by the shells and the bombs and the destructive instrumentalities of World War II.

I have said so often when I hear people talking about defeatism that it reminds me of the man who went into a restaurant, got a napkin around his neck, and, when the waiter came, said, "What kind of soup have you?" The waiter said, "Ox tail." The man said, "Why go back that far?" It is about time that defeatism is demobilized in this land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the substitute which I propose to offer is not revolutionary or startling.

I have tried to compress and simplify and to deal with unemployment as one problem in our national economy.

The Inventory Commission which it proposes, is independent, as distinguished from the Council of Economic Advisers in the pending bill. The bill places the council of three advisers in the office of the President. We now have a Budget Bureau in the office of the President, doing precisely that kind of advising, with a staff of 587 employees in Washington and in the field, which is exclusive of the 144 persons that were transferred to the Budget Bureau from the Office of War Information.

Its purpose is to do nothing more than look at this huge and complex industrial and agricultural plant, which we call the United States of America, see where it is, see what it has promised, see what its obligations are, what resources in men, money, machinery, and methods it has available to go ahead and then see what must be done within the structure of our free competitive enterprise system to make it go forward.

The language as I propose to offer it when the bill is read for amendment is as follows:

That (a) Congress hereby finds that—

(1) Recurring economic depressions, with the resulting poverty and unemployment, are not inevitable and unavoidable;

(2) The effective operation of the national economy depends upon the same factors and controls as those affecting all industry.

(3) Periodic, comprehensive inventories and accountings of the existing plant, together with intelligent appraisal, based on such inventories and accountings, of the potentialities for the immediate future are indispensable to the efficient and successful operation of any industrial enterprise;

(4) A periodic, comprehensive inventory by the United States of all of the facilities and conditions affecting the national economy is indispensable, not only to an intelligent appraisal of the potentialities of such economy for the immediate future but also to the efficient, stabilized operation of the national economy.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States, by making provision for such periodic national inventories and for appraisals based thereon, to determine the causes of economic depressions, with their resulting poverty and unemployment, to prevent them from recurring, and to stabilize the national economy at a high level of production and employment.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a commission, to be known as the "National Inventory Commission," which shall consist of 30 outstanding persons representative of industry, labor, agriculture, small business, finance, and the public, respectively, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Commission shall annually select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(b) The Commission shall annually make a national inventory of the facilities and conditions affecting the national economy. Such inventory shall include, but shall not be limited to, inventory of—

(1) The natural resources of the United States;

(2) Financial commitments, both at home and abroad;

(3) Requirements for consumer and capital goods;

(4) The economic effects of cut-backs in war production;

(5) The problems of reconversion;

(6) State and local needs for highways, paving, schools, hospitals, and other public and community facilities;

(7) Backlogs of orders;

(8) The amount and distribution of savings;

(9) Foreign balances available for expenditure;

(10) The size, value, and productive potential of the industrial plant of the United States;

(11) The size, value, and productive potential of the farm plant of the United States, and the amount and distribution of indebtedness thereon;

(12) The size, value, and productive potential of small business;

(13) The housing requirements in the United States;

(14) The needs of veterans;

(15) Employment and unemployment, and its distribution by regions, States, and areas;

(16) Wage payments in the United States.

(c) The Commission shall, not later than January 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) submit the national inventory to the President, and shall append thereto such recommendations, within the framework of the free competitive enterprise system and with due regard for national solvency, as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) Better functioning of the system of free competitive enterprise;

(2) Taxes;

(3) Cyclical balancing of the Budget;

(4) Retention, abandonment, or modification of price controls, and rationing controls;

(5) Liquidation of emergency agencies of the Government;

(6) Cost of Government;

(7) Extension of social security;

(8) Administration of the public debt;

(9) Stimulation of risk capital;

(10) Revitalization of competition and removal of Government from competition with private business;

(11) Speculative accumulation of inventories;

(12) Reduction of building costs and stimulation of construction;

(13) Public works at the national, State, and local levels;

(14) Stimulation of invention and the development of new products;

(15) Utilization of foreign patents and processes to develop new enterprise;

(16) The use of Federal works programs not as relief but to stabilize and expand the construction industry;

(17) Stabilization of the national economy at a high level of production and employment.

(d) In carrying out the provisions of this act—

(1) The Commission is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such specialists and other experts as may be necessary, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

(2) The Commission may conduct such hearings, investigations, and inquiries as it deems necessary;

(3) The Commission may constitute such advisory committees, and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

(4) The Commission shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after receiving the national inventory from the Commission, the President shall transmit such inventory (including the recommendations made by the Commission) to the Congress, together with his own recommendations with respect thereto. The national inventory and the President's recommendations, when transmitted to the Congress, shall be referred to the Joint Committee on the National Inventory (created by sec. 4).

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the National Inventory (in this section called the joint committee), and which shall be composed of the chairman and ranking majority party member, and the two ranking minority party members of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, of the Senate Committee on Finance, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) To make a continuing study of matters relating to the national inventory; and

(2) As a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to the national inventory, not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in connection with the national inventory, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

(e) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman, and shall not exceed $100,000 for each fiscal year.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to ask for time on the rule today. I do so in order that I may ask a question or two of the gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I listened with considerable interest, as I always do, to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, especially when he stated that tomorrow he is going to offer a substitute, one which will be a bill providing for the taking of an inventory, an economic inventory, if I understood correctly. I should like to ask the gentleman the following question:

How does his program for taking inventory differ from the national and employment budget as reported in the original Senate bill? It seems to me that that budget would do everything desired by my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the gentleman from California that it would include a great many factors that are not even alluded to in the present bill or any other bill I have seen on the subject.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman refers to such points as taxation in his statement. If he will turn to page 3 of the bill he will find other items there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is only one item.

Mr. OUTLAND. I was going to mention the other items for the gentleman's information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is fine. I would like to have them.

Mr. OUTLAND. The other items are taxation; banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; natural resources; the provision of public services, works, and research; and other revenue, investment, expenditure, service, or regulatory activities of the Federal Government.

Does the gentleman's bill include more than that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, infinitely more, I should say.

Mr. OUTLAND. I shall listen to it then with considerable interest. It would seem to me that this list is fairly comprehensive.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. OUTLAND. In my opinion and in the judgment of those of us who were cosponsoring the original full-employment bill, there were two basic things of value. The second of them was the machinery established. The first was policy. That policy was essentially in two parts: First, that every man and woman in America seeking work and able to work had the right to an opportunity for a job; secondly, that after every possible effort had been made by private industry to provide such employment, then in the last analysis, and in the last analysis only, the Federal Government had the responsibility of seeing that such opportunities were present. Does the substitute which the gentleman is going to offer include a statement of policy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, in a way, yes; it contains a bit of a preamble.

Mr. OUTLAND. How much of a "bit of a preamble?"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, not too much. I think it is all compressed in about one paragraph.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does it state the right of job opportunity for the American people?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it is approached from a different angle, because I think that is only part of our whole economy.

Mr. OUTLAND. I agree with the gentleman, but it is an absolutely essential part. Referring now to the second point, does it take anything up so far as Government responsibility after and only after private industry has not provided such a job opportunity?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it does not. If the gentleman will indulge me an observation at this point, I think it is all-important whether or not we talk about employment first or whether we talk about production first. Jobs, after all, spring from production. In proportion as you develop the incentives for production, it occurs to me that the problem pretty well takes care of itself. Then, if within the framework of the free-enterprise system, we fail, then obviously we will do the thing we have done in every generation of the country's history, namely, supplement it with some kind of constructive public-works proposal on the Federal, State, and local levels.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for that observation. I would say this, it is true in the recurring depressions in American history there has always come a time when there has been a necessity for some type of public works. The trouble is that in the past we have waited until the last minute and we have not planned in advance. Then we have had what the people have referred to as "boondoggling" or something similar because in advance there has not been sufficient planning as to what the responsibility of the Government is. We have waited until the catastrophe was upon us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield gladly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe it can be said that the Congress has at any time been derelict in its devotion to public works. On examination, for instance, of bills that come from the Committee on Appropriations, notably that on independent offices and the deficiency appropriations, they show we have provided money for advanced planning and we have tried to keep it on a constructive basis.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I interrupt the gentleman at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have never wanted to plan the complete economy of the country. Therein lies the great difficulty.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yet, was it not true that at the one time when we did have an over-all planning body, the National Resources and Planning Board, the gentleman from Illinois helped lead the fight to abolish it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman indulge me at that point?

Mr. OUTLAND. Gladly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, I took considerable pride in bringing about the final dissolution of the Economic Resources Planning Board. The reason was that they were setting up so many tenuous and academic plans that went into every field of public works, many of which were not the proper province of the Federal Government. Since that was the personality that was reflected in the reports which came from that body, there was no choice, in my judgment, in the interest of the solvency of the country, except to abolish the Planning Board.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one more minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I ask the gentleman this question? In case the program that he is going to advocate in his substitute bill tomorrow should prevail, would there not be a great deal that could be done by just such a planning board?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not minimize the fact that a planning board could have done a lot of good. But the point is, precisely where does it stop? If the gentleman took the trouble to examine the stack of volumes bound in gloss paper which is nearly that high, he would apprehend what I have in mind.

Mr. OUTLAND. I have read every volume of their reports. To me it represented the finest and most comprehensive program of democratic planning ever attempted in this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman took the trouble to examine the volumes emanating from that body, he would realize the ultimate end would, of course, be the complete regimentation, in my judgment, of almost every function in the country and the ultimate dissolution of the private-enterprise system.

Mr. OUTLAND. Of course, I disagree with that particular point. May I ask if the gentleman is going to introduce a substitute bill to recognize employment and not only production? He says employment comes later. It seems they go together and that neither comes first. But when we discuss unemployment we are discussing human suffering. I for one want to go on record as anxious to prevent such suffering to the greatest extent possible. The original full employment bill was one long step in that direction—the committee substitute definitely is not.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on speaking on this matter, but I have been very much interested in the different remarks made this morning. I think it is well that we should look into this thing calmly. I can remember the depression that occurred between the years 1928 and 1932. I happened to be in the wholesale and retail business at that time. I could not sell my wares in my stores because the people did not have the money with which to buy.

I can go back farther. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] spoke of a balanced budget. I was also in business at that time. We had practically a balanced budget back in the early twenties, particularly in the latter part of the twenties, but that did not solve the problem either of full employment or full production. We had a wonderful demonstration during the war of the ability of the businessmen of this Nation, the workers and agriculturalists of this Nation to double our production. We stepped up from possibly eighty billion to a one-hundred-and-fifty- or one-hundred-and-sixty-billion-dollar production and we had almost full employment during that time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman knows that the employer there was the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that.

Mr. RICH. It was the Federal Government which was spending the money for all the things that industry was creating, and look at the great deficit we have. How long can you continue that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that, and I am not advocating at this time tremendous deficit financing. I say it is up to the businessmen, the laboring men, and the farmers of America to maintain full production. That means full employment. There is no reason why the people of America who want jobs should not have jobs. If our present system of operation, which is a planless system, and which has failed time and time again as our cycles of depression prove, if that

fails to bring together the raw products, the machines and the men, we have got to plan a way out. I am not afraid of the word "planning." Planning has to be done or we will have a condition in this country like the nations in Europe who did not have any plans and who went into their cycles of depression, and fascism reared its ugly head. Many of us are very serious about this thing. We would like to see something done, and done within the scope of free enterprise.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this gives me a real opportunity to bring home some facts to the membership, especially to those gentlemen who have previously addressed the House.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and others would seem to think that we should do nothing; that this bill will not accomplish anything. That reminds me of 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, when we all recognized the danger that the country was faced with, when stocks started going down on the stock exchange, and efforts were made to close that gambling institution for 3 or 4 months so that people, whose stocks were posted as collateral, would not become bankrupt, and that the country would not be ruined.

I think there are some Members present who will remember a bill I introduced in 1931.

I introduced the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill. I did not designate it "Reconstruction" because I did not want to offend the sensibilities of the Republicans; that is never my desire. Nevertheless, later on it became the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill. At the time I advocated that bill to create such a corporation to help small business, and business in general, some of the Members on this side and especially the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mills, thought the bill would not work. Finally, we did reach the point where a bill was considered. There was a great deal of criticism. I concede, of course, that the bill did not accomplish what I aimed, to save the small people of the country from ruin, but had at that time President Hoover and the Republican Party taken advice from a Democrat and adopted the bill in 1931 instead of waiting until the election year of 1932—and I am giving you this in confidence—because Mr. Mills thought it would help the Republican Presidential campaign, things might have been very different. I warned them at the time that the country was fast approaching a crisis and to delay its passage would bring about bankruptcy and ruin to the Nation—the crash that everyone must remember. I pleaded that the Congress pass the bill before it was too late, to no avail. It was finally enacted in 1932. President Hoover vetoed it on the pretense that it would provide loans only to municipalities for self-liquidating projects. Unfortunately, the bill later did pass with certain amendments and only the railroads, insurance companies, and banks were aided; but the main group of people I aimed to help, the businessmen of this Nation, the small manufacturers and merchants, to obtain loans, were not aided.

The same thing applies to this bill. The purpose of this bill is to help the people and not industry as some gentlemen would like to have as its purpose. In view of that I believe we should learn by experience and although the bill may not be perfect, and I do not think it is, it is not a bill that I would recommend; but the President being misinformed as to eight or ten million people being thrown out of employment recommended this legislation in the interest of American labor and in the interest of our country. There is, however, no such danger of unemployment; if anything, as I have stated, there is a shortage of labor; consequently we do not have to go as far as he felt we should go. It really shows, however, that he has the interest of the country and the wage earner at heart.

Mr. Speaker, if the bill does not accomplish all that the President intended, it can be amended when it is taken up under the 5-minute rule. In conclusion let me again say to the President and to the membership that I do not fear any great unemployment and that the scare thereto was artifically created. Actually there will not be undue unemployment but the shortage of labor will continue as many of the industries ceased to operate some months ago, because, as they themselves stated, they made enough money during the year of 1945 and did not wish to pay increased income taxes as they would be obliged to pay if they continued to increase their production. The same situation applied to many businesses that made large profits during the year. They are aware that income taxes and excess-profits taxes will not be as great in 1946 and, therefore, it is but natural to assume that they will reopen, expand, and increase their business which will require additional labor. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the fears expressed concerning unemployment should cease.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak in the Committee of the Whole today on the bill may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include charts, newspaper articles, and other pertinent matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT-PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 380), to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 380, the Employment-Production Act, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, may I say that the chairman of that committee who now has the floor and is about to speak has been most active, most energetic, honest, and careful in his dealings with the members of the committee. This committee has held hearings for several months on the pending bill. I beseech for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], our chairman, the courtesy that is due a Member of the House of Representatives; he has been one of the best chairmen it has been my privilege to serve under.

Mr. MANASCO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has held extensive and exhaustive hearings on the so-called full employment bill. We started hearings on September 25 on H. R. 2202. About a week later a bill was referred to our committee that passed the Senate, S. 380, the bill which we are considering today. A member of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], introduced another bill, the number of which, I believe is H. R. 4181, on the same subject.

When we started hearings with reference to this matter there was quite a lot of pressure brought to bear to report a bill out immediately. Our committee—and the record will show this—made every effort to get members of the Cabinet to appear before the committee and express their views. For reasons beyond their control they could not appear when we first started hearings. The first witnesses appearing before the committee were the authors and sponsors of the bills; then there was the Director of the Budget.

There is quite a division of opinion in our country as to the advisability of passing the so-called full employment bill. We felt that those people in the country who opposed the present bill, S. 380, and who opposed H. R. 2202, should be given an opportunity to be heard by permitting those people to appear before our committee. Of course, there were a lot of people who wanted us to go ahead and not hear anyone, just report the bill out. But many of us on the committee had fears as to what might result to our system of Government if the bills in their original form became law.

The bills in and of themselves are not dangerous; but the implementing legislaton that would follow in order to assure every man in the United States a job is what many of us fear. We realized, as does everyone in this country, that every

American who desires to work should have a job; but there is a difference of opinion as to how that job should be provided.

Mr. Chairman, there are many countries in the world today that have full employment. I think it would be interesting for the Members of Congress to make an investigation as to the condition of laboring men in a country like China, which has full employment, and Java. Many of the Asiatic countries have full employment. Anyone who has ever visited those countries or who has read about those countries would agree, I think, that the wages paid those people and the amount of goods and wares produced per man-hour cannot compare with the results produced by even the lowest paid physically handicapped worker in the United States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I prefer to make a few remarks before I yield.

Those countries have full employment. The war period in this country has been cited as a period of full employment. Let us examine the facts. We had over 12,000,000 men in the armed forces who were taken out of the productive field. Those were the most able-bodied men in the United States. So I am wondering if we could fairly consider even our war period, when we had wives of war veterans, people beyond the retirement age, and children working in war industry—a full-employment period. Assuming that it was a period of full employment, how was it given? It was given by taxing the American people higher than they have ever been taxed before, and by borrowing over $200,000,000,000, much of it from unborn generations. Of course, some people are not worried about paying that debt. We can pay the debt very easily by inflation. But I, for one, hope that every American who has been induced to loan his money to enable us to bring this war to a successful conclusion will get dollar for dollar value for every dime he has invested, and I think we owe it to those people, and unborn generations of our country. Of course, you can give full employment by tax dollars or by borrowing money, but when the Federal Government borrows money or when it taxes people you are taking money that would ordinarily be used by private investors to give jobs to our people. We have had estimates, and you have seen them in the press, that by next year we will have between six and ten million people out of work. Of course, there is always a number of people out of employment who are changing jobs. We have seasonal employment in this country, and if you did not have some seasonal employment many of you would not eat. You have seasonal employment on the farms, in agriculture, and in the canning industry.

Mr. KNUTSON. And fishing.

Mr. MANASCO. Fishing, and many other industries. Without seasonal employment there would be no eating. I am wondering what would be the result if we undertook to guarantee 8,000,000 people a job next year out of the Federal Treasury. Under the provisions of both original bills the Federal works that would be performed under those bills must be done by private contractors, under existing law. I believe under the Walsh-Healy Act those workers must all be paid the prevailing wage. Let us assume that 8,000,000 people would be out of work next year; that they cannot get work in private employment or self-employment. Let us assume that the very barest minimum that many witnesses who appeared before our committee stated would be a decent living wage would be $2,000. That would take $16,000,000,000 out of Federal funds to give those people employment, and unless you give them useful employment that would be $16,000,000,000 thrown away. You can give a man employment by counting trees, but if we give employment on Federal projects we want some worth-while Federal projects; projects that will increase our national wealth. If we give them jobs on worth-while projects, I have seen cost figures varying anywhere from $1.46 to $1.75 per person per dollar invested for labor, that is required to give jobs on public-works projects. Let us assume that it is a dollar. That would be another $16,000,000,000 we would have to get up somewhere. I do not believe the people of this country are going to continue to loan their dollars to this Government with the same patriotic fervor they have been loaning it during the war period to give jobs to people.

We have certain commitments in this country that we just cannot overlook. We are obligated to pay compensation to men who gave parts of their bodies or their minds, and to the dependents of those who gave their lives to win this war. That is the highest obligation our country owes. It comes before the interest on the public debt. We owe to the men who come back to this country wounded in mind and body hospitalization, medical attention, and also worth-while job opportunities, and not leaf-raking jobs.

This is all based on the value of the dollar today. If you inflate the dollar and make it worthless, the compensation these boys will be paid will be worthless. We must keep that in mind. Unless we work out some sliding scale for our compensation we have to continue to have a dollar worth what it is now, and any of us knows it is worth much less than it was 4 years ago. But we cannot afford to let the value of that dollar be reduced.

If we recognize that obligation, the estimates show that it will take in the present dollar between $3,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000 to carry out our present commitments. Unless we are foolish enough to stick our heads in the sand, it will take between $3,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000 a year for national defense. It will take a little over $6,000,000,000 a year to pay the interest on the national debt, interest that will go to help many people get by in their old age, interest that will be plowed back into loans to give other people jobs. And we have other Federal commitments. We are committing ourselves daily to public-works programs. It has been charged that Congress has not planned. I think that is an unfair statement. Every year we have had public works appropriation bills. We have just finished considering an appropriation bill to provide public works for jobs, for useful jobs. We have passed legislation creating the Export-Import Bank, to enable foreign purchasers to purchase American-made goods and give jobs in our system of free enterprise. We are discussing now loans to other countries. Some say they will be used to give jobs to Americans in producing goods for export. That is a debatable question, and I will not enter into it.

All our commitments, the lowest estimate I have seen, will amount to around $24,000,000,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury. I am just wondering if we had not better be a little careful about coming out with some of these proposals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Some of the witnesses appeared before our committee and stated that these bills did not guarantee every American a job. I want to read paragraph (e) of section 2 on page 3 of H. R. 2202, a bill commonly known as the Patman bill. It reads as follows:

> To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is a further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment.

Witnesses who have appeared in behalf of the bill say that does not mean what it says. They say it did not mean to guarantee everybody a job. I want to read to you from the hearings before the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency on the bill S. 380, a statement made by one of the witnesses, Mr. Wolf, of the National Lawyers' Guild, on page 812 of the Senate hearings, and let you see what he thought this meant. Quoting from Mr. Wolf:

> The dictionary defines "assure" as follows: "to make sure or certain, to inspire confidence by a declaration or promise."
>
> This later gives us a real clue to the real basis for the objection. The promise by Congress for job opportunities will inspire confidence to the people of the country. They will rely on the assurance of their Government and they will expect those promises to be effectively implemented.

The word "implemented" is one of the words that scared me.

Continuing on page 812:

> Those who are sincere in their desire for the achievement of a goal of full employment will have no reluctance about creating such expectations. They do not balk at the word "assure." Those who do object and who do balk do so because they are opposed to the whole concept of Government responsibility for full employment. They realize then there may be no legal redress against the Government if it fails in its promises if after this bill becomes law no legislative steps are taken to give effect to its declaration. Nevertheless, the American people will have redress at the polls in their orderly, powerful, and democratic way. A promise is a commitment and the public relies on its legislators to honor their commitments.

In the hearings on H. R. 2202, this question was asked many witnesses, but I just happened to pick this one out

because he was a very fine witness representing a great labor organization, Mr. Hines, of the American Federation of Labor. I will say that he certainly did present his side of the case about as well as any of the proponents of either bill. This question was asked Mr. Hines on page 403 of the House hearings:

> But after the President transmits the Budget, under the provisions of either one of these bills under consideration, it is still necessary for legislative committees to pass legislative authorizations for appropriations for specific projects and then it is still necessary for the appropriation committee and the Congress to make appropriations the same as we do now.

Mr. Hines answered that question as follows:

> No; there is a difference, Congressman, between the Appropriations Committee under this or anticipated under this and the conditions at the present time. You would be under obligation in accordance with this bill to carry out the intent and the purpose of the bill, that is, it requires the President to make recommendations and requires the appropriations as necessary and recommended by the President to relieve unemployment.

In other words, he thought it was a commitment on the part of Congress and if we were to fulfill that commitment we would be forced to give 8,000,000 jobs.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. HENRY. Does the distinguished chairman of our committee agree with me that the plain and obvious meaning of paragraph (e), on page 3, of H. R. 2202 is an absolute, unlimited pledge on the part of the Federal Government to make expenditures and investments to such an extent as to guarantee full employment?

Mr. MANASCO. According to the witnesses who appeared before the committee, that is their opinion. I have just read their testimony. We will be held responsible if we do not carry out that commitment.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman agree with me that the United States Treasury is not equipped to make such an unlimited pledge?

Mr. MANASCO. I do not see how we could, when we owe around $263,000,000,000.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. We want to get the position of those who are in opposition to this bill as quickly as we can. There are apparently two schools of thought. One theory is that it is absolutely milk sop and does nothing. So, we were cocked and primed for that. Now we come to the opposite proposition, that it does entirely too much and falls overboard on the other side. So we are at a loss to know which horn of the dilemma we are expected to meet. For once in my life I have labored with the hearings of a committee.

Mr. MANASCO. I believe you will agree that the proponents of the bill really mean that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Not from the standpoint of argument or controversy, but in all seriousness, does the gentleman think we can meet a $24,000,000,000 budget out of a $60,000,000,000 or $70,000,000,000 income per year?

Mr. MANASCO. I certainly do not.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, if we go back to the level of total production in this country, which was from $40,000,000,000 up to possibly $80,000,000,000, can we subtract this great increasing amount of taxes from that?

Mr. MANASCO. That is exactly the reason I say that unless you reduce the value of the dollar to where it amounts to nothing, you cannot afford to assure every American a job out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not talking about that right now. I am asking this other question, if the gentleman will yield further. During this war I think we have subtracted about forty or fifty billion per year in taxes, but we have subtracted it out of a much larger total economy. In order to meet those obligations, which I think we all want to meet, is it not going to be necessary to operate our economy at around one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty billion, some amount above a hundred billion, in order to take out that amount of taxes and still leave in the hands of the people enough money to maintain the average standard of living?

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, we have been paying taxes of forty-five or fifty billion out of money we have borrowed from children who are not now living, unborn children.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that; but we still have to maintain a higher level of employment and a higher level of production than we did before the war in order to meet the taxes.

Mr. MANASCO. We certainly must. I think it can be done under our system of free enterprise. If our private enterprise system has been a failure, and the passage of either one of the original bills is an admission on the part of the Congress that our system has been a failure, I cannot understand for the life of me how every country is coming to our door trying to borrow money that we have to borrow from unborn generations. I cannot understand why those successful systems—if they are successful—would not be coming to the National Capital today trying to loan us money.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] mentions the possibility of a $75,000,000,000 national income. National incomes increase and decrease in proportion to our prosperity. We cannot be prosperous if our people are being ground between the upper and nether millstones of taxes. If I understand the gentleman, he thinks we can work up an economy of prosperity in this country by taking in each other's washing. I do not believe it can be done.

Mr. MANASCO. Some of the witnesses who appeared before our committee stated that the main purpose was to create purchasing power. You can go down to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing today and print $24,000,000,000 worth of money to purchase goods, but somebody has got to produce the goods.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have got to have created wealth.

Mr. MANASCO. Absolutely.

Mr. KNUTSON. Created wealth that comes from creative toil.

Mr. MANASCO. And I say you cannot have creative useful employment by putting people to counting trees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish to take this occasion to compliment the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Alabama, who has done a fine job.

The other body passed a bill that was perfectly cockeyed. It is surprising that anyone on the floor of the House should be for it; unfortunately there are. The gentleman from Alabama has pared it down to where it is at least respectable if innocuous.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to make a statement in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MANASCO. I will yield in just a minute. I want to make one further statement, and I do not believe anyone can truthfully contradict it. The President of the United States under the original bill, S. 380, or under the provisions of the bill H. R. 2202, can do nothing more than he can do right now under our Constitution except assure jobs and create a joint committee. I believe no one can contradict that statement. He can submit a budget any day he wants to, he can transmit a message to the Congress any day he wants to under our Constitution.

In transmitting a message on the original bill the President had to look into a crystal ball. He states that 8,000,000 people would be unemployed in November of next year and asked what Congress was doing about it. He looked into an almanac and said that crops were going to be infested with bugs in the summer of next year and we have got to do something to relieve the farmers.

A budget message would have had to be made up around September of this year to be transmitted to the Congress in January of next year for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946; and I do not believe any President of the United States would risk what might follow if he made a failure in his statement.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Are we going to accomplish anything that we pledge? The Republican Party made this as a part of its platform, so did the Democratic Party. Now, the President is elected and he asks for it as a part of the policy of the Government. If the Republicans had elected their candidate he would no doubt be doing the same thing.

I say that whenever we commence to try to accomplish the thing we promised the people and the party that gets elected

and its leader asks for it, we find the statement made that it is innocuous, but they oppose it, or they say it goes too far and they oppose it. How are we going to get the confidence of the people if we do not carry out the promises we make to them?

Mr. MANASCO. I challenge any fair-minded man to read the platforms of both political parties for the last 40 years and say anything but that if we had put into effect everything they promised to the American people, the country would have been destroyed long ago.

I think we have got to use some common sense.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Constant reference has been made to the large national income, and the gentleman has pointed out that it has been due largely to exorbitant taxes and borrowed money. Does it not finally come down to this: Can we bring about prosperity in this country by taxing and borrowing? Or can we tax and borrow and spend ourselves into prosperity? Can it be done?

Mr. MANASCO. If you will read the hearings you will find charts placed there by the proponents of the original bill which show that through the thirties the Federal Government spent billions of dollars to prime the pump, but in 1939 there were still 9,000,000 Americans unemployed. I think that is very interesting.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. I wish to make one observation, then ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman made the statement that the promises made by the political parties, both Democrat and Republican, had not been lived up to. That seems to me to be a very serious statement. If when election time comes around the people of America cannot rely upon the promises of their two parties, then I think the republican system of government is in danger.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman, may I say that the American people are not as easily fooled, as a lot of people think, by campaign platforms. They usually take the platform with a grain of salt and expect their elected Representatives to use their best judgment in passing legislation to implement the program.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman stated something about the machinery that is established and the fact that under the bill the President could do practically everything already. The question I am going to ask is one similar to what I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a few moments ago, namely, that while there is a certain amount of machinery in the committee substitute, the declaration of policy has almost entirely changed. It seems to me that part of the strength of the original bill lay in that declaration of policy which stated the right of job opportunity for all Americans able and willing to work and the responsibility of the Government for meeting that opportunity when private industry, and only after private industry had not done so. I wish the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. MANASCO. I may say that you cannot do it under our system of free, competitive enterprise. Now, it can be done, of course. I have been criticized a great deal, but I am going to read something to you. I think we should just look at the history of some of this legislation. It might be interesting to read what happened in France in 1848, I believe it was, when the Second French Republic undertook to guarantee everybody full employment. The farmers started to come in and work on these projects, because it is a lot easier to work for the government than it is to work out in the sun, the rain, and so forth.

I want to read to you from the Constitution of the U. S. S. R. I am not throwing off on the Soviet people now. If they want communism, I am in favor of their having it. I want them to have the kind of government they want, but I do not want them telling us what kind of government we should have.

This is a section entitled "Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens," article 118, which reads as follows:

> Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work; that is, are guaranteed the right to employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality.

They are a little smarter than we are. We do not make any reference in our bills to either quantity or quality. All you have to do is to go out on a leaf-raking job.

I want to read another interesting article from this. Article 12 of that same constitution reads as follows:

> In the U. S. S. R. work is a duty and a matter of honor for every able-bodied citizen in accordance with the principle: "He who does not work, neither shall he eat."

So that they take care of folks who go out and lean on shovels. We do not do that under our system and I want to see our system continued.

The American people are not going to stand by and let anyone starve to death.

You had full employment in Germany under the Nazi regime. Many of the Members of Congress, many of the members of the armed forces who are now in the galleries, went into the concentration camps and saw what happened to those people over there who had the courage to object to any of the ideologies of Adolf Hitler. I do not want to see that come to our country.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would not the gentleman agree with me that one of the primary reasons for the rise of Hitler to power was widespread unemployment in Germany?

Mr. MANASCO. I have read that in certain publications, but if that is true, the German people that we are ruling over today in our effort to convince them that nazism was wrong, would be over here in our country just like certain other groups are in here. I do not think that you can defend nazism in any way, although I did hear a boy who was a prisoner of war for 13 months say that when Hitler first started out he did a lot for his people. When you do a lot for your people they want more, more, and more, and in giving them more you have to give up your liberties. I am wondering if our liberty is not a little more precious than giving it up for more security.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had an opportunity to discuss the provisions of the bill that has been reported and that has been criticized so much. I know that this bill will be fully discussed later on.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield for just one little question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to point out to the gentleman that he has obtained quite a bit of applause on that side of the aisle, but he will find his votes for his bill, which I intend to support, on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MANASCO. I do not care where the applause comes from, so long as it is American applause. I have been condemned by every left-wing organization in the United States. Some of the most scurrilous attacks that have ever been made on anybody have been made on me. Yet I do not budge. I am still for a free America and I am going to continue to vote for a free America as long as I am a Member of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Pause for station identification. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that just two Members on that side applauded.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, I am not looking for applause. I am not looking for any approval of my position. My position is honest. I know many men who are supporting this original bill are honest in their opinion, just like I know there are millions and millions of people in this country who are honestly supporting different political parties from the party that I support. Every man in America is entitled to his own opinion. That is the reason I like this country. If I had lived in Nazi Germany and did not believe in the ideologies of Adolf Hitler, I would be placed in a concentration camp. I hope that situation will never happen in this country.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. I wonder if the gentleman does not believe that we can have a high standard of living and full employment and still maintain a free America. The gentleman is talking about Germany and Russia.

Mr. MANASCO. I know what the gentleman's argument is. I have read every one of the arguments for the bill that have been made available to me. But it was human nature even in the WPA days to want to work for the Government. I saw farmers in my country quit their farms and go to work on WPA projects for $36 a month. Why? Because they did not have to work hard for $36. They worked about 3 days a week, and they did not have to work much in those 3 days.

Not all Americans like to work like you do. I am one who does not like to work hard, and if I had some easygoing job from now on I might not be out here, and a lot of my neighbors would not be planting peas and beans to feed you.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Even before the heyday of WPA in Alabama, how much did the workers, the farmers, get a day down there?

Mr. MANASCO. They did not get much. I have heard a lot of these people beating their chests for the under dog and the under privileged. I want to say something about that. I think I know as much about the under dog and the under privileged as any man in this House. I was born the son of a tenant farmer who had pellagra, and anybody knows that a man who has pellagra has it because of deficiency in his diet. My father lay flat on his back and my mother was keeping boarders to feed five hungry mouths, and yet I am accused of being a tool of Wall Street when I get up and protect a system that made it possible for a son of a tenant farmer to be a Member of Congress. I know something about work. I had a broken shoulder and a right eye that was injured in a coal mine while trying to work my way through school. I know something about being a union man. I have been on strike, and I am in favor of the right of American workers to strike. The only time I was fired in my life was for failure to break a union condition. If I had it to do over again today I would be fired again. I know something about the under privileged. I live in a house today that many of you men would consider a substandard house, and I am not ashamed of it. I am not ashamed of my background. I want the background of our American children improved; certainly I do. But I want it improved under a system that has made it possible for me and made it possible for some of you, I am sure, to come from the humblest American homes and be Members of this great, free legislative body.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I ask this question of the gentleman, for whom I have the greatest admiration. Could he not see the secret pleasure on the faces of his side, even though they did not applaud? I often see it when I am speaking.

Mr. MANASCO. I did not worry about the applauding. I did not mean to discuss a lot of matters here. I wanted to discuss the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending bill, S. 380, reported with amendments by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on which I am privileged to serve. My views, and those of three of my colleagues on the committee, with respect to this particular bill are briefly set forth in the minority report. I should like here to reemphasize the basis for my opposition to the committee bill, as expressed in the minority report, and to outline my individual views on the underlying theory of government that gave birth to this proposed legislation.

The pending bill is our committee's recommendation, after rather extensive hearings and extended executive sessions, on proposed legislation purporting to represent a full employment program. The committee courageously rejected the theory of the Senate bill and the two companion House bills, H. R. 2202 and H. R. 4181, which theory would, as stated in the committee report, destroy the system which has made this Nation strong and great—the system of free competitive enterprise, under which the highest standard of living in history has been attained. In comparison with the legislation sponsored by the administration, the pending bill is indeed innocuous but, nonetheless, quite useless.

Last Friday the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] spoke somewhat at length in behalf of so-called full employment legislation. The burden of his remarks was with respect to the "natural rights of man" and the importance of the "right to work" in relation to all other human rights. I found myself in agreement with practically everything the gentleman had to say about the evils of unemployment—economically, politically, and morally. Depressions constitute a challenge to our democratic way of life, and it is for us to meet the challenge. There is no argument about that, and on that point I agree with the gentleman from California. But it does not follow, ipso facto, as the gentleman and other advocates of the program have concluded, that the proposed "full employment" legislation meets the challenge.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called full employment program advocated by the administration, is embodied in H. R. 2202, H. R. 4181, and S. 380 as passed by the Senate. The proponents of the program utter grave warnings of the future for our system of government if the Nation again experiences an economic depression with widespread unemployment. They remind us of the lessons of history, that revolutionary doctrines take root and revolutionary movements grow in periods of economic discontent and unrest, in periods of hunger and want. They urge enactment of their program as protection against such development.

There is no doubt that communism and fascism, as opposed to our system of capitalism, will constitute a real threat to the continued existence of the American system of free enterprise, if we should find ourselves in the throes of economic stagnation. These lessons of history, particularly considering the strength of communistic doctrines in the United States even today, are not to be viewed lightly. While the proponents of the so-called full employment program profess, in the legislation they are here advocating, to protect this great Nation against such radicalism, the program they are advocating is itself as radical and as inimical to our principles of government as that advocated by the acknowledged enemies of the American system of free enterprise.

I do not question the good faith of the advocates of the program. I believe you are sincere. It unfortunately appears that the American system of free enterprise has more cause to fear its friends than its acknowledged enemies.

Mr. Chairman, the best way I know to describe the full employment program, as embodied in the bills submitted to our committee, is to say that it is one of the most fantastic schemes ever submitted to Congress. The proposed legislation in substance purported to guarantee "useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment" to all willing and able to work, and to that end committed the Federal Government to "such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed." As stated by one of the witnesses before our committee, "if this guaranty means anything, it means that anyone unable to find useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time private employment is entitled to demand employment by the Government." And it should be obvious that such an idea is a delusion, if we are to maintain a free economy.

It is indeed a cruel deception to lead the American people to believe that the Federal Government can keep such a promise and, at the same time, continue with the system of free enterprise which has enabled us to attain the highest standard of living in history. The secret of our strength and power, as so clearly demonstrated in this last war, lies in our individual self-reliance, our individual initiative and resourcefulness, our freedom as individuals to dream, to create, and to make dreams come true. These qualities make America what it is, and these qualities the American people wish to retain. But we cannot possibly retain them and adopt a program whereby the Federal Government must control production and consumption. Only by a Government-planned and Government-controlled economy, in which the central government decides what shall be produced, where it shall be produced, the amounts to be produced, the price to be paid and quantities each may buy, where one shall work, what hours he shall work, and what he shall be paid can there ever be a guaranty of jobs.

Our committee recognized the program as a "gigantic and unworkable proposal," and the bill we have before us today, as reported by the committee, drastically revises the bill submitted to us by the Senate. The title of the bill has been changed from the Full Employment Act of 1945 to the Employment-Production Act, 1945. The change is a distinct improvement, and I should like to add that I am in full accord with that part of section 2 of the bill, which sets forth the policy of the United States for preserving and encouraging free competitive enterprise for the maximum employment opportunities.

But the bill adds nothing whatever for achieving the policy therein enunciated. It provides that 60 days after the beginning of each regular session of Congress the President shall submit an economic

report to Congress and his recommendations. It cannot be denied that this provision adds nothing to what can now be done. As a matter of fact, it is the duty of the President to advise the Congress relative to the state of the Union and his constitutional right to make recommendations to the Congress. I cannot conceive of any President, as the responsible head of this great country, failing to advise the Congress with respect to an economic condition which may necessitate legislation.

The bill creates a Council of Economic Advisers to assist the President in the preparation of the Economic Report. The Council shall consist of three members at a salary of $15,000, and a total expenditure of $345,000 is authorized to be appropriated each year for the salaries of the Council and its employees. That, too, is entirely unnecessary. In each department of the Government there are innumerable economists, experts, and specialists of all kinds, and it is the duty of the members of the President's Cabinet to advise and assist him. The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor themselves can constitute a council of economic advisers. All three are directly concerned with economic and employment conditions, and all three have in their respective departments, bureaus, and divisions which are engaged in studies of economic conditions. The creation of the proposed Council by this bill would mean a duplication of work, and this is the very thing we are seeking to eliminate by the reorganization bill we passed a few weeks ago.

The bill further provides for the creation of a joint committee of Congress to make a continuing study of matters relating to the Economic Report. Here, again, is a wholly unnecessary provision, representing an additional expense for the performance of services that would be performed by existing committees. Such a committee would only serve to encumber an already cumbersome legislative machinery, to which we have been giving study for the purpose of reorganizing.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us serves no useful purpose, and it should never have been reported and should be defeated. One of the most compelling reasons for our defeating the pending bill is to eliminate completely any possibility of the fantastic full employment legislation, as it is deceptively called, ever finding a place on our statute books. It must be realistically recognized that the enthusiastic proponents of that dangerous legislation will employ every parliamentary advantage to secure the enactment of their proposal. We should overwhelmingly defeat this bill and make it clear, once and for all, that we will have nothing to do with proposals which are inimical to our principles of government and system of free competitive enterprise.

There is much that can be done for encouraging the maximum production and the maximum employment, such as revision of the tax laws to encourage new enterprises, removal of wartime controls over industry, avoidance of Government competition with industry, elimination and avoidance of Federal Government control over matters local in character, and reduction in governmental expenditures. We have demonstrated to the world what this great Nation can do in production for war. We can and shall demonstrate what this great Nation can do in production for peace if we adhere to the principles that made this Nation great and courageously defeat such fantastic panaceas as has been proposed in the so-called full employment legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for months the committee has had this matter under consideration. It is difficult to get people to agree upon just what the language in any one of the bills means. I refer to the original House bill H. R. 2202, the Senate bill, the LaFollette bill, and also the substitute language for the Senate bill.

As you are aware the committee or a large majority of the committee was extremely hostile for many, many weeks. At times there was no indication that we would be able to report out any kind of a bill.

I think my view is well known. I am for liberal legislation in connection with this subject. I found, however, there was no chance for me to have my way, so I set myself to the task of trying to "smoothe the fur" of the members of the committee, in the hope that eventually we would be able to bring some kind of legislation to the floor so the House as a whole could consider the matter.

We had a great deal of trouble preventing the committee delaying any action until next year. We also had trouble closing the hearings, but finally succeeded. Then, it was upon my motion that a subcommittee was appointed to see if we could draft some kind of legislation that we might be able to report to this House.

The subcommittee realized full well just exactly what confronted us as far as the full committee was concerned. We knew that they would not accept the Senate bill as written nor the original Patman-Murray bill as written, nor would they accept the LaFollette bill as written, so we finally concluded that it would be necessary to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute new language. After we reported to the full committee numerous amendments were offered and adopted. Even then we could not get a report from the full committee other than members agreeing to authorize a report reserving the right to support whatever amendments they desired on the floor. You have a bill here to be considered under a rule, that will permit the offering of a substitute as well as amendments.

The claim has been made that there are 125 or 150 Members of this House pledged to support what might be termed liberal legislation on this subject. I felt that when there was such a large number of Members of the House anxious to consider legislation we should give them an opportunity to do so.

As a member of the subcommittee that drafted this legislation, I was in the minority. I could not get what I wanted. In the end, however, we did succeed in putting language together that we felt the committee as a whole might accept. I will say for my colleagues on the subcommittee they did make some concessions to me, they were not many. I had to accept far less than I wanted. As I said, my objective was to get a bill to the floor. I received a great deal of encouragement and help when the President wrote a letter to the majority leader which was read, and appeared in the RECORD, in which he said he wanted some legislation and he was not thinking about any specific bill. I am not satisfied with the report of the committee but the bill is here, it is for you ladies and gentlemen to approach it as you desire. I reserve to myself the right to support such amendments as I feel may better express my own view.

This bill has been misunderstood. I receive just about as much mail as any Member of this House. I have received many letters referred to the full employment bill. As you read them you find they refer to the $25 a week unemployment bill which has no connection whatsoever with this bill.

The claim has been made not only in the committee but on the floor that efforts are being made to guarantee everybody a job and that the legislation provided a job for everyone who wanted to work. Nothing could be further from the truth. Neither in the original bill, Mr. Patman's bill, the La Follette substitute, the Senate bill, nor this bill, can anyone find language providing jobs for everybody who wants to work. They do lay down standards, all the bills. The only jobs provided for in any of the bills are those to give the President the assistants he needs in having investigations made in order that he may send to the Congress such recommendations as he deems advisable.

We refer in this regislation to free enterprise, we offer a great deal of encouragement in the legislation for free enterprise, and we agree to lend what assistance we can to help do the job and to provide employment. There is no objection to that from anybody. You are all willing to help business, large and small. But if the time comes, and I pray to God it will never come again when private industry cannot do the job, then I want to make some provision for the Government to step in and help do the job, and if that time comes business will want us to step in.

The bill reported by the committee will be fully explained by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], and may I say now that I am obligated to the gentleman from Mississippi because of the tremendous amount of work he has done in connection with this legislation and the assistance that he gave me in the effort I had been making for weeks and weeks to get the legislation to the floor of the House.

We had witnesses come before the committee and tell us that President Hoover failed to meet the great crisis that confronted him because he did not have the proper information. We had the same and other witnesses tell us that President Roosevelt failed because he did not have the proper information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, therefore, we set up the machinery in order that the President may get the proper information. Suggestions were made that we should not create any new or additional positions but leave it up to the President's cabinet and the heads of agencies to supply him with the information. Well, if they failed to supply President Hoover and President Roosevelt with the information, it seems to me it would be a good idea to set up machinery in the White House providing for advisers to the President, three to receive $15,000 a year. Aside from that we provide an authorization of $300,000 a year for assistants to the Advisory Council. Then we provide in the bill for a joint committee of the two Houses to which any message upon the subject that the President sends down could be referred and to properly staff this committee we provide an authorization of not more than $100,000.

Those are the jobs and the only jobs created under the terms of this bill or any other bill that has been introduced on the subject. It is the Congress in the end, if jobs are created, that will create the jobs. After they have been considered by the joint committee, the matter will be referred to the various legislative committees of the House and Senate for their consideration. It will be necessary for the legislative committees to bring in an authorization to carry out the recommendations of the President.

If authorizations are approved by both bodies, then it will be the job of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the money. I explain this to show those who contend this bill creates jobs that the only jobs it creates are the ones that will be necessary in the President's office and the jobs that will be created by reason of the setting up of the joint committee of the two bodies.

Undoubtedly there will be a large number of amendments offered to this bill. I do not think there is a Member of this House that ever wanted to see or will ever want to again see the people of this country rake leaves. The reason that they raked leaves was that we had no advance planning to meet a situation that developed whereby millions of people in our country could not obtain employment. Do not forget that when you talk about private industry, that private industry did not hesitate in 1933 to appeal to the President and the Congress to save it from destruction. It was willing then to have the Government come to its rescue.

I want private industry to provide jobs for all. The more jobs, the more production and the more purchasing power. That is what will bring about prosperity, and when we do have prosperity we will be able, through the collection of taxes, to take care of the obligations of the Government. This bill does not limit recommendations to public works. The President can send down a recommendation of any sort he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

For instance, assume that we had not repealed the excess-profits tax. If the President came to the conclusion that private business would be greatly benefited if the excess-profits tax was repealed, he could send that recommendation down to the Congress. I just simply cite that as an example. There are many other things that he might be able to do other than provide for public works.

I do feel that there should be advanced planning ready to be put into execution in the event that we are faced with a situation that needs assistance from the Federal Government. I have no desire for the Federal Government to spend any more money than is necessary. The sooner we can reduce this public debt, the lower the interest charges will be. But I want to say that I feel that we should pass legislation and send to the President, before we recess for the Christmas holidays, the most liberal legislation that we can agree upon, that will give him the assistants to learn the conditions throughout the country so that he will be enabled to keep the Congress advised and make such suggestions as he deems necessary not only for the benefit of private industry, but for the benefit of all the people of the country.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Does not the gentleman believe that probably the appropriations asked for are more than would be necessary, in view of the fact that the Government has a great deal of information, and it is available? Might it not be better to scale down, to begin with, the appropriation from $500,000 to possibly $250,000?

It looks like the creation of another large and expensive department of Government. Maybe it would not be necessary to have the appropriations quite so large.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that if I had no other complaint than that in reference to such an important bill as this, I would not even speak about it.

I will have more to say concerning this legislation when amendments are being considered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, under the authority which I obtained in the House this morning, I shall insert in the RECORD at the end of the remarks I am making now my statement before the committee in support of my proposed legislation, H. R. 4181, and that statement will be marked A. Immediately following it I shall insert the bill H. R. 4181, which will be marked B.

My reason for doing that is that if the parliamentary opportunity arises and I feel that it is psychologically sound and worth while to do so, and I do not get myself all tangled up in the parliamentary procedure, which I seem to have a facility for doing, I shall offer the bill H. R. 4181 as a substitute for the committee bill at the proper time tomorrow. The probability that I shall do so is so high that I think the Members ought to know about my proposed amendment, and I am inserting this bill and my statesupporting it so that Members may have an opportunity to read them.

I should like to discuss certain background conditions in this country with reference to the pending legislation generally. In the first place, I think it would not be amiss for me to tell the story that was told about the old Senator La Follette. I assure you that in telling you this story I do not consider myself fit even to look at the gentleman's shoes, let alone step into them, and I do not want any such idea to prevail in this House. Apropos of the vote that was cast yesterday in support of the amendment I offered, may I express my appreciation for the votes which I received from my Republican colleagues, but, as anyone could observe, the great mass of the votes came from the Democratic side of the aisle.

The story told about Old Bob is that while he was still in the Republican Party, and I believe when he was a Member of this House, he was running for renomination up in Wisconsin and the charge was made against him that he voted too often with the Democrats. He said, "Why, that is not so. The Democrats vote with me."

I think that could have been observed yesterday. That represents a cleavage which we find in our thinking in America. The gentleman from Utah got rather steamed up yesterday on his side of the aisle and pointed out that there was a cleavage. Since he is here, I do want to say to him concerning something I thought possibly was implied in the remarks about him by a member of his own party that I want the gentleman from Utah to know that I admire him highly and I know he is not a Communist.

Now, gentlemen, some of the things that are tearing us apart in America today arise from the fact that presently we do not have an alinement of political parties which serves the people of this country who think pretty much in the same way. I do not know the solution to it completely. If any of you gentlemen saw a statement which I issued in good faith and which is not derogatory but contains my own thinking with reference to the Republican platform which has been developed here, you know it is my thinking that the Republican Party owes it to the people of America to become the radical party. It was the radical party when it came into being. It was radical and faced the greatest social and economic issue in the country, slavery, four-square. It came into existence because the Whigs were afraid to face it and the Democratic Party of that day had no intention of facing it. Now part of the misalinement we have is due to the question of names. If the Republican Party can become the radical party,

it will get most of its strength from industrial areas and the North. I propose we ought to kind of change the names in some way. I do not quarrel with the gentlemen from the South because I know that sores that are created in wars last a long time. It is impossible psychologically, and psychology has a great deal to do with the way men act, for a man who went through the Civil War in the South or who is a descendant of a man who went through the Civil War, to vote for anybody who is called a Republican. I understand that. On the other hand, many of the people who vote Democratic and who live south of the Mason and Dixon's line think politically as the great majority of the people in the North apparently think who are Republicans.

A two-party system is designed to serve the people. I want to see the Republican Party win. I have certain definite ideas of its capacity to administer, and I have never heard even the most vigorous friends and protagonists of the late President say he was a good administrator. I think it is traditionally true and established that people who come into the Republican Party have administrative capacities. I believe this Government needs it very badly. But the purpose of political parties in a democracy is to serve as vehicles through which people can express their opposing views. Now, I have presented you with a situation where it is clear and evident that the people who vote Democratic and who are the descendants of the people who suffered invasion during the Civil War can never vote Republican even though they think Republican, or as the largest segment of that party thinks today.

Now you can either pass a law and change the names, which, of course, we are not going to do, or we can afford the people of America vehicles through which to express themselves by having the Republican Party become the radical party in America and the Democratic Party the conservative party, in which event there will be a crossing of that imaginary line known as the Mason and Dixon's line. I think a great service would be rendered to the people of our country if we do that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman care to define the word "radical" as he uses it in relation to parties?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes. I think I will develop that. As a matter of fact, I used the word "radical" because I am getting very tired of the present-day concept of "liberal." When I grew up a liberal, in my book, was a person who took it as well as dished it out; who laid down a rule and then abided by it; who had intellectual and moral integrity; who thought that slander of his opponent was something he should not indulge in; who gave the other man the full chance to express his views, without impugning his motives in order to assure himself the same right. I find that many people who call themselves "liberal" today have those attributes of character which I think are not properly associated with the word "liberal" in its old sense. Therefore, because I do not like or respect many of the modern "liberals" I use the word "radical" instead.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I suppose the gentleman heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] a few moments ago, who was applauded vigorously on your side, when he said that the platform did not mean anything. To be exact, he said if the two parties had observed all their platforms the country would have been broke long ago. I take a different view of that. If we have responsible party government—and that is what our country is—I do not think the gentleman would, and I certainly would not want to brush away our platform as mere words, and fool the American people.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I did not hear the gentleman from Alabama. I was in the gallery, and it is rather difficult to hear. I think I discussed a few minutes ago the underlying reason for that condition. It would serve the political parties much more, and would serve the people much more, if we could stay in line with our platform pledges. But the gentleman from Utah in his speech yesterday disclosed why his party finds that difficult, and I have attempted to discuss briefly what I thought were the underlying psychological reasons for that difficulty.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield; yes.

Mr. GRANGER. There is only one mistake I made yesterday. I said we had two parties over here. We have three parties. Some of us are sitting in between the two. We want to be good liberal Democrats and do the right thing for the people we represent, and yet we are stymied. We have got to either go to one extreme or the other. I believe the gentleman is talking sense when he says we have arrived at the time when the political parties need revamping, or that we should do away with these party labels and get into the place where we belong, and be politically honest and not fool anybody.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I think the gentleman is right. I had to give the gentleman the answer I gave, which I think is honest, because no one has ever heard me say that I am a paragon of virtue in following the platform of my party, or at least the leadership of my party in this body. I think I am entitled to say that after my Presidential candidate got through making his four speeches on the west coast in 1944, in which he came out against laws restrictive of labor, for the FEPC, for the advancement of social security, and the statement which would in effect approve this legislation for full employment, I found myself in line-up with his interpretation of that platform.

He did not win, and I do not want to have to speak as the gentleman from Utah was forced to speak now about two parties on my side of the aisle. I want only one. I think you still have one party over here on the Republican side. I try to make it what I think it ought to be and other gentlemen try to keep it what they think it ought to be, but unless I am a great deal more provoked than I have ever been before I do not intend to quarrel with the people who are more greatly in the ascendancy, but I do not intend to give up the fight to get them to think as I think, because I think my philosophy means the preservation of my country and the preservation of the democratic system, the ascendancy of the Republican Party is bound to follow, but as compared to the preservation of two-party democracy that is incidental.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Utah has brought up the subject of party platform several times. Perhaps the gentleman from Utah could tell us why, when the Democrats got into power in 1933, they completely ignored their pledge to the American people to balance the Budget and continued to violate that promise for 12 long years; yes, 13 long years.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. If the gentleman from Utah please, I do not want to carry on that fight now out of my time; perhaps he can carry it on in some other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana five additional minutes.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I will answer my friend from Iowa. I think, in the first place, that the Republican Party came into existence as the preserver and defender of the rights of minority people, and, in particular, people of black skin, and I think they still owe that obligation to those people now in order to preserve my party's tradition.

I believe the fight which is being made in Detroit by the auto workers under Walter Reuther represents an advancement towards the goal of what I believe is fluid, radical capitalism, as an alternative to totalitarianism, and I think it is one of the greatest fights being made on behalf of the American people today. The worker's job is capital, and it must be reckoned with in the management of industry.

I think that in matters affecting commerce it is traditional with the Republican Party, if it was a descendant of Hamilton, and we are charged with that, that in matters affecting commerce, which affect the whole national interest, the Republican Party should abandon completely any arguments in favor of States' rights.

There are no such things as States' rights. There are rights of citizens who live within a State, and I would measure it by what services the local governments can render to the highest degree to those citizens and what services the Federal Government can render to the highest degree to those citizens, but we ought to abandon the idea of States' rights, because, actually, there is no State sovereignty. The man who speaks of State sovereignty speaks the language of totalitarianism. There is only individual sovereignty.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman, then, explain why we have State governments?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes; I will.

Under the concept of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and the dignity of man, man is sovereign. He gives part of that sovereignty to varying degrees of government, to his county, to his State, to his Nation; but he always has the power to withdraw it or to delegate it. We have State governments to serve man in those areas embraced by the geographic boundaries of the State to do those things which in his State will serve him best—the State supreme court, the State educational system in places where the county courts or the county educational system does not serve him. But the State is not sovereign, the individual is sovereign; he is always sovereign. He can withdraw his sovereignty or he can extend his sovereignty.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will admit that certain rights are left to the States.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. No.

Mr. JENSEN. The States are close to the people. In effect, that is the fact.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The gentleman states it differently than I do.

Mr. JENSEN. And the State governments are closer to the people; hence, we have learned down through the ages, not only here but in every country in the world, that the closer the government is to the people the more effective and the more efficient is government.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes. Now, may I answer the gentleman from Massachusetts? The gentleman must appreciate, however, that my time is very limited.

Mr. JENSEN. I do. Because a government close to the people is more effective is why I think we should preserve States' rights—and I still contend there are such things as States' rights.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I believe the gentleman from Iowa is thinking the same way I do, but he is using terms that I believe are dangerous.

Let me repeat, there are no States' rights. There are rights of the people who live in the State of Iowa, but they themselves can delegate to the government of the State of Iowa those things which they think the State of Iowa will do better for them. They also have the right to withdraw from the State of Iowa and give to the Federal Government or to give to a government of the peoples of the world that degree of their sovereignty which they think will best serve them.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did not the sovereignty of the States exist long before the Federal Government was established?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes; but man existed long before the State of Massachusetts, and man created the State of Massachusetts by delegation of his individual sovereignty—that part of it which was suitable for the State of Massachusetts in order to render the best service—but the State of Massachusetts did not create the citizens of Massachusetts, nor does not own the citizens of Massachusetts. The citizens of Massachusetts own the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. During the Continental Congress the question of States' rights was one of the most important discussions in the whole debate, was it not, not only so far as the State of Massachusetts was concerned but so far as the Original Thirteen States were concerned, and they reserved those rights?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, of course, there was an argument about States' rights in the Continental Congress and in the Convention which created the Constitution, because it is always true that people who have power to govern other people—government—hate to give it up, but the people of the State of Massachusetts determined that in order to have a full government—a government which could serve them better—they would delegate a part of their sovereignty to a new Federal Government so that they might be better served. The issue was not States' rights. The issue was, Shall the people determine that they can be better served in certain areas of their life by a government which had power over the State of Massachusetts? That is the constitutional answer, and it is the only answer that ties in and parallels with any idea of the innate dignity and honor of mankind, and from that premise I do not now yield, nor shall I ever yield, God giving me the strength to retain my intellectual, moral, and spiritual integrity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we might well turn aside from loose and extravagant statements, from at least one panacea that has been suggested, the sponsor of which did not think enough of to submit it to either of the Senate or House committees, and I think that we might turn aside from partisan and party politics to consider the question of employment before us, and that question is important. It is one of the most important and one of the most difficult of public problems.

I am in complete accord with the broad objectives of employment legislation, the ends desired, but the means are different and very difficult. There is continuous employment today in Russia, with a low standard of living. There was full employment in Italy and Germany. It resulted from planned economy. Who wants to follow in the footsteps of Italy and Germany? We more nearly approached full employment in the United States during the war with multiplied billions of deficits. Full-employment deficit spending contemplates control both of price and wage. I make the statement that there has never been absolute full employment, that there has never been a planned economy, without stateism or state socialism.

Employment is not the sole responsibility of the Government. Industry, agriculture, and labor have their responsibilities. It is the responsibility of Government to create sound, basic conditions for promoting employment in our free competitive enterprise system. Other sound policies, including fiscal agricultural policies, are important. They are even more important than the matter of spending, probably the most inefficient of all proposals for solving unemployment. Legislation to improve the causes of depression, the causes of unemployment, is more important than appropriations for spending.

I assert that the sound policy of government is to promote rather than to guarantee employment. The so-called Murray bill, S. 380, amended as introduced, and passed by the Senate, is substantially identical with H. R. 2202, known as the Patman bill. The LaFollette bill, H. R. 4181, is identical with the Patman bill, with some additions that are even more objectionable. I shall refer to these bills as the Senate and the House bills. They were considered by the committee, and the committee instructed a subcommittee to prepare a substitute, and that substitute, after being carefully considered and amended by the whole committee is the pending bill and I shall hereafter refer to that as the substitute.

There are three views in the committee. A small minority is opposed to any legislation. A few advocated changes in the substitute. The large majority of the committee supported the reporting of the pending bill as a constructive approach to what is probably the most difficult problem that confronts the Government.

The Senate and the House bills adopted the theory that full employment is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and that it is also the responsibility of the Federal Government to assure at all times sufficient opportunity for employment to provide an adequate or remunerative wage for the employment of all citizens. That is the declaration. That is the first part of the Senate and the House bills. But that declaration is coupled with this statement, "and to the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal expenditure and investment as may be needed to assure continuing full employment. That is the vice of the philosophy of the Senate and the House bills.

Your committee rejects that philosophy. Your committee states that the declaration in favor of the continuance of the system of private enterprise then becomes perfunctory and that the basis

of the Senate and the House bills is the expenditure, without identifying, of Federal investments and Federal expenditures, a program that is so gigantic, a program that is so destructive of private enterprise that the perfunctory declaration in favor of private enterprise falls of its own weight.

That view was a view that was emphasized before the committee by many who favor the objectives of full employment. I refer to Mr. Beardsley Ruml, I refer to Mr. R. E. Flanders, and I refer to other witnesses who concurred that the very declaration with the word "full," with the word "right," and with the word "assurance," is destructive of the objectives. I share their views that it is utterly unwise to degrade the declaration of human rights by controversial terms that at once invite opposition.

There is a difference between the right to liberty, the right to freedom, and the right to work. The Senate and the House bills ignore private initiative, ignore the desire to work at one's own destiny, ignore whether a man is suited or qualified for a particular job, and deprive us in one bold stroke of any effort to work at our destiny by announcing at this time of all times that the Federal Government proposes to guarantee or assure the right of full employment to all no matter whether they are qualified or not to do the work.

Nor is that all. I invite your attention to the fact that the Senate and House bills provide for a national budget. It is a misnomer and deceptive. A budget contemplates authorization, a budget contemplates previous policies having been adopted by Congress. Yet we are told that under the Senate and House bills there is no authorization. Why the term "budget"? Those of us that have devoted much time to the study of this problem see in the retention of the national budget in these two bills a survival of this bill as it was originally written. As originally written, it embraced a modification of the Stabilization Act of 1931, which did provide for a budget as an amendment to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

It has been said that the declarations and the provisions of the Senate and the House bills are innocuous. I challenge the statement. When did it become but the sounding brass and tinkling cymbal for the Congress of the United States to declare and give utterance to a policy? I assert under the language of the Senate and the House bills, improved somewhat by the Senate version, that the underlying philosophy is that our system of private enterprise will be hampered and will be destroyed by the declaration to the American people and by a deception to the average American citizen, that no matter whether he is qualified or not, deserving or not, whether he needs it or not, no matter whether in this period of transition he wants to work or not, it is not necessary for him to accept a job because his government will assure him employment. Now we reject that philosophy.

But I am not content merely to oppose. We have had ample demonstration today that to be critical is easy—to be constructive is difficult. We have had depressions. We have had great emergencies. Were we satisfied to do nothing? What was the program undertaken in the great depression of the early thirties? Were we satisfied with a do-nothing policy? The Stabilization Act of 1931 was passed and was intended to alleviate unemployment and to promote employment during the depression. That was during the administration of President Hoover. There are many Members of the House now who were here then. I was among the number then as I am among the number now who believes that employment is profoundly important. I recall that the Government cannot provide jobs for all. I have emphasized that full employment does obtain in socialistic states. It does obtain in Russia today. But I repeat there is a low standard of living. I have emphasized, and I call your attention to the fact, that the most ardent advocates of the so-called full employment legislation assert that the Government of the United States could not provide for more by public works and other expenditures than 10 or 15 percent of our total expenditure. All agree that the real job must be done by private enterprise. If that be true, why contradict and destroy private enterprise by this declaration and definite commitment. And I say definite. A declaration means something to me. A budget means something to me. After the National Budget in the Senate and House bills, there was a provision for the joint committee to pass a joint resolution or to present it to the Congress. I assert that under the language, and certainly under the philosophy of those bills, after we had an emergency, that a concurrent resolution authorizing a lump sum appropriation to be disbursed by the Chief Executive would be in order. What is the philosophy of the substitute in the House bill? It is vastly different. It is sound.

It has been said that the President under the Senate and House bills could do just what those bills provide. There is no declaration now as is contained in those bills for practically turning the Treasury inside out in order to guarantee every citizen all the time continuous full employment. What about the substitute? I believe it is time for a declaration. I think it is time for a sound declaration. We stand for employment. There is nothing more destructive than unemployment. I endorse the objectives of the bill, whether they are proclaimed by bishop or priest, whether they are proclaimed by minister or layman, or whether they are proclaimed by industrialist or worker. It is not right to deceive the American people. We have heard a lot about reconversion, about its being for the benefit of the employers. Frankly I do not know how an employer or the operator of a factory can reconvert from war to peace unless he provides for employment.

But what about the importance of this question? What did the Congress do? The only time that Congress has ever undertaken to make anything that approaches a constructive solution of this problem was when the Congress passed the Stabilization Act of 1931. It undertook to solve the problem by public works, by a budget for public works that had been authorized. There was a committee appointed to advise the President. That committee consisted of five members of his Cabinet. It functioned. The testimony shows that notwithstanding the Stabilization Act of 1931—it was proposed in 1928; it was too late; too long delayed; it was never given a fair chance. We embarked upon a policy of spending ourselves into prosperity very shortly after the adoption of the Stabilization Act. Experience showed that the President, whether that President was Hoover or Roosevelt, did not have sufficient or sound advice. It was President Hoover who stated, "Prosperity is just around the corner." The American people were misled. He depended upon a board of advisers, consisting of members of his Cabinet—able, capable, and distinguished Americans. In 1938, with the same sort of advisers, the same board of Cabinet advisers, the late President Roosevelt made a mistake, and you know we all but escaped the depths of another depression in 1938.

What about the substitute? How does it approach the solution of this problem? We have gone much further than in 1931, and we are providing now in advance. Let me say in this connection that all who know say that at present the few unemployed millions will be absorbed. I find no fault with the men who come back from across the sea because they do not go to work at once. It takes a little time in the transition, going from one factory to the other; but all who know say that the present unemployment, and unemployment for the next 12 months, will be absorbed, and for three reasons. In the first place, the people of the United States have the greatest amount of savings they ever have had. In the second place, the demand for civilian goods is greater than it ever has been. In the third place, we have the greatest productive capacity that our Nation has ever known. But after next year, and after the boom following the war, we should profit by our example in 1931, when we delayed from 1928 until 1931 passing the Stabilization Act; and we should pass a measure now that is sound.

Let me invite your attention to the substitute. It has been glibly said by those who evidently have not thought that the substitute is mere words. What about it? There are those who do not believe in our system of government. There are those within our borders who advocate state socialism. There are those who would destroy private enterprise. It is time for a declaration. The substitute proposes that we shall make a declaration. Was there ever a more important document in human history than the declaration known as the Declaration of Independence? The declaration here in the substitute is that we propose to promote employment by giving the free, competitive enterprise system, unhindered, unfettered, a chance to do the job.

The policy is declared in no uncertain terms. I read you the first paragraph of the pending substitute:

Section 2 declares that it is the continuing policy of the United States, by certain specified means which will have the effect of creating the maximum opportunities for employment, to attain and maintain a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power. The means thus specified are—

(1) Preserving and encouraging the American system of free competitive enterprise, and fostering investment of private capital;

(2) Aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business, and to promoting continuous growth in the quality and quantity of facilities of production;

(3) Encouraging individual initiative;

(4) Avoiding competition of Government with private business enterprise; and

(5) Adopting sound fiscal practices and maintaining the credit of the United States.

To those who allege—whether they mean it or not—that we are deceiving the American people and those who toil, we say that in the last 12 years we have profited by experience.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. When I have finished my statement.

We say that the depression of the twenties was caused on account of commodity collapse. Whatever our shortcomings were we undertook to remedy them by agricultural legislation. The depression of the early thirties was caused by stock manipulation. Have we done nothing? We have guaranteed bank deposits, we have passed the Securities and Exchange Act, we have passed the Utilities Act, and other legislation in an effort to prevent depression. It is just as important to ascertain the cause of depressions and remove those causes, yes, more important, than it is to spend.

It is not fair to say we have never adopted any program for works. And so this substitute states that we encourage our States—not "we aid and encourage"—to at a time when their treasuries are full, not by providing grants, but we encourage the States when periods of unemployment come to step up their public employment.

What have we done to provide for employment? We have adopted measures, we have adopted and planned programs of public works, we have provided for loans, loans to the suffering peoples of other nations, loans to our own people. RFC loans are available today to any applicant who can qualify. We have provided loans by the billions to our veterans; and we say now that it is our policy to step up these public works that have been adopted, highways, flood control, and other public works, whatever they are, in order to stimulate and in order to stabilize employment when there is depression.

We substitute for the so-called national budget a provision for a report by the President of the United States, give him an entire year to study the matter and we say to him without having made any commitment for the expenditure of a single dollar that we want him to ascertain what added legislation is necessary. We say to the President that if there is unemployment or if it is anticipated we invite him to submit his suggestions for any additional outlay or expenditures and for any other measures; and we say to him: "Mr. President, we invite you to submit with them a sound fiscal program to protect the credit of the United States." Is that an empty word? Does not that language mean something in times and days of deficit spending?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we undertake to profit by our experiences under the Stabilization Act when we tried in 1931 to do our dead level best by public works to solve the problems of the early thirties.

We provide here not for a committee of the Cabinet, the members of which are thinking about political questions and are engaged in administration; we provide here for an advisory commission of three of the outstanding men of the United States, representing all segments of our population, familiar with our economic conditions, familiar with our industrial, our agricultural and our labor problems. We say to them: "We are placing you at the disposal of the President of the United States. We invite you to discuss the causes of these depressions, or of these inflations and give us the remedy, if it may need legislation. You submit your report to the President so that he will have the benefit of it." We will then profit by the experiences of the thirties when the President had to rely on the members of his busy Cabinet. We provide that those men shall be on a par with the Cabinet. They shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year, the same amount paid members of the Cabinet.

We provide further that when they submit a report to the President of the United States they shall not merely be a planning board. Now, I know something about planning boards and I know about their defects. The defects in planning boards, whether State or Federal, are that they plan and plan for nothing except spending and at no time were they required to submit measures by which to finance the plan. Whatever may be said about these economic advisers, we require in their report to the President that they shall submit a sound fiscal program and policy of financing any outlays for any works, or other programs.

We retain then the provisions that occur in the Senate and House bill which provide for a joint congressional committee. Whatever we may say about committees, whatever we may say about joint congressional committees, they are the only way by which we can function. We have to create a committee to make explorations of this kind and if we should confine it to one House it is difficult to say what the other might do.

We establish the policy of both Senate and House bills in providing for a joint committee to which the message of the President of the United States with respect to prospective employment, with respect to economic trends, with respect to economic conditions, with respect to the causes of any dislocation, shall be submitted by the advisory committee and the joint committee will in 2 or 3 months submit its report to the Congress of the United States for reference to the appropriate committees.

We have anticipated the argument that this will be nothing more than another commission. We have stipulated, after conferring as best we could with those who know, and we have provided a ceiling of $300,000 for the expenses of this advisory council to devote its full time to the most important questions that ordinarily confront the Government. We have undertaken to provide it with an adequate staff. We say that there shall be no duplication. We say that the records statistics and investigations of the Government departments shall be available to them. We have provided the joint committee of the House and Senate with an adequate staff and we say, in response to the argument as to expenditures of money, that those expenditures shall be limited to $50,000 in each House.

Is this problem worthy of further study? We rejected the Senate and House bills because we say there has been no study. After conferring with his Cabinet, as Hoover did in 1930, Hoover submitted a plan, and Roosevelt did the same thing in 1938. We have undertaken to be constructive. We say, "When you do submit it, if it means more outlays, if it means more expenditures, give us your tax program, give us your fiscal policy." It should be sound, of course.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the substitute is a constructive approach to the problem of unemployment. I am unwilling to deceive the American people by assuring them at this time, of all times, when there are many who learned through the years to ask the Government to provide for them, when we are trying now to prevent the labor disturbances that obtain in our land, I can think of no more dangerous, I cannot think of a more destructive thing to do than to declare that at this time, whether men desire to work or not, whether they are on strike or not, it does not make any difference, the Government will guarantee them jobs.

We reject the policy and we recommend a constructive approach that in my judgment will solve the problem. Abraham Lincoln in 1860 said, in substance, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." He also said, "This Nation cannot endure half slave and half free." Private enterprise must have a chance to do the job. It will promote employment. The substitute declares that it shall have a chance. We cannot endure half private enterprise and half state socialism. It must be one or the other. The conflict is on between competitive private enterprise and state socialism. America has arrived at the fork of the road. This generation must determine the way we are to go. The Senate and the House bills would implant the germs of national socialism in our economic system. We have destroyed the frontal attacks. Is it possible that the germs of the diseases that we have overcome will destroy the

American system? Under private enterprise every citizen enjoys the privilege to shape his own destiny. The Government promotes his right to work out his own destiny, but at the same time the Government guarantees freedom. When the Government guarantees economic security it destroys thrift, self-reliance, self-denial, initiative, and self-respect. I believe that the trend toward communism in the rest of the world will be definitely checked in America, and I believe that our system of free enterprise will be preserved. We are either for or against that system. I am ready to stand up and be counted. It is time for a new declaration. We will not exchange the freedom transmitted to us by our forefathers for a mess of socialistic pottage.

We hear a lot about security. When Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death," he was thinking of something dearer than mere security. He was thinking of something more important than work. He was thinking of liberty. The Pilgrim Fathers were not seeking security when they landed at Plymouth Rock. They were thinking of something more than mere security. They were thinking of the tyranny that they had left in the Old World and of the freedom and liberty they sought in the New. They sacrificed security under tyranny for liberty and freedom in America.

In the convention that adopted the Constitution there was much wrangling and there were many discussions. George Washington was the chairman. Just back of the chair was a painting of the sun as it appeared above the horizon. Differences often threatened to break up the convention. But when the Constitution was finally signed, Benjamin Franklin, 83 years of age, who had been a great stabilizing force in the convention, arose and said, "I have looked upon that painting again and again. I have wondered whether it is a rising or a setting sun, but now I know it is a rising sun."

For 156 years a rising sun has shown on America. It is for this generation to see that this sun, that has brought to America the highest standard of living known to human history and that has seen America grow from a few struggling colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to the greatest and mightiest of all nations, does not set, and above all, it is for this generation to see that the light of freedom does not go out.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. I have listened with considerable interest to the gentleman's remarks, and I have seldom heard a more sincere speech in behalf of his belief. There were two things I wanted to comment upon briefly. One was, a few moments ago the gentleman used the phrase "whether a man wants to work or not." The original House bill and the original Senate bill definitely stated "all Americans able to work and seeking work." The phrase "seeking work" would effectively eliminate the cases the gentleman is concerned about, whether a man wants to work or not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer that question—and I anticipated it and I do not quibble about words—by saying that I do not believe we ought to mislead the American people. There are still a few people who had rather not work.

I should say that the statement of the advocates of real employment—when I say "employment" I mean a high level of employment, as all thoughtful men who advocate employment have said that the goal is not full employment, that the goal is a high level of employment. May I say to the gentleman that whenever the word "employment" occurs in this substitute we mean a high level of employment. That is the level that economists and all advocates of real employment advocate. For my part, I share the belief of those who oppose the use of this controversial language that we ought not to degrade the fundamental human rights by the use of a term that is controversial and unnecessary.

Mr. OUTLAND. I said a moment ago that I thought the gentleman made an excellent statement in behalf of the philosophy in which he sincerely believes. But will the gentleman grant that there are others of us here who are just as anxious to prevent state socialism and who are just as anxious to preserve our freedoms, but we think it is not going to be done if we go through recurring depressions increasingly severe.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Neither do I. I said in the beginning that I thought the matter of employment was one of the most important problems that could confront us. But it is time for us to analyze; it is time for us to think things through; it is time for us not to be misled; it is time for us to resist the boring from within; and it is time for us to know that those who said that it could not happen there may come to realize that it can happen here.

Mr. OUTLAND. May I say further that it seems to a great many of us, however, that the path down to these things which the gentleman fears, isms of any kind, comes through hunger and unemployment, which came in Italy that way and which came in Germany that way. Unless we take adequate steps in advance, there may be danger of its coming here. For that reason, many of us are advocating the original full-employment bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want adequate, but I want sound steps. I do not want steps that will lead to a repetition of what happened in Italy and what happened in Germany.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman states here, and I am abbreviating:

> Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy of the United States by means of preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise, aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, encouraging individual initiative, avoiding competition of government with private business enterprise, and adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States, and thereby creating under, and in a manner consistent with, the American system, the maximum opportunity for employment.

That is No. 1. Since the gentleman has gone into detail in enumerating these things, I am wondering why he left out preventing monopoly. That is one of the most dangerous things to our free enterprise system.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fair question. For my part, I have no objection to inserting the word "monopoly."

Mr. PATMAN. I just wondered why it was overlooked.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There are other matters. That is important, and I have no objection to it. We have to handle the matter of employment, we have to handle the matter of taxes. We cover it by saying we shall undertake to ascertain the causes of inflation. Whether it is monopoly, a fiscal policy, or any other policy, I think our language here is broad enough to cover the matter the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. PATMAN. One other question. Where you mention high levels of employment, you follow it by saying "by means of encouraging State and local governments, planning and adopting programs for loans by the United States, and planning and adopting a program of sound public works."

It does not say anything there about maintaining a high level of employment, it says "to stimulate private enterprise in the periods in which widespread unemployment exists or threatens so as to stimulate and promote employment."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so. I repeat what I said, that the word "employment" and the words "high levels of employment" and the word "maximum" are equivalent.

Mr. PATMAN. But the bill does not say that.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BENDER. The speech of the gentleman indicates that the original bill provided for state socialism. Am I correct in assuming that?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that I adopted the philosophy of witnesses who indicated that that was just exactly what it would do; that it was unsound, and would lead to a system that was destructive of my Government because the real basis for full employment would be Government expenditures, and I repeat it.

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman firm in that conviction?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I usually say what I mean and mean what I say.

Mr. BENDER. How does the gentleman explain the President's position, the position of the Secretary of the Treasury, of Mr. Vinson, of Mr. Snyder, and Secretary Wallace, and Budget Director Smith, appearing before our committee and advocating the original full employment bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I explain it by saying in my judgment you did them a very grave injustice when you said all

of these 1,163 pages of hearings here were a bunch of "bunk." I think those and other witnesses were entitled to consideration and you ought to give consideration to their constructive statements.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman does not answer the question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is unable to realize that I have answered it. I said I considered it answered.

Mr. BENDER. I understand the gentleman. The gentleman in making that statement implies that these gentlemen who appeared before our committee, and the President, by the way, took our committee to task for not acting more speedily on the bill, were advocates of state socialism.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have never charged any person with any sort of political advocacy. I am dealing with facts and I am dealing with the philosophy of the bill. Without referring to you and referring to any of the witnesses who testified, and we had many constructive statements, I said I reject that philosophy. I am in accord with those who believe that the philosophy of the Senate and House bills mean just what they say—and that is what I have said.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You did say a moment ago you were firmly convinced that H. R. 2202 followed the philosophy which would take us into state socialism, did you not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is my objection to it, and I so stated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and it is true that the gentlemen named by the gentleman from Ohio, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Vinson, Mr. Snyder, the Director of Reconversion, and Mr. Smith of the Budget, and Mr. Schwellenbach, each and every one of them without qualification endorse H. R. 2202?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, sir; I will say this, with all due deference, that those gentlemen said just as I say, that they were opposed to state socialism. They said to us in response to our questions that if there is any language in this bill or in either of these bills that needs to be clarified to make it definite and certain that we are not going on the path of state socialism, they favored clarification of that language.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. I have a question to ask, but before I put it I would like to pay my respects and my compliments to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], for the very able and patriotic service that he has rendered to our committee which reported out this substitute bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I love to hear the gentleman say that, but what is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HENRY. My question is whether it is not true that in addition to dealing with matters of depression and unemployment this bill also deals with the question of inflation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so, sir, and I repeat in conclusion, that under the terms of this substitute instead of committing ourselves by the declaration to implement that policy by Federal investments and expenditures without any sort of limitation, we say in this substitute to the President, if we have not adopted sufficient policies, give us your recommendations and give Congress a chance to take a look at them and we say there shall not be expended a single dollar for any purpose for any kind of outlay until and unless the Congress has first affirmatively authorized that expenditure.

I now yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. A moment ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took exception to the fact that we do not have any reference in the committee substitute to the prevention of monopoly. Do we not now have on the statute books all kinds of legislation dealing with monopoly?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably. I repeat what I said to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], if we find that that legislation ought to be amended we have provided that that legislation shall be amended by recommendation of the Congress to eliminate the causes of depressions. I think my chairman is absolutely right.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Following that, I suppose from what the gentleman has said, that we are to forget what everybody else said about this matter and accept his philosophy and his version of this thing? As I understand, he is the author of it and he does not want any amendments? There is no question about it but this is what is right?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have a high regard for the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]. I have confined myself not to a discussion of politics or partisanship, but I have endeavored to confine myself to this bill. I accord the gentleman the right to his views. I have stated the views that actuated this committee. If my statements are not supported by reason and by logic, if they are not supported by the course of history, if they are not supported by the very fact that under this system for 156 years our Government now enjoys the highest standard of living of any government in the world, reject them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How many members of the gentleman's committee support his views?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I repeat what I said, that four members of the committee filed a minority report, and that the vast majority of the members supported the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. But you are supported in your views by an overwhelming majority of your committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably, or the bill would not have been brought here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, you say an overwhelming majority. Eight members signed the minority report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But four of them voted for reporting the bill. I repeat my statement, that as far as this particular substitute is concerned, a vast majority of all the members of the committee, except four or five, voted to report it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And after those eight members had visited the White House, then they were for the bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I repeat what I stated in the committee. Something was said about the President bringing pressure to bear. He said this matter was on the doorstep of the Committee on Expenditures. He said in a statement, "I ask that committee to report an employment bill." He never at any time, and I speak by his statement to the public, said that he wanted the committee to report the original Senate bill or the original House bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. All the hearings that were had were on H. R. 2202?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The hearings commenced on H. R. 2202. In a few days the Senate bill S. 380 came over. At the time the hearings began the LaFollette bill (H. R. 4181) was introduced, and the hearings were conducted on all three bills.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi on the work he is trying to do on this bill. While I signed the minority report, if I could follow the bill as it was written by the gentleman from Mississippi and take that as the final result, I would vote for it. But I want to qualify that. If it is going to be amended by a lot of amendments that will be offered in the House, then I would vote against it. The gentleman has worked diligently on this matter.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I want to say in this connection that the committee considered this bill for four long days. Many amendments were proposed, and among those, at least one amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was adopted. Many members of the committee proposed amendments which were adopted. I know of no legislation which has been more carefully presented to this House in a long time. If we profit by legislation that was enacted in 1931 but too late to be given a chance, no Member of the House, no Member of the Senate has submitted a philosophy or program that is more constructive than that contained in the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. All time has been against the original bill. I just wonder if the author of the original bill and those who are sponsors are not entitled to some time along about now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled by the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member.

Mr. GIBSON. I am not going to yield for the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, we are going to yield the gentleman time. The proponents of the original bill will be given time, but the custom, as I understand it, is to give members of the committee who are either for or against the bill an opportunity to make their statements.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] yielded 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill, I should like to take the skin off of it and let you look on the inside and see just what it is. I can tell you in plain language what it is and I hope some of you understand it. Its purpose is that of a political compromise, but it is what is known to some of us people in the South as a misconception—if you get the idea. Now, let us figure just a little bit what it says about itself. That is a pretty good way to take inventory. It starts off by saying:

Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy of the United States—

(a) By means of—

(1) Preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise and fostering the investment of private capital in trade—

And so forth. The next clause reads:

By means of aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business—

And so forth. Third, and I want you to listen to this closely:

By encouraging individual initiative.

In the name of all that is holy and right, I ask you: Since when has this or any other legislative body been strong encugh and broad enough to legislate into the heart of the individuals of this or any other Nation individual initiative?

(4) Avoiding competition of Government with private business enterprise; and

(5) Adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States.

In other words, it takes up about 90 percent of its time apologizing for the statement that it is a bill to sponsor and foster free enterprise.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It goes on the theory that Congress can pass a miracle.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; some have come to believe that it really can. As I say, 90 percent of the effort in drafting the bill is devoted to apologizing for defending and fostering free enterprise. If it had not been for the ingenuity of men like Henry Ford and other businessmen in this country, God knows where you and I would have been; I guess I would have perished.

But the most ridiculous thing in the whole bill outside of this one thing—it is like taking the beautiful pure maiden out and spending a whole afternoon telling her how you are going to protect her virtue and then when the sun sets behind the western clouds destroy all that you told her you would protect. The first 90 percent of the words tells how it loves free enterprises, how it cherishes, and how it means to nourish free enterprise. The next 10 percent says: "Look out! Oh, boy! Here I come! I am going to cut your throat." And it does not fail to do it.

As between this bill, this political compromise, if you please, and those other monstrosities that have been offered by various Members, I want to tell you that this is much the less harmful. There is no question about that. If I had to vote for one—which, thank God, I do not have to do—it would certainly be this instead of the others. But let me tell you what the strongest proponents of this bill have to say about it. They say it just does not do anything at all. I agree with them, with one exception; it sets up one more bureau at an expense of $435,000 a year. That means a little bit to me, whether it does to you or not, and it means a little bit to the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. It attempts to do one other thing, and that is to deceive and mislead the American people. It is a synonym for mockery and hypocrisy; it is a sham and a shibboleth, and a slogan that cannot do anyone very much harm, and God knows it cannot do them any good.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for that contribution. It is well said.

Let me tell you this is one time in our lives, for God's sake, we should become realistic in approaching subjects pending before this House. It seems that this body has long since forgotten that there is such a power and force in existence as human psychology. I want to tell you that the mere fact these things have been discussed by the Members of this body during these few months has done more to break down the morale of the people of this Nation and teach them to pull in their wings and say, "This gracious Government will take care of me, I do not have to work," than anything that could have been done to the American people.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. That being true, does the gentleman not think it is about time that this Government officially declare that it still believes in the free system of private enterprise?

Mr. GIBSON. If this bill does not cover that I think we ought to do that. It is time for this Congress to wake up, and I mean that literally, and get back to running the Government's business and, so help me God, let the businessmen of this Nation run their business before we bankrupt the world.

You hear men say, and, my God, it is pitiful to a man who has a brain to think with: "We must have some law that says that an American citizen has got the right to work." Just weigh that for a minute and think about it. We have to pass a law that an American citizen has got the right to work.

Let me tell you Members something. I was reared in a family of 10 and we had just 1 old gray mare to plow up the soil and till it. My father never had $25 at one time in all his life. We got up at 4 o'clock in the morning, we went into the field at hard toil and into woods cutting cross ties or dipping turpentine before the stars ceased to shine. We ate a cold lunch out of a tin bucket and worked until the stars began to shine again as the sun hid itself behind the western horizon. Did we do that because the gracious Government said we had the right to work? We did not do it because of a right; we did it because it was a duty and in order to keep the wolf of hunger from stalking the door and leaving us as dripping skeletons as you people are going to leave this Nation if you keep on with this tomfoolery. We looked on work as a duty and not a right, but a privilege. My God, Mr. Chairman, it is a duty you ought to be willing to perform.

When this Congress gets through performing operations, I do not know, it may then become a right and a glorious one, to go out and do a day's toil, because miracles you are performing, and it may actually be just that when you get through, God knows.

Now, let us go on a little bit. I have heard some gentlemen stand up here today and say that we had to set this thing up so that the people would have money to pay taxes with, to pay the national debt, and so forth. Let us follow that reasoning a little bit. How many of you folks have ever gotten drunk to cure a bad cold? It is just about the same thing. You think you are well, but when you get over the shock you sink to depths to which that horrible disease had never carried you, and if you do not quit this tommyrot, this downright foolishness, in this body, you are going to sink the fiber of this Nation from the shock to a point to which no depression we have ever had carried us.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I take it the gentleman subscribes to the philosophy enunciated some years ago by a very wise gentleman when he said, "The Congress of the United States cannot legislate everybody rich, but the Congress of the United States can legislate everybody poor." This bill would go a long way in that direction?

Mr. GIBSON. This and other similar bills passed by this body has just about brought us to the skeleton stage in this Nation.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. In New York City during the depths of the depression in the thirties there were more than 500,000 people unemployed. If the gentleman had been the mayor or an official in New York City, how would he have met that problem?

Mr. GIBSON. Well, that is kind of like asking——

Mr. THOM. No, no; that is the question at issue. Now let us have the correct answer.

Mr. GIBSON. In other words, the gentleman has gotten so grand and mighty in his position that he is going to ask the question and answer it, too. I give him the privilege, go ahead.

Mr. THOM. I will give the gentleman the chance.

Mr. GIBSON. I wish he would.

Mr. THOM. Go ahead now. I will give the gentleman all the time he wants.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman have any time to give?

Mr. THOM. The gentleman asked for it.

Mr. GIBSON. If I had been mayor of New York, I would have handled that problem, but I did not happen to be. I represent the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia in Congress, and this is my function and my job, and I am going to try to handle it without any dictation from the gentleman.

Mr. THOM. I assume the gentleman does not have any factories in his district where there is unemployment; he has farmers. But what would he do in the city of New York under the circumstances I have set up? I want an answer.

Mr. GIBSON. If the gentleman wants an answer, I would let free enterprise make employment. How many people has the gentleman employed in his life? Tell me, please.

Mr. THOM. Free enterprise did not employ 500,000. Only when Government intervention came was there employment.

Mr. GIBSON. Excuse me now. How many people has the gentleman ever provided work for?

Mr. THOM. That is beside the issue.

Mr. GIBSON. Very much so, I imagine. The gentleman has not done as good as Henry Ford, has he?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In reference to the New York situation, the jobs were there, sir. The jobs were there, but the pickets would not let them through the line.

Mr. GIBSON. If that is not a satisfactory answer, the gentleman will just have to wait.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I would like to answer the question asked by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM]. It so happened that I was mayor of the city of Marion, a city of about 34,000 people, during the depression. Our city was in financial distress, to the extent that even some of our business people thought it might be necessary to place it in bankruptcy. We had the same distressed conditions in Marion as were present in Cleveland, precisely, yet in the midst of that depression we balanced our budget, we paid our debts, and we fed our people.

Mr. GIBSON. You did it by work, did you not? That is a very good answer.

Now I want to go on and discuss this proposition of the national debt. It has been said here today that we had to set up public works so people could get money to pay taxes to pay the national debt. Let us follow that cycle around and see where we are getting. How many people in this House—and answer this to your own soul, because my time is about out—will admit that out of every dollar that the Federal Government handles, irrespective of how it handles it, it deliberately wastes 40 cents? No man can disprove that statement. Oh, you are going to set up public works and hire people out of the Federal Treasury so that they can pay taxes and retire the national debt. All right. You spend a dollar, except it will grow to billions of dollars, and out of every dollar you send out you may average getting 10 cents back, and that is just about as good financing as I think this Government has been doing since it has been dabbling in business; in other words, we throw away one dollar to collect a dime back in taxes. But that is one of their arguments. This Congress cannot get away from the fact that the responsibility for this Government rests in the bosom of the membership of the House and the Senate. If you are serious about wanting to pay the national debt, then for God's sake quit throwing money at everything that will catch it. You know, and I know, that 50 percent of the appropriations made here are foolishly and unwisely made, and the money is absolutely thrown away so far as any value or benefit coming back to individuals or the Government is concerned. The worth of the dollar is what that dollar will produce. You cannot get away from it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GIBSON. You are talking about the Government running the business of this country. The Government operated the American railroads during the First World War at a net loss of $1,922,000,000. It did not pay one penny of taxes into the Federal Treasury. During this World War, the businessmen, the men who built the railroads, the men who are responsible for free enterprise in this country, the men who have made it possible for you and me to be where we are today, operated the railroads. During this time they paid over $4,370,000,000 into the Federal Treasury in taxes, save and exclusive of pay-roll taxes. They paid into the Federal Treasury over $3,000,000 in taxes per day during the period of the war. They netted $2,190,000,000 after paying those taxes. The difference in the efficiency of businessmen and that of the Government was above $9,000,000,000 over that short period.

Let me get back to this theory and show you what I am talking about. A dollar is not worth anything at all within itself. It is worth only what the dollar will produce in material things, food or otherwise. If you as a farmer can take a dollar and produce five barrels of corn and I as a farmer can take a dollar and produce one barrel of corn, then your dollar is worth five of mine. What the Government can produce with $10, free enterprise, businessmen, can produce with $1. Do you people actually believe we are doing anything but destroying this country when we set the Government up in business throughout the length and breadth of this land?

Talk about this do-good business, helping the poor. I get so sick of that, I get so sick and tired of hearing it until I become nauseated. If you want to help the poor, let me tell you how to do it. Fall back to the fundamentals of this Nation and maintain the country that you and I were blessed to come up in. When I was 25 years old I was shoveling coal in a coal chute of a railroad at 18 cents an hour. Not by my ingenuity did I become a Member of this Congress? No. It was because the businessmen of this Nation had built a country, had built a democracy where poor men like me had a chance to climb. God knows I will spend my life and my energy to maintain that same Government so that my children may have the same right.

There seems to be a sentiment in this body that people should not suffer hardships, that you have to legislate them out. But let me tell you that hardships have built more men of national stature than opportunity ever did.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon in the course of the discussion on the rule, I indicated that tomorrow I will offer a substitute for the bill in the nature of an amendment to create a national commission on inventory. That amendment or substitute will be printed in the RECORD and will be available to all Members in tomorrow morning's RECORD.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of a bill that has been more misrepresented and more misunderstood than the bill that has been called the full employment bill. It happens that I am not in favor of any other form of government except our own good American Government. I think it is the finest and best Government on the face of the earth, a good parliamentary Government where the people's will represents the established democracy of this country. I am opposed to all these "isms," like fascism, communism, and socialism. I do not want them to get started in this country at all. I want us to maintain the kind of country and economy that we have all lived under. Therefore, feeling that

way, and the people who had to do with the writing of the bill feeling the same way, I believe I know something of what is behind this legislation. This bill was written commencing the last part of 1944 after the Presidential election when both Presidential candidates pledged themselves for full employment, both Mr. Dewey and Mr. Roosevelt. A group of people here in Washington, most of them Members of Congress, got together and commenced to write that bill. I had just a little part in it. I remember one of the meetings just before the bill was introduced in the Senate. That meeting was right here in the House wing of the Capitol. Our group met, and we went over it carefully. It was written right here in the Capitol of the United States. We are proud of it because it represents the language of Members of this body or of the other body. I am telling you that to let you know that it originated right here on Capitol Hill.

Now, let us see how bad this proposal is wherein we are trying to eliminate the bad things that have always happened after every major war in history. Let us study the past. Let us profit by the horrible examples of the past. Let us pass legislation or do what is necessary to prevent these horrible things happening that have not happened after just one war in history, but have happened after every war in history. I want you to take the hearings on this bill. Turn to page 670 and you will find a chart there representing the business booms and depressions since 1775. You will find that every 10 or 12 years we had a boom and then we had a bust. After the other war, there was no exception to that rule. After the other war, we had inflation, the ruinous type, the runaway type of inflation. After that we had ruinous deflation. Five hundred thousand small businessmen closed their doors. Because of something they did? No, because of an economic situation that the Congress of the United States could have prevented and failed to prevent. Why did 500,000 farmers lose their homes? Why were they foreclosed and put out in the cold? Because Congress did not study the past after the other war and try to prevent what has always happened after every major war.

Now, with the knowledge of the past and with the information that there has never been one single exception, there has always been a boom and a bust after very major war, do you not think as sensible men and women that we owe to the people we have the honor to represent to draw upon that knowledge and information and try to do something to prevent what has invariably happened after every major war?

What is the proposal—this proposal that many in their extravagant claims and declarations say would absolutely change our form of government? Let us just analyze it briefly. What is it? It merely says that the President of the United States will set up an organization in the White House, just a little group of his Cabinet members, to study the future and see what the trends are. If it is inflationary, to make recommendations how to stop inflation. If it is deflationary, to suggest means to prevent deflation. How will this little group do that? They will make recommendations to the Congress on January 3 of each year when the new session commences. Then, where does it go? Does the Congress have to debate it? No. Our bill says it will go to a joint committee of the House and Senate. Composed of whom? Members of the Senate and Members of the House; men like Senator GLASS, Senator MCKELLAR, Senator BRIDGES, and Senator GEORGE; over here, men like Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, and Mr. TABER. Men like that will be on this joint committee to which that report will be referred. Under the terms of the bill it will go to men like that. What do those men do? By March 1, they will submit a joint resolution to the House and Senate, containing recommendations of a general policy—or as a guide—as to what should be done to, as far as possible, maintain continuous employment during the next year. H. R. 2202 has the following provision:

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) To make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this act; and

(2) To report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

Suppose that committee submits this resolution to the House, and it says, "We are likely to have inflation. We have got to cut out this public works, this housing, and things like that. Too much public money is going out. We recommend that the Congress stop it just to stop inflation." We just debate it. Nothing to be done except debate. Then the Congress will adopt its policy, telling the committees that handle the respective bills, "Now, gentlemen, we are liable to have inflation, and we want to reduce it. Withdraw this authorization on public roads, or we want the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee to withdraw the housing appropriation. We want work done, but we do not want it done now. It is a bad time to do it."

Is there anything wrong about that? It is using parliamentary processes to try to protect the people that we have the honor to represent. No power to appropriate money; no authorization of any appropriation; cannot spend a dollar without this Congress voting for it. The fact that the Budget suggests it you know does not have much weight with Members of Congress who vote independently.

Now, what does the substitute bill provide? It provides a set-up in the Executive Offices to study the economic conditions. When do they report to Congress? By March 3. The substitute sets up the same kind of a joint committee, with the type of men I mentioned to you, that is stated in the original bill. They have until May 1 to report to Congress. What kind of report? Just like the report that committees file. That is exactly right.

One of the cornerstones of this legislation is in the original bill, which says that that joint committee will submit a joint resolution to Congress in order that that resolution may be discussed, and the Congress can agree upon the type of legislation it wants the respective committees to report to the House. That is left out entirely in the committee substitute. That is a cornerstone of this legislation that has for its goal full employment, yes. The preamble to the Constitution of the United States contains the phrase "to promote the general welfare" and we are trying to promote the general welfare all the time, but that does not mean that every act or deed of Congress or the individual Members thereof is promoting the general welfare; generally we are. The same way with full employment. Do we expect full employment, 100 percent? No; nobody expects it. We have never had it in the world. We never will have it. A million and a half people because of over age will not want to work, likewise people who are crippled, and people who go from one job to another just not wanting to work. We do not try to take care of them. We are saying we want to provide employment, if possible—that is our goal, that is our goal—to provide employment opportunities, if possible, to those who are able, and willing, and anxious to work. Where is there any dole in that? Where in that will you find a holding out of promises and false ideals to the idle people who do not want to work?

Mr. Chairman, we have the highest national debt in history. No country on earth ever had a higher debt than we have today, $265,000,000,000. There is only one way that we can pay that national debt in good honest dollars, and that is with a high national income. There is only one way we can have a high national income, and that is with a high level of or full employment. That is what that means. So if you want repudiation of that debt by paying it with worthless money, vote against any effort to provide full employment and full production. It is only with those two that we can pay this national debt with honest dollars.

Is this such a violent and such an unreasonable proposal? Let me read you an excerpt from a statement made by a candidate for the Presidency in this country in 1928 advocating this type of legislation—1928. Let me read it to you:

I wish to lay down the proposition that the very prerequisite, the very foundation of economic progress to our industrial and business employees is full and stable employment.

Full employment and stable employment.

A continued surplus of unemployed workers means decreasing wages, increasing hours, and fear for the future. To protect labor, to maintain its prosperity, to abolish poverty, we must so organize our economic system as to provide a job for all who have the will to work.

Herbert Hoover made that statement. He advocated this bill in 1928.

In 1931 a law was passed known as the Economic Stabilization Act, which was very similar to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. It was passed in plenty of time to stop the depression of 1932 if it had been workable, but it was not workable. To ask us now to take the same thing that failed before is, I think, asking too much.

Let me tell you another candidate for the Presidency who made a statement along these lines, President Roosevelt in 1944:

To assure the full realization of the right to useful and remunerative employment an adequate program must, and if I have anything to do about it, will, provide America with close to 60,000,000 productive jobs.

If anyone feels that my faith in our ability to provide 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is fantastic, let him remember that some people said the same thing about my demand in 1940 for 50,000 airplanes.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, at Chicago, October 28, 1944.

Let me read you a statement from the other candidate who also was working on this problem and the people who were elected on the other ticket, the minority party ticket, asked the people to vote for them and to vote for their candidate on the basis of the statements he made in that campaign. Let me read you one by Thomas E. Dewey at Seattle, Wash., on September 21, 1944:

If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours. If there is one thing we are all agreed upon it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this county must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore, it is the business of the Government.

Thomas E. Dewey made that statement and upon the basis of that statement the people of this Nation were asked to vote for him for President. Now, suppose he had been elected, would we be assuming the same attitude about it?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Here is what President Truman has said about this proposal.

A national reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work—a declaration of the ultimate duty of Government to use its own resources if all other methods should fail to prevent prolonged unemployment—these will help to avert fear and establish full employment. The prompt and firm acceptance of this bedrock public responsibility will reduce the need for its exercise. I ask that full employment legislation to provide these vital assurances be speedily enacted.

Mr. Chairman, this thing has become more or less of a nonpartisan issue. Both sides advocated it in the election last year, both sides asked for the vote of the people on the basis of full employment. Now, then, one side has been elected. Will both sides carry out that one promise in common? Both sides promised it to the American people. Are we going to be true to our promises? Will we carry them out? Does a campaign promise mean anything? I think it does. So, since both sides promised that we would work to the end that we would do our dead level best to provide opportunities for work for those able, anxious and willing to work, are we going to keep that promise?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. When Dewey made that statement he was speaking for Thomas E. Dewey. It was not in the Republican platform and that is the thing that defeated him and no one on this side of the aisle is bound by what Dewey said.

Mr. PATMAN. That is refreshing. I did not hear anybody denounce it last year. I did not hear the gentleman denounce it. If he did I would like to know in which newspaper it was published.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would say the same thing about the statement of Mr. Hoover?

Mr. PATMAN. You know, Mr. Hoover made that statement too.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Hoover, Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Roosevelt never advocated the setting-up of an organization like the gentleman advocates setting up in this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. How are you going to do it?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman should say that before he makes these bald statements.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman is not for this, what is his plan?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has misrepresented these other gentlemen.

Mr. PATMAN. I certainly have not. I have read exactly what they said. Nobody will say that they stated anything else.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield to the gentleman to state in which newspaper he denounced those statements.

Mr. GROSS. There was also in that campaign and prior thereto, Pearl Harbor, when Roosevelt said: "Anyone who thinks we need a two-ocean Navy is dumb." Does the gentleman recall that too?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we have done too much fighting over dead issues already. I think we ought to look into the future. We ought to study the past and look into the future. This is planning for the future, planning against the horrible things that have always happened in the past after every major war.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman spoke of the fact that the original Senate bill and the bill introduced by him provided for a report of the President to be considered by a joint committee and the joint committee introduce a resolution. Is it the purpose to bypass committees of Congress?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The object is to work with the committees of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that if you require that committee to submit a joint resolution and then have the joint resolution pass and the matter go to committee, that there would be delay that we propose to obviate in this substitute?

Mr. PATMAN. Not as much delay as the substitute, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi. There should be only a few days' discussion on the joint resolution, and that should be right after March 1. Then we would have plenty of time for the committees to act and pass legislation. The gentleman wants to wait until after May 1 to even file the report. Then it would be June 1 before bills would be introduced to carry it out and the Members would be ready to go home before it would come out on the floor at the end of the session every time. Let us bring in this legislation at the beginning of the session when we are all fresh, when we are especially anxious to do something to help the people.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In all deference, there is a lapse between the time that the committees render their reports and the President submitting his report under both bills. Under the bill introduced by the gentleman, he is requiring the President to submit his report at the end of the session.

Mr. PATMAN. January 3 in each year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. When is the new President going to submit his report? January 3 has gone.

Mr. PATMAN. No; the President will submit his report at the end of the succeeding year.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Again, with all due deference now, the more constructive way to do it, as we have it in the substitute, would be to provide that the report shall be submitted within a reasonable time.

Mr. PATMAN. That is quibbling over words, I will say to the gentleman. We are not concerned with that. The President who is in power at the time will submit the report. Then if a new President comes in on January 20, and he has different ideas, let him make recommendations. All in the world this does is this, it is planning, it is studying, it is looking at the past, it is trying to prevent the horrible things that always have happened in the past after every major war. We are trying to plan against that. They were man-made. Man can prevent them if man wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Over before the committee, in a very pleasant manner and engaging smile, of course, the gentleman asked that same question he asked here,

"What have you to offer?" Then I remember that both the gentleman and the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] said that the system we had had worked out more successfully than any other anywhere else in the world. Would it be asking too much, as long as that system has demonstrated its worth, that we just follow it a little while longer?

Mr. PATMAN. We have had things happen under that system that we do not want to happen in the future. We have had things happen after every major war, inflation, deflation, boom, and bust. That part of the system has not been functioning right. We want to correct it. We want to get back on the track during that period and keep it on the track.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not going to control the rainfall and the sunshine, is he?

Mr. PATMAN. No; but the depressions are man-made, I tell you. Man can prevent them if man wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What man? Superman?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the period after the war. Does the gentleman think that if this bill or an identical bill had been introduced and passed right after the Civil War that the prairies of Kansas and Nebraska and the great Northwest would have been settled and developed with this kind of plan in operation?

Mr. PATMAN. They would probably have done better under this plan.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman thinks so?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; because this plan is helpful and constructive.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think it should be pointed out that long before either the Republican candidate, Mr. Dewey, or the Democratic candidate, Mr. Roosevelt, endorsed it, that this plan was thoroughly laid out and advocated by Earl Browder, the head of the Communist Party, in his so-called book Tehran.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentlewoman is familiar with communism; I am not. I have never read the book. I know enough about communism to be against it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That was a clause taken from the Constitution of Russia.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. It has been stated that rainfall cannot be controlled. May I say for the benefit of you who have been making such bold statements on this proposition that rainfall has been controlled for the benefit of humanity through sewage systems, through dikes, through flood-control projects, and man has made possible the savings of not only property, but the protection of health, life, and good living.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Let me tell you why this is so essential now. After the last war we had about $53 per capita in the pockets of the people and a proportionate amount of deposits in the banks the same as cash. That is so small compared with what we have now. We have over $200 per capita in the pockets of the people, in actual cash more than $28,000,000,000. We have available purchasing power of $140,000,000,000. This money is looking for goods and services. If we permit this money to go into competition all the way through our economy we will have ruinous inflation. We know that. Everybody knows it. Everyone who has studied it will admit it.

With that explosive, that atomic energy or power there that is likely to throw us off into ruinous inflation, runaway inflation at any time, do you not think that we ought to do something to stop it? All right, what should we do? Right now it is proposed that we spend billions of dollars on public roads, highways. I am for highways. Let us build them at a time when it will aid employment. Let us not rush in and add to this huge reservoir of money and credit and make inflation more likely.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. May I point out to the gentleman that there is very little likelihood of this pressure being decreased, because employment in the United States today is 52,000,000 and only 1,500,000 are unemployed, so that if any of these public-works programs are started now there will be competition for workers.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. If the program the gentleman so vociferously advocates is so beneficial, why did you not try it from 1932 to 1938 and 1940?

Mr. PATMAN. In 1932 we were not in power. I do not know that we would have done any better. I believe that somebody could have done a little better, but we did not. We did have some planning and that planning helped a lot. That planning caused homes to be built for people, it encouraged business and gave employment to people, and the country was on an upward trend all the time during that period. In 1936 a bill was passed to pay the veterans of World War I, and it looked so good and so prosperous that they even put the brakes on too fast and too effectively and caused a minor depression in 1937. But generally the trend was upward. Suppose we did fail to do it, should we fail to do it now? Let us say that we made a mistake by not doing it, shall we make two mistakes and call it a right?

Mr. JENKINS. If things were on the ascendancy so much as the gentleman has claimed, why was he before us just this week asking for a big appropriation to help out the small businessmen?

Mr. PATMAN. They need help as against the big fellow and against other factors that we can help them with.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. I think the point that was just brought out by the gentleman from Ohio needs a little further elaboration. The gentleman from Texas, who is ably presenting this point, started to do so. It is, are we going to wait until depression strikes us again before we take concrete steps? Are we going to wait until we have twelve to twenty million Americans out of work, and then bring up some hastily conceived projects to put them to work, or are we going to try to plan constructively ahead of time so that in case private enterprise cannot meet the gap the Government can step in? I think it should be repeated over and over again that this bill does not call for Government expenditure or Government investment until and unless private enterprise does not fill that gap.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In line with the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and I concur in the view he has indicated, does not the substitute provide now for decreasing in times of no need for employment the public works that have been authorized and for accelerating them at other times? With all due deference, is not that a direct requirement of the substitute bill?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not believe the substitute bill is very effective.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It may not be effective, but in all fairness that is written in there.

Mr. PATMAN. I appreciate the fine work the gentleman did, but it is a reenactment of the 1931 bill that failed in 1932. I am not willing to take something that has already failed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is is not true that the act of 1931 only required permanent works? Is that not true?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know. But I know that the gentleman is always stressing the fact of the repeal of that act. This would restore that power.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman does not know, in all fairness I do not believe he ought to make the statement because I read from a copy of it when this bill was presented.

Mr. PATMAN. I was just taking at face value what the gentleman said. If I misunderstood him, I am sorry.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It provided for permanent works only whereas the substitute provides for loans, for works, and for annual outlays that the President may want us to consider in his program.

Mr. PATMAN. May I complete my statement? We have plans in a half dozen different committees of the House to spend billions and billions of dollars for rivers and harbors and flood-control works, airports, and housing. Are they all good, meritorious projects? Yes; and

every one of them should be constructed. But when? Should we rush in here from all those committees and pass all these bills and make all these appropriations and spend them when we already have so much money in circulation which is likely to cause ruinous inflation? Why is it not better to have a coordinating committee of the kind we endeavor to set up by H. R. 2202, which coordinating committee will have members from both the House and the Senate to study these things and come in with a joint resolution saying, "Gentlemen, you can build roads this year. That will be all right. That will not hurt our economy. That will not be too much. But you had better leave off those other things and wait till next year or build something else." Is it not better to coordinate these public works and have them constructed at a time when they will help give people employment when they actually need the employment and when the people are begging for work, when they are anxious to work, and are seeking work? Is it not better to do that than to have public works for the fellow who does not want to work or who would like to be on the dole? There is no dole money or leaf-raking in this proposal. There is nothing like that at all. This is to avoid that.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has commented, and rightly so, upon the dangers of this inflationary pool and the possible effect upon our economy. May I ask the gentleman why, in that case, did he vote for the tax reduction?

Mr. PATMAN. I did not vote for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not vote for it. I think it is the greatest mistake that this Congress has made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. It is the greatest mistake this Congress has made. I did not vote for the Ruml plan.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Neither did I.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not vote for the Ruml plan to make a crop of war millionaires to the extent of $6,500,000 either.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If it is your desire to have a great flood of public work, why is it that at a time such as this when we have millions of jobs today and no one wants to take them, why were thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars voted for flood-control projects at the present time when they could have been deferred to a time when those projects would be needed?

Mr. PATMAN. That is an intelligent question, and the gentleman always asks an intelligent question. I will do my very best to answer it. The answer is that they had no coordination such as we propose in this bill. If this bill had been a law and we had this committee to study all these different things in our economy and report back to the Congress, they would have reported "Do not do such and such, but do so and so."

Mr. RICH. Why is it you have the FWA program to provide jobs at the present time with Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming who is in charge and have over $5,000,000,000 to spend on that as conditions are today?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think that affects this bill at all. The object of this bill is to provide coordination.

Mr. RICH. But it answers the question, what you said we wanted to do in this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. It is a good argument why this bill should be passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], in relation to his inquiry of the gentleman from Texas about flood-control appropriations, to the fact that flood control is to preserve human life and property. Certainly, the preservation of human life should always be paramount in the minds of everyone, particularly legislators charged with the responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. In what I said about those things, I had in mind things not involving public health or life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. In conclusion, permit me to say we have 117 cosponsors on this bill. Although the bill was introduced in my name, I did it for this group. I am no more the original author than either of these cosponsors. Each one is coauthor and cosponsor of this bill. Under the rules of this House, only one Member can introduce a bill. In the Senate any number of Members can introduce a bill. In the House only one Member. That is the reason we organized a cosponsors' unofficial steering committee group. The gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is chairman of that steering committee. That committee met after this bill was reported out the other day. We studied the amendment and we found that it was very, very weak. We were not willing to accept it. Therefore, we agreed, and the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] will verify this, that first we wanted a direct issue made on this particular question. We think that both candidates last year, having pledged the American people that they would be for this platform, it is our duty to present it in a constructive way; in a way that will carry out these promises that were made to the American people just before election. Therefore, we decided we were not going to offer any amendments at all. We are not going to suggest any amendments. We are going to vote this amendment of the committee up or down. We are going to vote against it. If it is voted down, we hope to succeed in passing the Senate bill, which will do the things we have asked to be done.

In connection with the Senate bill there were 70 Members voted for that bill, 44 Democrats and 26 Republicans. They voted for the bill we will ask you to adopt, if you will vote down this amendment that the committee has voted out. Against that Senate bill there were only 4 Democrats and 6 Republicans, 10 in all. Now, we are going to ask the House to vote down this amendment that is offered by the committee, and if we do not succeed in Committee of the Whole, when we return to the House, of course we will ask for a roll-call vote on it, and we hope to succeed in defeating this amendment. If we succeed, then we will have a direct vote on the bill that we believe will get the job done.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago the vote in the Senate. I wish the Members of this House today who have called S. 380 socialistic, communistic, or something else would read the names of the Senators who voted for it. You would get a very good impression of what they think of it over there, and you would find some of those who are certainly not radical lined up for it. I ask you to read a list of the Senators who voted for this bill.

Mr. PATMAN—

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28, 1945]

SENATE ROLL-CALL VOTE ON S. 380

FOR S. 380 AS AMENDED—71

Democrats, 44: Bailey, Bankhead, Barkley, Bilbo, Briggs, Carville, Chavez, Connally, Downey, Ellender, Fulbright, George, Green, Hayden, Hill, Hoey, Johnson of Colorado, Johnston of South Carolina, Kilgore, Lucas, McCarran, McFarland, McKellar, McMahon, Magnuson, Maybank, Mead, Mitchell, Murdock, Murray, Myers, O'Mahoney, Overton, Radcliffe, Russell, Shipstead, Stewart, Taylor, Thomas of Oklahoma, Tunnell, Tydings, Wagner, Walsh, Wheeler.

Republicans, 26; Aiken, Ball, Brooks, Burton, Butler, Capehart, Capper, Cordon, Donnell, Ferguson, Hawkes, Hickenlooper, Knowland, Langer, Morse, Reed, Revercomb, Saltonstall, Smith, Taft, Tobey, Vandenberg, Wiley, Willis, Wilson, Young.

Progressive, 1: La Follette.

AGAINST S. 380 AS AMENDED—10

Democrats, 4: Byrd, Gerry, McClellan, O'Daniel.

Republicans, 6: Buck, Gurney, Millikin, Moore, Robertson, Wherry.

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews, Austin, Brewster, Bridges, Bushfield, Chandler, Eastland, Glass, Guffey, Hart, Hatch, Pepper, Thomas of Idaho, Thomas of Utah, White.

I insist you can find lots of excuses for opposing this legislation, but I do not believe, in view of what has always happened in the past after every major war, that you can really find any good reason for opposing it.

I am inserting herewith the following:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY ON THE FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL (S. 380)[1]

1. THE RIGHT TO EMPLOYMENT

Section 2 (b) of S. 380: "All Americans able to work and desiring to work have the right to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment."

Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, pages 521–522:

"The 'right to a job,' which this bill proposes to make a basic policy of our Government, is as important to the preservation and

[1] All page references apply to the unrevised prints of the hearings.

sound functioning of democracy as are the time-honored rights of free speech, a free press, and freedom of religion."

Clarence Avildsen, chairman of the board, Republic Drill & Tool Co., Chicago, Ill., page 656:

"The right to work: I do not say, nor do I think anyone else will argue, that the Government owes anyone his living. I do believe, however, that in a free society one must have an opportunity to earn a living, to do constructive work, and to be paid a reasonable wage therefor. I know there are those who will argue that there is no such thing as a right to work, and even if one does admit that such a right exists, that it is unenforceable, but I also know that we have just fought the most terrible and destructive war in history to establish the fact that men as individuals do have rights. These political rights and civil rights, based upon the concept that the individual is the most important one and that governments exist only to satisfy his needs, can be enjoyed in a modern, industrial society only if every person is able to support himself—to have those basic necessities of food, shelter, clothing, medical care, and a reasonable amount of leisure, without which all other rights are meaningless. If we are to maintain those rights for which so many have given their lives in these recent years, we must admit the necessity to add to those rights another which is most basic and upon which the other rights depend. This is the right to work, to earn a decent living, and to do something creative for oneself and one's fellow men."

L. Garland Biggers, New Florida Liberator, page 144:

"It is essential that specific declarations be provided in legislative enactments, and these specific declarations seem to be sufficiently comprehensive to accomplish the primary objective. Free, competitive enterprise; the encouragement of the investment of private capital; the right of all citizens of the Nation to useful, remunerative, full-time employment; a constantly rising standard of living; the prevention of restrictions on production; the designation of the Federal Government as the guarantor of these salutary and desirable attainments, are succinctly stated and are so self-evident that only the most self-centered and unpatriotic individuals can object to them."

Charles G. Bolte, chairman, American Veterans' Committee, page 417:

"We veterans and servicemen have a right to expect that, when all this is over, jobs will be available for all of us."

Ralph E. Flanders, president, Jones & Lamson Machine Co. and Bryant Chucking Grinder Co.; chairman, Boston Federal Reserve' Bank; and chairman of the research committee of the Committee for Economic Development, page 596:

"This right to a job is a right which I myself have come, after much thought, to accept as an objective which our society may attain. Like all rights, it carries with it duties which are an indissoluble part of it. * * * While the right to a job resembles the elements of the Bill of Rights in carrying with it certain duties, it differs from the rights of the Constitution in certain important particulars. The privileges under the Bill of Rights come automatically to the citizen unless he is restrained from exercising them. Preserving rights is, therefore, a matter of overcoming resistance. In contrast we do not assure ourselves of a job by simple resistance to some person or some group who is keeping jobs from us, as in the case of those who seek to impede free speech and free assembly. The duties involved in supporting the right to a job are of a different sort. They involve constructive action, cooperatively undertaken by many different elements of society in a rather difficult field of operation."

* * * * *

Walter P. Reuther, vice president, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), page 325:

"Section 2 (b) is, of course, the heart of this bill; and it is unnecessary for me to register my hearty accord with it. I note with approval the improvement in its language over the previous version, which referred only to the 'right to a useful and remunerative job.' You now speak of 'the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment.' "

Col. Lewis Sanders, industrial engineer, page 1095:

"Every citizen is entitled to the opportunity for gainful employment. This is not a guarantee of a job or an expression of the philosophy that the world owes an individual a living. It is simply the adoption as a guide to Government policy and procedure of the obvious moral obligation of an industrial society to afford to each of its members the opportunity to earn a living. The people of the United States long ago accepted as the obligation of society the care of helpless members. Even more does it owe an opportunity to work to all its able and willing members when by its very nature a highly industrialized society has closed to most of its members all avenues of self-support except employment within its economic system."

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, and director of the Catholic Youth Organization, archdiocese of Chicago, page 838:

"It is the primary and essential function of government to secure citizens in the peaceful enjoyment of their natural rights; every government has the bounden duty to see to it that men are not denied the fundamental right of providing for themselves and their dependents a decent livelihood by honest and efficient labor. If, therefore, private industry is unable to afford men the opportunity of a decent and honorable living, government is bound by its very nature to employ all its resources to secure to all citizens this essential right to work. In the words of Pope Leo XIII: 'Each man has the right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure what is required in order to live in no other way than by work and wages.' "

John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, pages 1062–1063:

"Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to read into my statement an excerpt from a statement of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, which I think defines what we have been referring to in this bill as the right to work and the right to a job. It is an approved condensation from his speech, and if I may I would like to read that here.

"The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

"Mr. SNYDER. I think it defines that very well.

" 'The right to a job does not mean guaranteeing jobs carrying set salaries and definite social standing. It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. Our economic system of free enterprise must have free opportunities for jobs for all who are able and want to work. Our American system owes no man a living, but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living. That is the proper interpretation of the right to work.' "

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, senior Senator from the State of Utah, pages 114 and 117:

"What is meant in the bill by the 'right to full employment,' the 'right' idea as a legal concept? I am not afraid of the question, and I think that we have plenty of evidence in our constitutional history to point out that we are not entirely moving into a sphere that has been unknown to our constitutional scheme. While it is true in this bill the 'right to a job' refers to that type of right which is mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, there are other things which our Government has done which have set up partially the right, in a constitutional way, to a continuation of employment."

"There would be no sense at all to compensation laws if the Government hadn't, for example, accepted the theory. There would be no sense in our civil service, the tenure in civil service, if we hadn't in some way or another accepted the theory of a right to continue employment. Tenure has no meaning if it has not the right with it, that is, in a strictly legal sense. Retirement of the Army, the Navy, and all of the various services of our country indirectly point to a right."

"In the beginning of the discussion of this bill it was charged that the full employment idea was taken from the Russian Constitution. The Russian Constitution does contain the concept of the right to work and the right to a job, but the idea was not taken from the Russian Constitution, although it is there; and the concept as expressed in our full-employment bill and the concept as would be expressed in any American consideration would be just as different from the concept as it is worked out under a communistic-sponsored constitutional theory. It should be remembered that the basic difference between the American constitutional concept in doing for its people and doing for the individuals is that in America we have all the time the welfare of the people in mind."

Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, senior Senator from the State of New York, pages 1 and 2:

"I can define full employment very simply, by quoting a statement which I made 15 years ago. Then I said: 'The right to work is synonymous with the inalienable right to live. The right to work has never been surrendered and cannot be forfeited. Society was organized to enlarge the scope of that right and to increase the fruits of its exercise.'

"Any person who accepts the proposition that the right to work is of all-prevailing practical importance; any person who recognizes that all other rights, the freedoms, and liberties which we cherish, depend upon this all-important right to work; any such person is committed to the principle of full employment."

Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, pages 687–688:

"I am wholeheartedly in favor of the passage of this bill. I consider it a most essential step in making a living reality of the economic bill of rights so clearly set forth by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The economic bill of rights embodies the fundamental aspirations of all our citizens, which our great production potential will allow us to realize if only we have the vision, the courage, and the will to take the necessary action.

"The full employment bill would give legislative recognition to the most essential economic right—'the right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or farms or mines of the Nation.' Under this measure the Federal Government would, for the first time, recognize its over-all responsibility for assuring opportunity of employment to all who are able and willing to work."

James P. Warburg, Greenwich, Conn., pages 662, 665, 668, 669:

"The full employment bill will for the first time enact into law the responsibility of the people as a whole, acting through their Government, to see that the right to work becomes a reality.

"Those who oppose the bill do so because they oppose the fundamental principle that it has now become both the right and the duty of the American people, acting together through their Government, to make the right to work as much a reality as the right of free speech.

"Actually, I believe that we will—and I hope that we will—come to a revision of that concept of property, and that we will come to a concept of property where we recognize that the man who makes tools usefully by

using them, by adding labor to the tool, has a right to that plant very similar to the right of the fellow who buys the tools for him.

"* * * He hasn't any right to that particular tool. He has a right to go on performing that service or a similar service by which he can earn a living. That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about a man's right to earn his living, really. Whether you call it the opportunity to work or the right to work, it is a right to earn a decent living, and that is implicit, I think, in the contribution that a worker makes who works steadily and well in a factory."

Arnold S. Zander, general president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFL), page 379:

"This federation is in full agreement with the basic premise of S. 380 that all Americans able to work and seeking work should have the right to a useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment and that the Government should have the responsibility of guaranteeing such rights."

2. THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO ASSURE CONTINUING FULL-EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Section 2 (c) of S. 380: "In order to assure the free exercise of the right to an opportunity for employment * * * the Federal Government has the responsibility to assure continuing full employment; that is, the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and desiring to work."

STOP INFLATION, TOO

John J. Ahern, mayor, Troy, N. Y., page 138:

"Certainly, the fundamental thought of all in these troublous times is to assure, under all circumstances, sufficient employment and that all Americans be engaged in useful and remunerative full-time occupation.

"This, of course, is a basic responsibility of the Federal Government."

Hon. Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, page 522:

"If we are to have full employment, as I believe we must have, the Federal Government will have to assume the responsibility for maintaining it. This bill, S. 380, recognizes this fact. There is no one segment of our economy which can provide the necessary guaranties. Yet all of us—farmers, businessmen, laborers, producers and consumers alike—can together, through the instrumentality of our democratic Government, assure the maintenance of full production and, hence, full employment.

"The assurance that Government is committed to a policy of maintaining full employment, within the framework of our free-enterprise system, is one of the greatest encouragements that Government can give to individual producers. They will know that with a fully employed labor force there will be a market for their particular products."

Clarence Avildsen, chairman of the board, Republic Drill & Tool Co., Chicago, Ill., page 657:

"Everyone knows that the businesman cannot guarantee continuous employment for his workers. So, if this is true, and if we grant that men and women in a free society must be assured an opportunity to obtain remunerative employment, the job of assuring this employment must rest upon the only institution which has authority over all of us and which is subject to our collective will—the Government of the United States."

Charles A. Beard, historian, page 142:

"In my view of things, the Federal Government must carry a heavy responsibility for employment after the war, and should be preparing for it now, before a crash comes upon us—a crash such as we had in 1933, probably far worse."

Virgil Browne, chairman, State Board of Public Affairs, Oklahoma, page 157:

"I think it is highly important that the Government cooperate with business in every way it can possibly do to encourage free enterprise and private business toward full employment, not only in furnishing all necessary information to this end, but in the event private industry cannot keep up full employment, then to supplement Government work and employment so that full employment will be maintained."

Mrs. J. B. Caulkins, president Young Women's Christian Association, pages 977–978:

"A positive declaration of the intention of the Government to protect the basic right of its people to engage in useful, remunerative work, is an assurance that the workers of this country expect and have the right to expect. It is an assurance that private enterprise should also welcome, because it supports continuous purchasing power and lessens the threat of sudden fluctuations and of depressions that have hovered over business and worker alike."

S. H. Dalrymple, president, United Rubber Workers of America (CIO), page 190:

"Although the responsibilities of our Federal Government have never been clearly defined in the direction of maintaining full employment, I contend that the obligation is a very definite one. Years ago the responsibility was clearly enunciated in this phraseology—'Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.' The meaning of this is incontrovertible. The Government exists for the sole purpose of functioning in behalf of and in the interests of the American people. By seeking to maintain full employment throughout our country, the Government will promote the best interests of our people by improving our national economic conditions, with a related improvement in the direction of health, security, and happiness."

A. C. Denison, president, Fulton Foundry & Machine Co., Cleveland, Ohio, page 192:

"It would seem to me that basically government exists to make peaceful living of many people a possibility. Therefore, it must assume an interest in the welfare of those peoples whom it is trying to hold together peacefully. And therefore, it has a responsibility in the maintenance of continuing full employment because there is nothing more vital to its people's needs and interests."

William F. Devin, mayor, Seattle, Wash., pages 195–196:

"It has become increasingly apparent to me that the people of our Nation are looking to the Federal Government to assume considerable responsibility for full employment after the war. I think the people as a whole have no definite or concrete suggestions as to how this should be done, but they do feel that there must be full employment. I think they lack confidence that it can be accomplished except by the aid of the Government.

* * * * *

"I am unable to see how private business is able to guarantee these benefits. If such a guaranty is to be made, the Federal Government is the one to make it. Therefore it would seem to be the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide a safety net under the free enterprise of our Nation and to encourage the citizens in every way possible to establish businesses and through individual industry and initiative develop those enterprises to the greatest possible extent."

Francis R. Draper, Mabel Newcomer, Marietta Stevenson, Caroline F. Ware, Faith Williams, members of National Social Studies Committee, American Association of University Women, page 299:

"The basic responsibility to assure conditions leading to full employment must rest with the Federal Government. Under modern economic conditions such responsibility cannot be left to any private controls, to the unregulated forces of the market, or to any governmental units smaller than the national Government.

* * * * *

"In the absence of full employment, no other public program can be successful. In order to provide a foundation upon which to carry out whatever specific measures the Nation may desire, the Government must be prepared to take steps leading to full employment."

Miss Loula Dunn, president, American Public Welfare Association, and commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare, State of Alabama, page 441:

"As I understand the bill, it proposes really to guarantee that there will be full employment, which is an insurance against the very social hazards and problems that I have been talking about. Certainly out of the experience I have had in seeing what happened to people when they did not have economic security, I would be one of the people who would wish to raise my voice in behalf of any measures that would guarantee that there would be that type of employment. I think not enough has been said, on the social consequences in broken homes and crime and prison population, all the by-products of long-time unemployment, as well as your byproducts in the health of the community, which was amply demonstrated, I think, in the number of rejections for physical reasons in the draft."

Harry Golden, president, Magna Products, New York, N. Y., page 616:

"I am for this bill because:

"It places on the Federal Government the definite responsibility of avoiding unemployment.

"Where else can this responsibility be placed?

"Not on business. My plant employs 150 men and women. How can I hire any more unless I feel that I will be able to sell what these extra people would produce?

"The responsibility for unemployment can't very well be placed on the employee. He can't create jobs.

"The last decade certainly should have taught us that, when depression comes, no one but the Federal Goevrnment can assume the prime responsibility for relief. Hasn't the fire department the duty of preventing conditions that may cause or spread fire?

"It aims to give every businessman what he needs most—assurance of a market. Now, let us dwell for a moment on those most important words, 'assurance of a market.' I cannot attempt to tell you how important those four words are.

"Fortune magazine said, 7 years ago:

" 'Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that he does not know how to guarantee, without Government intervention, the markets with which alone his free competitive capitalism can function. Every businessman who is not kidding himself knows that, if left to its own devices, business would sooner or later run headlong into another 1930.'

"Now, when a little fellow quotes from Fortune magazine he thinks he has a real argument, that he has something worth while."

L. E. Keller, research director, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Detroit, Mich., page 985:

"It is our position that the Federal Government has both the right and the absolute duty to concern itself with the behavoir of private enterprise to the extent that its activities have any important bearing on the social and economic well-being of the country as a whole, or upon the political well-being of the country. And I want to repeat there that it is not only the right, but we insist that it is the absolute duty of the Federal Government to do that.

"We cannot escape social and economic disaster in the days ahead of us, we think, by any program of timidity or delay or evasion."

Fiorello H. LaGuardia, mayor of New York City, page 866:

"Senator TOBEY. Before you get to that may I point out in paragraph b the word 'assure'? 'It is the policy of the Nation to assure the existence'—that has been a very moot word here. People have come before us and questioned the word 'assure'; tried to get around it by using some other language, etc.

"Is it your thought it is the very intent of the bill to assure?

"Mayor LAGUARDIA. Well, you either assure their existence by employment or you assure their subsistence by relief."

Col. William C. Menninger, United States Army, Chief, Psychiatric Division, War Department; psychiatrist with Menninger Clinic, Topeka, Kans., pages 676 and 678:

"With demobilization of the Army and war industries, unemployment will confront us shortly, and not only will we have the inherent problems of unemployment, but these will directly contribute to making many of this group of veterans into confirmed invalids. If there were assurance of sustained employment opportunities for all, this possibility would be of less concern.

"So that I think unemployment has had a tremendous impact and will continue to have if we do not bring about some kind of a positive assurance that a man shall have an opportunity to get a job if he can."

E. F. Milliman, president, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, page 288:

"It is the basic responsibility of the Federal Government to encourage the fullest possible measure of regular full-time employment, to be provided through private enterprise; to assist private enterprise in the complete fulfillment of this essential economic necessity; and to supplement these efforts on the part of private enterprise if and when it develops that private enterprise cannot or will not provide regular, full-time employment for all those who depend upon work and wages for their economic security.

"It is not only the right but it is the absolute duty of the Federal Government to see to it that the American home and the American family are made secure in the economic field just as it is Government's responsibility to promote and preserve their security in other respects."

Walter Morrow, president, American Retail Federation, page 290:

"It is the basic responsibility of Government to see to it that private business is given an opportunity to provide jobs that will enable those who are able and want to work to maintain a decent standard of living and improvement upon it. When private industry fails in this purpose it should be the function of Government to fill the employment gap."

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from the State of Montana, pages 9 and 12:

"The full employment bill is based upon the theory that no single group in the country—either industry, labor, or agriculture—can by itself assure the expanding markets which are necessary for full production and full employment. The bill recognizes the fact that only the Government, acting in cooperation with industry, labor, agriculture, and States and localities can assure a continuing level of demand sufficient to absorb the goods and services produced under our modern economic conditions.

"In short, the so-called right to a job is a meaningless figure of speech unless our Government assumes responsibility for the expansion of our peacetime economy so that it will be capable of assuring full employment."

Senator MURRAY (in the course of Ralph Flanders' testimony) page 605:

"Webster's Dictionary gives as a definition of the word 'assure': 'To make sure or certain; to inspire confidence by declaration or promise.'

"Mr. FLANDERS. That second definition of it, Senator, is applicable a hundred percent.

"Mr. MURRAY. It also says: 'To confirm; to give confidence to.'"

Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., page 510:

"The words 'assure' and 'sufficient' are very desirable. (We should) accept no substitutes such as 'promote' or 'encourage' for 'assure' * * * or 'substantial' for 'sufficient.'"

Jean Trepp McKelvey, president, Rochester Group for Liberal Action, page 302:

"The group is of the opinion that the responsibility for maintaining full employment after the war rests with the Federal Government. Nor is this responsibility for assuring the economic health of the Nation anything new in American history. In our frontier days Uncle Sam was called upon to provide individuals with homesteads, while through tariff subsidies and land grants the Federal Government stimulated private enterprise."

Naomi Nash, president, the WIVES, page 315:

"The WIVES feel that the basic responsibilities of the Federal Government in the maintenance of continuing full employment after the war must be an absolute guaranty, that anyone who wants to work will have the opportunity to earn an annual living. We are particularly concerned that persons who are working during the war years for the first time, may have an opportunity to continue to utilize the skills they have learned for war production, and that the veteran will find immediate absorption as an income-earning citizen in the community, upon his discharge."

Mabel Newcomer, Vassar College, page 316:

"Unless every precaution is taken, we shall be faced with a far more serious depression than that of the 1930's, in view of the serious economic dislocation of this war. This will not only prove costly, both in human suffering and Government expenditure, but it will threaten the peace of the entire world, since depressions spread from one country to another.

"It is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government to prevent this, since no other authority has adequate power and resources."

Charles F. Palmer, president, Palmer, Inc., Atlanta, Ga., page 727:

"In opposition to the view of Mr. Mosher that this bill will help to bring about depression, I feel that its enactment will help to give assurance to those who fear they will lose their jobs and to those industrialists who believe they will not be able to carry on. There may be some who may oppose such assurance being given industry as well as employees, because there are some in industry who may say they would prefer to have it out with labor now."

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative from the First District of Texas, pages 54–55:

"While clear-cut objectives are indispensable, they are not enough. Our people want and need some assurance that we will not only talk about the twin goals of full employment and free competitive enterprise, but that we shall also attain them.

"During the great depression, the Federal Government had to undertake the responsibility of doing whatever was necessary to prevent destitution and starvation, a responsibility hitherto regarded as the province of private charity and local government. Today the average man and woman feel that their Government is also obligated to do whatever is necessary to prevent unemployment and to maintain full employment in a free competitive economy. The full employment bill recognizes this obligation.

"The bill makes it the responsibility of the Federal Government, in cooperation with business, labor, agriculture, State governments, and local governments, to assure our people conditions under which they can exercise their right to work as freemen in a free society."

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, page 569:

"What is essential is the underwriting of confidence. When President Roosevelt many years ago told us that all we had to fear was fear itself, he was stating a basic proposition. Now, as then, fear is our greatest enemy. What we must search out is the way to universal confidence, the way to make businessmen lose their fear of risking capital, to make consumers lose their fear of spending, to make all of us live in confidence and well-founded hope for the future.

"That is all that depressions are anyway—the expression of mass fear. Once the Nation has found a way to end that fear, then it will have found the way to permanent full employment and prosperity."

Walter P. Reuther, vice president, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), page 325:

"The policy set forth in subsections 2 (d) and 2 (e) is one with which no intelligent American can quarrel. It gives every active encouragement of Government to the task of making private enterprise work. But it insists that if private enterprise, though stimulated and encouraged by Government in every possible way, is unable to deliver on full employment the Government must step in and discharge its responsibility to assure continuing full employment.

"It seems to me that this is the very least that we in America can expect for both civilian and veteran after this war. We shall never accept a system in which jobs for all can exist only at the price of spilling our blood and in which peace must be the harbinger of unemployment. There can be no compromise on these provisions of your bill."

Lloyd G. Reynolds, Johns Hopkins University, page 326:

"It seems to me inescapable that the Federal Government must assume basic responsibility for maintaining full employment after the war. No State government, business corporation, or group of business corporations is large enough to assume this responsibility and make good on it."

Harrison M. Robertson, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., page 331:

"It is not a question now of what should be the basic responsibility of the Federal Government in meeting full employment. This responsibility exists if our great form of government is to be continued. The question is, not what is the responsibility of the Federal Government but how shall the Federal Government meet that responsibility."

Diarmuid Russell, Russell & Volkening, Inc., page 338:

"There is no doubt in my mind that the Government will have to take responsibility for employment.

* * * * *

"The idea that dominates men's minds now is security. They want to be free from the threat of starvation for themselves and their families; they want medical attention in case of illness; they want work, for work is part of life and the denial of this by any economic means is a denial of part of their vitality. I do not see how this can fail to be recognized, nor how the Government can be denied an interest in the happiness or health of those who make up the country and in whose talents the real wealth of the country resides. So I am for anything the country can do which will assure full employment and give to its citizens opportunity."

Wesley E. Sharer, Wesley E. Sharer & Associates, page 346:

"I believe the basic responsibility of the Federal Government is to assure the continuing of full employment. In the course of the war we have had a phenomenal growth in our power to produce, which has been reflected in the fact that our gross national product has been roughly one and one-half times greater than the previous all-time high of 1929. Our problem for the reconversion and postwar period will be to create the markets necessary for the goods that can be produced by our national economy. When markets are available, businessmen, in an effort to meet the demand created by these markets, will have to employ as many people as possible."

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, and director of the Catholic Youth Organization Archdiocese of Chicago, page 338:

"But it is the primary and essential function of Government to secure citizens in the peaceful enjoyment of their natural rights; every government has the bounden duty to see to it that men are not denied the fundamental right of providing for themselves and their dependents a decent livelihood by honest and efficient labor. If, therefore, private industry is unable to afford men the opportunity of a decent and honorable living, Government is bound by its very nature to employ all its resources to secure to all citizens this essential right to work. Again, Pope Leo XIII is pertinent:

" 'It is the first duty of every government to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character and administration of the commonwealth, are such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity. Above all, the public administration must duly and solicitously provide for the welfare and the comfort of the working people.' "

Harold D. Smith, Director of the Budget, Washington, D. C., page 903:

"Assurance of full-employment opportunities, of course, does not mean a guaranty of specific jobs. It means, rather, that the Government will pursue policies to assure job opportunities for those willing and able to work. In an expanding economy, changes are bound to occur in the type and location of jobs. Some opportunities vanish while others are created. The bill anticipates that there will be time intervals between old and new jobs. Shifts may require retraining or migration. In other words, some 'frictional' unemployment is inevitable.

"A policy declaration by the Congress is, in itself, an important factor in attaining the goals of a full-employment program. Assurance of full employment is identical with assurance of sustained markets and confidence, the main prerequisites for business investment and a high level of employment opportunities."

H. Chr. Sonne, National Planning Association, page 353:

"I am on record as having said that the elimination of unemployment should be a national policy, second only to that of winning the war, and is a necessary step to winning the peace."

Morey Sostrin, president, Yonkers, Des Moines, Iowa, page 355:

"Just as it is the responsibility of the Government to mobilize our resources in time of war, so it should be the responsibility of the Federal Government to set forces in motion to maintain reasonably full employment in time of peace. Unemployment on any broad scale will be a constant threat to our domestic peace and security."

Sam Sponseller, regional director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Cleveland, Ohio, page 356:

"This bill represents what I think to be the first duty and responsibility of the Government, that is, that of assuring full employment after victory has been won and the war is ended. Responsibility, if not fully accepted and shouldered by the Federal Government will leave them with a much worse problem, which obviously can only be their responsibility, that of unemployment benefits, which is a negative approach to the problem and responsibility, as compared with that of responsibility for full employment."

Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Secretary of the Treasury, pages 962 and 963:

"Too frequently in the past it has been popular to place the blame for depression on the businessman.

"But no businessman can continue to employ labor and to produce goods unless he finds a market for his output at a remunerative price. The fact is that if any businessman continued for an extended time to produce goods for which there are no buyers, he would inevitably incur such losses that he could not stay in business. For this reason businessmen cannot assume the responsibility to keep producing goods and employing labor in the face of an inadequate demand for their products.

"Clearly it cannot be the responsibility of businessmen alone to prevent unemployment. But that is not to say there is no responsibility anywhere to prevent unemployment. We cannot assume that depressions are acts of God, that they are a burden men must inevitably bear. We must face the fact that all of us have a responsibility to see that our economic system works efficiently, that there are jobs for men and women able and willing to work. When we are confronted with problems of national scope involving collective responsibility we must look to the National Government, acting for all the people, to take the leadership in their solution.

"Let there be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word 'assure.' It is more than a mere pious hope—a mere paper promise to be kept to the ear and broken to the hope. It means the assumption of a definite moral responsibility. It does not, of course, mean that every individual will be led by the hand from one job to another."

Edward J. Volz, president, International Photo Engravers' Union of North America (AFL), page 369:

"In view of the great dislocation of the manpower of the country to fill the Government's military needs both in the armed forces and on the production lines, and the necessary reconversions and reconstruction which must follow, the responsibility of the Federal Government in maintaining full employment after the war is quite generally realized, and will undoubtedly receive Nation-wide approval."

J. P. Wernette, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, page 371:

"The basic responsibilities of the Federal Government in the maintenance of continuing full employment after the war are two:

"1. The fullest possible encouragement of free enterprise, and the cooperation in helpful policies by labor, industry, agriculture, and all other segments of our economy.

"2. The maintenance of an adequate supply of money so as to facilitate the large market for goods and services which is essential to full employment."

A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, page 372:

"It is the basic responsibility of the Federal Government to stand by on the problem of employment, and when private industry, for any reason, fails to furnish job opportunities for all who seek them to have a shelf of public works and feasible plans which will furnish employment to all who seek it."

F. R. von Windegger, president, the Plaza Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo., page 647:

"The most enlightened business leaders today acknowledge that business alone, in this machine age, cannot furnish full employment to all those able to and seeking work.

"Therefore, full employment being necessary to the continued existence of our economic and political system and necessary for the general welfare, it becomes encumbent upon the Government to take whatever steps are necessary to fill the gap left by private enterprise."

Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C., pages 692, 694, 696:

"No individual firm, however, should be expected to employ people producing goods or services for which it cannot find a market at a reasonable price. That assurance of adequate market opportunity, which is essential to full production and employment, is the responsibility of all the people, including business management, acting through their chosen representatives in Government.

"* * * It is only the assurance that the Government will use its financial power to prevent shrinking markets that will induce business to continue to produce at full-employment levels. Without the assurance and without Government implementation of it, we are sure to see the familiar spectacle of inventory liquidation, cutthroat competition, stoppage of investment programs, mounting unemployment, and farm foreclosures whenever deflationary forces are unloosed.

"Senator TOBEY, I was impressed by the fact that all through your statement, at least 8 or 10 times, you definitely used the words 'give assurance.' I merely ask you this in view of the controversy that has arisen in this committee; do you agree with the authors of the bill, of whom I am one, that the purpose of this bill is to assure—give assurance of opportunities? Is that right?

"Mr. WALLACE. That is right.

"Senator TOBEY. And the word means just what it says, assure them an opportunity to work.

"Mr. WALLACE. An opportunity, yes. But not any specific job to any specific individual."

James P. Warburg, Greenwich, Conn., page 665:

"Those who oppose the bill do so because they oppose the fundamental principle that it has now become both the right and the duty of the American people, acting together through their Government, to make the right to work as much a reality as the right of free speech.

"Let the vote be taken on that principle."

Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., president, Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn., pages 828 and 829:

"I support the underlying principle of this bill, because I am convinced that it is the definite and inescapable responsibility of Government, in a modern society, to see that stable economic conditions prevail, affording a high level of employment.

"In the past, action usually has been taken only after some calamity has occurred. This bill puts on Government the responsibility of planning to avoid calamity.

"I do not believe that the private-enterprise system, left entirely to its own devices in our present-day complex economic system, can avoid cyclical fluctuations, the low points of which are so severe as to bring about extended mass unemployment such as existed in the thirties.

"Of itself, private enterprise has not the power to command widespread action in times of crisis, or to sufficiently influence its membership to avoid crisis. Whether we like it or not, we have reached a point where, despite the risks, we must depend upon Government as the only possible authority to broadly coordinate our activities, to use some of its power directly when necessary, and to plan for us. The only solution lies in wise and sound government. The only logical course open to those who fear government is to do their utmost to improve gov-

ernment. If this attitude is not taken, I am convinced that we will finally end up with all government in a socialized state."

I am inserting herewith my testimony and cross-examination before the committee. It is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PATMAN, the author of the bill, is our first witness.

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS, SEPTEMBER 25, 1945

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, as author of the bill, I want to express my appreciation to the committee for giving us such a prompt hearing on this very important proposal. We know that this committee has been very overworked. We have had some of the most important legislation that has come before this Congress before this committee, and I commend the committee for the fine work it has done, and am doubly appreciative for that reason of the opportunity for early hearings on this bill.

I speak for the 112 Members of the House of Representatives who are coauthors and cosponsors of this legislation. Mr. GEORGE OUTLAND, Representative from California, is chairman of our steering committee, which is composed of the 112 House Members, and Mr. OUTLAND will be here to testify, and he will have charge, of course, of pushing the bill before the Congress. He has been delegated for that purpose.

This bill, to my mind, is more important than any other peacetime bill that I know of to come before the Congress. It involves matters affecting every person in the United States. It affects every part of our economy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you say something about it affecting taxes?

Mr. PATMAN. I said it affected every part of our economy. It affects taxes, too, of course.

I don't know of any better speech that could be made for this bill than a reading of the bill itself. I am not going to read it, because I presume the members of the committee, if they haven't already done so, will read the bill in the course of the hearings and as points are brought up affecting the different matters embraced therein, and I am sure you will give it your consideration.

To my mind it will be impossible to have free enterprise survive in this country unless something is done in the direction of full employment and full production. I don't mean by that that we must have exactly 60,000,000 jobs, or 58,000,000 jobs; I mean that we must create a climate that is such that it will encourage private business to employ people and keep them substantially and generally employed up to the limit. Not perfection. I don't mean that we should have a particular job for a particular person. Not at all. We just want to create a climate, an atmosphere, in a way that will induce private business, free competitive enterprise, to do this employing and thereby eliminate any possible necessity of another WPA under which useless work would be performed. We don't want that. And this is in the direction of preventing what has happened in the past in the way of public relief and useless work.

That is the object of this bill.

If we were to have another depression, the first people to feel the effects of it, of course, will be the very poor and the lowest-income groups among the workers. Among the business people, the first to feel it will be the independent merchants, the little-business man. They are the very first to feel it, the first to have to close their doors, the first to have to give up, and the very first to have to go into bankruptcy. The larger concerns, of course, have a backlog of capital to draw on. They also have certain standard practices, bordering on the monopolistic, and sometimes they are monopolistic—patent rights, and so forth, that keep the trade coming to them and doing business with them, and for that reason they can get through a pretty hard depression. But the little man, the independent man, is out right off.

So when you are considering legislation like this, you are considering legislation that will be helpful, first, to the small, independent merchant, to free enterprise, to competitive business, and to the very poor, the poorest, who are the people who will need relief.

The question is: If we don't do something of this kind, what are we going to do? And I plead with you, members of the committee, to keep that one point in mind: If we don't have this, what is the alternative? What do we suggest should be done in place of this?

Now for a moment, let me tell you briefly what this proposal is; just the fundamental principles of it, not in detail.

First, it is proposed here that the President will make some kind of a budget—we will call it national production and employment budget, if you will—in the early part of the year.

You know that now Congress meets every year on January 3, unless a different date is fixed by law, which is not often done. The President would be expected to have his Budget on production and employment ready by that date.

This Budget will set forth the number of people that likely will be offered employment and be given employment. Not the idle people, not the people who wouldn't work anyway, but the people who are able and anxious and willing to work, the people who want work. It is true that there are about 3,000,000 people who will never work; they are sick, they are old, they are not in position to work at all. There are 3,000,000 that you can count off. Then we will have about 2,000,000 in the armed services after this war is over. That makes about 5,000,000 you can deduct.

But the Budget should take all these things into consideration and tell Congress about how many jobs will be available; and then also tell the Congress about the investments and expenditures by private business, by cities, towns, counties, and different political subdivisions; and if the Government is engaged in a public building program—post offices, for instance—the amount of that.

In other words, he will add all that up and determine how many jobs that will make available. Then, after he has done that, after he has told Congress about how many jobs will be available and about how many workers will be given an opportunity to have jobs, he will then tell us about how many will want jobs and will be eligible under this. If there are more jobs than there are people, then we will have on our hands the problem of preventing inflation, and we have a provision in here that in the event such a situation should occur, it will be the duty of the President to enact measures, or suggest measures, that will have a tendency to retard or prevent the inflationary trend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you mean high wages?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it could be anything. In other words, if there are more jobs than there are people, naturally there should be a lot of money in the country, and with lots of money there will be higher prices, which, of course, can be a serious matter if not retarded.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And if there are more jobs than people it would mean, necessarily, higher wages.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that is a point you know more about than I do, but I suspect wages would certainly rise with everything else. They usually do. I don't see why this should be an exception.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just thought that under the general law of supply and demand, if there were more jobs than workers that necessarily means higher wages.

Mr. PATMAN. That is inevitable. Therefore something should be done to prevent a ruinous inflation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In wages?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, anything. Yes; wages, prices, or anything else.

The CHAIRMAN. If I recall, back in the spring, the Military Affairs Committee brought out a bill asking us to draft labor. You will recall that the blood was knee deep over in the well of the House. We voted for that bill on the insistence of the leaders of the administration. When the House passed it that put us in a pretty bad spot with labor. A few days after that it went over to the Senate and the military leaders said we didnt need the bill. This budget is to be made out 6 months ahead of time. I am wondering if the same kind of mistake could be made 6 months ahead of time as was made on the bill I just mentioned.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, I think mistakes will always be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't it natural to make those mistakes on the safe side?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes; we know mistakes will be made, especially in times of war. I am sure that there are times in this war when you wouldn't have known what to do if you were the leader. But it is better to do something than nothing at all, even by the trial-and-error method, where, if we make a mistake, we can back up and correct it.

Now, on this budget, in the event there should be more people who want jobs than there are jobs, something will have to be done to permit those people to have jobs. That is one of the objects of this bill, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You said "permit them to have jobs." You mean give them jobs?

Mr. PATMAN. Give them the opportunity to work. The bill provides, in that event, that first an effort shall be made to create a climate in some way that will encourage private business, free competitive enterprise, to take up that slack, take up that surplus of labor. That is No. 1; do it that way, if possible. In the event it is impossible to do that—well, you know that we are not going to permit people to starve in this country; you know we are not going to permit millions of people to be unemployed in this country without opportunity to work. We all know that. We may make out like we are not going to do anything about it, but we will. So the thing to do now is to do a little planning in advance of that time and see if we can't have an economy that will absorb all these workers, and not have a situation develop that will compel us to go back to relief, such as we had in the thirties. We don't want that. We want people to work for what they get, if it is possible to do so.

I believe that the facts that I have just enumerated about the bill substantially and generally cover the objectives and intentions of this legislation, and I hope the committee will keep in mind what I said a while ago—that if we don't have something like this, what will we have? What will be the alternative? Let us not reconcile ourselves to a cycle of booms and depressions. I don't know that it is possible to prevent every little depression or every boom. I don't think, as long as we have human beings running this country—and as long as we have a democracy, we will have human beings running it—that we will always be able to avoid those things. But let us do our best to avoid them; and if we have a depression, make it as easy as possible; and if we have a boom, make it as little as possible. Let us not reconcile ourselves to the idea that we must continually have these booms and depressions. If we do have them, we will destroy the private-enterprise system in this country. Every 10 years, practically, we have been wiping out small business, small industry, and we shouldn't do it.

Mr. RICH. May I ask this question? In the face of the strikes going on all over this country now, do you know of anything that creates unemployment more than strikes?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not. I thoroughly agree with you. I certainly regret that there are strikes.

Mr. RICH. Do you know of anything that creates more unemployment——

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know the merits of the contentions on either side. I am not passing on it.

Mr. RICH. Do you know of anything that will compel small business to go into bankruptcy quicker than strikes?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, it so happens that small businesses are not directly concerned in these strikes.

Mr. RICH. Oh, yes; there are lots of small businesses that are affected out in my country.

Mr. PATMAN. They are indirectly affected because of the strikes.

Mr. RICH. They are indirectly affected; yes. Do you know this—that there is a communistic tendency to close down all business through these strikes? It is not a question so much of higher wages as it is to close everything down so that the Government will have to take over all business.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know that——

Mr. RICH. That is the motive behind these strikes at the present time.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, anyway, I would be against it if that is the motive. You know, we almost came to communism at one time in 1932, and if we hadn't given some relief to some folks, we would have had communism. This is a bill to prevent communism and help small business, encourage the growth of private enterprise, rather than destroy them every few years.

Mr. RICH. Anything that will prevent that, I am for.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, this is it.

Mr. RICH. You will have to convince us on that point, because we need to get some action pretty quick if we are going to prevent it.

Mr. PATMAN. This is a long-range program; it is not a "quickie" for stopping disorders, all disunity.

Mr. RICH. Do you know of anybody who doesn't want full employment for all the people in this country who want to work?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know of anybody who says he doesn't want it. But there are a lot of people who are "yes—but" people; they just "but" it off. They "but" this and "but" that, and when you get through putting all the but's in you haven't any legislation left.

Mr. COCHRAN. Isn't the gentleman's question now in conflict with the question he asked, or the statement he made just a while ago, when he said the Communists wanted to close down all business? He is now asking you if you know anybody who doesn't want full employment; and just a minute ago he said the Communists were trying to close down all the business in this country.

Mr. RICH. I am not in favor of that.

Mr. COCHRAN. In my opinion, I don't agree with what you said. I can't reconcile your two statements.

Mr. RICH. And in my opinion, that thing is growing so fast that I am fearful the President might have to take over all business in order to give people jobs. That is just what they are working toward, and we have to be careful that it don't happen.

Mr. COCHRAN. In the first instance, you said the Communists were trying to close up all business; then you ask the question, "Do you know anybody in this country that doesn't want full employment?" If the Communist wants to close down all business, then certainly they don't want full employment.

Mr. RICH. In asking that question I was speaking about good, sensible men. I don't believe Communists are sensible people.

Mr. COCHRAN. That doesn't prove your contention that these strikes out there are the result solely of communistic activity. That doesn't seem sound, in my opinion.

Mr. PATMAN. Since Congressman RICH brought up that point, I think one of the greatest tests, one of the greatest challenges to the democracies, is that of keeping people from looking at exceptions and saying that that is the general rule, and selling others on the theory that the whole country has gone to the dogs and everything is rotten, just because of certain exceptions. You can take any church, or lodge, or the finest institution in this country, and you can pick out a few fellows in there who are not deserving; and yet you cannot, because of them, condemn the whole thing. We could do that with our own Congress, because sometimes some of these fellows will say something on the floor of the House that they haven't given full consideration to; and if the people judge the whole Congress by what the individuals said, they would have a bad opinion of the whole Congress. So, in a democracy, I think it is necessary that we should keep our eye on the ball and not look at the exceptions, but at the general rule, and I think the general rule in our country has been that it is mighty fine. There are certain things that are irritating, annoying, and that we don't like, but generally this democracy is getting along fine. It is the best Government on earth, and we want to keep it that way. And this bill is in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. You referred a few minutes ago to creating a suitable climate for employment and emphasized the fact that this climate should be healthy for private enterprise. I am just wondering, if we do undertake to guarantee and insure full employment for everybody, if it wouldn't be necessary for the Federal Government, in order to prevent dislocation in employment, to place a ceiling on production in certain industries? We hear a lot of talk about the machine age now. Of course, everybody knows you could produce enough automobiles in 2 or 2½ years to glut the market. Then, as we have thousands of people out of work, wouldn't it be necessary, in order to insure employment, full employment all the time, to have a ceiling on production?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't think so. I think we should have full production; and if we were to get to the point you mentioned, I would think shortening the hours of labor would be more desirable than cutting down production.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are still going to have some discrimination between employees because the farmer can't shorten his hours very much.

Mr. PATMAN. He can shorten them with machines.

The CHAIRMAN. But the old cow has to be fed early in the morning and late at night.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. So you would have the fellow on the assembly line——

Mr. PATMAN. One of the objects of this bill is to give the farmer a fair price for what he does.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. But take our cotton—we are producing more cotton now than our domestic economy will consume, and it is having to fight for its life against the synthetics—rayon and the like.

Mr. PATTON. Cotton isn't whipped.

The CHAIRMAN. If we continue to produce cotton at the rate we have been producing it over the last 10 years and expect the Federal Government to buy all the surplus and store it in the warehouse, we are going to run into a pretty serious problem, aren't we?

Mr. PATMAN. We would have to have a rather stagnant mind, from the national viewpoint, to permit that to be done. There are too many uses for cotton. I can invite your attention to one that is not so very old, and yet it isn't new—insulation for houses. Cotton makes the finest insulation in the world, and I predict that in time to come they will use millions of bales of cotton for that purpose alone—the insulation of houses. That is one of the new uses that has been developed.

Mr. RICH. Do they make mineral wool out of cotton?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know whether they do or not. But cotton is a commodity that never deteriorates. You know they found cotton in King Tut's tomb.

Mr. RICH. Will we have to subsidize it in order to keep on growing it, if they continue to find substitutes for it?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't think that is contemplated now. I don't see any reason why the development of new uses should be so slow as that.

The CHAIRMAN. I brought cotton into discussion for the reason that we have tried to curb the production of cotton in this country by placing a ceiling on the number of bales to be produced by the farmers.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I was thinking, if we had to do that to protect the economy of the farmer, wouldn't it be necessary to place a ceiling on the amount of coal produced, and the amount of automobiles and washing machines?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't think so. Of course, if they produce too many, the price will go down, and the manufacturers themselves probably will not be anxious to overproduce for that reason.

The CHAIRMAN. If the price goes down, then we would have to cut wages, so that it just goes around in a vicious circle.

Mr. PATMAN. Ford didn't cut wages when his prices went down.

The CHAIRMAN. I say, it would go around in a vicious circle.

Mr. RICH. What did Ford have to do during the last week because he couldn't get wheels on account of the Kelsey-Hayes wheel strike? He had to close his plant practically down and throw 80,000 employees out of work.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. He had a large integrated operation there. You see, size is sometimes a burden and a responsibility, as well as a benefit and an advantage.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. PATMAN, this bill lays down a policy which commits the Government to bring about full employment. Now, analyzing the bill, it is to prevent what you might say is another depression, if possible, by cooperating with industry, agriculture, etc.; and if such a condition exists or develops, and this bill becomes law, the Government will be able to step into the picture to some extent to prevent a depression. So that if it is necessary for the Government to do something to bring about employment, this bill, in effect, would be an authorization for that, would it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; that is one of the objects of it.

Mr. COCHRAN. And we would have a plan developed whereby, if it was necessary for us to spend some money to assist both business, agriculture, labor, etc., to provide employment and an appropriation was brought in for that purpose, it would not be subject to a point of order if this bill is passed. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. This bill would be an authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. PATMAN. If there was no authorization.

Mr. COCHRAN. If this bill were passed, wouldn't this bill serve as an authorization for that?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; that is my opinion of it.

Mr. COCHRAN. That was my understanding, and I wanted that definitely stated.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what a lot of people have stated—that this does not authorize an appropriation. But I understand that if somebody introduced a bill on the floor to build a bridge across Lost Creek it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. It has to be enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. But if this bill becomes law, would it?

Mr. PATMAN. I think there would have to be some program designed to assist the Na-

tion, a program to relieve general unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. In that particular area there might be unemployment in the factories by reason of their being shut down, and the rest of the Nation might have full employment. In this particular area where the bridge is to be built they might have serious unemployment, and you want to guarantee employment in that particular locality.

Mr. PATMAN. May I say——

Mr. CHURCH. Will you follow that through?

Mr. PATMAN. That is a specific instance.

Mr. CHURCH. You don't think this would constitute an authorization, then?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I don't think this constitutes an individual authorization. I think this would have to be based on national welfare.

Mr. CHURCH. It constitutes an authorization for what kind of legislation?

Mr. PATMAN. It constitutes an authorization for legislation to relieve a general situation over the Nation.

Mr. CHURCH. Like the WPA appropriation?

Mr. PATMAN. Something to eliminate a WPA, to obviate the necessity for it.

Mr. CHURCH. I shouldn't say, perhaps, WPA, but for putting people to work.

Mr. PATMAN. That will affect the national economy.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, if we pass this bill under that theory, we can offer an amendment on the floor of the House to start a billion-and-a-half-dollar road program without going to the House Committee on Public Roads for an authorization. That certainly would affect employment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. I couldn't say.

Mr. COCHRAN. I notice here, on page 20, paragraph (c):

"Nothing contained herein shall be construed as directing or authorizing any change in the existing procedures on appropriations."

Mr. PATMAN. I am not in a position to testify about that, because I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of the things that has disturbed me about this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. We will get somebody to testify on that.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have an expert parliamentarian testify on that. I think that is a very important factor.

Mr. PATMAN. The best expert in the United States is Mr. Deschler, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Deschler would not give an opinion without knowing the facts.

Mr. PATMAN. He would want to see the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. He is like a court; he doesn't give a preview of what he will decide.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to state some of the things this bill does not do, to correct erroneous impressions around the country. There is no bill that has been more misrepresented and more misunderstood than this particular bill. I want to tell you some of the things this bill does not do.

This bill does not authorize the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government.

The bill does not guarantee specific jobs to specific workers.

The bill does not authorize the compulsory assignment of workers to jobs.

The bill does not authorize changes in existing procedures on appropriations. That is the part Mr. COCHRAN called our attention to just now. That is section 8 (c).

The bill does not provide Government guaranties of individual markets or prices, or profits.

The bill does not authorize Government determination of prices or wages.

The bill does not authorize Government determination of total output or of production quotas.

The bill does not authorize a disclosure of trade secrets or other information the publication of which might be harmful or have a harmful effect upon the firm or person supplying such information.

I think that is the only difference between the House bill and the Senate bill. We added on to our bill, H. R. 2202, a provision, which is subsection (e) of H, which says:

"The disclosure of trade secrets or other information, the publication of which might have a harmful effect upon the firm or persons supplying such information, shall not be called for or authorized."

The CHAIRMAN. That provision is not in the Senate bill?

Mr. PATMAN. That provision is not in the Senate bill, no; but we felt people should not be required to disclose trade secrets or information involving their business unless they were protected.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Senate bill were to become law, if the investigators who were making up this Budget to present to the President, would find I had some trade secret that gave me an advantage over my competitors, under the Senate bill that would be made public?

Mr. PATMAN. It would not necessarily be made public, but there is no prohibition against it. But the House bill carries that prohibition to protect business. I think it is a wise provision. That was the only difference we had when we met with the Senators to agree on a bill. That was the only thing we put in our bill that was not contained in the Senate bill. I think it is a very helpful provision.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. PATMAN, you just quoted from some document. What is it?

Mr. PATMAN. I quoted from the unrevised hearings before the Senate, part I, page 75.

Mr. JUDD. And when you said this bill doesn't do certain things, you mean the Senate bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I meant the House bill. This is part of my testimony before the Senate committee. I was just reading it because I had it in summary form. And I want to invite your attention, gentlemen, if you please, to the hearings before the Senate. I have some charts here, but I have no one to help me handle them so I will not attempt to show them.

Mr. JUDD. May we get a copy of these hearings for our benefit?

Mr. PATMAN. There are none now available.

The CHAIRMAN. We called the Senate committee and they haven't printed the revised hearings. They just printed them from day to day.

Mr. PATMAN. And you couldn't get one anywhere. They are not available. There were a thousand copies printed and I had two copies and I let one of them go. We tried to get it replaced and were not able to do so. I have just this one copy, which has all these charts in it, and I invite your attention especially to the testimony of Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, the testimony of the other Senators is there, and I don't mean to say their testimony isn't good, but Senator O'MAHONEY happened to have some very impressive charts in his testimony that I want to invite to your attention especially.

Mr. JUDD. You are inviting our attention to something you cannot furnish, you say.

Mr. PATMAN. You will get it.

The CHAIRMAN. They are printing the complete record.

Mr. PATMAN. In one of these charts it shows from 1929 to 1941, that by reason of this depression the sales loss amounted to $355,000,000,000. That is the amount of the sales loss.

This chart, labor force and employment, shows the standing of the employment and the labor force at all times since 1900, and you will notice the general trend, of course, has been upward. That is a matter of general knowledge. And employment, in prosperity years, of course, went above the normal labor force. But in time of depression the line went down, as in 1932, when so many people were out of work.

That brings me to another thing: I was here in 1932 when I saw 20,000 men assemble here in Washington. They were not law violators; they were law-abiding citizens, peaceable and law abiding. They had nothing to do in their home counties and cities. If anyone said, "Come on, let's go to Washington," they would just join together, get on freight trains and come to Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. PATMAN, while you are referring to that; at the present time, according to the press this morning, there are 400,000 law-abiding citizens where there are jobs available who apparently don't want to work. In connection with this full employment, have you any plan to get those men back to work?

Mr. PATMAN. This is not a strike measure in any way. It doesn't involve any quick way of solving any of the economic ills.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, wait a minute. You were speaking about these men who can't get jobs. In Michigan today there are many employers who can't get workers. And while we are talking about full employment, have you any plan whereby those who apparently don't want to work now can be persuaded, peacefully I mean, of course, by inducement, to go to work?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the object of this bill is not to do that. The object of this bill is to give people who are anxious, willing, and able to work an opportunity to do so. It doesn't deal with strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One of the objectives of the bill is full, continuous employment?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You cannot have continuous employment if, periodically, a large number of men who are employed in a particular plant will not work. Isn't it necessary, if you are going to have full employment, to have some provision or some plan which will induce those people to work?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, now, we are not trying to make people work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, but you are trying to make people provide jobs.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not trying to settle strikes. We are trying to give people who are able to work, who are anxious to work, and who are seeking work an opportunity to make a living.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you think you can have continuous employment; that you or I, for example, can give a man a steady job if 2 days in the week he doesn't want to work or won't work? How can any large corporation make available hundreds of thousands of jobs in a period when the men will not work?

Mr. PATMAN. We are not trying to make people work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know. You said that.

Mr. PATMAN. We are trying to create a climate here whereby they can make a living if they want to. If they are not going to do that, we are not going to compel them. We are not going to try to break any strikes. We are trying to create an atmosphere here in America that will help, not the people you are talking about, the people who don't want to work—we are trying to help the people who want to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. PATMAN——

Mr. RICH. Now, Mr. PATMAN——

Mr. HOFFMAN. We all want men to have opportunity to work continuously, do we not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. He doesn't have that opportunity now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under your plan you want someone to create and keep available jobs. Do you think that anyone, or any organization, can create jobs for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, when the men won't work on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday?

Mr. PATMAN. We are not going to be so specific as that. This national planning doesn't take care of any Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday. It is to insure, over a period of years, the person who wants to work will

have an opportunity to work and make a living for himself and his family. That is all it is for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I agree with you on that.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the only fellow we are working for, the fellow who wants to work. We are not working for the fellow who doesn't want to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you going to have this plan for the fellow who wants to work 2, 3, or 5 days a week and lay off the rest of the time?

Mr. PATMAN. We are not going to be so specific.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a practical question. I can see that you don't know the answer to it.

Mr. PATMAN. If we attempted to deal with details like that we would never pass a law here. You can't deal with details like that. We want continuous employment for people who are willing and anxious to work and who are seeking work. That is the class we are working for. We are not working for the fellow who don't want to work.

Mr. RICH. Mr. PATMAN, right at the present time in this country there are thousands and thousands of men who want work in those industries that are closed down by strikes, and if this bill is to accomplish full employment, as you say, to establish a national policy and program for guaranteed, continuous employment in the free competitive economy, you certainly have a job on your hands.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The committee met at 10 a. m., the Honorable CARTER MANASCO (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Yesterday we sidetracked Mr. PATMAN to hear some other witnesses. Mr. HOFFMAN, I understand, has some further questions he would like to ask Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to Mr. BENDER.

Mr. BENDER. I have no questions. I yield to Mr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. PATMAN, I just want to ask one major question.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. JUDD. This question troubles me. You stated yesterday that the main purpose of this bill was to create a favorable climate or atmosphere under which private business will, as well as labor and agriculture, be confident and go ahead and pull out the throttle and really use our economic system to the full. Yet at the same time I remember that no Member of the House has been more concerned about inflation than you have. I wonder, if the President sends down his Budget under this bill and is very optimistic, predicts that times are going to be good, lots of purchasing power, industry is active, and it looks as if very little Government assistance will be necessary, perhaps none at all—what climate is that likely to produce, what attitude or state of mind is that likely to produce throughout the country in business, and so forth? May it not increase the danger of inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. It may tend toward the inflationary.

Mr. JUDD. Therefore, if the President finds the prospects are good and reports that to the country, it may well have an inflationary effect?

Mr. PATMAN. The bill anticipates that and makes provisions against it as a safeguard. It will be the President's duty in a case like that to do something that will have a tendency to retard or prevent inflation.

Mr. JUDD. Such as recommending an increase in the tax rate?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, of course, that would depend upon the circumstances at the time, I think. That could be one of the things.

Mr. JUDD. Or to tighten up on credit facilities through the Federal Reserve?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I think we have had in the past few years some examples of what can be done regarding credit facilities, installment loans, and purchases.

Mr. JUDD. Now, suppose the opposite takes place—suppose his predictions are pessimistic, and he says that we are pretty much exhausting the accumulated savings and there is reason to expect there will be a slowing down of business activity and the Government will have to be prepared to put in more, and so forth. Don't you think that, almost inescapably, would produce a feeling of caution and apprehension and reserve on th part of business and thereby create and foster the very slowing down of the economic processes which you are trying to avoid? Everybody would say, "I will wait before I expand; I don't want to get caught; I'd better lay off men rather than put more on. I'd better wait until next year before I build this new addition to my plant."

Mr. PATMAN. Under the existing order of things you are correct, but this bill is to provide against that. In other words, when he predicts a pessimistic situation, it will be overcome by the suggested remedies.

Mr. JUDD. Don't you think that an announcement that would be pessimistic would sweep over the country almost instantaneously and produce a hesitation that would precipitate the very thing you are trying to avoid?

Mr. PATMAN. Without, at the same time, a statement that would be optimistic or encouraging. And such a statement would necessarily be accompanied by one that would be encouraging.

Mr. JUDD. Suppose the President just couldn't find anything in the situation that was encouraging. You wouldn't want him to send out a false report, would you?

Mr. PATMAN. It is his duty under this legislation to plan for it, just as you plan a campaign for the years ahead.

Mr. JUDD. If he can't find favorable and optimistic factors, does he not have to make his report somewhat untrue or incomplete, or else produce a bad effect on the Nation's economy by stating the full truth?

Mr. PATMAN. We set forth a plan that he can use that will offset that defeatism.

Mr. JUDD. You are confident that it will work?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, no one knows how well it will work, but the theory, I think, is good.

Mr. JUDD. That is the thing I am concerned about, the theory. The other morning about 8:30 o'clock it was announced over the radio there was a closing down of three of the main oil-refining districts of the country, and by noon people were lined up a block long at the filling stations. Our people listen to the radio, and they have more information than in the past. You could produce a bad mass psychology, the same as when they announced they were going to have to ration certain things—people immediately swamped the stores to get those particular commodities and thereby create a much greater scarcity or shortage than there would have been without the announcement.

Mr. PATMAN. It has been that way all the time. We are just trying to have some plans for the future, just like you, in your business, would plan for the future. This is Government planning for the future.

Mr. JUDD. The whole point is, We are all in favor of the objective, but I want to be sure this mechanism will work. I want to get the patient well; is this the right operation for the patient?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we know the existing order of things has not worked.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will you repeat that last statement? I didn't quite get it.

Mr. PATMAN. We know the existing order of things has not worked, to the extent that we have had times of depression every 15 or 20 years, wiping out hundreds of thousands of businessmen and farmers in the lower brackets. Those are the first to be wiped out. That is what we are trying to avoid. In other words, we don't want to recognize as necessary a scheme wherein there must be a cycle of booms and depressions. We want to see if we can avoid it. That is the object of this legislation.

Mr. JUDD. How can the Government, with any reasonable assurance, estimate the number of jobs that will be available when so much of it depends not upon just economic facts but upon these psychological facts?

Mr. PATMAN. I understand that they can estimate pretty well. They could in the past, but then they could do nothing about it. This gives the President the authority to do something about it.

Mr. JUDD. They weren't able to estimate very well on the number of hogs and cattle the farmers would raise, and things like that.

Mr. PATMAN. That depends not altogether on economic factors.

Mr. JUDD. And this doesn't depend altogether on economic factors. The economists decided they wanted more hogs, and they raised the support price to what they thought would increase them by 5,000,000 hogs, and they got 15,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, they might not get that many on account of the feed situation——

Mr. JUDD. But the reason for this marked increase was because the psychological effect on the farmers was enormously greater than they had anticipated. Then they said, "This is too big; we had better cut it down." The program designed to reduce the hog population 10 percent actually cut it down almost 30 percent, to use rough figures.

Mr. PATMAN. That is just one factor in our economy.

Mr. JUDD. But it is an illustration of the difficulty of prediction.

Mr. PATMAN. I know. I don't think it will be perfect. I don't think that we should expect it to be perfect, but I think it would be a great improvement over the present, just saying, "Let the worst come to the worst, and we will do the best we can," without any planning at all. It occurs to me that good judgment would dictate that we should try to plan against such things happening in the future, as a businessman would do it. You, as a businessman, would do it. Why shouldn't we, as a Government, do it?

Mr. JUDD. I think we should plan as a Government. But I am not sure that these announcements of what is likely to come will not produce an exaggeration of the very thing you hope to avoid—either an inflationary or a deflationary condition.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, there are a number of things involved. We cannot expect perfection, any more than we can expect perfection in the administration of the law.

Mr. JUDD. We are not asking perfection, but we don't want to make it worse. We don't want to make it so that the remedy is worse than the disease.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't think it would be as bad as the present situation.

Mr. JUDD. Well, I just want to be sure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You said that to do away with these ups and downs we should exercise more good judgment, didn't you?

Mr. PATMAN. We should have the judgment. We should have the foresight and the vision to look into the future the best we can. Of course, we won't be able to see everything, but we can do our best to see what might come and the possibilities and probabilities.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And in the past that good judgment or poor judgment, whatever it may be, has been exercised by businessmen and industrialists, hasn't it?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, a few of them have; and some of it has been successful and some has not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But you will concede they have tried, because their own welfare depends on the results of their judgment.

Mr. PATMAN. Sure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What you propose to do in this plan is to substitute the judgment of Government officials for that of businessmen, who heretofore have exercised their own judgment?

Mr. PATMAN. No; that would be socialistic. I am opposed to anything like that. I want the businessman to have freedom and let him still continue to exercise his own foresight and vision and form his own good business judgment. Nobody is in favor of anything that would impede his efforts in that direction at all. And I hope this bill isn't intended in that direction. I know it is not, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Heretofore businessmen and industrialists—and when I say "businessman," I mean everyone who creates employment—have used their own judgment, good or bad, and we have had resulting ups and downs. That is your position. Now, what you propose to do, if I understand you correctly, is to substitute the judgment of another group for the judgment of those whom you think, to a certain extent, have failed.

Mr. PATMAN. No;. not replacing it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Acting in conjunction with it?

Mr. PATMAN. You might say supplementing and aiding.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Which is to be the controlling factor when there comes a difference of opinion—the businessman or the Government?

Mr. PATMAN. I suspect you will find that more businesses have gone broke than have succeeded——

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is not answering my question. When we have adopted your plan, and Government supplements the judgment of those people who heretofore exercised their own, then which is to be superior? When there is a difference of opinion?

Mr. PATMAN. This bill will not interfere with anyone running his own business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you are a lawyer; just take the hypothetical question: Assuming that there is a difference of opinion——

Mr. PATMAN. There won't be any difference of opinion. There won't be any clash. There can't be. They won't be on the same board——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sorry that you don't feel free to even give your opinion.

Mr. PATMAN. Because I don't say what you want me to say that doesn't mean that I am not expressing facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The record will show that you won't answer this question.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, that isn't a fair statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right, then; tell me. Your proposition is this: Assuming that heretofore those who have created and maintained employment have not been able to prevent depressions——

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And booms, as you call them. And that something should be done. Am I right so far?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To assist and aid them.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I right so far?

Mr. PATMAN. Well——

Mr. HOFFMAN. You will concede something must be done?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't like the words "aid and assist." They are just a little apart——

Mr. HOFFMAN. You can substitute for "aid and assist" any word you want.

Mr. PATMAN. Any one concern in this Nation is a very small part of the Nation, and I don't care how much good common sense is used in directing the affairs of that concern—the tail can't wag the dog, and this is the dog helping the tail a little bit.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think we have it. This bill is the tail wagging the dog.

Mr. PATMAN. No; it isn't to direct or tell people what to do. It is just the opposite of that. Let the people go ahead and do exactly what they want to do, but if they are trying to keep the economy on an even keel, the Government will through this planning aid and assist them in doing so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right, Mr. JUDD; thank you.

Mr. JUDD. Yesterday, Mr. Smith, the Director of the Budget, was with us, and in his statement he said that the bill was to provide maximum effort to get full employment opportunities. Then he went on:

"This does not mean that the bill assures there will never be unemployment. As long as we have progress there will always be individuals looking for jobs at the same time that employers will be looking for workers. * * * It is the responsibility of the individual to seek the job for which he is best suited."

Then in the discussion Mr. Smith went into great detail about the matter, but emphasized that the bill did not insure full employment. Well, if it doesn't insure full employment, don't you think it is erroneous, and perhaps even a mistake, to call it the full employment bill, because it has given the impression throughout the country that it does insure or guarantee full employment?

Mr. PATMAN. Not to perfection.

Mr. JUDD. Maybe not in your mind, or in my mind, but in the minds of the general public.

Mr. PATMAN. No more than when you have prosperity in the Nation that is prosperity for everybody. There are always a few people that do not have prosperity. Nobody expects perfection.

Mr. JUDD. Don't you read in the papers almost every day the news reports and letters to the editor from people who believe that this bill does guarantee full employment for everybody? And Mr. Smith says it doesn't.

Mr. PATMAN. I will take the gentleman's word for it, but I haven't read those letters.

Mr. JUDD. Well, I have, and I feel it is a mistake, because it apparently guarantees a perfection which cannot be delivered, even if it works as well or better than you, its author, anticipate.

Mr. PATMAN. Where there are 130,000,000 people, no sensible, sane person who has thought the question through would insist that everybody would have work.

Mr. JUDD. I agree with you. Nobody who has thought the question through. But, don't you believe it is unfortunate for the sake of the success of the bill, assuming it passes, to have such a general attitude, that it is going to guarantee, as soon as it is passed, full employment?

Mr. PATMAN. There are exceptions, of course.

Mr. JUDD. I hope there are——

Mr. PATMAN. If we based our judgment on the exceptions, we would have an awful country here.

Mr. JUDD. I wouldn't consider it the exception. People have been down here from my district urging the passage of this bill. They consider that the main thing is that this would end unemployment. I tell them, "Don't put all your eggs in this one basket, because you may find some leaks in the basket."

Mr. PATMAN. You could make that same statement if someone proposed a law against murder. If such a bill were passed you would still have murder.

Mr. JUDD. That is right, but I have been concerned——

Mr. PATMAN. But we shouldn't fail to pass the law.

Mr. JUDD. I am not using this as an argument against passing the bill. I am saying there ought to be from you, its sponsor, and Mr. OUTLAND, and his steering committee, careful statements and propaganda, if you wish, to make clear that this is not a guaranty that unemployment will be no more in this country. I feel it is too bad for the success of the bill, assuming it passes, to have such an impression on the part of the general public.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not afraid of that.

Mr. JUDD. You are not.

Mr. PATMAN. Any more than if some person from a foreign country would walk over here to the House gallery and listen to all of us express our individual views. He might come to the conclusion from what he heard that this is an awful country. That isn't true at all. I am not afraid of that. We can't legislate for the exceptions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You said something about murder, Mr. PATMAN. The bills which have to do with murder, or the laws, are to punish murder. I don't know, and I don't believe you know, of any bill that was ever entitled "A bill to prevent murder," or know of any bill that will prevent murder, and I think what Mr. JUDD is getting at is that the bill should not parade under the guise of the title of full employment, which carries to many people the idea that this thing, if it is put in operation, will insure there will be no more unemployment. That is the point, isn't it, Dr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. The whole point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And, Mr. JUDD, that is what you were stressing.

Mr. JUDD. Right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. PATMAN, you have had many wires from the CIO, haven't you?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know whether I have a one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, I have had them.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't recall receiving a single one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you have answered my question.

Mr. PATMAN. Wait a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You said you didn't recall it. So there you are.

Mr. PATMAN. I don't know whether I have any CIO organizations in my district or not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I didn't ask you whether you had or had not. I just asked you whether you had had wires from them. You said you hadn't any.

Mr. PATMAN. I think I had a wire from Mr. Murray one time, about 2 months ago, about this bill, and outside of that I don't recall one.

Mr. HOFFMAN. My point is this: The wires which I have had from the CIO stress the idea that if I would support this bill and it becomes law that our unemployment problems will end. They don't say this will help end them; they say it will end them. That is what Mr. JUDD is bringing out.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice from their literature it is rather carefully gotten up. Of course, I don't know anything about the people who write this literature, but I don't think anybody expects us to be 100 percent perfect in this law, or any other law. I think that is asking too much. But the goal is employment for all people who want a job.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. And you are willing to put in the record that this bill does not assure the end of unemployment?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it doesn't guarantee to end unemployment, Mr. JUDD; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does it hold out the promise of a job to everyone?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it does not. It holds out the promise that the Government will try to offer work opportunities to those people who are anxious, willing, and able to work; that is all.

Mr. JUDD. And you don't interpret——

Mr. PATMAN. Excuse me. In 1928 we had good prosperity in this country, but everybody was not prosperous. A lot of people weren't prosperous. You can use that as an example. There will always be times, with 138,000,000 people, when some of those people will not be prosperous.

Mr. JUDD. You don't think, then, that this section 2 (e) can be read to mean that the Government guarantees it will provide

enough investment and expenditure so that everybody will have a full job, when it says: "To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment."

You don't think anybody could rightly read that to mean that it guarantees the end of unemployment?

Mr. PATMAN. That is merely to carry out the goal.

Mr. JUDD. That is the objective?

Mr. PATMAN. We now hope it will.

Mr. JUDD. But you don't think anybody can say, "Well, now you have made a pledge here. You have pledged the end of unemployment; now you must deliver"?

Mr. PATMAN. Doctor, no. I say that no sane person will insist that every person must have a job all the time.

Mr. JUDD. But don't you think there may be a lot of people in the country who will be demanding things that you and I wouldn't think were sensible and achievable?

Mr. PATMAN. There are a lot of people who will always be demanding things.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Smith says we have to pass this bill because the people are demanding it.

Mr. PATMAN. I think they are. They have seen these things happen, and they don't want them to happen again.

Mr. JUDD. He says, "The people of this country hold the Government responsible, and this bill is simply a response to a demand."

Mr. PATMAN. Doctor, I want to call your attention to the fact that this subsection (e) is like you read it, understand, but you didn't read subsection (f), which should be considered a part of it. Subsection (e) refers to Federal investment and expenditure; subsection (f) says:

"Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities in private enterprise."

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, we just want to create an atmosphere or climate that will cause private enterprise to employ these people.

Mr. JUDD. I am a hundred percent in agreement with that——

Mr. PATMAN. But if we can't do it, and we still have unemployment, you know, as a Member of Congress, you would vote for relief before you would let people starve.

Mr. JUDD. And this is to provide something useful rather than boondoggling?

Mr. PATMAN. This is to provide for doing things that will contribute to the national wealth and well-being. I think it is a good provision, myself.

Mr. JUDD. Well, I think if it is going to be spent, the money should be spent according to (f).

Mr. PATMAN. We can't afford to tear down the structure. We can't judge just by the exceptions. Doctor, you take a church, any church in the country, good as churches are, and you can probably pick out a few members that do not live up to the standards. You wouldn't want to burn down the church because of that.

Mr. JUDD. I am not arguing on the basis of exceptions. And I don't know any church that pretends it can guarantee that all its members will get into heaven.

Mr. PATMAN. No; they don't guarantee it, but they give them the training and the guidance that will aid and assist them in getting there.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. I am for it that far. I just don't want us to make a pledge that we might not be able to fulfill.

Mr. PATMAN. Would you destroy all churches because they can't guarantee to get people into heaven?

Mr. JUDD. Oh, no, indeed; but they don't hold out a free ticket to heaven as an inducement; they don't use that as their label.

Mr. PATMAN. The goal here is full employment.

Mr. JUDD. We have, for example, Mr. Smith's further testimony where he says that it expresses in legislation the declaration of both parties in the last election and it gives the world assurance we intend to carry out the pledge expressed in the Charter of the United Nations. I don't think anybody, when we signed the Charter of the United Nations, thought we were pledging full employment, and yet he now comes in and says that was a pledge.

Mr. PATMAN. Let us get back to your party. I read the Republican platform last year, and at the end of it I saw a statement like this, that all candidates are pledged to this platform and obligated to run on it, or words to that effect. Do you remember that?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, then, Mr. Dewey, in interpreting that platform, came out for this kind of bill, full employment. Was he deceiving the people?

Mr. JUDD. I don't know.

Mr. PATMAN. He believed in full employment. He didn't quibble about the few who might not get work.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield right there? Did you say Mr. Dewey came out for that?

Mr. PATMAN. He certainly did; in a strong statement.

Mr. COCHRAN. It so happens that I have Governor Dewey's language in a speech that he made a year ago, in which he said:

"The Government's first job in the peacetime years will be to see that conditions exist which promote widespread job opportunities in private enterprise. If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can and must create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours."

Does not that go much further than this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Sure. That is a direct promise of jobs. While we are not promising that, at the same time he didn't intend it—that was his goal. I think all the Republicans ought to be for this measure, because of the promises made to the people last year that you would be for it.

Mr. JUDD. I am a physician, and I never pledge that certain medicines will get the patient well, because sometimes, in spite of the finest calculations and the greatest confidence, things go awry. I think we are misleading our people if we allow them to think this will certainly cure unemployment. I hope it or other measures will, because we are certainly going to be in a jam if it doesn't succeed.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not misleading the people. A few exceptional cases might misunderstnad, but they will be the exceptions, not the rule.

Mr. JUDD. Then your mail must be different from mine, because my people——

Mr. PATMAN. Your mail may be from the exceptions.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad, however, to get your testimony in the record, that this bill doesn't guarantee full employment; that full employment is merely our goal; it is what we are working toward. This is the best machinery we can think of to help achieve that end. It is calculated for that purpose. But it is erroneous, and it is the exception, if anybody feels that this is going to insure full employment.

Mr. PATMAN. A specific job for specific persons; no. Pardon my bringing this up again, but if Mr. Dewey had been elected that paragraph right there would have been before this Congress in the form of a message, asking you to provide full employment like this.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; full employment.

Mr. PATMAN. And the Republicans would have to support it, because they would have to carry out the will and wishes of their leaders.

Mr. JUDD. They will support whatever they feel is designed to achieve full employment, but Mr. Dewey's statement does not necessarily refer to H. R. 2202.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; but the principle of full employment. Now, if this is no good, what is your remedy?

Mr. JUDD. We are not discussing my remedy, or Mr. Dewey's. We are discussing your bill that was put in because you are in the majority, and we don't have a chance to discuss our remedy.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes, you do. The minority has great power in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean to register a protest.

Mr. PATMAN. More than that. It is more than in a position to protest.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You ignored our advice 10 years ago.

Mr. PATMAN. We followed it for altogether too long.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We got along and had prosperity until you got us in the First World War; then we had to pay for that war.

Mr. PATMAN. We know that you had it for 12 years before 1933, and look at what happened.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You got us into a war.

Mr. PATMAN. After the war we had an economic collapse; everything in the country closed down.

Mr. JUDD. I am not interested in the past, except to learn lessons therefrom. I am interested in full employment, and I am just trying to be sure we understand and the people understand the limitations of this bill, even though it works up to your fullest expectations and hopes, and mine.

Mr. PATMAN. I think it should be a nonpartisan measure. I think both parties came out for it last year, and I think we ought to put through some kind of a full employment bill.

Mr. JUDD. I have no more questions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. PATMAN, as I understand this bill, introduced by you, H. R. 2202, on February 15, it is identical with S. 380, introduced in the Senate on January 22 of this year, except, as you pointed out in your initial statement, you include subparagraph (e) under section 8. Except as to that paragraph the two bills are identical?

Mr. PATMAN. I think they are; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. These bills were introduced many months ago.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And since that time Germany surrendered, and now Japan has surrendered, and the motive is to provide employment, and this bill generally undertakes to solve the unemployment problem, first, by encouraging and promoting private enterprise to give employment; and secondly, by supplementing any deficit in that regard by Government support or by Government provision for employment.

Mr. PATMAN. First through the States, the cities, and political subdivisions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, that work is under the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But it is to encourage it either by the Federal Government or by the States.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Second, and with that worthy objective the mechanism to promote the employment by the agency of private enterprise and by the Government, is said to be contained in this bill. Is that a fair statement as to the general outline and purpose of the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I think it is. First, we want private enterprise and free competitive business to employ people, if they will, to the extent that available jobs should be there for the people who want to work, who are anxious to work. Next, if that is not sufficient, we want to encourage the States and counties and the cities and political subdivisions to offer opportunities in some way, and if we

still don't have enough, then the Federal Government should come in and encourage some kind of work that will be to the national well-being—not any wasteful work, but work that will create wealth, or will be to the national well-being and provide these jobs.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And secondly, with these objectives, you undertake to provide the mechanism in this legislation; is that true?

Mr. PATMAN. Generally, not in detail.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand, because there is an undertaking. Because if we stop with this objective, we won't get anywhere. Then the question arises, first, isn't it important for the Government to promote legislation, programs, and policies that will prevent unemployment, in the first instance?

Mr. PATMAN. That is one of the objectives of the bill, one of the main objects.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. To prevent unemployment.

Mr. PATMAN. And create full production.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the best way I see—I don't know whether you agree or not—to do that is to create and continue full production. Now, the question arises as to whether or not we are providing any real mechanism in this bill for the accomplishment of these objectives. And frankly, I ask you if concrete mechanism is contained in this bill now that will provide, first, for continuing employment in private enterprise. Just name me one concrete provision in this bill that would provide that.

Mr. PATMAN. I think if I were to attempt to enumerate things like that we would have more objections than we have now, Mr. WHITTINGTON. You see, that would be legislating in detail. We have to leave something to the administration. We don't want to tie them down in a strait-jacket.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am agreeing to that.

Mr. PATMAN. We want to have it elastic.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am agreeing with that. But to get back to my question—I want to be helpful; what concrete mechanism is contained in this bill that will provide for the accomplishment of the objectives, first, continuing employment in private enterprise?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I think it is generally well stated, and I think you covered it fairly well a while ago. For instance, suppose we can see ahead in 1946 unemployment to the extent that it will need our attention after this budget is prepared. Well, there are several ways adjustments can be made. You take through taxes; you can create an atmosphere that will encourage some businesses to employ more people. There are lots of small businesses——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Without meaning to interrupt you, I think that is one answer.

Mr. PATMAN. I haven't got through.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All right; give me some more.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, another one is reciprocal trade. It may be necessary to make deals with certain foreign countries to stimulate production in this country that would give employment. That is No. 2. No. 3, we can take the Bretton Woods proposals; that would encourage the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to give certain countries that have been deficit in this war loans which they will repay with interest, which will enable them to purchase large amounts of supplies and services in this country which will create additional employment. And in addition to that, No. 4, we will take the Export-Import Bank, which can be more specific, which will have a huge amount of funds that in the event the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development doesn't take our advice, we are in position to do it ourselves through the Export-Import Bank to help the country, help ourselves, and they will repay the loan and it will create opportunities for employment here. There are four ways.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Very well. Pardon me a minute. In giving those four concrete cases it occurs to me that you have given one of the strongest objections to this bill. I could enlarge upon those four concrete cases by saying that, in my judgment, we ought to provide measures, and that means banking, to which you have referred primarily. That, however, is the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. That means tax problems and tax policies, to which you refer, that are involved in our tariff policy. Those are concrete matters. Now, then, if you undertake here to involve and to incorporate all these matters in a bill without specifying that we are going to take jurisdiction of the laws that we have passed and fold them up and change them by some other solution, my judgment is that we are making a mistake, and for that reason, I think like you; we ought to plan, but we ought to plan constructively.

We ought to have a mechanism, we ought to have concrete cases, but it is going to take not one policy but many policies, all coordinated and correlated. I think you might add to it a public-works program. I think it would be unwise for us to repeat what happened in 1929, where we found ourselves in the midst of a depression without any adequate program of public works, and we just reached out and took this make-believe program here and there. So that in addition to a guaranty of bank deposits, in addition to the provisions we have made for treaties with other countries, in addition to our improving our taxes, all of which have to be done by separate programs and separate policies, we ought to continue what we have done to provide for the encouraging of the States and the municipalities, not in one panacea but in general legislation, in public works, to adopt a public-works program that will provide for the construction of public works that are Government functions as contradistinguished from works that are local and private functions. My thought is that you have given us in your answer, and in these four concrete cases, the best argument that has occurred to me as to why we should not undertake to pass a bill here and say that we are providing for full employment, when in truth and in fact we can only provide for it by these four concrete proposals that have got to be correlated and coordinated with other programs, and if we undertake in anywise to modify them here, we are led to one inevitable conclusion, and that is that, in addition to these programs, taxes, public works, we provide for lump-sum appropriations to enable the accomplishment of the objectives which have been provided for by all of these separate policies and programs, to wit, as is pointed out in subsections (e) and (f) of section 2, to provide for such volume of Federal investment and expenditure, and that it shall be designed to promote the national wealth and well-being. I say that we are going to fall down on it in these various committees of Congress and with these various programs we have adopted—banking, public construction, and so forth—if they are not supplemented and implemented so that we will have real programs worked out without getting to the point where under some panacea bill we will come in and ask the President of the United States to provide for it and give a lump-sum appropriation which I think will promote unemployment rather than encourage employment.

Mr. PATMAN. Will you let me answer that?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think you have given me the best answer that I could think of.

Mr. PATMAN. Let us see if I have.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All right.

Mr. PATMAN. Our plan is to have coordination of effort. We don't have it now. Suppose we go ahead as we have in the past. We have a Congress working on taxes, giving relief here and there. We have the Export-Import Bank granting loans to foreign countries. We have all these different agencies dealing with the same thing in the over-all picture, but no coordination of effort. This coordination brings these things all together. We might say that if we had no planning, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and all these others might be planning something if they knew what the outlook was for next year, but they might not do what they have in mind. In other words, if a certain country wants to have a loan from the Export-Import Bank, the directors might be seriously considering this loan, but this National Budget comes out, and it looks like we are going to have all the jobs we need. It would be foolish to grant that loan and thereby cause inflationary conditions in our country. Now, while you say I have given you the best arguments against the passage of this bill you would want, I think you have given the proponents of this bill the best argument, because you are willing to go ahead, everyone working along a separate line without any coordination of effort, and thus not planning and working cooperatively and in a coordinated way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let us see about that. Ought Congress, before it authorizes the lending of the taxpayer's money through the Export-Import Bank, recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, to find out before we authorize that, if there be a need of it, and isn't that the time to do it? And with respect to the Budget, isn't it also true that the Chief Executive submits a Budget covering public works, covering the operations of all the agencies of the Government, and we require that under the Budget and Accounting Act, for the purpose of—to use the language of that act—coordinating our programs and our policies?

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true, if your premise were correct. But it is incorrect in that Congress has nothing to do with that. The Export-Import Bank—it has $5,000,000,000——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a minute. Are you correct on that? They haven't got it yet.

Mr. PATMAN. It is authorized. They can borrow the money and we have no control over it. They can go down there, as a board of directors, and do anything they want to, and it isn't coordinated with the reciprocal trade program, it isn't coordinated with the Export-Import Bank, it isn't coordinated with the International Bank for Reconversion and Development, it isn't coordinated with anything, and each one of these others can do the same thing. The object of this legislation is to have coordination of effort and to do exactly what you said you wanted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wouldn't vote, and I have never voted, for any bill, and I have never heard of the Committee on Banking and Currency recommending any Export-Import Bank bill that would allow them to do anything they wanted to do. The administration recommended Bretton Woods and reconversion and demobilization, because they were part of a coordinated scheme to provide for foreign trade, and to promote trade between the United States and foreign nations, and production, and if I hadn't believed that was a sound, coordinated program and correlated with the other activities of the Government, I couldn't have supported it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is one of the arguments used.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What would this bill authorize the Congress to do with respect to the Export-Import Bank operations that is not otherwise authorized? Just take that one case?

Mr. PATMAN. The Budget would give them information by which they could intelligently act, and in their negotiations with foreign countries or with domestic concerns, they would have that guidance. As it is now, we have no planning body which people who want to do the right thing toward their country can come to to exercise that judgment and furnish them that information. This will give them the information upon

which they can base their judgment to work in their country's interest in an intelligent way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, now, we would supplant the functions of the Export-Import Bank administration by giving to this committee on the budget here a directive to ascertain the basic fundamental facts to enable that institution to function as Congress wants it to function? My thought is that it is the duty of the Export-Import Bank to advise the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer that now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All right.

Mr. PATMAN. Here is the Budget, the President has made his recommendations, and he says—I am just presuming now—I am merely giving this as an illustration He says, "I have consulted with the people who are handling reciprocal trade and they will do so and so. That will give employment to so many people. I have conferred with the directors of the Export-Import Bank and decision is that they will make certain loans to certain countries that will need certain supplies that will be produced in this country. That will provide so much employment. I have conferred with these other agencies you have mentioned, and each one of them will supply employment for so many people. But after they do that, we will still need to take up the slack," and the President may recommend a public-works program such as you are talking about. But we have something intelligent to go on.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All right. You have mentioned four concrete cases. I think I have your thought about the Export-Import Bank. What would this Budget contemplate with respect to taxes and revenue that would supplant and take over the work now being done by Congress upon the reports of the Ways and Means Committee? What function with respect to taxes, in order to provide for employment, that we have now delegated to that committee would be here?

Mr. PATMAN. The President's advisers could say, "We have conferred with the committees that handle taxation in the House and Senate, and we have agreed on a plan whereby if the tax laws are changed a certain way, it will make it so easy on business that they will likely employ very many people," and the President could ask the Congress to pass that type of legislation making that number of jobs available.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And that would be considered by the Committee on Ways and Means and reported to the House?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, it would. This is not dictatorial. It is not anything that will be mandatory. It is setting up a plan based on the best information that it will be possible to gather together that will enable people who are trying to help their Government intelligently to act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And that same thing would apply to the Export-Import Bank? That would be considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. We presume they are all patriotic people and will cooperate with their President.

Mr. WHITTINGON. And the other items you mentioned will be considered by the appropriate committees of Congress?

Mr. PATMAN. Taxation is the only one I know of. Congress has already passed out of its hands the reciprocal trade and Export-Import Bank and the Bank of International Reconversion and Development.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, Mr. Patman, the passage of this bill, the advocacy of it, is for the psychological effect, among other things, as has been testified here, of assuring full employment, and whatever be the details of this bill, or its provisions, it is generally recognized by the man in the street that this bill is to provide for employment. If that effect, and that assurance to the country, is to be given, isn't this a most unwise time to promote any such an impression, because it can't do anything more or less, as this is designed, than provide new legislation or appropriations at a time when we have got more money in the banks than we have ever had, we have got more savings, we have got the largest productive organization, we have got the largest supply of labor we have ever had before in the history of our country, and, finally, we have the greatest need of our civilian population who sacrificed and denied so that today the situation is materially different from what it was at the time these bills were introduced. There is employment now for every person that honestly wants to work, and if we come in here and pass this bill and say they are going to have unemployment, won't there be a tendency for these people to rely upon the largess of the Government, the appropriations of the Government, rather than find their legitimate place in private industry? This legislation will do more harm than good.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield there? We also have the largest debt.

Mr. PATMAN. We haven't overlooked the debt. I wanted to mention that, the public debt. That is right, we have a large debt. But when do you plan against things that are likely to happen that will be disastrous to our people? After they come or before they happen? We waited before until the worst came to the worst, and we had an awful time getting out of it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman——

Mr. PATMAN. Now, then, since we have that experience of the past to draw upon, why don't we draw upon it to the extent that while we have this prosperity you speak of we can make some provision against what has always happened in the past every 10 or 15 years?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All right. I think that is a fair question. We have provided for it by improving our taxation. We have that under consideration. And we have provided for it, as you said, by the Bretton Woods Agreements, and we have provided for it by the Export-Import Bank, and we have provided for a constructive program of Federal public works, and we have done everything this bill contemplates except a Nation-wide WPA. That is my judgment.

Mr. PATMAN. This bill does not contemplate that. This bill is trying to avoid that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand your view is to try to avoid that.

Mr. PATMAN. If all these things were exercised to the limit, public works, etc., just pouring money out with no coordination, without knowing what the other people are doing—would you want that?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No, indeed.

Mr. PATMAN. All right; then we should have some coordination of effort.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. And if every one of them spend the money you are talking about for public works, the Export-Import Bank, the Bank for International Reconversion, and the reciprocal trade, and each one of them work separately and went the limit of their ability, we would have inflation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that without——

Mr. PATMAN. That is the reason we need planning for that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We need a sound, constructive plan for that, but there is a whole lot of difference between sound, constructive planning for public works, and the so-called planned economy that is wrapped up in this bill, and it is to distinguish between the two that I have propounded these questions, because I don't believe that the Congress ought to pass any Bretton Woods agreement, any Export-Import Bank, any public-works program that doesn't correlate and coordinate with the unified program to prevent unemployment, in the first instance, and provide for it in the second.

Mr. PATMAN. Where is your coordination under existing laws? Each one operates independently of the others.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a fair question—

Mr. PATMAN. There is no coordination.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think absolutely that is in error. We have the Budget and Accounting Act, which gives us the recommendation of the Chief Executive to be investigated by committees of Congress with respect to the expenditures of every one of these agencies.

Mr. PATMAN. On everything except employment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; I beg your pardon. We would have no occasion for a public-works program, for a sound public-works program as you have advanced here from time to time, and I think you have done it constructively. We haven't waited to make a make-believe program. We have a sound public-works program under way, and it is coordinated. If we don't have everything embraced in the President's message of the other day, I would like to have you name me something that has not been included by Congress with respect to those agencies you have mentioned.

Mr. PATMAN. I still insist we have to guard against inflation as well as deflation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So do I.

Mr. PATMAN. And these agencies, working independently and alone, going the limit of their power and ability, even in public works, we will have a ruinous inflation in this country, and a program of this kind will guard us against that and will enable us to act in a way that we will not have that ruinous inflation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think our system of government, with the Chief Executive, and all these executive agencies, has done everything we could reasonably be expected to do to coordinate these agencies, and if we need any further coordination, I am for it. But to come in here without saying what that coordination is, and undertaking to say that we are going to provide for full employment in some indefinite sort of a way in the future—if we haven't got that coordination in the Budget and Accounting Act, we ought to provide for it affirmatively.

A moment ago you said whatever was done here would have to be handled by the Banking and Currency Committee, on export-import, whatever was done on taxation would have to be handled by the Ways and Means Committee, and whatever was done on public works would have to be handled by the appropriate committees of Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we can't do it any other way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly; I wouldn't want to do it any other way, because Congress did not abdicate its functions, and if we need a correlation of that, it is the job of the Chief Executive to recommend that.

Mr. PATMAN. He has recommended it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In giving the agencies of the Government the power to spend money as they want to?

Mr. PATMAN. He recommended it, and the candidate on the other side recommended it, so both the candidates last year promised the people they would stand for this kind of a bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Here is what bothers me. You are trying to solve the problem of unemployment at a time when there is need for workers, when we have got no depression, when everybody that really wants a job can get it. You wouldn't promote a program for defeatism by saying to them, "If you don't do this work, the Government is going to provide you with a job"?

Mr. PATMAN. I know the gentleman from Mississippi pretty well, and I don't think he honestly believes we should wait until misfortune overtakes us before we provide against it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Oh, no; and I have stated and I have voted for all these constructive measures, to provide public works, for the Bretton Woods, and for all of them, but I don't want to wait until we have to make make-believe work. Whatever we do in a Federal way, we should do constructively and promptly.

Mr. RICH. Mr. PATMAN, in section 5 of the bill, you set up a joint committee, in this bill H. R. 2202, composed of 10 members of the important Senate committees, and 7 members to be appointed by the Senate, and then you have 10 members of the important House committees, and 7 members to be appointed by the House, making a total of 34 members on this committee, composed of men who are at the present time, or at least should be, as busy as any Member of Congress. What is the idea of such a large committee, and don't you believe a smaller committee will do better work than a committee of 34 members?

Mr. PATMAN. That was seriously considered by the Senate committee, and I think you will find that they recommended that we change that.

Mr. RICH. Do you think that a committee of 34 Members of Congress is going to do anything?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; they can operate all right.

Mr. RICH. As a rule, we find that when we have a large committee, we only have a few of them present at any one time.

Mr. PATMAN. The Ways and Means Committee has 25 members and it functions.

Mr. RICH. But you are establishing 34 members for this committee.

Mr. PATMAN. The Appropriations Committee has 44 and it works pretty well. I think the gentleman is on that committee, isn't he?

Mr. RICH. I was at one time; I left Congress of my own free will and naturally I went off the committee. I tried to save too much money; they wanted to spend, and they did it.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, I am not talking about the reason the gentleman is not still on the committee. But you said the committee is too large. I don't know; maybe it is too large. I wouldn't object to any reasonable change in the number, so far as I am concerned. But I am just giving you that as an illustration; we have in our own House of Representatives a committee of 44 members and they function pretty well.

Mr. RICH. No; they don't. I say they function very poorly. Let me ask you this: If you have a committee of 34 members, and have a few of them that work at it and the balance of them that vote, do you believe you would get good results from a committee that works in that manner?

Mr. PATMAN. You are talking about something now that legislation cannot control.

Mr. RICH. You have the idea, then, that this committee of 34—what kind of men are they going to appoint to take the active conduct of the committee? Are they going to have politicians; are they going to have lawyers; or will they be professional men?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope they have——

Mr. RICH. Are they going to have Congressmen or men who are going to deal with this in a businesslike way?

Mr. PATMAN. You say politicians and Congressmen. I guess a Congressman is a politician, and I hope they have people who are interested in politics. I would be opposed to it otherwise. I think a person who is against politicians is against democracy. I don't believe you can be against politics and be for democracy, because politics is the people ruling, and you have got to have people who are subservient to the will of the people, and to that extent they are politicians.

Mr. RICH. The object of this bill is to give employment, and when you play politics, you create jobs, certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe everybody should be interested and believe in politics. Of course, there are good politics and bad politics. I wouldn't want bad politics in this.

Mr. RICH. I think, myself, personally, that this committee is top heavy, and you will never get results from this committee if they are supposed to be a joint committee on the National Budget. What are you going to do with your Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, and his organization that we spend hundreds of thousands of dollars annually to maintain?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the Budget is an army of the President and that is under the President. Undoubtedly, he will use the Budget to the limit.

Mr. RICH. Then, if you use the Budget, and the Budget officers that we have now, and they continue on in the same way for the next 10 years that they have in the last 10 years, we are broke. We can't have a Budget office that functions like it has in the past 10 years.

Mr. PATMAN. Was the Budget responsible for it?

Mr. RICH. They make recommendations to Congress, and Congress always says, "We are equal to the Budget; we stayed under the Budget." And they think when they do that they have been able to perform a good duty. But you see where we are. It hasn't been good.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I appreciate he is always on the alert against wasteful expenditure of funds. And I commend him for it. But I dare say the gentleman voted for all these appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Oh no; I did no such thing. I wouldn't vote for them.

Mr. PATMAN. You voted for the $86,000,000,000 to go to war.

Mr. RICH. No, no. For 10 years before the war we were in the red every year, and you never tried to get out.

Mr. PATMAN. We started deficit financing back in 1931 and 1932.

Mr. RICH. I know. We had 2 years of it Republican, and we have had 13 years of it under the New Deal, and it has got us about ruined. You know we have a debt now of $265,000,000,000. We never dreamed of anything like that. It was $20,500,000,000 in March 1933.

Mr. PATMAN. With this bill we can pull out; with full employment and full production we can pay that debt easier than we could have paid one-tenth that much in 1932.

Mr. RICH. Are you in favor of paying the national debt?

Mr. PATMAN. I certainly am.

Mr. RICH. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman didn't have any question in his mind about that.

Mr. RICH. I certainly did, because I have heard a lot of gentlemen in Congress say we never intend to pay the national debt.

Mr. PATMAN. I never heard that.

Mr. RICH. Well, you come with me, and I will show you a dozen or more who will say that. I would like to get you to cut this committee down. I don't think you will get any results unless you do. I think you ought to do it.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to argue with the gentleman about that. That is a matter about which people can differ. You agree to the rest of the bill and I will agree to cut the committee down.

Mr. RICH. You cut the committee down and I will agree that the bill will be a whole lot better. I want to say here that I am in favor of full employment, but I don't believe you are going to get full employment or that the Government is going to do a great deal to aid or assist in full employment and in keeping this country solvent, unless you get sound men who are going to administer it with the idea and purpose of trying to give men jobs who want to work.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with you.

Mr. RICH. And today, Mr. PATMAN, we have 500,000 men who are idle, and they have created this idleness because they don't want to work unless they get more money. At least, those are the statements issued to the newspapers. In New York City they have closed down all the elevators practically, except those those in the apartment houses, and that in itself is going to throw out a lot of small businesses in the country, because the American Express Co. refuses to take any more packages. Now, if those men having jobs waiting for them refuse to work, don't you think we should have some legislation that would compel the people of this country to arbitrate their difficulties rather than have a few radicals—and I say it advisedly—a few radicals who want to close down the industries in this country so that the Government will come in and take them over?

Mr. PATMAN. That question has cropped up in this hearing all the time, and I want to answer it to the best of my knowledge and ability. This bill has nothing to do with strikes. I don't know anything about the merits of any controversy that is pending that is causing strikes, justified or unjustified. I don't know anything about them. But I think the time has come when the public realizes that the public has an interest in these things and there should be some kind of arbitration. We have always been taught that where there is a wrong there is a remedy. Lawyers especially have always been taught that. And there should be a remedy. When a case of dispute between the employers and employees, and the public is involved—and they are involved in practically all these cases—there should be some person or some court, or some board or some authority that has the right to determine the merits of the controversy and pass upon it, and that judgment should be respected and abided by the same as the Supreme Court of the United States.

I think the time has probably come when, if these strikes are not stopped rather soon, there will be such an overwhelming demand for something along that line that it will be established. I regret exceedingly that the time has come, or will come, that that will be necessary, but you see there can be monopoly on either side and there must be a remedy provided. And if there are wrongs without a remedy, this Congress will just have to be called upon and we will have to rise to the occasion and grant the remedy. I am speaking without too much consideration but these are my thoughts at present in the light of the information I have.

Mr. RICH. Don't you believe the occasion is almost here now when we are trying to get the country back—we have the jobs now?

Mr. PATMAN. I think it is approaching, and I think that the recognized and responsible labor leaders recognize and appreciate it as much as you and I.

Mr. RICH. I think the responsible labor leaders do.

Mr. PATMAN. I think they are trying to stop it, but they can't stop it. They are wildcat strikes, they say, and they can't stop it. Well, what can be done? They can't insist that people must stand idly by and do nothing about it. Something must be done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will you yield to me for a question?

Mr. RICH. For a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You say that something must be done. Couldn't the Government quit extending benefit payments?

Mr. PATMAN. I don't think they extend benefit payments to strikers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; they do, as I got it from the Secretary of Labor the other day before the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I know this bill won't help them any.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute——

Mr. PATMAN. This bill has nothing for people who are out of work because they won't

work. This is only for people who are out of work, who want a job, and are willing and anxious to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listen a minute; if you will, please. There isn't any question at all in anybody's mind who knows about the facts. Take the Kelcey Wheel Co. strike; the men who are on strike there don't get benefit payments under the Michigan law, but that strike throws out of work 40,000 employees over at the Ford plant, and they do get benefit payments because they are not on strike and are unemployed. They are, what you might call, locked out.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, they are innocent victims.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute. Those employees don't belong to the same local, but they all belong to the same national organization. As long as we continue to pay benefits to members of an organization which causes a strike or doesn't prevent a strike, you are going to have strikes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. RICH. I don't yield any further. I am going to continue.

Mr. COCHRAN. Right on that point: Haven't the officers of that international organization declared that an unauthorized strike and demanded that the men go back to work?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You're right; they have.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then how are they responsible?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If they can't control their own members, they are responsible in this way, because they insist upon maintaining their collective-bargaining rights with the employer, but they don't hold their employees in line on the bargain they get.

Mr. RICH. Mr. PATMAN, does the phrase "raise the scale of living of the American people" mean to increase the national income, or the annual volume of consumption?

Mr. PATMAN. I think it could mean all three, very well, because you take, for instance, there are so many homes in this country that do not have certain conveniences and facilities that we all agree they should have, and if we supplied them that might—that market alone might well do all of those three things.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. RICH, just a moment. This morning we had three witnesses scheduled for 10 o'clock. They did not appear. I understand that one of the witnesses is now here, and it now seems that we will not be able to get to the witnesses. Without objection, any witnesses who were to appear may submit a written statement for the record. We have a full schedule ahead, and it will be impossible to hear them tomorrow.

Mr. RICH. Mr. PATMAN, based on deficit spending, would the application of this measure aid or prevent inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. The object is to prevent inflation. I hate inflation just as much as I do deflation, and I wouldn't want to be a party to anything that would cause inflation. It is not contemplated that deficit spending will be needed in this. The intention in this is to prevent deficit financing.

Mr. RICH. With the proposal that you made on the floor of the House a good many times in reference to issuing currency, would that in any way affect full employment?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no issuance of currency involved here.

Mr. RICH. I recall that you have advocated that the Federal Government issue currency, all that is necessary, for paying off the national debt.

Mr. PATMAN. You have heard that? Well, you didn't hear the truth. It is not true.

Mr. RICH. It isn't. Well, I am glad to be straightened out on that, because I was under the impression that you were advocating the issuance of currency.

Mr. PATMAN. No. Currency only comes out as you need it. That is automatic; that expands and contracts with the demands of the people, and I am certainly not going to try to put money into the pockets of the people who do not need it. We have $200 per capita now in the pockets of the people and the tills of the people. That is too much. That is four times as much as we had during the inflationary period after the other war.

Mr. RICH. If that is too much why has that been issued?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, because the people demanded it. You take your bank account; you can leave it where it is, or you can demand currency and get it, and a lot of the people have elected to take the currency. That was one of the objects of the passage of the postal-savings bill. So many people in this country, foreigners, especailly, who were not willing to trust the banks, wanted some institution in connection with the Government, in which the people could have confidence, where they could put their money, so they had enacted the postal-savings law, and now they have $2,400,000,000 in savings banks run through the post office system.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Patman, do you believe that the broad legislative powers granted in peacetime to Government officials is a wise thing?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I think the laws Congress passed grant broad powers to executives. I think Congress was very wise during the war to put a cut-off provision in practically every major law we passed. If you will think back, practically every major law we passed, involved in this war, had a provision like this: "Upon the passage of a resolution by both Houses, by a majority vote, this law shall be ended." Those are not the words, but that is the effect of it. Or, "6 months after the war, this law shall be terminated." Or, "6 months after the declaration of peace, this law shall terminate." We have several phrases that we have used, but the effect of each was to automatically cut off the law.

Mr. RICH. There is nothing in this law that would terminate this legislation, and if we found that it was bad legislation, and that it might create unrest among the people in private enterprise, fearing that the Government would go into various lines of industry in competition with them, it would be bad legislation, and it should be terminated. Now, if you will look at the statement made by Lindsay Warren, as to the number of duplications we have now in government operations, certainly we don't want anything more in government. We want less government rather than more government, and the private individual then will be able to go ahead, he will have some confidence in the fact that he can do things and not be molested by the Government. But if he were to go out today, with a great number of duplications we have in government, a man doesn't know whether he is secure or not, and he is afraid to enter into private business because he is afraid the Government might put him out of business. It seems to me that the thought and idea behind the bill is fine; I agree with it. I agree with that idea, that we ought to try to get a job for every man that wants to work, and he ought to be assured a job if he wants to work. But we have got a lot of things to consider in the Federal Government at the present time that causes me to wonder whether it will do what we think it is going to do if it is enacted into law.

Mr. COCHRAN. Assuming, Mr. Rich, that private business does not take the leadership in providing for economic security, don't you think that this bill would, to some extent, provide a plan?

Mr. RICH. Well, I think it possible.

Mr. COCHRAN. Whereby others would step in?

Mr. RICH. I think this, Mr. COCHRAN: With the laws that are on the books today, there is nobody who has a dollar left who wants to invest it in private enterprise, because there is no future for him in business, and until and unless you change the laws we have on the books, you are going to find that private enterprise cannot go ahead, and therefore you are not going to have the employment in private enterprise, and you are only going to have the Government come in and take over all business, and that is what the radicals in this country are working for, and that is what I am afraid of. So I would advise you to change a lot of the laws and do it quickly, or you are going to ruin private enterprise in the United States of America.

Mr. COCHRAN. All right. The gentleman will recall, because he was here at the time, and so was I, when we provided for social security. Do you know of any sound businessman in this country that wants to do away with that program?

Mr. RICH I am talking about the things that are a detriment to private enterprise, that prohibit him from going out and expanding and doing business and prevent him from even getting his same dollar back that he puts into the business.

Mr. COCHRAN. What we are trying to do here, as I understand it, is to provide for economic security, is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. It is to help private enterprise. If you are for private enterprise, you ought to be for this bill.

Mr. RICH. I am afraid that this bill is going to ruin private enterprise, unless you do away with a lot of the laws that are now on the books.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman tell me how much private business the Government has taken over and is now operating?

Mr. PATMAN. In war munitions, and things like that, it would be a tremendous percentage. But outside of that it would be very small. I don't know of any intent on the part of those in authority to take over private business by the Government. I don't know of anybody who has that intent.

Mr. LATHAM. I understood you to say in answer to Mr. RICH's question that the passage of this bill would eliminate the existing debt, and would help eliminate deficit spending. Now, if we were to have 10,000,000 unemployed, and they were to receive $2,000 a year, that would be $20,000,000,000 that we would have to add to the debt.

Mr. PATMAN. This bill doesn't contemplate that. Let us take, for instance—we will compare 2 years: Take 1932, when the debt was at the lowest it has been, and at the same time the national income was at the lowest it has ever been in history. All right; now take 1944: The national income was probably the largest and the national debt was the largest of all time. The people in 1944, with their large national debt to pay, because of their large national income could more easily pay their part of the national debt than the people could in 1932. In other words, the future security of this country depends upon a high national income. We can't pay our national debt any other way. You can't reduce this country to an income of $40,000,000,000 a year, as it was in 1932, and ever hope to be able to pay this national debt, so you have got to have a high national income in order to pay this national debt, and when you have a high national income there is no reason why you shouldn't have reasonable prosperity.

Mr. LATHAM. I think I see your point. But by this program you would add a solid $20,000,000,000 to the debt for that year.

Mr. PATMAN. There is nothing in here that says we will pay $2,000 a year, or $1,000, to any person.

Mr. LATHAM. You stated you would pay a reasonable wage.

Mr. PATMAN. No; we are trying to avoid that. Certainly, we are not going to pay $2,000 a year on relief.

Mr. LATHAM. Does this contemplate that the people will go on relief?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it doesn't.

Mr. LATHAM. This plans for real jobs?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. LATHAM. Well, you couldn't pay them much less than $2,000 a year for a real working job, and that would add $20,000,000,000 to the debt. Where will you get that $20,000,000,000, if not by increasing taxes?

Mr. PATMAN. I think that is just a little far-fetched, if you will pardon me. The bill makes no provision for paying anybody $2,000 a year, or any sum.

Mr. LATHAM. I understand that.

Mr. PATMAN. I know this is just a promise. It provides for full employment, if we can get it. In other words, full employment. No one expects every person to get a job, just like they wouldn't any more expect, when you run for office—like all the gentlemen around this table—you promise the people certain things and you expect to carry out those promises, but you don't always do everything you promise the people you will do. And to that extent you fall down. They don't throw you out because you do, because they know you have made an honest and sincere effort. The same way with this; there will be an honest effort on the part of the Government to give people full employment, but in the event the Budget, at January 3, next year, discloses that, for instance, there are going to be 7, 8, or 10 million people unemployed, that should put us on the alert, and we would say, "What are we going to do about this?" The President should recommend in that same message some way of taking care of it, through taxes, reciprocal trade, Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconversion and Development, public works, including housing and all those things. In other words, we would plan for 1946, and before we would ever get down to any proposition of paying the worker to engage in work, we would first have to fail in our efforts to create a climate that would cause people to employ those people.

Next, we would have failed in our efforts to get the States and counties and cities and political subdivisions to take up that task. We will have failed in that. And after we have failed in all those things, and we still have unemployment, and believing, as we both believe, that a person who is anxious to work and is able to work, should have a job to provide for himself and his family, then we would have to make some provision for him, some way in which we could do that, through the development of rivers and harbors, and through public roads, and through the construction of public buildings, including post offices, and many other things like that. So you would have to go a long way before you would ever get down to the point of paying a person so much to do work for the Government.

Mr. LATHAM. But if you finally wound up with five or ten million you had to take care of, that couldn't be hired by private enterprise——

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we are not going to let people starve; you know that as well as anybody else. In times that are good, we are trying to plan for times that will be bad.

Mr. LATHAM. If it finally got to the point where we have 5,000,000 or 10,000,000—let us say 10,000,000, because it is easier to figure—that you have to take care of, you have to create jobs for, you will have to spend some public money in order to create those jobs. Where is the money coming from except from taxes to do that?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I might say, my dear sir, that if this bill is put into effect and properly administered, we won't have any 10,000,000 unemployed.

Mr. LATHAM. I hope not.

Mr. PATMAN. And we won't have 5,000,000 or 3,000,000.

Mr. BENDER. Won't have how many?

Mr. PATMAN. We won't have 5,000,000 or 4,000,000 or even 3,000,000. We will always have some.

Mr. JUDD. We won't have 3,000,000, and we won't have to borrow any money for deficit spending, deficit financing, to keep it down to 3,000,000 or less? You are confident we can have fewer than 3,000,000 unemployed without the salaries or income of some of them being furnished out of Government borrowed money?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. You see, if we keep the national income up, we can pay off our national debt and give the people work.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I have quite a few questions to ask of Mr. PATMAN. I don't think I could develop them within the time that is left, and since it is important that most of us be on the floor, I would suggest that we adjourn until tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. With the understanding that Mr. PATMAN will be available at any time in the future for further questioning by the members of the committee, the committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House, S. 380, as amended by the Committee on Expenditures entitled "An act declaring a continued national policy and program to promote high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy" postulates a politically planned economy. It would establish a Federal planning body, composed of a Council of Economic Advisers consisting of three members appointed by the President, and a Joint Committee on the Economic Report composed of representatives of the Senate and House. The President is made the head of the planning organ.

The Council would be composed of economic experts, three in number. It would be upon this segment of the planning body that would fall the responsibility of formulating the political schemes and devices that are involved in a planned economy. It would engage in the formulation and recommendation of a national economic policy to promote employment and production, to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and trends, appraise various programs and activities of the Federal Government, formulate and recommend to the President national economic policies and legislation relative thereto, and so forth, all for the purpose of maintaining a high level of employment, production, and purchasing power for promoting the American system of free competitive enterprise.

We would hardly need to go any further for a basic understanding of this bill. A politically planned economy and free private enterprise are opposed to each other as are human slavery and liberty. Specifically, therefore, the bill we are considering is one to put the American people in chains in the guise of preserving their liberty.

This is, of course, wholly in line with the policy that has been pursued by the Federal Government 30 years or thereabouts. It is only in the last 10 or 12 years, however, that the Government has consciously pursued a policy of exterminating free competitive enterprise and substituting therefor a planned economy, or to be specific, a totalitarian state.

New dealism, not altogether a monopoly of the Democratic Party, fascism under Mussolini and Hitler, and Russian communism are fundamentally the same in nature. The regime which now dominates the United States differs from the others only in degree. Every one of them has destroyed freedom of contract and replaced this mode of life with arbitrary political regulation and control of social and economic relations. Like the others, new dealism has abolished the competitive market where prices are made by mutual bargaining, and forced upon the Nation a system of federally controlled prices and wages. This process was well advanced before the war began in 1939.

The most important characteristic common to new dealism, fascism, and communism is the nationalization of the money metals, silver and gold, from which must follow State-made prices of all commodities and services, since such prices cannot otherwise be made except under a system of free contractualism, which requires for its functioning the politically unhindered use of the precious metals. As a part of this trait must be mentioned the high degree to which the banking system has been nationalized. Both the nationalization of the precious metals and banks have been accomplished in large measure by the Federal Reserve banking system, which, contrary to common belief, has never operated as a private institution but has always been completely dominated by the Government.

New dealism, fascism, and communism are in general constitutionally constructed on the principle of state capitalism versus private capitalism. The thirty-odd so-caled Government corporations, RFC, TVA, CCC, Federal Housing Agency, and so forth, which had a book value of about $6,000,000,000 before the war and now have a value of approximately $27,000,000,000, represent the purest form of state capitalism.

The argument is being made that the bill reported out by the Expenditures Committee is innocuous and will not do anything, in contrast to the Senate Full Employment Act and the Patman full employment bill, which would do much. This is, in my judgment, a specious contention. The point about the bill before us is that it formally legalizes and gives respectability to the idea of a politically planned economy. The Council of Economic Advisers and Joint Committee on Economic Report, which this measure seeks to establish, is merely a renewal or restoration of life to the National Resources Planning Board.

To say that this measure would give the President no power to act until and unless it was further implemented by legislation also has little force. With the principle of state planning already

well established and in operation, the effect of the passage of this measure will be to implement such planning by formally providing it with a head. This directing body will have plenty to do in coordinating and streamling the hundred and one social and economic plans which are already in process, the nationalization of banking, electric power, housing, lending, farming, and so forth, but not excluding labor, for that, too, comes within the scope of regimentation.

At present, the Congress is a passive element in this whole movement. So long as this condition persists, it must remain subservient to practically all of the grants of power given to or usurped by the executive and the other forces which so completely dominate the policies of the Government. Just as those forces are now able to importune Congress to pass this act to formally establish the principle of State-planning, so those same forces will be able to impel this body to pass the legislation necessary to implement, not only the all-out program of nationalization, which is already so far advanced, but the powers of the planning head itself.

This measure, both by avowal and implication makes the Federal Government responsible for a high level of employment, just as the Soviet constitution guarantees every person the right to work.

With that responsibility must go the power of direction, the ordering of persons to work at what they are told to, where they are told to, at the wage they are told to, just as prevails in Russia.

In undertaking this step, new dealism is but following the course which has been pursued by Russia, Germany, Italy, and every welfare state that has ever existed.

After having exterminated the basis of private capitalism and the natural job opportunity flowing from it, and so disordered the economy as to seriously threaten its control, the New Deal regime now seeks to acquire totalitarian power over labor to retain such control, just as was necessary with the Soviets and Fascists of Germany and Italy to keep themselves in power.

Given sufficient time, this monstrous force, known as new dealism, will prove to labor in general, as it is already doing to labor in particular, that instead of being a great blessing to it as proclaimed, it is the greatest curse ever visited upon it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reminds me of a story my grandfather always liked to tell. It seems in the old days there was a famous and prosperous ancient city. Something happened that it became very dirty and the citizens became concerned; it was a scandal among them, and people no longer were coming there. To take care of the situation, they did this and they did that, they appointed commissions, and they appointed bureaus, but the situation slowly got worse. They finally went down and called on a very wise old person who had taken no part in all this discussion and argument, he had been busy minding his own business—and they asked him to advise them how to get the city clean. He gave them this simple formula: "Let every man sweep in front of his own door." The last sentence of the story is that every man did sweep in front of his own door, and, lo, the city was clean.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if a return to that philosophy would not do this country more good than the passing of legislation like this? Here is what I mean by that: All over this country there are thousands of men and thousands of small businessmen with money to invest. They would carry on a business and give employment. There are millions of people who want work. Why do they not get together? Why does that system not function like it once did? Let me give you a little example. I have a friend out home who before the war was engaged in business and used and occupied five or six large buildings. When the war came on the Government took them over. When I was home last summer the Government turned them back to him, and I said to my friend: "I presume you will take back these buildings and go back to your former business and give employment to your old employees."

He said: "No; I am sorry, but I will not; and the reason is this: There are so many Government restrictions now."

It is so difficult for anyone to be in business, and besides, if he makes any profit most of it is given up to the Government.

This question of unemployment is a big one, but it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the best statement ever made on it was the statement made in the Book that not only is a great book on religion and life but is somewhat of a book on statecraft. You remember the parable in the Bible where the Master went into the market place and found the people standing idle? He asked: "Why do you stand here idle?" And they said: "We stand here idle because no man hath employed us."

That is the answer, Mr. Chairman—no man hath employed us.

When will the unemployed man go back to work? When someone gives him a job.

When will someone give him a job? When he can do so at a profit? No; not quite, but when he can do so under such conditions that he can reasonably anticipate a profit.

Whether we like it or not, that is the capitalistic system, that is the individualistic system, that is the American system; and we have worked under it for many years. It has not been a 100-percent success, I grant that, but I would like to hear someone point out where on this earth for a similar period of time did any other system work better?

They say that this bill we have before us is simply a statement of policy. That is probably correct. Nevertheless, it does set up a Bureau. I recall that back a few years ago we created the TNEC, as it was called. We got together a very imposing committee of Senators and Representatives and members of the executive branch of the Government. They called in people from all over the country and worked several years. What was the net result, Mr. Chairman? The net result was the expenditure of over a million dollars and the collection of a great shelf of books.

I think sometimes it is good to lay down a policy, but I would suggest laying down a policy that will cost us nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, that should be the policy.

First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the Members of Congress, and the Members of this House particularly, take a pledge. I would like to see every Member stand up, put up his right hand and promise that from now on he will mix up no more patent medicine for the long suffering American people. That is my first suggestion.

Next, that we resolve to return to constitutional government, resolve to return to free enterprise and individual responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, because of my former long service on this committee I feel as if I would like to say a word or two in reference to the pending bill. I congratulate the committee for at long last bringing something before us. A child has been born. For years we tried to bring some legislation from that committee but the majority would block any investigation or planning that might be proposed. I have read the bill and I am reminded of the kind of planning we have been getting and the kind we will likely get as reflected in the message of the Executive on September 2 or 6. Is that the kind of planning we are going to get? If it is I do not want any more of it, because I hoped we were finally coming to our senses under this new regime, and I was applauding our President. But I am disappointed. That message frightened me. Since then I have not been able to hear so well when proclamations are made from that direction.

In this bill you want a staff set up to make a report to the President each year. The President would then send a message to Congress. It would be your platform, only a recitation of a platform holding out more promises to the people. You tell him to study all the conditions, then bring in a report as to what he thinks we ought to do. In my opinion, it is time that the Congress itself should say what we ought to do.

It is said that this report will then be sent to a joint committee and that committee will study it. Then it will come back here and we will refer the recommendations, as usual, to various committees and it would take a long time before action could be taken. I am glad you did not ask that the President report in 1946. This bill takes effect in 1947.

Mr. Chairman, we will have a debt of some $300,000,000,000 or more, and a contingent debt of about as much more. You

would be planning how to spend more money rather than to reduce the debt. How can we do this and do it safely? Well, it does seem to be safe enough to print money. The gentleman who preceded me by a few minutes has often advocated printed money.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman. I need assistance.

Mr. HOOK. I was wondering if the gentleman believed that a man could pay a debt without working.

Mr. GIFFORD. I formerly did not think he could, but under your administration they have been perfectly able to do it somehow or other. You have all sorts of pensions, compensation, and social-security schemes, and so forth. We know that many thousands are on the Federal pay roll who seem not to be working very much. You have found wonderful ways within the last few years of putting purchasing power in the hands of the people and the very men who plead for this bill say that there are now $200 in the pockets of everybody in the country. They tell you that when, as a matter of fact, the share of the public debt for each of us is $1,831. The Governor of Pennsylvania recently warned his people that their share of the debt is five times the entire assessed value of the property of that State.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think the reason they usually have depressions is that they do things even when Congress says no. Assume, for instance, that this law was in operation this year and the President sent over a message that what we ought to do to prevent depressions within the next 2 months is to stop deficit spending. Does the gentleman think that would stop deficit spending?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no. By what method was a large proportion of this House elected? By a strong personality that appealed to the people, and they came in hanging on his skirts, having promised to give him what he wanted. Because they promised to support their President they voted for anything that the President suggested. And with a sort of President we have had, there seems no end to the amount of public debt. I should hesitate to give more Presidents a chance to plan for me.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is it not further true that there has not been any President around here lately that has had the courage to come in and ask for a cessation of deficit spending.

Mr. GIFFORD. That seems to be true. The gentleman from Texas quoted Hoover. I am glad he did, because they have hitherto paid no attention to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. When they quote Hoover, it is like the devil quoting scripture when it serves their purpose. He mentioned and quoted Dewey. Dewey was a "Me, too, boy" only he would do it better. I know it as well as you do. I am not belittling him. For we Republicans had to try hard to build up some personality that the people would follow. We have not found one, but there may possibly be one lurking somewhere.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Indeed yes, for you did not help me the last time.

Mr. HOOK. Would the gentleman be so kind as to tell me whether he voted for Dewey?

Mr. GIFFORD. I certainly did.

Mr. HOOK. Then you must be a "Me, too, boy," too.

Mr. GIFFORD. I voted for him. I had no one else to vote for. As I told one of you southern Democrats one day, "Of course, you voted for Roosevelt." I read that one said, "We voted from principle. We are Democrats. We voted for Roosevelt in 1932 and in 1936. We voted for Roosevelt in 1940. We are Democrats, but if you damn Yankees keep on voting for Roosevelt this country will sure go to hell." Of course, I had no other candidate to vote for. I was really pleased with Dewey. His personality was good. Why, only yesterday you heard one of your own number say oratorically that "Your party had sunk very low." Did you not hear him? And he sounded like a very able man to me.

Now, I love every one of you. I do not think your party has sunk so low, but I recognize how the members of your party are differing with one another. You cannot agree, but you will vote for a Democrat no matter who he may be or what he stands for. I love these southern Democrats, even though they act differently than they talk. They are really wonderful fellows. I mention FRITZ LANHAM, who is listening to me. I would hardly trade him for a Republican, but generally he has to go along. Of course, I had to vote for Dewey, did I not? I had to go along, but I was not satisfied, really. He tried to match your liberality. I wanted a different type of platform than he advocated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You did not have the same opportunity that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] had, when we had this Dies committee question up. You remember once he voted for it, once he voted against it, and once he voted present. There is an illustration of being fair all around.

Mr. GIFFORD. I just wanted to say in the few remarks I was to make that I have a watchful eye and that I am trying to cut down the expenditures and I am compelled to vote "no" on this bill planning more and more public expenditures. I do not want you fellows to do any more planning for me.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I just want to find out—and there is no fun in this.

Mr. GIFFORD. I should be glad to have a little fun in it.

Mr. PATRICK. Well, I do not mind, if it provides the gentleman with fun. But I am asking this, whether the gentleman feels that this bill goes too far or does not go far enough?

Mr. GIFFORD. It does not go anywhere except to give you fellows a chance to write a spending platform. You seem to be able to advocate spending only.

Mr. PATRICK. I am for it, if it does that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I thought you would have to be for it. I ought not to blame you for supporting your own party. The old adage, "My country right or wrong," hoping of course that it might be right. Bait, bait, bait, you have advocated nothing but bait. After all, this bill has no real force except setting up more committees and bureaus. You have had all the bureaus you are going to get from me.

Mr. PATRICK. I am glad to get the gentleman's position.

Mr. GIFFORD. But I am getting old, and I am not as able as I formerly was to help stem the tide.

Mr. PATRICK. I wish I had the gentleman's ability now.

Mr. GIFFORD. Thanks. We all like to have a little flattery. I once heard that "flattery is the food of fools; but now and then men of wit condescend to take a bit."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have read Senate 380 as it is now presented to us by our House committee in new and different verbiage. I think most of us will agree that it is preferable in terms to the original Senate bill, but I find no incentive to enthusiasm in either. For instance, let us contemplate the meaning of the verbiage in this modified form. What does it say? It says in effect that we who serve in these legislative Halls believe that Washington and Jefferson and Madison and their worthy successors were right in their desire to preserve free competitive enterprise as the basis of our happiness and prosperity, and that we who are now obligated to enact the laws have a purpose to continue these fundamental principles of our American Government.

Maybe the people of this country will be gratified, in spite of recent perils to these fundamental tenets, to learn that we, their representatives, wish to preserve and restore and promote them. But this measure goes further and reminds the people that it will cost them something to get this comforting assurance that we are still devoted to the doctrines in which loyal Americans have always believed.

To convince them of the certainty and the soundness of such adherence on our part, this proposal suggests that we create some more Federal jobs, with the natural incident of additional financial burden on the taxpayers, in order that another governmental agency or committee or bureau may help to steady us in our resolution to continue our free

competitive system of progress. It may seem at first blush that among the three million Federal employees now on the Government pay roll we could find a few qualified to advise us and to put the necessary starch in our backbones to enable us to do our duty. But, judging from the provisions of the measure as now reported for our consideration, there are some who do not think so. It appears they feel that we should still go far afield and search for some other wise monitors who can "screw our courage to the sticking place."

Of course, these new preceptors must necessarily be wiser than anyone in the Congress or in the executive departments, so the committee recommends that three advisers be appointed, in the light of their superior knowledge and more ardent devotion to our governmental tenets, to receive an annual salary of $15,000 each. But to make it surer still that the people of the United States will have confidence in the sincerity of our loyalty to the basic principles of our American system, there three preeminent experts will not be sufficient. So they are authorized and empowered to employ still other experts and also some specialists, who presumably may be smarter than the experts, to help us assure the people that the Congress really believes that our original conception of the government of a free people is a pretty good one if allowed to operate. I suppose these superexperts will afford the country an even greater persuasion that we intend to do our duty. Of course, it will increase the cost to the taxpayers to get such solacing information, but I presume it must be inferred that the people will be entirely willing to assume this added expense in order to be advised officially that we in the Congress are determined to act in accordance with our oath of office.

But to make sure that the country will have this confidence, the expense to the people will not end with the expenditures I have recited. Oh, no. We must have also a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and provision is made for this joint committee to have, in the language of the bill, some other experts and consultants and technicians and clerical and stenographic assistants so that those other experts and specialists will not try to put something over on us that would be disadvantageous to our traditional free competitive enterprise policy.

After all, ladies and gentlemen, why not give American free competitive enterprise a fair chance without all this expensive legislative folderol? I thought the people could take it for granted that we have good intentions and really want to be true to the fundamental principles upon which our Government was established. I think we could prove it to them without such costly collateral machinery involved in this new proposal. Let us do it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman's statement is a classic. I think its language and verbiage and the arguments surpass anything that I have heard on this floor since I have been here. I pay the gentleman this compliment because I am really sincere and, further, desire to ask this question. I have been thinking as I have listened to these debates why does not the President now under his own authority, if he wants to organize labor, get the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior together and do the things he wants to do through the payment of $345,000 under this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am responsible only for the obligations resting upon me and I cannot assume to report why anyone in the Federal service does not do certain things. But I am very sure in my own mind that the statement I have made is in accordance with the policy set forth in this revision of Senate bill 380 as it is now presented to us. I do not think that, in order for us to give assurance to the people of this country that we are devoted to the organic law and the principles there recited, we have to create more Federal jobs, and that we have to have more people on the Federal pay roll. I think it is high time to get some of the people off the Federal pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman so that he may yield to me for a question later.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would give us the benefit of his proposed substitute to solve this problem. He said he had one in mind.

Mr. LANHAM. I think the solution of the problem is the Congress doing its duty in accordance with its various institutions and the committees which assume to act in this regard. I tried to set a precedent for this House, and it has been in effect in the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for 2 years or more, of having these administrative authorities come before us once a month in order that we can question them and in order that they can give us any information they have at their disposal, so that we may keep advised with reference to the situation and see what should be done from the standpoint of legislation. Out of the 3,000,000 people on the Federal pay roll, surely there is a sufficient number who are qualified through experience to give us any possible advice that could be procured through the passage of either one of these proposals.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then, as I understand the gentleman, he does not favor any legislation at all?

Mr. LANHAM. What is the Department of Labor for if it is not to gather these statistics? It is one of its functions to advise us in this regard. They certainly have the personnel to make any necessary survey. I think it is high time that we get back to our organic law, which in my judgment has been disrupted in a great many respects, and adhere to the principles upon which this Government was established.

Give free enterprise a fair chance to go into operation, and remove some of these restrictions that are preventing it from operating and from giving employment. There is a lot of employment in this country available today that people will not accept.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half minute additional.

The gentleman has so well described these three experts, who are not even to be approved by the United States Senate, $15,000-a-year experts. Does the gentleman still think they can be of value if they are not even to be approved by the United States Senate?

Mr. LANHAM. If we do not have experts on the Federal pay roll today, out of the 3,000,000 people, who can give us the necessary advice in keeping with their fundamental duties, then, instead of employing additional experts, it is time to fire those and get some others who can.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, among other reasons, I am supporting the principle of full employment because it is one of the most effective means of developing unity and a sense of true fraternity between the various groups in our extraordinarily varied population. When everyone has a job and the national income is high, men feel secure. They can meet their needs and no one threatens them. They look on their neighbors as friends and are ready to cooperate on terms of relative fellowship. It is this spirit which accounts in large part for the high degree of cooperation which we developed in the early history of our country. At that time families had their farms and their jobs, and, in the face of common perils, joined together to face them. Upon this fact, as well as upon our rich resources, much of our success has been based.

But in modern industrial society, as we have learned to our cost, this is often not the case. When the depression breaks out then many millions lose their jobs. They become afraid and resentful. Those who are still luckly enough to hold their jobs are fearful that they will soon lose them. In such a time jobs are life rafts and men are afraid that they will be plunged into the icy waters of unemployment and destitution. Against this danger unemployment insurance is at best only a partial protection. Large numbers of men try to find security for themselves by pushing others off the raft. That is why periods of unemployment are generally marked by bitter conflicts between various groups, with the stronger groups oppressing the weaker.

Thus, when there are large numbers out of work, men decide that woman's place is in the home and that married women, most of whom need their pay, should be forced out of their jobs. Anti-Semitism grows like an evil weed. Movements are started to oust Negroes from industry. Those of Mexican stock meet the same opposition. Unemployed vet-

erans, justly smarting at the fact that a society which demanded their lives in a period of war, does not give them a chance to earn their living in a period of peace, frequently demand that those who worked in industry during the war should now give way to them.

The result is that bitter class and race cleavages develop. I am not an alarmist but I fear what might happen to this country, which we love, if a depression were to occur in the near future. The dangers and strains of war have made us all more emotional and the coming of mass unemployment would heap fuel on the flames.

During the war when there was work for all in beating off Nazi and Japanese aggression, we could forget our differences in the great task we shared in common. We need to retain this unity for the tasks of peace. We want to build a land of high productivity where poverty and slums would be abolished and where children will have the chance to grow up happily. We want a land where men and women will be judged and rewarded according to their individual merits without regard to their race or their religion. That is the spirit of democratic America. It can flourish in the climate of full employment. Virtually everyone then will have a job and will be free from the anxieties which I have mentioned. But this spirit will be difficult to maintain where many millions are without jobs.

We cannot afford to be passive in this matter. If we are to avoid the hatreds spread by the extremists of both the far left and the far right, we must try to see to it that everyone who is able to work and willing to work should have at least a chance to be employed. The country does not owe any man a living, but does it not owe every man the chance to earn a living?

The task of insuring full employment is a large one and I am aware of the technical difficulties involved. But the dangers of our not acting are much greater than any minor dangers of action. What is wrong in seeing to it that all men have a chance to produce? Such a policy would increase the food, clothing, shelter, and services which we all need. And in this process we would extend the basic principle of America as a land where all sorts and conditions of men can live together as friends in a common effort.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the Members of Congress who originally sponsored the so-called Patman full employment bill (H. R. 2202), I am opposed to the substitute bill submitted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Although Senate bill 380, the legislation for full employment passed by the Senate, does not meet with my approval, I shall vote for it in preference to the committee bill now under discussion.

If the Members of this Congress now opposing the so-called original full employment bill had an opportunity to visit the Calumet industrial region during 1930, 1931, and 1932, and observe the deplorable conditions under which thousands of unemployed workers lived, they would certainly support legislation which would prevent this condition from reoccurring.

During the last century we have had 10 major depressions in this country. Previous to 1932 these periods of unemployment and financial upheaval were called panics instead of depressions.

This full employment legislation is the first time our Congress has considered taking steps to devise a plan wherein our Government would cooperate and aid private enterprise to prevent panics or depressions from reoccurring.

Our country cannot survive another period where approximately 14,000,000 men were out of work, as we experienced 15 years ago.

The menace of postwar unemployment threatens the security of our country. In addition to providing jobs for men and women who have been displaced by the closing of war industries, we will have over 12,000,000 ex-servicemen seeking jobs within a short time.

We must manufacture goods and machinery of sufficient quantity and quality to satisfy human necessities and desires and to insure continuous purchasing power of the people, and past experience has proven that to make this condition permanent the Government must provide some practical planning formula. We must not forget that in our heavy industry fewer men now do the work which required great numbers a quarter of a century ago.

In the manufacture of steel 7 men now do the work which formerly required 60 in the casting of pig iron; 2 men now do the work which formerly required 128 in molding pig iron; 1 man replaces 42 in operating open-hearth furnaces. A brick-making machine can now make 40,000 bricks per hour. It formerly took 1 man 8 hours to make 4,000 bricks. The same relative displacement percentage is obtained in other industries.

The Members of Congress should realize that employment methods must progress as rapidly as methods of industry have progressed in the last 30 years.

Members who oppose legislation of this kind are committing a great injustice to the millions who are depending upon Congress to aid and counsel private enterprise to keep its wheels in operation.

This is legislation that provides a means for maintaining jobs in a desirable fashion and not in the manner that demoralizes individuals such as doles or charities or some modified form of both.

The farmer of our Nation should be interested in this bill because the prosperity of the farmer is very much dependent upon the purchasing power of the industrial workers. This same statement holds true for the businessman, both large and small. When full employment and good wages predominate, all lines of business and industry are enjoying prosperity.

I hope the substitute bill which has been submitted by the committee and is now under consideration is defeated, and the Members vote favorably on Senate bill 380 passed so overwhelmingly by the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, because I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which the so-called full employment bill was referred, I deliberately refrained from making up my mind on the soundness of the legislation until I had a chance, during many long days of testimony, to hear all the pros and cons brought out by the people, both sponsors and opponents, who have studied it most.

I am compelled to say that the more I heard H. R. 2202 and the Senate bill, S. 380, discussed, the more I became convinced that they are neither necessary nor wise legislation, and that I cannot conscientiously support either of them. There is a whole series of reasons, to some of which I want to refer.

First, I think the original bill, from its title to the last paragraph, is misleading to the American people in that they have come to think it actually will assure full employment. I could read from the hearings, if I had time, where I myself asked witness after witness after witness, including the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who introduced the bill, the Director of the Budget, Mr. Smith, and others, whether this bill would mean the end of unemployment and would guarantee that there would be no unemployment hereafter. Every one of them admitted that it could not assure that end. Then why should it be given the false label of full employment?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is not fair to the American people to use words which give people the impression, as millions of persons in the country have gained the impression, that somehow that bill will make sure nobody will ever again be unable to find a job if he seeks one. I do not believe, especially at a time like this, we should be less than perfectly candid and frank with our people. Certainly we should not promise them anything we cannot be sure we can deliver.

I am opposed to the full-employment bill for the additional reason that there is so much language in it that is indefinite. It says everybody is "entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment." In our committee the gentleman from Illinois, among others, asked a great many witnesses just what, precisely, is meant by each of these adjectives: "useful, remunerative, regular, or full-time employment." If that bill were passed, somebody some day would have to define just what employment is "useful," how much is "remunerative," what is "regular." How many hours a day and weeks a year is "full time." What would our canneries up in Minnesota do in order to get 6 to 10 weeks of work during the summertime? Pay a year-around wage? That is just a sample question which ought to be answered.

In 6 weeks' of hearings we could not get any of the authors or sponsors of the bill to say just what these words

mean and involve. And there are many other words equally undefined.

Then again, the more I heard about the National Budget, which the original bill proposed, the more I became convinced it could not be accurate and it could be dangerous.

I put in the RECORD the other day some figures to show how difficult it is, how impossible it is, for the experts, or anyone else, to make accurate predictions regarding unemployment.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. For the moment I cannot yield.

The original bill would require the President and his advisers to make predictions 18 months in advance as to the number of persons expected to be unemployed. Well, on August 15, Stabilization Director Snyder who should have available more statistics than even the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce, the man whose primary responsibility is to know what the situation is, predicted there would be 5,500,000 or more unemployed in 3 months.

At the same time the War Manpower Commission was predicting 5,000,000 unemployed in the last quarter of 1945. How accurate were they? In October, 2 months later, it was reported that we had only 1,500,000 unemployed, and that was 130,000 less than in the month of September and the number of involuntarily unemployed has gone down still further since then.

Mr. Chairman, if it is impossible for the greatest experts in our Government to make predictions that are within 300 percent of accuracy for only 3 months ahead, how can we honestly expect the makers of the so-called National Budget to make predictions and make plans and recommendations for appropriations on the basis of those predictions, 18 months in advance? I became convinced that was asking an impossible perfection on the part of the President or anybody else. The forecasts could not be sufficiently accurate to be of real value.

Furthermore they could be positively dangerous, rather than helpful. I wish I had time to read the testimony of many witnesses on this point, but I will quote only one. If you will look at pages 105 and 106 of the hearings you will find some questions I asked of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the author of the bill. I asked similar questions of almost every witness—whether there might not be some dangerous results economically from the predictions in the National Budget, and received about the same replies from most of the proponents:

Mr. JUDD. If the President sends down his Budget under this bill and is very optimistic, predicts that times are going to be good, lots of purchasing power, industry is active, and it looks as if very little Government assistance will be necessary, perhaps none at all, what climate is that likely to produce, what attitude or state of mind is that likely to produce throughout the country in business, and so forth? May it not increase the danger of inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. It may tend toward the inflationary.

Mr. JUDD. Therefore, if the President finds the prospects are good and reports that to the country, it may well have an inflationary effect?

Mr. PATMAN. The bill anticipates that and makes provisions against it as a safeguard. It will be the President's duty in a case like that to do something that will have a tendency to retard or prevent inflation.

We discussed for a moment the things he might do. Then, on page 106, the following colloquy occurs:

Mr. JUDD. Now, suppose the opposite takes place—suppose his predictions are pessimistic, and he says that we are pretty much exhausting the accumulated savings and there is reason to expect there will be a slowing down of business activity and the Government will have to be prepared to put in more, etc. Don't you think that, almost inescapably, that would produce a feeling of caution and apprehension and reserve on the part of business and thereby create and foster the very slowing down of the economic processes which you are trying to avoid? Everybody would say, "I will wait before I expand; I don't want to get caught; I'd better lay off men rather than put more on; I'd better wait until next year before I build this new addition to my plant."

Mr. PATMAN. Under the existing order of things you are correct, but this bill is to provide against that. In other words, when he predicts a pessimistic situation, it will be overcome by the suggested remedies.

Mr. JUDD. Don't you think that an announcement that would be pessimistic would sweep over the country almost instantaneously and produce a hesitation that would precipitate the very thing you are trying to avoid?

Mr. PATMAN. Without, at the same time, a statement that would be optimistic or encouraging. And such a statement would necessarily be accompanied by one that would be encouraging.

Mr. JUDD. Suppose the President just couldn't find anything in the situation that was encouraging. You wouldn't want him to send out a false report, would you?

Mr. PATMAN. It is his duty under this legislation to plan for it, just as you plan a campaign for the years ahead.

Mr. JUDD. If he can't find favorable and optimistic factors, does he not have to make his report somewhat untrue or incomplete, or else produce a bad effect on the Nation's economy by stating the full truth?

Mr. PATMAN. We set forth a plan that he can use that will offset that defeatism.

Mr. JUDD. You are confident that it will work?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, no one knows how well it will work, but the theory, I think, is good.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is typical of the kind of questions that we asked witness after witness, sincerely seeking for light, and of the answers we received—the theory was said to be good. My inclination at first was to be for the bill because none of us wants to leave unturned a single stone that may help give us maximum employment, production, and prosperity; but in view of all the testimony I became convinced that the results of the original bill were so uncertain and so likely to be the very opposite of what is desired that I lost faith in it as a sound and workable mechanism.

Then again I think the language of H. R. 2202 was recklessly irresponsible in places. It contained in section 2 (e) a flat pledge to pay for making jobs at some unknown time in the future an unknown amount of money, although we have no possible way of knowing what the state of the country's Treasury will be at that time. I cannot make any such promise. Certainly we cannot have prosperity in this country unless first of all there is a solvent United States Treasury. For these and other reasons I cannot vote for that original bill, not because I do not want maximum employment, but because I do.

Then the question came up: If we are opposed to H. R. 2202 and S. 380, shall we vote down everything and have nothing at all and say that is all we can do about it; or should we attempt to get a bill that is honest, candid, and responsible, and one that provides the best possible mechanism we can devise to get the highest level of employment? I thought we should make an effort to do the second thing. Therefore, I voted to have a subcommittee appointed to draft this substitute for S. 380, embodying an approximation of the ideas expressed by members of the committee. I hope it can be amended tomorrow in two or three places, but I intend to vote for it even in its present form for the following essential reasons——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. First it declares to any who may have doubts on the matter that the Congress intends to do everything it can to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power in this country. Mr. Chairman, I understand why the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], spoke rather deprecatingly a few moments ago of this part of the bill. I admit that it merely reaffirms the preamble of the Constitution of the United States. That should not be necessary. I hope nobody thinks that this Congress does not intend to do everything it possibly can, as every Congress in history has always done everything it could within the limitations of its collective wisdom, to provide conditions which would stimulate and promote prosperity in this country with a maximum of employment and income for all. But if there is any doubt, surely it does no harm to reaffirm that we are going to do our utmost to promote the highest possible level of employment. The writers of our Constitution did not say they were going to "assure" the general welfare. They said they were going to "promote" the general welfare. That is the word we use in the committee bill. It is an honest word. It does not promise more than we can do. So the bill does not establish a new policy. It merely reaffirms or redeclares the policy that has always existed, as I understand it, the policy that says promoting maximum prosperity is a responsibility and a constant objective of the United States Congress.

Second, our committee bill reaffirms that we intend to do it in a free, competitive economy, with Government stimulation and assistance where necessary, but with only as much Government control as is necessary to assure the people of the rights and liberties guaranteed them in the Constitution. I do not think there is any harm in such a redeclaration, a recommitment of ourselves before the people, and perhaps

some good, after all the misleading propaganda that has been handed out to them that the Congress is lying down on the job and only the executive branch of the Government and the bureaus are working for the people. I do not think there is any harm in our saying again that we intend to do our utmost—nobody can honestly promise more—and that we intend to do it within the American system, not because we do not want to achieve these desired objectives, but because we are convinced that is the way which gives us best hope of achieving them.

The third reason I am for the committee bill is because I think there can be real value in the Council of Economic Advisers provided in section 4. Our idea was to set up a group of three high-grade men who, with their assistants, would give their full time to studying the economic situation and trends in this country. It is expected they would study and analyze the statistics gathered in various departments of the Government, would consult with such organizations as the Brookings Institution, the Committee on Economic Development, the research agencies of labor organizations, economists, executives, and all the rest. They would give their full time to coordinating and interpreting economic facts in order to help guide the President and his Cabinet and the Budget Bureau in the writing of his economic report and his messages on the state of the Nation.

The committee accepted an amendment I offered that will make the reports of the Council of Economic Advisers available to the joint committee of the Congress, if it requests them, as well as to the President, because Congress needs the results of the advisers' studies just as much as does the President.

I am going to offer two amendments tomorrow. Each was offered in the committee but defeated by 1 or 2 votes. One is that the members of the Council of Economic Advisers shall be bipartisan. I do not think it would be wise or of much benefit to have any President, of whichever party, pick for his Council of Advisers only those of his own party, or only men who subscribe already to his own particular economic theories. The Council ought to represent broadly both major parties.

The second amendment would require that the advisers be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is the only way to make sure the men will be of the high quality specified. We do not want three more jobs for lame ducks. We do not want Harry Hopkins or men with his spending views appointed, or at least not without the approval of the Senate. I do not think that it would confirm such men as members, or at least not more than one such. We had in mind such men as Bernard Baruch who generally have been above the ordinary currents of politics, and able to give more detached and broader views. I hope those two amendments will be accepted, because if they are, we can vote for the bill with more assurance that it will be of real value to us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. There is another good provision with regard to the Council of Economic Advisers. One of the weaknesses of the National Resources Planning Board was that practically all of the remedies it recommended were to spend, spend, and spend. So far as I know, it never sent down with its recommendations to spend other recommendations on how to raise the money. We require in this bill that every plan for spending shall be accompanied by a suggested plan for raising, over a reasonable period of years, the revenue which will be required. That is a real improvement over the old National Resources Planning Board.

The next thing of value in the bill is the joint committee of Congress. I know that all of the members of the joint committee are already busy. They will be the 2 top Democratic and the 2 ranking Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House and of the Senate, 4 from the Finance Committee of the Senate and 4 from the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, with 3 members at large from each House—22 members in all. The joint committee will have a full-time staff of experts, the same as our Joint Committee on Taxation has, to study the reports and recommendations of the Council of Economic Advisers, to study the economic report of the President, and then to make recommendations to the various committees of Congress, the Ways and Means Committee, the Committees on Appropriations, the Committees on Rivers and Harbors, the Committees on Flood Control, the Committees on Public Buildings, the Committees on Banking and Currency, and so forth, as to measures each of them should consider bringing out. The joint committee will both integrate and distribute the various proposals so as to give us the maximum of production, economic activity, and employment.

Therefore, in summary I feel that the bill before us, this committee substitute for S. 380, does give a mechanism which, so far as I can see, will not do any harm. The worst it could do would be to waste $445,000. But I think that is a trivial price to pay for the possibility of a great deal of substantial good. I believe that it can, if handled well, be very effective in helping us get a longer look at our economic problem. So I intend to support the bill, and I hope that all of you, both Republicans and Democrats, will support it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. One reason that the gentleman is arguing so effectively for this measure over the Senate bill is that it will bring us a step nearer to the gearing of our public-works program to the economic conditions of this country.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. I want to confirm that because the economic advice we get from these technical persons will help us to gear our public programs to the employment situation.

Mr. JUDD. We cannot guarantee it will, but I think there is every reason to expect that it will.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman would agree that it is important from the standpoint of congressional policy.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. For example, here are two types of public-works programs; one is for flood control, that might be of an emergency character. We want to create these protective levees, and so on, regardless of conditions. But there are other programs, such as the erection of county agricultural buildings that occur to me as worth-while enterprises.

As one of the proponents of that kind of program, I agree that they ought to be geared to the employment situation. Is it the gentleman's opinion that under this program for which he is speaking it would be possible for us to plan, we will say, the construction of buildings of that kind and other public works so that we would do it in those periods in which it is beneficial from the standpoint of the Nation's economic life?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, precisely.

Mr. HAYS. And that we can therefore avoid some of the criticisms of pork-barrel legislation if this is developed?

Mr. JUDD. That is certainly one of the objectives of this legislation. As I say, we cannot be sure that it will achieve them, but I think the President should welcome these and I, as a Member of Congress, will welcome these reports to help guide me in my thinking.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. May I ask the gentleman if the President under section 3 (a) of this bill were to render an economic report to the Congress on economic conditions affecting employment in the United States that was generally of a very optimistic tone, and pointed out that economic conditions were very good, that the prospects of employment were very high, and so on, would not that be very likely to touch off the kind of inflationary boom that optimistic expressions of President Coolidge touched off, for example?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. I have already referred to that. I think there would be that danger. On the other hand, this committee substitute is infinitely to be preferred to the original bill where the President had to present a detailed estimate, or guess, 18 months in advance, as to how many jobs private enterprise would furnish and how many there ought to be to give everybody a job, and then how many billions the Government should appropriate to fill up the estimated deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, anyone who would do me the honor of reading this short speech that I am about to make, I most respectfully suggest that he read the speech made a few minutes ago by my distinguished friend from Texas

[Mr. LANHAM]. He sets forth in fine language and in clear logic my views exactly.

There is no question but that there are hundreds of men and women already on the Federal pay rolls who can furnish all of the information and who can do everything that is suggested to be done either in the bill favored by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] or the bill favored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

If Mr. Wallace is qualified to be the Secretary of Commerce in the President's Cabinet, he surely is qualified to furnish all of the necessary information about commerce, both foreign and domestic. The same can be said of the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture. These four men, through their Department Chiefs can do everything that anyone can do under the provisions of these bills.

The whole country is clamoring against bureaucracy.

The whole country knows that there is plenty of employment in this country at this time.

What we need more than anything else is that our people quit fighting each other and go to work in a program of production. We cannot pay our terrific debt nor keep up our terrific governmental expenses unless we soon start on a program of producing new wealth. That is done only by work and more work.

If I thought that either of these bills would tend in any way to produce employment I would support them. They are simply a recitation of some beautiful sentiments to which we all can subscribe, but when you search this bill or either of them for any concrete dependable suggestions that would benefit the workers of the Nation you will find none. The only concrete suggestions are those that set up two or three new and expensive bureaus.

The title of this proposed legislation is very alluring—I confess that it beguiled me at first reading but when I read these bills I was disillusioned completely. The Whittington amendment is an effort to soften down the Patman bill in the hope that the House might adopt it and thereby save the face of the New Deal administration. This bill will not benefit the workers of the Nation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, our colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] brought out one constructive suggestion for a project so far as agriculture is concerned. If we are going to have full employment it should include the rural people. There happens to be around 12,000,000 people working on the farms of our country. These 12,000,000 people up to this time have not had any of the benefits of social legislation like social security nor the benefits of civil-service retirement. The AAA employees, the FSA employees, the PCA employees, and the many other employees of agricultural agencies do not even come under civil service and are not eligible for retirement. Some people here worked 10 years in these offices, but no provision whatever has been made for them at their retirement. Why?

We can talk about 60,000,000 jobs all we want to. Possibly other groups, like the American watchmakers up in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Illinois, today are wondering where they are going to get their share of these 60,000,000 jobs they heard so much about before election last fall. They are evidently wondering where they will get any employment, say nothing about full employment. Some may think that the 90 percent of parity guaranty for agriculture is going to provide jobs for the farm people of this country. I personally think that the way that the CCC is being manipulated and with the bucket-shop operations that are being carried on by this CCC the hopes for jobs by the rural people at a decent hourly wage is each day becoming more doubtful.

However, our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], has for many months been working to pass the Cooley bill. This bill will do much to furnish jobs and provide homes and promote reconversion for the rural people. Our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, has worked hard in connection with that bill. If we pass the Cooley bill we will have done our part to provide jobs and homes during the reconversion period for the rural people of America.

The following summary by the United States Department of Agriculture gives a picture of what the Cooley bill is trying to accomplish:

SUMMARY OF HISTORY AND PROVISIONS OF H. R. 2239, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HISTORY

This bill is an outgrowth of the work of the Select Committee appointed to investigate the Farm Security Administration pursuant to House Joint Resolution 119.[1] The select committee filed its report on May 9, 1944.[2] In that report, the committee recommended approval of the bill H. R. 4384 (78th Cong., 2d sess.), introduced on March 13, 1944, by Mr. COOLEY, chairman of the select committee. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and after hearings,[3] was again referred to the select committee for further study. After additional consideration in conferences, H. R. 4384 was revised, reintroduced on May 24, 1944, as H. R. 4876 (78th Cong., 2d sess.), and favorably reported with amendments by the House Committee on Agriculture on June 23, 1944.[4] The bill was not acted upon during that session of the Congress and, with certain minor changes in language and corrections in dates, was reintroduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session by Congressman COOLEY on February 16, 1945, as H. R. 2239, and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill would abolish the Farm Security Administration, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C. (the only remaining regional), the functions of the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration relating to crop and feed loans, and the functions of the National Housing Agency with respect to all properties, except housing projects, originally acquired by the Farm Security Administration and transferred to the National Housing Agency by Executive order.

The bill would also repeal title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act relating to rehabilitation loans, which has never been used by the Farm Security Administration, repeal the laws relating to crop and feed loans, and repeal the laws relating to the organization and operation of the regional agricultural credit corporations.

In lieu of these provisions relating to rehabilitation loans, crop and feed loans, and loans by the regional agricultural credit corporations, the bill would set up a new authority in the Farmers' Home Corporation under which so-called production and subsistence loans could be made to those farmers who could not obtain credit from existing sources. This Corporation was originally created in 1937, pursuant to title IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

The bill would also amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act by providing for preferences to war veterans, enlarging the lending authority in some respects, and establishing a system under which tenant purchase loans might be insured by private lenders in lieu of the Government making direct advances for all such loans. These authorities would also be exercised by the Farmers' Home Corporation.

OBJECTIVES OF THE BILL

The report (p. 2) states the objectives of the bill as follows:

1. Prompt liquidation of Government interest in cooperative farming and landholding projects. Definite authorities and procedures for such liquidation are provided. It is required that all projects be discontinued and that the properties not suitable for farming be sold within 18 months.

2. There can be no more 99-year leases in the farm-security program.

3. There can be no land acquisition by the Corporation for any purpose except in the normal collection of debts in foreclosure or when needed for the routine business purposes of the Corporation.

4. The industrial plants originally started by the Farm Security Administration, such as hosiery mills, furniture factories, woodworking shops, and so forth, will be transferred to the Corporation for liquidation.

5. Labor camps will be closed out not later than 6 months after the close of the war when such camps will no longer be needed in the farm-labor-supply program.

6. The trusts relating to the State rural rehabilitation corporations will have to be wound up.

7. The bill places a definite limit ($3,500) on the total amount which can be loaned to any one individual for general farming purposes.

8. The bill prevents any borrower from the Corporation from "staying on the Government" indefinitely. After a borrower has been financed by the Corporation for five consecutive years, he will have to pay his account in full before he can obtain further loans from the Corporation.

9. The bill eliminates the possibility of competition by this agency with farmers' cooperative lending organizations and other responsible private lenders furnishing credit to farmers at reasonable rates and terms.

10. The bill provides preferences for veterans in the matter of obtaining loans to buy farm homes.

11. The bill provides for insured mortgages with which to purchase farm homes, with specific preferences for veterans.

12. The mortgage-insurance features of the bill make it possible for private capital to

[1] 78th Cong., 1st sess. The resolution was originally approved by the House on March 18, 1943.

[2] 78th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 1430, Union Calendar No. 492.

[3] The hearings were held from March 29, 1944, to May 15, 1944.

[4] Rept. No. 1747, 78th Cong., 2d sess.

participate in financing the farm-home-acquisition program.

13. The bill prohibits any farm loans under the tenant purchase program on the basis of inflated values. Loans must be based upon the fair and reasonable value of the farms to be purchased, based upon the normal earning capacity.

14. The bill prohibits any loan unless approved by a local committee of farmers.

15. The bill provides no basis for the paternalistic supervision and coddling practiced by Farm Security Administration in the past.

16. The bill eliminates duplication of Federal agencies making direct loans to farmers, by combining three of such agencies.

17. The bill eliminates regional offices by the agencies involved.

18. The bill provides for savings of manpower and money by eliminating duplication and reducing personnel.

19. The bill provides that only qualified and necessary personnel will be retained to carry on the functions authorized in the bill.

20. The bill will result in the saving of time of farmers by requiring all Federal agencies within the Department of Agriculture making loans or furnishing agricultural credit services to farmers to utilize common or adjacent offices wherever practicable.

21. The bill restricts the promiscuous printing and distribution of bulletins and pamphlets, by providing that information as to the operations and programs of the Corporation may be printed and published only when funds are specifically provided therefor by the Congress.

22. The bill requires an annual audit by the Comptroller General.

23. The bill requires an annual accounting of the affairs of the Corporation, with a full report to the Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture.

OTHER SIGNIFICANT PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The assets incident to the agencies and functions abolished would be transferred to the Farmers' Home Corporation for liquidation and remittance of the proceeds to the United States Treasury, except (1) the Corporation would be authorized to use the necessary funds to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation sums borrowed from it by Farm Security Administration; (2) the water programs of the Department of Agriculture, which are under the direct authority of the Secretary and are being administered by the Farm Security Administration and Soil Conservation Service would not be disturbed by the transfer; (3) the Corporation would retain such of the files of the agencies abolished and such of the office furniture, equipment, machinery, and supplies as were necessar, for its own purposes, and (4) $10,001,000 of the assets would be exempted from the transfer for the purpose of capitalizing the Farmers' Home Corporation and creating the mortgage insurance fund.

The unused balances of existing appropriations under which the Farm Security Administration and the crop-loan programs are being carried on would, under the intent of the bill, also be transferred to the Corporation. The bill, however, would now need a slight change to describe the appropriations which are now being used for these purposes.

As the bill now reads, the Farmers' Home Corporation would have capital stock of $1,000 to be held by the Secretary of Agriculture on behalf of the United States. Management of the Corporation would be in a board of three persons appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary would also be authorized to appoint other expert personnel as needed. The salaries of none of the principal officers or experts could exceed $10,000 per annum. The other personnel would be appointed by the Secretary pursuant to civil-service laws and their salaries would be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act.

The Corporation would be dependent upon annual congressional appropriations or authorizations to borrow the funds needed for all of its purposes except, in part, for carrying out the mortgage insurance provisions. The proceeds of all loans which it made would, after payment of any sums borrowed pursuant to congressional authorization, be deposited in the Treasury. The Corporation would have the usual powers of Government corporations and other powers especially designed for its purposes. It would be audited annually by the Comptroller General and reports of its operations furnished the Congress.

Under the new authority to take the place of existing authorizations for crop and feed, and rural rehabilitation loans, the Corporation could make loans to farmers for the purchase of livestock, seed, feed, fertilizer, farm equipment and supplies, other farm needs, the refinancing of indebtedness and family subsistence. The initial loan to any one borrower could not exceed $2,500 and no further loan could be made to him so long as he owed $3,500. The term of any loan, including renewals, could not exceed 5 years. After a person had been indebted to the Corporation for five consecutive years, he could not obtain a further loan until his indebtedness was paid. Exceptions as to the amount and length of time loans might be outstanding are made in the case of borrowers from the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation until the expiration of any special programs for its borrowers. Indebtedness of Farm Security Administration and crop loan borrowers existing at the time the new act went into effect would be excluded in determining these limitations with respect to terms and amounts of loans.

The Corporation could not make loans to corporations or cooperative associations. Neither could the Corporation make a loan to any person unless the county committee certified that the applicant was eligible for the loan and that, in their opinion, his character, ability, industry, and experience were such as would justify extension of the credit. In addition, before the loan could be granted, there would have to be a certification by the committee to the effect that credit sufficient to finance the actual needs of the applicant was not available to him at the rates (not exceeding 6 percent) and terms prevailing in the community in or near which he resided for loans of similar size and character from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or from any other responsible source.

Except as otherwise authorized by the Congress, the interest rate of 5 percent would apply to all loans which the Corporation made.

Specific policies and authorizations would be provided for liquidation of the so-called resettlement projects of Farm Security Administration. Within 6 months after the effective date of the act, the Corporation would be required to determine which of the project lands would be suitable for family-size farms. A report of this determination would be filed with the Congress. Lands suitable for farming and personal property usable in farming operations would be sold to persons eligible for tenant purchase loans or insured mortgages under policies and at prices consistent with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Loans could be made to these purchasers to enable them to improve the lands or repair the properties.

Real and personal property not capable of being sold for family-size farms would have to be disposed of within 18 months after the effective date of the act. The sales would be at the best prices obtainable after public notice, for cash or on secured credit. On credit sales, the Corporation would have to obtain at least 20 percent down payment and the balance within 5 years. Among the property to be sold in this manner would be the electric light and power plants, water systems, sewage systems, schools and churches, which have been constructed by Farm Security Administration. In certain instances, however, some of these properties could be granted or dedicated to local organizations or municipalities.

Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which is the law under which tenant purchase loans are made, would be amended to give preferences to war veterans in the matter of loan funds and insured tenant purchase mortgages. There would be specific authority for farm enlargement and farm improvement loans and it would be possible to refinance existing indebtedness when loans were being made to enlarge or improve inadequate or underimproved farm units. The bill provides that loan values could not exceed the "fair and reasonable value of the farm based upon its normal earning capacity." The farms would be appraised by the county committees, but reports of employees of the Corporation trained for appraisal work would be available to the committeemen in determining farm values. The county committees would include in their certifications for loans a statement that the applicant could not obtain adequate credit from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies and other private lenders at rates (not exceeding the legal rate) and terms prevailing in the community in which the applicant resided. The applicant would also be required to agree that he would refinance his loan with the Federal land bank when it was possible to do so.

The interest rates on tenant purchase loans would be increased from 3 percent to 4 percent. The Corporation's authority to supervise tenant purchase borrowers' operations would be limited to that necessary to assure that proper farming conservation practices as prescribed by the Corporation would be carried out.

The loan and mortgage insurance funds available would be distributed equitably among the several States on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, except that the Corporation could allocate to each State such amount as was necessary to finance applications from veterans.

The mortgage insurance fund would be created with an initial deposit of $10,000,000 accruing from the funds realized by dissolution of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Money in the fund not needed for current operations would be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States or invested in obligations of or guaranteed by the United States. The Corporation could use money in the fund to purchase any notes issued by it to the Secretary of the Treasury. There is authorization in the bill for appropriations, as needed, to augment the fund and for paying administrative expenses.

A mortgage could not be insured unless the Corporation had made a commitment for such insurance before the mortgage was executed. The total amount which could be insured and on which commitments for insurance had been given could not exceed $100,000,000 in any one fiscal year. In order to obtain insurance, a person would have to be eligible for a loan under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the farm would have to meet title I requirements. The principal obligation could not exceed 90 percent of the value of the farm and necessary repairs and improvements. The value of the farm would be based upon its normal earning capacity, as provided in Title I. The interest rate on the mortgage would be 4 percent. One-half of 1 percent annually would be placed in the mortgage insurance fund and one-half of 1 percent would go to the Corporation for administrative expenses relating to the mortgage insurance provisions.

The mortgage holder (the mortgagee) would be required to agree that he would

accept the benefits of the insurance in lieu of any right of foreclosure and the Corporation would act as collection agent for the mortgagee. The Corporation would be required to remit promptly to the mortgage holder all payments which it collected from the mortgagor. It would have to advise the mortgagee promptly of any default. If the mortgagor failed to pay installments within 30 days from the date due, the Corporation would make these payments to the mortgagee out of the mortgage insurance fund. The mortgage holder could assign the note and mortgage and contract of insurance upon notice to the Corporation.

If the mortgagor was in default for more than 12 months, the mortgagee could obtain payment in full by transferring the note and mortgage and related instruments to the Corporation. The Corporation would then pay the holder the amount due on the mortgage out of the mortgage insurance fund. If there were not sufficient money in the fund to make the payment, the Corporation could obtain it by issuing a note to the Secretary of the Treasury. This note would bear interest at a rate determined by the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, of not more than 3 percent per annum. The redeemed mortgage would become an asset of the mortgage insurance fund. As soon as sufficient cash was obtained in the fund, the Corporation could use it to retire the note made to the Secretary of the Treasury. These insured mortgages would be made eligible for investment by National banks, savings banks, and insurance companies.

After repurchase of any mortgage from a mortgage holder, the corporation would ascertain whether the mortgagor desired to keep the property. If so, the Corporation would consider whether the mortgagor had made reasonable efforts to meet his payments and a reasonable chance to retain the property. Upon such finding, an extension agreement could be entered into for a period not in excess of 5 years. If the mortgagor failed to make good during that time, the Corporation could foreclose.

There is also a provision in the bill that the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture or under its supervision could act as agent for the Corporation upon terms and conditions mutually agreeable. There is a further provision for consolidation of the field offices of the Corporation where practicable.

There are several provisions in the bill which need to be revised or deleted in order to bring it up to date.

While no one individual may subscribe to all the provisions of the Cooley bill, it is a step in the right direction and it can be used to meet situations that always have and that probably always will appear in rural life. It is hoped that the committee and the House will give this meritorious legislation its approval and I personally hope some changes can be effectuated in some of the sections.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], a member of the committee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, it has been my privilege to join with other members, regardless of partisanship, within the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for a period of several weeks to listen to witnesses who appeared both for and against the objectives of this type of legislation. We have held many executive sessions when we labored over the details of the measure with a view to perhaps perfecting its provisions. It is in a spirit of approval of the over-all objectives of the bill now before us that I take the well of the House in counseling briefly with my colleagues.

In beginning I should like to say that there are certain sections during the reading of this bill when I shall vote for amendments which will be presented by my colleagues. I voted for at least two of those amendments in committee and they will be presented to the membership of this House for their approval or disapproval. I believe also that we can properly, within the framework of the purposes of this proposal, strengthen the measure which has been reported by our committee. I want it very clearly understood that I am not one of those possessed of a haunting fear of the implications which are often ascribed to this type of legislation.

I have a high regard for the opponents, of course, of this type of bill. I am constrained, however, to say to my colleagues that I am in disagreement with the minority opinion filed in connection with this bill. It has been presented by our good and able colleagues, Representatives HOFFMAN, CHURCH, GIBSON, and RICH. I have read not once but many times their viewpoint and opposition to this legislation. I have thought back, as they have presented their thinking, of what they set forth to be certain fears which they hold about the public-works developments within the framework of our system of check and balances. These gentlemen have pointed out, for the membership of Congress to read and perhaps follow, their views about too much Government activity.

We have, as a Congress, approved by authorizing legislation and implemented by appropriations certain measures and programs which create a public-works program in this Nation to cushion, as it were, a so-called period of reconversion. If we have an economic upheaval and then go into a period of unemployment which might conceivably stretch over not only a period of months but a period of years, Congress is charged with a responsibility to plan and aid job opportunities under Government impetus.

The minority members have objected to expenditures or the authorizations for expenditures which have already been made in certain bills which provide for the construction of highways, development of airports, and the inauguration of types of projects which would be beneficial to the communities themselves, to the Nation as a whole, and to the well-being, as I understand it, of the people of our Republic.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. The point to which the gentleman is now referring in the minority report is that there is not anything that can be done under this bill that the President and his advisers and the Congress and its committees cannot do under the present legislation. Is that not the point we make?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think it is one of the points made, but I also think, and if I am in error the gentleman will correct me, you have a feeling that the appropriations or authorizations that have been made are not founded in necessity, and that Congress has perhaps been on the side of error in the passage of those bills to which I refer as public-works spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As far as I know, it was not the purpose of that report to criticize any past legislation. That was not the point. The point was, for example, that General Fleming I think has announced that he already has plans for the spending of $5,000,000,000 in public works. Then, the House has either appropriated or authorized appropriations of $107,000,000 for planning, and all this bill does is get another report from another committee to be considered by an additional committee that the House will appoint, but finally by the Speaker and the President of the Senate, to be taken apart and referred to the appropriate committees of the House, all of which is but a duplication of the present functions of the President and his advisers and Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I regret that I have read into the minority report any philosophy which the four signatures did not intend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I speak only for myself. I do not know what was in the minds of the other three gentlemen.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is under the impression that the minority report objected to appropriations already made. There was no intent of that kind in the minority report. Our point is that these appropriations and authorizations are made and every Member of Congress must at that time consider the private enterprise system always, but we do not need this measure to do that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I reiterate what I just said to the gentleman from Michigan. If I did weave or underline into the minority report that which was not intended, I certainly regret having done so.

I do desire, however, to supplement or reinforce what I said earlier by pointing out that the individuals who have signed this minority report, and for whom I have very genuine personal regard, in many instances have voted against post-war public-works programs which have been passed by the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses, and I refer especially to the Federal aid airport bill and flood-control-projects program, that there were votes from this group against such legislation.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman was justified in taking his position. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], one of the minority members, stated this afternoon, "This is one of the most fantastic schemes ever submitted to the Congress." The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] said, "The time has come for us to run the Government and let business run itself. Let business alone."

Those are two gentlemen who signed the minority report, and those two statements were made where the gentleman now stands this afternoon.

Mr. CHURCH. I refer the gentleman to the statement by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. The gentleman understands Mr. LANHAM'S position on public works. He is certainly opposed to the pending measure, the substitute bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have knowledge, I think, of the viewpoint entertained, not only this afternoon but on other occasions, by our able friend and veteran legislator, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. I attempt to understand the facts behind legislation, and often there are good motives, but they may be incorrect, in connection with the legislation by certain Members who are opposing this bill.

I feel the Congress has an obligation to give leadership in going forward in a coordinated program of public works, rather than to adopt, as we have from time to time adopted in our Nation, a public-works program hastily conceived, and oftentimes carried out faultily. We have acted to take care of a situation of unemployment which existed as of a particular time. I think that in the Labor Committee of this House, where we are considering legislation at the present time, there is a feeling among the Members that apparently we come to a place where the recent labor-management conference breaks down, and the country expects Congress to step in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, certain questions were resolved in that conference, but when it came to an actual agreement of labor and management on a particular problem, while there was no bitter outward feeling, no unpleasantries perhaps, they just said in effect: "We cannot get together." So the President of the United States, feeling that there had been this breakdown in negotiations, sends to Congress a proposal. He desires, as does the American people, labor-management peace in this country so there will be production of essential goods for our people during the reconversion period. When Mr. Truman saw all this breaking apart he quickly sent to the Congress of the United States a plan to establish, by law, fact-finding boards. It is the feeling among the members of the Labor Committee and the Members of this House that the draft of the bill was conceived quickly and brought to the Capitol with a plea for immediate action, action before Christmas and that such haste would be an improper way to approach such a big problem. It is not easy to write provisions to meet our kind of industrial relations trouble.

I think we have a like situation existing, when from time to time in this country we are under the impact of unemployment or an economic crisis, and we attempt to come to the Congress quickly and provide certain public works of one type or another—roads, airports, flood control, or what not. I feel such a hit-and-miss policy has not given the type of well-rounded public-works program which the people of this country desire. I have long believed we ought to head up a coordinated program of public works, not that it be undertaken in any particular period, but that it be on the shelf, as it were, just as the wise grocer, if possible, will keep upon his shelves the products which he believes from time to time his customers may desire to purchase. He does not want a run on those groceries in one morning or afternoon. He knows, however, that the supplies are ready for purchase if and when his customers desire them.

I believe it is absolutely necessary that we think, then, in terms of our country's development in the future in order that we do not provide a job to a man for a certain day, or week, or month, but that the worker is employed in an over-all program of public-works development which, when a dollar of Government money is spent, returns many fold in dividends that Federal expenditure of moneys. Without attempting to justify the expenditures for Nation-wide programs for airports or highways, in which I thoroughly believe, I feel that it is the type of expenditure which in the future will implement private business development rather than destroy. In other words, we will do a job of funneling projects, as it were, through one channel and from that funneling we shall have ready as a backlog what the country will need in the way of public works.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should allay our fears as to any philosophy in this legislation which would seem to destroy private enterprise and initiative in this country. I certainly would not want to destroy those traits. I would want to encourage them. I think it appropriate for me to say, as I close my statement this afternoon, that many months ago I joined with Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, in proposing to the Congress legislation which has become law which removes the Securities and Exchange Commission regulations and controls from small industries and businesses. Where it formerly was in effect at a $100,000 level, the level, under our proposal, was raised to $300,000. We thus give small private enterprise and energetic business investors an incentive in this country. New venture capital outlets must constantly be increased.

This Congress, my colleagues, does have a responsibility to the American people and to the functioning of valuable Government leadership to its best advantage for public works planning. We present a bill, which may be amended, but which will occupy a storehouse of worth-while projects funneled through one agency exercising care over peacetime employment problems. We also make for a better and basically sound America when we add to its value stones of progress which have been fashioned with the aid of expert Federal and private cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, "It is time for a declaration that really means something."

These words, which I take as the theme of my remarks today, are not my own. They are a direct quote from the majority report of the Committee on Expenditures on the substitute bill for S. 380.

The gentlemen who signed that report have left no doubt as to their intentions. They have, indeed, come forth with a declaration that means something. They have made it unmistakably clear that they reject the principles of the full-employment bill, that as far as they are concerned the Government has no responsibility for employment, and that they do not intend that the Government should take the steps necessary to make jobs available. The entire structure of this substitute measure is built around this outright repudiation of the right to work. Hence there is obviously no point in trying now to incorporate in it the minimum principles originally endorsed by the sponsors of H. R. 2202. This substitute is not amendable.

I think it is high time that we should declare, in words that really mean something, these minimum principles embodied in both H. R. 2202 and the Senate version of S. 380. As I see it, these principles fall into two groups, the policy objectives, and the machinery for implementing the objectives.

H. R. 2202 clearly enunciated the right to work, defined as "sufficient" employment opportunities for all Americans able to work and seeking work, and declared that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to assure continuing full employment.

The committee substitute, and I quote, "unqualifiedly rejects this theory." Why?

For one thing, because they argue that the right to work is not synonymous with the right of freedom, and that is the function of the Government to assure the latter, but not the former. Let me ask you, how can the Government assure freedom without seeing to it that every individual has the opportunity to earn a living? If a man has no job, how can he enjoy freedom of political participation, freedom from fear, freedom of competition, freedom to health, education, recreation and security, freedom of social and economic democracy, freedom to make the most of himself? How can a man on the dole exercise that initiative and self-reliance which is declared to be a major objective of this committee bill? Without the right to work, a man is not free.

In this connection I consider it highly significant that the substitute bill deletes all of the original references to promoting the general health and welfare of the Nation, fostering the American home and education and way of life, raising the standard of living of the American people, providing adequate employment opportunity for returning veterans, maintaining markets for agriculture, economic development of underdeveloped areas, strengthening national defense, and contributing to world peace.

It also omits the specific safeguard against exporting unemployment by avoiding resort to methods that would lead to economic warfare among nations.

Gentlemen, the case for this substitute measure is rested mainly upon the thesis, that full employment is impossible. They are trying to tell the people that it is a snare and a delusion to expect jobs under our system. I quote:

> Full employment never has been and never will be maintained under our system of free competitive enterprise except in wartime under huge deficits.
>
> Unemployment, they say, is essential to our economy.

Here you have it in plain words that really mean something. All they are willing to do is state that the Government will promote the fullest sustainable employment, which by their definition is clearly something less than enough jobs for all who want and need them.

This makes it very easy to locate the principal difference between H. R. 2202 and the substitute for S. 380. The sponsors of the original bill, taking their cue from the official platforms of both parties and from the administration, committed themselves to write into the law the obligation of the Government to do everything in its power to stimulate full employment, plus the conviction that the Government is powerful enough to assure that goal. This substitute measure, on the other hand, would publicly declare that the Government has no responsibility for full employment, that it does not have the requisite tools, and that in any case it shall not take the necessary steps.

That indeed, is the essence of the so-called implementing portion of the substitute bill. Let no one make the mistake of interpreting the economic report as a kind of a national budget. The majority report explicitly states that since the committee substitute rejects the theory upon which the Senate bill was conceived, it creates no provision for such a budget. And this is clear enough from the fact that all the five essentials which constitute a national budget are missing in the substitute draft.

First, by creation of a special Economic Council, it practically eliminates Presidential responsibility for the budget. The intent of the original bill was that the budget should be an executive function and should be cooperatively prepared by the administrative departments and agencies in close consultation with economic groups. Thus it would utilize existing functions and information, and it would be the administration's economic program. Under the substitute measure, however, the economic report would be prepared in an ivory tower vacuum by an advisory board with limited appropriations, not subject to congressional approval, and completely divorced from responsibility for carrying out its own suggestions. The budgeting process would be stymied before it ever started.

Second, you cannot budget the Nation's resources toward a given goal if you do not even know what the goal is. The present bill makes no provision for stating the objective—whether it be full employment or high employment—in quantitative terms. We would never know what we were after or whether we had ever achieved it—we would only know when we did not achieve it.

In the third place, there is no provision for collecting the essential information upon which any intelligent legislative program must be based--no appraisal of current economic trends to see how nearly we have approximated the goal. Congress would be asked to take measures to promote high employment, but it would have neither a measure of what constitutes high employment, nor a measure of how much action is required to achieve it.

The fourth and greatest gap of all lies in the absence of an economic program for combating depression. It is supposed to be the policy of the bill to promote private enterprise, but the only way in which it proposed to do so is through limited public works and unspecified loans. I say "limited," because not only must the public works be no greater than "normal"—"normal needs in normal times"—but they must "avoid competition of government with private business enterprises." "Normal," of course, means past rates of construction; the bill does not contemplate additional action in case of emergency. But as was pointed out in the debate of the Senate committee, the restriction to "noncompetitive" public works could and probably would be interpreted to exclude some of our most important and most productive undertakings like REA, TVA, flood control, housing, even outlays for public health.

In contrast to this do-less-than-now policy for stimulating private enterprise, H. R. 2202 proposes to utilize the whole tool kit of Federal policies for influencing economic activity. It specifically mentions taxation, banking, credit and currency, monopoly and monopolistic practices, wages, hours and working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, education, housing, social security, natural resources, the provision of public services, works and research, and leaves the door open for other measures that Congress might feel would stimulate private enterprise.

In addition, just to make it crystal clear that the Government will not stint on its efforts to stimulate private production, it guarantees the expenditure of whatever Federal funds are necessary for these purposes. This is the final bulwark to the promise that the Government will do nothing short of enough to make available full employment opportunity. Yet it has been the main target for the opponents of the bill, who charge that this would necessarily involve huge deficits and undermining of the credit of the Nation.

Gentlemen, I want to be sure that you fully grasp the position of the committee on this point. In unmistakable language they tell us that above all the objective is to adopt sound financial practices, by which they mean rigid balancing of the Budget. They state that "the provision in the Senate bill against deficit spending is nullified by the concluding limitation that the goal of full employment will not be interfered with." Do you realize what this means? Not only do they consider deficits a worse evil than unemployment. But they would not even be willing to give the unemployed a dole—because you cannot finance doles by taxes, when your tax base is withering away. H. R. 2202, on the other hand, proposes to avoid deficits, doles, and unemployment. It recognizes that, aside from war, deficits are caused by depression, and that the only road to sound finance is full production and employment.

Fifth, and finally, the substitute measure stops the budgeting process in the middle, by omitting the provision for a joint resolution by the joint committee. All it would have the committee do is file a report—to join all the other reports in the dusty file. The original idea, after all, was that the President should recommend and the Congress should decide. Why provide for coordinated study of the problem as a whole—why waste the time and talents of 18 or 30 Members of Congress, if this is all that comes out of it?

As I see it, the only justification for the policy declaration, and the collection of information, and the setting of goals, and the administrative recommendations, and the joint committee—in short for the bill—is that Congress should emerge with an approved framework around which it could coordinate all of its subsequent activities. Without such a frame of reference, there can be no national economic program for achieving employment—full, high, or even "middling."

"It is time for a declaration that really means something."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the debate on this bill today and, not only that, but during the summer and since, I have spent many hours studying this bill which has been labeled and advertised to the people of our country as the full employment bill. The title is wrong and the people have been deceived. This bill does not provide for employment—full or otherwise.

As I listened to the debate this afternoon several questions have beset me—sincere worries about the trend of things and what is happening and has happened to our Government in recent years. On yesterday it will be remembered that the Members of this body found it necessary to pass a bill which says in so many words that robbery and extortion are crimes and felonies. For Heaven's sake, where have we drifted when it becomes necessary after 150 years under the Constitution of the United States for the Congress to declare that robbery and extortion are crimes?

Now we are considering a bill in which the authors seem to find it necessary in two or three places to reaffirm the rights of the people of this country to engage in private enterprise and go forward on their own initiative. Why is it now necessary to write into a piece of legislation in the United States of America, operating under the Constitution, a statement that private enterprise is to be encouraged and fostered? Those principles made this country what it is today. The basis of our very foundation is freedom and private enterprise, yet

now and at other times in recent years we have found it necessary to do something like this.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman asked a question as to why it is necessary to reaffirm our allegiance to private industry. I think I have here the complete answer. This letter came to me this morning:

I am just a small grocer trying to make a living, but the way things are going I don't know but what the union is going to make me joint to make a living. The union has been picketing for some weeks at the Standard Grocery Co. in Holland, and if they keep it up they will have to close, and it will leave me and other grocers with no place to buy. The employees of this wholesale house voted 100 percent against joining the union, and I don't think it is a free country if the union is going to hold up freight from this wholesale house in order to force them to join. My customers will not be able to buy unless this practice is stopped.

There is a man who is engaged in running a little corner grocery store.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think the gentleman has answered one facet of the question I asked.

Let me continue with a discussion of the bill under consideration. The authors of the bill apparently thought it necessary to restate that the people of this country have a right to engage in private enterprise and have their undertakings protected and fostered. I think it is a sad thing if that must be done. We must have traveled a long way down the road toward state socialism or some other "ism" if such basic principles of our Republic must be reenacted into law.

Just about all this bill does is authorize the appropriation of $450,000 with which to set up a new bureau and a new congressional committee. Most of the things provided for in it can be done by existing agencies of the Government and by the Chief Executive with existing appropriations and with existing personnel.

If we pass this bill are we not, as a Congress, drifting into doing something that has been the much-used devise of the Executive during these last 10 or 12 years? We all know—certainly the people on our side of the aisle know—that the Presidential solution of almost any problem that has come before the Federal establishment these last 10 or 12 years has been the appointment of a new bureau, a new authority—that is a new word that has come into our Government—or a new administration or a new committee or a new body of some kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I notice in the press this morning that there is even something new under the sun in this field, and that is that we have the position of "Expediter" created by the Executive. I hope that this body will not at any time soon start passing legislation creating expediters, and I hope that it will not proceed to pass this legislation which provides only for the creation of a new bureau, and a new committee, at a cost of $445,000, thus falling into the error of administration that the Executive has fallen into in the last 10 or 12 years. We have too many bureaus now. We have too many people on the Federal pay roll now. We should use for economic planning some who are already on the pay roll, with the appropriations already authorized, and vote down this unnecessary and wasteful proposal.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in the closing hours of this debate I think it is very important to place before the Members of the House information with respect to what I consider to be a very sad situation affecting the training of our young naval officers through what is now called the NROTC, formerly the V–12 training program.

This House recently passed a bill establishing the peacetime strength of the United States Navy at 500,000 men. This figure was recommended by the Navy Department and is the result of many months of careful planning. This peacetime Navy will need an estimated total of 40,000 regular officers. It will also need a substantial number of officers always ready for duty in the Naval Reserve.

The officer strength of the Navy must be constantly renewed by a continuous flow of newly commissioned ensigns. The Regular Navy needs these young officers to move to higher ranks through the years as older officers are lost through death, disability, or resignation. So far as the Naval Reserve is concerned, experience during the war has shown that a Naval Reserve officer is usually unfit for immediate service at sea if he has been more than 5 years out of college. Hence, it is vitally necessary that the Naval Reserve have a constant supply of new young officers from year to year.

I have learned that the Navy Department, with these considerations in mind, began planning nearly 2 years ago for a transition from the wartime officer candidate program to a peacetime program of the proper size and type to meet the needs of a peacetime Navy of 500,000 men. Beginning in July of 1943, the Navy had on active duty in 131 colleges and universities, approximately 70,000 young officer candidates. This program—the Navy V–12 program—produced more than 50,000 qualified officers for the Navy during the war. It served the country well, and it also provided a substantial number of students to many colleges which would otherwise have had a difficult time to remain in operation. Since the trainees were on active duty in class V–12, the colleges were required to readjust their facilities in order to provide housing and messing arrangements to meet Navy standards. Also, because much of the academic work was prescribed by the Navy, the colleges have hired instructors in numbers and proportions which were different from the usual faculty pattern. For example, they hired many more instructors in mathematics and physics than would normally be required to meet their peacetime needs.

More than a year ago, when the Navy realized that the V–12 program was producing officers in greater numbers than were absolutely essential for the successful prosecution of the war, steps were taken to decrease the size of the program in a way which would not break any definite commitments to the men in training, would make the transition back to peacetime operation as easy as possible for the colleges, and would provide a steady, though decreasing flow of qualified officers to the fleet. By November 1, 1945, the program had been decreased from 70,000 to 30,000 trainees, with plans for further decreases in prospect. This process involved two basic procedures: First, decreasing the input of new trainees to the program, while permitting those who were partially trained to continue to completion; and second, increasing the average length of the college course permitted from approximately five college terms to eight terms, or the equivalent of a full 4-year college course. The second portion of this plan involved the transfer of V–12 deck and engineer trainees to the NROTC. The Congress was informed of this plan in the fall of 1944, and in order to facilitate its operation, passed a bill which became Public Law No. 1 of the current Congress. This bill provided that the postwar limitation on the number of trainees in the NROTC should be increased to 14,000, a figure based on the needs of a 500,000-man Navy and an adequate Naval Reserve. The bill also provided that the Navy Department would be permitted to continue not more than 24,000 men in the NROTC for a period of 1 year after the termination of hostilities, in order that there might be a smooth transition from the wartime V–12 NROTC program to a new peacetime program.

Immediately after VJ-day, the Navy Department undertook steps to curtail the V–12 program as rapidly as possible, with the objective of reaching the 14,000 maximum on July 1, 1946. All premedical, predental, and pretheological trainees were eliminated from training on November 1, 1945, and trainees in medical and dental schools and in theological seminaries are being dropped at the end of the current term at each institution. The Navy Department also completed the process, begun in March 1945, of transferring V–12 deck and engineering students to the NROTC. It was planned that the NROTC portion of the program, together with senior engineers and naval aviation preparatory trainees, would continue training on an active duty basis until July 1, 1946, and all the colleges were so informed. This information was of considerable importance to the colleges, since they normally employ instructors for a full academic year, and also make definite plans for use of housing facilities well in advance of the opening of each academic term.

One of the chief reasons why it would be desirable to continue the program on the present basis until the end of the present academic year is that no legislation establishing the basis for training men in the postwar NROTC has as yet been presented to Congress. If such legislation can be passed during the next few months, it would make possible a direct transition from the active duty V–12 NROTC program to a new peacetime NROTC program.

A plan for the peacetime NROTC has been prepared by the Navy Department, and will soon be presented to the Congress for action. I have seen a copy of the proposed legislation, based on the Holloway Board report, which provides that every trainee in the NROTC will be given free tuition, $50 a month while under instruction, and additional minor benefits. I am convinced that this plan will bring into the new NROTC a group of men with strong determination to become good naval officers, and a feeling of definite obligation to the Navy and to their Government. This plan is of great importance, because it will provide a considerable proportion of the future officers for the Regular Navy as well as officers for the Naval Reserve. I understand that the program has been favorably received by leading educators throughout the country, and I am confident that it will prove attractive to the type of young men whom we need in the future Navy. I, therefore, feel certain that if the present officer candidate program of the Navy were continued on the same basis until July 1, 1946, and that if, at that time, the men were given the opportunity to volunteer to continue their training on this new basis, a very large proportion of them would agree to do so. This fact is of very great importance to the Navy, since it would insure a continuous flow of young officers to the fleet. Approximately 80 percent of all the officer candidates now in the NROTC are in the upper level of instruction. If a large proportion of these men are eliminated from training, it will not only mean a substantial loss to the Government for the money spent on their training up to this point, but it will also mean that there will be a mere trickle of young officers from this program in 1946 and 1947, followed by several classes much larger than the Navy will actually need.

Another point which deserves consideration in this regard is that many of the 52 NROTC institutions, feeling satisfied that the plans for the continuation of the NROTC were firm, have obligated themselves to construct naval science buildings at costs ranging from $150,000 to $250,000. It is naturally disturbing to these institutions to discover that the Congress is in process of curtailing appropriations so that the program cannot be continued in accordance with the Navy's plans even to the end of the current fiscal year. It is possible that the rescission of this small portion of the Naval Reserve appropriation at this time may have an effect upon the relationship of the Navy to the colleges which will make it difficult to complete the necessary building program in a way which will insure satisfactory facilities for the long-range program of training. We cannot blame the colleges for not investing large sums of money in this program if Congress will not permit the Navy to do its part.

I believe, therefore, as I have indicated above, that the plan of the Navy is sound and that it deserves every support that Congress can give it. What has Congress actually done? Shortly after VJ-day, the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the House Appropriations Committee recommendations concerning rescission of appropriations for various Government Departments. These recommendations included a substantial reduction in the Naval Reserve appropriation for the current fiscal year. The amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to be retained in the Naval Reserve appropriation, which supports the Navy V–12 program, was further reduced by the House Appropriations Committee. If the bill as originally passed by the House had become law, it would have been necessary to terminate the entire officer candidate program of the Navy on or before January 1, 1946.

When this bill reached the Senate, an opportunity was given for representatives of the Navy Department to discuss the effects of this rescission on the Navy V–12 program. As a result, the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended a compromise. The amount of money permitted to remain in the appropriation for this program—$51,676,000—would permit the Navy aviation portion of the program to continue as scheduled to July 1, 1946, but would make it necessary to terminate the active-duty training of all other men in the program, including approximately 20,000 in the NROTC, on or about March 1, 1946. The conference committee reduced the amount to $51,500,000, which will merely have the effect of further curtailing the number of aviation candidates who can remain in college during the spring.

If the bill, as it now stands, is permitted to become law, the men now in the NROTC will be forced immediately to make up their minds whether or not to remain in training on the basis, not of a new and attractive plan, but on the basis of the prewar legislation, which did not provide for the payment of tuition and offered pay to junior and senior students only at the rate of one commuted ration per day. I understand that the highest possible amount which could legally be given under this old legislation during the spring of 1946 would be 65 cents per day. Obviously, there will be many NROTC trainees who will be forced to leave college and interrupt their training merely because they do not have the funds to continue in college at their own expense. No one can definitely predict exactly what this step will mean, but it is probable that the number of men remaining in the NROTC during the spring will be reduced by 40 to 50 percent. Furthermore, Congress, by its action on this appropriation bill, will force the Navy Department to break definite commitments previously made in writing to the colleges. The colleges have more than enough returning veterans to fill their lower classes. Their instructional plans will be seriously disrupted, however, by withdrawal of upper-level students and the substitution of large numbers of freshmen. We cannot blame the college authorities, therefore, for feeling, as I know many of them do, that Congress, through this appropriation-rescission bill, is taking action with respect to the officer-candidate program of the Navy, which is arbitrary and unwise. I understand that an additional sum of $9,676,000 added to the Naval Reserve appropriation would be sufficient to continue the entire V–12 program according to the original plan until July 1, 1946. I further understand that only about one-third of this amount would actually be spent for instruction. The other two-thirds would be spent on payments to the men and for provision of housing and messing, all of which would have to be provided from some other appropriation if the men were continued on active duty on some other capacity in the Navy. In view of these facts, I consider the portion of the present bill which curtails the Naval Reserve appropriation to be unsound, and I strongly believe that it would be for the best interest of the Navy, the colleges, and the entire Nation if the original appropriation approved for this program were restored.

The schedule of schools and universities where present V–12 NROTC program is being carried out is as follows:

NROTC AND V–12 SCHOOLS COLLEGE-TRAINING PROGRAM—COLLEGE AND LOCATION

College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology,[1] Cambridge, Mass.
Tufts College, Boston, Mass.
Worcester Polytechnic Institute,[1] Worcester, Mass.
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Stevens Institute of Technology,[1] Hoboken, N. J.
Colgate University,[1] Hamilton, N. Y.
Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Rensselaer Polytechnic, Troy, N. Y.
Union College,[1] Schenectady, N. Y.
University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Webb Institute of Naval Architect,[1] New York, N. Y.
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Swarthmore College,[1] Swarthmore, Pa.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Villanova College, Villanova, Pa.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.
Duke University, Durham, N. C.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
Tulane University, New Orleans, La.
University of Mississippi, University, Miss.
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Rice Institute, Houston, Tex.
Southern Methodist University,[1] Dallas, Tex.
University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.
Iowa State A. & M. College, Ames, Iowa.
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
Oberlin College,[1] Oberlin, Ohio.
Case School of Applied Science,[1] Cleveland, Ohio.
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
California Institute of Technology,[1] Pasadena, Calif.
University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Colorado College,[1] Colorado Springs, Colo.
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.
University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Southwestern University,[1] Georgetown, Tex.

[1] Non-NROTC schools.

Distribution by term level of trainees who are scheduled to be returned to inactive duty under present plans for deactivating the present active-duty V-12–NROTC program

Type of trainee	Number	Percent of total
Eighth term NROTC	2,404	11.9
Seventh term NROTC	4,451	22.1
Sixth term NROTC	7,424	36.9
Fifth term NROTC	823	4.1
Fourth term NROTC	331	1.6
Third term NROTC	455	2.2
Second term NROTC	1,405	7.0
First term NROTC	1,308	6.5
	18,601	92.6
Eighth term engineers, physics majors and aerologists	1,468	7.4
Grand total	20,069	100.0

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee on the great improvement they have made in this bill. As originally introduced in the Senate the bill was very vicious. The Senate improved it. Now our House committee has made a great improvement in the bill. I cannot see any sense for any bill on this legislation, however. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says we do not want to make the same mistakes after this war that we made after the first World War. The biggest mistake we made after the First World War was in loaning money to European countries to buy our merchandise, and then shipping the merchandise. The collapse was caused by the fact that in 1929 they had our merchandise and they had our money and we did not have anything. We are starting out to make that same mistake after this war. We are going to be asked to vote in a few days to loan $4,400,000,000 to England at a rate of interest half as much as we charge when loaning money to our own GI boys.

So we do not want to make the same mistake after this war as we did after the first war. We do not want to lend money to people to buy merchandise from us so they will have both the merchandise and the money and we will have nothing but their I O U's. Gentlemen of the Committee, there is no unemployment problem in the United States today. We could use 50,000 men in my own little congressional district today if we could get them. We are definitely short of labor. The trouble with passing this bill is that we are going to deceive the people into thinking that the Government is going to take over the business of the Nation and that everybody is going to work for the Government like they do in Russia. I have no criticism to make of Rusisa. I realize what a wonderful ally they have been with us in the recent war. I give them credit for what they have done. I realize their present Government is a great improvement over the Government they had in the days of the Czar. But at the same time I do not want the Russian Government for America. I do not want to pass any legislation here that can be construed as the slightest step in that direction where the Government owns everything and where everybody works for the Government. The more employment our Federal Government gives, the less private employment there will be. If we start this program, the result will be that we will continue to have to employ more people in the Federal Government and there will be fewer people employed by private enterprise. We cannot collect taxes on the business that the Federal Government does. In order to have a sustained prosperity, we must have high employment, but it must be private employment and not Federal public employment. So, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee, I hope that no legislation will be passed although I compliment the committee for the fine job they have done. Their bill is a wonderful improvement over the legislation that was proposed prior to the bill which was reported out by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the full employment bill, S. 380, upon which millions of Americans placed their economic faith, has emerged from committee surgery, looking like the ghost of its original self.

We are asked to vote for this sick bill as our champion, or vote against it, killing whatever slim hope it may offer. In neither case are the people getting the national insurance against the miseries of depression.

We are not being given the opportunity to vote for a real bill. This anemic declaration of policy fails to tackle the root of the problem, which is: "What will take up the slack, when and if private enterprise falters in its responsibility to the people?"

All of us are pulling for free enterprise to do the job. But if it fails periodically, as it has in the past, what then? Are we going to let our people wither on the vine in this, the richest country on earth, while free enterprise takes time out to reflect on its mistakes? Hardly. The people know that we have a productive machine capable of producing in abundance. They saw the proof of that during the war. They will not accept its failure to produce and distribute in abundance, for peace. They want free enterprise to do this job, but if it falters, they will not take breadlines. They will insist on Government action to fill the gap.

In the discussion on full employment, no one has suggested that Government compete with industry or that Government should nationalize certain key industries. No. Industry is being given the green light and the second chance to succeed, where it once faltered.

Too many Americans bear the scars of industry's failure to the country from 1929 to 1941 to so easily forget. They remember how bankrupt in practical remedies industry was after 1929. In all those years industry did not come forward with one workable idea to solve the problem. Its chant was: "Back to the good old days of greed and speculation, and may the devil take the hindmost when the day of reckoning comes." They failed to realize that a new age demands readjustments. And that failure happened before the atom burst upon us, bringing with it the greatest social and economic challenge in man's history.

The people do not forget that as late as 1940 we had over 7,000,000 unemployed. They know the tragedy which these figures tell and the burden which was placed on the shoulders of so many more. They know, what industry fails to realize, that these 7,000,000-plus represents the loss of a great market which could benefit industry foremost. Yet industry complains of the high taxes which resulted from its collapse, for which it can blame no one but itself.

The war boom, bringing full employment at good wages, was not a solution but merely a shot in the arm. And this boom was achieved through Government financing as the Government stepped in to become the chief buyer of goods and services. Industry was the agent and not the principal in achieving this illusion of prosperity. And because it came about through war, which destroys wealth, we are faced with a debt of over $300,000,000,000.

The point is that the wartime prosperity was not achieved by free enterprise, but through the medium of a Government-controlled economy. Industry demonstrated miracles of production, but it has not as yet proved that it can solve the greater problem of distribution.

The American people are giving it another chance, hoping and praying that it will do this job, but at the same time, they are not going to sit back and rust, in the event it fails. That is why they want insurance against failure now.

This insurance principle has been accepted by Americans for over 200 years. In fact, it is the base upon which some of our largest and strongest businesses have been built. On the national scale, we already guarantee bank deposits through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the mere existence of which has eliminated runs on the banks. The time has come to duplicate this on a larger scale, by insuring jobs as well as deposits. Our human resources are too precious to waste.

In 1941, someone suggested that at attainable full employment the United States could produce even more than $99,000,000,000 worth of goods and services which were turned out in the boom year, 1929. Many an economist and businessman called him a dreamer. But the war came, proving that a production of more than $150,000,000,000 is possible. Furthermore, and this presents a major responsibility, this vast flood of production was achieved without any of the 10,000,000 young men who normally provide the backbone of the labor force.

These young men were ready to give all they had for the national welfare and they are determined that those who remained at home shall be prepared to give some for the national welfare, which means security at home as well as abroad. This must be done, by private enterprise if possible, by Government guaranties, if necessary. These men, like all who are a part of these United States, demand freedom of opportunity. In a complex economy such as ours, every increase of economic power, whether in the hands of individuals or corporations, brings with it an increased responsibility to the people of this Nation. That fact must never be lost sight of. By all means, let free enterprise try to do this job, but if it falls short, it must expect Government to step in and fill the gap. The issue is clear and fair. Enterprise can do the job. It must do the job. But if it falters, it cannot expect to have the whole hog.

The time to provide for such a contingency is now, in a realistic way that will have our economic defenses ready for instant mobilization. The last time we were not ready because we did not expect it. But it came, and because we were unprepared the results were tragic. Have we learned nothing from that grim experience?

First, we know that the Government will have to spend public funds to deal with unemployment in any case. Prolonged unemployment on a large scale is no longer politically possible. Shall we commit ourselves in advance to spend whatever is necessary to keep men at work, or shall we spend hurriedly, wastefully, and on a larger scale to put them back to work after depression has hit? If we make the commitment in advance, we may never have to spend at all. To anticipate and be ready for an emergency is simply sound business. From a cold-blooded financial standpoint, the most dangerous thing we can do is to trust to luck and do nothing.

Job security then is a must. Give the average consumer a reasonable assurance of steady work and he will put a good part of his wartime savings back into circulation. But if you leave him uncertain of the future, he will hoard. In other words, the promise of security would take a big load off his mind, stimulate enterprise, and go a long way toward creating jobs. If we in Congress are afraid to go ahead with this program in a realistic and straightforward manner we shall betray to the people that we are uncertain and will thus help to bring on the unemployment which we fear.

S. 380 in its amputated form is merely a token. It does not provide the necessary and expected guaranties. It is letting down our veterans and war workers who did not let us down. It is a pious hope and not a legislative solution. Unless blood and substance are pumped back into this measure, it will completely fail our No. 1 responsibility to the American people, which is making certain that unemployment never again will be permitted to become a national problem.

In the telegram which Henry A. Wallace, present Secretary of Commerce, dispatched to President Roosevelt the night of his Soldier Field speech in Chicago in October of 1944, he wrote:

> Your goal of 60,000,000 jobs is perhaps high, but I glory in your daring; and as you say, America can do the seemingly impossible.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, in the course of the last campaign, stated:

> Republicans all agree that full employment should be the first objective of Government policy.

Emil Schram, president of the New York Stock Exchange, has warned us that:

> Any sound postwar domestic program must contemplate the production of goods and services at a level sufficiently high to occupy all who wish to work and are able to do so.

The attitude of the great labor organizations, the American Federation of Labor and the CIO, is wholeheartedly behind the program to guarantee full employment.

It is the obligation and not merely the policy of the Government to back up this program. The people want deeds and not words. This bill has good intentions, but no practical commitments. It is an insurance policy of doubtful value.

And so we are supposed to go along and endorse a statement when we might have given guaranties.

The committee has offered for our consideration, not a full employment bill, but a form that has no substance. This House has the inglorious opportunity of voting for nothing. S. 380, as amended, is presently a gesture, and little else.

When, when will we get a full employment bill that is not emasculated by amendments? That is what the people want to know without equivocation or delay.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, why do we need this bill now if we have not needed it in the long years past? I believe this is a question that many of us mull over in our minds when we wonder about the necessity for it. I believe it is necessary because we are making great headway in this country, great progress economically and technologically. Early in the history of the United States we would not have needed this legislation because people were independent, each man had his farm, and his family lived on the farm and they worked there. They made their own clothes, they raised their own food, even if the women did have to work 14 and 16 hours a day in the home and at the loom, and the men just as long toiling in the fields, and the kids, instead of going to school, worked on the farm.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. THOM. Is it not a fact that in the early depressions in this country it was possible to give homesteads to men who were unemployed and set them up in farming in the West? As a matter of fact, what we are doing now is to provide jobs instead of homesteads as they did 50 and 75 years ago.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is very true. That is what happened in my family. They started out on the east coast. Later they settled around Cleveland, Ohio, when the pinch came. Still later they went to Wisconsin, and finally wound up on the west coast. We cannot go any farther west or we would be in the Pacific. Now we have to pioneer in economics, and that is why I am here in this Chamber, to help to keep people from having to move farther west into the Pacific. Nowadays people cannot be the rugged individualists they once could be when we had everyone on his own farm. We gave up that privilege of producing everything on our farm and making everything in our home, and instead now have factories to manufacture goods. We gave up the privilege of wearing homemade suits and now buy our clothes made from fabrics produced by the textile industry.

We bought our furniture that was made in the factories. In fact, we buy everything from the factories, while we used to buy a little bit of salt, a little bit of sugar sometimes and a few spices. We will never be able to go back economically and as far as technological development is concerned unless we are willing to give up all these modern conveniences. Certainly, if we go backward there will be no place to stop. The first thing you know we will be building our roads with a wheelbarrow again. So when we think about the progress that we are making technologically, then we realize economically that we have got to make plans for distribution so that all these people who have given up the privilege of being rugged individualists on the farm may have some assurances that they are going to have full employment or a reasonable amount of employment.

Not to do that means saying, "Let them starve; if there is no work for them, let them go hungry, let them go without positions." We do not stand for that. That is not according to American principles. That is not what America started out to do.

We are dealing here not with the Government. Some people say that to med-

dle with this is to interfere with our system of government. We are dealing here with economics, not government. We can improve our economics as we have right along and not interfere at all with people electing their Congressmen, electing their President, and electing their Senators. What we are trying to do is to keep our economics up with our modern production methods. Sometimes it is confusing when people say, "We cannot improve that because we will interfere with our form of government." Nobody wants to do that. Some say that we have to leave the system entirely free and that it will take care of employment. I want to direct your attention to the fact that the system was never freer than in the twenties. What came out of that? A depression came out of it which made it necessary to deal with economic problems. That was the very thing that it brought about; too much freedom in technological advancement was taking effect on our economy. That is what made it necessary to have things like the WPA.

We are proposing to plan in advance so that we will not have to suddenly force ourselves into a slipshod system in a hurry to take care of unemployment like we did when we went into WPA with which not even the proponents of WPA were satisfied. They had a long-time system in mind, but they found it was going to take too long to plan projects. So, suddenly, they had to start the WPA to take up the slack.

We are certainly capable of running a government and keeping our economics free enough so that we do not have to destroy our own system, which some men believe. I have talked to Members of Congress who, in speaking of unemployment, said: "Any man who wants a job can get it any time he wants to." Mr. Chairman, I can tell you from my own personal experience that is an erroneous opinion. I have had the experience myself. Like many of you I lost a great deal during the depression. We had a business and lost money, yet we paid wages after wages cost more than the income. Finally we locked our machinery up and I went out to get a job. I was not broke then, but I went out to get work and I traveled over several States in the car. I took my family with me because I could do a great many types of work in construction, running a gas shovel, a bulldozer, doing electrical work, construction work, reinforcing steel. I had been a superintendent and foreman on construction. I could do many other things, including bookkeeping. I said, "Well, I could go out here in 1930 and 1931 and get a job." I traveled over several States and many times I came up to the gate where it said, "No help wanted." I thought, "Well, a lot of men are not trained in quite as many things as I am. I am going in and ask for a job. I have been rebuffed many times." They would say, "What is the matter with you? Can you not read the sign that said 'No help wanted'?"

That is what happened to men. It did not hurt me so much at the time, but other men were doing that who did not have a dollar. They were just tramping around and seeing nothing but "No help wanted" signs. That is going to come again. As was said here on the floor today, the system never has actually been taken out of the fix that caused the bad depression. We are still in it in a way. I admit that the pump priming of WPA did help temporarily to bring it out, but it is like taking aspirin for a toothache—it did not cure it. When this war is over and big production is over, we are going back into it again because we still have the technological development, more advanced than it was at that time, so we are looking forward to try to do something that will help alleviate the situation so that we can take care of the situation when it comes instead of relying on the WPA or some other such plan. I hope that America will never say to the workers that we are going to put our economic welfare above the welfare of you and your children and your people. My people and yours came to America to get a better place to live, to have more freedom for the people, and that is what I am fighting for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said that he hoped we would never put the economic welfare of our country above the welfare of our people, did he not?

Mr. SAVAGE. Not exactly. I say we do not want to put economics above the welfare of the people; I mean, that we have got to consider human rights above property rights.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but is it not a fact that the welfare of our people depends upon the soundness of our economic system?

Mr. SAVAGE. If the economic system leaves 15,000,000 or 17,000,000 people unemployed, it is no good, because it is not serving the people, and we can make it serve the people if we have the will. But to say, "Let us go back" is no good. A gentleman said this afternoon on the floor that we should sweep in front of our own doors. I say that Hoover had that policy. He had the policy of telling everybody in each block to feed his neighbor if he was hungry. I saw a good many blocks on the west coast that did not have any rich man in the block, and they were all hungry, and I do not believe in that policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SAVAGE. Nobody is against the system, especially a system that lasts. I think I can put myself in the same position as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] did, when he said that this system allows a humble person to rise to high position. None of us are against a system like that, but it is no argument that we should not go on. We should see to it that every last person in the country has a job so that he can feed his family. I thought it was not good to use that kind of an argument against a bill like this. We can be for the humble and still be for this bill; they go together.

It was also mentioned on the floor that Germany had full employment, that Italy had full employment, that Russia had full employment, and that China had full employment, as arguments that we should not adopt the same program of full employment. Germany had full employment only one time, and that was while she was preparing for war and during the war. During the war Germany had full employment, the only time since the big technological development began. Italy had the same thing. Russia had full employment and still, perhaps, she had a low standard of living, I do not know, but it only took 20 years to build a country that we had been doing for more than 150 years. I admit they may not have high standards of living, but let us see what they have after 150 years. I do not think that is any argument against America giving full employment. As far as full employment is concerned in China, it is one of the least industrialized big, important nations, next to India, but certainly I do not see how anyone can say that China has full employment. No number of people can go out and get a job in China. They have the same individualism that we had earlier in this country. If they can go out on a farm and eke out a living and call that employment, that may be true, but they are not making a good standard of living industrially. We cannot compare China. They are not industrialized like America. They have not given up that privilege of giving up rugged individualism like we have on the farm, so we cannot say because China has a low standard of living that America should not have full employment.

Another thing, reading the constitution of Russia as an argument against full employment is not good, because I do not think we need to reject a good thing just because Russia adopted it. If we followed that policy and every time Russia did something good we rejected it, certainly that is no way to legislate. Men should not get on this floor and try to legislate by emotion and that kind of fear. Let us consider the bill on its merits. Let us consider our own problems, and not Italy, Germany, Russia, and China.

I believe the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] said as an argument against this bill that our system did a great job of production during the war. That is granted. We did a great job. But I want to say that that is no argument against this bill. In the first place, the system was not free. There was some planning. We planned from top to bottom to do the production in the war job. The system was not free. The Government ran it from top to bottom for production. Therefore, it is an erroneous argument to use against this kind of a bill because the system was not free.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. It was a free system before the war, and even during the war.

Mr. SAVAGE. Not during the war, it was not free.

Mr. CHURCH. It did accomplish the objects. It furnished the material to everybody in the war, did it not?

Mr. SAVAGE. The Government said where every bit of material would go, what it would be made into, and who would get it. They told the automobile companies they could not produce cars, they would have to produce planes, and so forth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I felt and still feel that our two-party system of government means and promises a lot. It promises the way the majority shall rule. That promise is the pledge of the successful or winning party. The majority rule in this Nation is on a contractual basis, the contract of the party which is in power, which obtains a majority upon an election, with the people of the Nation. When a party establishes a program it says, "This is our policy. If the people of America follow us and vote with us, this is the program they will get." The other party says the same and submits its platform. The party that is elected, having the majority vote, has a solemn obligation, a contractual relation with the people of this Nation to deliver as nearly as possible the things embodied in that program.

This policy of today—and I favor the Senate version of the bill—is a statement, as nearly as its framers have dared come forth and hope for passage, carrying the declaration of each party in its party platform, which is a covenant with the people of America. That covenant is sealed when a party is elected. The Republicans, not having been on the big end this time, are not bound as a party by a sealed covenant but are left entirely with their conscience. But even so, if I had run for Congress and espoused that as a doctrine for my people and adopted that as a platform, I do not see how I could feel other than that I, as an elected official under my contract, under my pledge, as it were, was bound by that program.

The President of the United States, who is the standard bearer of our party, the majority party, has come forth with this as a policy, and the bill has been reported out, as I say, as nearly as they dared report it out in toto and still hope to see it become law. That, I think, is sincere. I do not share the views of my good friend from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], my colleague, though he is my father's and mother's Congressman. I want to hand him a palm because he came up from the humble walks of life and fought his way every inch. He is a man of integrity and ability and is honored, esteemed, and respected by the people of Alabama, supported politically and morally by my own folks who vote for him—they do not vote for me because I am not in their district. But this does not present an unusual study in the political education and philosophy of those who were raised as was Mr. MANASCO of Alabama. He and I were both from humble origins. This is a sample of the American way of life. I see one way and he another. We were raised in similar, in fact identical, surrounding, sprang from the same sort of people, one of the paradoxes of democracy at work. The thing goes farther. In the history of America, in its beginnings from which it grew to be the great Nation it is today, there was Alexander Hamilton born in the West Indies of very humble parentage. He had to fight his way up. Then we had Thomas Jefferson of the aristocracy. Yet, Hamilton became the angel of those who felt that the necessary regulation of property rights was an invasion of the sanctity and security of the people. Thomas Jefferson, the aristocrat, became the champion and the charterer of the course of the humble people and the hard-bitten people. You can go to the Congressional Library and dig up the editorials written about them. In those days it was declared that Jefferson was only supported by the ragtags, rabble, and the ragged edge of society.

Yet, today, he stands as the champion of the people's rights and of the integrity of the common man and as the trail blazer for individual security as a way for a democratic people to travel. So there is no great presumption upon which one can stand up and contend that because he was raised in humble circumstances his way is the right way for people who were raised like me. It does not mean that and it never can. I think the opposition to this bill is essentially not that it will do nothing but that it will do something. That is the reason the committee found itself reporting out the bill we have before us as a House bill instead of the Senate version and not the version as originally introduced by our group bearing the name of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. How are the people of America going to treat the fact that the gentleman of the Executive Expenditures Committee chose to report the weak version of the bill instead of the stronger and now assail it as feeble and impotent? My letters from the people in Alabama who oppose this legislation, and from other places declare, as did the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON], "The time has come to let the businessmen of America alone." You heard him, the gentleman from Georgia, a member of this Executive Expenditures Committee, whom I respect and like—he is my neighbor; if you remember, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] did not call it a milksop bill. On the contrary he thinks it does too much. He is on the committee and is one of the four who signed the minority report. Incidentally, my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], who yielded me this time, declared this is one of the most fantastic schemes ever submitted to the Congress, and that is the word he used.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] said, "The time has come for us to run the Government and let business run itself. Let business alone." The fear of the forces who oppose this action is that there will be something done. They promise to be good boys always. But when the time of crisis comes they run away and this bill is to head that off now. Can we learn nothing from our sad history? A stitch in time saves nine. We go through our lives saying that but when the time comes to put it into practice we get scared. We are like the passenger who looks down the railroad and sees the tracks coming together. "Stop this engine." They yell it every time. They say; "Stop the train. Don't you see the tracks run together down there?" Those acquainted with the facts and those who have studied it know that the tracks do not come together. They know that you have to run the engine down there. Some must either gain a longer perspective than is theirs today or get down there before they can see it. They are afraid it will do something. They do not fear it will do nothing. Quite the opposite is their fear. They think more of themselves than of guaranteeing full employment.

We know many must be regulated, and that a stitch in time is the only way we will save ourselves from running into the same sort of depression we ran into before. That is the reason my letters and your are coming, saying, "For heaven's sake let business alone." Let them alone. This is the first step. We know what they will do. We have seen them run in their own unions. In my district they used to be called popsicle unions. We have seen how they take care of the people if we do not have proper machinery to control and manage them. "Let us alone." That is their cry. We have had it ever since we have been in. That is all a burglar wants, to be let alone. So they say, "Let us alone."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You referred to the burglar in that argument. Are you comparing business with burglars?

Mr. PATRICK. Of course not. The gentleman was not listening very well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Of course, such a comparison would be odious. I am stating the proposition. When business says it wants to be let alone, all a burglar asks is to be let alone. Is that not true? Is that not a proposition of honesty? I only state this to show the extreme to which that logic will lead. See how far the reasoning follows? Of course, there is no comparison between business and a burglar.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman will agree that a Congressman wants to be let alone, will he not?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, indeed; I know what it means not to be let alone.

Now, this is an opportunity we have. It is not only an opportunity but I think it is an obligation. We have our parliamentary processes. Those parliamentary processes are in the hands of Congress. We are responsible to the people of America, and it is in our hands; it is not only our opportunity but it is our duty to employ those parliamentary processes to secure the economics of our Nation. We should not wait until the horse is stolen and then lock the stable. The time to do it is now. Take time by the forelock and be prepared, so that

when the time comes we shall have the machinery; we have the organization set up, and then we can do it.

Of course, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], the able gentleman whom we all respect, said, "Useful employment, regular employment, high level employment, have not been defined." Of course, they have not been defined. The engine has not come to that place down the railroad track. Many a law has been passed in terms that had not been defined. Oftentimes it takes a court decision, but that is the way to blaze the trail. To apprise this is the very doctrine of laissez faire. Nobody thinks that Herbert Hoover or the Republicans wanted to get into a depression. They fell into the depression because they were afraid to test a new word or tackle a new idea.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; I yield gladly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman in favor of turning over to executive bureaucrats, as they are frequently called, the power to define what these words mean? Does not the gentleman believe if we are going to pass legislation that the Congress ought to decide what they mean? Somebody someday has got to. We passed a surplus property disposal bill and thought we knew what it meant, but when the directive came out we found it was something totally different from what we had in mind.

Mr. PATRICK. That has been true since America began. We have to write it, we have to put it in the griddle. Even the housewife does not know what is going to come out when she puts ingredients together to make something new in her pantry. If it does not come out all right she tries again. That is the way we have to work if we keep pace with the demands of a thriving race of men.

Mr. JUDD. No; I do not admit that of necessity. I say that if we are going to pass legislation containing words which are susceptible of wide interpretation the Congress has the responsibility to define those words so that it will not be possible for somebody to assume any powers never contemplated by this body.

Mr. PATRICK. That has been the doctrine of laissez faire since our Nation was established.

Mr. JUDD. That is the doctrine of responsibility.

Mr. PATRICK. That is what has been done since Hamilton and Jefferson fought. That has been done all down the line. We must not be afraid to go into a field that is unexplored or afraid to deal with terms that have not been before set out. If we hold to such fears we will remain standing on the same old tracks and wondering why the world went off and left us.

If America is going to continue to be the forward-moving nation she has always been, when she is faced with a new problem she must meet it, and she cannot in this instance without going into a new field of endeavor and employing new terms and making a new fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman yield me 5 minutes more?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It grieves me almost beyond bearing, but I cannot give it.

Mr. PATRICK. I see the gentleman is heartbroken. I appreciate what the gentleman has done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] reads something into the platforms of the two parties that I never discovered there, and that is the promise of full employment. Both parties advocated a course designed to give full employment, but it was not through Government employment or deficit spending.

My only reason for speaking at this time is that some of the Members on our side criticized me for remaining silent and said that inasmuch as I was a member of the committee some misconstruction might be placed on my silence.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. PATRICK. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is it?

Mr. PATRICK. Has the gentleman been beset by a great many inquiries as to why he remained silent?

Mr. HOFFMAN. How is that?

Mr. PATRICK. I say, has the gentleman been beset with troublesome inquiries as to the reason for his silence?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What a silly, foolish question.

Mr. PATRICK. That is the only kind of question I believe that could be asked of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is about the kind of observation I would expect from the gentleman. Is it his return for courtesy just granted him?

Mr. Chairman, the original bill which was presented to the committee was characterized as a full employment bill. As the gentleman from Texas said, we understood it was drafted by himself and by 116 other Members as cosponsors.

Mr. PATMAN. I had a minor part in its drafting, I may say to the gentleman; I was consulted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who had the major part?

Mr. PATMAN. Other Members of Congress and people who are interested in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And people who were interested. For instance? Who?

Mr. PATMAN. There are a lot of people who are interested in full employment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I assume so.

And that bill had a false label. It was called, and was so understood throughout the country, as being a full employment bill designed to give a job, a regular full-time job at remunerative pay, to every individual who might be unemployed. One of the first paragraphs of the bill stated that it was to give employment to all Americans, and yet when the bill was under consideration by the committee its sponsors and administration witnesses who appeared refused to accept amendments which would have made provision against discrimination because of race, creed, color, state of origin, membership or nonmembership in any religious, fraternal, or labor organization.

So, as a matter of fact, it was a bill designed to give employment to the members of certain unions. A motion was made that the committee report that bill, but the motion was defeated by a vote of 3 for reporting out the bill, H. R. 2202, to 17 against reporting it out.

Then a subcommittee was appointed to draft a bill. The hearings, which are on the desk, consisting of several hundred pages, were held on the original bill. There were no hearings on the bill which will be offered as a substitute tomorrow, S. 380. The Director of Reconversion, Mr. Snyder, the Director of the Budget Mr. Smith, former Vice President Wallace, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, appeared for the administration and each and all endorsed 2202. None ever endorsed or testified on S. 380. Am I not right about that?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know that the gentleman would be correct in saying that they endorsed 2202. Some of them did, I do not know which ones did, but all of them said they wanted something to carry out the objectives contained in 2202.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There might have been some paragraphs in that bill of which they did not approve?

Mr. PATMAN. They approved of all of it, I am sure, but they were not insisting on any particular bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, they were not coercing us, but some of them, Mr. Vinson especially, said he spoke for the President and that the President wanted that bill.

I hope that you get the significance of that action and the action subsequent action of the committee. Before the committee came all of those representatives of the administration and endorsed a particular bill, yet when the committee makes its report it throws that original bill H. R. 2202 in the ashcan and brings in a bill altogether different. Am I right in that statement?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct in saying it is altogether different.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Congress has been high-pressured a good many times. Very frequently the administration has sent down bills and insisted on their immediate passage. We have come to know that as "must" legislation. The administration puts it right through the House. Then it goes over to the Senate and there sometimes all too often it lies buried.

Those Cabinet members came before the committee and insisted that the welfare of the Nation depended upon the reporting out and the adoption by the Congress of a full employment bill, bill H. R. 2202, yet the committee brings in a bill which in no way resembles it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, it happened that this particular committee did not agree with them, but on another committee where the same number of members would be on the committee, that is, the same number of Democrats and the same number of Republicans, they could possibly get a majority. It just happened on this committee the administration recommendations did not meet with the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It was 3 for to 17 against.

Mr. PATMAN. With other committees in the House it would probably have been the reverse.

Mr. HOFFMAN. "It might have been?" Those are sad words, you know. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact the Speaker, who controls legislative procedure and who is a part of the administration, picked that committee to refer this bill to.

Mr. PATMAN. I happen to know something about that and I know that there is no other committee he could refer it to because the rules of the House would require the bill to go to that committee. You cannot refer it to the Budget without sending it to that particular committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right for talk, but the gentleman and every Member of the House knows very well that often bills which might well go to one committee go to another. How many bills which should have gone to the Committee on Labor have gone to the Committee on the Judiciary? Half a dozen or a dozen or more in the last session of Congress.

But getting on now to this bill, what is it? It is not the bill that the 117 sponsors asked the House to adopt, nor, as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], a bill anything like it. So there is no reason, so far as I know, why the 117, or any one of the 117, should vote for the substitute reported out by the committee. They all say, if I understand them correctly, that the committee substitute will not accomplish the purpose they want to accomplish; that it will not do the job. So why should we fool around with it or why should they, I mean; any one of the 117 support the committee bill?

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It accomplishes this purpose: It is the beginning, a peculiar sort of a beginning. This bill ostensibly was brought in here for the purpose of giving work to people who industry and farming and business could not give work to in the ordinary course of the operation of their private business ventures, but this bill opens up this program and this vista of full employment, of setting up a new bureaucracy that will speedily cost the people who are struggling to operate their farms and their business not less than a million dollars a year, with a commission of experts and statisticians, and God save us when the experts get to experting around. It will cost more than they are worth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman that the sponsors should not support this movement, and I do not think they will. They will vote against the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, but if you are not able to substitute the so-called Patman bill, 2202, you are going to take the Senate substitute; are you not?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, here is our problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman not answer that?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I can answer it if the gentleman will let me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Please do.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to coordinate——

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman can coordinate everything.

Mr. PATMAN. We will vote against this amendment. We are not going to try to improve it. We are not going to try to vote for any amendment——

Mr. HOFFMAN. To what?

Mr. PATMAN. The House committee amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means the committee report.

Mr. PATMAN. If we are successful in defeating it, why then the Senate bill will be open for consideration and we will vote for the Senate bill. We want the Senate bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why do you not stick to 2202, if I may ask?

Mr. PATMAN. The parliamentary situation is such that we cannot get it considered under favorable circumstances.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman not, when we are in Committee, offer 2202 for the pending bill?

Mr. PATMAN. We do not feel we can have it considered under favorable circumstances.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You do not think you will get enough votes.

Mr. PATMAN. We will not get an even break.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How do you feel you will not get an even break?

Mr. PATMAN. The committee has brought in this amendment which is really the House bill like it is now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is no good, you say?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it is no good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. It does not do what we want done; does not go far enough in that direction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot understand then why you will support the Senate bill.

Mr. PATMAN. If we cannot succeed in defeating the amendment and the amendment passes any way, then we will vote for it, because it will go to conference, and we have hopes that the conferees can write a good bill with the two before them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So you have somebody planted over there.

Mr. PATMAN. We have no plant anywhere.

Mr. JENNINGS. It occurs to me that there is a confession here that those gentlemen who bring in this grandiose scheme for universal employment at the hands of a munificent government are not in favor of it. I think I know some people that perhaps favor that sort of thing. So they come now and say, "We are not willing to submit this to a majority vote." Of course, this vote will cross party lines. Do they confess that a majority of the House is not with them on this proposition?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my understanding that is the implication. If I understood the gentleman from Texas correctly he said the conditions which would then exist would be unfavorable, meaning, I assume, that he would lose out.

Mr. JENNINGS. He does not mean weather conditions, does he, he means the vote of the House?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I assume that is what he means. He sits here before me. If I am wrong he may correct me.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not admitting we would be defeated. I am saying it would be presented under unfavorable circumstances.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means the prospects are you would not be able to get the votes.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not talking about the prospects, I am talking about consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In this bill 2202 you are always talking about the prospects in the future. The whole bill is based upon the ability of someone to predict the future.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the rule, under which this bill is being considered, the gentleman from Texas or any other proponent of H. R. 2202 can offer that bill as a substitute for the committee amendment, and if they have the votes to adopt that amendment they have enough votes to pass the bill. It is unfair to say they do not have an even break in the committee. Is not that true?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the situation. I will ask the gentleman from Texas if he cannot offer H. R. 2202 as an amendment or as a substitute for the amendment offering the House bill as a substitute for S. 380?

Mr. PATMAN. We are satisfied with the Senate bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You think that is a better bill than 2202?

Mr. PATMAN. No; no better, but we can get the job done with the Senate bill. The parliamentary situation is such that we believe we should proceed in the manner I have indicated. Maybe our judgment is bad.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but the gentleman will admit that under the situation as it will exist tomorrow he is privileged to offer his bill as a substitute.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no question that any bill can be offered as a substitute, but we feel that our strategy

would be more satisfactory and more likely to get the right result.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is to say, you do not want to meet the issue as to whether your 2202——

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Wait a minute; let me ask the question. You will not meet the issue as to whether 2202 is good or bad. You will not submit that issue to the vote of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. We feel that we are submitting that issue on the Senate bill. We feel that that is substantially the same, and the same job can be done under the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

But if you have faith in 2202, and if you think the House approves of it—and certainly you would not want any legislation that a majority of the House did not approve—why chase us over to the other end of the Capitol with the Senate bill and come back with the provisions that are in your 2202?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have a direct vote on 2202 when we vote on this House amendment, because the argument will be made, "Vote down the House amendment, then we will have an opportunity of getting a bill that is good as 2202."

Mr. HOFFMAN. But have you the courage to submit to the House 2202, have you?

Mr. PATMAN. It is the same thing. Courage? We are not lacking in courage, we are using strategy to get the same results on a roll call vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are ducking it?

Mr. PATMAN. We do not want to get in the position where we could not get a record vote. We want a record vote.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the rules of the House, if 2202 is adopted as a substitute for the committee amendment, then they can get a roll call on H. R. 2202 when we get back into the House after the Committee rises.

Mr. PATMAN. The advice of you gentlemen is very interesting and is appreciated, but we are going to determine this strategy ourselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; we realize that. But I just want to satisfy myself and some Members of the House want to be satisfied as to whether or not you had the courage to and would submit to the judgment of the House the merits of 2202.

Mr. PATMAN. I object to the word "courage," because we are submitting the same thing in S. 380.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Let me talk about the bill which is reported out by the committee. I shall oppose that bill because it does not provide for the doing of one single thing which cannot now be done by the powers that be. That bill provides for the creation of an economic council, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, without the consent of the Senate, at an annual salary of $15,000 each. That committee is authorized to employ experts and specialists in the District and others outside the District, at an expenditure of not more than $345,000 per annum.

That committee gathers information. It has available all of the agencies and experts of the Government who are now on the pay roll. That committee cannot do one thing that the other agencies and departments of the Government are not now charged with the duty of doing. After it gets all its information it sends it over to the President, who today is authorized, who has the authority to call on his Cabinet officers and all of their employees to do the same kind of a job. Then the President, after he has received this report which could have been furnished him by the Cabinet officers and by other agencies, studies it and in a message transmits to the Congress the information and recommendations which the council may have made and to which he may add.

Congress gets the message and the Speaker turns it over to the Joint Committee, which is a new committee of 22 members, 11 from the Senate, and 11 from the House. That committee is authorized to expend an additional $100,000. It studies the report which is presumed to tell us what sort of sickness we are suffering from and what sort of remedy we should take to cure it, and also the President's views on what is the matter with us and what he thinks we should do to get well. After studying that, the joint committee makes a report telling what it thinks is wrong with the United States of America and what it thinks we should take, either in treatment or medicine to cure what it thinks is wrong with us. Then the joint committee sends that—where do you think? To the President pro tempore of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House. As was stated by Senator BARKLEY, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House cuts it up and sends the parts to the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Is not that, to use a basketball term, dribbling the ball? You have seen them do it—bouncing the ball across the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; when you start dribbling the ball across the court, you are going some place and you get some place. In this bill you just go around in a circle and come right back where you started and where we are now, because all those things are provided for under our present law and present practice. After the creation of a new agency, the council, a new committee, the joint committee, after all the searchings and recommendations we are just where the present law and practice would leave us—in the committee rooms of the Senate and House standing committees.

Here is one more fact which I want to call to your attention: Each and every witness appearing in behalf of the administration, that is, those secretaries I mentioned, and I think I am safe in saying the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], without any reservations of any kind, said that the system under which we had proceeded for the last one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years was the best ever devised and that it had given to the American man who must work with his hands for his livelihood more of all the good things of life than any other system.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will also admit that we said there were certain rough places every 10, 12, or 15 years that we wanted to iron out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. That is, to improve on the system.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that is what you said. You wanted to tinker with it.

Mr. PATMAN. No; we want to improve it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just like the boy with the clock when the family goes to church. The kid gets the clock down off the wall where it has been running for years and years and all the time keeping accurate time. But it ticks too loud, or the tune is not quite right, or the face is dusty or it is a little too fast or too slow.

There is something wrong with the old clock. It keeps time, all right, but the kid has got to monkey with it. That is the attitude of some of the gentlemen who always want to fix something just so they get a new agency, a new committee, spend some more of other people's money. They say, "Take the old clock all to pieces," and they do, and when the family comes home from church, there it is, scattered all over the floor, wheels, springs, weights, this, that, and the other, and they cannot get it back together again.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why, as long as we have the best system of government, the best economic system, you want to fool around with it, just because now and then something goes wrong. I wonder if those gentlemen expect that all of these rough spots, these ups and downs, which we all regret, are all going to be wiped out, and there will be no more unemployment, no more scarcity of food, no more discomfort or hardship, no more dissatisfaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will take two additional minutes.

This Congress is committed—both parties are committed—to the reorganization plan, to the streamlining of Congress; and yet, before that bill providing for reorganization has been signed by the President, in the gentlemen come and insist that we add another agency, create another standing committee. I cannot see it. Unless it is to give the reorganization machinery something to work on.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Does not the gentleman get some consolation out of this, that the expenses of this latter committee will be borne half by the other body and half by us? We do not have to pay it all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are correct. Half of the $100,000 per year is charged to the other body, but we have to appro-

priate the money, and it all comes out of the same borrowed funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman was very anxious to have H. R. 2202 considered. If the gentleman will not insist upon making a motion to recommit, which he has a right to do, being upon the minority and the ranking member, and will yield to some Member over there who will submit that on a motion to recommit, it would suit all of us over here very well. Then we would have a record vote. So if the gentleman wants to help us work out strategy, if he will yield to a Member on his side to make a motion to recommit and to substitute H. R. 2202, it would be very pleasing to us, and there would be a record vote. I wonder if the gentleman wants a record vote on that?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, under that system of procedure, no amendment could be offered to H. R. 2202.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Texas, as usual, did not accurately state what I said, nor did he state my position.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry if I did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You said I was anxious to have a vote on H. R. 2202. As far as I am concerned, you can throw 2202 in the ash can, and you could have done it the day after you offered it. I am not asking for that, but you introduced it, and you had cosponsors with it. You say you have faith in it.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, and we will get a vote on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then you should have the courage to bring it out.

Mr. PATMAN. We will have a vote on it. S. 380 will get a vote on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, the setting of the goal of full employment for society has drawn much ridicule. It is easy to denominate it as visionary and impossible of performance.

Had I selected the title for the proposal we are considering, I should have labeled it a "bill to prevent depressions," for that is its exact and precise purpose. That title, I submit, is more meaningful.

Many people who do not think of themselves as employed persons because they are entrepreneurs, managers, or professional men would hesitate to scoff at a proposal for united government effort to ameliorate or obviate the effects of business crashes. For it is a fact that these economic phenomena pull down, in their ravages, every man Jack, high and low—stock broker, banker, storekeeper, those in retirement living on fixed income, teachers, and all ranks of employment from skilled mechanic to street sweeper.

Next to the age-old enemy of war, nothing brings upon modern civilized society so much suffering and devastation as does the paralysis of all business that strikes nations periodically under the familiar name of depression. It is one of the ills that is peculiar to highly organized industrial life. It is the successor of famine, which man's ingenuity has eradicated in most parts of the world.

Its chief end product is unemployment. The idleness of millions of men stops production, destroys values, creates government upheavals, shakes the foundation of men's faith in government, and invites desperate and dangerous men to prescribe cures and panaceas.

Owen Young, the great industrialist, who speaks from first-hand observation of our machine age, says of depression-bred unemployment:

> The most dangerous surplus that can exist in any country is the idleness of men who want to work. It is ridiculous to speak of unemployment as a necessary condition of human society; it is a blot on our intelligence; it is an indictment of society's machinery; it is a drain on our sympathy; it is a promoter of charity which affects disadvantageously both those who give and those who receive. Some day we shall learn to do better, but we must learn it soon.

In the light of what has happened before our eyes in Germany, can anyone say that mass idleness is not a danger? The triumph of nazism and destruction of Germany are traceable directly and solely to the depression of the thirties. Without this economic storm, Hitler could not have succeeded. He had rapped at the doors of power ever since 1924, only to be rejected time after time, until he was on the verge of suicide. However, when increasing business chaos came he mustered the idle into his Storm Troops, keeping them from starvation by wages paid from party funds that came from the coffers of the rich industrialists. Hitler was invited into the chancellery by the failing Hindenburg, out of the deadly fear that the unemployed would drive the Reich in bolshevism. Unemployment indubitably made Hitler, and it will spawn the same kind of demagogues in the future.

In 1933, when the depression was at its worst 18 out of the 20 other American Republics experienced revolutions.

But there are those who hold that in the long run depressions are more or less a boom to mankind. This is the social philosophy of Ralph Biodget, of Iowa, an advertising man, who wrote these fantastic paragraphs:

> It is to be hoped that depressions are never abolished, for they have many desirable features. Those who learn to ride the business cycle can find as many advantages in depressions as in booms—personal as well as business advantages. Smart folks take advantage of the boom * * * they are then ready for the depression-time bargains, bargains in every conceivable thing, from a suit of clothes to a railroad.
>
> That very name of "depression" is inappropriate. It horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits. Let us keep those periods but only abolish the name.

As far as I am concerned, this kind of argumentation falls on deaf ears, because I am too close to the great depression of 1930 to forget its ugly mien and not to nourish the hope that we shall never again be compelled to endure a similar era of distress. I suspect the corn growers of Iowa who saw their farms sold under the sheriff's hammer will enthusiastically agree with me. In fact, they might suggest the lunatic asylum for the panegyrist of panics just quoted.

Since the first international business crisis in 1847, there has been a periodicity of these world disturbances that compels us to accept them as the inescapable and inevitable by-products of our competitive society. If anyone undertakes to challenge this statement, let him first consult the economic history of the United States which records major panics for the years 1857, 1873, 1893, 1907, and 1929.

Even the stoutest defenders of the free enterprise system admit that business disturbances are a natural phenomenon of that system. Dr. Henry M. Wriston, of Brown University, to whom the full employment bill is anathema, writes in his recent book:

> Depressions weed out the weak, the inefficient, the submarginal producer. Sometimes the weeding seems cruel and haphazard, but weeding there must be; so far no gentle method of condemning obsolete industry to death has been found.

The causes for cyclical disturbances are many. Some of them are fluctuations in prices; over-investment beyond capacity of public to consume, considering its spending power; readjustments caused by inventions of labor-saving machinery; uncontrolled stock-market speculation; shifts or slumps in foreign trade; disturbances in the business and commerce of related countries. Some of these factors, often combine to produce the panicky results. Generally, it may be accepted that any prolonged boom will sooner or later end in an abrupt decline of business because business enterprise has literally worn itself out and needs a rest.

If, then, we must conclude that there will always be a recurrence of these disturbances, are we willing as an intelligent people to let disaster succeed disaster, without at least attempting by economic instruments to control or at least to cushion them? I am not ready to join those who are afflicted with economic despair. Man made the competitive system and he has it within his power to improve it. Its defenders do their cause no good when in the present debate they assert that full employment is not obtainable within the framework of a free competitive society. They are better propagandists for communism and its compulsory labor than Earl Browder himself.

It is to the great credit of the Roosevelt New Deal era, that at a time while liberal attitudes prevailed in the country, two noteworthy pieces of legislation were enacted that build barriers against this economic evil.

First. The insurance of bank deposits has immensely steadied our financial system so that when slow-up in business comes there will not be a grand rush to withdraw savings and deposits. Without this protection, we saw how financial panic leaped from community to community in the thirties, wrecking many in-

stitutions that could have remained open, if the wild hysteria of fear over loss of savings had not seized upon the people.

Second. Unemployment compensation that will not only serve to lift the problem of immediate food and shelter from the shoulders of the unemployed for a reasonable time, but will prevent the sudden, almost cataclysmic drop in the income of merchants and manufacturers that in former panics has destroyed business confidence and created widespread pessimism.

What we now hope to do, by the enactment of the full-employment bill, is to frankly and openly say that it is a function of government to protect its people from the ravages of economic upsets, not by waiting to salvage them after the storm has hit them, but by economic steps beforehand that will cause panics to be postponed, or at least to be mitigated in their havoc.

Some laissez faire advocates will, of course, say that the furnishing of jobs is the province of private enterprise, and that Government should be restricted to providing a favorable atmosphere in which private business can expand and supply the necessary job opportunities. However, these same persons took to the cyclone cellars, when the business debacle hit our economy in the thirties and filled the streets with idle men. They were not very vocal when Government, after the damage had been done to our economic system, stepped in to prevent what might have been riots and possible revolution, by furnishing jobs through Government investment. This idea of the neutral or negative role of the State quickly disappears when the ugly facts of a depression confront you.

The full employment bill sets up as it were a lighthouse, to survey the economic scene, and warn us, if necessary, of impending business dangers. The President is cast in this role of lighthouse keeper. He is empowered in the Patman bill to prepare a national production and employment budget, the content of which will deal with foreseeable trends in business, much as business forecasters like Babson, Dun & Bradstreet, and others have been doing for years. Regularly the Government is now issuing estimates of crop production. Every trade association in the country outlines, usually in cold figures, the volume of business its members may expect for a year or so ahead. Why is there anything revolutionary in having the President, with the aid of Government departments, set up a preview of what the future holds for the country, as a whole, in the way of production and consumption? This budget will point out in particular those usual streams of spending that show a diminishing flow and which may conceivably be bolstered up.

Economic activity is dependent on expenditure, and the economists have roughly classified national expenditures in the following categories:

First. Private consumption of durable goods, semidurable and perishable goods, and services.

Second. Private investment for residential construction, business construction, producers' durable goods, changes in stocks.

Third. Public Government expenditures for goods and current services, including Federal, State, and local.

Fourth. Public investment by Government, Federal, State and local.

Fifth. Net foreign investment.

When it was revealed that there was dangerous lag in any of these categories of expenditure, it would be the business of the President not only to declare its existence but to suggest along with the Joint Committee on the National Budget, consisting of Members of the House and Senate, what can be done to revive that particular category of expenditure, or perhaps to investigate some other type of spending to counterbalance the shortage.

It is remarkable what substantial work has been done by economists the world over in cataloging the things that are feasible as antidepression policies. This whole literature is of no avail unless the only unified institution that has the power to deal with depressions, to wit, Government, has the courage and boldness to use these implements. So far, this House of Representatives has evinced so much timidity, that I think this volume of economic knowledge might as well not have been formulated.

May I enumerate some of the steps that may be resorted to if evidence points to business recession.

First. Old-age pension taxes, in order to increase the wage volume available for immediate spending, might temporarily be reduced.

Second. Government, by loans, could persuade railroads in slackening times to intensify maintenance and upkeep repairs and improvements, which usually are curtailed as soon as there is the slightest reduction in car loadings. Suppliers of railroad materials constantly complain that railroads are never in the market for rolling stock, and so forth, until boom times come, when the fabricators are swamped with orders to fill deferred needs.

Third. Variation in the rate of interest, and reduction in amortization payments on mortgages in order to stimulate construction projects, both business and private.

Fourth. Grants to local governmental units in order to induce them to undertake needed capital improvements which by reason of fear and timidity springing from temporary adverse business conditions would not otherwise be undertaken.

Fifth. In such cases as present congressional appropriations for road building to extend over a period of years, a change in the timing of the use of the money, so that increased outlays should be concentrated in the slow business year, when it occurs, and a corresponding reduction or elimination of expenditure when the business indexes are favorable.

Sixth. Stimulation of foreign investment.

While thus far in this discussion, I have dealt with the devastating results of deflation in our economy, the machinery contemplated by the full-employment philosophy is likewise intended to watch for the signs of inflation, and to recommend to Congress the steps that should be undertaken to counteract it.

At the moment, the stock exchange offices are filled to the doors with people who are betting on a bull market. Inflation is as deadly as deflation, and the first is the precursor of the second.

Some Members of this House who have spoken today should remember that when the Government let business take its own course, and when there were no cries of regimentation and interference from Washington by a New Deal, this thing happened:

> Between September 1929 and January 1933, according to the Dow-Jones Index of stock prices, 30 industrials fell from an average of $364.9 to $62.7.

Another statement about stock behavior on October 29, 1929, from Beard's book America in Midpassage:

> In the tumult of the day a record turnover of 16,410,000 shares was registered and the average price of 50 stock leaders fell almost 40 points.

The incalculable effects of such price fluctuation on the money and banking system of the country certainly places high responsibility on Government, entrusted as it is with the control and management of the currency system on which foundation rests the prosperity and solvency of the country.

Inflation and deflation are scientifically treated in what is probably the latest treatise on the subject, prepared and issued under the auspices of the League of Nations. That report, entitled "Economic Stability in the Postwar World," ought to be read by every Member of this body. Sometimes I think Congress needs a study hour as the college prescribes. I venture to say that if we adjourned a day, with the understanding that every Member secluded himself to read this League of Nations report, we would come back into this Chamber prepared to act vigorously and boldly.

The heart of man is always stirred when God again fulfills His gracious promise "that while earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest shall not fail."

In due time, man will be wise enough, after much trial and error, and outright bungling, to add to the beneficence of providence, the guaranty of employment to all who need it—an ideal that is so roundly derided and ridiculed in this Chamber today.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the Employment-Production Act of 1945."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. KING, having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment

and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. MANASCO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the mayor of Kansas City.

Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MANASCO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by one of his constituents.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. MANASCO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, first, to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with a resolution I introduced today, which is the identical resolution of Senator WAGNER, reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 17 to 1, asking for immediate congressional action with reference to Palestine.

Second, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier this week having to do with the shortage of penicillin.

Third, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a series of resolutions passed by the American Lithuanian Conference in Chicago. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost $260, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole and to include therein certain statements and excerpts, and especially my testimony before the committee concerning this particular bill, including certain charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today and include a copy of the substitute which he expects to offer tomorrow for the pending bill.

Mr. GAVIN (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorandum of the Committee of the American Watch Manufacturing Industry.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO (at the request of Mr. JUDD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper clippings.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, December 18, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black;

H. R. 4407. An act reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 14, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m., on Friday, December 14, 1945, the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the bill (H. R. 4479), to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

834. A letter from the Chairman, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending March 31, 1946; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

865. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting recommendations for changes in the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275); to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4932. A bill to amend section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims H. R. 262. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Wikle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 804. A bill for the relief of Alvin W. Twigg; with amendments (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 841. A bill for the relief of Lander H. Willis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1037. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hortense Arnow, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers; with amendments (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1264. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. John P. Maher, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Palmisano and the legal guardian of Anthony Palmisano, Jr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie A. Shedd, Mrs. Maude C. Denney, Mrs. Mabel Glenn Gray, and Mrs. Ruth C. Shedd for injuries sustained when an Army truck was in collision with the car in which they were riding; with amendments (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of Harry Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2011. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. Earl Evans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Wesley A. Mangelsdorf; with amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2786. A bill for the relief of John S. Wingate; with amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2843. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2956. A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Mary G. Paul; with amendment (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3050. A bill for the relief of David Siskind; with amendment (Rept. No. 1420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3121. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth M. Simmons and Robert H. Simmons; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean Taube Weller; with amendment (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3127. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Vinton, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3159. A bill for the relief of Ernest Pedro Ferreira; with amendment (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3177. A bill for the relief of James J. Barrett, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3261. A bill for the relief of Gen. William J. Williamson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3301. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Herbert Keith, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of George F. Powell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3431. A bill for the relief of F. W. Burton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3543. A bill for the relief of Elmer D. Thompson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3590. A bill for the relief of Charles Brown and the legal guardian of Lula Mae Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4054. A bill for the relief of H. A. Edd; without amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4176. A bill for the relief of Mabel R. Woodfall; with amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3828. A bill for the relief of James R. Vaughan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart; without amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1930. A bill for the relief of Maj. Edward A. Zaj; without amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4980. A bill to authorize the issuance of visas by United States Army officers in certain designated areas until consular service is reestablished; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 4981. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4982. A bill to enable the Department of State more effectively to carry out its responsibilities in the foreign field by means of (a) public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, and (b) promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4983. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4984. A bill authorizing lump-sum payments to enlisted personnel of the armed forces upon their discharge or release covering accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4985. A bill to give widows of any deceased person, entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, credit for each child regardless of number, removing present top limit of $100 monthly; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4986. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4987. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4988. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4989. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY:

H. R. 4990. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4991. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4992. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 4993. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4994. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of April 28, 1904, as amended, to extend the franking privilege of the Vice President and Members of Congress to include certain correspondence sent by air mail to members of the armed forces in reply to inquiries from them affecting the interest of such members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4995. A bill to provide for the immediate use of all ships owned and controlled by the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration to return our overseas men; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KELLY of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the House Committee on Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1, 3, 7, and 8 of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to aid to the physically handicapped; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. Res. 456. Resolution providing for an investigation with respect to the handling and disposition of surplus lumber; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Municipal Council of Santa Rita, Samar, P. I., expressing gratitude to Gen. Douglas MacArthur for his successful military operations

in the Philippines; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Joan Esther Hedin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 4997. A bill for the relief of the estate of Novella Wade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Meeks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4999. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Raphael Elder; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5002. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1412. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Amalgamated Local 686, International Union of United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, at a meeting of American War Veterans in Lockport, N. Y., requesting immediate abrogation of clause in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 which disqualifies veterans, employed in plants involved in industrial disputes, from receiving unemployment insurance in the event of a work stoppage; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1413. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of residents of Marion County, Ind., urging early and favorable consideration of H. R. 2082 to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. Also, petition of residents of Marion County, Ind., in favor of the passage of S. 623 to stop alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1415. By The SPEAKER: Petition of Social Work Action Committee, Washington Chapter, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to American responsibility for support of UNRRA; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that in the fullness of the times the lamps of prophecy were dimmed by dawn when the Star of the Morning arose, as Thou didst gather Thy light into life and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. Once more a weary and war-worn world lifts agonized eyes to the Star of Hope and hails the birth that broke the ages in two. We commemorate His holy nativity, His lowly toil, His lonely way, the gracious words of His lips, the deep compassion of His heart, His friendship for the fallen, His love for the outcast, His care for the sick, the hungry, and the naked.

We thank Thee that He who came to a crib of straw and could not be stopped by a cruel cross is our Great Contemporary, and that when from our plenty we feed and warm and clothe even our enemies, we, too, bow at the manger and keep Christmas in our hearts as the Christ of the Holy Night whispers, "Ye do it unto Me." In His dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 13, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, reported it on December 13, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 857) thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it had been my purpose on yesterday to ask that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate on yesterday and also today because of the attention he is giving to public business. I defaulted on my intention and my obligation, and I now therefore make the request that the Senator from Nebraska be excused for his failure to attend yesterday and that he be excused also from his obligation to attend today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I do not know how the Senate can excuse the Senator from Nebraska nunc pro tunc, so to speak. Certainly I am not raising any objection. I realize the Senator from Nebraska is engaged on important public business; but I hardly know how we can go back and excuse him for a previous absence, except for the sake of the RECORD. I was simply wondering what precedent and policy we might be making.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me that if we can excuse a Senator from attendance today, Friday, we can excuse him for his failure to be present on the preceding day.

Mr. HILL. I certainly shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Nebraska is excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL SEED ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1939

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, recommending the enactment of legislation affecting the administration of the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN NAMES

Four letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing certain names from reports relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended more than 6 months, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate pursuant to law; to the Committee on Immigration.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A letter from Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, Raleigh, N. C., relating to world-wide abolition of peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter from Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, to the United States, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of Santa Rita, Province of Samar, P. I., commending the President and Congress of the United States and General MacArthur for liberating the oppressed people of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RELIEF OF PEOPLE OF GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND HUNGARY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have received petitions signed by approximately 100,000 citizens of Illinois reading as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully petition the Government of the United States to reestablish postal, wireless, and banking services with Germany, Austria, and Hungary, and to allow relief shipments of clothing, food, and other necessities to save the lives of millions of people in Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

Mr. President, these signatures are evidence of a very extensive anxiety and activity on the part of many of our citizens to be of direct assistance to distressed people in central Europe, particularly the nations named in their petition, as they face disaster, disease, and famine, as well as death from the cold.

Several times I have taken this matter up with the State Department and other Senators have done likewise.

The establishment of these services would allow direct methods of relief.

The same humanitarian reasons that have impelled our extreme generosity in providing billions for UNRRA would seem to urge our Government to rees-

tablish these services so that loyal citizens of the United States could make their own personal and direct contribution to alleviate pain, suffering, and death in this part of the world.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL—PETITION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate disposition petitions from a number of citizens of the State of Illinois.

The petitioners request me to support the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, now on the Senate Calendar. This bill is known as the anti-poll-tax bill. In addition to urging my support, they ask me to vote for cloture so that the bill may be brought to a vote and not be defeated by filibuster.

I ask that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, ordered to lie on the table, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Whereas a bloc of southern poll-tax Congressmen are jeopardizing the passage of such vitally necessary legislation as the full employment bill, the $25 for 26 weeks unemployment compensation bill, the 65-cent-per-hour minimum wage bill, and other important legislation needed to insure full employment and security for the American people; and

Whereas the poll tax disfranchises 7,000,000 white and 3,000,000 Negro people in 7 Southern States and deprives them of a voice before the Government, thereby threatening the rights of all American citizens; and

Whereas the proposed substitute bill, the constitutional amendment, is impracticable and can only serve to confuse the issue and prolong this undemocratic practice;

Therefore we, the undersigned, urge Congress—

To give H. R. 7, the anti-poll-tax bill, precedence on the Senate Calendar;

To vote for cloture so that the bill will come up for a vote and not be defeated by a filibuster;

To vote for H. R. 7, the anti-poll-tax bill, to insure full democracy for all American citizens and provide a truly representative Government.

NAVY RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have just received under date of December 7 a letter from my friend and former colleague, President Harold W. Dodds, of Princeton University, commenting on recent reports that Congress is moving to reduce the Navy Reserve Officers Training Corps organization throughout our colleges and universities to a prewar basis and may reject plans of the Navy Department for providing a large number of officers in the future from Navy ROTC ranks. As Princeton University was one of the institutions designated for carrying on an enlarged Navy ROTC, President Dodds has made a careful study of this matter and his observations, therefore, are especially worthy of our serious consideration.

President Dodds' comments on the development of the ROTC units in our colleges and universities are particularly pertinent at this time because he has been urging delay in the adoption of universal military training.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD President Dodds' full letter to me on this important subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N. J., December 7, 1945.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am deeply concerned as a college president and a citizen by reports that Congress is moving to reduce the Navy ROTC organization to a prewar basis and to reject the plans of the Navy Department for providing a large number of regular officers in the future from NROTC ranks. The purpose of this letter is to call your attention to the reasons why I consider that it would be a grave mistake to follow the course which seems to prevail in Congress.

In the interval between wars, the colleges of the country have had much first-hand experience with the method of producing officers for the armed services through the system known as the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Although at Princeton we had only an Army unit in being, my observation of that unit here, my observation of the operation of the ROTC system in general, and the record which our Army ROTC graduates have made in this war, have convinced me beyond any doubt of the validity of that method for training officers and of the great need for its perpetuation. Because, therefore, I believe that the testimony of those who have had this first-hand experience with the ROTC may be of some value, I am communicating to you some thoughts on the program for a postwar Navy ROTC.

In general, I feel that a reduction of this program to prewar levels would be a mistaken and shortsighted policy. In particular, I feel that there are certain considerations which should be given ample weight in determining future policy.

First, a curtailment or reduction of the present program at this time would represent on the one hand the scrapping of the training which the Navy has given to the trainees now in the program by failing to continue it to the terminal point at which it becomes productive. On the other hand, it would create great difficulties for those colleges in which ROTC units have been set up and in which all the plans and programs have been formulated with the idea that the ROTC was to continue at the size which had been determined and announced. This will merely add one more difficult problem for the colleges, which are already harassed by the multitude of problems attendant upon reconversion to peacetime status. Nor would the curtailment of the program fail to work great hardships upon many of the individual trainees, who had rightly formulated plans for their education on the assumption that they were to have the opportunity to continue through the program which the Navy had outlined. If now, after having progressed part way through that program, they are obliged to reorient themselves to a program of purely civilian education, the readjustment will be most difficult.

Secondly, and of greater significance, the reduction of the program will result in a double injury to the Navy. Not only will there be an interruption to the orderly program of officer procurement upon which the effectiveness of the postwar Navy will so largely depend, but there will follow beyond any doubt a definite injury to the prestige of the Navy, which rightly or wrongly will be accused of having failed to live up to its moral obligations toward the trainees in its program and toward the educational institutions which have cooperated with it.

In the third place—and this is as important a consideration as any—it seems to me that the reduction of the NROTC program will constitute a blow to a rapidly disintegrating national morale. And it is needless to point out that any blow at the national morale has its repercussions in diminishing national strength and thus diminishing American influence in international affairs. On the other hand, the articulation of plans for an expanded postwar ROTC will convey a definite assurance that we mean to implement an adequate postwar Navy and will, therefore, sound a badly needed note of firmness and orderly approach to the problems of the future.

It is true that I have argued for delay in adopting universal military service for young men. I think that the subject is in great confusion and that it is only a part of a larger picture, namely, completely adequate national defense backed by national morale. But I have no doubts whatever as to the advisability and wisdom of continuing selective service until we know what we shall need. I can see no way by which our national influence can count for anything toward the building of the sort of world in which we want to live if we continue to withdraw from our obligations and to reduce our military strength as we are. To the continuance of selective service I would link strong Reserve officer training programs for both the Army and the Navy.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD DODDS.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3995) to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department, reported it without amendment.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION HEARING

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent to report without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on December 11, 1945, and request unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings held before said joint committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, a concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1685. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Paul Dudick (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1686. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act, as amended; and

S. 1687. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend title V thereof to the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1688. A bill reauthorizing the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1689. A bill for the relief of William H. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOWNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING MATTERS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT-OWNED LUMBER

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the amount of lumber available in the hands of any executive department, independent establishment or agency in the executive branch of the Government; the places where and the conditions under which such lumber is stored; the amount of such lumber which can be economically disposed of in the domestic market; and such other matters relating to the handling and disposition of surplus lumber as the committee deems advisable. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

THE NAVAL DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAM TO DATE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate received a report yesterday from the Navy Department in regard to the demobilization program to date. I ask that the information the committee received be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As of December 8, 922,422 personnel had been released from the Navy in less than 4 months since VJ-day. This means that the demobilization job is over one-fourth done. By the end of the calendar year approximately 1,200,000 personnel will have been released and by the end of January the job of demobilization will be half done. The entire demobilization program will be completed prior to September 1, 1946.

The critical scores for the release of personnel have been reduced just as rapidly as the men can be spared from operational requirements. On the 21st of November a further reduction in the point scores was announced effective December 1, December 15, and January 1, to 38, 37, and 36 for male enlisted personnel, and 24 on December 1, and 23 on January 1 for female enlisted personnel.

These scores apply to the bulk of the personnel in the Navy, except for certain critical rates in which the lack of replacements has made it necessary to maintain somewhat higher scores for people in those rates. These include storekeepers, transportation specialists, yeomen, and other similar rates essential to the demobilization process itself, and rates such as the watertenders and machinist mates, which are absolutely essential if the Navy is to continue to operate the ships in the fleet and those engaged in transporting men home Every step is being taken to find and train replacements for these people and their scores will be brought down to the general scores at the earliest possible moment.

The basic system of demobilization remains as it was, relying primarily upon the point system, supplemented by the provisions for individual hardship cases. The only new development in this respect has been that on December 4 it was announced that men over 38 years of age with dependents will be considered to have a hardship case and will be released upon their application to their commanding officers. Of the approximately 35,000 enlisted men in this category, somewhat over half were already eligible for discharge under the point system, and this provision will make the balance eligible for release upon their application.

The Navy hopes they will be able to reduce the critical scores for the release of personnel still further after the first of the year, although the exact amount of these reductions is not now known.

The controlling factors on the speed of demobilization continue to be the numbers who can be spared and the facilities to bring them home. The Navy has responsibilities which must be discharged. These consist primarily of the support and supply of occupation troops in the Pacific, the roll-up and disposition of the valuable material and equipment in the Pacific, and—equally important—a major share of the responsibility for bringing home to this country the personnel of all the armed services. In order to discharge this last responsibility as rapidly as possible, all available combatant ships which are capable of carrying any sizeable number of passengers have been or are being assigned to transport service. These include in the Pacific service 217 transports, 16 hospital ships, 77 aircraft carriers, 8 aircraft tenders, 26 cruisers, and 6 battleships. The bulk of these combatant vessels are now in the transportation service and the balance will be so operating just as rapidly as they can be provided with the necessary reconversion or additional facilities.

As a measure of the over-all size of this task the joint Army and Navy transportation program requires the return of personnel at the rate of 867,000 men a month.

It is still the program of the Navy to return to civilian life just as rapidly as possible all of the nearly 3,000,000 men and women who are scheduled for demobilization. The Navy's plans call for the completion of demobilization by September 1, 1946, at which time the Navy will be down to its anticipated peacetime strength of 500,000 men and 58,000 officers.

NAVAL DEMOBILIZATION IN THE MEDICAL CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on December 11, 1945, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] submitted Senate Resolution 200 and had it referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The resolution, among other things, requested information with reference to the naval program of demobilization in the Medical Corps.

The information given the Committee on Naval Affairs at a recent meeting with respect to the demobilization of doctors in the Navy is as follows:

On January 1, 1945, there were some 12,845 doctors enrolled in the naval service. No one, of course, could foresee in January 1945 that the war would end in the following August, and the Navy continued to procure doctors to meet its needs and to insure adequate medical care for the then-expanding Navy and for the anticipated casualties which could be expected from the then-planned invasions in the Pacific. As a result of this recruiting program, the Navy reached its peak in the number of doctors at approximately the time of VJ-day. As of VJ-day, there were in the naval service 14,216 doctors which consisted of 1,952 doctors of the Regular Navy and 12,264 Reserves, including 506 interns. That is the peak from which the Navy started its demobilization program.

Under the existing point scores approximately 5,500 doctors will be eligible for release by the end of the year, or approximately 45 percent of the Reserve doctors in the service on VJ-day. Of that number it is estimated that by the end of the year 4,000 of these will actually have been released or be on their way to separation centers for release. As of December 10, there were approximately 3,094 doctors who had actually been released or were under orders to separation centers for release. The release of doctors has only recently begun to hit its stride as indicated by the fact that while releases to date have totaled 1,290, there are an additional 1,799 of the doctors now technically in the service who are already under orders to separation centers for release. This number will be increased so that by the end of the year approximately 4,000 doctors will be released or under orders to separation centers. It is expected that 1,583 Reserve doctors will be released in January 1946, and 583 in February.

It is essential to keep an adequate number of doctors in the naval service during the demobilization period. In the first place, there are some 69,000 patients in naval hospitals within the continental United States who require medical care. There are in addition between 8,000 and 9,000 persons under

treatment in hospitals outside the United States. These are for the most part patients currently requiring treatment because of illness rather than battle casualties, the bulk of whom have been brought back to this country. These likewise require proper medical care. The ships bringing the men home must have aboard competent doctors, particularly in view of the crowded conditions on the ships and the increased danger of epidemics if proper medical care is not available. The demobilization process itself in this country requires in excess of 1,000 doctors to carry out the program of giving to each man as he leaves the service, the type of physical examination which will protect both him and the Government. Not only must the Government be protected against false claims in the future, but the men themselves should know of any condition existing which justifies medical attention now or in the future.

On September 1, 1945, the ratio of Navy doctors to Navy and Marine Corps personnel was 1 to 274 as compared with an Army ratio on that date of 1 doctor for every 175 persons. The Navy Department expects to maintain this approximate ratio of 1 to 274 until the end of demobilization.

Mr. President, the committee, proposes, therefore, to hold the resolution in the committee for the present and to continue to study the demobilization in the Medical Corps of the Navy along with its study of the general demobilization program.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all America has been cheered to hear the good news that Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr., our greatest field commander in World War II, has battled death to a standstill, and is on his way to making a breakthrough to health.

While we know that Georgie Patton's military career as we have known it in the past is probably through, yet we feel certain that, in spite of his injuries, Georgie Patton will continue in his own way to fight for constitutional Americanism so long as he draws the sweet breath of life; and may that be for a long time to come.

All America says, "Get well, Georgie, and come home soon. We want you near us and with us." But there is a more meaningful way of sending our greetings to Georgie Patton for his rapid and complete recovery.

That is why I should like to make the following suggestion, as follows: I suggest that President Truman nominate this great hero who now holds the permanent two-star rank of major general in the Army, and the temporary rank of four-star general, be promoted to the permanent three-star rank of lieutenant general. If a law is necessary to accomplish this, then let us pass a law.

Anyone who has followed the developments in the Pearl Harbor inquiry and the policy of military promotions throughout the war, knows that in quite a few instances "seven-day wonders" and "swivel-chair generals" have been promoted to very high ranks. Here, however, in Georgie Patton, is a man of 41 years of active military service, a man with 23 proud decorations including every great American decoration except the Congressional Medal of Honor, an undisputed military genius, one of the three greatest American heroes of the Second World War, the others, of course, being Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur, who holds the permanent rank of only major general at this time.

I suggest four reasons then why General Patton should be given this fitting honor now.

First. He himself as an individual deserves it.

Consider, for a brief moment, Georgie Patton's great military record in this war alone. He commanded our landing forces at Casablanca in north Africa. He routed Rommel after the retreat at Casserine Pass. He invaded Sicily and enveloped the foe.

He landed in France on the Fourth of July, was held with his Third Army under wraps until August 1, and then, in the next 9 months and 8 days went 1,400 miles against a mighty foe completely across France into south Germany. By May 9, 1945, the day of the German surrender, he had gone into Austria and Czechoslovakia.

The total losses from all causes sustained by the Third Army in Europe were 139,000 men. But that Army inflicted 1,811,000 casualties on the enemy, an unmatched victorious record of 13 to 1, the greatest record of conserving American life.

Second. Such an honor would serve as an inspiration to the Georgie Pattons who are to come; the courageous men who will follow in his wake as "soldier's soldiers"; the men devoted to a career in the military service of their nation.

Third. Such an honor would serve to rebuke that motley Leftist gang which has been sniping at General Patton and attempting to smear him; the same crew that has been trying to defame General MacArthur, because both of these men represent the very highest in American ideals.

To confer this well-deserved honor on Georgie Patton would be to show these defamers, that their smear attempt has not worked with the American people and the American Congress; to show these domestic followers of what might be called Red fascism that America intends to stand by the men who stand by constitutional Americanism.

Fourth. There is a last reason why I feel this step should be taken. This is the season of Christmas. George Patton is on his back in a foreign land; Patton, the Son of Battle; Patton, the Invincible. This honor to him at this time might well make the difference between life and death. We should send him this appropriate Christmas greeting, this salutation from the heart of 140,000,000 Americans.

I have called him Son of Battle. We pray God that in the future, peace will remain a constant blessing to America and to the world. But if war comes, we need men like Patton, the lionhearted, the man who fights battles, not simply plans them, but the man who executes them; the man who inspires men to do the impossible and makes them unbeatable.

Almost a year has elapsed now since Ike said to Patton on December 19, 1944, "Start 100 miles north and break that threat in the bulge." We all know that Patton did just that. He wheeled about, smashed through the south side of the bulge, relieved the heroic besieged One Hundred and First Airborne Division at Bastogne and so impacted Von Rundstedt's line as to make the foe reel and stagger and finally retreat.

So let us now at this Christmas season send this Son of Battle of ours a greeting from the President and the Senate of the United States, making him a permanent lieutenant general.

I make this suggestion, therefore, at this time to President Truman.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT TO RALPH K. DAVIES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the citation to accompany the award of the Medal for Merit to Ralph K. Davies, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bushfield	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	White
Gossett	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Willis
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hart	Murdock	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained at a conference being held at the White House.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on official business at Government departments.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] if he will yield to me for the purpose of taking up the deficiency appropriation bill. As the Senator knows, that bill has been before the committee for weeks—I have forgotten exactly how many, but five or six, as I recall—and much work has been done on the bill. We hope to get away next week. I trust the Senator from California will agree that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose I have indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall not make any objection. I simply wish to say that I have heretofore agreed that the Federal pay bill which is now before the Senate may be laid aside. I am very conscious of the heavy responsibilities the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee carries on his shoulders. I feel I should yield, and I am very happy to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered. I also ask Senators to watch carefully as the amendments are taken up, and I suggest that all controversial matters be postponed until later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Minnie McN. Johnson, widow of Hiram W. Johnson, late a Senator from the State of California, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to Mary T. Peavey, daughter of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 8, to insert:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, $120,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not think this amendment should be agreed to without the Senate realizing what is proposed to be done. This is a proposal to give to each Senator $2,500 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.

Mr. President, it had been my hope that the entire question of salaries, expenses, and retirement might be deferred until such time as the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress had an opportunity to report. Since the Senate rejected this proposal when it first came before us, I felt that the matter ought not to be disposed of without there being an understanding of exactly what was contemplated.

So far as I am personally concerned I am sure every Senator knows that I am not pleading in behalf of the dignity or jurisdiction of the Committee on Organization. I did have the feeling—and I shall be entirely frank about it—that there would be a better opportunity for a complete consideration of the problems, which I think are interrelated, namely, the questions of salary, retirement, and proper deductions of expenses directly and legitimately connected with the discharge of the duties and responsibilities of the offices of, respectively, Representative and Senator, and that they might be better considered if the whole matter could be taken up de novo.

While I know that there is much force in the argument that the House has provided this amount for its membership, and therefore the Senate should not be left in a different position, I frankly had the feeling that if we left the situation just as it is, the House having appropriated this expense accounts for its Members, and the Senate not having done so for its Members, it might be very helpful in getting the entire problem and all its interrelated factors considered at one time.

I hope the able chairman of the committee will pardon me for having made this statement, but I wanted my own position in the matter to appear in the RECORD. I reemphasize that the Senator knows me well enough to realize that I am not standing on the jurisdiction of the Organization Committee, because clearly the ultimate legislative jurisdiction lies with the Appropriations Committee or some other committee of the Congress. But I was rather pleased at the outcome of the situation last spring, because I felt that, in a way, it resulted in what might be said to be an anomolous condition that would be helpful in getting a full and balanced consideration of the problems of salary, retirement and appropriate and legitimate deductions for expenses in connection with the discharge of the duties of the senatorial office.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think it is proper to make a statement in this connection. Apparently the view of Senators was that, the House having increased the compensation of its Members, Members of the Senate should be placed on a parity with Members of the House. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin and to other Senators that, as I recall, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, the vote was unanimous, with one exception. I voted against the proposal, but I was so overwhelmingly overruled that I feel there is nothing to do but to go along and let the provision become law. For that reason I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has Congress enacted any basic law authorizing the payment of these expenses, or an appropriation to pay them?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no law, but last year such a provision was held to be in order in the House. The two Houses have the power, of course, to fix the salaries of their own Members.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has been stated that this sum would be tax-exempt. That statement was made with reference to the payment made to House Members under the provisions of the bill which was passed earlier this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it would be tax-exempt. I do not know what the authorities have held, but it seems to me that it would not be tax-exempt.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue informed me that it would not be tax-exempt. That is what he told Members of the House, and for this reason I shall vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was my understanding. I have always heard that it was not tax-exempt.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The item is designated in the bill as expenses, and not as salary. If it is for expenses, and if that is the purpose of it, and it is not simply an increase in salary, why would not any expense which a Senator actually incurred be a proper deduction from his income tax? The item is designated as

an expense allowance. If it is used for expenses, it strikes me that it should be exempt from taxation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that during the rather long time I have been a Member of Congress I have had a great many expenses, and I have never been given any tax exemption on the salary which I have received. I do not believe that this item would be tax-exempt. I believe that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has held that it was not tax-exempt, so far as Members of the House were concerned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My principal objection is that we are terming it "an expense allowance." The truth is that we are increasing our salaries in the amount of $2,500, and every Senator knows it, and we ought to say so and call it salary, and not expenses.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would support the amendment and vote for it if the reference to expenses were eliminated and it were termed an increase in salary. To me it seems to be a subterfuge. In fact, we are increasing our salaries to that extent. I think we are entitled to such an increase, and probably more; but I would much prefer to vote for a salary increase rather than for an expense allowance, if it is to be subject to taxation. If it is for expenses, it ought to be exempt from taxation. If it is not for expenses, but is an increase in salary we ought to say so, and vote for a salary increase that, of course, will be subject to income taxes. That is the objection I have to the amendment. It goes under the guise of expenses when, in truth, we all know, and I think every one else in the country will know, that it is simply an increase in salary, and the Senate ought to say that it is salary and not expenses.

Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennesee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield first to the Senator from California, and then to the Senator from Indiana. Before doing so, let me say that this amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and it received the approval of the overwhelming majority of the Appropriations Committee—all except one member. Under those circumstances it seems to me that there is nothing to do but submit it to the Senate and let the Senate vote on it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, there are 96 Senators, and each of us inhabits a different world, where different conditions prevail. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that, so far as I am concerned, the allowance of approximately $200 a month would be an allowance purely and solely for expenses. Since I have been a Member of the Senate there has not been a single month when my traveling expenses, extra clerk hire, taxicab, telephone, and telegraph expenses have not exceeded that sum. Mine may not be a typical case. Up until the time when my poverty compelled me to give up my California home, I was put to an expense of between $100 to $150 a month, at the very minimum, in providing for my California home, that being an extraordinary expense. Also, the allowance for travel has hardly been sufficient to pay the cost of transporting across the continent my wife and children, and the furniture, and other items which I have had to have transported.

This is a condition which is so ridiculous that it can hardly be described. The Collector of Internal Revenue refused to allow me to deduct from my income-tax return the extra amount which I was compelled to pay to hire additional clerks to do the work of Uncle Sam. That position was taken because, said the Bureau, "We assume that Senators would have judgment enough to allow themselves all the money they need for clerk hire or traveling expenses, taxicabs, and other expenses; and since such an allowance is not made, we must assume that they are not official expenses."

So far as the Senator from California is concerned, he certainly will be able to present to the tax-collecting authorities a statement of official expenses totaling at least $200 a month; and I take it that under those conditions official expenses would be deductible, although, of course, the amount stated in the amendment would not be deductible, but would have to be accounted for as income.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Indiana, which I now do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I was not present at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee when this item was passed on. For some reason, notice of the meeting did not reach me. I believe the meeting was held on rather short notice. If I had been present at that meeting, I would have voted against this proposal. I would have joined with the Senator from Tennessee, who voted against it.

Mr. President, I feel that we are very inconsistent in trying to adopt this proposal at this time. We have already passed on this item at this session of the Congress, within a few months; and it seems to me that it is very inconsistent for us to bring it up at this time.

The second point is that only this week, when the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] desired to include in the pay bill an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress, an informal poll was taken, and a majority of Senators expressed their opposition to including such an item in the bill. The reason why they did so was that they felt that at this time, when the problem of wages in private industry is a very critical question between labor and industry, it would be inconsistent for us, as Members of the lawmaking body of our country, to take a stand on the question and further complicate the problem. Therefore, I feel that we are wholly inconsistent in considering such a proposal at this time.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that this is really a salary increase. Let us say so. So far as the amount being exempt from Federal income tax is concerned, I believe that, as a matter of justice, we should have an allowance to take care of the additional expenses incurred in maintaining our offices and residences in Washington while we have our permanent homes in the States. But that is not the problem here. I think we are very inconsistent in considering the proposal at this time, and I wish to express my disapproval of it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in response to the statements which have made by the very able Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] I merely wish to state that I have had similar experiences with reference to the problems of meeting extraordinary expenses which were occasioned by the necessity of living in Washington and performing the duties of my office. Like the Senator from California, I, too, had to give up my home in my State because I positively could not maintain two homes on the salary which I am receiving. But my contention is that if we appropriate money in order to meet our actual expenses incident to our services in Washinton as representatives of the people, it should be subject to deduction if actually used for that purpose. We should not have to pay an income tax on money spent in connection with actual expenses incident to our office. If the purpose of the proposal is to increase our income while at the same time requiring that we shall pay an income tax on it, I think we should increase our salaries sufficiently to take care of our extraordinary expenses and call it salary. If we are to be subjected to these extraordinary expenses and feel that it is necessary to appropriate a special allowance in order to take care of them, such allowance should not be taxable as income.

But, Mr. President, in my opinion the proper way to resolve this problem is simply to increase our salaries a reasonable amount, call it salary and pay tax on it and not resort to this kind of subterfuge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with what has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. This is not an item for meeting expenses; it is an increase in salary. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has made it very clear that its interpretation of the word "home" as applied to a Senator of the United States, is that his home is in the city of Washington. So long as that is the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Bureau, no deduction is allowed for any amount, no matter what Senators might vote themselves in the way of salaries. I am opposed to the proposal because it is purely and simply an increase in salary.

Today is the first time that many of us have known anything about the item.

I am opposed to it. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am very much in accord with what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the other Senators who have spoken. There is no question in the world that something must be done for Senators who sit here and work day and night. Something should be done so that all Senators can make both ends meet, and live respectably. But I have been one of those who have felt that this subject should be taken up in its entirety and not part by part by making a loud noise about a little something here and there. I believe the whole question of the compensation and expenses of Senators should be carefully reviewed. We should know what we are doing. I think we should determine to take up this subject shortly after we convene next year, and grant whatever relief is proper and wise in connection with the services rendered and the necessities involved.

I thought that I might read from a memorandum which I hold in my hand which indicates the salaries paid to Senators and Representatives from the time our Government was established.

The compensation of Senators and Representatives up to 1816 was $6 a day. It was increased to $1,500 a year shortly thereafter.

In 1856 the salary was increased to $3,000 a year. In 1866 it was increased to $5,000 a year. In 1873 it was made $7,500 a year. Then apparently some one objected, and the salaries were reduced in 1874 to $5,000 a year. That may have been due to a reduction in the increased cost of living following the Civil War, so that it was felt justifiable to reduce the salaries to $5,000 a year.

In 1907 the salaries were increased again to $7,500 a year and they remained at that figure until 1925, when they were increased to $10,000 a year.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the cataloging should be completed. In 1930, I believe, the salary was not $10,000 a year.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for his correction. I do not have that information on my memorandum.

But, Mr. President, what I have said gives a general idea of how the salaries have ranged since the Government was founded.

I feel very much the same as the Senator from Arkansas has expressed himself. If we are going to grant and justify an expense account it should be so defined by law that there can be no question as to whether it is taxable or not taxable. All expenses associated with industry, such as expenses of traveling salesmen and officers of the company, are nontaxable, provided that they are within reason. The present language of the bill does not define expenses. I understand that there is no definition supplied in connection with a Senator or a Representative. I believe the definition should be written into the law so that there can be no question as to whether such expenses are deductible or taxable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me inquire if a definition that the home of a Senator or Representative must be considered as being in the State from which he comes cure the situation?

Mr. HAWKES. It seems to me that it would help to cure the situation, but I feel very strongly as does the Senator from California. I can tell Senators that for the one item of coming to Washington from New Jersey and returning—New Jersey is a close-by State, and I take my wife back and forth, which entails a proper expense—my expenses for railroad fare and food on the train is nearly $2,400 a year. I feel that I must return home to New Jersey occasionally because the constituents in a close-by State expect their Senators to return home often.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They do in all States.

Mr. HAWKES. I receive demands every week to return home.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am heartily in favor of the salaries of Senators and Representatives being increased to a point which will enable Senators and Representatives to live decently and respectably, and perform their duties without worry and care. But I feel very strongly that, inasmuch as we took the action which we took a few months ago, and inasmuch as only a few days ago the Senator from California withdrew an amendment dealing with the question of increasing the salaries of Senators, now is not the time to increase them. I am convinced that we should thoroughly study our own needs, become familiar with the situation, and return here with a sound recommendation with which we may face the people without fear of them believing that we are trying to mulct the Government, but that instead, we are trying to provide decent compensation and expenses for the representatives of the people.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the committee I offered the amendment. In answer to some of the statements which Senators have made, I simply wish to say that the amendment is not inconsistent. It is consistent. There is no inconsistency about it. This proposal was not first made by the Senate. It was made by the House of Representatives. Let me point out that the House not only made the proposal and adopted it last June, the House also made the payments retroactive to the 1st of January 1945. So the Members of the House were paid the additional allowance of $2,500 for the full year. This will certainly make more consistent the position between the Senate and the House.

The amendment is simply an attempt to make the Members of the Senate equal to that of Members of the House of Representatives, on an expense basis. The amendment is in no way inconsistent. I offered it. I joined in offering it before. I have offered it now, and I am again telling the Senate that if the Senate is to degenerate into a millionaires' club, it will be a sorry day for America.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the interest of being able to keep in the Senate a cross-section of America, which it should be, and to have some Senators who are rich, some who are poor, and some whose incomes are moderate, I offered the amendment, and I say that it is sound to have the House of Representatives and the Senate placed on an equal basis.

After we adopt this amendment, if the House of Representatives states that it is ready to repeal the provision, insofar as it is concerned, or if hereafter a major adjustment is made in the salaries of Members of Congress, certainly I shall be open-minded in regard to repeal of the amendment on such a basis. This was considered by the Appropriations Committee last night. The committee voted it out. People have known about it.

Last June I heard Senators stand on this floor and say how terrible it was that the House of Representatives had taken such action and that there would be a great public hue and cry—that the public would rise up and protest against this action by the House. However, when I left here and traveled around the State and country, I found that people said to me, "Why, I supposed, of course, that your expenses were paid—that when you went from Washington to New Hampshire to make a speech or to participate in an official conference your expenses were paid. Why, of course, we thought they were paid. We thought all expenses of Senators and Congressmen were paid."

Mr. President, people have an entire misconception of what a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives receives in the way of salary. I am glad the Members of the House had the courage and foresight to make such a provision for themselves, and now I am merely trying to have a similar provision made for Members of the Senate, so that the treatment received by Senators will be equal to that received by Members of the House of Representatives.

I hope that if we adopt the amendment now Senators who object to it will have the good taste not to accept the allowance involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask a question of the Senator regarding the exemption. What would be the effect of the addition of the following language:

> There shall be paid to each Senator, whose home for tax purposes shall be considered the State he represents.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that would strengthen the amendment. I would welcome the addition. I proposed the amendment in the form in which it was proposed in the House. I did not try to change it from the House version. But I think the suggestion the Senator has made probably would settle the argument which has been going on, and would strengthen the provision. Personally, I would favor it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that to have a tax on an allowance of $2,500 for people who are serving the Government and are away from home is a most discriminatory and absolutely improper procedure. It has irritated me ever since I heard of it. I should like to have the Senator include that language in the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the situation. In normal circumstances, and generally, I am in complete harmony with the views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am quite content to have determination of the proper amount of salaries of Members of Congress and determination of the question of retirement for Members of Congress await a report from the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is the chairman.

But here we are confronted with a situation for which I think there can be no possible justification. The Senate and the House of Representatives are supposed to be coordinate branches of the Congress of the United States; and yet by action taken by the House of Representatives and acquiesced in by the Senate, the Members of the House of Represetnatives have been accorded an advantage, a preference, a benefit to the extent of $2,500 a year more than is accorded to Members of the Senate of the United States. I resent that situation. I am quite ready to brush aside all technical questions, all questions of procedure, and to move directly and instantly to the restoring of the equality which the Senate should enjoy with the House of Representatives in the matter of salaries or in the matter of allowances for expenses, whichever the proposal may be.

The objections to the amendment remind me of something which happened some years ago when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. A merchant marine bill was pending before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and various witnesses would come before the committee and would pound their chests and tell of their love of the American ship and the American merchant marine, they would state that they wanted American ships to be on every sea and to be in every port of the world, with the flag of America at the masthead, and carrying the commerce of America to the people and markets of the world. But then from all sides criticisms and objections would be directed to this feature and that of the proposed legislation, notwithstanding all the encomiums which the general purposes of the measure had received.

After one meeting, Mr. Lasker, who then was Chairman of the Shipping Board, came into my office and said he never had undergone an experience quite like his recent one before the committee. He said the nearest to it occurred when he was appointed to a committee, in Chicago, to solicit funds for some Jewish relief; and he was assigned to canvass a certain section of the city with which he was not particularly familiar, so he was given a guide. As he would come to a particular store, his guide would tell him the business which was conducted in the store and would also tell him what should be contributed by the owners or managers of the store.

He said that finally, as he was about to enter a certain store, the guide said to him, "There are a couple of brothers here, and they are pretty well to do. They can give plenty if they will, but they are pretty tight, and you will have to work on them." Lasker said he went into the store and met a man who turned out to be the older brother. What happened was substantially as follows: Lasker asked the man for a contribution, but he said, "No; I cannot." Lasker then asked why he could not contribute, and the man said, "Well, my old mother is over in Warsaw, and I have to send her money regularly; and my wife is sick and in a hospital here in Chicago, and the hospital bills are simply terrifying in their amount and frequency." When he was further pressed to make a contribution, the man said, "I have a daughter in one of the fancy finishing schools in the East, and the authorities of the school seem to devote their entire time to offering justification for this charge or that charge or some other charge, and the total of the charges is positively staggering. So I simply cannot give you anything." At that point the door opened and another man entered. He turned out to be the younger brother. Lasker asked him for a contribution, but the younger brother said, "No." Then Lasker said, "Come on, now; you know you can contribute something if you want to." But the man said, "No; I cannot do it." Then Lasker called his attention to the fact that he was not supporting his mother, he did not have a wife in a hospital, he did not have a daughter in one of the fancy finishing schools in the East, and all it would mean if he made a contribution of a couple of hundred dollars would be that he would have only that much less to spend on his lady friends in Chicago. But still the man refused to contribute. Lasker finally turned to him and said, "Will you honestly tell me why you will not contribute?"

The man said, "Yes; I will. It is because I don't like mince pie."

Lasker said, "What does that have to do with whether you will contribute?"

"Well," the man said, "when you ain't going to do a thing anyhow, one excuse is as good as another."

Mr. President, that is the situation here. When some Senators take the position that they simply are not going to vote for this proposal, when they take the position that they will not insist that the Senate of the United States stand on a basis of equality with the House of Representatives, one excuse serves as well as another. Mr. President, the multiplicity of excuses is simply astounding.

I happen to be one of those who hope that the day is not far distant when there will be a salary increase for the Members of the Congress of the United States. I happen to be one of those who hope that the time is coming in the near future when we may draft a retirement law for Members of Congress, recognizing that throughout the whole political life of this Nation retirements are approved, recognizing that throughout industrial America the principle of retirements and annuities has been constantly expanding, until today what we term modernized industry recognizes and practices the principle.

Mr. President, I hope that we are going to bring the Senate up to an even level with the House of Representatives in this matter. I care not whether it be called salary or expenses or what not. I want equality to be brought about between the House and the Senate, and because this amendment will help in this direction I am for it as reported by the committee.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. I intend to vote against this amendment. I am not going to vote against it for the reason that I do not think there should be an additional salary paid to Members of Congress. I have been for that, and I am for it now; but not in this manner. I have had the opportunity to serve on the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee considering proposed increase in the salaries of Federal judges and that committee, although it has not acted as yet, has, I think, been of the opinion that it would be desirable to have an opportunity to consider an all-around salary bill which would include Members of Congress. I am just as enthusiastic for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress as, I think, any other Senator; I recognize the justice of it; but I do not want to do it in this way. That is the reason I shall vote against the amendment. Whether that is a sufficient reason in the minds of other Senators or not, that is my position.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was at the White House with a committee of Senators and missed a portion of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire. I should like to ask him if the addtional compensation will be tax-exempt.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it is on the same basis as the additional compensation paid to Members of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reliably informed it is not tax-exempt, and has been so held by the tax authorities.

Mr. BYRD. Did not the Internal Revenue Bureau give an opinion that under some conditions it is tax-exempt?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that the Internal Revenue is of the opinion that it is not tax-exempt.

Mr. BYRD. That is not my understanding.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] made a statement about that, after calling the internal revenue collector. He said it was not tax-exempt. That statement was made on the floor of the Senate less than 20 minutes ago.

Mr. BYRD. I was not present at the time. I am asking for information.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If it is left to the determination of the public officials in charge of such matters, it is not tax-exempt.

Mr. BYRD. If the fund, when spent for certain expenses, would be tax-exempt, I want to know about it, because I think it is a vital question. I think it a

subterfuge to vote to Senators and Representatives money that is in any way tax-exempt.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I sought an answer from the Bureau of Internal Revenue a few months ago after the House acted. The answer I got was that the House appropriation is tax-exempt insofar as any expenditures would be tax-exempt for any taxpayer receiving expense money. Then, I tried to discover what that meant, and I do not know the answer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what expenses does he refer to. The amendment provides that $2,500 shall be paid to each Senator "to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties"

What are those expenses?

Mr. BRIDGES. Senators and Members of the House who live near Washington probably do not have as many expenses as Senators who live some distance away. I think there would be included, for instance, expenses incurred in going to their home State and returning. Members of Congress are allowed expenses for one trip a year, but the average Senator makes many more trips than that. For example, I think last year I made 18 trips to New Hampshire and return. Then, Senators constantly are going to various places to make speeches as a part of their official duties and then they have traveling expenses in connection with attending conferences. Probably the average Senator will make 50 or 60 speeches or participate in that number of meetings in a year. Furthermore, personally, I feel that inasmuch as Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are obliged to maintain homes in their respective States, when they come to Washington the amount of rent they pay here in the District of Columbia should normally be chargeable as an expense, just as in the case of a businessman, a labor leader, or an agricultural leader who visits Washington to present a matter to the Congress or to participate in a conference of some sort. He further pays all his own expenses in or about Washington.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator think that expenses of that character should be deductible?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; they should be deductible, just as the expenses of a businessman are deductible.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator want to establish the principle that all Government employees when they are away from their domiciles should get their living expenses paid when assigned to Washington or some other place?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. BYRD. That is what the amendment does in the case of Members of Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The Senator is aware that Senators and Members of the House must maintain two homes. Each must have a home in his home State or home district or he could never run for Congress, and when he comes to Washington he must maintain a home here, whether in a hotel, an apartment or in a house. So an elective officer coming to Washington is in a peculiarly different position from that of a person working for the Government and on the Federal pay roll. So my answer to the Senator is by no means do I want to see the principle extended to nonelective officials and employees. I want mere justice. Let us keep the Senate a cross section of America and to do that adequate salaries must be paid and necessary expenses taken care of.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief observation. If the Senate wants to raise its own salaries it ought to do it directly; it ought not to come in the back door instead of the front door. Personally I think that this is a subterfuge. As in fact it is an increase in salary under the classification of expenses and if it is actually for expenses in the conduct of official business it is deductible from the income tax. I said as much when the same question was before the Senate previously. I think it a great mistake to raise salaries in this manner. If the Senate wants to raise the salaries of its Members let it be done directly and not take something in the way of expenses that have never heretofore been considered as expenses and have not been considered as deductible from the income tax. Whatever we do, let it be done in a straightforward manner.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been requested and ordered, and the Senator will have an opportunity as will every other Senator to act in a straightforward way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to make this observation: I voted against this same proposal when it was before the Senate a few months ago. I voted against it because I felt that if there was to be an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress it ought to be made with the understanding that it was an increase of salaries to Members of Congress and that we ought to come in through the front door and tell the American people that that was what we were doing instead of coming through the back door under the guise of an expense account increasing our salaries. Whether it will be tax-exempt or not, so far as I am concerned, is immaterial. When the matter was before the Senate previously we voted to deny it to ourselves, but we did not vote to deny it to the Members of the House of Representatives, and therefore we established a discrimination between the compensation of Members of the Senate and Members of the House which has never before existed in the history of the United States. That, so far as I am concerned, is also immaterial because I voted to deny it to Senators and I also voted to deny it Members of the House, but the majority was in favor of giving it to Members of the House and denying it to the Senate.

I dare say there is no Member of this body who needs the $2,500 extra compensation more than I need it; but, Mr. President, I am not willing, under the guise of an expense account, to vote myself $2,500 a year extra, notwithstanding the fact that Members of the House are now obtaining it. I have said here and I repeat that I think I would vote for an increase in the salary of Members of Congress if it was presented on its merits and as an increase that the American people could understand, but I would not vote for an increase in the salary of Members of Congress alone. I have said and I repeat that even if it comes up on its merits as a direct increase in the compensation of Members of the Congress, brought in by the front door instead of the back way through the kitchen, I will not vote for it unless and until all Government employees have had their salaries considered and determined upon the basis of justice and equity in a scheme designed to consider all salaries. I mean by that from the President of the United States down through the judiciary, the legislative branch, and all other branches.

I think there would be justification for a readjustment of the salaries of all Government employees. In view of what we know, I think we might well increase either the salary or increase the allowance of the President of the United States. I have a very deep conviction that we should increase judicial salaries, from the Supreme Court all the way down through the Circuit Court of Appeals to the district courts. Whenever an all-inclusive bill is brought before the Senate readjusting the salaries of all departments of our Government, I shall then be prepared to vote for it on its merits, and I think I shall support it, unless I conclude that it is extravagant and unjustified. But I will not vote for an increase in the compensation of Members of the Congress of the United States by themselves, under any pretext, until and unless there is a suitable adjustment in the compensation of all Government employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 2, beginning with line 9, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

> There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, $120,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and permit my vote to stand. If the Senator from Louisiana were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Sen-

ator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained at a conference being held at the White House.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at various Government departments.

I wish to announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is detained in committee meeting.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay," if present. His general pair and its transfer have been announced.

The result was anounced—yeas 24, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—24

Ball	Gurney	Mitchell
Bankhead	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Taylor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Kilgore	Tobey
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	White

NAYS—47

Austin	Huffman	Radcliffe
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Bilbo	Knowland	Revercomb
Bushfield	La Follette	Robertson
Byrd	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lucas	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Smith
Donnell	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Morse	Willis
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Young
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Bailey	Briggs
Andrews	Brewster	Buck
Butler	Hatch	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Carville	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Myers	Wheeler
Ferguson	Overton	Wherry
Glass	Russell	
Guffey	Stanfill	

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS — MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the votes whereby the Senate, on December 12, agreed to the committee amendment, as amended, to House bill 3603, to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; and to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] striking out, on page 32, line 13, the word "dry-cargo."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be filed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, how did the Senator from Maryland vote on that subject?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, my motion is a privileged one. I simply move to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Maryland making a motion to reconsider at this time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am filing the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is simply filing the motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Maryland further yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator disclose when he proposes to press his motion to reconsider?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish I could answer the Senator from California, but I can simply say at the earliest moment possible. Under the rules of the Senate a motion such as this must be filed within 3 days of the action that was taken, and this is the third day, so I am entering the motion to protect the situation. At the earliest possible moment I shall ask that it be taken up and pressed for action. That will be, I trust, in a day or so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can such notice of intention be filed by a Senator who did not vote on the prevailing side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When no record vote, or yea-and-nay vote is taken, such a motion may be made by any Member. The motion is filed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that his amendment will not be in order until consideration of committee amendments is concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to have the amendment read so the Senate may understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $13,300 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of $19,950 per annum each.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, while we are on this subject I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. [Putting the question.]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the question on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment. I think we should have a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. President, I understand the Chair put the question on the amendment. Was the amendment agreed to or rejected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not announced the result. The Chair is in doubt as to the result.

Mr. BYRD. Then I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, before the request for the yeas and nays is granted, I wish to make a brief explanation of the amendment. There seems to be a practically unanimous feeling in the Senate that the present salary situation, particularly with respect to Senators, but also with respect to Members of the House, is not justified, and that it is not in the public interest. I think it can be well said that the statements which have been made by individuals of intelligence in this Nation who have considered the subject, and expressions by various writers and commentators and newspaper editors, indicate that the sentiment is overwhelmingly in support of the plan to increase the

salaries of both Senators and Representatives. While that is true and while I believe there is a predominant sentiment in the Senate in favor of such action, still it seems impossible, for one reason or another, because of objections made on one ground or another, because of excuses of one nature or another—it seems impossible for a majority to agree upon the method of making the increase and, possibly, its amount.

Personally I believe the salary of a Member of Congress should be fixed at at least $15,000. Some Senators think the salary should not be fixed at so high a figure. Some think, as is shown by the majority leader's statement, that it ought to be contingent upon what increases are made, and when such increases are made, in the salaries of the ordinary employees of the Government.

Mr. President, I do not consider that the congressional salary should be upon the same basis as the salaries of stenographers and other worthy workers in the Government service. The Congress of the United States constitutes the board of directors for the greatest Government in all the world. It is a board of directors handling the expenditure of many billions of dollars. It is a board of directors chosen by the American people, whose duty it is to levy taxes upon such items and in such amounts as will bring revenue into the Treasury in a fair and just way, without undue oppression upon the wealthy or the poor. That, Mr. President, is the most difficult problem that ever confronted an American legislative body. Still there are some who think we ought to have cheap men on that board of directors, men who are willing to perform these duties and assume these responsibilities and carry these burdens at a compensation comparable with that of workers who engage in mental or physical work by the hour, and who have no such burdens and responsibilities as are placed upon this great body of men.

So Mr. President, in the face of the numerous declarations made that this is not the time to do it, that this is not the way to do it, I submit the question: When will there be a suitable time and a suitable way to go on record?

We know the necessity for men in politics, subject to popular elections, to keep an eye upon the time when they will be required to submit their candidacies to the electorate of their States. How many men have we heard say "Well, do not forget my election comes up next year." I have no criticism at all to make of men who take that factor into account. I merely point it out to indicate that ordinarily one-third of the membership of this body have deterring influences to prevent them from a full and free expression of their judgment upon this great business proposition.

Mr. President, I hear it said, as other Senators have heard it said, by some Members of Congress, that we ought not at this time to pass upon the salaries of Members of Congress, because it may have an influence upon the labor situation, upon the question of the amount to be paid industrial workers in the controversies which are now pending. We have heard it said—and we know it is in the air—that some Members of Congress want the adjustment of this subject, the real settlement of the law and the facts, made after all these labor problems have been settled and gotten out of the way.

Mr. President, there is no connection between the compensation or the salary to be paid to this great body of directors for 135,000,000 people, who handle hundreds of millions of dollars, and a wage dispute between employees and employer. Labor does not seek cheap men to lead and handle their organizations and to adjust their differences with employers. Do Senators hear labor talking about removing a $25,000 or $50,000 a year president of the CIO or of the American Federation of Labor, or of any other labor organization, in order to get a cheaper man, to save a little of the salary of the men who are looking after the affairs of the great body of workers? No. In fact, I am advised that the labor organizations approve an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My problem in connection with this issue is this: I quite agree that there should be an increased level of compensation for Members of Congress, but I cannot escape the feeling that I am under contract with my constituency, that I accepted the contract at $10,000 a year, and that any increase should be effective only after the intervention of an election.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I appreciate the conscientiousness of the Senator from Michigan, and his desire to observe his obligation. I look upon him as a thoroughly honest man. I like him. But the Senator should know that at least two-thirds of the Senators are not in that position, and he is voting to adjust the salaries of all of us, and not merely his own. If his conscience restrains him until after the intervention of an election, he can settle that question as the late Senator Borah did on one occasion, by simply not receiving the check for the increased amount of the salary. That would fully comply with the personal obligation which he feels, and I do not doubt that he feels it, as it has been stated. But he is helping to hold back a decision which in my judgment the Senator from Michigan realizes ought to be made by the Congress at this time, and without delay.

Many Senators are amply able to serve without any salary. Sometimes I think we ought to establish a system whereby we would serve as dollar-a-year men. We seem to be drifting in that direction. As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has said, we seem to be drifting in the direction of having rich men predominate in the Senate. Of course, the matter of salary is of no concern to many Members.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we are to proceed on the basis of what might be called parity with the whole Federal employee picture, my information is that since 1941 Federal employees have received an increase of approximately 21 percent. Is that figure substantially accurate?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I believe so, subject to correction by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the Byrd plan, they would receive a still further increase, which would bring them up to an increase of approximately 33 percent as compared with 1941.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the basis of my amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. So those who argue that Members of Congress should not receive any increase greater than that received by Federal employees have that argument taken away from them under the Senator's plan.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Likewise, as the Senator has pointed out, the last time the compensation of Members of Congress was increased was in 1925. That was nearly 21 years ago. So if we are to be anywhere near consistent in the position we take, pro or con, we ought not to make one argument at one time, and then use another argument at some other time. We ought to be consistent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This amendment is offered to meet the issue fairly and squarely.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me complete this statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

It is agreed in the debates by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is a great economist, and by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], as I understand, that the average increase in the cost of living since 1941 has been 33 percent. That is the position of the Government in its effort to hold down run-away inflation, and that is the position announced by Judge Collet. Members of Congress have had no increase in their compensation since 1925. I have offered an amendment to adjust the situation directly, not by circumvention, not by any claim that a certain item is tax-exempt or not tax-exempt. My amendment would adjust the compensation of Members of Congress in the same way that the compensation of Federal employees is sought to be adjusted, by increasing our salaries, not to what many of us think they ought to be, but to an extent which would recognize that Federal employees are seeking and are likely to get, an increase of 33 percent. My amendment would provide the same degree of increase in the compensation of Members of Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for yielding. I know that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] always wishes to be accurate. The point which he raises is a very good point, but I wish to emphasize the fact that it does not apply to the schedule of the Senator from Virginia, because, beginning with $5,200, the over-all increase is 21 percent, instead of 33 percent; and when we reach a salary of $5,600, the total over-all increase is 20.25. At $6,000 it is 19½ percent. At $8,500 the percentage is 16.41,

and so forth. I know that the Senator wishes to recognize those facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was taking the over-all figure. However, as I understand, in the lower brackets the Senator from Virginia would allow substantially the full increase advocated by the Senator from California.

Mr. BANKHEAD. To those receiving salaries up to $2,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Virginia told me a moment ago that according to his recollection the increase in Federal salaries from 1941 to 1945 was 21 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to make it clear that that is on an over-all basis. The increase in the case of those receiving $10,000 is $1,440.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, to be perfectly fair the Senator from New Jersey would have to admit that the average employee of the Government who receives $8,000, $9,000, or $10,000, and who would receive an increase under the proposed legislation, does not have to maintain two homes. He has the advantage of retirement pay when he completes his service. He has no election expenses. He does not have to transport his children from the place where he is appointed to Washington and return. If we wish to be frank about it and face the issue, all kinds of conditions enter into the congressional status which are not incident to any other situation. If a Federal employee is moved by Government order, he is paid a certain allowance for moving expenses.

I am interested in this argument, not primarily from the standpoint of personal aggrandizement for myself or anyone else, but because I believe that there are certain elements of justice which are visible and ought to be faced by the Members of this body. I agree with what the Senator from Alabama has said. One of the worst things that could happen to this body, or the other House, would be to make it a rich man's club. To my personal knowledge many Members of Congress who are provident in their manner of living, have a difficult time making both ends meet and paying their taxes and other expenses. That is not a healthy condition for a Member of a legislative body.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that apparently he was not in the Chamber when I spoke a few moments ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I was not. I was at the White House.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to be fair. I agree with what the Senator from Alabama has said. The situation must be corrected. But my point is that we have a committee working on the subject and I should like to see a report on it, just as I would want a report in connection with a business which I might be operating. By following that procedure the question can be decided in such a way that later there will not be criticism regarding things forgotten or things done a second time. I am heartily in accord with what the Senator has said.

Two or three times in this debate emphasis has been placed on the point that we do not wish to make this a rich man's club. No one in the United States is more in accord with that statement than am I.

The Senate should be a place where men of ability, patriotism, honesty, and integrity can be elected to serve their constituents and the people of the United States, to the benefit of all the people. The question of money or lack of it should not be a determining factor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama further yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we are making a fundamental mistake if we conceive of the Congress as we conceive of the Federal employment establishment. Senators have no retirement. They cannot pay into a retirement fund. Neither can Members of the House of Representatives. Members of the Congress have no long tenure of office guaranteed on good behavior, because many fine and well-behaved Senators have, for one reason or another, been eliminated from this body. I think this body is cheapened if it is considered on any basis other than that of a body whose Members are elected for a limited period of time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is a separate branch of Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to have the Senator yield to me for a moment so that I could point out that in the Appropriations Committee of this very body this matter was amply considered and discussed. A vote was taken in the committee, and there is on the calendar a bill, with a favorable report which was almost unanimous, advocating an increase to $15,000 of the salaries of Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, and an increase for the President, an increase for the Vice President, and an increase for members of the Cabinet. All their positions are of short tenure. There is no relationship between the service they render and the service rendered by those in the classified service of the Federal Government. As I have said, that bill is on the calendar. Naturally, a Member of Congress who will be up for reelection next year, as will all the Members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Members of the Senate, wil be in a very difficult position if he supports any bill for any salary increase for Members of Congress at this time, because it is the mechanism of demagoguery, which happens to be a part of democracy, for an opponent to say, "He voted himself a salary increase." But, Mr. President, under that philosophy, 150 years from now, even if everything else went up 500 or 1,000 percent, the salaries of Members of Congress would be what they are today.

No Member of Congress has received a salary increase since 1925. Yet we have given to the employees in the classified service an increase, in round numbers, of 21 percent. Why, then, if we are going to argue the relationship between service in Congress and the classified service, should not Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have received increases in their salaries? Since they have received none, and now that the Senator from Alabama has attempted at the last moment to establish some platform of justice, it seems to me that the argument and logic of the case, as proven by the opponents of his amendment, are all on his side. The very arguments made to defeat his proposal were made to defeat the other proposal; but now that the circumstances are reversed the Members who made such arguments have retreated from them.

I think the Senator has made out a good case. I think we should consider it, not from the standpoint of politics, but, in view of all the circumstances, from the standpoint of what is just and fair for the welfare of the country in this emergency.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the proposal made by the Senator from Maryland and approved by the Appropriations Committee would be effective at the end of this Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; if it passes.

Mr. BYRD. This amendment is to be effective immediately, as I understand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; because we are not asking for the full $15,000.

Mr. BYRD. However, I understand that the Appropriations Committee has recommended that the increase to $15,000 be made at the end of this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and that is the way it should be done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, Mr. President, let me point out that I have not heard that the Senator from Virginia is supporting it.

Mr. BYRD. That may be. But I asked the question. Regardless of whether I am going to support it, I am entitled to know the facts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I trust the Senator will obtain the facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I would much prefer to have the proposal taken up as a separate matter and have the increase made effective at the end of the present Congress, rather than now. But my point is that when that matter comes up under its own steam, new arguments will be made and the matter will be laid aside for further study and the present situation will continue to prevail.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, that is what will happen. We all know that it is always easy to find excuses when one is opposed to a certain proposition.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that the proposal is to establish equality of treatment temporarily.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not an attempt permanently to increase the salaries of Members of the Senate, as I understand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator said he had not heard that the Senator from Virginia was supporting the bill providing that the salaries of Senators shall be $15,000. The suggestion also was made that in the next election some point might be made if Members of the Congress voted to increase their own salaries. However, I would not be affected by such an argument, because I will not be involved in the next election.

The point I make is that the salaries of Members of Congress should be increased. The Senator from Maryland pointed out why the matter of increasing the salaries of Members of Congress should not be considered simply on the basis of comparison with increases granted to persons in the classified Government service, namely, because there is very definitely a difference between the expenses and the circumstances involved. I take it there is a very definite difference between the position of a person in the classified Government service, however worthy he may be, and the position of a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I take the position, and I wish to make it plain, that I am ready to support the bill which has been reported by the committe. In order that the record may be straight, I wish to say that I think $15,000 a year is the minimum salary which Members of Congress should receive, and I think such an increase is justified and we should have the courage to bring up the measure providing for that salary and to vote for it. But Mr. President, I do not want to increase my salary under any guise or pretext that it is expenses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. But the trouble is that we simply cannot get a sufficient number of Members to face the music.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The other reason why I wished to make the statement I have made is that I did not wish to leave an inference that I am opposed to having the salaries increased. I wish to make it clear that I am ready to vote for an increase in salaries, and I think the salaries of Members of Congress should be the amount reported by the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad the Senator has made that statement, although personally I understood his position. I am glad he has made it for the benefit of other Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Tentatively, Mr. President, I should like to propose, as a substitute for the pending amendment of the Senator from Alabama, the following:

> The compensation of the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum, each. The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum, each; and the compensation of heads of the executive departments who are members of the President's Cabinet shall be at the rate of $17,500 per annum, each.

Mr. President, that is the proposal which was recommended almost unanimously by the Appropriations Committee, with the proviso that it should not go into effect until January 3, 1947, as I recall. I would much prefer to support the proposal I have just stated rather than the one offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. The proposal I have just stated would eliminate the nasty implication of Members of Congress voting to increase their own salaries; at least, it would do so as far as we humanly could eliminate it. I would rather see the matter handled in this fashion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator knows that I am in favor of his proposal. Of course, I hope he will not complicate the issue at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator from Alabama has expressed his approval of this proposal. But after standing by for a long time and seeing no action taken, he has taken the stand he has today.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct. Later I shall vote for the bill which has been referred to, and I hope the Senate will take up the entire question and will deal with it broadly and effectively in comprehensive legislation.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] made a most convincing address, one which impressed me very deeply. He is always a clear thinker. He pointed out that we are occupying an anomalous position, a position which really brings the Senate of the United States into disrespect. It subordinates Members of the Senate to the superiority of the House, because in public opinion salaries are paid in large measure according to the ability of the occupants of the office.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not until I complete my statement, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maine pointed out that the House of Representatives favorably considered this matter. Of course, the House of Representatives is composed of able men. Many of them later become Members of the Senate. Nearly all of them do so at their first opportunity. The House of Representatives adopted the amendment providing for an increase of $2,500 a year. I have not heard any complaint about it among the people. Some Members of the Senate thought that it would result in a strong protest being made. The only criticism which I have heard is, "Why do not you Members of the Senate have the courage to do the same thing, and keep yourselves on an equal plane with the Members of the House of Representatives? Do you feel inferior to them? Have you lost courage?" The people understand that nearly everyone at the present time is facing the change which has taken place in the standards of living.

Mr. President, it has been said that we may make the Senate a rich man's club, or require Senators to earn additional compensation in order to meet their necesary obligations while living in Washington. Many of them came from sections of the country where the cost of living is not so high as it is in Washington. It is not in the public interest to force upon them a difference in standards of living without making it possible for them to meet the increased costs. The people who reside in the States who send Representatives to Congress do not obtain the best results by sending a type of man to the Senate, for example, who bids for the office, or a rich man who does not need any salary, or a man who must earn additional compensation by engaging in professional or business transactions.

Mr. President, the Senate has come to be an all-time body. When I first became a Member of the Senate it was approximately a half-time body. The Senate was in session about 6 months at the most during any year. The present salary of a Senator was fixed on that basis before the lame-duck amendment was adopted. The time which a Senator must actually consume in fulfilling his duties as a Member of the United States Senate has gradually increased until now no Member of the Senate can carry on his law practice, his banking business, his insurance business, his real-estate business, or any other kind of a business, and do full justice to the rights of his constituents and other citizens in his State. It has become necessary for him to separate himself from any private business he may have had. I have had to do so, and I know several other Senators who have had to do likewise. It has been necessary to sever all connections with other legitimate means of earning a livelihood which a Senator may have had. It has been necessary to give his constituents all his time and his best thought, as well as the greatest amount of study and research that it is possible for him to give.

Mr. President, I think the people want to pay their Representatives reasonable salaries. They know that officials in industry receive salaries ranging from $25,000 a year to even as high as $250,000 a year for conducting the business of only one company. Such salaries are carried into the costs of production, or transportation, or whatever it may be, and passed on down the line to the consuming public. So, after all, the people pay those high salaries. They may not know specifically how it is done, but nevertheless they must pay them. The stockholders are willing that it be done because they want able men to transact the business affairs of their corporations and companies.

Mr. President, let us take for example the Cabinet members and heads of the various governmental departments. I have a long list of Government officials who receive salaries of $12,000 a year and more. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has a similar list.

Mr. BYRD. I have a list of approximately 10 or 15 such officials.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have a list which is much longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list

of executives and officials of the Government receiving salaries of more than $10,000 a year.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Salaries of more than $10,000

Executive Assistant (White House)	$12,000
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization	15,000
Director, Export-Import Bank	15,000
Director, Office of War Information	12,000
Administrator, Surplus War Property Administration	12,000
10 Cabinet members (each)	15,000
Comptroller of the Currency	15,000
Collector of customs, New York	12,000
General manager, Anchorage, Alaska (Department of the Interior), the Alaska Railroad	14,400
Federal Security Agency (Director)	12,000
Administrator, Federal Works Agency (includes pay and allowances for commissioned officer on active list of U. S. Army, etc., p. 271, Official Register of United States)	12,000
Comptroller General	12,000
Chairman and 9 other Commissioners, Interstate Commerce Commission (each)	12,000
Commissioner, U. S. Maritime Commission	12,000
Administrator, National Housing Agency	12,000
Commissioner, Office of Federal Housing Administration	12,000
Administrator, Office of Price Administration	12,000
4 members, U. S. Tariff Commission (each)	11,000
Administrator, Veterans' Administration	12,000
9 Supreme Court Justices (each)	20,000
2 Chief Justices (each)	20,500
U. S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, 6 judges (each) (1 of above places vacant)	12,500
3 circuit judges, first circuit (each)	12,500
6 circuit judges, second circuit (each)	12,500
5 circuit judges, third circuit (each)	12,500
3 circuit judges, fourth circuit (each)	12,500
6 circuit judges, fifth circuit (each)	12,500
6 circuit judges, sixth circuit (each)	12,500
5 circuit judges, seventh circuit (each)	12,500
7 circuit judges, eighth circuit (each)	12,500
6 circuit judges, ninth circuit (each)	12,000
4 circuit judges, tenth circuit (each)	12,500
5 judges, U. S. Court of Claims (each)	12,500
4 judges and 1 vacancy, U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (each)	12,500
Total	118
Court judges	78
Number of Federal employees receiving $10,000 per annum	176
United States district judges receiving $10,000 per annum	101
Customs court judges receiving $10,000 per annum	9

Mr. BANKHEAD. In many instances, in addition to salaries which are higher than the salaries received by Members of Congress, automobiles are supplied.

Mr. BRIDGES. And chauffeurs.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. In some cases officials are supplied with two or three automobiles, as well as chauffeurs. The automobiles are used in connection with the transaction of business in Washington. Yesterday the Appropriations Committee considered a request from the Maritime Commission, or the Civil Aeronautics Board, for authority to purchase seven airplanes. Free automobiles do not travel fast enough. Of course, the furnishing of the airplanes would include expenses for pilots.

Mr. BRIDGES. And probably copilots and hostesses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The officials who are now furnished with long, sleek limousines and chauffeurs, as many bureaucrats are, would not be satisfied with airplanes unless they were also furnished with pilots, copilots, and good-looking hostesses. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the present situation prevails, I believe that the standards of Congress will be lowered. Two things should be considered. One of them is that the tax law giving businessmen the right to deduct expenses incurred in making trips which are necessarily made in connection with the conduct of business, should be repealed.

With reference to the subject of automobiles, does any Senator know how many automobiles are furnished to Government employees? The number runs into thousands. Some time ago the Senate witnessed a debate in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] took part, concerning the number of automobiles which should be allowed the TVA. The Senator from Tennessee fought vigorously to have the number reduced.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. As the Senator knows, as the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, yesterday I appointed him, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] to be a committee of three to examine into the number of automobiles now being supplied to Government officials, who has them, how many there are, what the cost is of maintaining them, and everything concerning the subject. I think these matters should be examined, and I am sure the committee will do its duty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is unfortunate we have waited so long as we have waited, and have let them get such a firm grip on a situation of that sort, while we, with power to keep them out of office, we, who are required to pass on the qualifications of every one of them, go around trying to catch a ride, thumbing a ride from time to time in order to get downtown, or to reach our apartments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The very distinguished Senator from Alabama has always been a man of courage, and he has stood here and voted for what he believed to be right in this matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to ask him whether he can imagine, if the $2,500 expense account creates this racket in the Senate, what would happen if he should propose that each Senator and Representative should be furnished a long, slinky Packard limousine or Cadillac limousine, with a chauffeur, such as every bureau in Washington has, at least one, and sometimes more?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would need the detail of a whole regiment of soldiers to get me out of the Senate Chamber, if I seriously made such a proposal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago, in answering a question propounded by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Alabama stated that his proposal would not fix the salaries of Senators and Representatives on a permanent basis.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is there in the language to indicate that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is merely a deficiency appropriation bill, and the appropriations under it run only to June 30.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not according to the copy of the amendment I have. The amendment I have states that "the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $13,500 per annum each; the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of $19,500 each."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I had a proviso in the amendment. I intended to include the words "to June 30." I will amend it now, because this is a deficiency bill, and I have no intention of fixing a permanent program. I think Congress will do its duty and in the regular way deal with the salaries of Members of Congress, as well as other officials, probably. But I do not think we should mix our compensation with that of any other group of employees or officials of the Government. We are legislative, they are executive, and I do not intend to vote to provide for a readjustment of compensation as between Senators and Representatives and other officials.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose Congress should adopt the Senator's proposal. Would not the Members of the House of Representatives receive, in addition to the compensation fixed, the $2,500 extra they are now receiving?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Members of the House would, of course. We cannot deal with them. I am dealing with the Senate. I have pointed out that it is disgraceful for us to remain in the situation in which we have been, and neglect the whole compensation program so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that if Congress should adopt the Senator's proposal a United States Senator would be paid at the rate of $13,500 a year, and Members of the House $16,000. Am I correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what it would be. The $2,500 additional now paid Members of the House, plus the $13,500, would aggregate $16,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If we count the $2,500 as compensation.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is really salary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Whatever it may be, that should not deter us for, while Members of Congress are not, of course, on a starvation basis, yet they are on a basis far below what they have heretofore enjoyed socially, economically, and in business.

Mr. President, I do not care to take further time. Every Member of the Senate understands what is involved. They say, "Yes, we should have more pay; we need it; it is in the interest of the people that we should have it, but—" There is always "but, if, and." Some circumstances arise which keep some from going on record. I stated that I would add to the amendment the provision that it should apply through June 30, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I have said, I am not trying to go fully into this subject at this time. It would not satisfy me to stop at $13,500 as permanent compensation. I do not think that is adequate; I do not think it is sufficient. My amendment merely meets the various arguments which have been made, and will put many to the test as to whether the arguments which have been made on this floor are really the result of the convictions of those who have spoken that Members of Congress should have their salaries increased commensurate with the increase in the cost of living. I make it apply for only a time, until Congress can work out a permanent program. It would commit the Senate to the idea that something, at least, must be done. If we cannot agree on anything else, here is a little; we will at lease make a start. If we cannot agree on anything else, then we will have this, and perhaps get this much.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In connection with his very forceful and able address relative to this problem, I think the Senator from Alabama should at this time point out that many very able men in both branches of Congress have to face the prospect of leaving the Congress. There were two very recent examples in the House of Representatives. One was Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, who is one of the very able Members of the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He is the ranking Democrat on the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then there is Mr. RAMSPECK, chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, another very able man.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He is the whip of the majority party, it may be pointed out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Both of them have been forced, as a result of the salary situation, to leave the Congress as of the first of the year, and take positions where they will receive two or three or four times what they are getting as Members of Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me point out one further argument, that the tax on his salary would decrease the amount a Senator would receive, so that he would get but little more than $11,000. The Government by way of tax would take $3,000 or more out of the salary fixed. So the Government would not even pay out as much as is provided.

Congressional salaries were fixed back in the old days when Federal salaries were all exempt, when salaries of Members of Congress were exempt. A salary increase to about $11,000 would be the total effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I stated from memory approximately the amount of money that would be left to a Member of Congress from a salary of $13,300. I now have the correct figures before me, and I ask that this statement of figures be substituted for what I stated from memory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the Revenue Act of 1945 a Member of Congress with a salary of $10,000 per annum (claiming himself and wife as exemptions) would have withheld from his salary $1,604.40, leaving his net salary $8,395.60. (Tax equals 16 percent of salary.)

With a salary of $15,000 per annum, he would have withheld $2,580, leaving his net salary $12,420. (Tax equals 17.2 percent of salary.)

With a salary of $13,300 per annum, he would have withheld $2,256.96, leaving his net salary $11,043.04. (Tax equals approximately 17 percent of salary.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. What is the pending amendment? May we have it read at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], as modified, will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Up to and including June 30, 1946, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $13,300 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of $19,950 per annum each.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I inquire whether that pay increase takes effect immediately, if we adopt the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. LANGER. Does the increase in salary, or whatever Senators may choose to call it, take effect immediately after the bill is passed and signed by the President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the 1st of January.

Mr. LANGER. Of next January?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to make my position very plain and clear, and I shall take but a minute to do so. So far as I am personally concerned the people of my State elected me as one of the two Senators from my State under a contract to pay me $10,000 a year. I want to make it very clear that I believe I would be betraying the trust of the people of the State of North Dakota if I voted to increase my own salary one single penny, either directly or by any artifice or subterfuge.

I intend to vote against any measure in any shape, manner, or form which will in any way increase that salary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], as amended.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to make a statement in the best of feeling to my colleague from North Dakota. He said that the people of his State elected him to serve here at a contract price of $10,000. That is one way of putting it. I was elected in 1933 to serve in the House of Representatives, when the salary was $10,000. One of the first acts I voted in favor of was an economy measure, so-called, which reduced my salary $1,500 a year for 3 years. That was done by act of Congress. It was a commendable act. It was a necessary act. The condition which then prevailed no longer obtains in this country. I am only speaking to the Senator's argument that he was elected under contract. The Congress of the United States has the power to fix the salaries of its own Members, and that is what the amendment now pending proposes to do. It is not a question of a compact with the voters of the States at all. We are sufficient unto ourselves, and the people of whatever State we come from will accept our judgment, I am sure, with equanimity and with confidence.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to say that I was elected governor of my State at a salary of $5,000. It was decreased 20 percent, and made $4,000. I simply submit that if any Senator cannot get along on $10,000 a year, the amount which was his pay at the time he was elected, he has a very simple method out, and that is to resign and let somebody else take his place who can live on $10,000 a year.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Amplifying the remarks of my colleague on my right, again in the best of feeling, I point out that his argument seems to me to be that if costs have gone up and Senators cannot live on the $10,000 fixed salary, then they can resign. Of course, that is elementary. We all know that. But is the Senator from North Dakota going to apply that rule all along the line to men who toil, men who labor, men who spin, and simply say to them if their costs of living go up, "If you do not like your job, get out"? Or is the Senator going to act as a statesman, a man of foresight and courage and

guts, and say to the men who labor and toil, "If your costs have gone up we are going to see to it that you receive adequate compensation"? What is the Senator's answer to that question?

Mr. LANGER. The answer to that is that in a period of drouth, when half our people in the drouth South were on relief, I did not notice United States Senators at that time reducing their salaries, let us say, one-half, to $5,000, or such a sum as that.

Mr. TOBEY. That, Mr. President, does not answer my question. Would the Senator apply the rule he applied in the present case to those who toil for a living, and would he say to them, "If your living costs have gone up, and if you do not like your present condition, then get out and quit your job"? Is that the rule the Senator would apply to them?

Mr. LANGER. I will answer the Senator by saying that when Senators were conducting their election campaigns the salaries of Members of Congress were $10,000 a year each, and everyone knew it. There are many individuals who do not run for public office because they figure they cannot get along on $10,000 a year. If the salary of Members of Congress were $15,000 a year the Senator from New Hampshire might have a candidate running against him in the State of New Hampshire who might say, "I will run for this office since the salary is $15,000 a year." The Senator knew when he was running for Senator that he would receive a salary of $10,000 a year for a period of 6 years.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has not yet answered my question, but I will leave the matter as it now stands. My question was: In the specific instance I have given would the Senator apply the principle of economic sanction to those who toil, regardless of how much their cost of living has gone up? Would he say to them, "If you are not willing to accept the wage paid when you came on this job, very well, get out"? Is that the policy the Senator would adopt?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator speaks of policy. The situation is simply this, that the people who toil or who spin are not hired for a period of 6 years. They are not public officials. They hire out for a day or a month——

Mr. TOBEY. Or for a year—indefinitely, in future.

Mr. LANGER. Well, make it 5 years. They simply go to the boss who employs them, and talk it over, and they come to an agreement.

Mr. TOBEY. Would the Senator's answer to the people who toil be, "If you do not like your present situation, get out"?

Mr. LANGER. Oh, no. But, Mr. President, we are elected under a peculiar situation. We are in a position of trust. We cannot say, "We are going to raise our own salaries," because we are in that position of trust. We not only represent ourselves, but we represent the people of the country.

Mr. TOBEY. Do not the people of North Dakota, the State from which the Senator comes, have confidence enough in BILL LANGER, United States Senator, to say, "He is down there in Washington on the job. He knows what the cost of living is. He knows the expenses that BILL LANGER and his colleagues have to meet. If they need more pay to meet expenses, then they ought to have it." Would not the people of North Dakota say that, I ask the Senator?

Mr. LANGER. I want to say to the junior Senator from New Hampshire that BILL LANGER is not going to put it up to the people of North Dakota or to the people of any other State.

Mr. TOBEY. If the question, as I have just stated it, were put to the people of the Senator's State, would they not say "Amen"?

Mr. LANGER. I do not think so.

Mr. TOBEY. Well, try it on them and see.

Mr. LANGER. No; I am not going to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe that the argument of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is extremely inconsistent. He contends that he made a contract with the people of North Dakota to work for a certain salary. I take it that the Senator from North Dakota intends to vote for the Downey bill. I intend to vote for the Downey bill. Most of those affected by that bill are now working under a contract with the Government, working under civil service at a certain rate of pay. According to the argument of the Senator from North Dakota, we would not be justified in voting for a 20-percent increase in the case of Government employees. They agreed to come to Washington, or to work in North Dakota or New Mexico, at a certain definite salary, under civil-service rules. However, I believe that under the circumstances which affect Government employees, the Congress is justified in voting them an increase of 20 percent, and possibly more.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The answer is, of course, that the distinguished Senator is begging the question. He knows very well that every man who takes a job under the Government realizes that if he renders satisfactory service he may receive more pay. He may be up-graded. But we are elected for a definite term of 6 years at $10,000 a year. Perhaps some other man in New Mexico might have been a candidate for the same office had he known that the salary was to be $15,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to take a chance with anyone who wishes to take a shot at the Senatorship from New Mexico, either this afternoon or at election time. However, the point which the Senator made was that we were elected to Congress at a salary of $10,000, and that, even if the cost of living should go up, we would not be justified in seeking an increase.

Last night the Committee on Appropriations worked until about 8 o'clock. It reported a bill which is being properly presented by the Senator from Tennessee. The bill involves appropriations of billions of dollars. Does the Senator believe that any private industry which trusted a group of men to spend the amount of money carried in the bill which we are now considering would pay them only $10,000 a year?

Mr. LANGER. The answer to that is that we knew exactly what we were going to get for a period of 6 years, namely, $10,000 a year. A man working for private industry knows when he is employed that he may receive an increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the increase suggested by the Senator from Alabama becomes law the Senator from North Dakota, in keeping with his desire to comply with his agreement with the people of North Dakota, will not be compelled to take the increase.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that. Of course, I would not be compelled to take it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this situation reminds me of something which happened in my home State several years ago. In one of the largest counties in the State there was a movement to increase the salaries of county officers. The proposal met with the approval of everyone but the prosecuting attorney. He was asked if he did not want his salary raised. He said, "No. It may cause some good man to run against me." [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Bankhead	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Saltonstall
Byrd	La Follette	Smith
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Mitchell	Wherry
Gossett	Moore	White
Green	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdock	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BILBO in the chair). Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about the proposed salary increase. I speak as a poor man. I have never been rich. During all my life I have always tried to be provident and keep my finances in as

good order as possible. Before I came to the Senate the greatest debt I ever incurred at one time was $2,500. At the present time I am in debt to the extent of approximately $14,000.

I am not excited about the contract. I did not draw up a contract to come here at a definite figure. I may have known just before I was elected to the Senate what the salary was. I ran three times before I made the grade. I am certain that I can say in all truth that during one or two of those campaigns I was not at all certain what the salary was. I did not care. I would have run if it had been $5,000, $6,000, or any other figure. I wanted to come to the United States Senate because I felt that I could be helpful to the people. So it is not a matter of the salary at which I agreed to come here. Some Senators may consider themselves bound by a sacred contract. The Senator from North Dakota says, "If you do not like it you can resign." Certainly if one had a high regard for his contract he would not resign. If he had agreed to come here for 6 years, and could not live on his salary, he would stay here and starve to death, but he would observe his contract.

I do not mean to imply that anyone is likely to starve on $10,000 a year; but I think I can give a pretty fair account of what happens to a man who has no other resources. I came here and took up residence in a hotel. For five and one-half months my wife and I and two small children lived in a hotel. It was not very pleasant. During all that time we diligently sought some place to live. For $250 a month we could have obtained an apartment just large enough for us to get into, with two bedrooms, no room to accommodate help of any kind, and no room for guests.

Mr. President, I repeat that we could have gotten an apartment of that kind for $250 a month; that was the minimum. The only fly in the ointment was that those who controlled the apartment would not rent it to us because we had children. For a furnished house to accommodate us the owners or agents wanted around $400 or $500 a month. So we decided that the sensible thing to do was to buy a house. We found that a great majority of Senators live in the northwest section. So we went to a real-estate agent, and said to him, "We would like to live out there with the rest of the boys and be sociable." So he took me out there and showed me a house. It was a brick colonial house of seven rooms, with a lot about 12 feet wide and about 50 or 60 feet long on one side of the house. The garage doors were falling off their hinges; the plaster was coming off the ceilings in the house. It had an attic which was not finished, although the real-estate dealer pointed out that it would be very easy to finish it and have another room up there. He wanted $24,000 for it. I said to him, "Mister, I am in the wrong neighborhood. You can just turn around and start in another direction, some place."

So he took my wife and me into the Southeast section, and we looked around. We looked at row houses. They are pushed right up together, you know, and they are very dark. My family have not been used to living in luxury, but at least out in Idaho there is lots of sunshine, and it is free. [Laughter.] In Idaho we had windows on all four sides of our house and we could get some sunshine without any extra cost.

We looked at row houses. Even the best of them are dingy. That is the only way they can be described. The owner of one wanted $10,000 for it. I offered to buy it for that figure, and the woman said she would speak to her husband about it. When I went back they wanted $12,000.

Then I went across the street, near here, and found an old row house three stories high, on top of a basement, and the basement was on top of the ground. But there was one good thing about the house: it had hardwood floors. Well, the owner wanted $8,500 for that one. We would have gotten lots of exercise running up and down the four flights of stairs, and the house would have had to be remodeled and refurbished completely before we could live in it. So I said, "Well, I will take it; but first I want to see a contractor, to see how much it will cost to fix it up so that we can live in it." The owners wanted $8,500 for the house; and I found out that a contractor would want $5,000 to fix it up so that we could live in it. But I said, "Well, all right; I guess it is about the best deal we can get." So I went back to the house, but when I got there it had a sign on the front, "Sold." They had sold it while I was considering the contract. [Laughter.]

So we started looking again. We found a house. It was a double-width row house, made of brick. It was twice as wide as any other row house we had seen, but the owners wanted $15,000 for it. We had decided that we could not possibly go above $10,000, but that house looked much nicer than a single-width row house; it looked something like a real house; it had some room in it. So we decided we would take it, anyway. We bought it in March, with the understanding that we could occupy it within 30 days. But we did not actually get in until May; we simply could not get the people out of it before then.

So we are there now. There is nothing fancy about the house. It was built long ago when hardwood was plentiful but pine was scarce. So all the trimmings of the house are made of hardwood, but they are real high-toned and the floors are made of pine.

I saw plainly that we would not be able to make ends meet, the way things were going; so I put my wife on the pay roll, and she is on the pay roll now. We have always worked together, and regardless of whether she was on the pay roll, I am sure she would spend a great deal of her time at the office because we enjoy each other's company. Nevertheless, she is on the pay roll and she is going to stay there until someone passes a law that will take her off the pay roll. [Laughter.]

So I feel that most certainly Members of the Congress should have more money. I do not believe the people of Idaho expect me to go into debt, as I have had to do here, and stay in that condition and pay out a good percentage of my salary as interest to the banks, as I am doing now.

I may point out that last night I read in the newspaper that Mr. Mayer, of Loew's, Inc., which I believe is the name of the organization, made $900,000 last year. That is almost as much as the entire Senate made. Well, maybe he is worth more than all of us put together; I do not know. [Laughter.] I will wager that he has more guts than there are here. Even if we trim down the figure and consider it after the deduction of taxes, Mr. Mayer receives a greater net income than do more than 14 Senators.

We have had presented to us the Heller study, which was made by a group composed of labor leaders, farmer representatives, consumer representatives, and business leaders. They studied the problem, and they said Members of Congress should be paid at least $25,000 a year. The mayor of New York is paid that much, I understand. Bill Green and John L. Lewis get that much. Yet we who must decide on stupendous tax bills and appropriations and UNRRA and all the other problems which come up do not seem to think we are worth the money.

I am not afraid of raising our salaries. If after raising our salaries I find that a better man will run against me and will beat me, that will be all right. I came here firmly determined to vote as though I never expected to come back here. I am going to work like hell to get back [laughter], but I am going to vote that way.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] for taking the firm, courageous stand which he did. I wish to compliment the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for his action in this matter. I understand he is a man of considerable wealth, and I appreciate especially having a man in his position stick out his neck when he does not have to do so. I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] for putting up the fight he has made on this proposition. I understand that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], also a wealthy man, is likewise in favor of the proposal.

Certainly I do not wish to see this body become a rich man's club. As the Senator from North Dakota said, if you do not like it you can quit and let someone who has more money take the job. Mr. President, that is what it amounts to.

Mind you, I will stay here at $10,000; I would stay here at $5,000. In that event I would pitch a tent out here on the lawn, and I would defy them to put me off. So I would stay here. But I do not believe the people intend to have us receive such small salaries while we are representing them here.

I wish to call attention to the fact that we are allowed no tax deductions whatever—none at all. I also wish to call attention to the fact that Representative RAMSPECK and Representative WOODRUM have resigned from the House of Representatives simply for financial reasons—or else they did not tell the truth. They

said that was the reason, and I am willing to take their word for it.

The other day Secretary Clinton Anderson appeared before us, and he was practically crying. He said his good men were leaving his Department because he could not pay them enough.

Mr. President, I will vote for any measure which may be proposed to provide for either temporarily or permanently increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. As I have said, if any Member of Congress does not wish to receive the increased salary, he can vote to help us poor benighted heathens who do want it to receive it, and then he will not have to take it for himself.

So, Mr. President, for all these reasons I hope this amendment will be adopted. I believe its adoption is justified by all the facts of the case. I do not believe that we signed any contract to continue here at the same salary. In fact, we did not sign any contract. At any rate, we got the job to come here and be Senators, to think for ourselves and, literally, to think for the people of America insofar as legislation is concerned. There is only one way in the world to raise congressional salaries, and that is for us to raise them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and will vote. I vote "yea." If the Senator from Louisiana were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at various Government departments.

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "nay."

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay." His general pair and transfer has been announced.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who would vote "nay" if present, is paired on this question with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bankhead	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Taylor
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McMahon	Tobey
Green	Mead	Tydings
Hayden	Mitchell	Wagner
Hill	Morse	

NAYS—45

Austin	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Huffman	Revercomb
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Knowland	Russell
Bushfield	La Follette	Saltonstall
Byrd	Langer	Smith
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Carville	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Gossett	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Young

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken	Ferguson	Overton
Andrews	George	Shipstead
Bailey	Glass	Stanfill
Brewster	Guffey	Stewart
Briggs	Hart	Taft
Buck	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Wheeler
Capehart	McCarran	Wiley
Cordon	Magnuson	
Eastland	Myers	

So Mr. BANKHEAD's amendment as modified was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, for the fiscal year 1945, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1946 is hereby amended by striking out "night watchman, $1,920", under the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and inserting in lieu thereof "special officer, $2,280", and the necessary amount is hereby authorized to be expended from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate beginning January 1, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

Beginning January 1, 1946, the salary of the secretary for the majority shall be at the rate of $5,400 per annum and $1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

The Sergeant at Arms is authorized to install in the offices of Senators special telephone wiring plans with features to pick up, hold and intercommunicate on one to three lines, the cost thereof to be paid out of the appropriation for "Miscellaneous items, contingent expenses of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

For an additional allowance for stationery of $500 for each Senator and the President of the Senate, for the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, $48,500, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

For an additional amount for "miscellaneous items," exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1945, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expense of the House," on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

Whenever the usual day for paying salaries in or under the Senate or House of Representatives falls on Saturday, the respective disbursing officers are authorized to make such payments on the preceding workday.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 12, to insert:

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

For carrying out the provisions of Public, No. 523, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944, fiscal year 1945, $1,183.47, to remain available until June 30, 1946, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 21, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

The provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917," approved May 10, 1916, as amended (relating to dual compensation), shall not apply to services rendered by the assistant clerk and stenographer of the Joint Committee on Printing from May 16 to August 3, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Architect of the Capitol," on page 5, after line 6, to insert:

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Capitol buildings: For an additional amount for the Capitol Building, including the same objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, $19,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

Erection of a statue of George Washington on the Capitol Grounds: To enable the Architect of the Capitol to acquire a statue of George Washington and a suitable granite pedestal upon which to erect such statue and to defray all expenses of erecting such statue upon the Capitol grounds, all as authorized by the act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 299), $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The Judiciary—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals," on page 6, after line 4, to insert:

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS OF EXPENSE

Salaries of criers: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946; for "salaries of criers," $20,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. This provides for 16 additional criers who shall act as bailiffs and messengers for the Federal judges. They will receive salaries of $2,100 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Executive Office of the President," on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267, 78th Cong.), to be available for expenditure in the manner specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, and subject to the recommendations contained in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946, $400,000,000: *Provided*, That this additional appropriation shall not become available prior to the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4649, 79th Cong.) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 7, line 1, to strike out "$400,000,000" and insert "$750,000,000."

Mr. President, the House has passed a bill authorizing $1,350,000,000 more for UNRRA. The Senate committee has reported the bill. This amendment would make the appropriation contingent upon that bill becoming the law.

It was reported to the full committee that now is the crucial time to make these appropriations if any are to be made. It is said that looking after the needy in the countries which are enumerated in the bill will require at least the $750,000,000, until April 1, and in addition thereto furnish seed for the planting of crops in the various countries where there have been very much smaller crops because of the ravages of war.

For that reason the President has very urgently requested that the additional appropriation be fixed at $750,000,000. It seems to me that if the Congress is to authorize it, it would be better to provide the money while it will do the most good. We all know that the principal distress and trouble will occur between now and the 1st of April, and it seems to me that the seed should be furnished in order to give these distressed people a chance to make crops for themselves in the coming year.

Mr. President, for these reasons the amount carried in the amendment is sought to be raised from $400,000,000 to $750,000,000. The vote in the committee was very close. I hope the Senate will generously provide this sum for the poor and needy of the other countries, and give them a chance to work out their salvation by furnishing them seed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the amount first proposed, $400,000,000, or the $750,000,000 proposed by the able Senator from Tennessee, be taken into consideration when the new appropriation for UNRRA, just passed by the House, comes before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not catch the question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the figure which is placed in the bill, whether it be $400,000,000 or $750,000,000, as now proposed by the Senator, be deducted from any amount hereafter appropriated for UNRRA?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it will be. The bill in the House and the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have authorized the appropriation of $1,350,000,000. The amount carried in the bill now before the Senate will be taken out of that authorization. We cannot appropriate unless an appropriation is authorized, and if the Senator will examine the amendment he will see that inasmuch as the bill which was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday has not passed, we have to provide that this appropriation shall not be available until the bill passes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That means that if the authorization is passed, whatever may be appropriated under the pending bill will be a credit against that authorization?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The Senator has it exactly correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to reiterate what I said in the committee. We are going at the foreign loan business and the UNRRA appropriations just as if we were going over Niagara Falls. We cannot go over a little bit. We are apparently over. We were told originally that $1,350,000,000 would be the end. We were given that assurance by Governor Lehman. But before they were through they were here with another request for $1,300,000,000.

At that time I complained that we did not know where this money was going, and no Member of the Senate knows today. We have not had a hearing and pinned Governor Lehman down to find out whether the needy will actually get this money.

Mr. McKELLAR. Governor Lehman was before the committee, and every Senator on the subcommittee had the right to pin him down and ask him any question on earth he desired to ask.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator say to me now that he is convinced that all this money will reach only those who are the needy?

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not say so because I have not the information.

Mr. BROOKS. No one else can say so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think anyone on earth can say that. All we can do is to take the word of those who are administering the appropriation.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator say whether or not he believes the people who are the beneficiaries of the relief even imagine it comes from America?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not so sure about that. I will state to the Senate what I said to the committee yesterday. My own judgment is that we should see to it that the money goes without cost to the people for whom it is appropriated—that is, to the people themselves, and not to various governmental agencies. On an amendment to that effect I was voted down, and my recollection is my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois helped vote me down. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator is dead wrong about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am happy to make the correction, then, in my own mind, and to make the statement to the Senate, because I would not do the Senator an injustice for anything in the world. The Senator is too good a man for anyone to do him an injustice.

Mr. BROOKS. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that when we were appropriating $500,000,000 I made my protest that we had not written anything into the law which would insure that the recipients of relief would at least know that it came from America, and at that time the distinguished Acting Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said he would join me in that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did join the Senator, but, unfortunately, my amendment was voted down.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sure we cannot stop this now, but I protest again, and say that in passing these laws relating to foreign dealings under the UNRRA we are not insisting that the people in the foreign countries at least know where the money is coming from, and there is no provision which would enable us to know that they actually get the food. I protest against giving the money to foreign governments and letting them do whatever they want with the money to further their power politics, regardless of the people who are starving. I cannot conscientiously oppose an ap-

propriation to feed the poor, but I can conscientiously oppose the way we are doing it.

A bill comes over from the House and is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. They report it to the Senate. Before we even see it, we have to appropriate the money. They say they are not responsible for the appropriation, we say we are not responsible for the legislation, but like a flood the money goes out, and it will continue to go out, until somebody says, "Stop this thing until we can ascertain that the people of the world are going to be at least grateful for the hard-earned taxes our people will have to pay for the rest of their lives because of their great, Christian-hearted, humanitarian instincts."

I realize I cannot stop this today, but I am going to keep on protesting, and with all my energy I ask the Committee on Foreign Relations, before they come again with a bill, please to write into the bill a provision which will prescribe where the money is to go, so that at least we may be assured where it goes.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois made reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I should like to comment.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois seems to lay the blame on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BROOKS. I did not lay it on one committee. I laid it on both committees.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator referred to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations had reported the bill before he saw it. If the Senator had cared to appear at the hearings, he could have seen it and could have testified. The Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings for 2 days on the matter, and we invited anyone who cared to come and testify to appear; so the Committee on Foreign Relations is not solely responsible. We did report an authorization, but the Senator from Illinois does not have to vote for the appropriation unless he cares to do so. The appropriation is one thing, and the authorization is another, so it is up to the Senator from Illinois. If he does not like it, he can vote "no."

Mr. BROOKS. I suggest to the Senator that I did vote "no," and I will vote "no" again, not because I do not want suffering people fed, but because I am not sure they will get the food.

Mr. CONNALLY. The only way the Senator could be sure about that would be for him to go over and distribute the food himself.

Mr. BROOKS. It would be much better if we had Americans distributing the food, and it would be better if we had veterans who fought in these countries placed in charge. I understand we are to give hundreds of millions of dollars to Italy, and there are many servicemen who were in Italy, away from their families, trying to beat down the Italians to the point where they would quit shooting our soldiers, and if we would send some of our servicemen back to distribute this money, they could at least let recipients know that America was sending it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Senators of both the majority and minority were present when the committee went into this matter, and there was not a vote against the authorization. It is up to the Senate to decide whether it wants to appropriate the money or not. It is easy enough for the Senator from Illinois to talk about the questions he raises. Anyone can do that. That is one thing, and our duty here is another.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Arkansas in a moment, but before doing so let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I am sure he recalls that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations took a very determined, firm, and vigorous stand in favor of putting into the Appropriation Act exactly what the Senator suggests on the floor of the Senate today. I still think it was a mistake not to have done it, but it was not done. It has all depended on whether we pass the authorization bill which is before the Senate. So every Senator will have two whacks at the proposal, once in voting against the appropriation if he feels he should do it, and once in voting against the authorization bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very much of the information I desired to obtain has already been given since I first rose and asked the Senator to yield. I did want to understand—and I did not understand on the first reading of the amendment—I did want to understand that this appropriation is yet subject to the action of Congress, even if the amount contained in this bill is authorized. It is still subject to the action of the Congress on the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to ask the Senator whether he knows if the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee makes any change in the basic law, the law we passed originally.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not read it and I would refer the Senator to the Senator from Texas. I inquire of the Senator from Texas if the bill reported by his committee makes any change in the terms of the basic law respecting UNRRA.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, is the bill reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee practically the same as the original act?

Mr. CONNALLY. Practically so. I have not compared them line by line. Any Senator can examine them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I voted against the original bill because I thought then, and I think it is being demonstrated now, that we have been providing the money and paying about 90 percent of every dollar that goes into UNRRA.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; 71 and a fraction percent is paid by the United States. The largest part of the remainder is paid by Great Britain and Russia.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; not Russia.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; Russia makes no contribution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Except to the cost of administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the contribution to administration is paid on the same pro rata basis of percentage.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Russia does make a contribution under the basic law, as I remember, to the administration expense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment and I will give the Senator the figures.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. That is unimportant, however.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was my idea, but it was disputed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is a member of the committee, and one of the most valuable members of the committee. His statement made me hesitate and doubt whether I was correct in the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My recollection is that Russia makes no contribution to UNRRA—that is, to the funds which are distributed—but it does make a contribution to the administrative expense, the expense of distributing. I think that is correct. That is my recollection of the original act. The Senator from Tennessee says we are paying approximately 71 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. A little more than 71 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A little more than 71 percent; that is assuming that all the other countries are contributing. But I dare say that if we take into account that part which has been contributed by Great Britain and by other countries out of lend-lease we have given them, it will be found we are contributing more than 90 percent of the total amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not say about that, but the Administrator said that all other countries had paid their pro rata share as agreed upon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is very much like the situation we have now respecting the loan to Britain. Britain will come into the International Bank and will do several other things if we will furnish the money. That is the way they have gone into UNRRA. We furnished them lend-lease and then they came along with their contribution to supplement our direct contribution of more than 71 percent of the whole.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is clear we have furnished 71 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We have furnished directly 71 percent and more indirectly. That is the reason I make this point. I opposed the bill in the beginning, and the record of my remarks at that time will substantiate what I am saying now. Distribution is being made in the name of an international organization, and we are furnishing substantially all of the money. We find ourselves in the situation today where this relief money and

goods and services and so forth are actually being turned over to governments of other countries and they are administering it and distributing it in the name of those governments, and taking credit for it, and America is getting no credit. Yet America is paying 90 percent of the bill. I do not like the set-up. I want to make and am willing to make a contribution to the people of the world who need help. I want to do it, however, in the name of America, and under the American flag, and let those who receive help know that America is giving them the help they are getting. But today it is not being done that way.

Mr. President, I had a little opportunity while overseas to inquire how UNRRA was administered. The reports I received, and I received them from high authority, were to the effect that UNRRA was not being administered so America received any credit for what was done whatever. I think that is true. For that reason I am not going to vote for the bill to continue UNRRA. I will vote for a bill to authorize appropriations to be expended in the name of my own country, and let the American people get credit for it, and let the help go direct to those who need it, and not to some other government which will distribute it to their political advantage and get credit for it. Let the people know that America is doing it.

It is proposed that we spend a great deal of money for this purpose. How will that money be obtained? It will not be obtained by taxing ourselves. Every dollar of it will be added to the national debt. You, Mr. President, know that, and I know it. We are taxing others who are to come after us, to pay for this. But I do think that since our Government is willing to go so far to help those in distress, I think it ought to be done in the name of the United States of America. For that reason I am going to oppose this appropriation and I expect to oppose the original bill unless some correction is made in it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. If the Senate passes the bill which has been reported from the Foreign Relations Committee, and authorizes an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for the purposes stated in the bill, does it not become the duty of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to appropriate that money? Considering that this season of the year is the cold season, the trying season for the distressed people whom it is sought to aid, does not the Senator from Arkansas think that we ought to contribute sufficient at this time to tide them over until warmer weather comes and to give them the seed to plant their crops? It can be done with $750,000,000, if it is appropriated now. It cannot be done if we appropriate only $400,000,000. Does not the Senator think that if the Senate passes the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee—and this appropriation is dependent on whether the Senate passes that bill—we can do more good by distributing the money at the time when it is most needed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That may be true, if we are going to spend the money. But I do say to the Senator that since I am going to oppose the bill that authorizes the expenditure, I am not going to vote for the expenditure until I have voted against the bill. If we commit ourselves, then the situation may be different. I did not oppose the appropriation made the other day, but I thought that appropriation was to take care of the immediate needs.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. Those needs have already been met.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. When UNRRA was started we all understood it was to provide relief, not reconstruction, not rehabilitation, but relief for the suffering people of the liberated areas.

Mr. McKELLAR. The name of the organization is UNRRA—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. BROOKS. But it was designed to relieve the people of the liberated areas. Now we have changed it somewhat, and I think the Senate ought to know where the money is going; what countries are going to receive it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be received by the same countries that received it before, except in the case of two subdivisions of Russia that now are also going to receive aid. Those are people who were overrun by the Germans and were kept under German rule for about 4 years, until the Russians received our help at Stalingrad and made the westward backsweep toward Germany.

Mr. BROOKS. Can the Senator from Tennessee tell the Senate whether Russia has asked us to feed the people of these two subdivisions of Russia?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, I cannot. They are provided for in the bill. Governor Lehman testified that they had asked for this relief. I wish to say to the Senator that if people in Russia are suffering and we can help them I should like to help them for this reason: I think Russia helped us more in the last war than did any other nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not like to take issue with the Senator from Tennessee on that point, but I think the United States of America helped Russia much more than Russia helped us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, we helped Russia and Russia helped us. She had an army in the field against Germany which was not well fed, which was not well clothed, and did not have sufficient ammunition. We furnished the Russians with those things, and they did a wonderful work, and are now in possession of a part of Germany. I honor them and respect them for what they did. Everyone knows that there is not one-millionth of a particle of communism in me, but I honor and respect people who fight for their country, and I am willing to help them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no disrespect for Russia. I admire Russia for her contribution to the war. I take issue only when Senators stand up and say that Russia did a great deal more for us than we did for Russia.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, no. I stated that I thought that Russia had done more in this war to help America win it than had any other nation. I do not care what nation it is. I think I can maintain that position.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to reiterate that this is a rather loosely handled affair in its entirety, and I resent turning over money to Russia without Russia asking for it and letting that Government sell our food to its people. We are going to tax our people to feed them, and no one in Russia will know where the food came from.

Mr. McKELLAR. Governor Lehman stated that two districts had applied for aid. Let me read what was said, so as to be certain about it:

> I would also like to mention in this connection the limited program of relief and rehabilitation assistance through UNRRA to the two Soviet Republics of the Ukraine and White Russia. Any invaded country is entitled to seek UNRRA assistance, provided that the established procedures and policies for such assistance, as agreed upon among the member nations and embodied in the UNRRA resolutions, are observed. The Soviet Union had made an application for UNRRA aid shortly in advance of the Council meeting in the amount of $700,000,000, which was only enough to cover a part of the minimum supplies essential to relieve their civilian population on terms similar to those of adjacent areas.

Those are the facts. For my part, I would infinitely rather help the indigent and needy in a nation which went to the front and helped us in this great struggle than to help the indigent and needy in countries which either played on both sides or which did not help us at all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A few days ago I heard that if one wished to see Mr. Lehman, he must first obtain the consent of a Britisher. I did not believe it at the time, but I hold in my hand the headquarters telephone directory, issued by the Bureau of Finance and Administration, Division of Administrative Services. Sure enough, I find that Mr. Lehman's assistant, in charge of the office here, the man whom one must see if he wishes to see Mr. Lehman, does not come from Tennessee. He does not come from the State of Montana. He does not come from Maine. He does not come from any one of our 48 States. He is a Britisher.

Looking further, we find the Office of Senior Deputy Director General, the man who will have charge of the $750,000,000. Who is he? Not one of the veterans whom my distinguished friend from Illinois mentioned a few moments ago. He is Sir Robert Jackson, of England, who

has an office here, and who will handle the $750,000,000 which we shall appropriate sooner or later. So I have prepared an amendment, to which I believe the Senator from Tennessee will have no objection. It is the same as the committee amendment, with this additional language:

Provided, That all of said money shall be administered and distributed by American veterans of World War I and World War II.

Would the Senator accept such an amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I would be loath to accept it without having any evidence on the question. The Senator could have brought that amendment before the committee, where it could have been considered by the committee. The committee did not refuse the request of anyone to be heard. It did not turn down Mr. Lehman and those associated with him. It did not turn down those who were against Mr. Lehman. I believe that Governor Lehman has a room in my hotel. I myself have never called on him, but I know that he would be glad to see the Senator at any time; and if the Senator has any trouble in meeting Mr. Lehman, I will take the trouble to see that the Senator meets Governor Lehman if he would like to meet him.

I believe that the Senator has a great deal of misinformation on this question. It is true that others than Americans are working for this service, because it is an Allied Nations' service. It is true that we furnish most of the money. We furnish 71 and a fraction percent of the money. It may be that all those in charge of the administration should be Americans. I certainly would like to see American soldiers get any jobs they want. I do not think I have ever turned down a soldier in my life. I have been a Member of Congress for 34 years, but I do not think I have ever turned down a soldier who wanted a job or who wanted any other favor. I do not expect to do so. But I do not believe that it is the proper thing to do to offer such an amendment at this point, providing that the administration of these funds shall be handled by returning soldiers, when we have not had any evidence on the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to make this observation to the Senator from North Dakota: My information is that the second largest contributor to this fund is Great Britain. We contribute approximately 71 percent of the whole enterprise, but the 29 percent which we do not contribute amounts to approximately half a billion dollars, which is a very sizable sum of money. Of that half a billion dollars, the major portion comes from the British. It seems to me, therefore, entirely appropriate that in an international organization composed of 44 nations the deputy administrator, the next one under the head, the head being an American, should be a representative of the British. I am advised that the deputy administrator is not only a Britisher, but a Scotsman, and that he is very cautious about the expenditure of money. So there is a positive advantage in having a Scotsman looking after our expenditures, to see that the money is not wasted. Perhaps there is an asset rather than a liability in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let us look at this thing in a fair way. Australia contributes to this fund. It is a part of the British Empire. It contributes $38,000,000. Canada contributes $69,000,000, and Egypt $4,000,000. The Union of South Africa contributes $18,000,000. The United Kingdom contributes $322,000,000.

It will be seen, Mr. President, that the United States Government contributes the greater part of the fund, but the British Empire contributes a very large sum, the next largest sum. In order to sustain the statement which I have made, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the contributions of all countries as of September 30, 1945.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of contributions (operating and administrative)—all countries, as of Sept. 30, 1945

[Values in United States dollar equivalents]

Country	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization	Total contributions paid or available on request	
		Amount	Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Australia	$38,400,000	$38,400,000	100
Belgium*	175,000	175,000	100
Bolivia	95,000	32,000	33
Brazil	30,000,000	10,000,000	33
Canada	69,369,000	69,369,000	100
Chile	2,153,000	0	0
China*	875,000	875,000	100
Colombia	2,356,000	52,000	2
Costa Rica	400,000	0	0
Cuba	35,000	35,000	100
Czechoslovakia*	175,000	100,000	57
Denmark*	19,000	0	0
Dominican Republic	350,000	245,000	70
Ecuador	150,000	0	0
Egypt	4,256,000	70,000	2
El Salvador	129,000	5,000	4
Ethiopia*	9,000	9,000	100
France*	700,000	700,000	100
Greece*	87,000	87,000	100
Guatemala	9,000	9,000	100
Haiti	49,000	49,000	100
Honduras	59,000	59,000	100
Iceland	718,000	718,000	100
India	24,042,000	24,042,000	100
Iran	18,000	0	0
Iraq	18,000	18,000	100
Liberia	9,000	9,000	100
Luxemburg*	9,000	9,000	100
Mexico	3,602,000	1,148,000	32
Netherlands*	262,000	262,000	100
New Zealand	8,476,000	8,476,000	100
Nicaragua	129,000	5,000	4
Norway*	52,000	52,000	100
Panama	400,000	142,000	35
Paraguay	38,000	10,000	26
Peru	1,000,000	793,000	79
Philippines*	9,000	9,000	100
Poland*	175,000	100,000	57
Union of South Africa	18,135,000	4,130,000	23

*The Council recommended that member countries whose area had not been occupied by the enemy contribute 1 percent of their national income for 1943. Countries indicated by the asterisk are those whose area was occupied by the enemy and such countries have contributed only to the administrative expenses.

Status of contributions (operating and administrative)—all countries, as of Sept. 30, 1945—Continued

[Values in United States dollar equivalents]

Country	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization	Total contributions paid or available on request	
		Amount	Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*	$1,750,000	$1,000,000	57
United Kingdom	322,400,000	322,400,000	100
United States of America	1,350,000,000	800,000,000	59
Uruguay	520,000	485,000	93
Venezuela	1,017,000	17,000	2
Yugoslavia*	122,000	70,000	57
Total	1,822,760,000	1,284,166,000	68

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he does not believe that when Mr. Lehman is called away, as he very frequently is, to Europe and other countries, the man in charge of all this money should be an American citizen? I may suggest that many American citizens are of Scotch ancestry.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is the situation: If we ask other nations to join with us in this enterprise we must show our willingness to be cheerful givers, and ask them to give cheerfully. In order that that may be done, there must be some kind of recognition of the contributions made by other nations. Would the Senator go to the extreme and say, "Whereas 71 percent of this money is contributed by the United States, regardless of what other nations put into this fund they shall have no representation in determining how the money shall be distributed"? I am sure the Senator will agree that that would not be the right thing to do.

I cannot agree with Senators who say that this should be entirely an American operation. I base that statement upon our experience with American relief after the last war. We turned over to Mr. Hoover many millions of dollars. The relief was labeled American relief. The administration was headed by an American. The beneficiaries of that relief received aid from an American source, and it was so understood by everyone. What happened? We did not have enough to go around. We did not give everyone all he wanted, and when we came out of it we gained no particular credit. Looking back 25 years ago, does anyone think that there are people in Europe who are grateful to America when we did not have money enough to take care of them fully?

There is an advantage in the present arrangement. There will not be money sufficient to take care of all the needy, but the failure to take care of all the needy will not be blamed upon the United States alone, which is considered the richest country in the world and able to grant relief. A world organization composed of 44 nations will say, "We have come to the time when we must

stop." That time has been fixed by the organization, so far as Europe is concerned, as the 31st of December next year, approximately a year from now. In other areas it will extend into the spring of the following year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to reply to the question which was raised by the Senator from North Dakota. The other evening I spent more than 2 hours with the Deputy Administrator, who comes from London. At first he did not impress me. After talking with him and listening to him for more than 2 hours I was very much impressed with his knowledge of the whole situation throughout Europe, as well as the situation in China and Korea. I believe that he is a very careful administrator. We, who put up 71 percent of the money, have the Administrator in Governor Lehman. He is the policy-maker, as I understand. The man to whom I refer is the Deputy Administrator, with personnel under him. I should say that he is an extremely well qualified man. He did 4 years' work in Malta. Following that he did a great deal of work in Cairo. As the distinguished Senator from Arizona has stated, he is a Scotsman. After listening to him, I came to the conclusion that he was extremely careful as to how the money was being spent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that out of 130,000,000 Americans, we could find one just as capable as the man the Senator has described?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Then why should not we use him?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because the policy-maker is an American, and I think it is much more important that the policy-maker be an American, rather than to have an American as the administrator of personnel, who is under the policy-maker. I think an American should be the one to be the policy-maker, the one to guide the policies. That is what I am proposing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me answer the Senator from North Dakota. He has suggested an amendment which he wishes to have me accept on behalf of the committee. The Senator has had some little experience with the workings of the Appropriations Committee for the last several weeks because he has been before it. I am quite sure he would say openly, to everyone, that that committee has acted exceedingly fair and just and has heard all witnesses who cared to be heard.

Mr. LANGER. I will attest to that; it is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have tried to be exceedingly fair in every way, not only in respect to this matter, but in respect to all other matters. I do not think the Senator, upon reflection, would ask us to accept an amendment of this kind unless testimony had been adduced. The Senator can get one opinion about UNRRA from one person and another opinion about it from another person. After all, we depend upon the testimony which is presented to us; and if ever there was a free and fair opportunity for all interested people to be heard on all the questions which come before us, it was had in connection with consideration of this deficiency bill by the committee. We have been daily at work, as I remember, for approximately 6 weeks. We have been at work very vigorously for 2 weeks, but the matter has been before us for twice that long, I am sure. We have been working very vigorously and actively, trying to settle these questions. We barred the door to no one who wished to tell us what he thought about the question before us.

So I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not insist upon the amendment which he has suggested.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Personally, I wish to attest to the very fine work of the Appropriations Committee. However, in my judgment the committee is not informed about the work of UNRRA. For example, I hold in my hand a list of the heads of UNRRA in all the countries in which it is operating. Does the Senator from Tennessee know that 90 percent of all the men who are administering UNRRA in Europe are Britishers? I can understand why it might be necessary to hire one occasionally, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to relate to the Senator a story which will show how wrong he is.

Mr. LANGER. Well, I hold the list in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. A soldier who has returned from one of the European countries receiving UNRRA aid said that while he was abroad he entered a restaurant to eat lunch, and that after he had been there a few minutes a man drove up in an American limousine with UNRRA marked on it. The soldier—a major in the Army, and he is a splendid young man—said he thought that would be a good chance to talk to someone from home, especially in view of the fact that when the UNRRA officer entered the restaurant he sat down at the same table, to eat his lunch. So the major said to him, "How did you leave things at home?"

The answer was, "Huh?"

The major said, "Well, how did you leave things in America?"

Again the answer was, "Huh?"

Then the major said, "Don't you speak English?"

Again the answer was, "Huh?"

In other words, Mr. President, the UNRRA representative could not speak a word of English. Certainly, if England has reached the point of having men who cannot speak the English language, that is most unusual.

I do not believe all these UNRRA men are English. I think all the nations are represented proportionally or substantially proportionally among the UNRRA representatives. Out of a total of 8,471, Great Britain has 2,285.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; but I am speaking of the heads. They are the ones I am interested in.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the head was not an American, the Senator would have some complaint, it seems to me. But the head of this organization is an American; he is a former Governor of the State of New York. He has a very excellent reputation. I do not know him, except very casually, but he bears a very fine reputation. I believe he has twice been elected Governor of the State of New York, and apparently he acted in a very reasonable and sensible way while serving as Governor of that State.

It seems to me, since we furnish 71 percent of the funds for this purpose, that if the head of the organization was not an American, there would be some reason for complaint on our part. But when we furnish the larger part of the fund and when Great Britain as an empire furnishes the second largest amount, nothing could be more natural or fairer, in my judgment, than that the head of the organization should be an American and that the second in command should be a representative of the British Empire. For that reason, it seems to me the Senator's argument is not well founded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say a word at this juncture, I should like to point out to the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee that in the same conference which I had with the Deputy Administrator the other evening he told me—and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who was there, will confirm the statement—that there are now openings for at least three Americans among their top policy positions, if they can get them, but that the great difficulty is to get American citizens who will serve at the salaries which UNRRA is able to pay.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me once more?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to make clear to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that I am not impugning anything in regard to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand.

Mr. LANGER. The Appropriations Committee is a very fine group of men, and they treated me nicely; but I wish to say that I hold in my hand a list of the top men in the UNRRA organization, and the list shows their addresses and locations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will have the list printed in the RECORD. However, under the circumstances, in view of the fact that the British Empire is furnishing the second largest share of the fund and, I suppose, is being as generous as it can be, it seems to me that in all fairness the British should have the second place in the administration of the fund.

Mr. LANGER. Then I will adopt the suggestion of the distinguished acting chairman of the committee and I will ascertain the country of origin of each of the men on the list, and I will have that information placed following the name of each of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that will be fine.

Mr. LANGER. In that way the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will have the information. I shall submit it to him, and he can have it placed in the RECORD if he wishes to do so.

I simply wish to call attention to the fact that in Frankfort, Germany, the man in charge of the operations of UNRRA is Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that no UNRRA relief is being furnished in Germany.

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I have the information on the list which I hold in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be on the list, but I am sure UNRRA is not furnishing relief in Germany. Relief in Germany is being furnished by the Army—not by UNRRA.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Perhaps UNRRA is supervising the work at camps in Germany where displaced persons are temporarily located, but no German receives relief under UNRRA. A citizen of another country who, during the war, was taken prisoner, sent to Germany, and used there as a slave laborer, and is now temporarily held in a camp in Germany until he can be returned to his native country, can receive UNRRA relief. UNRRA is supervising work of that kind. If a large number of Frenchmen, Italians, Austrians, or citizens of various other countries, who were captured by the Germans during the war and were taken to Germany and placed in concentration camps there, met with some delay in returning to their homes after they were released, would the Senator object to having UNRRA employ a British lieutenant general to supervise them until they could be sent home?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my objection is that a great many nations contribute to UNRRA relief, and I do not see why 90 percent of the heads of UNRRA in Europe and 50 percent of the heads of UNRRA in the East should be British citizens. That is my opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. That cannot be the case, because I have before me a list of the persons who are employed by UNRRA, and it indicates the nations from which they come. The total number is 8,471, and only 2,285 come from Great Britain.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How many come from the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Two thousand three hundred and fifty-three come from the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Two thousand three hundred and fifty-three of those in the employ of UNRRA are from the United States; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And the total number of UNRRA employees is approximately 8,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how many of the heads which UNRRA employs in the various countries are British citizens and how many are American citizens?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe the tabulation which I have shows the heads by countries.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate if an amendment such as the one which has been suggested should be accepted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator speaking of my amendment?

Mr. TUNNELL. No; I am speaking of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator from Delaware is in favor of the amendment which I have offered to increase the amount to $750,000,000, because if we are to help these people at all, the necessary funds should be promptly appropriated. Of course, the money cannot be used until the Senate authorizes the appropriation. If the authorization is made, at least the sum proposed will be spent.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am strongly in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee; but to incorporate a proviso that the money which we contribute for the use of the UNRRA can be spent only by an American is merely to invite restrictions by other nations, and we would soon face the situation of the UNRRA having no authority to spend or allocate any money. Such a situation would be very unfortunate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I believe that we should not do anything in the Senate which would bring about a situation of the kind to which the Senator has referred. I may say that the committee had all the facts before it. I am sure that there was some mistake made in connection with the statement that 90 percent of the employees are of British appointment.

Mr. TUNNELL. The money which is being distributed in the various foreign countries is spent by the governments of those countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TUNNELL. So I cannot conceive of all those who are associated with the distribution of the funds being under British control.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not under British control.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the pending proposal is not for the purpose of saving lives and the relief of suffering, we should not contribute anything at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the money is to be used for such a cause, we should not object too much to the person who will be appointed to do the job.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. First of all, I wish to say that I have enjoyed the Senator's exposition of UNRRA's case. I think he has presented it very well.

With reference to the personnel involved, we must always have in mind that the work to be done is not here in this country, but is abroad. The necessity for speaking the language of the country in which the work is being done is always present. Until very recently it was difficult to recruit a sufficient personnel in this country to take care of the work abroad. We were told that the cost of employing natives of the localities in which the work was being done was insignificant in comparison to the cost of taking our people to those countries for the purpose of administering the work.

Mr. McKELLAR. That fact was brought out before the committee, and I thank the Senator for bringing it out again.

Mr. MEAD. Immediately after UNRRA was organized it was necessary to recruit hastily a commission for each of the various countries in which UNRRA was to operate. But now the political and military situation is much clearer and many of the commissions are being reorganized. Take, for example, the Polish Commission. The man who is heading that commission is one of the heroes of the war, a general of the Canadian Army by the name of Drewry. By the way, he was in command of a large Polish force in the Hook of Holland. Associated with him on that commission are outstanding Polish Americans from Detroit, New York, Milwaukee, and other cities in the United States. They are men who were leaders in their respective communities, and are entirely familiar with the situation in Poland. They have been enabled to become members of the commission because the political and military situation of the world has cleared.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are they American citizens?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment to the committee amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I dislike very much to differ with the distinguished acting chairman of the committee; but I believe that a majority of the committee reduced the request from $750,000,000 to $400,000,000 on the basis that $400,000,000 would carry UNRRA until at least March 1 and thereby give the committee, upon reconvening in January, an opportunity to call before it Assistant Secretary of State Clayton and perhaps Governor Lehman, and take another look at the way UNRRA is running its show. This item was brought up late yesterday afternoon, following the close of the hearings, on a verbal request of the President, as well as a letter from Representative CANNON, chairman of the House committee. No testimony was introduced in regard to the subject. It seems to me that if $400,000,000 will carry UNRRA until March 1, and until the committee can take a look at the matter again, the figure contained in the committee amendment is an appropriate one and should be agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I read from a memorandum from the State Department:

If UNRRA is to ship the $700,000,000 worth of supplies which it has scheduled for February, March, April, and May, it must have the money to order those supplies immediately. In January alone UNRRA must furnish the procuring agencies of the United States Government—the Department of Agriculture and Treasury procurement—with

orders amounting to $315,000,000, to be paid for out of money UNRRA does not now have. In February it must furnish the procurement agencies with orders amounting to an additional $254,000,000. In March it must furnish orders amounting to $230,000,000. That means that it must place orders exceeding $700,000,000 within the first 3 months of next year. It cannot place those orders until it receives the money from this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNRRA urgently requires an additional appropriation of at least $750,000,000 before the recess period. The reasons why an appropriation of at least $750,000,000 is required are as follows:

1. The supplies and services financed out of the first $1,350,000,000 appropriation made by the United States will have been completely used up by the middle of February. That includes the $550,000,000 which has just been appropriated by the Congress.

2. The supplies and services financed by the contributions of approximately $500,000,000 which have been made by countries other than the United States will be completely used up by the middle of March.

3. In February, March, April and May, UNRRA plans to ship more than $700,000,000 worth of supplies from the United States, for which it does not now have the money. It is of the utmost importance that those shipments be made on time. If we can ship food and clothing quickly enough to get the people of Europe and China through the winter, and if we can deliver enough seed, fertilizer and agricultural equipment in time for the spring planting, we should be able to get these people back on their feet by fall, so that we can bring this relief operation to an end. If we do not get these supplies there in time, this year's harvest will be as bad as last year's, and we may have to continue furnishing relief indefinitely.

4. This is the crucial moment in the battle. Just as in military matters, speed is the essence of military strategy.

5. If UNRRA is to ship the $700,000,000 worth of supplies which it has scheduled for February, March, April and May, it must have the money to order those supplies immediately. In January alone, UNRRA must furnish the procuring agencies of the United States Government—the Department of Agriculture and Treasury Procurement—with orders amounting to $315,000,000, to be paid for out of money UNRRA does not now have. In February, it must furnish the procurement agencies with orders amounting to an additional $254,000,000. In March, it must furnish orders amounting to $230,000,000. That means that it must place orders exceeding $700,000,000 within the first 3 months of next year. It cannot place those orders until it receives the money from this Congress.

6. The reason why UNRRA needs the money now for the shipments which it plans to make through next May is that it takes from 4 weeks to 4 months between the time the Government procurement agencies receive an order from UNRRA and the time that the supplies are loaded on board ship. During that period, the Government procurement agencies must find suppliers and sign contracts with them, the suppliers must obtain the goods, the goods must be shipped to port, and at the port they must be loaded on board the ships. Those things take time.

UNRRA plans to stop sending supplies to Europe at the end of December 1946, and to stop sending supplies to the Far East at the end of March 1937. Those cut-off dates were fixed on the assumption that UNRRA would be able to supply—by this spring—the essential materials, such as seed, fertilizer, trucks and the like, which will be needed if the receiving countries are to get back on their own feet. If Congress fails to appropriate now the money which is required to carry out this program, it will truly be penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we must plan far ahead I am sure, as a businessman, the Senator from Minnesota will agree that authority should be given to proceed.

Mr. BALL. May I ask the Senator where the memorandum came from which he has been reading? We did not have it before the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am merely saying that if this memorandum which has been supplied to me is correct, it would of course answer the Senator's statement.

Mr. BALL. Since within only the past few days Congress approved an appropriation of $550,000,000, which obviously must have been committed some weeks before it was appropriated, it is perfectly evident that if UNRRA, on the basis of our authorization, goes ahead and makes its commitments on——

Mr. HAYDEN. No; this is the situation: They did not make a firm commitment to buy anything that they were not authorized to buy. They actually canceled orders which they hoped to have filled. They did not take advantage of bargains which they could have made. Moreover, they had to borrow $50,000,000. The situation was bad. We should have made $550,000,000 available to them some 6 weeks ago. The effect of not appropriating $750,000,000 will be to put them right back in the same situation they were in. That is what convinced me that if we are planning to go ahead with this work it should be known how much money will be available in order that proper plans may be made. I am afraid that $400,000,000 will not be sufficient, and I am satisfied that $750,000,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator was good enough to say some kind things about me a few minutes ago, and I wish to return his friendly sentiments. As he knows, I am his admirer. He has done a great deal of work on the committee. Every man on the committee wanted to do exactly what he thought was right.

The Senator will recall that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] came before the committee and recited substantially what the Senator from Arizona has said.

Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Minnesota wants this money to be used where it will do the most good. I am convinced in my own mind that the Senator will agree that the time during which it will be most needed will be between now and next April. Money will be needed in connection with planting. Seed must be made available. Those facts lead me to hope that the Senator will vote in favor of granting $750,000,000. Whether it will be expended will depend on whether the Senate passes the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. But if that bill shall be passed we can greatly aid the people who need UNRRA's help by spending the money within the next 3 or 4 months. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not object too strongly to the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in view of the memorandum which the Senator from Arizona has read, which indicates that UNRRA is running out of funds and will need at least $315,000,000 during January and $254,000,000 during February, I would be inclined to agree that it will be doubtful if we can get an additional appropriation through Congress before March 1.

I am inclined to withdraw position which I took in the committee. I told the acting chairman of the committee, as well as all the other members of the committee, that it seemed to me to be an unusual procedure, without having a budget estimate, to appropriate more than half of a total authorization which has not yet been passed by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. A Budget estimate was made. But the Senator has been very fair. I thank him for the position that he takes. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to give my assurance to the Senator from Minnesota, on the strength of the testimony submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, that if this appropriation is to be authorized at all, it is perfectly obvious that as a matter not only of good business, but as a matter of meeting the challenge which we confront in the field, it is indispensable that the major portion of the fund should be available the first few months of the next calendar year. It is perfectly apparent that the burden of human suffering is concentrated in the winter months.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is equally obvious that if our objective is to put these people on a self-sustaining basis again, the burden of furnishing seed, fertilizer, elementary agricultural implements, and the like, concentrates in the spring of the year. So I am convinced from every point of view that we are completely justified in concentrating the major portion of this expenditure in these preliminary months, and in making appropriations on the basis recommended by the committee.

It seems to me that really it comes down to this: We had better stay out of UNRRA, and we had better face that naked issue in the authorization bill and defeat it rather than so crimp UNRRA under an expectation that we are going to support it that it cannot adequately meet the situation on a business basis.

Of course, we have the cart before the horse, with an appropriation ahead of the authorization——

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, but the appropriation is dependent on the authorization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that. I think the basic issue is, Are we to support UNRRA for another year? The answer is "Yes" or "No." If the answer is "Yes," I think there can be no doubt on earth that the appropriation now requested for commitment in the early months of the next calendar year is absolutely indispensable to the plan upon which we are working.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I wish to thank him for having made this statement, which sets forth the facts much better than I could have stated them. I wish to say to him also that last night—some time between 7 and 8 o'clock—we tried to get both the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to come before the committee. It was a hurry-up matter, and the Senator from Michigan had already gone to his home, and for that reason we did not reach him. We would have liked to have his advice then, and I am perfectly delighted to hear what he has to say about the matter at this time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very sympathetic toward the program of feeding the people in Europe who are suffering, regardless of who they are or where they are. What disturbs me about UNRRA is the reports I have received. One of the reports came to me directly from a man who was connected with UNRRA, and who served in UNRRA in Yugoslavia, and was still with UNRRA. He said that I could get the same report he was giving me from our Ambassador or Minister to Yugoslavia, whose report is now in the State Department.

He said, first of all, that Tito kept UNRRA representatives waiting in Rome for about 6 weeks while people were starving in Yugoslavia, until UNRRA would agree to turn over the distribution of the food and materials, the trucks, and whatnot, to Tito himself or to his government, and that it was finally agreed to do that, contrary to all the agreements which had been entered into by the various governments, with the understanding that the representatives of UNRRA would have a chance to go in and check up as to who was getting the materials and the food.

This man told me that when our representatives went into Yugoslavia they were unable to check up on the facts for the simple reason that they had to get permits to travel from one place to another, and that the authorities would let them go only where they wanted them to go. He said there was constant propaganda being carried on by the Tito government against the United States and against Great Britain. For instance, they were saying that while the cans of food were marked with the United States label, the food actually in the can was furnished by Russia. He said the Tito government was giving the food only to its own partisans, letting the other people starve, and would not give them food, and that some of the materials were being sold. I am extremely disturbed about UNRRA for that reason. I think that when we are furnishing 71 percent, or whatever the amount is——

Mr. McKELLAR. Seventy-one and a fraction percent.

Mr. WHEELER. The man who made these reports to me is a reputable man, one who is now working for UNRRA, or was 2 or 3 months ago, and said he expected to continue to work for them. He told me I could get the same story he was giving me if I would get the report of our minister to Yugoslavia from the State Department.

Mr. President, if what this man told me affords a true picture of what is going on, then it seems to me it is very important that the people of the United States, who are putting up 71 percent of the money necessary to furnish food for these starving people, should at least be getting some good will out of it.

I agree that that is not the principal thing to look for in our attempt to feed these people. We want to see democratic governments established in those countries. We want to see the "four freedoms" established there, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the others, but if the food and the other things we are furnishing are being used in just the opposite direction—and it will be used in just the opposite direction—unless it is known that the United States is furnishing it—and unless it is going to all the people, regardless of whether or not they are Tito's partisans or are Serbians, who were Mihailovitch's followers—I do not think the people of this country want to be parties to going into a country and favoring one class, and letting one class of people profit and the other people starve. I think it is highly important that the true facts be brought out before the committee with reference to what is actually going on.

The same report came to me not only with reference to Yugoslavia, but with reference to some of the other countries. I think the matter should be thoroughly investigated in order definitely to ascertain how the food and materials are being distributed.

Frankly, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that the relief should be distributed by the Government of the United States, just as was done after the last war. I was in Europe after the last war, and I know the United States derived a tremendous amount of good will out of what we did in feeding the people of Russia, in feeding the people of Hungary, in feeding the hungry people of Europe generally at that time. The situation is far more critical now even than it was after the last war.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of confidence in Governor Lehman, in his honesty, integrity, and ability, but if the information I have received is correct, if some of these governments are forcing us to turn the materials over to them, and they are selling a part of them, that knowledge should be brought home to our people. The information with reference to what was going on in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria came to some of us when we were in Rome from newspapermen who had just been in those countries. It came to us from intelligent, responsible people from all over Europe.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator wish to comment on what has just been stated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a comment in response to what has been said by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to say a word particularly in view of my previous statement. I would not want what I previously said to indicate for an instant that the UNRRA record is satisfactory, either from my own standpoint or from the standpoint of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think there is very serious doubt in the minds of all of us about some of the phases of UNRRA.

I wish to say in mitigation, however, that it is to be remembered that this organization had to be hastily thrown together in the face of a world calamity and that it was probably utterly impossible to anticipate that in its first year of operations, and no matter what the auspices which operated it, it would run into doubtful situations upon many occasions. I think a number of those difficulties have now been corrected. I specifically inquired during the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee whether relief in a given country went to those who required it, or only to the political partisans of the governments in control, and the assurance was given us that it went to all now, although I think it is quite clear that in many instances in the initial stages of the operation that was not true.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Senator is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Let me ask him if he has ever received a report concerning what went on in Yugoslavia from our minister in Yugoslavia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I have not seen such a report.

Mr. WHEELER. A man who works for UNRRA came to me and told me of the situation in Yugoslavia. For obvious reasons he did not want his name known. He was sent to me by a very reputable individual in this city, to tell me the story, and I think he told it to other Senators. He said that our own minister in Yugoslavia had sent a report to the State Department. I wish the Foreign Relations Committee at least would ask for the report which was made by our Minister to Yugoslavia. If the things that are reported to be going on are true, then certainly we ought not to turn money over to other governments so they may feed it out to their own partisans, and permit those who do not agree with them to starve to death. The horrible conditions that this man who works for UNRRA told me existed in Yugoslavia were, to say the least, blood curdling.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If there is any such evidence as that available, I say to the Senator that I agree with him and that it ought to be scrupulously explored, and undoubtedly that can be done. Governor Lehman, in his appearance before our committee, was very frank in conceding many of the difficulties which he confronted. He confronted black-market operations in many instances, but he pointed to the fact, with some right of

pride, I think, that only 13 or 14 employees out of 8,000 so far as the UNRRA personnel itself was concerned, had been found guilty of black-market operations.

All I am saying in response to the Senator from Montana is that I think there is a very substantial background of justification for complaint. I think the overwhelming opinion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is that the termination dates for UNRRA indicated in this second appropriation bill, mean exactly what they say.

Mr. WHEELER. Speaking of black-market operations, I should like to say that we saw evidences of them when we were in Athens. At a time when American housewives had difficulty in buying certain canned goods in this country, one could go into the stores in Athens and buy such canned goods. The goods were advertised in the stores, and could be bought there. How they got into those stores I do not know. The goods could not be bought in America, or very rarely could be; but similar goods could be bought in Paris, they could be bought in Rome, and in other cities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suppose it would be impossible for an international organization of this nature to operate this international adventure in war-torn Europe, under the stress and strain of circumstances that are almost beyond description or definition, in the absence of any established legal government in most instances, surrounded at all times by the pull and haul of Europe's power politics——

Mr. McKELLAR. And frequently by revolution or near revolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes. I doubt whether you could hope for a more efficient result than has been obtained.

All I want to say is that I think we are caught on the horns of a dilemma. Unless UNRRA is permitted adequately to function during this next period in this suffering area, I do not know what is going to happen, except that misery will multiply into chaos and chaos into anarchy. And since the record, believe me, has its assets as well as its liabilities—and let us not for an instant overlook that—I think there is no alternative except to proceed for another year. There can be no doubt on earth about the good faith of the general management of UNRRA and its high dedication and high purpose.

In my opinion, unless the situation is vastly changed at the end of another year I, certainly so far as I am concerned, intend that the dates fixed in the pending authorization for the termination of UNRRA shall mean exactly what they say. And if there is any necessity beyond those dates for a continuation of this operation, my present feeling is that it should proceed precisely as indicated by the Senator from Montana, under our own American auspices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will answer very briefly the statement made by my good friend from Montana. He said that a gentleman told him that our Minister to Yugoslavia had reported on these conditions.

Mr. WHEELER. The one who gave me the story was himself a representative of UNRRA.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Montana had told that to the committee the other day when he was down there, I as acting chairman would certainly have had this official brought before the committee. But we did not have any specific proof respecting that particular country.

I want to say that I had heard the same reports that the Senator had heard. Therefore, yesterday I offered this amendment in committee, which the committee rejected:

> That no part of this appropriation, and no supplies or other property procured with this appropriation, shall be available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration until such Administration has furnished to the President assurances found by him to be adequate and satisfactory to insure that this appropriation will be used only for providing food, clothing, and other relief to distressed or needy persons, without charge, and for paying such administrative and other expenses as are necessarily identical to furnishing such relief.

My purpose in offering the amendment was to take care of the very suggestions that were made. The committee voted down the amendment. I was sorry the committee did so.

I want to thank the Senator from Montana for the statement he has made, for the reason that with the publicity that is going out Governor Lehman and UNRRA will be obliged to exercise the greatest care and the greatest industry in seeing to it that the purposes of the Senate and the House are carried out with reference to this appropriation. So I hope the Senate will vote for the larger amount, $750,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish the Senator would offer now on the floor of the Senate the amendment which was rejected by the committee, because I think it would probably be adopted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am embarrassed about the matter, for the reason that if ever there was a splendid subcommittee it was the committee which handled this matter. Not all members of the subcommittee are present this afternoon. That committee certainly worked faithfully and well, and without regard to party, without regard to faction. They were simply excellent men all trying to do their duty, and they outvoted me, and naturally I feel diffident about offering the amendment under those circumstances. The Senator from Montana can readily understand that.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the Senator's position. I have a great deal of respect for the members of the subcommittee which handled this matter. I might say to the Senator respecting the report which was made to me by this gentleman who is working for UNRRA, that I myself intended to write a letter to the State Department about it, but in the press of business I completely forgot about it, and I had forgotten about it until this discussion arose this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad the Senator brought it up on the floor of the Senate because it will make those managing UNRRA very much more careful, I hope.

Mr. WHEELER. I got the story of black-market operations in Athens from soldiers, GI boys, and from newspapermen, and I got the story of mismanagement from many others. In fact we got the same story nearly everywhere we went. I agree that UNRRA was in an exceedingly difficult situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it was.

Mr. WHEELER. Because of the tremendously difficult conditions which existed all over Europe. I am the last one who wants to see suffering women and children, whether friends or foes, starve to death, because after all, as General Eisenhower said, children have no nationality. I cannot help but feel that we have adopted a very poor policy with reference to the children in Central Europe who are starving to death. I cannot bring myself to be vindictive enough to permit women and children to die, even though their governments were our enemies. I cannot stand idly by and permit them to die.

If they are in central Europe, that will affect the whole economy not only of central Europe, but of every single country on the European Continent. If this condition persists it will mean that we shall drive those people to a philosophy and ideology which is directly opposed to everything we stand for in the United States.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it clear, in view of the fact that I began by opposing this increase in the amount, that I have supported UNRRA. I still support it. I believe that the Senator from Michigan is correct. After all, an international organization depends upon the cooperation of individual nations and governments. It has no operating force of its own. We cannot expect it to operate with real efficiency, any more than war can be conducted with efficiency. Both operations are wasteful and inefficient.

But we had absolutely no evidence before the Appropriations Committee last night on this question. I had heard some of the same reports to which the Senator from Montana has referred. It seemed to me wise to give the organization enough to carry it through until the committee could call witnesses and try to put a little more pressure on the administration of UNRRA to take a firmer stand with governments in one or two places which insist upon using the distribution of UNRRA supplies for political purposes. I am afraid that that sort of thing is going on. I had hoped that we could take a look at that question early next year. But the figures presented by the Senator from Arizona, with whom I have cooperated in the committee in an effort to avoid riders which would in effect tie the funds up and make the appropriations meaningless, convinced me that we need the larger sum, and, therefore, I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me read the names of the members of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. I have never known any com-

mittee to work more faithfully. Unhappily, two of the members of the subcommittee could not be present. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] was ill and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was engaged in another committee. He was present at the full committee meeting, but not at the meeting of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations.

The names of the subcommittee members are as follows: The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. As I recall, most of the members of the subcommittee were present every day, and I never saw members of a committee perform more yeoman service. Irrespective of party, they tried to be fair and just in all the undertakings before the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, frankly, I do not know how the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], stood up under the hearings on the bill. I forget how many score witnesses we heard. He sat through the hearings, from 10 o'clock in the morning often until 5:30 or 6 o'clock in the evening, and last night until after 7.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. First, I desire to commend the able Senators who have extolled the virtues of Governor Lehman. I felt that before the debate concluded I would like to take the floor and do so myself, but it has been done better by other Senators.

Let me say to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that his explanation of the difficulties which beset UNRRA has been presented to us on numerous occasions. The other evening the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I attended a 2-hour forum on this subject, at which time Governor Lehman's chief deputy was present to present the case of UNRRA.

I would vote for the proposal now pending if there were nothing else to it than provision for the care of needy people of the Old World. America has always been charitable, and will always be generous in its treatment of stricken people the world over. Certainly, the humanitarian aspects of this case have been brought out very vividly and very effectively; but there is another side to the case which I believe is worth a brief moment in this debate.

Much of this money will be spent in the United States. During the past several months we have been busily engaged, in the special committee of which I am chairman, in the consideration of the expeditious sale of Government surpluses. This agency will take Government surpluses in this country and abroad, and in return pay the Army or the surplus-property agency in the American dollars which we are today appropriating for that purpose.

I attended a number of meetings called by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I also attended a number of meetings on the House side, called by those interested in agriculture. By reason of the very marked cut-back in military contracts for agricultural commodities many hardships are developing throughout the United States. We have an enormous potato crop in Maine, Idaho, New York, and other States. We appealed to Governor Lehman. Much of this money will be used to relieve the situation in agriculture in the United States.

We might in some way or other succeed in surviving in a sick world; but I doubt very much whether we could attain full employment or be able to sell our goods in a sick world. So it is to our advantage that we take an added interest in the situation which brings this legislation before the Senate for consideration this afternoon. I merely wished to express the thought that there is some self-interest in this legislation, in addition to the humanitarian aspects which have been so appropriately presented.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have not heretofore participated in this debate, but I hope the Senate will indulge me for a very short time.

As between the original item in the committee amendment of $400,000,000 and the amendment providing for an appropriation of $750,000,000, it seems to me that it would be wiser to adopt the figure of $750,000,000 than the figure of $400,000,000. If we adopt the authorization of $1,350,000,000, we shall certainly spend at least $750,000,000 of that authorization before this program is completed. So there is no reason why we should not appropriate the amount which has been requested by the President of the United States.

Some reflection has been cast upon the Committee on Foreign Relations. We do not arrogate to ourselves the degree of perfection to which other Senators have referred. The committee is endeavoring to perform its duty to the Congress, to the Senate, and to the country.

A hearing was scheduled before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and there were present a group of 8 or 10 appearing in behalf of UNRRA. The group included Governor Lehman; Dean Acheson, the Under Secretary of State; and others.

There is no question that there are errors of administration in UNRRA. In my mind there is no question that there is a great deal of waste and inefficiency in its administration. No doubt some of the complaints which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] mentions are justified. But, Mr. President, the first automobile that was ever built was not the latest model Cadillac. We cannot start a world-wide organization such as this, from the very initial stages, and expect it to tick like the Swiss watch which I hold in my hand. I believe that Governor Lehman is entirely honest and conscientious, and is doing the best he can. Probably he is lacking in some of the qualities of leadership and administration, but I believe that he is doing the best he can.

Mr. President, if this were an initial proposal, with the light which I now have, and which I did not have before, I would favor a strictly American relief project, to be financed by the Government of the United States and administered entirely by the United States. But we are not faced with that problem. We have already passed that problem, because we have entered into an international organization and international convention to participate in the organization and contribute certain funds.

It was clear in the hearings, from Governor Lehman and others, that it would be absolutely physically impossible for this Government, through its own employees, to administer the distribution of relief in all the nations where UNRRA is operating. To do so would require an army of employees. As it is, there are 8,000 employees. If we should undertake to administer relief in each country, in every village, and every locality, with representatives going there and maintaining warehouses, transportation, and things of that kind, many more thousands of employees would be required. That was one of the complaints in the committee about the organization, namely, that too much of it was being eaten up in salaries, some of which were rather large.

Mr. President, that is the situation. When we extend relief in a particular country, if we do not do it ourselves, who is there to do it, except the governmental authorities of that country? The Senator from Montana has told us what some man told him, but he did not tell us who the man was. He said the man is working for UNRRA. If he is working for UNRRA he should tell Governor Lehman about these difficulties. He should not slip off and whisper into some Senator's ear. He should go to his chieftain and point it out and have him correct it, instead of trying to cause dissension regarding the organization. If it be true, I condemn it as heartily as did the Senator from Montana. But we do not know the man's name or anything about him. He was not present at the hearings, and in the hearings no one told us about these matters. The Senator from Montana did not honor us with his presence. So, Mr. President, the committee feels no compunctions about not having heard what the Senator from Montana has referred to.

The situation is that we have embarked on this enterprise. We can either finish it and make the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 or we can stop. This legislation warns the world that this program will end in Europe on December 31, 1946, and in the East, in Asia, on March 31, 1947. It is said that because we ourselves are not administering this relief, we are not getting any credit for it. There is no doubt that there is much merit in that claim; I do not dispute that. It is an international organization, and no doubt the governments which

are distributing the relief create the impression, in at least some cases, that they are the ones who are contributing the money. I am sure the Senator from Montana will remember that when the WPA was operating in this country there were charges that it was used for political purposes; there were charges that it was ill-administered. I have no doubt that in many instances it was ill-administered, and I have no doubt that in some instances it was used for purposes of political influence. I do not question those things.

But we are dealing with realities. We are not living in a dream world. We are living in a world which has been cursed by the scourge of war. In many parts of Europe misery and suffering exists. We cannot pick out some of the unfortunates and say to them, "We will feed you," and say to others, "We will not feed you." We must trust someone. If we require those who are charged with the administration of the organization to do their duty fairly and properly, we shall have done the best we can do.

I wish to point out that we impressed upon Governor Lehman the necessity of making sure, insofar as possible, that in all the countries in which UNRRA relief is furnished the distributing agents, whether Government agencies or others, should carry out the distribution in accordance with the purposes and aims which are written into the act, according to the purposes and aims which are animating our people, who are extending so lavishly this humanitarian aid and relief.

Mr. President, it is true that we shall not get the entire credit for it. Many persons in many countries will be angry at us when the relief is terminated. They will be angry because it is not more lavish, and some of them will be angry because they get a rump steak instead of a porterhouse steak or a sirloin steak. But we cannot help that. We know that those who knock at our back doors for help, and get it, on the second application expect it and on the third application demand it.

Mr. President, those things should be taken at their face value. It is true that many of the people will hate us. They will forget the gift. They will forget that we have extended aid to them in their time of need. Very well; we have had evidence of that before. We have had evidence of that in the case of the camps which have been maintained in Germany for displaced persons. Some of the displaced persons will not leave the camps in which they are now located and return to the homes from which they were evicted or from which they fled because they are content to remain in the camps and to be fed and housed by the United States of America. That is the problem which we shall have to face throughout the administration of this act.

Mr. President, as I view the situation, the Senate is going to adopt one of these items, either the one providing $400,000,000 or the one providing $750,000,000. I think it wise to adopt the one providing $750,000,000. I think the intelligent world will understand the attitude of the United States. Every recipient in Europe may not feel indebted to the American people; but this is one of the handsomest and most magnanimous acts of any government in the history of the human race. The United States is reaching down into its depleted Treasury and is borrowing money, and paying interest on it, to accumulate $2,700,000,000, an amount which up to this time would have astounded the world. The United States will hand that money over for the relief of the suffering people of Europe and Asia—a magnanimous act. If there ever was a national good Samaritan, the United States is entitled to that appellation.

Mr. President, in the light of history, I think we shall not be ashamed that we have done this. If some of these funds are misappropriated, I shall regret it. If some of the people in Europe who are hungry are not fed, I shall be sorry.

We can do this thing. We can do the best we can; and, as the act says, we serve warning on all the peoples of the earth that they may expect the termination of this system on the 31st of December 1946 in the case of Europe, and on the 31st of March 1947 in the case of Asia.

Mr. President, in brief, those are my sentiments. I wish to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously reported the authorization. At that meeting of the committee not all its members were present; but those who were there and those who held the hearing and those who interrogated the witnesses reached that conclusion.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. In the committee hearings was consideration given to the subject of feeding the nationals of Germany who are in the part of Germany now occupied by American forces? I have in mind the little children and the old men and women who are there. Or does the act continue to provide that only displaced persons may be fed and aided?

Before the Senator answers the question, I wish to say that probably I have as much reason to feel bitter toward our enemies in this war as does any person in this Chamber. I lost my only son in the war. But if I were to let that make me so bitter that I would attempt to take vengeance by letting little children and men and women on one side of the street starve while I contributed shelter and food and clothing to those on the other side of the street, I would be ashamed of myself.

The other day I said in this Chamber that if we continue to do that or if we overlook such a situation and simply stand on the side of the road, I believe it will be a blot on our national escutcheon for all time.

Mr. President, my question to the Senator from Texas is whether his committee gave consideration to the feeding of these people who had no responsibility for the war; did the committee consider the question of having the UNRRA feed them if and when the Army ceases to feed them? I know the Army is supposed to be feeding them today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the committee did not recommend any basic changes in the original act. I do not have a copy of the act before me, but my recollection is that the original act forbids UNRRA to engage in any activities in any enemy territory occupied by Allied troops. As I recall, in the case of Germany, for instance, that means that the Army is now feeding a great many German people. When the Army discontinues that activity, I am of the impression, although I am not sure about this, that UNRRA might then undertake it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall the testimony before the Appropriations Committee in regard to the last $550,000,000 appropriation which was made several days ago, it was stated that the original agreement between the United Nations carried the proviso referred to by the Senator from Texas, namely, that no UNRRA aid would be extended in the case of nationals of the Axis Powers. That restriction has since been modified; and UNRRA is now operating in Italy, and it is proposed to have it operate in Austria.

In a report of the Foreign Relations Committee on this new authorization for the second increment of $1,350,000,000, there is no mention made of Germany. Here is the gist of the report:

> Part of the additional 1 percent contribution will be used to continue UNRRA's existing operations in Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, China, and Italy. The remainder will be devoted to taking over the extensive relief operations which are now being carried on in Italy by the American, British, and Canadian armies, and to furnish supplies and services to several new areas in which UNRRA has authorized an administration to operate.

Those areas are Austria, a part of Russia, the Ukraine, which is a large part of Russia, Formosa, and Korea.

Nowhere in the report is Germany mentioned, and nothing in the testimony indicated that aid would be extended to Germany. As a matter of fact, Mr. Clayton testified that there was no intention of operating within Germany except insofar as relief might be given to the nationals of other countries who are temporarily in Germany in the camps to which the Senator from Texas has referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much for his statement. The testimony before the committee discloses that the allocations which are to be made in the future are all tentative, and subject to readjustment.

Mr. RUSSELL. A resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of UNRRA would be required before any of those funds could be expended in Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct. If, in the event conditions in Germany develop in such a way that it is felt wise to extend the operations of UNRRA into Germany, I am sure that the Supreme Council of UNRRA has authority under the agreement to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had occasion to look into this matter. I saw a notice in one of the newspapers to the effect that large operations would be carried on in Italy. I recall that when the bill was originally pending it was stated on the floor of the Senate that operations would not be conducted in any country that had been our enemy during the war. It now appears that a considerable portion of this new authorization is to be used in Italy. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that I have not been able to understand why that has been done. So far as I am concerned in considering this matter, the only difference between Germany and Italy, is that Italy's efforts to kill our men during the war were not very effective, whereas Germany's efforts were considerably effective.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Texas in thanking the Senator from Georgia for the information and light he has thrown on the subject.

I wish to ask the Senator from Texas if he does not think there should be more than the right in UNRRA's board of directors to change the situation? Does not the Senator believe that the Government of the United States should put itself on record in that regard?

Mr. CONNALLY. When the authorization bill comes before the Senate the Senator from New Jersey may offer an amendment along that line.

Mr. HAWKES. I know that the Senator will agree with me that it is not customary to ask for an appropriation of money before the bill authorizing the appropriation is passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. The appropriation provides that it shall not become effective unless the authorization is made.

Mr. HAWKES. That is true. I am very definitely in favor of increasing the amount to $750,000,000, because time is of the essence of everything in connection with this matter. There is no use of appropriating the money next April after the funeral has been held. In other words, what we do should be done with as much soundness and speed as we can give to it. I agree with the Senator from Texas that we should not expect perfection in connection with this matter. It is impossible to throw a great organization together under the conditions which UNRRA must operate.

I also believe that what the Senator from Montana has said contains valuable suggestions and a great deal of sense. I think it will cause the persons who are operating UNRRA to sit up and take notice, and see that some of the things which are being criticised are corrected.

But, in connection with the $750,000,000 as related to the $400,000,000, I believe that the appropriation should now be made to apply to all citizens in distress in the countries where we are granting relief either through the Army or UNRRA. I also feel that this great body should see that proper consideration is given to the innocent children, the older men and women, and the needy in those foreign countries, before the winter has passed. I know from first-hand information, as many other Members of the Senate know, that terrible conditions exist in Germany and in Italy. We also know that thousands of people in those countries are on the verge of starvation and freezing to death. Time is of the essence of successful relief.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all members of the Senate when I express our sympathy to him on account of the death of his son in the late war. What we may say to him will not assuage his grief, but he must take great pride in knowing that his son died a heroic death in fighting for the honor and integrity of his country.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has stated that there is a great lack of food in Germany. There has been considerable conflict of opinion in regard to that point. I have talked to many persons who have been in Germany, such as officers and others, and they have stated to me that in the country districts there is plenty of food. I do not mean that there is a surplus of food, but there is sufficient food to take care of the needs of the people in the country districts, and they are getting along very satisfactorily. However, because of a lack of transportation and distribution that situation is not true in regard to the cities. The testimony before the committee was that in the country districts sufficient food is to be had. I may say that a report of a similar nature comes to me with respect largely to Italy. I doubt not, however, that there is suffering, hunger, and starvation in both of those countries as well as in the other countries which have been referred to in the debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a few minutes.

I do not know where the distinguished Senator from Texas got the idea that the Foreign Relations Committee was being criticized. Certainly it was not being criticized by me.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] made the statement to which I referred.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know what some other Senator said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not denominate the Senator from Montana. If he wants me to be more particular, I will say that I had more reference to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHEELER. Nothing which I said could be construed as being the slightest criticism of the Foreign Relations Committee, because I did not know what its position had been. I merely asked the Senator from Michigan whether or not consideration had been given to the Minister of Yugoslavia who, I understood, would confirm everything that had been told me by my informant. The Senator from Texas said that I had reported the name of someone and stated that that person should go to his chief. Whether that person had reported to his chief, I do not know, but I am assuming that his chief knew all about the situation. He certainly knew whether or not people had been kept waiting in a row for 6 weeks while other persons were starving in Yugoslavia. And certainly he knew whether or not food had been allowed to be turned over to Tito contrary to every agreement which had been entered into by the various nations involved that food would not be handled in that way.

Under the UNRRA agreement, as I understand it, food was not to be turned over to any government to be distributed wherever it saw fit, but it was to be distributed by the representatives of UNRRA. I did not call the matter to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee, because, as I said a moment ago, I had completely forgotten what this man had said to me about the situation until the discussion arose, and, secondly, I did not know when the Foreign Relations Committee was going to take up the matter. I merely suggested that I thought, and I still think, that the food should be distributed by the Government of the United States, and that it should not be turned over to some government, whether it be Tito's government or some other government, to be distributed only to partisans of that government or its particular pets, and used for political purposes. That is not the reason why the Congress voted money to help needy persons in foreign countries. I voted for the previous appropriation and I intend to vote for the one now proposed. But I believe that the taxpayers of the United States would be opposed to turning money over to a particular group in any country for the purpose of distributing food to partisans of the government which may happen to be in power, or distributed by a government which may not legally be in power. That would not be charity and it would be taking sides in the internal affairs of another country. It would be wrong morally, and it would be wrong from the standpoint of the understanding which the people had when their representatives voted for UNRRA and the preceding appropriations.

We all know that the only way in which we can get facts, the only way Senators can ascertain conditions, is by someone coming to us and telling us what goes on in the departments. That is the only way we get facts in many of the investigations which are carried on. If people could not come to us and tell us these things, corruption would exist in some of the departments, and we would never know anything about it. The only reports we get before the committees come from those who give the good side and do not tell anything about the other side.

I repeat, Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Michigan say that when this provision expires, if help shall be needed in these countries, he, for one, will vote to see that the United States Government distributes the food and that we shall derive whatever good will we deserve from the relief which is afforded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, can we not have a vote now?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will give me about 2 minutes, I should like to say a word.

The Senator from Montana has raised a serious question about the administration of the UNRRA funds. Naturally, abuses have occurred in many countries

in which they were distributed, but in the last few weeks I have visited some of those countries, and I know that in one country in the Balkans the UNRRA authorities have given a directive to the local government that if they did not change and improve and make more efficient the administration of the funds, the funds would be withheld from that country. So that I think UNRRA is on the alert to see that the local governments do not for political purposes improperly administer the funds.

In the case of Yugoslavia, to which the able Senator from Montana referred, I may say that during the month of October I happened for about 3 days to be in Belgrade, where I talked to the British and American representatives of UNRRA. I did not hear, either from them or from our Ambassador in that country, that there was any abuse on the part of governmental authorities in the administration of the funds, certainly no more than what would normally occur.

On the other hand, in their hearts those people, who cannot speak to the Congress, I know would like to say how grateful they are for the funds which are being principally provided by the United States. They do know it. They know that seventy-odd percent, or the majority of this money, comes from the United States.

In Rome I talked with the head of the whole UNRRA in Europe, and he said, "If there is anything I should like to transmit to the American Congress as a message it is that, whatever funds they are going to give us—and we pray they will be the same we had last year—should be provided promptly so that we may know what we can count on and can make arrangements for our purchases and our plans for the use of the funds in the most efficient way."

The President has recommended that the amount of the authorization, $1,350,000,000, be appropriated by the Congress. Mr. Will Clayton, for whom I have great respect, and of whom my opinion is constantly improving, committed us in London to the $1,350,000,000, and if it had not been a sound proposal I do not think he would have made that commitment for us.

The House of Representatives has already passed an authorization of $1,350,000,000, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously has reported to the Senate the authorization of $1,350,000,000, and now I cannot see anything to be gained, if we intend to appropriate $1,350,000,000, by making available only $400,000,000. I do not see what is to be gained by that, and I am sure it would work out injuriously to the efficiency of the program. I certainly wish to add my one voice to those who will support the Senator from Tennessee in his amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will speedily adopt the amendment. I wish to read to the Senate a letter I have received from Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a great American, which gives information which in my judgment is accurate regarding conditions in Europe today. He says:

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I have some direct information on food conditions in Europe which I hope you will read personally. It supports the statements made in the attached report from five international organizations in Switzerland.

The five international organizations were five international church organizations, which have had representatives in Europe securing first-hand information of conditions in all the countries in the stricken area. Dr. Morgan continues:

First, as to infant mortality, which in some areas reaches 100 percent. My neighbor, Dr. Lester W. Sontag, director of the Fels fund for child study, has just returned from Italy where he went to study famine conditions. He says that with the extreme undernourishment prevailing in many places, emaciated mothers have no milk for babies as they are born, and there being no milk supply, the babies necessarily die.

Second, my son-in-law, Landrum Bolling, has returned from investigations in Austria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, where he got about as few other men have. In Austria, for instance, he found Gen. Mark Clark struggling to raise the diet from 900 to 1,500 calories a day.

Third, on two occasions recently I have visited the starvation experiments now being concluded at Minnesota State University. This group of men, carefully selected for health and vigor, and with all other conditions comfortable, were reduced to skin and bones by a diet of 1,700 calories a day. They do not begin to recover on 2,000 calories.

Mr. President, even though the appropriation which is sought for UNRRA will not relieve starvation in Germany, our Army in our zone is attempting to furnish only 1,500 calories a day, when this country has ample supplies to relieve starvation there, and in the Russian areas, my information is, there reside 22,000,000 people today, with sufficient food for only 4,000,000. The Russians have no food, and if they had the food they would not have the transports in which to deliver it in order to relieve starvation. In my judgment, the American Government must ship in food and exert every effort to relieve starvation in the stricken areas.

I read further from Dr. Morgan's letter:

A diet of 3,000 to 3,500 calories is necessary to bring recovery. Germany is being held to 1,500 calories.

Fourth, Clarence Pickett, director of the American Friends Service Committee, tells me from his first-hand examination in Europe, that, in his opinion, present American policies are driving Germany directly to communism. Do not General Eisenhower's statements say the same thing in more diplomatic language?

Europe has been greatly disillusioned with communism and will turn to America if we act wisely. Food for starving people is the first key. Humanity and selfish policy unite in calling for prompt help on a large scale.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. MORGAN.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed an editorial from the Yellow Springs News, of Yellow Springs, Ohio, which gives the report of the five international church organizations on conditions in central Europe.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL GROUP PLEADS FOR RELIEF SUPPLIES

An urgent appeal for relief supplies to prevent the threatened death of millions of children in Europe was recently issued by five international organizations, in conference in Berne, Switzerland. The groups were the World Council of Churches, the World Jewish Congress, Caritas, which is the International Catholic Welfare agency, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the Save the Children International Union.

"Children by the millions are in imminent danger of starving and freezing as winter comes to Europe," the joint statement said, "unless immediate help comes from countries which have food, clothing, vitamins, and medicines."

Stressing that "helpless children cannot survive much longer unless there is a united effort to help them," the appeal declared that "every official, humanitarian, and religious agency must come to the rescue immediately or it will be too late."

The agencies said they welcomed present efforts of governments and national and international groups, and urged generous public support of all organizations willing to cooperate in the "dire emergency now confronting Europe."

"We pledge ourselvs to work together in meeting needs without regard to nationality, race or creed," the signers promised, adding that "only by immediate and coordinated effort can colossal catastrophe be avoided."

Dr. Sylvester C. Michelfelder of Toledo, Ohio, newly appointed director of the new Division of Material Aid in the Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid of the World Council of Churches, estimated that 13,000,000 would die in Europe this winter unless help comes, and that one-third or one-half of these victims would be children.

Father Alois Stegerwald, of Lucerne, representing Caritas, recalled that Catholics helped 10,000 Belgian, Dutch, French, and other children to find refuge in Switzerland and now desire to do a similar work of mercy for the suffering of Germany and Central Europe.

Father Stegerwald added that a report just received by him says that all children between the Oder and Neisse Rivers under 2 years of age have already died. "We must help at the earliest moment," he said, "because it may be too late in the spring."

As documentary support of their appeal, the five groups released a carefully compiled report portraying the conditions which children face from France to Russia. The report included the following facts:

Near Salzburg, there are 60,000 children, and in the rest of Austria, 150,000, of various nationalities, herded in camps without sufficient food, clothing, and medical care.

In Vienna, 18,000 infants under 12 months suffer from lack of milk and clothing, and the infant mortality rate has increased from 6 percent in 1943 to 15 percent today.

In Budapest, most children below 1 year of age died during the siege of the city, but the situation has been remedied to the extent that now only one of four babies dies.

In Yugoslavia, children who look like skeletons and are covered with lice have diseases which doctors met before only in books. They eat roots, leaves, and nuts. Some of their parents have no clothing and plow naked at night.

In Greece, with more than 30,000 orphans, children in 'teens often care for families of five and six younger children.

In Albania, half of the nursing mothers cannot feed their babies. The usual diet of these infants consists of a pap concocted of bread and water.

In Germany, at Eberswald and Neuruppin, the infant mortality rate is 100 percent. At Prenzlau, four of five babies born this year and last are dead. At Goettingen, the milk ration for children is one pint daily, and half that in other areas.

George Thelin, general secretary of the Save the Children Union at Geneva, said that 400,000 children in Poland have lost both parents and that 700,000 others lost one.

"It is easy to imagine," the report said, "the situation of children and babies in territory where, according to a recent account from Frankfort, 5,000,000 refugees are wandering and live by theft and plunder, taking food of people who themselves do not have enough."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, speaking for myself personally, and I hope I represent the views of a number of Senators present, it seems to me we are not approaching this problem with the seriousness and the efficiency that its magnitude requires. It seems to me we are acting wholly on the impulse of a great emotion. That emotion, which is shared by all the people of our country, moves us to believe we can do something to relieve the suffering and hunger of the women and the children of Europe.

We have all been disturbed during the last several months by reports of inefficiency in the operation of UNRRA. We were told, when some protested the appropriation of the additional sum of $550,000,000, that this would all be reviewed when the time came for the appropriation of the larger sum, or second commitment of $1,350,000,000. Some of us, acting upon that assurance, voted for the $550,000,000 item.

Now we are asked to appropriate, first, $400,000,000, and now to increase that to $750,000,000, which is a great sum when we compare it with the enormous burden which has been laid upon the American people. We have an obligation to think of the people of America who will have to pay for this expenditure. We have an obligation to see that the money is administered in a faithful and in an efficient manner at the places where the American people desire relief be given. Therefore at this time, when we are concerned about this distribution, why is it that we are voting this immense sum without a thorough canvass of what UNRRA is doing, without a diligent effort to help UNRRA and to correct its mistakes so that it may carry out the wishes of the American people as effectively and as economically as possible, so that the relief may be distributed as far as possible.

Now we are told that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported the measure authorizing this $1,350,000,000. We are in effect here, as Senators representing our several States, being advised to vote for the appropriation now proposed on the strength of the statement that the authorization bill has been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, after only a very brief study. We have not had any opportunity to study the report of the Foreign Relations Committee. We have not had opportunity to examine the evidence which was adduced before that committee. I can see no reason why this whole appropriation cannot be laid over, to come up along with the consideration of the authorization measure. We are, it seems to me, acting in a very inefficient and very irregular way in making this huge appropriation of the people's money when we have not thoroughly examined the basis for it. Now we are told that if we will take the $1,350,000,000 which will be provided for the hungry people of the world and scatter and distribute it around, if it does not do the job, we will not give them another cent.

We all know, however, that when the time comes a year from now when we will be told "The job is not done in Europe; more money is needed to carry out this program; UNRRA is the only agency which can do it, and therefore an additional appropriation must be made," we will then be asked to vote a further appropriation. This is a continuing job, Mr. President. This is not the end of it.

So I move that this appropriation be laid aside for the present so that it may be considered and the whole subject reviewed in connection with the authorization measure, so that the whole matter may be completed at one time, without delaying the aid which we wish to give to these people. That would be the orderly and proper manner in which this subject should be handled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment, in line 1, on page 7, to strike out $400,000,000 and insert $750,000,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we have concluded action on six pages of the bill and I note there are 65 pages in it. I should suppose it would be utterly impossible to conclude action on the bill this evening, and I wonder if this would not be an appropriate time to recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from Maine is correct. It would be impossible to complete the bill this evening. I shall ask that the Senate recess now until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, and I want to express the very great hope that Senators will be present so that we may finish action on the bill as soon as possible tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I may say a further word, I am in complete sympathy with the desire of the Senator from Tennessee, that Members may be present tomorrow so that we may make progress on this bill. If there is to be a Christmas recess begining at a time which makes it possible for many Members to go to their homes, it is necessary that we put on pressure and gather speed in the termination of the program between now, and let us say, the 21st of December. So I hope, as does the Senator from Tennessee, that the Members of the Senate will be present tomorrow and will stay with the session in the further hope that we may conclude the passage of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate all of next week, a part of the time to attend the meeting of the American Bar Association at Cincinnati, Ohio, and the remainder of it to make a visit to my home State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Missouri is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be a member, Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, December 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Clarence E. Gauss, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia, for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Seybourn H. Lynne, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Thomas A. Murphree, deceased.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Capt. Louis L. Bennett, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore, for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of November 1945, while serving as commanding officer of Coast Guard training station, Groton, Conn., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. Joseph E. Stika, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore, for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of November 1945, while serving as commanding officer of the Coast Guard group, Alameda, Calif., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be Postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Arthur M. Matthews, Alicia, Ark., in place of F. W. Lemay, resigned.

Fred G. Williams, Bismarck, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Barbara L. Payne, Patmos, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Lilburn G. Rice, Upper Lake, Calif., in place of Roy Bucknell, retired.

FLORIDA

Rae Moore, Darlington, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IDAHO

Roberta D. Keirnes, Pierce, Idaho., in place of C. N. Dundas, resigned.

Josephine McMurren, Weiser, Idaho, in place of R. J. Wood, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Raphael V. McGreal, Chatsworth, Ill., in place of J. F. Donovan, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Daisy H. Hampton, Artemus, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Verne W. Dunham, Dover, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vernon Hall, McDowell, Ky., in place of Willie Hall, declined appointment.

Mattie S. Catlett, Mount Eden, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clyde W. Rice, Tyner, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Ward Gibbs, Sixlakes, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Lucile M. Bell, Lake Elmo, Minn., in place of R. A. Collopy, transferred.

Peter F. Hipp, New Brighton, Minn., in place of O. E. Schaub, resigned.

Lillian S. Mahlum, Nisswa, Minn., in place of V. M. Parks, resigned.

MISSOURI

Emma E. Farrell, Point Lookout, Mo., in place of E. G. Wilson, resigned.

MONTANA

James P. Waters, Manhattan, Mont., in place of F. J. Hughes, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Fannie T. Matthews, Columbus, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mabel D. Woods, Farmington, N. Mex., in place of J. H. Odle, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Birdie Allen, Clemmons, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Milton I. Abell, Fortuna, N. Dak., in place of Cecil Wigness, transferred.

Ellen J. Powell, Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of S. A. Lucy, resigned.

OREGON

William W. Wooddy, Corvallis, Oreg., in place of V. P. Moses, retired.

Hugh E. Watkins, Myrtle Point, Oreg., in place of E. A. Schroeder, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clifford G. Douthett, Cabot, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Annie M. Riegle, Freeburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John J. Burchill, Smokerun, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Allan R. Newman, Chamberlain, S. Dak., in place of H. E. Henegar, deceased.

Margaret A. Jones, Cresbard, S. Dak., in place of D. L. Stewart, resigned.

UTAH

Lois C. Sargent, Coalville, Utah, in place of W. L. Sargent, deceased.

Carma C. Cutler, Kanosh, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Linwood M. Latimer, Carrollton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alex Moore, Chuckatuck, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John J. Wilson, Saint Brides, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Kenneth J. Van House, Burton, Wash., in place of O. A. Carlson, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer O. Bowyer, Dundon, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hezekiah H. Pine, Scott Depot, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HUNGARY

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

M. Williams Blake	Herbert V. Olds
Overton G. Ellis, Jr.	Rolland Welch
Beppo R. Johansen	Robert E. Wilson

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Correction of names as nominated October 3, 1945)

Francis H. Colombat
Herbert D. Spivack

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7, A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AND A CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Meredith Weatherby

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Lynn U. Stambaugh, to be a member, Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Cyrus E. Tolbert, Omega.

MICHIGAN

Mina Cato, Ceresco.
Frank J. Nackerman, St. James.
Fred B. Mohr, Sherwood.
Paul E. Telfer, Trenton.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Pauline E. Stanislaus, Wallace.

TENNESSEE

Louise White, Clairfield.
Hayden Glover, Elmwood.

WASHINGTON

J. Frank Hall, Edwall.
Lillian Brain, Thorp.

WISCONSIN

Jennie Ruid, Loretta.
Vivian A. Edberg, Radisson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, chosen by Thee for great and blessed designs, we pray for Thy wisdom and vision to clear our motives, and for freedom from that vanity and selfishness which give only passing satisfaction. Oh, reveal unto us that certitude and teach us how to live a life that is good enough to endure forever. Forbid that we should think that a noble life can grow in godless soil, spurred only by ambitions that sting and blast our better natures. O Master, grant us a larger portion of Thy spirit that we may do the work entrusted to us, focusing our talents toward a more contented way of living, never thinking of a great God with a small outlook. We pray for maximums of belief, experience, service, and trust which will give to mankind the heights of love, of heaven, and God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 4129) entitled "An act to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes."

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 457, Rept. No. 1438), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the act (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a letter from a young marine, and in the other to include a letter from the clerk of the superior court of Boston urging the establishment of a veterans' building in the city of Boston.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech which I was supposed to make at Columbus which I cannot make and which they will miss.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech, There Will Always be a U. S. A. if We Don't Give It Away.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to insert an editorial from the Bee and Herald, of Jefferson, Iowa, A Suggestion on the Housing Shortage, and in the second instance to insert a letter from a prominent citizen of Waterloo, Iowa, concerning military training.

Mr. DWORSHAK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief statement on veterans' legislation.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to print in the RECORD three resolutions of the India League of America adopted at Steinway Hall, in New York, on Wednesday, December 12.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to insert his own remarks on the subject of consumer credit, and in the other with reference to the occasion of the presentation of the Nobel peace prize to Secretary Hull, a speech on that occasion by Gunnar Jahn, former Norwegian Minister of Finance, and chairman of the committee.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 203]

Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Merrow
Andresen, August H.	Geelan	Murdock
	Gerlach	Murphy
Andrews, Ala.	Granger	Norton
Bailey	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Baldwin, Md.	Hall, Leonard W.	Powell
Baldwin, N. Y.		Quinn, N. Y.
Barden	Hancock	Robinson, Utah
Barry	Harless, Ariz.	Rockwell
Bates, Mass.	Hart	Roe, N. Y.
Blackney	Hartley	Rogers, N. Y.
Bland	Healy	Sasscer
Boren	Heffernan	Schwabe, Okla.
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Sharp
Brehm	Horan	Short
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Simpson, Pa.
Carlson	Jackson	Starkey
Chiperfield	Jennings	Stevenson
Clark	Jones	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Jonkman	Sumner, Ill.
Colmer	Kee	Sumners, Tex.
Combs	Keefe	Taylor
Courtney	Kefauver	Thomas, N. J.
Curley	Kelly, Ill.	Towe
Davis	Keogh	Wadsworth
De Lacy	Kirwan	Wilson
Dickstein	Kopplemann	Winter
Dingell	Lewis	Wolverton, N. J.
Douglas, Calif.	Luce	Wood
Doyle	Madden	Woodhouse
Drewry	Maloney	
Fogarty	May	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EMPLOYMENT-PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 380, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose last night, the first section of the bill had been read, and it is now open to amendment.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a statement. I said yesterday in my remarks that at the conclusion thereof I would include a statement, together with the bill H. R. 4181, which I had introduced and proposed to offer as a substitute. The bill and papers were properly marked, and I laid them on the table here in the well of the House. In collecting the other material which I had I inadvertently took those two exhibits and did not discover it until this morning. Naturally, they are not in the RECORD this morning. Under the circumstances, I feel I must bear the consequences of my own inadvertence. The bill was very long, and I doubt if many Members have read it, although they might have had an opportunity to read it this morning if it had been included in the RECORD. It was not included, so I shall not offer it as a substitute amendment. I want to offer that explanation of my own error. I am sorry that I cannot get a vote on it, although I have no delusions as to whether it would carry. I will not take any more time of the Committee, but merely make this statement in explanation of why the Members did not find in the RECORD that which I said would be in it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I heard considerable of the debate on yesterday and I did not have an opportunity to speak. I am going to speak frankly. In the first place, it is my opinion that a great deal of the debate yesterday carried with it a philosophy of defeatism and despair. I want to repeat with all the emphasis at my command what I said in a question to the Chairman of the Committee, namely, that in my judgment the root cause of the destruction of democratic institutions in Germany and in every other country that has lost its democratic institutions has been economic conditions under which the the people of that nation found it impossible to have any hope for a decent life.

The worst feature of those economic conditions has always been unemployment itself. The danger to constitutional democracy, to freedom, is not from full employment as was implied so frequently on yesterday, but rather from unemployment. That is the first point I want to make.

The real question before the House is not whether we shall accomplish the job perfectly, which a democracy never does, but whether in truth we shall make a sincere effort. The question is whether we will have the courage to state it as a policy of Congress to enact from time to time measures necessary for the maintenance of an opportunity for employment for all Americans ready and willing to work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at this time. I am sorry.

Many Members rose on the floor yesterday and said, "You can do all this without a bill. You do not even need a

bill." I would agree that is largely true as to the committee substitute. For that substitute contains little that is different from the situation prevailing in the past. I agree there is little need of a bill like the committee substitute, because, except for the setting up of the council, it does not seem to me the committee substitute does much of anything except what can be done and has already been done.

Now, is that enough? I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough. I submit to those Members who spoke yesterday, "Give American free enterprise a chance," which is what I want to do, but I want to give it a real chance—I submit to them that they forget that in 1929, after there had been the greatest possible freedom for industry to pursue its own course and develop in any way it saw fit, the bottom dropped out of the economic situation, and the very people who were soon to condemn every New Deal measure that was taken, came and begged the Government of the United States to save them from utter ruin.

The burden of my speech is simply this: That in this, the beginning of the age of atomic energy, it is absolutely necessary that there be a reasonable appraisal of where the job of government lies, and where the proper field of private enterprise lies, in solving the problems of a great nation like the one in which we live. That solution will never be found, on the one hand, by those people who insist on unlimited extension of governmental activity, nor, on the other hand, by those who say that government must not even act to prevent the growth of monopoly power or to control the supply of money in the Nation. There are duties of government today which, if performed wisely and well, can increase the true freedom of not only our people but also our industry and agriculture. Some of these are preventing inflation and deflation; developing a security system which will be broad enough to really undergird the consumer buying power of the country; having a tax system which will offer an incentive to business expansion and production. None of these measures involves deficit spending. It is unnecessary to rely wholly or even largely on public works as a means of overcoming unemployment. If anyone really wants the system of freedom to continue, his first duty is to take steps which can prevent unemployment in the future, and to take a stand in this Congress for the opportunity of Americans to work. In my judgment, the Senate bill is a good bill on the whole. I want an opportunity to vote for the Senate bill, and I am going to try to get an opportunity to vote for the Senate bill by voting against the committee substitute.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from California had his opportunity only yesterday. The committee gave the gentleman a whole day's session, as indicated in the hearings.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true.

Mr. CHURCH. And now you are criticizing the committee and the chairman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not say a word about the committee not giving me an opportunity. Of course, I was before the committee.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman said he did not have an opportunity to speak yesterday.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I did not. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I said I hoped I would have an opportunity to vote for the Senate bill; that I was going to try to get such an opportunity to vote for it. I said that on yesterday I did not have an opportunity to address the Committee. That was not criticizing a single soul when I said that. I had to leave at 6 o'clock. That was the reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. The gentleman is complaining he did not have an opportunity to speak yesterday. Did the gentleman ask anyone on this side for time?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Let me say to the gentleman the only reason I made that remark was because I wanted to make a rather general speech on the bill, but the chairman of the committee promised me time on yesterday. Unfortunately, however, I had to leave, for reasons that are quite personal with myself, before they got to my time. When I made that remark I implied no criticism. I only regret the fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and in connection with the amendment I may say for the benefit of the House that the text of the amendment appears on page 11970 of this morning's RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Strike out the language of the committee substitute and insert the following:

"That (a) Congress hereby finds that—

"(1) Recurring economic depressions, with the resulting poverty and unemployment, are not inevitable and unavoidable;

"(2) The effective operation of the national economy depends upon the same factors and controls as those affecting all industry;

"(3) Periodic, comprehensive inventories and accountings of the existing plant, together with intelligent appraisal, based on such inventories and accountings, of the potentialities for the immediate future are indispensable to the efficient and successful operation of any industrial enterprise;

"(4) A periodic, comprehensive inventory by the United States of all of the facilities and conditions affecting the national economy is indispensable, not only to an intelligent appraisal of the potentialities of such economy for the immediate future but also to the efficient, stabilized operation of the national economy.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States, by making provision for such periodic national inventories and for appraisals based thereon, to determine the causes of economic depressions, with their resulting poverty and unemployment, to prevent them from recurring, and to stabilize the national economy at a high level of production and employment.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a commission, to be known as the National Inventory Commission, which shall consist of 30 outstanding persons representative of industry, labor, agriculture, small business, finance, and the public, respectively, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Commission shall annually select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

"(b) The Commission shall annually make a national inventory of the facilities and conditions affecting the national economy. Such inventory shall include, but shall not be limited to, inventory of—

"(1) The natural resources of the United States;

"(2) Financial commitments, both at home and abroad;

"(3) Requirements for consumer and capital goods;

"(4) The economic effects of cut-backs in war production;

"(5) The problems of reconversion;

"(6) State and local needs for highways, paving, schools, hospitals, and other public and community facilities;

"(7) Backlogs of orders;

"(8) The amount and distribution of savings;

"(9) Foreign balances available for expenditure;

"(10) The size, value, and productive potential of the industrial plant of the United States;

"(11) The size, value, and productive potential of the farm plant of the United States, and the amount and distribution of indebtedness thereon;

"(12) The size, value, and productive potential of small business;

"(13) The housing requirements in the United States;

"(14) The needs of veterans;

"(15) Employment and unemployment, and its distribution by regions, States, and areas;

"(16) Wage payments in the United States.

"(c) The Commission shall, not later than January 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) submit the national inventory to the President, and shall append thereto such recommendations, within the framework of the free competitive enterprise system and with due regard for national solvency, as it deems advisable with respect to—

"(1) Better functioning of the system of free competitive enterprise;

"(2) Taxes;

"(3) Cyclical balancing of the budget;

"(4) Retention, abandonment, or modification of price controls, and rationing controls;

"(5) Liquidation of emergency agencies of the Government;

"(6) Cost of Government;

"(7) Extension of social security;

"(8) Administration of the public debt;

"(9) Stimulation of risk capital;

"(10) Revitalization of competition and removal of Government from competition with private business;

"(11) Speculative accumulation of inventories;

"(12) Reduction of building costs and stimulation of construction;

"(13) Public works at the national, State, and local levels;

"(14) Stimulation of invention and the development of new products;

"(15) Utilization of foreign patents and processes to develop new enterprise;

"(16) The use of Federal works programs not as relief but to stabilize and expand the construction industry;

"(17) Stabilization of the national economy at a high level of production and employment;

"(d) In carrying out the provisions of this act—

"(1) The Commission is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such specialists and other experts as may be necessary, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

"(2) The Commission may conduct such hearings, investigations, and inquiries as it deems necessary;

"(3) The Commission may constitute such advisory committees, and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

"(4) The Commission shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies.

"SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after receiving the national inventory from the Commission, the President shall transmit such inventory (including the recommendations made by the Commission) to the Congress, together with his own recommendations with respect thereto. The national inventory and the President's recommendations, when transmitted to the Congress, shall be referred to the Joint Committee on the National Inventory (created by sec. 4).

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the National Inventory (in this section called the joint committee), and which shall be composed of the chairman and ranking majority party member, and the two ranking minority party members of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, of the Senate Committee on Finance, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"(1) To make a continuing study of matters relating to the national inventory; and

"(2) As a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to the national inventory, not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in connection with the national inventory, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

"(e) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman, and shall not exceed $100,000 for each fiscal year."

Mr. BENDER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, since this appears in the RECORD on page 11970, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object; the amendment ought to be read.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, would it be in order now to ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in my judgment, is a recapitulation or a restatement of some of the main principles involved in the Senate act and in the Patman bill, and I object to the request because I think every Member of the House should hear the amendment read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I am constrained to make the point of order against the proposed substitute that it is not germane to the Senate bill or to the substitute bill proposed by the committee.

With the Chair's indulgence I call attention to the fact that the Senate bill undertakes to assure full, continuing, remunerative employment by supplementing the deficiencies of the private enterprise system by Federal expenditures and disbursements. I emphasize that the purpose is to provide for what is termed in the Senate bill full employment.

Secondly, under the Senate bill, in order to promote the objectives of this full remuneration employment to all, assured as stated, a national budget of Federal expenditures and disbursements is proposed. The Senate bill is confined to the matter of employment. The proposed substitute of the House, while also confined to employment, adopts an entirely different view. The substitute undertakes to provide and not to assure high levels of employment or maximum employment, production, and consumption by giving to the private-enterprise system of the country an opportunity to function, and it provides for an economic report by the President of the United States with respect to the subject in hand, to wit, employment. It sets up an advisory council of three outstanding citizens comparable to demobilizers and to those who provide for reconversion at salaries of $15,000, and whatever be said about the expenditures by those three men, their expenditures are limited and the amount would be fixed hereafter by the Congress of the United States in approving appropriations. But they are confined to the matter of consideration of employment, of the loans, and of the programs that have been adopted by Congress, and with any supplemental recommendations with respect to additional expenditures or outlays or additional legislation to promote employment.

The proposed substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois goes far afield. He has embraced in his language many desirable matters, but fundamentally he provides for an inventory of the United States. I read the first provision of his substitute:

"The natural resources of the United States and the needs of the States, of the local agencies for highways and schools and hospitals and other facilities"; a national inventory covering the property and covering the operations not only of the National Government, but of the States composing the National Government. The objective is an inventory, and inventories are sound, and if there are not adequate provisions in our budget for inventories, the place to correct it is under that system.

Secondly, it proposes to establish a commission on national inventory, to be composed of 30 persons, at salaries of $15,000 each, with no limitation upon the amount that they might expend for the purpose fundamentally not of providing employment, but undertaking to make an inventory of the properties and of the operations of the Federal Government and the State governments as well.

To show that such is the intent and purpose of the proposed substitute, the matter is submitted to the President, and I quote from the substitute, "for him to transmit to Congress with his recommendations with respect thereto, to wit, the national inventory."

It may be correct and it may not; it may be desirable and it may not. But with all due deference, having covered practically the entire field of governmental operations, it does strike me that this proposed substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois goes far afield and undertakes to substitute for the proposed employment solution embraced in the two bills before the committee an entirely different proposal, an entirely different matter dealing not only with inventories, and not only with inventories of the Federal Government, but restricting and limiting only the matter of the inventories to the consideration of the joint committee.

Mr. Chairman, I feel, as I said, that under the circumstances I am constrained to make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THOMASON). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair thinks the amendment is clearly germane. The Senate bill, the

committee amendment, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, all deal with economic policy, recommendations, programs, and so forth, thereon relating to the question of full employment. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the discussion on yesterday reflects a rather interesting division of sentiment in the House with reference to this generic problem of unemployment in a time of dislocation. There are some who evidently want the Senate bill. There are some who want the House bill. There are some who want no bill at all. There are some who want a modification of the bills that have been presented in both the House and the Senate. This effort in preparing a substitute to provide for a National Commission on National Inventory is nothing more than a humble effort to aid the cause, as it were.

It comes about from the experiences we had early in the war with respect to a problem of national proportions. Do you remember the day rationing was imposed upon tires and all kinds of rubber products in the country? We discovered very suddenly that there was a very critical condition confronting this Nation. It was ventilated very freely before a Senate committee, and the result was headlines, incriminations, and recriminations between administrators and Cabinet Members of the Government on this whole rubber problem.

What was done? The President of the United States reached out and found two private citizens and charged them with the responsibility of studying this question. One of them was Mr. Bernard Baruch. They inventoried our position in rubber, our needs, what we had. They made and recommended a program. They estimated the cost. The result was that there sprang up in the country industrial plants which last year produced well over 1,000,000 tons of rubber.

Good results flowed from the making of an inventory. So I was very much interested some time ago in the report Mr. Baruch made to a Member of this House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. It was on the 14th of November that he dispatched a letter to the gentleman from Tennessee, and I want to read only one paragraph, if the House will indulge me.

Evidently there had been a meeting and it was in comment on that meeting, that Mr. Baruch said this:

> Here is what I wanted to say: Before we can decide the question of inflation and all the other economic problems, domestic and foreign, facing us we must get an over-all picture of the balance sheet of the country—a kind of inventory that would show these facts.

Then he alludes to debt, distribution of savings, productive capacity, how to divide what we produce, what to allocate to rehabilitation for foreign countries, what to do with the surplus, and finally, to produce and produce and produce.

Now, then, if you can solve one problem that way, certainly you can solve what may be the biggest problem that may confront the country by the setting up of a group of 30 men representative of finance, the public, of labor, of agriculture and industry, and small business, and give to them the responsibility of rendering a national balance sheet to the President and to the Congress of the United States. It is quite in line then with what we are attempting to do at the present time. It may be said that there is already a council of advisers in the pending bill. That is quite true. But let me point out what I think is a weakness. On page 15 of the bill you will notice this language:

> There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a council of economic advisers.

Let me repeat. "There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a council of economic advisers."

We have a council there now in the form of the Budget Bureau. When they last came before the Committee on Appropriations to procure funds for their operation they reported they had 587 people on the pay roll. For the fiscal year 1946 we gave them $2,900,000 for their operation. In response to my questions to Director Smith of the Bureau of the Budget last year, he said, "We do have authority to pass upon all planning and planning funds that are submitted by any agency in Government."

Now, it is proposed today to set up another council in the office of the President, a council of only 3 when you have a Budget Bureau that has been functioning for 24 years with 587 people on the pay roll, exclusive of the 144 who were transferred there from the Office of War Information. Now my contention is that this is an over-all problem and that unemployment and employment is simply a facet of a national problem. It becomes necessary then to determine our capacity, to determine what commitments we have made both at home and abroad, and to make an exploration of the national debt, to make an exploration of all economic conditions in the country, and to do it by means of an independent group.

Is that not the technique we have followed heretofore with respect to other economic and administrative problems? We have, for instance, today a Veterans' Administration looking after the affairs of millions of veterans. It is an independent agency of Government and Congress was so interested in its independence that when the reorganization bill, the conference report on which was completed only yesterday on this floor under the splendid leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], we said in the bill that the independence of that agency must be preserved and that it must not be disturbed in any reorganization bill.

It is 58 years ago that we consolidated all the railroad affairs under the Interstate Commerce Commission. We kept it an independent agency. In the reorganization bill we protected its independence no later than yesterday as that bill was before us. When we had an economic tailspin in 1929 and $50,000 fur coats and $50,000 apartments went on the market, there was a great slump in equities and values and the savings of people were wiped out by the millions.

Under the leadership of the splendid and beloved Speaker of this House, who was then chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, there went across this floor and onto the statute books of this Nation the Securities and Exchange Act, to give us control of the security markets of this country. We preserved the independence of that agency and protected it in the reorganization bill. If that approach is good for the tremendous problems that confronted the economy of the country in those days, then why should we not have an independent agency outside of the office of the President to make an inventory, to make a survey, to ascertain the conditions that have a bearing upon unemployment, and then to make a recommendation that shall involve every factor and every incentive? In that independent inventory we have got to know something about the distribution of manpower. Every release I have seen from the Department of Labor says there are 3,000,000, or 4,000,000, or 5,000,000, or 8,000,000 out of work. Have you ever seen it broken down by areas? The industries in my district today are advertising over the radio for help. Why not get a clear picture? An inventory commission could give us a clear picture of every industrial area in the country, to determine exactly and precisely what that problem is.

What about materials? Think of the letters on your desk today, shrieking out in protest against the housing situation in this country. We should build many houses, but it requires material. What is the availability of lumber, soil pipe, sheeting, and everything else that goes along with it? Who in Government today has a clear picture of that subject?

What about the distribution of savings? How much in the hands of the consumer? How much in corporate treasuries? How much in trust funds? How much in the hands of the banks? How much of it is spendable today? I have seen no balance sheet to indicate what we can expect in that respect.

I think the inventory requires also that we look at the question of foreign trade and tariffs. The president of the watchmakers' union was at the White House last week. He protested that in the month of October alone over 2,000,000 Swiss watch movements came into this country. The number of Swiss watchmaking plants has increased from 50 to 500, when our own people at Waltham, Mass., and Elgin, Ill., were busy producing precision fuzes for war and for victory.

Now, here come so many imports from the outside that threaten employment in the country. Only through an inventory commission, in my judgment, can you appraise that kind of development, put it together and render a balance sheet to the President and to the White House.

We are going to have to analyze this whole question of debt and its amortiza-

tion. There is the question of devaluation of gold. When the going gets too thick, it is still possible to go back to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and still squeeze 9 cents out of the dollar of the United States. What about it? What effect is it going to have upon confidence, upon the profit motive, upon incentives, upon all those things that encourage the free enterprise system and that finally produce jobs?

In the main, that is the whole story. This substitute, though it seems a little bit long, is considerably compressed, in comparison with the committee bill, but it sets up an independent commission on national inventory to look at every factor so that then we can address ourselves more intelligently to the question of a high level of unemployment, and to make a report to the President. Then have the President add his recommendations, and submit them to the joint committee on national inventory, made up of selected Members of the House and Senate. There is the whole story.

I fully concur in the sentiment that Mr. Baruch uttered to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in that letter of October 5, when he said:

> Here is what I wanted to say: Before we can decide the question of inflation and all the other economic problems, domestic and foreign, we must have a kind of inventory that would show us the facts.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman provides for recommendations to be made by the commissioners to be appointed on various matters, one of which is the cyclical balancing of the budget.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Would the gentleman give us a few illustrations of where cyclical balancing of the budget has been practiced and how it worked?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has never been the practice since 1931 or 1932. Even in the days of President Hoover there was no balanced budget, and in all the years since, of course, there has been no balancing of the budget. Now, we go along with expenditures greater in some years than they are in other years. Perhaps it may not be possible to balance the budget in every year but certainly we can have a balancing of the budget once every 2 years or some stated period of time, a cyclical balancing of the budget, once every 3 years or 5 years. The fact of the matter is that for sixteen or so years we have never had a balancing of the budget. I think it is imperative as a matter of fact that there be some kind of balancing of the budget. If you cannot do it every year then let us do it on a cyclical basis involving 2 or 3 years at a time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentleman cite an instance in history when that has been the practice, to have a so-called cyclical balancing of the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a matter of fact, you can compare no country on earth with the United States in the matter of the size of the Budget, for our Budget is probably greater than that of all the other countries combined. But if we cannot do it every year, then we ought to work out some system whereby it can be done periodically, and that is what I have reference to.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I am very much impressed, but I wish to ask the gentleman if that would not involve a tremendous force and expenditure of money. Would it not be colossal?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from North Carolina has asked whether it would not involve a tremendous force and a tremendous amount of money. It may involve a substantial amount, but do not forget the billions that we lost when we went through the valley of the shadow of dislocation once before.

And, finally, may I add this: If it is good business for business to take an inventory every year, then it is good business for the biggest business on earth to take an inventory, namely, the United States Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it grieves me greatly to oppose anything suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. During the last campaign he made a very, very wonderful and effective speech over in my district advocating my reelection. If there is any individual in the whole Nation whom I have ever had the privilege of meeting, who has more speaking ability and eloquence, more downright persuasive power, than the gentleman from Illinois I cannot recall his name at the moment.

The gentleman from Illinois is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He has a vast knowledge of our financial condition, of the money we have and do not have, of what appropriation should and should not be made. I regret that the gentleman with all his eloquence and persuasive power could not have seen fit to have given the committee 5 minutes of his time when this bill was under consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think since the 5th day of September when Congress reconvened—and my friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and others will bear me out—we have had hearings in the Appropriations Committee continuously 6 days a week and there has been no possibility of going before other committees.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No Member renders more continuous and worth-while service than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If the gentleman could just have sent us over, say a memo on it, that would have been appreciated.

The gentleman has advocated economy time and time again. Now he comes before us and in place of a committee of three members of a council at $15,000 he says we ought to have 30 at $15,000 each, and he wants to make an inventory of everything the country has.

That would have been fine if we had started back years ago. I suggest to the gentleman that if he will just wait 6 months there will be less to inventory; and his plan if he waits a little longer perhaps there will be still less to put in an inventory, we will have given it all away. Let us not blow hot, let us not blow cold on the same day; let us either be for economy by act as well as by word, or against it by word when we are for spending by act. The gentleman is on the Reorganization Committee, is he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a committee to cut down Government agencies, cut down Federal expenditures. Yet he comes here now and offers an amendment which calls for an inventory of our national assets, our resources. Unless I am mistaken, and if I am the gentleman will correct me, there is no limit, not even the sky, to the amount of money that these thirty $15,000-a-year men can spend. If he gets his inventory, it will show that our stock of dollars is short, in fact we not only have none we do not owe, but we owe for those we do not have; but would that keep us from loaning Britain four or more billion dollars or end our spending? It would not. Oh, it grieves me to oppose the gentleman's amendment, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It should not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us be consistent. I know the gentleman is eloquent, I know he is persuasive, but why not be consistent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I will be happy to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With respect to expenditures, let me say to the gentleman that only last week when the deficiency bill went across here it contained items for the Department of Commerce for the gathering up of all sorts of facts of a piecemeal nature and it embraced an appropriation of over $5,000,000. My friend from Michigan never raised his voice in opposition to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I never voted for it. The gentleman has voted for a dozen appropriations I voted against.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman by his tacit consent let that thing go across the floor of the House. If you are going to have a piecemeal approach you can do an over-all job infinitely cheaper than that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean to infer that if I had protested and spoken against the passage of the bill it would have had any effect on the vote?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know; probably not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think we have had enough inventories and I hate to see anybody from the Republican side ask for it because our people are getting tired of having Government snoopers

from the OPA and WPB asking questions. If we have not any hope from the Republican Party, where is the hope?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion all I am asking is that we vote down this amendment because it is just another enlarged agency for more Federal spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I have not had an opportunity to study it as carefully as I would like, but I notice there are some 18 or 20 objectives in the amendment offered by him. Many of them are very laudable objectives and I am sorry he did not see fit to submit them to our committee because we might have included one or two of them in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman will recall that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and several of us were interested in not closing the hearings. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was listed as a witness we wanted to hear. Our committee did not give him the opportunity because it closed the hearings.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, we had requests from three or four hundred people to appear, but I think every member of the committee heard enough. We had about 7 weeks of hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of our committee believes that the President of the United States should have some machinery to make continuing studies of our economic problems. I realize that there is a place the Government occupies in our economic system to advise and counsel industry, wholesale distribution systems, our investing public, and other segments of our society. Heretofore we have made attempts to do that loosely. The gentleman referred a moment ago to the Department of Commerce that was given four or five million dollars to make certain studies. At the present time we have over 75 agencies in the Federal Government gathering statistics. We hope that in the reorganization plan the President will send down under the Reorganization Act adopted yesterday many of these statistical-gathering agencies will be consolidated. We realize that Government statistics are of great value to industry and the wholesale distribution trade, but, unfortunately, we have no coordination of those agencies. In many instances, by the time a fellow finds which agency is getting the information he desires it is too old to be of any benefit to him. We do hope that the President remedies that situation in the reorganization plan.

We realize that the Bureau of the Budget could make some of the studies recommended in this legislation, but we think that a separate agency not connected with any of the old so-called bureaucratic agencies should make these studies. We do not want people going around snooping in safety deposit boxes or people's socks or under the bed, trying to make investigations to carry out the intent declared in section 2 of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I think it is safe to say that if this substitute offered by the gentleman were adopted and became law it would ultimately cost the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars. We limited the amount of expenditures by the Council set up in our substitute bill to $345,000. We did that purposely, because many of you have seen Government bureaus grow from 20 men to 20,000 men, and they can come before the committees of Congress and justify that increase. It is very hard to resist them. That is the reason we placed a ceiling so that when they come before the Committee on Appropriations they cannot go beyond $345,000. We think that that machinery will give the President an adequate staff.

They can utilize the services of other Government agencies in making these studies to be made under our committee substitute and can do a worth-while job for the people of our country without jeopardizing in the least our economy or without increasing appreciably our public debt.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Would not this new agency that the gentleman's substitute would set up be a permanent haven for all the old run-down economists, analysts, and stenographers of the OPA, the WPB, the OSS, and the OWI and all the other agencies which we would like to see terminated just as soon as possible?

Mr. MANASCO. Yes; and many others in that same category. I sincerely trust the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois made passing reference to a visit by a gentleman to the White House who sought a quota on Swiss watches. I cannot let that reference go by without making comment on it. We cannot have full employment in this country unless and until we have exports to the extent of about $10,000,000,000. International trade is no longer a one-way street. People must have the dollars with which to buy our goods or, if they lack the dollars, we must buy goods from those to whom we send our exports; otherwise we are stymied. The Swiss send their watches to us. We send to the Swiss quantities of agricultural products. If we put a quota on Swiss watches, as was demanded by that gentleman who visited the White House, we encourage not only the Swiss to put quotas against our own goods, but encourage other nations to put quotas against our goods, and with that sort of trade irritations it would discourage and tend to preclude our share of international trade. With such trade we make for unemployment. That gentleman who went to the White House represents a company union, a company-controlled union. He represents companies that are now under indictment by the Department of Justice. Surely, the gentleman does not want to come to the aid of three companies particularly who had been indicted—indicted for violation of our anti-monopoly laws. Monopolies and cartels discourage competition and freer trade and thereby reduce our productivity with consequent loss of jobs. The monopolistic practices charged against these companies are the practices that so interfere with our national economy as to reduce employment. You can pass all the so-called full employment bills in the world, but monopolies kill fullest employment. The watch companies and their machinations to stifle competition really ruin the purposes of any bill like the one before us.

No. All kinds of quotas are ruinous to our national economy. Quotas mean monopoly and favoritism. It becomes a mad scramble as to who gets which. If you set up a Swiss watch quota there will be a continual trek to Washington and all and sundry interested to get a larger piece of the quota pie. Any quota would give the American watch manufacturers, under indictment, a firmer grip on their monopoly. They would have a lush time, lifting skyward the price of their product. They would get away with huge profits because there would be a decided dearth of watches since no Swiss watches of any appreciable number could come in. They could not supply the terrific demand for watches. Prices would leap. Then profits would swell.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman must be fair. The three largest watchmakers in the United States have all sent information, data, and letters to every Member of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. CELLER. So have the American Watch Assemblers Association, but the three large watchmakers—the Waltham, the Elgin, and the Hamilton—are now under indictment by the Department of Justice. Do not forget that. Also they have blatantly advertised heavy demand for their product. They know that the shelves of all retail jewelers are bare of watches of all sorts. Try to get any kind of watch. You will fail. The American watchmakers would double and triple that scarcity if we had a quota against Swiss watches.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman would not want to leave the implication that simply because some clerk down at the Department of Justice has seen fit to draft an indictment that makes them culpable of any wrong?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman does not believe that. That indictment was the result of many, many months of investigation. It was the result of deliberations of a grand jury.

May I say to the gentleman, however, that the CIO and the A. F. of L., both of which organizations are very much interested in jobs, are opposing any Swiss quota. These labor groups have expressed strong opposition to any quota. I assure the gentleman those organizations, which are vitally interested in removing the spectre of fear of loss of jobs, should know what they are talking about. I hope the gentleman will recanvass in his own mind the facts concerning this matter of Swiss watches. I have great respect for the gentleman. When the full facts are known to him, I am sure he will revise his judgment.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Two weeks ago I introduced a bill to place a quota of 25 percent on the import of Swiss watches, based on the production of the watch industry in 1940.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I am aware of the gentleman's bill. I understand the gentleman's bill. He is seeking to get a quota by legislation. He will fail. His bill would destroy our entire international-trade program.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As I understood the gentleman, he said we ship lots of agricultural products to Switzerland. I want to keep my good friend from New York straight by saying——

Mr. CELLER. I refuse to yield further. I ask the gentleman to read the treaty between the United States and Switzerland, and he will find that there is an intent on the part of both Governments that the Swiss take large quantities of agricultural products. During the war, because of the lack of shipping, the Swiss could not take those agricultural products. They are very anxious to take them now, but they will not take them if there is any attempt to put a quota on their productivity.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that the American Watch Assemblers Association, who oppose the quota, is a wholly American industry.

It has to do not only with the importing of movements. They make in the United States the cases, the metal and leather straps, the bracelets, jewelled pieces, and assorted accessories and adjuncts that go into watchmaking. They employ just as many men as the American Watch Manufacturers employ. They were engaged in the manufacture of war precision and airplane and radar instruments and tools to just as great an extent as was the American watch industry. They won just as many Army and Navy E awards as did the American watch industry. Both groups participated in the war effort. The American watch group cannot claim a monopoly in that regard.

On this bill, may I say I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I believe that unless we come to the conclusion that the right to a job is as inalienable a right as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we are going to get into the economic doldrums.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his kindness in yielding. May I say to my good friend from New York that I not only can read but I do read. If he cares to look the situation up and do a little reading himself of the OPA order, he will find that contrary to the law of this country Swiss cheese is coming in here with a 12¾-cent-a-pound ceiling above American-produced cheese.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will not yield to the gentleman; he would not yield to me.

What can the Tariff Commission do about that? They have no more power than I have.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, we are witnessing an outstanding exhibition of what the French historian and statesman, Guizot, called, "the great delusion faith in the soverign power of political machinery." This is, of course, nothing out of the ordinary since it is representative of the dominent psychology that has prevailed in the Congress in the last 10 or 12 years. The attitude of mind seems to be that every social and economic defect, imaginary or real, can somehow be corrected through the creation of an additional Federal board, bureau, or agency.

Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment calls for the establishment of a national Inventory Commission, appointed by the President, composed of 30 members, each of whom is to receive an annual salary of $15,000. The members of this body are to be selected from "outstanding persons representative of industry, labor, agriculture, small business, finance," and, of course, the dear "public." It would be the business of this commission to make an inventory of all our natural resources; financial commitments at home and abroad; requirements for consumer and capital goods; State and local needs for highways, paving, schools, hospitals, and other public and community facilities; the amount and distribution of savings; the size, value, and productive potential of the industrial plant, and also farm plant; the size, value, and productive potential of small business; housing requirements; veterans' needs; employment and unemployment and its distribution; wage payments; and so forth.

The first inventory is to be submitted to the President by the Commission not later than January 1, 1947. The Commission shall append to such inventory recommendations, "within the framework of the free competitive enterprise system and with due regard for national solvency," with respect to better functioning of the system of free competitive enterprise; taxes; cyclical balancing of the Budget; retention, abandonment, modification of price controls and rationing controls; cost of Government; extension of social security; administration of public debt; stimulation of risk capital; revitalization of competition and removal of Government from competition with private business; speculative accumulation of inventories; reduction of building costs and stimulation of construction; stimulation of invention and the development of new products; the use of Federal Works programs not as relief but to stabilize and expand the construction of industry; stabilization of the national economy at a high level of production and employment; and so forth.

The Commission would be authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such specialists and other experts, officers, and employees as may be necessary. The Commission may conduct such hearings, investigations, and inquiries as it deems necessary.

It is provided the Commission shall submit its national inventory to the President with recommendations in respect thereto. In turn the President shall submit the national inventory with recommendations of his own to another body which the Dirksen amendment seeks to establish, called Joint Committee on the National Inventory, to be composed of Members of Congress.

This joint committee is also authorized to hold hearings as it deems advisable, to at will go into the affairs of any and all enterprises in the United States.

There are numerous other provisions in the Dirksen amendment, but we have stated enough of them to show the broad implications of his proposal. We have here many of the provisions and practically all of the basic ideas contained in the sections relating to the National Budget as provided in the Senate Full Employment Act and the Patman full employment bill.

In my testimony before the Expenditures Committee opposing the so-called full employment bill I pointed out the similarity between the National Budget provided in those measures and the Soviet national budget. The point is that the psychology embraced in formulating the Dirksen amendment is essentially socialistic and is in nowise related to anything required of a legislative body to maintain a true republic. When one examines the individual items embraced in this amendment one is constrained to conclude that they represent that dogmatism and mysticism characteristic of Jacobin thinking. Let us look at a few of these items.

It is provided that the commission shall, within the framework of the free competitive enterprise system and with due regard for national solvency, make recommendations with respect to cyclical balancing of the Budget. Now who can define cyclical balancing of the Budget? I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

DIRKSEN] whether he could cite any examples of cyclical balancing of the Budget. His reply indicated that he knew of no such examples. Of course he does not, nor does anyone else. So far as I know there is no record of any such reality. The gentleman from Illinois may have had in mind that the Government might be financed for a time by keeping expenses under income and then in turn reverse the process whereby outgo would exceed income, so as to balance accounts over a long-run period. But is this a rational concept? I do not believe it is. In my opinion it is typically representative of socialist thinking, faith in the power of words. If it is not that, then it can be nothing other than an excuse for deficit financing.

The terms "stimulation of risk capital, revitalization of competition, stabilization of the national economy at a high level of production and employment," and so forth, are all indefinable, mere cliches, and can, in my judgment, by no stretch of the imagination be brought within the realm of rational thinking.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] remarked that enterprise keeps an inventory of its affairs and he asked why should the Government not do likewise. This concept is commonly held by Members of the House. Indeed, it dominates largely our thinking. It exhibits the great distance this legislative body has departed from comprehending what the true functions of the Federal Government are.

Certainly private industry keeps tab on its affairs, but only on its own. But the Congress seems to be minding everybody else's business but its own.

Why should the Congress want an inventory of all the economic factors of the Nation? What would it do with it after it had made it?

What does the Soviet regime do with its national inventory? It uses it as a coercive instrument to keep the people rigidly regimented, to virtually hold them in slavery. To the extent that our Government would use the machinery which this amendment calls for it would do to our people precisely what the Soviets do to theirs.

The Dirksen amendment embodies almost the entire congeries of concepts that make up the Socialist philosophy. It provides that it shall be the policy of the United States, through the political machinery that would be set up by his amendment, to determine the causes of economic depressions and to prevent them from recurring. If the author of this amendment can show me two economists who could agree upon the causes of depressions and their cure, I would like to have him do so. They just do not exist. This proposition postulates nothing less than that the political machinery, which it would establish would somehow be possessed of those attributes of God which come under the head of omniscience and omnipotence.

Congress should, indeed, make an inventory—not, however, of something it is wholly incapable of comprehending, namely, the social and economic life of the Nation, but of the affairs it can really call its own, namely, what constitutes its real function and duty under the Constitution. It should begin by redefining the principles of the Republic which was vouchsafed us by the founding fathers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to detain the Committee. There is no Member whom I esteem more highly than the gentleman from Illinois. He is versatile and he is comprehensive. His comprehensiveness is only exceeded by the versatility and comprehensiveness of his proposed substitute. He emphasizes the matter of a proposed inventory. Government departments are required to keep inventories. The first thing you would expect of a committee is to advise you what is being done under existing law. I favor strengthening the law providing for inventories. The House passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress a bill to provide better facilities for inventories. It went to the other body, and it reposes there still.

But we have under consideration a bill limited as nearly as may be to the matter of employment. To show you how many matters are covered by the proposed amendment that we might well eliminate, studies are to be made with respect to the liquidation of emergency agencies of the Government. They will shortly expire. Why bother to go into an investigation of those agencies?

"The better functioning of agencies." It covers all matters.

Whatever may be said with respect to the committee bill, in order to enable the President to submit and in order to aid him in preparing his economic budget with respect to employment, we establish in his office—and the bill so states—three outstanding officials on a par with the Cabinet to advise him with respect to the great question of employment. We put them at his command. We did that because the testimony before the committee showed that President Hoover and President Roosevelt would have been in a better position if they had had the benefit of their advice.

Something has been said about the amount they will expend. The Senate bill contemplates the expenditure of at least billions of dollars. My judgment is that to promote production during the war we have done it by the establishment of small commissions and small committees, whether it be the War Production Board or the OPA, and when we provide them with millions of dollars, it occurs to me we could do no less than to put an absolute ceiling of $300,000 on the amount that may be spent by these men in the Executive Office of the President of the United States; just as the Director of the Budget is in his office. I say the Director of the Budget, like members of the Cabinet, does not have the time required. They are all too preoccupied. If the Director of the Budget, in order to provide for our normal expenditures, has a staff costing two or three million dollars, it occurs to me it would be economy, before we embark upon a policy of expending billions of dollars in lump-sum appropriations, and it would be the part of wisdom and the part of economy to put a ceiling on the amount that the advisers of the President may spend. It strikes me, with all due deference to my good friend, that when the Senate began hearings on this bill in July and the House began hearings on September 25, in a matter that has engaged the attention not only of the Congress, but of the country, if the gentleman had had any confidence in his proposal, if he had wanted to have a committee to pass on it, with all due deference and in all kindness, in a matter of this magnitude, while I am willing to trust the gentleman when I can, it does occur to me the least that could be done with a proposal of this sort is to demand that a committee of the House or a committee of the Senate take a look at it.

I trust the amendment will be overwhelmingly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

All time has expired.

The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 2. Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy of the United States—

(a) By means of—

(1) preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise and fostering the investment of private capital in trade, agriculture, commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

(2) aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new busniess, and especially small business, and to promoting continuous growth in the quality and quantity of facilities of production;

(3) encouraging individual initiative;

(4) avoiding competition of government with private business enterprise; and

(5) adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States;

and thereby creating under, and in a manner consistent with, the American system of free competitive enterprise, the maximum opportunity for employment (including self-employment), to attain and maintain a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power.

(b) By means of investigating and determining the causes of economic fluctuations, and providing for continuous study of economic conditions and economic trends, to make provision for diminishing such fluctuations and avoiding the causes thereof.

(c) By means of—

(1) encouragng State and local governments to plan and adopt sound programs of public works for their normal needs in normal times, capable of acceleration and expansion when widespread unemployment in the State or in any substantial portion thereof exists or threatens, and capable of reduction when inflationary conditions exist or threaten;

(2) planning and adopting programs for loans by the United States, consistent with a financially sound fiscal policy, for use when widespread unemployment in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof exists or threatens;

(3) planning and adopting a program of sound public works, consistent with a financially sound fiscal policy (such works to be performed, except as otherwise authorized by law, by private enterprise under contract), for the normal needs of the United States in normal times, capable of accelera-

tion and expansion when widespread unemployment in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof exists or threatens, and capable of reduction when inflationary conditions exist or threaten;
to stimulate private enterprise in the periods in which widespread unemployment exists or threatens so as to stimulate and promote employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy, thereby aiding and assisting employables (including self-employed) in such periods to secure employment, and to aid in removing or preventing innationary or deflationary conditions in periods in which such conditions exist or threaten.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a few minutes to say something about quotas, because it has something to do with jobs. One would think, from listening to the debate, that quotas were something new. What is so sinful about putting quotas on watches coming into this country? We have many quotas. I will just enumerate a few of them.

We have a quota on wheat put on at a time when wheat was 54 cents a bushel, after 7 years of the more abundant life, in 1939. It was put into effect in 1940, and only 800,000 bushels of wheat are allowed to come into this country, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount of wheat produced in this country.

We have a quota on potatoes. We allow only a million bushels of potatoes to come into this country unless we have a yield of less than 350,000,000 bushels in this country.

We have a quota on tobacco seed, as you will remember, put on under the Kerr bill. Now we are not allowed to ship any tobacco seed out of this country. I suppose it is part of the good-neighbor policy and was put on because we do not want anyone anywhere else in the world to raise our kind of tobacco in competition with us.

There is a quota on milk. Only 4,000,000 quarts of milk can be imported to this country, which is almost nothing in comparison with the 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk produced in the United States.

There is a quota on beef cattle. We do not have any quota on dairy cattle. I do not know why that is, but maybe you can explain that one.

Why should it be so sinful all at once to want to put a quota on watches? That is the reason why the time has come when we cannot go down both sides of the street with the American people. The watchmakers of this country are going to have jobs producing American watches, if some quota is put on the number imported. And the glass boys and all the rest of these small industries in this country are going to have unemployment if the American workman is not protected.

If we are going to come to the point where we run the economy of this country on nothing but automobiles, we are surely going to find out that we are going to have a lot of people unemployed.

What good is it to have a fixed economy if we cannot give a man a job? What good is it to have 10,000,000 unemployed in 1940? What good is it to have an economy that does not give people jobs?

What good will it be to put on 140 cents per hour minimum wage if it does not produce jobs? What the people need to buy groceries with is the money that will come from providing jobs.

What good is it going to do the people of our country if we are going to let the people in Czechoslovakia make all the shoes, the people in Belgium make all the glass, and the people in Switzerland make all the watches? I for one cannot go along down the road under this hypocritical hypothetical trade agreements policy and approach to furnishing jobs for American workmen.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I wish to ask the gentleman if he knows where a person can go to buy a watch in America at the present time?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I presume one can; I have not had occasion to.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have been trying to.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman has been trying to. I take it that if he has got the money he can buy it. Yes; they brought in enough watches that he ought to be able to buy one. They brought in 28,000,000 during the war from Switzerland.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I mean American watches.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. It was brought out before the Ways and Means Committee that the watchmakers under this program do not get enough to do. Provide them employment and you can buy watches made in this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The point is whether we are going to give the American people a chance to have American jobs at American wages or are we going to turn our markets over to others with low wage rates.

I have just about come to the conclusion that there are a lot of people here who want to give America away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to quotas of any sort, because if you are going to have quotas, you are going to Balkanize the nations of the entire world, and you are going to build up all kinds of walls against the products of American industry. It is a policy entirely contrary to the Hull policy of reciprocity. Quotas are contrary to the very pronunciamento that was issued by the State Department only a few days ago which accompanied the Anglo-American loan pact. It was specifically stated therein that it opposed quotas. Our State Department must square its actions with its preachment. I cannot, should not, encourage any quotas. Switzerland watches to a great number have come in. Why? Because there were no watches of any sort to supply the terrific demand. Besides, the War Department strained every effort to have the watch importers bring in as many Swiss watches as possible. The War Department bought for our GI's millions of Swiss watches. The War Department urged the watch assemblers to bring in every possible watch. Now, because of Government action, the American watch manufacturers would "strafe" the importers. That was unjust. Despite that large importation there are no watches left. Further, the demand for imported watches will gradually slough off as American watches again come into the market. In a few months all will be normal again and all can be satisfied—without any quota. I am not going to belabor the situation further. I want to get to this bill and give my views on it for the interest of my own constituents in my State.

Mr. Chairman, we ask, President Truman asked, and President Roosevelt asked for a genuine bill. The bill that has been given to us is so weighted down as to be valueless. We ask for wool, we get shoddy. We ask for gold, we get dross. If we pass this bill, the specter of unemployment will still hang over the heads of millions of working men and women throughout the length and breadth of the land. That includes not only city but rural workers and suburban workers. It means farm laborers, it means industrial workers and service industry workers.

This bill, to my mind, is just an ersatz bill. It is a synthetic bill that gives us practically nothing. It is a bill that contains a bundle of pious wishes, pontifical promises, and dulcitudes. There is no implementation of action. It is just preachment. If somebody asked me why it is that, I would say, with all due respect to the gentlemen of the committee, it was something written by the best minds of the eighteenth century. The committee members failed to realize that "time marches on." They would maintain the status quo, that the unemployed shall always be with us. Well, the unemployed should not always be with us.

To my mind, we must develop some sort of economic substitute for war contracts and war work; otherwise, then, jobs and full employment are taken off the masthead of the Nation. Our economy is producing now in goods and services about $160,000,000,000 a year. That means in general a satisfactory level of employment, approximately 60,000,000 jobs, more or less. That level must be continued.

There is no such thing as full employment. There is always the situation where men are going from one job to another. There is always some unemployment. But 60,000,000 jobs is a good goal

to shoot at, particularly when all the "Johnnies are coming marching home." We cannot afford another jobless depression. We cannot risk another march to Washington of the unemployed as happened during the Hoover administration.

Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, who cannot be accused of any socialistic tendencies, in a book recently published, had this to say:

> The American economy set-up has been predominantly private capitalistic. But that does not arbitrarily exclude the utilization of State power and State economy for specific purposes.

Those specific purposes that he had in mind were the creation of jobs. He implied that when private industry falls down in creating fullest employment the State and Federal powers must be invoked to supplement private activities to create jobs.

When we were considering TVA there were no charges made that that was socialistic. That was a matter of Federal spending and it was a matter of job creation. The opponents of a genuine full-job bill bitterly complain that there should be no Federal spending to create jobs. They sang a different tune with TVA.

This bill now before us, in my opinion, is like trying to put out a future depression conflagration with a seltzer-water bottle. It cannot be done. Government, in my judgment, must first do everything to stimulate and encourage increased employment in private industry in part by the following:

First. Reducing taxes.

Second. There should be no double taxation like taxes on corporation profits and taxes on dividends.

Third. We should lighten some of the SEC burdens, particularly on small business.

Fourth. There should be a curtailment of consumption and sales taxes.

Fifth. We should curb monopolies and cartels.

Sixth. There should be a more liberal policy in the RFC and the Smaller War Plants Corporation in making loans, particularly to small business.

Seventh. We must aid, to the fullest, veterans.

Eighth. We must dispose of surplus porperty for the benefit of small farmers and small businessmen.

Ninth. We must offer encouragement to aviation, railroad, and merchant-marine industries—by subsidies, if necessary.

Tenth. And we must encourage international trade by increasing our exports as well as our imports.

To the extent that private enterprise cannot insure full employment, the Government must fill the gap.

The bill before us is woefully insufficient in all this.

I prefer the Senate bill.

It says that the President shall submit to Congress a national production and employment budget.

A twofold program is set forth for balancing national production and employment budget.

First. There is to be a general program for encouraging increased non-Federal investment and expenditure. This may call for new policies or programs dealing with banking and currency, taxation, wages and working conditions, social security, and related fields.

Second. To the extent that this program may not be sufficient to balance the Budget, a second program is called for—a program of Federal investment and expenditure. This program would be designed to contribute to the national wealth or well-being. It could include specific programs for assistance to business, public works, public services, conservation, and other public activities. On the performance of all public contruction, work should be by private concerns.

That is the answer.

A barometer reading of national economy should be taken periodically. Danger signals can be set in various economic fields. When private business seems insufficient to cope with the situation of threatened joblessness. Where purchase power lags so as to threaten stock piling of civilian and capital goods due to lack of demand and lack of money in hands of purchaser.

Then an economic level can be set. Then Congress must act to inaugurate plants for Federal expenditures.

In other words, if all else fails, the Government must step in by setting up plans and appropriations for public works like Federal housing, slum clearances, Missouri Valley authorities, St. Lawrence waterway, and other TVA's for hydroelectrification of rural areas, river and harbor developments, flood control, reforestation, urban rehabilitation, expansion of aviation, improvement of railroads, and merchant marine—but all the public works shall be through private contractors and private concerns. The State also must aid in these public services and conservation programs.

If the parliamentary situation is such that I have no choice and must take a half a loaf, I must do so, and then vote for the bill, weak as it is, in the hope that in conference it will be strengthened and put into more palatable form. I hope the conferees will see the light and finally give us an honest-to-goodness full-employment bill.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to mention something that is really important to prevent the next depression. Of course, you know there is really nothing in any of the bills that have been suggested that would help prevent a depression. If any of these bills had been passed and been in operation in 1921, would it have prevented the 1921 depression? Certainly not. Long before the 1921 crash sensible experts, like Benjamin Anderson, were saying that what Government must do to prevent the next depression was to stop the inflationary spending for foreign loans; cut down expenditures and go back to American principles. What did Congress do? Nothing. If this bill had been in operation before 1929, would it have prevented the crash? No. Long before the 1929 crash, in 1927, the same experts, like Benjamin Anderson and others whom I could name, were saying, "Cut out the inflationary money; go back to common principles," they warned. "The Federal Reserve bank in 1927 had started an inflationary, cheap-money policy which was intended only for the benefit of Britain. This policy will not even help Britain, but it will certainly bring on a terrible depression." What did Congress do? Nothing. The candidates for President in both parties surely knew, because the little employees like me, who were working in New York at the time knew it, that the rug had already been pulled up from under inflation, and that it was only a matter of time before the crash. But they both promised full employment. What would such a bill do if it were in operation today? Once more the same men, like Anderson, whose articles have come to your desk, have said, "Cut out the inflationary spending. If you do not, we are going to have the worst depression this country has ever known." What does Congress do? Nothing but pass a communistic full employment bill, hiring some more New Deal experts to fool the people into believing that the inflationary spending is right.

If you really want to perform a miracle, why do you not take an interest in the fact that the Government has cut out the new synthetic rubber industry, making alcohol out of grain. To preserve this industry would prevent the next depression for agriculture, according to the hardest headed grain men in Chicago. During this war that industry cut down costs 100 percent. We are told—and it was testified to before the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has copies of the testimony he can give you—that that industry, if permitted to develop with a little assistance and protection from the Government, would absorb all the agricultural surpluses in both the North and the South, because it uses any kind of grain that contains starch. It would bring cheaper food to the people in the cities, meat, milk, and eggs, because there is a resulting by-product that the farmers can use for grain. It would prevent the depression for agriculture, help prevent it for the rest of the country, according to the best and ablest grain men in the country. Why do you not do something about that instead of passing phony prosperity bills?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER:

Page 10, line 22, strike out the word "free" and after the word "competitive" insert the word "private."

Page 11, line 12, strike out the word "free" and after the word "competitive" insert "private."

Page 12, line 23, strike out the word "free", and insert the word "freely."

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I missed my opportunity a while ago to make the observation that I think the substitute we are presently considering is largely, oh, I would not say a conglomeration of platitudes, but a declaration of one thing and another that does not do anything or tend to accomplish anything.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in my opinion, would provide machinery by which we would not travel haphazardly in this country in an economic way any longer. I think it would be the providing of an inventory and a place for the filing of information from time to time that would make us able to apprehend what the months and years would bring forth in our economic situation. But that amendment having been voted down, I am minded to suggest that in this accumulation of words we have in this amendment to S. 380 we do not go back to the days of 1921 to 1933 and guarantee to business in this country an absolute freedom to do as they please. I think the word "free" is unfortunately stated here as a policy, and I do not wish to subscribe to it.

On page 10 are the words "preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise." What are we going to draw from that? That enterprise may conceive itself to be privileged to do just as it pleases, that it is free, not freely competitive, but free? We do not want any more of that thing happening in this country. They are not free any longer than the Government says they are operating in a competitive way.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course this substitute does not repeal any existing laws or restrain industry or anybody else.

Mr. FOLGER. May I say to the gentleman that I do not believe the substitute repeals anything, but we are just dealing in platitudes, and I do not want the words "free enterprise" in there because the Government is here yet to command what is right and prohibit what is wrong, even when it is related to enterprise of any sort or the business interests or any other interests of this country.

Then we find the same thing on page 11, that we are going to do everything we can, or something of that sort, and in a manner consistent with the American system of free competitive enterprise. It is a repetition of an assurance. If it means anything at all, it is a repetition of an assurance to enterprise that "we are not going to interfere with you at all, we are going to leave you free to work your own will regardless of what effect it may have on the welfare and the common weal of the people of this country." I am unwilling to subscribe to such a declaration and will not vote for it on that account.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, when I was home last summer and had the opportunity of talking with people in my district, the paramount subject on the lips of everyone was, "How is Congress going to solve the unemployment situation?" I have noted a certain vein of thought running through this debate. It is being said that it is not within the province of the Congress to consider unemployment. We give way to groups of industrialists and businessmen and listen to long treatises and discussions about what those particular individuals think about employment. We read columns in the newspapers and embellished headlines about what labor unions and trade-unionists think about unemployment and how it should be solved. It seems to be within the province of college professors and scholars and all those groups of pedagogs to talk about the foremost problems of the country in relation to employment and unemployment. Certainly, therefore, it is the prerogative of this House to talk about how the country is going to solve the employment problems of the day.

Directly after our victory over Japan, I viewed the prospects of reconversion and of reemployment in peacetime pursuits with a great deal of optimism. As the ensuing weeks and months passed, I confess I departed into the doldrums of despair over the delay we have permitted with respect to the problems of peacetime industry that we ought to be facing. I regret that it has come almost to the time for a Christmas recess before anybody thought it necessary to talk about unemployment. I think this Congress should give ear to the consideration of this legislation and to vote it either up or down as the majority decides. I call another point to the attention of the House. The rise of national socialism in Germany and throughout the continent of Europe was brought about through one cause. There were millions of idle men in Germany after the First World War. By the year 1922 they were gathering nightly and by day in beer halls and dance pavilions and other places of congregation with nothing to do. They were unemployed and desperate and were ready to give ear to the odious ideology of nazism and all the other dangerous ideologies which unemployment gives vent to. I say to you that the only way to prevent the danger of the rise of any unwelcome ideology in our country today is to see that every man and women is given an opportunity to earn their daily bread. Never again must idle time hang heavily upon the people of our Nation. We should try to prevent this problem from arising. It is our responsibility as much as it is the responsibility of those who speak for labor, business, and the professions. The Congress of the United States, the elected representatives of the people, must see to it that the millions of veterans who are returning and who are taking their places once more in peacetime activity must be taken care of. The ills of the country must be solved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall submit to the Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947) an economic report (hereinafter called the Economic Report) on economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or in any considerable portion thereof, on the extent to which the policies declared in section 2 are or are not being achieved, and on the extent to which the various programs and activities of the Federal Government are, and the extent to which they are not, contributing to the achievement of such policies.

(b) If at the time of submitting the Economic Report, high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power are not being maintained or are threatening to decline, the President shall include in the Economic Report, in addition to the matter required to be included under subsection (a), a statement of what, in his judgment, are the causes thereof, a statement of the extent to which then-existing legislation may be utilized for attaining high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, and of the plans therefor and means of financing the programs thereunder, and his recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation) as he deems necessary for attaining such high levels.

(c) If at the time of submitting the Economic Report widespread unemployment exists in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof, the President shall include in the Economic Report, in addition to the matter required to be included under subsections (a) and (b), a statement of what, in his judgment, are the causes thereof, a statement of the extent to which such unemployment may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and of the plans therefor and means of financing the programs thereunder, and his recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation) as he deems necessary for alleviating such unemployment and attaining high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power.

(d) If at the time of submitting the economic report inflationary conditions exist or threaten, the President shall include in the economic report, in addition to the matter required to be included under subsection (a), a statement of what, in his judgment, are the causes thereof, a statement of the extent to which such conditions may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and his recommendations for such further legislation (including recommendations for the reduction or suspension of public outlays) as he deems necessary to alleviate such conditions and to prevent them from recurring.

(e) The President may, from time to time, transmit to Congress, such supplemental or revised reports, or such supplemental recommendations, as he deems necessary to achieve the policies declared in section 2.

(f) The economic report, and any supplemental or revised reports or recommendations, when submitted to Congress, shall be referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report (created by sec. 5).

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a council of economic advisers (hereinafter called the Council). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policies declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment and production under the American system of free competitive enterprise. Each member of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as chairman, and the Council shall annually select one of the members as vice chairman, who shall act as chairman in the absence of the chairman.

(b) The Council is authorized to employ, in the Disctrict of Columbia, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this act, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ, in the District of Columbia, such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the economic report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the policies declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining whether such developments and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policies, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and trends;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policies declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policies, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to formulate and recommend to the President national economic policies for promoting the American system of free competitive enterprise, avoiding economic fluctuations or diminishing the effects thereof, and for maintaining a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power;

(5) whenever in the opinion of the Council high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power are not being maintained or are threatening to decline, to make a report to the President on what, in its judgment, are the causes thereof, and on the extent to which then-existing legislation may be utilized for attaining high levels of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power, and to include in such report its recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation in a manner consistent with sound fiscal practices) as it deems necessary for attaining such high levels;

(6) whenever the Council determines that widespread unemployment exists in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof, to make a report to the President on what, in its judgment, are the causes thereof, and on the extent to which such unemployment may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and to include in such report its recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation in a manner consistent with sound fiscal practices) as it deems necessary to alleviate such unemployment and to attain a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power;

(7) whenever in the opinion of the Council inflationary conditions exist or threaten, to make a report to the President on what, in its judgment, are the causes thereof, and on the extent to which such conditions may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and to include in such report its recommendations for such further legislation as it deems necessary to alleviate such conditions and to prevent them from recurring;

(8) to make and furnish, when requested by the President, such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy as he may request.

(d) The Council shall make an annual report to the President not later than January 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) and shall also make interim reports quarterly (following January 1, 1927).

(e) The President is requested to make available to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, if it desires, the various studies, reports, and recommendations of the Council which have been submitted to the President.

(f) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this act—

(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committees, and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

(g) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and the salaries of officer and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $345,000 in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 15, line 20, after the word "President", insert the words "by and with the consent of the Senate."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the amendments of which I spoke yesterday. It provides simply that the members of the Council of Economic Advisers shall be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate.

This amendment was offered in our committee and was defeated by 1 vote.

Personally, I wanted the Council of Economic Advisers to be an independent agency, not in the Executive Office of the President, and I tried to get that done. I agree thoroughly with the argument made this morning on that point by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I had hoped that the Council of Economic Advisers might be something like the National Research Council, an independent establishment not immediately under the Congress, not immediately under the President; that it would be a group of economic and financial experts, sort of elder statesmen, who would be able to stand aloof from the general political struggle and perhaps be able to see in better perspective than we in the Congress can, or the President and his Cabinet members and their subordinates can, because the latter and we are so overwhelmed every day with other duties. However, that proposal was rejected in the committee.

It seems to me the very least we can do is to provide that these men who are to have such influence, in the sense of their reports carrying great weight with the country, should be scrutinized carefully by the Senate and receive their appointment only if the Senate consents.

Cabinet members, who are of the President's own official family, must be confirmed by the Senate. The Under Secretaries of the various Departments must be confirmed by the Senate. Yesterday we passed the Government reorganization bill, which provided that appointment of anybody as head of an agency or member of a board in charge of an agency, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, must be confirmed by the Senate. That was for appointees whose salaries are even less than $10,000 a year. That was only yesterday, yet today in this bill we authorize a Council of Economic Advisers whose members will have salaries of $15,000 and we do not require that the appointees be scrutinized and confirmed by the Senate.

No one could properly object to the President's appointing to the Council one member, for example, who had a particular economic theory, such as deficit spending; but certainly we should put in every possible safeguard to make sure that not all three of the members of the Council are of one particular economic or political philosophy. I hope no President would make such appointments, but if he should, surely the Senate would not approve them all.

One of the majority members of the committee said to let it go because the Senate would put it in anyway in conference. I suppose the Senate will, but I do not know any reason why we should not make the bill as nearly correct as possible before it leaves this body rather than to assume that the other body will correct oversights or defects that we leave in the bill.

I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is very much worth while. Certainly it should receive the support of the membership.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman. I cannot see any reason why in this particular instance the appointment by the President of such high officials should not be with the advice and consent of the Senate when that is required in the case of almost all other top officials.

I hope the Members on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it is not correct to say that all of the President's advisers are approved with the consent of the Senate. These officers are to aid and assist the President in drafting his economic plans and presenting them to Congress, just as the Director of the Budget aids and assists the President in submitting his budget. Let me remind you that the Director of the Budget is appointed by the President and holds office at his pleasure, and he does not have to be confirmed by the Senate. We think that in all fairness to the Chief Executive whether he be the present occupant of the White House or someone who may occupy the White House in the future, that these men who are his close advisers, these men who are to aid and assist him in the preparation of his report should be on a par with the Director of the Budget who is not confirmed by the Senate. We therefore provide in this bill that it shall not be necessary for these men to be confirmed by the Senate. They hold office during the pleasure of the President.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

If we mean to enable the President to submit a constructive proposal for the solution of the problems of unemployment, it does strike me that we can do nothing more nor less than to give him the men of his choice to aid him and assist him in preparing his budget.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman believe that these three officers are on the same level or perform exactly the same duties as the Director of the Budget? The Director of the Budget has the duty of studying the executive branch of the Government. These other advisers will have the duty of studying the entire economy of the Nation. It seems to me even more important that these men should be approved by the Senate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We find ourselves here with economic problems. The Director of the Budget is the adviser to the President with respect to the problems of the Budget. In my opinion it is nothing more nor less than fair to give the President the men of his choice to work with him in the matter of submitting this report of employment needs.

We rejected the gentleman's amendment in the committee.

Mr. JUDD. By one vote.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That makes no difference; it was rejected in the committee, nevertheless. I repeat my statement, with all due deference to the gentleman from Minnesota.

It does strike me that unless we want to hamper the President then we ought to give him the free choice of advisers just as the experts of the members of the joint committee of the House and Senate do not have to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate—we give this committee free choice to select its own experts and they do not have to be approved by anybody. Is there any reason why we should not at least give the President of the United States the same privilege and the same opportunity when it comes to the selection of his advisers?

In my humble judgment this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does the gentleman desire to ask me a question?

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman think his argument that the members of the joint committee do not have to be confirmed by the Senate holds true in the case of these advisers to the President? Are the two sets of experts analogous?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. JUDD. We have a system of checks and balances.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I repeat my statement. There is no misunderstanding between my friend and myself. The cost of the experts to be employed by both the House and Senate is limited to $50,000. These are to be appointed without reference to confirmation by the Senate, and I repeat that the President ought to have advisers of his own choosing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota stated that we have a system of checks and balances. When have we had a check and balance since the New Deal came into power?

Mr. JUDD. We have had a lot of checks.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, it does strike me that unless we mean to hamper the President this amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOM) there were—ayes 48, noes 58.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the section just read there is a provision for the work of the Economic Council, and in that section it is also provided that the Council shall make studies when either a deflationary trend or an inflationary trend threatens the country. As is true throughout the committee substitute, there is no statement as to what policy should be pursued by the Congress in those events but only a proposal that facts shall be laid before the Congress by the Council.

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the real question lies even deeper than whatever differences of opinion we may have as to whether the House ought today to enact the committee substitute or enact the Senate bill. The real question will come as to what we do after we get through with this legislation. The importance of the present legislation lies in the question of whether or not the Congress will have the courage to go on record unequivocably for a policy which can give steady opportunity for employment in the Nation.

There is every likelihood at the moment that we will drift into a serious inflationary period in the next few years unless great care is exercised. In my judgment, this is not a time for tax reduction but, rather, for courageous action to prevent that inflation from coming. The main way we can prevent inflation is to prevent the Government from borrowing newly created money from the banking system. We recently provided for a tax reduction of some $6,000,000,000 and, on the other hand, started borrowing $11,000,000,000. We might much better have borrowed $5,000,000,000 and left the taxes where they were. But following that period of inflation, unless measures better than ever were taken before in this country are taken to prevent it, we shall be confronted with another deflation and collapse of prices, production, and employment, which is when the real danger will confront us.

Against that danger we ought to guard now. In the debate on this bill, as well as at other times, we have been repeatedly told that anyone who foresees the possibility of a period of unemployment in the future is a prophet of doom; that we ought to have confidence that such a thing will not happen, and therefore we should wait until those conditions are ruinously upon us until we do anything about them. I submit that is very shortsighted, indeed. I submit it is dangerous. The job of this Congress is to adopt measures beforehand that can maintain a high level of national income employment and production and prevent the downward spiral from ever getting started in the first place.

If, Mr. Chairman, the Senate version of this bill were passed, what would we be committed to? I call your attention to subsection (d) of section 2, page 3, which outlines a number of policies in different fields of governmental action which that bill says should be pursued as best they can be for the purpose of maintaining a full flow of demand, production, and jobs. The committee substitute lays primary emphasis upon two things, public works and loans. I do not

believe myself that that is either primary or adequate. I believe that much more fundamental are some of the things I mentioned in my speech earlier today.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the remainder of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be open to amendment section by section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report (in this section called the "joint committee"), and which shall be composed of the chairman and ranking majority party members, and the two ranking minority party members, of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, of the Senate Committee on Finance, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and three other Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three other Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the economic report;

(2) to study means of coordinating programs under existing laws relating to loans, public works, and other outlays in order to further the policies of this act; and

(3) as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to the economic report, not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947), to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the economic report, and from time to time make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

(e) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman, and shall not exceed $100,000 for each fiscal year.

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(1) any change in the existing procedures an appropriations, or authorizations of appropriations;

(2) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the economic report; or

(3) the disclosure of trade secrets or other information, the publication of which might have a harmful effect upon the firm or person supplying such information, without the consent of the firm or person affected.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to declare a continuing national policy and program to promote high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 12026 of the RECORD of December 13, appears a statement that impressed me very much, and I quote:

> The most dangerous surplus that can exist in any country is the idleness of men who want to work. It is ridiculous to speak of unemployment as a necessary condition of human society; it is a blot on our intelligence; it is an indictment of society's machinery; it is a drain on our sympathy; it is a promoter of charity which affects disadvantageously both those who give and those who receive. Some day we shall learn to do better, but we must learn it soon.

That statement was made by one of the greatest industrialists of our country, Owen Young, and I think that Mr. Young's statement is worthy of deep consideration. We have a bill before us today and we are in a rather peculiar situation from a legislative angle. To those who believe in trying to implement private business—and that is what I believe in; not to substitute but to implement—when the forces of deflation visit us and unemployment takes place with the resulting distress that follows not only to the worker but to the farmer and to all classes of our economic society, business, and management, sound legislation of this nature constitutes an implementation of our free competitive system. We have before us the Senate bill as well as the bill reported out by the committee. I have heard many friends interested in legislation of this kind express themselves in opposition to the committee amendment. Personally, I favor a bill that would contain stronger language, but I am supporting the committee amendment, and I hope that those who favor legislation of this kind on both sides of the aisle will support the bill, because we are undergoing a particular legislative process in Congress today.

This is not the final action, this is not the final vote. After we vote on this bill today, if the committee's provision is carried, it goes to conference, and then later if the conferees agree it comes back to both branches. If they do not agree, under the rules of the House after so many days have elapsed, 20 days as I recall, a motion can be made for the House to instruct the House conferees:

Those who favor the passage of legislation but who are not satisfied with the House bill, let us see what position you are in if the House bill should be defeated, the committee amendment constituting the House bill.

Suppose in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union the committee amendment is defeated. When you come back into the House you come back with the Senate bill. Are you going to have a chance to vote on that? No. My good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not going to let that happen. He is going to offer a motion to recommit. He remains silent, and that confirms my statement. He is within his rights in that. The motion to recommit is the right of the minority. An individual Member of the minority may offer it although the motion may not represent the viewpoint of a majority of the minority or even a substantial percentage of the membership of the minority. Any one of the minority party who wants to offer a motion to recommit the Speaker is bound to recognize under the rules and customs and practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. We will assume that the committee bill is not defeated in the Committee of the Whole but comes into the House. When the bill is reported back into the House it comes up on a vote for adoption by the House, there being one amendment. No matter how many amendments are made to the committee amendent, there will be but one amendment before the House. When we get into the House the vote will be on that.

Suppose my good friends who favor the passage of legislation but are not satisfied with the provisions of the committee bill—and I put myself in that category—should then vote on a roll call against the committee amendment. Where are you then? You are back with the Senate bill. But do you get a vote? No. The vote on the committee amendment comes after the previous question has been ordered. The motion to recommit comes later. Then if the committee amendment is defeated in the House, my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will submit his motion to recommit. I assume he is going to do it. He is opposed to the bill. The gentleman is standing. Is the gentleman going to offer a straight motion to recommit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am going to vote to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is going to vote the same why; is he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman going to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I say, is not the gentleman going to vote the same way?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have made my statement. I am voting for the committee bill. But is the gentleman going to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am going to vote just as the gentleman is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman going to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me answer, please.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, please; two pleases. Answer it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am going to follow the gentleman and vote to substitute for the Senate bill the House bill. Then I am going to offer a motion to recommit and vote for that. I will vote for both of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is always frank.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Always so.

Mr. McCORMACK. After two pleases he admitted that I had read his mind.

Where does that leave us?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You did not read my mind. That is just common sense.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is reading a man's mind. One has to have a little common sense to read the mind of another, particularly the versatile mind of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Now, where does that leave us? There you see the parliamentary move. If by any chance the motion to recommit is carried, and there is a strong chance of it under these circumstances, where are we? We are back in committee. I am taking the floor for a constructive purpose as one who favors this kind of legislation and recognizes it as an implementation of our free competitive economic system.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand the gentleman is afraid, and probably his views are justified, that if we do not pass the House bill there will be no legislation at all due to the procedure which the gentleman from Michigan will try to pursue.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has never made a more correct statement in his life. I have never heard him make a statement that I thought was incorrect and I have heard him make many correct statements. But with respect to this particular statement, he never made a more correct one in his life.

There is the situation. So let us try to look at it constructively. This vote is a vote to send the bill back to conference. After the conferees meet, it comes back to the House. We are going through the regular legislative procedure provided for by the rules of Congress and by the laws of the Nation and the Constitution itself. I am speaking for progress by this legislation. Legislation which passes through Congress is a series of compromises. But the situation today legislatively is such that those who favor the passage of this legislation are faced with the possibility that unless they think correctly and soundly they will be contributing to the defeat of the legislation. I hope the Committee amendment will be agreed to. I hope it will be passed by the House and sent to conference.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have come to the well of the House with only one paper this time and perhaps I will not lose it. I am afraid I am not going to be able to throw much light on this parliamentary situation because I always get my feet tangled up in it as if it were flypaper. The difference of opinion, of course, as to the original bill, the bill which I introduced, and the Senate bill before the amendments of the committee were written into, was based on the philosophy of the obligation of government. Yesterday we discussed a little the idea that there were no sovereign States of any kind. The people are sovereign. You cannot speak of the rights of government, you cannot speak of the rights of the Federal Government, you only speak of the rights of the people. Government has obligations in carrying out its functions. It may have some corollary privileges such as those of taxation and regulation but actually the Government only exists to serve the people. In that regard, I think if you are going to have a democratic economy in America and to extend the concepts of democracy, which are inherent in our thinking and which are presently expressed in our fundamental governmental documents, that we must realize that the Government exists to serve the people. This idea of the obligation of Government to serve the people must also extend to include the right to eat as well as the right to vote. For that reason I have resolved for myself the decision that I must support legislation which proceeds upon that theory.

One body of the Congress of this Nation has had an opportunity to act on legislation having that philosophy. It is a matter of interest, and I think I am entitled to call to the attention of my colleagues on this side, the fact that in that body those people who were chosen by direct vote of the people from the States of Minnesota, Vermont, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Oregon, Missouri, Michigan, New Jersey, Iowa, California, North Dakota, West Virginia, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, all Republicans, supported this legislation.

As to those people who came into the other body from the States of Nebraska and New Hampshire, all of them elected by the Republican Party, one-half of them have expressed a philosophy similar to that of those from the other States I have mentioned.

It is beginning to be a surprising thing, is it not, that this body which, in a sense, is closer to the people, is a little slower to respond to new concepts of democracy than the other body. I only leave that as a thought for my colleagues, that somebody, some place, is going to be terribly embarrassed by the conflict between certain representatives of the Republican Party in one branch of the Congress and those in another.

I would like to leave that thought for my Republican colleagues before we vote at all.

The following remarks were not made in the presence of the Members before the debate on the motion to recommit was taken.

Under the general leave granted to extend my remarks, I am setting out the language of the amendment to the motion to recommit which I would have offered had not the motion for the previous question intervened and then prevailed. The motion read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute to the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

I move to recommit the bill (S. 380) to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to that committee to strike out all of the committee amendments and then to restore all of the language of the original Senate bill 380, and to report the same back to the House forthwith.

Had the motion for the previous question been voted down it would then have been in order for my amendment to have been offered.

Thus a vote against the motion for the previous question was a vote squarely for an opportunity for the membership of the House to vote on the Senate bill. Indirectly, then, a vote against the motion for the previous question was a vote for the Senate bill. That is why I demanded the yeas and nays.

I am sorry not a sufficient number of the friends of the full employment philosophy rose to enable the yeas and nays to have been ordered, so that we could have had a record vote on the issue involved in S. 380 as it passed the Senate. Perhaps I must take some of the blame for not advising the membership earlier of my strategy. I could not because it occurred to me only as I made the parliamentary maneuver.

Being opposed to the House bill for the following reasons set out in the report:

SEPARATE VIEWS

We, the undersigned members of the committee, have voted to report the foregoing legislation to the House for the reasons and with the reservations which we here express:

1. We believe that adherence to the democratic process required us to vote to report legislation out of the committee so that the full Membership of the House could have the opportunity to pass upon the subject matter involved.

2. We believe that when our free-enterprise system encounters a period of failure to serve the economic needs of a free people, as it has from time to time in the past and doubtless will from time to time in the future, legitimate and effective emergency measures designed to prevent crisis, chaos, and collapse must be undertaken by the Federal Government in order that the system may be preserved and the interests and welfare of all our people may be protected. We believe that the obligation of the Federal Government to defeat disintegration within our Nation is as positive and inescapable as its obligation to defeat aggression from without, and in neither case is its obligation sufficiently recognized and assumed by a mere declaration of policy.

3. The integrity of the national debt, the Nation's obligations to its war veterans, the necessity of maintaining adequate means of national defense, and the necessary costs of the operation of the Government necessitate a volume of revenue from taxation which, in an economy committed to mass production, cannot be achieved without the constant maintenance of a high level of income-creating purchasing power, widely distributed

among the people. This we believe can normally be achieved by the operations of private enterprise in a truly competitive economy. But we believe the freedom itself of private enterprise must be expected, from time to time, to produce abnormal disturbances of the economic system, and we believe that before such a disturbance can develop into a collapse of income-producing and tax-supporting purchasing power it is the obligation, and should not be deemed merely a policy, of the Federal Government, in the interest of all the people, to undertake measures to effect the earliest possible economic recovery. We believe that employment and adequate wages are indispensable conditions to such a recovery.

4. Because the proposed legislation fails to give to the obligations of the Government adequate recognition and expression, we find it impossible to agree in all respects with the committee report.

CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE.
WILLIAM L. DAWSON.
EDWARD J. HART.
ALEXANDER J. RESA.

I did all that I could to effect a roll-call vote on the issue between the two bills. I do not regret my votes or my actions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to read section 3 of this bill:

The President shall submit to the Congress within 60 days after the beginning of the regular session, an economic report on economic conditions affecting employment in the United States—

And so forth. Then I want to read from the Constitution, which gives the duties of the President.

Section 3 of the Constitution:

He shall, from time to time, give to the Congress information on the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

The President at all times has the right to do what this bill contemplates doing. He is to keep the people of this country informed. He has that right. He has that power. He has everything to do it with if he so desires.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. But this bill makes it also a duty for him to do it.

Mr. RICH. That is right. He is compelled to do it now. That is his privilege and right under the law as it now stands.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Does not the Constitution make it his duty as well as his privilege?

Mr. RICH. I am sure that it does. He is supposed to do those things. As long as we have that explicitly stated I cannot see really that this legislation is going to do for the country what the majority leader said a while ago when he said we want to pass this bill and then he wants to improve on it. I do not like the improvements that are made by the majority leader and the New Deal on the legislation that is passed by this Congress that he is the majority leader of. You men know what happened in the last 6 or 8 years, on a lot of New Deal legislation and you are all sick and tired of a lot of the so-called improved legislation and want now to do away with it. That is just what is going to happen with this legislation if you enact it into law.

It is not a question of taking this bill as it is here that I am afraid of, it is what is to follow if you pass this legislation that I am afraid of.

So far as this bill is concerned, so far as the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] are concerned, they have been working hard on it and have tried to give us what they thought was the best, but they have been driven to the point of bringing in something quickly, bringing in anything to get it passed before Christmas, so they have not even now done the best they could if proper time were taken. They could do better I know, if they had more time. But they have tried to follow the mandate of the majority leader and the President who said they wanted legislation. So here it is, take it or leave it.

They call it the full employment legislation. It is only going to fool, harass, and humbug the American people.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HENRY. Is not the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in the position I now find myself since hearing the majority leader speak? Before he spoke I had intended to vote for the bill because I thought it was a good one, but since hearing from the majority leader I am beginning to wonder whether or not I should vote for it.

Mr. RICH. I believe if the gentleman follows his present inclinations he will be better off, and I believe that if the entire membership would do it, they would be better off themselves, and I am sure the country would, because the advice and counsel of the majority leader does not seem to work out to the benefit of the American people, and if he were my majority leader I would not follow him.

We have had before us in the consideration of this legislation, the bill H. R. 2202. That has been the bill that we considered in all our hearings for 7 weeks. We have had many men, prominent men, good men, come in and testify against this legislation because of the fact they believe that eventually it will lead to regimentation. As somebody said yesterday, "See what happened to Germany. See what happened to Japan. We do not want that to happen to America." Now, we are regimenting, regimenting, and eventually if we pass this legislation so similar to other bills, we have passed, we will reach the point where we take over the business of this country from private enterprise and set up a dictator to tell you where to work, what to do, how to do it, what pay you receive, and so forth, and so forth. Notwithstanding the fact that it is alleged the pending measure does not interfere with the private-enterprise system, it will eventually take over the private-enterprise system and then you will have communism. That will be the final outcome unless you stop, look, and listen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, last July some of us who were interested in trying to get legislation designed to bring about conditions in this country where every man able to work and seeking to work could find a job, met and organized a steering committee for what seemed to us to be the best legislation toward that end, H. R. 2202, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. That original steering committee grew from a comparative few up to the present membership of 116, including Members of both parties in this House. We felt that there was strength in the bill, because it did two things: Because it stated governmental policy, first, that every American willing to work and able to work had the right to an opportunity for a job; and, secondly, that if every possible effort on the part of private industry failed, then the Government had certain responsibilities under the law. Furthermore, it provided the initial machinery to carry out this policy.

It has been stated that this measure is socialistic, communistic.

Mr. Chairman, whenever you have no argument to come back with you start to call names, you start to say something is communistic, you start to say something is red. I see nothing communistic or socialistic in the Congress of the United States passing a bill which states that the democratic right of the opportunity to earn a living and secure a job shall be reaffirmed in this body. I can see no reason why we should start waving the red flag, as has been done here, about a decent, constructive bill.

I was hoping that we in this House would have the opportunity to vote upon such a decent and constructive bill. I was hoping that the parliamentary situation would be such that there would be a clear record for the American people where every man and woman in this House would be on record. I was hoping, Mr. Chairman, that the situation would be such that every person in this House would be able to state clearly, not only to his constituents but to the rest of the American people where he stood on this legislation. I am sorry, I regret very deeply, that from developments that are taking place there evidently will not be such a position possible.

I recall a few years ago when it was my job to work in connection with the Federal Transient Service in Los Angeles. It was my duty to take care of the boys who were bumming all over the country on freight trains simply because they were looking for jobs or because the mortgage was being foreclosed on their farms. They came to California from every State in the Union. There is not a

Congressman here who did not have youngsters from his district riding freight trains. When you asked them why they were there, they told you they were looking for jobs. I am wondering if a few years from now we are going to be facing a situation like that again when the transients are going to be on the highways and freight trains, when you have apple sellers on the streets, when you have the relief rolls of every town and county crowded and people will look back and ask: "What did you do in Congress at that time about it?" We will say, "What did we do? We enacted a pious declaration and sent it to conference."

Mr. Chairman, if this Congress does not take more concrete steps toward the prevention of human suffering, toward the prevention of unemployment, than have been taken thus far the American people are going to have the right to stand up and say, "Why did you not do something that was a little more constructive?"

I heard it said yesterday that pledges made in party platforms did not mean anything, that a lot of it counted for nothing. The candidate for President on the Democratic ticket and the candidate for President on the Republican ticket stated very clearly that if private enterprise could not provide work it was the responsibility and the duty of the Government of the United States to see that it was provided. Whether you happen to be on the minority side or whether you happen to be on the majority side, the responsibility is almost equally yours in seeing that this responsibility is carried out.

I, for one, believe in taking declarations like that seriously. I think our American form of government is at stake if all that a party platform states or all that a party candidate says amounts to nothing.

I would like to say one more word, and that is this: Mr. Chairman, we may not get a strong full employment bill out of this House. We probably will not. We may not get a strong full employment bill out of Congress. We probably will not. But those of us who have been carrying the ball here trying to get such a full employment bill hope we will be able to build up the record of public opinion for the future and that some day, sometime, a future Congress will enact legislation far stronger than we are hesitating to enact now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Regardless of what the candidates for the Presidency said, I have before me the platforms of both parties and the platforms are silent as to the Senate and the House bill.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman concur in the statement his chairman made yesterday?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answer that question by saying "No." My statement speaks for itself.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman answer directly?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. OUTLAND. The statement was made yesterday that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey made certain statements.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. There is nothing in the party platforms to that effect.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is wiggling out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Are there any amendments to section 5? Are there any amendments to section 6?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the final months of the war this Congress served as a forum for all sorts of expressions relative to reconversion from wartime operations to the normal peacetime activities of the country. During those months this Congress very definitely assumed the responsibility for charting the course of the Nation during the reconversion period. The people of the country were very definitely led to believe they could expect leadership from this Congress. We promised action. We produced practically nothing.

The President appeared before the Congress and made certain specific proposals for our consideration. All those proposals were aimed at a speedy return to full-time employment at decent wages, with an assurance of security for all the people.

This Congress has been successful in providing big business with financial cushions. It has been successful in pushing the clock back. Aside from these monumental accomplishments, I am unable to see that we have taken any positive step in carrying out the responsibility which we so willingly assumed.

The President proposed a program of full employment. The Senate held hearings and finally enacted a law, far from the original proposal, but nevertheless a law which did constitute a step in the right direction. The House now has for consideration what is termed a "high level of employment" bill.

Having in mind the responsibility which this Congress undertook—having in mind the fact that Members of Congress believe the country should look here for leadership—this measure, as reported by the committee, is a saddening spectacle. It is merely an acknowledgment that we hope everyone can find a job somewhere. It constitutes nothing but some very boring reading matter.

The House has an opportunity today to enact the full employment bill as it came from the Senate. While I for one am not entirely satisfied with that bill, it must be admitted that it does contain certain definite proposals looking to action on the part of this Government of the people—proposals which are intended to promote a stabilization of our economy.

I have heard many Members of this House find fault with the late President Roosevelt. I have heard many Members insist that the Hoover depression came to an end only because the war brought with it full production and full employment. If those Members are sincere; if they do not want to witness a repetition of the horrible tragedies that accompanied the Hoover depression, then they must admit in their hearts that this Congress must take constructive action to provide full employment for all the people.

It is not enough to criticize. It is not enough to find fault. The people are far less interested in what was wrong with the past than they are with what is being done to protect their future.

The people of the country have heard a great deal about cooperating with the peoples of other lands in order to promote peace and prosperity throughout the world. They have witnessed the discussions leading up to an appropriation of millions for United Nations relief. They have read and listened to debates over the proposed loan of billions to Britain intended to help that country regain its equilibrium. They admit that we must do a lot of these things to relieve distress and suffering in other nations. Yet they have a perfect right to expect that their chosen representatives in this Congress will do a little thinking about the needs and the hopes of the people of our own country.

It is natural that the little people of the land should become concerned when they see this Congress willing to provide millions for other countries—and windfalls for big taxpayers—and then see this Congress suddenly become niggardly when it comes to—not appropriating millions for home—but merely adopting a constructive proposal for security which seems to depart somewhat from the hoary systems of the past.

I am heart and soul in favor of a full employment bill. I believe it is no more than just and proper that this Congress should enact a real full employment bill. I believe with every fiber of my being that to enact the weak-kneed measure as proposed by the committee will be an act of cowardice on the part of this Congress. It will mean we have shirked our responsibility.

There are Members of this House who claim to be the great defenders of private enterprise. They profess to see in the original full employment bill a threat to private enterprise. The only real threat there is does not lie in the original proposal or in the bill as passed by the Senate. The real threat to private enterprise lies in the attitude which sponsors this committee measure. It lies in laissez faire—in an attitude of do nothing. The threat to our system of government lies in the possibility of another depression for which we have made no plans. It lies in another plan of relief and charity which the people of the country will reject with vehemence.

I believe in private enterprise. I believe in it because I do not want to see labor unions controlled by their Government. Because I believe in private enterprise I am certain it must be made to work or there just will not be any.

I believe in profits for private industry—but I do not believe there is anything sacred about profits. I do not believe we must shut our eyes to every other factor in our economic life and do

nothing but cry horror everytime someone suggests doing something for the laborers of the country who make those profits.

I believe in being rid of regimentation and Government control. But I do not believe this Federal Government can be turned into a dummy to sit idly by while millions clamor for security.

I can recall vividly the cries that rent the heavens when the original social-security proposals were made. The SEC would destroy profit and would destroy the capitalist system. Bank-deposit insurance was a dire threat to the American system of government. Old-age retirement, unemployment insurance, were all branded as Communist inspired methods to overthrow our democracy.

In spite of all the horrible predictions we survive. We have actually become the greatest nation in the world under the leadership of the great Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The same horrible things are predicted again when it is suggested that we try to provide some assurance that all the people able and willing to work can have a job. We are called radicals because we propose that we no longer rely on things as they were—because we propose that we take a hand in fashioning the future—so that that future can be one that is free from fear and free from want.

Do we threaten private enterprise when we propose that? If we do then so did the founding fathers of our land who grew discontented with things as they were and themselves took a hand in shaping the destiny of the people of this New World.

They were the radicals of their day. I take pride in possessing some of their get up and go.

The rugged individualists of a few years ago appear to have grown more stodgy than ever and now refuse to contemplate that we can do something for ourselves. The men who pleaded that every man is the master of his own destiny—now cringe at the thought of acting as masters and plead instead that every man must be the victim of his own fate.

Personally, I repudiate all that living in the past. I believe in my country. I believe in the little people who have contributed so much toward making it great. I have confidence that we can undertake a bold program and make it go. I am positive we have the ability and the know-how to make a greater life for all our people. The only real threat to our democracy comes from an absence of courage—from a blind opposition to everything progressive—from a stolid reliance on methods of the past—methods, incidentally, which failed when put to the acid test.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that there is going to be a basic amendment offered to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to answer that.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that this bill does mean something. I call as my witness the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. According to him, it is a vehicle whereby the entire full-employment program that was proclaimed to the Nation will be forced upon this Congress. I am opposed to it. It is predicated upon the theory that the Federal Government should be a wet nurse to everything and everybody in the country. It is predicated upon the doctrine that the Government of the United States owes every man not only a job but the kind of a job that he wants. The question was raised the other day as to what you would do if you had so many thousands of people unemployed in the State of New York. I can answer that question. Let the State of New York carry the load. The States have plenty of money. Every State in the Union is well fixed financially.

The Federal Government has a debt unheard of in all history. The Federal Government has on many occasions helped the States. That should now be reversed. If we want to do the patriotic thing here, we should start a campaign for State aid to the Federal Government in these programs rather than Federal aid to the States. Of course the unfortunate should be taken care of. But with the heavy load that the Federal Government already has, the several States should assume greater responsibility. If it is worth while that some should die for this Government, surely the preservation of its financial structure is worth while. Mr. Chairman, we tried to cure one depression by spending and spending on Government projects. Many of the projects were fine, but the depression got worse. Unemployment continued to rise all during that period. Now the proponents of this measure say they love private enterprise and that if private enterprise cannot do the job, then the Government will step in. Rest assured that private enterprise will be controlled, hampered, and interfered with so that it cannot do the job if the philosophy of this measure prevails.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud and pleased to join and concur with the sound philosophy and remarks given voice by the able and eloquent gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], as well as the arguments advanced by the brilliant gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]. In my judgment, the committee substitute is sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. It is neither fish nor fowl, nor a good red herring. It resembles what was once said by the historian concerning the Holy Roman Empire: "It is neither holy nor Roman nor empire." But I may vote for the sterile committee substitute as being a modicum better than no bill at all. Yet in truth this substitute bill before the House is a congeries of ponderous, pontifical nothings.

In my State at one time a Tory-controlled legislature was asked what they were going to do for the taxpayers who were suffering so much. The leader of the majority party said, "It is about time we thought about the taxpayers." So he introduced a resolution to the effect that the legislature give three cheers for the taxpayers.

That is analogous to what this does. This says to the people who are interested in solving the unemployment problems of the American Nation, "We believe that something ought to be done in a vague sort of way for unemployment." We are sympathetic. We feel for you unemployed. We shall study the problem. Then we have heard speech after speech made by gentlemen, conservative Democrats from the South, and Republicans, that we should return the whole country to "private enterprise," a much used shibboleth phrase, sometimes referred to as free enterprise. Well, some cynic has said the only thing we learn from history is that we learn nothing from history. It seems to me that the majority of this House have learned nothing from the history of the American Nation in the last 25 years.

What happened to Herbert Hoover, the President of the United States in 1929? He went out in the greatest defeat in American history. Why? Because overwhelming unemployment inundated the Nation.

Now, the only remedy, apparently, offered by the tory coalition controlling this Congress is to recommend we revert to the good old days. I remember the campaign of 1920, when a man by the name of Warren G. Harding, of Ohio, said what we should do is to "go back to normalcy." Scores of Members are echoing the same old platitudes on the floor of this House today. "Go back to normalcy." What did that normalcy achieve? Depression and its lugubrious concomitant, unemployment. What has been offered by this Congress to solve the same conditions which brought about the panic of 1929? Nothing. Nothing. What is there in the offing which will preclude a recurrence of the same unemployment that prevailed in 1929? Nothing. After the last war we had a boom and then a depression. After this war we are going to have a boom and a depression. That is an inducible prognosis. It is incumbent on Congress to enact remedial legislation to forestall it. Otherwise chaos will ensue.

There were some forward-thinking progressive American citizens who had the temerity to suggest that the problem of unemployment was about to confront the American Nation, and something practical should be done to correct it. The answer to those gentlemen from conservatives in this House is they are Reds. Chest-thumping protagonists of the status quo ante bellum read sections from the Soviet Union Constitution and attempt speciously to impute to Communists the origin of the Patman

proposal, in behalf of which many of us have served on the steering committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is my experience that when a speaker cannot support his advocacies with cogent argument, nor refute his opponent, he resorts to red-baiting. That tactic demonstrates the weakness of the committee position. Tom Dewey, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman have proclaimed their warm championship of full employment. The Senate bill or the Patman bill, offered now by the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], are the signboards truly pointing the way to that desideratum, full employment. The committee substitute probably will be the only bill which finally on a record vote will be before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I regret I find myself at this moment in disagreement with my good friend the distinguished majority leader, but I must state my position this way: I am in favor of a full employment bill as President Truman and the people of this country want full employment.

The bill that is presented to the House today by the committee is neither fish nor fowl. It reminds me of the fellow standing in the zoo looking at a giraffe and saying "There ain't no such animal." This committee reminds me of a small boy walking down the middle of a highway whistling because he is going past a cemetery.

I am not going to compromise my people here on the necessity and the urgency and the demand of the people of this country for a full employment bill. This bill before us today is not a full employment bill nor has it any resemblance to such a bill. Let us look at it, and I want to address myself to my friends who with me are cosponsors of the full employment bill. I want to address myself to the parliamentary situation, and that is this: We are now in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and I say you who are cosponsors with me should vote down this committee bill which is nothing but an amendment to the Senate bill. Now, do you understand that? Your vote is "No" on this proposition. If you lose on that, when we get back in the House you will vote again on the Senate bill as amended by this amendment that was passed over your vote of "No." Then you vote "No" again in the House. If there is a motion made to recommit, as there will be, then you vote not to have this whole thing recommitted to the committee. That gives us a chance to get a roll call on the House bill and vote it down. Then you will get something. Now, understand that clearly. You are cosponsors of the full employment bill. Now, let us vote for a full employment bill, but this is not it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman wants to bear in mind that if a motion to recommit carries, the bill is dead.

Mr. FLOOD. The bill may be dead, but the position taken by the majority leader is that you had better get half a loaf than none, you had better get what you can out of the wreck. I cannot agree. I say we can, will, and must force this issue and get a real bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLOOD. Just a moment.

If this bill is recommitted it does not mean that the subject is dead. It will be very much alive in the hearts and minds of the great masses of the people of this country who are suffering from existing conditions that require a full employment bill for their solution and demand they get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chaiman, President Truman some time ago urged the Congress to pass a bill assuring or guaranteeing full-time employment to all Americans able to work and desiring to work, including self-employment in agriculture, commerce, industry, or the professions. No one could be more anxious to see full-time employment by agriculture, commerce, industry, labor, and the professions than myself and this, of course, is the desire of all of us, but the important question is how to attain this utopian dream. There are those who violently criticize anyone who do not join with them in the means or methods by which this may be accomplished.

No doubt many of you, like myself as a youth and later on attended religious revival meetings in the country, villages, and towns, and have heard eloquent ministers describe heaven and the New Jerusalem, with its golden streets, its beautiful River of Life, and the wonderful Tree of Life on the bank of this river, its walls of jasper and other precious stones, 216 feet high, its mansions, and being 1,500 miles long, and 1,500 miles wide, according to Revelations, and where there was constant rejoicing and happiness, with no sorrow, sickness, or death, and following this wonderful description of heaven by the singing of some soul-stirring songs, Onward Christian Soldiers, Shall We Gather at the River, and other gripping spirituals, and then the minister in his exhortations would frequently put the proposal, "All who desire to go to heaven stand up." Of course, saints and sinners stood up. I certainly never did observe anyone expressing the desire not to go to heaven. Although no one expressed a desire to miss heaven, yet through my experience in life I found there was a great diversity of opinion as to how to secure this wonderful blessing after it was necessary to give up our abode on earth.

Of course, we all stand up in favor of full employment, but is it wise for the Government to make such a promise to the American people?

We are honor-bound to deal fairly and squarely with the American people.

The Senate passed 380. It was quite different to the program laid down by the President. In fact, it was denounced as not meeting the requirements to enter into this utopian land where everybody had full employment in agriculture, commerce, industry, and the professions. When the press reports first came out about this proposal, we were led to believe that this measure was designed to help the working people, but a reading of the bill will indicate that it applies to agriculture, commerce, industry, labor, and the professions. This bill, the President's proposal, guarantees full self-employment for the farmers, with plentiful markets and high prices; plenty of business and work in all of the fields of commerce and industry, and guarantees to the doctors, lawyers, dentists, and all others engaged in professional activities full employment. This certainly ought to attract lawyers who are not overrun with clients and doctors and dentists who do not always find they are busy. It even promises that the Government will not interfere with private enterprise. It will not engage as it has been in competition with private enterprise. It promises to strengthen the national defense, to contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations. I hope this may prove more successful than the Atlantic Charter or the San Francisco Charter, and that it will stop a number of the wars that have sprung up among our allies since we whipped Italy, Germany, and Japan. It also assures development of trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, and guarantees an expanding income for agricultural enterprises. It, too, says that it will promote the general health, foster the American home, and American education. I wish to say in passing that it required a master-mind promiser to think up and write out all of these promises. It is nothing short of utopia itself. Nothing is omitted to beguile the unthinking. Of course, this promiser did not have in mind the congressional elections next year and a Presidential election in 1948.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] introduced a bill undertaking to promise as much as the President had promised in his measure.

COMMITTEE REJECTS BOTH

The Committee on Expenditures, made up of a number of the ablest men of the House—Democrats and Republicans—rejected the proposals of the President and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and came to the point where it appeared that no bill would be reported. They did definitely indicate, however, by votes in the committee that they could not accept these wild promises and this proposed hoax on the American people in the President's message, the Patman bill, or even the watered-down Senate bill. This committee did not act arbitrarily. It held extensive hearings, and any group or individual who desired to be heard had an opportunity to be heard, and many persons did testify before the

committee. The President threw behind his proposal and the Patman bill all the power of the administration. He did criticize the Senate bill when it was passed, as I recall, by a statement to the effect "that the Senate had let him down." The committee did finally bring out a substitute bill after rejecting the President's proposal as embodied in the bill of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the Senate bill. When this bill was reported to the House, the CIO and a group of Members of the House who favored the Patman bill, denounced it as a fraud and a hoax, and many of them used stronger denunciatory terms than these, and urged the Members of Congress to defeat this substitute committee bill. The committee filed a report on its bill. A minority report made up of one Democrat and three Republicans expressed opposition to this scheme and to all the bills. They pointed out that this proposal would create another and great expanding bureaucracy and that, according to the statement of Philip Murray, president of the CIO, it would require an expenditure of $24,000,000,000 annually.

Of course, no one was so impolite, according to the minority report, to suggest where and how we would get the twenty-four billion, and there is nothing in any of the bills that includes an authorization or an appropriation to provide any person with a job or to create any markets for the farmers or any business for commerce or industry, and they did not indicate in any of these bills or in their report how many tens of thousands of officeholders would be put on the backs of the American people to carry out this prodigious program. There is nothing in either one of these bills to create a single job for anybody or to indicate the hours of service per day or the wages to be paid, except the committee bill does create some jobs. It creates a Council of Economic Advisers in the office of the President of three members with an annual salary of $15,000 each. This Council has a multitude of duties. They must have an army of experts, specialists, and others of lesser responsibilities. This Council can under this bill determine the number of experts, specialists, and others and fix their salaries. The Lord only knows how many experts, specialists, and other officeholders this Council may select and the salaries they may fix. If the purposes of this bill are carried out these new officeholders will run into the thousands and we will establish one of the greatest and most far-reaching bureaus and place this additional burden on our tax-burdened and debt-burdened people. Outside of these officeholders there is no provision in any of the bills to provide full employment or any employment to labor, agriculture, commerce, industry, or the professions. The American people, of course, will have to pay the bill, and be subject to the snooping of this new army of snoopers.

There was another group, made up of four Democrats and one Republican, who filed separate views. As I understand their statement, they were not in favor of S. 380 or the committee bill. I have heard quite a number of the Members of the House, who favor the President's proposal, state, many of them publicly, that they could not and would not support the committee bill. They contend, as did the CIO and many others, that the committee bill will not accomplish anything in assuring or guaranteeing full employment and they could not give the committee bill their support, but I hear it whispered around on the floor that a lot of those who favor the President's proposal and the Patman bill, and are against the committee bill, that they will vote for the committee bill on a motion to recommit and on final passage so that the committee bill and S. 380 will go to conference, and they hope by some strange quirk of fate they will get the conference committee made up of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate, to adopt substantially some bill other than the committee bill.

It is only fair to say that the committee bill does not make the extravagant promises set forth in the President's message or the Patman bill. It does not undertake to deceive or mislead the American people as I believe that the President's proposal and the Patman bill does and would. The committee bill was ably presented by a number of able and fair speakers, Chairman MANASCO, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. LANHAM, and others. Like myself and many others, they desire to render whatever service can be rendered in justice to our financial situation and in keeping with our Constitution and the American way of life, in aid to all individuals and groups to enjoy the fullest measure of happiness and success and to uphold the American high standard of living. I do not desire to put my stamp of approval on something that cannot be done and will not be done. It in the end can serve no useful purpose to deceive the American people. They have already been deceived and misled enough by these rosy proposals sponsored by many of those who are now trying to put through the President's proposal. My great objection to the committee bill is that it creates another bureau. We have approximately 3,600,000 Federal officeholders in this and foreign countries, and it costs the American people annually approximately $8,000,000,000. We should cut down the number of these bureaus and commissions and take at least 2,000,000 Federal officeholders off the backs of the American people. There should be no council, board, or commission created that we can get along without, without injury to the service to the American people.

PATERNALISM, SOCIALISM, AND COMMUNISM

In my opinion the President's proposal and the Patman bill are a mixture of all of these. We are told about the planning that has been done in Russia and about the full employment in Russia. Let us assume that they do have national planning in Russia and that they do have full employment, but they have a totalitarian, paternalistic, and communistic government. The citizens of Russia do not have free choice in selecting their work or profession. Their miners do not receive ten or more dollars per day or other workers receiving that much or more per day. They do not have such working conditions as we have in this country, or the short hours of service, holidays, and vacations. They cannot choose their work. They cannot belong to a real free labor union. There is no such thing as a free choice, free press, or free speech in Russia. In Germany they had full employment and so did they have in Italy and Japan when they were under totalitarian rule and their lives were subject to the whims and caprices of dictators.

CONGRESS HAS PROVIDED FOR EMPLOYMENT

If management and labor can get together and we operate this country under private enterprise and in the true American way of life which has made this the greatest, freest, and most powerful Nation on the earth in a brief period compared with the lives of other nations, there will be no real unemployment in this country for a long period of time. We have more than one hundred billion in savings to enter private enterprise, to buy thousands of necessary articles for civilian use, in building homes, providing for the necessary equipment of homes. There is literally no limit to the resources of our people to buy and there is no limit to their demands as well as the demands of the peoples of other parts of the world. Let us work out some plan that will settle the strife between industry and labor, and furnish jobs through a long period ahead of us for all of those who desire to be gainfully employed, and maintain our high standards of living. If there comes unemployment in this Nation it will be due in a large measure to the unwise policies of this administration and its predecessor. The bill before us, in my opinion, will discourage private enterprise. It will destroy jobs and not make jobs. It adds to unemployment. Under the New Deal we have had many planners and plans. It was urged that if we reduced our dollar to 59 cents, plus, that would bring prosperity and employment. It was urged that if we destroyed our cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and burn our pigs and mother sows and destroy our cattle, that would bring prosperity and employment.

It was urged that if we cut out thirty or more millions of acres of productive land and plow under our crops, that would bring prosperity and employment. This is only a sample of the many plans and schemes that have been promoted by some of those who are promoting this bill. It was also urged that if Congress would appropriate twenty or more billions of dollars and turn it over to the administration as blank checks, that would restore prosperity and employment, but what were the results? After we had done all of these things in 1938, as I recall, a great labor leader, Hon. William Green, and president of the American Federation of Labor, announced there were approximately 11,000,000 unemployed, and John L. Lewis, another great labor leader, and president of the United Mine Workers, announced in his opinion there were 13,000,000 unemployed. In fact, unemployment was on the increase and the national debt continued on the increase, and so were taxes, until war started in Japan and other countries of the world, and we began to produce armaments and other

materials of war and furnish to Japan, Germany, and Italy great quantities of war materials.

In my opinion, the bills that have been presented offer less promise of benefit to business and employment than these other paternalistic and socialistic schemes.

CONGRESS HAS PLANNED

We passed a bill providing $1,500,000,000 to aid the States in the improvement of their highways. We passed a bill appropriating $1,000,000,000 to provide flood control and the use of the water power of the country. We have passed many other bills of a constructive nature with plans worked out to provide employment and to aid agriculture, industry, and commerce, as well as those in the professions. Neither one of the bills before us either authorizes or appropriates any money for any jobs except this new council and those employed by it.

I shall vote to substitute the committee bill for the Patman bill and whichever is adopted I shall vote against it. The committee bill will likely win by more than a 2 to 1 majority. If it does, then this matter will go to the conference committee, where I hope that something constructive and feasible will be worked out that will really encourage private enterprise, aid agriculture, commerce, labor, and the professions, and will not hold out to the American people that utopia is just around the corner. Let us not overlook the fact that we are nearing a three hundred billion national debt, with an admitted deficit this year of thirty billion, and with deficits in 1946 and 1947 and on to the end of this administration. Whatever money is provided under the President's proposal will have to be borrowed and bring us nearer to uncontrolled inflation. We should constantly pray that this Nation may be saved from uncontrolled inflation. We cannot go on with this unnecessary spending and escape the horrors of inflation. Desiring to do nothing that would encourage inflation, but anxious to preserve our American form of government, private enterprise, and to hold out continued opportunities for American youth, I shall, until I see some bill that in my opinion will help the American people, vote against this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OUTLAND: On page 1, line 3, strike out the language of the committee substitute and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Full Employment Act of 1945.'

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"Section 2."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the matter pending before us under the rule is the substitute. The amendment offered by the gentleman undertakes to amend the original Senate bill.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, this is the House bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The House bill begins on page 10.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California offer this amendment to the committee bill?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OUTLAND: Page 10, line 15, strike out the language of the committee substitute and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Full Employment Act of 1945.'

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that—

"(a) It is the policy of the United States to foster free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in trade and commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

"(b) All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right;

"(c) In order to carry out the policies set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and in order to (1) promote the general welfare of the Nation; (2) foster and protect the American home and the American family as the foundation of the American way of life; (3) raise the standard of living of the American people; (4) provide adequate employment opportunities for returning veterans; (5) contribute to the full utilization of our national resources; (6) develop trade and commerce among the several States and with foreign nations; (7) preserve and strengthen competitive private enterprise, particularly small business enterprise; (8) strengthen the national defense and security; and (9) contribute to the establishment and maintenance of lasting peace among nations, it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States;

"(d) In order to assist industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in achieving continuing full employment, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue such consistent and openly arrived at economic policies and programs as will stimulate and encourage the highest feasible levels of employment opportunities through private and other non-Federal investment and expenditure;

"(e) To the extent that continuing full employment cannot otherwise be achieved, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investment and expenditure as may be needed to assure continuing full employment; and

"(f) Such investment and expenditure by the Federal Government shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being, and to stimulate increased employment opportunities by private enterprise.

"THE NATIONAL PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT BUDGET

"SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session the National Production and Employment Budget (hereinafter referred to as the 'National Budget'), which shall set forth in summary and detail, for the ensuing fiscal year or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate—

"(1) the estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed in industry and agriculture;

"(2) the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, require to produce such volume of the gross national product, at the expected level of prices, as will be necessary to provide employment opportunities for such labor force (such dollar volume being hereinafter referred to as the 'full employment volume of production'); and

"(3) the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure by private enterprises, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government (not taking into account any increased or decreased investment or expenditure which might be expected to result from the programs set forth in such Budget).

"The estimates and information herein called for shall take account of such foreign investments and expenditure for exports and imports as affect the volume of the gross national product.

"(b) The extent, if any, by which the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is less than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, shall for the purposes of this title be regarded as a prospective deficiency in the National Budget. When there is a prospective deficiency in the National Budget for any fiscal year or other period, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for encouraging such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure, particularly investment and expenditure which will promote increased employment opportunities by private enterprise, as will prevent such deficiency to the greatest possible extent. The President shall also include in such Budget such recommendations for legislation relating to such program as he may deem necessary or desirable. Such program may include, but need not be limited to, current and projected Federal policies and activities with reference to banking and currency, monopoly and competition, wages and working conditions, foreign trade and investment, agriculture, taxation, social security, the development of natural resources, and such other matters as may directly or indirectly affect the level of non-Federal investment and expenditure.

"(c) To the extent, if any, that such increased non-Federal investment and expenditure as may be expected to result from actions taken under the program set forth in accordance with subsection (b) of this section are deemed insufficient to provide a full employment volume of production, the President shall transmit a general program for such Federal investment and expenditure as will be sufficient to bring the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government up to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production. Such program shall be designed to contribute to the national wealth and well-being and to stimulate additional non-Federal investment and expenditure. Any of such programs calling for the construction of public works by the Federal Government shall provide for the performance of the necessary construction work by private concerns under contracts awarded in accordance with applicable laws, except where the performance of such work by some other method is necessary by reason of special circumstances or is authorized by other provisions of law.

"(d) If the estimated aggregate volume of prospective investment and expenditure for

any fiscal year or other period, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (3) of this section, is more than the estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure required to assure a full employment volume of production, as set forth in the National Budget in accordance with paragraph (a) (2) of this section, the President shall set forth in such Budget a general program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations, or diminishing the aggregate volume of investment and expenditure to the level required to assure a full employment volume of production, or both.

"(e) The programs referred to in subsection (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall include such measures as may be necessary to assure that monopolistic practices with respect to prices, production, or distribution, or other monopolistic practices, will not interfere with the achievement of the purposes of this act.

"(f) The National Budget shall include a report on the distribution of the national income during the preceding fiscal year, or such longer period as the President may deem appropriate, together with an evaluation of the effect upon the distribution of the national income of the programs set forth in such Budget.

"(g) The President may from time to time transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised estimates, information, programs, or legislative recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable in connection with the National Budget.

"PREPARATION OF NATIONAL BUDGET

"SEC. 4. (a) The National Budget shall be prepared in the Executive Office of the President under the general direction and supervision of the President and in consultation with the members of his Cabinet and other heads of departments and establishments.

"(b) The President shall transmit to the several departments and establishments such preliminary estimates and other information as will enable them to prepare such plans and programs as may be needed during the ensuing or subsequent fiscal years to help achieve a full employment volume of production.

"(c) The President may establish such advisory boards or committees composed of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, and others, as he may deem advisable for the purpose of advising and consulting on methods of achieving the objectives of this act.

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL BUDGET

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the National Budget, to be composed of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Finance, and seven additional Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Labor, and Ways and Means, and seven additional Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation of the Joint Committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"(b) It shall be the function of the Joint Committee—

"(1) to make a study of the National Budget transmitted to Congress by the President in accordance with section 3 of this act; and

"(2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1 of each year, its findings and recommendations with respect to the National Budget, together with a joint resolution setting forth for the ensuing fiscal year a general policy with respect to such National Budget to serve as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to such National Budget.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(d) The Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearing shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned, under authority of this section.

"(e) The Joint Committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it deems necessary and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments.

"(f) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

"RATE OF EXPENDITURES

"SEC. 6. (a) The President shall review quarterly all Federal investment and expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which the current and anticipated level of non-Federal investment and expenditure warrants any change in the volume of such Federal investment and expenditure.

"(b) Subject to such principles and standards as may be set forth in applicable appropriation acts and other statutes, the rate of Federal investment and expenditure may be varied to whatever extent and in whatever manner the President may determine to be necessary for the purpose of assisting in assuring continuing full employment, with due consideration being given to current and anticipated variations in savings and in investment and expenditure by private business, consumers, State and local governments, and the Federal Government.

"AID TO COMMITTEES

"SEC. 7. The heads of departments and establishments shall, at the request of any committee of either House of Congress, furnish such committee with such aid and information with regard to the National Budget as it may request.

"INTERPRETATION

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

"(a) the operation of plants, factories, or other productive facilities by the Federal Government;

"(b) the use of compulsory measures of any type whatsoever in determining the allocation or distribution of manpower;

"(c) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations; or

"(d) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the National Budget, unless such program shall have been authorized by provisions of law other than this act.

"(e) the disclosure of trade secrets or other information, the publication of which might have a harmful effect upon the firm or person supplying such information."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment that I am offering is the original bill that those of us in the House cosponsored last July. It is a bill which states that it is the policy of the United States Government, after private industry has failed, and only after private industry has failed, to see that job opportunities are provided for those Americans able to work and willing to work. Throughout the bill every possible safeguard is thrown around the principle of private enterprise. Every possible means is taken to see that business, industry, and agriculture in this country are protected. But what this amendment does say is that after everything else has failed, that the Federal Government has the responsibility of coming in.

You will recall that during the last depression how every mayor, every Governor of every State in this Union came to Washington asking for relief. We did not hear anything about communism then. We did not hear anything about socialism then. All we heard was the cry for help, because that help had to come from the Government as a whole. That is what is taken care of in this original House bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if we in this Congress are going to fulfill our responsibilities to the American people, we are going to have to take constructive action such as this. We are going to have to take other measures during the reconversion period here on the home front to prevent depression, to prevent the serious conditions which will arise in the future. We cannot wait until the catastrophe hits us. We have to act now.

I hope with all my heart that we will not make this a partisan issue; that Members on both sides of the aisle will join together in voting for this amendment, which would be truly a full-employment bill. Any other action is meaningless.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment offered by my colleagues from California, of course. Furthermore, if that amendment should not carry, I am going to vote against the committee substitute in order to try to get the Senate bill before the House; in other words, I am going to vote my convictions on this matter.

Those convictions, very briefly, are as follows: That it is all-important that in Democratic fashion in this great national legislature in the United States there should be a declaration that it is the policy of this Nation not to permit mass unemployment to come to this country again; that it is the policy of

this country that we shall maintain so effective a balance between the floor of buying power on the one hand and production on the other as to assure the opportunity for employment for our people. How? I read a passage from the Senate bill itself which is similar to a provision in the Outland amendment:

(d) To that end the Federal Government shall, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and others, develop and pursue a consistent and carefully planned economic program with respect to, but not limited to, taxation; banking, credit, and currency; monopoly and monopolistic practices; wages, hours, and working conditions; foreign trade and investment; agriculture; education; housing; social security; natural resources;

And so forth. What means do we have in the committee substitute to consider these matters, to consider for once the vital, over-all economic problem of America? We have a committee proposed in the committee substitute which is composed of the chairman and the ranking minority members of the two busiest committees of this House, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means. I have great respect for those gentlemen, but how in the world, with their normal duties, are they going to be able to consider the tremendous question of a policy on the maintenance of national prosperity and employment? It is utterly impossible. But in the bill passed by the Senate or in the amendment offered by my colleague from California there is provided a committee of 30 members which will be able to devote its whole time to this all-important task and duty. If we adopt the amendment offered by my colleague from California, or if you adopt the Senate bill we are not committing this Nation to a new economic course of action, but what we are saying is that we will do all those things which will contribute to the necessary goal of not permitting a depression to visit this Nation again. Believe me, those of us who seek to do that thing are the true friends of freedom of enterprise and every other kind of freedom in this Nation. The alternative proposal is that we hide our heads in the sands of time until there comes again a great economic catastrophe in this Nation, at which time the survival of freedom will indeed be difficult.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this bill is called the full employment bill. To begin with, that is a sad misnomer. It should be called the employment bill of a council of three at $15,000 a year. That is really all that is in the bill. It is not obnoxious because it will not hurt anybody and it will not do anybody any good. "Full employment" is a good slogan, even though it gives full employment to only three.

This bill provides that a council of three be appointed to tell the President what the President already knows better than the council when the conditions exist. It tells them to figure out for the President what to do, but I do not know what these little hired men of his could tell him that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General could not tell him, and what every Member of Congress on either side of the House could tell him if he were willing to listen to them.

I am sorry you spent so much money printing this bill with nothing but meaningless words. They are not worth the price of the paper on which you printed them. I cannot see anything in this bill, yet I cannot see any harm in it. It has put me in the position for the first time on the floor of this House of voting for something and getting nothing for it, neither good nor bad.

Usually a bill has at least some objectionable or some good features about it, but all I see to this is that somebody shall tell the President when there is unemployment—a condition that any President, whoever he is, will already know. There is not a governor of a State of this Union who cannot do that; there is not a Member of Congress and there is not a single employee of the Congress or of the Federal Government that does not know when it exists.

The question is, when unemployment exists, What are you going to do about it? And there is nothing in this bill that tells you what to do about it. There will be unemployment—plenty of it. We are going to have a lot of headaches before we get back to normal times or to peacetime. We will have headaches that will be deliberately manufactured by a few, and we will have headaches that you cannot avoid during the transition. I am very sorry that I am put in the position of having to vote on a bill that really means nothing.

It is true that "full employment" is a good campaign slogan for election, but the people have a right to expect something better than that from us. I shall vote for this bill only because then it will go to conference, and I sincerely hope that the conferees will rewrite it and make a bill out of it—a bill that will, at least, have a definite purpose and a reason for being passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, again we are confronted with a choice. It is like the choice that is sometimes given to a criminal when he has been convicted. They ask him whether he would rather be shot or hanged.

The committee bill is a grand departure from what the sponsors of this measure intended. This measure could well be referred to as the Alabama Hay Ride of 1946. It has no meaning. As the gentleman from North Dakota said, it will do no good nor no harm as far as anyone can learn. The only thing that gives it any dignity at all, in my opinion, is that one of its sponsors is that great man, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], the great Congressman that I admire so much. I hate to see him mixed up in a mess of this kind.

We have worked a long time on the Patman full employment bill. We thought we were carrying out the mandate of the Democratic Party in offering legislation that would meet the requirements as outlined by the President of the United States in his appeal to the Congress for this legislation. The whole concept of the bill we sponsored has been scuttled. In my judgment, what we are doing here is absolutely meaningless. I do not know whether I could even support it if it were a question of whether or not to refer it back to the committee. The only impelling thing to cause me to vote for the committee version is whether or not I would want it to go out to the country that one of the major recommendations proposed by the President had been defeated by the Congress. That is an important consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vigorously support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] which is the originally full employment bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], H. R. 2202. It seems to me, Members of the House, that after two World Wars this Congress would learn a lesson. We know that after the last World War we had a disastrous unemployment. We know that after this war we are going to have a lot of unemployment, tragic unemployment unless we here in Congress do our utmost to prevent it. We know, furthermore, that sooner or later Congress is going to be forced to do something about the unemployment situation that is going to come. Why we should not adopt a real measure that means something now to take care of a situation which we know is inevitable is beyond my understanding. Why should we wait until starvation and hunger face us to act? Why shouldn't we adopt a real plan now?

Economics, business and Government are interrelated. The business of Government must be geared so as to create a national economy which will furnish jobs or make jobs available if we are going to have the kind of economy we all want. We know that if we adopt this substitute bill we are actually doing very little toward a solution. We are making no real plans for the future and no plans to avoid the repetition of what happened after the last war. Furthermore, the great people of a democracy are not going to put up with unemployment very long. The only way we can have a real democracy, a democracy that will survive, is to see that your Government works in tune with business, with economies and public-works plans so the people will have an opportunity for employment. You cannot have freedom and you cannot enjoy the great privileges under our Constitution if you are out of work. Sooner or later, no matter what we adopt here, the people are going to demand the opportunity for work. So why should we not adopt a forthright plan here and do something about it?

I remember in 1939 we had an unofficial committee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], a nonpartisan group, which studied the situation at that time and tried to make

plans to help the 10,000,000 unemployed at that time. We came to the conclusion that there had to be a governmental policy which would be synchronized with business and give the people an opportunity for employment. Furthermore, we now have, or shortly will have, a national debt of $200,000,000,000 on our shoulders. If we let our employment sink to a low level, how are we going to pay interest let alone any of the principal of that debt? Business must be kept humming, employment must be kept high, or we face chaos. So why not do the courageous and right thing and recognize a fact as a fact and get behind the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] and show that Congress intends to meet its responsibility in doing something about this situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this is certainly not a time for oratory, even if I were capable of it. This is a time to state clearly that the 117 sponsors of the full employment bill have an opportunity at this time to vote on the bill which they sponsored, H. R. 2202, commonly known as the Patman bill. It is now being offered as an amendment to the committee amendment to the Senate bill. This gives you for the first time a chance to vote on the subject which you sponsored. So let us keep that in mind in voting on this particular amendment. I have no time for recriminations. I think the committee has tried to do a good job in bringing out the bill which they have reported. I think this amendment that is offered has better substance in it.

I want to call to the attention of this House that in 1920 things were pretty bad in Italy, and Mussolini marched on Rome and took over because of unemployment.

In 1933, Hitler took over Germany because unemployment prevailed throughout Germany. We know we will face a condition of unemployment when this war is over and deflation arrives. We do not want what happened in Italy and Germany to happen here because of our unemployment. We know we have to make some plan to look forward and meet that situation. H. R. 2202 is a well-thought-out plan. It is not communistic or socialistic. It is democratic. It gives the commission the right to bring before the President certain data. The President makes certain recommendations to Congress. The Congress can then discard his recommendations or approve them at that time. Anyone who tries to draw a red herring of radicalism or communism or socialism across the trail regarding the vote on this amendment is merely beclouding the issue.

You will now have an opportunity to vote as to whether we shall plan to take care of unemployment or whether we will let unemployment descend upon us without planning, and then try to take care of it as best we can at that time, because that is just exactly what the Congress will have to do. We planned to win the war. Why can we not plan to eliminate these cycles of depression that inevitably follow every war?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, there are many in this House who are worried that the free private enterprise system may be replaced by some other system. I think those Members should recognize quite frankly that there is just one way the American free enterprise system will fall. That is if we continue to have recurring depressions, with large numbers of unemployed and nothing being done about it. Those who oppose the Outland amendment, which is the original Patman full employment bill, are those who should think twice, because in opposing it you are saying, "We do not want to plan against the period of unemployment. We are willing to take our chances, and have fifteen or twenty million unemployed roaming the streets of this country, and thereby create a crisis in which a great radical movement can develop; a movement which would demand a radical change in our Government."

During the war we were all pleased by the tremendous job that was done of turning out war material. It is true our country did the greatest job the world has ever known. I submit that job was done through a partnership of management, labor, and Government. It was a tripartite job. All three elements played an important role in the partnership. What the original Patman bill now before you does is to set up a similar kind of proposal for a period of peace. It is trying to apply the techniques that we learned during the war, techniques that produced results, except that we want to apply them this time to build peacetime prosperity, rather than in building engines of destruction.

I submit to this House, the techniques that did turn out the kind of production we had during the war ought to be equally useful during a time of peace. The techniques that produced all the weapons necessary to down the most ruthless war machine the world had ever seen, should be used now to make sure that we have housing and food and clothing and all of the good things of life for our population. That is the plea which the authors of the full employment bill lay in front of you. We are not trying to change the basic concepts of American life in any way. We are trying to give you some fire insurance—insurance against a great conflagration which will sweep this country and sweep the entire world if we do not make plans to prevent it. In my opinion the committee bill is a very sad substitute and I sincerely hope the committee will vote to restore the language of the original bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, last February the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] introduced House bill No. 2202, which was designed to make the immortal Franklin Roosevelt's dream of 60,000,000 jobs for the toilers of America come true. Later the country's leading humanitarian statesman, former Vice President Henry Wallace, by means of his famous book entitled "Sixty Million Jobs," made this memorable expression as familiar as a next-door neighbor to every household in the land.

Soon after the introduction of the Patman bill, I became one of its cosponsors, and subsequently a member of the executive committee charged with the responsibility of endeavoring to prevail upon the House to approve it. Unfortunately, this liberal bill was referred to a committee in which it had no more chance to escape ignominious death than Socrates had to avert it in Athens or the Saviour had to avoid it in Jerusalem.

The measure which the committee has brought forth, after the manner in which the mountain labored and brought forth a mouse, is no more like the Patman bill than the jackass in the lion's skin was like the king of beasts which the skin had previously adorned.

Fortunately for the progressive Members of the House, there will soon be an opportunity to vote to substitute the Patman bill for the committee measure. To my regret, the existing parliamentary situation is such that the vote on the motion of the able gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] to substitute the Patman bill will, at the best, be successively by voice, division, and tellers, and no record will disclose the manner in which any Member discharges his duty in this important matter. Therefore, let me improve this opportunity to assert that I shall, of course, vote to substitute the Patman genuine full employment bill for the meaningless measure which the committee has reported to the House.

But if the motion to substitute is defeated, the Members who desire real instead of humbug employment legislation, will be confronted with this dilemma: They can either vote for the notoriously undesirable committee proposal, in the hope that if it is adopted it will be vitalized with some degree of merit by the conference committee of Senators and Representatives to which it will inevitably be sent; or they can vote against the committee proposal, with the unhappy realization that if it is defeated the only chance for any sort of employment legislation during this session of the Congress will have been lost forever. In this deplorable situation, if the worse becomes the worst, I shall, with unfeigned reluctance, vote for the committee amendment.

But let me entreat the House to approve the Patman bill which, if it becomes a law, will provide adequate protection against Nation-wide unemployment.

Ever since we were dragged into the Second World War, it has been my inescapable belief that in the postwar era this country's predominant peril would be that of unemployment. That belief sprang from the recollection of the long, tragic years of unprecedented distress that followed World War number one. The lack of vision, preparation, and performance which brought us to the brink of ruin after the First World War should not be permitted again to curse the country in this second postwar period.

Young men generally were promised before their induction into the armed service that after they had defeated Germany and Japan and victoriously returned from the war, they would be restored to the identical jobs they surrendered in order to fight for their country and the preservation of the blessings which make it the happiest land on earth. As the far-seeing had feared the task of performing these pleasing promises is proving to be as difficult as it would be for a camel to go through the eye of a needle.

Let me remind you that before the sun had set on the last day of the First World War practically every Government contract for military supplies was canceled. War-serving industries, that had been operating at capacity 24 hours a day, immediately extinguished their fires, closed their doors, and began their long and laborious return to peacetime production. Overnight millions of war workers lost their jobs. And before the first trainload of soldiers returned from their camps in the United States, and weeks before the first shipload of veterans returned from overseas, every industrial center in the country was confronted with the problem of unemployment which, during its long-delayed solution, caused this country suffering such as only a Doré could depict and distress such as only a Dante could describe.

Before the completion of demobilization, a panic worse than the world had ever known descended upon the Nation. Subject to occasional interruptions, that panic, during the next 15 years, impoverished a majority of the American people. After it had destroyed business, wrecked banks, ruined farmers and bankrupted manufacturers, it overran the land with an army of 15,000,000 jobless men, destitute women, and starving children. It agonized the Nation until millions of its victims cried out with the Apostle Paul: "Oh, death, where is thy sting?"

The progenitor of these heartbreaking tragedies was the unemployment which destroyed the purchasing power of the country.

Between 1918 and 1933, our governmental structure was again and again shaken by the convulsions of unemployment from "turret to foundation stone."

At some time during this postwar period the unemployment strain upon our democracy will be as much greater than that of the last postwar period as 12,000,000 veterans of this war are greater than the 4,000,000 who came marching home 27 years ago.

When the pharisaical lawyer propounded the inquiry: "Which is the greatest commandment?" the Saviour specified two, and added: "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Please mark this prediction. During the next few years, on employment will hang "all the law and the prophets" of success in the stupendous enterprise of rebuilding the world in conformity with the fervent desire of the countless millions who constantly yearn and devoutly pray for permanent prosperity and everlasting peace.

American industry may, as usual, be depended upon to employ all whom it can profitably utilize. But it is more than possible that there will be millions during the next few years whom private enterprise cannot absorb. Hence prudence dictates that plans for vast, useful public-works programs should be formulated and held in readiness for execution the moment the necessity for governmental assistance appears.

As experience teaches that it is the part of wisdom to pay premiums for fire insurance on one's home that may never burn instead of running the risk of having it destroyed in circumstances in which the owner alone would suffer all the loss, so common sense dictates that it will be better for us to be prepared with the Patman bill to meet an unemployment crisis, which it is hoped will never come, than it will be for us to ignore perceivable danger until we are overwhelmed by disasters such as we suffered for more than 3 years prior to the 4th of March 1933.

There are great self-liquidating improvements, such as that of controlling the devastating flood waters of the Mississippi and its tributaries, that will require tens of millions of days' work and billions of dollars for their achievement which, when the necessity for their execution arises, should, for obvious reasons, be prosecuted by the Federal Government.

But it is conceived that the combined demands for labor by the Federal Government and private industry may not equal the available supply during the next few years. In that case, every State in the Union should and, with undoubted economic propriety, could sponsor labor-employing public-improvement programs which, if providently executed, would, in a short time, liquidate themselves and thereafter long pay liberal dividends in utility to those whose taxes had made such improvements possible.

Every State of average area and topography has hundreds of miles of narrow, winding, hazardous roads, which, in behalf of safety and economy of time, gasoline, and motor equipment, should be widened or straightened, or both. Even through mountainous country the high cost of shortening the distance between important points by substituting straight for crooked roads would, in a little while, be repaid by the resulting savings of the traveling public's time and the reductions in the cost of operating the instrumentalities of transportation.

In this aeronautical age, no State can keep step with progress without adequate airport facilities for all its important cities and industrial centers. In the construction and improvement of these ports lie innumerable opportunities for the profitable employment of surplus labor by State and municipal governments.

More than nine-tenths of our municipalities need sewage-disposal plants to conserve valuable fertilizing material and abate the nuisance that it perennially generates by polluting streams, filling the air with nauseating odors and spreading disease far and near.

These are but a few of the many meritorious projects that would require unlimited labor for their consummation to which the Federal Government's assistance, in cases of necessity, could and would be lent if the Patman bill becomes a law.

Friends of the general welfare and champions of full employment for the hosts of toil, our opportunity is at hand. Let us unhesitatingly improve it by adopting the Patman bill amendment and thus do everything in our power to make it impossible for unemployment ever again to smite this Nation with its curse, and pour out upon the American people its vials of wrath and desolation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, Abraham Lincoln on March 21, 1864, said:

> Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world. (That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise.)
>
> Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

I am one of the coauthors of the original Patman bill and perhaps I feel impelled to speak briefly now because I find intolerant language used toward some of us who are coauthors of that bill. Charges of fraud, charges of intention to defeat the American way of life; to deceive the American people. I am a lawyer by profession. In that profession, we learn to respect the opinion of our opponents, even though we differ with that opinion. A state of mind in the thinking of legislators which is so closed, that it does not admit of any truth or sincerity or patriotism in the plans and thinking of that other American across the aisle from you, is not conducive to sound legislative results in the interest of the public good. An attitude of mind which thinks habitually in terms of suspicion and contempt for that other American's opinion, is a form of intolerance and egotism which bears no good results for the American people.

I am 1 of the 116 coauthors of the Patman bill. I was honored to be one, for I believe in the proposition that if there is full employment for the American man and women, then there will be increasingly higher levels of life. Yes; higher levels of daily life for the American people on all human experience fronts. In proportion as there is full employment, there will be full purchasing power. And full production depends upon a full ability to purchase the products of full production. Manufacturers make their money profits off of the sale of their wares. The more sales they make, presumably they make more profits. But folks who have no work, cannot buy and pay cash for wares produced in our factories, unless they have opportunity for the full employment best enabled to raise the standards of living of the families of America. Full production is dependent upon a full buying power; a full buying or purchasing power, depends upon job opportunities for the American people. I believe it necessary and sound

in our American way of free competitive enterprise, that employing industry have opportunity for full steam ahead in production. We have produced for war, now let us produce for peace. Our competitive system can do this, provided, however, that a full job opportunity is available to every honest-to-God American who is industrious and forthright to work as fully as may be in decent, dignified work at a decent wage. You will see then, why I am for the full employment bill of which I am a coauthor.

Furthermore, it is a clear sign of lack of understanding of other Americans, to argue that those who favor full employment are favoring the State taking over free enterprise. Such an argument has no application to my thinking or intentions. Why any American should want to limit job opportunity for any other fellow American, is more than I can understand. Is it untrue that the hope and aspiration of America is that all industrious men shall become free of fear and free from hunger and free from want? Freedom of press and worship and speech is an empty phrase, if honest, industrious men cannot find job opportunities.

The machine age, the atomic age—these have combined together to compel us to recognize man's inhumanity to man in matters of allowing the man who works with his hands or brain to rise and live at a level of life consistent with recognition of the declaration that all men are created equal or in the image of God.

If you think that my extemporaneous remarks are this day too idealistic, then, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, let me remind you that a nation which places too much emphasis upon the materialistic, to the destruction of proper place for the spiritual, is a nation which is bound to dissolve and decay.

To deny creation of a national philosophy which is bounden to not let honest men starve and children not go without schooling and recreation is to deny that our fellow man who is willing and anxious for employment is nevertheless condemned to compulsory idleness with all of its damning and destroying results. Compulsory idleness comes from lack of job opportunities in almost every case. Please note that I said compulsory idleness from lack of opportunity to gainfully work at decent wages and honest toil.

And, when mass compulsory idleness comes about again as part of the depression that even you Members of this House on the Republican side admit will come if certain conditions prevail, then, our free competitive system is not unlikely to be further weakened and justly condemned as inadequate. This full employment bill is a backlog to free enterprise; a friend of free enterprise in time of trial and need. Freedom of enterprise will not survive in its present form, if we allow mass compulsory idleness to come about through fault on our part of procrastination or blindness to truth. Hunger, cold, lack of opportunity for schooling for children, lack of ample necessities of life—these are determining factors in the progress of our great Nation. Full production and full employment would make lack of the necessities of life impossible for honest men.

Yes, I am liberal enough to insist upon the right of all my fellow Americans to have full enough job opportunities so that they, too, regardless of race, creed, or color, can also have a sense of rise in their standards of living from day to day.

But, if this original full employment bill does not pass this day, I shall vote for the committee amendment. While it shuns the declaration for full employment which I favored as essential, yet the committee amendment declares a national policy of "high level" of employment. It does not say how "high." But the ordinary meaning of the word as compared with the term "low" or "medium" or "average" or other applicable or comparative terms will take care of that when the time comes. And, as I had no desire to weaken the system of "free" enterprise, it appears to me that the committee amendment also keeps it strong. This committee amendment is a definite beginning in the right direction; inasmuch as the original bill may not pass today. A "high level" is not a "full level," but it is higher than our present national level, of no declared policy at all as to doing away with compulsory mass idleness.

Money profits are essential, as motive for taking money risks, for the investment of initiative and for outlet for American resourcefulness and ingenuity. But, Mr. Chairman, I feel we have so far in this Congress, magnified the extent of the need or desirability for piling up material gain. Man never has lived by bread alone and man never can seek primarily to acquire and acquire and acquire more and more and more of the material things to the exclusion of the spiritual, unless such man anticipates self-destruction and moral decay.

Yes; we have pretty well taken care of American industry in terms of taxes, cut-backs, excess-profits-tax cancellation and other protection from money losses growing out of this war. But what have we yet done to protect and fortify the human body and mind and soul from the ravages of war. I do not minimize the proper place of material and money gain as essential. But, I do say, it is high time we recognize in terms of legislative action, the fact that men and women of forthrightness and morality and industry and with the love of God in their daily lives are the realistic national wealth. Manhood is higher than money and character is richer than cash.

The obligation of government is not to control men fully. Nor is it to enrich a few at the expense of the many. There is no security for the few, if there is insecurity as to the necessities of life for the many. Let us be willing that all worthy men shall achieve an abundant life. We want this for ourselves. And, feeling that we are entitled to a working condition in which we can deservedly reach this level of living for ourselves, we are also obligated to see to it that our neighbors have like opportunity to earn it. This is free enterprise in opportunity for employment and advancement.

I see no reason to think I am unsound in arguing for full employment when these four older statesmen of America pronounced for it. Listen to them.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Chicago, October 28, 1944:

> To assure the full realization of the right to useful and remunerative employment, an adequate program must, and if I have anything to do about it will, provide America with close to 60,000,000 productive jobs. * * * If anyone feels that my faith in our ability to provide 60,000,000 peacetime jobs is fantastic, let him remember that some people said the same thing about my demand in 1940 for 50,000 airplanes.

Harry S. Truman, Washington, September 6, 1945:

> A national reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work—a declaration of the ultimate duty of government to use its own resources if all other methods should fail to prevent prolonged unemployment—these will help to avert fear and establish full employment. The prompt and firm acceptance of this bedrock public responsibility will reduce the need for its exercise. I ask that full-employment legislation to provide these vital assurances be speedily enacted.

Thomas E. Dewey, Seattle, September 21, 1944:

> If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, the Government can, and must, create job opportunities, because there must be jobs for all in this country of ours. * * * If there is one thing we are all agreed upon it is that in the coming peacetime years we in this country must have jobs and opportunity for all. That is everybody's business. Therefore, it is the business of government."

Herbert Hoover, Newark, September 18, 1928:

> I wish to lay down the proposition that the very prerequisite, the very foundation of economic progress to our industrial and business employees is full and stable employment. A continued surplus of unemployed workers means decreasing wages, increasing hours, and fear for the future. To protect labor, to maintain its prosperity, to abolish poverty, we must so organize our economic system as to provide a job for all who have the will to work.

When Patrick Henry said, "Give me liberty or give me death," he was not pronouncing for the protection of a material thing. It was a patriotic and positive assertion for the preservation of an everlasting and necessary principle of human conduct and of an enduring human relationship. Patrick Henry knew that where there was no liberty there was no chance for human happiness. It was for this indestructible essential of daily life for which he was willing to die.

This leads me to observe, that the evolvement of civilization demonstrates that material things are only of real value, as they contribute to the progress and happiness of human kind. Material things are made for man and not man for material things. Any other deduction would enslave the very souls and spirits of men to unworthy objectives. I mentioned liberty as one of the indestructibles of daily living. This leads me to add to this list of the indestructibles of human progress and liberty, the freedom to think although we may think differently; good will amongst men; faith in God; faith in other human kind,

too; conscience, fortitude, humility, tolerance—these are a few of the absolute necessities in the daily consciousness and conduct of our Nation. And the victory in war we recently won along side of our allies, makes these indestructibles and absolute necessities even more essential than before, in our daily approach to, and solving of, our national and international relationships.

If you are thinking or would say to me if you had the opportunity, that these remarks of mine are too idealistic and are therefore impractical of accomplishment, may I remind you that it is still a fact—and always will be—that a nation without God and a nation without ideologies which keeps that nation on her knees in the terms of a spiritual humility, is too materialistic to endure. And also, that the materialist philosophy that might makes right and that power begets privilege, without regard to justice, has never yet contributed toward the inspiration of humanity and the raising of the standard of living for the masses of the people, and away from serfdom and ignorance.

Yes, we have won our recent war against the militarists of Germany and Japan. At the same time the necessary development of and use of the atomic bomb resulted in our own nation becoming the most destructive in the world's history in time of war or peace. Granting, gentlemen, that this development and use was essential to the preservation of the democratic way of life, this very possession of the most destructive power within the knowledge of man likewise places upon us the most far-reaching responsibility and trusteeship for its sanest and soundest and surest use, for the perpetuation and preservation of enduring peace.

Sound judgment and the dictates of self-preservation compelled us to cooperate with and understand and respect the other Allied Nations with whom we fought a common battle of self-defense. We did this in time of war, even though we continued to think we had material differences of opinion on some major matters with reference to their forms of government and their economic philosophies as related to our own.

And whether all of us would have it so or not, it clearly appears that our Nation is now a member of a world neighborhood of nations and that for this reason, we must either learn to live in terms of residence and responsibility in a world neighborhood, or not to live in enduring peace and security at all.

Amongst the decisive lessons which the necessities of war have taught us, is that there can reasonably be plenty of opportunity and work for earning of money and for material prosperity in our Nation and in the world. God forbid, that it can ever again be truthfully said that our levels of life and living rise more in time of war than in time of peace. Or, that it can ever be said again, that our economic expansion and stability depends for its life on a shot in the arm in the form of a World War tablet. The war discoveries, inventions, and advancements discovered and developed by the Public Treasury and for the public benefit and defense, must now be promptly turned to the raising of the standard of livelihood for the people of America. And international cartels designed to make millions of money profit out of the slaughter, if needs be, of the youth of the world, have no longer a place in a world which must live together as neighbors in order to survive at all.

And what of some of our world neighbors? Can we in good faith and with tolerance and mutual respect criticize, condemn, even outlaw in our speaking and attitude their right to self-determination of their own ways of life. Is there no room for mutual respect, confidence, and good faith in the minds and hearts of all thinking and acting men without regard to race, creed, color, or otherwise? I do not conceive that we have exclusive ownership or control of all of the good faith, justice, liberty, and desire for peace that exists in the world. I therefore emphatically speak for international tolerance, international good faith, with increased consciousness of and participation in all reasonable steps which may be necessary to establish and preserve an enduring world peace. Gentlemen, anything less than this, is to belittle the unselfish sacrifice already made by those who have died in this and other wars, that we might have liberty and live more abundantly. It will likewise result in the eradication of the fundamental principles of world understanding, neighborliness, and cooperation which is essential to an enduring world peace.

There is no other way provided whereby mankind can be saved from the destruction of the essential implements of civilization. As the spreading of jealousy, hatred, suspicion, ill will, gossip, and rumor destroys the possibility of individual neighbors living in terms of neighborhood good will and neighborhood security, so in like manner do the same forces destroy the possibility of international neighborhood understanding and cooperation.

We are in a period of reconversion from what to what? Is there imagination that we will ever reconvert back to the same normalcy and status existent before Pearl Harbor? Such return will be absolutely impossible—for the discoveries, inventions, and improvements in transportation, communication, science, manufacture, and distribution alone, will compel us to raise our standards of living. As Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry revolted against the status quo as intolerable, so we must have our eyes to the east and not only be willing to live and let live, but also be willing to have others enriched by a sense of economic and political advancement and achievement. I conceive of my beloved Nation reconverting into a land where honest and forthright men and women, without regard to race, creed, or color, have a more adequate opportunity to support themselves and their families with dignity; with fuller opportunity to work; with increasing freedom, from the destructive fears and forces which are born out of the womb of greed and intolerance.

In this period of reconversion, it is my belief that we have not yet adequately approached at least two major necessities in such period. First, and without criticism of any person or any committee for doing or leaving undone anything, I nevertheless feel that the GI boys, and likewise the girls who served in this war, have not yet had adequate or prompt provision made for their fair and just and earliest possible reconversion from youths in uniform to youths in civilian endeavor and life. For instance, from my native State of California, comes reports to me from bankers as well as veteran groups to the fact that it is taking as long as 45 days to process a GI loan. This, of course, in practice, amounts to foreclosing the intended use of the GI bill. Then, I feel that the amount of aid and assistance presently provided in the GI bill, for the continuation of education of these distinguished men and women is not adequate. Hundreds of thousands of them gave up their education voluntarily, and those who did not have that privilege, were compelled to bear arms and sacrifice their education in order to serve the ideologies of our American way of life. Can we now do less than to immediately and adequately see that those who seek their schooling and are deserving have it at the earliest possible date? The standards of living do not raise sufficiently where there is lack of educational and recreational opportunities. We must see to it that this war does not condemn this generation to be an unschooled one, because of any lack on our part, of doing our fullest duty to prevent such a catastrophe. No less than the fullest possible and immediate reforming amendments to change the GI bill in whatever ways may be ascertained as essential can be considered as honorable and fair treatment of those who would have died for us if needs be.

And secondly, I call your attention to the fact that we have already made much provision for the reconversion of machinery and of factories and of the necessary material things in our Nation; while we have not yet reached our responsibility of recognizing the need of reconversion by the citizens of our Nation back to peacetime life and endeavor. And is it not true that the machine of the human body and the human temperament with its human limitations of discouragement and despondency is the most delicate machine there is to reconvert? Granting that it is essential under our competitive system of free enterprise, that the money profit motive be encouraged and protected, nevertheless, we can, if we are not very careful—go to an unnecessary extreme in allowing cut-backs and credits and reducing sources of national income to such an extent that we will not have adequate reserves to protect the needs of the reconversion of the human element in our Nation to peacetime life and endeavor.

My experiences as a Member of this great legislative body have been most pleasant. I have received the utmost courtesy and understanding from everyone. But I am sure you are also aware of the fact that entirely too often for the welfare of our Nation and of the world we are not in possession of all of the material facts in connection with the major

legislation or decisions which we have to make.

This fact is most distressing to me. I increasingly feel that it is only in the light of an informed democracy, that there will be an intelligent acting and, therefore, an enduring democracy. Illy or only partially considered legislation, I deem as legislation too poorly born. The fullest possible opportunity for discussion and debate and discovery in committee and on the floor is an essential prerequisite to sound legislation and therefore to perpetuation of our American way of life. Less haste will make less waste in the field of legislation as it does in the experiences of daily life. Our determination in this testing period of our national and international existence and relationships, should be to the decision and to the end; that there shall be the fullest possible revealing of the true facts and a corresponding freedom of speech and opportunity for expression by and for the American people. I have never heard of intolerance of other men's sincere opinions, having made any contribution to the preservation of our American way of life. I conceive of it as everlastingly true, that it is sound to be willing to fight for the other man's right to speak his mind even though he may not agree with me.

As no nation ever makes material or spiritual progress over the backs of and out of the abuse or misuse of the life of its children and youth, so we must increasingly take heed and make reasonable provision for the preservation and continuation of those elements in our national existence, which definitely contribute to the upbuilding of the character of American youth and against those factors in our existence, which are known to tear down and destroy. The all too rapid increase in the child and youth delinquency of our Nation is not only appalling, it is a matter of immediate and vital concern to the continuation of our Nation as one of necessary homes, churches, and schools. Just what the States themselves should respectively undertake and do and just the exact field of responsibility which should be occupied by the National Government I am not sure of. But, gentlemen, the total field of the problem of the childhood and youthhood of America is rightly of national concern. Not least of all is this true, because it is from the ranks of these future citizens that come the men and women upon whom we call to sacrifice their lives, if need be, in time of war or national defense.

I shall not conclude these remarks without calling to your attention that this war would never have been won had it not been for the volunteer spirit of service and sacrifice rendered by those millions of Americans who gave of their utmost of material and spiritual resources without a cent of compensation or material reward therefor. It is this dominant spirit and fact of self-sacrifice and patriotism in the line of emergency duty to family, God, and country, which has established and preserved our American way of life. Without discrediting or discounting the high services rendered by those in office or in all organizations wherein they were paid a financial compensation, either adequately or inadequately, for services rendered, yet, I think it highly essential, that we also give recognition to those millions of men and women and children who rendered services to God and their country and their fellowmen during this war, knowing in advance, that they had no opportunity of ever receiving either financial compensation or pay therefor.

It seems to be proved by human experience, that we get back what we send forth in our loves or hates or fears or in our prejudices, suspicions, or our good will. And, I am frank to say, that it seems to me, that if the people of certain foreign nations could hear some Members of this House speak of their nations in terms of suspicion, condemnation, and of fear of their purposes and intent and of their alleged lack of good faith or sincere purpose for world peace, that then, those peoples, hearing such declarations on this floor, would likewise be justified in suspecting our motives or fairness of dealing.

As we were powerful in war for winning that war, we must likewise be powerful for winning a world peace. There is no other way, whereby mankind will be saved from self-destruction by atomic power development and war. We will either become civilized enough to live together, or we will fall further and further apart and end in chaos.

So, I bespeak that we give to other peoples of the earth as much credit for good faith in their conduct as we know we ourselves are part entitled to. This will build world good will and build for world unity; for world collaboration; for enduring peace.

The dictates of self-preservation in this atomic world—even if we are not advanced enough to place it on higher grounds—compel us to conduct ourselves energetically and in good faith for an enduring world peace by implementing the United Nations Organization.

I want that no other parents of any other lad in any land in the universe shall know what it means to raise their son to die in another world war.

There is no need of it. But we must mobilize our hearts and spirits and souls and material resources for it. We must be willing to give and take for the sake of peace. It is the most important goal within reach of man. It must be achieved.

We must not tolerate any conscious act, which will bring us to the precipice of the destroying of world collaboration for peace. We should not need the catastrophe of another world war, to bring us to the realization that we must work for peace as we also worked and prayed for the end of war. Peace does not just happen. Nor will it just continue as a matter of course. We will have to fling our heart and soul and mind into the purpose of enduring world peace. War is the common enemy of mankind; it is a beast which must be attacked in force and kept at bay. It prospers in greed, lust for power, hunger, hate, misunderstanding, ignorance of truth. There must be millions spent in education for peace through the Charter of the United Nations. Research and technological achievements together with an undying human will and patriotism to principle won the war in large measure. We must direct this same perseverance to peace perpetuation. World peace depends upon world order, and American peace and security depend in large measure, upon the peace and security in Europe and the rest of the world. A hungry and starving and warring world any place, means jeopardy to our peace and security—both economically and to our political philosophy.

Let us, as a Nation, create cause for happy laughter. Let us look up to God. Let us destroy man's inhumanity to man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, full employment for all with a fair income is an objective worth striving for, particularly when this employment is in one's own business, in his own line of work or in private enterprise, but when the question is whether the Government is going to guarantee full employment by creating jobs and paying the bills out of the Treasury of the United States the whole matter must be viewed from an entirely different angle.

There is a distinct difference between a governmental policy of encouraging private enterprise to the point where it will offer employment to all who may desire it and that which would establish a policy where the Government takes the position it owes every person a living and guarantees that it will furnish the necessary employment and pay for it out of the Treasury of the United States. The latter suggestion would establish a policy wholly inconsistent with our democratic system of government and create an entirely new system—a system so entirely different from any policy of the past that it will mean the abandonment of that freedom of action heretofore enjoyed by anyone to select his own vocation in life, and substitute therefor a system that will channel or regiment the people into lines of activity, enterprise, or industry where they will be permitted to exercise little or no discretion. Such a policy would destroy that spirit of individual initiative that has meant so much in the development of the social and economic life of our Nation. "Full employment by the Government" may sound well, but we all know that it would be impossible for the Government to create a job that will meet the desire and choice of every individual. Full employment under such a program would mean that many people will find themselves required to accept work in lines of activity in which they will find no personal satisfaction and be deprived of the thought that increased efficiency and the exercise of individual initiative will be of any value. When such an inspiration is eliminated or destroyed we will have destroyed that American spirit which has contributed so much to the lives of millions of American people in the past and we will soon have a population absolutely devoid of ambition and initiative, which can only mean that the desire for liberty and freedom in mapping out one's life or economic future is gone and the disintegration of our boasted democratic

system of government will be well on the way out, if not completed.

Therefore, the problem of full employment is one fraught with serious dangers and a policy that cannot be established as an expedience or temporary matter, for when once established there will be continuous demand for employment, not simply this next year, but 5 years from now, 10 years from now, 25 years from now, and on and on indefinitely. We must not forget that guaranteed social security and guaranteed economic security out of the Treasury of the United States is either socialism or communism, and it matters not by what name we call it.

The American people have always been strong for fundamentals. They have generally acted upon the theory that the basis or foundation of any system or program inaugurated for the guidance, direction, or permanent interest of the public should be fundamental—that which will insure permanency. On the contrary, they have always been afraid of expediencies, which has been defined by Webster as the "subordination of moral principle for the sake of facilitating an end or purpose." Is this proposal now before us an expediency, or is it a fundamental in our system of government? Or is it the purpose to make it a fundamental or permanent function of government? The people who created this Government recognized certain fundamentals and incorporated them into the structure itself, and this structure will be preserved by those who are willing to stand by those fundamentals and not those who are willing to resort to expediencies or subscribe to policies inconsistent with the basic principles upon which it was founded.

At no time, up to the present, have the people indicated it to be a fundamental concept that this Government owes every person a living or that it is fundamentally bound to guarantee every person a job. It is well recognized that a person has the right to create his own job or work for anyone ready and willing to offer him a job. The Government guarantees him this right, and it should encourage him to exercise it. In fact, it has been the philosophy of our life as well as our Government that it is the duty and responsibility of people to work for their own living and not look to the Government for support.

The guaranty of a job by the Government and paid for out of the Treasury has never been considered as one of the fundamentals of government.

Furthermore, where is there any necessity for full employment legislation at this time? Where is there any justification for it? There is now a job for every man in this country. In fact, there are thousands of sections where there are two jobs waiting for every man, or there are two jobs available where there is only one person to fill it, or in many cases there is no available person to fill it. Of course, there are people who do not have the job they want. For that matter none of us are satisfied with what we have. There is not one person in a thousand who would not like to have a better job, and this is commendable. There would be little or no progress or development if every person were satisfied with himself and his status in life. But this is no reason why the Congress should go ahead and enact legislation designed to furnish every person a job of the kind he wants and if it develops that the job cannot be found then undertake to make or create a satisfactory job and pay him for it out of the Treasury. Tailor-made jobs is what is contemplated in S. 380—Government-made jobs—jobs made to fit in every particular. The idea is absurd. Such a policy will destroy that incentive, that individual initiative, that business acumen so essential in maintaining that American spirit of individualism that has developed a great people and a great country. Full employment is another synonym for dole, which has never had but one definite result and that was to turn the unemployed into the unemployable.

I do not believe any true American would knowingly and intentionally subscribe to any fundamental change in our system of government, but it should be remembered as a warning that the people of ancient Greece and Rome did not plan the destruction of their democracy. It was through a planned program of government beneficences and through their indifference to fundamentals that their liberties and independence were absorbed by the government which became the master of their time and actions and executioner of their great civilization. Today the descendants of those great people are begging bread from the hands of our great democratic system of government. We cannot lose sight of the fundamentals of this Government and expect it to survive. The full employment program proposed in the Senate bill may not seem extremely significant, but do not forget that "a nation may lose its liberties in a day and not miss them in a century," says Montesquieu. And Edmund Burke said:

> The people never give up their liberties but under some delusion. The true danger is, when liberty is nibbled away, for expedients and by parts.

The principal argument made in Senate bill 380 and H. R. 2202 is that either of them, if enacted into law, will furnish employment or reemployment to returning veterans. Any proposal in the interest of veterans is always appealing and there is not too much we can do to assist them in rehabilitating themselves so long as the program or policy is consistent with those fundamentals for which they fought and for which many made the supreme sacrifice. But I have an idea they would much rather have a program that will assist in creating or establishing their own jobs than to think they will hereafter look to the Government for a job from month to month and year to year, with little or no possibility of getting ahead and establishing a business of their own. Therefore, my idea is that instead of the Government providing jobs for temporary employment attention should be given to the idea of assisting veterans to create their own jobs or establish new enterprises for themselves. I can probably best illustrate my idea.

About a year ago I undertook to make inquiry of civic organizations and chambers of commerce in practically every town in my district, suggesting they enumerate what new enterprises, if any, that in their judgment could be established and permanently maintained in their town or community. The thought was that most of such enterprises would be small at the beginning and many would probably be maintained as such. My further idea was that if the Government knew of a reasonable certainty what new enterprises would be self-sustaining in town A, for example, and it were the judgment of the representative citizens of that town or community the enterprise would be well supported locally and the returning veterans were advised of these opportunities they would be able to take advantage of the facilities offered under the GI bill and be able to provide themselves with a job of their own creation. There would be prospects where two or more veterans may be willing to pool their resources, abilities, and efforts and undertake the promotion of an enterprise that would afford employment not only for themselves but possibly others.

Another thought was there may be opportunity for a dozen or more new enterprises in town A, the establishment of which would afford facilities for jobs that never existed before. They would be new facilities for creating new wealth and thereby add to the financial resources of the community and to our national economy.

Another impelling reason for such a program is it would relieve these men of the necessity or possibly the embarrassment of looking to a Government agency for an indefinite period to find suitable or satisfactory employment. That is, the suggested program would encourage individual initiative on the part of a considerable number and their actions would prove to be a stimulus, an inspiration, and encouragement to many others. Give the veteran a chance or opportunity to demonstrate his fighting spirit in peacetime and he will set an example for future generations. These young men have endured the heat of the tropics, the cold and snow of Europe, the sunshine, rain, smoke of battle, and the deadening hum of bullets and I feel they are now willing to fight their personal battles of life with a fair opportunity and a fair chance with others. Furthermore, such a program will be in harmony with our system of government; it will be in harmony with the American philosophy of life; it will be a constructive program and will avoid the continued necessity of resorting to expediencies.

This has been my idea for some time, and I proposed such a program several months ago. We now have three bills before us for consideration. One is known as Senate bill 380 and one is referred to as the Patman bill, H. R. 2202. Then we have what is referred to as the committee bill. In short, the first two bills named propose that the Government should first undertake to find employment with private enterprise for all persons desiring a job, but upon failure to find suitable and satisfactory work in private enterprise, then the Federal Government would undertake to provide employment even if it required the establishment of a business or enterprise that

would be in competition with private industry. That is, these two bills, as I understand, would create a permanent governmental policy of guaranteeing employment to every person even if it should become necessary to take the money out of the Treasury of the United States to maintain such a program and even if such a program is made permanent would eventually mean the destruction of private enterprise. I am definitely opposed to such a program and have endeavored to give the reasons for my position.

The committee bill, as I understand, does not undertake to guarantee a person a job or employment at the expense of the Federal Treasury, but, on the contrary, undertakes to assure continuing and full employment, as well as full production, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local government, and through private enterprise under a free and competitive system of economy. I can probably explain the purposes of this bill and what it undertakes to do by quoting part of the first five provisions which undertake to show how and to what extent it is proposed to aid or assist in promoting full employment and production.

First. It would undertake to do this by preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise and fostering the investment of private capital in trade, agriculture, commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States.

Second. By aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business, and to promoting continuous growth in the quality and quantity of facilities of production.

Third. By encouraging individual initiative.

Fourth. By avoiding competition of government with private business enterprise.

Fifth. By adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States; and thereby creating under, and in a manner consistent with, the American system of free competitive enterprise, the maximum opportunity for employment—including self-employment—to attain and maintain a high level of employment—including self-employment—production, and purchasing power.

Mr. Chairman, after reading other parts of the bill and listening to various interpretations of the provisions of the proposal before us, I would like to ask the chairman or whoever may be in charge of what is referred to as the committee bill three or four questions. I see the gentleman from Misssissippi present; I invite his attention to page 11, the third line from the bottom, line 23, where it refers to one purpose of the bill as "encouraging State and local governments to plan and adopt sound programs of public works."

Now, will the gentleman tell us exactly what that means?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It means what it says. We do not promise to aid them at the time their treasuries are full and when the Federal Government owes the highest debt in its history. But we will encourage them to plan and to do their own public works and to provide for the doing of most of them when there is unemployment in their States.

Mr. HARE. Now, turn to page 12, paragraph 2, line 5, where it reads: "Planning and adopting programs for loans by the United States."

I would like to know to whom these loans will be made?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The Federal Government has provided loans by the billions to the veterans in legislation we have passed. There are now loans available through the RFC for the promotion of business enterprise. Loans are also available to agriculture, and so forth. We say that before we provide for any other loans than those now authorized in our substitute the President will submit his recommendation so the Congress may approve or disapprove rather than to commit ourselves indefinitely to unparalleled expenditures and investments without getting approval, as provided by the Senate bill 380 and House bill, 2202.

Mr. HARE. One more question. I refer to page 12, line 10, reading: "Planning and adopting a program of sound public works." Just what is included in this program?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The language of the substitute is that it is unfair to say that we have a plan; that Congress will continue not only to plan but to adopt, as we have for highways, as we have for other public improvements and public works. We will keep them on the shelf, and we will provide for their expansion and enlargement when it is necessary to stimulate employment.

Mr. HARE. Do I understand that to mean public highways, public buildings, and so forth?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Whatever we have adopted, flood control, highways, and other public works.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion, I am not certain the Council of Economic Advisers provided for in section 4 of the committee bill will add much to the program I have had in mind but if it succeeds in reaching the objective contemplated by the proponents of the bill it will come much nearer solving the employment problem than either S. 380 or H. R. 2202 or both of them put together, and I shall support the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

H. R. 2202: FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a real full employment bill. Those who want to vote for a bill that will prevent the boom and bust period that has always happened after every major war should vote for this amendment submitted by the chairman of our steering committee for full employment, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

This bill, if enacted into law, will enable us to plan for the future, to provide against the things that have happened in the way of depressions and deflationary periods that have always followed a major way. It will enable us, if enacted, to have a balanced Budget. So it is a bill to balance the Budget of our Government. It will prevent deficit financing, so if you want to vote against deficit financing, vote for this bill which will make plans for jobs, for national income, that will give us sufficient taxes that can be conveniently paid in order to pay our national debt in honest dollars, and when we do that, we will not have any deficit financing.

I invite your attention to page 11986 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, the speech that I made on the floor of this House, and the insertions I made, which include my testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments as well as the cross examination by practically every member of that committee. I attempted to answer every question that was asked me by the members of that committee, and those questions and answers are contained in the speech that I delivered here on the floor of the House yesterday.

Our No. 1 problem today is preventing inflation. Just like we began to prepare to build up the greatest and finest war machine in the history of this world, we have this task of preventing inflation, because we know that following every war we have inflation, and then we have deflation. After the other war this deflation cost our people 500,000 farm homes and 500,000 businesses. So vote for a real full employment bill by voting for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, so many claims have been made for and against this bill that it is difficult to determine just what good, if any, can be expected of it.

We recognize that production comes from the farms, industries, mines, and the natural resources of the country. Merely appropriating Government funds does not add any real wealth for distribution, in fact it takes away from the wealth already produced the amount of the tax money. In that way it leaves less wealth for distribution.

However, government can, it seems to me, help gather facts, disseminate information and plan for production. Our economic system and the productive mechanisms of our country are so complicated that many producers are at a loss just what to expect in the way of markets. They cannot get a clear view of the factors which may make for full employment or may make for reduced or no employment in their industry. This is particularly true of small businesses making some specialized product.

The particular point I want to make is that government, in at least one field, has, for over half a century, indulged in planning to help business. I am referring to the public-utility business. The Interstate Commerce Commission, and the railroad commission, or public-utility commissions in every State in this Union are virtually continuous planning bodies for our public utilities. They supervise the working and the expansion of the utility business. Not a single im-

provement can be made by any company without the approval of these commissions. Those of us who have sat through such hearings know how meticulous the commission is to be sure that a proposed improvement will be justified by the probable revenue; that the securities of the utility must not be jeopardized; that the earnings must be adequate to pay for running expenses, including labor; that the solvency of the utility must not be threatened. In fact, the Government in all those instances plans, supervises, and approves the steps to the end that the particular business may be a success and good service to the public be maintained or instituted.

Of course, you will say that the utility business is impressed with a public interest. It is in that it must maintain service and what it gives the public is some kind of a service of vital public interest. But, in a slightly different sense, the public is interested in keeping every business that employs men and produces goods for public consumption in a healthy condition. The failure of a business reduces employment and if it is widespread that makes for economic chaos. Having attained a certain standard of living, it is hard, and many times almost impossible, to live on a reduced standard. Our whole life—education, entertainment, religion, recreation—rests on our standard of living. Therefore, it is vital to our social well-being that it be maintained.

The Government certainly can gather facts and help make plans to maintain high employment. It can arrange its public-works program so that it will be at the peak, when private employment is low. But public works cannot solve the unemployment problem. It can help to a degreee. As I see it, we must try to take steps—after thorough study and investigation of future employment levels—to prevent great reductions in gainful employment. In this way we may obviate disastrous unemployment. In that manner, our workmen can be kept busy and the customers for the things we produce can maintain their purchasing power.

Slogan bills, such as this, are dangerous. They raise the peoples hopes too high. But judicious planning can help obviate unemployment reductions. This plan was suggested in 1928, in substance, by President-elect Hoover. It has been suggested by others. It may give the private enterprise system the needed foresight to prevent too rapid declines in employment. It may furnish the very date that a good periodical furnishes to its advertisers, the facts and methods by which a particular business may maintain its production level or even build it up. Certainly, our Government should be interested in helping that sort of a program and by judicious study on a national scale and wise planning for the future our private enterprise system may be kept in a healthy condition.

If the Public Utilities should be maintained economically healthy by Government asistance, I see no reason why the Government should not likewise try to help other business maintain good economic health and high levels of employment by furnishing it with factual date, prognostications as to the business future and suggestions on how to hold or stimulate production. Abundant production and full employment for those wanting work make not only a prosperous but a happy people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] to close debate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the hour that has been allotted has been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. The hour has been exhausted, with the exception of the time allotted to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I opened my advocacy of the committee substitute by saying that the problem of employment is one of the most important confronting this or any other government. I stated that I am sympathetic with the problems of unemployment that will arise sooner or later in the country and especially in the industrial areas and the more densely populated areas of our country. I assert now as I asserted yesterday that the Patman bill and the Senate bill will not solve the employment problem. I repeat now as I said in opening the debate that all thoughtful witnesses who appeared before our committee said that if the job of unemployment is to be done it has to be done substantially by the free competitive private enterprise system to the amount of 85 or 90 percent. The Government cannot be expected through out-lays to provide for more than 10 or 15 percent of all employment without deficit spending.

Those who advocated high levels of employment and full employment asserted that the Patman bill and the Senate bill would defeat the very objectives of those bills because, they said, and I repeat, that the language of those bills, the committal of those bills, the basis of those bills, is Federal expenditures and Federal investments and thereby the very objectives of providing full employment or high levels of employment in private enterprise would be endangered and destroyed at the very beginning.

We have heard a lot about employment. There has not been a single statement made as to how the Patman bill or the Senate bill will give a man a single job. What kind of employment, what kind of appropriation, what kind of disbursement, what kind of work?

I submit that we have approached this from a constructive angle in the committee substitute. The substitute says we will continue the policy of public works and loans. The substitute without committing us in advance to billions of expenditure without knowing what they are, and to billions of investment without knowing whether they are sound or unsound, says to the President of the United States, "If we need anything else other than the works we have authorized or the loans we have authorized, Mr. President, submit your plans. We give you the ablest talent in the Nation to advise and help you submit your plans. If we have to make any more outlays, if we have to make any more expenditures, give us your plans for financing the expenditures." Is that against employment? We ask only sound plans, with adequate taxes, before Congress approves other expenditures.

We confined our operations in 1931 to public works alone. We have since supplemented it by loans. We say that if other provisions are necessary the Congress of the United States, when the President submits his program to us in his message, will investigate them, and before we approve them, before we walk blindly into billions of expenditure, we will know the character of the work, we will know whether or not they will provide jobs, we will know whether it will be a lump sum appropriation to be disbursed by the Executive or whether the taxpayers' representatives, the Senators and Representatives, shall select and adopt the works and other construction and appropriate the money they call upon the taxpayers to pay. We undertake to safeuard any expenditures that are made by saying that instead of committing ourselves to billions of investment the President's advisers cannot spend more than $300,000, in advising and assisting him in recommending legislation or further Federal outlays to promote employment.

Then the Committee on Appropriations will determine whether they need that much or not. We limit the appropriations of the Senate and House committees to $50,000 each. We put a ceiling on it; it may be less. Yesterday we voted $75,000 for one segment of our population, small business. Is it too much when we come to employment that affects 135,000,000 people, when we come to an effort to do a constructive job and to provide for real employment in the national interest that the President may be authorized to spend some $300,000 to get the advice that all witnesses said was not available to President Hoover and President Roosevelt? We may not have fought a good fight, but, in my judgment, the committee in rejecting the Patman bill, supported as it was by only three or four votes, has kept faith with the House and with the American people and has submitted a substitute, the most constructive proposal ever brought forth by a committee of this House for Congress to provide for real employment.

The Patman bill contemplates appropriations. The vice is that before any works or plans are submitted to Congress the Patman bill commits Congress to a gigantic unworkable deficit spending program. The committee substitute does not deceive. It does not assure full-time remunerative employment to all whether they are qualified or not. It repudiates deficit spending. It promotes employment by private enterprise and it provides that, if to stimulate employment in private enterprise, if to stimulate private construction, additional works and outlays are necessary, they

shall be appproved by Congress with adequate taxes to finance them. There is available employment for all workers for the present. All unemployed can be absorbed during the next year. The House substitute is a sound solution for the problem in the long-range view. I urge that the Patman substitute be rejected and that the House substitute be adopted in lieu of the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

All time has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITINGTON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the vote now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND], the so-called Patman bill, as a substitute for the committee amendment. If that amendment is adopted, of course, the committee amendment is defeated. If the Outland amendment is defeated, then the vote recurs on the committee amendment as a substitute for the Senate bill. If the committee amendment is adopted, it means that the substitute bill of the committee will be adopted in lieu of the Senate bill.

Am I correct in that statement, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OUTLAND) there were—ayes 81, noes 127.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman oppointed as tellers Mr. MANASCO and Mr. OUTLAND.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 95, noes 185.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, pursuant to House Resolution 449, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, be recommitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LAFOLLETTE) there were—ayes 178, noes 70.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 242, answered "present" 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—136

Abernethy	Gathings	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl.	Gibson	Miller, Nebr.
Arends	Gifford	Mundt
Arnold	Gillespie	Phillips
Baldwin, Md.	Gillette	Pickett
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gillie	Ploeser
Barrett, Wyo.	Goodwin	Plumley
Beall	Graham	Ramey
Bell	Grant, Ind.	Rankin
Bender	Gross	Reece, Tenn.
Bennett, Mo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Gwynne, Iowa	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Hale	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Rich
Brown, Ohio	Hancock	Rizley
Brumbaugh	Harness, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.
Buffett	Henry	Rockwell
Butler	Hess	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hill	Roe, Md.
Campbell	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Hoffman	Schwabe, Mo.
Chenoweth	Holmes, Mass.	Scrivner
Church	Howell	Shafer
Clason	Jenkins	Sharp
Clevenger	Jennings	Short
Clippinger	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Springer
Crawford	Kilburn	Stefan
Cunningham	Kilday	Stockman
Curtis	Kinzer	Sumner, Ill.
Dolliver	Knutson	Taber
Domengeaux	Kunkel	Talbot
Dondero	Lanham	Talle
Dworshak	LeCompte	Tibbott
Eaton	LeFevre	Vursell
Ellis	Luce	Welchel
Ellsworth	McConnell	West
Elston	McCowen	Whitten
Fellows	McGehee	Wigglesworth
Fisher	McGregor	Winstead
Fuller	Martin, Iowa	Winter
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Wolcott
		Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—242

Adams	Gordon	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gorski	Neely
Angell	Gossett	Norrell
Auchincloss	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Barden	Granger	O'Konski
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ala.	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Outland
Beckworth	Griffiths	Pace
Bennet, N. Y.	Hagen	Patman
Biemiller	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patrick
Bland	Hand	Patterson
Bloom	Hare	Peterson, Fla.
Bolton	Harless, Ariz.	Peterson, Ga.
Bonner	Harris	Pfeifer
Boykin	Hart	Philbin
Bradley, Pa.	Havenner	Pittenger
Brooks	Hays	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Bryson	Hedrick	Price, Ill.
Buck	Heffernan	Priest
Buckley	Hendricks	Quinn, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Herter	Rabaut
Bunker	Heselton	Rabin
Burch	Hinshaw	Rains
Burgin	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoch	Randolph
Camp	Holifield	Rayfiel
Canfield	Holmes, Wash.	Resa
Cannon, Mo.	Hook	Richards
Carnahan	Hope	Riley
Case, N. J.	Huber	Rivers
Celler	Hull	Robertson, N. Dak.
Chapman	Izac	Robertson, Va.
Chelf	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Clements	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Cochran	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, N. Y.
Coffee	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rooney
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Rowan
Cooper	Judd	Russell
Corbett	Kearney	Ryter
Courtney	Kee	Sabath
Cravens	Kefauver	Sadowski
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kelly, Ill.	Savage
Daughton, Va.	Keogh	Sheppard
Davis	Kerr	Sheridan
Dawson	King	Sikes
De Lacy	Kirwan	Slaughter
Delaney, James J.	LaFollette	Smith, Maine
Delaney, John J.	Landis	Smith, Va.
D'Ewart	Lane	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	Larcade	Sparkman
Dirksen	Latham	Spence
Doughton, N. C.	Lea	Starkey
Douglas, Ill.	Lemke	Stewart
Doyle	Lesinski	Stigler
Drewry	Link	Sullivan
Durham	Ludlow	Sumners, Tex.
Earthman	Lyle	Tarver
Eberharter	Lynch	Thom
Elliott	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Elsaesser	McDonough	Thomason
Engel, Mich.	McGlinchey	Tolan
Engle, Calif.	McMillan, S. C.	Torrens
Ervin	McMillen, Ill.	Towe
Fallon	Madden	Traynor
Feighan	Mahon	Trimble
Fenton	Manasco	Vinson
Fernandez	Mansfield, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Wasielewski
Flood	Marcantonio	Weaver
Fogarty	Mathews	Weiss
Folger	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Forand	Mills	White
Fulton	Monroney	Whittington
Gallagher	Morgan	Wickersham
Gardner	Murphy	Woodhouse
Gary		Woodrum, Va.
Geelan		Worley
		Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kopplemann

NOT VOTING—53

Anderson, Calif.	Cox	Lewis
Andresen, August H.	Curley	McKenzie
Andrews, Ala.	Dickstein	Maloney
Bailey	Douglas, Calif.	May
Barry	Gearhart	Merrow
Boren	Gerlach	Morrison
Brehm	Halleck	Murdock
Cannon, Fla.	Hartley	Norton
Carlson	Healy	O'Brien, Mich.
Chiperfield	Horan	O'Hara
Clark	Jackson	Powell
Colmer	Jones	Roe, N. Y.
Combs	Jonkman	Schwabe, Okla.
	Keefe	Simpson, Pa.

Snyder	Thomas, N. J.	Wilson
Stevenson	Vorys, Ohio	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sundstrom	Wadsworth	Wolverton, N. J.
Taylor	Walter	Wood

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mrs. Douglas of California against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Murdock against.

Mr. Jones for, with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey against.

Mr. Jonkman for, with Mr. Snyder against.

Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Vorys of Ohio for, with Mr. Wood against.

Mr. Maloney for, with Mr. Morrison against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cox with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Healy with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. May with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. CELLER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KOPPLEMANN changed his vote from "present" to "no."

Mr. FULLER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 255, nays 126, answered "present" 1, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—255

Adams	Byrne, N. Y.	Delaney,
Allen, La.	Camp	John J.
Andrews, N. Y.	Campbell	D'Ewart
Angell	Canfield	Dingell
Auchincloss	Cannon, Fla.	Dirksen
Barden	Cannon, Mo.	Domengeaux
Barrett, Pa.	Carnahan	Doughton, N. C.
Bates, Ky.	Case, N. J.	Douglas, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Celler	Doyle
Beall	Chapman	Drewry
Beckworth	Chelf	Durham
Bell	Clason	Earthman
Bennet, N. Y.	Clements	Eberharter
Bennett, Mo.	Cochran	Elliott
Biemiller	Coffee	Elsaesser
Bland	Cole, Kans.	Engel, Mich.
Bloom	Cole, Mo.	Engle, Calif.
Bolton	Cooley	Ervin
Bonner	Cooper	Fallon
Boykin	Corbett	Feighan
Bradley, Pa.	Courtney	Fenton
Brooks	Cravens	Fernandez
Brown, Ga.	Crosser	Fisher
Bryson	Cunningham	Flannagan
Buck	D'Alesandro	Fogarty
Buckley	Daughton, Va.	Folger
Bulwinkle	Davis	Forand
Bunker	Dawson	Fuller
Burch	De Lacy	Fulton
Burgin	Delaney,	Gallagher
Butler	James J.	Gardner
Gary	Landis	Reed, Ill.
Gordon	Lane	Rees, Kans.
Gore	Larcade	Resa
Gorski	Latham	Richards
Gossett	Lea	Riley
Granahan	Lemke	Rivers
Granger	Lesinski	Robertson,
Grant, Ala.	Link	N. Dak.
Green	Ludlow	Robertson, Va.
Gregory	Lyle	Robinson, Utah
Griffiths	Lynch	Rogers, Fla.
Hagen	McCormack	Rogers, N. Y.
Hall,	McDonough	Rooney
Edwin Arthur	McGlinchey	Rowan
Hand	McKenzie	Russell
Hare	McMillan, S.C.	Sabath
Harless, Ariz.	McMillen, Ill.	Sadowski
Harris	Madden	Sasscer
Hart	Mahon	Savage
Havenner	Manasco	Sheppard
Hays	Mansfield,	Sheridan
Healy	Mont.	Sikes
Hébert	Mansfield, Tex.	Simpson, Ill.
Hedrick	Marcantonio	Slaughter
Heffernan	Mathews	Smith, Maine
Hendricks	Mills	Smith, Va.
Henry	Monroney	Somers, N. Y.
Herter	Morgan	Sparkman
Heselton	Murray, Tenn.	Spence
Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.	Starkey
Hobbs	Neely	Stewart
Hoch	O'Brien, Ill.	Stigler
Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.	Sullivan
Holmes, Wash.	O'Konski	Sumners, Tex.
Hook	O'Neal	Tarver
Hope	O'Toole	Thom
Howell	Pace	Thomas, Tex.
Huber	Patman	Thomason
Hull	Patrick	Torrens
Izac	Patterson	Towe
Jarman	Peterson, Fla.	Traynor
Johnson, Calif.	Peterson, Ga.	Trimble
Johnson,	Pfeifer	Vinson
Luther A.	Philbin	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson,	Pittenger	Vursell
Lyndon B.	Poage	Wasielewski
Johnson, Okla.	Price, Fla.	Weaver
Judd	Price, Ill.	Weiss
Kearney	Priest	Welch
Kee	Quinn, N. Y.	Whittington
Kefauver	Rabaut	Wickersham
Kelley, Pa.	Rabin	Wigglesworth
Kelly, Ill.	Rains	Woodrum, Va.
Keogh	Ramspeck	Worley
Kerr	Randolph	Zimmerman
King	Rankin	
Kirwan	Rayfiel	

NAYS—126

Abernethy	Goodwin	Mundt
Allen, Ill.	Graham	Norrell
Andersen,	Grant, Ind.	Phillips
H. Carl	Gross	Pickett
Arends	Gwinn, N. Y.	Ploeser
Arnold	Gwynne, Iowa	Plumley
Baldwin, Md.	Hale	Ramey
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Barrett, Wyo.	Leonard W.	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Hancock	Rich
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Rizley
Blackney	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Rockwell
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Rodgers, Pa.
Brumbaugh	Hoffman	Roe, Md.
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Ryter
Case, S. Dak.	Jennings	Schwabe, Mo.
Chenoweth	Jensen	Scrivner
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Shafer
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Sharp
Clippinger	Kean	Short
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Kilday	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Kinzer	Springer
Dolliver	Knutson	Stefan
Dondero	Kopplemann	Stockman
Dworshak	Kunkel	Sumner, Ill.
Eaton	LaFollette	Taber
Ellis	Lanham	Talbot
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Talle
Elston	LeFevre	Tibbott
Fellows	Luce	Tolan
Flood	McConnell	Weichel
Gamble	McCowen	West
Gathings	McGehee	White
Gavin	McGregor	Whitten
Geelan	Martin, Iowa	Winstead
Gibson	Martin, Mass.	Winter
Gifford	Mason	Wolcott
Gillespie	Michener	Woodhouse
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillie	Miller, Nebr.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Outland

NOT VOTING—50

Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	O'Hara
Andresen,	Gerlach	Powell
August H.	Halleck	Roe, N. Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Hartley	Schwabe, Okla.
Bailey	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Barry	Jackson	Snyder
Boren	Jones	Stevenson
Brehm	Jonkman	Sundstrom
Carlson	Keefe	Taylor
Chiperfield	Lewis	Thomas, N. J.
Clark	Maloney	Vorys, Ohio
Colmer	May	Wadsworth
Combs	Merrow	Walter
Cox	Morrison	Wilson
Curley	Murdock	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dickstein	Murphy	Wolverton, N. J.
Douglas, Calif.	Norton	Wood

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murdock for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey for, with Mr. Maloney against.

Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Jonkman against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Jones against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Vorys of Ohio against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Cox with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Lewis.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Boren with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. May with Mr. Carlson.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. O'Hara.
Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. ROONEY changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to declare a continuing national policy and program to promote high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may address the House for 20 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to ask, if I may, what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday: The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday. If the following three bills are not passed by unanimous consent they will be considered either in the House as in the Committee of the Whole if objection is not made, or under suspension of the rules.

H. R. 2647, providing for a 2-cent postage rate for local delivery letters.

H. R. 4652, a postal service bill relating to rural and regular carriers, providing credit to substitute employees. This is to bring certain of these carriers within the benefits of the recent pay-increase bill. This is to correct one of those unintentional inequalities that sometimes result from the passage of such broad legislation as we passed with reference to pay increases.

H. R. 3936, providing for bringing home the remains of certain persons who died and were buried outside of the continental United States.

S. 1580, the United Nations Organization bill, will be called up on Monday.

On Tuesday we will call up Senate Joint Resolution 122 relating to housing for veterans. This bill has passed the Senate, and I understand an apropriation of $190,000,000 will be added to the deficiency appropriation bill contingent upon the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 122.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The subject matter has already been before us and the House has granted $25,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. A very acute situation exists with reference to housing for veterans that must be met as soon as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does that have to do with the moving of barracks to other localities? I understand that in one of the big colleges only five men have been enrolled for training, because there is no housing for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I prefer not to answer the question specifically, if the gentlewoman does not mind, because I do not have sufficient information as to the details of the resolution to answer satisfactorily; but it is with reference to demountable housing, moving them from where they are not needed to places where they are needed to meet the housing shortage of the veterans. As I understand, between $180,000,000 and $190,000,000 will be put in the deficiency bill in the Senate contingent upon the passage of this resolution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I got the information by telephone just now from the Department that that was the fact as far as the Department knew.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts apparently knows more about it than I.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They did not know the legislative procedure, but it was just an impression on their part. When will that bill come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. That will be called up on Tuesday, or will follow the United Nations Organization bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A very important conference report will come over from the Senate on the GI bill. Can the gentleman tell us when that will be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will come to that later.

Then we will take up the bill S. 715, the Naval Dental Corps bill.

Thursday and Friday: The program for these days is undetermined.

There are two Navy bills pending, one of which is S. 1438, to encourage careers in the Navy for enlisted men. If a rule is reported and the unanimous consent is granted, we will try to bring that up. There is also another bill, S. 1405, relating to involuntary retirement from the Navy. There are certain conference reports that will be in order at any time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The one that most Members are interested in is the GI conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. I made inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] as to when that conference report might be called up, and the best information I can get is that it will be either on Wednesday or Thursday. I cannot advise the House more definitely than that. That is the most definite information I can get.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that there will probably be before the Rules Committee tomorrow application for a rule covering a minor bill relative to Navy officer training in order to catch the deficiency bill in the Senate. I presume measures of that sort, that the leadership finds are satisfactory, can be added to the schedule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I understand the Rules Committee also has the housing matter before it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; and I understand that this minor resolution must be adopted in the next 2 or 3 days in order to catch the deficiency bill in the Senate if the stoppage of officer training in the Navy is to be prevented, and that can be taken up for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I assure the gentleman if that committee reports a rule, the situation next week is such that it can be considered, because we have Thursday and Friday open and undetermined. We ought to get through with the United Nations Organization resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 1222—and the Dental Corps bill on Tuesday or Wednesday at the latest.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This measure to which I referred will not take over 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will be glad to take care of that.

Mr. KUNKEL. Is it definite that the conference report on the GI bill will not be taken up on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I made inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] so that I could advise the House. As a result of my talk with him, I can state to the House, when I announce the program for next week, that the GI conference report will be called up on either Wednesday or Thursday. That is all I can say to the gentleman. If I had control of the situation, as the gentleman knows, and I told any Member or the House itself that the matter would not be brought up for Monday, it would not be brought up. The best information I have from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is that it will not be called up on Monday or Tuesday. I told the gentleman I would make that statement to the House. My statement is that it will not be taken up before Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. KUNKEL. I thank the gentleman. I know he is always most courteous about the giving of any possible information he can.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no control over it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman I think it is extremely important to get the conference report up as soon as possible because there is the age limitation that has been taken away in the conferees report or action and the loan provision is increased to $4,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over that. As far as I am concerned, if I had control, I would call it up just as soon as possible. But I do not know the facts.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is there any chance of additional appropriations for UNRRA under the authorization passed last week being taken up before the Christmas recess?

Mr. McCORMACK. That matter is now being considered by the Senate.

Mr. JUDD. But if authorization is granted in the Senate, is there a chance of getting a bill passed to make additional appropriations under that authorization before Christmas?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that if the Senate recommended $750,000,000 in the deficiency bill, that

would be concurred in by the House conferees.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The Senate committee recommended that $400,000,000 be appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I was coming to. I understood the House Committee on Appropriations was willing to go up to $750,000,000, but the Senate committee recommended $400,000,000. Whether or not the Senate will increase that amount is something else. In my opinion it is imperative that additional funds should be authorized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A good many people are interested in when this recess is going to begin so they may have an opportunity to make reservations.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am taking my recess Thursday night.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is that a hint to the rest of us?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am stating frankly when I am taking my recess. We are hopeful, as the gentleman knows, that the recess will be from the twenty-first to January 14. Of course, that is a matter of agreeing with the other body. I am hopeful that the Senate will concur in the understanding the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this body have reached.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that he has a reservation for Saturday night, and we will have sessions Friday and Saturday if it takes that long to get through.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill S. 380.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 461), as follows:

Resolved, That BERKELEY L. BUNKER, of the State of Nevada be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on War Claims.

The resolution was agreed to.

FEDERAL NARCOTIC LAWS

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2348) to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON THE FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1446) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 111), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session, relative to the Full Employment Act of 1945.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON AID TO THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1447) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 112), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the House Committee on Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of parts 1, 3, 7, and 8 of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to aid to the physically handicapped.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I left the Pearl Harbor Committee meeting to be present to vote on the motion to recommit on the full employment bill, and returned again just too late to vote on final passage of the bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Lynchburg News of Lynchburg, Va., which I hope will come to the attention of the United States Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis relative to the advantages of a local site for the headquarters of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Contra Costa County Labor Journal.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial entitled "Westward Bound" that appeared in the New York Times today, and in the other an editorial that appeared in the Lynn Daily Evening Item.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a resolution recently passed by the National Assembly of the Philippines paying tribute to present Resident Commissioner of the Philippines to the United States, Brig. Gen. CARLOS P. ROMULO, and in the other an editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in one a statement by Mr. Villamin on the Philippine Islands, in another an article from the Chemical and Engineering News Journal of the American Chemical Society, and in the third an article on the May-Johnson bill; and further to extend his remarks concerning the Hollywood Victory Committee and include an article from Variety.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was given permission to include as part of my remarks a copy of the statement and the accompanying letter sent by the Secretary of State to the Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding a resolution of inquiry which was referred to that committee and which I introduced. They have not to date sent me a copy of the report to the committee. Since nothing has actually come from the State Department, one of the representatives of the State Department suggested that I use the report of the committee at the time the resolution came up for action in the House yesterday. Since there seems to be difficulty in getting information from the Department of State quickly at this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Affairs Committee report may be included in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and to include an address delivered by L. Douglas Meredith, vice president of the National Life Insurance Co. of Vermont before the Committee on Banking and Insurance of the Senate with respect to the bill S. 1592, having to do with the Federal housing proposition.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast to be made by him next Sunday.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, to include therein several editorials on veterans' housing, and an article by Felix Morley on Java.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks on a bill she introduced last month on weather stations in the Arctic, H. R. 4991.

Mr. LEA and Mr. DOYLE asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include some excerpts from a report on the poll on the unemployment bill and also to extend his remarks in two other instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter from a soldier.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two separate newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DOUBLE TALK IN OUR STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by the Polish Government declaring marriages by the church illegal is the first overt act of this Communist-sponsored puppet state to establish a pagan nation with the sole objective of substituting the state for the Supreme Being. The Polish people have always been a religious and God-fearing people, and I cannot believe this action on the part of the puppet government of Poland was taken of their own free will and accord, but under duress and force.

This step indicates that the present authorities are carrying out the instructions of Communists who believe in the philosophy of Marx and Lenin that religion is "the opium of the people," and that faith in and reliance upon the Ruler of the Universe shall be replaced by worship of the state.

The world must bear witness to this inauguration or edict abolishing one of the very freedoms for which democratic nations of the world sacrificed so much and received so little, if anything, in return. It must be remembered that Poland is the nation for whom the world was plunged into the most tragic war in human history. She must surrender freedom of religion, one of the rights for which England, France, and the United States entered the conflict in her behalf.

Can such a government, or any government, long endure? Or will it, like the battleship *Prince of Wales*, on which the Atlantic Charter was planned, vanish and, like the Atlantic Charter, fail to guarantee freedom of press and religion?

Communists regard religion as a private matter, so they say. They define private matter, however, to avoid any misunderstanding. They demand that religion be regarded as a private matter as to the state but not as to the Communist Party. The socialist proletariat says:

> Our party is a league of class-conscious, progressive fighters for the liberation of the working classes. Such a league cannot, and must not, be indifferent to the lack of class-consciousness to ignorance or insanity in the shape of religious beliefs.

The party of the proletariat demands that the state shall declare religion a private matter, but it does not for a moment regard the question of the fight against the opium of the people—the fight against religious superstition, and so forth, as a private matter.

The edict coming out of Poland has come as a shock to the Christian world. Even more sensational and staggering is the recent attack by Harold Laski, of the British Labor Party, on the Catholic Church in Spain. Still more amazing is evidence of the fact that his broadcast in the United States had been reviewed by the network in advance of the broadcast, without censor or restriction on the attack made by him.

Laski claims he is a representative of labor. He was born in England. After graduating, he toured America, speaking on socialism. He was at one time editor of the New Republic, described by a congressional committee as a subversive organ. In an article published in that publication on November 3, 1917, he extolled one George Lansbury, a signer to the call, and I quote him.

> The conference to which we recently invited you is already assured of great success. It will be one of the greatest democratic gatherings ever held in this country. It will be historic. It will begin a new era of democratic power in Great Britain. It will begin to do for this country (Great Britain) what the Russian Revolution has accomplished in Russia. * * * Russia has called us to follow her.

Laski's address was broadcast from England to the Communist-front group rally at Madison Square Garden, New York, September 24, this year, held under the auspices of the Spanish Refugee Appeal.

My colleagues in the House, and every loyal and God-fearing American, will be interested in Laski's record, or at least a part of it. He is past president of the British Atheist Rationalist Free Press Association, Ltd. He has lectured on Religion as a Social Danger. He wrote the foreword to the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx—Socialist Party of America edition. He is the author of Why I Am a Marxist—Nation Magazine, March 11, 1939. Laski said:

> The defense of the Soviet Union is one of the highest duties a Socialist can fulfill. (New Republic, October 30, 1935, p. 339.)

The New Masses—March 3, 1940—referred to Mr. Laski as a Marxist who "acknowledges Lenin as one of the great leaders and thinkers of all time." He taught at Harvard University—1916–20—and was charged with addressing and encouraging the Boston police strikers.

The Harvard Lampoon—January 16, 1920—said concerning him:

> It would be no mean blessing to have the next Soviet ark that sailed transport this pseudo-instructor from the United States.

In his book, Karl Marx, this Marxist proposes the plan of Red revolution thus:

> The preparation for revolution is a qualitatively different problem from what it was in the days of the Paris barricades. * * * A State like England, which is wholly dependent on foreign trade, would not undergo a successful revolution except upon the assumption that her neighbors viewed its results with benevolence. * * * In a period of universal suffrage it ought to be possible to capture the seat of power at the polls and throw upon the capitalist the onus of revolting against a Socialist democracy.

Certainly, those words are something to think about at this time, in view of what transpired in England at the recent election.

Laski also wrote a book called The American Presidency. In that book he stated that Congress should be shorn of its authority to vote appropriations and that full bureaucratic powers should be placed in the President of the United States without approval from Congress.

I have spoken on this floor on different occasions, presenting the activities of radical, subversive, and Communist groups and individuals within our gates and within our Government. Their influence has become serious, a menace and a threat to our very existence as a Nation and a free people.

I now come to a matter which should alert every official in our Government and arouse our people to the serious double talk emanating from our State Department. I have faith and confidence in our Secretary of State Byrnes. His loyalty and devotion to our country is evidenced by his long and faithful service to the Nation. At the present time he is on a difficult mission to Moscow.

I seriously question whether he knows or is aware of what is happening in the State Department, a Department charged with the responsibility of our foreign policy and dealings with other nations of the world.

I measure my words in making that charge. I justify it by making known that on September 4, 1945, two letters were written by officials within the State Department, announcing two policies, oposite in character, in reference to the internal affairs of foreign governments.

A letter signed by Francis H. Russell for the Secretary of State, Chief Division of Public Liaison, addressed to Bishop Lewis O. Hartman, chairman of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, 55 West Forty-second Street, New York City, reads as follows:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1945.

MY DEAR BISHOP HARTMAN: I acknowledge the receipt, by reference from the White House, of your letter of August 8, 1945, on

behalf of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom with regard to relations between this Government and the present Government in Spain.

Our current relations with the Spanish Government are conditioned by the basic fact that, so long as the regime retains its present character, there can be no expectation either of cordial relations between Spain and the United States, or of constructive measures by us to assist Spain. Moreover, under these circumstances, Spain is unable to take her proper place in the community of nations. This policy was evidenced by the support given the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference to the resolution put forward by the Mexican delegation to the effect that a State whose regime was established with the help of the Axis Powers would not be eligible for membership so long as that regime was in power. You will have noticed also the statement made by President Truman and the other heads of governments in the report on the Tripartite Conference of Berlin on August 2, 1945, that in view of its origins, nature, record, and close association with the aggressor states, the present Spanish Government was not considered eligible for membership in the United Nations Organization.

This department recognizes and shares fully the feeling of the American people that there should be established in Spain forms of government which would give to the Spanish people the opportunity to achieve their political aspirations. The question of how to use our influence, in the best and most effective manner, to aid in the achievement of these objectives in an orderly and peaceful way, is receiving constant study by officers of the department.

Your courtesy in making available the views of your organization is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

For the Secretary of State, Chief, Division of Public Liaison:

FRANCIS H. RUSSELL.

Here is a clearly announced policy of meddling in the internal affairs of another nation, Spain, with which we are at peace and maintain peaceful and friendly diplomatic relations.

Does this represent the foreign policy of the United States? I do not believe it does.

On the same day, and from the same Department of State, another letter was written by Harry P. Leverich, Assistant Chief, Division of Central European Affairs, to Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Dubosh, president of the Slovak League of America, Cleveland, Ohio. This letter reads as follows, and I quote:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1945.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR DUBOSH: I have your letter of August 2, 1945, suggesting that the Department of State support your suggestion of a plebiscite to be held in Slovakia, and approve the sending of observers to Slovakia to attend trials held by the people's court.

The United States recognizes the Czechoslovak Republic and has accepted as a fact the agreement between the Czechoslovak Government and the Slovak National Council, published on June 3, 1945, which provides for a division of authority and guarantees certain measures of Slovak autonomy.

In view of our recognition of the Czechoslovak Republic, the Government of the United States cannot question the composition of the Slovak National Council nor request the Czechoslovak Government to hold a plebiscite, as suggested in your letter.

Likewise, the Department of State cannot send representatives of groups of American citizens to observe the operations of the Czechoslovak judicial system. Any request to have observers present to insure fair trials would constitute an interference in Czechoslovak internal matters. However, I have every reason to believe that the Czechoslovak judicial system will insure fair trials.

Yours very truly,

HARRY P. LEVERICH,
Assistant Chief, Division of Central European Affairs.

These two letters amount to double talk. They proclaim two foreign policies, exactly opposite in character. We all know that our Government's long sustained and established policy has been, and is, not to meddle in the internal affairs of other nations and especially friendly nations.

The administration should not, Congress and the American people cannot and do not, condone nor approve a foreign policy which interferes with the internal affairs of other nations. Our Secretary of State should at once repudiate and disavow the communication to Bishop Hartman, chairman of his Communist-sponsored committee, as not representing the foreign policy of the United States.

Such double dealing strikes at the very foundation of confidence and faith in our Government. All the group in central Europe had requested was relief from Red domination and a return to Christian concepts. They must have believed that such protection would be accorded them by the Western Powers as a wartime condition.

If such a commitment were made as a result of the war, it should be kept. Those unfortunate people now have learned that although the Allies won the war they have become enslaved to a new master.

I reiterate my personal faith in Secretary of State Byrnes, but I believe it is high time for housecleaning in the State Department, and I call upon him to do so. Whitewashing of radicals and frustrating the efforts of the FBI and other agencies of government, created to guard and protect the welfare of our people and their Government, will not be tolerated by Congress or by the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MEDICINE AND THE ARMY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army, has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for outstanding leadership in directing the largest medical department in the history of the United States Army.

While there has been considerable criticism about the Army being slow in discharging the medical personnel and particularly physicians, I feel it should be pointed out that the American physicians, dentists, and the Medical Department of the Army established an outstanding record in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading the annual report concerning the Army Medical Department, and I wish to give a brief résumé of some of the outstanding points in this report.

In the last 2 years the Army hospitals treated 9,000,000 patients; another 2,000,000 were treated in quarters; and more than 80,000,000 cases passed through the dispensaries and received out-patient treatment. This task was accomplished by 45,000 Army doctors assisted by nurses and first-aid men.

There were 207,754 men in the United States Army killed in action and 571,490 wounded. The record shows that 13 percent of the wounds were of the upper and lower extremities. Of the wounded, 363,322 returned to duty after hospitalization and 25,145 died. In World War I, twice as many died of wounds compared to World War II.

There were some 15,000 amputees of World War II. There were 14,000 that needed artificial limbs. There were two quadruple amputees and nine triple amputees recorded. Of the 14,000 needing artificial limbs, 95 percent lost one arm or leg and 5 percent suffered the loss of two limbs.

The care of the wounded was divided into three distinct phases. The first phase took place on the battle front where surgeons and first aid crews gave emergency treatment. The severely injured were evacuated swiftly to hospitals in the communication zones. Much of this was done by air. Emergency operations and treatment were going on within the sound of guns and in a few hours the individual would be in a hospital bed 500 miles behind the lines. Those needing plastic surgery or repairs were evacuated swiftly and moved to hospitals in the United States where the final phase of surgical reconstruction was undertaken. The results were apparent in the lowest mortality rate in the history of the Army in the world—4.3 percent of the wounded.

In World War I, we labeled many patients with a nervous disorder "shell-shocked" and in the postwar period they filled our hospitals. Today, with modern treatments, 90 percent of the cases with battle fatigue return to some form of duty.

Our soldiers lived and fought in some of the most disease-infested areas in the world. Yet, the death rate from known battle cases in the Army in the last 2 years, was about the same with the corresponding age groups in civilian life, about 3 per 1,000, per year. Known battle death rates in the Mexican War was 10 percent of the officers and enlisted men. The rate was reduced to 7.2 percent of the Union troops in the Civil War, to 1.6 percent in the Spanish War, to 1.3 percent in World War I, to 0.6 percent in this war. The use of sulfanilamide and penicillin reduced the death from meningitis from 38 percent in World War I to 3 percent in 1944 and pneumonia from 24 percent to 0.7 percent in this war.

In using penicillin it was found that it had a tendency to disappear from the blood stream after a few hours. Army scientists and physicians worked out a method of suspending it in beeswax and peanut oil and when given hypodermically in this combination penicillin remained in the blood stream for as long as 24 hours destroying disease germs. Two years ago penicillin was difficult to obtain. Today by new methods of production it is possible to use 2,000,000 ampules a month.

Insect-borne diseases have always had great influence on the course of operations throughout military history. The campaigns of our Army in remote Pacific islands and other places would have been far more difficult except for the rigid sanitary discipline and the development of highly effective insecticides and repellants. The disease-bearing lice, mosquitoes, flies, fleas, and other insects were controlled by the use of DDT.

Early in 1944 a serious typhus epidemic developed in Naples. The cases reached 50 a day. DDT dusting stations were set up, and by March more than a million and a quarter persons had been processed through them. This, with an extensive vaccination program, brought the epidemic under control within a month.

During the invasion of Saipan an epidemic of dengue fever developed among the troops. Extensive spraying of DDT in mosquito-breeding areas caused the number of cases to fall more than 80 percent in 2 weeks.

The development of methods of handling whole blood on the battlefield was a great contribution to surgery. While plasma is useful, it was not as effective in combatting shock and preparing wounded for surgery as was whole blood. Blood banks were established in every theater and whole blood was shipped by air from the United States and could be kept, under proper refrigeration, at advance surgical stations, for a period of 21 days. The American people contributed 206,000 pints of blood, and it was sent overseas in 9 months.

To insure that men were properly prepared for return to civilian life, the Army established 25 special convalescent centers. At these centers, men received, not only highly specialized medical treatment, but had full opportunity to select vocational training or recreational activity. Men who had been disabled by loss of arms or legs are fitted with artificial limbs and taught to use them. The men who are suffering from mental or nervous disorders resulting from combat, are not returned to civil life until they have been given every possible treatment and regained their mental balance.

The Army Dental Corps, has made 71,500,000 fillings, had 16,500,000 extractions, and 2,600,000 dentures for personnel of the Army since Pearl Harbor. Dental defects were the leading cause for rejection from the Army, with eye defects second and mental and nervous disorders third. The dental requirements for entrance into the Army were lowered twice in 1942 to meet the need for men in the military service and finally the only disqualifying factors were severe jaw malformations or malignancies. The Dental Corps is now working in cooperation with ophthalmological services on methods of fabricating an artificial eye in synthetic resin, of which more than 5,000 have been inserted to date. They are also improving techniques for plastic ears, noses, and chins.

The Office of the Surgeon General recently announced that snakes brought from Okinawa will be kept at the Washington Zoo to aid in experiments for the production of American antivenom. This antivenom is being compared with the effectiveness of that made from American snakes. It is thought that the American antivenom should be reasonably effective in the treatment of snake bites on Okinawa. The snakes on Okinawa are now in the Washington Zoo. There are no similar snakes to these in America. Until September 13 this whole subject was classified as confidential. Since then it has been reclassified.

Of the 1,400,409 decorations given in World War II in recognition of meritorious service and gallantry, 6 percent were received by Medical Department personnel, according to this bi-annual report by General Marshall. These figures are exclusive of air medals and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, as a physician I point with pride at the record made by the Medical Department of the Army and our American physicians. They should receive the thanks of all of us for a job well done.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. MAY (at the request of Mr. THOMASON) for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4129. An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m., on Tuesday, December 18, 1945, the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the bill (H. R. 4479), to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

866. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board and the National Railway Labor Panel, for the period ending March 31, 1946, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 457. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1580, an act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 473. An act relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral; with amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1405. An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. Senate Joint Resolution 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4512. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the current session, relative to the Full Employment Act, for the use of said committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the House Committee on Labor, Subcommittee To Investi-

gate Aid to the Physically Handicapped, to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1, 3, 7, and 8 of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to aid to the physically handicapped; without amendment (Rept. No. 1447). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HEFFERNAN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1238. A bill for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee, with amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4335. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co., with amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1217. A bill for the relief of Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc., with amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5004. A bill to provide for the protection of the Dall sheep, caribou, and other wildlife native to the Mount McKinley National Park area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5005. A bill relating to sales of surplus property to veterans under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 5006. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a "T" tunnel as a means of communications and transportation between San Pedro, Wilmington, Long Beach, and Terminal Island, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution making the last Thursday in November a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 458. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1405, a bill to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine, Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. Res. 459. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia:

H. Res. 460. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the composition of, and the procedure and conduct of cases before, courts-martial; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 5007. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., and Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Harry McCauley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5009. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Troth; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May Holland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 5011. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1416. Mr. CANNON of Missouri presented a petition of members of the faculty of the University of Missouri, relative to control of atomic energy, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and glory, as with an unnumbered host crowding the Bethlehem way under all skies, we come again to the feast of the Child, may we in very truth be drawn into companionship with Him who giveth all. May the delicate tints of flowers, the sweet symbolism of holly, mistletoe, and fir, the memory of deep woods, of peaceful hills, and of the mantling snow which guards the sleep of all God's creatures be but the grateful frame for those gifts which are beyond price, outlast time, and bridge all space—pure joy, a merry heart, a clear conscience, and love which thinks no evil is not easily provoked and seeks not its own. So may the little Christ hands beckon us to come within the circle of His faith and love where are bright angels of good will and everyday saints and all goodness, truth, and beauty. In His dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 14, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2348) to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the current session relative to the Full Employment Act for the use of said committee; and

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the House Committee on Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1, 3, 7, and 8 of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to aid to the physically handicapped.

ADDITIONAL BASIC AUTHORITY FOR CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to grant certain additional basic authority to the Civil Service Commission, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

THE GARRISON DAM—RESOLUTION FROM BURKE COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Burke County, N. Dak., commissioners on September 21, 1945, relative to the operation of the pool of the Garrison Dam. The resolution is signed by Oscar A. Kallberg and A. J. Young.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the operation of the pool of the Garrison Dam at the proposed "maximum normal operating pool level" of 1,850 feet above sea level will unnecessarily inundate thousands of acres of fertile bottom lands along the Missouri River in Williams and McKenzie Counties in North Dakota, thereby removing such lands from the tax rolls of said counties with resulting loss of public revenue, and thereby taking such lands out of existing and potential production valued in hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, and thereby causing tens of thousands of dollars of severance damage to uplands,

and thereby disturbing the homes of hundreds of long-time residents; and

Whereas the operation of such "maximum normal operating pool level" will damage and be a constant hazard to the city of Williston, installations of the Great Northern Railway, and the Lewis and Clark and the Buford-Trenton irrigation projects in the Williston area; and

Whereas the elaborate and costly system of levees and automatic pumps proposed by the Corps of Engineers of the Army for the protection of said city, railroad, and irrigation projects is of doubtful and speculative value and without engineering precedent in reclamation history; and

Whereas disturbing and alarming fears in the minds of residents and property owners in the affected area have become widespread that the Corps of Engineers of the Army will operate said reservoir at such "maximum normal pool level," irrespective of the efficacy of its proposed protective works and irrespective of the inestimable damage, actual and potential, which will be caused thereby in the affected area; and

Whereas such fears have already served to discourage large and small commercial and industrial investments and have had a demoralizing effect on the values of all property in the affected area, with resulting insecurity of our people; and

Whereas the operation of the pool of the Garrison Dam at a "maximum normal operating pool level" of 1,830 feet above sea level will allay such fears and will avert such damage and hazard without costly or speculative protective works; and

Whereas the public interest requires that such fears be allayed, that such damage and hazard be averted, and that there be no further fear, anxiety, or uncertainty over the maximum level at which such pool may ever be operated; and

Whereas no hearings have ever been held or conducted in the Williston area concerning the effect of such pool on people and property in the affected area: Now, therefore, be it jointly

Resolved, That we, municipalities and organizations in the affected area, are unalterably opposed to the operation of the pool of the Garrison Dam at a maximum level exceeding 1,830 feet above sea level; that we demand that fair and impartial hearings and studies be held and conducted in the affected area by a special congressional committee; and that the maximum level at which such pool may ever be operated be, in all events, speedily, irrevocably, and authoritatively determined; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, the members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee; the Governors of the Missouri Basin States, the Commissioner, United States Bureau of Reclamation, and Chief, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D. C., the Committees on Appropriations in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives in Congress from North Dakota.

Adopted by Burke County Commissioners this 21st day of September 1945.

OSCAR A. KALLBERG.
A. J. YOUNG.

PROBLEMS OF THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received the following letter from Mr. Guy L. Ireland, proprietor of Ireland's Lumber Yard, of Grand Forks, N. Dak.:

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: The matter of the OPA crucifying the retailer on the cross of holding down building costs is strictly up to Congress.

Raising wages and then costs to the retailer and forcing him to absorb all this raise simply means ruin. It is un-American, unfair, and all in the interest of politics. We retailers are being made the goat and none of us can hope for any correction or fair play from the OPA unless you in Congress force the issue.

Please note the attached.

Yours very truly,

GUY L. IRELAND.

I ask that the paper attached to the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPA AND RETAIL PRICES

Building material: The OPA is now going from place to place setting up prices on the basis of 1942. It is, of course, evident that the manufacturer is going to get advances and that OPA is going to refuse to allow the advances to be added until we have spent 6 months or a year establishing a loss on our entire business and waiting for OPA to grant relief.

No thought is given to our increased cost of doing business.

First, in 1942, we had a union contract, 48½ cents common help and 50 cents yardmen, 54-hour week straight through; today this is 60 cents and 70 cents for 40-hour week, 90 cents and $1.05 for overtime; this is inefficient help and the overtime we are forced to employ brings the income of these men 75 to 100 percent over 1942. All office and other help has also advanced. Local taxes go up 29½ percent for 1946.

In addition to this, we have to take green lumber and pile it up to dry; also have some milled in transit at $9 to $12 per thousand. OPA refuses to allow us to pass on any of this expense.

OPA allows the mills to charge $2 per thousand, $60 to $90 per car, for mixed cars, four items, and now has ruled the retailer must not pass this on.

On green lumber the OPA says it should weigh rough 3,300 pounds; it weighs over 4,000; and OPA says we must absorb this 700 or more pounds at 56½ percent.

If we don't buy green and remilled stock, we just won't have enough lumber to do the farmer any good.

In addition to all this, the mill is given export prices far and above the domestic price. One mill told us they were shipping their very good flooring to South Africa and getting $23 per thousand more for it than they could charge us or we could pay.

Everywhere you go it is the same conversation. Congress alone is responsible as responsible as long as they refuse to act on these questions and the labor question.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of A. Hayden; and

S. 1691. A bill for the relief of S. I. Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1692. A bill granting an increase in pension to Mrs. Nellie Lambert Kernan; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1693. A bill to grant certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave to personnel in the land and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1945

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Employment-Production Act, 1945."

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 2. Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy of the United States—

(a) By means of—

(1) preserving and encouraging the American economic system of free competitive enterprise and fostering the investment of private capital in trade, agriculture, commerce, and in the development of the natural resources of the United States;

(2) aiding in the development and maintenance of conditions favorable to stimulating new business, and especially small business, and to promoting continuous growth in the quality and quantity of facilities of production;

(3) encouraging individual initiative;

(4) avoiding competition of government with private business enterprise; and

(5) adopting sound fiscal policies and maintaining the credit of the United States; and thereby creating under, and in a manner consistent with, the American system of free competitive enterprise, the maximum opportunity for employment (including self-employment), to attain and maintain a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power.

(b) By means of investigating and determining the causes of economic fluctuations, and providing for continuous study of economic conditions and economic trends, to make provision for diminishing such fluctuations and avoiding the causes thereof.

(c) By means of—

(1) encouraging State and local governments to plan and adopt sound programs of public works for their normal needs in normal times, capable of acceleration and expansion when widespread unemployment in the State or in any substantial portion thereof exists or threatens, and capable of reduction when inflationary conditions exist or threaten;

(2) planning and adopting programs for loans by the United States, consistent with a financially sound fiscal policy, for use when widespread unemployment in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof exists or threatens;

(3) planning and adopting a program of sound public works, consistent with a financially sound fiscal policy (such works to be performed, except as otherwise authorized by law, by private enterprise under contract), for the normal needs of the United States in normal times, capable of acceleration and expansion when widespread unemployment in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof exists or threatens, and capable of reduction when inflationary conditions exist or threaten;

to stimulate private enterprise in the periods in which widespread unemployment exists or threatens so as to stimulate and promote employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy, thereby aiding and assisting employables (including self-employed) in such periods to secure employment, and to aid in removing or preventing inflationary or deflationary conditions in periods in which such conditions exist or threaten.

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall submit to the Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing

with the year 1947) an economic report (hereinafter called the Economic Report) on economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or in any considerable portion thereof, on the extent to which the policies declared in section 2 are or are not being achieved, and on the extent to which the various programs and activities of the Federal Government are, and the extent to which they are not, contributing to the achievement of such policies.

(b) If at the time of submitting the Economic Report, high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power are not being maintained or are threatening to decline, the President shall include in the Economic Report, in addition to the matter required to be included under subsection (a), a statement of what, in his judgment, are the causes thereof, a statement of the extent to which then-existing legislation may be utilized for attaining high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, and of the plans therefor and means of financing the programs thereunder, and his recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation) as he deems necessary for attaining such high levels.

(c) If at the time of submitting the Economic Report widespread unemployment exists in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof the President shall include in the Economic Report, in addition to the matter required to be included under subsections (a) and (b), a statement of what, in his judgment, are the causes thereof, a statement of the extent to which such unemployment may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and of the plans therefor and means of financing the programs thereunder, and his recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation) as he deems necessary for alleviating such unemployment and attaining high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power.

(d) If at the time of submitting the Economic Report inflationary conditions exist or threaten, the President shall include in the Economic Report, in addition to the matter required to be included under subsection (a), a statement of what, in his judgment, are the causes thereof, a statement of the extent to which such conditions may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and his recommendations for such further legislation (including recommendations for the reduction or suspension of public outlays) as he deems necessary to alleviate such conditions and to prevent them from recurring.

(e) The President may, from time to time, transmit to Congress such supplemental or revised reports, or such supplemental recommendations, as he deems necessary to achieve the policies declared in section 2.

(f) The economic report, and any supplemental or revised reports or recommendations, when submitted to Congress, shall be referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report (created by section 5).

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Economic Advisers (hereinafter called the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policies declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment and production under the American system of free competitive enterprise. Each member of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as chairman, and the Council shall annually select one of the members as vice chairman, who shall act as chairman in the absence of the chairman.

(b) The Council is authorized to employ, in the District of Columbia, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this act, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ, in the District of Columbia, such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the policies declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining whether such developments and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policies, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and trends;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policies declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policies, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to formulate and recommend to the President national economic policies for promoting the American system of free competitive enterprise, avoiding economic fluctuations or diminishing the effects thereof, and for maintaining a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power;

(5) whenever in the opinion of the Council high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power are not being maintained or are threatening to decline, to make a report to the President on what, in its judgment, are the causes thereof, and on the extent to which then-existing legislation may be utilized for attaining high levels of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power, and to include in such report its recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation in a manner consistent with sound fiscal practices) as it deems necessary for attaining such high levels;

(6) whenever the Council determines that widespread unemployment exists in the United States or in any substantial portion thereof, to make a report to the President on what, in its judgment, are the causes thereof, and on the extent to which such unemployment may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and to include in such report its recommendations for such further legislation (which may include recommendations for outlays in addition to loans and public works, and which shall include recommendations for means of financing the recommended legislation in a manner consistent with sound fiscal practices) as it deems necessary to alleviate such unemployment and to attain a high level of employment (including self-employment), production, and purchasing power;

(7) whenever in the opinion of the Council inflationary conditions exist or threaten, to make a report to the President on what, in its judgment, are the causes thereof, and on the extent to which such conditions may be alleviated under then-existing legislation, and to include in such report its recommendations for such further legislation as it deems necessary to alleviate such conditions and to prevent them from recurring;

(8) to make and furnish, when requested by the President, such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy as he may request.

(d) The Council shall make an annual report to the President not later than January 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) and shall also make interim reports quarterly (following January 1, 1947).

(e) The President is requested to make available to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, if it desires, the various studies, reports, and recommendations of the Council which have been submitted to the President.

(f) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this act—

(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

(g) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this act there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding $345,000 in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, which shall be known as the Joint Committee on the Economic Report (in this section called the "joint committee"), and which shall be composed of the chairman and ranking majority party members, and the two ranking minority party members, of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, of the Senate Committee on Finance, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and three other members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three other members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the Economic Report;

(2) to study means of coordinating programs under existing laws relating to loans, public works, and other outlays in order to further the policies of this act; and

(3) as a guide to the several committees of Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Economic Report, not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, and from

time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

(e) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman, and shall not exceed $100,000 for each fiscal year.

INTERPRETATION

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act shall be construed as calling for or authorizing—

(1) any change in the existing procedures on appropriations, or authorizations of appropriations;

(2) the carrying out of, or any appropriation for, any program set forth in the Economic Report; or

(3) the disclosure of trade secrets or other information, the publication of which might have a harmful effect upon the firm or person supplying such information, without the consent of the firm or person affected.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to declare a continuing national policy and program to promote high levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in a free competitive economy."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BUCK conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE HEARINGS ON FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 111, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session, relative to the Full Employment Act of 1945.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN PARTS OF HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LABOR INVESTIGATING AID TO PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 112, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the House Committee on Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of parts 1, 3, 7, and 8 of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to aid to the physically handicapped.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, are these the usual concurrent resolutions from the House asking for the printing of certain hearings?

Mr. HAYDEN. For their use.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

OPENING ADDRESS BY ROBERT H. JACKSON AT TRIAL OF GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS (S. DOC. NO. 129)

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the opening address for the United States of America, delivered by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Representative and Chief Counsel for the United States at the trial of German war criminals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROBLEM OF LUMBER DEALERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Edwin W. Elmer, executive secretary, Independent Retail Lumber Dealers' Association for North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and two of the other adjoining States, before the Senate Small Business Committee hearing on December 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN LUMBER-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by the Independent Retail Lumber Dealers Association, Deward G. Schultz, acting executive secretary, to Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, relative to conditions in the lumber manufacturing industry, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT ON THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE OF UNITED NATIONS FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report received by him from the Secretary of Agriculture on the Quebec Conference of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CAUSE OF INDIA—ADVERTISEMENT BY NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR INDIA'S FREEDOM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement under the heading "Mr. Attlee, what about the world of today—An open letter to the British Prime Minister," signed by the chairman of the National Committee for India's Freedom, published in the Washington Evening Star of November 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM DETROIT NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway's Opponents Gradually Fade Away," published in the Detroit News of November 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN—ARTICLE BY PAUL MALLON

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Paul Mallon dealing with the proposed loan to Great Britain, published in the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of December 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR EXPANSION OF GEORGIA'S HEALTH SERVICES

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Georgia Rural Health Conference showing the need for expanding and improving Georgia's health services, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEED FOR HEALTH INSURANCE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "The Need for Health Insurance," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WOOL PROBLEM—STATEMENT BY MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & BEANE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a publication regarding hearings on the wool industry, issued by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEEDING OUR ALLIES—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Feeding Our Allies" published in the Washington Post of December 15, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Ball	Hart	Murray
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Carville	La Follette	Shipstead
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Mead	White
Gerry	Millikin	Wiley
Gossett	Mitchell	Willis
Green	Moore	Wilson
Guffey	Morse	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia

[Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pensylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations to be acted on.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Executive Mansion and Grounds," on page 7, after line 11, to insert:

Addition to the Executive Mansion: For an addition to the Executive Mansion; for alterations, improvements, and furnishings, and for improvement of grounds, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, to remain available until expended, $1,650,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses," including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $56,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 22, to insert:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Printing and binding," $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office for Emergency Management—Office of Alien Property Custodian," on page 8, line 7, after the word "mail", to strike out "$679,700" and insert "$780,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 9, to insert:

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses," including the objects specified under this head in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1946, $165,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Service Commission," on page 8, after line 21, to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission," including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $1,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee, in charge of the bill, if we may not pass this amendment over temporarily.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily, and the clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Loan Agency—Reconstruction Finance Corporation," on page 10, line 2, after the word "Corporation", strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of the funds available under this head for administrative expenses shall be used in paying the salary of any person engaged in making or processing loans to any State, any subdivision thereof, any municipality therein, or any public authority, for construction purposes, unless in pursuance of a specific authorization."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, referring back to page 7, I should like to know why it should cost $1,650,000 to fix up the Executive Mansion. Is not that a tremendous sum? Could we not build a brand new one for that amount?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I know that.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Plans have been drawn for additional offices which are absolutely necessary. The Senator will recall that a number of executive offices have been created by the Congress. The plans for the offices have been carefully worked out and sent to us by the President, and we think we should appropriate the money.

Mr. LANGER. Is it the intention to build these offices as part of the White House?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh no. They are executive offices. The Senator will recall that the executive offices are on the right as one enters the White House grounds. This has nothing to do with the White House itself. It is for executive offices. The regular executive office of the President and his staff is to the right as one enters the White House grounds. I am sure the Senator would approve the project if he saw the plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Power Commission," on page 10, line 14, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$300,000"; in line 17, after the word "to", to strike out "$1,440,000" and insert "$1,498,000"; and in line 18, after the word "to", to strike out "$208,000" and insert "$217,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 18, to insert:

Flood-control surveys: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Flood-control surveys," Federal Power Commission, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $50,000: *Provided*, That the amount under this head which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from "$85,000" to "$101,000" and for travel is hereby increased from "$10,000" to "$12,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Howard University," on page 11, after line 15, to insert:

Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction on the grounds of Howard University of a dental school building, and engineering and architectural school building, two additional units of the women's dormitories, and an auditorium building with facilities for the school of music and the teaching of fine arts, including engineering and architectural services, printing, and travel, to remain available until expended, $181,575.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the amendments are read so fast we can hardly keep up with them.

Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. I call attention to the committee amendment on page 11, lines 16 to 23, inclusive. Do I understand that the cost simply for drawing up the plans is $181,575?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes. As the Senator knows, Howard University is a Negro university in this city, and there are very elaborate plans drawn up for this institution. The committee was unanimously of the opinion that this amendment should be adopted, and I hope the Senator will not object to it.

Mr. LANGER. I merely want to obtain some information respecting it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand that merely for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction the cost will be $181,575?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; that is precisely correct. By the way, there are a great number of buildings at the university, and there are to be renovations made and additional buildings erected. I suppose Howard University is the largest Negro school in America. It certainly is the most important one. It is here in our own Capital City. It occupies a very large section of ground. Has the Senator ever been out there?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I have been out there.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It occupies a very large area. I think by all means this

amount should be granted. I hope the Senator will approve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 12, after line 8, to insert:

Hospitals and medical care: Not to exceed $90,000 of the appropriation "Hospitals and medical care," fiscal year 1946, shall be available for necessary major repair, remodeling, and alteration of the Neponsit Beach Hospital without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 15, to strike out:

Foreign quarantine service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Foreign quarantine service," including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1946, $70,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Foreign quarantine service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Foreign quarantine service," including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1946, and including the purchase of 12 passenger automobiles; construction, purchase, major repairs, and remodeling of buildings and auxiliary facilities; rental of buildings and other structures (including quarters for commissioned officers and other personnel) without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended; and architectural and other special personal services by contract without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; $601,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 11, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$875,000" and insert "$950,000"; and in line 14, after the numerals "410", to insert "(including the purchase and distribution of penicillin and other antibiotic compounds for use in research projects for which grants are made)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 17, to insert:

Public-health services, Philippine Islands: To enable the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, fiscal year 1946, to assist the public-health organization of the Philippine Islands in reconstituting and reactivating public-health services and programs in the Philippine Islands, including personal services in the District of Columbia; personal services outside the District of Columbia without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of 25 passenger automobiles and 10 aircraft; travel; printing and binding; purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating, drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commissioned officers and transportation of their dependents on change of station, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board," on page 14, line 17, after "Survivors Insurance", to strike out "$1,682,500" and insert "$1,850,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 3, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 16, line 5, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; in line 6, before the word "shall", to strike out "$375,000" and insert "$675,000"; in line 9, after the word "by", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$50,000"; and in line 10, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no loans shall be made or participated in by any Federal agency for the construction of any public works, plans for which have been wholly or partly financed out of this appropriation, except in pursuance of a specific authorization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 17, after "'Virgin Islands public works'", to strike out "$554,000" and insert "$1,878,420."

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say concerning this amendment that it will be remembered that we bought the Virgin Islands from Denmark for purposes largely of defense. We had much testimony before the committee on this subject, and after a very careful examination the committee felt that these items should go into the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have we gone past the amendment on page 16, beginning in line 5?

Mr. McKELLAR. We will return to it if the Senator desires.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to ask a question of the distinguished Senator. The Senate committee increased the amount from $12,500,000 to $25,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency. I was not present at the time that was done. Was a satisfactory showing made before the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Bureau of the Budget asked for $50,000,000, and a contract authorization for $57,000,000 more. The Federal Works Agency already had applications for more than $25,000,000. The committee very carefully considered this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the applications come in after this appropriation bill left the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they came in before, but the House did not grant the amount asked for. The Senate committee, however, felt that after cutting off the contractual authority for $57,000,000, and after cutting down the Budget authorization of $50,000,000 to $25,000,000, we had done a fair and reasonable job.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator feels that a satisfactory showing has been made, in view of the fact that applications have been filed which would amount to $25,000,000, and therefore that Congress should appropriate that much money?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that the Congress should contribute that much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 22, to insert:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn.: For the acquisition of a site in Nashville, Tenn., by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and the construction thereon of a new Federal office building for the use and accommodation of the United States, including the Veterans' Administration, $5,575,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration," on page 17, line 22, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 109, and"; and in line 23, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$296,867.45" and insert "$473,528.31."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Interstate Commerce Commission," on page 18, line 25, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$206,000" and insert "$306,000"; and on page 19, line 3, after the word "to", to strike out "$2,688,000" and insert "$2,788,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 8, to insert:

Motor transport regulation: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Motor transport regulation," including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $164,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Housing Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 19, after line 19, to strike out:

Veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, $24,500,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1501), $191,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That, without regard to the provisions of any other law, but subject to the removal of provisions of section 313 of said act, said Administrator may transfer, for such consideration and subject to such terms and conditions as he deems feasible under the circumstances, any temporary housing (intact or in panels suitable for reuse) under his jurisdiction to any educational institutions, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, for use or reuse in providing temporary housing for families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, or, in the discretion of the Administrator, for single veterans attending educational institutions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to correct the amendment just stated by striking out the word "of", on page 20, in line 3, where it first appears. The word "of" appears twice in that line. The "of" I ask to have stricken appears between the words "removal" and "provisions." The language should be "removal provisions." I ask further to correct the amendment in line 8, by striking out the letter "s" in the word "institutions." The word should be singular instead of plural.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Labor Relations Board," on page 22, after line 8, to insert:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board, War Labor Disputes Act," including the objects specified under the appropriation for this purpose in the National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1946, $300,000, for reimbursement to the appropriations "Salaries" and "Miscellaneous expenses," National Labor Relations Board, fiscal year 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Veterans' Administration," on page 25, line 8, after the figures "$5,000,000", to insert a semicolon and "the limitation under the above appropriation upon the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be purchased during the fiscal year 1946 is hereby increased from '55' to '284'; the limitation under the above appropriation upon the amount which may be available for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material is hereby increased from '$50,000' to '$99,500'; and notwithstanding the provisions of section 106 of the above act, the appropriation shall be available for the purchase of newspapers (other than legal) and periodicals in an amount not exceeding $975. Subparagraph (c) of section 201 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words following the words 'Veterans' Administration' and substituting in lieu thereof the following words and figures, 'the amount available for such purpose shall be $10,000.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, referring back to the language of the amendment on page 20. Does it provide primarily for veterans' housing?

Mr. McKELLAR. Practically all is for veterans.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought that ought to be stated and clearly understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia—Health Department," on page 28, after line 1, to insert:

Capital outlay, Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Sanatorium: For preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for employees' living quarters, $4,600, which amount may be credited to the appropriation account, "Office of Municipal Architect, construction services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 12, to insert:

MENTAL REHABILITATION SERVICE

Capital outlay, District Training School: For the construction of a third floor and a permanent roof to the hospital and administration building, $70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public works," on page 29, after line 17, to insert:

Motor Vehicle Parking Agency: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 90), including personal services and printing and binding, payable from the highway fund, fiscal year 1946, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 2, after the figures "$320,000", to insert a comma and "and in conducting a survey for city relief sewers the Commissioners are authorized to employ engineering and other professional services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and civil-service and classification laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 6, to insert:

SPECIAL EMERGENCY FUND

For all expenses necessary to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District during the period of public recognition extended to returning military or naval personnel or visiting dignitaries, including the cost of removing and relocating streetcar loading platforms, roping of streets, erection of stands, printing of signs, and operation of temporary comfort stations, fiscal year 1946, $15,000: *Provided*, That the certificate of the Commissioners shall be sufficient voucher for the expenditure of $1,000 of this appropriation for such purposes as they may deem necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Administration—Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine", on page 31, line 14, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 14, to insert:

FOREST SERVICE

National-forest protection and management: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for national-forest protection and management, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest roads and trails," on page 32, after line 9, to insert:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for the agricultural wage stabilization program under the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration," in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, is hereby increased from "$275,000" to "$373,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 23, to insert:

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The limitation of $50,000,000 for the objects and for the purposes of the item "School lunch program" contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, is increased by $15,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 3, to insert:

MARKETING SERVICE

Insecticide Act: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Insecticide Act," including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, $26,500, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for departmental personnel services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased from "$1,228,446" to "$1,235,446."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farm labor-supply program," on page 33, line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "$14,000,000" and insert "$22,000,000."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in connection with the committee amendment on page 33, line 22, striking out $14,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,000,000," at the bottom of the page the language is "Not less than $5,000,000 of such additional funds shall be apportioned among the several States," to provide for farm labor. I am advised that the farm organizations whose representatives appeared before the committee are very desirous of obtaining a $7,000,000 foundation for this fund. The Senator will recall the testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me explain this situation. The committee heard a great deal of testimony on this question. There is no doubt that there is great need for farm labor. So far as the information of the committee is concerned—and we received a great deal of it—during the war this practice has been of tremendous service, and we think it will be of tremendous service in the future.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment. As the Senator will note, on page 33, the language is "Not less than $5,000,000." We thought that if more than that amount were required, even to the extent of $7,000,000, those who administered the act would be authorized to use that much, or even a larger sum.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that anyone has any quarrel with what the Senate Appropriations Committee has done. It has provided that not less than $5,000,000 shall be available. Therefore it is assumed that if six, seven, eight, nine, or ten million dollars were needed, it would be available. However, the position of those who are dependent upon the farm labor for which provision is made in the bill is that $5,000,000 will not be sufficient.

What I should like to have the Senator agree to—and I know he will give it his usual careful attention—is to establish a floor of $7,000,000, and take the item to conference. If it seems unwise to raise the floor, that is one thing, but I should like to have the question considered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The testimony before the committee was that there must be imported into the United States at least 75,000 foreign workers. The money to do that is included in the $22,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is also in the $22,000,000 an estimate of approximately $6,000,000 to provide for what the Senator is talking about, namely, interstate transportation of American workers.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. To the extent that we increase the limit, we take away money which possibly could be used for the importation of badly needed foreign labor from the West Indies, Mexico, and other countries.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why not increase the $22,000,000 figure?

Mr. HAYDEN. If we wish to increase the figure $5,000,000 to $7,000,000, we ought to increase the figure $22,000,000 to $25,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. We should increase both amounts. Unless we should do so, the Administrator would be placed in a very awkward position.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not desirous of wasting a single cent of the appropriation. However, anyone who has any knowledge of conditions in the farming States must realize that for a long time they have been dependent upon transitory labor within our own country and labor imported from outside the country. If the labor situation on the farms should improve so that we would not need this money, that would be one thing. But up to date there is no evidence of such an improvement. For example, farmers in Maryland—and I suppose farmers in many other States—are advertising for labor at very high wages, offering the inducement of fine houses with electric lights, baths, and many other facilities, but they are unable to attract farm labor. With the world in its present condition, I suggest that we err on the side of producing food.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is more or less of an insurance policy.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest that there be taken to conference an amendment which would further increase the $22,000,000 to $25,000,000, and also increase the $5,000,000 in line 24 to $7,000,000, and see whether or not, on further examination, those figures are warranted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to that suggestion if the Senate will agree to it. When the matter goes to conference we may have to change those figures. Probably it would be wise to increase both figures.

Mr. TYDINGS. I offer an amendment on page 33, line 22, in the committee amendment, to strike out "$22,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; and I shall also offer an amendment in line 24, on the same page, to change the figure "$5,000,000" to "$7,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the committee amendment on page 33, line 22.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the amendment is adopted, the Senator from Colorado wishes to be heard, and should be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I know that all the Senators from Western States appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Tennessee in agreeing to increase these amounts, because they are vital. I have before me a telegram which was sent to all the Senators of the 11 Western States by the chairman of the Regional Western Cooperative Extension Service, Mr. F. A. Anderson. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT COLLINS, COLO., *December 14, 1945.*

Senator ED C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended an appropriation of twenty-two million for the emergency farm labor program in 1946, of which five million shall be available to States for expenditure by agricultural extension services and seventeen million to Office of Labor, United States Department of Agriculture, for recruitment, transportation, and so forth, of foreign workers, State extension directors of the 11 Western States in which one-half of the deficiency in our national labor supply exists. Do not feel that five million is adequate for the performance of duties assigned to us by Congress and respectfully request that the amount be increased to at least seven million. Our recommendation as submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee was for a total appropriation of twenty-nine million, of which nine million would be available to the States and twenty million to the Office of Labor. An inadequate appropriation will result in a large reduction in sugar beets and other crops for which a great deal of hand labor is required.

F. A. ANDERSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Anderson makes the point that the Extension Service has a tremendous responsibility, and is put to great expense in carrying out its part under the cooperative arrangement between the Federal Government and the States, and seeing to it that sufficient labor is provided.

The Secretary of Agriculture has boosted his request for the production of sugar. Of course, sugar cannot be produced without sufficient labor. If the bill is amended as has been suggested by the Senator from Maryland and agreed to by the Senator from Tennessee, who is in charge of the bill, I think the situation will be taken care of.

At this point I should like to yield to my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish very heartily to associate myself with what has been said by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland and my very able and distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Colorado. I wish, also, to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for what I believe to be a very wise and constructive concession. I express the hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will prevail in maintaining the increased amounts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the committee amendment on page 33, line 22.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I now offer an amendment on page 33, line 24, to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the amendment before it is adopted. I wish to add to the remarks of both Senators from Colorado the statement that we in Nebraska find ourselves in the same position, especially in the sugar-beet area, so far as the need for labor is concerned.

I deeply appreciate the amendments offered by the Senator from Maryland, and I hope they will go further than the stage of being offered and agreed to here. I hope that when the conferees take all the amendments to conference they will insist upon these particular ones. Of course, I am interested in economy; but food is needed in the United States and in the world, and I think these appropriations are most desirable.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Probably the Senator from Nebraska has had the experience which I have had. One section of my State produces great quantities of cannable crops. It is most distressing for the farmers who produce crops which are perishable at the time of ripening to find that when they have ripened and are ready to be canned sufficient labor to gather them and get them to the canning houses is not available, with the result that the farmers sustain great losses after having made every possible effort to produce the crops; and of course it has been most difficult to produce them, in view of the shortage of labor and the shortage of machinery. When losses of that kind occur once, the farmers are not likely to make the effort again.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Mr. President, I wish to say, not only for myself but for the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who, if he were here, I know would join me in this statement, that we appreciate very much the efforts which have been made in this connection and we join with other Senators who are endorsing these amendments.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to those of other Senators who have expressed their endorsement of the amendments, and I desire to express on the part of the farmers of Idaho appreciation for the attention this matter has been given by the Senator

from Maryland. I know it is vital. A number of farmers in Idaho have communicated with me about it. If we are to have the necessary food produced, I know the adoption of the amendments is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to add my endorsement of the amendments, in behalf of a number of farmers in North Dakota who have written to me regarding the matter, and I desire to compliment the Senator from Maryland for the action he has taken in connection with the amendments. I am only sorry that the amounts involved are not larger.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think I should say that probably very few items in the bill have received so much consideration as has this particular one. A considerable amount of the attention it has received is attributable to the fact that many of the labor shortages which were shown to have existed were ameliorated during the present year, especially, by the labor of captured soldiers who have been brought to this country from abroad. Of course, they will have to be replaced, and that is a further reason why the committee acted as generously as it could. We are glad to have these amendments offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair withdraws his previous announcement that the amendment is agreed to; and the question, then, is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the committee amendment on page 33, in line 22.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland on page 33, in line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, after the word "purposes," to insert "agricultural workers may be admitted into the United States to perform agricultural labor in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (g) of said act during the continuance of this program, notwithstanding any official determination of the cessation of hostilities in the present war."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 35, line 11, after the word "binding," to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$344,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 35, line 17, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$1,970,000" and insert "$3,295,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics", on page 35, after line 18, to insert:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For an additional amount for "Establishment of air-navigation facilities," fiscal year 1946, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, $182,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 11, to insert:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Departmental salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Departmental salaries and expenses," including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, $350,000, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for personal services is hereby increased from "$1,929,250" to "$2,241,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 20, to insert:

Field office service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Field office service," including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946, $30,000, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for personal services is hereby increased from "$395,000" to "$421,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the acting chairman of the committee to return to the amendment, on page 35, in line 17, in the item dealing with the Bureau of the Census. I wish to have the Senator explain why the item was increased by the committee from $1,970,000 to $3,295,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House approved the amount of the Budget estimate. We took considerable proof in regard to this item. The committee was of the opinion that the Budget estimate should be increased—and it was increased—in order to enable the Bureau of the Census to do the work it is required to perform at this time, namely, to compile the census and to report on all the other matters which are required of it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the Senator from Nebraska, let me tell him, so that there may be no misunderstanding, that the members of the committee were not unanimous in their views in regard to the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they were not unanimous.

Mr. BRIDGES. Several members of the committee felt that the expense was wholly unwarranted and unnecessary.

Let me also take this opportunity to say that I think the Appropriations Committee is to be commended in regard to certain items in the bill. The committee did cut out many, many hundreds of millions of dollars of proposed appropriations; but I, for one, regret exceedingly that it was found necessary to increase the appropriation items in this bill by $619,260,876.86 over the appropriations voted by the House of Representatives. I think many of these appropriations could well be reduced in amount substantially more than they have been; and the item about which the Senator from Nebraska has raised a question is typical of many others. However, a majority of the committee felt that the increase should be made, and the committee voted accordingly.

If other Members of the Senate feel that the committee has been too liberal, I, as a member of the committee who voted against many of these increases, will be glad to have them discuss the items further.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that while there has been an increase in the amount of six-hundred-and-some-odd million dollars, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, it should be pointed out that the additional $750,000,000 item was adopted by the Senate yesterday as a result of the vote on the UNRRA appropriation.

I wish to say that the Senator from New Hampshire studied this bill as much, perhaps, as any other member of the committee did, and the Senator from New Hampshire rendered a splendid service in helping reduce many items of appropriation. As he will remember, I frequently voted with him in connection with the reduction of appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. I acknowledge that, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. But in connection with the comment the Senator has made about increased items of appropriation, I wish to point out that, of course, the $750,000,000 appropriation which the Senate voted yesterday to add to the bill is an appreciable item in itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The increase to which I have referred did not include the $750,000,000 appropriation which was added by the Senate yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. That action was taken by the Senate after the bill was reported from the committee. The figures to which I referred, as the Senator well knows, were compiled on the basis of the bill as it was reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me inquire whether the Senator considered the item of $167,000,000 which the committee unanimously voted to add to the bill, as I recall, for veterans' housing.

At this time I wish to say to the Senator from New Hampshire, and to all other Members of the Senate, that I think all the members of the subcommittee, with the exception of two who were absent—one of whom was absent because of illness and the other because of the necessity of attending another committee meeting—worked on this bill as few committees have ever worked on a bill during the time I have been in the Senate. I cannot say too much about the splendid work which was done by the Senator from New Hampshire and other Senators who felt that there should be economy.

As the matter has been worked out, we all realize that action on the bill will not be completed when the bill is passed by the Senate. I know perfectly well

that it will be necessary for the Senate conferees to make many concessions to the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives; and I feel that when the bill becomes law it will be a measure which even those of us who are economy minded will be glad to endorse.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the $400,000,000 item which was reported by the committee on behalf of UNRRA was increased by $350,000,000 on the floor of the Senate yesterday. Perhaps there is no more economically minded Member of the Senate than the Senator from Tennessee. Generally I agree with him. But I would go further than the Senator from Tennessee would go in reducing some of these items. The bill was a difficult one. The appropriations were large, and the committee did its work well. In some instances we felt that some of the House figures could have been reduced. I regret that some of the other members of the committee did not see the situation in that light. Nevertheless, I do not condemn the Senator from Tennessee but, on the contrary, I have great admiration for his courage and his vision.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask what is the justification for the item? I understood that had been raised above the Budget estimate.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to say so.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are involved four items in the total amount. Three of them were favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. We received a Budget estimate of $50,000 for marine statistics, and so forth, which are to be gathered. That is one item.

The other item is the quarterly report on labor forces in the United States. It is highly important.

There is involved also a consumers' income study. All those matters were estimated by the Budget. Three of them were rejected by the House committee. We received an additional Budget estimate and restored them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior," on page 38, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

For payment to certain individual Sioux Indians, their heirs or devisees, in full settlement of their claims against the United States for personal property losses, as authorized by the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 97), including payment of attorney fees and other expenses authorized by said act, $111,630, to remain available as provided in said act: *Provided*, That the respective Indian agency superintendents, acting as ex officio guardians, shall have authority to make application for, and to receive, payment of the amounts due the said claimants, their heirs or devisees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation—Reclamation fund, special fund," on page 39, line 4, after "offices)", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 5, after the words "General investigations", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 1, after the word "fund", to strike out "$20,442,000" and insert "$22,042,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund, construction," on page 40, line 11, after "Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$6,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 22, after the figures "$550,000", to strike out "switchyards, $1,600,000" and insert "switchyards at Shasta and Keswick Dams, $800,000"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "transmission lines, Oroville to Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, $730,000, and Sacramento between substations, 230 kilovolt, $50,000"; and on page 41, line 2, after the words "in all", to strike out "$19,215,000" and insert "$17,635,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the acting chairman of the committee that this amendment is a controverted one. We are proceeding so well through the bill that it occurs to me that we might well dispose of the remaining amendments, at least those as to which there will be no objection, and then return to this amendment and consider it. I refer to the amendment beginning in line 22 on page 40, and ending in line 2, on page 41. I refer particularly to the item of switchyards at Shasta and Keswick Dams, and transmission lines from Oroville to Sacramento.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I am agreeable to that amendment being passed over for the time being, but I do not believe there is any necessity for the amendments being passed over pertaining to the Kings River project in California and the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I am making a suggestion with reference only to the amendment which I have indicated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that it would be satisfactory to pass that amendment over for the time being.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the consideration of the amendment is merely being postponed?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am suggesting that consideration of the amendment be postponed until we have reached the end of the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to be on the floor of the Senate when the matter is considered. I should like to get some lunch, and I wondered if I would have time to do so before consideration of the amendment is taken up. My interest in it is a detached one, but I understood from some maps which were sent to my office that the transmission line, which was built by the Government, will, in effect, parallel lines which are already in use.

Mr. HAYDEN. A direct issue of fact is involved which will have to be presented to the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Government should go into the power business and compete with private lines which are already in the field. It is all right for the Government to sell power at the switchboard. That is the only interest I have in the matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the Senator will be interested in hearing the discussion which will take place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 2, to insert:

Kings River project, California, $197,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 4, after "Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$6,500,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill something about the appropriation in line 4 on page 41. The Senator will recall that the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I appeared before the committee on behalf of a transmission line known as the Brush, Sterling, and Hollyoke Transmission Line, which extends down into Nebraska, and in which the Senator from Nebraska has considerable interest.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say that the two Senators from Colorado not only appeared before the committee, but they appeared very effectively and obtained an additional $500,000 for the construction of transmission lines. It had the full approval of the acting chairman of the committee. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is understood that the item to which I have referred is included, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is so understood. It was so understood in the committee, and I hope that the Senate will understand also that $500,000 of this appropriation is to be used for the building of a transmission line from Brush into the southwestern part of Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my capacity as the acting chairman of the committee, I make that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in line 4, on page 41.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 7, after "Columbia Basin project, Washington," to strike out "$10,050,000" and insert "$10,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 9, after "Total, general fund, con-

struction", to strike out "$42,765,000" and insert "$45,132,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this amendment should be passed over for the time being in view of the fact that several other items in connection with this amendment were also passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to point out that generally speaking, the appropriations will not represent the total amount that will eventually be appropriated. They are merely a start. I do not wish the Senate to be led astray into believing that this will be the end. Many of these projects will require larger appropriations later on. For example, the Hungry Horse project in Montana involves initially approximately only $1,500,000, but it will take a little later $48,000,000, and later on about $35,000,000, or, roughly speaking, $80,000,000. That same situation is true of many of these projects. The ground work is being laid for the expenditure of large sums of money, and I want the Senate to know what it is doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River development fund," page 41, line 21, after "774)", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$41,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fort Peck project, Montana," on page 42, line 1, before the word "to", to strike out "$480,000" and insert "$1,335,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin," on page 42, line 7, after "(58 Stat. 887", to strike out "$10,269,100" and insert "$11,402,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 8, to insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Administrative provisions: The limitation contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, on the number of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles which may be purchased is hereby increased from "280" to "380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 14, to insert:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Topographic surveys: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Topographic surveys," $13,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 17, to insert:

Geologic surveys: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Geologic survey," $800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 19, to insert:

Gaging streams: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Gaging streams," including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, $321,100, and the amount that shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities is hereby increased from "$1,300,000" to "$1,620,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the top of page 43, to insert:

Classification of lands: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Classification of lands," $800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 2, to insert:

Arkansas River compact: For payment of the compensation, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, including time performed in travel, and expenses, including travel, of the person appointed by the President, pursuant to Public Law 34, Seventy-ninth Congress, to participate as the representative of the United States in the negotiation of a compact between the States of Colorado and Kansas relative to the division of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, to be available until June 30, 1947, $15,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to the contrary, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer of the Army as such representative without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer who shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 17, to insert:

BUREAU OF MINES

Drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo.: For continuing the construction of the drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo., including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, to remain available until expended, $485,000, of which $8,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service," on page 44, line 15, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$123,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 18, to insert:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents," including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1946, $20,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I inquire if that item comes under the supervision of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources which is headed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. McKELLAR. I am afraid it does not, but the Senator from Maine is present, and can no doubt answer the question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Maine is chairman of the special committee referred to, and I wondered if this item had his approval.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say I never had the item called to my attention before. I take it there are a few rodents and other obnoxious animals in the State of Maine, and if there are, they should be speedily destroyed, and I would unhesitatingly favor an appropriation for that purpose, a part of which would go to my State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that while the proposal was not well presented to the committee, as he will recall, still in fairness and justice it seemed to the committee that the item should be allowed, and it was allowed, I think, by a vote of the full committee, although I am not absolutely sure as to that.

Mr. GURNEY rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps the Senator from South Dakota can tell us about it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there was a larger appropriation than this in the regular appropriation bill. This item is for a deficiency, and I believe it should be adopted.

Stockmen and others in the States where coyotes are killing sheep and calves are not at all satisfied with the administration of the fund. It is not spread evenly and the results desired are not obtained.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is particularly interested in this item, as I am, for our States have been discriminated against, and, for certain, we are going to require a more efficient program before we give our consent to the next authorization. A proposal has been suggested to the Fish and Wildlife Service which will better the program, and I am sure that it will be forthcoming.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy the Senator from South Dakota has made those remarks on the floor so that the Commission will have due notice of them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word further. I was out of the Chamber when this item was reached; I came in just in time to hear the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire say something about the State of Maine. I gathered from what he said that this was a matter of peculiar interest to Maine. As a matter of fact, I know nothing of the testimony about this item, as I was not on the subcommittee, but I do know that for a long time those interested in the fish and wildlife resources of the country have been fighting desperately to control rodents and predatory animals and all other forms of life destructive to our useful and worth-while wildlife. This is a small appropriation, and I believe it should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 45, after line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government in the Territories—Government of the Virgin Islands," on page 46, line 7, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I trust Senators will appreciate the significance

of this item. It is under the heading "Government of the Virgin Islands," and reads:

Municipal government of St. Croix: For defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I., because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1946—

The House provided $100,000, and the Senate has increased that amount to $150,000.

Are we not establishing an unsound principle here? I was not in favor of this item in the committee, and I do not know that the distinguished acting chairman of the committee favored it, but I should like to have him explain it, so that we may all understand what we are doing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to explain it.

We bought the Virgin Islands from Denmark. We also came into possession of Puerto Rico, but not in the same way. We have both those islands. Their principal revenues have been derived from the tax on rum. Puerto Rico is allowed to use the tax she collects on rum, but, on the contrary, in the case of the Virgin Islands the tax on rum is paid into the Treasury of the United States. It amounted to about two and a half million dollars normally, as I recall, but it ran up during the war to a very much larger sum, perhaps $20,000,000——

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am in error about that. It was about $4,000,000, or double what it had been previously.

Mr. GURNEY. The $20,000,000 figure which the Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. McKELLAR. Which I had in mind was for the whole time.

Mr. GURNEY. No. That was the figure for Puerto Rico.

Mr. McKELLAR. For Puerto Rico?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it was during the whole war that the figure reached about $20,000,000. That was paid into the Treasury of the United States, when, if we had treated the Virgin Islands as we treated Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands would have had that much money for their own purposes.

Governor Harwood before the House committee had this to say:

Mr. CANNON—

Mr. CANNON is chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House—

Mr. CANNON. How much revenue would you say will accrue to the United States Government from liquor exported from the islands during the fiscal year?

Governor HARWOOD. During this fiscal year we will not receive as much as in the last year. We had a banner year and paid the United States Treasury upward of $25,000,000. The falling off of sales and revenues had been tremendous. We have been exporting some from St. Thomas, but from St. Croix not much has been exported this year, so the income taxes on profits from liquor sales will be very meager.

We have been paying these deficiencies for a number of years—whether rightly or wrongly, it is no use to consider at this time. We have been paying them. For this purpose the Senate committee has allowed $150,000; we have increased the amount which the House allowed, which was $100,000.

Under the circumstances, since we are treating one island differently from another, and since we have received the rum taxes from the Virgin Islands, which are very poor and their revenues even from rum are going down, as has been shown, it seemed to a majority of the committee that this amount ought to be allowed, and it was allowed. I hope the Senate will approve it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have not the exact figures here, but in the period of years when WPA relief was being granted we paid out in relief to the Virgin Islands, roughly, twice as much as we paid for the islands in the first place.

Earlier in the bill, on page 16, lines 15, 16, and 17, we recommend $1,878,420 for Virgin Island public works, which is an increase of approximately $1,300,000 over the House figure. Now we come to the point where we are not only dealing with the islands as a whole, but dealing with individual communities of the islands, and it is said we will make up any deficit that occurs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that Congress passed a legislative bill authorizing for public works the sum of $10,000,000. This appropriation of $1,878,420 is in part compliance with that authorization. We may have made a mistake in authorizing it, but we did authorize it, and the Committee on Appropriations felt, under the proof before us, that we should make the appropriation. The authorization bill was passed on December 20, 1944, nearly a year ago. That would have been the time to determine whether or not we should appropriate the money.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me point out that the authorization of money in advance, wholesale, which the Senate and the House have been doing, is a very dangerous practice. When an authorization bill is before us it is said, "This is not an appropriation, it does not obligate us to make an appropriation, we are merely authorizing an appropriation." In most every instance I know of, when we authorize an appropriation, we eventually have to appropriate the money. There are only a few instances where that has not been done.

I have been told by many Members of the Senate and by representatives of the Government that when we authorize that does not bind us to appropriate. If that be true, we are not bound in this case. This is not the time for appropriate action in the matter but it is the time to point to the danger of the practice. I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, in his heart, generally speaking, agrees with me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was not that the point the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate with regard to the projects on page 40?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Especially the one on line 6, page 41, where we start in with an authorization of $1,500,000 for planning, and we may wind up with an appropriation in the next year or two of $75,000,000.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that I agree with him fully in the statement he has just made. When authorizations come before us those in support of them say, "This is merely an authorization. We have the power to withhold the appropriation, and we need not make the appropriation when the time comes." But after they get their foot in the door with an authorization they come back and say that we are compelled to appropriate, that we have authorized it, and that we must appropriate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Nebraska for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate. What he has said is absolutely accurate. In authorization bills, not only the Senate but the Congress as a whole, are wont to say the very things the Senator has repeated, namely, "This is merely an authorization, and we can vote for it," but after we vote for it, it is claimed we are committed, and that argument is made before the Committee on Appropriations. I hope the Senate will view authorization bills with a great deal more care in the future than has been the practice in the past. I take this occasion to thank both Senators for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I always endeavor to agree with the Senator from Tennessee, but sometimes, in order to do what we might think is correct, we go even further than waiting for an authorization bill. For instance, last evening—and I think correctly—we appropriated $750,000,000 for UNRRA when we did not have a technical authorization.

Mr. McKELLAR. But that appropriation is dependent on the authorization being passed, and if it should fail to pass, the money would not become available.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Mexico is to be complimented just as the Senator from Tennessee has complimented the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Hampshire. Regardless of the merits or demerits of UNRRA, to my mind it was improper for us yesterday to appropriate $750,000,000, or any amount, without an authorization. I admit that I offered the motion to appropriate $400,000,000 in the Committee on Appropriations, because we were pressed. I again wish to say that when the Committee on Appropriations is meeting, and doing the best it can, as the chairman knows, for him to be called on the telephone, as he was, and told that an additional amount had to be appropriated, without any hearing before the committee or anything of the kind——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; Mr. President. The chairman was not told it had to be done. Oh, no. The very strongest kind of hopes were expressed, but there were no orders given or received.

Mr. BRIDGES. I withdraw that statement. No one orders the Senator from Tennessee around. But very strong hopes were expressed that the Committee on Appropriations would act before the Senate had authorized the appropriation. Certainly it was illegal and unethical to do it that way. Yet I was a party to reporting the bill from the Committee on Appropriations with the $400,000,000 provision for UNRRA in it, because of the dire emergency that was urged. I do not approve of the system, and I think we should never again consider anything so urgent that we cannot at least determine the facts before appropriating funds.

I hope the acting chairman of the committee and the committee itself will never again allow themselves to be forced into such a position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal activities and general administration," on page 46, after line 9, to insert:

Office of the Assistant Solicitor General: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Office of the Assistant Solicitor General," $29,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 14, to insert:

FERERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Damage claims: For the payment of a claim for damages to privately owned property adjusted and determined by the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment and settlement of certain claims arising out of the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation," approved March 20, 1936 (31 U. S. C. 224b), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 113, Seventy-ninth Congress, $37.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State," on page 51, after line 18, to insert:

Representation allowances, foreign service: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Representation allowances, foreign service," $23,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 52, line 12, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,770,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International obligations," on page 52, line 22, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Bureau of Accounts," on page 54, after line 8, to insert:

Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses," including the objects specified under this head in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1946, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Military activities—Damage claims," on page 55, line 14, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 107, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, in line 16, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$118,144.91" and insert "$276,627.43."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, lines 16 and 17, in lieu of the sum "$276,627.43" it is proposed to insert "$274,127.43."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, by mistake a claim of $2,500 was duplicated, and the amendment makes the proper correction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting chairman of the committee a question in connection with the citizens' military training and the ROTC. I have received several letters from colleges which say their funds for the ROTC will be cut off March 1. Does that activity fall within the classes which will be discontinued because of lack of appropriations? May I inquire into that situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have additional information about that. It might be that the Senator or the Senator's constituents are referring to B–12 of the Navy, as I think it is called, which is a similar organization for training. That will be cut off on the 31st of March, but the activity the Senator from Massachusetts is referring to will not be cut off. It will proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask, is there any method by which it can, or in the mind of the chairman should, be continued until July 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator refer to the Navy program?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; to the ROTC program.

Mr. McKELLAR. The ROTC program will continue right along.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the inquiries which the Senator from Massachusetts has received relate to the bill which was disposed of a few days ago—the bill dealing with rescissions of appropriations. An argument was raised in connection with it as to whether under the rescission sufficient money should be allowed to carry on the work in the colleges up to the 30th of next June or whether it should be stopped in the spring of next year. We provided that the work should continue to the 30th of June. The House insisted upon it being cut off earlier than that—in March or April. That is in another bill, not in this measure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee in the item for damage claims in connection with military activities, in lines 16 and 17, on page 55, has not been disposed of as yet, has it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; that amendment is pending.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee a question, if he will yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the basis of these claims?

Mr. McKELLAR. The claims are for damages resulting from military activities. The language is as follows:

For the payment of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 107 and House Document No. 349, Seventy-ninth Congress, $276,627.43.

This amount represents all kinds of claims of the smaller character which are filed with the War Department. Congress gave the Secretary of War power to determine them and to submit them to the Congress for payment.

Mr. WHERRY. The statute, as I recall it, fixes a maximum amount of $1,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my recollection. It is a very small amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The War Department may settle a claim up to $1,000 without reference to Congress. If it is above $1,000 it must be listed in a document sent to Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. And if a claim is for more than $1,000 it comes to the Senate Committee on Claims?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I desired to ask the distinguished acting chairman a question, but first I wanted to lay the foundation for it by having an explanation of what the claims are. Is the amount provided in this item to cover the total of the claims, or is it simply for the balance of claims——

Mr. McKELLAR. Claims of this nature represent a continuing transaction. For instance, if a jeep belonging to the War Department runs over a person and hurts him, but not very badly, and the claim is for less than $1,000, it is included with such claims and passed upon by the Secretary of War.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator place in the RECORD a statement showing the number of claims of this character.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may do so, I should like to give a typical claim of this nature? This is one of them:

William F. Finke, Kittie Finke, and Carris Finke, Route No. 4, Metropolis, Ill. On December 9, 1944—

A little over a year ago—

an Army airplane engaged in operations incident to the noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army set claimants' house on fire, destroying furnishings and personal property, thereby resulting in a loss to claimants in the amount of $1,954.44.

That is a good illustration of the kind of claims which the Congress very properly, in my judgment, left to the Secretary of War to decide. The Secretary of War is required to pass on such claims.

Mr. WHERRY. We gave him that authority under a previous act which the Senator has just mentioned.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. But I wanted to know whether the Senator has any idea of the number of claims each fiscal year which the War Department itself passes upon, and for which Congress provides payment. Then I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator that it would be well to have a list of all claims, amounting to more than $1,000, for which Congress provides payment. If a statement of that sort could be presented on the floor of the Senate, it would not only be informative but I believe it would be astounding.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that we do not have before us the facts with regard to claims, but I will write a letter to the War Department and obtain a list of claims which have been presented during the past year.

Mr. WHERRY. The claims we are now considering are only minor claims. On top of that are the claims in amount of thousands of dollars presented to the House and Senate Claims Committees. The item in the bill is really but a drop in the bucket.

Mr. McKELLAR. The larger claims the Senator referred to are acted upon by the Claims Committees.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senate should be given the information I have requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment on page 55, lines 16 and 17, to strike out "$276,627.43" and insert in lieu thereof "$274,127.43."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was: On page 55, after line 17, to insert:

CITIZENS' MILITARY TRAINING

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The third proviso under the head "Reserve Officers' Training Corps" in the Military Appropriation Act, 1946, is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "or for additional motor transport or tank units unless in replacement of existing cavalry units"; and the fourth proviso under said head is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "Air Corps."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 56, line 24, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$81,759,000" and insert "$84,259,000"; and in line 25, after the word "expended", to strike out "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for constructing the Garrison (North Dakota) Reservoir beyond dimensions which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet or for constructing dikes or levees which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam" and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee to read a list of those projects.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are quite a number of them. Would the Senator be satisfied to have them placed in the RECORD, or would the Senator rather have them read?

Mr. BYRD. It would be very interesting to have them read to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a page or more of them, and I shall put them in the RECORD, if the Senator does not object.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a list of the several projects, as set forth on pages 11049 and 11050 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 27, 1945.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Data on flood-control reservoirs, including power-generating facilities

The supplemental estimates include 56 reservoir projects, of which the following 13 reservoirs include power-generating facilities:

Project	Total estimated Federal cost of project	Initial power installation (kilowatts)	Estimated cost of power features
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	$30,900,000	85,500	$5,660,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	35,300,000	160,000	11,005,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga.	17,400,000	66,000	3,220,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark.	6,470,000	17,000	1,253,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark.	11,080,000	42,000	2,647,000
Norfork Reservoir, Ark.	27,500,000	70,000	4,676,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark.	47,000,000	126,000	6,171,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.	59,315,000	70,000	8,094,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla.	21,435,000	45,000	6,914,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.	130,000,000	80,000	5,900,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky.	52,000,000	135,000	9,522,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	22,739,000	36,000	5,075,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn.	25,400,000	90,000	6,200,000

NOTE.—Based on power market studies made by the Federal Power Commission there is need for power at all of these projects.

I wish to point out for the information of the House that the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative KERR, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, will on tomorrow, upon the reading of the bill, offer an amendment which is intended to carry into effect the conclusions of the Civil Functions Subcommittee which had the hearings on these items and is based upon its report to which I have referred.

I shall at this point in the RECORD insert a copy of Judge KERR's amendment. I also shall insert at this point in the RECORD a list of the projects which are involved, some 119 in number, as they appear on pages 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the hearings of the Civil Functions Subcommittee:

"Amendment offered by Mr. KERR: On page 43, after line 2, insert the following:

" 'RIVERS AND HARBORS

" 'For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Rivers and harbors," including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $25,516,000, to remain available until expended.

" 'FLOOD CONTROL

" 'Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Flood control, general," including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $81,759,000: *Provided*, That any dam constructed at the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir site shall not be operated at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level unless operation at a higher pool elevation subsequently is authorized by law, and no part of this appropriation shall be used to design or construct dikes or levees for operating such dam at a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet above sea level.

" 'For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries," including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.' "

NOTE.—The foregoing accords in form, text, and amount with the Budget submission, with the exception of the proviso limiting the height of the Garrison Reservoir Dam to 1,830 feet above sea level, and the amount for "Flood control, general," which is $6,200,000 less than the estimate because of the proposal of the War Department subcommittee to eliminate the following projects:

Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo.	$1,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga.	200,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa.	3,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif.	2,000,000
Total	6,200,000

TABLE I.—*Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946, new work*

Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.	$75,000
Hudson River, N. Y.	515,000
Great Lakes to Hudson River waterway	2,000,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea	743,700
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	645,000
Potomac River water front, District of Columbia	413,000
James River, Va.	652,000
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	185,000
Pearl River, Miss. and La.	1,573,500
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.	8,439,500
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont.	1,185,000
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	2,700,000
Keweenaw waterway, Michigan	548,000

Racine Harbor, Wis	$72,300
Lorain Harbor, Ohio	131,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y	967,000
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	571,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif	7,100,000
Suisun Canal, Calif	160,000
Sacramento River, Calif	390,000
San Joaquin River, Calif	150,000
Columbia River and tributaries, Celilo Falls to Snake River	100,000
Total new work	24,316,000
MAINTENANCE	
Chesapeake & Delaware Canal	1,200,000
Total	25,516,000

TABLE II.—*Flood control, general—Supplemental estimate for fiscal year 1946*

Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H	$60,600
Mountain Brook Reservoir, N. H	521,500
Nashua, N. H	195,000
Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn	1,500,000
Norwick, Conn	632,000
Union Village Reservoir, Vt	1,000,000
Surry Mountain Reservoir, N. H	17,000
Knightville Reservoir, Mass	14,000
Hartford, Conn	285,000
Winsted, Conn	132,500
Springfield, Mass. (Mill River)	42,000
West Springfield, Mass. (Agawam)	338,000
Riverdale, Mass	403,000
Chicopee, Mass	170,000
Holyoke, Mass	500,000
Syracuse, N. Y	500,000
East Sidney Reservoir, N. Y	700,000
Whitney Point, N. Y	243,000
Elmira, N. Y	1,000,000
Lisle, N. Y	240,500
Bath, N. Y	295,500
Addison, N. Y	331,100
Almond Reservoir, N. Y	1,000,000
Canisteo, N. Y	250,700
Almond, N. Y	30,500
Sunbury, Pa	500,000
Williamsport, Pa	1,000,000
Wilkes-Barre, Hanover Township, Pa	135,000
Plymouth, Pa	400,000
York, Pa	218,200
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	1,000,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	1,000,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga	3,000,000
Homochitto River, Miss	15,000
Wallace Lake Reservoir, La	193,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Terre Noire Creek, Ark	100,300
Bayou Bodeau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, La	65,000
Bayou Bodeau Reservoir, La	1,000,000
Shreveport, La	500,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark	500,000
Memphis, Tenn	1,000,000
Buffalo Bayon, Tex	1,500,000
Columbus, Tex	212,300
John Martin Reservoir, Ark	500,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark	193,500
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo	1,000,000
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark	1,000,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark	3,000,000
Fort Smith, Ark	853,600
Little Rock, Ark	548,400
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	1,500,000
Canton Reservoir, Okla	2,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla	2,000,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Wister Reservoir, Okla	1,000,000
Hutchinson, Kans	500,000
Union Township drainage district levee, Missouri	47,000
Green Bay levee and drainage district No. 2, Iowa	49,300
Dry Run, Iowa	382,500
Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, S. Dak. and Minn	$45,800
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir, Minn	30,900
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans	2,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Osceola Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Mo	1,000,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak	2,000,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa	500,000
Omaha, Nebr	500,000
Hamburg, Iowa	236,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	500,000
Schuyler, Nebr	64,000
Hot Springs, S. Dak	154,000
Cotton Wood Springs Reservoir, S. Dak	510,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky	4,000,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	1,500,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn	3,000,000
Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga	200,000
Brevoort Levee, Ind	30,000
Muncie, Ind	70,000
Harrisburg, Ill	24,500
Golconda, Ill	29,200
Brookport, Ill	28,500
Mounds and Mound City, Ill	500,000
Newport, Ky	500,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio	1,500,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va	3,000,000
Massillon, Ohio	500,000
Parkersburg, W. Va	500,000
Dewey Reservoir, Ky	1,000,000
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio	1,000,000
Tionesta Reservoir, Pa	277,600
Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa	360,000
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa	494,000
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa	573,000
Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa	3,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa	3,000,000
Punxsutawney, Pa	500,000
Elkins, W. Va	500,000
Coal Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	500,900
Kelly Lake drainage and levee district, Illinois	97,900
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas and Kerton Valley drainage and levee district, Illinois	172,900
Sebewaing, Mich	241,800
Lancaster, N. Y	570,400
Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y	500,000
Santa Fe Reservoir, Calif	900,500
Los Angeles River, Calif	2,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif	2,000,000
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion, California	435,000
McKensie River, Oreg	62,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg	11,500
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg	2,000,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg	1,000,000
Mill Creek, Wash	125,600
Mud Mountain Reservoir, Wash	257,000
Tacoma, Wash	700,000
Yakima, Wash	134,000
Snagging	500,000
Round-off	−100
Total	85,159,000

TABLE III.—*Projects requiring additional funds for advance planning in fiscal year 1946*

Bennington Reservoir, N. H	$30,000
Nashua, N. H	7,000
West Peterboro, N. H	8,000
North Andover and Lawrence, Mass	9,000
North Plymouth Reservoir, N. Y	100,000
Genegentalet Reservoir, N. Y	60,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va	150,000
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La	150,000
Big and Little Sunflower Rivers, etc	150,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff, Mo	$15,000
Black River, Poplar Bluff, Mo., to Knobel, Ark	10,000
Creede, Colo	5,000
Louisville, Ky	100,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek levee, Ind	8,000
Indianapolis, Warfleigh section, Ind	8,000
Bald Hill Reservoir, N. Dak	35,000
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers, Minn	30,000
Kings River and Tulare Lake Basin, Ind., Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif.; Folsom Reservoir, Calif.; Table Mountain Reservoir, Iron Canyon site, Calif.; Terminus Reservoir, Calif.; Isabella Reservoir, Calif.	600,000
Harlan County Reservoir, Missouri River Basin, Nebr	300,000
Panther Mountain Reservoir, N. Y	50,000
Cahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	200,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak	100,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir, Kans	200,000
Success Reservoir, Calif	50,000
New Melones Reservoir, Calif	125,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg	100,000
Quartz Creek Reservoir, Oreg	150,000
Recreational investigations and plans	50,000
Total	2,800,000

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator at this time point out what total amount this initial appropriation may commit us to, what it is going to cost eventually to complete all these projects?

Mr. McKELLAR. We do not have all of them, because a great many of them are yet in the purely planning stage, and we do not have the estimates. I shall have to say to the Senator, as I said a few moments ago to another Senator, that I shall send for the information.

Mr. BRIDGES. My point is that it would be along the lines of authorization.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that, and I will send to the Department and obtain the figures and place them in the RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. Take, for example, the Buggs Island project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the Buggs Island project is provided for in this item, $1,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let us consider, for example, what it would cost to complete the Buggs Island project.

Mr. McKELLAR. That project, when completed, will cost $30,900,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. The point I wish to make is that when we appropriate $84,259,000 for a series of projects, one of which is Buggs Island, the appropriation for which is $1,000,000 of the $84,259,000——

Mr. McKELLAR. The cost of the project will be $30,900,800.

Mr. BRIDGES. I mean that of the $84,259,000, only $1,000,000 is for this particular project. When we commit ourselves to the extent of $1,000,000 we are committing ourselves to a future expenditure of $29,000,000 more. On just one item in the group.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is in error. We commit ourselves to it when a bill authorizing the construction of these projects is passed. We do not commit ourselves when we appropriate the money for planning. The Congress commits itself to the expenditure of these large sums in the authorization bills which we were discussing a while ago.

Mr. BRIDGES. It would be fair to assume, would it not, that in the case of most of these projects, by a token appropriation of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000, we commit ourselves to the expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars? If the projects are eventually completed, they will cost the taxpayers many hundreds of millions of dollars in the aggregate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is fair in that statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. For example, suppose we vote for appropriations for the Buggs Island project, which is in North Carolina, the Center Hill project in Tennessee, the Garrison project in North Dakota, the Wolf Creek project in Kentucky, the Narrows project in Arkansas, the Blakely Mountain project in Arkansas, or the Bluestone project in West Virginia and Virginia. If we vote for token appropriations of $1,000,000, $2,000,000, or $3,000,000, for projects the cost of which runs from $15,000,000 to $130,000,000, does the Senator consider that by voting such token appropriations we are obligating ourselves to put up the rest of the money?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. We are obligated by the act of Congress which authorizes the various projects. This appropriation covers merely the beginning of the carrying out of the authorizations which have heretofore passed the Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make a statement with reference to these projects. I believe that they are as meritorious as almost any projects for which the Government could spend money.

Mr. McKELLAR. Most of them will be self-liquidating projects. The power projects which the Government has already built, if honestly administered—and I have no doubt they will be eventually, if not now—will return to the Government every dollar that the Government pays for them. There are some reclamation projects, or combined reclamation and reservoir projects, with respect to which a return might not be so certain; but by furnishing additional land for the people to cultivate, in my judgment they will return to the Government every dollar that is appropriated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In that connection I wish to say that it is not only the power projects which are meritorious. Certainly much revenue will be returned directly to the Government from those projects. Without attempting to argue the merits of any particular power project, I believe that many of them are fully justified. My particular interest in these projects—and particularly those in my State—is flood control. I am not trying to pass upon the merits of all the other projects. There is no direct revenue coming into the Treasury from the operation of flood-control projects, but they contribute to the national economy and to the conservation and development of our national resources, as well as to the enhancement of the use of those resources. In my State there are some of the richest valleys in the world—the Mississippi River Valley, the Arkansas River Valley, the White River Valley, and the Red River Valley. If those valleys are not protected from floods they are practically useless; but as we are able to control the floods those valleys are most productive, and great development is possible. These projects are for that purpose.

With regard to the inquiry made by the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] with respect to our continuing obligation, or the extent of the obligation which we incur by reason of making an initial appropriation, my thought is—and I am speaking only for myself—that certainly we ought not to make any appropriation unless we intend to complete the project. It seems to me that it would be very foolish and wasteful and certainly not the economical thing to do to make an appropriation and spend $1,000,000 on some project which will probably later be abandoned. If there is any thought that such a thing might occur, we ought not to make the initial appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

In the processes of developing this character of legislation, after having the projects surveyed and investigated by the most competent agency in the Government for that purpose, the Corps of Engineers, and after receiving a report as to the economic feasibility and justification of the projects, the Congress then authorizes them.

With reference to the projects in my State, from the information which I have I think I can say without reservation or qualification that I honestly believe them to be fully justified economically. I can see no point whatsoever in taking the position that we will appropriate $1,000,000 to start a project when the probability is that later it will be abandoned. If we make the initial appropriation we ought to intend to complete the project; and I vote for this appropriation with that purpose in mind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is much more straightforward in his approach to this question—and he is always straightforward in his approach to all questions—than are some who advocate such projects. I do not question the meritorious character of many of the projects. I am only making the point that when we appropriate a relatively small amount—and three or four million dollars is not a small amount—we are committing ourselves to total appropriations for a large number of projects which will eventually mean the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. I am only trying to make Senators realize what they are doing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the Senator's statement is absolutely correct with respect to an initial appropriation for a project of this character, and with respect to many other appropriations which we make as partial payments, or appropriations to start projects. In one sense they are "come-on" appropriations. But I still maintain that we ought not to make any appropriation unless we intend to go through with the project.

In this connection let me say that there has been a great deal of concern about unemployment, full employment, and Government spending and investing to guarantee—or assure—everyone a job. Senators can choose whichever term appeals to them. Many proposals have been offered in that field. I have earnestly supported the authorization of projects of this character, particularly those in my State and those on streams which traverse my State. I have done so with the thought in mind primarily, of course, that they are constructive in character and that they contribute to our national wealth and national economy, and, secondly, because I believe that they are the character of projects in which the Government can well afford to invest, not merely for the purpose of creating jobs, although incidentally such expenditures will create many millions of man-hours of labor; also, appropriations for such meritorious projects will certainly lessen the need for appropriations for experimental projects, many of which will never bring back a dollar of return to this Government. I would much rather appropriate money for projects of this character, which provide men with jobs, when there is some hope of making a contribution to our national wealth, than to make appropriations to pay unemployment-compensation insurance. I think it is much sounder to pursue this policy than to pursue the policy of making appropriations for many other purposes not so worthy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me point out in this connection that in the Appropriations Committee there was considerable discussion about the reclamation fund, for example. I approve of the reclamation fund; I think the principle which was established was a correct one and that all through the early days the procedure was sound. But I was amazed to find that the earnings of the Grand Coulee Dam go into the reclamation fund and cannot be used from that fund except as authorized by Congress. I was astonished to find that the earnings of that dam and other very large projects similar to it do not go into the general fund in the Treasury. The Grand Coulee Dam and the other large developments cost tremendous sums of money to construct, and the cost of construction was paid for with money from the general funds of the country, accumulated by the taxpayers. We were told—and we all assumed—that the net proceeds from the operation of the dams would go to amortize their cost.

Mr. President, I should think that funds received from the operation of such great projects certainly should go into the general funds in the Treasury. Any Member of the Senate who stands

here and states that any similar project will be paid for by having the money obtained as a result of its operations go into the general fund is going to have to stretch a point even in his own mind to believe that his statement is true. I believe that the money obtained as a result of the operations of these projects should go into the general funds of the United States Treasury. I think the able senior Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who serve on other committees which have the matter under consideration might very well work out such a procedure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very happy to hear the Senator say that he thinks all the money obtained from the operations of such projects should be paid into the Treasury of the United States. I agree with him entirely. I think that should be done. What causes me to refer to this matter in the first place is the wonderful hydroelectric power project we have in Tennessee. It consists of many dams, and it brings in a large income. It certainly, beyond any question, will pay back every dime the Government has spent on it. However, the money is not being paid into the Treasury. I hope the Senator will help me in the effort to see that the income from that project is paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree that that should be done; I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that contained in the $84,000,000 appropriation is an item of $2,000,000 which is appropriated for the purpose of actually starting construction of the first of the large Missouri River dams authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. The money will not be used for the pouring of concrete, but to get ready to pour concrete. This appropriation is not the first one. The first one was, of course, for engineering services; and other appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation have been made for the dam known as the Garrison Dam, in North Dakota, and for some of the dams in my own State of South Dakota. Those appropriations have been used for preliminary engineering services, on the part both of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. So this $2,000,000 appropriation will provide for the commencement of construction.

We have had much information on the floor of the Senate and in committee about the total cost of these worth-while flood-control-irrigation dams. I am sure that with this start of construction at the Garrison Dam there will be a subsequent request by the Army engineers for a larger amount of funds in the regular appropriation bill which will come before the Congress next spring. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas when he says that these projects are worth while. They certainly are worth the money which Uncle Sam spends on them; and we who live in the Dakotas and, I am sure, the people in other States along the Missouri River deeply appreciate the support which the Congress has given by passing the authorization measures. We express our thanks now for making a beginning by providing funds in accordance with the requests which have come from the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 56, in line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to what has been said by the able Senator from South Dakota. This project in North Dakota—the Garrison dam and resultant irrigation—will not merely provide jobs during the period following the war, especially jobs for servicemen, but it will stabilize the entire agriculture of North Dakota. That section of the United States is subject to periodical droughts which have occurred throughout our history. In 1934 there was an extremely serious drought which forced our people to sell most of their livestock. If at that time we had had an irrigation project similar to the one provided for by the item which has been under discussion here, our people could have produced enough forage to enable them to keep their herds, and thus it would not have been necessary for so many of our people to go on relief. Shortly after the 1934 drought, 53 percent of the people of North Dakota were on relief. Following that time, during the war we were able to pay off most of the feed and seed loans, at 5-percent interest while ranking first of all States in reaching our E-bond quotas in four bond drives, and we produced more than a billion bushels of small grain and potatoes and nearly 10,000,000 head of livestock. Once again we were able to stabilize our agricultural operations. That extreme variation would not have occurred at all if we had had available irrigation facilities similar to the ones which the appropriation under discussion provides, and would also provide for the generation of vast amounts of cheap electricity so sorely needed by the farmers of North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in entire accord with the views of Senators who have expressed themselves in favor of irrigation, reclamation, and power projects.

In particular reference to my own State, let me say that the upper section of South Carolina is well developed insofar as industries are concerned. For the information of the Senate and also of the people of the United States and of the world, let me say that last month 26 percent of all cotton spindles running in the United States were to be found in the State of South Carolina. On the other hand, very few were running in the lower section of South Carolina.

In the upper area of our State most of the available hydroelectric power has been developed, and, of course, all industrial plants which are established in that part of the State are located in close proximity to the sources of power. But in the lower part of the State there were very few industrial plants until the Government developed what is known as the Santee-Cooper project. That development occurred a few years ago, and now we find that industries are beginning to be established in the lower part of South Carolina, with the result that millions of dollars are coming into that section of the State and employment is being given to thousands of people there. Before that happened, nothing but agriculture was to be found in that section of our State. However, today we are able to locate industries there.

That means that more tax money will be paid into the Federal Treasury by the people who obtain work. It will also be found that there will be less unemployment. We need a better distribution between industry and agriculture.

I was glad to hear the Senator from North Dakota state the conditions as they prevail in his State. The people in that region are in the same plight as those who reside in the lower area of South Carolina. I believe that much good will result by an appropriation of the sum requested.

I am very pleased to note that approximately $1,000,000 will be devoted to the Clark Hill Reservoir development between South Carolina and Georgia. It will be found that in that section there are no industries, but only 50 miles from there where power is available industries have been located because of the availability of power.

Mr. President, I think the appropriation, if granted, will be well spent and that it will bring to the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars in the form of taxes and that employment will at the same time be afforded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I join in what has been said by my distinguished colleague [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. During the drought period which my colleague has mentioned, I was the Governor of North Dakota. I found, to my amazement, that practically nothing had been done in the way of obtaining irrigation for North Dakota. At the same time, in Montana, a State west of North Dakota, there were more than a million acres of irrigated land. In North Dakota there are only 21,409 acres of irrigated land. In other words, Congress has taken exceedingly good care of the State of Montana and some of the other Western States, but has neglected North Dakota. During the time I was Governor there was established the first water board in the State of North Dakota. We appropriated money and obtained some of the most competent engineers who could be hired.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to pay tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, as President of the United States, came to North Dakota and remained there for a day and a half. He drove in an automobile all over the western section of North Dakota, and saw for himself the desperate plight of the farmers. As my colleague has said, roughly 53 percent of the people of North Dakota were on relief. The farmers could not pay taxes. The public utilities had not been paying them for various reasons until a short time previously. Even the railroads had not been paying their just share of taxes. The result was that more than 1,100 school districts in North Dakota were rendered insolvent or partially so. The President of the United States recommended that

North Dakota receive aid from the Federal Government, and we did receive aid in order to keep our schools open. The people of Montana did not have to lose all their cattle, but only their sheep. However, in North Dakota many farmers who had paid $60 a head for cattle saw their cattle shot, and received for them from the Government $17, $18, $19, and $20 a head when they were killed at the request of the former Secretary of Agriculture.

So, Mr. President, I join in the hope that nothing will be done to reduce the proposed appropriation, and that everything will be done that can be done to see that North Dakota gets the 1,100,000 acres of irrigated land to which the State was entitled a long time ago.

When the original irrigation act was passed North Dakota was the only State which, for some reason or other, never used approximately $12,000,000 which was allocated to it. Instead of that money being spent for irrigation about 35 years ago, it was allowed to revert to the general fund of the United States Government, although every other State in America used the money which was allocated to it. Out of all the vast sum of money which was made avalable to North Dakota the only irrigation project which was built was a small one at Williston, N. Dak., which afterwards fell into disuse.

Mr. President, I certainly wish to commend the Senator from South Dakota and my colleague. We have done everything we could possibly do in order to see that at last, after many years, our representatives in Congress are on the job and seeing to it that North Dakota obtains irrigation for the area of land the State was entitled to have irrigated many years ago. I think that now we shall be on a par at least with the State of Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I join with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] in the remarks which he made relative to appropriations in particular, for the Missouri River Basin. The appropriation makes possible what is generally known as the so-called Peck plan which has been endorsed by both the senior Senator from Nebraska and myself.

I also endorse the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. When we start making these appropriations we should mean what we say. That is what I had reference to when I called attention to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. If we believe in these projects we should be willing to appropriate for them. As a member of the committee, I wish to have the RECORD made clear that I have done and will continue to do all that I can do in order to see to it that appropriations are made available not only for flood control, and power projects within my State, but reclamation projects as well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for including reclamation projects in his endorsement. It is a very important matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A great deal of sniping has been commenced against reclamation appropriations. I am glad to know that at the present time, as he previously has been, the Senator from Nebraska is in favor of supporting such appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24 on page 56, and in line 25 down to line 15 on page 57.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in connection with the Garrison Reservoir I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point pages 301 to 308, both inclusive, and pages 336 to 338, both inclusive, from the hearings upon this item which is intended for the protection of the Three Affiliated Tribes on the Fort Berthold Reservation.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE SENATE INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON POSITION OF INDIANS ON GARRISON RESERVATION PROJECT

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief statement supplementing what I said a little while ago?

Senator MCKELLAR. Certainly, Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have here a brief statement of what occurred before the Committee on Indian Affairs. It appears from the testimony of Mr. Martin T. Cross, a member of the Gros Ventre Tribe, and chairman of the Tribal Business Council of the Three Affiliated Tribes, which are the Arikara, Mandan, and Gros Ventre Tribes.

Mr. Cross testified that there are in this reservation approximately 600,000 acres of land, of which 221,000 acres would be flooded by the Garrison Dam.

In response to a question which I addressed to Mr. Cross with respect to where the Indians lived, he told me that they have about 500 homes on the reservation, and that of those 500 homes 437 would be inundated.

The chairman of this commiteee remembers very well the state of mind of the people in a historic town in Tennessee, when a dam was to be constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority which would have flooded out an area in which they lived and a cemetery in which they buried their dead. The Senator from Tennessee and the people from this town yielded finally only on the persuasion that the construction of that dam was essential to the prosecution of the war.

Senator MCKELLAR. That is the only thing in the world that brought it about.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The feeling of the people in this town was akin to the feeling that is expressed by these Indians.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Martin Fox declared in that hearing—and I am quoting Mr. Fox:

"Years ago, back in 1851, the United States commissioned a number of men to come up and meet us at Fort Laramie, Wyo. We had representatives there and we drew up obligations and agreements and declarations between the United States Government and ourselves. Those agreements and declarations and treaties are still binding with us.

"If there is anything that needs to be amended or needs to be modified in those agreements, it is the people themselves—the soldiers—who should remedy this, if anything comes up. Violations of the treaty have been made, not by this group of men, but by the War Department, and I wonder if the War Department," and I am quoting, General Wheeler.

General WHEELER. All right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. All right.

"I wonder if the War Department is not a little touched in the head."

That is what the Indian said.

He said further:

"All the original declarations and treaties were made between the military personnel and the Indians. I maintain that they are still binding, and I am opposed to this plan."

STUDY OF STATUS OF INDIAN-TREATY OBLIGATIONS

The chairman of the committee then called upon the Assistant Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, who was there representing the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to submit a memorandum to the commitee on the status of the treaty obligations; not having had the opportunity to examine the treaty, the members of the committee felt that it would be well to have a summary of that kind.

I do not intend to make this summary a part of the record, Mr. Chairman, but let me say briefly that it tells this story. That treaties were made with those Indians as far back as 1825, in which the United States recognized this general area as the country of the Indians. To quote the Acting Solicitor:

"Treaties made with the tribes in 1825 referred to the lands which they occupied as 'their country.'"

It was also provided that the Indians agreed to "give safe conduct to all persons who may be legally authorized by the United States to pass through their country."

Now, the boundaries of what was thus referred to as "their country" embraced lands concerning which we are talking about today. It was a large territory which involved millions of acres of land—about 10,000,000 acres, all told.

There were Executive orders, and I find that these Executive orders were not the product of the New Deal, but this language on these orders was employed many years before, in reference to the Indians.

And by an Executive order dated August 8, 1868, one dated April 12, 1870, and one dated July 13, 1880——

Senator OVERTON. That was all under Republican administrations?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think so.

SUIT BY INDIANS OF NORTH DAKOTA AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The interpretation of the order was strict. The lands given to the Indians were diminished by some 9,846,186.93 acres of land.

Senator GURNEY. That is when the Indians of North Dakota filed a suit against the Government.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes; the Indians filed a suit, and Congress authorized them to do it, in the Court of Claims, on the theory that they had been damaged by the taking away of their land, and the Court of Claims held that the Indians were entitled to get back the value of the 9,846,186.93 acres of land.

Senator OVERTON. Why did not the Court of Claims allow them to take back their land?

JUDGMENT RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS

Senator O'MAHONEY, Senator OVERTON, I do not know, but it may be that they did not want to take it away from the South Dakotans. The Court of Claims rendered a judgment that the Indians were entitled to recover the value of this land, to the extent of $4,923,093.47. How they figured that 47 cents I do not know.

Now, in 1891 this question arose again, and again the question of the title of the Indians to these lands was recognized when a treaty was negotiated between the United States and the Three Affiliated Tribes, providing for the cession to the Federal Government of certain lands not needed by the Indians, and

for which the Government was to pay the Indians $800,000.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NONCEDED LANDS OF FORT BERTHOLD RESERVATION

Now, when the result of this treaty was promulgated—and it was promulgated by President Benjamin Harrison—he said this:

"I particularly notify all persons to observe that a certain portion of the said Fort Berthold Reservation not ceded," and that includes the 274,000 acres which would be flooded by the Garrison Dam "not ceded and relinquished by said agreement, is reserved for allotment to, and also as a reservation for, the said tribe of Indians; and all persons are, therefore, hereby warned not to go upon any of the lands so reserved, for any purpose or with any intent whatsoever, as no settlement or other right can be secured upon said lands, and all persons found unlawfully thereon will be dealt with as trespassers and intruders."

TREATY OF FORT LARAMIE WITH THE INDIANS

Now, in that famous treaty of Fort Laramie, when the Indians agreed to give the right of passage across their country, they authorized the United States to "establish roads, military and other posts"—and I am now quoting, Mr. Chairman, "to establish roads, military and other posts, within their respective territories."

That treaty, Mr. Chairman, has been in force, and it was a right that was granted by the Indians to the Federal Government.

EFFECT OF CONSTRUCTION OF GARRISON DAM ON INDIAN LANDS

That, Mr. Chairman, in brief, is the story which was told by the Indians to the Committee on Indian Affairs about the treaty made at the Fort Laramie Reservation.

It seems to me to be clear that when we appropriate this money to build this dam we will be taking the land of these Indians, and be subjected to another lawsuit, even if we insist upon disregarding the wishes of the Indians not to be compelled to leave their homes. There would be a very interesting legal question here involving just what the Indians could do to protect their rights. They may sue the Chief of Engineers, General Wheeler, or the Secretary of War, to enjoin them from building the dam; or they might wait until condemnation proceedings are instituted—and the Indians deny that under the treaty we have any right to condemn—and then, after condemnation proceedings are begun, they might seek to defend that in the courts.

I think it is my duty, as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, to lay before this committee the very serious question of the alleged invasion of the rights of the Indians by the construction of this dam.

Senator LANGER. And it will flood their lands.

LANDS TO WHICH INDIANS WOULD BE MOVED

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; they will have to leave their homes, and they say that the lands constitute the best portion of the reservation; and they will be driven to lands which are not as good grazing lands, and they say that they could not go into any other part of the State of North Dakota which would be as good.

Mr. Chairman, Senator LANGER, who was present at the hearings, calls my attention to a colloquy which took place between myself and Mr. Bateman, a member of the tribal business council, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. These questions were asked by Senator LANGER of Mr. Bateman:

"Senator LANGER. How many acres of this stuff will you have to have that they are trying to give you, to make a living?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Well, for my part they would have to give me the whole piece to make a living.

"Senator LANGER. In other words, it is rough land?

"Mr. BATEMAN. It is rough land.

"Senator LANGER. Buttes on it?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Yes, sir.

"Senator LANGER. Ravines?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Ravines.

"Senator LANGER. It is not fit for agricultural purposes at all, is it?

"Mr. BATEMAN. No, sir.

"Senator LANGER. It would have to be used entirely for grazing?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Grazing, mostly.

"Senator LANGER. And the land you have now, you have very fine farms?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Yes, sir.

"Senator LANGER. You have places that are level for miles and miles; is not that true?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Yes, sir. Grain will grow in dry seasons.

"Senator LANGER. You have subsoil many feet deep of fine chocolate-colored loam?

"Mr. BATEMAN. Yes, sir."

Senator OVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question.

Senator MCKELLAR. Very well.

Senator OVERTON. Are you opposed to the appropriation?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Not necessarily. This hearing I referred to was held on October 9.

Senator OVERTON. Of what year?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of 1945.

The counsel for the Bureau of Indian Affairs was not prepared to give us at that time the information with reference to the Indian treaties, and I asked him for this memorandum and I was under the impression that the memorandum was not yet received, but after coming to the hearing room this afternoon I telephoned to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and I found that it had been submitted. The Committee on Indian Affairs, because of other pressing matters, like hearings before the Committee on Finance, and the Petroleum Committee, has not yet given attention to this matter. I do not want to speak for the committee, but I think the committee does owe an obligation to the Indians to consider this matter and to make a recommendation. I shall endeavor to do that before this matter now before us is taken up.

In the meantime, let me insert in the record here the memorandum submitted by Mr. Cohen, the Acting Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, appearing on pages 20–23 of the hearings held on October 9, 1945.

Senator OVERTON. That may be done.

That record reveals that whenever the Government wanted any of the lands, they took it?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Senator OVERTON. And compensated them for it?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is a conclusion but not my statement of fact.

Senator OVERTON. Thank you, Senator.

(The memorandum referred to is as follows:)

"MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY FELIX S. COHEN, ACTING SOLICITOR, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"In response to the request of your committee, I am submitting this memorandum supplementing my statement of October 9 and dealing specifically with: (1) The character of the title of land held by the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation; and (2) the legal means available to the Indians for the possible protection of such land.

"1. THE INDIAN TITLE

"The Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, comprising the Arikara, Mandan, and Gros Ventre (the last named are also variously referred to as Hidatsa, Minnetaree, or Balantse-Etoa), occupy an area in which they have lived at least since the time of the earliest white contacts with them (Handbook of American Indians, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bull. 30, pt. 1, p. 548). Treaties made with the Three Tribes in 1825 referred to the lands which they occupied as 'their country' and provided that they would 'give safe conduct to all persons who may be legally authorized by the United States to pass through their country.'[1] The boundaries of what was thus referred to as 'their country' were first set forth in the Treaty of Fort Laramie, September 17, 1851 (2 Kappler 594). Article 5 of that treaty provides, in part:

" 'The territory of the Gros Ventre, Mandans, and Arrickaras Nations, commencing at the mouth of Heart River; thence up the Missouri River to the mouth of the Yellowstone River; thence up the Yellowstone River to the mouth of Powder River in a southeasterly direction, to the headwaters of the Little Missouri River; thence along the Black Hills to the head of Heart River, and thence down Heart River to the place of beginning."

"By this treaty the signatory tribes recognized 'the right of the United States Government to establish roads, military and other posts, within their respective territories.' No other easement or interest was granted to the Federal Government by this treaty.

"Subsequently, by Executive orders dated August 18, 1868, April 12, 1870, and July 13, 1880 (Kappler, vol. 1, p. 883), the territory of these Indians, as originally set out in the Fort Laramie Treaty, was diminished. The land thus taken from the Indians was used in part for governmental purposes and the remainder was disposed of to railroads and individual settlers. This diminution effected unilaterally was later held by the Court of Claims to have been a violation of the possessory rights of these Indians, and on the basis of this decision a judgment was awarded to these Indians in 1930. The Indians were held to be entitled to recover the value of the 9,846,186.93 acres of land taken from them as of the time of the taking, which amounted, at 50 cents per acre, to $4,923,093.47, less offsets for past Federal expenditures amounting to $2,753,924.89, leaving a net judgment in favor of the Indians of $2,169,168.58.

"The Court of Claims found that the Indians 'had never given their consent to the action taken under the authority of the Executive orders of 1870 and 1880 and noted their objection when the facts became known to them' (at p. 327). Taking of lands from the Indians, the Court of Claims found, was a violation of the treaty. The treaty of 1851, the court found, provided that—

" 'The territory of the Indians was to be delimited in accord with their claims and protection assured them within its bounds. * * * Beyond doubt, the Indians so understood the treaty, and the Congress legislated in accord with its amended terms to which the Indians agreed * * *. The Indians' rights are not to be prejudiced by technical construction or words of doubtful import' (at p. 333).

"Because of a delay in submitting to the tribes a minor amendment to the treaty inserted by the Senate, the Fort Laramie treaty was not proclaimed or published in the usual course. Government officials thereafter assumed that no valid treaty existed, and it was in this belief that various portions of the Indian domain were disposed of without Indian consent. The Court of Claims found that the treaty, having been formally ratified, was valid and binding and

[1] Treaty of July 18, 1825, with Ricara Tribe (7 Stat. 259, art. 5); treaty of July 30, 1825, with Balantse-Etoa or Minnetaree Tribe (7 Stat. 261, art. 5); treaty of July 30, 1825, with the Mandan Tribe (7 Stat. 264, art. 5).

that the taking of lands without Indian consent subsequent to this treaty was a violation of its terms, justifying the Indian suit.

"In 1891 further recognition was given to the title of the Indians to the lands here in question when an agreement was negotiated between the United States and the Three Affiliated Tribes providing for the cession to the Federal Government of certain lands not needed by the Indians, for which the Federal Government paid $800,000, and guaranteeing Indian possession of the lands not so ceded. The agreement provides: 'That the residue of lands within said diminished reservation, after all allotments have been made as provided in article 3 of this agreement, shall be held by the said tribe of Indians as a reservation."[2] The significance of this guaranty is elaborated in the Presidential proclamation which followed the ratification of this agreement. That proclamation declared:

" 'I furthermore notify all persons to particularly observe that a certain portion of the Fort Berthold Reservation not ceded and relinquished by said agreement, is reserved for allotment to, and also as a reservation for, the said tribes of Indians; and all persons are, therefore, hereby warned not to go upon any of the lands so reserved, for any purpose or with any intent whatsoever, as no settlement or other right can be secured upon said lands, and all persons found unlawfully thereon will be dealt with as trespassers and intruders; * * *' (27 Stat. 979).

"Other agreements and statutes made with the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation are consistent with the foregoing provisions and guaranties.[3]

"In recent years the possessory rights of the Three Affiliated Tribes in their remaining tribal lands have been recognized and guaranteed in a constitution and charter issued under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), and ratified by vote of the Indians concerned.

"The constitution of the Three Affiliated Tribes, following the language of the governing statute, authorizes the tribal business council—

"(e) To approve or veto any sale, disposition, lease, or encumbrance of tribal lands, interests in lands, or other tribal assets which may be authorized or executed by any authorized official or agency of the Government, provided that no tribal lands shall ever be sold or encumbered, or leased for a period exceeding 5 years, except that mineral lands may be leased by the tribal business council for such longer periods as may be provided by law.

"This solemn pledge that the United States will not again, without Indian consent, deprive these Indians of any interest in their remaining lands, is further amplified in section 5 of the corporate charter ratified on April 24, 1937.

"The history of our Federal negotiations with these Indians indicates that at all times the guaranties and protections which these Indians asked from the Federal Government and which were granted to them from time to time in consideration of valuable cessions of territory, were not merely guaranties against private trespass, but were preeminently guaranties against any future taking of Indian land for governmental purposes. The spirit in which these guaranties were asked and given is that expressed over a century ago by Attorney General Wirt who, on the question of whether surveying parties might be sent over Indian soil without Indian consent, declared:

" 'So long as a tribe exists and remains in possession of its lands, its title and possession are sovereign and exclusive; and there exists no authority to enter upon their lands, for any purpose whatever, without their consent. Of the admission of this principle, the treaty above referred to furnishes a proof. The United States stood in need of a road through the lands of the Senecas from Fort Schlosser to Lake Erie; yet, inasmuch as they had no authority to enter upon the lands of the Senecas, even for the purpose of passing through them, without their consent, their right-of-way became the subject of compact. Although the Indian title continues only during their possession, yet that possession has been always held sacred, and can never be disturbed but by their consent. They do not hold under the States, nor under the United States; their title is original, sovereign, and exclusive. We treat with them as separate sovereignties; and while an Indian nation continues to exist within its acknowledged limits, we have no more right to enter upon their territory, without their consent, than we have to enter upon the territory of a foreign prince' (1 Op. Atty. Gen. 465, 466–467).

"This statement of Federal law and policy has been often repeated but has not been improved upon.[4]

"Since, however, treaty obligations may be violated by act of Congress,[5] the possessory rights of these Indians depend upon whether Congress, in appropriating funds for the construction of the Garrison Dam, or otherwise legislating thereon, will continue to respect the treaty obligations of the United States.

"2. FORMS OF LEGAL PROTECTION

"Assuming that an attempt is made to condemn or otherwise interfere with Indian possession of tribal land in connection with the construction of the proposed Garrison Dam, the Indians desire to know in what way they can challenge the legality of the proposed action. Inasmuch as the whole Garrison Dam project is still in the blueprint stage and apparently no moneys have as yet been appropriated which could be used for the building of the dam or for the condemnation of these Indian lands, it would be premature to discuss the authority of the War Department to condemn these lands or to flood them without condemnation. Assuming, however, that the Indians concerned are satisfied that no legal authority exists for the taking of these lands in derogation of treaty rights, two methods would appear to be available to the tribe for the presentation of such objections. In the first place, the tribe might bring suit to enjoin the Secretary of War from the commission of the acts in question. In the second place, the tribe might await the institution of condemnation proceedings and in those proceedings challenge the legality of the proposed condemnation.

"The legal capacity of the tribe thus to defend its rights is recognized in article VI, section 5 (e) of the tribal constitution and in section 5 (i) of the tribal charter. Its right to employ counsel for such purposes is recognized in article VI, section 3 (a) of the tribal constitution. Under these provisions of its constitution and charter, the tribe has the same right that any American citizen has to challenge construction activities carried on or threatened by the War Department or any other department of the Federal Government, where it appears that such activities are not properly authorized by act of Congress or are in derogation of rights established under Federal law. The propriety of such action, for example, is sustained in *Ryan* v. *Chicago, B. & Q. R. Co.* (59 F. (2d) 137 (C. C. A. 7, 1932)), in which an injunction was issued against the Secretary of War and his subordinates and attorneys to prevent construction of a dam, and condemnation proceedings in support of such construction, where the contemplated dam was in excess of the legislative authority granted by Congress. The court held that such a suit was not a suit against the Federal Government but merely a suit against Federal officials to prevent action in excess of their statutory authority. In that case Congress, after the issuance of the injunction, enacted supplementary legislation specifically authorizing the dam against which the injunction had issued. The case, however, is square authority for the proposition that suit will lie against the Secretary of War to prevent construction activities not clearly authorized by act of Congress. As the court said in that case:

" 'The least that can be said is that there is great doubt and uncertainty as to the extent of the authorization of Congress relative to the Alma Dam. The damage which will necessarily result to appellee under plan 2 is so enormous that no uncertainty should be permitted to exist as to appellee's right to compensation' (p. 143).

"Again, in the case of *Barr et al.* v. *Rhodes* (35 F. Supp. 223 (D. C. W. D.; Ky.)), the court declared:

" 'The rule seems to be that the courts will not interfere with matters entrusted by Congress to the discretion of the heads of executive departments of the Government, but that they will enjoin acts which are beyond the scope of statutory authority or jurisdiction of executive officers. As was said in *Goldtra* v. *Weeks*, supra (271 U. S. 536; 46 S. Ct. 616; 70 L. Ed. 1074) "by reason of their illegality, their acts or threatened acts are personal and derive no official justification from their doing them in asserted agency for the Government" ' (p. 225).

"In the case of *St. Louis & F. R. Co.* v. *City of Tulsa* (213 Fed. 87 (D. C. E. D., Okla.)), a somewhat similar question was discussed in connection with a suit against a municipality to enjoin condemnation proceedings. It was there held that an injunction was a proper remedy to prevent the municipality from interfering, through condemnation proceedings, with rights which it had already granted to a railroad. The court quoted with approval from Elliott on Roads and Streets (2d ed.):

" 'Section 219. * * * The intent of the legislature to destroy the rights granted by former statutes must unequivocally appear. A grant of authority to appropriate land seized under former statutes, or previously seized for public use, cannot ordinarily be inferred from a mere general grant. The general rule is that if the two uses are not inconsistent, and both may stand together without material impairment of the first, authority for the second use may be implied from a general grant; but, if they cannot coexist without material impairment of the first, authority to take for the second cannot be implied from a mere general grant of authority to condemn' (p. 93).

"It is clear that the remedy of injunction, which, as the foregoing cases indicate, is available to a non-Indian citizen to prevent unlawful interference with his property, is equally available to the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation.[6]

"FELIX S. COHEN,
"Associate Solicitor."

* * * * *

EFFECT OF GARRISON DAM ON INDIANS

Senator O'MAHONEY. What do you think about the Indians?

Representative LEMKE. The land that is to be taken away from the Fort Berthold Indians is land where their bread basket is.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The bread basket of the Indians?

---

[2] Act of Mar. 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 989, 1035).

[3] See unratified agreement of July 27, 1866 (Kappler, vol. 2, p. 1052); act of June 1, 1910 (36 Stat. 455).

[4] See Cohen, Handbook of Federal Indian Law, pp. 309, 393.

[5] Cherokee Tobacco (11 Wall. 616 (1870)); Chinese Exclusion Case (130 U. S. 581, 600).

[6] *Cherokee Nation* v. *Hitchcock* (187 U. S. 294); *Lane* v. *Pueblo of Santa Rosa* (249 U. S. 110); and see Cohen, Handbook of Federal Indian Law, pp. 283–285.

Representative LEMKE. Yes, sir. It is the river bottom cultivated land. I am not satisfied with the lands that the War Department is attempting to give to the Indians.

Senator MCKELLAR. You cannot have the dam and keep the Indians there.

Representative LEMKE. No. But I am not satisfied with the land the Army has offered to the Indians. I do not think that upland hills is fair compensation, or anywhere near it. I am willing to help the Indians find land that will compensate them.

Senator MCKELLAR. Surely there are local courts out there that will give the Indians what they are entitled to.

Representative LEMKE. In my experience as a legal practitioner I have found this——

Senator MCKELLAR. When I was practicing law I was the trial lawyer of my firm, and I tried a good many condemnation cases. I hardly recall one when the persons were not amply compensated, not in a case that I ever tried, and sometimes they got more than they were entitled to.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The difficulty here as affecting the Indians is this, that the possibility of compensation does not exist, for compensation in money means nothing to them. What they want are homes.

Senator MCKELLAR. But it seems to me the progress of the country rather requires that this dam shall be built, and I think the Indians should be compensated in the fullest measure, because, so to speak, we treat them as the wards of the Nation, and we ought to be generous with them.

PROPOSAL TO COMPENSATE INDIANS NOT ADEQUATE

Senator O'MAHONEY. Congressman LEMKE, you were about to say that in your opinion the proposal made by the War Department to compensate the Indians is not adequate compensation.

Representative LEMKE. No. If I am correctly informed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they are trying to push them up in the Killdeer Mountains. But there is land in North Dakota that is productive, and land that probably could be irrigated, and I will try to see that the Indians are given.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you think the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs could rely upon any vague promises of that kind as to compensation?

Representative LEMKE. No. I think they might have a fight over it, as you always find when you deal with departments of the Government.

Senator MCKELLAR. Again referring to my personal history—which I ought not to refer to, but sometimes I have to—when I was a trial lawyer for about 17 or 18 years, I learned to know men pretty well by looking at them. I do not believe that the present head of the Bureau of Engineers, General Wheeler, is the kind of man who would see the Indians imposed upon. That is just the way I feel about it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. If that were true, I think the Indians would probably rest very easily, but that is not the case. General Wheeler, able though he is—and I am glad as a member of the Military Affairs Committee to have voted for his confirmation—but he cannot create land to which these Indians are to be moved.

Senator MCKELLAR. But he can see that they are treated fairly and justly.

Senator O'MAHONEY. There is evidence before the Committee on Indian Affairs that the land which is offered in the Killdeer Mountains is not comparable land, and this is now confirmed by Congressman LEMKE.

Representative LEMKE. In dry years there is very little grass on those hillsides. Now it looks nice, and I have no intention of criticizing the War Department, but if they had gone there 3 or 4 years ago they would have found no grass there. It just makes a difference when you see it.

I repeat, and I will agree with the chairman, that the Indians, I believe, will have to give way, because after all, even the city of Williston will have to give way if subsequent events show that it is for the best interest of my State and the Nation.

TIME ELEMENT IN COMPENSATING INDIANS FOR LOST LAND

Senator O'MAHONEY. If you recommend to this committee that it report to the Senate a bill which compels the Indians to go away, do you also desire to say to those Indians that for their compensation they must depend, not upon this committee, not upon the Congress, but upon the future action of some court? Maybe 20 or 25 years may pass before those Indians are compensated for the lands taken away from them by Executive order.

Representative LEMKE. I agree with you absolutely on that. Something should be done before the Indians are moved, that they should get full compensation. Let me give you an illustration: I handled a case at Elwood, Ill. There they took a farm 150 years old and before a Chicago jury I secured $22,000 more than the Government offered.

Senator O'MAHONEY. If you did that before a Chicago jury you ought to be able to do something with a Senate committee.

Representative LEMKE. Then at Omaha, when we had the Frazier-Lemke cases——

Senator O'MAHONEY. Who was that Lemke whose name is mentioned there?

Representative LEMKE. Myself. When we had the Frazier-Lemke cases, then these so-called expert civil-service appraisers came and testified that a home, though used 20 years, is as good as it was when built. But when we had the Omaha condemnation cases these same fellows appeared and testified that a home depreciated 5 percent each year, and at the end of 20 years it was worth very little.

Remember that if you go up against the Federal Government you have all the powerful machinery arrayed against you. I will say this in justification of the Army, that General O'Brien, who was in charge, said, "If I had known you before, we would not have had all these lawsuits." But as to these Indians, with all the power of the Federal Government, there is no way by which they can collect what is due them unless Congress gives them assistance.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT TO PROTECT INDIANS

Senator O'MAHONEY. Do you recommend that we throw these Indians off the land and trust to luck?

Representative LEMKE. This project has been started, and the Army engineers have made surveys.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It is in the blueprint stage, but the Indians are on the land.

Representative LEMKE. I still feel that before the Indians are removed, we should compensate them and justify our action. They have counsel now, and I think counsel will attempt to get some settlement agreeable to both sides.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Would you see any objection to a limitation being placed on this appropriation which would provide that the Indians should not be driven off the land until there is a settlement?

Representative LEMKE. I have no objection to that. That is a limitation on their using it, but they can go ahead with their plans and preparation and construction. I am perfectly in accord with the idea that the Indians of all people have gotten a very bad deal all through the history of the United States of America.

Senator MCKELLAR. Any other questions?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask a question, if I may. Was the amendment drawn with the consent and advice and approval of the attorney for the three affiliated tribes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not have opportunity to consult the attorney for the tribes, but I did consult the Department of the Interior and the Office of Indian Affairs, and I had the assistance of the Office of Indian Affairs in the preparation of the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to line 13, page 57. May I have his interpretation as to what will happen if it should develop that the land offered in exchange that is selected by the Department of the Interior should be unsatisfactory to the Indian tribe?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it should be unsatisfactory to the Indian tribe, the question, I think, would then be open for further consideration, because the engineers report as filed in the House contains the provision that the total appropriation shall be sufficient to provide for compensation for the Indians or for moving the Indians.

We also have in this appropriation bill an item of $78,000,000 which will permit the Department of the Interior, through the Office of Indian Affairs, to make a survey of that entire area for the purpose of finding lands of the same quality and suitable for exchange.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much gratified by the explanation, because I know that the distinguished Senator, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, has time and time again seen to it that the Indians were protected. I am very happy to know his interpretation of the item.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. In view of the point made by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from North Dakota, I believe it would be well if we could have in the RECORD at this point the pertinent paragraph in House Document 475, which document is the basic background for the whole Missouri River authorization. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that paragraph 12 of House Document 475 appear in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

12. The proposed reservoirs will inundate Indian lands at several points. The estimates submitted on the over-all cost of the projects include funds to cover the cost of taking such lands and buildings, including relocation of burial grounds. It is to be understood, therefore, that approval of this plan includes authority for the Indians through their tribal councils, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to convey and relinquish such property to the United States, and authority for the Secretary of War to enter into appropriate agreements with the Secretary of the Interior and the Indian tribes concerned for the payment of the fair value of the property taken, or for the contribution of a sum approximating such value toward locating or constructing or toward relocating or reconstructing buildings, works, facilities, or water projects in the

vicinity of the Missouri River or its tributaries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad the Senator has made that request, and I am glad the matter is to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I should like to add that immediately following this insertion, there should be inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mr. Felix S. Cohen, Acting Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, dealing with the same subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: With reference to your telephonic inquiry concerning the meaning and effect of the comments made in paragraph 12 of the letter of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 31, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 475, 78th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4), concerning arrangements to be made where Indian lands are inundated by proposed reservoirs, there are two observations that I should like to submit:

1. As a legal matter I should think it very doubtful whether a statement by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Flood Control would be considered a limitation upon any powers of condemnation which may be vested in the War Department by prior legislation, such as the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1058, 1084; 25 U. S. C., sec. 357), authorizing the condemnation of Indian allotments with cash payment of damages.

2. Even if the statement in question should be construed as having the force of law, it purports in terms not to limit any legal authority heretofore vested in Federal agencies to carry out condemnation, but rather to spell out authority to handle land transactions with Indians on a basis of agreement and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. I do not doubt that such a method of procedure is highly desirable. Unfortunately, the language of the statement in question, while purporting to authorize future action on such a basis, does not in terms limit action to any such basis. It thus fails to accord to the Indians any assurance that they will be consulted with regard to the disposition of their lands.

I trust that the foregoing observations appropriately answer your inquiry. Because of the pressure of time these observations have not been submitted to the scrutiny of the Interior Department and they are therefore to be considered merely as the expressions of my own opinion.

Sincerely yours,

FELIX S. COHEN,
Acting Solicitor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what effect the amendment he had made just a moment ago would have on the disposition of the Indian problem.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have the effect of compelling an immediate study of this problem, so that the Indians would not be removed from that land until an opportunity had been granted to make certain that they were being properly treated.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has been very fair with the Indians. Probably this is the first time in 300 years they have gotten such a deal. I think they are in a better situation than are the whites. The whites will have their lands condemned and payment received, and then will have to go and find homes elsewhere. I have no objection to the amendment.

In the Senator's opinion, how long will it take to settle these affairs? How long will construction of the dam be held up?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I doubt very much whether construction of the dam will have to be held up at all, provided the War Department and the Interior Department undertake, as it is the desire of those who are the sponsors of the amendment, the immediate solution of the problem.

I pointed out in the committee that although a treaty was made with the Indians at Fort Laramie in the middle of the last century, almost a hundred years ago, recognizing the Indians' title to these lands, and although later, in the administration of President Benjamin Harrison, some eight or nine million acres of land were taken by Executive order, the Indians were not compensated for that taking until 20 or 30 years had passed, until they had been authorized by Congress to prosecute a claim in the Court of Claims. That injustice is obviated by this amendment. The responsibility is really placed upon those who desire to construct this dam to deal justly with the Indians, and do it now.

Mr. YOUNG. I certainly am in accord with the Senator's thinking, though I had hoped this might be accomplished in some other way. We have interested in the solution of our affairs out there, and in the construction of these dams, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission, and now there is being added the Office of Indian Affairs. I think that places more importance upon the interagency committee there, composed of these Federal departments, together with the governors.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Indians are the wards of the Government of the United States. They are the beneficiaries of a treaty. The United States today stands before the world urging justice to all people. It seems to me it cannot support a moral position upon that issue unless it deals justly with its own wards, the Indians of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG. I am in entire accord with the thinking of the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of the amendments in the bill be agreed to en bloc. That is the usual way in which such amendments of their nature are handled. They relate to judgments and claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—Property damage claims," on page 57, line 24, after "Sec. 201" to insert "(a).";

On page 59, after line 3, to insert:

"(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 108, Seventy-ninth Congress, as follows:

"Executive Office of the President:
"Office for Emergency Management:
"War Shipping Administration, $676.57;
"Federal Security Agency, $591.54;
"Federal Works Agency, $100.85;
"Department of Commerce, $609.65;
"Department of the Interior, $149;
"Navy Department, $33,612.21;
"Post Office Department, $598.25;
"Treasury Department, $1,843.08;
"In all, $38,181.15";

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States courts," on page 60, line 8, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 111, and"; and after line 10 to strike out the following:

"Under—
"Independent offices: Veterans' Administration, $60.42;
"Department of Agriculture, $6,287.50;
"Farm Security Administration, $1,702.50;
"Navy Department, $3,000;
"War Department, $7,490.50;
"In all, $18,540.92."

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

"Veterans' Administration, $60.42;
"Fderal Works Agency: Public Buildings Administration, $1,950;
"United States Maritime Commission, $549.14;
"Department of Agriculture, $6,287.50;
"Farm Security Administration, $1,702.50;
"Navy Department, $3,000;
"Coast Guard, $2,250;
"Office for Emergency Management: War Shipping Administration, $4,750;
"War Department, $18,031.60;
"In all, $38,581.16";

On page 61, after line 8, to insert:

"(b) For the payment of a judgment, rendered against the Government of the United States by a United States district court under the provisions of an act entitled 'An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damages caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1928 (46 U. S. C., 781–789), and which was certified to the Seventy-ninth Congress in Senate Document No. 112, $35,144.95";

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 62, line 11, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 114";

On page 62, line 16, after "Public Buildings Administration", to strike out "$2,167.89" and insert "$8,383.51";

On page 62, line 18, after "Federal Public Housing Authority", to strike out "$22,350.41" and insert "$72,350.41";

On page 62, after line 19, to insert: "Interior: Indians, $850";

On page 63, line 1, after "Treasury Department", to strike out "$27,804.56" and insert "$32,804.56";

On page 63, line 2, after "War Department", to strike out "$341.58" and insert "$1,294.58";

On page 63, line 3, after "In all", to strike out "$159,752.23" and insert "$222,770.85";

On page 63, after line 5, to insert:

"(b) For the payment of judgment No. 45990 rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Alfred Oscar Schaffer, in the amount of $4,170.10, and certified to the Seventy-ninth Congress in Senate Document No. 115, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay interest, to be paid from funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation";

Under the subhead "Audited claims," on page 64, line 3, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 106, and"; in line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,182,938.53" and insert "$6,225,198.02"; in line 10, after the word "and", to strike out "$911.91" and insert "$1,483.79"; and in line 11, after the words "in all", to strike out "$3,183,850.44" and insert "$6,226,681.81";

On page 65, line 1, after "June 26", to strike out "1944" and insert "1934"; and in line 2, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 110, and"; and

On page 65, line 6, after the word "property", to strike out "$39.21" and insert "$70.39."

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, is the Senator about to speak on the Indian matter which was being discussed a little while ago? I was the one who suggested that the amendment on page 8 be passed over, and I should like to refer to it. I have to leave the floor soon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have a short statement I wish to make.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is it in reference to the pending bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wonder if we could not proceed with the first amendment passed over. I do not think it will take long. It is a matter having to do with the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, for "Salaries and expenses, Civil Service Commission," including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, $1,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I might say that after the bill had been considered in the House of Representatives, the President of the United States requested a deficiency appropriation for the Civil Service Commission of $1,600,000. The reason for asking for the additional amount was the very heavy burden cast upon the Commission in its replacement work in the Civil Service in connection with veterans. The obligation of carrying out the provisions of the veterans' preferential law was placed upon the Civil Service Commission, and this money is largely needed for that purpose.

I should like to say to the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that I am thoroughly acquainted with all the facts, and I have data in my possession which I think show that the President's request should be granted. I am reluctant to detain the Senate on this item, but since the matter will have to be taken up with the House, it being a new item, I wonder if our distinguished chairman will not take the additional item of $600,000 to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the committee gave this matter very careful consideration. We had a great deal of evidence in favor of it, we went over it very carefully, and unanimously came to the conclusion that, under all the facts and circumstances, an additional appropriation of $1,000,000 would be sufficient for the remainder of the year.

Under these circumstances, this being a unanimous report of the committee, I feel compelled to leave the matter as the committee decided on it. I am sorry I cannot accede to the Senator's request. I think they are entitled to a million dollars, and I shall certainly fight for that amount in conference. If anything arises of an unusual nature, the Civil Service Commission, being located here in Washington, can always apply to Congress. We are going to be in session constantly, and I do not believe any wrong will be done anyone.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to make plain to the Senate, if I may have the attention of Senators, how critical this matter is. It seems to me that what has been done must have been done under some misapprehension.

In April 1945 the Commission had on its rolls 7,552 persons. The number has now been cut to 4,835. Denying this deficiency appropriation will further reduce the personnel of the Commission to 3,969 persons. That was the same number of persons they had in 1941, when the average employment in the Federal service was only 1,100,000, as compared with an average for this fiscal year of 2,500,000. In other words, the per capita burden, under what has been done by the committee, will be two and a half times as great.

Added to that we have the demands upon the Commission for replacement of veterans. All over the United States it has become necessary to take the representatives of the Commission out of the separation centers; they have had to close centers for veterans in almost every city.

Mr. President, the distinguished acting chairman of the committee has just stated to me in an aside that he will take to conference an amendment providing $1,200,000. That is certainly better than $1,000,000, so I shall desist, and express my appreciation. I move that the amendment be amended by increasing the amount from $1,000,000 to $1,200,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT AS DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Mr. BALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. BALL. Very well. I withhold it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have noticed in the newspapers recently several instances where decisions have been made dealing with surplus property, and for that reason I should like to make a statement at this time before we adjourn, and before it is too late.

On September 27, I introduced in the Senate a bill, S. 1440, authorizing use of credits established through the sale of surplus properties abroad for the promotion of international good will through the exchange of students in the fields of education, culture, and science. The bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and has been under consideration by the Subcommittee on Surplus Property, headed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The purpose of this bill was to provide a means by which the returns from the sale of surplus materials might accrue to the best interest of America. After World War I war debts incurred by foreign nations became a source of irritation and brought about ill feeling and a disruption in the reestablishment of trade and commerce and affected our political relations with these nations. By legislation such as is proposed in this bill, it is hoped we can, to some degree, avoid a repetition of these conditions.

In connection with the introduction of this bill, it was determined that in order to bring about the orderly dispositions of surplus property abroad full authority vested in the Surplus Property Administrator should be delegated to the Secretary of State, not only to insure conformity with American foreign policies but to utilize these credits to the best advantage in securing the greatest possible benefits to the American people.

The original bill, while containing provisions contingent on such authority being transferred to the Secretary of State, did not specifically delegate the authority of the Surplus Property Administrator to the State Department. In arriving at a method by which this could be properly brought about conferences were held with representatives of the Department of State, Surplus Property Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. As a result of these conferences a new bill was drafted which I introduced on November 30, 1945—S. 1636.

The new bill not only carried out the suggestion of Surplus Property Administrator that these powers relative to the sale of surplus property abroad be transferred to the Secretary of State, but also includes a provision authorizing the Secretary of State to enter into agreements with any foreign governments for the use of currencies, credits for currencies, of such government, acquired as a result of surplus-property disposals in any proper manner and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem proper and to the advantage of the United States Government, including the original provisions under S. 1440.

At the time that the Congress passed the Surplus Property Act of 1944 it was recognized that the problems of surplus property disposal abroad were different in character from the problems here at home. Accordingly, included in that act is a provision (sec. 32 (b)) which empowers the Surplus Property Board, created by the act, to exempt disposals

abroad from "some or all of the provisions" of the statute. This has proved wise, but actual experience has shown that the maximum benefit to the United States cannot be obtained merely by an exemption from the restrictions of the Surplus Property Act, but that positive enabling legislation granting additional disposal powers is needed also.

The first section of S. 1636 relates solely to administration. As I have stated, it transfers the present policy responsibilities of the Surplus Property Administrator with respect to disposal abroad to the Secretary of State. Some time ago it became apparent that the disposal of surplus property must be integrated with lend-lease settlements and with our other foreign economic activities. Accordingly, by Executive order, the Office of Army-Navy Liquidation Commissioner was transferred from the War and Navy Departments to the State Department; and the State Department was designated by the Surplus Property Administrator as disposal agency for surplus property abroad. Progress since that time has shown the wisdom of the move. Nevertheless, there is a remaining defect that can be cured only by congressional action. Under existing legislation the Surplus Property Administrator remains technically responsible for the policies of the State Department in carrying out the foreign surplus disposal program. For obvious reasons, the Surplus Property Administrator cannot have independent access to the facts on which policy must be based unless he largely duplicates the disposal staff of the State Department. At the present time, therefore, the Surplus Property Administrator is in a position where he has responsibility without authority—I may say that is the same position he is in with regard to domestic materials—while the State Department must clear programs and proposals with an agency which is unfamiliar with the changing situation abroad. Both the Secretary of State and the Surplus Property Administrator have recommended this change, and it has the approval of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. There should be wholehearted approval of this consolidation of responsibility and authority.

The next section of the bill clarifies the provisions of the present Surplus Property Act concerning what may be accepted in return for surplus property. Section 15 of the present act was broadly written, so far as domestic disposal is concerned; for example, it permits property to be exchanged for other property. However, the authors of the legislation did not have in mind at this point the peculiar, in fact unique, problem that exists abroad. Basically the question is one of foreign exchange. Many of the countries in which our surplus is located and to which a large part of the surplus will be sold, do not have enough dollars. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide for the acceptance of things other than dollars. To a considerable extent, possibly to a major extent, the difficulty can be overcome by the extension of credit, a practice that is used in this country, although the credit terms abroad may be somewhat different in character from the credit terms here. But there are other possibilities of acquiring benefits for the United States in return for surplus property that are either not clearly defined in the present act, or not covered at all. It is obviously in the national interest to strengthen the hand of the disposal authorities by giving them the necessary power to accept other types of benefits. While specific provision is made for the payment into the Treasury of the United States any such credits as may be converted into dollars, the bill authorizes acceptance of the following; when credits cannot be converted into United States currencies:

First. Foreign currency or credits: In a sense, accepting foreign currency is not unlike extending a dollar credit, but in many cases payment in local currency to be liquidated under agreed conditions may be more acceptable to the foreign governments and at the same time may involve less risk than an ordinary loan or credit.

Second. Intangible rights or benefits: To some extent it may prove possible to obtain concessions from foreign governments—rights and privileges of various sorts—in connection with surplus property disposal that could not easily be obtained in any other way.

Third. Discharge of claims: It is well to note that our claim problem has been vastly reduced during this war by virtue of the reverse lend-lease arrangements we have had with many of our allies. Nevertheless, a certain residue of claims remains, and in some cases our best chance of settling these promptly and satisfactorily is by the use of surplus property.

The third section of the bill provides for the disposal of surplus property abroad to establish educational programs. The Secretary of State is authorized to enter into agreements with foreign countries under which, in return for surplus property or local currency or credits received for surplus property, there will be established the following types of educational programs: Education of foreigners in American schools abroad, such as Roberts College; transportation expenses of foreign students coming to the United States to study; and, most important, transportation and expenses of American students studying in foreign institutions. It is contemplated that in general the agreements to be entered into by the Secretary of State with foreign countries will take the form of trust funds or foundations, so that the activities may continue into the future. The expenditures under these agreements in any one country are limited to $2,500,000 per annum.

It is my firm belief that the interchange of students between countries can play a major role in helping to break down mutual misunderstandings and in furthering the kind of knowledge that leads to mutual confidence. No visitor or traveler can gain as much appreciation of the way and thought of living of foreigners as students can who actually live in the foreign country while they learn. We all now know that no country is far away in the age of airplanes. The necessity for increasing our understanding or others and their understanding of us has an urgency that it has never had in the past. The adoption of this program by the Congress is a vital counterpart of the steps we are taking to increase our participation in world affairs.

In conclusion, I might add that this section S. 1636 does not include authorization in connection with lend-lease settlements because the Lend-Lease Act itself provides sufficient authority. Section 3 (b) of that act states that—

> The benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

I am advised that the President deems these educational benefits entirely satisfactory. In some countries the State Department will negotiate these agreements on the basis of surplus-property disposals; in others it will rely on the lend-lease settlements; but because of its inability to do the latter in those countries where there is no lend-lease settlement, or where the settlement offers no propitious opportunity for such an agreement, the passage of this bill is essential.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certian appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is one other amendment which was passed over, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 40, in line 22, it is proposed to strike out "switchyards, $1,600,000" and insert "switchyards at Shasta and Keswick Dams, $800,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are apparently two amendments here, although they both relate to the same subject.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think a quorum should be established before we consider this amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I simply wanted to make a unanimous-consent request that the two amendments be considered en bloc.

Mr. BALL. Very well.

Mr. HAYDEN. Senators will notice that the amendment beginning in line 22, on page 40 is to strike out "switch yards, $1,600,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "switch yards at Shasta and Keswick Dams, $800,000;".

Then the following language is stricken out "transmission lines, Oroville to Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, $730,000, and Sacramento between substations, 230 kilovolt, $50,000."

I should like to have the whole subject matter beginning in line 22 on page 40 with the words "switch yards" down

to the end of the amendment on page 41, considered as one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 40, beginning in line 22.

Mr. BALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Murdock
Ball	Hart	Murray
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bridges	Huffman	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Carville	La Follette	Shipstead
Chavez	Langer	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Mead	White
Gerry	Millikin	Wiley
Gossett	Mitchell	Willis
Green	Moore	Wilson
Guffey	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 40, beginning in line 22.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate for a few moments to explain the nature of this amendment.

An examination of the bill will show that the House of Representatives, recognizing the need for transmitting power from Shasta Dam down into the Central Valley, a distance of approximately 200 miles, has approved an appropriation of $730,000 to build a transmission line for that purpose. In the House report the statement is made that the purpose of transmitting this power is to make it available to pump water up to the farm lands in the San Joaquin Valley. Senators who are familiar with the situation in California, know that there rises in northern California the great Sacramento River, in an area where there is much greater rainfall than there is in the area to the south, where the San Joaquin Valley is located. The Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys combined form what is known as the great Central Valley of California, an area containing some of the richest farm lands in America.

In the Sacramento Valley there is usually an abundant supply of water, but in the San Joaquin Valley the supply of water is deficient, and many of the farmers who depend upon pumping have gradually driven wells deeper and deeper, until the supply has been exhausted. So the only way to meet the critical situation, to meet the actual needs of farmers—not to bring new lands into cultivation, but to afford relief to a great agricultural area aggregating nearly 500,000 acres—is to impound the water of the Sacramento River, let it continue down that stream in a regulated flow, and then pump it over into the San Joaquin Valley with power generated from the stored water. This item provides an appropriation for a transmission line for that purpose, to serve the farmers so that they may obtain water.

All during the war there was no construction of transmission lines in the Central Valley project because of the great need for materials and men. A wartime arrangement was made between the existing power company, which operates in northern California, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and the Government, under which the Government arranged to carry over the lines of the power company the power then developed, down to San Francisco and the Bay Cities to be used in war work. The understanding was that there would be no loss to the company and no advantage to the Government as a result of that temporary arrangement. So every proposal which has been made during the past 4 years to construct a transmission line in that area has been set aside by the House of Representatives until the end of the war.

The war being over, the House of Representatives, recognizing the need, placed this appropriation item in the bill, and I believe that the Senate should go along with the House. Therefore I am urging that the Senate reject the committee amendment reducing the appropriation for these transmission lines.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have listened with great interest to the very clear statement of the Senator. Am I correct in concluding that the entire beneficial effect of construction of this line would occur in one valley within one State? As I understand, the result would not be to benefit a large area of the country. It would not be something of national interest, but would be solely for the purpose of building a transmission line into a valley in California. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. It so happens that when the good Lord made the world there was only one Central Valley of California. At one end of it water can be stored to make power. At the other end the supply of water is short. With the power developed at one end water could be pumped into the irrigated area. I agree with the Senator, but it all happens to be entirely within the State of California.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am trying to determine whether this is an undertaking which has a national effect or whether its effect is entirely within one State.

Mr. HAYDEN. We are laying down a principle, I may state to the Senate, which is national in scope. Wherever a dual-purpose dam is constructed in the United States, that is to say, when we construct a dam which controls a stream so as to prevent floods and impounds water in that connection, and the water impounded behind the dam can gradually be let out, through hydroelectric power facilities, thus creating electric power, the Government building the dam and the power plant can receive revenue from it. If we are to say that, having built a dam of that kind, the Government is forbidden by a policy of Congress to transmit the power away from the dam to any other place, if there is an existing public utility which can carry it, that will mean that the Government must not build a transmission system which will compete with or take business from an existing public utility.

In other words, Mr. President, the dispute here really narrows down to this question: Is it necessary to build this transmission line in order that the power generated at Shasta Dam may be carried from that dam into central California, or can that purpose be accomplished by transmitting the power in a roundabout way over the existing transmission lines owned by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.? That is where the dispute arises. The power company admits that it does not have the lines now, but it claims that by combining its lines with other lines and placing them all under its control, it could handle the matter better and with greater advantage to the community than the Federal Government could do by building transmission lines. I wish to place in the RECORD the proof of the statement that the building of a new transmission line will be required.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not advised about the utility companies. I know nothing at all about them and I know nothing about the issue to which the Senator has referred. My question is simply with respect to the scope of the undertaking and whether we are to appropriate Federal funds for a project which will be entirely of local benefit. Heretofore we have appropriated vast sums of money for the purpose of constructing projects which would aid several States or several sections of the United States. I simply wish to be advised whether we are to be called upon to appropriate Federal moneys for strictly local use.

Mr. HAYDEN. Suppose, as is true in many instances, there are streams which rise wholly within one State and on which floods occur which do damage wholly within that State, and suppose the Federal Government steps in and builds a flood-control dam in order to protect the lands within the State. If that were done, the Senator would say the project was wholly local, although it would involve a policy which applies throughout the United States. The item under discussion involves the same theory.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The building of a dam on a stream which is interstate in character or which affects lands in several States, certainly is not a local matter. But the building within a State of a transmission line which affects and benefits only the people of a particular locality is a local matter.

The item we are discussing is quite different from a dam which would protect or benefit the people of perhaps many States.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point is that the Congress authorized the construction of this project for several purposes—for flood control; for improvement of navigation on the Sacramento River; to prevent tidewaters from drowning out lands in the delta, and thus making them salt; to provide hydroelectric power, and for other purposes; and work on the project has been carried on for some time.

In connection with the issue which is presented here, let me say that it is urged on the part of the private power company that it should be the sole purchaser of the power from Shasta Dam, that it is now so situated that it is taking the limited product from the dam—the power there is not fully developed—and that it can expand its transmission-line facilities so as to be able to take all of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The company has offered to buy all the power which the Shasta Dam will provide.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not question that.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the Senator to say that the company is not taking all the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is because all of it has not yet been developed or generated.

Mr. WHERRY. But I think it should be pointed out that the company stands ready to take all the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. WHERRY. If the rate which the company agrees to pay for the power is not satisfactory to the Federal Government, the company will agree to let the Federal Power Commission fix the rates; is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. President, a committee of which I was a member went to California and considered this whole matter. We interviewed representatives of both sides of the controversy, and we heard their views. I wish to have the Senator keep the record straight. From what the Senator said, I received the impression that the company would not take all the power.

Mr. HAYDEN. I had no intention of making such a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the Senator did not mean to say so, but I received that impression from his statement.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry that the Senator derived such an impression.

Mr. WHERRY. I know the company is perfectly willing to take all the power which is developed at the Shasta Dam, and is willing to take it at rates which are determined by the Government agency, and the company will distribute all the power over its own transmission lines. The only question is whether the Government wishes to build a competing transmission line.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The Senator has stated the issue better than I have.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question is whether we are to build a tremendous storage reservoir and a very large power plant—one developing 120,000 kilowatts, which is an enormous amount of power—and whether we then are to arrange to have only one purchaser for the power; in other words, take such action that no one except the public utility which now monopolizes the field in northern California can buy the power. That is the proposition which is presented by those who feel that the Federal Government should not engage in the transmission of power. They honestly believe, as does the Senator from Nebraska, that the private utility can serve the community better than the Government could, and that the Government would thus avoid the expenditure of the money which a transmission line of that kind would cost.

So the issue is whether we wish to make the enormous investment in dams and power plants, with the certainty that we shall have but one purchaser. I do not believe that is good public policy.

The argument goes a little further: The company says, "We are now in position to take whatever power is produced there, and we will expand our lines so as to be able to take any additional power which may be produced."

Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that the building of the transmission line as provided for by the House of Representatives will not result in a duplication of the facilities which the power company has on hand. I shall read from the record of the hearings which I held as chairman of the subcommittee handling the Interior Department appropriation bill last July. I first read from the testimony of Mr. Warne, who represented the United States Reclamation Service:

> I should like to point out that there are no transmission lines now in existence which would be capable of delivering the 120,000 kilowatts of required power from any source to our proposed pumping plants on the Delta Cross Channel, Delta-Mendota, and Contra Costa Canals.

The Reclamation Service flatly asserts that there are no transmission lines in existence today which can do that job.

When Mr. Black, representing the power company, was on the stand, I asked him about the matter. At that time Senator Burton, of Ohio, quoted from a previous record, as follows:

> "Project pumping plants are future loads and present facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. do not have the capacity for delivering 150,000 horsepower to serve the Mendota pumps. The project pumping plants are only one of several future loads in the area without facilities for service."
>
> Mr. BLACK. Well, that is not correct. We have facilities for serving any load in the territory, or we will add them as they become necessary.
>
> Senator HAYDEN. If you will do that, that will mean that if the existing transmission lines will not carry the load, you will install additional ones?
>
> Mr. BLACK. Yes; or add to the existing ones.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish to read from page 531 of the Senate hearings on the deficiency appropriation bill. Mr. Black would have answered the question this year along this line, because he made this statement to the committee this year:

> The company has already provided facilities at a cost of $5,000,000 for taking one-third of the project's ultimate power capacity. We can provide the additional facilities required for about $22,000,000. To accomplish the same purpose the Bureau proposes to spend $70,000,000, of which $44,000,000 would be expended on a transmission system and $26,000,000 for a steam plant.

Mr. HAYDEN. I remember that testimony perfectly. The point I wish to make is that the transmission line is not in existence today.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. In his testimony with regard to this particular item of $730,000 for an extension of the Oroville line to Sacramento, Mr. Black said, on page 525 of the hearings, as follows:

> Moreover, a line from Oroville to Sacramento and to the pumping plants will be a clear duplication of a company line already in operation and now used in connection with the transmission of Shasta power. There is also a vacant position on the towers which carry this line on which the company can install additional wires at a cost of $900,000. With this expenditure the company can do what under the Bureau's estimates would cost the Government $3,500,000. Here is a waste of $2,600,000 which must be carried by the water users on the project or the Federal taxpayers of the Nation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Black was merely talking about the initial expenditure.

Mr. BALL. No; he stated flatly that this is a line now having a vacant position on the towers. That is what he stated, if I can read English.

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to do the entire job it would cost his company approximately $22,000,000. It was claimed that it would cost the Government more money.

Mr. WHERRY. But the appropriation is one for a transmission line that would duplicate the present system.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I have presented what evidence I can to the Senate to the effect that there would be no duplication.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as its present location is concerned, there would be a duplication. From now on the question will depend on whether the private company or the Government builds the line.

Mr. HAYDEN. I presume that it will be necessary to go there and look at it.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have to look at it because I have heard the testimony. That was the testimony of Mr. Black.

Mr. HAYDEN. We are confronted with a flat contradiction between the engineers of the Reclamation Service in stating that there would be no duplication, and the statement of Mr. Black that there would be partly a duplication, but Mr. Black admits that in order to do the job his company would have to spend $22,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the statement that from the present point on to the point where it is to be built, the question to which the Senator has referred may be involved. I am talking about the appropriation which has been

requested in this bill. I contend that there would be a duplication. Here is the testimony, on page 523:

> The requests now made are intended to commit Congress to a plan to parallel and duplicate existing facilities of this company.

What language could be plainer than that?

Mr. HAYDEN. The testimony which appears in the next volume of the record which, unfortunately, has not been printed—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not mean to say that Mr. Black has changed his testimony, does he?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. I am merely saying that all along we have had this dispute between Mr. Black and his engineers on the one hand, and the engineers of the United States reclamation service on the other. The question remains, Do we want to insist that at this dam there shall be but one customer for the purchase of power?

If the Senator believes that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is a well-managed and well-supervised power monopoly, he will vote to strike out the amendment. If he believes on the other hand that the Federal Government should have more than one customer for its power, he will vote to spend money for the purpose of building a transmission line for a distance of approximately 200 miles in the Central California Valley. In my judgment it would result in a great saving to the landowners and to the farmers.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does not this matter come under the jurisdiction of the Power Commission of the State of California?

Mr. HAYDEN. The public utility does. Every time Mr. Black testified he said in effect, "We admit that we are a monopoly but we think we are a good and well-regulated monopoly. We are regulated by the State of California. We are regulated by the California State Railroad Commission. If anyone has a complaint he can go to that commission with his complaint."

Mr. Black said further that if that were not satisfactory he would submit to regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Mr. Black has said that he and his company alone should be the one purchaser of that power. He wants to say to the people of California, "You must buy power from us. What is the use of your making a contract for any Government power? Inasmuch as Congress has refused to construct the first transmission line, it will not be built. You come to us and we will take care of you and we will get all the business."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Has the commission in California made an investigation and a recommendation concerning the project?

Mr. HAYDEN. The California Railroad Commission would have no occasion to do so. The California Central Valley Authority was created by the Legislature of California and it backs this entire project.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What do they think about it?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is a division of opinion in California concerning the matter.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Concerning the authority?

Mr. HAYDEN. The official representatives of the State of California have indicated—not in the hearing to which reference has been made, but before my other committee—that they preferred to have the Federal Government transmit the power from the dam into central California.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator is referring to the State authority?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am referring to the California Central Valley Authority.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The proposition now is to have the Federal Government overstep the recommendation which has been made.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; not at all. The proposal here is to do exactly what the Central Valley Authority has recommended, namely, to provide money for the construction of a transmission line.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that the California Power Authority and local authorities have recommended the amendment upon which the Senate is about to vote?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the authority, which was created by the Legislature of California and which resulted finally in the enactment of legislation by Congress to construct the Central Valley project for navigation, for flood control, power, irrigation, and so on, recommends that the United States Reclamation Service own the transmission line and transmit power to central California.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, if we do not vote for this amendment we are voting against California's legally constituted authorities?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when we build a transmission line of any size or consequence we know that it costs a great deal of money. Therefore, when we look at the appropriation it looks rather large. But is it not true that the money which we appropriate for the construction of this transmission line will come back to the Government through the sale of the power which will be carried over the transmission line?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what the Reclamation Act provides. It provides that all investments in power projects shall be returned eventually to the Government; that the power shall be sold at a rate which will return the entire investment to the Government by the end of 40 years with interest at the rate of 3 percent. That is a directive which goes to the Reclamation Service in connection with the disposal of power.

Mr. HILL. The Government gets its money back with interest, and there would not be any watered stock for which consumers would have to pay.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish first to answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina by saying that it is my opinion, and of course I must express it with certain reservations, that probably 75 or 80 percent of the citizens who are living in the district to which reference has been made, and the various organizations there, including boards of supervisors, city councils, chambers of commerce, and other municipal bodies, are very much in favor of this appropriation. It would allow the construction of a transmission line by which the people would be in a position to have power conveyed to them from the Shasta Dam.

I should like to try to make it plain to the Senator from West Virginia that I think this is very much a national project. The elevation of the Sierra Mountains is about 12,000 or 13,000 feet, and in some places even as high as 14,000 feet. The Sierra Mountains run generally north and south through California. The waters which fall into the great forests there reach the Pacific Ocean through the Golden Gate, within a distance, I believe, of less than 200 miles. They flow in a westerly direction. There are no other States to the west of California. The Sacramento River is one of the great streams from the standpoint of the volume of commerce which it carries. From the standpoint of the value of its commerce it is one of the greatest of all streams. Of course, its water flows into and makes the great port of San Francisco in which many vessels of the American Navy anchor.

In the past we were devastated by tremendous floods which have been prevented by levees built all along the Sacramento River and other rivers which flow into it. I believe that it is accurate to say that the proprietors along the Sacramento River bore a greater burden of the cost of constructing those levees than was borne by the people of any other great river, including the Mississippi River.

Mr. President, I must in frankness declare that while the Pacific Gas & Electric is almost wholly a monopoly and controls almost all the power and gas of northern California, it is in my opinion a good company. It does provide service at very reasonable rates. I do not think the claim can be made that monopolistic practices by the Pacific Gas & Electric, which desires to take this power at the dam site, has at this time created exorbitant and exaggerated charges.

I must in frankness declare one bit of relationship I have with this whole matter. One of the great areas which the Pacific Gas & Electric serves, and the area traversed by this great river, is the Sacramento Valley, and the heart of the Sacramento Valley is the capital of California, Sacramento, a city of more than 100,000 inhabitants. I practiced law there from the time I was a very young man, much younger, unfortunately, than I am now, until I left the law to go into politics, which was some time before I was elected to the Senate.

I was formerly in partnership there with my brother, Stephen W. Downey, and for the last 5 years he has been representing the people of Sacramento County, who formed the Sacramento Utility District to take over the retail distributing system of the Pacific Gas & Electric, resulting in probably the most severely fought, the longest and hardest fought case, perhaps, that has occurred in the United States in a condemnation suit. The case has gone to the appellate courts of the State and of the Federal Government several times.

On several occasions the State railroad commission, which was the first

forum, passed condemnation judgment in favor of the Sacramento Utility District against the Pacific Gas & Electric. The case was tried upon other issues in the Superior Court of Sacramento County, and again a judgment was given, and that judgment is now on appeal by the Pacific Gas & Electric to the appellate courts of the State of California. But I think there is now no doubt, the people of Sacramento County having invoked the necessary bond issues, and the judgment having been given, this particular part of the Pacific Gas & Electric, the retail distributing system of Sacramento County, will be taken over, and it is the desire of the people in that district that the proposed transmission line be constructed so that they may be in a position to buy public power from the great Shasta Dam for public distribution in the county of Sacramento.

I felt it only fair to disclose the fact that my brother, with whom I was formerly associated in law partnership, is the attorney representing the district, which is very vitally concerned in this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to make the matter perfectly clear, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding, let me say so far as the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, is concerned, that when a dam is built for flood control in the eastern part of the United States, the Engineer Corps has never engaged, and there is no authority of law for it to engage, in the retail distribution of power to consumers. It can sell the power to a municipality, a cooperative, or a private power company.

The United States Reclamation Service has never engaged in the retail sale of power. Congress never granted it such authority. The United States Reclamation Service, under the law, brings power from a dam down to a transmission line, and can sell it to a municipality or a cooperative.

When it comes to the retail distribution of power, I want it thoroughly understood that I do not advocate, and no one who supports this amendment advocates, so far as I know, that the Government shall take power away from one of its dams and go into the business of its retail distribution direct to consumers. It is always a wholesale business. It has never been anything but a wholesale business, and we intend to keep it a wholesale business.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Bearing out the Senator's statement about the Sacramento Utility District, in the testimony before the committee, Mr. Black made this statement:

> If the suit were decided tomorrow in favor of the district it would take many months to work out the physical details of transferring the property. Furthermore, the district has stipulated in the condemnation proceedings that it will purchase its power requirements from the company for a period of 2 years after the next June 30 following the acquisition of our property.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I must admit my ignorance about the facts, as I am not a member of the committee which has been giving consideration to this matter, but, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator lives in California, I should like to ask him one or two questions.

It is his judgment, I understand, that people in Sacramento will in the near future obtain what is called the distributing system?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. I have heard the discussion on the floor by several Senators, and I wish to know whether or not in the Senator's opinion the present transmission line adequately supplies power to the communities which need it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am not certain I thoroughly understand the Senator. There undoubtedly will have to be additional transmission lines constructed to bring the power down from the dam into the valley. In frankness, I must say I think there is no doubt that if the public constructs the transmission line it will, to a certain extent, I would say to a material extent, duplicate the transmission facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has anticipated my third question. The fourth question is that the Pacific Gas & Electric is largely owned, is it not, by stockholders in California?

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish I could say that that is true, but there are a great number of stockholders of both common and preferred stock of the Pacific Gas & Electric all over the United States. It is a listed stock, I think, on the New York Stock Exchange, considered one of the blue chip stocks. Its bonds also are considered very high class, and I think they are owned all over the United States.

Mr. WILEY. I could put the matter this way, then, that a large group of citizens of the United States own the stock of this company, and that the stock is largely distributed.

Mr. DOWNEY. I believe it is; yes.

Mr. WILEY. The proposition here, then, as I gather it from the discussion I have heard during the last few minutes is for the Government to spend about $70,000,000 to build transmission lines, and when built——

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, a stand-by steam plant is included.

Mr. WILEY. And a stand-by steam plant, which, when built, will directly come in competition with the investments of the ordinary citizens in the stock of this company.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would say that there is no doubt of that. I might say to the distinguished Senator that I think one of the strongest arguments for municipal ownership of power plants is that it makes it possible to have a measuring stick by way of competition, so that it may be determined what rates public power companies should charge. I might say we have in Los Angeles the same kind of public ownership as that for which the people in Sacramento and the people in other places in California are seeking, and in the case of Los Angeles the business has been very profitably and very efficiently conducted.

Mr. WILEY. Now I come to probably my last question. Public ownership to a large extent, as indicated, consists in what may be called the distribution of the power to the various localities. If Congress should appropriate $70,000,000, which would result in building this competing transmission line and the erection of a steam plant, and that transmission line and steam plant were utilized by the various communities instead of the properties of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., is it not true that a very considerable portion of the earnings of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would disappear?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President; I cannot agree with that.

Mr. WILEY. What percentage?

Mr. DOWNEY. I would doubt whether it would depreciate the Pacific Gas & Electric in the way of any profits it might make in distributing the service at a reasonable rate, because if any particular association of farmers or any community wants to go into the municipal power business, they of course would have to do practically what has been done in Sacramento, that is, condemn the facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric and pay them a fair price. There is no disposition on the part of anyone in California in any way to injure any equity or right of the Pacific Gas & Electric. If any property is taken over, as it is being taken over in Sacramento, it will be at a fair price, after fair hearings in court.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator misunderstood me. I thought the Pacific Gas & Electric owned its distribution system, that its transmission lines were transmitting current to each community, and that the transmission system was owned generally by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Am I correct? If that be so, if we take away from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the business of furnishing current to these communities, whether the systems are publicly owned or privately owned, we are taking away from it a source of revenue, and thus we are injuring the rights of the citizen in the stock which he may own. That is what I am getting at.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me express this opinion: Certainly, so far as I know, there will be ample market in northern California for all the power which can be produced by this public project, and likewise by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. In other words, the mere fact that the public is in operation there will not prevent the Pacific Gas & Electric from finding a market for what it produces.

I will admit that it may be possible to operate a complete monopoly more cheaply and efficiently than if two companies are competing. On the other hand, many of us are of the opinion that competition, to a certain extent, at least, has distinct merit, and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I think the people of that whole great community who know what this is

all about are pretty well satisfied that they want this competition, and want the Government to assist in building this transmission line.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. So far as I know, in the State of Wisconsin, there are no Government-owned transmission lines. But if, as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia, the State of Wisconsin should want to start to build transmission lines, and the Federal Government is going to begin to give to the various States sums up to $70,000,000 with which to build transmission lines in order to compete with companies which are already rendering wonderful service, as the Senator admits is done in California, then I think it would be pretty nice if we in Wisconsin could have $70,000,000 expended by the Federal Government, because when that is done it always means cheaper rates necessarily; it generally means that that much capital is not counted when the rates on electricity are fixed. But in this instance, there is a company which is in existence, which is providing transmission lines which are adequate for present needs, and willing to supplement its lines to meet any future needs, and since there is no criticism respecting company service, why should the Federal Government, when we are now spending so much money, reach out and spend $70,000,000 more? Citizens naturally would be benefited there, but if we are to do the square thing, we should expend $70,000,000 in each of the other 48 States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. A few minutes ago the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] stated on the floor of the Senate, if I understood him correctly, that there is a California Valley State Authority. Did the Senator from California hear him make his statement?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator so understand him? What did the Senator understand his statement to mean?

Mr. DOWNEY. This project is wholly a Federal project.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. This is not a project under a California authority, as stated by the Senator from Arizona, which either endorses or does not endorse this reclamation project. This is simply the Central Valley project which is being built by the Federal Government, possibly being matched by some State funds. I am not sure what is provided in that respect.

Mr. DOWNEY. There is no matching.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, It is a straight-out Federal project.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me inform the Senator, in explanation of what the Senator from Arizona said. There is a Central Valley Authority which represents the State of California in determining its policy in this project, but it has nothing to do with raising the money or distributing the water or the power.

Mr. WHERRY. It has nothing to do with the fixing of the rate?

Mr. DOWNEY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. So though the project may have its endorsement, yet if we should not adopt this proposal it would not mean that we would be taking a stand detrimental to the people of California, because as I recall when witnesses testified in San Francisco just as many were favorable to not building the line as were in in favor of building it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before taking my seat I desire to clarify my own position in respect to one or two matters. Of course the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin understands that this is not a gift from the Federal Government, but is a reimbursable item, and we are quite positive that the installation of this transmission line will be profitable from a financial standpoint.

Mr. WILEY. Is it needed?

Mr. DOWNEY. I know of no reason for going back over everything we said.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, to whom California is indebted in many ways for assistance in legislative matters, has, I think, summed up and stated the whole proposition and it is unnecessary for me further to detain the Senate.

I merely want to repeat that I think the overwhelming majority of the people in this area desire this projeet. We feel very keenly that with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in this project it would not be wise policy so to bottle up the power that at some future time it would be entirely at the mercy of one monopoly, but it should be so held that the people of the State of California may cause it to be distributed in ways which they may think expedient and desirable.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I had yielded the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. DOWNEY. If I still have the floor I will be glad to yield and to answer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the State of California have a public service commission which regulates the utilities?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; it has. It is called the State Railroad Commission.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And they have complete authority and regulation over utilities such as the power company referred to?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Argument has been made here that unless this line be built with Federal funds there will be but one taker of the power, namely, the utlity company referred to. There is no question about the utility company taking the power, is there?

Mr. DOWNEY. No. I understand that the Pacific Gas & Electric is willing to sign a binding contract to take all the power as it becomes available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So failure to build this line with Federal money and to appropriate millions of dollars of Federal money will not prevent the sale of the power which is generated at this dam?

Mr. DOWNEY. I think that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If I may ask one further question, what position does the railroad commission, which regulates utilities, take upon this matter?

Mr. DOWNEY. They have no right or duty to take a position, and I am very certain they have not done so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. They have taken no position?

Mr. DOWNEY. In this matter; no.

Mr. REVERCOMB. They would, however, have no control whatsoever over the lines built by the Federal Government, will they?

Mr. DOWNEY. I feel sure they would not. They could not control the power that was developed by the Federal Government.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But they can control the rates of the public utilities?

Mr. DOWNEY. Undoubtedly they can.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I will be very brief because I think the Senate will try to wind up this bill in the next half hour. I should like to emphasize that there is involved in the pending amendment a $1,580,000 reduction, which is the only reduction which the Senate will make, if it sustains the committee, in this entire bill totaling $2,404,000,000. So far, on the Senate floor, we have increased this bill approximately $1,000,000,000. It seems to me that, as a point of pride, if nothing else, we ought to try to make at least one reduction in a bill so vast as this one.

I do not think the Senator from Arizona stated the issue quite correctly, at least not as I view it. The Senate committee, I might say, unanimously, at the request of the Senator from Arizona, put into the Davis Dam project $1,800,000 specifically for a transmission line from Phoenix to Tucson, which the House had denied. I do not think anyone on this side takes the position that where there is a demonstrated need for a transmission line to reach possible consumers, when there is no other way to reach them, Federal funds to build such a line should be denied.

The point here it seems to me is not that this is a monopoly. We all know that a monopoly in the public-utility field, particularly in the power field where it takes vast sums to build a power grid so that the supply of power can be used efficiently, provides the most efficient and economical method of operation. That is why we have monopolies, and we have them under public regulation. I might say that the testimony before the committee was that the utility rates in California are considerably the lowest average rates in the Nation. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has publicly stated that the price which Pacific Gas & Electric is paying for Shasta power at the dam site is a fair and equitable price, and it is approved, as I understand, by the California Raliroad Commission and the Federal Power Commission.

The question here it seems to me is this: Is there any evidence whatever that the Pacific Gas & Electric, which admittedly has or is prepared to build whatever facilities are necessary in the next 20 years to transmit all the power

that Shasta Dam will produce wherever it is needed, is trying to gyp the Government either by paying less than it should for the power or by charging consumers more than it should? There is not the slightest bit of evidence on that point.

Mr. President, all the evidence is that the price which Pacific Gas & Electric is paying the Government is fair, that under a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation it is delivering power to the pumping plants wherever it is necessary at rates which actually save the Government money compared to what it would have to pay if it built its own line.

The company has offered to sign a contract to purchase all the power which may be produced at the Shasta Dam and distribute it over its own system at whatever price is determined to be fair, by the California Railroad Commission or the Federal Power Commission.

So it seems to me that before we start spending $70,000,000 we should consider what we are doing. I believe that the opponents of the committee amendment have by implication admitted what was charged in the hearing, namely, that this little $730,000 item is a camel's nose under the tent which will commit the Congress to an eventual expenditure of $70,000,000 for a duplicate transmission system.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I recall, I first became a member of the Committee on Appropriations in 1941. At that time there was pending a controversy somewhat similar to this one. The committee held hearings for a few days. There was full testimony and a large attendance. Many representatives from California appeared before the committee. At that time there was a request to build a portion of this proposed transmission line. I visualize a map of California about 12 inches high. There was then a request from the Bureau of Reclamation to build a line down to what is known as the Oroville switchboard or substation. Oroville would be approximately an eighth of an inch down on the 12-inch map. As I remember, the Bureau was then asking for an appropriation of a few million dollars to build that section of the transmission line.

We heard all the testimony, and the committee decided against it. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senate decided against it, and it was specifically agreed in conference, as set forth in the report, that no Federal funds should be used to start building that transmission line. None of the funds appropriated under that act were used, but from unexpended balances previously appropriated the line was built down to Oroville. I believe the record will bear me out in the statement that that is how the transmission line was started.

We now have before us a request to extend the line down along the Sacramento River into the San Francisco Bay area. Why are we asked to do that? Because it is all a part of one project. It is said that irrigation in the Central Valley will be cheaper if the farmers can get power at a low cost. So it is up to Congress to see that they get their electricity for pumping just as cheaply as possible. Otherwise the people of the Central Valley will have to pay more per acre, and for a greater number of years, to pay back into the Federal Treasury the entire cost of the Central Valley project, which I believe amounts to more than $400,000,000. There is a system of canals, dams, and irrigation ditches yet to be built. The entire cost of the project will be approximately $400,000,000; and through the Bureau of Reclamation revenue will come back to the Federal Treasury in the form of annual payments by farmers.

The testimony is quite clear that distribution of power can be done more cheaply by the utility company which is now doing business there. Why would it be cheaper? I think the reason is very clear. Two persons starting to build the same service line could probably build it at about the same cost. But when it comes to the question of production and distribution of electric power the situation is different. The existing companies all have hydroelectric plants and steam plants to firm up the power and make it available 24 hours of the day, 365 days in the year. This new proposal means that should the Government build a transmission line it would have to build a steam plant to make power available at all hours of the day. That is why such a project would cost more. To me it is a matter of simple arithmetic.

This is not a new project. Most of the information has been given in the colloquy today; but I wish to tell the Senate that this is the same project about which our former colleague, Senator Burton, spoke last year. I am sure that the Senate will be doing the right thing if it takes the same action this year that it took last year, when we heard such a fine explanation of the project from our former colleague, Senator Burton.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken in one respect. Whenever this issue has been presented to the Senate it has always voted in favor of the construction of transmission lines. The House has been opposed, and it has only been in conference that failure to appropriate has resulted. On every occasion on which the question of constructing a transmission line in the Central Valley has been fairly presented to the Senate up to the present time the Senate has voted to proceed with the project. We would go to conference with the proposal, and the House conferees would say, "No; we are not doing it that way." I so stated at the beginning of my remarks.

Now, for the first time, the House has adopted the position of the Senate. It has approved an appropriation for a transmission line. The House having changed its mind, and having adopted what has heretofore been the view of the Senate, I hope the Senate will go along with the House.

Mr. GURNEY. My memory may be in error, but I know that the transmission line project has been turned down by Congress every year since I have been a Member of the Senate. It was turned down in the Senate committee; and while it may have been approved on the floor of the Senate——

Mr. HAYDEN. It was.

Mr. GURNEY. I know that the money was never appropriated for the transmission line.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is quite correct. All I wish to state is that sometimes, as in this instance, the Senate committee has failed to report the item to the Senate, but the Senate has always inserted it in the bill, and I hope it will keep the item in the bill now.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the Senate has always inserted the item in the bill, and the reason why the item did not remain in the bill was that the House did not agree. Today we find ourselves in a situation in which the House itself has inserted the item and all we need to do is to agree with the House, since the House is now taking the position which the Senate has always taken on this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have not been a Member of the Senate for so long a time as has the distinguished Senator from Alabama. No doubt his statement is correct, and no doubt the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arizona is correct.

All I wish to say is that on every occasion when this question has arisen in the Senate Committee on Appropriations the Senate committee has turned it down. That is where the testimony is taken, and that is where we get a frank expression of the issues at stake. Last year and this year the committee turned down the item, and now it is brought to the floor of the Senate.

The item involves more than merely an appropriation of $730,000. The distinguished Senator from Arizona knows that to be so. This is the beginning of an appropriation to build a steam plant and transmission lines involving appropriations of more than $70,000,000. That is the question on which we are voting this afternoon. So I feel that the Senate ought to know that the Senate committee which has handled this matter and heard testimony on it at least twice since I have been a Member of the Senate, and has voted upon it, has turned it down. As I have said, the evidence is considered before the committee. The witnesses appear before the committee; and the committee has decided that this project should not be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 40, beginning on line 22.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Connally	Gurney
Barkley	Donnell	Hart
Bilbo	Downey	Hayden
Brewster	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Ellender	Hill
Brooks	Ferguson	Hoey
Byrd	Fulbright	Huffman
Capehart	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.
Capper	Gossett	Johnston, S. C.
Carville	Green	Kilgore
Chavez	Guffey	Knowland

La Follette	Morse	Smith
Langer	Murdock	Taylor
Lucas	Murray	Thomas, Utah
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Tydings
McFarland	Pepper	Vandenberg
McKellar	Radcliffe	Wagner
McMahon	Reed	Wherry
Maybank	Revercomb	Wiley
Mead	Robertson	Willis
Millikin	Russell	Young
Mitchell	Saltonstall	
Moore	Shipstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. Is the pending question on agreeing to the committee amendment striking out the $730,000 appropriation for the building of a transmission line to Sacramento?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment which embraces the matter referred to by the Senator from Kansas.

On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that on this question the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "nay."

I announce further that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is detained on official business. His pair on this question has been stated.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—27

Ball	Gerry	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bridges	Hart	Robertson
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Byrd	Hoey	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Tydings
Capper	Millikin	Wherry
Donnell	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Radcliffe	Willis

NAYS—38

Bilbo	Huffman	Mitchell
Carville	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Murdock
Connally	Kilgore	Murray
Downey	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Lucas	Russell
Fulbright	McClellan	Shipstead
Gossett	McFarland	Taylor
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Guffey	McMahon	Wagner
Hayden	Maybank	Young
Hill	Mead	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	George	Taft
Andrews	Glass	Thomas, Okla.
Austin	Hatch	Tobey
Bailey	Hawkes	Tunnell
Bankhead	McCarran	Vandenberg
Barkley	Magnuson	Walsh
Briggs	Myers	Wheeler
Buck	O'Daniel	White
Bushfield	Overton	Wilson
Butler	Stanfill	
Cordon	Stewart	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the rejection of the amendment will necessitate changing the totals on page 41, and we shall have to change the $17,635,000 figure. I ask that the change be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the change will be made.

Mr. MCKELLAR. A corresponding change in figures will be necessary in lines 9 and 10 on the same page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the totals will be changed accordingly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The total figure will be $46,712,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the change will be made.

The bill is still open to amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 56, in line 24, was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. In the committee amendment on page 56, line 24, I move to strike out "$84,259,000" and insert "$84,659,000." That will result, Mr. President, in an addition of $400,000 to the amount specified in the committee amendment.

I desire to make a brief explanation of why I seek to obtain the additional appropriation.

Back in 1936 the War Department requested Congress to authorize an appropriation of approximately $122,000 for the purpose of removing logs and debris from the mouth of the Sangamon River. The request was approved by the War Department and was authorized by the Congress. However, the appropriation was not forthcoming. Later, in 1944, once again, upon the recommendation of the War Department, Congress authorized an appropriation of $400,000, not for the purpose of cleaning out the mouth of the river, because of the tremendous expense which would be involved at that time in doing so, but for the purpose of constructing a new channel of approximately 4½ miles in length which would empty the Sangamon River into the Illinois River a short distance above the city of Beardstown, Ill.

In 1943 the highest floods in the history of the Sangamon Valley occurred, and thousands upon thousands of acres of the finest farm land in the country were inundated. One of the major causes of the flood was the debris, the logs, and other materials which clogged the mouth of the Sangamon River.

So important, Mr. President, is the Sangamon River Valley, from the standpoint of producing food for the Nation, that Marvin Jones, who was head of the War Food Administration in 1944, requested that this improvement be made in the Sangamon River Valley in order that we could be assured of more food being produced on the 100,000 acres of land which the floods in the Sangamon River Valley had destroyed from time to time.

Mr. President, this valley is one about which I personally know. It is rich in tradition and in history. It extends from Springfield, Ill., to Beardstown, Ill., a route which Abraham Lincoln traveled when he lived in that section of the country. I was born approximately 8 miles from the town of Chandlerville, which was flooded in 1943 primarily because of conditions at the mouth of the Sangamon River, and I know personally that water stood in some of the homes of that region to a depth of as much as 4 feet. That is one reason why an appropriation should be made, but it should be made primarily because approximately 100,000 acres of the most fertile land which can be found anywhere are affected by what occurs from time to time at the mouth of the Sangamon River.

An appropriation was made to take care of the construction of levees in what is known as the Coal Creek drainage district which lies just across the river from Beardstown, Ill., where the

Sangamon River empties into the Illinois River. A little farther up the stream the Kerton Valley district has been taken care of by appropriations for the purpose of constructing levees for flood control.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has made a very interesting statement. I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference. I think the Senate will agree to have the amendment taken to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I realize that what the Senator from Illinois has said has been very interesting. I have listened to his statement with considerable interest. It was an impressive statement but it failed to reveal important reasons for requesting the amendment. I realize that the statement contained some historical background——

Mr. LUCAS. I merely mentioned it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator gave some interesting history of the region and stated that he was born within approximately 8 miles of one of the towns in that section. However, I have not yet heard a great deal of argument in behalf of the need to which he has referred.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may eliminate the fact that I was born in that region. I merely mentioned Abraham Lincoln because I thought I could interest the Senator from New Hampshire. I think he is a great admirer of Lincoln who is the patron saint of his party.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Illinois was born in the particular region of the country to which he has referred, and I should like to help him if I could do so. However, I ask the Senator if the Army authorities or the War Department have asked for a Budget approval of this request, and if so, has such approval been given?

Mr. LUCAS. The Bureau of the Budget did not approve it. For many years the Army authorities have tried to obtain permission to clean out the mouth of the Sangamon River. I have a letter from Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, which states in part as follows:

> The project for improvement at the mouth of the Sangamon River was authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and provides for straightening and enlarging the river channel from its mouth to a point about 5 miles above the mouth.
>
> In May 1944—

And here is the important thing—

> the War Production Board, upon the recommendation of the War Food Administration, approved construction of this project during the war emergency as a war food measure. Funds for this project in the amount of $400,000 were included in the War Department civil appropriation bill for fiscal year 1945 as it passed the Senate but were eliminated from the bill by action of the conference committee. The Department is, therefore, unable to proceed with the work at the present time.
>
> I can assure you that the Department fully recognizes the importance of the authorized improvement at the mouth of the Sangamon River to relieve flood conditions in that area, and that it is prepared to undertake construction of the project promptly upon receipt of the necessary appropriation of funds by Congress for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know that the practice of the Committee on Appropriations which handles bills of this character is not to recommend a requested appropriation which has not first been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I do not like that practice, but nevertheless it is a practice which has been followed. I think Congress should appropriate and not the Bureau of the Budget. But that system has prevailed heretofore, and I do not think it is fair to the Senate for a Member to come here at the last minute with a proposal of this nature, no matter how meritorious it may be. We all have projects of this type in which we are interested, but we do not bring them in at the last moment.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the Senator's statement, but I may make a plea of justification on my part. The Senator knows that I have been fairly well engaged in the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. I called my good friend, the Senator from Tenessee, the other day and told him that I wanted to appear before the Appropriations Committee, and he agreed that I should be permitted to do so. As time went on I found myself not able to appear before the committee. Consequently, as this is the only opportunity I have had to present the matter before the Senate, I hope that the Senate will allow the amendment to go to conference. It involves what is practically an emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4805) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3603, often referred to as the ship-sales bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Reserving the right to object, provided by unanimous consent we may lay the pending business aside until not later than 12 o'clock Monday, I shall be very glad to have the Senate proceed with the ship-sales bill, which probably can be concluded today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. If the request of the Senator from Maryland shall be granted, at any time, not only on Monday, but today, all the Senator from California or any other Senator would have to do would be merely to rise and demand the regular order. That would bring the pay bill back before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would remind the Senate that a special order has been set for Monday at 12 o'clock, namely, the Palestine matter.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I entered a motion yesterday to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to. Since the Senate has just acted favorably upon my motion to take up the ship-sales bill, I now ask that the motion to reconsider be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion pending now is the motion by the junior Senator from Wyoming to recommit the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask that that motion be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion will be laid aside temporarily.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from California was attempting to get recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs the Senator's pardon. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Maryland asking for unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, before the Senate recessed Thursday, the committee amendment was agreed to. Therefore, before this subject matter of ship sales can come up for further consideration, there will have to be a reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to. If that were done, it would open the matter up again for consideration of amendments affecting specific provisions of the general committee amendment. I, therefore, ask that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HILL. If I may have the attention of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland make a motion to reconsider?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion is in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry. Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable.

Mr. RADCLIFFE obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, as I understand, the committee struck out everything in the bill after the enacting clause and reported a substitute amendment, and the substitute amendment constituted the entire bill as reported by the committee. What happened was that when the bill was under consideration the Senate agreed to the substitute amendment, which, in effect, amounted really to agreeing to the bill, certainly up to that stage. What the Senator from Maryland is seeking is a reconsideration of the vote by which the substitute amendment was agreed to, so that the substitute amendment may again be in order for amendment, or such discussion as the Senate may desire to proceed with. Is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. That is the only way by which the matter can be brought up on the floor for further consideration of specific provisions of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation for the benefit of those who are interested in the bill. As I understand, the motion to reconsider means a vote upon the bill as amended. Is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that mean we would be adopting the bill now if the modified amendments were accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is only one amendment that can be acted on.

Mr. WHERRY. And that amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from California, which the distinguished Senator from Maryland accepted.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, if the vote shall be reconsidered, the result will be that there will be no bar to a further amendment being offered, if it is desired to offer one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the parliamentary inquiry I was about to propound. If a Senator is opposed to the bill as modified, the only chance he would have would be on this vote to reconsider. Is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to reconsider.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill as it has been amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As it has been amended. If any Senator desired reconsideration, he would vote in the affirmative, if he did not wish reconsideration, he would vote against it. If the bill shall not be reconsidered, then it stands just as it stood on Wednesday.

Mr. WHERRY. So that if any Senator on either side of the aisle desires to oppose the bill as amended, with the modifications accepted, the only opportunity will be to present his views now on the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not the only opportunity to present his views. The motion is to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and that is debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable. If the motion shall be agreed to, and the vote shall be reconsidered, then the matter comes back before the Senate for further consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. If it comes back, it comes back as a committee amendment, as modified and accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I state, in explanation of my motion, that one or more Senators who did not understand that we were up to final passage of the bill had several matters they wished to present for consideration. That is why they have asked me to make the motion to reconsider. I certainly did not and do not wish to do anything to preclude any Senator from having a reasonable time to present his views to the Senate, especially when there was misapprehension as to the parliamentary situation. That is why I have made the motion, so that an opportunity may be afforded to Members of the Senate to bring up matters in which they were interested but were prevented from doing so because they had not realized the bill was on the verge of a vote on final passage.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what is the motion the Senator from Maryland has made? I was out of the Chamber for the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to reconsider the vote by which the amendment adopted Wednesday was agreed to and that included the dry-cargo amendment.

Mr. HILL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. In other words, what the Senator from Maryland is seeking to do is to get the committee substitute amendment, which really constituted the bill which was considered by the Senate, back before the Senate, and if the motion of the Senator from Maryland to reconsider the vote by which the committee substitute amendment was agreed to shall prevail, then the whole substitute amendment will be back before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is there a question pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the question pending now is on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Maryland is going to discuss the matter further, if it is in order, I should like to make a statement in opposition to reconsideration of the vote at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the amendment which I offered a few days ago, and which the able Senator from Maryland, who was handling the bill, accepted, would strike out the word "dry-cargo." The effect would be, as I fully explained when the matter was before the Senate, that it would permit the chartering not only of dry-cargo vessels but also of tankers. It would put them in exactly the same position.

This matter had been up for discussion in the subcommittee, as the Senator from Maryland has already outlined. The subcommittee had before it the language in the bill as it is now with my amendment in it. However, when the matter came before the full committee, by a narrow margin the word "dry-cargo" was put back into the bill which was reported to the Senate. I was not present at that particular meeting, but the Senator from Maryland has stated what happened.

As a matter of fact, in my opinion, there is no justification for putting back the limiting word "dry-cargo." If Senators will examine their copies of the bill, H. R. 3603, section 5 (a), they will find the following:

SEC. 5 (a). Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to charter a war-built—

Then, as the bill was reported from the committee, came the word "dry-cargo," which my amendment struck out—

vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, for bare-boat use. The Commission may, in its discretion, either reject or approve the application, but shall not so approve unless in its opinion the chartering of such vessel to the applicant would be consistent with the policies of this act.

(b) The charter hire for any vessel chartered under the provisions of this section shall be fixed by the Commission at such rate as the Commission determines to be consistent with the policies of this act, but, except upon the affirmative vote of not less than four members of the Commission, such rate shall not be less than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price.

Under the amendment which I offered and which was accepted by the Senator from Maryland, permission is given to the Commission to charter tankers. It is purely permissive. The Maritime Commission is still bound by the general policy to sell these vessels if they can first be sold, and I think we all agree upon that point. But if the Commission have offered these vessels for sale and have not been able to sell them, and it is a question as to whether they shall be tied up in the harbors and rivers of the east or west coast, or whether they shall be chartered and be put to use on the high seas, and afford work for American seamen, then I think the Commission should have the power to charter them and that their hands should not be tied.

The able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] the other day raised as one of his objections to the bill the fact that it did not give sufficient discretionary power to the Maritime Commission. My amendment merely gives them greater discretionary power.

I read into the RECORD the other day, and I wish to read again at this point for the benefit of those who were not present, two telegrams which I received, which I believe express the view of some of the seamen who will be affected adversely if this amendment is not written into the bill. I read:

Your amendment to S. 292—

And I might parenthetically say that Senate bill 292 was the companion bill to this bill, and the amendment would apply in either event—

Your amendment to S. 292, which provides that American operators may charter American oil tankers, in our opinion assures employment for American seamen and should be adopted in the interest of the American merchant marine. We hope that it will be concurred in.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

I read the second telegram:

Our organization, composed of 60,000 seamen affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, heartily approve of your amendment to Senate bill 292 allowing chartering of oil tankers to American operators. If bill passes without your amendment, it will result in foreign tankers being chartered by operators and thousands of American seamen who sailed these tankers all during war will face severe unemployment and will be a burden on the taxpayers.

HARRY LUNDEBERG,
President, Seafarers International Union of North America.

The fact of the matter is that this amendment is necessary in order to furnish the smaller operator a chance to have some competition with the larger operator. I can see no consistency in the Senate taking a stand whereby rather than having tankers operated, thereby furnishing employment and stimulating business, they would be tied up in the harbors and the ports of the United States rotting away. Rather should we give the Maritime Commission merely the permissive power to charter them if in their discretion it is found to be good public policy to do so. Therefore I am very strongly opposed to reconsideration at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in support of the motion to reconsider I should like to make a few remarks in regard to the amendment which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from California and on which he has just spoken. I should like to correct him in his statement that this item was adopted in the Commerce Committee by a small majority. I was somewhat doubtful myself as to the actual voting procedure on that point, and I called the clerk of the committee yesterday and asked her to refer to her notes and let me know exactly what happened in the consideration of that amendment, and she advised me that there was no vote taken and that there was no opposition, and it was agreed to. But I would explain to Senators that the Senator from California was not present on that occasion.

Mr. President, I shall quote from page 2 of the report respecting the objectives of the bill:

The measure, reduced to its simplest terms, involves two objectives: (1) The establishment of a firm pricing policy for the sale of war-built merchant vessels, and (2) the establishment of an inactive merchant vessel reserve promptly available for security needs, but frozen so far as commercial use is concerned.

Mr. President, the approach of the Commerce Committee when considering this bill was very definitely one of sale and not of chartering of the surplus vessels, and particularly the tankers. In order to promote sale rather than chartering the percentage of cost on tankers was reduced by the Commerce Committee from 100 percent in the bill to 60 percent in order to encourage the complete sale of the tankers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, is it not the case that the sale price of the tankers is still above the sale price of the dry-cargo vassels?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The dry-cargo vessels were left in at 50 percent and the tankers at 60 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What consistency is there then in permitting the chartering of dry-cargo vessels which the bill provides for and denying the chartering of tankers?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are many reasons for that, Mr. President. I shall name but a few. The object in permitting the chartering of dry-cargo vessels is to get rid of a number of old ships which would be noncompetitive so far as the United States is concerned, and which are largely of the coastwise and smaller type of vessels. In the case of the tankers almost every ship is a new ship not over 3 years old. Already 68 of the tankers have been disposed of which leaves approximately 400 tankers to be disposed of, and practically every one a new ship, and which can be readily sold.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the statement is correct that there are only 400 left, and they can readily be sold, then it is perfectly obvious that the Maritime Commission, under the powers granted in the bill, will sell the vessels. It is only if they cannot be sold and if in the discretion of the Maritime Commission it would be sound policy to charter them rather than to let them rot, that my amendment would apply in any event.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. The case is not the same for dry-cargo vessels as it is for tankers because of a technical reason which has to do with depreciation. Tankers which are engaged in carrying gasoline, Mr. President, rust very rapidly, whereas that is not so in the case of the so-called dirty trade where the oil film prevents corrosion. If Government-built tankers are chartered, those who charter are not very much concerned about depreciation, because the vessels may readily be turned back as soon as they become in such condition that they can no longer carry kerosene. The result then is, Mr. President, that anyone who wishes to go into the kerosene trade is most likely to charter a Government tanker. Then the Government takes the ultimate loss, and if the operator owns other ships he uses those ships in the dirty trade in which the deterioration is not so great.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that the Maritime Commission under this bill which would give them discretionary authority would have the right to set up the rules and regulations under which they would charter, and therefore if any company was proposing to use its own ships in the dirty trade, the oil trade, and to use the Government vessels in the gasoline trade, the Commission itself could provide the safeguards?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HART. I doubt that that would be administratively practicable. I do not recall just what provision there is in the bill for that, but I very greatly doubt that the Maritime Commission would charter a tanker on condition that she could only be used in a dirty oil trade.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I might say that during the committee's hearings Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission was present and he expressed himself as confident that with the price based as the committee based it on tankers there would be little difficulty in disposing of all the tankers by sale.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was adopted, be reconsidered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we have before us a bill involving approximately $10,000,000,000, and I do not believe we ought to proceed to a vote on the question of reconsideration unless we have a quorum present. Therefore, Mr.

President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. If a quorum is obtained, does the Senator expect to speak on the bill for some time?

Mr. LANGER. No.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator will not let us go ahead without a quorum at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I do not believe that a matter so important as the reconsideration of a committee amendment involving $10,000,000,000 should be taken up unless we have a quorum.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me emphasize to the Senator from North Dakota that we have spent several days in the consideration of the bill, and every feature and aspect of it has been given considerable attention. I was sincerely hoping that we might pass the bill tonight and so get it into conference. Every day we delay passage the Federal Government may be losing money. If we do not get the bill into conference and have it enacted this week and therefore are unable to act upon it until next January, the Government may lose many sales of ships, because proposals are now pending for sales and leases which cannot be consummated without this legislation. I do not wish to hurry any Senator in reaching conclusions, but this question has been under consideration for a long time. It has been discussed at great length several times on the floor of the Senate. I sincerely hope that the Senate will send this bill to conference so that we may have a law under which we can operate. We need it most seriously.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am entirely willing to remain here until midnight if it will help the distinguished Senator from Maryland. However, at the present time only 14 Senators are present in the Chamber. The bill involves a sum amounting to $10,000,000,000. I have no objection to having a quorum call and remaining here until midnight if it will help the Senator.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that on Thursday the bill was practically passed, which fact indicated that Members of the Senate were ready to act upon its final passage. The committee amendment, which means practically the entire bill, as it came from the Commerce Committee as modified, was approved. The only reason why the motion to reconsider was made was, as I have just stated, that there were one or two minor points to which some Members of the Senate desired to give further consideration. So far as I know there is no desire on the part of any Member of the Senate to consider the bill, generally speaking. Only one or two relatively small points are involved at present. Therefore, I believe that we should act on the bill without tying it up until next week, which may mean that the bill will have to go over until January.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I view the picture, considerable debate occurred the other day. The amendment was very carefully explained. I believe that I have attended the sessions of the Senate as faithfully as almost any other Senator. Several times on the day when the amendment was before us for consideration I made the point of no quorum, so that a good attendance would be maintained.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] was in the Chamber at the time I offered my amendment and the Senator from Maryland accepted it. I leaned over backward in order to explain just what the amendment would do. The RECORD will bear me out.

Certainly we shall not make progress on the bill if, after an amendment has been agreed to, we must back-track and reconsider the whole procedure. We have discussed this question. I am perfectly willing to vote to pass the bill through the Senate and send it to conference, where some of the differences can be ironed out. But I do not believe that we shall serve the purposes of expedition if, after we agree to an amendment and place it in the bill, we back-track and do the whole thing over again.

Had the Senator from Wyoming not been in the Chamber at the time, and had the situation been that the amendment had not been explained at the time, I should feel entirely different about opposing the motion. But the Senator from Wyoming was in the Chamber. I explained the situation, and the amendment was accepted. Any Senator had an opportunity at that time to raise an objection, at which time the question could have been fully debated. Under the circumstances I do not believe that we are expediting consideration of the bill by reconsidering the committee amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that his expression "back-track" may be appropriate, but I rather question it. If there was a misunderstanding, if any Member of the Senate has some aspect of the legislation in mind which he wishes to present, and he thinks he has not had the opportunity to do so, it seems to me that it is reasonable to give him such an opportunity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I was in the Chamber during the brief explanation of the amendment which was made, but my attention was distracted by some other matter, and I did not realize until a few moments later that the distinguished Senator from Maryland had accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from California with the agreement to take it to conference. The committee was so definite in its policy of prohibiting the chartering of tankers that I asked for a reconsideration of the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is apparent that Senators do not agree. It will require some time for them to straighten out their differences. I believe that we should have a quorum, and I again suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hart	Morse
Bilbo	Hayden	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Radcliffe
Brooks	Hoey	Revercomb
Capper	Huffman	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Donnell	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Downey	Knowland	Smith
Ellender	La Follette	Taylor
Ferguson	Langer	Tydings
Gerry	Lucas	Wherry
Green	McClellan	Wiley
Guffey	McKellar	Willis
Gurney	McMahon	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, December 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 15 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Robert J. Hoey, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from October 1, 1940.

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Charles P. Weiland, from the 10th day of April 1941.

Edward R. Polgrean, from the 4th day of August 1941.

William M. Watkins, Jr., from the 14th day of October 1941.

Richard R. Amerine, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Herbert A. Peters, from the 9th day of February 1942.

Robert R. Ayres, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.

Louis F. Ferguson, from the 12th day of March 1942.

Homer S. Hill, from the 12th day of March 1942.

Lawrence L. Herzog, from the 14th day of March 1942.

Jack B. Winters, from the 17th day of March 1942.

Scott G. Gier, from the 25th day of March 1942.

Cloyd R. Jeans, from the 25th day of March 1942.

Dean S. Hartley, Jr., from the 3d day of April 1942.

Wilbur F. Evans, from the 1st day of May 1942.

Robert L. Cremer, from the 15th day of May 1942.
Austin Wiggins, Jr., from the 15th day of May 1942.
James H. Phillips, from the 22d day of May 1942.
Elswin P. Dunn, from the 8th day of June 1942.
John M. Walker, Jr., from the 18th day of June 1942.
David R. Moak, from the 25th day of June 1942.
Edmond P. Hartsock, from the 18th day of July 1942.
Ralph E. Robinson, from the 18th day of July 1942.
Charles E. Call, from the 1st day of October 1942.
Emmett O. Anglin, Jr., from the 1st day of November 1942.
Phillip C. DeLong, from the 16th day of December 1942.
Edwin H. McCaleb III, from the 1st day of February 1943.
Bruce J. Matheson, from the 1st day of February 1943.
Thomas H. Miller, Jr., from the 1st day of March 1943.
John H. Glenn, Jr., from the 16th day of March 1943.
Earl W. Johnson, from the 16th day of March 1943.
George W. Brewer, from the 1st day of April 1943.
Loren K. Bronleewe, from the 1st day of April 1943.
Thomas J. Burnam, from the 1st day of April 1943.
David Cleeland, from the 16th day of April 1943.
Lynn W. Griffitts, from the 16th day of April 1943.
John E. Hansen, from the 16th day of April 1943.
George F. Bauman, from the 16th day of May 1943.
Stewart R. Lauer, from the 16th day of May 1943.
Joseph A. Mitchell, from the 16th day of May 1943.
George E. Jenkins, from the 1st day of June 1943.
Stanley J. Posluszny, from the 1st day of June 1943.
Richard H. Rainforth, from the 1st day of June 1943.
Eddie C. Torbett, from the 1st day of June 1943.
Thomas T. Tulipane, from the 16th day of June 1943.
Boyd "M" Phelps, from the 1st day of July 1943.
Harold D. Shields, from the 1st day of July 1943.
James C. Frew, from the 16th day of July 1943.
Richard M. Moore, from the 16th day of July 1943.
William K. Treynor, from the 16th day of July 1943.
Albert F. Dellamano, from the 1st day of August 1943.
Robert E. Wellwood, from the 1st day of August 1943.
Claude O. Barnhill, Jr., from the 16th day of August 1943.
Robert S. Hemstad, from the 16th day of August 1943.
Elmer E. Luther, from the 1st day of September 1943.
Dwight E. Mayo, from the 1st day of September 1943.
George H. Elias, from the 1st day of October 1943.
Frank K. Reilly, Jr., from the 1st day of November 1943.
Walter E. Daniel, from the 16th day of December 1943.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father, we lift up our hearts as again o'er the earth's dark shadows the angels' song is heard. We rejoice with adoring wonder that the skies are aflame with shining glory and vocal with ecstatic anthems of the winged heralds of peace, for over an earth grown old with its burden of care again the voice of the Christ Child rings out with its cheer that we all are the children of God.

With the coming of Christmas everywhere as the only alternative to chaos, grant us such courage that our efforts may never falter; such love that every barrier to brotherhood and equality may be beaten down; such wisdom that every problem of boundary and trade, of language and culture, may be solved; such faith that when the way is long and hard we may yet persevere to the end in the knowledge that Thy sovereign will reigneth, as revealed in the redeeming Word made flesh. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On December 14, 1945:

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; and

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

On December 15, 1945:

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; and

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the last session be approved without reading.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the floor, and I do not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, of his own motion, will state that, without objection, the Journal of the previous session will be approved without reading.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I have the floor, and I am not inclined to yield. The Senator from New York has not asked me to yield?

Mr. WAGNER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, I am entitled to the floor at the opening of the session.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not recall the Senator's name being mentioned in the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will suspend for a moment while the Chair sees what was done.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the 13th instant, the Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) relative to the opening of Palestine for the free entry of the Jews, and the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas and will then recognize the Senator from New York.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to inquire what effect the unanimous-consent agreement has upon the fact that the Federal pay bill is the unfinished business before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has no effect on it at all, except that by the unanimous-consent agreement it was agreed that the resolution as to the Jews entering Palestine would come up today.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator from Texas will yield for a further parliamentary inquiry, does that mean that, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I am entitled to call for the regular order whenever I desire?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can call for the regular order at any time during the consideration of the concurrent resolution, which is before the Senate under a unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate, made when the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair and did not know about it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Unfortunately, it was made when I was not present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was made, and must be carried out, of course.

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand that; but if the President pro tempore will further bear with me, am I to understand, then, that I would be entitled to call for the regular order when I desire?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator would.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not present at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, but I agree that the resolution should come up today. I did not know, however, that the agreement was to be so exclusive and so iron-bound as it seems to have been.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4649, known as the UNRRA authorization bill. I wish to assure the Senate it will take a very short time, and it is probably the most important matter now pending for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is in order.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement which was made provided that Senate Resolution 44 should come up at the opening of the session today, and that I was to be permitted to address the Senate upon it. That is all a part of the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement was stated by the Chair a while ago. The agreement was made when the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair, but the Chair has read the unanimous-consent agreement, and as it was made and given to him it does not provide that the Senator from New York should have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be a violation of the rules if it did, because the Chair recognized me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas was in front of the Chair and had a paper in his hand and asked for recognition, and under the rules of the Senate, unless by unanimous consent, the first Senator to arise and address the Senate is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as a matter of information, may I read the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. WAGNER. Here is the unanimous-consent agreement made on my request:

After conferring with the majority and minority leaders, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and having obtained their consent, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the beginning of the session, the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, which deals with the Palestine problem, and that I may be permitted to address myself to the resolution when it is taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator from New York, no one is trying to prevent his addressing the Senate when the resolution is taken up, but the agreement does not say he shall make the first speech of the day. It does not say he shall have a corner on recognition; it does not give him a monopoly of the floor, but simply says that he shall be allowed to address the Senate.

Mr. WAGNER. When the resolution is taken up.

Mr. CONNALLY. When it is taken up, of course.

Mr. WAGNER. That is the unanimous-consent agreement, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly it is, as plain as day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I insist on my motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. If this matter is to involve controversy, I think there should be a quorum present. I do not know who is interested in the resolution which the Senator from New York is pressing, or whether Senators would prefer to go on with the UNRRA bill, which the Senator from Texas is seeking to have considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will take only a little while, I will say to the Senator from Maine, because we thrashed the question out a day or so ago when the appropriation was before the Senate. So I anticipate only very brief debate.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I am merely insisting upon the unanimous-consent agreement that was entered into Thursday, which I have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think the unanimous-consent agreement had anything in it about the order in which Senators should be recognized; but the Chair has recognized the Senator from New York now, the motion pending is debatable, and therefore the Senator can make his address, if he desires to do so.

Mr. WAGNER. I am merely asking the Senate to follow the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is mistaken about the language that is used. It does not require that the Senator should be recognized first.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not think I had lost the floor. The Senator from Maine asked me to yield for the purpose of enabling him to have a quorum called. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Texas had taken his seat, and supposed, therefore, he had yielded the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. The question now is on my motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. WAGNER. I inquire of the Chair whether the Chair will recognize the unanimous-consent agreement which was made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the unanimous-consent agreement which was made, and has laid the matter before the Senate. However, the motion of the Senator from Texas has priority over all other motions. The Senator can address himself to anything he desires.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I ask for a quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has not yielded for that purpose. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Huffman	Pepper
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lucas	Stanfill
Capehart	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Carville	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. I announce that he is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably absent on important business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews, which is as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I will not yield; no. I wish to proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York declines to yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the essence of the resolution on Palestine, reported favorably by a 17-to-1 vote of the Foreign Relations Committee, is to be found in the following language:

That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended, and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. President, we are now talking about maintaining peace through the control of the atomic bomb. I devoutly hope that these efforts will prove successful. Another world war would destroy us all. But let us remind ourselves that the principles of peace do not change as rapidly as the instruments of war. New instruments of war are constantly discovered, but the principles of peace are as eternal and unchanging as the Sermon on the Mount.

Permanent peace can rest only upon the foundation of the eternal bases of morality. Permanent peace requires justice and truth and fair dealing—toward the weak as well as the strong, toward the oppressed as well as the free, toward those who are homeless as well as those who are secure.

These are the reasons why I believe that the Palestine question is so vital. A few hundred thousand more or even a few million more Jews in Palestine may not weigh so heavily in the scales of world affairs. One more small commonwealth, added to the long list of the nations of the world, may not seem to count for much.

Palestine will never be able to start a war or keep the peace. But Palestine as a symbol of the faith of the great nations, Palestine as a test of the integrity and conscience of mankind, Palestine as a signpost of where the world is going—that is terribly important. That carries a tremendous weight in the scales of the future of the world.

The very fact that Palestine and the Jewish question may look small, in the perspective of world affairs, is the very reason why it is so large and so important. For if the great powers of the world prove themselves incompetent to deal honestly and fairly with a matter of this size, what hope or faith can we have that they will rise to the enormously larger problems of the future? If even the small pressures being brought to bear against a just solution of the Palestine question—the small pressures of oil concessions and Arab threats—if even these small pressures are enough to divert Great Britain or America from the course of honor, how pitifully inadequate is the state of our international morality.

Did anyone ever hear of a police force that was too weak or timid to stop a small dance-hall brawl, but that was strong enough to quell a riot? Did anyone ever hear of a fire department that was too slow to get to one small fire, but that was adequate to deal with the possibility of a conflagration? What sense, then, does it make to say that the world is unable at this time to do justice toward Palestine?

Was a League of Nations, which was too weak to prevent the plunder of Ethiopia or the initial pillage of Manchuria, strong enough to prevent World War II?

If the great English-speaking peoples today shrink away from the first small test and challenge placed before them, will a United Nations Organization be strong enough to fulfill its many fearful and sacred trust of the future?

Can we maintain and support the infamous repudiation of Palestine, embodied in the Chamberlain white paper of 1939, without reaping once again the consequences of Chamberlainism?

Can we resort to appeasement, without suffering again the holocaust which resulted from appeasement?

Can we make the remainder of the twentieth century a golden era of international morality, if we proclaim from the housetops that when we talk about international morality we are holding our tongues in our cheeks?

What are the compelling circumstances, alleged to be so important, which are standing in the way of Britain's fulfillment of her promises and duties? I should like to have these alleged compelling circumstances brought out into the light, and discussed out in the open. I am not satisfied when they remain hidden in the cloakrooms of diplomacy. Until they are brought to light, I will not believe that they legitimately exist. The only interpretation now possible is that these so-called compelling circumstances are small and ungenerous and unworthy, and that they cannot stand the light of day.

This resolution commends the President for his interest in the solution of this problem. Personally, I do not believe that more study is necessary. We need action. But if we are to be sure that the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry is to serve a useful purpose, the immediate adoption of this resolution by the Congress is imperative. We want the members of the Committee to have discretion in their methods. We want the members of the Committee to have discretion in devising the quickest possible means of fulfilling the promises already made for Palestine. But we do not want the Committee to have the discretion to make its own decisions on matters of fundamental policy. We do not want the Committee to recast promises or reformulate objectives. We do not want the Committee to substitute the judgment of a few men, however worthy, for the intent and determination of the American Congress and the American people. In this whole matter, the members of the Committee should be the servants and not the masters of the people at large. We should by this resolution let the Committee know what we want it to do, and we expect it to do just that, without delay.

The facts that are available to us now are simple and crystal clear. What are these facts?

For countless generations, the dispersed and oppressed Jewish people have looked toward Palestine as a land of hope and promise. This promise has been repeated many times by statesmen and politicians.

But we must remember that in the view of many, this promise was a holy promise, originating from a higher source whose Fatherhood we all acknowledge.

This promise was historically formalized in the Balfour Declaration of a generation ago.

Acting on this promise, the Jews already in Palestine have made superhuman sacrifices. They have reclaimed a wilderness and established a modern civilization—a civilization founded upon

the highest ideals of democracy, tolerance, and equality of opportunity.

When World War II commenced and Britain was in mortal danger the Jewish people in Palestine repaid evil with good. Despite Britain's violation of her pledge to them, they fought and died to maintain Britain's life line. The value of their aid was incalculable.

Now, to the frustration and disappointment of these Jews in Palestine, there is added the desperate plight of their hounded and persecuted brethren in Europe. These Jews in Europe are now but a pitiful remnant—a mere brand saved from the flame of Nazi terror.

Mr. President, while the great and powerful Empire of Britain is stretching out its hands to us and asking for loans, what are the Jewish people asking? They are asking merely for an opportunity to save themselves. Unlike Britain, they are not asking that we create a new obligation running from them to us. They are asking merely that we see to the fulfilment of an obligation running from us to them.

This obligation toward the Jews and toward Palestine is not on the part of Britain alone. It is an American obligation as well. It is an American obligation because the American Congress long ago went on record in favor of its fulfillment. It is an American obligation backed by a greater power and a higher law than the Congress—the overwhelming sentiment and conscience of the American people whom we here represent. It is an American obligation for a still greater reason—because America cannot escape its role in world peace and world justice, because the iniquity and injustice of the past handling of the Palestine question is the road to international anarchy and war.

We have heard that the entry of Jews into Palestine might create a Jewish majority there, and that this would be hurtful to Arab interests. No one has offered proof to support this assertion of injury to the Arabs. It is the responsibility of the great nations, as this resolution clearly states, to make certain that the increasing Jewish colonization of Palestine is consistent with equality and justice for all. This is an affirmative responsibility, but we cannot avoid it without admitting abject failure to deal with any problem of international adjustment.

What if it be true that the Jews may come to constitute a majority in Palestine? Was this not known when the original promise was made? For countless generations the Jews have been in the minority everywhere—and generally a persecuted minority. What is wrong with the proposition that in one place they may come to be the majority group?

And what alternative solutions have been offered? Certainly it is no solution to leave the remnants of the Jews of central Europe in their present unspeakable plight. Certainly it is no solution to confirm and condone the repudiation of obligations founded on the honor of Britain and America.

The resolution now before the Senate is directed toward the only honorable fulfillment of this sacred obligation. Half measures and sleight-of-hand are unacceptable. There can be no honorable Palestine policy, except in keeping with the original purpose and intent of the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate.

There must be an abrogation, now and at once, of artificial restrictions on immigration and colonization on the land. The Jews who want to go to Palestine must be facilitated to the fullest possible economic extent in reaching their refuge and accomplishing their redemption. We must, then, assist them and assist those who await them there with open arms and yearning hearts, in the reconstruction of Palestine, as a free and democratic commonwealth in which all men shall enjoy equal rights.

If we take half measures they will be half measures on the road toward the rapid deterioration of world organization for the purposes of peace. Only complete measures, taken at once, can mend the dangerous breaches already created by wrongdoing and neglect.

We and the world are rapidly being confronted with decisions as important as the decisions made at Munich. I pray God that we do not repeat the fatal errors which sacrificed 40,000,000 lives.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the resolution, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at the moment the Senate has under consideration a motion that it proceed with the consideration of the UNRRA bill. The Palestine resolution is not formally before us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. For what purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. For a question.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the pending motion is that the Senate proceed to consider the UNRRA bill. I deplore the consumption of time on the resolution relating to Palestine. We shall reach that resolution in due time. I have no disposition to delay its consideration, but I hope Senators will permit the Senate to vote on the motion relative to the UNRRA bill and take final action on that bill. Then the Senate can take up the Palestine resolution. I think it is just about as important to give the Jewish people in Europe food so that they will not starve before they can go to Palestine; for if we let them starve before they can reach Palestine, it will not do much good to open the door to Palestine to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, without passing on the relative importance of these two measures, I wish to say that it seems to me when we take up a measure we should consider it until it is finally disposed of, if possible. Never before since I have been a Member of the Senate have I seen quite the confusion which has existed in the last 2 weeks as a result of interrupting the consideration of one measure with consideration of another. Both the measures which have just now been referred to are short ones; and if we finish consideration of the Palestine resolution first, we can then proceed to consider the UNRRA bill. Of course, I think the Senate should pass the measure sponsored by the Senator from Texas.

In the meantime I desire to urge on the Senate the adoption of the so-called Palestine resolution. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself have introduced several resolutions on that subject during the past 2 years. In my opinion, the present session of Congress has before it nothing of any greater importance in respect to foreign policy than the Palestine resolution, because I think there is no more important step toward a permanent peace than the acceptance by Congress of the principle of the Palestine resolution. Our resolution states that—

> The United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power—

That is Great Britain—

> to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. President, we intend this resolution to be a reaffirmation of the Balfour Declaration of 1917. That declaration, which was approved by the British Government and the British Cabinet, stated unequivocally in favor of—

> the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people * * * it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

That is the end of the quotation from the Balfour declaration.

In the mandate from the League of Nations, the British, as the mandatory, undertook to put that declaration into effect, and it is written into the mandate from the League of Nations.

In April 1922 Congress adopted a resolution stating its satisfaction that—

> Owing to the outcome of the World War and their part therein, the Jewish people, under definite and adequate national guarantee, are to be enabled to recreate and reorganize a national home in the land of their fathers.

Mr. President, when I first studied the whole problem it seemed clear to me, beyond a possibility of doubt, that both Britain and the United States are clearly committed, by promises of support assumed as solemnly as possibly, to carry out the general policy stated in this resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the resolution of 1922 was unanimously adopted by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and it was signed by President Harding.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Some objection has been made to the fact that our declaration in favor of a free commonwealth—the word "commonwealth" is used in the resolution—set up by a Jewish majority goes beyond the idea of a Jewish national home, as contained in the Balfour Declaration. Those who had to do with the matter at the time of the World War, however, spoke repeatedly of a Jewish commonwealth, meaning a commonwealth set up when a majority of the people in that district were Jews. Certainly it was not meant to be an old men's home for Jews in an Arab Palestine. The Jews already had the rights of a minority race in nearly all countries throughout the world. There would have been no particular point in giving them the same status in Palestine. The expression "Jewish commonwealth" was used in the Versailles Conference by Lloyd George, and has been used by Winston Churchill. Lloyd George said:

> It was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish commonwealth.

President Wilson said, on March 3, 1919:

> I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth.

Because the British Government and others have tried to limit the term "Jewish national home," so that it means practically nothing, we have felt it essential that there be at this time a clear repudiation of that position by the use of the term "commonwealth." The very terms of the Balfour Declaration itself, assuring complete, equal rights to non-Jewish races, show clearly that a Jewish majority in Palestine was intended.

So the purpose of this resolution is to declare in favor of a policy which shall permit the unrestricted migration of Jews into Palestine until they become a majority of the people there, at which time a free and independent state shall be organized. So far as I know, no conditions relative to Palestine have changed since the World War, except the attitude of the various Arab states. Apparently that is the reason for the objection which has arisen. Previous to the World War, all that territory was part of the Turkish Empire. The Allies liberated all that territory and set up a number of states—Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and a number of other states—in which the Arabs clearly had a majority. At the same time they set up a separate state in Palestine, in which the Arabs also had a majority, but subject to the terms of the Balfour Declaration which provided for the immigration of Jews until the majority was Jewish. There was no other reason to set up Palestine as a separate state, because under the Turkish Empire all of it had been merged with Lebanon and Syria. It was not a particularly separate governmental unit. It was set up in order to take the first step toward carrying out the guarantee of the Balfour Declaration. At the time the Arabs did not raise any objection, and in fact their leader was in full accord with the plan. Nor was their position unreasonable. Palestine was only a very minute faction of the total territory in which Arab states were established, and it was a territory in which three great religions had a profound interest. It was distinct from all other surrounding states.

Today a strong Arab opposition has arisen; but whether it is real or whether it is artificial, is indeed difficult to judge. Whether the British Government has encouraged it, whether those interested in oil development have encouraged it, I certainly do not know. I only feel that it is unreasonable and represents just as much a change of position on the part of the Arabs as that which has occurred in the British attitude. It does not weaken in any way the Jewish historical case.

Mr. President, for the sake of the RECORD I think I should review the history of what has happened to these resolutions.

The purpose of the resolution which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and I introduced in 1943 was to reaffirm the position of the United States with respect to what should be done in Palestine, and call upon the British Government to carry out the terms of the mandate. At that time, as today, there were thousands of Jewish refugees throughout the world who were seeking a haven, and they were excluded from Palestine not for economic reasons, but, allegedly, for fear that to allow them to enter might antagonize the Arabs. Many more wanted to go to Palestine. It is probably that if the policy of unrestricted immigration had been adopted at that time many lives would have been saved, particularly among the Jews of Rumania and Bulgaria.

An argument had also arisen regarding the meaning of the term "Jewish national home" which we thought should be definitely settled. We also felt that a general peace treaty was in sight and that the settlement regarding Palestine which would be made in that treaty might well be final.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate where it had the support of a large majority of the members of the committee. We were then very much surprised to hear that a letter had been written to the chairman of the committee by Secretary of War Stimson, objecting to the passage of the resolution on military grounds. This letter was backed up by the personal appearance of General Marshall before the committee. The committee was requested not even to hold public hearings, on the ground that the news of those hearings might so excite the Arabs in northern Africa as to interfere with our military operations which were then taking place in Italy.

I certainly did not believe that this was the real ground of opposition. I felt that the Army was cooperating with the British, and desired to please the British by not taking any position which it thought would be inconvenient for the British government. Certainly the argument advanced was not sound.

While dubious of the facts, the committee had no other choice than to accept the military judgment of our military leaders in time of war. But the committee was astonished a few days later when the President issued a statement that "Full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home, for which the Government and the American people have always had the deepest sympathy." Surely, if the holding of public hearings by a Senate committee would have so stirred up Arabic public opinion as to endanger our armies, the issuance of this statement by the President, with his tremendous prestige, would have had even greater effect. But there is no evidence that the Arabs were in any way excited, or that there was the slightest interference with our armies then fighting in Italy.

The matter remained quiet until the Republican National Convention which was held in June 1944, called for the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and land ownership, so that Palestine might be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth. The platform stated:

> We condemn the failure of the President to insist that the mandatory of Palestine carry out the provisions of the Balfour declaration and of the mandate while he pretends to support them.

Thereupon the Democratic platform, in July, endorsed the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic national commonwealth.

On October 12 Governor Dewey endorsed the Republican plank. On October 15 President Roosevelt endorsed the Democratic plank, and stated that "efforts will be made to find ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable."

Immediately after the election the Senator from New York and I therefore pressed for immediate consideration of our resolution. I had obtained a letter from the Secretary of War stating that the military considerations which led to his previous action in opposing the adoption of the resolution were not so strong a factor as they had been, that in his judgment political considerations now outweighed the military, and that the issue should be determined upon the political rather than the military basis.

We were greatly astonished, therefore, when the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, appeared before the committee and opposed the adoption of the resolution, apparently under the President's direction. This was all in secret. The committee insisted on proceeding to report the resolution unless the Secretary of State was willing to state publicly his opinion. This he finally did on December 11, 1944, after consultation with the President, giving as his opinion

that the adoption of the resolution at that time would be unwise from the standpoint of the general international situation. Even then the resolution was shelved by a vote of only 12 to 8.

Then President Roosevelt again endorsed the Democratic platform and stated that he would seek to bring about its earliest realization. I have never been able to see, Mr. President, why there should be any objection to a Senate concurrent resolution stating the position of Congress in accord with the traditional policy of the United States and of both parties. I have never been able to understand why the Executive should state his position and yet object to any expression by Congress of its opinion on this well established American policy. President Roosevelt repeatedly reaffirmed his position, but he always blocked a congressional resolution.

After this delay in the fall of 1944 the President took his trip to Yalta and talked with Ibn Saud. It was never clear to me why he should discuss the matter with Ibn Saud at all, since that potentate never did have any jurisdiction over Palestine, nor any right to be consulted about British and American policy therein. Yet the President apparently brought up the subject and failed to press it in any way when he met the unqualified opposition of the ruler of Saudi Arabia. He went even further, because he actually entered into correspondence with Ibn Saud in which he said that no decision would be taken by the United States with respect to the basic situation in Palestine without full consultation with Arabs and Jews, and more specifically that, "I would take no action, in my capacity as Chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people." Apparently, Ibn Saud was treated as though he were the Arab people. It is hard to understand why the President should have considered it necessary to give any such assurance. The position of the United States had already been made clear. Mr. Roosevelt had pledged himself to this position. Why he should consult the head of a state with no direct interest in Palestine is and always has been a mystery to me.

Early this fall the Senator from New York and I called on the President to determine whether, if we resubmitted a resolution, we would meet the same opposition which we met from previous administrations. Mr. Truman indicated no opposition to the resolution and referred us to Mr. Byrnes. We pointed out that we did not desire to submit the resolution if there was to be administrative opposition. We were assured that there would be no such opposition, although the administration might agree with the British to a commission of investigation. Accordingly, we submitted the resolution. Unfortunately, for the third time we have met the opposition of the administration, although Mr. Byrnes assured us that he would have said nothing if he had not been called before the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is claimed that the appointment of a committee of investigation justifies postponement of consideration of the resolution, but that committee was almost entirely arranged for when we first saw the President and Mr. Byrnes. I had no objection to the appointment of a commission to investigate thoroughly all the facts, but this appointment should not be made in such a way as to imply that the United States has in any way changed its basic policy. In fact, it seems to me all the more necessary now for Congress to express its view so that the American representatives may know what the policy of the United States Government is, and always has been.

Recently one other question has arisen which I think I should answer. It has been claimed that an attempt is being made to set up a theocratic state, a religious state. That certainly is not the purpose of the resolution, nor of the Balfour declaration. The Jews referred to in the declaration represent a race. The Jewish nation, which we hope may be established, will bear the same relation to the Jewish people throughout the world that the Irish Government bears to the Irish-Americans throughout the world, or the Italian Government to Italians who have left their homeland and settled elsewhere. The Jewish people are a race just as are all other races, but a race which has no country in which it constitutes the majority. There is no suggestion that the Jews of this country would have any closer relationship to this new Jewish state than that which a Norwegian emigrant, or the Norwegian-American in this country, feels toward the people of Norway, and certainly there is no thought or suggestion of establishing a religious state.

I have supported this resolution and propose to continue to support it, but I believe that the Palestine plan affords the only solution of the Jewish problem.

I might say that there is an additional factor which should be favored. The suggestion was recently made by former President Hoover that the great irrigation possibilities of the Euphrates and the Tigris Rivers in Iraq should be developed, and that Arabs who desire to leave Palestine be given the opportunity to do so and to settle on land which in ancient times was the most fertile land in the entire world. But that is something which would have to be added later to it, perhaps a way by which Arab opposition may be eventually killed.

Who have any alternative to offer? Palestine is the only place to which there may be transferred satisfactorily hundreds of thousands of Jews who are unable to return to their homes or remain in concentration camps or find homes in central or eastern Europe. In many of these countries, Germany, for instance, it would be very difficult for a Jew to return to the village or town in which he originally lived because he would have to live next to people who either were active Nazis, who actively persecuted the Jews, and perhaps killed members of his family, or at least people who acquiesced in the anti-Jewish program which formed the basis of the Hitler movement. They cannot go back to their former homes. There are other places in eastern Europe and central Europe to which they possibly can return, and to which it is hoped many may return, but for the others there is no other haven, there is no other solution except that pointed out by this concurrent resolution.

I have supported the resolution because I believe we owe the best retribution we can give to the Jewish people who first bore the brunt of the Hitler attack, who have suffered the most intolerable tortures and the most frightful decimation, who fought bravely throughout the war, and have been among the strongest friends and supporters of the United Nations. I have supported it because I believe as a Nation we should keep our promises. I have supported it because I believe that the Jews, with the support of the mandatory power, could get on with the Arabs of Palestine and work out their own salvation. I have supported it because the solution of this problem will contribute as much to the permanent peace of the world as any other project before the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express the hope at this time that my good friend the Senator from Texas will not insist——

Mr. CONNALLY. I know what the Senator is going to say, and I agree to it. If the leader wants to take up the day talking about Palestine and sidetrack the UNRRA matter, which we think is much more pressing, I agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry the Senator put his agreement in the terms which he did. I was merely going to suggest that he withdraw his motion in the hope that we may speedily dispose of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw my motion. I cannot go up against the leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not making the request in my capacity of leader, but I do not see any reason why this resolution should take more than a few minutes in order to get a vote upon it. I understood that it was unanimously agreed last week to take it up today and dispose of it, and the appropriation based upon the UNRRA bill has already been made under the rule of the Senate that where a committee reports an authorization the Senate may go ahead and make the appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. That appropriation is contingent upon the enactment of House bill 4649.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and I think, if the Senator will permit me to say so, that we can dispose of both the resolution and the bill today.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DOWNEY. For 2 weeks the Federal pay bill has been before the Senate of the United States and it has been displaced or ejected or kicked around from day to day. I have in my hands here a typical budget—and I emphasize the word "typical"—of a man making $5,000 a year in the Federal service and running a deficit of $2,000 a year for which he is borrowing on his insurance

policy. Workers in the $5,000 group have to pay 20 percent of their salaries for income taxes and depreciate the balance by 30 or 35 percent. The condition of this great group of Federal workers throughout the whole United States is lamentable beyond words, and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to do something to attempt to bring the Federal pay bill to a conclusion before the Senate of the United States. I have agreed——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that he will have my full cooperation in that matter so far as I have any influence with Senators, but I think we would get to his bill as quickly as possible if he will let me say what little I have to say about Palestine.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield to me for about 30 seconds?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have agreed with the Senator from New York not to call for the regular order until quarter after 1 o'clock. At that time I am going to call for the regular order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from California or any other Senator has the right to call for the regular order at any time, but I had hoped, inasmuch as we entered into an agreement the other day to take up the concurrent resolution and dispose of it today, that no technicality would be interposed to prevent that being done.

I wish to say a few things and will try to make them as brief as possible.

The Senate understands my position about this resolution, and the Committee on Foreign Relations also understands it. Long before I ever raised my voice in behalf of an independent nation in Palestine, long before I ever realized that there really was a problem, I formed a devoted friendship for a man, born and reared in my State, whom I regarded as one of the great Americans. He lived in Kentucky in his early youth and became a great lawyer and a great public servant before he was ever given any official position. Then he was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where he rendered outstanding service, and took his place among the great justices of that court. I refer to Mr. Justice Brandeis. I used to sit with him and listen to him talk about the problem of the Jew and the problem of Palestine. I visited Palestine some 10 or 12 years ago, and I could not help but contrast what it looked like then with the description I used to get of it when, as a boy, I attended Sunday school, where it was referred to as the land of milk and honey. It was far from a land of milk and honey in 1930 or 1935.

I shall not go into the long history of Palestine. It is, or was, the cradle of two religions, at least, the Jewish religion and the Christian religion, and it is now my belief, as it has always been, that if priority of occupation should have any right to consideration the Jew was entitled to prior consideration from the standpoint of sentiment, emotion, and history.

It is true that the Arab came in, and the Turks and various others conquered Palestine in time immemorial, so far back that the mind of man scarcely runneth to the contrary, but that has no bearing upon the original history of Palestine and Israel. When World War I was in progress the Turkish Government, which controlled Palestine and all that part of the Near East, was lined up on the side of the Central Powers, Germany and Austria-Hungary. Turkey never became very active, but her sympathies were with Germany and the Austria-Hungarian monarchy.

During the progress of the war, in 1917, the Balfour Declaration was promulgated by Lord Balfour, then Arthur Balfour. I have forgotten the exact date of the declaration, but it was not very far removed from the date of our entry into the war, the 6th of April 1917.

The Balfour Declaration has been endorsed by every President of the United States from that time to this. It was endorsed by the British Government, of course, and it was endorsed by the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, and when the so-called white paper was promulgated in 1939, that document was unanimously rejected by the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations.

It has always been my understanding that the Balfour Declaration contemplated that immigration should be allowed into Palestine, looking forward to a time when the Jews would be a majority of the people, and when they should become a majority of the people, there was to be an independent commonwealth. That did not mean that everyone else was to be driven out.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky permit a suggestion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the observation made by the Senator from California that he intends to ask for the regular order at a quarter past 1, and several Senators desire to speak on the Palestine resolution, I suggest that a vote be immediately taken so that the resolution may be adopted before a quarter after 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am hoping that the Senator from California will modify his suggestion about calling for the regular order at a quarter after 1, because there are a few Senators who desire to say something about the concurrent resolution, and I think both the resolution and the bill of which the Senator from Texas has charge will be out of the way by the middle of the afternoon, and the Senator can then have his pay bill resumed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, the Federal pay bill was on the Senate floor long before this resolution and the UNRRA bill were, and hundreds of thousands of people, even millions, are vitally interested in it, I think probably more interested in it than in these other matters.

I may say that if there can be a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the Palestinian measure at 1:30 o'clock, and thereafter vote on the UNRRA bill at 2 o'clock, I shall not press whatever rights I may or may not have.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the suggestion of the Senator from California in the form of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is nearly a quarter after 1 now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished leader that I had a clear understanding——

Mr. BARKLEY. That we vote at 2 o'clock on the Palestine resolution?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; at 1:30 on the Palestine resolution, and at 2 o'clock on the UNRRA resolution. I may say that I had a clear understanding with the Senator from New York that if he was not through by a quarter after 1, we should proceed with our Federal pay bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not aware of such an understanding as that. I did not know the Senator was to call the pay bill up at a quarter past 1. I do not wish to take any time so as to deprive the Senate of the right to vote, and if we can get a vote now I am ready to yield the floor, but I am not going to yield the floor now and deny myself the opportunity to say a few other things I had in mind if nothing is to be accomplished.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky yielded to the Senator from California, and while yielding to him the Senator from California asked unanimous consent that the Palestine resolution be voted on at 1:30 o'clock and that the UNRRA bill be voted on at 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. HART. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the President of the Senate what are the orders and what are the arrangements which have been made with respect to the Palestine resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Palestine resolution is before the Senate by unanimous consent, granted December 13, the Chair is informed.

Mr. LUCAS. Does that mean that after we have agreed to take up the Palestine resolution any Senator may demand the regular order, while we are debating it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wonder if it is possible to get any sort of an agreement about voting.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HART. I have an amendment to the Palestine resolution I wish to offer, and I should like to have about 15 minutes to explain it, when the time comes to offer it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, obviously it is impossible to get any agreement, and if the Senator from California desires to call for the regular order, it is now a quarter after 1, and he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is Senate bill 1415, which is the unfinished business.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the Senator yields, may I ask him a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield if I can. It is now past the time limit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from California will not object. My purpose in rising was to ask the majority leader and the minority leader whether in their opinion it would be possible to secure a definite understanding that the Palestine resolution shall be voted on some time this afternoon, say at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. The suggestion I had in mind, and I thought I made it to the Senator from California a while ago, was that the Senate vote on it at 2 o'clock, and I was going to follow that with the suggestion that we vote on the UNRRA bill at not later than 3 o'clock. I do not know how much time will be taken on the UNRRA measure, but no great amount of time will be lost to the pay bill by putting off the votes on other matters until 2 and 3 o'clock, respectively.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky make that as a request at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I incorporate it in a request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Chair state the request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is that the Senate vote on the Palestine resolution at 2 o'clock, and on the UNRRA bill at 3 o'clock. It will require a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will agree to take not more than five more minutes.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. MORSE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I may say that no one is more anxious than I to see the Palestine matter disposed of, and also to see passed the UNRRA bill, on the passage of which the appropriation recently made is contingent.

The Senator from Connecticut has advised us that he has an amendment to offer to the Palestine resolution, and he thinks it will take 15 minutes for him to express his views concerning the amendment. I wish to be assured in some way that the Senator from Connecticut will have an opportunity to present the amendment and to discuss it, and that he will not be precluded by an agreement now as to a time for a vote on the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I can accommodate the Senator from Connecticut by yielding the floor instanter, and hoping that the Chair will recognize him for the offering of his amendment, I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. HART and Mr. MORSE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BARKLEY. If an agreement is entered into, I shall of course yield the floor at once.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am confused about this agreement. I merely wish to present my amendment and to explain it for 15 minutes. Whether I can conclude my remarks by a certain time depends on when I get started. I am ready now.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the agreement is entered into, I shall yield the floor and let the Senator proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon objects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall occupy the Senate floor at this time for perhaps only 10 or 15 minutes. I think that if Senators could but once be made to understand the critical and unhappy condition of the Federal employees, they would begin to take an anxious interest in them, just as they are taking an anxious interest in helping people in Europe and in Palestine. Apparently no one is very much concerned about expediting the Federal pay bill.

I think a majority of the Senate has been convinced that Federal workers receiving less than $1,800 a year or less than $200 a month are in rather critical condition. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in his last argument endeavored to convince the Senate that the increased cost of living had not disturbed the workers receiving the higher incomes. I have prepared for the Senate a typical budget of a Federal worker receiving $5,390 a year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I fear that the Senator is misinterpreting what I said. I do not have the RECORD before me, but I believe I said, or I intended to say, that the impact of the increased cost of living does not affect the worker in the high brackets to the extent that it does the worker in the low brackets; that in the low brackets practically 100 percent of the worker's income goes for necessities; that as the bracket of pay becomes higher a lesser percentage of the worker's pay goes for necessities. I do not know what statistics the Senator now has, but I still think that statement of mine is substantially true, so far as the rank and file of workers are concerned.

Mr. DOWNEY. If I misinterpreted the declaration of the Senator from Iowa, Mr. President, I regret it. However, he has made his own explanation, and Senators realize what it is.

I wish to say that while this particular budget contains some unusual circumstances, every budget has in it unusual circumstances, but in its general result it is representative of the very desperate conditions of Federal workers in the upper brackets.

I should like to read this statement of the budget of a Government employee, and I might say that the particular man who gave me this story happens to be a very conservative Republican, and it is a typical story. This particular Republican has a very high regard for the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and was much shocked at the Senator's statement that he knew many men in the Government service who were receiving $5,000 a year but were not worth more than $1,500. This man says that in his opinion, from his own knowledge of his associates, the Senator's statement is totally erroneous, and injurious to public morale. I read the statement:

ANOTHER SAD STORY OF ANOTHER SAD GOVERNMENT WORKER

This worker entered Government employment during 1942 at an annual salary of $4,600, having worked previously in a financial house outside Washington. Since then the basic increase of July 1, 1945, raised his compensation to $5,180 annually and he has had one within grade promotion bringing him to his present compensation of $5,390.

He is 40 years of age, has a wife and three daughters and is carrying insurance chiefly for their protection and the education of the latter at a monthly cost of $60 or an annual cost of $720.

Entire family enjoys good health but wife and daughters have required some medical, dental, and optical services during each year while in Washington at an average annual cost of about $175.

Worker first rented a home in Washington and then was ejected because of its sale and to secure place to live paid $11,500 for a home worth about $8,000 at January 1, 1941, prices, an increase of over 40 percent its then value. Two thousand dollars down payment was made on purchase price and contract of purchase will now require about 10 years to pay out; and monthly cost of principal, interest, insurance, taxes, and upkeep approximates $125 a month, or $1,500 yearly. Furniture is still being purchased for new home.

Since entering Government service, the worker has been purchasing war bonds at the rate of about $500 annually and has disposed of his automobile for approximately $1,500. Bond purchases do not appear in budget.

In 1939 and 1940 worker paid no income tax while his payment for 1945 will amount to $617.50.

The percentage disbursements for food, clothes, transportation, furniture, medical care, and laundry all follow about the normal pattern for workers in this income group.

The items included under miscellaneous cover movies and recreation, Christmas gifts, drugs, magazines and newspapers, travel and entertainment, and spending money for three daughters, two in high school and one in grammar school.

Worker is now financing deficit by borrowing on insurance policy and by cashing bonds. He regards his financial future with dismal foreboding.

This is his budget:

1945 Budget Federal worker, Washington, D. C.

Salary	$5,390.00
Deficit	1,971.00
Increased cost of living	1,532.00
Increased taxes	617.50

Let us run over the items of this budget which I say are typical—and I am so told by the Bureau of the Budget.

First. Food. Annual current cost, $1,320. Percentage increase over 1941, 42 percent. Approximate annual additional cost over 1941, $390.

I want to emphasize to the Senator from Iowa that a Federal worker in the United States, wherever he is, could have bought the same amount of food for $390 less in 1941 than he can now buy it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. According to the Government statistics he can still buy the same amount of food in the United States for approximately 30 percent over the $500 to which I understood the Senator to refer, and not $1,320 which is carried in this—what I consider to be an outlandish and exorbitant budget, and clearly beyond the means of a man who is receiving $5,000 a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Perhaps the distinguished Senator does not understand the budget, or I do not understand him. The total expenditure for food of a family of five is $1,320 a year, or $110 a month, and I might say the typical expenditure for food considered necessary for a family in that bracket is about $100 more than that a year. Does the Senator say a family of five should live on $500 a year for food allowance?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was merely replying to what I understood the Senator to say, that the same amount of food which cost $1,320 in this budget could have been bought before the war for some three or four hundred dollars.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, no, Mr. President. It could have been bought for $390 less. In other words, the extra cost for this same amount of food is $390.

Item No. 2: Purchase of home, at price 40 percent above 1941 prices. It is true that only a portion of the Government workers have to buy homes at exaggerated prices, but those who do are generally men with two or three or four or five children who could not find apartments, and they have been caught in many cases for a 50-percent increase over the true value of the home as measured by 1941 prices. This worker has a much more sorry tale to tell than is told here. When he came to Washington he had to go to a hotel and live for a month or two at very high cost. Then he found a house and moved into it. He was later ejected by someone who bought the house. Then he went back to a hotel, and then was compelled to buy a house. As a matter of fact, I find a substantial percentage of the workers having large incomes and large families who could only procure accommodations by paying from 25 to 50 percent more for homes than they would have had to pay in 1941. This worker has paid $2,000 on his home and is now paying for it over a 10-year period at the rate of about $125 a month. In other words, on this item he is caught with slightly more than a 40-percent increase over 1941. He has been buying some furniture for the new home at a cost of $600 for the past year. That cost is up 46 percent. The cost of medical, dental, and optical treatment has increased approximately 40 percent. The cost of heat, light, gas, garbage disposal, and telephone has increased slightly. The cost of laundry and dry cleaning has increased 30 percent; and the cost of other items has increased as indicated in the budget. These items cost this worker a total of $1,532 more than they would have cost him on January 1, 1941.

He could have surmounted that obstacle, but on top of that the Government requires him to pay income taxes of $1,617. He is carrying an insurance program which costs him $60 a month, and he must pay more than $250 for a retirement annuity.

In addition, like approximately one-third of the people of the United States, he is supporting his parents. He had been contributing $25 a month for the support of his parents, and a brother had been contributing a like amount. Because of the increased cost of living he had to increase the contribution to his father and mother by $10, so the cost of that item is up 40 percent.

I am not pleading for any sympathy for this particular Federal worker. The truth is that because of an increase in the cost of living of 30 or 35 percent, and because of a 20 or 25 percent income tax upon salaries in the upper brackets, workers in the upper brackets have had their buying power cut almost in half. Does any Senator believe that a man who has created a standard of living commensurate with an income of $5,000 or $6,000 can easily accommodate himself to a standard of $2,500 or $3,000? If so, he deals differently with the values of life than I do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have just had laid on my desk the budget which the distinguished Senator from California is discussing. I notice that at the bottom of the column he comes to the conclusion that there is a deficit in this man's budget of $1,971. From a hasty examination of the budget within the past few minutes I notice an item of $1,500 a year for the purchase of a home. That is a saving. I notice an item of $600 for furniture, which is counted in the annual budget. That is a capital investment, as is the purchase of the home. I notice an item of $720 for insurance. That is item No. 11. That is a capital investment, or a saving.

Item No. 13 is retirement contribution. That item amounts to $269, and it is counted in the budget. It is certainly a capital investment or saving.

Those four items in the budget total $3,089, which is approximately $1,100 more than the deficit. So the capital investment, even counting the deficit, would show an accumulation to this man from that budget of $1,100.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the budget minutely, but I merely call attention to the fact that in the budget which the Senator from California is discussing there are many items of capital investment and capital savings which I feel are not quite apropos to the argument as to what the increased cost of living has done to Federal workers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know that the Senator is inadvertently grossly inaccurate in his statement. There is an item here of $1,500 for the purchase of a home. Certainly some of that payment is on the principal, but the major part goes for taxes, insurance, and upkeep. Of course, the item of principal is balanced by the depreciation of his house.

The Senator has entirely overlooked the real point. I am not appealing for sympathy for this particular worker. What I am trying to show the Senator by that item is that the cost of the home is 40 percent more than it would have been on January 1, 1941. The total increased cost of living, including income taxes, is $2,149. That is just about the amount of the deficit established by this budget. Surely some of his expenditures are for insurance, and he is gaining some headway in the purchase of his home. But the probability is that after he shall have paid on his home for 5 years, he will not then be able to sell it for as much as he will still owe on the home 5 years from now, because by that time we expect that the value of the home will have gone down, not to $8,000 but probably $5,000 or $6,000.

Mr. President, the point I desire to make is this: A man with an income of $5,000, $6,000, $7,000, or $8,000 a year cannot have 20 percent of his income taken away in income taxes, have his cost of living increased by 30 or 35 percent, and his real purchasing power cut in half without being thrown into desperate straits. This worker is now running behind his income of 1941 by more than $2,000 a year, although he now has an income of $5,390.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know how generous and considerate the Senator is. Will not the Senator from California let us go ahead and act on the concurrent resolution and the UNRRA bill, and then take up his bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. Why does not the Senator ask unanimous consent for the passage of the UNRRA bill? I believe that every Senator is in favor of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some Senator might object.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not think any Senator would object. I believe that if the Senator were to ask unanimous consent to have the bill passed, it would be passed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I believe that the same statement is true with reference to the Palestine resolution. An amendment may be proposed, but aside from that I think it would be passed almost unanimously.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not acting through any spirit of ob-

struction in regard to the bill of the Senator from California; but I believe that he would gain time if he would let us get these other matters out of the way. The minds of Senators are disturbed about all these questions, and they are not giving the Senator from California the attention which his remarks justify, and to which he is entitled.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am accustomed to that experience, so I am not unduly worried.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is the usual situation, I should like to offer the Senator a diversion and show him that we can listen to him. He can understand that, with Senators on the qui vive with regard to the other two measures, they cannot give him the proper attention.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator that with his prestige and diplomacy, if he could undertake, while I am speaking, to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on these various measures which would be satisfactory to all Senators, I should be very happy. Apparently the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has a speech which he wishes to make. I do not know on which of the measures he wishes to speak, or for how long he expects to address the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the Palestine resolution at a quarter to 3, and on the UNRRA bill at 3:30.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. A moment ago I stated that I was anxious to see both those measures disposed of, and I have no objection, and shall voice no objection, to the request that the UNRRA legislation, which came from the Foreign Relations Committee, may be promptly disposed of. I am compelled to ask assurance that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] be given an opportunity to offer his amendment to the Palestine resolution and to speak in explanation of that amendment. If that assurance can be given, so far as I am concerned there will be no objection to considering either measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that that arrangement would allow a little more than an hour for the consideration of the Palestine resolution. I assume that the Senator from Connecticut would be recognized. I wish to speak for 5 or 6 minutes on the Palestine resolution. Other than that, I do not know of any extended speeches.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I would be willing to agree to set an hour to vote on the pay bill. We have three measures pending before the Senate. It may be that we can fix an hour to vote on all of them.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would be very happy to do so. I would be willing to make an agreement to postpone consideration of the pay bill until tomorrow, upon the consideration that we begin to vote not earlier than 4 o'clock, the time between 12 and 4 to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator is that the pay bill, together with all amendments thereto, be voted on not later than 4 o'clock tomorrow, as I understand.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, and that the time between 12 and 4 o'clock tomorrow be spent without interruption on consideration of the pay bill and that the division of the time between the proponents and the opponents be handled by the Senator from Virginia, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART]. We are patrons of the same amendments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am heartily in favor of fixing a time for the Senate to vote on the pay bill. I may call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from California has occupied a total of perhaps 4 hours or more on the pay bill—I say that without being in any way critical, for the Senator had a right to do so—whereas the proponents of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Connecticut, and myself have had approximately 30 minutes' time in which to discuss it. However, even in spite of the fact that unanimous consent to the proposed agreement or any similar one, by which the Senate would vote at a certain time tomorrow, would probably deny the proponents of certain amendments any time comparable to that already consumed by the Senator from California in advocating his bill, I still think the bill is so important that we should fix a time for the Senate to vote on it, and thus stop this most peculiar and, I think, most unparliamentary procedure in which the Senate has been indulging for 4 or 5 days. I think the Senate should reach a decision regarding the bill, and I am heartily in favor of doing so promptly. In fact, I think the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Connecticut, and I were prepared to propose such an agreement a little later. We would have proposed that the bill be voted on this evening. However, if the Senate is to proceed to consider other measures in the meantime, perhaps that could not be done.

So I join with the Senator from California in urging that the Senate fix a time tomorrow at which it will vote on the pay bill, and that provision be made for consideration of the pay bill tomorrow without interruption.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am prepared to move that consideration of the pay bill be laid aside until tomorrow, to be voted on at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, if it can be agreed that consideration of the bill will begin at 12 o'clock and will continue without interruption until 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Huffman	Pepper
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lucas	Stanfill
Capehart	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Carville	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE PROMISE OF AMERICA—PATRIOTIC EFFORTS OF AMERICANS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have read an article in This Week magazine which has caused me to pause and ask myself some questions. One of them is this: What is it that we have here in America that has the effect on our foreign-born citizens as shown in this article? The answer came clear.

America is the home of freemen. It is a land where they can go toward the larger life; freedom of mind, body, and soul.

That is why, during the American Revolution, Englishmen fought Britain. That is why, in two world wars, some of our most outstanding soldiers who were of German extraction fought the Kaiser and Hitler. The same is true of men of Italian extraction who fought on behalf of their new homeland. That is why men of Japanese extraction in this war made the proudest records of the war.

America does something to folks who come to our land. They find something on these shores that no other land possesses.

We call it liberty and freedom, Mr. President. Just what is it? It is faith realized. It is opportunity for growth of mind, body, and soul. It is equality before the law. It is living in a land where the Bill of Rights is vital and intact, and where the State is but the servant, and man's home is his castle.

Yes, Mr. President; this America does something to those who come to our shores. We want to make sure in these times of stress and change that we keep this "something" in America. We must not let it be lost. There are those among us who are eyeing foreign concepts, and wish to copy what other lands may have. We cannot let them dissipate this "something" about which we are talking today.

Mr. President, what was the article to which I have referred? I hold it in my hand. It speaks of the loyal and valuable service which was rendered to this country by the Nisei, the first generation of Japanese-Americans to be born on this soil. The article explains how the services of the Nisei saved American lives, and how MacArthur is finding them to be irreplaceable and beyond value.

Mr. President, Robert Burns has stated that "The man's the gowd for a' that." It is not the color of the skin but the quality of the heart which counts. May America never forget the significant fact that while we stem from many races we are one people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FINDING JAPAN'S HIDDEN TREASURE—THAT'S ONLY ONE OF THE MANY MISSIONS ACCOMPLISHED BY GI's OF JAP ANCESTRY

(By Lt. Col. Wallace Moore as told to Don Eddy)

One crisp morning this fall, jeeps whirled through Osaka, Japan, and bore down on the city's most powerful bank, the Sumitomo Genka. Yanks in battle dress hopped out and surrounded the building.

At once, a staff car followed by other jeeps drew up at the main entrance. An American Army officer strode into the bank at the head of a strange company—a squad of soldiers, two unhappy Jap gendarmes, four plain-clothes members of the Japanese secret police, and four noncommissioned American Army officers with Japanese faces.

These latter four were boys from California and Oregon, American citizens of Japanese ancestry, members of the most remarkable and perhaps most valuable military unit we have in the Orient.

As babble inside the bank died, the officer proclaimed:

"The United States, in the name of the Allied Governments, seizes this bank. All employees will assemble before me immediately without touching the bank's resources, records, or documents. All persons not employed by the bank will depart at once." He beckoned an American-Japanese noncom. "Sergeant, you will translate my instructions."

The trim little sergeant repeated the order in crackling Japanese. Customers were ushered out. All employees, including the manager in elegant morning coat, striped trousers, and silk hat, were sent home. The doors were locked. And the Army had a bank on its hands.

JAPS HID THEIR LOOT

Not just one. Throughout Japan, at that instant, the scene was duplicated as 21 banks were occupied. But why? Because Gen. Douglas MacArthur knew that somewhere, in some secret place, the Japs had hidden $250,000,000 of gold, silver, and platinum looted from southeastern Asia. It had to be found.

We hoped to recognize it from the records. But the records were in Japanese. Who could read them? Generally speaking, only one small group in our entire occupation force—the handful of gallant, loyal American-Japanese.

In the cavernous vaults of the Sumitomo Genka, the sergeants shed their blouses and tackled a mountain of records. Night came. They slept on the job. Toward evening of the second day one of the men called his mates. "Hey, guys, what do you make of this?"

It was an irregular entry concerning an enormous amount of money. They reported to their commander. Soon the bank was swarming with intelligence officers. Thus, the hidden treasure was found and another Jap plot foiled—thanks to men whose faces may be Japanese, but whose loyalties and instincts are purely American.

Behind this is a hitherto secret story of our desperate need for Japanese-speaking intelligence operatives when war impended, and how it was met by these boys called Nisei, or second generation—whose relatives we sent to relocation camps here at home.

We had intercepted the key Japanese codes. Decoding them was a monumental task. We had no more than seven individuals with any knowledge of the right dialects. Finding more quickly was literally a case of life or death.

We found them on our west coast—50 men of Japanese ancestry who wanted to fight for America. They became pupils in a secret language school established at San Francisco by Brig. Gen. (then lieutenant colonel) John Weckeiring. All were made sergeants and assigned to intelligence.

At first, every GI was suspicious of them. That attitude changed to something approximating hero worship a few hours after the first three went into action at Buna.

We were in the jungle. Wriggling through the kunai grass between the lines were our Nisei, searching bodies of Jap casualties. One of the boys crept back with a scrap of paper. "It says," he reported, "the banzai attack is ordered for 7 o'clock tomorrow morning."

We deployed our forces accordingly and smashed the attack with almost no losses to ourselves. From that moment, the GI's took the little Nisei to their hearts. I can't use names of these men, since many are now engaged in dangerous undercover work in Japan, but there has never been a whisper of disloyalty on their part. It is no secret that several have been publicly commended by their commanding generals.

Toward the last of the Buna show the Japs were evacuating on barges. One day an enemy officer and several men walked toward our lines waving and shouting. Scores of Yank fingers were closing on triggers when a Nisei yelled, "Don't shoot! They're surrendering!"

The officer was a medic who, with his men, surrendered because their General Tanaka had ordered wounded left behind so he might be saved. "If that is bushido (chivalry)," the disgusted doctor said, "I am through with the war." He told us everything, even identifying his general's barge, which our air force promptly blew to kingdom come.

PRISONER FEARED TORTURES

In the Saidor campaign, somewhat later, we captured several unwounded prisoners. They would answer no questions at all. Loitering near their enclosure, one of our Nisei overheard one prisoner say he lived in Kochi. Our man had been in Kochi and struck up a friendly conversation. The prisoner burst into tears and confessed he was terrified. He had been told we tortured prisoners.

"I won't let them torture you," our sergeant promised. They continued to talk about Kochi. "You remember the house with the cherry trees?" Yes; the prisoner knew it well. "What time is the banzai attack tomorrow?" "Three o'clock," the prisoner said. "And do you enjoy the theater?" the sergeant went on. The prisoner never knew he had made it possible to save countless American lives.

I say flatly that our military intelligence in the Japanese war would have been impossible without these loyal American-born boys.

Australians fighting beside us also used our Nisei. They insisted, unwisely, that the Japanese-Americans wear Aussie hats for protection, and ordered that no Japanese in an Aussie hat was to be molested. The enemy heard of this and soon the jungle was full of Nips wearing Aussie hats. That order was quickly rescinded, and the Nisei put on their GI hats again.

Until we actually used loud-speaker systems to persuade the enemy to surrender, nobody believed they would work. We borrowed equipment from the Australians and used the first set at Hollandia. Our broadcasters were our American-Japanese. The sets would be prime targets for enemy bombbardments, but not one boy hesitated.

A jeep carrying the equipment was hustled up an enemy trail and the voice of a little sergeant began bellowing surrender advice out of the amplifiers. Nothing happened.

We were getting discouraged when a live prisoner was brought in. We learned then that the Nips opposing us spoke the Kanto dialect, whereas our man spoke Kansai. The only possible broadcaster who spoke Kanto was our prisoner.

"Let me work on him," our Nisei sergeant said. He took the prisoner to see the tremendous strength coming ashore. The awed prisoner agreed to broadcast. The prisoner spoke through the amplifiers so convincingly that 35 Nips gave up.

This was the Army's first group victory through psychological warfare. It paved the way for mass surrenders of later campaigns, the ultimate capitulation of Japan itself, the saving of thousands of American lives.

When General MacArthur planned the raid to free Allied prisoners at notorious Santo Tomas prison camp in the Philippines, it was learned that Nip guards had been ordered to massacre all prisoners in event of attack. Who might persuade them to disregard their orders? Only someone who spoke fluent Japanese.

Thus, as other troops stormed the camp's approaches, gallant Nisei made straight for the captain of the guard and, heaven only knows how, convinced him the slaughter would bring horrible retribution. The prisoners were saved.

At Okinawa, American-Japanese worked with native farmers who pointed out enemy bastions for our forces to blast before they could do much damage.

In Japan, our Nisei (and we haven't nearly enough) form the bulwark of General MacArthur's military secret service. Our occupation army stands in a land where nothing is comprehensible. Thus our Nisei are our spearhead against Jap finance, politics, and propaganda.

When Tokyo Asahi, the powerful newspaper, blandly published false and vicious allegations of assaults by American soldiers on Japanese women, the ordinary GI couldn't even read them. But our Nisei could and did. Now a Nisei sergeant makes sure that Asahi is behaving itself.

All through Japan, our American-Japanese are listening, watching, understanding. When a Nisei sergeant reported that the government of Higashi Kuni was scheming secretly against the occupation, Kuni was ousted.

THEY MUZZLED THE BENSHI

Their influence is felt even in the most plebeian places. Every Japanese movie theater has a man called a benshi who stands beside the screen to explain the cinema. A Nisei sergeant in a crowded Tokyo theater recently heard the benshi suddenly break into a vicious anti-American tirade. Next day there was a new benshi and all others in the empire had been ordered to stick to their dramatics. Left uncontrolled, they could be a powerful force of evil.

Finally, there is the colossal task of reeducating Japan in the ways of democracy. Every textbook in every school and college must be rewitten by individuals who understand democracy and also thoroughly understand Japan. No group can do this as well

as our Americans of Japanese ancestry. They have already started.

Whether we do or don't fight another war in the Orient, one fact is crystal clear. Our good Americans of oriental extraction constitute an asset of incalculable value, an asset we never could buy for money. Outspoken Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell said not long ago:

"These boys bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood. They have a place in the American heart, now and forever." The General said a mouthful.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SEYBOURN H. LYNNE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 10, 1946, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Seybourn H. Lynne, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Thomas A. Murphree, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

ISSUANCE OF AMERICAN-INDIAN POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Lawrence P. Swan, of Erie, Kans., urging the issuance of an American-Indian postage stamp with a picture of the late Senator and Vice President Charles Curtis in the center of it. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERIE, KANS., *December 13, 1945.*

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We are asking of you as our Senator to lend your influence to the issue of an American-Indian postage stamp, it will be known as the American, with our late Charles Curtis' picture in the center of it.

Mr. Hannegan has been forwarded the description of the design. Such a stamp would be a tribute to the American Indian who has become an outstanding citizen of our great country, as well as to Charles Curtis.

Thanking you for any service that you may render.

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE P. SWAN.

CREATION OF A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Leonard W. Mayo, president of the Child Welfare League of America, New York City, N. Y., together with a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that organization, urging the strengthening of services to children and the creation of a Federal Department of Welfare. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and resolution and that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., December 11, 1945.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: A resolution which urges strengthening of services to children and the creation of a Federal Department of Welfare was voted at the December meeting of the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America. At the request of the board a copy is sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD W. MAYO,
President.

Whereas the public services for children so essential to the welfare of the community have been seriously weakened during the war, and

Whereas many of these services have never been developed to a degree consistent with American ideals and resources: Be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America express its concern that public services for children in local communities, in the States and in the Federal Government be substantially strengthened.

To this end it is urged that the governments of the several States give attention to the improvement of such services and to the improvement of all essential related services without which special services to children cannot be properly sustained. It is recommended further that the State governments give attention to more effective administration and coordination of the various public departments within their jurisdictions concerned with services for children.

In order to insure a more economic and efficient administration, coordination and leadership for the development of child welfare and related services within the Federal Government,

It is recommended that a Federal department of welfare, headed by a secretary of Cabinet rank, be established within which a closer administrative relationship of services for children could be realized, the strength of services already developed being preserved; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Members of the Congress, to the governors of States, to the directors of State departments of welfare, health, and education, to appropriate Federal officials, and to the league's constituency.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1694. A bill for the relief of Southern Aviation Corp.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1695. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louis Runs Above;

S. 1696. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Left Hand Bull;

S. 1697. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Miles Two Crow; and

S. 1698. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Peta Zuha or Owns The Fire; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1699. A bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of Allied authorities of occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "EMBARGO ACTS OF CONGRESS"

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the document entitled "Embargo Acts of Congress," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

INFORMATION FOR SECURITY COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION RELATING TO ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. HOEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 206), which was referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to negotiate an international agreement with the other member nations of the United Nations Organization, such agreement if made, to be ratified by the United States only with the advice and consent of the Senate, providing in substance—

(a) That each of the member nations will continuously make available to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization all information in the possession of such nation relating to nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and the release of atomic energy.

(b) That the Security Council shall at all times have the right to investigate and inspect, within any nation which is a member of the United Nations Organization, facilities and developments relating to nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and the release of atomic energy.

(c) That in connection with matters relating to nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and the release of atomic energy, no member nation of the Security Council shall have the power of veto.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MANASCO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. BENDER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 608) to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

VOLUNTARISM VERSUS COMPULSION IN LABOR RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Voluntarism Versus Compulson in Labor Relations, delivered by him November 17, 1945, before the American Trade Executive Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS OF OPA ADMINISTRATOR BOWLES BEFORE THE NEW COUNCIL OF AMERICAN BUSINESS, INC.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by OPA Administrator Bowles, before the New Council of American Business, Inc., New York City, December 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUGGESTION OF NAVY ISLAND AS SITE OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—ARTICLE BY LEROY E. FESS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article suggesting Navy Island as the seat of the United Nations Organization, by LeRoy E. Fess, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that upon the understanding that we desist from further consideration of the Federal pay bill until noon tomorrow, we proceed to consider and debate it exclusively, and vote upon the amendments; that the time be divided between the proponents and opponents of the measure, and that voting on the amendments to the bill and a vote on the bill itself commence not later than 4:30. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that certain members of the committee desire that the vote shall not be taken until 4:30. I suggest that the division of the time be as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] shall control the first hour, the chairman of the committee shall control the next hour and a half, the Senator from Virginia shall control the next half hour, the chairman of the committee shall control the next 15 minutes, and the Senator from Virginia shall control the closing 15 minutes.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Oregon is perhaps prepared to make some objection to this suggestion. I wish to tell him that this measure is one which has been on the floor of the Senate for 2 weeks. It is being anxiously thought about by all Federal employees. If he desires time on this particular measure, I am sure that we can give him all the time he desires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree in accordance with the suggestions which I have made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that I am perfectly willing to attend night sessions of the Senate every night this week in an endeavor to enable the Senate at least to catch up with its schedule. I think the Senate should hold night sessions on these pending matters because it is about to complete one of the most remarkable do-nothing sessions in its history. I think that during the last week of this first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress we should be willing to hold night sessions if necessary in order to pass some legislation which is of vital concern to our country.

I find myself in favor of the bill being sponsored by the Senator from California, namely the Federal pay bill. I find myself in favor of the Palestine resolution submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], as well as the UNRRA bill now proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Because of some unfortunate experiences over this issue of limitation of debate which occurred earlier in the session I also find myself very much in favor of seeing to it that unlimited debate shall prevail in the Senate of the United States. As I have said before, this forum must be maintained as an open forum with unlimited debate protected from steam-roller tactics in the closing days of a session of the Senate. For the reasons stated, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon objects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill is before the Senate, and open to further amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I will continue my remarks on the Federal pay bill.

I think that the great diminution in the actual buying power of the Federal employees in the upper brackets is rapidly stripping away from the Government service some of its best and ablest men and women and is creating a grave lack of efficiency in Government service.

I have already distributed among Senators a budget of a typical worker receiving $5,000 a year. It indicates that income taxes, and the increased cost of living, have cut the employee's compensation by $2,300, leaving him with an actual buying power, as compared with 1941, of about $3,000.

I know that probably the great majority of the Federal employees will be compelled to remain in Government service. But I ask you, Mr. President, What kind of efficiency and loyalty can we expect of Federal workers when, as though they were lepers of some kind, they are singled out for the most prejudicial treatment that could be given any great labor group in the United States, and left in a precarious condition of insolvency? Under the critical financial conditions which confront them, should they be expected to demonstrate any high degree of loyalty and efficiency?

Mr. President, I know there are many Senators here who are alarmed at the great power of the strike. They desire—and all of us do—to adjust great labor disputes by mediation and conciliation. I ask you, Mr. President, What kind of an effect will be left upon the Nation when almost the only great group of workers which does not have the power to strike is dealt with as we apparently intend to deal with the Federal workers to whom I have referred?

The right of unlimited speech? Of course, we are all devoted to it. But certainly, where eminent justice is an issue, as well as the financial integrity of men, we should be able to work out some kind of agreement.

Mr. President, I have used some strong language when I have said that of all the great wage-earning groups the Federal workers have been the least fairly dealt with. Why do I say that? In 1940 the cost of living began to ascend, and we, the Senate of the United States, saw to it that the income of the farmer and the income of the industrial worker were protected, but we let 5 years go by, 5 years with the cost of living mounting, and the income of everyone else going up, before we so much as raised the basic income of the Federal worker by one single dollar. They were years behind every other group.

There are in this body, of course, wealthy men, who have spoken upon the Senate floor, and who have said that they are independent of their Government incomes. Can they not for a few hours at least begin to project themselves into the lives of the humble individuals, and know that each home is the center of a world, that in almost every home of these Federal workers the people live lives of quiet desperation? It is easy enough when one has an independent income, so that he does not have to worry whether his $5,000 income is cut in two or not, to be placid and slow and happy about this matter.

We, the Senate of the United States, are on trial. If I were a labor leader and wanted to disrupt relationships of a conciliatory nature, nothing would suit me better than to be able to say to my

workers, "Well, see the Senate of the United States. The plainest and simplest thing is now before it, and it has not even energy enough to act upon the dispute."

Mr. President, last Saturday the last of many corporations, the Sinclair Oil Co., increased the pay of its workers by 18 percent over a prior 21-percent increase, bringing the oil workers to a much higher standard than we are asking for Federal workers in the bill. As a matter of fact, I do not know of a single labor dispute which has not already been settled at a higher wage allowance than is being asked in the bill. I do not know one single corporation, including the General Motors, which has not offered at least as much as we are asking for here, or more. Why should we single out the Federal worker for punishment and prejudicial treatment?

I know that Senators in opposition to the bill, including the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], have expressed the opinion that Federal workers are highly inefficient. I was saying on the Senate floor, when the Senator from Ohio, who has just entered the chamber, was not here, that I have presented this morning the budget of a Federal worker making $5,390 a year, and by reason of the increased cost of living and the increased income tax his real buying power, compared with 1941, has been cut down to about $3,000.

Mr. President, the condition of that man, who now is facing a deficit of about $2,000 a year, and borrowing on his insurance policy, is not only typical of the great majority of workers, but is most unhappy indeed. That man happens to be a conservative Republican, and happened to express very high admiration for the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He said he had some legal training, and that he failed to understand how any distinguished statesman with a legal background could on the Senate floor make a gereral charge that he knew men making $5,000 a year who were worth only $1,500. I must admit that that kind of a generalized ex-parte statement shocks me also.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator deny that it is true? Does not the Senator know that some employees in Government service are receiving three times what they are worth, three times what they could get if they went out into private enterprise? It is no general charge against the employees of the Federal Government, it is true here, and my argument was made in behalf of a selective increase of salaries, not a general percentage increase for everyone, regardless of whether he was worth anything or not.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may tell the distinguished Senator from Ohio the opinion I get from men who entered the Government service from industry, men high in the councils of the Nation, who testified before our committee, the opinion I get from Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal, the opinion I get from workers in whom I have confidence, that is, that there is about the same degree of inefficiency in Government service that is found in a lawyer's office or a doctor's office, in industry, or in the Senate of the United States. Certainly one can probably point out 10 percent of Senators who some people would say are not worth anything, but I do not know how by generalized castigation one can justly attack the allowance of a wage sufficient to bring back the real buying power of workers as of January 1, 1941.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from Iowa sought to interrupt first, and I yield first to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator from California that by training and by personal opinion I dislike ex parte statements and quoting what this one and that one said to me, because I cannot repeat the names. I therefore also disapprove the budget referred to by the Senator from California because the maker of that budget is not here to be examined as to its details, and we cannot probe into the budget. But so long as the Senator has mentioned it, let me trespass for about a moment on his time to say, in support of at least a part of what the Senator from Ohio stated some time ago, that three individuals in the higher brackets of public employment in the civil service in the last week told me individually—and, so far as I know, they do not know each other—that they thought we were committing a most confusing and in many respects a most unnecessary act in providing for blanket increases throughout the civil service. They were very positive and definite indeed in their opinion as to the inefficiency of Government employment because of excess employees, because of inattention to duties, because of the desire on the part of department heads to reach out and gather in more employees so that they could make their departments larger and get more power.

About 4 days ago an official of one of the Government employee unions—I should not say a union, I should say an organization, because I do not recall that it is a union—came to my office, and of course prefaced his remarks by saying "For heaven's sake do not bring my name into this or I will be scalped." He said in my office that we would be committing, in thoughtless haste, an act which would have adverse repercussions on the Federal Civil Service, if we passed the bill as it is presently proposed, without adequate amendment. The advice of this official was that we should give a very substantial amount of study to it, but he said that unfortunately he was in such position that he did not dare appear before the Civil Service Committee. He said he was ashamed of it, but he did not dare express publicly his views of the facts he knew.

I again apologize, Mr. President, for using these more or less ex parte statements, but so long as that issue is injected into the discussion, I feel free to say what has come to my attention, in private, from Government officials, who feel that the bill as presented, without amendments being considered, is a dangerous measure, that it has not had adequate or proper study, and that it should be given serious consideration, or we may commit an act which will confuse the entire civil-service system and destroy the efficiency of the Government workers.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before I yield, I desire to answer the statement made by the Senator from Iowa; then I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio. I assume he wanted me to yield on this particular matter.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it has to do with this.

Mr. DOWNEY. First, let me say, I am, of course, not so naive as not to realize that in throwing together a great organization of members of the military, with civilian members as well, amounting to fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen million, there would be a great degree of inefficiency. I know that at the beginning of the war some of these organizations had far more employees than they needed. I know many of them were submarginal workers because they were the only ones available. I know they lacked proper supervision. But we cannot take these new organizations, formed overnight, and fairly judge them as we judge the Standard Oil, which was formed back in 1867, or the Post Office or the Treasury Department.

I know that the present efficiency of my own office is at least twice what it was per worker when I first came into the Senate of the United States. Of course there has been overstaffing; of course there has been inefficiency; of course there has been waste motion. While I realize likewise that the Appropriations Committee has the entire power, acting, of course, with the advice and information of the Bureau of the Budget, to keep employment down to any figures it may desire, I know that that committee has a most difficult task, and probably very often is not entirely satisfied the results it accomplishes are correct.

I consider the Senate Appropriations Committee as one of the most able and most heavily burdened organizations I have ever known. It is a bipartisan group, working under the leadership of one of the most distinguished Senators we have ever had, and that group is working almost constantly determining the number of workers that should be in the Treasury Department, in the Department of Commerce, in the Army, in the Navy, in every one of the thousand or more Government agencies.

Under the classified civil service we have set up certain categories and certain ability and training standards are required before any man can get into any one of those categories. If what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said is true—I do not think it is true—but if a man who has no higher qualifications than would justify his receiving $1,500 a year is receiving $5,000 or $10,000 a year, that problem ought to be approached directly and not by way of resisting a pay bill which attaches the increased pay, not to the individual but to the office and to the standard set up after years of investigation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I made a rather mild statement in favor of selective increase and a study of this problem, in view of the fact that there had been an increase made in the last 6 months. I therefore propose a further study of the whole problem. The Senator has seen fit to compare this organization to a business organization. What does the Senator think a business organization would do in such a case as this? If a business organization faced an increase in the same proportion as this—which is an increase of approximately $1,000,000,000—in its total pay-roll bill, such an organization would make a survey of the whole situation and if they could do with fewer men. They would regrade certain positions. They would determine how they could properly give every individual who was employed by them what he was entitled to, and still not increase the tremendous burden on their stockholders—or as it is in this case, on the American taxpayer. I say that there is a selective question involved.

I have a letter from the head of a bureau, one of the bureaus of the Department of Commerce, in Columbus, written December 6 from Columbus, Ohio, as follows:

> I understand that there is a proposal before Congress to increase the compensation of civil-service employees by 20 percent. While I am not familiar with the rates of pay in agencies of the Government other than this bureau, I do believe that existing rates in this bureau are high enough for all full-time employees. But observers working on a part-time basis at substations are deserving of the proposed increase.
>
> I feel strongly that every possible measure of economy in Government activities ought to be applied now, so that reduction in the public debt may begin as soon as the armed forces are fairly well demobilized.

I shall not give the name of the writer; it may make him unpopular with his fellow employees thus to have expressed his opinion.

Mr. President, I do not say that a general increase of some kind ought not to be made sooner or later; that employees who remain should not receive a higher salary. I only say that I do not see the immediate necessity for considering this question until something can be done to reduce the total bill, and some study made as to whether every employee's salary should be increased, or whether there were some positions which are very much overgraded; whether we should not investigate and determine whether some departments have jobs for which they are paying $9,000 a year, for which only $6,000 should be paid, whereas others may be paying salaries of $6,000 a year for work for which $9,000 ought to be paid. I do not know what the result may show, but after having provided one blanket increase, then before another blanket increase is made we should investigate to find out whether the increase will be above the cost of living in 1941.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it so happens that the Senator from Ohio, when I was not on the floor, made a most learned and very valuable argument, I think about 2 weeks ago, in which I was glad to note his declaration that in his opinion the depression of 1929 came on because of an excess of saving. I was glad the Senator made that statement. As I understood, the Senator also stated in that argument that he favored a sufficient increase to bring the Federal workers up to the increased cost-of-living standard. I might say to the distinguished Senator that in the main that is all the chairman is trying to do. What we propose to do will not quite bring those in the higher brackets up to the standard of living index, and it will do a little more for those down at the bottom of the group. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator is familiar with this or not, but when we gave the basic increase of 16 percent last year we gave 20 percent on the first $1,200, 10 percent on the brackets from $1,200 to $4,600, and only 5 percent on the salary above that. That left those in the upper brackets with an increase of only 9 percent, and it left them 24 percent below the cost of living standard. We are not seeking any raise here. We are merely seeking to do what has been done for every possible wage group up to date, or has been offered, and that is only to restore the real buying power of 1941.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think we have dealt rather severely with Federal workers in this debate. I think we have been a little bit too critical of our Federal workers, and I think at times we have been rather hasty in placing them in a category of inefficiency. It is true that there are inefficiencies in the Federal service, and occasionally it will be found——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator said it was true, and that is all I ever said. I never made any general attack on the efficiency of Federal workers. I simply said there were some who were inefficient. I said we ought to do something about selective increases rather than general. I never made any statement that there was any general inefficiency of any kind among the Federal workers.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me resume the floor for a moment. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio a question, if I may. Would the Senator from Ohio justify examination into the personality of every one of the 96 Senators and say, "Well, the Civil Service Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, may determine that 10 percent of them are inefficient, and 10 percent are lazy, and 10 percent go haywire," and that therefore instead of attaching the $10,000 to the office attempts should be made to parcel it out among the efficient individuals?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My answer would be that there may be departments in which there are too many high-salaried individuals whom the departments can do without, or, there may be departments which can function adequately with but half the number of employees.

The Senator from California said the Appropriations Committee handles this matter. The committee does not. I was on the Appropriations Committee for 2 years. We practically never cut an appropriation made by the House of Representatives. This year the committee has been somewhat more diligent and has made a few cuts, but as a practical matter it cannot be done effectively without a study being made by the executive departments, which is what I would like to have done, indicating how they could reduce the total number of employees. They have to take the initiative, I think. My only suggestion is this: Because of the fact that there has been a recent increase, I would prefer to recommit the bill and have a study made before we make another increase. But I certainly will not vote against any proposal which I believe is only large enough to restore salaries to the increased cost-of-living level, because I believe in that and am willing to vote for it. But there seems to be a difference of thought as to whether the Senator's proposal does that or does more than that.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator leaves he will be given the opportunity to vote upon a raise which will do nothing more than meet the increased cost of living, plus a slightly higher increase for the workers in the lower groups.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I do not say that any individual arbitrarily charges the entire Federal group with being inefficient, but I make the statement that if anyone reads the RECORD of either today or any other day when the bill was under consideration I am sure he will agree that too much stress is placed upon the fact that there is inefficiency in the Federal service, and that too much stress is placed on the fact that this bill is brought before the Senate hastily, and that we ought to send it back to the committee, and that we ought not to consider the subject of a raise in the salaries of Federal employees at this time.

Mr. President, this type of argumentation may defeat the bill, and if it does defeat the bill it will be due to the fact that too many members of the Senate are stressing too often the inefficiency in the Federal service and offering no specific proof for it, and that too many Senators are stressing the fact that the bill has not been carefully considered. What are the facts?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Not now, Mr. President. I am going to make my statement now. I have been trying to do so for some time. After I have made my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, I care not what department of government we may consider, whether we consider an old department or an emergency agency, we will find in it, in my judgment, just as much efficiency, comparatively speaking, as we will in any industry throughout the country. If we consider some of the old

departments, we find much more efficiency that can be found in many private industries of the country.

We are told that the bill which is now being considered was prepared hastily. The bill was prepared for us by the administration, by the Civil Service Commission. Representatives of that agency appeared before our committee. The Civil Service Commission is responsible for the recruitment of the personnel of our Government. It had that enormous task throughout the war years. That agency recommended passage of the bill and pleaded with us to pass it. As a result, the bill is before the Senate with a majority of the Senators on the committee who considered the bill in favor of it.

The charge is made that there may be inefficiency here and there in the Federal service. As my argument against that charge, let me say that, first of all, in order to obtain a position in the civil service—in the postal service or any other service—an applicant must undergo a real civil-service examination. The test is severe, particularly in times of peace. It is not so exacting in time of war, when it is necessary to go to great lengths in recruiting sufficient personnel for the Government. At any rate, there is required a civil-service examination which is a real, bona fide one.

Once a person is in the service, he may be promoted, provided he has attained a suitable efficiency rating. Under various provisions of the law he may be promoted by progressive steps. That action is administrative. It is accomplished by the department and by the Civil Service Commission, under laws of the Congress which we helped to enact. Under the so-called Mead-Ramspeck law provision is made for a systematic method of promotion within grade.

So, Mr. President, a severe test as an entrance examination is prescribed for our workers. Efficiency ratings are applied administratively at regular intervals. We have a law which permits advancement within grades. I know of no industry which is more particular than is the Government in the selection of its employees. At a time such as this, pulling out of the hat charges against patriotic, loyal, conscientious Government workers may have a tendency to defeat the bill. Let me say in their defense that when they comply with the requirements of the civil-service system and the requirements of the law they demonstrate that, in the main, they are outstanding, loyal, conscientious, and faithful employees.

Mr. President, I believe that the bill has been properly considered. It comes to us with the recommendation of the Civil Service Committee, which not only considered the bill, but examined witnesses concerning it. It received the approval of the majority of the committee, and by reason of that fact is now pending before the Senate. Ever since the bill has been brought to the floor of the Senate one effort after another has been made to sidetrack it, refer it back to the committee, and find all sorts of weaknesses in it. The record with regard to the bill is one of proper, adequate consideration. The bill comes before us recommended by the administration, by the Civil Service Commission, by the President of the United States, by members of the Cabinet, and by representatives of the employees' organizations, without a single objection.

Mr. President, I believe that we ought to consider the bill provision by provision, on its merits, and we should not be discussing the inefficiency which may occur here and there in isolated instances. If there is any way to perfect the bill I believe that we ought to decide now to put our minds and hearts to the task and do it, rather than set the bill aside or send it back to the committee, or do something else to forestall final action on the bill.

I conclude by saying that the bill is hereafter going through the proper parliamentary procedure prescribed under the law. I dislike the insinuations which have been injected into this debate, which might lead some to believe that inefficiency in the Federal service overbalances efficiency. I know from my own observation that there is as much efficiency, as much administrative ability, and as much loyalty and conscientiousness in the Federal service as there is in any other service in the United States.

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. For what purpose?

Mr. BYRD. For a quorum call.

Mr. BROOKS. Very well. I yield for a quorum call.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Huffman	Pepper
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lucas	Stanfill
Capehart	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Carville	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. For what purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me inquire as to the nature of the request the Senator has in mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up a bill. It will not interfere with the Senator's speech; he will be able to speak, anyway.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator will not lose the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Very well; that is the only thing with which I am concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4649, the UNRRA bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

ANALYSIS OF TERMS OF PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I propose, with the indulgence of the Senate, to attempt today a discussion of what I believe to be the most extraordinary agreement ever proposed between two nations. For the sake of continuity, I respectfully request that I be allowed to proceed without interruption until I conclude these remarks, and then I shall be very glad to be interrogated or to enter into a discussion.

The agreement which I wish to discuss is one which I can liken unto nothing so much as a great international game of chance in which the United States is to furnish the money for both participants and in which the British Labor Party is to furnish the dice.

Like all of the fantastic enterprises into which we have been drawn before and since the war, this one is being sold—to the American people, of course—with the same pretensions of altruistic concern for the world, mixed with some supposed benefits which we are to obtain. I take it, therefore, that I would do well at the outset to state as clearly as I can precisely what this proposal is.

There are two separate agreements.

One of them is for a definitive settlement of our lend-lease claims against Great Britain. The other is an agreement with Great Britain in which we undertake to make the British loan. The first agreement provides that England, in full liquidation of all her loans of arms and supplies, as well as cash, under the general term of "lend-lease" is to pay us $650,000,000. That also will pay us for the surplus property belonging to the United States and still remaining in the United Kingdom. However, Great Britain is not going to pay us the $650,000,000. It is to be settled in the future, as stipulated in the agreement.

The second agreement provides for an outright loan of $3,750,000,000 by this Government to the Government of Great Britain. This loan is to be repaid to us in 50 annual installments beginning in 1951, at an interest rate which amounts

to 1.62 percent. On its face, the loan is at 2 percent; but since no interest is to be paid during the first 5 years, the net interest that will accrue to this Government will be 1.62 percent.

In return for this, Great Britain undertakes certain obligations. The most important of these have to do with a proposed agreement which it is supposed will, in the words of President Truman, "put an end to the fear of an economically divided world; will make possible throughout the world the expansion of employment and of the production, exchange, and consumption of goods; and will bring into being for the first time a common code of equitable rules for the conduct of international trade policies and relations."

Stated more specifically, the proposal is that Great Britain will make an end of, or at least enormously modify, her policy of empire preference, and that the United States and Great Britain will attempt to remove as far as possible the barriers to international trade which are described as tariffs and preferences, quantitative restructions, subsidies, state trading, cartels, and other types of trade barriers treated in the document which I am discussing. In other words, it involves an understanding between these two governments that not only England but the United States will begin to open its doors to the products and merchandise of all countries, upon the theory that this is essential to the rehabilitation of the world and the creation of an era of prosperity.

The other agreement is that the British will take measures to unfreeze some $14,000,000,000 of blocked sterling in the so-called sterling bloc of countries, in order to free these credits and to enable the countries in which they are blocked to resume multilateral trade operations.

Let me say a word about the first of these agreements, namely, the settlement of lend-lease. I do not have the precise figure, but I can say in general terms that the goods and services advanced to Britain under the lend-lease policy had a value in round numbers of $25,000,000,000. When that policy was adopted, we were told we would not make the mistake we had made in the First World War—of lending money to Great Britain—because the First World War proved that she could not repay such sums. We would, therefore, lend her certain goods and materials, arms, and munitions. We were told that all this would come back to us, or most of it; that England and our other allies would be able to pay back to us goods and merchandise—products of their factories, farms, and mines—when the war ended and that this would actually aid their people then. At that time, I argued that that was a wholly dishonest assertion to make to the American people.

After the last war, England was enormously more sound economically than she is today, but she could not pay a loan of $4,000,000,000 then. It was perfectly obvious that if another such loan was made, she could not—and certainly would not—pay it, but it was equally obvious, nevertheless, and we warned at the time, that neither England nor any other country would be permitted to send goods manufactured abroad into this country to compete with the products of our own workers. Of course, what we predicted has come true, but the American people apparently have not yet completely grasped this fact.

Up to this minute, I am sure the American people who have not had the time to read these agreements imagine that we are going to be paid for what we gave to our allies during the war.

I wonder what they will say when the truth dawns on them—that under this agreement they are going to be paid $650,000,000 for $25,000,000,000 worth of material and installations. If you will compute that quickly, you will find that it comes down to a settlement of 2½ cents on the dollar. So far as I am concerned, and considering the generosity of our internationalists when dealing with England, I am amazed that our negotiators exacted so much. I have not the slightest doubt that before this episode is ended it will be called by the British a "hard settlement"—and it was called that just the other day—and perhaps another instance of the financial depravity of old Uncle Shylock.

However, it is not so hard if we will look at it a little closer. This $650,000,000 settlement of a $25,000,000,000 claim, this paying off of a debt of a dollar with 2½ cents, has certain features which mitigate its severity. First of all, it is divided into two parts. The British are to pay $118,000,000 for all the lend-lease they received after VJ-day. The remaining $532,000,000 is to settle all lend-lease advances before VJ-day, and also to pay for all American surplus property and installations located in the United Kingdom and owned by the United States Government. Mr. President, in the preparation of this statement the stenographer inadvertently interposed the figures. They are correct as I have just given them.

As a matter of fact, when we come down to it, England is really paying a very small sum for vast stores of property, magnificent airfields, and great installations which cost billions, and which she still has and can use and, as to some of it, can sell. I wish to congratulate those distinguished Americans who have been looking after our interests in this agreement for the manner in which they have guarded them, for I note with great relief and satisfaction that the agreement provides that England cannot export any of this surplus property back to us.

There is another feature of this amazing agreement which I know will please those whose hearts beat so warmly for the plight of people in other lands. I cannot quite make out how this money is to be paid, but I want to call the attention of Senators to this almost unbelievable agreement. First, England will pay this money in sums of $50,000,000, to be paid every now and then, no time specified; but whenever before December 31, 1951, old Uncle Shylock demands a payment—whenever he does this—he will notify the British and they will transfer to him pounds sterling to an aggregate dollar value not in excess of $50,000,000.

And what will we do with this $50,000,000? Will we bring it back here and use it to do a little rehabilitating in our own land—perhaps pay some of the obligations we owe our own soldiers, perhaps do a little something in the way of relieving the unemployment which seems to loom ahead, or perhaps increase the pay of Federal workers about whom we have heard much debate. Oh, no. Here is what we have agreed to do:

> The Government of the United States will use these pounds sterling exclusively to acquire land or to acquire or construct buildings in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies for the use of the Government of the United States—

In other words—I break off this quotation for a moment to make sure that Senators realize its meaning—we will never take that $50,000,000 out of the United Kingdom, we will use it to build such things as we will want in the United Kingdom. I do not know what we are going to want to build there that will cost $50,000,000, now and then, but that is the agreement. I now resume the quotation because I do not want Senators to miss this. There is another purpose for which we can spend the money, which is—

> and for carrying out educational programs in accordance with agreements to be concluded between the two Governments.

This, mark you, Mr. President, we do not have to do in the United Kingdom, but it means that a part—and doubtless a large part—of this $650,000,000 is to be spent by us in carrying out educational programs in combination with England.

Here, I want to amend the observation with which I started. I said that this is a game of chance in which we will furnish the money and the British will furnish the dice. I think history has taught us that in any educational program carried on by ourselves in cooperation with the British, we will furnish the money and the British will furnish the teachers.

What are these educational programs? What are we going to teach? To whom, and to where are we going to carry these adventures in propaganda? To Asia? And whose system of economic government are we going to propagate? Is it to be the system of private property and republican free government of the United States, or the planned society and socialist government of Great Britain? Certainly, whatever is done with this agreement, that incredible—that obnoxious—provision should be stricken from it.

One thing, however, is certain to come out of this lend-lease settlement. Little or no part of the $650,000,000 will ever come to the United States. The whole settlement, so far as that agreement is concerned, is a pure and unmixed fraud upon the American people.

The second agreement provides for new loans amounting to $3,750,000,000, to be paid back in annual installments beginning 5 years from now and covering a period up to 50 years from that date.

The first we heard in a concrete way about this now completed agreement came on September 13, of this year, after John Maynard Keynes, now Lord Keynes, arrived in this country in advance of the mission which has reached

its present result. Of course, all Senators know Lord Keynes. He was simply Mr. Keynes when he came to this country in the middle thirties and introduced our administration to the scientific theory of mass spending and deficit financing by the Government. Up to that time our Government had been spending money in a desperate effort to stem the depression and on the theory that they were "priming the pump." It was not, of course, working, and in 1937, when President Roosevelt began to talk about once again balancing the budget and actually to attempt it, we were treated to what was called a recession. We had seven or eight million people out of work; the spending was not a success; none of the fundamental defects in our economic system had been corrected; nothing was keeping the administration afloat but the indiscriminate spending of public money borrowed from the banks, and the President decided that he had better taper off the spending, cut out the borrowing and balance the budget—and down went the New Deal into its recession.

I am sure that at that moment there must have been some troubled hearts among the statesmen in this Chamber and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Just about that time John Maynard Keynes came here and assured our leading statesmen that the spending they had been doing was all right, that it was not just a "hit and miss" strategy of bewildered politicians, but was actually a profoundly scientific procedure, and that the only trouble with it was that they were not spending and borrowing enough.

And so was born the new theory of the New Deal which appeared among us in 1938 of the permanent deficit—the endless borrowing upon the theory that a Government debt is not like a private debt, that we owe it to ourselves, that we need never pay it, and that the interest on it is not a burden because we merely take it out of the right-hand pockets of the people in the form of taxes and put it back into their left-hand pockets in the form of interest.

This same John Maynard Keynes had been preaching that theory in England. He had gotten himself elected to the position of director of the Bank of England. He was later elevated to the House of Lords, and sent to America to negotiate this present agreement. I congratulate him. Any man who can settle a debt of $10 for 2 cents is good, and deserves the admiration of all financiers and the thanks of at least his countrymen.

He arrived here in September and he told us he was here to make some kind of an arrangement about lend-lease, and about some way of helping England struggle out of her economic difficulties. But there was one thing he wanted to make plain to us. That was that Britain could not afford to make a commercial loan in this country. To quote him, he said:

> No doubt an easy course would be for you to offer, and for us to put our name to a substantial loan on more or less commercial terms, without either party to the transaction troubling to pay too much attention to the question of the likelihood of our being able to fulfill the obligations which we were undertaking.

The New York Times said:

> Not only did he fear that the deception would probably have a very short life but it would be extremely shortsighted if the absence of friction and bad feeling between the two countries is one of the principal aims.
>
> However, this may be—

He said—

> we shall not lend ourselves to any such soft and deceptive expedient.

He continued:

> We are not in the mood, and we believe and hope that you are not in the mood, to repeat the experiences of last time's war debt. We would far rather do what we can to get on as best we can on any other lines which are open to us.

What did he mean by a "commercial loan"? He meant a loan of money made to his Government to be paid back with interest on it. In the meantime, Lord Keynes said that his Government was in "no mood" to enter into such a transaction. He said it would be a "false start," that its terms could not be fulfilled, that it would have "a very short life" and would lead to nothing but "friction and bad feeling" between our nations—and so he said "no commercial loan."

That is what he thought. Lord Keynes, well as he knows us, just did not know who he was dealing with. He might have thought that England would not borrow money from us, but he was bargaining without us. If he thought that England could get away without a loan of billions from us, he now knows he was mistaken. Anybody can borrow from us. We are now talking about a loan to Russia, and we want it understood that neither England, nor Russia, nor Lord Keynes, nor anybody else can escape borrowing money from us if we want to lend—and we want to lend to anybody and everybody.

After Lord Keynes arrived in this country, he began negotiating for some kind of deal, apparently, which would not be a commercial loan.

In short, what Lord Keynes wanted and what the English wanted was what they call a grant-in-aid. In other words, they wanted money as a gift and without any pretensions that it was to be a loan, or that they were to pay interest on it, or even pay it back.

Sydney Campbell, financial editor of Reuter's, said, in July:

> One thing should be made clear about the present discussions in the United States about a loan of three to five billion dollars to Britain. Britain would almost certainly refuse any such loan, however big it might be or however low the interest. British official and business circles are virtually unanimous that Britain is not interested in converting sterling debt into dollar debt or in adding dollar debt to existing sterling debt. They are rather mystified as to why Americans trouble to discuss the matter. A grant-in-aid would, of course, be accepted. Britishers would regard that in terms of the United States and possibly others of the United Nations taking over their fair share of the common war debt, which is at present piled on Britain's back alone. In return for such aid, Britain would be only too glad to make what Americans would regard as concessions in regard to freeing sterling and mitigating the exclusivity of the sterling area.

Now, I call attention to the fact that this man, the editor of a leading financial journal, says that British official and business circles are "virtually unanimous" that Britain is opposed to the kind of arrangement that is now offered to this Congress. In other words, this Congress is now being asked to approve a loan to Great Britain to which the then official and business elements of Great Britain are opposed to.

I cannot help commenting on their more or less generous attitude toward us in being willing to accept a grant-in-aid. We know what grants-in-aid are—they are gifts—we used the term during the period of relief to describe what we call grants-in-aid to our States. But note the reason which Mr. Campbell gives for Britain's being willing to accept this grant-in-aid. He thinks that giving Britain, on top of the $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease, another three or even five billion dollars would be a "taking over of our fair share of the common war debt." Do our British friends think that we have not borne our fair share of the war debt?

I learn from the Bankers Insurance Magazine of London that between the beginning of the war in 1939 and its end on August 25, 1945, Britain borrowed in England fifteen billion in bonds which is $60,000,000,000. We in this country borrowed $230,000,000,000 in the same time, or nearly four times as much as Britain borrowed, although our population is not three times as great.

I call attention to the fact that we borrowed $25,000,000,000 in this country and spent it specifically for the benefit of England, through lend-lease, much of it in the British Empire which is almost one-half as much as she borrowed herself for her own interest. I should think that if there was to be any adjustment of this situation by which each country would bear its fair share of the debt, England should be making us a grant-in-aid. However, this is not the point I started to make—what I want to call attention to is Mr. Sydney Campbell's testimony that the "official and business" opinion of England was practically unanimous in July that such an arrangement as this ought not to be made.

In September, about the time that Lord Keynes came here, the New York Times carried a dispatch from London, September 9, saying:

> It can now be stated with assurance that he (Lord Halifax) and Lord Keynes will tell the United States officials that the American offer of a 2⅜ percent dollar loan is not acceptable as it stands. * * * Badly as the British need help they are determined neither to beg for it nor to sacrifice their social and world trade program, which they firmly believe to be sound and just.

In another dispatch to the New York Times, on August 13, 1945, John H. Crider stated that Mr. Will Clayton, our Assistant Secretary of State, was in London sounding out the new Labor Government and trying to find out "whether the new British Government would consider such credits." Apparently our Assistant Secretary of State was in fact trying to sell the British this idea, but the same

dispatch said that the Churchill coalition government felt that such a loan "would only add to Britain's huge external indebtedness, increase the strain on exports and merely postpone the day of reckoning."

Now the matter has come before the British House of Commons. Mr. Churchill and the Conservative leaders urged their followers not to vote on the measure thus disapproving its terms. However, 50 of the party members, not satisfied with a mere silent protest, voted in the negative against the proposal. There were 38 other votes against it. But the vote by which it was passed does not represent the true opinion of the Commons. The New York Times said that even the Attlee-Laski Socialist members suffered a revolt and that many of them voted for the measure only under the party lash. Mr. Churchill said the British had "gotten the worst of it both ways." He meant that Britain had to take a commercial loan with interest and had also to agree to join in the Bretton Woods pact and to agree to changes in her export policy and to hand over dollars so soon that he felt the proposal would defeat itself. He said, with a true Churchill flair for epigram, "It is—in fact let us hope—it is too bad to be true." He objected to the indecent haste with which the proposal was being jammed through the House. And I think we may say that we have seen enough of the same kind of indecent haste in jamming projects of tremendous import through these Halls and that this pact will not be approved until the American people have had a chance to know what is in it.

Of course, there would have been no objection to this plan if the American Government had offered Britain a free gift of four or five billions. Last week apparently our Government would have been willing to do that. But we were informed by the morning papers last Thursday that Mr. Hugh Dalton, Labor Chancelor of the Exchequer, said in Commons that the American Government would not do that because our negotiators thought it would not be practical politics and because Congress would oppose it. But I might say to Mr. Dalton, in passing, that our negotiators did everything they could to comply with that request. And if he will examine the agreement more narrowly he will see that our negotiators inserted into the agreement several little jokers, the effect of which may well be to make this an interest-free loan, and perhaps ultimately a gift.

I notice also that Mr. Robert Boothby, a Scotch member, has denounced the loan. Mr. Boothby is not a hard-shelled conservative. He was once Mr. Chuchill's Parliamentary Secretary. He is now the leader of the young conservatives in the House, where he has taken an advanced stand in favor of a planned economy and even the Beveridge plan. He seems to me to be pretty close to a British New Dealer. But he is a New Dealer who thinks in terms of his own country. He came to this country and urged strongly against any sort of loan to Britain. He has now repeated these warnings in the House of Commons where he said that this loan, for Britain, is "an economic Munich; the greatest economic defeat we have ever had." And so we see that while this arrangement can do nothing for us save drain away from us immense sums of money and add to the weakness of our public fiscal position and give another push to inflation, there are some Englishmen who do not like it any better than some of us do.

Now, I ask, if Englishmen—Englishmen who are patriots and who are profoundly interested in the welfare of their country—Englishmen whose ideas of economic organization are far closer to ours than those of the Attlee-Laski Government—if such Englishmen, much as they see the dire needs of their country, can say to us plainly: "We do not want such a loan, we think it will not help us, we think it will add to our troubles, we think it is putting off the day of reckoning, we think it will increase the frictions between your country and ours,"—if such Englishmen can say those things to us, how can we delude ourselves into such a notion that we are doing a favor to England by forcing upon them a loan in which, in spite of all their troubles, their better judgment tells them they ought not to become involved?

Now, either this is a commercial loan or it is not. So far as the documents go, as I have said, it is obviously a commercial loan just as much as the loan one makes when he goes to his bank. Certainly, the interest is unreasonably low, but it calls for repayment in both principal and interest. But can it be that in spite of this pretentious appearance of being a commercial loan it is not one after all? Can it be that on its face it is a commercial loan but that actually the American people are being artfully and cunningly deceived again? A close examination of this document indicates that it will be very easy for England to escape paying either interest or principal whenever it suits her purpose.

In other words, the document is full of holes. They are called escape clauses—that is to say, they are clauses through which England can escape her share of obligations. For instance, England can at any time request the United States to waive the amount of interest due in the installment of that year. The United States will grant this under two conditions: First, if the Government of the United Kingdom finds that a waiver is necessary in view of exchange conditions, the United States then must grant the waiver. In other words, the United Kingdom makes the request for the waiver and then the United States submits the matter to the judgment of what is supposed to be an impartial judge. The impartial judge in this case is also the United Kingdom. In other words, the United Kingdom makes the request for the waiver and if it decides that exchange conditions are not favorable, then the United States must grant the request and apparently has no discretion in the matter.

The second condition is that the United States must grant the waiver if the income of the United Kingdom, from its exports and its invisible current transactions, was, over a period of 5 years, less than the imports during 1936–38. That sounds a little complicated, but the fact of the matter is that there is a most excellent chance of this being true almost every year in the troubled times ahead of England. There is very good ground for saying that the escape clauses in this document are so wide and inviting that we can scarcely look for Great Britain remaining incarcerated in this agreement for any considerable period of time. Some might say that the British are trying to pull the wool over our eyes, but I do not subscribe to that theory. I think the British in this negotiation are looking after themselves. I think that somebody ought to be looking after America. Apparently nobody has been looking after America. The men who negotiated this agreement with Britain understand this as well as you do and I do. I think we are having the wool pulled over our eyes, but I do not think it is being pulled over our eyes by the British. I think it is being pulled over our eyes by the men who are misrepresenting America again and sacrificing the interests of this country to the interests of another country—for some reason which I do not undertake to understand.

Now, Mr. President, there are two things about this agreement which should doom it as far as the Congress is concerned. The first is that the conditions upon which it is based are such that neither England nor the United States can carry them out. The second is that the United States is assuming an obligation in terms of dollars which will put a strain of the first magnitude upon our resources. Let me consider these in order.

The first of these obligations is that neither Great Britain nor the United States can carry out the obligations they assume as a condition of the agreement. There are a number of such impossible conditions, but I refer in particular to one. It is stated that the great objective is to set in motion again the currents of multilateral international trade. I read from the joint statement which accompanied the agreement:

> To this end (that is the reestablishment of freer international trade) they have undertaken to begin preliminary negotiations at an early date between themselves and with other countries for the purpose of developing concrete arrangements to carry out these proposals including definitive measures for the relaxation of trade barriers of all kinds. These negotiations will relate to tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels and other types of trade barriers treated in the document published by the United States and referred to above.

I do not wish to go too fully into this. I hope at some future time to discuss it in detail, but I think we ought to be clear about just what we are getting in for. This agreement, if we conclude it, is a solemn pledge on our part that we will undertake a major operation upon our whole tariff policy.

About that, I want to say two things.

First, I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that the old problem of tariff and free trade has become enormously changed. The old arguments about building up industries, and that sort of thing, are no longer relevant. Today, the Administration has set out by law to produce in this country a standard of living very much higher than that which existed before the depression. The Administration has announced its intention to assume the responsibility for full employment, for the security of every man and woman from the cradle to the grave, and in order to accomplish this it has formulated a program of government control of industry on the most

elaborate scale. This policy has been in the making for a number of years. We are now imposing enormous taxes for these purposes upon our producers. We force old-age and unemployment insurance taxes. We have compensation insurance and factory inspection laws guaranteeing working conditions matched no place else in the world and costing huge sums. We have instituted rules and regulations controlling our banks, our investment institutions, our producing agencies. We have imposed the will of the Government upon the employer-labor world which has resulted in higher wages, shorter hours, working conditions, even the terms and amount of production which have sent and will continue to send the cost of production in America to very high levels. I am not now discussing the wisdom of these things—I say they are a fact and every man knows it.

Mr. President, you know, as well as I do, that we cannot impose these kinds of cost and production elements upon Brown in Illinois and not impose them on Smith in Virginia. Both are entitled to compete upon the same level. We recognize that. But does anyone mean to tell me that we are now going to force both Brown in Illinois and Smith in Virginia to submit to these extensive controls and cost elements and then let some man from India, upon whom we cannot impose these controls, or someone in Britain or France or any other country whom our laws and regulations cannot reach, send their goods in here and compete with Brown and Smith? Whether it is right or wrong, wise or unwise, the American people will not permit that to be done and if attempt is made to throw down our trade barriers in order to open our markets to a flood of products from these low-income, low-standard, low-cost countries, every manufacturer in America, every trade union in America, every farmer in America will send representatives to the Capitol to protest and no one will dare comply with such an agreement.

Now, I know that there are unreasonable trade restrictions which ought to be done away with, but that is not what these men are talking about in this agreement. They are talking about what I have described as a major operation on those tariff arrangements which have for years protected the American standard of living from the competition of countries which pay from 15 cents to $1 a day to their labor. I do not wish to discuss the entire tariff issue. I merely say that when you promise the people of England that you will undertake to throw down to any considerable degree these barriers, you are making a promise which you cannot fulfill—which they know you cannot fulfill.

The difficulty about this agreement is that this is a promise which is made to be carried out after England has gotten our $3,750,000,000. In other words, the first step in this agreement is to be performed by us, namely, to hand over the cash. Then comes the period of repayment by Britain; but that will be conditioned, at least so Britain can say, upon our performing the next step in the agreement, namely, meeting her in an arrangement for the elimination and relaxation of tariff barriers, and if we do not perform that condition, Senators will hear from their English friends when the next installment on the loan is due—and I can already hear in the not distant future the iteration and reiteration of that affectionate term "Uncle Shylock."

Now, what about England's share in this arrangement? The English have a system of empire preferences which is a system of tariffs designed to maintain preferential trade within the British Commonwealth. We have been told in numerous English statements preceding this agreement that the English did not look with favor upon any such condition for this loan. As a matter of fact, England has been moving in the direction of stringent trade barriers far more than we have in the last 20 years.

But England has an additional reason for looking with disadvantage upon this condition. Certainly, every Member of the Senate must be aware of the kind of government which has now taken over the management of affairs in England. It is a socialist government. It has already taken over the Bank of England and the coal mines and is now proceeding with legislation to take over the transportation and power and communication systems; but at the same time it is committed to putting into effect the Beveridge plan. Not only are the socialists for this, but a considerable number of the Conservatives are for it. Now the Beveridge plan is a proposal something like what we have heard advertised in this country for security from the cradle to the grave. But the Beveridge plan faces this proposal frankly, and we do not. It recognizes that to do this it must establish the most extensive regimentation, not only of private manufacturing and distributing agencies of all kinds, but of the labor unions as well. It is a proposal for planned economy upon the most elaborate scale. When one undertakes to plan the economy of a country he must recognize—and the British do recognize—that planning cannot stop at the waterfront. Trade which flows into Britain from without, as well as trade which flows out of Great Britain, has got to come under the supervision of the planners, as well as trade within the Kingdom—and planned foreign trade is not free trade. One of the first responsibilities of the planner is to set up controls to protect the producers within the planned society from the competition of producers outside. The idea of throwing down trade barriers in a Kingdom which is now going in for a planned economy is a contradiction in terms—and the British will not carry out this agreement any more than we will. But the difference lies in this—that they will already have some more of our cash, and they will find it very easy to put upon us the first violation in the field of dismantling trade barriers.

I said there was a second reason which would make this agreement impossible, and that is that we, at the very outset, cannot carry out our proposal to give them this money without putting upon our own economic system a strain of the first magnitude.

We are called upon, as soon as the agreement is ratified and as fast as England wants the money, to hand over $3,750,000,000 in American cash. I ask Members of the Senate if they have given any thought to where this money is to come from. Mind you, this is to be a loan by our Government to the British Government. Obviously, our Government does not have the money to make the loan. It must, therefore, go out into the markets of money and borrow it from our people, just as it borrowed the money in the various war loans and in the recent Victory loan.

I wonder if Senators have been induced to suppose that because during this war we could borrow almost unlimited sums we can continue to do it from now on. How are we going to borrow this $3,750,000,000 from the American people? Are we going to launch a big Britain loan drive? Are we going to bring the stars from Hollywood and Broadway out on the streets singing "Hail, Britannia" and "God Save the King"? And then when the surrounding audience is under the opiate of these enchanting melodies, are we going to get them to fork up their dollars out of their pay envelopes—"dollars for Britain"? Are we going to get our advertisers to take out for the Government full-page advertisements in the newspapers calling upon the workers to buy bonds for Britain? Are we going to see microphone-equipped trucks parked in our city streets calling upon the population to buy bonds for Britain? Does anyone think they are going to buy them? If so, let me call attention to some figures which ought to give us pause even aside from this present issue.

Before the war and throughout the war, we paid the bills of this Government with money from two sources—from taxes and from Government borrowings. Always we have managed to get enough by taxes and by borrowing to more than cover our expenditures and to pile up a very large Government cash reserve in the banks. But things have changed. The war is over. The soldiers are coming home. The workers are striking. The war plants are being emptied, and the people are cashing in their bonds. They are cashing savings bonds at the rate of nearly $5,000,000 a month. Businessmen who bought Treasury savings notes are cashing them in enormous quantities. An enormous volume of short-term Treasury notes and bills is coming due in the next 2 years, much of which will have to be refunded. It is conceivable that this Government can go out for itself and its own necessities, if they are sufficiently justifiable, and raise additional funds by a series of bonds; but this Government cannot go out and raise money by a series of bond issues for the purpose of handing the money over to Britain, or Russia, or any other country in the world.

Let me call attention to a fact which we would do well to investigate. Since the first of July, the beginning of this fiscal year, in nearly 6 months we have spent, as of December 6, $17,219,000,000 more than we collected in taxes. Presumably we should have borrowed enough to carry that deficit. We borrowed much, but while we were borrowing, older bond issues and notes were

coming due, so actually we got a net return from our borrowing of only $13,500,000,000. In other words, both taxes and borrowings in the first 6 months of this fiscal year up to December 3 have failed to cover our expenditures by $4,000,000,000. This deficit has been met out of the cash reserves built up in past borrowings. We may, of course, make up this deficit in the taxes which will be collected this very week, but it will be hard scratching. This is an alarming situation, and I ask Senators to consider what it will be next year, for while the Government expenditures ought to decrease greatly, taxes also will decrease enormously, and the borrowing surplus may well disappear.

Where, then, are we going to get the $3,750,000,000? I predict that we cannot get it from the people and will be forced to go to the banks for it.

At the beginning of the Victory loan drive just ended Secretary Vinson wisely called on the American people to buy these bonds out of their incomes, warning them that the time had passed when we could afford to indulge in any further inflationary borrowings at the banks. The time has certainly passed, but, above all things, we ought not to permit this Government to indulge in inflationary bank borrowing to lend money to Britain or anybody else, including the United States of America.

Here is a loan of $3,750,000,000 at 2 percent interest. But because there is a 5-year prologue without interest the actual rate over the whole period will be 1.62 percent a year. Our Government will have to borrow this money from the American people. It will have to pay at least 2½ percent for it. That is the interest rate on the present Victory Loan. It will borrow at 2½ percent and lend to the British at 1.62 percent. We will pay $93,750,000 a year interest and they, when they pay, will pay us $60,750,000 a year for the privilege of using the money. The Government will take a loss of $33,000,000 a year on the interest account. Of course, this will decrease gradually as the loan is paid off. But I predict it will never be reduced very much, if at all.

This is not all. We are told blithely that this agreement settles the lend-lease problem. But does it? It settles it for the British. But remember, our Government borrowed $25,000,000,000 to advance to England on lend-lease. Our Government pays at least 2 percent interest on the loan. England gets out of that, but this Government must go on taxing our people $500,000,000 a year to pay interest on the debt which we forgive.

Let me say, therefore, that we cannot make this loan without adding another severe burden to the fiscal problem of our Government, while on the side of Great Britain, I predict that she will never pay this loan any more than she has paid any other to us. Have we not had enough experience in this field? When we were lending her billions during the last world war, we were the very best fellows in the world. When the war ended, England owed us $4,000,000,000. She paid a miserable fraction of this, and then began to denounce us as old Uncle Shylock for even suggesting that she should pay on a very much reduced basis. Does anyone think that either we or our English friends have changed very much?

Then came this war, and the lend-lease proposal. No man in America dreamed that the sums poured out on lend-lease would ever reach such fantastic proportions. Nevertheless, we were told that while we would not ask repayment in dollars, we would get payments for a great deal of it in goods and trade concessions when the war ended. Now, for every dollar of lend-lease to England, and for the billions of installations and surplus property remaining in England, we are getting $532,000,000, which we are agreeing to spend in England for real estate and construction and educational programs.

We now have a proposal for another loan of $3,750,000,000. The English themselves have warned us that they take it only because they are desperate. They have practically told us that they could not stand a loan. They have—in words as plain as involved diplomatic double-talk can make it—told us they cannot pay such a loan. After the last war England was in a far more powerful economic condition than she is in today. Yet she could not pay us $4,000,000,000. Do Senators think that England, weakened as she is today, is better able to assume such an obligation than she was 25 years ago? She will never pay it. Under this arrangement, she is supposed to pay an average of $96,000,000 a year. Where is she going to get the $96,000,000? Her exports cannot provide it. They will be scarcely sufficient to pay for her imports from this country. And when England comes to us later and tells us she cannot pay, many persons in America will say that once again England is rooking us—but remember we are going into this with our eyes wide open. England cannot pay this money, and we are sowing the seeds of endless international friction, reviving old animosities, and setting in motion a flood and counterflood of bitter criticisms across the Atlantic Ocean between two nations which should be friends.

Just one more thought. For what purpose is Britain going to use this money? Some of it she is expected to spend here, and that is supposed to keep our factories going. The rest of it she will spend at home and in various parts of the world; but however she spends it, I remind the Senate that we are lending this, not to British industry but to the British Government.

Mr. President, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that in this world today there is a life-and-death struggle between two systems of government. One of them is our own—the capitalist economic system of private ownership operating under a free republican form of government. The other is a system of economic collectivism operating under a powerful and unlimited central government—either a dictatorship or moving toward dictatorship. The people of England have made their choice. They have decided that they are through with the old capitalism under which England grew powerful and great. I do not make any defense for those leaders of capitalism in either England or the United States who have committed so many offenses against their own system and who have blindly refused to see its abuses and to correct them. Here in this country, however, I think our choice is clearly indicated. It is to correct the mistakes and eradicate the abuses. In England the choice has been to get rid of the capitalist system and turn to an all-powerful political state which will control the economic life of the nation upon the most comprehensive scale.

I do not question the right of the English people to make this choice. It is their country to do with as they choose; but we cannot escape the fact that in the coming generation one of these systems of life and policy is going to succeed and the other will probably fail. Our just duty is to make our system strong and to use our energies, our wealth, and our devotion to preserve and perpetuate our great society of the free man. I think the English people have a right to take the same course with reference to their new venture in socialism, communism, or whatever one may wish to call it; but I do not think they have a right to ask us to pour out our resources to their Government in order to make its socialistic experiment a success. If they can make it a success, if they can produce that abundance and security of which men have always dreamed, we wish them well. The example of the English and the Russian experiments may lead the world in the same direction in the future. But, on the other hand, for our system of society there is only one hope, and that is that we shall make it a success—that it will succeed upon its own strength—and that we shall let Russia and England and every other socialistic experiment either succeed or fail upon its own merits. If our system succeeds and that of England and Russia fails, the world will come back to our way of life and to our ideals of government.

Certainly we have voted to cooperate with them. We have already provided for international financial cooperation through the Bretton Woods agreement, the Export-Import Bank, and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Through the RFC we have already given them loans on a business basis.

I do not propose that we shall do anything to injure England along the course she has chosen. I believe that we should trade with her, visit with her, and behave generally as reasonable neighbors. If there are any private industries in England which are solvent and can qualify for loans upon the same basis as private industries in America, I would not oppose such loans; but I will oppose loans to the Government of England to make that Socialist government a success, particularly when I know that that government cannot repay the loans and that we cannot afford to make them, and that if we make them we shall be giving a transfusion of blood into this Socialist body out of our own private enterprise body at a moment when we would do well to look to the health of our own country.

Mr. President, I have voted for cooperation with the other countries of the world. I voted to grant great powers to our Executive in those dealings, but I want our representatives truly to represent the interests of America and, above all, I want them to be honest with the American people.

FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now vote on the bill, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas should make a full statement in regard to the bill and in regard to what the $1,350,000,000 will be used for and what countries will receive it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senator said that he looked serious, but then he smiled, as if to throw a doubt on his earnestness in the matter.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held public hearings on the bill for two entire days. I did not see the Senator from Ohio there, although he diligently appeared before the committee every day, so far as I now recall, when the committee considered the Palestine resolution. I regret that the Senator from Ohio could not spare any time from his attentions to the Palestine resolution, to favor the committee with his presence when it was considering the UNRRA bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will remember that I appeared before the committee only at the invitation of the committee, and I was not invited to attend the committee's hearings on the UNRRA bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. We were glad to have the Senator there; but I do not recall that we felt that we had to invite the Senator to attend the hearings on a bill to which the public was invited. We did invite the Senator to attend the hearings on the Palestine resolution, because that meeting was secret; and the Senator accepted with alacrity and was there. But he did not do us that honor when we were considering the UNRRA bill; he did not attend the hearings on that bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the hearings were open to the public?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that they were.

Mr. TAFT. No; my understanding is that they were executive hearings. I was not invited to be present.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator could have asked to be present, and we would have been glad to have him there and to hear him.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I expect to vote for the UNRRA bill, but I think the facts regarding it should be known to the Senate before it votes for the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator expects to vote for the bill without knowing the facts, I do not see why I should take time to explain the facts. If he is going to vote for the bill without knowing anything about it, why should I spend any time in attempting to enlighten him regarding it?

Mr. President, I may say that House bill 4649 provides for an additional $1,350,000,000 for the work of UNRRA. The bill amends the original joint resolution by striking out the figure "$1,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,700,000,000," making both allocations in the amount of $1,350,000,000.

As all Senators who have taken any interest in this matter know, this money is expended through the United Nations Organization. Former Governor Lehman, of New York, is president of the Organization—not the American president, but president, or Director, of the entire program.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the United Nations Organization, the participating nations subscribe proportionate amounts of money. I believe the United States subscribes approximately 70 percent of the total; is that corerct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When we make this appropriation, do we know that the other nations are going to subscribe their proportionate amounts, so as to meet their obligations under the UNRRA setup?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the principal other nations already either have made their appropriations or are in process of making them—Great Britain and the other principal nations. Of course, there are a number of small countries whose allocations are small, and all of them have not as yet made their appropriations. But I understand that Brazil, which contributes quite a substantial sum of money, is taking measures to appropriate its share of the money.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Are they making appropriations to meet the new appropriation which we are making?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is what I am talking about.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So when this appropriation is made by this country, the other nations will have made their corresponding appropriations, on the basis of their original allocations; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. In the main, they have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the Senator says "In the main," does he mean the larger countries?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I mean the larger countries. I am sending for the hearings now, so that I may give Senators the detailed figures, if they wish to have them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Have the Senate hearings been printed?

Mr. CONNALLY. They have, and I now present the Senator with a copy of them.

Mr. TAFT. I have had a copy of the House hearings, but I have not seen a copy of the Senate hearings.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg pardon; let me say that I have sent for the stenographic copies, and I shall be glad to present one to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Then the Senator from Texas again is mistaken; for he said the hearings were printed, and now I understand the Senator to say that they have not been printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; they have not been. When I saw the volume, I withdrew the statement that they had been printed. I do not expect to attempt to catch the Senator from Ohio on such a trivial matter, nor do I expect him to raise a question as to one so lacking in importance.

Mr. President, there is no attempt to conceal. The UNRRA is a new organization which is confronted with the greatest difficulties in respect to hunger, suffering, and sacrifices in the war-torn countries. The Foreign Relations Committee went over the matter very thoroughly with Governor Lehman. He admitted that there were shortcomings, but he said they were striving to correct them. I do not doubt that there has been waste in many places, but I do not know how we are going to avoid such things in connection with a program of this kind. The UNRRA is a charitable organization. There is no doubt that there are impositions upon it. It has an employee list of 8,000 persons, who are scattered all over the world. It is now extending its activities to some countries which heretofore have not enjoyed the benefits conferred under the UNRRA program. It will begin a program in Italy, where it will spend approximately $300,000,000. Later on it will begin a program in China, where it will spend approximately $400,000,000. Those are simply samples of what I am undertaking to point out in answer to the Senator from Ohio.

Although the committee did not approve of a good many things which had been done and a good many things which had not been done by the UNRRA nevertheless, it was of the opinion that we were embarked upon the program and we could not withdraw from it—with the exception that the bill provides, and Governor Lehman and others agree that the program shall end in 1946, so far as Europe is concerned, and on March 31, 1947, insofar as Asia is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. Are the other countries agreed as to the time limit; in other words, that the program shall close on the dates which we are fixing in this authorization bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot assure the Senator categorically of that, but my understanding is that they are agreed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the time now proposed a longer time than was originally intended?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that any time limit was set originally; but most of us thought, when we voted for the first appropriation, that it would be all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask the question because, as I remember, in a conversation with Governor Lehman more than a year ago, he said he felt that the major work of UNRRA would be completed with a year after the war. However, this authorization provides for a period beyond that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is quite true, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts; and when the first authorization was passed I chided Governor Lehman on the statement which he was making to the Senator from Massachusetts. I said, "You say this is all you are going to need, but you will be back here next year with a request for another authorization." And faithful to that suggestion, he is back.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it be wise for us not to go so far as is proposed—into 1947—but to have the subject come up again next autumn, when we could look into the matter again?

Mr. CONNALLY. Next autumn would be very near the end of the program, very near the end of 1946.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have in mind the 1947 date.

Mr. CONNALLY. That applies only to Asia. UNRRA has not yet commenced operations in Asia, and so it was felt that it would need those 3 months to wind up the program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask a further question. When we make this authorization, do we become obligated legally or in any other way to make appropriations beyond the $750,000,000 now already in course of appropriation?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio knows just as much about that as does the Senator from Texas. He knows what an authorization is, and what an appropriation is. He knows whether we are morally obligated. I do not think we are morally obligated, but I suppose the Senator thinks we are.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. When the question of $550,000,000 arose in connection with the first authorization, it was said, as I remember, that we were morally obligated. Other nations had gone along and put up their whole 1 percent, or at least some of them did, and I supposed we must do the same. I wonder if we are again getting into a situation where we are practically appropriating the money instead of merely authorizing it?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator knows, as a matter of fact, that when an authorization is made the supposition is carried with it that the money later will be appropriated.

Mr. TAFT. No; I was not and am not certain about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no obligation binding upon us. No one can compel us to appropriate the money. However, when we are dealing with other international bodies, if some other nation puts up money on the assumption that we will also appropriate, I think that an obligation is involved upon our part.

Mr. TAFT. The original act expressly disavows any obligation upon our part beyond what we appropriate, does it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. If there was such a disavowal, it would not be changed by the terms of this bill because in it that matter is not dealt with.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the testimony showed before the committee as to when the program is to start in China and in the Orient?

Mr. CONNALLY. No definite date has been agreed upon, but the organization has had representatives in China for a year looking into the situation and preparing for initiating its work in that region. I think they will start shortly after they obtain the money.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am supporting the Senator's bill, because I am somewhat familiar with the problems existing in Europe and the need for relief this winter. I believe, however, that if we have undertaken certain obligations through UNRRA, even though there may have been a better way to perform the work which UNRRA will perform, we will have to follow through in the way we have started because it is not practical to set up an American organization to do the work. But I may state frankly that I have some question in my mind as to whether we are acting soundly in following through with the UNRRA program in China and whether it would not be a better policy for us to furnish relief to China through an American relief organization instead of becoming involved in relief associated in any way with international high politics. I think the problems involved have resulted in our not doing so efficient a job as we could have done with an American organization. So far as Europe is concerned we must go ahead in the way we have started because if we did not do so we would have a duplication of effort. But so far as China is concerned I question very much the policy of furnishing relief through UNRRA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator that if the work were not done through UNRRA it would involve establishing another organization. We would then have two organizations, and would be constantly debating as to which one of the organizations should have the larger number of employees and the greater appropriation. I would favor an American relief organization in Europe disassociated from other nations, but inasmuch as we have the present organization I do not think it would be consistent to make a change in our policy in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator that so far as Europe is concerned we are tied in with the present organization. We are contributing about 70 percent of the money, although each of the Nations sitting in the organization has an equal vote. Liberia or Guatemala, for example, has put up a few thousand dollars, and is sitting in the organization with a vote equal to that of the United States. As I have said, we are tied in with the present organization, but we are not in that position so far as the Orient is concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator may—I hope he will not—offer an amendment to set up another organization. We are hoping that the appropriation will cover the situation everywhere.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is it possible to put into the RECORD a statement of what countries will receive this money, and in what sums? I think it appeared somewhere in the hearings. At least, I was told so.

Mr. CONNALLY. A tentative statement to that effect was put into the record, but it cannot be definite and final for the reason that the Administrator himself does not know. I can give the Senator a statement with regard to the matter. Let us consider some of the countries to whom relief will be afforded. For example, let us take Yugoslavia. Does the Senator object to the continuance of operations in Yugoslavia?

Mr. TAFT. What I should like to know is how much Yugoslavia is to receive.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will try and furnish the Senator that information. I cannot dig it out at the moment. I do not suppose, however, that the Senator objects to helping Yugoslavia.

Mr. TAFT. Yugoslavia is a country which is entirely under the control of the interests which exclude American newspaper reporters and all American action of any kind. No American can get into Yugoslavia and see what is taking place there. I doubt very seriously, under those circumstances, whether we should extend relief to Yugoslavia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator offer an amendment to strike out Yugoslavia and we shall be glad to have it considered. I suppose that the test of the Senator from Ohio is not whether a man's body is hungry and is about to starve, but instead, is what church the man belongs to, or what political party he may be a member of. I do not recognize such artificial standards. If a man is suffering from hunger, he should be fed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to inquire about Poland.

Mr. CONNALLY. Poland is being treated in the best possible way. A great deal of money has been spent there.

Mr. LANGER. I was curious also about Austria and Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. Operations will be started in Austria immediately, although

Austria was an enemy country. When operations were started by UNRRA they did not feed anybody in an enemy country. But the council modified the regulations to the extent that UNRRA will begin a program of furnishing relief in Austria.

Mr. LANGER. And, I presume, sooner or later in Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that later, when the Army gets through feeding people in Germany—the Army is feeding people in Germany at the present time—UNRRA will start operations there. However, inasmuch as the Army is now feeding people in Germany we do not wish to have two agencies operating with the same object in view.

Mr. LANGER. So the appropriation for which we are voting includes Poland, Austria, and later it will include Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I should say, Mr. President, that some of the countries are not asking for anything. Norway, who suffered terribly and was conquered, is not asking for relief. Belgium is not asking for relief. Several other countries have not asked for any relief under UNRRA. Their attitude is a shining tribute to their fine outlook on world affairs.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Did I understand the Senator to say that UNRRA is extending relief into Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I said that it probably would do so ultimately.

Mr. TAFT. Is it contemplated in the report on the bill? The report states that a part of the additional 1-percent contribution will be used to continue UNRRA's existing operations in Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, China, and Italy. The suggestion has been made that we extend operations further to include Austria, Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Formosa, and Korea. Can the Senator tell us what is Byelorussia?

Mr. CONNALLY. Byelorussia is White Russia. It borders Poland and the Baltic provinces. I shall be glad to obtain the necessary information for the Senator. Mr. President, I ask that the revolving globe be brought into the Chamber. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Why must we extend relief to White Russia and to the Ukraine? Those countries are a part of the Soviet Union, are they not?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. We interrogated thoroughly the representatives of the UNRRA on that point. Of course, there is no compulsion upon us to carry this work on within those countries. We are not compelled to do so, but UNRRA is doing it on the ground that Byelorussia and the Ukraine were terribly devastated by the war, both by the Russians themselves in their scorched-earth policy as they retired before the invading Germans, and later by the Germans who swept in toward Stallingrad. They destroyed homes, killed women and children, and murdered members of the civilian population. Finally, with great heroism, the Russians rallied and drove the invader from their soil. However, as I have said, the two territories to which the Senator has referred are a part of Soviet Russia. We interrogated various officials as to why Russia herself, as a nation, could not meet the requirements of those two territories. The answer was that even Russia herself was not in possession of imports of food and certain articles sufficient in quantity to feed the people in those territories, and that she could not obtain the necessary material except through UNRRA. Byelorussia and the Ukraine made their applications. They are members of the United Nations.

That is the best answer I can give to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only a few things to say about UNRRA.

From the beginning, I opposed the original organization. I think we should have a national relief organization in which we would be free to pick out those seeking relief, in which we gave the relief, in which we got the credit, in which every cent would be spent by Americans in the interest of relief which we wished to give. I think that would be a far more efficient method. I think we could have done more for the same money, probably by 20 or 25 or 30 percent, than UNRRA ever has done or will do. As an administrative organization UNRRA is inefficient, it has five masters instead of one. It cannot do anything to which Russia objects, it cannot do anything to which England objects, it cannot do anything to which we object. It has to satisfy every one of these nations before it can go ahead. So we had the fiasco of proceeding to supply Italy for months on months when UNRRA should have taken over the job. It seems to me that was the only proper way to handle the matter.

If the senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, had been on the job 6 months ago he would have seen that we were prepared to set up a national organization when the money originally appropriated ran out, if it did run out. It seems to me that we should now change the organization to a national organization. But I feel helpless. We are up against the proposition either of voting for relief or not voting for relief. I think this is a most inefficient way to handle it. I think it will result in extending relief, because of political reasons, to places which may not need relief.

I feel very strongly that we have not sufficient knowledge of conditions, because we have not been furnished any detailed information. Relief is to be offered on the basis of starving people. We do not even know how much is to go for food and how much for something else, for agricultural implements, or for lumber. I observed a statement in the press the other day to the effect that lumber for 100,000 housing units was going abroad, I do not know where, or even whether it was under UNRRA.

It seems to me we are pursuing the most inefficient and unsatisfactory method of handling this responsibility. When the money runs out, certainly I shall vote against the next UNRRA authorization. I think we should now make it clear to the foreign nations—and we can do so—that we are putting up only $750,000,000 out of $1,350,000,000, and that we may never put up the other $600,000,000. Let the other nations contribute only a little more than half their total allotment as we are now doing. If they contribute more, they may be deceived about our intentions. We are not obligated to go on with the $600,000,000 merely because we authorize the appropriation. I think it should be made clear to the nations that we may not appropriate the additional $600,000,000. We may choose to handle the matter in some other way, or we may regard the job as finished.

Incidentally, of course, we are not covering large sections of Germany, which are going to be in very much worse shape than some of the other countries. Stories from Germany show conditions there to be worse, in many respects, than in other countries, not so bad as in some of the countries, but worse than that in others.

If we create a situation in which millions of people starve in Germany and Japan, certainly we will look back upon our neglect with shame.

Mr. President, in my opinion Congress is not in a position to substitute another form of organization, so, with the greatest regret, I intend to vote for the appropriation. But I think the administration has lamentably failed in presenting an economically reasonable American plan for the distribution of relief.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I shall vote for the appropriation relying upon the word of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas that Germany, Hungary, Austria, and Poland will get some of the money.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Texas did not say that. He said they probably would. I do not give my guarantee they will ever get a dime.

Mr. LANGER. I give notice that if I find they are not getting it, I shall introduce a bill whereby this Government will see to it that the suffering women and children of those four countries get a sufficient amount of food to enable them to sustain life.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a great many Senators have been concerned about this UNRRA matter for some time. I presume most of the Members of the Senate are greatly in favor of the aid we are giving to displaced and unfortunate people in the occupied territories. But letters such as the one I have in my hand, a portion of which I shall read, are certainly disturbing indeed, and I think show the need for some drastic action, and serious consideration, before we blithely donate billion after billion without being assured that we get at least commensurate results for the sacrifices our action will eventually cost the American people.

I shall read a portion of a letter applicable to UNRRA which I received 3 days ago from an American Army officer in Europe. This man is about 50 years of age. He is a lawyer by profession, a very successful lawyer, a man of substantial judgment, who went into the service as

a patriotic duty, and at considerable sacrifice to himself. He says this, among other things:

This UNRRA is probably the most modern Cook's tour at public expense I have ever seen. They, from the top down, are for the most part a disorganized mob—not "Kitchener's mob" but "Lehman's mob." There are a relatively small percentage of most excellent, hard-working people. There are many with good impulses and a rather philanthropic outlook. But there is a god-awful percentage of them who are merely here for the buggy ride, and they have considerable social life, all they can stand.

The chief trouble, in my judgment, is that it lacks any organization. This job of handling DP's could have been done a thousand percent better by the Army. I used several UNRRA teams and they did all right. UNRRA didn't even know where they were. But we took care of them and had an Army officer over them always. That was better all around. They didn't know anything about supplies and they had no transportation. That had been sold, loaned, or stolen in Paris, I see by today's paper.

It is my opinion that probably $900 out of every $1,000 appropriated to UNRRA is absolutely squandered—unnecessarily wasted. That money could well be better given to some of these homeless devils than to provide travel, entertainment, and sustenance for UNRRA personnel.

If we could have another Hoover relief setup it could do a much better job, and much more easily here as the Army is along to help. They would not be working in hostile territory as in Russia.

But a large part of the remaining DP's are actually not properly so designated. Many came here prior to the war. Many came to Germany to escape the Russians—just as did the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Now they have no place to go.

Mr. President, that closes the paragraphs with reference to UNRRA; but I will say, in connection with those paragraphs, that the letter gives me a great deal more concern because I know this man. I know his background, I know his general attitude. He is not a Regular Army officer, he does not praise the Army organization there because of any lifetime loyalty to the Regular Army. In my opinion, his judgment is sound, and I am concerned when this man, whom I know, makes a measured and considered statement of this kind about the squandering of the money which the American people are sacrificing from their own reconversion, from their own needs, in a humanitarian effort to aid other people. I am concerned about his statement that about nine-tenths of the money is being squandered, in his judgment, by these officials who are disorganized, and who spend the money for private entertainment and private travel, and do not give it to the people who are hungry and starving, and who will die this winter if they are not afforded assistance.

Mr. President, I am for this UNRRA appropriation and for all the relief we can properly give these people, but I think there is a tremedous responsibility which, if not met, will amount to neglect on the part of those in charge, if we do not see that as nearly as possible a hundred cents from every dollar we give goes to the humanitarian purposes for which the people of this country are sacrificing, and for which they are willing to sacrifice in the future.

Mr. President, I think the confusion of UNRRA will some day be clearly shown to be a national and an Allied disgrace if it is not corrected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything in the debate, because I am almost as critical of some phases of UNRRA as are some of the Senators who have preceded me. But let us not overlook the fact that there is a personnel in UNRRA which is highly dedicated to the faithful discharge of a high, humanitarian obligation.

I am particularly moved to testify because of the letter just read by the able Senator from Iowa, in which his correspondent expresses the fear that UNRRA funds are being dissipated in personnel expense and personnel travel and entertainment. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that the administrative expense of UNRRA is taken care of in a fund separate from the UNRRA fund itself. As compared with $1,350,000,000, which was our contribution to the first year's operation, the administrative expense was $24,812,189. In other words, even compared to our contribution alone, the administrative expense in UNRRA was less than 2 percent of our contribution, and that less than 2 percent figure I give the Senate is the total administrative obligation. So I say to the able Senator from Iowa that, so far as the particular charge which was brought to his attention is concerned, I very much doubt whether it is justified, except in the isolated instances which will be found in every institution of this magnitude. The administrative expense, I repeat, is less than $25,000,000 out of a fund which is approximately one and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that this is not the only such letter which has come to me. I have received a number of letters from different places in Europe where the UNRRA funds are being expended and activities are going on which contain somewhat similar statements of suspicion, of doubt, and of criticism. I have not undertaken to introduce them into the RECORD because I do not care to continue or to prolong a controversy on manifestly a humanitarian and a needed activity. I read this letter today because, first, of the supreme confidence I have in the man who wrote it, and, secondly, in the hope that in some small way the message of this man, who has been on the job for many months, in fact he has been over there for a year and a half in this particular activity, may bring us to our senses, so that we will establish some kind of reorganization which will bring the highest degree of efficiency into UNRRA. I believe UNRRA is not at the highest peak of efficiency so far as getting the foods which are purchasable by dollars and available by dollars, quickly and directly to the people who need it and should have it. I certainly should not want to continue or prolong this argument by placing in the RECORD a great number of letters dealing with the question of inefficiency, but I hope the letter I read will in some small measure help to straighten out the situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I hope the Senator does not for an instant believe that I am questioning the necessity which he emphasizes for maximum efficiency in making appropriations for UNRRA reach the maximum of humanitarian service. I quite agree with him that the more general the discussion of the problem can be the greater is the probability of the highest proportion of efficient and effective result. I simply felt that we could hardly be justified as a Senate in voting any additional UNRRA appropriation if I allowed the record to stand with the unchallenged suggestion that practically 90 percent of the appropriation is lost or misdirected or maladministered. I do not believe that to be so, and I have given the specific figures to demonstrate that it cannot be so in respect to administrative expense.

That certainly does not mean for an instant that there has not been maladministration, that there has not been waste, that there have not been instances, many of them, of far too much seepage between the donor and the donee. I doubt—and I am sure the Senator will agree with this statement—whether it would have been humanly posible to put together a human institution such as UNRRA in the midst of Europe's disorganization and disintegration, suddenly to serve with adequate sufficiency the needs of those war-torn areas where often there has been no semblance of legal Government remaining. Yet I agree with the Senator that every possible effort toward improvement must be made, so long as we are continuing this particular method of serving these relief necessities. I agree that there cannot be too much emphasis placed upon the necessity for improved administration and added assurance that relief will reach those for whom it is intended. Even though that be brought to a maximum peak, I will say to the Senator, I am convinced that this should be our last year of UNRRA, because I am convinced that beyond this particular period, if there is any necessity for additional services of this nature, it will be far better for us if we selectively handle the relief ourselves, under our own administration, and on whatever basis our judgment may recommend.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to hear the Senator make the last statement, especially because I feel that so much of the confusion and inefficiency and loss under UNRRA is directly traceable to the original conception of UNRRA and its original set-up—its original responsibility. It is entirely probable that it is too late now to change the set-up in the middle of this operation, and I would not advocate it at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me inject myself again at that point. This is the situation, I think, in which the Senate finds itself—and I think that was the feeling in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: We are caught on the horns

of a dilemma. Obviously, except as it has organized relief, particularly in central Europe, during this approaching winter and the following spring, the inevitable results will be that misery will be followed by chaos and chaos will be followed by anarchy or worse. It is impossible to substitute any other sort of service for this winter and early spring. We have not the time; we have not the facilities; we have not the organization. It is this or nothing, and it is essentially in that spirit in which I have been satisfied to close my eyes to some of the things I dislike—and I dislike them just as much as does any other Senator upon this floor—and to agree that for 1 year there is no alternative to proceeding under the existing formula.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. With reference to the Senator's statement that this could not be done by a new organization quickly enough, I will say that I was the secretary of the American Relief Administration after the last war——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Wait a moment. I think the Senator is misquoting me. I said it could not be done with complete efficiency in the midst of the sudden situation which we confront.

Mr. TAFT. So far as Congress is concerned, I agree with the Senator that we have no choice because we cannot originate a new kind of an organization.

I sailed with Mr. Herbert Hoover from Boston the day after the armistice, on November 12. By the 1st of February we had operating relief organizations in Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, later on in Armenia, in Poland, and later on also in Lithuania. We built up the personnel of that organization in 3 months. It was not on such an elaborate scale as the present organization. Its overhead was one-tenth of what UNRRA's overhead is, but I think we did as effective a relief job in that winter after the First World War, which was very similar to this war, as could have been done. And I feel very confident that if the administration, foreseeing the need of this $1,350,000,000 3 months ago, had said "We will administer our own organization" it could have built up an American organization to administer relief. Now it may be too late. As I have said, I do not see much choice except to vote for the bill, because we in Congress cannot originate another kind of organization, but I think the administration could have done it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I emphatically agree that the type of service rendered in this field following World War I is a model which we might well have hoped to emulate, and I wish it had been done.

I desire to add a word in respect to the situation in which Congress finds itself when it has to audit accounts of this nature. I want to lay bare the utter impotence of any committee in Congress to deal adequately with the Senate's responsibility when an appropriation of this sort has to be authorized. It is absolutely impossible under the existing organization of the Senate system for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee confidently to pass upon whether the past expenditure has been properly or wisely made, or whether the new appropriation is justified. Until Congress arms itself with its own adequate and independent corps of investigators and auditors in respect to these expenditures we shall continue to be 95 percent at the mercy of the executive branch of the Government. What can the Senate Foreign Relations do when a problem of this sort is suddenly dumped upon the table? What can it do to explore the realities? All in the world it can do is to go on a fishing expedition here and there, by way of cross-examination, hoping to disclose some useful information.

When an appropriation of this size is made for a specific purpose, the Congress ought to have its own agents to follow the appropriation every hour of every day from the beginning of the year to the end. I know of no greater service that is waiting to be rendered, not only to the Senate but to the American people and the solvency of our public credit, than the report which I hope is coming from the joint congressional committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in the very near future, which will make it possible for the first time for a committee of Congress adequately to confront the executive departments of the Government when the executive departments are either, on the one hand, attempting to justify what they have done or, on the other hand, attempting to justify that which they seek in the future.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In that connection, I invite the attention of the Senate to a bill which I introduced, Senate bill 958, which has been reported. It is a bill to provide for a more effective inspection and supervision of the Congress with respect to the administration of the laws of the United States. It would establish a joint committee for that purpose and authorize it to be adequately staffed to inquire into such things from time to time, and continuously, so that the Congress might be informed as to how our laws are being administered and how funds are being expended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator, and I congratulate him upon the proposal which he has submitted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall yield in a moment. I merely wish to add in passing that I doubt if it will be sufficient to have a general staff for the purpose of general inquiry. In an undertaking of this magnitude, for example, I doubt whether we can ever adequately audit the ultimate report, either in terms of dollars and cents or in terms of service rendered, except as our specific agents, representing us alone and responsible exclusively to us, are following the appropriation from the hour it is made down to the hour when it is exhausted.

I apologize to the Senator from Nebraska for keeping him waiting. I now yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. Before doing so I wish to make the observation that I was one of those who originally opposed the UNRRA set-up. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his remarks, because they are an absolute defense to the vote which I cast against UNRRA when the legislation was first passed. I only hope that the time will come when we may have our own independent organization, acting as such to expend funds for relief.

Getting down to the pending bill, whether we had our wishes with respect to the original organization or not, I believe that the only road we can now follow is the one described by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator recently to make a statement on the floor of the Senate that before any more appropriations to UNRRA were made he felt that we should get behind the "iron curtain" and find out what was behind some of the foreign policy, and what was done with the food and other relief supplies, before we granted an appropriation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the contrary. So far as the impression which I evidently left with the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, my speech was a total failure. The plea which I was making at that moment was that it was not fair to withhold a crust of bread from a dying man to see whether a reporter was available to take a picture of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the definition of that particular phase of his remarks, because I did not correctly understand him. I gained the impression from the distinguished Senator that the appropriation proposed at that time, which was approximately $550,000,000, should be granted for the very reason he now states; but I certainly gained the impression from him that the Foreign Relations Committee, and especially the distinguished Senator from Michigan, would insist that in connection with future appropriations we should get behind the "iron curtain" and gain the full knowledge that starving people actually got relief.

We now have before us a proposal for an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. I certainly gained from the distinguished Senator from Michigan the impression that we should insist upon inquiring into the needs of the petitioning countries, and that we should have something to say, through amendments to the legislation, as to whether we should get behind the iron curtain and make sure that materials we sent over there reached the people in the countries who actually needed them. Am I correct in that impression?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think my previous answer to the Senator evidently was not complete. I thought the Senator was inquiring only with respect to the

first appropriation, to which my previous address related.

Certainly the net result of the "iron curtain" speech, if there was any net result identifying it, was the conviction that the iron curtain must be lifted in Europe before there can be the remotest hope of permanent international cooperation or the remotest possibility of international peace.

Mr. WHERRY. It was one of the finest speeches I have ever heard the Senator deliver in the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Furthermore, I am sure that the Senator is justified in saying that even though I felt that it was improper to attach a requirement to insist upon a free press before proceeding with our humanities, I urged that there should be every possible inquiry into the situation, so that we could have maximum information in respect to the administration and the integrity of the disposition of relief supplies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his observations, because he has stated exactly the way I felt. That was my reaction at the time the Senator made the statement.

If the Senator will further yield, I wish to say that at the time the $550,000,000 appropriation was before us, if I correctly remember, all the amendments to the bill requiring observers and newspaper correspondents to be permitted to go into the petitioning countries were stricken by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That was in connection with the $550,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe so.

Mr. WHERRY. The theory was that we had already made the commitment, and that therefore no strings should be attached, but that we should appropriate the $550,000,000 because of the emergency. I took the position of the distinguished Senator from Michigan in that appropriation.

The bill under consideration, which is House bill 4649, contains certain restrictions and limitations, as I read the bill. One of them is in subparagraph (2) on page 2. The language of the paragraph is as follows:

(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

Did that language meet with the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Completely.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the kind of an investigation which we really should have can be made if the petitioning countries furnish the personnel and facilities? I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that I had submitted an amendment which was almost identical with the provisions of subparagraph (2), with the exception of the last three lines. I should like to read the amendment, because I submitted it as an amendment to the $550,000,000 appropriation, for the very reason which the Senator from Michigan stated. However, he said that we had already made our commitments, and should not vote restrictions on a commitment already made. We are now making a new appropriation. The amendment which I intended to offer to the Senate was offered in the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe it was defeated by only 1 or 2 votes of the members present on that occasion. The amendment provided that—

such countries shall supply to accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, and in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country for the purpose of obtaining information as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished such country.

I understand that the language appearing in subparagraph 2, page 2, came over from the House; but I point out to the distinguished Senator that my amendment would provide that UNRRA personnel, other than the nationals of that particular country, would be required to do the very thing provided for in subparagraph (2) in the bill. Under the provisions of subparagraph (2) as it stands, the personnel could and I think would be taken from White Russia or the Ukraine, and we would have to be satisfied with their observations and investigations. Under those circumstances, I ask the Senator whether we would ever get behind the iron curtain, so as to find out whether the food, implements, and supplies were actually going to the place where they should go?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so under those circumstances.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator if the Foreign Relations Committee or he would be favorable to my amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I believe that the bill should be passed as it comes to us from the House, because the limitations have been very carefully weighed and agreed upon. I am unable to conceive that subparagraph (2), beginning in line 18 on page 2 of the bill, could be administered in good faith unless external personnel dealt with the inspection and investigation in any particular foreign country.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will further yield, before the Senate Small Business Committee we had considerable testimony on this question. One of the reasons why I offered the amendment was the fact that one of the administrators of UNRRA stated that in order to get food into White Russia and the Ukraine it would probably be necessary to use UNRRA personnel appointed by the Russian Government, and that UNRRA would have to rely upon their investigations and observations as to whether the food should be sent in, and whether it would reach the starving people about whom we have been talking.

Under subparagraph (2) we have no assurance as to what will become of the food once it reaches the Ukraine or White Russia. This amendment has nothing to do with the so-called freedom of the press amendment. I am stating that UNRRA personnel other than nationals from the petitioning countries ought to be the ones to go in and check up on the claims of the recipient on petitioning countries, and UNRRA personnel should trace the shipments to the very people who obtain relief.

They ought to check upon the food from the very hour we provide it until it reaches the mouths of the people who are starving. We have no assurance under the terms of this bill that that will be done. We must take the word of personnel of the petitioning countries. If I correctly understood the Senator's interpretation of what he stated about the so-called iron curtain, we would not get behind the iron curtain in the Ukraine and in White Russia so as to make sure that the starving people received the food. At least the personnel should be appointed outside the Ukraine or White Russia, whose representatives would give their own views and figures as to their needs. We have been talking about feeding starving people. What assurance is given the Senate that the food will ever reach the starving people of the Ukraine or of White Russia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator is asking the Senator from Michigan, I will give the Senator from Nebraska no guaranties about anything that may happen at any time, anywhere, in connection with any possible subject, in Byelorussia or the Ukraine until the iron curtain is rolled up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, for whom I have the most profound respect, in the statement he has just made.

So again I ask, what is the objection to the amendment I have offered, which provides that UNRRA personnel other than nationals from participating countries shall make the inspections and observations? My amendment does not provide that persons outside the UNRRA organization make the inspections. It merely provides that personnel of UNRRA, made up of personnel other than the nationals of the petitioning country, shall inspect and investigate, so that we may actually know the needs of such country and so that we may actually be sure that the food and implements and supplies go where they are needed.

I wish to point out further to the distinguished Senator that in the testimony before the committee it was stated that only 50 percent of the funds went for food and the other 50 percent went for implements. Some of the UNRRA shipments sent over last year included 35,000 tractors and 500 or 600 combines. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what assurances we shall have, unless we have the check provided for in

the amendment that inspection shall be made by UNRRA personnel from outside the petitioning country, that additional shipments of tractors will reach the people in White Russia or in the Ukraine who need them. Unless the amendment is adopted what assurance will we have that tractors will not be sent to some other place, to satisfy the desire or demand of the Russian Government? What assurance will we have that any supplies sent to countries dominated by Russia will reach starving and needy people?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not care to take any responsibility for identifying who shall receive the tractor or who shall receive the combine. UNRRA deals with the governments of the various countries. It has to hold the governments responsible for the net results.

In connection with the adding of two Russian Soviets to this year's list of recipients of UNRRA relief, the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee at least pretends to show that a very careful inquiry was made to establish the necessity. Under the terms of the bill and under the assurances given us in the testimony, the relief sent into those countries, as in the case of that sent into other countries, must be followed by adequate and satisfactory investigation and inspection. So far as I am concerned, I think the bill as drawn clearly indicates without necessity for any further bill of particulars, the need for independent inspection and investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his answer. If he feels that this paragraph amply provides for inspections, and that we shall be able to place the food in the hands of the dying people over there, then we have accomplished something. I cannot agree with him; we do not get behind the "iron curtain." I wish to say further that the testimony offered at the hearings just mentioned showed that the two countries I have been discussing had not permitted the personnel of UNRRA from other nations even to suggest an investigation or a check-up regarding their needs. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are defeating the very purposes for which we are making the appropriations when we do not insist that adequate investigations and inspections be made. We are the grantors; we are providing almost 75 percent of the funds to be used for these purposes. Why cannot we provide that a petitioning country shall permit an investigator or observer to enter it and check on these things, so as to make sure that the starving people—the ones who really need the assistance—receive it. Why cannot we include such a provision or requirement in the bill? What is the haste? What is the need for hurry?

We already have granted $550,000,000, and we already have appropriated another $750,000,000. If we are to guard the taxpayers' money, I think the Senate of the United States has a perfect right to insist that a petitioning country which is pleading that its people are starving shall permit the personnel of UNRRA from countries other than the petitioning country to enter that country, make a check, and see what is needed, and I think UNRRA has a perfect right to follow through, so as to see that the people who are starving and the people who wish to farm the land, the people who are ready and able to produce the agricultural crops, are the ones who receive the implements.

I think the amendment I have suggested can do a great measure of good. I only hope that subparagraph 2, as interpreted by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, will bring it to pass.

I certainly feel that when we appropriate $1,350,000,000 for starving people and people who expect to till the land, so as to become self-sustaining, we have a right to see to it that the food and implements go where they should go; and it seems to me that any country participating in the UNRRA agreement would be glad to see that such investigations are made.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say first that I agree with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I think there is no doubt that some of the UNRRA material which was sent to Yugoslavia was immediately sent to another country. There is no doubt of that at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly not.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that in my office I have a very fine blanket which was donated by the American Red Cross. A friend of mine went to the basement of Selfridge's store, in London, and found that thousands of them could be purchased there. Right on the blanket is marked "Donated to the starving and freezing people * * * by the American Red Cross."

There is no question that something is wrong. Of course, as the Senator from Texas has said, the organization is new, and it is difficult to get it properly set up. But I agree with the Senator from Nebraska in the statement he has made in connection with offering his amendment, and I join him in offering it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his suggestion.

Mr. President, I wish to state further that in the testimony which was taken before the Small Business Committee it was stated—I do not say the statement is true—that 90 percent of the UNRRA supplies given to a certain country were sold in that country and the money was not paid back to UNRRA, but was placed in the treasury of that country. I am not saying that is authentic, but I will say that other persons testified that in case after case UNRRA supplies were sold and money for them was collected, and the country that received the supplies received the benefit of the money.

Senators assure us that they wish to feed starving people. I, too, wish to feed starving people. I wish to have that done just as much as does the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, and I do not wish to put any impediment in the UNRRA bill which is designed to have that result, even though I was against it in the first instance. But certainly, Mr. President, inasmuch as we contribute nearly 75 percent of the money, we have a right to say that all the food that is bought with the money contributed by the countries participating under the agreement shall go to the people who need it to sustain their lives, and that the money to be devoted to the purchase of implements shall be used to buy tractors and combines which will be used by the people who need them, rather than to have the money used by some of the governments as they please.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the pending authorization bill. Congress has met every demand for funds made by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, because under the conditions there has been nothing else to do. Congress previously appropriated $1,350,000,000, covered by the first authorization. On Saturday, the Senate appropriated $750,000,000 in addition to the $1,350,000,000, even though the authorization for a second $1,350,000,000 had not been finally enacted.

Mr. President, I feel certain that all Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are keenly alive to the distress and starvation of the unfortunate people living in the war area in Europe. I certainly am, for I was one of a group of Senators who inspected that area shortly after the conclusion of the European war. However, we all know that an appropriation and expenditure of public funds to relieve the distressed and the starving will not accomplish the purposes desired unless the organization administering the expenditure of such vast sums is efficiently operated and unless the relief reaches those in actual need and dire distress.

The United States pays 72 percent of the total expenditures of this organization. It is my firm conviction that up to this date, UNRRA has been conducted in a most inefficient and wasteful manner. I appreciate that because of the very nature of the work it has undertaken, a certain amount of inefficiency is almost inevitable; but as one who has personally investigated the operations of UNRRA in Europe, and as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which made a further investigation during which Governor Lehman and other officials were examined. I believe that unless UNRRA is reorganized and placed on a more efficient basis, thousands and hundreds of thousands of people will die of starvation in Europe during the coming months, despite the enormous appropriations which the United States has made. I say this reluctantly, but I voice the opinion, I think, of practically every Member of the House of Representatives and Member of the Senate who has visited Europe and has had first-hand contact with the operations of UNRRA.

Mr. President, I publicly appeal to Governor Lehman, the head of the UNRRA, without delay to place the ablest and most patriotic businessmen he can secure at the head of the distribution of food, clothing, fuel, and other necessities for existence, to eliminate the inefficiency and the lack of coordinated leadership

now existing, and to place his organization in the condition which is required if it is to provide efficiently the necessities of life to those who are in such great distress and such imminent danger of death from starvation and freezing.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, this afternoon I have listened to a great deal of criticism of UNRRA. I have a feeling that I am a member of a very inefficient committee, namely, the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The assumption of most Senators who have spoken is that the Foreign Relations Committee has not investigated anything concerning the matter which is now under consideration, and that Governor Lehman has not taken any pains to administer his office in a proper manner.

I am perfectly willing to admit that former President Hoover did a great job in handling relief in Belgium during the First World War.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I forgot to add the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to say that at that time Mr. Hoover and myself were a part of the Democratic administration in doing the work to which the Senator has referred, so there can be made no claim of political superiority of any kind.

Mr. TUNNELL. I hope I did not suggest that the work was done in any political way. I was trying to throw out a bouquet to President Hoover. I now include the Senator from Ohio. I think that my offense perhaps was in not saying that it was not only President Hoover but his entire organization that did the great work which it did.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, was that at the time President Hoover was still open to receive the Democratic nomination for President?

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not know. I believe that at that time he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is not true in any sense. He was Food Administrator, and American Relief Administrator, and was not a candidate for any office.

Mr. TUNNELL. I recall that he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination in four States.

Mr. TAFT. He may have been after President Wilson died. I do not know about that, but I am speaking of a time 2 years before President Wilson died, or at least a year before that time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, in order to get on, we will all admit that Mr. Hoover was highly efficient in feeding starving people in Europe.

I wish to proceed directly to the matter which I started to discuss.

It appears that most of the criticism which we have heard has been coming from persons who are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee. For that I am very glad. The Foreign Relations Committee has exercised considerable pains in connection with this matter. I believe that the members of that committee have a pretty good idea about how the money has been and will be spent. I do not believe there is a situation such as many friends on the critical side of the subject seem to believe. I have no doubt that many things could be done in a better way than they have been done by Governor Lehman. Governor Lehman is only a human being. He has under his authority approximately 8,000 employees in UNRRA. If he were to do all the things which have been suggested, in my opinion he would necessarily require 108,000 employees. I believe that the actual distribution of food would require many more employees than he now has.

I do not entirely agree with those who have said they would favor an entirely American organization, notwithstanding the arguments which might be made in that regard. As I recall, about two-thirds of the money, or perhaps 70 percent of the total funds used by UNRRA, comes from the United States. It is my recollection that the subscriptions have amounted to 1 percent of the income of the people of the various countries taking part in UNRRA for the year 1943. We are receiving at least some help from the remainder of the world.

I was very glad when it was shown that the man who had written to the Senator from Iowa thought he was right. That man was offering what he believed to be genuine criticism when he told of the cost of administration. From his statement it might be believed, if one thought that the man knew what he was talking about, that 90 percent of the funds of UNRRA was being wasted. The fact is, as shown by the Senator from Michigan, that only approximately 2 percent of the contribution of the United States is used in the total administration of UNRRA.

Mr. President, I think it is well for Senators to understand this: UNRRA is spending a large amount of money. A large number of people are in need of something with which to save them from starvation.

I remember that when Governor Lehman came before the Committee on Foreign Relations he stated that what was needed was something with which to relieve starvation and prevent pestilence after the Army had moved on. The Army took care of the situation so long as it was in a given territory. But as it moved out there had to be an organization provided to take on the work, and a civilian organization was, as he believed and as we believe, the proper kind of an organization to furnish for the purpose of relieving existing conditions.

It is not entirely the work of the United States that is being done in connection wtih countries that were liberated by the Allied armies. It is something in which the other members of the Allied Nations had an interest. And they are contributing large amounts of money. I regret that the idea has been expressed that it is a mistake for the United States to use money which is being contributed by our allies for this purpose. I do not believe that the waste which has been mentioned has been to any extent comparable with what has been stated.

As I understood Governor Lehman when he spoke before the Foreign Relations Committee, he said that he was going to have inspections made in all countries which are receiving aid. He said that he would require employees of the UNRRA to be present in order to see that the funds were expended as they should be. Furthermore, he said that if that were not done the expenditures would be discontinued.

During the course of the testimony and deliberations of the committee, it was finally determined that the head of UNRRA is an American, one who as its governor had had charge of a great State for several terms. He is now devoting his entire time, as I understand, to the work of administering UNRRA. I cannot believe that he is as inefficient as some of our friends seem to believe he is. Certainly, no evidence was presented before the Foreign Relations Committee which would in any way suggest that there has been any great degree of inefficiency in connection with the administration of UNRRA. However, inasmuch as UNRRA's work is being done in a large part of the world which was overrun by armies, where much of the life of the country was destroyed, and where business was wiped out, there is bound to be a lack of efficiency to the extent which one would expect in connection with the operation of some of our large business houses or large institutions, although sometimes we find that even they are not operated efficiently.

But after all is said and done, we come around to the very cause of the appropriation which we are asked to make. We are being appealed to to relieve starving peoples. The appeal comes to a people who are in a less straitened circumstance. The situation appeals to human beings, and it especially appeals to us. I am glad to say that members of the Foreign Relations Committee, so far as I heard them express themselves, agree that there can and will be increased efficiency in connection with the administration of UNRRA, and that the demand for aid at once is terrific. We should give aid which will not begin a year from now or 5 years from now, but will begin at once.

Mr. President, today I heard someone say that perhaps a large number of people in Germany will starve this winter. Many of them are starving today, it is claimed, but the fact is that there is an urgency, and, as Governor Lehman told us, he must know what he can do, he must be able to tell the people who are to get the particular benefits what they can get and when they can get them, if they are to do the most good.

Of course, there is the criticism that this relief is being distributed through other governments. I mentioned the fact that UNRRA believed it to be better to distribute through those who have an intimate knowledge of conditions in the countries in which the distribution is made.

It has been said on the floor of the Senate today that UNRRA sells things. I think it is admitted that material is turned over to the government of a country which may sell to those who can pay in their own countries, and the proceeds are used in a way that is considered satisfactory by UNRRA. So that there is some truth in the contention that there are sales. There are sales which are known to UNRRA. There are such things as farm machinery, and my understanding is that people can get them

if they can pay the government, and the government is using the funds collected in administering relief and help.

I merely wanted to say a word showing that I believe UNRRA is doing a tremendous amount of good, comparable to what would be done by the United States if it had its own organization, and comparable to what any new organization would be likely to do under similar conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if section 2 is a restriction or a recommendation in this appropriation bill, which was not in the first one.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator knows the answer to that as well as does the Senator from Texas. What does he mean by section 2? Is he referring to the language to the provision on page 2, subdivision (2), which reads:

(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

Mr. WHERRY. I say, is not that a restriction in this bill which was not in the first appropriation we made for UNRRA?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that it is a restriction.

Mr. WHERRY. I said a recommendation or a restriction. Let the Senator define it in any way he pleases. Is it a restriction, or limitation, or recommendation?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is merely a condition.

Mr. WHERRY. I accept the definition that it is a condition, and I ask the Senator whether it is not a condition which was not in the first appropriation for UNRRA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know whether it was in the first bill or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator that it was not in the first bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator complain of the provision?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I think it is a fine step in the right direction; and in view of the fact that we made it a condition, I ask the Senator whether he will accept a modification to strike out line 23, and after line 23, and insert the following:

And in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country, for the purpose of obtaining information and the need for and use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished to such country.

The only difference is that I am asking that the Senator consider an amendment which provides that those who do the inspecting should be different from the personnel of the countries which petition. It seems to me that would help in the inspections, because the inspecitons would be made by nationals of other countries, rather than the nationals of the petitioning country.

Mr. CONNALLY. That would greatly complicate matters. It would add to the burdens of UNRRA. This subdivision represents a great advance over what we have now, and I hope the Senator will be satisfied with it. The bill has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate. Any amendment will have to go to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like, if I can, to vote for the appropriation. I am satisfied that when the amendment I offered in the Committee on Appropriations was considered the members felt kindly toward it. It was defeated by a vote of only one. I am quite satisfied it would make a better and more constructive piece of legislation out of the bill. The bill as it is drawn provides that the investigating personnel can be appointed from the recipient country, which amounts practically to no investigation at all. Under my amendment there would be an investigation by personnel of UNRRA other than those from the country petitioning for the relief. That would provide a double check as to where the food goes and where the implements go in giving the countries the relief that is so badly needed.

Mr. CONNALLY. UNRRA is not required to accept the nationals of the recipient countries. UNRRA could conduct its own investigation independently of them. But the requirement is that "each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations."

How there could be any objection to that I cannot see. I hope the Senator will not delay us. We are about ready to vote. I hope he will not delay us with an amendment which I think would hamper the activities and facilities by which UNRRA will discharge its duties. The provision in the bill does not prevent UNRRA having its own inspections.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to offer the amendment. I had hoped the Senator would take it as a modification. I do not wish to hold up the vote at all. I am satisfied that if the Senator from Texas would accept the amendment, then the inspections to be made in White Russia and the Ukraine would be made in those areas by nationals of other countries, which would afford a double check on the materials and the food sent in. I think it would be a more workable plan, and I am satisfied that those who contribute would feel much better about where the appropriations for food would go in the petitioning countries. Otherwise we have no check whatever in any country under Russian control.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the able Senator from Texas for information.

On the first page of the bill, line 7, it is provided as follows:

The first section is amended by striking out "$1,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,700,000,000."

Are we to understand that on this $2,700,000,000 the $1,350,000,000 we have already appropriated is a credit, and we are just making provision for the additional amount?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIS. The date is changed from 1946 to 1947, which carries it to June 30, 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the end of the fiscal year. The Senator is correct. The reason is that UNRRA wanted 3 months to administer the Chinese and Asia relief and liquidate the organization there. The European relief will end December 31, 1946.

Mr. WILLIS. If other funds were needed in 1947 beyond the $2,700,000,000, there would be a new authorization?

Mr. CONNALLY. UNRRA would have to come back to Congress for a new authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill H. R. 4649 was passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; they were not ordered.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 44.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WAGNER. I understand the junior Senator from Connecticut has an amendment he desires to propose.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which lies on the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, beginning with the word "with", strike out all down to and including line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be opportunity for colonization, so that they may assist to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall enjoy equal rights."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed deletes a considerable portion of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and makes it somewhat similar to Senate Joint Resolution 112, which was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr.

TAFT]. Before pointing out what seems to me to be the defect in Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 as it now stands, I wish to say that I have not been in communication in any way whatever with any Federal Department or any other organization—official or otherwise—and have discussed the subject in no way, shape, or form with any individual outside the Senate. What I have to say represents my own thought alone.

The phrase "good offices" as contained in the concurrent resolution and also in my own amendment is most important. Those are key words and agreement on their meaning is essential. According to the dictionary, "good offices" means a mild form of mediation. One contemporary authority states that "good offices" consists merely in either bringing representatives of the disputing parties together for discussion, perhaps under the presidency of the third party, or in passing between the disputants written proposals and counterproposals. In any case, he continues, the third party refrains from giving opinions or advice upon the substance of the question.

In Hackworth's Digest of International Law we find:

> The term "good offices" concerns various kinds of action tending to call negotiations between the conflicting states into existence. Good offices consists in a friendly interposition of a third party to adjust differences and lead to a pacific solution of the dispute between two powers at variance.

Those definitions constitute the most authoritative meaning that I can find and seem to be acceptable. Whatever follows those two words, good offices, in the Senate pronouncement on the Palestine issue should not be in discord with their meaning. We also need to give thought, Mr. President, to what our words may signify to peoples other than the Jews who live in or near Palestine.

Now, in the concurrent resolution as reported, the United States is to use its "good offices with the mandatory power," that is, with Great Britain and, presumably, only Britain. The real disputants in the case appear to me to be the promoters of the Zionist movement or other organizations representing those who wish to live in Palestine on one hand, and the Arabs, who are living in Palestine or its vicinity, on the other. It seems most apparent that, if we are to be effective, our good offices should not even appear to be so directed that the Arab element is ignored.

The Arabs and their position are most important, Mr. President. Palestine has no natural borders and there are Arab communities and states on virtually all sides—notably Lebanon, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. Even Iraq and Egypt are so near to Palestine that the attitude of those states should also be taken into account as we apply our good offices. Those people are all Mohammedans, and Jerusalem is just as much of a holy city to them as it is to the Jews or to the Christians. There are 200,000,000 Mohammedans in the world, and most of them live in that general area.

We need not go into the characteristics of the Mohammedans other than to note that their religion is very important in their general psychology, that they have fanatical tendencies, and that they can easily become most decidedly explosive. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the area has been an Arab home for centuries.

If we properly employ our good offices as such, it seems likely that we could accomplish more with the Arabs than could any other great power, simply because they are more likely to trust the efforts of the United States. We can easily lose that status by ill-judged use of our good offices. I submit, Mr. President, that we will be in danger of losing it if we follow the lines of the concurrent resolution as reported and act upon the terms as therein laid down.

As the resolution stands, our good offices are to be used, with Britain only, toward three ends. The first of them is set forth by the words "that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities." To me those words seem to mean that the full agricultural and industrial potential of Palestine is to be absorbed by the addition of Jews and of Jews alone. Those words do not say that there can be no further Arab immigration into Palestine, but it is difficult to see that those words are intended to mean anything other than just that. Moreover, that is what the Arabs are likely to think that the Senate means as the end in view.

Any effort by the mandatory power to that end will most likely be strongly opposed by the Arabs. In my opinion, there is grave danger that the opposition will include the direct use of force, which is a long distance from what "good offices" is intended to accomplish.

The second end set forth in the concurrent resolution is somewhat less definite, but the objective is quite similar. The words of the concurrent resolution are "that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development so that they—the Jews—may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine." That says "full opportunity" and "freely proceed" by the Jewish people. The clause does not mention other peoples, even those already living in Palestine. There again, Mr. President, if we of the Congress really mean what the concurrent resolution says, we should foresee that what begins with the simple use of our good offices may lead far too easily to conditions under which force may become the arbiter. The concurrent resolution is discordant, and the amendment which I have proposed is intended to correct the defect.

The third objective stated in the resolution can be interpreted as part of the second purpose just discussed; but there seems to be no certainty that it will be understood as such. It does finally recognize the fact that there are people other than the Jews living in Palestine, and goes on to express a goal with which no one should quarrel. The words are, "in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

I believe that the word "commonwealth" is questioned by some who worry about this resolution, but I myself raise no point about it.

I believe that the third objective is entirely proper and is fully in accord with the thinking and sentiment of this country. At least the resolution as written does end on a good note which is not out of harmony with the meaning of the phrase "good offices."

Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 deals with a subject in foreign relations which is far from unimportant. The Senate Committee, I understand, reported that resolution with only one dissenting vote. Not being a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and not knowing the considerations which guided the members in their deliberations, I have hesitated to speak on this matter. I do so partly in the fear that, under the pressure of public duties which have been with us over the past few weeks, one of the fundamentals in the conduct of foreign relations may have been overlooked. That fundamental is that the United States should not lay out a course and should not adopt a line of foreign policy which may lead to the clash of arms unless we first answer two questions in the affirmative.

One of those questions is the ready availability of our forces in case the pursuit of such policy should unfortunately lead to open conflict. The other question is, Would we be entirely willing to use that force if the policy which we adopt should be opposed to the point of war? History is replete with instances when that fundamental in the conduct of foreign relations has been forgotten. We ourselves have figured in some of those instances.

It is quite true, Mr. President, that the concurrent resolution as reported says only that we shall use our "good offices with the mandatory power." However, when we go on to indicate that the Congress expects to open Palestine for the entry of Jews alone, to the maximum of the country's potentialities, and that we intend that the Jews may freely proceed with the upbuilding of that country for their own purposes, perhaps without even asking the wishes of the Arabs, who now constitute a majority of the population, then we face the danger of serious involvement for which we may not be prepared. If we are only urging Britain to efforts along these lines, it is quite true that we make no definite commitment which may lead to the use of our armed forces.

From that viewpoint, Mr. President, the question then arises: Are we fair in asking Britain, as the mandatory power, to take measures which to the Arabs will seem extreme and which will vitally affect their interests, unless we are prepared to join Britain in accepting responsibility for whatever involvement may result? To put it more bluntly, will we have the military power available and will we be resolved to use it in assisting the British to the ends now set forth in the resolution? I submit, Mr. President, that if the Senate votes upon the resolution as it now stands, Senators should have that contingency very clearly in mind.

Mr. President, I share the horror and resentment aroused by the treatment of the Jewish people in Europe at the hands

of the Nazis. I hold in full measure the great sympathy which is felt for those persecuted people by the civilized world. The Jewish remnants in central Europe deserve all that we can do in a practical way to alleviate their plight. So far as the use of our good offices is concerned, I submit that we could well employ them in central Europe, where the remnants of the race are still living. Those people are now where, for the most part, they have always been. They have every right to treatment by the non-Jewish elements there which will make their present state and their future prospects fully as good as they were before the Nazis perpetrated those horrible crimes. Those countries in central Europe are all under our allies of this war, and the Congress could well resolve in emphatic language that our good offices should be employed with those Allies in order that the plight of the Jews in Europe may be alleviated at once. We should be able to get much quicker results that way than the Zionist project in Palestine can possibly achieve, because at best that project would take considerable time.

I am entirely ready to join with my colleagues in any action along that line which gives promise of rescue for the Jewish people of Europe. The concurrent resolution is understood to have that immediate end in view; but it is not practical for that purpose and I cannot join in its approval.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed is much like Senate Joint Resolution 112, which was introduced by three Senators, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and which I assume was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. My amendment would make the resolution read something like that, and it is not open to the objections which I have raised to Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 as it now stands. It would give full scope and play in the use of our good offices, instead of confining them to the mandatory power. It would not put Congress in the position of saying that the United States should pursue certain policies which could involve this Nation in further hostilities. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, for whose judgment I have high regard, if when he made the important change suggested by his amendment he considered the obligation which the United States assumed in the covenant between Britain and the United States, agreeing that His Britannic Majesty should administer the government of Palestine? Did he consider that question?

Mr. HART. Does the Senator refer back to the action of 1922?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. I refer to the covenant of December 3, 1924, a covenant which incorporated within its four corners the express terms of the mandate and solemnly agreed that His Britannic Majesty should administer that government. The question is excited by the proposal that we offer to intervene between the wards, as it were, of His Britannic Majesty, both Arabs and Jews. I wonder if the Senator realizes that when we do that we are turning around on our promise that His Britannic Majesty should have the exclusive administration of Palestine. In other words, having made this agreement with Britain, how can we exercise the rights which we have and the obligations which we owe under that treaty, except through the mandatory power, Great Britain? I wonder how the Senator views that question.

Mr. HART. I believe that any answer or the opinion of anyone on that question must be colored by the fact that the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a joint committee of inquiry to examine into conditions in Palestine. Quite naturally, the legalistic aspect of the question—and that, I assume, is rather what the esteemed Senator from Vermont refers to—will receive full examination. It is to be remembered that after trying for 15 years—from 1924 to 1939—to effect an arrangement in Palestine which would be satisfactory to all parties concerned, the British finally were compelled to issue a White Paper rather admitting that they were unable to bring about such conditions, and proposing other measures, under which they would do far less than they had agreed to do. So far as I recall, that never received the approval of the League of Nations.

Today the status of the League of Nations is rather doubtful; we are not sure just what it is. Another factor now has entered upon the scene. I think it is article 106 of the Charter of the United Nations which makes provision for an interim arrangement. Under that article, four powers, as I recall, appear to have cognizance over the question.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the legal aspect of the matter, if we go back to the early 1920's, is rather buried by practical considerations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator consider that we go back a single moment from today in respect to the obligations under that treaty? Are we not bound today, and until that treaty is abrogated, by its terms, its obligations, and its duties?

I am not asking anyone to go back to 1924. I am only asking that we adhere to the obligations of this moment in considering this very dangerous resolution. I fought, as I suppose the committee will assure the Senator, the original wording of the resolution, primarily because it went away beyond the terms of the mandate and beyond the terms of the treaty. Any justification for doing that which may have been contained in statements of distinguished men of those times, I am not willing to accept. I am willing only to go according to the obligations and duties and rights which were established by the mandate and by the treaty which we entered into with Great Britain. If we do that, we shall be on a ground which cannot be the cause of an armed dispute. If we stay within our own jurisdiction, namely, our relations to the mandatory power, we shall not give the rest of the world cause to complain that we have broken into a matter where we have no right to intrude.

I wish to adhere to a position which will be legalistically correct, on account of the consequences which may arise from adhering to a position which may be illegal as to a great government.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I see no conflict whatever between the resolution as I propose to amend it and the situation under our covenant which the Senator has set forth. I see no conflict there.

The other point the Senator raised was that we are not involving ourselves in a commitment. I gave my answer to that in the body of my remarks.

Then the question arises, Is it fair for us to urge upon the mandatory power, the British Government, with all the emphasis which this body can put upon the power which now carries all the responsibility, that it should do things involving responsibilities which we are not willing to help it carry?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I answer that by saying it is not fair. That is why I wish to have us be in a strictly legal position with respect to the mandatory.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, let me say that I have listened patiently and as well as I could to the argument made by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut in proposing his amendment. I am sorry to say I could not hear all of it. However, as I understand the amendment, it would make very substantial changes in the concurrent resolution which has been reported to the Senate. The distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut stated that he thought the Foreign Relations Committee, because of the pressure of other duties, had overlooked the fundamental questions which he wished to bring to our attention.

I may say briefly that the short history of the concurrent resolution is as follows: Several resolutions relating to Palestine were introduced in the Senate and were referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee, after a discussion of them, voted to appoint a special subcommittee to investigate and make a report. The committee itself had a meeting with the Secretary of State. The subcommittee had two meetings with the Secretary of State. They met with other interested Senators. They met with other interested citizens who asked to be heard. They gave consideration to all the facts which have been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut and they gave consideration to all other related facts. After that careful consideration, they decided that none of the resolutions which had been presented to them met the situation, in their opinion. It was very difficult to arrive at an agreement among the different points of view, but I am glad to say that in a spirit of conciliation and explanation finally the common purpose of all of them was expressed in the concurrent resolution which the subcommittee drafted and reported to the full committee. The full committee gave it consideration and discussion, with a knowledge of all the facts

which the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut seems to think he alone has discovered.

The result was that the committee voted 17 to 1 to report the resolution to the Senate. I hope the resolution will be adopted without change. It has been very difficult to reach a common agreement in regard to phraseology so delicate as that of the resolution, but the desired result has been achieved, and I certainly hope the resolution will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is with the deepest regret that I have to take issue with my colleague the respected junior Senator from Connecticut, to whose remarks on this subject I listened with great interest. As I understand the concurrent resolution in the form in which it has been reported by the committee, it calls upon the British Government to fulfill the obligation which it undertook many long years ago. We hereby resolve that we are going to urge, and use our good offices to see, that the Government which is now in charge of the Kingdom of Great Britain shall fulfill the policy which they proclaimed many times before they came into power.

I refer to a speech which I made on this subject on October 2, 1945. Upon looking at it I note that I quoted the official declaration on Palestine of the British Labor Party, the party which is now in control of Great Britain, and I should like to read it again into the RECORD, because I think it should be emphasized. This is what the British Labor Party said before it came into power:

> There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a "Jewish national home," unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. * * * The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine less than the size of Wales.

That, Mr. President, was the declaration of the men who now constitute the ruling power in Great Britain. As I understand the pending resolution, we are going to call upon them, now that they have assumed the responsibility of office, to carry out what they stated to be their principles before they assumed their present responsibilities.

Mr. President, we can do no less than to nail the pending concurrent resolution to our masthead and say, "Here is our position; here is where we stand."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the argument which was presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

There are three essential differences between the concurrent resolution and the amendment. In the first place, where the concurrent resolution states: "Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities," the amendment would say, "Palestine shall be opened for entry of Jews into that country."

At the present time 1,500 Jews a month are allowed to enter Palestine. One of the issues is free entry to the limit of Palestine's economic possibilities. I should be unwilling to agree to any change in that respect in the concurrent resolution.

Secondly, the concurrent resolution provides that "There shall be full opportunity for colonization and development." The amendment says only "opportunity." That also is a definite issue. Today there is an opportunity for colonization of about 1 percent of all the land in Palestine. I do not think we want to make any change there.

Thirdly, there is an omission in the amendment of the words "the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power," and so forth. The suggestion is made that we should use our good offices with everyone. I think the distinguished Senator will admit that the words "good offices" do not mean war or armies. They mean peaceful offices. They certainly cannot mean that the good offices are confined to the British because we certainly are not going to war with Britain.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HART. Does the Senator believe that we are entirely fair in urging upon Great Britain rather extreme measures, or measures which the Arabs believe to be rather extreme—without being willing to share the responsibility which will follow, even to the extent of permitting the use of our own forces?

Mr. TAFT. For all practical purposes, for almost 20 years the British have administered Palestine as a British colony. They have full economic advantage of whatever may take place in Palestine. Palestine is today a part of the sterling area. I have letters from American importers who desire to ship goods into Palestine and cannot do so because the British refuse to allow them to ship goods into that country. The British are in full control in Palestine. We have no right to go to the Arab states nearby and discuss with them what we will do in Palestine. We have no part of the country. Before talking with ibn-Saud, President Roosevelt discussed the matter with Churchill and obtained his permission to discuss the matter with ibn-Saud. I think the President made a great mistake in discussing it with ibn-Saud, because I do not believe that ibn-Saud was the man with whom the President should have discussed the matter. I think we would make a great mistake were we to try to discuss the matter with the Arab nations in the Middle East. In the first place, the British agreed in the mandate of the League of Nations to do this. As it has been pointed out by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], in 1924 we made a special treaty with Great Britain under which she agreed to carry out the mandate which she had assumed from the League of Nations in return for various things which we agreed to do. I assert that they now have a direct treaty obligation with us to carry out the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. President, I think it is very serious to suggest that the President use his good offices and ask the British to carry out a treaty obligation which they have to the world, and to the United States in particular.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe I did not make my question clear. I was speaking of the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44. Those terms indicate that rather extreme measures are to be taken in Palestine insofar as the Arabs are concerned.

My question referred to the situation which might arise under the resolution. I asked the Senator if he believed that we should be ready to accept any share of a responsibility which might result from any trouble which might ensue.

Mr. TAFT. That depends on what the Senator means by sharing the responsibility. We are saying by the concurrent resolution what we think should be done. We are not assuming to say that we are going to send any troops, or do anything else beyond saying that we hope to use our good offices with the mandatory power, and call their attention to their treaty obligations. If the British chose to say in return, "You take Palestine, that question is a new thing to us," that is one thing. But, up to the moment, they have shown no indication of any such intention. I personally would not be in favor of assuming such a responsibility.

Mr. HART. I gather that the Senator is not in favor of our sending troops into Palestine in the event a necessity arose for them. Will the Senator state why he thinks ibn-Saud was not a proper representative for President Roosevelt to confer with?

Mr. TAFT. It is because ibn-Saud had never previously had any relations in a political way with Palestine. He never had any jurisdiction over Palestine. Palestine was never a part of Saudi Arabia. Both countries were parts of the Turkish Empire. Palestine was set up with an Arab leader as a special state for the purpose of making it into a Jewish commonwealth. It was so understood by the Arabs at the time, and I see no reason for consulting the heads of other states with regard to the matter when they have no direct relation with the obligations which the British assumed in Palestine.

Mr. HART. I merely observe that according to my understanding ibn-Saud is the leader of the Pan-Arabic Organization, and that makes him count for a good deal.

Mr. TAFT. The Pan-Arabic Organization, so far as I know, has no official status of any kind.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I shall say just a few words. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and I were appointed a subcommittee, and we worked for 2 weeks on this resolution, the others working harder than I myself did. Later there was consultation with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. WALSH], I believe, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Then there were consultations with others, and, so far as I know, there had been no objection on the part of those who had taken an interest in the matter up to that time.

This resolution has been as carefully studied as any I have known of, and I think it is generally satisfactory. I think that even the one vote that was cast in the committee against it, which has been referred to, was not because of the language of the resolution itself, but was cast on another ground.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the correction of a mistake in the language of the report which was made when the resolution was sent to the Senate. In the fourth line from the bottom of the report the language is, "and where they can establish," and so forth. That means the Jews. That does not correspond to the language of the resolution itself. There should be inserted there the words "in association with all elements of the population." For the sake of the future historian I should like to have the correction made, in order that there may be no misapprehension.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the correction in the report or in the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GREEN. In the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate. I should much prefer not to say anything, but I feel it to be my duty to say a few words to the Senate to explain my position in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Texas voted against reporting the resolution, not because he was lacking in sympathy for the Jewish people, not because he did not want to see the stateless and homeless Jews of Europe immigrate to Palestine, but according to my view we are going about this matter in the wrong way.

In the first place, this is not a primary United States responsibility. Under the League of Nations Great Britain received a mandate for Palestine. We were not members of the League of Nations. In 1922 we adopted a resolution expressing sympathy with the Jewish people, and the hope that Great Britain would permit immigration into Palestine. I do not recall the exact language of the resolution. Great Britain has been permitting immigration into Palestine. At the present moment I think the quota is 1,500 a month. The Jewish people think that is not sufficient.

Mr. President, what I rose to say was that the President of the United States is the constitutional representative of the Nation in its foreign relations. The President has been undertaking to discharge his functions with regard to this particular matter. On the 31st of August 1945 he addressed a letter to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. I have a copy of the letter. I shall not undertake to read it, because I do not want to consume time, but I ask permission that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Because of the natural interest of this Government in the present condition and future fate of those displaced persons in Germany who may prove to be stateless or nonrepatriable, we recently sent Mr. Earl G. Harrison to inquire into the situation.

Mr. Harrison was formerly the United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and is now the representative of this Government on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. The United Kingdom and the United States, as you know, have taken an active interest in the work of this Committee.

Instructions were given to Mr. Harrison to inquire particularly into the problems and needs of the Jewish refugees among the displaced persons.

Mr. Harrison visited not only the American zone in Germany but spent some time also in the British zone where he was extended every courtesy by the Twenty-first Army headquarters.

I have now received his report. In view of our conversations at Potsdam I am sure that you will find certain portions of the report interesting. I am, therefore, sending you a copy.

I should like to call your attention to the conclusions and recommendations appearing on page 8 and the following pages—especially the references to Palestine. It appears that the available certificates for immigration to Palestine will be exhausted in the near future. It is suggested that the granting of an additional 100,000 of such certificates would contribute greatly to a sound solution for the future of Jews still in Germany and Austria, and for other Jewish refugees who do not wish to remain where they are or who for understandable reasons do not desire to return to their countries of origin.

On the basis of this and other information which has come to me I concur in the belief that no other single matter is so important for those who have known the horrors of concentration camps for over a decade as is the future of immigration possibilities into Palestine. The number of such persons who wish immigration to Palestine or who would qualify for admission there is, unfortunately, no longer as large as it was before the Nazis began their extermination program. As I said to you in Potsdam, the American people, as a whole, firmly believe that immigration into Palestine should not be closed and that a reasonable number of Europe's persecuted Jews should, in accordance with their wishes, be permitted to resettle there.

I know you are in agreement on the proposition that future peace in Europe depends in large measure upon our finding sound solutions of problems confronting the displaced and formerly persecuted groups of people. No claim is more meritorious than that of the groups who for so many years have known persecution and enslavement.

The main solution appears to lie in the quick evacuation of as many as possible of the nonrepatriable Jews, who wish it, to Palestine. If it is to be effective, such action should not be long delayed.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish also to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the President under date of November 13, slightly over a month ago. It refers to an agreement the President made with the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The President's statement reads:

Following the receipt of information from various sources regarding the distressing situation of the Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution in Europe, I wrote to Mr. Attlee on August 31 bringing to his attention the suggestion in a report of Mr. Earl G. Harrison that the granting of an additional 100,000 certificates for the immigration of Jews into Palestine would alleviate the situation. A copy of my letter to Mr. Attlee is being made available to the press. I continue to adhere to the views expressed in that letter.

I was advised by the British Government that because of conditions in Palestine it was not in a position to adopt the policy recommended, but that it was deeply concerned with the situation of the Jews in Europe. During the course of subsequent discussions between the two Governments, it suggested the establishment of a joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry, under a rotating chairmanship, to examine the whole question and to make a further review of the Palestine problem in the light of that examination and other relevant considerations.

In view of our intense interest in this matter and of our belief that such a committee will be of aid in finding a solution which will be both humane and just, we have acceded to the British suggestion.

The terms of reference of this committee, as agreed upon between the two Governments, are as follows:

To examine political, economic, and social conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and settlement therein and the well-being of the peoples now living therein.

How many Members of the Senate know those conditions? A few who have traveled there in recent years know them, but most Senators do not. I am frank to say that the Senator now speaking does not know.

The statement continues:

2. To examine the position of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution, and the practical measures taken or contemplated to be taken in those countries to enable them to live free from discrimination and oppression and to make estimates of those who wish or will be impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine or other countries outside Europe.

3. To hear the views of competent witnesses and to consult representative Arabs and Jews on the problems of Palestine as such problems are affected by conditions subject to examination under paragraphs 1 and 2 above and by other relevant facts and circumstances, and to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States for ad interim handling of these problems as well as for their permanent solution.

4. To make such other recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States as may be necessary to meet the immediate needs arising from conditions subject to examination under paragraph 2 above, by remedial action in the European countries in question or by the provision of facilities for emigration to and settlement in countries outside Europe.

It will be observed that among the important duties of this committee will be the task of examining conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration. The establishment of this committee will make possible a prompt review of the unfortunate plight of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been subjected to persecution, and a prompt

examination of questions related to the rate of current immigration into Palestine and the absorptive capacity of the country.

The situation faced by displaced Jews in Europe during the coming winter allows no delay in this matter. I hope the committee will be able to accomplish its important task with the greatest speed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. Does he not think that the adoption of this resolution by the Senate now will be an indication, and a wise indication, of the direction in which we wish our delegates to go in the negotiations with the British? I am supporting the concurrent resolution. I have had all the difficulties and doubts which have been expressed, but I think the resolution is in such form that it conforms fully with the treaty obligations, with the Balfour Declaration, and with the plight in which we find the poor Jews in Europe. It seems to me the delegates to the joint conference will be strengthened rather than weakened by having the Senate adopt the concurrent resolution. I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether he does not agree with that conclusion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the conclusion, if the Congress is going to overthrow the President's control of the matter and take it over, but I think it is most unwise. We are dealing with Great Britain. The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have mutually agreed to appoint a commission to go to Palestine to investigate all these questions and to bring back a report on the facts. They have agreed to do it within 120 days. A distinguished committee has been appointed to represent the United States, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York times telling who the commissioners of the United States are to be.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES, BRITAIN PICK 12 TO STUDY PALESTINE—TRUMAN CALLS JUDGE HUTCHESON TO SHARE CHAIRMANSHIP WITH SIR JOHN E. SINGLETON—BROAD INQUIRY ORDERED—COMMITTEE TOLD TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS IN EUROPE AND TO CONSULT ARABS AND JEWS

WASHINGTON, December 10.—President Truman named today a six-member group to represent United States interests on the British-American Committee of Inquiry on the Palestine question. The chairman is Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, of the Fifth Circuit Court, of Houston, Tex.

Membership of the committee of 12 was announced simultaneously in Washington and London under terms of reference calling for the "utmost expedition in dealing with the subjects committed to it for investigation" and for a report to the 2 Governments within 120 days of the inception of the inquiry. When the investigation will begin the White House was unable to say.

Members of the American group, besides Judge Hutcheson, include Frank Aydelotte, former president of Swarthmore College and now director of the Institute for the Advanced Study at Princeton and American secretary of the Rhodes Trust.

EDITOR IS APPOINTED

Others are Frank W. Buxton, editor of the Boston Herald; O. Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina and a Washington attorney; James G. McDonald, former chairman of the Foreign Policy Association and High Commissioner of German Refugees for the League of Nations; and William Phillips, former Under Secretary of State, Ambassador to Italy, Presidential representative in New Delhi, India, and delegate to the London Naval Conference in 1935.

Sir John E. Singleton, judge of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, was named chairman of the British delegation and will alternate with Judge Hutcheson as a chairman of the two-power group under an agreed-on plan of rotation.

A White House announcement said: "The procedure of the committee will be determined by the committee itself, and it will be open to it, if it thinks fit, to deal simultaneously through the medium of subcommittees with its various terms of reference."

OTHER BRITONS NAMED

British committeemen include Wilfred P. Crick, economic adviser to the Midland Bank; Richard S. Crossman, Labor Member of Parliament and former assistant editor of the New Statesman and Nation; Sir Frederick Leggett, former Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Labor and National Services; Maj. Reginald E. Manningham-Butler, Conservative Member of Parliament; and Lord Morrison, Labor Member of Parliament.

The terms of reference of the Committee were:

1. To examine political, economic, and social conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and settlement therein and the well-being of the peoples now living therein.

2. To examine the position of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution and the practical measures taken or contemplated to be taken in those countries to enable them to live free from discrimination and oppression and to make estimates of those who wish or will be impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine or other countries outside Europe.

3. To hear the views of competent witnesses and to consult representative Arabs and Jews on the problems of Palestine as such problems are affected by conditions subject to examination under paragraphs 1 and 2 above, and by other relevant facts and circumstances, and to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States for ad interim handling of these problems as well as for their permanent solution.

4. To make such other recommendations to His Majesty's Government and to the Government of the United States as may be necessary to meet the immediate needs arising from conditions subject to examination under paragraph 2 above by remedial action in the European countries in question or by the provision of facilities for emigration to and settlement in countries outside Europe.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the fact that as the Chairman of the United States group the President has appointed Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, of my State. He is a distinguished member of the Fifth Circuit Court, of Houston, Tex., a man of the highest public character, education, and experience.

Mr. President, the point I am making, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey, is that the President of the United States does not want this resolution adopted. He so told the Foreign Relations Committee—not in person, but he told me over the telephone and authorized me to tell the committee, and I did tell the committee what he said. He stated, "I do not regard adoption of the resolution as advisable. I do not want to see any sort of resolution adopted until the Commission can conduct its inquiry and submit its report." I reported that to the committee.

The Secretary of State appeared before the committee and testified that the resolution ought not to be adopted and that it was not wise, and that he opposed it.

Yet, Mr. President, the committee could not wait 4 months. It could not wait 120 days. It had to rush this resolution through.

Mr. President, those are my reasons for objecting to the adoption of the resolution at the present time.

Furthermore, I believe the resolution is calculated not to help the Jews, but to injure their causes. Great Britain is not going to be persuaded by a resolution which she does not want adopted. I assume she does not want it adopted, because I assume that she is expecting to go through with the machinery of this Commission, and to wait its report. I do not believe it is in the interest of the Jews at this time to adopt the resolution.

I shall not argue the situation in regard to the Jews. All Senators know the facts. Senators have seen in the press that the Arab League is bitterly opposed to the contemplated action of the United States Congress in adopting this resolution.

Mr. President, with the utmost sympathy for the Jews, with the utmost sympathy for those in this country who are sympathizing with their brethren in Europe, I must in the interest of my country vote against the adoption of this resolution at the present time. I shall vote against it because, under the circumstances, I do not believe the President of the United States should assume the obligation of handling this matter, that Great Britain does not want a resolution of this kind adopted, and that the Secretary of State, who is in touch with the international situation, does not want any resolutions adopted at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate as long as I really should like to do, for the reason that there is not much on the record to show why we ought to act, and why we should act now on this subject. I think the facts are so cogent that they should be on the record. In order to conserve the time of Senators who are weary, I shall refer only to a few things and then ask permission to insert in the RECORD some reports made by a Commission called the Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Commission, which studied the crisis in Palestine when it was at its peak. The report was made in October 1936, and as an introduction to the report the Commission said, over the signatures of its members, among other things:

Our own Government, however, cannot be held blameless until it calls sharply to the attention of Great Britain our feeling that the mandate is not being administered as it

should be. No matter how pressing may be the demands of a Presidential election, time out must be taken to have the atrocities in Palestine stopped. We cannot shed our own responsibility until we remind Great Britain of its neglected duty and insist upon its performance.

The members of our group will do whatever possible to impress our Government with what appears to us to be its manifest duty. To this end we shall do all we can to fulfill the international obligation, to which our Government is a party, to establish the Jewish National Home in Palestine, with full justice to Moslem and Christian in the Holy Land.

ROYAL S. COPELAND.
DANIEL O. HASTINGS.
WARREN R. AUSTIN.

Mr. President, I regard it a duty at this time to place in the RECORD in some way the facts to which we were witnesses at that time and to which I am a witness now. Because of the nature of the amendment proposed, I briefly refer to the legalistic position which I have taken in interrogating the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

The United States became a party to the mandate by virtue of the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924. It will suffice to refer to two articles in order that it may be perfectly clear that we owe an obligation here, and there is a definite country to which we owe that obligation.

ARTICLE 1. Subject to the provisions of the present convention the United States consents to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty, pursuant to the mandate recited above.

In other words, every detail of that mandate is something that the United States Government has gotten behind in a solemn way and we said, "We accept His Britannic Majesty as the trustee of this great trust. We will not only let His Britannic Majesty perform so long as His Majesty does perform according thereto, but we will be vigilant to perform our duty to our nationals living in Palestine and to all the other wards of that trust, by calling direct and vigorous attention to what we regard as a breach of the trust, a nonperformance of the mandate."

The other article is this:

ART. 7. Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States.

Now I ask: Can we stand by after having had brought to our attention, without any opportunity for doubt, very important particulars in which the mandatory is not administering Palestine according to this treaty and is thereby in effect changing the mandate? Is it not equally important for us to try to hold the mandatory to the terms of the treaty in regard to his administration of it as it is to hold the mandatory to the terms of the treaty in regard to a formal amendment of it, particularly when we find this type of change made by practice, namely, cutting down of the area of land into which Jews are permitted to immigrate? That was one of the early changes in the mandate, made without any formal action, by the sole act of the mandatory power. All of Transjordania was cut off from the area of Palestine which was originally comprehended in the terms of the mandate.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HART. Was not that action approved by the League of Nations?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. I do not know. Certainly I have never seen any approval of it, and I think it would have been called to my attention in 1936 if there had been any such record.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In any event, it is entirely clear that the white paper has never been approved by the League of Nations or the United States. That goes very much further.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is distinctly right. Most Senators also recognize, I am sure, that such a formal change as that would have to come to the United States and be approved by the United States under the terms of our treaty with Britain, and that certainly never has been done.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not also true that as parties to this treaty, if we continue silently to acquiesce in its violation, which is admitted on all sides, we then lend our acquiescence, and that an estoppel will operate?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not ready to say that. I once learned in a lawsuit that silence under certain circumstances is probative. Silence under circumstances in which a man or a nation ought to speak is probative.

I am going only a little way into this story, but I go this far: Aside from the treaty, we were asked by Britain to make her load as light as possible, to help her. Lord Balfour, the author of the resolution which is recited in the preamble of this concurrent resolution, wrote to Secretary of State Hughes on January 13, 1922, during the negotiation of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, as follows:

The task which the British Government have undertaken in Palestine is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. * * * However this may be, the duty has devolved upon Great Britain, and I hope the American Government will do what they can to lighten the load.

In the report which I have before me appear two short paragraphs which I wish to read, because they were fresh when they were written, with the facts immediately before me:

American public sentiment should be frankly expressed in support of the mandate and in approval of its strict administration according to the British policy laid down during the negotiation of its terms. It would strengthen the arm of the mandatory and discourage the employment of violence and civil disobedience to induce either the abrogation of the mandate or a modification of its essential obligations.

Again, quoting from another part:

In fulfillment of the principles of the mandate and the declared policy of the mandatory power, a stable supporting public sentiment among the American people, frankly announced, may be of great value. It may help to lighten the load assumed by the mandatory, in accordance with the spirit of Lord Balfour's letter to Secretary of State Hughes, in the performance of the great task of establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine.

With respect to the terms of Concurrent Resolution 44, it will be noticed that it does not declare for a Jewish state. That was the supreme issue in the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and the original draft was changed in that particular and peculiar regard to make it absolutely clear that we were not asking the mandatory to go beyond the terms of the treaty or of the mandate itself and undertake by bayonets—and that is what it would ultimately mean—to set up a Jewish state anywhere, certainly not in a tiny land which is in a humble position as a result of the war.

The language of the resolution recognizes the other nationalities. There are approximately 60 of them. The population of Palestine is not all Jew and Arab. To be found there are the Christian religion, the Moslem or Mohammedan religion, the Hebrew religion, and various cults. There are many sacred shrines which must be respected according to the terms of the mandate.

On the point of a Jewish state, I think only this language is necessary to bring to light the essential difference between the original resolution which was offered and the one now pending, which is Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 44. This is taken from a Government paper published while we were negotiating our treaty with Great Britain. It became a royal instruction. It contained the following language:

A Jewish national home will be founded in Palestine. The Jewish people will be in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. But His Majesty's government have no such aim as that Palestine should become as Jewish as England is English.

Nor do His Majesty's government contemplate the disappearance or subordination of the Arab population, language, or culture. The status of all citizens of Palestine will be Palestinian, and no section of the population will have any other status in the eyes of the law.

We entered into the treaty with that language before us. Who can now say that we would be doing a wise act if, as the Senate of the United States, we should adopt a resolution calling upon the mandatory to establish a Jewish state? Much as I am devoted to the cause of the Jews, I cannot bring myself to that point, primarily because I know that the repercussion from such a position would do the Jews more harm than anything they have suffered in the long, long centuries. Their prospects would not have the promise and hope that they now have, and that they would have by the adoption of a resolution which is reasonable and which recognizes the rights, according to the Balfour Declaration, of other peoples, religions, and shrines in Palestine.

I quote from the concurrent resolution. This is the point:

So that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home—

Note the following—

and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men,

regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

I have talked with many Jews. I have talked with some of the leading rabbis of the world about this matter. During our last consideration of it this note, which was finally adopted by the State Department, came to the committee through the hands of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] from three brilliant Jews who drafted the language.

In my opinion this recognition of the status of all people who live there is the proper attitude for the United States Senate to take, while undertaking to say to the mandate, "Open the doors of Palestine to the free immigration of Jews and to the full settlement of the land. Do not answer us by saying, 'No; we cannot do it; the land will not support them all; it will not support all the population that is there and the additional ones that come in.' That will not do at all."

The facts which I shall introduce, if I am permitted to do so—I shall ask unanimous consent to have them placed in the RECORD—show that immigration is a dynamic thing, that Palestine has never arrived at the limit of her capacity to receive immigration, and that all the time she has been receiving just as many Arabs as Jews. Her doors have been open to them all, and they have come in; but, as I have said, Palestine has not yet reached the limit of her capacity to receive immigration or her capacity for agricultural development.

The resolution provides a limit, for it says:

> Shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Can the Senator inform me whether there is any restriction on the immigration of Arabs at the present time, or whether there has been in recent years?

Mr. AUSTIN. None that I know of.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not rather extraordinary, in questioning the good faith with which the mandate has been administered, that we find that the Arab population has actually increased more than has the Jewish population, during the 20 years since Palestine was promised as a homeland for the Jew?

Mr. AUSTIN. Senator Copeland discussed that point fully, and he said it is not the result of an increased birth rate, but is the result of the improvement in water supply, the extension and development of cultivatable lands, education, better control of disease, higher level of wages, higher standard of living, and similar factors which make a country productive. That is what causes the Arabs to flock into Palestine. They go there in order to enjoy the dynamic power which has come to Palestine. Please understand, it is almost a visible thing. The spirit of the people is most amazing. It is miraculous how they have had a rebirth, how happy they are, and how they have swung into this project of restoring the Holy Land, the home of their fathers, to great productivity, and to get upon that sacred soil.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but before yielding I should like to place in the RECORD something which is an admission by the mandatory. This is taken from the report of the Palestine Royal Commission, submitted at London in 1937:

> The Jews in Palestine, to begin with, are happy. They are not as happy as they were before the outbreak of the last war. * * * But, speaking generally, whether it be the Jew who has been driven from a comfortable life in a cultured "melieu" and is now digging all the day in the fields and sleeping in a bare cottage, or whether it be the Jew who has emerged from a Polish ghetto and is now working in a factory at Tel Aviv, the dominant feeling of both is an overwhelming sense of escape. The champions of Zionism have always held—and on the whole they are now proved right—that a Jew released from an anti-Jewish environment and restored to Palestine would not only feel free as he had never felt before but would also acquire a new self-confidence, a new zest in living from his consciousness that he was engaged in a great constructive task.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have these papers printed in the RECORD. They prove that the Jews are engaged in a great, constructive task, and that they have accomplished miracles, thus far, and give great promise for the future.

Now I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, assuming that the Arabs who were living there at the time of the League of Nations mandate and the treaty with the United States have their rights which are fully provided for and protected, can it be said that the 600,000 Arabs who have come there from outside or who have appeared there in the new population during this period can claim any similar rights of protection, inasmuch as Palestine had been promised, and under the mandate and the trusteeship was designed, as a homeland for the Jew? If there is any saturation point, do not the Jews have priority, insofar as new immigration is concerned?

Mr. AUSTIN. My answer will have to be "No." In my opinion it is "No." I think the Arabs are there as a matter of right. They have not violated the law by entering Palestine. They are just as much citizens as if they had been born there or had gone there when the other inhabitants went there. Being there as citizens, it is only one of the incidents which I regard as a failure to administer the mandate strictly that there has not been the immigration of Jews, the fostering of the development of a form of government which will advance the Jewish national home, and all the other provisions which are provided for in the mandate. It is a failure to go through with those things which have caused the slow-down. The slow-down has been caused by unduly limiting the number of Jews who could enter that country. The Arabs, at the time when I was there, were clamoring to cut off the immigration entirely. They did not succeed in that, but they succeeded in having it limited.

I wish to say before I conclude that not all Arabs are opposed to having the Jews go to Palestine. Some of the finest of them told us—and I took verbatim minutes of their statements, and some of them will be placed in the RECORD—that there is no reason why Jews and Arabs should not get along together in Palestine. They are cousins; and so far as the economic status of Arabs is concerned, they benefited in all kinds of ways by the coming of the Jews. So far as health, education, and culture are concerned, the Arabs have benefited by the coming of the Jews. The only point was that those who were so strenuous in their efforts and desires to cut off the further immigration of Jews had a great fear of being overwhelmed by the Jewish population, so that ultimately, some time in the future, the Government of Palestine would become Jewish.

What I hope to see the mandatory do is carry out the policy expressed in this concurrent resolution, which looks to a government formed as we form one here in the United States—not based on a racial stock but containing many racial stocks whose nationals shall not be known as either Jew or Arab but—just as we are known as Americans—shall be known as Palestinians. If one race or another outstrips in population the other races, that is in the hands of the Almighty, and we do not have much to say about it.

Mr. President, I conclude by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the reports of the Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Connecticut raised a very important point, namely, that the action which we are requested to take might conceivably lead to hostilities, and involve a question of responsibility. I feel that if we ask the British to take action, we should be willing to assume our share of the responsibility for it, and my belief is that it would then put the matter into the hands of the United Nations Organization. Is that that the Senator's judgment?

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator give me an opportunity to reply without saying "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. SMITH. I think the United Nations Organization is the organization to be concerned with the entire problem.

Mr. AUSTIN. We now have a commission which was appointed jointly by the mandatory and by the United States Government to investigate these facts. We will learn from that Commission the facts which we do not now have. We will obtain a better foundation for a decision concerning the precise character of changes which are to be made, than we have at the present time. We will perhaps learn whether it is possible to reach an agreement between Jews and Arabs. At one time an agreement was entered into. If the mandatory had adhered to the agreement and had hued to the line, we would not be where we are now in respect to the Palestine situation.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the matter is handled rightly, I believe that it will be possible to secure another agreement. But if it is not possible to do so, undoubtedly Great Britain will be the actor. She now has power under the United Nations Charter to say whether she will give up her trusteeship to the United Nations, or to someone else. I doubt if it would be appropriate for us to make any recommendation. That is why I should not like to make any commitment or statement as to what should be done.

Mr. SMITH. My thought is that the situation might lead to participation on the part of the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator from Vermont receive permission to have printed in the RECORD the reports to which he referred?

Mr. AUSTIN. I asked for such permission.

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, I heard the Senator use the words "Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Committee." What kind of a committee is that?

Mr. AUSTIN. The name was probably given by Hearst, but it was a committee consisting of three Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. But it was not a committee which had been appointed by the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was not a committee which had been appointed by the Senate. I should have said "commission." The Senate did not participate in the expense of the commission, or anything concerning it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely wanted to have that fact made clear.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was trying to identify the document.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not complaining to the Senator. I merely wanted it to be understood that when the Senator stated "Unofficial senatorial committee" the reports to which he referred were the reports of a purely voluntary committee and were not reports of a committee which had been appointed by the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the reports were not made by a committee authorized by the Senate. I have referred only to the title of the document so that the printer may know what I am talking about. The document is entitled "The Crisis in Palestine. Reports of Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Commission."

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if it were a Hearst commission, it was not a Senate commission or a Senate committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the document referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN PALESTINE—REPORTS OF HEARST UNOFFICIAL SENATORIAL COMMISSION

PURPOSE OF THE INQUIRY

The following statement, issued by the members of the Unofficial Senatorial Commission on their arrival in Palestine on August 23, 1936, is reprinted from the Palestine Post:

"We have come to Palestine not as officials, but as citizens of the United States. We do not commit the American Government by anything we say or do.

"Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the publisher of many newspapers in America, expressed to us the desire to get accurate and unbiased information concerning the situation in Palestine. We agreed to come here for that purpose.

"This is no official mission, but we are mindful of the fact that the information we hope to get will be of value to us as United States Senators.

"We are mindful of the fact that our Government is greatly interested in the problems of this country.

"We are mindful of Lord Balfour's historic letter to Secretary of State Hughes, of January 13, 1922, in which he expressed the hope that 'the American Government will do what they can to lighten the load' undertaken by the British Government in Palestine.

"If we can get accurate information and make an unbiased report, it ought to be helpful to the millions of Americans who are interested in the reconstruction of Palestine.

"We are here, free from all bias and prejudice. We seek reliable information and invite the aid of all who can help. We wish to hear from all sides, so everybody may be sure that our survey is conducted with strict impartiality.

"Regardless of religious or racial origin, all Americans have a genuine interest in the peace and prosperity of Palestine, a land sacred to Christian, Moslem, and Jew alike. In the midst of the world-wide depression from which our country suffered so deeply, we watched with admiration the great era of prosperity enjoyed by you.

"Our people have contributed greatly toward the reconstruction of Palestine, so as to confer benefits upon all elements of the population. We are confident that an early return to peace will insure the continuation of American economic aid to this country. And we pray that there may be unbroken progress on the part of all the people of the Holy Land toward an era of lasting prosperity."

"WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?"

The following statement, issued in New York by the members of the Unofficial Senatorial Commission on their return from Palestine, appeared in the New York American on September 18, 1936:

"We found Palestine in a state of terror. Shootings, bombings, and every other form of violence had become part of the daily routine during the past 5 months. Murder is a common occurrence. Nearly 1,000 lives have been lost in the present turmoil, including those of Arabs, Jews, and British soldiers.

"In spite of the fact that thoughtful Jewish and Arab leaders strive for mutual peace and lasting understanding, the intolerable state of affairs in Palestine continues. It is a condition for which, as we see it, the mandatory government must be held responsible. Its failure in this matter is of concern to the United States.

"Great Britain holds the mandatory power over Palestine. It is charged by the world with the responsibility for good government there. The United States has a treaty with the British sovereign, a treaty which includes every word of the original mandate designed to guarantee a Jewish national home in Palestine and to give unfailing justice to the Moslems and other religionists in the land.

"In consequence of the solemn treaty, it is our right, and probably our duty, as citizens and as United States Senators, to investigate and report upon the fulfillment of the convention which we believe is not being administered in accordance with its letter and spirit.

"We found the High Commissioner of Palestine to be a fine gentleman. In matters so fundamental, so vital to the welfare of Great Britain, so interlaced with the affairs of England in the Near East, we cannot believe that the High Commissioner is acting upon his own initiative. Undoubtedly, he is an able and honest man, but open to the accusation of indecision and weakness, because he must be loyal to whatever is the 'policy' of the British Government.

"The failure to make conciliatory and peace-promoting moves culminated in the present 'strike,' with its horrible record of murders and destructive acts. Failure to deal sternly with the lawbreakers and to end the inexcusable acts of violence would bring discredit even to the police department of a second-class American city. All in all, there has been created a cleavage between Arab and Jew, which will take years to close. In the last analysis, the British Government must take the blame for the chaos in the Holy Land.

"Our own Government, however, cannot be held blameless until it calls sharply to the attention of Great Britain our feeling that the mandate is not being administered as it should be. No matter how pressing may be the demands of a Presidential election, time out must be taken to have the atrocities in Palestine stopped. We cannot shed our own responsibility until we remind Great Britain of its neglected duty and insist upon its performance.

"The members of our group will do whatever possible to impress our Government with what appears to us to be its manifest duty. To this end, we shall do all we can to fulfill the international obligation, to which our Government is a party, to establish the Jewish national home in Palestine, with full justice to Moslem and Christian in the Holy land.

"ROYAL S. COPELAND,
"DANIEL O. HASTINGS,
"WARREN R. AUSTIN."

REPORT BY SENATOR ROYAL S. COPELAND

ARTICLE 1

We arrived in Palestine at the height of the reign of terror which had been sweeping the land for 4 months. Even before we stepped off the boat at Haifa we were made aware of the fear which filled every heart.

The country was an armed camp. A state of warfare prevailed, without the martial law warranted by the activities of the Arab terrorists.

Yet we were amazed at the sight of Haifa. Here was a beautiful harbor created by Jewish endeavor and sacrifice where but a decade ago no port facilities existed. The harbor presented a busy appearance.

Freight was moving. A cargo of immigrants, Jewish refugees from Russia, was being disembarked in the land of promise.

But there were also some British warships at anchor ready for instant action. These warships were part of the armed forces which Great Britain had been assembling in Palestine ever since the outbreak of the Arab strike and campaign of assassination.

It was a sight typical of all Europe today, where civilization is being eclipsed by the shadows of guns and marching armies.

Haifa did not look at all like Asia. It impressed me as a miniature Naples, a beautiful modern city which dotted the slopes of Mount Carmel down to the blue waters of the sea. It was as if the frontiers of Europe had been shoved eastward by a magic hand.

Modern buildings, hotels and cafes, schools and hospitals, theaters and shops, all bore witness to the peaceful conquest of the Near East by a host of Jewish pioneers and builders from the West.

We were welcomed upon our arrival by representatives of the American Jewish community in Palestine and by the representative of the Jewish Agency. The latter is recognized under the Mandate by Great Britain as the official body in charge of the restoration of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

We proceeded with the inquiry, which was the purpose of our visit. Shortly after landing we held a series of conferences with both Jewish and Arab spokesmen in Haifa. Although our stay in the Holy Land was limited, the size of the country made it possible to conduct a pretty thorough investigation in a couple of weeks.

The area of Palestine is about one-fifth larger than that of Massachusetts or New Jersey. The entire population is less than one-fourth of either of these two States. The Holy Land is provided with excellent modern highways which have been built largely by Jewish labor, capital and engineers.

One of the vital questions which concerned us was the absorptive capacity of Palestine.

In view of the burning need for a haven for millions of persecuted Jews in eastern Europe, it was imperative to settle the problem: Can Palestine house a population of several millions?

If Palestine, with an area a little less than that of Belgium, could ever maintain the density of population equal to that of Belgium, it would have room for at least 6,000,000 souls. If Palestine were ever to rival Massachusetts in density of population, it could harbor over 10,000,000 people.

It is obvious that the answer to the absorptive capacity of Palestine lies in the development of industry and commerce. For Palestine is the maritime frontier of a vast hinterland which is just beginning to awaken to the call of civilization.

Haifa supplied us with some hopeful indications that the future of Palestine, as a home for millions of Jews, may be made possible by the development of industry, without minimizing the role of agriculture.

We inspected some industrial establishments in the vicinity of Haifa. It will suffice to cite but one example of the industrial progress of the Zionist movement, the Kremmener foundry on the Plain of Zebulon.

But 3 years ago there was nothing but sand where the busy plant is now turning out bathtubs and plumbing fixtures for Palestine and the neighboring countries.

The creator of the foundry was a victim of the Hitler campaign against the Jews. He left Germany, and with small capital launched and built a plant equipped in ultramodern fashion.

He trained his workers, many of whom are German refugees who had never done manual labor. He developed a market which has never been tapped in that part of the world.

As we surveyed the operations of the foundry and conversed with the workers I sensed the great happiness of these begrimed men. There was a pride in their stride and in their faces which said to me:

"At last we are now in our own home. We have been driven from pillar to post long enough. We have come to rebuild our land and our land has already rebuilt us."

ARTICLE 2

Between Haifa and Jerusalem lies the major war zone of the present strife in Palestine. The railroad connecting the two cities is periodically cut by Arab night raiders. In spite of patrol engines running ahead of them, trains are derailed. Marauders from the hills shoot at the passing coaches. All night traffic is suspended. Highway travel is even more precarious because of terrorists lying in ambush.

The British Mandatory Government of Palestine was deeply concerned over the safety of our party. We had been formally notified when we entered the harbor of Haifa that we must not travel to Jerusalem except by air and that we must not go about the countryside. Naturally, some of us wondered why the mandatory power, after 4 months of turmoil, was unable to maintain law and order in the land entrusted to its care.

We called on the district commissioner of Haifa, Mr. Keith-Roach, who eventually arranged for our trip to Jerusalem. We proceeded in two stages, by rail to Lydda, and thence by motor to the capital of the country. We had the protection of a special convoy consisting of a detachment of 30 soldiers. The men, armed with rifles and machine guns, were under the command of Captain McAllister of the Cheshire Regiment.

Our baggage preceded us in our two hired cars, driven by Max and David, two Jewish drivers who had come up from Jerusalem through the Arab-infested back country. Max is a deputy constable. A native of Palestine, he went about his business undismayed by the daily toll of murders. Indeed, it was remarkable to watch the fortitude with which the entire Jewish population conducted itself in the face of constant danger.

In the compartment adjoining ours in the railway coach was a detail of soldiers. At both ends of the coach were armed soldiers who alighted at every stop, with their guns ready for action. Ahead of the train was a special patrol car, a converted open Ford truck on railway wheels. The sides of the truck consisted of half-inch armor plate. This "lookout trolley," as the Tommies in Palestine call it, ran ahead of the train at a distance of a couple of miles. It carried five soldiers and a machine gun.

It was perhaps an unusual experience for three United States Senators, accompanied by their wives, to find themselves traveling under conditions which resembled those of a battle front in wartime. We passed Athlit, on the Mediterranean, where Richard the Lion Hearted landed with his crusaders. It was not difficult to imagine what his feelings were in the long ago.

The train proceeded through a zone dotted with flourishing Jewish colonies. Citrus groves enriched the landscape. It was a scene to gladden the eye.

But all along the way were dugouts in which soldiers nestled behind sandbags. Now and then we passed encampments. Bayonets gleamed in the sun. Raw youths just from England and veteran soldiers of Allenby's triumphant army were sharing alike the hardships and hazards of guerilla warfare under a civilian administration.

The train slowed up. We could see the fresh embankment over which we were passing. Laborers were at work repairing the roadway. Here a train had been derailed a few days earlier, resulting in many casualties. A favorite trick of the marauders is to creep up in the night and loosen the rails by removing the bolts. It is one of the purposes of the "lookout trolley" to test the roadbed and to watch for loose rails, running at a speed of about 40 miles an hour.

We were approaching Hedera. The stretch beyond, as far as Tul-Karm, was exceptionally dangerous. Although it was forenoon, Captain McAllister warned us that the train might be fired upon. In that event, he said, it would be safest for the party to leave the compartment and stay in the passageway of the coach, on the side away from the hills. Fortunately there was no shooting that day.

Some of the soldiers were bitter and outspoken in their remarks. One officer had lost four of his men in an engagement with an Arab band. He was a veteran who had marched into Jerusalem under the banner of Allenby's victorious army.

Another officer with whom we talked on that trip said:

"This was a wasteland when I first saw Palestine. The Jews simply transformed the country. For centuries the Arabs did nothing. The Jews took the desolate land and turned it into gardens and groves. They built villages and cities where no man thought it could be done. The Arabs sold the land for big money. Now they want to keep the money and they also want the land back."

It was clear that many British soldiers chafed at the leniency with which the Arab terrorists were being treated. They are pining for a Kitchener or an Allenby. About twoscore British soldiers have already been killed during the latest disturbances. Yet in the absence of martial law no soldier was allowed to fire on an Arab, even if the latter was taking aim at him. He was only permitted to shoot when actually fired upon.

After 3 hours of travel by train, we alighted at Lydda, where we were met by the American consul from Jerusalem. Seated in three cars, each of which carried an escort of soldiers, and followed by a special car containing a machine-gun crew, we started on a wild dash to Jerusalem. The winding road traversed the hills of Judea. In the recesses of those barren hills lay hidden the main bands of the Arab terrorists.

We were approaching the City of Peace, but the atmosphere was that of war. We received the news of the latest outrages in the land, and we asked ourselves:

"Has Great Britain not the power to make human life safe in the Holy Land entrusted to her care by the nations of the world?"

ARTICLE 3

"Will the British Government take stern measures to suppress the guerrilla bands or will it yield to the terrorists by making concessions to the Arab high committee?"

This was the overshadowing question when we arrived in Jerusalem on August 25. The 400,000 Jews of Palestine were in a state of despair, in the belief that the mandatory power was about to nullify certain vital provisions of the mandate as the price of a temporary peace.

It should be noted here that the restraint of the Jewish population, which includes at least 50,000 World War veterans from all countries, has been truly remarkable in the face of the prolonged Arab campaign of assassination and arson. This was later confirmed by the British High Commissioner, Sir Arthur G. Wauchope.

The arrival of the Hearst unofficial senatorial delegation, in these circumstances, assumed an historic character. The entire Jewish population welcomed our coming as a godsend.

Was our presence in Palestine at that critical moment welcome to the British authorities? If so, they did not go out of the way to demonstrate it. It is true, we referred publicly upon our arrival in the Holy Land to the standing invitation issued by Lord Balfour to Secretary of State Hughes in January 1922, in which the United States was asked to do whatever possible "to lighten the load" assumed by Great Britain under the mandate. But it was clear that the British did not like being reminded of that document and of America's recognized interest in the administration of the mandate.

We were deluged by requests for audiences and conferences from responsible public bodies. The entire press of the country, both Jewish and Arab, as well as the large contingent of foreign correspondents now in Palestine, displayed the deepest interest in our mission. We proceeded with our inquiry without delay and found oursleves in the vortex of conflicting Jewish, Arab, and British claims and counterclaims.

Although Jerusalem resembled in some ways a besieged city, no handicaps were placed in our way. The government had placed at our disposal a special detail of soldiers, but within a day or two we dispensed with their services. It appeared that traveling about the city in the company of an armed soldier offered the greatest temptation to Arab snipers.

All the gates to the city have barbed-wire fences, guarded by armed patrols. The streets and squares are similarly patroled. The evidences of the Arab strike are everywhere. Arab shops are closed. In the walled

old city, the narrow lanes which are usually crowded to capacity by vendors and shoppers are now deserted. Here both the Jewish and Armenian shops are shut, too. Only bread stores are open.

At 7 o'clock every evening the curfew law descends upon Jerusalem, and all movement is stopped, except by the few who possess special passes. Such passes were provided upon request to members of our party and to such callers who had appointments with us. Not a night passed in Jerusalem during our stay there without shots being echoed among the hills on which the city is built.

Yet it was exhilarating to be in Jerusalem. Probably no city in the world has had so much written about it. But the full story of Jerusalem can perhaps never be written. It has to be experienced.

Coming from torrid southern Italy and Egypt, with reports before us of temperatures ranging as high as 105° back home, Jerusalem late in August proved a haven of delight. Situated at an elevation of 2,700 feet above sea level, the climate of the Holy City was blessed indeed. Even during the hours of brilliant sunshine there was always a balmy breeze. The nights and mornings were invigoratingly cool.

We had worried on our journey as to the hotel accommodations in Jerusalem. How astonished we were when we found ourselves in one of the finest and newest hotels in the world, the King David, which has no peer in the entire Near East and which is not surpassed by any hostelry in the United States.

That hotel alone, erected 6 years ago, is a monument to the miraculous transformation of Palestine in recent years. Jerusalem itself has spread out in all directions, the old city forming the hub of a far-flung and throbbing metropolis in the making; new residential quarters, modern edifices rub elbows with historic relics of stirring antiquity.

But the physical face of Jerusalem is secondary to its soul. Who can capture the mood which hangs over the city at sunrise and at sunset? It is truly unique. That alone can explain the rise within its cradle of the three great religions of the world, of which the mother religion was that of the Hebrews.

And now the descendants of those Hebrews come to redeem the land of their forefathers under a pledge made to them by the nations of the world, were fearful of the repudiation of that pledge by the trustee, Great Britain.

The Jewish settlers in Palestine were hoping that the United States, which ratified that pledge by an act of Congress and which consented to the British trusteeship by a solemn treaty, would, through our delegation, take their case before the supreme court of world public opinion.

ARTICLE 4

On the night of August 23, the date of our arrival in Palestine, a quarter of Jerusalem inhabited largely by American citizens of Jewish faith was subjected to a fusillade on three sides. The press and the official bulletins reported nothing about the attack. We did not learn of it until some days after we reached Jerusalem.

The matter was brought to our attention in an appeal for help presented to us by a delegation of the United Brethren of American Jews in Jerusalem, an association comprising about 600 citizens of the United States. From this report it appeared that the atrocities being committed by the Arab terrorists were jeopardizing the lives of thousands of American citizens now settled in Palestine.

The status of these American citizens, it should be noted, differs from that of our citizens in Spain or other foreign zones of trouble. Palestine is under a mandatory government, and is not a colony or a possession of Great Britain. Under the treaty concluded between the United States and Great Britain in 1924, American nationals are guaranteed protection of their lives and property in Palestine.

The plea made to us by the Jewish American community in Jerusalem is, therefore, a document of vital concern to the Government and to the people of the United States. At the same time it recites facts which cannot be ignored by our Department of State.

"We left America not as a result of persecution and hatred," reads the petition presented to us by six representatives of the United Brethren of American Jews in Jerusalem.

It continues:

"We were animated by the high ideal of the restoration of our ancestral holy country, of the revival of our people, of the realization of the vision of our prophets: 'From Zion goes forth the Law.'

"The American Jews invested millions of dollars in Palestine. They founded new settlements. They erected hospitals and clinics. They built health centers. And their share in the foundation and development of the Hebrew University is a prominent one.

"But all these achievements are for the moment menaced by destruction. Wild bands are uprooting our groves, burning down our buildings, ambushing our men and our women, and not sparing even children. There is no security on public roads, no security for life and property.

"We came to Palestine relying on the solemn declaration of Great Britain, supported by 25 other governments. We put our trust especially in the treaty signed between Great Britain and the United States of America. But we had to experience that the mandatory power is far from keeping its solemn pledge.

"Transjordania was separated from Palestine. Government land was granted to Arabs only. Jewish immigration was limited and the acquisition of land was made difficult.

"And what has been going on during the last 5 months is beyond any imagination. The Jews are almost outlawed. And not only are they not given sufficient protection, but they are also hindered in the elementary right of self-defense. The police and authorities investigate with no results. The courts do not punish adequately. And the Arab bandits are treated like an enemy's army.

"We desire to give here but one concrete example of the dangerous position to which the majority of us here have had the unfortunate experience of being eyewitnesses. On Sunday night, August 23, between 10 and 11, our quarter, known as Kerem Abraham, was violently attacked by shooting from three sides. The firing came from very close range and we heard the bullets strike the stone walls.

"'We woke the children and together we got down on the floors for safety. There was no help from police or soldiers. In the morning, boys picked up bullets on the streets. On one shutter, there were more than 20 bullet marks. One missile pierced the iron grating and entered the home.

"Panic-stricken we went to the American consul, who gives us his valuable aid at all times. We fear, however, that the chaotic conditions here are fast reaching the point beyond the aid of the consulate.

"In danger and distress we appeal to you, honorable representatives of our great and beloved country and of the noblest traditions of human rights, asking you to bring our lament before the people and the Government of the United States, and to cause friendly intervention in our favor."

The petition was signed by Rabbi S. Winograd, Rabbi S. Bernstein, Rabbi H. Koufman, Sisman Shafer, I. W. Wolf, and Harry Leyton.

It was the prayer of these delegates, as expressed to me, that Washington would take note of their plight and that of the other Americans in Palestine whose rights and lives were in constant peril.

ARTICLE 5

Do the British police authorities actually play into the hands of the Arab terrorists? Are means of defense denied and proper protection refused to the terrorized colonies, thus inviting invasion by bands of vandals? Are the lives and property of American nationals safeguarded by the mandatory government, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain?

The case of the American citizen, Savel Kwartin, whose orange grove was ravaged during our stay in Palestine, presents a striking answer to the foregoing questions. It is a case typical of the havoc being wrought in the Holy Land under a lax administration.

Several days after our arrival in Jerusalem, we received the following telegram from Tel Aviv:

"The American Senators Copeland, Hastings, Austin.

King David Hotel, Jerusalem.

"Kindly grant interview at your stay in Tel Aviv. I wish to present precarious condition of American residents and their property here. The day before yesterday approximately four thousand trees were uprooted in my grove. Local authorities have refused all adequate protection.

"Savel Zebulon Kwartin."

An investigation upon our arrival in Tel Aviv disclosed to me the following facts, which should be of interest to our Department of State:

On the night of August 26, a band of 50 Arabs, armed with guns, invaded Mr. Kwartin's orange grove, 3 miles from the Jewish settlement of Hedera. The vandals held up the three watchmen, and within a few hours uprooted approximately 4,000 trees, valued at about $16,000, without counting the loss of income to the proprietor involved in the destruction.

Now 2 months earlier the same grove had been similarly invaded and several hundred trees then uprooted. Mr. Kwartin had applied to the district police office at Rehovoth for permission to keep on the property a number of armed constables. His request was flatly refused. He was permitted to supply his laborers temporarily with two shotguns.

Toward the end of July, a police patrol searched the grove and found one shotgun and one old Turkish rifle in the possession of the chief watchman, who had apparently failed to renew his license. The arms were seized, the watchman and his two helpers were arrested. The grove was left without any protection, at the very time when the owner was frantically trying to secure from the higher authorities a special police guard.

Three days before the destruction of the orange grove, on August 23, Mr. Kwartin went to the deputy district superintendent of police and to the assistant district commissioner of Gaza to plead that at least four special constables be placed on his plantation. The situation in the country was tense. The answer he received was:

"The matter is receiving attention."

Following the devastation of the grove on the night of August 26, the desperate Mr. Kwartin requested of the authorities in Gaza that a British officer be entrusted with the investigation of the act of vandalism. Instead, an Arab officer was assigned to the case. When we were in Tel Aviv, the culprits had not yet been discovered.

A week after the invasion, on August 31, Mr. Kwartin received from police headquarters in Jaffa a notice that his application for armed constables had been refused.

Scores of thousands of trees, planted with love and sacrifice, have been destroyed in the Holy Land in recent months. Homesteads, barns, livestock have been destroyed by fire. Factories have been burned to the ground. Much of the damage suffered was sustained by American citizens.

There is considerable evidence available that the indifference of the local authorities is responsible for the continuation of the reign of terror. It is, indeed, a mockery that while the British Army in Palestine is striving to extinguish the blaze of arson and assassination, many of the civilian officers are either wittingly or unwittingly encouraging the spread of that blaze.

Mr. Kwartin, a cantor of international repute, moved to Palestine under twofold assurances As a Jew, he went there to participate in the rebuilding of the Jewish national home guaranteed by Great Britain and all the nations of the world, including the United States. As an American citizen, he went there with the knowledge and belief that the solemn treaty existing between the British Government and the United States was intended to protect American nationals and interests.

In the course of our investigation we received many complaints from injured settlers in Palestine, indicating that the terror is not due to the inability, but to the unwillingness, of the British to cope with it effectively.

In Palestine, as elsewhere, a policy of yielding to violence begets more violence. As our inquiry progressed it became clearer that both Jews and Arabs who were bent on pursuing their peaceful labors were suffering from the malfeasance of the mandatory administration of the country.

ARTICLE 6

Next to the great sanitation work carried out in Panama by American genius there has been no greater achievement in the field of public health anywhere in the world than the sanitation program put into effect in Palestine by American Jews.

Into a land infested with malaria, reeking with disease, peopled by backward and superstitious races, the Zionist pioneers brought the most modern methods of preserving human life and health. The best that we have in America has been transplanted and successfully established in the Holy Land.

At a moment when Arab terrorists were assassinating Jewish nurses and planning bombing in Jewish playgrounds it was inspiring to visit the Nathan Straus Health Centers and Hadassah Hospitals where the work of mercy was being carried on in the interests of both Jews and Arabs.

Even the shocking murder of the two young Jewish nurses at Jaffa, a few days before our arrival in Palestine, served to emphasize the Jewish contribution to the welfare of the Arab people. For the two sisters of mercy were killed while reporting to work at a hospital filled mostly with patients belonging to the race of their murderers.

The inscription over the door of the Nathan Straus Health Center in Jerusalem, "For all races and creeds," epitomized to me the broad humanitarian character of the Jewish reconstruction work. Knowing and loving Mr. Straus and having talked with him many times years ago about his plans for Palestine, I rejoiced to see how fully they have been realized.

The death and infant mortality rates in Palestine show a steady and unusual decline during the last decade. The death rate mong the Jews fell from 13.45 to 8.57 per thousand from 1927 to 1935. Among non-Jews the corresponding reduction was from 31.4 to 22.3. During the same period the infant mortality rate dropped from 115.3 to 64 among Jews and from 213.4 to 146 among non-Jews.

Who would have thought a decade ago that the infant mortality rate in Palestine would be among the lowest in the world and approximate that of the healthiest cities in the United States? In the adjacent Arab countries that rate is nearly twice as high as in the Holy Land.

Where in the Near East, and, in fact, all of Asia, is there to be found a public-health budget per head of the population comparable with that of Palestine? Although the Jews contribute the major part of the Government's revenue, the Palestine health budget is devoted mainly to the needs of the Arabs. The Jewish Health Service is almost self-supporting.

The total health expenditure in Palestine is over three times as high as that of the highest of the neighboring countries.

More than $2,000,000 have been expended by Jewish public funds on drainage works, resulting in an amazing reduction in malaria cases. The superior efforts at the improvement of health conditions in Palestin are further illustrated by the fact the Holy Land imports per head of population five times as much medicine as Egypt and three and one-half times as much as Syria.

Take such an American commonplace as the pasteurization of milk. When our party reached Egypt on the way to Palestine, we were warned not to drink milk or consume any dairy products. For days we touched no butter. Pasteurized milk is almost unknown in the Near East.

But in the Nathan Straus Health Center in Jerusalem I found a modern pasteurization plant, installed by the Hadassah organization some years ago. And the children in the various clinics bore witness to the value of fine milk and other modern facilities and care given them.

This health center and that of Tel Aviv, which I inspected, are model institutions, equipped with experimental kitchens, dental clinics, nurseries, prenatal and postnatal dispensaries, visiting nurse services, and excellent medical staffs.

As a former health commissioner of the city of New York I could not fail to recognize the monumental progress in the preservation of human life made in Palestine by the Jewish settlers, aided by their coreligionists throughout the world.

As a United States Senator conducting an inquiry into the general status of the Jewish National Home under the mandate, I could not but feel outraged over the wanton destruction of innocent children's lives in the country, due to a lax government.

When I returned from my inspection of the health center in Jerusalem, where the tots romped about me so gaily, I found a copy of a letter addressed to the high commissioner waiting for me. It had been penned by the bereaved grandmother of three little children who, together with their father, were murdered in their beds on the night of August 13 by Arab rebels. The letter read:

"Self-assured and with a fearful calm, the murderers stood shooting their bullets one by one into the hearts of the children. * * * After they had shot their bullets at two of the children, whose souls departed at once, I threw a sheet over the third child and sat upon it to protect him, but the murderer flung me off the sheet, wounded me and shot the death-dealing bullets at my third grandchild before my eyes and the eyes of the unhappy mother, who never ceased entreating the murderers to leave her at least one child alive. * * *

"Were they not killed because the representatives of the government in the town did not provide any guard for their lives? Yes. They fell as sacrifices to the dreadful mistakes of your government representatives. And from whom can I demand the blood of these sacrifices?

"Your Excellency, you have, to be sure, seen more than enough bloodshed in your life. But have you also seen the blood of children on their cots? Have you also seen the blood of a babe gushing across its mother's knees?"

ARTICLE 7

With sandbags lining the observation roof of the Hebrew University and barbed-wire gates barring the road to Mount Scopus, on which it is situated, the condition confronting that astonishing center of learning in Jerusalem brought home to us as nothing else in Palestine did, the great tragedy of the people of the Book.

If there be a modern prophet in Israel, Dr. Judah L. Magnes, the chancellor of the Hebrew University, a native of the United States, comes nearest in my opinion to that stature. A firm believer in peace between the Jews and the Arabs, he continues to reside in an Arab quarter of the city in spite of imminent peril to his family.

I have seen many universities in Europe and in the United States in my lifetime. But the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, which is only 10 years old, impressed us all as an incomparable achievement.

It was thrilling to go through the University Museum of Biblical Botany, where the plants mentioned in the Bible are on exhibition. It was fascinating to stand in the Untermyer Open Air Theater on the university grounds and behold the magnificent panorama stretching as far as the Dead Sea and the Jordan.

It was impressive to walk through the fireproof stalls of the university library containing more than 300,000 volumes, the largest collection in the Near and Middle East.

The departments of the university cover a vast range of subjects, from the Bible to chemistry, from archaeology to physics, from Arabic history to cancer research. All of the courses are conducted in the Hebrew of the Bible, which has become once more a living tongue in Palestine.

Despite the terror in the country, plans were being completed while we were in Jerusalem for the laying of the cornerstone of the medical center of the university. The Jewish Physicians' Committee of the United States, in cooperation with Hadassah, has been mainly instrumental in creating the building fund for the new institution.

The medical and the lay public will be surprised to learn, as I was, that Jerusalem harbors one of the finest cancer research institutes in the world. It is now housed in the Nathan Straus Health Center, but is part of the university, and will be transferred to the medical center when it is constructed.

It was my good fortune, as a medical man, to meet Professor Halberstaedter, one of Europe's greatest cancer radiologists, now a refugee from Germany. We were joined by Prof. B. Zondek, numbered among the world's leading gynaecologists. Both of these renowned medical authorities are associated with the university.

Many other leading physicians from central Europe have migrated to Palestine. It is no exaggeration to say that their presence would grace the leading medical schools in the United States.

Palestine bids fair to become a universal center of education, if the Jewish national home is allowed to develop unhindered. In Haifa our party visited the Hebrew Institute of Technology, founded through the munificence of the late Jacob Schiff, of New York. The shops and the laboratories of the institution testified to the ability of Jewish youth to master the applied sciences.

New building materials which were being tested there showed how the Jews are making use of the advance in modern science in the reconstruction of the Holy Land.

In Tel Aviv I had occasion to inspect the Balfour High School, as modern a school of its kind as is to be found anywhere in America. The enthusiasm of the teachers was most revealing. Incidentally, this newest city in the world boasts of a 100-percent school attendance. The entire elementary school system of Tel Aviv is maintained almost entirely at the expense of the Jewish municipality.

The mandatory government is entrusted with the maintenance of the educational system in Palestine. Actually it supports almost entirely the Arab schools, but grants about 14 percent of the budget of the Jewish public

school system. The Jewish National Council stressed this point to us as evidenc of discrimination against the Jews and of the benefits accruing to the Arabs from revenue largely derived from the Jewish population.

The total public-school expenditure in Palestine, on a per capita basis, is four times as great as that in the adjacent Transjordania, and nearly three times as great as that of Iraq, the latter two ccuntries being almost exclusively Arabic.

In Palestine, 1 out of every 11 of the population is a school child. Across the Jordan, where no Jews are to be found, 1 out of every 27 is provided with schooling facilities.

As our survey progressed it became ever clearer to us that the Jews brought to Palestine an improvement in social welfare which is still undreamed of in the neighboring Arab countries. They poured into the desolate Holy Land their boundless energy, large streams of capital, and scientific abilities. Within 15 years the Zionist pioneers raised the standard of living of the entire population to a level which stands out high above that the Asiatic environment.

Yet the peaceful march of civilization in Palestine was being challenged before our very eyes by certain violent agitators among the Arabs, who demanded the stoppage of Jewish immigration. The reign of terror in the land plainly showed that economic blessings do not spell political peace. In Palestine, as elsewhere, a virus is at work which was designed to destroy the best gains of civilization.

ARTICLE 8

There are really two strikes going on in Palestine. One is conducted by Arab terrorists who throw bombs and snipe at passers-by in the streets and on the highways. The other is conducted silently by the Mandatory Government of Palestine against the proper administration of justice.

The prolongation of the terror in the Holy Land is due, in a large measure, to a manifest sympathy for the vandals and assassins displayed by many officials who are sworn to uphold the law.

It is an inconceivable but indisputable fact, too, that not a single capital conviction was handed down by the courts of the country during the first 4 months of the terrorist campaign.

Yet during that period hundreds were killed, other hundreds were wounded in many bloody attacks, including dozens of British soldiers, and scores of terrorists were seized while perpetrating their crimes.

During our stay in Jerusalem the press of Palestine, and even that of England, furnished ample evidence of this unique state of affairs, creating a condition which could not but shock any American observer. At the height of the terror 25 interned Arabs were released from the concentration camp. Cases against terrorists were dismissed by judges on flimsy technicalities. There was daily proof, if not of official encouragement, at least, of no apparent discouragement to the murderers and lawbreakers.

What an astonishing situation. Here was a government solemnly pledged to the establishment of a Jewish national home. Here was an open and ugly rebellion conducted by the foul means of assassination, which spared not women and children. And here was the most vital branch of the Government apparently flagrantly obstructing the machinery of justice.

The Palestine judiciary is part of the civil service of the mandatory government which is nothing but a trustee for the Jewish national home.

An investigation disclosed that about 50 percent of the total number of judges of the supreme court are Arabs and about 75 percent of all district officers in the country are Arabs.

In addition, a considerable number of English judges and court officials sworn to carry out the provisions of the mandate could not disguise their opposition to the mandate and their prejudices in favor of the rebels.

Three days before our arrival in Palestine, an Arab terrorist, Ahmad Mustafa, was arrested by the military during an engagement with a large Arab band. At that moment there was a widespread outbreak of violence in various parts of the country.

The case came up on August 31 before Judge Sherwell, the president of the district court of Haifa. The prisoner was charged with possessing ammunition when caught. Lance Corporals Tetlow and Atkinson gave evidence.

The prosecutor was Ibrahim Bitar. Judge Sherwell acquitted the prisoner and censured the prosecution for failing to present the prisoner 4 days earlier.

A similar striking example occurred in Jerusalem when another judge dismissed the case of an Arab terrorist charged with murder, because the chief witness, a British Army officer, had been temporarily called out of the country in the performance of his duty. Instead of continuing the case, the court set the prisoner free.

On August 26, the Palestine Court of Appeal reduced a number of sentences passed upon Arabs caught at the scenes of their crimes.

One Abdullah Ghazawi, who had been sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment for setting fire to crops in Herzlia, was given a new sentence of 1 to 3 years.

Another convict, Yusef Yacoub, sentenced to 5 years' hard labor for being in possession of a pistol, had his sentence quashed by the court of appeals.

There are innumerable cases on record which serve to create the impression that many of the Palestine judges and magistrates are coddling the terrorists, thereby encouraging murder, and palpably violating their oaths of office.

Many such cases have been cited in petitions and memoranda submitted to the High Commissioner by responsible bodies without any seeming effect.

On the other hand the judiciary shows no leniency in its treatment of Jewish prisoners, despite the fact that the Jews are under attack in their own national home. That they have displayed exemplary self-restraint under extraordinary provocation, was volunteered to me by the High Commissioner himself.

There was the case of two young Jewish watchmen in Jerusalem who were sentenced to 6 and 7 years' hard labor respectively for carrying arms. These watchmen, it was not denied by the prosecution, were defending property in the section where shooting was common.

This was not an isolated case. The records show numerous instances of Jews receiving heavy sentences when arrested in the course of resisting Arab attacks, and under circumstances where no police or military protection was available.

While we were in the country two Arabs who had been seized in the act of attacking soldiers were brought to trial. The court acquitted the bandits of the capital charge of shooting at the soldiers on the technicality of the delay in preparing the case, and sentenced them to 7 years' imprisonment for possessing rifles.

The plain fact is that the British judiciary is sabotaging the British military in Palestine in spite of the state of warfare.

"It is hardly fair to the soldiers who risk their lives to let them think that those who shoot at them, if caught, may escape with 7 years' imprisonment," observed the Palestine Review of August 28 regarding this astonishing decision. Similar comments were heard by us.

How can the terror be stamped out in Palestine when the civil service in effect stimulates civil disobedience? How can the mandatory trusteeship for Palestine be fulfilled when many of the trustees are unfaithful to their trust?

How can the lives of 12,000 American nationals of Jewish faith in the Holy Land be safeguarded under our treaty with Great Britain when the Palestine judiciary treat the mandate as a scrap of paper and abuse justice in a manner which cries to heaven?

ARTICLE 9

If you would behold a living monument to individual initiative and the eternal pioneering spirit in man, in these days of collectivist regimentation, go to Tel Aviv, the magic city on the blue Mediterranean in Palestine.

Without any 5-year plans, without the drive of dictatorship, there has arisen on the sands of the desert this modern city, the only new city built in the world since the great war.

The story of Tel Aviv is the story of modern Palestine. The first entirely Jewish city of our times, with a population of nearly 150,000, Tel Aviv throbs with the energy and zeal of a wandering people at last come into its own.

When our party left Jerusalem to drive to Tel Aviv, escorted by the usual machine-gun crew, there was still fresh in our minds the protest of certain Arab leaders against Jewish immigration into Palestine on the ground that the Jewish settlers were displacing the Arabs.

When at the end of our drive through the barren hillsides there came suddenly into view the city of Tel Aviv, it furnished a striking and irrefutable answer to the Arab claim. But two decades ago a desolate stretch of desert covered the area of the city which now harbors almost 40 percent of the entire Jewish population in the Holy Land.

Tel Aviv is no mushroom town. Its 355 streets, its boulevards and theaters, its shops and cafes, its factories and schools, its superb beach, modern hotels, playgrounds, and massive residential quarters, fully justify Sir Herbert Samuel's description of it as "Palestine's city of miracles."

Perhaps it would be even more fitting to describe Tel Aviv as the city of the healthy children. All of us were equally impressed by the extraordinary physical appearance of the children of Tel Aviv. It was clear that they owe their vigor not only to an outdoor life in continuous sunshine, but also to the emphasis on child welfare underlying the policy of the Jewish national home.

Tel Aviv is a melting pot of Jewish immigrants from over 50 different countries. Here sturdy refugees from Salonika and Yemen rub elbows with their coreligionists who were compelled to flee from Russia and Germany. More than 15,000 refugees from the latter country settled in Tel Aviv in the last 2 years.

The industrialization of Palestine is reflected most in this modern city which houses about 1,600 industrial plants, giving employment to about 30,000 workers. The manufactures include textiles, electrical appliances, building materials, chemical products, and even artificial teeth in the first establishment of its kind in the Near East.

We visited this plant which supplies false teeth as far east as Siam and as far west as London. It was a revelation of the industrial possibilities of the Holy Land in relation to the markets at its disposal. Many of the Tel Aviv factories are running even now on two shifts, turning out products for export to the neighboring countries.

A vital factor in making Palestine a center of international trade is the Levant Fair, the grounds of which we inspected at Tel Aviv. Here several foreign nations have permanent exhibition buildings. This fair promises to do for Palestine what Leipzig does for Germany and what Nizhni-Novgorod used to do for Russia once—to serve as a mart for far-flung traders.

Yet, even in Tel Aviv, which is the safest place in Palestine today, the specter of the terror was felt. In one of the buildings of the Levant Fair we saw a large company of Jewish youths enrolled as special constables undergoing military drill. The city is rigidly policed by regulars and volunteers along its boundaries. Within Tel Aviv there is now but a handful of police, yet crime is almost unknown.

In spite of the guards in the environs Arab terrorists occasionally slip through in the night. A time bomb was planted in this manner in the sand of a playground, and only by its accidental discovery was a tragedy of major dimensions averted.

The municipal authorities of Tel Aviv, led by Acting Mayor Rokach and by the president of the American Jewish Association, Nathan D. Kaplan, formerly of Chicago, met us upon our arrival at the city gate. There was a grand reception in our honor at the town hall, where a huge American flag was on display.

Later we met the notables of Tel Aviv and the representatives of the American Jewish colonies who came from their farms especially to greet us. In addition to the valuable information furnished to us, we felt during our stay the pulse of invincible youth in the ancient Hebrew people and the undying spirit of a reborn race of pioneers in a decaying old world.

ARTICLE 10

At the very heart of the Palestine knot is the problem of immigration.

The execution of the mandate entrusted to Great Britain is organically connected with it. The Arab "strike" is based mainly on that capital issue. The development of the country is entirely dependent upon immigration. The solution of the Jewish tragedy in central and eastern Europe is largely related to the absorptive capacity of Palestine.

As a member of the Committee on Immigration of the United States Senate who has wrestled for years with this problem, I was especially interested in its various phases. Many thousands of relatives of naturalized American citizens have in recent years found their only available refuge in Palestine.

In 1935 alone, 62,000 Jewish immigrants were admitted into the Holy Land, a number which equals the annual influx into the United States in the prewar years when immigration was unrestricted. How was a country as small as Palestine able to absorb them, and how did they affect the economic and political conditions in their new home?

A study of the records even on the way to Palestine revealed a number of authoritative reports, compiled by British officials as well as certain Jewish and Arab experts as recently as 8 years ago, which conclusively proved that Palestine was economically unfit to absorb any appreciable stream of immigrants.

The reality belied these authorities. In the last 4 years alone the Jewish population of Palestine was doubled. The total population of the country increased from 757,000 in 1922 to 1,315,000 in 1935, a rise of two-thirds. During the corresponding period the population of Egypt increased only 13 percent.

Yet, we found no unemployment in Palestine. The incoming settlers are absorbed by the thriving industries as rapidly as they land. Tel Aviv took in more than half of all the Jewish immigrants during the 4-year period. Haifa increased its Jewish population by 34,000 since 1931. Jerusalem added some 16,000 new residents in the same period.

What has been the effect of this Jewish immigration upon the Arab population? Did it provide a justifiable cause for the political agitators and terrorists among the Arabs?

The Moslem population showed its greatest growths precisely in those centers where the Jewish immigration was largest. The striking feature was disclosed by an inquiry into official statistics. The Arab community in Haifa increased by 117 percent since 1922. In Jerusalem, the corresponding growth was 47 percent. In Jaffa, which adjoins Tel Aviv, the increase in the Arab community was 69 percent.

On the other hand, the Arab towns far removed from the zones of Jewish development show for the same period but an insignificant growth, such as 12 percent for Jenin, 8 percent for Nablus, and an actual decrease for Gaza.

Has Jewish immigration been the cause of Arab emigration? Before the war, the Arabs were migrating from Palestine by the thousands. Since the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home, the Arabs in neighboring Syria, under a French mandate, have been emigrating at the rate of 9,500 annually.

Over 100,000 Arabs from the surrounding countries entered Palestine as immigrants since the beginning of the Jewish development of the country. This striking fact is but part of the tale of the new Palestine. For even more remarkable has been the total increase of the non-Jewish population of the country since 1922. It shows a growth of nearly 40 percent in 14 years. It is a growth which surpasses by nearly 12 percent that of the rapidly increasing population of Japan during the same period.

What a commentary on the prosperity brought to Palestine by the Jewish pioneers. But what accounts for this tremendous rise in the Arab community? Surely not a sudden expansion of the birth rate. Our survey showed that the main cause of the population rise was due to a decrease in the Arab death and infant mortality rates and to a raised standard of living.

Both the Arab and the Jewish populations retain their rural and urban ratios of distribution. In spite of the great tide of immigration, about three-quarters of all the Jews in the country settled in cities and one-quarter remained on the land. The claim of some Arabs that the Jews were acquiring their land is disproved by Government figures showing that the proportion of Moslems engaged in agriculture in relation to their urban population has remained constant.

Today the Jews of Palestine number about 30 percent of the total population. By their performance they have demonstrated that there is room in Palestine, including Transjordania, for millions more of their persecuted brethren if the British Government carries out the terms of the mandate for the facilitation of Jewish immigration.

ARTICLE 11

In the recurrent bloody strife between the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine, the agents of Moscow have been quick to exploit the opportunities for their own ends. In the present reign of terror, according to information we gleaned in Jerusalem, the Communists early joined the campaign by inciting the Arabs against the Jewish settlers.

In my candid opinion, there is no more solid anti-Communist body in the world than the 400,000 Jewish people in the Holy Land. Many of them hail from Russia where Zionism is persecuted and the Hebrew tongue outlawed. One of our chauffeurs was a Jewish youth typical of this class of immigrants. He had been exiled to Siberia for his Zionist beliefs. His mother arrived in Palestine on the day our party landed in Haifa. She had buried her husband in Siberian exile and was ransomed from Soviet captivity by her son.

The powerful Palestine Federation of Labor, which numbers nearly 100,000 members, and which represent virtually all the Jewish workers in the country, has a standing rule which automatically bars any Communist from joining a labor union.

We were reliably informed that the Jewish section of the Communist Party in Palestine numbered less than 200 persons. It was difficult to ascertain the extent of the Arab Communist movement.

The recent policy of Moscow has been to aline the Communist with the Arab nationalists, under the disguise of a united front, and to identify the Zionist leadership with British imperialism. The latter has been done despite the obvious cleavage between the responsible Jewish leaders and the British authorities.

The policy of the Jewish community in Palestine, in the face of Communist proclamations encouraging massacre, has been to deliver known Communists to the authorities for deportation. A group of such deportees was being taken in a prison car to the Haifa port in the same train which carried us there on the way out of Palestine.

The Palestine Review, leading Jewish weekly of the country, commented:

"It is impossible to give as yet a complete account of the atrocious part played by the Communists, Jewish as well as Arab, in the present riots. The facts so far known suffice to make it amply clear that they have been even more active than in 1929.

"Never were the Jews of Palestine so deeply revolted as now by these activities * * * and never were they as determined to rid Palestine of the Jewish section at least of its Communist Party."

In the course of our investigation of this phase of the terror, we received from a high official source the text of a Communist proclamation, issued in Haifa this August, written in English, and addressed:

"To all British soldiers, members of the navy and the air forces in Palestine and Transjordania."

This remarkable document described the terrorist strike as "the struggle of the working masses in Palestine for liberation."

It took up the agitation for an "independent Arab federation" of all Arab countries. It proceeded to fan Arab nationalism by representing Palestine as "an organic part of Syria," torn away by imperialistic Great Britain and turned over to the latter's "partner"—Zionism.

"And what is the purpose of this partnership?" read the text of the appeal, giving answer as follows:

"An eternal subjugation, cruel suppression, limitless exploitation of all inhabitants of the country. And all this for what purpose? For the creation of a Zionist state, which will serve as a secure point of support in order to get out the highest possible profits for the British-Zionist capital!

"The Arabs will become a minority in their own country, and on the ruins of their cities and villages shall be built by the Zionists * * * under the protection of the British bayonets, a new dominion, a national home for the international capital.

"Limitless suffering has been caused to the working masses by the Zionists, who are evicting them from their lands and robbing them of their places of work, and by the British imperialists who are sucking out the country's sap and are shedding the blood of its inhabitants."

The proclamation then proceeded to call on the British soldiers and marines to join the Arab insurgents. It closed with the following battle-cry:

"Long live the Soviet Government, a government of deputies of workers' and peasants' councils, in a federative republic of all the working people of the Arab countries!

"Long live Soviet England!

"Long live the world social revolution!"

This document indicated to us that Moscow was ready to take over the most bigoted arguments in order to foster civil war. It offered proof that while the Soviet Government was attempting to fraternize with Great Britain in Europe, it wielded the assassin's knife in the East. And it furnished evidence, if any was needed, that the Communist international still adhered as firmly as ever to the cause of world revolution.

ARTICLE 12

While the Arab High Committee in charge of the strike is officially demanding the prohibition of the sale of land to Jews, some of the prominent Arab leaders active in that committee are quietly trying to sell land to Jewish buyers.

Several such cases were brought to our attention. The most striking of these involved no less a personage than T. A. Husseini, a relative of the Grand Mufti, the religious head of all the Moslems in Palestine, and the dominant figure in the present strike. The Husseini family exercises an almost dynastic influence upon the political and economic life of the Arab population.

The strike in Palestine broke out on April 19, with the avowed purpose of bringing about a stoppage of Jewish immigration and acquisition of land. Twelve days later, at the very height of the Arab movement, T. A. Husseini, of Jerusalem, addressed in his own handwriting a letter to a prospective Jewish customer in Tel Aviv, offering to sell to him four plots of land. A facsimile of the letter is in our possession.

An interesting feature of this attempted transaction is that the intermediary, Mr. Fuad Farah, is one of the Arab leaders of Jaffa, where the strike was particularly violent at the time.

The cry of the Arab strike leaders has been that the Jewish colonies are robbing the Arab fellahin (peasants) of their land. The evidence disclosed by our investigation revealed that the Arab effendis (landowners) are the sellers of large tracts of land to the Jews. Yet these very effendis, who are not compelled to sell their holdings, incite the Arab peasants against Jewish acquisition of land.

Many of the tracts owned by wealthy Arabs have been assembled during the last 15 years from the neediest Arab peasants, at the lowest possible prices, to be disposed of at high profits to Jewish settlers.

It was, however, somewhat of a surprise to discover that the Jews own altogether but 5 percent of the land in Palestine, although they form 30 percent of the population. In view of this fact, the agitation against the sale of land to Jews seemed to us to be purely artificial in origin and political in purpose.

Moreover, an analysis of the official records showed that the Palestine Government has consistently discriminated against the Jews and favored the Arabs in the disposition of state lands.

The mandate for Palestine contains an unequivocal undertaking, to "encourage * * * close settlement by Jews on the land, including state lands and waste lands not required for public purposes."

Has the mandatory government carried out this provision in good faith? It has not.

The government of Palestine came into the ownership of 945,141 dunams (a dunam is one-quarter of an acre) of state lands. In view of the solemn obligation imposed upon it by the mandate, it is of moment to trace the distribution of this area among the Arabs and the Jews.

Nearly 149,000 dunams, or 15.7 percent of this area, were leased by the government to Arabs. Over 532,000 dunams, or 56.3 percent, have passed out of the hands of the government into Arabic possession. Thus 72 percent of the state lands went to Arabs.

The total of state lands leased or concessioned to Jews amounts to 50,483 dunams, or 5.3 percent. This is what happened under an administration committed to the encouragement of Jewish settlement on the land. The remaining 22.7 percent of this area is either owned by the government or is under litigation.

Now, what happened to the state lands which passed into Arab and Jewish hands? A typical and illuminating case is that of the Hule concession, comprising 57,000 dunams, leased by the government to Selim Bey Salam of Beyrouth, Syria. One-half of this area was swampland.

The Arab concessionaire immediately entered into negotiations with the Zionist organization for the sale of his lease. The deal was consummated at a price of $1,000,000. The Jewish holders undertook to spend another $5,000,000 for the reclamation of the land. Before consenting to the transaction, the government exacted the condition that 15,000 dunams of the improved land be turned over by the Jews to the Arab squatters.

Under the mandate, the Jews had a prior claim to the purchase of the land. Under the original concession, the tract yielded a handsome profit to an Arab from Syria. Under the present arrangement, the Jews are redeeming thousands of acres for Arab cultivators at a cost of $1,500,000. When the reclamation is completed, the balance of the land left in the hands of the Jews will cost them about $600 an acre.

One could go on citing other illustrations of large tracts of land turned over to Arabs by the government, on easy terms, which are not being cultivated or developed. They are being held for speculative purposes. Whenever parcels in these areas do pass into the hands of Jewish settlers, the face of the land is immediately changed by the labor and enthusiasm of the Zionist pioneers.

No impartial observer of Palestine today could find any basis for the agitation against the extension of Jewish agriculture, which has set the pace for the rebirth of the Holy Land.

ARTICLE 13

We met and visited with many of the Arab leaders during our survey of conditions in Palestine. Fairness requires the statement that we found them to be a highly cultured and charming class of people. Among the Christian Arabs there are numerous physicians and lawyers and journalists of ability.

There is a wide chasm dividing the upper sphere of Arabs and the great mass of their race. From the time the Arabs conquered Palestine, 13 centuries ago, there has prevailed what is in effect a feudal system, both economic and social.

Wealth and influence among the Arabs are centralized in a small number of effendi families, the landowners. These are split into parties by deep-seated rivalries and bitter competition for religious as well as political leadership.

In the main, the ruling Arab clans fall into two major camps, one headed by the Husseini family and the other by the Nashashibi family. According to the evidence gathered by us, the British exploited this rivalry in their political maneuvers.

It has been the aim of the mandatory government to prevent the concentration of too much power in one Arab family or group. The policy of dividing the plums was therefore adopted. Amen Husseini was made grand mufti and president of the Supreme Moslem Council. Ragheb Nashashibi was made mayor of Jerusalem. Unfortunately for the British and for the peace of Palestine, this balance of power was upset by the defeat of the mayor in the last municipal election, and a Husseini elected in his stead.

To repair the damage, the High Commissioner advanced the proposal for a legislative council. Although designed to solve peacefully the existing differences between the Jews and the Arabs, the council also represented a scheme to restore the balance of power among the effendi families, the landowners. The defeated mayor was to become the president of the legislative council, according to report.

The High Commissioner was to receive the power to appoint a sufficient number of members to insure proper control.

The Grand Mufti and the Husseinis violently opposed the plan. Jewish leadership also adopted a negative attitude toward it. The British Parliament vetoed the proposed reform, but not before the outbreak of the riots and the attacks on the Jewish settlers.

Temporarily the divided Arab interests joined hands on the issue of the mandate and Jewish colonization. The Grand Mufti sponsored the demand for the stoppage of Jewish immigration and for the prohibition of land sales to Jews. The strike really became an attempt to nullify the mandate and the provision for the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

One of the Arab spokesmen in Jerusalem, to whom we are indebted for generous entertainment, even advanced the theory to us that the mandate represents an instrument illegally conceived and executed. He founded this conclusion on certain secret promises allegedly made by British representatives to Arab leaders in the early stages of the World War.

It is a theory which we cannot accept. If any such promises have been made by one or another power, they could not but have been tentative. The war was won by the Allies collectively. No matter what the Arabs elsewhere did, those of Palestine did not contribute to the victory. The mandate was set up by the joint decision of the Allies, with the express consent of the United States. Until it is repealed or modified by some method yet unknown, it must stand as the last word of those who broke the shackles of Turkish bondage.

Great stress was placed by Arab spokesmen, in their conversations with us, upon the claim that many Jews have entered Palestine illegally. Our personal observation convinced us that the numbers smuggled into Palestine must be very small, for the frontier control is remarkably efficient. The official Government report shows that in 1935 there were 7,874 persons remaining in the country illegally. Of this number only slightly more than one-half were Jews.

It must be emphasized that immigration into Palestine is highly regulated on a selective basis. A financial test is imposed upon all admissions. Many are required to possess $5,000 or more upon entering the country. Skilled artisans must produce a substantial sum of money, while immigrants with a minimum earning capacity are held down to a mere handful.

We found no evidence that immigration into Palestine has been excessive. Yet London by its very passivity encouraged certain elements in Palestine to believe that under political pressure, the mandatory government may actually suspend all immigration for the sake of a truce.

ARTICLE 14

Palestine is the key to a vast territory, to great oil deposits, to regions of vital value to Great Britain. Its loss by the British Empire might be fatal to its interests in India, in Egypt, and the Suez Canal zone.

Fifteen years ago the British regarded Palestine in a different light. In a letter to Secretary of State Hughes, dated January 13, 1922, the late Lord Balfour wrote:

"The task which the British Government has undertaken in Palestine is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. At Paris I always warmly advocated that it should be undertaken, not by Britain, but by the United States of America, and though subsequent events have shown me that such a policy would never have commended itself to the American people I still think that, so far as the Middle East is concerned, it would have been best."

Lord Balfour was right. It would have been far better for the Middle East and for Palestine to entrust the mandate to America. Of course, it could not have been done because of our traditional attitude of opposition to foreign alliances and entanglements.

But the doubtful gift of 15 years ago has now become a coveted prize, thanks to the astonishing transformation of the land by the Jews. Its value as a maritime frontier, its newly discovered mineral resources, its unforeseen agricultural and industrial potentialities, have been brought to light by the Zionist development.

The international status of Palestine, however, remains unchanged. It is not a British colony or possession. It is held in trust by Great Britain under the mandate. The mandatory is responsible to the League of Nations for its proper administration. It is responsible to the Government of the United States under special treaty, for the execution of the mandate.

Now the Government of Palestine is in power by virtue of the terms of the mandate, which is the supreme law of Palestine. The Government of Palestine must carry out these terms correctly, firmly, and fairly, without prejudice or favor, but it cannot alter the basic law, nor can it formulate policies which violate international undertakings.

"We can return a mandate if we find that we cannot carry it out or if we object to its terms," declared Lloyd George in the House of Commons on June 19, 1936, 2 months after the outbreak of the present terror in Palestine. The war statesman, who was intimately identified with the launching of the mandate, went on to say:

"Then the League of Nations can consider whether they will hand the mandate over to somebody else * * *. But we cannot forget the obligations of the mandate. They are obligations of honor, and, as the Secretary of State has said, we cannot go back upon it * * *. The obligations of the mandate are specific and definite. They are to encourage the establishment of a national home for Jews without detriment to any of the rights of the Arab population * * *. The Arabs are demanding practically that there shall be no more Jewish immigration. We cannot accept that without dishonoring our obligations."

No one can question that it is the duty of the mandatory to guard against the admission of immigrants beyond the capacity of the country to employ them. But to yield on the issue of immigration under the pressure of political agitation and highway terror is another matter.

A pertinent observation on this point is to be found in the blue white paper, published by the New Zionist, in criticism of the official Zionist policy. "That no country can be colonized even to a hair's breadth beyond its economic capacity is a truism," reads the statement. It continues:

"But that capacity can be increased by judicious application of capital on the one hand, and of appropriate economic and social legislation on the other—exactly what is implied in a mandatory Government's obligation to further the development of Jewish colonization.

"Secondly, it is totally wrong to pretend that a country's 'absorptive capacity' is mainly conditioned by its acres, quality of its soil, cubic meters of running water, etc.

"Its 'capacity' depends, above all, on human conditions: First, on the quality of the colonizing element, its skill, endurance, devotion, resourcefulness, financial power, and world connections; secondly, on the action of the state. As to the first condition, the Jews are doing their share; what remains is to bring the state into line."

But how can the state—the British Government—be brought into line with its obligation? Our Government is a party to that obligation, by virtue of a pact with the British Sovereign.

It seems clear to me that our country cannot evade its responsibility under the treaty. We owe it to ourselves to inquire why the great British Empire has failed to make safe the small population of Palestine. It is our duty to find out why the mandatory power has done nothing to bring together the Arab and Jewish leaders in an effort to promote a lasting peace. It is our right to question the wisdom of bringing into the Palestinian conflict the neighboring Arab chiefs in the capacity of mediators, a policy calculated to fan the blaze and extend the warfare.

REPORT BY SENATOR WARREN R. AUSTIN

ARTICLE 1

The grounds for the inquiry conducted by the Hearst unofficial senatorial commission into the crisis in Palestine are rooted in solemn international agreements. Further cause of our inquiry into the serious events now disturbing the Holy Land is the presence there of many American nationals.

Great Britain, to whom was entrusted a mandate for the administration of Palestine which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire, is now confronted by demands of the Arab population involving either abrogation of the mandate or modification of it in the following essential obligations:

1. Closing of the doors to Jewish immigration.

2. Prohibition of the sale of land to Jews.

3. The establishment of a national government in Palestine.

These demands have been brought to the attention of the world through the medium of violence and terrorism, accompanying a strike against the mandatory government and the closing down of Arab commercial and industrial establishments.

These demands, being in conflict with the mandate, are of interest to the American people. The Government of the United States became a party to the mandate by virtue of the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924, signed by Frank B. Kellogg, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, and Joseph Austen Chamberlain, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and properly ratified by both governments.

The provisions of this treaty which have an especially important bearing upon America's concern in the situation in Palestine are cited here:

"Whereas the Government of the United States and the Government of His Britannic Majesty desire to reach a definite understanding with respect to the rights of the two Governments and their respective nationals in Palestine. * * * The President of the United States of America and His Britannic Majesty have decided to conclude a convention to this effect. * * *

"Article 1. Subject to the provisions of the present convention, the United States consents to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty, pursuant to the mandate recited above. * * *

"Article 7. Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

The express consent given by the United States to the British administration of the mandate for Palestine and the express assent of the United States required in any modification of the mandate, which is fully contained in the treaty, constitute legal sanctions for our inquiry.

Under this treaty, Americans are clearly entitled if not obligated to investigate the lawlessness, civil disobedience, and criminal conduct prevalent in Palestine, and to consider the grievances and demands for abrogation or modification of the mandate which are the objectives of the leaders of the strike and rebellion in the Holy Land.

The United States also has reason to consider the grievance of many Zionists against the divorcement of Trans-Jordan from the original territory of Palestine. The withholding of the benefits of the mandate from Trans-Jordan and the barring of Jewish immigration from there has been questioned as an unwarranted modification of the mandate.

In an exchange of notes between the parties to the British-American treaty, in August and September 1924, the undertaking was embodied that any changes which may be made in the administration of Trans-Jordan will not be of such a character as to conflict with the terms of the convention.

Moreover, the vigilance of American public opinion with regard to Palestine was expressed by both Houses of Congrress in a joint resolution adopted in 1922, which recognized the principle of the historic Balfour Declaration of 1917 in the following words:

"That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which many prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christians and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."

That is natural and appropriate for Americans to conduct an investigation into the Palestine problem is also evidenced by the standing invitation of Lord Balfour, extended in a letter to Secretary of State Hughes of January 13, 1922, as follows:

"The task which the British Government have undertaken in Palestine is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. * * * However this may be, the duty has devolved upon Great Britain, and I hope the American Government will do what they can to lighten the load."

Finally, American intellect, capital and labor have poured into Palestine a life-giving stream. Graduates of American agricultural colleges, technologists, experts in irrigation, water production, horticulture, swamp drainage, health service, industrial experimentation, research and education, and rabbis and religious instructors, all of American nationality, with an American base of operation, are actively promoting the redemption of the Holy Land.

These thousands of American nationals, whose ideal is the redemption of the Jewish people, went to Palestine under the guarantees of the mandate and the British-American Convention. Their welfare is legitimate ground for an inquiry into the present state of affairs in Palestine.

ARTICLE 2

The Hearst Commission to Palestine first visited Egypt and obtained a basis of comparison between the condition of the Arabs there and that of the Arabs in Palestine.

Palestine is about the same size as Vermont. It is surrounded by Arab countries which form a Moslem crescent whose horns reach the Mediterranean, the western boundary of Palestine. The circumscribed area comprehended in the Balfour Declaration and in the mandate, drafted in 1922, was pinched down in the east as far as the Jordan by an act of the British Government known as the Declaration of Amman of May 25, 1923.

By this act, the benefits of the mandate were withheld from Trans-Jordan and the existence of an independent Arab government, under Emir Abdullah Ibn Husseini, was recognized in the latter territory. The validity of this act has been frequently challenged by many Zionists.

The geographical and ethnological matrix which contains the Palestinian jewel now being cut cannot be carved off or disregarded. The location of the Jewish national home is in an area less than one-hundred-twentieth part of the whole area inhabited by Arabic-speaking peoples.

Vast stretches of desert, however, separate Palestine in the east and in the south from the great Arab centers of population and form natural protection barriers around the Holy Land where the right has been granted to the

Jewish people to establish a national home without prejudicing the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities.

Eighty percent of the blood that was in Palestine on the promulgation of the mandate had been there since long before Moses was put in the bullrushes, we were informed. The peasants were Canaanites. A very small percentage were Bedouins, who constituted the majority in Trans-Jordan. The remainder, save for the Jews, consisted of city dwellers representing a mixture of Arabs, Greeks, Byzantines, Romans, and others. The Jews were small in number relatively but were faithful keepers of the light of Judaism.

It is certain the Arabs of Palestine represent an amalgam; every invasion, Persian, Assyrian, Greek, and Crusader, left a residue in the land. The census of 1931 shows 60 languages and dialects spoken in Palestine.

It is undeniable the spiritual vigor and self-discipline on the part of the Jewish immigrants, and a determination to redeem the prostrate land of their forefathers and to erect a home for their race in the Promised Land, have achieved miraculous transformations there.

Deserts have become forests, swamps have become orchards and vineyards. "Milk and honey" has become again descriptive of that part of the land cultivated by the Jews. Health for Jews and Arabs alike has been promoted by the purification of the water and the amplification of its supply. Drainage, sewerage, and other hygienic works, and especially the health centers and the excellent hospitals and dispensaries operated by the Hadassah, have materially improved the lives of all the inhabitants.

The death and infant mortality rates within the last decade dropped sharply. Educational facilities were widely developed, culminating in excellent universities, both Jewish and Arabic. Palestine boasts the highest per capita school budget in the Near East.

The tendency of wages has been upward for Arabs, as a consequence of Jewish standards. The wage of unskilled Arab workmen in Palestine is twice as much as in Egypt and probably three times as much as it used to be before the coming of the Jews.

The opportunities for Arab employment have greatly increased. There are about 1,500 Arabs employed in Jewish industry and about 8,000 Arabs working in Jewish agricultural settlements. In 1921 there were 80 men employed as laborers in Haifa Harbor. In 1936 about 1,500 Arabs were employed there, thanks to the building of the new port by Jewish enterprise.

The value of land in Palestine has been raised beyond the wildest dreams of two decades ago. With the exception of 5 percent of the land owned by Jews, the Arabs control or possess all of the country. Because the Jewish settlers are eager to acquire land, Palestine represents in the real-estate field a buyers' market. A large stream of capital has in this fashion been poured into Arab coffers.

Notwithstanding the strike, capital and labor of Jews and Arabs have in some instances been working together in peace all along as in the case of the potash plant on the Dead Sea and the cement plant at Haifa.

The political and economic issues involved in the reconstruction of the Holy Land under the mandate compel the attention of American public opinion.

In addition, the monumental example, set by the Jews of Palestine, of obedience to constituted authority and exercise of self-restraint under terrific provocation during the prevailing terrorism justifies a sympathetic interest in the promotion of the national home for the Jews by all friends of humanity and peace.

ARTICLE 3

Palestine is probably the only country in the world today where the treasury can boast of a surplus adequate for 2 years of the Government's budget. This surplus has been accumulated during the last 4 years, when immigration was heaviest and the Government expenditures were on the increase.

This phenomenon is understandable in the light of the finding that about $450,000,000 of capital has been brought to Palestine by the Jews all over the world, and constructive use made of this huge fund in agriculture and industry and public works and services.

Measured on a per capita basis, each of the 250,000 Jewish immigrants who entered Palestine since the establishment of the mandate carried into the country $1,800. Of course, a substantial part of this sum represents endowments by coreligionists abroad.

This singular feature of the Jewish colonization of Palestine is emphasized by the fact that more than $50,000,000 had been invested by Jews at large, through national funds, without any expectation of a commercial return. These funds have been applied to the direct reclamation of the land, with benefits to all the inhabitants.

Palestine has escaped in a remarkable degree the excessive cost of capital which accompanied all colonizing projects. It suffers from no crushing or even moderately heavy interest burden. It has imported large amounts of capital, but its external debt is negligible.

"Other parts of the world have been developed principally by the pioneering labor of persons of little or no wealth, equipped with capital provided by a totally different body of people," observes the Review of the Midland Bank. "The result has been that year by year the developing country has had to provide, out of its own surplus or by fresh borrowings, a growing amount of funds abroad for interest on its external debts.

"In Palestine, by contrast, the settlers have brought with them the great bulk of the funds required for development, so that a relatively small obligation remains to remit abroad for interest."

Significant evidence of the development of Palestine in the last 18 years is furnished by the growth of its foreign trade. In 1920–21, Palestine imported goods valued at $26,000,000. In 1935 the imports amounted to $90,000,000. During the same period there was a fivefold expansion of exports.

When the Palestinian foreign trade is compared with that of other Arab countries, the result is indeed remarkable. On a per capita basis, Palestine's foreign trade is almost four times as great as that of Egypt, six times that of Syria, and five and one-half times that of Iraq. This is reflected in the standard of living to be observed in the Holy Land.

The astonishing progress in foreign commerce made by Palestine because of Jewish endeavor is in turn responsible for the development of the country's shipping facilities, such as the building of the new port of Haifa and the projected construction of a harbor in Tel Aviv. It has been justly declared that these are developments of revolutionary consequences to the arterial system of the British Empire.

Palestine has acquired a new strategic role as an outlet for the Mosul oil fields as a key to both land and air routes to the east. Its ports are performing functions hithereto fulfilled by the Egyptian ports on the Suez Canal. Haifa is on the way to become the key Mediterranean harbor to the hinterland of Syria, Iraq, and Persia. Its tonnage has more than doubled since its completion a few years ago.

It is apparent that the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine, accompanied as it is by a steady influx of new capital, lifted the country upward while the rest of the world was sinking into the depths of depression. Bank deposits steeply increased in recent years. Business expanded at an accelerated rate.

In 1934, when Jewish immigration reached large-scale proportions, 227 new companies, both Jewish and Arab, were incorporated with a total authorized capital of $11,000,000. An additional 35 companies trebled their capital. The revenue of the government grew correspondingly, and its beneficent expenditures were widely diffused. Thus the treasury was able to remit a large part of the agricultural taxes which weighed heavily on the poor Arab peasants and to launch public works for the employment mainly of Arab labor.

The dynamic power which the Jewish pioneers brought to Palestine cannot, however, be measured merely with yardsticks of economics. It has redeemed and liberated the soul of the Jew. When the conscience of mankind recognized the right of the Jews to have a national home in the land where their kings ruled, their prophets led and their psalmists sang, where their religion, language, culture, ideals, and folklore were developed and changed the history of the world, it set in motion a powerful national revival.

It was natural that this resurrection of the Jewish national spirit in the land of their ancestors should flower forth, among certain elements, in an ambition for a Jewish state.

It is an ambition which is not justified by the terms of the mandate, although Secretary of States Hughes, in his communication to Balfour of January 27, 1922, referred to the Jewish national home under the mandate as "a Jewish state."

This ambition was in direct conflict with the Pan-Arab nationalist movement, and it served to sharpen the conflict between the two main elements of the population of Palestine.

ARTICLE 4

Our interviews with the Grand Mufti, with the members of the Arab Commission to England, now back in Palestine, and with many effendis of intelligence and probity lead to the conclusion that there is trouble ahead from time to time unless the fears of both Jews and Arabs are terminated. This can be done either by agreement or by a different administration of the declared British policy under the mandate.

The Arabs, treating all who are combined in striking and terrorism as such, form two-thirds of the residents of Palestine. There are Christian and Moslem Arabs. There are many political factions among them. There is a wide gulf between the social status of effendis and fellahin (gentry and peasants).

The leaders of Arab opinion, among whom are many who possess a large share of the wealth of the country, represented to us that in the present strike and warfare all Arabic-speaking people in Palestine are united. The cultured priests, businessmen, landowners, and professional men among the Arabs claim that the masses of their race follow their leadership.

On the other hand, the murder of many Arabs by their coreligionists during the present disturbances, the strange absence from the country of certain Arab chiefs such as the mayor of Haifa who sought safety in Syria, the remaining of thousands of Arab workers on their jobs despite the terror of the strikers, all indicated disunity in the Arab camp.

The cause of the strike and the campaign of violence, as stated in the memorandum submitted by the Arab Women's Committee of Jerusalem to the World Peace Congress at Brussels, in September 1936, is:

"It arose out of the nature of the mandate which was forcibly imposed upon the Arabs and which they persistently refused to recognize or accept."

In stating their case to us, the Arab spokesman laid emphasis on the following claims:

That the rapidity and effectiveness of the development of a national home for Jews in Palestine had frightened them;

That it is contrary to natural justice that they who have been for 13 centuries a majority in a country they call their own, should be reduced to a position of numerical, political, and economic inferiority;

That they deny any right of the victorious Allies to impose on them what they call a foreign dominion, and that force would constantly be necessary to maintain a Jewish state in Palestine;

That the Arabs had been promised during the war, as the price for helping the Allies, unity and independence of the Arab countries, which they claim comprehended Palestine; and

That Palestine is geographically and ethnically an essential part of the Arab world, which should be included in a Pan-Arab federation.

We probed deeply into all of these grievances, in the course of our investigation, and frankly presented them to the leaders of the Jewish agency and the Jewish National Council, whose statements will be reported by me in subsequent articles.

"The Arabs need the Jews and the Jews need the Arabs," one influential Arab told me. "We are cousins and have no racial antipathy. Difference in religion does not cause the difficulty; we fear the Jews dominating us."

It was apparent from the beginning, however, that the Arabs have a powerful economic hold on the country, and that there was little merit in their claim of Jewish economic domination. In addition to the Arab ownership of 90 percent of the land of the country, the Arabs own at least one-half of the main industry of Palestine, the citrus development.

The banana trade of Jericho is wholly Arab, and the larger part of the vegetables in the Holy Land are produced by Arabs. In the last 8 years alone, the Arabs extended their olive, fig, and vine cultivation from 197,000 to 633,000 dunams. (A dunam is one-fourth of an acre.)

The primary political character of the conflict in Palestine is shown by the appeal of the Arab women's committee to the World Peace Conference, in which it is alleged:

"In no other land in the world one feels so unsafe or insecure as in Palestine * * * because a riot is liable to take place for the simplest reason and might be accompanied by acts of violence on either side, irrespective of the consequences."

Thus far the evidence is conclusive that the acts of violence are premeditated and almost entirely committed by Arabs. The insecurity of the situation is shown by the four different strikes and outbreaks by Arabs which have occurred in 1921, 1929, 1933, and 1936.

ARTICLE 5

"We want the Arab population of Palestine to be contented. We want the good will of the Arabs. At the Birth of Christ the population of the country was 4,000,000, sustained by the standards of production of that time. There is room for the Jew in Palestine. There is no other place for him to go."

The speaker was Moshe Chertok, the official head of the Jewish Agency in Palestine. This body is recognized under the mandate as a governmental instrument for the establishment of the Jewish National Home. In the course of our conference with the leaders of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, Mr. Chertok presented to us an effective answer to the Arab claims.

After extending to our commission an official welcome in the name of the Jewish Agency, Mr. Chertok began:

"The Arab case divides itself into economic and political claims. On the economic side, the Arabs have no case. The Jewish development of Palestine has made the Arabs richer. The huge funds of capital poured into the country by the Jews since the World War have filtered through and been diffused among the entire population.

"At every step, the Jew had to pay the Arab. When the Jewish immigrant arrived, he had to pay the Arab boatman to bring him ashore. When he looked for shelter, he paid rent to an Arab. When he bought land, it was from an Arab. When he purchased food, he paid an Arab for it.

"As the Jews developed their own production, they also developed markets for export to neighboring Arab and other foreign countries. At the same time there has been a rise in imports to Palestine. This development gave employment to everybody, and enormously increased the revenue of the government.

"The government mainly serves the Arab population. The Jew is able to take care of himself. If the Jews are exploiting the Arabs, as it is claimed, why is there no exodus of Arabs from Palestine? Why do the Arabs in the neighboring countries migrate to Palestine? Since the war, the Arab population has increased over 50 percent in this country, and the increase has been greatest in the location of Jewish settlements.

"On the political side, the majority of the Arabs might say that they prefer to eke out a poor living, so long as the country remained Arab and not Jewish.

"This point of view the conscience of the world cannot accept. There is no other country open to the Jews of Germany, Rumania, Poland. The Jews do not seek to establish themselves here at the expense of the Arabs. We have proved that our coming has improved the condition of all.

"Moreover, the Arabs have received as a result of the war independence in several countries. They have Iraq—Mesopotamia, they have the Hedjaz, they have Trans-Jordan, they have Egypt, and they have a semi-independent status under the French mandate in Syria.

"The 25,000,000 Arabs have a habitable area 30 times as large as that of Palestine. They have all the room for development and unity. Are not the Jews entitled to a corner of their own?

"When the Jews were promised by the Balfour declaration a national home in Palestine, it included both sides of the Jordan. The Jordan was never a boundary. Subsequently, the British tore off Trans-Jordan and made it Arab. The Jews are denied the right to settle there. Yet it is 50 percent larger than Palestine and has only 25 percent of the population of Palestine."

When asked what was the stand of the Jewish agency with respect to the Arab demand for a stoppage of Jewish immigration, Mr. Chertok declared:

"Immigration must continue. In 1934 the country absorbed 45,000 immigrants, and yet there was a shortage of labor. In 1935 it absorbed 62,000 Jewish immigrants, and we still have a shortage of labor. So long as immigration can be economically absorbed without injury to the Arabs, it must continue.

"If a sudden change should occur in the economic condition of the country, we are prepared to come to an agreement with the Arabs. We are prepared to undertake not to buy land which would in the future displace Arabs, or to exchange land with Arab holders."

It was represented to Mr. Chertok that the Arabs claimed to fear the Jews becoming a majority in Palestine, to which he replied:

"An agreement not to become a majority would be impossible. The Jews of the world are pressing to enter the country. If we entered into such an agreement, what would prevent the upsetting of the balance?

"Look at Trans-Jordan. In the law, it does not exclude Jews. But in reality, Jews are not allowed there. Yet Trans-Jordan was promised to both Jews and Arabs, and the British Government decided to reserve it for Arabs only.

"The present controversy on immigration would be settled if Trans-Jordan were to be opened to our people. One hundred thousand Jews would gladly move there from this side of the Jordan. They would break ground and make room for more settlers.

"Politically, we Jews feel that a part of our body has been separated from us by cutting off Trans-Jordan from Palestine. But behind the Arab claims is the dream to abrogate the mandate and to build an independent Arab empire.

"In such an event, the alleged fear of the Jewish majority is meaningless. Even if we did bring in 5,000,000 Jews into Palestine, we would still remain a minority among the 25,000,000 Arabs in their proposed confederation or kingdom."

ARTICLE 6

The Jews of Palestine are willing to assure the Arabs permanent parity in the government of the country as a solution for Arab apprehensions of being dominated in the future by a Jewish majority.

A declaration to this effect was officially made to us by Mr. Barnard Joseph, the solicitor for the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, in the presence of Mr. Chertok and Dr. Ruppin, in the course of our conference with the three leaders.

"Numbers need not determine control," stated Mr. Joseph when the Arab claim of being frightened at the prospect of Jewish domination was called to his attention. "The control of a country is secured through the machinery of government. The answer to the problem is permanent parity of the two races in the government.

"We propose an international undertaking by Jews and Arabs not to seek control of the government, regardless of their numbers. It could be done by the Jewish Agency entering into a waiver of right to dominate.

"We deny the right of the Arabs to exclusive control of Palestine. We admit their right to remain here. We claim, however, that this is our country as much as their own. The right of the Jews to come here is recognized by the entire world."

In answer to the argument of certain Arabs that Palestine had for 13 centuries been their country and that the Jewish immigrants were invaders, Dr. Ruppin, a recognized economist and historian, replied:

"One hundred years ago Palestine had only 100,000 inhabitants. The Jews have always been in Palestine. Through the centuries Jewish communities remained in the Holy Land. The Arabs were not a distinct national group in Palestine; they were only a fraction of the whole.

"Besides, the country was not Arab. It was Turkish. Turkey ceded it to Great Britain. The Jews fought on the side of the Allies against Turkey. The Arabs of Palestine did not."

Mr. Joseph pointed out:

"There can be no comparison of the coming of the Jews to Palestine with a foreign invasion, for the situation of Palestine has no parallel in the world and the situation of the Jews has no equal among the other peoples.

"We made the history of Palestine. The Jewish people have no other national home. We have demonstrated that Palestine is capable of absorbing large masses of immigrants."

Mr. Joseph denied that there was any widespread fear among the Arabs that they might lose the country to the Jews and pointed out that but 6 months ago the two peoples lived and worked together in amity. He continued:

"But even if such a fear has come into existence because of political agitation, justice requires that we should be allowed to settle here in spite of that feeling.

"The Arabs are well provided for. They have ample space for their people and the development of their culture. They ought to be just to the Jews."

The Arab claim that the promise early in the World War made by the British high commissioner for Egypt, McMahon, to the

sherif of Mecca to give the Arabs unity and independence also comprehended Palestine came up for discussion next.

The Zionist records showed that King Feisal, the son of the sherif of Mecca, had entered into a solemn agreement with Chaim Weizmann, the leader of the world Zionist organization, specifically recognizing the Jewish national home in Palestine as guaranteed by the Balfour Declaration.

In the course of a conference with a group of Arab leaders in Haifa our senatorial commission was flatly informed that this agreement had never been signed, and was in fact a Zionist invention. I therefore pursued this matter in our interview with Mr. Chertok and his associates of the Jewish Agency, who promised to produce irrefutable proof of its authenticity.

When our commission reached Brindisi, Italy, on the way back from Palestine, we were met by Mr. Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency, who produced a facsimile of the original treaty between Mr. Weizmann and King Feisal, which contained a reservation purporting to be in the handwriting of the King himself.

King Feisal was an intimate of Lawrence of Arabia, who was his chief counselor. It so happened that Lawrence himself made the translation of Feisal's note. This document of Lawrence, the champion of the Arab cause, was published in the London Times on June 10, 1936, as a reproduction of his own handwriting, and is sufficient to establish the authenticity of the historic Arab-Jewish convention.

The pact, signed in London on January 3, 1919, is a treaty of friendship between the two races. It provides for measures "as will afford the fullest guarantees for carrying into effect the British Government's declaration of November 2, 1917."

It specifies that "All necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale, and as quickly as possible to settle Jewish immigrants on the land."

The reservation translated by Lawrence makes the pact dependent on the fulfillment by the British Government of the demands of King Feisal's memorandum in which he asked for the independence of Arabic areas in Asia.

Feisal had excepted Palestine from the area, in his address to the supreme council of the peace conference of January 29, 1919, as follows:

"On account of its universal character, I shall leave Palestine on one side for the mutual consideration of all parties interested. With this exception, I ask for the independence of the Arabic areas enumerated in the memorandum."

ARTICLE 7

"The Arabs in Palestine cannot get along without the Jews. The Jews in Palestine cannot get along without the Arabs."

This striking statement was made to me by an educated Arab of distinguished family, whose identity must be withheld. His point of view was so at variance with the official Arab attitude, and his approach to the Jewish question so constructive, that it shed a new light on the crisis in Palestine. He commented:

"So long as we live in the same country as cousins, we ought to cooperate. The Jews make the mistake of not employing more Arabs in industry. It would build up means of negotiation and maintaining peace.

"I am an Arab and if I want to put up a building I engage some Jews for the job. But if a Jew wants to build, he does not engage Arabs. The Rutenberg Electrical Works has some 800 employees, but there are only 5 Arabs among them.

"The Jews should include the teaching of Arabic in their schools, just as we have introduced the study of Hebrew in our schools. Twenty percent of the Arabs know Hebrew perfectly, while 30 percent of the Jews do not speak Hebrew themselves.

"The Arabs, on the other hand, do not cooperate with each other. The Arab who has a government position is always exposed to attempts of other Arabs to put him out and get his place.

"If Palestine were given over completely to the Jews they could not survive here, because they would be subject to constant attacks by Arabs from Syria or Iraq or Egypt. As a small state, they would be surrounded by enemies. A Jewish kingdom could never survive.

"The Arabs could not live alone in Palestine and make progress, because they have not enough capital to run the show. Where there is mixed Jewish and Arab capital, as in certain banks, cement works, potash plants, it works all right. The Jews cannot boycott the Jewish interests, and the Arabs cannot boycott the Arab interests."

When asked for the cause of the present conflict in Palestine, this Arab spokesman laid it to the desire of the Mufti to have sole control of the budget of the Moslem community, which furnishes a revenue of about $600,000 annually. He declared:

"The proposed legislative council was the cause of the strike. The Mufti wanted to keep his power. If we had a legislative council, it would have the power to check the books of the Supreme Moslem Council. Now the Mufti controls all the moneys himself.

"It was planned to have proportionate representation in the legislative council of all the Arab parties. The Mufti would have one representative but seven others would represent the other parties. These seven would insist on auditing the books of the Mufti.

"It was for the same reason that the proposal for a legislative Council made to the Arabs by Sir Herbert Samuel in 1922 fell through. Then the Jews would have had but one representative and the Arabs eleven. The Mufti wanted to keep his hands on the treasury of the Supreme Moslem Council.

"The Mufti stays in power with the help of the British Government. This government wants to have two Arab parties, so as to let them fight each other."

On the sore point of the land question in Palestine, my Arab informant differed sharply from the Arab leaders of the strike. He said:

"If Arabs in the agricultural districts have been dispossessed, it is the fault of the Arab owners. Take the case of an Arab woman proprietor of several small villages. If she sells a village to Jewish colonists, the Arab occupants have to move out. A law enacted about a year ago requires that the dispossessed be provided with other lands or funds for the purchase of parcels elsewhere.

"Most of the Arabs who have sold agricultural tracts for Jewish colonization are not Palestinians, but Syrians."

The main theme of this Arab spokesman's statement was the view that it was mutually advantageous for the Jews and the Arabs to cooperate. Because of the prevailing terror, it was not a popular stand for an Arab to take. Many of his compatriots had suffered direct consequences for preaching a Jewish-Arab understanding.

ARTICLE 8

Where Sodom and Gomorrah were wiped out by brimstone and fire, according to the Bible, a miracle of modern industry has appeared since the present world depression. The minerals of the Dead Sea are now supplying the life of fertilizer to many corners of the earth.

The potash industry of Palestine today epitomizes the epic of the industrialization of the Holy Land. But a decade ago the agricultural output of the country far exceeded industrial production. Today the output of industry in Palestine is already greater than all the farming produce, including that of the citrus groves.

The potash deposits of the Dead Sea, where up-to-date chemical plants began operations on January 1, 1930, are sufficient to supply the present demands of the world for 2,000 years. They contain over 2,000,000,000 tons of potassium chloride, an article vital to all vegetation. Every year the Jordan carries to the Dead Sea, which lies 1,300 feet below sea level, 40,000 additional tons of this valuable salt.

During our stay in Jerusalem we came into frequent contact with Maj. Thomas G. Tulloch, a Scot, one of the original promoters of the Palestine Potash Co., who has spent most of his time in Palestine since 1928. The credit for the pioneering work in the exploitation of the Dead Sea minerals belongs to a Jewish engineer, Mr. Novomeysky, now the managing director of the works, who as early as 1911 envisaged the vast potentialities of the industry for Palestine.

Despite the strike and the terror, the Potash Co. was operating on a normal schedule while we were in Palestine.

Said Major Tulloch:

"The Arabs and Jews in our plant are friendly and work together peacefully. For every vacancy we have there are 100 applications by Arabs to work with the Jews.

"At the north end of the Dead Sea we employ 400 workers—one-half Arabs and one-half Jews. We pay the Jews twice as much for an 8-hour day. The Jewish worker has to pay dues to a sick-benefit fund, to a library fund, to the food commissary, and for transportation. These deductions from the pay envelopes are made by the company, by arrangement with the Jewish Federation of Labor. At the end of the month the Arab takes home more money than the Jew.

"Besides, the Jew does more work than the Arab. He has more stamina. He does his job more intelligently. Many of the Jewish workers are university graduates.

"We have much work that requires skilled labor. The Arabs are not up to it.

"The Arab laborers do not protest against the lower wages paid to them. Sometimes the effendis try to make a stir about it. When a certain Arab political leader kicked against our wage scale, I replied 'When you Arab employers pay your Arab workers as much as we pay the Jews, we will do likewise.'

"During the last riots the leading firebrand of the white-collar effendis, while out on bail, held a meeting in the market place of Jericho. He appealed to the Arabs to get their guns and follow him. The whole country, he asserted, was going to be given over to the Jews, and the Arabs should fight against it.

" 'We don't care, effendi, if the government gives the land to the Jews,' replied the Arab workers. 'They treat us better than the effendis do. Will you take care of our wives and children if we are killed in the fight?' The meeting broke up in an uproar."

Major Tulloch, who emphasized the fact that he was neither a Jew nor an Arab, was of the opinion that the Jews and Arabs wanted to and could live peacefully together.

The disturbances in the country, according to him, were not due to economic grievances, but to a political agitation instigated by certain Arab politicians who seek political power so as to retain their domination over the Arab peasantry.

The industrial development of Palestine, due to Jewish initiative, is still in its infancy, according to Major Tulloch. His company is now building a second plant at the southern end of the Dead Sea. Being a newcomer in the field, the Palestine potash industry encountered fierce competition in the world market. After 5 years of existence, it was recently admitted into the international cartel which fixes the world price of potash.

The development of a chemical industry in the Holy Land, like the whole process of the industrialization of Palestine, provides a refutation of the claim that the Jews have

been displacing the Arabs. The industries of Palestine were virtually nonexistent 15 years ago. They do not draw upon the wealth of the country, but bring to Palestine entirely new sources of wealth, new opportunities, new fields of employment. The Economic Research Institute of Jerusalem observes:

"In their capital, the Jews bring from abroad the original wherewithal for the erection of new enterprises. In their persons, they bring the skill, intelligence and labor needed to set the factories in motion, and the consuming power on which success must depend.

"In industry, there can be no element of displacement; it represents in its entirety a net addition to the wealth of the country."

ARTICLE 9

The handwriting on the walls of Palestine today spells out the question:

What will Great Britain do to satisfy the combating ideas and ideals of her wards?

Great Britain, between opposing interests of Jews and Arabs, between imperial policy and international obligations, occupies a position of "extreme difficulty and delicacy," as Lord Balfour characterized it in his letter to Secretary Hughes.

We found complaints against the mandatory by both Jews and Arabs. By Jews, that the mandatory is not executing the mandate in maintaining peace and security; that it is not actively putting into effect the Balfour Declaration; that it is delinquent in protecting industry by tariffs; that it discriminates against Jews in respect to taxation and government support for education and public health. By the Arabs, that the mandate is unjust and that it ought to be abrogated or revised or differently interpreted and enforced.

Arab independence and unity is in the atmosphere. The Hedjaz, Lebanon, Egypt, Trans-Jordania, Iraq, and Syria have come into the promised state of independence. This excites the Arabs of Palestine to maneuver into a condition for unity with them, when and if a consolidation is made.

This agitation is promoted on the theory that Palestine was included in the British promise made to Arabs to induce them to join the Allies against Turkey.

Assuming that legally all prior promises became merged in the mandate, nevertheless, politically, the question enters into the cause of every Arab strike.

Therefore one of the definite acts of the mandatory tending toward peace and tranquillity ought to be the clarification of the record which the British claim proves that Palestine was excepted from that promise. The white papers of 1922 asserted:

"The whole of Palestine west of the Jordan was thus excluded from Sir H. McMahon's pledge."

The mandate in terms agreed to July 22, 1922, did not come into effect until September 29, 1923. If the Arabs dissented, they ought to have spoken then, but did not do so. Nevertheless, today the point is debated largely because there is disagreement regarding the record.

An alternative thereto is to treat Palestine as a conquered country—a country which failed to join its Arabic neighbors against Turkey—and to face boldly and firmly the continuing resentment of the conquered people.

To temporize by suspending labor immigration and making concessions every time the Arabs strike, as has been done in the previous strikes, settles nothing and invites further lawlessness and disorder.

As a consequence of the war, Palestine ceased to be under the sovereignty of the state which formerly governed her, and she was, therefore, placed under mandate.

Great Britain's obligation under the mandate differs from that of other mandatories in other mandates in this particular:

"The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political administration and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home."

Therefore, all details of government should promote that objective, and should not hinder it.

British policy under the mandate was published in Palestine July 7, 1922, and made binding by royal instructions August 14, 1922, and contained the following:

"2. A Jewish national home will be founded in Palestine. The Jewish people will be in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. But His Majesty's Government have no such aim as that Palestine should become as Jewish as England is English.

"3. Nor do His Majesty's Government contemplate the disappearance or subordination of the Arab population, language, or culture.

"4. The status of all citizens of Palestine will be Palestinian, and no section of the population will have any other status in the eyes of the law."

Vigorous execution of that policy probably would put an end to the discussion about an independent Arabic state in Palestine. Moreover, it would prevent the growth of the ambition, now budding, for a Jewish state in Palestine.

American public sentiment should be frankly expressed in support of the mandate and in approval of its strict administration according to the British policy laid down during the negotiations of its terms. It would strengthen the arm of the mandatory and discourage the employment of violence and civil disobedience to induce either the abrogation of the mandate or a modification of its essential obligations.

ARTICLE 10

After 14 years Great Britain should have accomplished in Palestine the following policy proclaimed in the royal instructions of August 14, 1922.

"His Majesty's Government intend to foster the establishment of a full measure of self-government in Palestine, and, as the next step, a legislative council with a majority of elected members will be set up immediately."

I am persuaded that a legislative council in which parity of representation of Jews and Arabs is maintained would allay the fears of both respecting majority and minority rights. There would not be so much emphasis on immigration as a cause of turbulence. Numbers of population need not determine control. Control is maintained through implements of government, regardless of numbers.

The duty of Great Britain respecting immigration is not definite. It is discretionary as to what will prejudice non-Jewish "rights and position," and what are "suitable conditions." But the mandatory "shall facilitate Jewish immigration," while insuring the rights and position of other sections of the population.

British policy on this vexed subject was, in 1922:

"Immigration will not exceed the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals."

Here the passivity of government has changed the yardstick into a sliding scale.

In 1930, experts reported that the economic capacity of absorption was exhausted. Since then the Jewish population has more than doubled and the Arab population has increased by 13 percent. There has been no growth of unemployment and no evidence that the indigenous population has been prejudiced in rights or position.

On the contrary, standards of life have risen, health and education have reached out their benign influence farther over all sections, the country's wealth has surpassed by several times the total progress of the first postwar decade, on which the experts based their inquiries.

The capacity for absorption is dynamic, not static. It does not depend on natural conditions alone. The opportunities for absorption have been created by immigration itself. A market of buyers, a supply of laborers, and the importation of capital are the ingredients of economic expansion. All these have been brought by the immigrants.

Government can increase further the capacity by the provision of lands—public and waste—the protection of industry and labor with protective tariffs, the granting of concessions and credit facilities.

There is no economic reason for suspending immigration now. A clear and definite denial of this demand of the Arab high committee ought to be made and adhered to.

The mandatory will no doubt establish the fact that there is no just ground for grievance in the purchase of land by Jews from Arabs. The price paid is high. No Arab is obliged to sell. Every cultivator must be assured another location, if he wishes it, before a purchase can be consummated. The government requires this. This Arab right is a stiff brake on Jewish purchasers.

There are large stretches of waste but potentially rich soil offering vast possibilities of development. With irrigation and other forms of capital investment there is reason to believe that Palestine may continue to expand in population and prosperity to the point of equaling more densely populated countries of the world.

Her density of population compares with some other agricultural countries as follows:

Palestine	46.7
Rumania	63.7
Hungary	95.0
France	76.0
Italy	136.1

A comparison nearer by is:

Palestine	46.7
Lebanese Republic	92.91

Land purchases should not be prohibited. On the contrary, articles 6 and 11 of the mandate, providing for facilitation of settlement of Jews on the land and intensive cultivation, should be actively administered.

Trans-Jordan, which was included in the Balfour Declaration, and regarding which Great Britain made a proviso in the Amman Declaration enabling her to fulfill her international obligations in respect of the territory, should be opened up to Jewish settlement whenever it becomes necessary in the performance of the mandate. Trans-Jordan is 50 percent larger in area than Cis-Jordan (Palestine west of the Jordan) and has a population of only 25 percent of the latter.

ARTICLE 11

It was a mistake on the part of the British authorities in Palestine, in our opinion, to deal with the Arab strike and violence leniently in the beginning.

As early as May 5, 1936, after anti-Jewish riots, many murders and destruction of fruit trees and crops had taken place, the High Commissioner received the members of the Supreme Arab Committee and addressed them to the effect that:

They should set their faces "against all illegal acts, whether of murder, arson, or any form of civil disobedience"; that they should send a delegation to London instead of supporting the strike; and that they should "make it known without delay to the public" that they do not associate themselves with any illegal acts.

And this was the Arab reply given the same day:

"The strike would continue; the district committees had already decided to favor a civil disobedience movement; they had already decided to defer the mission to London. * * *"

One hundred and fifty-one Arab officials of the government of Palestine issued a memorandum directed against the essential features of the mandate under which they hold office and to the support of which they are bound.

Subsequently, the British armed forces in Palestine were augmented, we were informed, until there were understood to be 16,000 of them when we left the country.

Following our departure, the British Government decided to increase this military force considerably by moving from England fresh reserves under the command of Lieutenant General Dill.

Yet martial law was not imposed upon the localities where crime and destruction were most frequent. From day to day the situation got more out of control, and several major engagements were reported in the press.

If, in the initial stages of the outbreaks, the antiriot ordinance passed 3 years ago had been put into effect, the mandatory government would have been implemented to suppress all the disturbances.

"Leniency to the individual is severity to the state," mildly represents the lesson taught by the situation in Palestine today.

Last week, it was officially announced, the strike was called off in Palestine by the Supreme Arab Committee. But the violence let loose through a mistaken policy has not ceased, according to the dispatches in the press. The attacks by guerrilla bands on Jewish settlements are reported to continue.

What will Great Britain do to settle the conflicting interests?

It is my guess that she will suppress with a stern hand the lawlessness, defiance, and sedition which terrorize the inhabitants and threaten the efficacy of the mandate as a form of government.

After that, from the standpoint of the British Empire, she will shake off the passivity which has encouraged the repetition of these threats to a rebuilt Palestine, loyal to her, and engage with vigor in the execution of her declared policy under the mandate.

She will promote the economic welfare of her colonial system by encouragement of the already great expansion of wealth involved in the creation of the Jewish national home. And she will smother the spark of plots and conspiracies against British Government elsewhere which the success of Arab civil disobedience might blow into a conflagration.

Diplomatically, Great Britain cannot afford to back the wrong horse. On the issue now raised of performance or nonperformance of the mandate, the contenders are not limited to the Jews of the world against the Arabs of the world. They include the treaty nations, of which the United States is one.

Therefore, it is rational to expect that after peace and order are restored in Palestine, the unfounded ambitions of certain Jewish and Arab elements that the mandatory could or would hand to either of them political control over the other, will probably be definitely nullified. A government in which all citizens are Palestinians and in which Jewish and Arab parity of power is guaranteed will be fostered.

These are the deductions of one to whom the facts seem clear and compelling. By the achievement of these measures, a new, permanent, and responsible political entity would be brought into being in a zone where good order and strength are needed for the peace of the world.

In the fulfillment of the principles of the mandate and the declared policy of the mandatory power, a stable supporting public sentiment among the American people, frankly announced, may be of great value. It may help to lighten the load assumed by the mandatory, in accordance with the spirit of Lord Balfour's letter to Secretary of State Hughes, in the performance of the great task of establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine.

REPORT OF SENATOR DANIEL O. HASTINGS

ARTICLE 1

If one is to get an accurate picture of the present troubles in Palestine, it is necessary to know something of the background of the recent political control of the country. For something like 400 years prior to the World War, Palestine was in the hands of the Turks.

As early as 1891 that heroic Jewish figure, Theodor Herzl, became the leader of the idea of a Jewish state. Herzl insisted that the Jews are a distinct nation, whose problems can be solved only by restoring them to a normal national life in a land of their own. By 1902 he had interested the British Government in his plans. He died early in life, but not until he had given the impetus to the Zionist movement and organization throughout the world.

There appear to be three distinct views today among Jews with respect to Palestine. One view is that Palestine must ultimately become a Jewish state, a nation of Jews, controlled by the Jews. The second is that Palestine must be looked upon merely as a spiritual center for Jewry.

Then there is a third view, the view of the present Jewish Agency for Palestine which is somewhere between these two, namely, that Palestine must offer to the Jews of the world a place of refuge, and that they must be permitted to immigrate as rapidly as the economic condition of Palestine may warrant, and the fact that Jews may ultimately become the majority in Palestine must not be taken into consideration.

The official Zionist leaders who adhere to the third view do not demand that Palestine be now considered as a Jewish state, and express the willingness to assure the Arabs that regardless of their numbers they will never demand anything politically more than parity.

Those Zionists who insist that Palestine shall become a Jewish state call attention to the statement made by President Wilson, in responding to a memorandum formulating the Jewish claim to Palestine, namely:

"I am persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and our people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish commonwealth."

Stress is also laid in this connection upon a statement by Secretary of State Hughes, in a communication addressed to Lord Balfour on January 22, 1922, to wit: "Even in case a Jewish state should survive" (in Palestine). This reference to a Jewish state was made in the course of the negotiations for the British-American convention in which the United States gave its consent to the British trusteeship over Palestine.

The Balfour Declaration was made on November 2, 1917. The American Jewish Congress, meeting in Philadelphia on December 15, 1918, in approving the Balfour document, added the very significant words "Jewish commonwealth."

When Dr. Weizmann, president of the World Zionist Organization, was asked at the peace conference in Paris, in 1919, by Mr. Lansing, the American representative, what he meant by the Jewish national home, he replied that "There should ultimately be such conditions that Palestine should be just as Jewish as America is American and England English."

On December 2, 1917, Lord Cecil, a member of the British Cabinet said:

"Our wish is that Arabian countries shall be for the Arabs, Armenia for the Armenians, and Judea for the Jews."

A study of the history of the Balfour Declaration shows, in my opinion, quite conclusively that the Jews of the world were justified in believing that the issuance of the Balfour Declaration intended to assure them a country they could control and call their own.

I think also that the Jews of the world were justified in believing that Palestine meant the country on both sides of the Jordan, and not the present western area from which Trans-Jordan has been severed and set up as a separate Arab kingdom under the aegis of the British High Commissioner in Jerusalem.

When the World War was over and the time came to translate a general declaration into a specific contract, we find a remarkable document known as the mandate for Palestine, which the Jews were, of course, compelled to accept.

There is, in my judgment, but one important definite promise in the mandate in which the Jews are interested, and that is the promise to place the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine.

There is a technical way out for the British Government of every other promise in it. You may offer strong arguments against the British and Arab interpretations of the mandate, but it is difficult to put your finger on anything definite. There is nothing in the mandate itself to justify the claim that the Jews have a right to make Palestine into a Jewish state.

One of the great troubles of the situation in Palestine today, as I see it, is that the Jews were led to believe for 5 years at least, from 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was made, to 1922, when the mandate was approved, that ultimately Palestine was to become a political unit, a nation belonging to the Jewish race.

ARTICLE 2

The Jews have made wonderful progress in Palestine in all things that make for healthier and better lives. They have made the Holy Land a progressive country with modern improvements, whereas it had made practically no progress for centuries before the war. This progress is due, in a large part, to the loyalty and generosity of the Jews in all parts of the world outside of Palestine, particularly the Jews of the United States.

One of the greatest assets to the world in the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine is that it has "become a center in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride." In these words did the British Government, on the eve of the approval of the mandate, define one of its objectives in Palestine.

The trouble in Palestine today is partly due, as former disturbances have been due, to a lack of a definite policy with respect to the interpretation and the administration of the mandate.

Any conflicts arising between Jews and Arabs, as to their respective rights in Palestine after the World War, can be settled only in the light of the provisions of the mandate, plus any papers interpreting it.

The obligations of the mandate are placed upon the British Government and consist chiefly of the following:

1. "For placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home * * *."

2. "Shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions * * * while ensuring that the rights and positions of other sections of the population are not prejudiced."

The British Government has given its own definition of what is meant by the development of a Jewish national home by stating that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of

the existing Jewish community. The official definition continues:

"But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance."

The policy that immigration into Palestine may be permitted as rapidly as the immigrants can be economically absorbed is resented by Arabs because of the fear that the Jews may become a majority in Palestine and ultimately impose upon them Jewish control.

If immigration is permitted until the Jews have a majority in Palestine and then it should be determined that the country was in a position to manage its own affairs and British control and protection were withdrawn, you would have all that the most ambitious Zionist could expect.

It is this condition and this fear on the part of Arabs that underlie the present crisis. Peace between the Jew and Arab in Palestine depends upon a firm policy of the British Government declaring a definite parity between the two races in the political control of the country.

It might be well to note here what the Arab has been doing since the 19th of April last. The Arabs began to organize in the fall of 1935 preparatory to calling a strike. When the strike was called and the order given to close all the business establishments, those of the Arab owners who did not obey found themselves in real trouble. They were beaten, their property was destroyed, and a real reign of terror was inaugurated.

The Arab political leaders admitted to us their responsibility for closing the shops, as part of the strike program, but did not admit their responsibility for the murders and other acts of violence in the country. But the general impression in Palestine was that these leaders were doing nothing to stop the terror. There has been instilled in the minds of the Arab youth the idea that he is fighting for his freedom and that what he is doing is a patriotic service to his country.

The Arabs admit that the Jews have done great things for Palestine. The good roads, schools, hospitals, and other modern improvements are largely due to Jewish influence and capital. The Arabs have sold lands to the Jews at enormous prices.

An acre of poor undeveloped land in Palestine, which can be made suitable for the growing of oranges, can be readily sold for $500. An Arab peasant will work in a Jewish orange grove, learn how to cultivate oranges, save his money, sell half of his land to a Jewish settler, and use the money to put the balance of his land in a condition to raise citrus.

A thousand and one instances could be given as to how the Jews have helped the Arab improve his standard of living. But the Arab political agitators disregard these economic factors and pay no attention to the statement of the Jewish representatives in Palestine that the Jews are not seeking political domination.

My own judgment is that there is no foundation for the fear propagated in the minds of the Arabs that the Jews are about to purchase all the Arab land and thus drive the Arabs from the country. There is enough cultivable land, or land that could be made cultivable to take care of several hundred thousand more Jewish agriculturists, and all to the advantage of the Arabs in Palestine.

ARTICLE 3

Perhaps the greatest miracle of the Jewish colonization of Palestine has been the transformation of small traders and intellectuals from eastern Europe into successful farmers. These children of the Ghetto, who had been removed from agriculture for many centuries, not only changed their habits overnight, but changed the face of the Holy Land almost overnight.

No traveler in Palestine today can fail to be impressed by the large stretches of redeemed soil which had lain barren and arid for generations prior to the coming of the Jewish pioneer. Forests, groves, and orchards dot the countryside and offer a striking contrast to those deserted tracts still awaiting the labor of rejuvenation.

The report of the high commissioner on the administration of Palestine says:

"The most striking result in this sphere that has been achieved during the last few years has been in the Valley of Esdraelon. When I first saw it in 1920 it was a desolation. Four or five small and squalid Arab villages, long distances apart from one another, could be seen on the summits of low hills here and there. For the rest, the country was uninhabited.

"There was not a house, not a tree. Along a branch of the Hejaz Railway an occasional train stopped at deserted stations. A great part of the soil was in the ownership of absentee Syrian landlords. The River Kishon, which flows through the valley, and the many springs which feed it from the hillsides, had been allowed to form a series of swamps and marshes and, as a consequence, the country was infested with malaria."

Then the Jewish National Fund acquired about 51 square miles of the valley. Young pioneers descended into it, formed labor gangs, crushed rock, built roads, dug trenches, erected houses and schools and factories. Continues the report of the High Commissioner:

"All of the swamps and marshes within the area that has been colonized have been drained and cases of malaria are proportionately rare. An active trade in dairy produce has sprung up, mostly finding a market by means of the railway, in Haifa.

"The whole aspect of the valley has been changed. The wooden huts of the villages, gradually giving place to red-roofed cottages, are dotted along the slopes; the plantations of rapidly growing eucalyptus trees begin to give a new character to the landscape; in the spring the fields of vegetables, or of cereals, cover many miles of land, and what 5 years ago was little better than a wilderness is being transformed before our eyes into a smiling countryside."

This valley is now the most compact Jewish agricultural settlement in Palestine. In the last 15 years the number of Jewish land colonies has grown from 45 to 173. In 1919 there were 10,500 Jews in rural communities. In 1935 there were 72,700.

Striking is the intensive farming methods introduced by the Jews in the country. The Jewish farmer produces more than twice as much wheat per acre as the Arab peasant, three times as much grapes, and the yield of milk of the Jewish dairy farmer per cow is actually seven times as great as that of the Arab.

The application of scientific farming by the Jewish settlers has brought agricultural machinery into Palestine for the first time in its history. The import of these modern farming implements has been growing rapidly in the last 5 years. As compared with Palestine, the three neighboring Arab countries show a negligible use of agricultural machinery. Even Egypt, with its great cotton industry, imported in 1934 but 7.1 per head of population of the Palestinian import of such machinery.

Jewish enterprise has made Palestine, within the space of a little more than a decade, into the second citrus-exporting country in the world. The area under oranges and lemons has increased more than eightfold between 1922 and 1935. The value of the exports of this commodity rose from $1,000,000 in 1921 to nearly $18,000,000 in 1935.

Nothing is as dramatic, however, in the story of agricultural progress of the Jew in Palestine as the discovery and development of the country's unknown or unused water resources. For centuries the Arabs squatted on the land, without troubling to dig for water even in such places where a little effort could have brought it to the surface.

The Jewish immigrants pioneered in this direction with remarkable zeal and perseverance and tapped hidden water sources which miraculously expanded the seemingly limited arable area of the country. In the valley of Esdraelon alone 70 borings were made, of which 34 were successful.

Water-boring machinery of the most modern type is now being imported into Palestine at an increasing rate by the Jews. Not only have many old wells been made to yield greater supplies, but in Galilee and Samaria and other parts of Palestine water was discovered in places where hardly anybody ever dreamed of finding it.

Although the Jews own but one-twentieth of all the land in Palestine, the transformation which they wrought in its primitive agriculture within a decade and a half can be felt and seen from one end of the country to the other. That it has been accomplished by a people whose agricultural tradition goes back 2,000 years is a revelation of the love and sacrifice which they brought to the land of their ancestors.

ARTICLE 4

One of the main demands of the Arab political agitation in Palestine has been for the stoppage of Jewish purchase of land in the country.

An inquiry into this sore phase of the crisis in the Holy Land shows that there is no economic justification for the Arab claim. On the contrary, there is unquestioned evidence that the settlement of Jews in Palestine has brought great benefits to the Arab peasantry, or fellahin.

The price of land in Palestine is 20 times as high as it is 30 miles east of the Jordan for a unit of the same quality. The poor Arab peasant, who is usually in the clutches of the Arab usurers, has been enabled in recent years through the sale of some of his land to achieve independence for the first time in his life.

An impartial government investigator, C. F. Strickland, reports:

"There is in general much to be said for encouraging the fellah to sell a part of his irrigable land and to repay the claims of his creditors from the sale proceeds, and develop the remainder of his irrigable land with any surplus remaining."

Jewish immigration and agricultural developments have raised large numbers of poverty-stricken and degraded peasants to a new level of existence. It must be remembered that the greater part of the indigenous population of Palestine is just beginning to emerge from a semi-feudal state. The fallahin are dominated in every way by the powerful landlords, who are not interested in the development of their great estates.

The director of the agricultural experiment station in Syria as recently as 1928, reported:

"The fellahin, who work the land, live under conditions comparable with that of the bondsmen of the Charlemagne dynasty. No more than 20 percent of the gross product of the land remains to the fellah. * * * It may almost be said that the big landlords are engaged not in the exploitation of the land, but in the exploitation of its cultivators. * * * As under the existing system of taxation no charges are paid on uncultivated land, the big landlords can leave large areas untilled without incurring any losses."

This Asiatic condition has been profoundly disturbed by the coming of the Jewish colonists. The Jews are driven to buy land at any price, which makes the Jewish colonization effort different from any similar undertaking in the past in other parts of the world. The Arabs are not compelled to sell

their holdings. Commercial considerations do not determine the price of land in Palestine.

Another boon to Arab agriculture has been the urbanization of the country as a result of Jewish industrial development. The fellahin suddenly found at their thresholds an undreamed market for their produce, a market which has grown rapidly and demanded a varied supply. The Arabs went in for mixed farming, whereas before they depended on one or two cereals.

As the depression in the United States has demonstrated, this kind of farming does not suffer much from world conditions, as its output does not depend upon world prices. In Palestine, the Arab agriculture escaped the great slump which struck the fellahin in Syria, Egypt, and Trans-Jordan in recent years.

The modern farming methods introduced by the Jewish colonists have not passed without beneficent effect upon Arab villages. They have begun to take on an improved appearance, as officially attested in the report of the High Commissioner. The march of progress in the country could not but leave its influence on the entire population. Jewish agriculture has awakened all agriculture, and set a new pace of enterprise and competition for the Arabs.

Due to the influx of Jewish capital and the flourishing condition of public finances in Palestine, there has been an astounding decrease in the tax burden on all agriculture in the country. In 1922, the agricultural taxes in Palestine furnished 15.8 percent of the government's revenue. In 1934, the percentage was 2.05. In absolute figures, disregarding the growth of the country, the fall in agricultural taxes has been from $1,500,000 to $850,000.

Since the majority of the Arab population is engaged in agriculture, this is a stupendous benefit provided largely from Jewish sources. Moreover, the government of Palestine has been enabled through its increased revenue to confer many other benefits on the fellahin, such as free distribution of seeds, low-interest loans, and agricultural exhibits and instruction.

There is little doubt that the break-up of the primitive feudal system in Palestine, with its attendant changes in the mode of life and educational standards of the Arabs, offers opportunities for agitators against the carriers of the new order of things, the Jewish immigrants.

The demand for the prohibition of Jewish acquisition of land is a political slogan, bound up with the pan-Arab nationalist movement which seeks the abrogation of the mandate. Strangely enough, it is a demand voiced mostly by Arab effendis who have disposed of large tracts to Jews and who have gained much from these transactions.

All the visible economic signs and official data in Palestine refute this political cry, and show that the coming of the Jews has brought a new era of prosperity to the Arab agricultural population, to the landlord as well as to the peasant.

ARTICLE 5

The British administration in Palestine has been weak and vacillating, and neither Jew nor Arab is satisfied with it, because he does not know what to expect next.

The olive branch is extended first to one side and then to the other, leaving both sides to believe that, with a little more pressure, a little more force, or a little more violence, additional concessions can be obtained.

It is true the British Government has an exceptionally hard position to fill under the mandate in Palestine. But I think the Jews do have a real grievance, because of a lack of vigorous effort to rid the country of the lawlessness that has existed for the past several months.

The mandate definitely promises security for the Jews in the establishment of a national home. No such security is now being given, although many thousands of soldiers are being maintained in Palestine.

If the British Government would announce a definite policy, and place officials in charge who were in sympathy with such a policy, and if necessary use such military power as was required to enforce it, there would, in my judgment, come into existence in Palestine a reasonably satisfactory condition.

A lasting solution, however, of the political antagonism between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine must be sought in Arab-Jewish cooperation.

Dr. Judah L. Magnes, the chancelor of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, which, I believe, will soon become one of the great universities of the world, had a real contribution to make on this subject. When I solicited his opinion, he referred me to a statement of his made in 1929, with the remark that it held good in 1936.

Said Dr. Magnes:

"I think I need hardly tell you my attitude towards the basic problem of the living together in the Holy Land of two peoples, Arabs and Jews, and of three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

"You are aware that in my opinion it is necessary to find, and I think we have all of us not been nearly diligent enough in finding, ways of living and of working together, culturally, economically, socially, politically, and in every other way.

"You know, too, that in my opinion if we cannot find ways of peace and understanding, if the only way of establishing the Jewish National Home is upon the bayonets of some empire, our whole enterprise is not worth while, and it is better that the eternal people that has outlived many a mighty empire should possess its soul in patience, and plan and wait.

"It is one of the great civilizing tasks before the Jewish people to try to enter the Promised Land, not in the Joshua way, but bringing peace and culture, hard work and sacrifice and love, and a determination to do nothing that cannot be justified before the conscience of the world."

How sensible and inspiring. And it comes from a recognized spiritual leader of the Jewish community. If but the Arab spiritual leaders spoke the same language.

As a result of the persistent efforts of the Zionists for 50 years or more there exists in Palestine today a Jewish national home. There are something like 400,000 Jews there, and it is now possible for the Jewish child to begin at a Hebrew kindergarten and complete his education in a Hebrew university, without ever speaking anything but the Hebrew of the Prophets.

He may work on a Jewish farm, in a Jewish factory, live in an all-Jewish city, read a Hebrew newspaper, visit Hebrew theaters, have his controversies decided by a Jewish judge. This can be truly said to furnish the spiritual center for Jewry.

This is a great accomplishment, and the Jews of the world have a right to be proud of their achievements. But what satisfaction does the persecuted Jew, who has been driven from his native land, get from a spiritual center established in Palestine?

He may properly take pride in it, but from a practical point of view, what he needs is a place to live in and pursue a natural course without complaint and persecution by those about him.

I agree with Dr. Magnes that it is not practicable to find a suitable place for the Jewish refugee if the maintenance of law and order in such a place depends upon "the bayonets of some empire."

What, then, is the solution to the pressing problem of the millions of oppressed and destitute Jews forced to emigrate from central and eastern Europe? I shall try to indicate it in the next article.

ARTICLE 6

The immigration question is the paramount issue in the crisis in Palestine. To the Zionist, the continuation of large-scale Jewish immigration into the Holy Land is of surpassing moment. To the Arabs, the stoppage of such immigration is a foremost political battle cry.

To the non-Zionist Jews and humanitarians of the world, the need for some haven for the persecuted Jews in central and eastern Europe is one of the great tragic problems of our times.

Is there a constructive answer to this question? I believe there is. While I see no place for all the many millions of persecuted Jews who might want to come to some such land as Palestine, I do see an opportunity to take care of large numbers of such refugees.

In my opinion several hundred thousand more Jews could be accommodated in Palestine itself. And several million additional Jewish fugitives could be provided for if they could cross the Jordan and be allowed to settle in Trans-Jordan.

Trans-Jordan was believed by the Jews to be included in Palestine proper at the time of the Balfour Declaration in November 1917. And I think it offers the hope in solving the practical and acute question of Jewish immigration.

The boundaries of Palestine were redrawn by the British Government 5 years after the Balfour Declaration so as to exclude the eastern half lying beyond the Jordan from the area of the Jewish National Home. Under the Turkish Empire, the frontiers of Palestine were part of a Province which comprised various loose and arbitrary districts.

This was officially recognized by the British Parliamentary Commission, headed by Sir Walter Shaw, sent to Palestine to investigate the causes of the riots and massacres in 1929. The Shaw report states:

"Viewed in the light of the last 6 centuries, Palestine is an artificial conception. Under the Ottoman regime, it formed part only of an administrative unit, the remainder of which consisted of areas now within the jurisdiction of the governments of other neighboring mandated territories. Its frontiers, too, are largely artificial. In many parts, they are frequented by nomad tribes, who, by intergovernmental agreement, are allowed unhindered passage across these frontiers."

The eastern frontiers of present-day Palestine are wide open to Arab migrants. But they are tightly closed to Jewish immigration. There seems to be considerable ground for the deep Jewish resentment against the chopping off of Trans-Jordan from Palestine and its exclusion from the sphere of Jewish settlement.

As far back as 1921 the conference of the British Labor Party protested against this policy in a resolution which declared:

"The conference calls upon the Government to put an end to the unnatural and harmful division of the British mandate territory and to effect the unity of eastern and western Palestine."

The British Government, however, effected an independent Arab kingdom in eastern Palestine or Trans-Jordan. The economic consequence of this measure has been the barring of Jewish immigration from Trans-Jordan.

Now Trans-Jordan is one and one-half times the size of present-day Palestine, and harbors but one-fourth of the population of the latter. It is a spacious and fertile land, sparsely inhabited, with no cities, and hardly developed. The Arab King and leaders of Trans-Jordan are understood to be eager for Jewish settlement and enterprise.

If Trans-Jordan could be opened to the Jews through a change of policy on the part

of the British Government which controls it, it would soon become a rich country. If the British Government could work out some plan of peace and good-will between the Arabs in Palestine and in Trans-Jordan, and have the mandate modified accordingly, it would not only go a long way in solving the problem of the Jews, but it would make out of these two countries rich and prosperous states.

It ought to be possible. The British Government has undertaken the administration of the mandate for Palestine. There is much to be said in favor of the British Government because of the natural difficulties involved in performing its duties under the mandate.

It is rather difficult, however, to find an adequate excuse for the plain violations by that great Government of the following provision of the mandate:

"The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion."

The situation in Palestine is not only serious for that country. It may involve world peace.

The opening of Trans-Jordan to the Jews would not only strengthen the position of Great Britain in the Near East, but would provide a solution to the urgent problem of Jewish immigration, which is at the bottom of the Arab-Jewish conflict in present-day Palestine.

In my judgment, this is the way to satisfy the patriotic visions of the conservative and reasonable people, both Jewish and Arab, who now occupy Palestine.

THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

[From the Sunday New York American and other Hearst newspapers of December 6, 1936]

The hearings before the British Royal Commission, headed by Earl Peel, now in session in Palestine, have already confirmed the salient findings of the unofficial senatorial commission sent to Palestine last summer by the Hearst newspapers.

The facts brought to light by the Royal Commission on the two major issues of the crisis in Palestine—immigration and purchase of land by Jews—are strikingly identical with those unearthed and reported by Senators Copeland, Austin, and Hastings.

While the Royal Commission is empowered to investigate the causes of the recent Arab strike and reign of terror and to recommend changes in the policy of the Palestine government, it has not been endowed with the right to alter the basic law of the mandate for Palestine aimed to establish a Jewish national home. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for the mandate is a trusteeship given to Great Britain by all the civilized nations of the world.

American interest in Palestine is in no sense a matter of meddling in foreign affairs.

It is an interest grounded in a solemn treaty concluded between the Government of the United States and the Government of His Britannic Majesty on December 3, 1924.

This convention, designed to protect the interests of American nationals in Palestine, recites in full the terms of the mandate.

According to the American-British Convention, the United States has given its consent to the British trusteeship over Palestine and has stipulated that its assent is required for any modification in the terms of that trusteeship.

It is noteworthy that it was the British Government which solicited America's active interest in the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, as expressed in a formal communication from the late Lord Balfour to Secretary of State Hughes.

It follows that any inquiry into the situation in Palestine by Americans is fully warranted.

The observance of the treaty concerning Palestine is a matter of proper concern to the people and the Government of the United States.

The Jewish tragedy in central and eastern Europe, which is so interwoven with the upbuilding of a Jewish national home, makes it imperative to find a constructive solution for the crisis in Palestine. That such a solution can be found is indicated by the findings of the members of the unofficial senatorial commission, which may be summarized in the following six points:

1. The crisis in Palestine has two mainsprings:

First, the lack of a consistent and firm British administrative policy.

Second, the political conflict between Jewish and Arab aspirations.

As for the policy of the mandatory power, Great Britain as trustee assumed the obligations to place Palestine under conditions "as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home" and to "facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and encourage * * * close settlement by Jews on the land," without impairing the rights of other sections of the population.

These are plain duties. Admittedly they are difficult to carry out. A steady and definite policy is required in their performance.

Yet it is an open secret, as shown by Senator Copeland, that certain elements of the mandatory civil administration in Palestine are not in sympathy with the trust of their office, and look with disfavor upon the establishment of the Jewish national home.

This accounts for the vacillating policy pursued by the mandatory, which in turn cannot but encourage lawlessness and strife in the country.

2. The mandate definitely promised security to the Jewish settlers in Palestine.

The failure of the British trustee to provide such security is manifest. According to all the members of the Commission, there can be no adequate excuse for the patent violation of this elementary provision of the mandate. There can be no justification for the outrages committed against innocent Jewish men, women, and children in recent months in the Holy Land.

The injuries suffered by many American nationals, who had settled in Palestine under the protection of the American-British Convention, serve but to emphasize the deplorable failure of the mandatory government to maintain law and order in the land under its care. No compensation for their damaged property can adequately make up for months of exposure to a reign of terror.

3. The basic cause of the Arab-Jewish discord is political.

Certain Arab agitators, who are identified with the Pan-Arab nationalist movement, seek the establishment of an Arab state in Palestine, and make much of the fear that certain Jewish elements may seek the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Now, there is nothing in the mandate to justify such ambitions on either side.

The responsible Jewish leaders have offered the Arabs a mutual parity pact, which would insure both sides against domination by either.

If Great Britain would reaffirm her declared policy under the mandate in a manner making it unmistakable that Palestine can become only a Palestinian state, the road would be clear for an understanding between the Arabs and the Jews.

4. The Arab demand for the suspension of Jewish immigration into Palestine is an issue of life and death to the persecuted Jews in central and eastern Europe. It also goes to the root of the mandate, for the stoppage of Jewish immigration would reduce the terms of the mandate to an absurdity. Only the economic incapacity of Palestine to absorb such immigration could serve as a cogent reason for its suspension.

The inquiry by the Senatorial Commission has demonstrated that there is no economic reason for suspending or curtailing Jewish immigration now.

Palestine has no unemployment problem.

The large stream of Jewish immigrants and Jewish capital has not only raised perceptibly the standard of living of the entire population. It has increased the capacity of the country to absorb more immigrants.

As for the Arab fear of an eventual Jewish majority, numbers of population need not determine control. Control can be maintained through implements of government regardless of numbers. Fear of subjection of Arabs to Jews and vice versa should be terminated by the establishment of a legislative council in which Jews and Arabs would have parity of elected representation.

5. The Arab demand for the prohibition of the sale of land to Jews, like that for the suspension of immigration, is political in nature.

The findings of the Senatorial Commission have clearly shown that there is no just economic ground for the stoppage of Jewish land purchases. No Arab landowner is obligated to sell his property to Jews. Moreover, the government requires that Arab squatters must be provided with other grants before a deal for any tract of land is closed.

The Jews now own no more than 5 percent of the land of Palestine, although they form 30 percent of the population.

The members of the Commission were profoundly impressed by what the Jewish pioneers, hailing from the ghettos, have done with the barren and rocky and sandy soil of the Holy Land. They have elevated agriculture to the position of the leading industry of Palestine and raised the level of the Arab peasantry.

There is still enough cultivable land in the country to take care of several hundred thousand additional agriculturists.

6. The practical question, however, of finding an immediate refuge for the several million Jews who are forced to flee or to emigrate from their native lands can be solved, in the opinion of Senator Hastings, if Trans-Jordan were to be opened to Jewish immigration.

Trans-Jordan was originally comprehended in the area of Palestine covered by the Balfour Declaration, but was severed from present-day Palestine in 1922 and set up as a separate Arab kingdom under the supervision of the British High Commissioner for Palestine.

The Arab ruler of Trans-Jordan is understood to be eager for Jewish enterprise and settlement. His country is backward and sparsely populated, but potentially it offers opportunities for development just as great as Palestine on this side of the Jordan.

All friends of humanity will concur with the senatorial commission that it would be an act of great wisdom on the part of Great Britain to bring about a friendly arrangement between the Jews and the Arabs of Trans-Jordan.

The opening of the latter territory to Jewish immigration would relieve the tension in present-day Palestine.

It would be an act of justice in the face of the flight of millions of homeless Jews, which would gain for Great Britain the approbation of American public opinion and of the great civilized nations of the world.

At the same time, it would assure for her the additional prize of a greater and more prosperous Palestine, which would serve as a bulwark for peace and progress at the vital junction of the British Empire.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had intended to speak at great length on the concurrent resolution which is now before the Senate, but with permission to have printed in the RECORD at a later date my remarks, I shall merely invite the attention of the Senate to what I believe is its obligation at this particular time.

Any student of this question who will review its history must come to the conclusion that as a result of the enthusiastic embrace of the subject matter contained in the Balfour declaration, Britain was given the mandate over Palestine by the League of Nations, and that the mandate was confirmed later by a special convention which was acted upon by the Senate of the United States. The very terms of the mandate were made part and parcel of that convention. As a result of the convention, and by reason of our action in that connection, Britain was to make no change whatever without first consulting with us and securing our consent.

Mr. President, a review of the history concerning this subject will reveal the fact that Britain made many changes. It is my judgment that the whole matter is a sorry and sad story of diplomatic relations between the two countries, which a review of the subject will reveal.

One change which was made by the white paper was very objectionable, and it was made without our consent. As a result, Mr. President, the mandate is no longer a mandate to facilitate Jewish immigration to Palestine. That is what it was intended for, but it is no longer that.

One of the subsequent changes put immigration on a restrictive quota basis. But the worst changes of all took place recently when that so-called homeland, as named in the Balfour declaration—one which we all hoped would be permanently created—was made the one place where Jewish immigration is not only to be restricted, but absolutely prevented and barred.

So, Mr. President, in view of the fact that we agreed in a solemn convention with Great Britain that no changes would be made without our consent, and in view of the fact that changes have been made, and made without our consent, I believe that we are wholly within our duty, in fact, it is my judgment that it is our obligation, to call this matter to the attention of Great Britain and register our protest.

Mr. President, I compliment my able colleague and other Senators who joined with him in bringing this concurrent resolution to the attention of the Senate. I hope that it will be agreed to by unanimous vote. At a later date I shall make further mention of my sentiments in connection with this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the extensive and able debate on the pending concurrent resolution, and having previously spoken on the subject, I shall merely ask, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], that a telegram, which contains resolutions adopted by some of our constituents in Massachusetts, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *December 17, 1945.*

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution has been unanimously adopted at the fifth annual meeting of the Associated Synagogs of Greater Boston, held at the Temple Mishkan Tefila schoolhouse, Roxbury, Mass., on December 16, 1945, composed of 10,000 families.

"Whereas the Jewish people, which has lost 6,000,000 of its number under Nazi tyranny, and has endured untold suffering for the past 2,000 years since it has been exiled from its national homeland; and

"Whereas the Jewish people, whose historic connection with and moral right to the land of Palestine has been recognized by the Balfour declaration issued by Great Britain and adopted by 52 nations of the world, including the United States; and

"Whereas this declaration has repeatedly received the approval of vast millions of the American people, the Congress of the United States in 1922, and every President of the United States from Woodrow Wilson up to Harry S. Truman: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, that in keeping with the dictates of justice as set forth in holy writ, the Associated Synagogs of Greater Boston record themselves as being in favor of the immediate opening of the gates of Palestine to the Jews of Europe who are in desperate need of a home and have indicated their strong desire to emigrate to Palestine as testified by Dr. Earl G. Harrison, the president's personal envoy and Mr. Harvey Gibson of the American Red Cross. We believe that the establishment of an independent democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine will give an opportunity to the unhappy survivors of Nazi persecution to once again live their lives in freedom, happiness, and human dignity in the name of Almighty God. The Jewish people can be satisfied with nothing else."

We urge upon our Senators to vote for the resolution to be reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

ABRAHAM CLOSE, *President.*

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], is absent on important public business, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by him in support of Concurrent Resolution 44.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, IN SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 44

Mr. President, one of the greatest tragedies of the war in Europe was the persecution of the Jews, surpassing in violence all the pogroms of recorded history. When we read the record of primitive savagery and bloodlust we can only wonder how any survived. Yet thousands, somehow, did survive. By force of arms, we have liberated them from Nazi tyranny. But liberation is not enough. They are still homeless, still seeking some refuge where they can begin again.

That refuge can be made available. It is the purpose of this resolution to make it available. In recommending that the United States use its good offices to clear the way for free entry of Jews into Palestine, the resolution reaffirms an historic American policy. Nearly a quarter of a century ago we placed ourselves on record in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for Jews. Today the need for such a home land is more urgent than ever before. President Truman has recognized that need, and has taken steps toward its fulfillment. We can do no less.

We are committed to a policy of international cooperation for maintenance of the peace. Many problems arise in which we, as one of the great powers, must raise our voice and exercise our influence. This is one of them. We cannot evade the responsibility. In simple justice, the least that we can do is to assure the homeless Jews of Europe, victims of the barbarity of Nazi Germany, that they will have some place in all the world where they can live in peace.

There is more involved here than the question of common humanity, although that looms large. There is the question of the rehabilitation of Hitler's victims, the restoration of an important part of Europe's people to full civic usefulness.

Much has been said on the other side of the question. But I submit, without considering or discussing these arguments in detail, that the safeguard of full religious liberty for all races and creeds, which you will agree is fully capable of enforcement, is adequate to meet those objections.

Solution of the Palestine question has been too long delayed. Because of that delay, many have suffered greatly. The suffering of those who have already lived for years under the yoke of the oppressor will be even greater if we do not move quickly to meet and dispose of the question as rapidly as circumstances will permit. This resolution is part of the effort being made in that direction. I therefore urge every member of the Senate to give it full support, so that there may be no question of where America stands. We must stand, as we have always stood before, on the side of the oppressed. They beg for an opportunity to reestablish their lives. We cannot deny them that opportunity.

Let us act quickly. While we are delaying, thousands are needlessly dying.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 44) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of a letter from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] asking permission to absent himself from the Senate for the remainder of the present session. Without objection, leave is granted, and, without objection, the letter will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 14, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is necessary for me to be absent from the Senate from Friday, December 14, to the end of the session, assuming that the Senate will recess the latter part of next week.

I will appreciate it if you will submit this request for leave of absence.

With great respect, I am,
Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. GEORGE.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] be excused from further service on the Special Committee of the Senate to Study and Survey the Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I may say that I do this with his full concurrence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Jack H. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the United States Naval Mission to Peru, and until reporting for other permanent duty; and

Col. Karl S. Day of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary service from the 29th day of November 1945.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Homer Allen Higgins for appointment as State medical officer for Arkansas and State medical advisor for Oklahoma under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified at once of these confirmations.

RECESS

Mr. WAGNER. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH OF OFFICE

Joseph E. Unsworth

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Emory S. Moore, Jr., August 20, 1945.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 10, 1945.

SENIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS TO BE PHARMACISTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1944

Raymond D. Kinsey
Thomas C. Armstrong

DENTAL SURGEON TO EE SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 15, 1945

Hubert H. Martin

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Donald L. Truscott, August 3, 1945.
Frederick S. Loe, Jr., August 2, 1945.
John C. Heckel, August 3, 1945.
Eugene H. Hess, August 3, 1945.
William B. Treutle, October 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Ernest C. Anderson, December 26, 1945.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, August 21, 1945.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Vactor O. Connell, July 1, 1945.
Ardell B. Colyar, December 1, 1945.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Gilcin F. Meadors, December 1, 1945.
Clarence K. Aldrich, November 1, 1945.
Paul C. Campbell, Jr., September 1, 1945.
Lloyd R. Hershberger, July 1, 1945.
Louis Jacobs, December 1, 1945.
Allen B. Eschenbrenner, September 1, 1945.
Robert V. Holman, January 1, 1945.
Lloyd S. Rolufs, July 1, 1945.

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS, EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 1945

Carl E. Rice
Alfred J. Aselmeyer

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 24, 1945

William B. Treutle

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEERS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Callis H. Atkins, December 1, 1945.
Fredrick C. Roberts, Jr., August 3, 1945.

SENIOR SCIENTIST TO BE TEMPORARY SCIENTIST DIRECTOR, EFFECTIVE JUNE 26, 1945

Willard H. Wright

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Emil J. Koch, Warner Springs.

IOWA

Ralph L. Zearley, Garber.

NEW YORK

Marie Gardner, Fly Creek.
Leonard A. Cafferty, Harpursville.
Dorothy B. Driscoll, Kauneonga Lake.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who didst manifest Thy Son by the leading of a star, we bow before the throne of Him whose earthly mission began with peace on earth, good will to men. Blessed be the Lord God who, according to His abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope wherein we greatly rejoice. We would have our hearts attuned to the angels' song: Glory to God in the highest. O let Thy holy mantle hover above the plains of night; come anew to our land; sanctify all toil; heal grief and woe. Crown us all with the spirit of love which makes good neighbors and good citizens. O Star of the East, once again climb the midnight sky, and again bless the world with the glad news of a Saviour born.

And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 14, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On December 3, 1945:

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary.

On December 5, 1945:

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands.

On December 6, 1945:

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations.

On December 7, 1945:

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

On December 11, 1945:

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; and

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll.

On December 12, 1945:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940,

with respect to the movement of Government traffic.

On December 14, 1945:

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the current session, relative to the Full Employment Act, for the use of said committee; and

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution authorizing the House Committee on Labor Subcommittee to Investigate Aid to the Physically Handicapped to have printed for its use additional copies of parts 1, 3, 7, and 8 of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the second session, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to aid to the physically handicapped.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 380) entitled "An act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BUCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Adams	Hancock	Outland
Allen, Ill.	Hand	Philbin
Baldwin, Md.	Hart	Phillips
Baldwin, N. Y.	Healy	Powell
Barrett, Pa.	Hedrick	Quinn, N. Y.
Barry	Heffernan	Ramey
Bender	Heselton	Ramspeck
Boren	Hook	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Horan	Rayfiel
Brehm	Jackson	Rich
Brumbaugh	Jennings	Rizley
Buck	Johnson, Ill.	Robertson, Va.
Buckley	Johnson, Okla.	Rockwell
Bunker	Jonkman	Roe, Md.
Campbell	Keefe	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Kelley, Pa.	Rooney
Carlson	Keogh	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kilburn	Schwabe, Okla.
Celler	Knutson	Sharp
Colmer	Kunkel	Sheridan
Combs	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Courtney	Latham	Smith, Va.
Curley	Lewis	Somers, N. Y.
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Stevenson
Dawson	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Dickstein	McConnell	Tarver
Dingell	McGlinchey	Taylor
Douglas, Calif.	McKenzie	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Maloney	Tolan
Fenton	Mason	Torrens
Gearhart	May	Vorys, Ohio
Geelan	Merrow	White
Gerlach	Morgan	Wilson
Gibson	Morrison	Winter
Granahan	Murdock	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Murphy	Wood
Hall, Leonard W.	Norton	Zimmerman
Halleck	O'Hara	
	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 317 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TWENTY-THREE YEARS IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended to 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I became a Member of this body on March 4, 1923. My retirement, voluntarily, is effective December 31, 1945. In the absence of some unusual circumstance, this is the last time I shall have the high honor and the great privilege of addressing the House of Representatives. I am very frank to say that I approach the task with mixed emotions. On one hand, I am very keenly conscious of the fact that I am perhaps about to give up something that is very, very dear to me, something that is really a part of me. On the other hand, there lies ahead the thrill of a new adventure, an adventure in private citizenship, a blessed state which I can hardly ever remember having experienced, because I have been in public office almost all of my life.

An English philosopher once said that there are two supreme pleasures in life. One is ideal, one is real. The ideal, he said, is when a man receives the seals of office from his sovereign. The real pleasure, he said, is when he hands them back.

His sentiment was a little differently expressed, perhaps, by the man who drives the milk wagon on the street where I live. A few days after the notice came out in the press that I would voluntarily retire from the Congress, he was passing one day and he said: "Good morning, Judge." I said, "Good morning, Bill." He said, "I see you are getting out of Congress." I said, "Yes; that is right. I have got my points and now, in the parlance of the day, I think maybe I will be liquidated or deactivated, or whatever you want to call it, for awhile." He said, "Judge, I always did say you were a smart man." I said, "I thank you; that is nice of you to say; I appreciate that very much." He said, "Yes; you are a smart man." He said, "You is getting out before they get you."

I appreciated that, coming as it did, because, after all, it is not a bed of roses being in public life that a lot of people would like to make you think. There are a lot of trials and tribulations along with these honors that come to us.

I do not know whether you ever heard the story of that sheriff out in one of our Virginia counties who ran for public office. We have in Virginia, as most States have, a law which requires you to report your campaign expenditures. After the election was over this sheriff got the usual forms and filled out the financial side of the questionnaire as to how much he had expended and how much had been expended for him so far as he was aware. But he did not feel that that told the entire story. So he turned over on the back and he thought he would write in the rest of the story. He wrote down: "I traveled 1,200 miles; I shook hands with 1,298 people; I plowed 27 acres; I joined 7 lodges; I was baptized 3 times, 1 by immersion; I kissed 74 babies; I made love to 16 old maids; I was bitten by 3 dogs, and I was defeated by 65 votes."

So it is not all a bed of roses. I hope that some of you young "guys" will pardon me if I become reminiscent for a moment or two for my own edification and of some gentlemen whom I see sitting around who have been contemporaries of mine during these 23 years. The other day I was just thinking about the panorama that was running before me of the good old days when I first came up here.

You know, back in the old days before the Norris constitutional amendment, Congress used to adjourn on the 4th of March every other year. The country went along pretty well. I know we used to go home sometimes on the 4th of March and not come back until December. Those were the good old days. I had an office up on the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building and right around the corner was the distinguished Congressman from Missouri and my distinguished friend who is standing right by me the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and his efficient and active secretary. Around the corner was the office of Lou Douglas, who afterward became Director of the Budget, and still later went on to bigger and better fields. I remember the bicycle he used to ride.

Then over here on the floor of the House. Those were great old days.

Hardly a day passed that we did not have some entertainment for members of the gallery and for Members on the floor. There would be a quorum call, just like we had today, that made you come away from your desk and your work and rush you over here and very likely you would see the distinguished leaders engage in serious debate, and when John Philip Hill, of Maryland, would ride up on his white charger and rush down to the well of the House and say something about national prohibition, the minute he mentioned it, down would come rushing Bill Upshaw, of Georgia, and Tom Blanton, and there they went at it; or perhaps you would hear a delightful repartee by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Tincher, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Connally. If you want something fine in repartee and quick wit, if you want to see the virtues and the vices of the two major political parties thoroughly gone over, get some of the debates between Tincher and Connally. Then following down the more serious side we would have Longworth, of Ohio, Madden, of Illinois; Garrett of Tennessee; Ramseyer, of Iowa; Crisp, of Georgia; Mapes, of Michigan; Bankhead, of Alabama; Wood, of Indiana; Rainey, Byrns, McDuffy, and so on. Then after the day's work was over, most of us would go over to the old Congress Hall Hotel where we lived. And I always did think they made a mistake to tear down Congress Hall to build the New House Office Building, because that old hotel had a great deal of sentiment about it. There the Members of Congress and their families, most of them, lived, and if there was a dull evening we would have the magic of the gentleman from Texas to entertain us, Mr. LANHAM, or perhaps we would have the treat of seeing those wonderful picture slides of the early days of Washington that the gentleman from California, CLARENCE LEA, used to show. He still has them. If you have never seen them, you ought to take a look. Those were great old days.

Where is now the happy party,
I remember long ago,
Laughing around the happy fireside
Brightened by its ruddy glow.
Or in summer's balmy evening,
In the field upon the hay,
They are all dispersed and wandered,
Far away.

Some have gone to lands far distant,
And with strangers made their home.
Some upon the field of waters
All their lives were forced to roam.
Some have gone from us forever,
Longer here they might not stay,
They have reached a fairer region,
Far away.

This has been a great experience these 23 years, almost a quarter of a century. I do not want to go further in these remarks without, from the bottom of my heart, thanking you and each of you individually and collectively for your friendship, your cooperation, your tolerance and your patience; not only the Members in this Hall, but everyone around this Capitol: The doorkeepers, the pages, the elevator men, the boys who work at the Speaker's desk, on the floor, the committee clerks, and all of them. It is a great aggregation and a great bunch.

My colleagues, may I bespeak a kind word for the hard-ridden Committee on Appropriations. Do not be too hard on them, please. Remember that it is one of the hardest-working committees in the House of Representatives. There is hardly a time when the Committee on Appropriations or some of its subcommittees are not in session, and they do not do that just because they love to work; there is work to be done. It has been a tremendous job during this war to turn out these appropriations involving billions and billions of dollars. Congress has expected a great deal of that committee. On the one hand you expect it to hold down appropriations and protect the Public Treasury, and on the other hand, if some department sends up a project with enough Members involved in it, well, you know what that old steam roller is when it gets to working, and we go right down under it, and we try to go down with good grace. It has done a great job, and it is a great bunch of people.

Then the Independent Offices Committee. That subcommittee, of course, is the greatest of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. You understand why I think that. I have a deep affection for it.

Now, what about this Congress, and I do want to say a word about Congress. I think I am at a point now where I can look at Congress and speak of Congress objectively, and that is what I shall do briefly. It has been referred to as the greatest legislative body on the face of the earth, and I do not believe that designation is very much exaggerated. It is in every sense of the word a representative group.

Every Member of this Congress has been and is a recognized leader of some proportions in his own constituency. One cannot serve here unless he has been chosen by an electorate. In this body there is represented, as there should be, every school of thought and every shade of economic and political philosophy. One cannot conceive of a more representative group of people. And what of the individuals? There are lawyers, doctors, bankers, businessmen, farmers, schoolteachers, and so on. Individually and collectively, in my judgment, the integrity, industry, and high purposes of the Members of this body compare most favorably with any other group of citizens that might be gotten together.

I have heard it said that being in Congress is a thankless job. I doubt if that is literally true. I am sure that many of our citizens deeply appreciate the service rendered by Members of this body. But undoubtedly many of our citizens fail too often to take into account the back-bending, heart-breaking burdens that the conscientious Member of Congress is called upon to carry. I know and I could name scores of men in this body—I see some of them sitting before me today—who labor diligently day in and day out, Sundays and holidays, in season and out of season, for the interests of the constituencies that send them here and their country which they represent. These men serve on and on and continue to serve oftentimes at their own physical and economic disadvantage. I have seen men come to this body in the heyday of hopeful youth and stay on under the blistering spotlight of public service until those once raven locks were frosted by the passing of many winters, until that agile step had been slowed and that eagle eye had dimmed—literally burning out in the service of their country.

I salute you, servants of the people. If I had a voice that would reach the ear of every thoughtful citizen of America—because it is no use to talk to the thoughtless citizens of America—if I had a voice that would reach the ear and the heart of every citizen who loves and appreciates his country, I would try to say to them that this fine variety of individuals who constitute the House of Representatives, even with its shortcomings and its failures, is yet the anchor to windward of the great ship of American state in the seas of a restless world.

Deprive the House of Representatives of its individuality and it independence and there will quickly come an end to free government.

Much has been said about reforming Congress. Probably there are procedures that could be initiated that would be beneficial, but the House of Representatives as its stands today is very unique in one particular. Whatever may be said of the antiquity of its rules, it is a legislative body that is strictly and literally immediately responsive to the will of a majority of its Members, and that is democratic government.

I think it is well to remember this fact because we are all prone at times to become impatient when some measure in which we are very much interested does not move as rapidly as we think it should. But remember this, my colleagues, that no leadership, no administration, no committee, no group of Members can very well delay very long consideration of any measure when a majority of the Members of this House wish to consider.

I have no particular advice to give you today as to what could or should be done in the matter of changes in procedure. I will mention one or two things in passing that I think might be beneficial, not only to the Members of Congress individually, but to the country at large and to the people whom you serve. The first thing is that Congress is entirely too hesitant and too timid about doing anything for it own welfare. Remember that nothing can be done for the Congress to ease its burdens or to help its Members unless you are willing to do it yourself. No one else can do it. You can take action for the Government employees; you can take action for the judges; you can take action for the various departments and agencies, but if anything is done for the Congress they must do it for themselves. You certainly should without hesitancy increase the pay of Members of Congress. Thoughtful citizens of this country do not expect Members of Congress to serve here without sufficient remuneration to permit them to live in Washington and to discharge the duties of their office in a manner and according to standards to which they are accustomed. I know many

Members of this body who dip into their own private income to augment their congressional salaries; and this does not take into account one, and sometimes two, political campaigns every year. Do not delay that matter longer, I beseech you.

There is another thing I would like to mention. Congress should establish without hesitation a retirement system for its Members. Such a bill has been favorably reported out of the committee; a rule has been granted, and it is on the calendar for consideration. It will not be taken up before December 31. Therefore, I shall not be a Member of Congress if and when it is passed and, therefore, I may speak about it. I would like to talk about that for a minute or two. In the first place, let me say I pay respect and appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who worked so hard to bring out this bill. I know how conscientiously they labored, assisted by other Members of the House who were interested. It is here, and I mean no criticism of these gentlemen when I say it is better than nothing. But it is very little better than nothing. I want to comment on that. From the report on this bill, I want to read you two or three paragraphs with which I do not agree. I challenge them as a matter of logic and good reasoning.

The report says:

3. The Members of Congress will be on no better retirement basis than civil-service employees and will not enjoy any special advantages;

4. As a matter of fact, Members of Congress will receive less retirement benefits than comparable members of the judicial and executive branches and of the Army and Navy;

5. The bill elevates Congress to the proper degree of the career recognition that it deserves;

6. The bill will assure the attraction and retention to Congress of the best brains;

7. The bill is more for future benefits and to the greater advantage of those yet to come to Congress rather than the present Members and the older Members with the longest service—the bill avoids any unjust enrichments to those voting on the bill; and

8. The bill would reward long and faithful legislative service with appropriate benefits of security, the desire of which motivates and shapes the actions of every man.

H. R. 4199 is an answer to the recommendation of the President of the United States made in his message of September 6, 1945, to the Congress, in which he said: "I recommend that an adequate retirement system should be provided for the Members of the Congress who have served for a long period of years."

Now, it does not do anything like that, with all deference to the committee that reported it. In the first place, it is utterly illogical to compare a Member of Congress with a civil-service employee of the Government.

That is said without meaning any reflection whatsoever on the fine body of splendid men and women who do perform fine service for the Government, who work conscientiously and for long hours.

I said it is very little better than nothing. May I say very personally, if I were eligible to come under this bill, after 23 years' service, and at my age, after 23 years' service in Congress, if I paid the minimum $2,500 that is to be paid in, I could then draw retirement, $100 a month. That is what the committee says will attract the best brains to Congress and keep them there.

Or, if I exercised my right to pay back the 5-percent all the way back for the 23 years, according to the report, I would pay in $13,619, if I could borrow that amount somewhere, and then I could retire on $175 a month. If I remained in Congress 35 years, and lived to be 62 years old, I could get $5,000 a year. That would mean I would have to come to Congress when I was 27 years of age and stay here until I was 62, which does not often happen in this body.

There is no comparison. I do not know of any members in the civil-service branch of the Government who gave up a law practice, gave up a banking business, closed their farms, took the hazards of running for political office and of being reelected and reelected. There is no comparison whatsoever in the hazards taken, or in the benefits that are given up, to serve the public.

Not only that, but the ordinary civil-service employee of the Government does not have to maintain a residence back in the congressional district, whether he wishes to or not, and also keep one in Washington. There is no comparison in any way along the line. That is said without any disparagement at all of the regular civil service.

What should be done is to amend this bill to make it a real retirement system, commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of Members of Congress, so that it would attract men to come to Congress and attract men to stay here.

If you gentlemen who are applauding that will get busy, you will have a retirement system.

One other thing I think can and should be done—that is, definitely limit the sessions of Congress. There is no reason whatsoever, now that the war is over and in the absence of some other great emergency why the Congress cannot do all of its business, take care of all of its duties, in 5, or certainly not more than 6 months in the calendar year. I am confident that when you come back here in the middle of January, if the first action you take is to set a definite date to adjourn—and you can always change it—adjourn the 1st day of May, or June, or certainly not later than July, you will do all the business that ought to be done, and maybe more. Let us never forget this, that the country seldom suffers from the failure to pass legislation. It has often suffered from the passage of legislation.

The period of my service in this body has been most interesting. In these years I have seen the American people and the Congress in many varying moods. The pendulum has swung from one extreme to another in public thinking and in public reaction. When I came here the country was restless after the last war, and the cry was "back to normalcy." We then went skyward on a cycle of artificial prosperity, only to be catapulted down into the depths of economic despair very quickly. Then we started again upon the tortuous road to recovery. Then came the war. The Congress had to give up many of its prerogatives, its rights, and its privileges. There had to be regimentation and controls. Now the war is over and we are starting back again upon that same cycle.

What alarms me is that notwithstanding our bitter experiences that we have paid for with blood and tears and death there are many of our people who want to turn back quickly again to the fleshpots, think again about their riches, disband the Army, and sink the Navy again. Ah, my friends, I do not wish to labor the point. I have great confidence that this Congress will in its wisdom meet the test.

But there is one thought I should like to leave with you, one sentiment, if you please, which comes from the depths of my heart. Whatever may happen, keep America strong, strong morally, strong economically, and strong militarily; they are all inseparably linked together. And let us never forget that strength wisely dedicated inspires respect; weakness breeds contempt.

And now, my colleagues, with a heart full of priceless memories and a spirit that is humble and grateful I leave you. I have an abiding faith that in the days to come as in the days gone by our great ship of state heavy laden with a cargo of precious freedom and liberty will under your guidance sail on majestically, weathering every storm that blows. Yours is a great responsibility. The fate of free government is in your hands. May God in His wisdom give you strength and courage.

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What Workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, such time as I do not use I reserve.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent request the gentleman is granted the privilege of yielding time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague from Virginia who relinquishes the reins of government and leaves the Halls of Congress for the marts of America, for which during his long and able career as a legislator he has given such able, constructive, and devoted service.

Farewells should be sudden and brief, and yet it is not farewell to CLIFF WOODRUM. He may wave his hand in friendly adieu to those of us with whom he has

labored so faithfully in the cause of preservation and of progress, but where we are, he, too, will be. He may be gone from before our eyes but his spirit of gentleness with power, of sympathetic understanding with sagacity, of fellowship with leadership will never leave this House. He has left for all time his imprint upon the legislative pages of our country's history.

Since 1908 when he first began the practice of the law in the Commonwealth of Virginia, he has served his State and Nation as lawyer, judge, and since 1923 as Member of Congress, doing so with brilliance, fidelity, courage, and wisdom. I have known him throughout the length of my service. Through these years I have grown to know, respect, and admire him, not only as a friend but as the gentleman he is. The best mirror is said to be an old friend, though CLIFF WOODRUM will never be old. He will always remain as the cherished associate and valiant warrior in the cause of justice for mankind.

CLIFF WOODRUM has always struggled for his ideals, the ideals of a gentleman and of a sound, broad-minded American, doing this since the day he first crossed the threshold of this legislative Chamber.

There is no need to speak of his accomplishments. There are no words which could ever trace the rare outlines of his record as a Member of this body and as a statesman. In peace or war, he always gave his best and with courage. Valiant in his endeavor to support his country and his Commander in Chief, untiring in his efforts for victory during the darkest days of the war when the clouds of near despair hung low over our beloved country, ever conscious of our obligation as men and as legislators to our fellow citizens in high estate or lowly hut, inspired in his patriotic devotion to the cause of the members of our armed forces, CLIFF WOODRUM has been to me a friend, a wise counselor, a patient adviser, a keen and discerning citizen, not only of Virginia and America, but of the world.

He has created his own monument of greatness. Nothing can cover his high achievement but the smiling blue of the heavens, which covers the world, a place better for those who know CLIFF WOODRUM because of him. In his leaving, we part with one on whom we had built our absolute trust. With him go our heartfelt wishes, not for success, for that will always be his, but for that health and happiness which should crown the head of one who has given his all in the service of his fellow man and of his country.

CLIFF WOODRUM voluntarily closes his legislative book as a Member of the National House of Representatives. But his service and his accomplishments while here will always occupy a foremost place in the history, and particularly the legislative history, of our beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, our beloved colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the able and inspiring address of our beloved colleague emphasizes more than could words the great loss that this House will sustain in his departure. We have all admired CLIFF WOODRUM for his fine character, his splendid ability, his constructive statesmanship, and his rugged Americanism. It is needless to tell of our affection for him. The ovation we have just given him tells eloquently of our love and respect for this outstanding Member of Congress.

I have known CLIFF WOODRUM all of my 21 years of service in this House, and during all of that time I never knew him to do a dishonorable act. I never knew him to break his word. He was a hard fighter but always a fair and sincere one. We all know his objective was always to serve his country and because of his service this country is better off than it would otherwise have been. If you were to make up a list of the outstanding Members who served in this House in the last 23 years, you would find the name of CLIFF WOODRUM high on the list. He is a student of government. As a member of the Appropriations Committee he was of necessity a student of finance. As we face these trying days ahead, these days of momentous problems that are before us, we will sorely miss CLIFF WOODRUM. He was a brave, gallant fighter for a safe and sound Government. He tried to keep expenditures in line and help to bring about a balanced budget which is so essential if America is to discharge its full obligation to the people of America and the rest of the world.

Yes, it is a great loss to our country to have CLIFF WOODRUM leave us at this period. He was a loyal Democrat. He believed in his party, and he stood foursquare in its support. Yet those of us who belong to the Republican Party knew that as much as he loved his party, he never hesitated to put his country above his party. That is the test of a real patriotic statesman. As we face these chaotic days ahead when the America we love is in peril, we need men like CLIFF WOODRUM in order that we can achieve the objectives sought by a majority of the American people. In leaving Congress, CLIFF WOODRUM departs with the respect and affection of every Member of Congress, irrespective of which side of the aisle he may sit on. He can carry with him the realization, that while he is physically absent, he will be here in spirit, his memory giving encouragement to those who will carry on. A great Congressman and a great American is leaving this historic Chamber.

May he find a full measure of happiness and prosperity in the new work which he will assume is the sincere wish of all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

CLIFF WOODRUM

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is a time-worn adage—and perhaps a very true one—that democratic officials seldom retire and never resign. The instance we have here today is not necessarily a refutation of that happy philosophy. On the contrary, it is perhaps the exception that proves the rule.

But, it must be remembered, there are extenuating circumstances—highly extenuating.

And there have been, it must be confessed, similar instances in the last few months. One Member who retired from Congress is said to have earned in fees a dozen times the emolument he received as a Member. Another recently left the august Chamber at the other end of the Capitol to arbitrate a great national sport, at a salary of $50,000. And this month two more, including the majority whip, leave Congress for salaries far in excess of the statutory stipend of Members of the legislative branch of the Government.

I do not know what significance attaches, but by a coincidence all these gentlemen are Democrats. It is difficult to determine whether this is due to the mere fact that the ablest members of the House are naturally members of the Democratic Party, or whether well financed Republican interests, despairing of ever voting Democratic leaders out of Congress have resorted to this method of making inroads on the party in power.

Whatever the circumstances, the retirement of CLIFF WOODRUM from public service, at this critical period, is universally deplored. I am certain I reflect the sentiment of the entire membership of the House when I say there is universal regret that he is leaving the Congress.

He is one of the most lovable and companionable of men and his service here reflects credit on himself, his country, and his constituency. It is quite a tug at the heart strings to have such a man leave the long and intimate associations which are inevitably developed in the daily grind of the House and the committees.

Had he remained to the end of his term he would have served here nearly a quarter of a century. It has been a notable period in the annals of the Nation and the world, and he has had a large part in its history.

His has been an exceptional career. He has promulgated no "isms"; he has championed no forlorn causes; he has led no crusades; he has not been stampeded by the veering winds of passion and sentiment which from time to time sweep the Chamber. He has kept his feet on the ground and his head above the miasma of partisanship and personal interest and sectional prejudice.

In the committee especially his work has been invaluable. His wise counsel, his mature experience, his discriminating judgment have exercised a stabilizing influence on the deliberations of the subcommittee and the committee itself.

There is only one consolation, and that is that we have this opportunity to express our regard and affection for him before he leaves with a lily in his hand. He is leaving while it is yet day, while the sun is still high, and while there are still ahead of him many fruitful years of achievement.

We wish for him health, happiness, and prosperity, the continued satisfaction of duty well performed, and all the laurels of continued success in an ever-widening field of service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I remember CLIFF WOODRUM when he first came to the House. In those good old days back in 1923, 1924, and 1925, when we finished the session and were all through with it, on the evening of adjournment it was customary after adjournment to have a little gathering here in the House and a song fest, and Cliff led the singing and did a grand job of it.

I remember a little later on when Judge Harrison, of Virginia, went out of the House and Cliff took his place upon the Appropriations Committee. He was assigned to the Independent Offices Committee by the then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Honorable Will R. Wood, of Indiana, one of the very ablest men I have known during my service here.

On the 4th of March 1933, just before Will Wood died—he died the next day—he paid this tribute to CLIFF WOODRUM:

> I can truthfully say that I admire you and your work. Had I not had perfect confidence in you, I would not have asked you as I did while chairman of the Appropriations Committee to protect the Independent Offices bill, you then being a minority member. My confidence was not misplaced. You kept the faith and did the work well.

That is the way he impressed the other members of his committee and the membership of the House. In the days that followed, he rose steadily in stature. He not only took a very prominent and laborious part in the work of the Appropriations Committee, but in the routine procedure of the House. He carried the load. Of course, he was subject to that influence which comes to all members who serve upon the Appropriations Committee who begin to realize what a serious situation is created by the useless and wasteful expenditure and appropriation of public funds. He absorbed some of the atmosphere that naturally goes with that realization. But I can truthfully say that his attitude through the years has been that of a sincere and devoted statesman who has carried the load here in the House for a long time. I am very sorry that he is leaving us. I wish him the best of everything in all his endeavors in the days to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement from the House of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the House and the country loses one of its outstanding public servants. It has been my good fortune to have known him from the day he came to the House. We lived for years in the Congress Hall Hotel which the gentleman so reminiscently described. During all those years I have admired his ability and naturally feel that that ability has been recognized and admired by every Member of the House who has followed his constructive service here. I hope that his admonition and advice to us today will be followed, because I know it comes after due and careful consideration on his part.

I know, sir, that not only I, and you know the feelings that I have expressed many times, but the entire membership of the House of Representatives deplores extremely your leaving. I know you have their best wishes. I hope that God will spare you for many years to continue to serve, though not in this House, but in many other ways, your country that you love so well. You are an outstanding American. I am proud of the fact that I have had the privilege to serve with you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, Virginia, the mother of Presidents, has contributed the services of very many able men to support the Declaration of Independence, to defend the Constitution, and to preserve thenceforth those fundamental principles of government for which the Colonies stood and fought.

None other and no more able champion of those concepts of liberty under law, no more outstanding representative of that great old State of Virginia and its conception of the difference between license and liberty, the right of the individual, opportunity for free enterprise, has ever served in the Halls of either branch of this Congress than CLIFF WOODRUM, affectionately and respectfully so known to us who have served with him, whose voluntary departure from these Halls we regret as a loss, not only to Virginia but to the Nation.

May you live as long as you wish and have all you wish as long as you live, Cliff.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, 11 of the 13 years that I have been in Congress I served on the Appropriations Committee; 9 of these years I served on the Deficiency Appropriations Committee—the committee that during the last 4 years has had more long hours of trying and nerve-wracking work than any other committee in Congress. During my service as a Member of the House, I have found that Members assigned to committees, regardless of politics, take their work seriously and render service of such quality that one would render in his untiring efforts to build a business of his own back home in his own district.

The gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable CLIFTON WOODRUM, of course, was on the Appropriations Committee long before I was, and I found him on the deficiency committee when I went on that committee 9 years ago.

I am happy to say that I learned much valuable knowledge from Cliff. I learned much in procedure and technique in handling appropriation matters. I learned from him that to serve effectively and efficiently and for the good of all we must not only give and take, compromise and recompromise, but be unselfish in the performance of our duties.

Yes; we will miss CLIFF WOODRUM. I will miss him a great deal. I always admired Cliff's frankness and judgment. Two years ago I was proud to present him to one of the outstanding old colleges in the United States for the degree of doctor of philosophy. Old Waynesburg College, Pennsylvania, endowed with the fine Presbyterian background for 97 years, never bestowed a degree of doctor of laws on anyone more deserving than CLIFF WOODRUM. The college is proud that they conferred this degree on this gentleman and statesman from the Old Dominion of Virginia. Cliff will have success, and I wish for him Godspeed and good health in his future endeavors.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my first assignment on the Appropriations Committee was to sit at the foot of the class in the Independent Offices Subcommittee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

For 6 years I have had the privilege of association in that subcommittee under the tutelage of that gentleman and the ranking minority member, an equally earnest servant of the country, the diligent and able Member from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

For such a privilege, I shall always be grateful. And, while I lack the ability to add to the high tribute paid to the gentleman from Virginia by the great ovation he was given by the House here today, I do want to record my great admiration for his character and the quality of service he has rendered.

In the committee room, as every Member knows, you get to know a man's real worth and gain an understanding of his motives. The gentleman from Virginia has my respect so completely that I say without hesitation that there is no post of honor in this Republic which he would not grace, none that he would not fill with credit and distinction to himself and profit to the country.

Indeed, my personal hope is that this retirement from the House of Representatives will not end the public career of the gentleman, but rather that it may open to him doors for wider service where his abilities and spirit may have an even greater expression than here. My best wishes will go with my chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, CLIFF WOODRUM, wherever he goes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, Kentucky, a part of Virginia, was carved out of old Virginia, the mother of Presidents and patriots. Virginia has been a dominant influence in molding and holding all the sound policies and sentiments which have made America the land of the free. She has done that through the inspiration and leadership of the galaxy of great men and patriots she has sent into public life. But Virginia is slipping in allowing this great Virginian to leave

the service of his country, the Honorable CLIFF WOODRUM. I am in favor of a compulsory draft law to keep him here, or in the Senate. I have sat at his side for 11 years on the Appropriations Committee and in the Halls of Congress. I have seen no man who has commanded more respect, who has furnished greater leadership, who has had more balance, whose judgment has been sounder, or whose devotion to his country's good has been of a higher order. His friends are numerous, but his admirers are legion. His high type of service will be a lasting inspiration to all and Virginia may add another name to her long list of distinguished Americans.

He leaves the House of Representatives with the highest respect of his colleagues and the deepest devotion of his friends.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, CLIFF WOODRUM to me has been one of the most efficient, honest, and capable persons it has been my privilege to associate with as a Member of Congress. The country and the State of Virginia will miss his counsel, advice, and work in the years to come as a legislator. We must thank CLIFF WOODRUM for what he has done. We wish that his future path in life will be happy, pleasant, and enjoyable. To know him and to work with him is to regard him and to love him.

May God bless CLIFF WOODRUM wherever he goes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and, I feel, also a great privilege to have been able to call the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] my friend since the day he came to Washington as a Member of this House. He brought back old memories when he stated a few minutes ago in his remarks about how we were close together on the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building, where you too, Mr. Speaker, had an office.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] was always a valuable Member of this House but it was when he becamecame a member of the great Appropriations Committee that he really distinguished himself. It was not long after he had been appointed on that committee before he became chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the independent offices appropriation bill. Mr. Speaker, when we were enjoying a little rest or a vacation in the late fall and during the month of December awaiting the call of Congress for the January session, Mr. WOODRUM's subcommittee would be in session daily. They would secure an advance copy of the Budget and hold their hearings so that when we returned his appropriation bill would be ready for the consideration of the House.

There is now on the President's desk a bill that gives the Chief Executive the power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. Having been a member of every committee for years that considered reorganization bills, I can say without fear of contradiction this is the best act of its kind that was ever passed. I am aware of no man who knows more about the actual workings of the independent agencies of the Government than the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. Although he is going to retire from Congress, I sincerely hope that he can be induced by the President to give him the benefit of his experience in considering the appropriations for the various independent agencies.

It would take pages to tell of the achievements of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. There are two outstanding matters however that I think worthy of mention. Included in the independent offices bill was an appropriation annually for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, this organization having been set up by an act of Congress. Outstanding scientists served on the Committee without pay. Money was appropriated for the construction of a laboratory at Langley Field, Va. There were few Members of the House who had any idea of the work performed by this agency. It so happens that on numerous occasions I had visited the laboratory at Langley Field. No one who is aware of its activities can question the statement that it is the greatest laboratory of its kind in the world. Time and again when the bill was under consideration Members would want to strike out the appropriation, saying that it was a waste of public funds to appropriate money for that purpose. After Mr. WOODRUM's explanation the appropriation would always remain in the bill. It has contributed more to the advancement of aviation than all the research laboratories in the country. So important was it to the Army and Navy that as the Second World War approached the Congress enlarged its activities by opening a second laboratory in Cleveland, Ohio, and a third laboratory in California.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, I remember how hard the gentleman from Virginia would fight those who desired to destroy the Federal Trade Commission or cripple it by a reduction in its appropriations. The Federal Trade Commission, as the Members of this House know, is the one Government agency that looks after the interests of the general public and protects it from unethical business practices.

While his burdens were many as chairman of this great subcommittee, still he assumed other responsibilities when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the late gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Taylor, became ill. It was CLIFF WOODRUM who took over his work and became acting chairman of the Deficiency Committee. It was this committee that brought to the House the tremendous appropriations that were asked by the President during the great depression. He was not a local legislator, but a national legislator and although many of these requests brought him a great deal of criticism, the gentleman from Virginia made the fight that the President asked, and all of us know how successful he was.

His activities on this floor were always a great inspiration to me, and I am happy to say that I found it possible to follow him on almost every occasion.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Virginia has a long list of illustrious statesmen who have served this Nation, and on January 1 it is fitting and proper that the name of CLIFTON A. WOODRUM be added to that list.

I wish for the gentleman from Virginia a long and happy life and success in his new undertaking.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has had a long and distinguished career in public service. He has served as a leading Member of this House for 23 years. Before coming here he served the State of Virginia as commonwealth attorney and judge for a period of 5 years.

Almost exactly 16 years ago he and I were appointed on the same day to the Committee on Appropriations. Almost exactly 16 years ago he and I were appointed on the same day to the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the independent offices.

Since that time we have been closely associated; we have served together on that subcommittee, on the deficiency subcommittee, and on at least one other special subcommittee. He has served as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the independent offices. I have served as its ranking minority member.

I have already paid my tribute to CLIFF WOODRUM many times on the floor of this House. I have considered him for years as one of the ablest Members of the House. I know we all regret that we are to be deprived of our daily association with him. I know we all join in wishing him every possible success and happiness in the new work on which he is about to embark.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible, nor is it necessary for me to enumerate the fine qualities of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. I once heard a former Speaker of this House, Speaker Bankhead, say "I am a sentimental cuss." I myself am a "sentimental cuss." I remember when I came here almost 10 years ago, not long out of college, when I faced the assembled membership and saw the great ability here, and so many men much older than I, I felt almost helpless. At that time one man took great interest in me and that man was CLIFF WOODRUM. I shall always cherish that great interest.

We are not all born with the same qualities. The gentleman from Virginia has greater qualities than many others. We cannot all hope to attain, Cliff, the great heights of statesmanship you have here.

May I say in conclusion that when I leave this House my fondest hope will have been satisfied if I receive the same display of affection and esteem as shown

you here today. We all love you, Cliff; and may God bless you!

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, my friend Cliff, I think it is safe today to violate the rule by referring to you by your first name. I could pay you no higher testimony after years of association in that little committee room downstairs than to say I would like to have it said of my services in Congress the thing that can be said of you: You have been so eminently fair. There have been opportunities when you could have taken political advantage. You never have.

Like the admonition of the Apostle Paul, your forbearance has been known in the sight of all men.

You have been courageous. I remember the day when you chairmaned that subcommittee that was investigating WPA, when they hung you in effigy in Massachusetts, New York, and elsewhere. That is rather disconcerting to a sensitive soul, but it did not deter you in doing your duty.

Your patriotism has been unassailable. You offered a son to this country, not knowing whether he would come back. Then, if there is one fine quality about you, Cliff, that I like, it is the grace with which you addressed yourself to the problems that were before us and always in that fine grace you have kept up the dignity of this body. How easy it is for us to jab and jibe at each other, how easily it is oftentimes in the vehemence of debate to indulge in those little things that are designed perhaps to be embarrassing but at the same time that demean this body in the eyes of people on the outside. I cannot remember in my 13 years of service in that body that you have done that on the floor of this House.

When we forget grace and sportsmanship, it does lower us in the esteem of the country. Only in proportion as we have a gracious regard for one another can we hope to retrieve that degree of public confidence which this body so long enjoyed and which it so richly merits if representative government is not to go into retreat even as it retreated and was finally eclipsed elsewhere in the world. That confidence can only spring from courage, forbearance, truth, and grace.

But, Cliff, I look upon your retirement as something more than a departure of just another individual from this legislative body which has gone on for more than 150 years and which has seen perhaps 9,000 men and women come and go in the constitutional life of this Republic. Your departure directs attention to the future and to the responsibility which is before us as a Congress.

I believe it was Disraeli who once observed that Western civilization is committed to what he called "that fatal drollery called representative government."

Evidently in using the word "drollery" he must have thought of representative government as something unstable and superficial, and when he used the word fatal he must have had in mind that in some generation, representative government would be challenged by systems of government that seemed more militant, more unrestrained, and more brutal. The war from which we emerged speaks so eloquently of the fact that free representative government has been challenged and that it may again be challenged in the future.

If Disraeli is correct, then what is the answer to what he alleges to be the fatal drollery of representative government in a rather tangled and perplexed world where we are constantly faced with the problem of readjustment to new conditions and new forces.

I think the answer lies in the lawmaking branch of this Government and in the improvement of its output to meet new problems from time to time. That, of course, requires efficient processes here but in even greater degree it requires men with initiative, with vision, with devotion, with experience, and with courage.

If, as you have so well pointed out, those things can be done which will develop a greater sense of independence and security here, it will improve the output and it will serve as a safeguard to free government.

Cliff, you have done your share in great abundance and Godspeed wherever you may go.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I may speak my word of appreciation of our old friend and comrade, Mr. WOODRUM, who is leaving us. I do so with a sorrowing heart, because of my keen realization of the loss his departure brings to the Congress and the Nation.

I do not know of any Member of this Congress whose departure from the halls of legislation would seem more of a calamity or whose passing from us would leave a more serious and aching void. To say that the Congress of the United States is losing one of the main pillars of its strength and usefulness would be expressing it mildly. There are times when the tongue cannot speak the language of the heart and that is the fix I am in when I undertake to fathom the personal loss I feel in being deprived of his ever helpful association and friendly counsel. To me he has always been a guide, philosopher, and friend on whose wise counsel and generous and unfailing friendship I have relied from the very day I entered the Congress in 1929.

For years I have sat by his side, day by day, on the appropriations subcommittee on deficiencies and I have never ceased to admire him for his clear vision, his sound and accurate reasoning, the righteousness of his purposes, and his nobility of character.

His work in Congress has been most outstanding, not only in the privacy of the committee cloister but in the proceedings on the floor, where his oratorical talents have shown most brilliantly. Whether as an advocate or an opponent, his fairness, his courtesy, and his logic make him almost irresistible in the arena of debate. On many occasions when I have been in charge of appropriation measures on the floor, I have gone to him for help, and I have experienced a great feeling of relief when he has come to my support. Every Member on this floor could likewise testify to his camaraderie and warmth of friendliness on innumerable occasions.

A good name is the best possession a man can have. The Bible, I believe, places it above great riches. Mr. WOODRUM has a good name, in this Chamber and at the other end of the Capitol and in every circle he has ever moved. No one who ever served in this body has had a better name. He has made a record of service that will be a priceless heritage for his family in all the years to come.

When I think of Mr. WOODRUM and his illustrious record as a legislator I think of another Virginian, also a man of clear vision, sound judgment, and fine humanitarian impulses, who was a Member of the Continental Congress during the birth pangs of the Republic. Thomas Jefferson. It seems to me that CLIFTON A. WOODRUM in his public service as a Member of this Congress has shown himself to be a man after Jefferson's own heart and that he has added new laurels to the rich traditions of his State and has demonstrated himself to be in every way worthy of the memory of the great founder of the Democratic Party.

The House of Representatives will not seem like the same place without Mr. WOODRUM and a heavy feeling of loss rests on all of us. I am sure that I reflect the deep emotions of all of the Members of Congress at both ends of the Capitol when I say to Mr. WOODRUM:

"Good-by, old friend. Good luck and Godspeed, and may you find much happiness and success in your new environment."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the floor today I did not know that these ceremonies were going to take place; in fact, I have not yet been able to realize that Cliff is going to leave us. I have been with him for many years. On the 3d day of July 1918, I qualified as a Member of this House. It has been a long time ago. A few years after that Cliff came. From that time to this he has been a warm, intimate friend of mine, and many of the duties that I have had to perform have been lightened because he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that dealt with appropriations for the Maritime Commission, appropriations for our shipping, and appropriations for aviation.

I endorse fully the many encomiums which have been pronounced today upon his service. They are well deserved. He has represented his district, State, and Nation, with distinction, and words are

inadequate and time insufficient for me to tell of his work specifically as to items. I knew when I approached him for any help that my request must be fully merited, and when merited would receive his best attention. More than that I would not have asked, and more than that he would not have granted. He has served his district, his State, and his Nation well. We shall miss him very much. Having served with him throughout his career here, I know whereof I speak.

I am sorry to see him go. I cannot add anything to the words of praise that have been spoken here today. I wish I could. He comes from the district of a great man, CARTER GLASS, who was a Member of this House when I came here. I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] that Virginia does not willingly let him go. If Virginia had its choice and participation in the election in his district, in fact, whether we participated or not in the other districts, he would come back here all right. There is no doubt about that, because the voters of that district are patriotic Virginians. Whether they be Democrats or Republicans, they have intelligence enough always to vote for and return the gentleman from Virginia, CLIFF WOODRUM.

We are sorry to see him go. We will miss him. But we well know that we will have his assistance always and help in any way that he can render assistance and help nationally or for his State and district.

CLIFF WOODRUM met in full the difference between a good representative and a bad representative as defined by Hon. John Sharp Williams, for many years a Senator from the State of Mississippi. He told us, out of the abundance of his experience and wisdom, that a bad representative would pay any price to stay here, while the good representative wants to do what is right and trust that the people will have sense enough to understand it if he has sense enough to explain it, and if they do not he will pay the penalty smilingly, but at any rate he is not going to be a craven and a coward and a poltroon.

Such a man was and is CLIFF WOODRUM. Cliff, I can only say to you from the depth of my friendship of many years—I hate to see you go, and may God bless you in all your undertakings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, nothing I could say would add to what has been said about the services of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

But I rise to express my profound regret at seeing him leave the House. His departure from this body is a distinct loss to the Congress and to the country at one of the most critical periods in the history of this Nation.

We need his wise counsel, we need his vast store of legislative information, we need his moral courage, we need his integrity, we need his ability to grasp the great problems with which we are confronted. I could think of no greater loss this House could sustain at this time than to see the gentleman from Virginia leave these Halls.

The longer a man serves in Congress, if he is worth anything to his Government at all, the better he gets, and the more valuable his services become.

The gentleman from Virginia brought with him those three things that Jefferson said are necessary to make a worthy public official: He was honest, he was qualified, and he has been faithful. Add to that the vast store of information he has gathered, the wide experience he has attained, the friendships he has built up—these have given him a power in this House and a standing before the country of which I doubt that he is personally conscious, all of which render his loss to this House at this particular time one of the greatest blows that could come to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. He is universally regarded as a scholar, a statesman, and a friend. In my opinion, he fits the definition of the perfect gentleman. He will be missed here. We wish him well. I am certain that he will carry with him those principles that have actuated his life, principles which he evidently learned at his mother's knee, that he do unto others as he would have them do unto him. Mr. Speaker, may the choicest blessings of God accompany him as he goes on his journey.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, a Member does not have to be an old-timer here to appreciate the importance of the occasion when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is on the floor. I am a new Member, having served only 1 year. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has been an inspiration to new Members, especially as to how to conduct one's self on the floor. I like his conduct, his mannerisms, his gentlemanliness. I appreciate his friendliness and kindness. Much can be learned from him. I remember how the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], for example, during the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1946, presented the case of the veterans from the well of the House with facts and figures in the form of charts. It was an impressive presentation that a new Member can never forget. I regret very much to see him go. I have been helped a great deal by the leaders in the House and other Members, but I am constantly learning from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. I am sorry that I will no longer have that privilege. To me it seems that he is just what a Congressman ought to be like. I know that Virginia has contributed many great men to our Government, and although last, not the least, is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, we may congratulate our country that in this stage of its history we have produced a man like our colleague from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. For 23 years I have seen him grow in the respect and affection of the Members of this House. For 23 years he has constantly been improving the service he has given to our country. To me he has been one of the most inspiring Members of the House since my service here began. I personally regret his departure.

The people of the Nation are losing a great public servant. I regret the loss from this body of one who so fully, in my judgment, represents the best we have in American public life.

In those 23 years he has gone through the crucible of practical, difficult service here. In carrying every responsibility these years have placed upon him he has acquitted himself in a manner worthy of a great statesman and fine citizen of this Republic.

Sometimes we are in doubt as to what are the rewards of public service. However useful one's service may be here, there is an uncertainty, a lack of concreteness, to what he may have accomplished. There may be a lack of recognition of the value of that service, but we must not be too concerned about the recognition that may come as a measure of our service in this great legislative body of the Nation. It is a great service.

Perhaps the best reward we can have for our service here—the one in which we can find the most happiness—is that when a Member's services are complete he can retire from this body with a consciousness of having rendered a useful service to his country. There are no scales that can accurately weigh the value of a good service in this body. Even a little thing is a great thing when done to the benefit of 134,000,000 people. It is a greater thing when one for these many years can take an effective part, as our colleague from Virginia has, in the great affairs of this Nation in the most important period of its existence.

As he leaves this body he is entitled to carry away the happiness of accomplishment, the joy of having done many useful things for his country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

It seems to me that text from Holy Writ applies with peculiar emphasis and fitness to CLIFF WOODRUM. He has laid down 23 years of life in this House for his friends. Now that those friends have grown in number until they cover 435 districts instead of 1, he is going, not to a well-earned rest, but to an advancing usefulness, for we know him beyond any peradventure of doubt, and we can testify that wherever he goes and no matter what he does, the investment of his life with all of its manifold meaning and deep significance will be for his friends who are now the American people.

Then there is another point wrapped up in that Scripture: "Greater love hath no man than this." Look around this audience. Listen to these tributes. Here you see and hear the stark sincerity of the superlative regard his colleagues proudly bear him. "Greater love hath

no man than this," that is being demonstrated for CLIFF WOODRUM here today, and which has been in our hearts for him throughout the years of his unselfish, outstanding service.

The love of this body is not maudlin sentimentality. It is bestowed only on those who earn it. It is compounded of justified admiration absolute confidence, real affection.

Alabama joyously joins her sisters in tribute of gratitude to the mother of Presidents, and one of her great sons.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our beloved Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, CLIFF WOODRUM has already been told by me my deep regret at his leaving the public service. I do not know of any man whose leaving this House would leave a greater void than the going of CLIFF WOODRUM. I know he loves this institution as we do. I know personally he regrets to leave. But I took the floor today to say a word in tribute to him in a way that is a little different. People, knowing of my long service in the House of Representatives, now a third of a century, serving with more than 2,000 men and women in that time, ask me if the Congress in character and ability today is up to what it was 33 years ago. My answer is, emphatically, "Yes, and more." I think in reading the history of my country I could go back to the foundations of the Government and say that the men and women serving in Congress today have certainly been equal in character and have as much ability as those of any Congress.

The great State of Virginia, that mother of Presidents, has contributed its great part to the founding of the Republic and to sustaining it ever since.

This is my tribute to CLIFF WOODRUM, to his character and to his ability: If he had lived in the day of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Henry, if he had approached a conference in which they were engaged, they, in character and in wisdom, would have received him as an equal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, CLIFF WOODRUM'S record here is its own tribute. He has carved his name on the pillars of Congress in indelible letters of statesmanship. Gracious, charming, affable, fair, tolerant, he is a superb Congressman. In handling a complex appropriations measure on this floor, he has had few peers in all our history.

His career may be felicitously epitomized in the words of Lincoln, "Die when I may, I want it said of me by those who knew me best that I always plucked a thistle and planted a flower where I thought a flower would grow."

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is a great lawyer, an eminent jurist, an exceptionally gifted legislator. He is a credit to Roanoke, to Virginia, to the Nation, and to this Congress. We shall miss him. We wish him health and happiness and long life in the new and private field to which he is going from our midst. As a fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations, I can testify first hand to his admirable qualities of leadership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to know CLIFTON WOODRUM since he first came to the Congress. I have loved him as a friend, I have admired him as a colleague. His legislative career has typified the wisdom, the sincerity, and the courage of those illustrious statesmen of the early days of Virginia who in preaching and in practice left us the heritage of our sterling Americanism. In preserving and promoting those tenets of government of a free people, he has labored faithfully and efficiently. We shall feel the loss of his service in our legislative tasks, and we shall miss him as friend misses friend. Our fond wishes for his health and happiness will always attend him. May God bless him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, Virginia cherishes the noble tradition that public office is a public trust. I know of no one in Virginia today who better exemplifies that tradition than CLIFTON A. WOODRUM. Virginia is proud of her distinguished son. We regret to lose his vauable services as a Representative in the halls of the Congress, and we wish him Godspeed in his new undertaking.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RESA].

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, in the short period of less than 1 year during which I have been a Member of the House of Representatives I have come to have a high opinion of Mr. WOODRUM. Very early I was impressed by the unruffled competence with which he went about the performance of his duties. The pertinence, importance and logical force of his discourses during debates set a type and standard to which all might profitably endeavor to conform. My expression of regret at the loss of his services to the Nation must be accompanied by an acknowledgment of my indebtedness for the profit I shall seek to derive from a remembrance of his work as I observed it. I deem it a privilege to join in the expressions of heartfelt wishes for his continued happiness and success.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I regret seeing the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] leaving the House. I speak as a new Member of the House, not as one who has served with him on committees, nor one who has known him for years. My acquaintance with him is only during this session of Congress, but I recall when he was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the first time I asked recognition to speak on the question then before the House. I remember his courtesy and consideration of me as a new Member. I was inspired by his gentlemanly manner to all Members of the House on that occasion and on all occasions when he presided or spoke in the House.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has impressed me as the ideal Congressman, possessing the intelligence, the temperament, the gentlemanly decorum, and in fact, all of the abilities necessary to properly represent his district and command the respect of his colleagues in the House.

His fine public record here will leave a void hard to fill. Virginia can be proud of him and the Nation has had the services of a great man in the House for 23 years which his successor will find it difficult to duplicate. I wish him every success in his new duties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the voluntary retirement from the Congress of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] leaves with the new Members of the House a deep sense of loss. When I came here just 1 year ago, I very soon developed a very sincere appreciation for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. To me he has been a perfect example of modesty, refinement, sincerity, and ability. I deeply regret his leaving and will always remember with sincere appreciation the excellent example he has been to the new Members.

My adjustment has been easier and my capacity to serve has been strengthened by association with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and I wish for him a richer field of service. May the years ahead bring to him a bountiful fulfillment of his heart's desires.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, because I deemed it appropriate that members of the Committee on Appropriations should be granted the principal time in the House to give their testimony to the high esteem in which Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM is held by the membership, I was compelled to forego the privilege I might have exercised, to join in an expression of good will, and best wishes to Mr. WOODRUM, who is, within a few days, retiring from membership in the House of Representatives.

In a sense it is said that this is a voluntary retirement. It is in that it is a matter of choice with him and not in keeping with the desires of his fellows in this body or his constituency at home.

I take advantage of this privilege as a Member, to make record, so far as words will allow, of my great regard for the ability, integrity, and standing of the Honorable CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, whose qualities I have had opportunity to observe for more than 4 years. Soon I came to appreciate the great service Mr. WOODRUM was rendering to the Congress and to the Nation in the exercise of his splendid faculties to the welfare of the United States in trying times. I would not make comparisons, but I am compelled to give it as my opinion that we have lost, in his separation from congressional life, one of the most valuable members in that body. At all times he has been active, but at no time willing

to impose his opinions in a thoughtless way.

Membership in this body has been with him a recognition of a duty the privilege imposes. In addition to his splendid service as a faithful member of the Committee on Appropriations, he has, when occasion demanded his splendid abilities, met every responsibility of membership in the Congress of the United States. Oftentimes, in critical hours, when measures seemed to hang in the balance, I have seen him take the floor of the House and, fortified by the high esteem as to ability and honesty in which he is held by the membership, apparently turn the tide in favor of measures designed and required to meet the necessities of the hour and the occasion.

I am just grateful that circumstances did not call him from the service at an earlier time. In retrospective realization of the need for ability and honesty in the last 4 years, and in remembrance of the great service he has rendered during that time, I am minded to express thanks and appreciation that he remained with us until these crucial days had passed. We shall, nevertheless, miss his splendid service in the important but less crucial days to follow.

I entertain the hope that, notwithstanding his separation from immediate activities of the House of Representatives, we may have his advice and counsel in meeting the responsibilities yet devolving upon Members of the Congress. It must be true, also, that the recollection of the wise, faithful, and important service he has rendered will of itself aid us, who remain, in the performance of our duties as the days may require.

In conclusion, I wish to express to him my sincerest good wishes for his health, his happiness, and many successful years in the days to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with his colleagues in deserved tribute to the high quality of the public service rendered by my friend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOODRUM. Personally, I regret that he is retiring from the House. The country can ill afford to loose the valuable public services of men of his ability.

Mr. WOODRUM possesses to an unusual degree the qualifications for successful legislative work. He is familiar with the science of government. He has an unusual personality and is an extraordinarily good public speaker. He not only has ability, but he has courage and independence. He is a man of conviction. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations he has exerted a great stabilizing influence. The country owes him a debt of gratitude.

With his hosts of friends I join in wishing him much success in his new fields of endeavor. I repeat that I personally and keenly regret that Congress and the country are to lose his most efficient services, especially at this critical period in the history of our country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, because of the admiration I have for him, I feel impelled to say a few words in tribute to our great colleague, CLIFTON A. WOODRUM. I was not closely associated with him. I served on no committee of which he was a member. But from the first day I served in the House, I recognized him as a man of great ability and of fine character who exercised a tremendous influence on his colleagues. In the 15 years I have been here he has continuously grown in stature until he is now unquestionably recognized as one of the truly great statesmen of our Nation.

His departure from the House is a tremendous loss not only to his State but to the Nation. A constituency with the good judgment to elect him would certainly have retained him in office as long as he desired, and I have no doubt of the great regret they feel at his departure from the House.

He has laid down the onerous duties of his office and has assumed a position in private enterprise where he can render service that will be inestimable to the farmers of our Nation. There is no doubt that the ability that distinguished him in public service will cause his rise to the most influential positions in his new field. The greatest reward of public service, that which brings more satisfaction to him who serves than anything else, is the respect and confidence and affectionate regard of his colleagues and the gratitude and friendship of his constituents. The demonstration of the respect in which CLIFTON WOODRUM is held by his colleagues leaves no doubt that he has that respect in a peculiar degree, and we know that his constituents whom he has served so long and faithfully will always hold him in the respect and confidence which he so richly deserves.

His name will be written high upon the list of great men who have served Virginia in the Congress of the United States. We can ill afford to lose his fine services, his sound judgment, and his good advice. We wish him health, happiness, and success in his new field.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who is resigning from the House effective December 31, and who has just made a very able and eloquent address.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve continuously with him as a Member of the House since we both became Members at the same time, on March 4, 1923. There were 117 new Members sworn in on that day, but only 7 of these now remain as Members of the House.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] was regarded as an able Member from the very inception of his service here, but I have watched with pride his growth and development and influence until today he leaves the House, regarded by all as one of the ablest and most influential Members of the entire House membership. He has reached this pinnacle by reason of hard work, an able and brilliant mind and an eloquent and convincing speaker, but above all of these qualities, he has character, and the membership of the House believes in his honesty, integrity, and sincerity.

His place is going to be difficult to fill, and his district and the Nation lose one of the ablest legislators when CLIFF WOODRUM ceases to be a Member of the House.

I am sure that I voice not only my own sentiments, but that of the entire membership when I wish for him a long, happy, and prosperous life.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, since I came to this Congress nothing has been more clear than the sentiment of this House today. The Members who make up the House of Representatives genuinely regret to see CLIFF WOODRUM pass from these halls and quit this body. But he will always be one of us. We feel his going keenly. We feel that we cannot afford to lose so valuable a Member. But he feels that we can get along and that the grand old State of Virginia can get along. Personally, I wish he had made up his mind to stick it out with us till we get by this hard pull. We are working out of our war gear into a peacetime economy and need our men who through the past years have learned where the pieces can safely be put together.

CLIFF WOODRUM has always stood as one of the tall men of this lawmaking department of the United States. He possesses ability, courage, energy, integrity, and perspicacity. These give to a man the respect of his fellows, always, but CLIFF WOODRUM has another quality. It is a genteel genuineness and warmth that made his fellows love him even above their high measure of respect. It is this that makes us gather in today and stay together to throw a few flowers after the lively carriage that conveys him to more profitable labors. Instead of selfishly bewailing his going out and leaving us I ask you fellow Congressmen to join me in unselfishly wishing him every happiness in his new field for we know he will prove a worthy laborer. Few of us are here who have not wondered why we do not lose more of our most able from these Halls. Very few are on the floor of this House who could not make a great deal more in civil activities.

Well, he leaves with a friendly word. He tells us we can raise the pay of United States judges but they cannot raise ours.

Before I take my seat please let me call attention to one matter for which we should be truly thankful. To succeed CLIFF WOODRUM as chairman of his important subcommittee stands the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable JOE HENDRICKS, a man of finest character, a man of ability and highest nobility of character. I talked today with CLIFF WOODRUM on this subject and he expressed his thoughts. I find the fact to be that his leaving this House is to him brightened by his confidence in his successor. I, for one, truly am happy that the work so well done by our departing colleague goes to capable and worthy hands.

So long, friend Cliff, you are to be long remembered here for men of your stature throw a long shadow.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that in view of the pressure of business today, there being the Consent Calendar, three suspensions, two messages from the President, and the desire to call up the United Nations Organization bill, the Chair cannot recognize Members to extend remarks until the legislative business of the day is disposed of.

EMPLOYMENT-PRODUCTION BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 380 to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, with a House amendment, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MANASCO, COCHRAN, WHITTINGTON, HOFFMAN, and BENDER.

AMENDMENT TO SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RANKIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4805), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, DIRKSEN, and ENGEL of Michigan.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent, due to the fact that time is very short, that the managers on the part of the House be permitted to include in the conference report matters upon which the conferees of the two Houses shall agree, section 2 of rule 20 to the contrary notwithstanding. That is the rule which requires conferees to bring into the House items on which there is no authorization.

I may say that in this bill are certain items which otherwise we would have to bring back out of mere formality, and we ask that they may be included in the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do this to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the benefit of the House and myself, if he can give us any idea when this conference report may be back in the House?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that we shall be able to bring this bill back to the House on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. It would be better, as a matter of fact, if it could be brought in tomorrow; that would be fine. The sooner the better. The $150,000,000 for UNRRA, of course, will have to come back for a separate vote anyway.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was one of the reasons for requesting waiver of technicalities.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 462, Rept. No. 1450) which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTINUANCE OF NAVY V-12 PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH (on behalf of Mr. BATES of Kentucky), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 463, Rept. No. 1451), which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V–12 program. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN DESCHUTES COUNTY, OREG., FROM THE PROVISIONS OF REVISED STATUTES 2319 TO 2337, INCLUSIVE

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 608) to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States, with Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after "States)" insert ": *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall disturb any vested rights of any person or persons in or to said real property or any part thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know what this bill is about?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill has already passed the House and the Senate. The Senate spelled into the bill what we stated in our report and on the floor, that we did not wish to disturb existing rights, and the following provision was put in:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall disturb any vested right of any person or persons in or to said real property and any part thereof.

We are asking the House to agree to the Senate amendment which would not disturb these rights.

Mr. RICH. Are we giving public lands to some one?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; we are taking out of the Forestry Service certain lands for recreational areas.

Mr. RICH. Who is going to control those areas?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. They will be controlled by the Forest Service or the Park Service, later to be determined.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASTERN CONTRACTING CO.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States which was read:

The House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (H. R. 2518), to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Eastern Contracting Co. against the United States for damages occasioned by reason of delays caused by the United States Government in carrying out the terms of a contract entered into by the company and the United States Government on June 8, 1934, for the construction of highway approaches to the Bourne Bridge, Cape Cod Canal, Bourne, Mass.

The bill directs the court to determine and render judgment upon the claim for certain equipment being idle because of this delay, and for overhead expenses. The court shall further determine and render judgment on the claim for the fair value of certain cubic yards of borrow material used in making a fill, as required by the contract. Action under the bill shall be instituted within 1 year after the date of its approval.

It appears that on October 5, 1942, the Court of Claims found against the Eastern Contracting Co. in an action for damages growing out of the delays set forth in this bill (97 Ct. Cls. 341). The court held that although the plaintiff was damaged, it had failed to furnish evidence by which such damages could be measured. Motion for a new trial was overruled.

It would seem that, when a case has been fairly tried in the Court of Claims and has been decided against the claimant for failure to sustain the necessary burden of proof, the court should not be required by statute to retry the issue. Moreover, to do so would accord to the claimant a special privilege not accorded to other claimants in like circumstances.

Accordingly, I am constrained to withhold approval of this legislation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1945.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message and accompanying documents referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

RANK OF CHIEFS OF NAVAL BUREAUS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States which was read:

The House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1862, the principal purpose of which would be to give to chiefs of naval bureaus the rank of vice admiral and to the assistant chiefs of naval bureaus the rank of rear admiral.

This enactment would extend preferential rank and retirement benefits to a particular group in one of the branches of our armed forces, and would not take into account the matter of rank and other benefits for personnel holding comparable assignments within other branches. This is piecemeal legislation. The time has arrived when we must consider all branches of our armed forces in the enactment of laws governing rank, promotion, and other privileges and benefits and conditions of service. The matter of increased permanent rank for chiefs of bureaus of the Navy Department and their assistants should await decision by the Congress on the matter of the organization and composition of our whole postwar Military Establishment and consideration of the problem of suitable rank for higher commands and staff assignments in the ground, sea, and air forces.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 17, 1945.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 14, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing herewith a copy of my letter of resignation from Congress, effective January 7, 1946, which I submitted to the Honorable Edward Martin, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

It has been a great privilege to serve under your leadership during the historic Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses.

With best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL A. WEISS.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

INCREASING NUMBER OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 320) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (57 Stat. 306).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. I object, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENDING PRIVILEGE OF RETIREMENT TO CERTAIN DISTRICT COURT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 565) to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

EFFICIENT DENTAL CARE FOR PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 715) to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR EVACUATION AND REPATRIATION OF REMAINS OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO DIED AND ARE BURIED OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3936) to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING CREDIT FOR PAST SERVICE TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4652) to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon appointment to a regular position in the postal service, any employee who was a substitute in the postal service prior to July 1, 1944, shall receive credit for actual substitute service, including time served as a special delivery messenger, performed prior to July 1, 1945, computed on the basis of 1 year for each unit of 2,448 hours, but such credit shall not exceed 5 years. The credit thus computed shall be added to credit for actual substitute service, including time served as a special-delivery messenger, performed on and after July 1, 1945, computed on the basis of 1 year for each unit of 2,024 hours, but credit for service performed on and after July 1, 1945, shall not exceed 1 year for each period of 12 months. Upon the appointment of any such employee to a regular position he shall be placed in the salary grade, four grades higher than the grade to which he would have

progressed had his original appointment been made to a regular position of grade 1, and the progression shall be computed on the basis of years of substitute service as herein provided. Any fractional part of a year's substitute service performed prior to July 1, 1945, and on and after that date, shall be included with regular service in determining eligibility for promotion to a higher grade following appointment to a regular position: *Provided*, That no substitute shall be appointed to a higher grade of a regular position than the highest grade to which employees may progress through annual promotions.

SEC. 2. War service indefinite substitute employees in the postal service, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be entitled to the same rights and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave that accrue to classified substitute employees in proportion to the time employed in a pay status.

SEC. 3. A temporary rural carrier serving a rural route in place of a rural carrier who has been inducted or has enlisted in the armed forces of the United States shall be paid for such service at the same rates per mile per annum and the same rate of fixed compensation that would have been paid to the regular carrier, Sundays and holidays included except at the beginning or end of the period of employment.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be retroactive to July 1, 1945.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, insert "1945" in lieu of "1944."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "exceed", strike out "five" and insert "four."

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out "four grades higher than the grade"; and on line 14 after "grade 1", insert "plus four grades."

Page 3, lines 5 and 6, strike out "in place of a rural carrier who has been inducted or has enlisted in" and insert "during the vacancy created by the induction of the regular carrier into."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORING 2-CENT-PER-OUNCE RATE OF POSTAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2647) to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN TORT CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 181) to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that a minority report accompanies this bill, it should not properly be considered on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I object.

STATISTICS OF THE GRADE AND STAPLE LENGTH OF COTTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4769) to amend Section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton".

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton", approved March 3, 1927, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That, of the reports issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Department of Agriculture to issue semimonthly cotton crop reports and providing for their publication simultaneously with the ginning reports of the Department of Commerce', approved May 3, 1924, only five shall be issued hereafter, one as of August 1, one as of September 1, one as of October 1, one as of November 1, and one as of December 1, each of which shall state the condition and progress of the crop and the probable number of bales which will be ginned, these reports to be issued simultaneously with the cotton-ginning reports of the Bureau of the Census relating to the same dates, the two reports to be issued from the same place at 11 antemeridian of the 8th day following that to which the respective reports relate. When such date of release falls on Sunday, a legal holiday, or other day which pursuant to statute or Executive order is a nonworkday in the Department of Agriculture at Washington generally, the report shall be issued at 11 o'clock antemeridian of the next succeeding workday."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR LAWFUL ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4149) to provide for the establishment of lawful entry into the United States of certain aliens not subject to deportation who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 328 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1151; 8 U. S. C. 728), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 328. For the purpose of the immigration laws and naturalization laws, any alien, not ineligible to citizenship, who has resided in the United States continuously since prior to July 1, 1924, and is not subject to deportation, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such alien's entry into the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 329 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1152; 8 U. S. C. 729), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 329. No declaration of intention shall be made by any person who arrived in the United States after June 30, 1924, until such person's lawful entry for permanent residence shall have been established, and a certificate showing the date, place, and manner of arrival in the United States shall have been issued. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner to cause to be issued such certificate."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 330 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1152–1153; 8 U. S. C. 730), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Two photographs of the applicant shall be furnished by each applicant for—

"(1) a certificate of derivative citizenship;

"(2) a certificate of naturalization;

"(3) a special certificate;

"(4) a declaration of intention or a certificate of naturalization or of citizenship, in lieu of one lost, mutilated, or destroyed; and

"(5) a new certificate of citizenship in the new name of any naturalized citizen who, subsequent to naturalization, has had such citizen's name changed by order of a court of competent jurisdiction or by marriage.

"One such photograph shall be affixed to each such declaration or certificate by the Commissioner and one shall be affixed to the copy of such declaration or certificate retained by the Service."

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 332 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156; 8 U. S. C. 732 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) At the time of filing the petition for naturalization there shall be filed with the clerk of ccurt a certificate from the Service, if the petitioner arrived in the United States after June 30, 1924, stating the date, place, and manner of petitioner's lawful entry for permanent residence, and the declaration of intention of such petitioner, which certificate and declaration shall be attached to and made a part of said petition."

SEC. 5. Section 342 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1161; 8 U. S. C. 742 (b), as amended), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commissioner shall charge, collect, and account for the following fees:

"(1) For application for a declaration of intention in lieu of a declaration alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed, $1.

"(2) For application for a certificate of naturalization in lieu of a certificate alleged to have been lost, mutilated, or destroyed, $1.

"(3) For application for a certificate of derivative citizenship, $5.

"(4) For application for issuance of a special certificate of citizenship to obtain recognition, $5.

"(5) For application for a certificate of naturalization under section 323, $1.

"(6) For application for a certificate of citizenship in changed name, $5.

"(7) Reasonable fees, with the approval of the Attorney General, in cases where such fees have not been established by law, to cover the cost of furnishing, to other than officials or agencies of the Federal Government, copies, whether certified or uncertified, of any part of the records, or information from the records, of the Service. Such fees shall not exceed a maximum of 25 cents per folio, with a minimum fee of 50 cents for any one such service, in addition to a fee of $1 for any official certification furnished under seal. No such fee shall be required from officers or agencies of the United States or of any State or any subdivision thereof, for such copies or information furnished for official use in connection with the official duties of such officers or agencies."

SEC. 6. Subsection (1) of section 346 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1168; 8 U. S. C. 746 (1)), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, line 6, strike out "derivative."

Page 4, line 16, strike out ", to other than officials or agencies of the Federal Government,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 332 (A) OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4628) to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Reserving the right to object, may I ask that a member of the committee explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. This is just a correction of a technical error. When the Nationality Act of 1940 was under consideration by the Congress, study was made of the question of extending the period involved here to 10 years. In all other sections the period is 7 years. This is to correct that technical error and make it 7 instead of 10 years.

Mr. BARDEN. It does not affect the body of the law in any way?

Mr. LESINSKI. It does not.

Mr. BARDEN. This simply makes the period 7 years all the way through, and does not affect the other provisions of the act?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1154; 8 U. S. C. 732), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 332. (a) An applicant for naturalization shall, not less than 2 nor more than 7 years after such declaration of intention has been made, make and file in the office of the clerk of a naturalization court, in duplicate, a sworn petition in writing, signed by the applicant in the applicant's own handwriting if physically able to write, and duly verified by witnesses, which petition shall contain substantially the following averments by such applicant."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4605) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the author of this bill explain it?

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] handled this matter. I shall ask him to make the explanation.

Mr. MASON. Under present law veterans of other wars who were born outside the United States but are naturalized citizens may live in the country of their birth for 3 years without losing their citizenship, and if they live in a different country then they may live there 5 years without losing their citizenship. At the end of the 3-year period or the 5-year period they must state whether they still want to maintain their American citizenship. This applies to the veterans of all other wars. This bill simply makes that provision which is now the law apply to the veterans of this war.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Would that mean that a veteran of the First World War, who at the time of his service in the war was a citizen of the United States, and who was discharged in Europe and elected to stay in the country of his nativity, and who has remained there all these years and lost his citizenship under existing law, have his citizenship restored so that he could come back to this country?

Mr. MASON. No; it does not have anything to do with the veterans of the First World War or the Spanish War or any of those other wars, but just applies to the veterans of the present war, that is, World War II, and gives them the privileges that were given to the veterans of the other wars. It does not apply to those other veterans. That is the law now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that apply only to veterans who are American citizens?

Mr. MASON. Yes; it only applies to American citizens who are veterans of this war.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would that include those who have become naturalized as well as native-born, or both?

Mr. MASON. If they were citizens when they served in this war, even if they were naturalized before that, it would apply to them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did I understand the gentleman to say if they were returning to the country of their nativity, would that mean the United States?

Mr. MASON. No; if I were born in Italy and came to the United States and took out my citizenship papers and lived here for a certain period of time and then served in World War II and after World War II is over I may want to stay in Italy 2 or 3 years, then I could still come back to the United States and claim my citizenship. Or I may want to live in England for 5 years, or in France for 5 years, for commercial reasons or any other reasons. Then at the end of that time I may still claim my citizenship if I wish to assert that right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When do you have to assert it?

Mr. MASON. At the end of 3 years if it is the land of my birth, or at the end of 5 years if it is some other country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION TO UNITED STATES OF ALIEN CHINESE WIVES OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4844) to provide for the admission to the United States of the alien Chinese wives of American citizens who are admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those authorizing exclusion on grounds of race or birth in a defined geographical area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in order that a more complete and adequate explanation may be had with reference to this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to make an explanation of the bill. I do not see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] on the floor at this time, but may I say that the purpose of this resolution is to have the Army engineers and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors continue as they did before on certain rivers and harbors work. There is a 6-month limitation placed in the law as it now stands. That work could not be carried on until 6 months after the termination of the war unless it was approved by the war agencies.

Mr. RICH. May I say if we permit a lot of that work to be prosecuted now when there are more jobs in the country than there is possibility of men to take those jobs and when eventually they will want these rivers and harbors projects to create jobs and all other kinds of public works in order to give people employment, it seems to me that it is very foolish to start that work now when you have so many jobs in industry and nobody to take them.

Mr. BARDEN. It is not so much a case of starting the work now, may I say to the gentleman. It is a case of if and when funds are available and if and when the Army engineers set up these things to be done as we did before the war.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that we should defer that until we can settle this strike business and get the people back in industry and in agriculture. If we do that, we will be doing this country a greater good. Let us do the most important things first; this bill can be delayed and it will be best for the country.

Mr. BARDEN. I suggest that the gentleman read the bill and then there would not be any conflict.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has made a unanimous-consent request. Is there objection?

Mr. PITTENGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members will acquaint themselves with this resolution. It passed the Senate without any trouble and it should be passed by the House.

There is a law on the statute books which provide that none of the programs of public improvements, rivers and harbors, can be undertaken until 6 months after the war ends. For technical purposes the war has not ended yet. We do not know when it is going to end. Projects are being held up now. I am a member of the committee and I know what I am talking about. Projects which were started before the World War started are being held up now. They were stopped, and unless this law is amended they cannot proceed. This is very important. If the Congress does not appropriate funds or the War Department engineers do not have help available, as was suggested a moment ago, the projects will not go ahead. But, if you are interested in having an orderly program, in the interest of the American people, you will not object to the present consideration of this resolution.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 265, has been unanimously reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, after full discussion. It amends existing law relating to improvement of rivers and harbors, so that projects authorized by Congress may receive an appropriation from Congress and the War Department engineers then may proceed with the work at an appropriate time. I wish the gentlemen who are raising questions had an opportunity to examine Public Law 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved March 2, 1945. This law authorizes completion of many rivers and harbors projects as well as the construction of new projects. It contains a section which says, however, that the Appropriations Committee cannot appropriate money for any of these projects and none of them can be constructed until 6 months after the termination of the war, which was in progress on March 2, 1945. This pending bill, House Joint Resolution 265, eliminates the above requirements about the termination of the war. That is all there is to it.

Now is the time to get ready for our internal improvements and to make it possible to provide jobs for returning soldiers who will be looking for this kind of work. So far as construction of public highways is concerned, that legislation had this same stipulation requiring everything to wait until 6 months after the war was officially declared terminated. We have already amended highway-construction legislation so as to eliminate this 6-month requirement. This pending measure ought to pass the House this afternoon, and I am sure that if my colleagues have a chance to study the hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives that they will not object to its passage.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANDERSON RANCH RESERVOIR SITE, BOISE RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1689) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase improvements located on public lands of the United States within the boundaries of the Anderson Ranch Reservoir, Boise reclamation project, Idaho, or to make payment for damages for the removal of improvements from the public lands of the United States within the boundaries of said reservoir. Any funds appropriated for the construction of the Anderson Ranch Reservoir, Boise reclamation project, Idaho, shall be available for such purchase or payment of damages. Payments may be made pursuant to this act to persons, firms, or corporations who shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that they are entitled equitably to receive the same, and who sign contracts and vouchers for the same upon forms approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That amounts so paid shall not exceed the reasonable value, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, of the improvements purchased or the actual damages (not exceeding in any event the reasonable value of the said improvements, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) found by the Secretary of the Interior to have been sustained as a result of the removal of said improvements, as the case may be.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2115) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to do a bit of reorganization in the executive departments by transferring certain activities in connection with the raising of rabbits from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the Congress has just given the President authority to make all sorts of reorganizations in the departments, it should be done by the President and not by legislation. Therefore, I object.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. I reserve the right of objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is very simple. It has been asked for universally by the farmers involved. Many thousands of farmers in the country raise these fur-bearing animals, one of which is domestic rabbits, and other fur-bearing animals. All Government contacts with them are handled through the Fish and Wildlife Service. The operations are purely domestic agriculture. The animals are domestic animals. All this bill seeks to do is to put that farming operation in the Department of Agriculture. The only objection comes from the department that will lose jurisdiction. The case is absolutely clear.

Mr. COLE of New York. Let me ask the gentleman whether this transfer from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture cannot be done by Executive order?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Theoretically, it could, but what is the matter with the Congress using its own head in something like this? It is much more difficult for the Executive to take something away from a department than it is for us. When we have a case that is as clear as this one, it seems to me we ought to act.

This has already been approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFIED EXECUTIVE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 102) to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to call attention to the fact that the report covering this bill does not comply with the rules of the House, in particular section 2 (a) of rule 23.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING FURTHER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The Clerk called the bill (S. 405) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act (approved May 29, 1930), as amended.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have this bill explained?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that came from the Senate Committee on the Civil Service to the House Committee on the Civil Service. It is designed to extend to men who left the classified service to enter the armed forces the same privilege they would have, had they transferred to civilian employment and then come back into civil service.

The House committee struck out the very bad provision of the Senate act which would have permitted the person to come back and be given credit under the Retirement Act for his military pay. In other words, there would have been much greater advantage to the man who was a major compared to the man who was a private. We struck that out, and the bill in its present form is simply a bill that treats all alike in the matter of credit for military service.

Mr. RICH. It puts them back into civil service where they were before they left?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Exactly.

Mr. RICH. That is required of industry. It is a good thing to be required of government. I do not see why we need legislation to do a simple thing like that.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The fact is, we need it, however.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 2 of section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of the said paragraph 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In computing length of service for the purposes of this act, all periods of separation from the service, and so much of any leaves of absence as may exceed 6 months in the aggregate in any calendar year, shall be excluded, except leaves of absence granted employees while performing active military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States or while receiving benefits under the United States Employees' Compensation Act, and in the case of substitutes in the Postal Service credit shall be given from date of original appointment as a substitute: *Provided*, That an employee may, at his option, receive full credit for all such military or naval service, without deposit, in lieu of the leave credit accorded herein, without reduction in annuity benefits."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 7, after the word "substitute", change the colon to a period and strike out the balance of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDED CLASSIFIED EXECUTIVE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 576) to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (1) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1212), is amended to read as follows: "(1) upon recommendation by the head of the agency concerned, and upon certification by such head to the Civil Service Commission that such incumbent has served with merit for not less than 6 months immediately prior to the date such office or position was covered into the classified civil service;".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out all of line 7 and insert "Upon a finding by the Civil Service Commission on the basis of the personal record of the incumbent."

Page 2, line 1, strike out all of line 1.

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "Commission."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE HATCH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1118) to amend the Hatch Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill make some explanation of its purpose.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; to permit the gentleman to make a brief statement.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a letter set forth in the report shows the purpose of the amendment which is to give the Civil Service Commission in its discretion in enforcing the Hatch Act——

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARDEN. If I understand this bill correctly, it gives the Civil Service Commission judicial authority, or rather the authority to impose fines on employees.

Mr. HOBBS. That is not the purpose exactly.

Mr. BARDEN. Is not that exactly what it does? If it finds that the offense committed does not justify discharging the employee it can assess fines against the employee up to a certain amount.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right, instead of requiring them to impose the supreme penalty which is equivalent to a much higher fine.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill going that far, I object to its consideration.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN SETTLERS OF KETCHUM, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 862) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho", approved July 11, 1940, is amended by striking out the words "3 years" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "6 years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING STATE OF TENNESSEE TO CONVEY RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY THROUGH MONTGOMERY BELL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1366) to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Tennessee is hereby authorized and empowered to convey a right-of-way for railroad purposes, not in excess of 100 feet in width, to the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway over, through, and across the Montgomery Bell Park in Dickson County, Tenn. previously known as the Montgomery Bell recreational demonstration area), notwithstanding the express condition contained in deed dated May 25, 1943, from the United States of America to the State of Tennessee, which deed was executed pursuant to the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 326), entitled "An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects and for other purposes." Such conveyance by the State of Tennessee shall not be deemed a breach of the express condition that the State of Tennessee should use the said property exclusively for public park, recreational, and conservation purposes. The State of Tennessee is authorized to expend funds received as a consideration for such conveyance for the acquisition of additional land needed to round out the Montgomery Bell Park area.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUANCE TO THE END OF JUNE 1946 OF THE NAVY'S V-12 PROGRAM

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 290.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That surplus amounts under any naval appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, not to exceed in the aggregate $10,000,000, may be transferred to the appropriation "Naval Reserve, 1946," for continuing the V–12 program to the end of June 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Naval Affairs Committee is presenting this resolution to make available to the Navy Department $10,000,000 of unexpended funds which have already been appropriated for the Navy for the fiscal year 1946. The Rules Committee has reported a rule making this bill in order. I am, therefore, asking unanimous consent that the House consider it now.

Mr. Speaker, this bill permits the V–12 college training program and the naval ROTC program which involves some 20,000 enlisted men of the Navy to continue in their training until at least the end of June 1946. When the rescission bill was before the Congress it gave to the Navy Department the total amount called for by the recommendation of the Budget for the V–12 and the Navy ROTC program, but the Budget had cut down the amount that the Navy had requested and needed; therefore, the Congress followed the judgment of the Budget but did not follow the judgment of the Navy Department before the Budget. The result will be that in March 1946 all of these boys, some 20,000 of them, will have to leave the V–12 program and the naval ROTC colleges and will be sent to the fleet.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is the plan that has been approved by the Naval Affairs Committee?

Mr. VINSON. The Naval Affairs Committee had a hearing on this matter on Saturday and by a vote of 13 to 2 recommended the course I am suggesting now.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This is the item which I questioned the gentleman about when we had the rescission bill up for consideration?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. This is an item in which the colleges are interested and on which they are seeking information?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman give the necessary information to the House in order that we may be better able to answer our constituents in reference to this matter?

Mr. VINSON. There are 62 colleges in which these students are studying at the present time. If the pending resolution is agreed to, it permits the Navy Department to use surplus money appropriated for other purposes for this purpose. This training can then continue until July, before which time the Appropriations Committee can bring in an appropriation dealing with the subject.

Mr. STEFAN. And give the colleges an opportunity to continue the program on which they are now working?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; up to that time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows what will happen to these boys who are now in those schools come next July?

Mr. VINSON. If additional appropriations have not been made by that time then they will go to the fleet because all of them have been sworn into the Navy and are enlisted men in the Navy.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What I mean by that is this: We are giving them an education at Government expense.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Are they then going to revert to civilian life?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In the demobilization program?

Mr. VINSON. They are being trained to take the places of officers in the Navy who have the points and who today cannot get out because we do not have the officers to take their places; in other words, it aids in demobilization.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House what happens to these boys who had their education interrupted when they were called into the service; those who had been taking the ROTC course? What becomes of them if they are in the service and not discharged?

Mr. VINSON. If they are taking the ROTC course or the V–12 course, this continues it until the Committee on Appropriations can bring in a bill here in January or February or March to make it applicable for next year.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose those boys are in the service, as many of them are now, and cannot get out between now and July 1946?

Mr. VINSON. This has no relation to the boys that are not in this course. It only applies to those in the V–12 or the naval ROTC.

Mr. DONDERO. But they are in this course and they are in the service now.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the time that is being taken up, I think I am obliged to object.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman withhold that, please? It will take but a few minutes. We have the rule now. Just bear with us a moment, please.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection momentarily?

Mr. SABATH. I will, but I am fearful that there are so many seeking information it will take considerable time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In regard to the V–12 and ROTC programs, I think the gentleman stated that on the first of July these men will go back into the Navy. Some of these men are dental, medical, and engineering students. Does that mean that they are going to give up their medical or dental work and go into the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. It means that the appropriation bill will come along in the next fiscal year and take up where we leave off here.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the Navy last month they had more physicians than they had on VJ-day. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will look into that portion of the bill very carefully, because I am satisfied we will get a sufficient number of qualified medical men for the Navy without continually speeding up.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There are no medical students involved in this at all?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I went into this very exhaustively, and as far as the subcommittee on appropriations is concerned, it meets with their approval, thought I cannot talk for the full committee. But I think this will take care of the situation because we will have the regular appropriation bill up in March.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I would just like to make a brief statement. There are 20,000 boys now in this training program. Over 80 percent of them have completed the first six semesters of an eight-semester program, and if those boys are summarily discharged because of lack of money as of March 1, the 60 percent that came from the Navy will go back to the boot camps or into the ships. We are starting the new ROTC program as of July 1. This simply carries us over until that period. Eighty percent will graduate as of July 1 and the other 20 percent would automatically go into the new program. This is just to carry them over that 3 months rather than to discharge the whole group of 20,000 and throw them all back into the service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 463 was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4587) to

provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, will the gentleman from Texas outline the provisions of the bill?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that has a unanimous report from the Committee on Military Affairs. It is to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army. At present the authorization for officers in the Regular Army is 16,719. This bill raises that maximum to 25,000. It will provide for additional personnel in the lower grades principally—that will be the result of it—to the number of 8,281.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The present limitation on officer personnel of the Army is 16,719, to be reached in added increments in 1949. This increases the limit on the number of officers in the Regular Army to 25,000, which is approximately the number of officers who would be required for an Army of 300,000. This would increase the number of officers in the Regular Army grades between second lieutenant and major by 8,281. It would benefit the Air Corps very materially, to the extent of 4,100 officers. The Air Corps is manned almost completely today by reserve officers. We are in the unfortunate position in the Army of not being able to offer permanent Regular Army commissions to hundreds of young men who otherwise will leave the service.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman has made a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Do I correctly understand that these officers are to be taken from those who have been and are serving in the Army at this time?

Mr. THOMASON. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements that have been made that we have too many officers, a lot of whom have no work to perform, I wonder why it is necessary to increase the force now after the war by 8,000. Is this to provide an opportunity to promote a lot of them to higher rank?

Mr. THOMASON. No.

Mr. SABATH. What are they needed for?

Mr. THOMASON. They do not have the younger officers in the Regular Army to do the necessary work at this time. Nearly all officers at present are temporary and all will get out if we do not pass this legislation.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that we have in the Army today thousands of officers serving in the grade of lieutenant colonel, colonel, and even brigadier general, from civilian life, men like many of the young men from the gentleman's district. They are desirous of staying in the Regular Army with a commission, but there are no vacancies for them. This makes it possible for the Air Corps in particular and the Regular Army to offer commissions in grades much lower than these men now hold, and they are some of the finest type of officer material in the country.

Mr. SABATH. Answering the gentleman's statement that very many of these officers are from my district, may I say that I did not urge the appointment or the obtaining of commissions for a lot of men, as some other gentlemen may have succeeded in doing.

Mr. SHAFER. If the gentleman will yield, these men have all earned their commissions. Most of them have gone through officers' school. None of them have been appointed through political pull of any kind.

Mr. THOMASON. Perhaps the gentleman does not understand that this provides for permanent officers in the Regular Army. The gentleman from Illinois does not understand the purpose of the bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, may I say as to the question involved in the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois that most of the officers in the Army today are in the Army of the United States, with temporary grades.

Mr. THOMASON. They are Reserve officers, or, in any event, only temporary officers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This increases the number of Regular Army grades. There are only 16,719 officers in the Regular Army, but many thousands in the Army of the United States. This lets the Army take in over 8,000 of these young men who are in the Army of the United States, or the Reserve.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the explanation made by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who called up the bill, and having the utmost confidence in him, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared the policy of the Congress to provide for the immediate selection for appointment in the Regular Army in a fair and equitable manner of a limited number of persons who, by their outstanding performance of duties while serving as temporary officers of the Army of the United States during the present wars, have demonstrated their fitness to hold commissioned grade in the Regular Army; and to provide a minimum increase in the commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army for that purpose.

SEC. 2. On and after the effective date of this act, the commissioned strength of the Regular Army shall not exceed 25,000 officers: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the foregoing limitation on the commissioned strength of the Regular Army, graduates of the United States Military Academy may be promoted and commissioned as second lieutenants in the Regular Army in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 17, 1886 (24 Stat. 50; 10 U. S. C. 486).

SEC. 3. The President is authorized to bring the actual commissioned strength of the Regular Army up to the commissioned strength specified in section 2 of this act by the appointment and commissioning of additional officers, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in such arms and services of the Regular Army as he may prescribe. Appointments of such additional commissioned officers may be made in accordance with any existing provision of law providing for the appointment of commissioned officers in the Regular Army, or as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 4. At any time not later than a date 8 months following the date of enactment of this act, the President is authorized to appoint and commission additional officers in the Regular Army, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, and major, subject to the conditions and limitations hereinafter set forth. Persons appointed under the provisions of this section shall—

(a) be male citizens of the United States, at least 21 years of age, of good moral character, physically qualified for active military service, and have such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War; and shall

(b) have served honorably in the active Federal service as commissioned officers of the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, on or after December 7, 1941, in grades equal to or higher than those prescribed in section 5 of this act for officers credited with the amounts of service with which they would be credited under that section if appointed in the Regular Army.

SEC. 5. Each person appointed as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army under the provisions of section 4 of this act shall be credited, at the time of appointment, with service equivalent to the total period of active Federal service performed by him as a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States or any component thereof from December 7, 1941, to the date of such appointment, or a period of service equal to the number of days, months, and years by which his age at the time of such appointment exceeds 25 years, whichever is the greater: *Provided*, That in computing the total period of active commissioned Federal service of any such person who was honorably discharged or relieved from active service subsequent to May 12, 1945, there shall also be credited the period from the date of his discharge or relief from active service to the date of his appointment in the Regular Army under the provisions of section 4 of this act. Upon the basis of service so credited, the grade in which each such person shall be appointed shall be determined as follows:

(a) Persons appointed in arms or services of the Regular Army, the officers of which are on the promotion list, who are credited with less than 3 years' service shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; such persons who are credited with three or more years' service, but less than 10 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; such persons who are credited with 10 or more years' service, but less than 17 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; and such persons who are credited with 17 or more years' service, but less than 23 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of major. Such persons shall be placed on the promotion list immediately below those officers of the same grade having the same or next greater period of service;

Persons appointed in the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, or the Veterinary Corps of the Regular Army, or as chaplains in the Regular Army, who are credited with less than 3 years' service shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; such persons who are credited with 3 or more years' service, but less than 12 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; and such

persons who are credited with 12 or more years' service, but less than 20 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of major;

(c) Persons appointed in the Medical Administrative Corps of the Regular Army who are credited with less than 5 years' service shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; such persons who are credited with 5 or more years' service, but less than 10 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; and such persons who are credited with 10 or more years' service, but less than 17 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of captain;

(d) Persons appointed in the Pharmacy Corps of the Regular Army who are credited with less than 3 years' service shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; such persons who are credited with 3 or more years' service, but less than 6 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of first lieutenant; such persons who are credited with 6 or more years' service, but less than 12 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; and such persons who are credited with 12 or more years' service, but less than 20 years' service, shall be appointed in the grade of major.

SEC. 6. No person shall be appointed as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army under the provisions of section 4 of this act—

(a) in a promotion-list arm or service if he would upon appointment receive credit with 23 or more years' service under section 5 of this act;

(b) in the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Pharmacy Corps, or as a chaplain, if he would upon appointment receive credit for 20 or more years' service under section 5 of this act; or

(c) in the Medical Administrative Corps if he would upon appointment receive credit for 17 or more years' service under section 5 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purpose of determining eligibility for promotion, each person appointed as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army under the provisions of section 4 of this act shall be credited, as of the time of such appointment, with continuous commissioned service on the active list of the Regular Army equal to the period of service credited to him under section 5 of this act. Each such person appointed in a promotion-list arm or service in the grade of major shall be deemed to have served in that grade during that portion of such credited service which exceeds 17 years.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 22, after the word "him", insert "after attaining the age of 21 years."

Add a new section at the end of the bill:

"SEC. 8. The first proviso of section 3 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 506), as amended by section 2 of the act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 380), is hereby further amended by deleting therefrom the words 'seven hundred and five' and substituting therefor the words 'one thousand and fifty-four.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORING 2-CENT RATE ON FIRST-CLASS MAIL

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2647) to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BURCH. This measure proposes to reduce the 3-cent postage rate on local mail to 2 cents, that is, on local first-class mail.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the former rate?

Mr. BURCH. That is the rate that was previously established by law on local mail for the last 60 years, with the exception of the 2½ years past when it has been more than 2 cents.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the rate would normally go back to 2 cents 6 months after the end of the war?

Mr. BURCH. Yes; that is true. The surplus on first-class mail is $170,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia whether this was the unanimous action of the committee?

Mr. BURCH. There was one objection in the committee, but when the vote was taken there was really no vote against it, although there was one member of the committee who did say he objected to it.

Mr. JENKINS. The reason I make that inquiry is that we have had at different times this matter of postal rates up before the Committee on Ways and Means and, of course, we raised the rates. I should like to know whether the Department is thoroughly in accord with the action of the committee.

Mr. BURCH. The Department is in accord with the action of the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, the Post Office Department and the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have recommended this legislation?

Mr. BURCH. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker reserving the right to object, if this bill passes, it simply means that foreign mail, which means mail going from one post office to another, will be 3 cents but that local mail in the same post office will be 2 cents?

Mr. BURCH. It removes the 3-cent postage on local mail.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this bill passes and the income of the Post Office Department is reduced, will it affect the pay of the postal employees in any way?

Mr. BURCH. It will not.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the reduction of postal income may relate to the reduction in wages for postal employees.

Mr. BURCH. No; it will not affect that.

Mr. DOYLE. If that is possible, I object to it.

Mr. BURCH. It will not affect it.

Mr. STARKEY. Is it not a fact that statistics show that the cost of carrying this mail to the Department is 1¾ cents?

Mr. BURCH. It is 1.85 cents.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman states that the Department has made, with proper management and efficiency, on first-class mail about $168,000,000?

Mr. BURCH. One hundred and seventy million dollars.

Mr. SABATH. That is $170,000,000. How much have we made on second-class mail?

Mr. BURCH. We have lost money on second-class mail. We have lost considerable money.

Mr. SABATH. About how much?

Mr. BURCH. About ninety to one hundred million dollars.

Mr. SABATH. And that helps these catalog companies, and weeklies, and so on?

Mr. BURCH. No; second-class mail consists of newspapers and periodicals. With reference to catalogs, you know we passed a bill increasing the postal rate on catalogs and also on parcel post. That will take care of some of that deficit.

Mr. SABATH. I understand that you are going to bring in another bill despite the fact that such a loss is being sustained on second-class mail.

Mr. BURCH. The Post Office Department is now studying it.

Mr. SABATH. What I have reference to mostly are these magazines consisting of 300 and 400 pages and so on, 98 percent of it is all advertising, advertising, advertising.

I do not see why they should not pay what it costs the Government. I do not feel we should make any money on them, but I think we ought to charge them what it costs.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. In case the request is granted, how much time is to be spent?

The SPEAKER. We will be under the 5-minute rule.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel obligated to press my objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2647) to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point or order.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 410 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1943, the increase in the rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery made by section 402 (a) of such act shall cease to be in effect on and after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the Congress with the approval of the Post Office Department, and without a dissenting vote by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in the House.

As I stated before, there was one Member who objected to the bill.

Since 1885 there has been but about 2½ years in which the local first-class postage was more than 2 cents per ounce. That was in 60 years. Those years were one year during the First World War. The Ways and Means Committee, for revenue purposes, placed an additional 1 cent, making it 3 cents, in the Revenue Act of 1943, which became effective in March 1944. So it has been in effect a little over a year and a half now. That, with about one other year, is the only time within the past 60 years that we have had a 3-cent rate on first-class mail for local delivery.

I do not think a 3-cent rate on first-class mail for local delivery is at all justified. In the first place, it only costs 1.85 cents to handle first-class mail. Local mail, of course, would be less than that. The Post Office Department is a service department. It is not a department to raise revenue. I do not think we are at all justified in trying to continue a rate of 3 cents on local delivery of first-class mail. In his annual report for 1944 the Postmaster General made this statement:

The postal service should not be used as a revenue-producing agency. It should be conducted as an organization for service. Only the rates and fees for each class of mail and each special service should be charged sufficient to pay its cost of handling. When the operation of the post-office service shows a surplus it means that the public is not only paying for the service which it buys but in addition it is paying a tax.

That is the opinion of the committee at this time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURCH. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It seems to me from what the gentleman has stated that it is really desirable that we reduce the rates at this time. It seems, however, that the idea has got around that to reduce this rate from 3 cents to 2 cents for local mail might mean the reduction of the salaries of postal employees. Is there any foundation for such fear?

Mr. BURCH. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri there is no foundation for such fear, for two reasons: In the first place, the surplus of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1944 was between thirty-seven and thirty-eight millions. For the fiscal year 1945, the report for which has not come out yet, it is estimated that the surplus will be something over $162,000,000. In addition, because of the 3-cent local-delivery rate we have been losing mail. Utility and other corporations have gone to postcards, to personal delivery, and to using much less first-class mail. The Post Office Department is of the opinion that a return to the 2-cent rate for local delivery will not reduce the postal revenues, or only to a very slight extent, if any.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is no probability of local mail being handled at a deficit because of this reduction?

Mr. BURCH. No.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then there does not seem any ground for the apprehension on the part of some that postal salaries might be affected because of this reduction.

Mr. BURCH. People who feel that way are very much mistaken.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURCH. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. As a matter of fact, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is the one that sought this increase in salary for the postal employees, is it not?

Mr. BURCH. It certainly is.

Mr. LYLE. And we are certainly very much concerned with maintaining the highest wage possible?

Mr. BURCH. The gentleman is correct; and may I say that no one worked harder than he and I to bring that about.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURCH. I yield?

Mr. GRANGER. Is not the salary of the postmaster based upon his sale of stamps?

Mr. BURCH. That is true to some extent.

Mr. GRANGER. Their salaries will not be affected unless their stamp sales fall off under the 2-cent rate as against the 3-cent rate.

Mr. BURCH. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURCH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have heard it said and my recollection is that we increased the rate on local mail from 2 cents to 3 cents more or less as an emergency measure during the war. With such a favorable report coming from the Post Office Department on the matter of earnings with respect to this type of mail, is it not natural, now that we are going back to normal conditions that we repeal the wartime 3-cent rate and go back to the peacetime 2-cent postage on local mail?

Mr. BURCH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURCH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any possibility that any loss which might be occasioned the Post Office Department on account of this change of rate on local delivery mail might precipitate a change or an increase in the rate on other classes of mail?

Mr. BURCH. I do not know. I do not think this would affect it one way or the other. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that investigations and studies are being made, and we are going to consider each class of mail. The gentleman recalls that already we have increased rates for special services such as special delivery, registry, and insurance, also on catalogs and parcel post.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is it estimated this will reduce the postal revenues?

Mr. BURCH. It would not be more than $12,000,000 at the outside.

Mr. DONDERO. The total receipts would be reduced by $12,000,000?

Mr. BURCH. That would be a maximum, if there were no increase in local delivery mail through the cheaper rate, which might offset the reduced receipts to some extent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need spend any lengthy time on this bill. It has been carefully considered in the committee and is a part of the whole revamping of the postal service.

There are only two things that the postal service is expected to do or that the people of the United States desire it to do. One is to carry the mail efficiently and to do it as near cost as possible. Now, when this law was changed in 1943 as an emergency measure applying 3 cents to the delivery of local mail instead of 2 cents, there was a clause in there which stated that it automatically would go back to 2 cents without any further legislation 6 months after the war is over.

The Postal Department claims, and I have good reason to believe it is right in its claim, that this will not decrease the postal receipts and we see no reason whatever why this 3 cents should not go back to 2 cents at the present time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It is a well-established policy of the Government that it was never intended that the Government should make money out of the carrying of mail?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am trying to find out what difference this would make in

the postal receipts. I think the gentleman has explained it is less than a million dollars?

Mr. MASON. Probably not that much.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When this law was changed making the postal rate 3 cents instead of 2 cents, I recall very distinctly when it was made they said it would only be on for a year or so, then we would return to the 2-cent rate. What happened? The New Deal administration came into power.

Mr. MASON. Wait a minute. Let me correct the gentleman. He is not talking about this law. He is talking about when the 2-cent rate for postage first class was changed to 3 cents.

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. MASON. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. RICH. That is all right, but you increased this postage at the same time.

Mr. MASON. No. This was increased in 1943 when the Ways and Means Committee included it in a revenue act.

Mr. RICH. That is all right too, but the New Deal did increase all the postage rates.

Mr. MASON. We are not talking about the New Deal at all, and we do not want to talk about the New Deal.

Mr. RICH. I want to talk about the New Deal because the New Deal is the one that raised this postage.

Mr. MASON. Then, if the gentleman wants to talk about the New Deal, ask me for time; do not try to take it out of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to oppose this bill for several reasons. While it is true that the 2-cent postage rate on local delivery was raised to 3 cents as a revenue measure, there were other increases made in postal rates, such as the special-delivery rate, I believe the money-order rate, and the air-mail rate.

With all due respect to this committee, it seems that it has a habit of bringing bills in here on a piecemeal basis. It considers one little aspect of the postal problem at a time. I happen to know that the excess revenues from air mail over the past several years have been vastly increased. For the fiscal year ending June 30 of the last year the revenues on air mail were something in the neighborhood of $50,000,000 in excess of cost and it is estimated that the profit on the air-mail business for the present year, that is the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, will be about $67,000,000. Now this committee comes in here and says the post office is not to be run on a profit basis. If that is true, why does it not bring in a bill to consider all of the aspects of the post-office rates and not merely one little local rate that is largely for the benefit of utility companies, department stores, and others who send out monthly bills?

This is a very important matter and I think the committee should consider it well and bring in an over-all piece of legislation. It might likewise bring in a piece of legislation authorizing such a thing as air parcel post. As a matter of fact, it might go into the entire subject of the post-office charges for the various services and the types of services that are being offered by that Department. It should consider the proposition of carrying by air all first-class mail that can be expedited thereby. There are many important matters that need consideration by the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

It seems to me that this is not the right time to bring in this rescission legislation but that the job should all be done at one time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will give me two more minutes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill is not devised for the benefit of the utility companies; in fact the utility companies are taking advantage of the situation under the 3-cent rate, you might say, by using postal cards and using our personnel in the offices to send out their different statements.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman said a minute ago that it was to their benefit to have this 2-cent rate, and I assume perhaps it is.

Mr. BURCH. For the ordinary man, the small man——

Mr. HINSHAW. When it comes to the ordinary man, I will tell you something that happens in my own home city of Pasadena, Calif. There is a post office in the city of Pasadena. There is another one in the town of Altadena and another one in the city of San Marino, and there is hardly anyone in that area who knows where boundary lines run between those towns, and we have a vast amount of mail returned for 1 cent extra postage, if it happens to go across the boundary line. It is simply amazing. It is the worst difficulty that we have in handling mail in that area. They are always calling for 1 cent extra postage, because the people cannot know the intricacies of the line of separation between one post-office service area and another. I think it would be very well worth while if the Congress gave consideration to restoring a uniform first-class mail rate for the entire United States and abolish this business of having little lines drawn. I do not care if you make the whole thing 2 cents; that is all right with me, but let us have a uniform rate for first-class mail throughout the United States.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman give me 1 minute then?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I will give the gentleman 1 minute, because I want to correct his impression of what this bill does. The gentleman says that he has lines between his cities that are causing a lot of people inconvenience because they have to go back and pay 1 cent.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right.

Mr. MASON. This bill would cure that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, no; this bill puts it in the exact condition it was before, which is a state of confusion.

Mr. MASON. This permits the mail within that city to go anywhere within the limits for 2 cents, regardless of lines.

Mr. HINSHAW. My friend, I am just telling you that the city limits between the cities I mentioned are hardly distinguishable, because the cities merge with each other. No one knows exactly where the city limits are without looking at a map, and consequently, as far as mail going from the city of Pasadena to the city of San Marino is concerned, you do not even know where the city of San Marino begins and where the city of Pasadena leaves off, yet it costs 3 cents between the two cities, and the people are always becoming confused by that difficulty.

Mr. BURCH. That confusion came about when they changed it from 2 cents to 3 cents.

Mr. HINSHAW. It should be a uniform rate all over the entire metropolitan area of the city and counties of New York, for example, as well as the New Jersey cities that adjoin New York. It should be the same thing in the entire county of Los Angeles; it should be the same thing in the entire county of Cook and all those other metropolitan areas we have. Another example is the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. It should be uniform throughout the entire area, at least. For my part, I believe the first-class mail rate should be so made uniform, and I trust this bill will be voted down so that the committee may reconsider its action. The 2-cent local rate is a nuisance in metropolitan areas.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 2647.

This bill proposes to repeal the 3-cent-per-ounce rate for postage on first-class mail for local delivery and restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate for postage on first-class mail for local delivery.

By an act of Congress effective July 1, 1885, there was established a letter rate of 2 cents per ounce, irrespective of distance, on first-class mail. The rate for local or so-called drop letters was fixed at 1 cent per ounce. These rates were in effect for more than 30 years, until they were increased to provide revenue in the First World War. This war emergency act increased the rate for nonlocal first-class mail to 3 cents and let the local drop letters remain at 2 cents per ounce. These rates were repealed by the act of February 24, 1919, which reestablished the rate on first-class mail in 1885, which was 2 cents per ounce irrespective of distance.

The act of June 6, 1932, increased for a 2-year period on both local and nonlocal first-class mail the 3 cents per ounce or fraction thereof. In about a year the 2-cent rate on local first-class mail was restored. Ever since that time we have had a 3-cent rate per ounce for nonlocal first-class mail, and the 2-cent rate for local delivery of first-class mail remained in effect from July 1, 1933, until March 26, 1944, when the local rate was increased to 3 cents.

Under the act this 3-cent rate was to continue until the termination of hostilities in the present war as fixed by a Presidential proclamation or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress and then the 2-cent rate would go back into effect.

As I understand it, the increase to 3 cents was purely a war revenue measure. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] if that is correct?

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If this bill reducing from 3 cents to 2 cents per ounce or fraction thereof for local first-class mail is not adopted, then under the law the 3-cent rate would come to an end after the present emergency is terminated, either by proclamation of the President or by a joint resolution of the two Houses.

The report on H. R. 2647 states there was a surplus of $170,494,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, in the handling of first-class mail. In other words, first-class mail has met the cost of this service with a surplus of $170,494,000. It is not the purpose of the Government to make a profit out of the post office in handling the mail of the people.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads whether or not this 2 cents an ounce or fraction thereof for local first-class mail will meet the cost and expenses of that service?

Mr. BURCH. Yes; that will meet the cost of that service.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This is not a measure in behalf of big concerns and rich people. It is in the interest of the common folks; and if this measure is adopted tens of millions of people who write local letters will be encouraged to use to a greater extent these facilities of the post office. It will help the people generally, and at the same time benefit the postal service. It certainly does not cost the Government as much to handle local first-class mail as it does nonlocal mail that may be carried from 2 or 3 miles to 3,000 miles. That being true, why should the local first-class mail cost the people as much as nonlocal mail? This is a fair, just, and equitable measure. It has practically the unanimous endorsement of the committee, Democrats and Republicans, and also of the Post Office Department.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did not want to give me time to talk about the inefficiency of the New Deal, but I want to say that now that I have got 3 minutes I am going to talk about it, because I remember when the Post Office Department was going in the red $80,000,000 a year and they boosted the price of first-class mail with one objective, and that was to try to take up the slack and get a balanced budget in the Post Office Department as far as the Post Office Department was concerned. They increased the rate from 2 cents to 3 cents on first-class mail, and we got in several hundred million dollars. But we found that at the end of a year or so the New Deal passed so many laws for the Post Office Department that they were in the red again, and have been in the red all the time since. How is that for efficiency? You have not had a balanced budget in the Post Office Department for a number of years. Here you are going in the red with a national debt of $265,000,000,000. You have to get some money some place to get this country out of the red and solvent. If you do not you will find later that you will be in worse trouble than you will be in trying to deliver a letter for 2 cents. You will find out you cannot deliver it at all. That will be the bugaboo. That is the end of the New Deal and the country.

It is time we in Congress try to keep this country solvent. When you come in here and try to eliminate revenue, regardless of what it might be, and put this country farther and farther into the red, then you are doing the wrong thing. Regardless of the merits of this particular piece of legislation, you need the revenues and you ought to get them. If you do not get them here you have to get them some place else. You cannot cut down revenues. If you do the day of reckoning is coming, and when it comes I do not want to be a Member of Congress. I have tried my best to get enough revenue here to make up in some manner for the amount of money you spend, but it does not seem possible. You who are interested in trying to reduce the income of the Federal Government, whether it be because you want the Post Office Department to deliver mail at cost or not, are doing something I cannot understand. It just cannot continue.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The evidence before our committee was that by increasing the local postal rates to 3 cents the Government lost money because so many of the business houses sent their statements out by their own employees and did not use the mails. Many of them took to using the penny post cards. Therefore, the 1-cent increase on local postage really lost the Government revenue.

Mr. RICH. You will have to show me, because I have had that explanation a number of times. I know it costs our business a lot more money with it in than it does with it out, and I am not for it. Too many departments of the Post Office Department are operated in the red; it must be stopped. You must correct that situation and get more revenue for the conduct of the Post Office Department.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than a matter of simple justice. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads at the direction of this House for some months has been making studies with reference to the cost of handling various classes of mail. We have ascertained that certain classes are not paying their way. And in response to the resolution of the House we have already recommended that on certain of those classes the rates be increased.

We find, however, in this investigation that first-class mail is more than paying its way. In other words, the Government is making a substantial profit on first-class mail.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the loss on second-class mail approximately?

Mr. GARY. I do not have those figures handy with reference to second-class mail. Perhap the chairman of the committee may have the figures.

Mr. BURCH. It is $90,000,000 on second-class mail.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the loss on third-class mail?

Mr. BURCH. About $20,000,000 or something like that.

Mr. GAVIN. Ninety million dollars plus $20,000,000 makes $110,000,000. We are making $170,000,000 profit on first-class mail. Is it the intention of the committee then to bring in legislation for the readjustment of second- and-third-class mail providing for increases?

Mr. GARY. It is. May I say to the gentleman that we have already brought in certain bills. We brought in a bill recommendin. an increase of the parcel-post rate and it has passed the House. We brought in a bill recommending increases in rates on catalogs, and that has passed the House. We are continuing the study on the various other classifications at the present time.

Mr. GAVIN. Why would it not be better to bring in one bill, taking into consideration the over-all picture? Woud it not be better than to take this up piecemeal? Thus, we could get legislation on the whole program.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that the committee discussed that in detail. It has given that question very grave consideration. The committee reached the conclusion that this is the best way to approach the problem.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Why does not the committee bring in a bill to restore the air-mail rate from 8 cents to the former 6-cent rate?

Mr. GARY. Simply because up to the present time the committee has not considered that particular classification. We are taking it up piece by piece. When we get to that classification, unquestionably there will be some recommendations from the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is making a terrific profit for the Government right now. That is the one that ought to be considered and reduced.

Mr. GARY. If that is so, then by all means it should be reduced because it is not the purpose of the Post Office Department to make a profit. That is the reason you have this bill before you today. We are making a tremendous profit on first-class mail, as a whole. We are not proposing in this bill, however, to reduce the rates on all first-class mail because when the Government carries a letter from New York City to San Francisco it passes through many hands and

they have to use various transportation facilities, which entails a much larger cost than when the Government undertakes to deliver a letter to the house next door. Those people who are sending the letter next door certainly should not be required to pay the same rate as a person sending a letter across the continent.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact it is a great deal easier getting a reduction in any rates that are charged to the people of this country than it is to get an increase in the rates for carrying the mail?

Mr. GARY. Not if the Members of Congress properly discharge their duties. I will say to the gentleman I voted for the two increases and when one of those increases was opposed on the floor of the House, I made the very point that the Congress should be consistent and that we should make each classification pay its way. I am willing now to vote for bills to make each classification pay its way.

I am not willing to see one classification or one class of post office users discriminated against for the benefit of another.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman made the statement that he did not want to see one class of mail pay an exorbitant price, but that he wanted to do a good job. If you want to do a good job as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, then you should take the thing as a whole, and when you find you have a balanced budget in the Post Office Department, then you can talk. But as long as you are going to deliver mail and have a loss of $100,000,000 in the operation, then you are doing a poor job, and I do not care who are members of that committee. If I made a profit on one article in my own business and lost money on a dozen other articles, I would think there was something wrong with me. Until the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads brings in something that will balance the budget in the Department, then it is poor legislation.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman says the Post Office Committee will have done a good job if it balances the Department's budget. May I say that this year we will have a surplus of $160,000,000, so evidently we have done better than a good job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the committee why I have objected to the consideration of this bill on this Consent Calendar. I have received eight telegrams from post-office employees in my district in Los Angeles County. I want to read only one or two of them as they are of similar text:

Urge you object to H. R. 2647 upon Consent Calendar as its passage would result in a loss of revenue and also react to any future pay adjustment due to going back to the 40-hour week.

Urge you object to H. R. 2647 coming upon Consent Calendar. If passed, the resultant loss in postal revenue will react against future salary-increase legislation. Two-cent local rate benefits only big business. The man in the street seldom uses it or even knows the rate.

Urge you object to H. R. 2647 upon Consent Calendar. If passed, the resultant loss in postal revenue will react against future salary-increase legislation.

I feel as a Congressman I must represent the expressed wishes of my district as I get them.

Since making my objection I have the assurance of the chairman and also ranking minority member of our Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads that there is no intention of allowing any condition to grow up which will result in the lowering of wages or salaries of post-office employees. Therefore, if there is any such intention on the part of anyone, I want the RECORD to show it, for I am opposed to allowing any condition to develop which will result in still less take-home cash in envelopes of these post-office employees. Committee members also assure this bill will mean more income than at present. But, I again ask that if there is any plan, directly or indirectly, to reduce wages or pay in the future that it be now stated. I have heard the committee members state that this bill would not result in any reduction nor in any inability to take care of anticipated increases in the future. I depend upon those statements on behalf of my constituents who have advised me they thought this bill would so result. Further, I am opposed to reducing of income to our National Treasury as much as this Congress has already for I feel we have not yet considered adequately the matter of future necessary compensation and human needs for all the workers of our Nation. It is truly happy people who are the truest national asset. I thank the distinguished chairman for his courtesy in allowing me time on the floor now.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is very much mistaken. It is not going to reduce the compensation of postal employees at all. This bill will not do that. We are not justified in not reducing the rate to 2 cents.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 76, noes 8.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

REPATRIATION OF REMAINS OF WAR DEAD BURIED OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3936) to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions, and that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Florida kindly explain the bill?

Mr. SIKES. I shall be very glad to explain the bill.

This legislation is reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs. It provides authorization for the repatriation of remains of American dead overseas, and it places responsibility in the hands of the Secretary of War for bringing back the bodies so that one agency will have complete control over this operation.

It is estimated that the bodies of about 300,000 persons may be moved under the terms of this legislation. This includes Army, Navy, civilians whose deaths were attributed to the war effort, and certain other groups.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did we have similar legislation after the last war?

Mr. SIKES. We had similar legislation following World War I. In the present case, however, because the bodies are scattered to the four corners of the earth the task will be much greater. There are many small cemeteries located in the various war theaters which will be abandoned after the bodies are removed. Inaccessibility and other factors contribute to this. It would at least be a very difficult task to look after and maintain many of them in years to come. The bodies should be concentrated at central points or brought back to this country.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. It seems to me this bill should be passed unanimously.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, I recently introduced a resolution providing for the bringing back of the bodies of two unknown soldiers of the present war, one from the Pacific area and one from the Atlantic area, to be buried in Arlington Cemetery alongside of the body of the Unknown Soldier of the First World War, that these three heroes typifying the many who lost their lives, may lie side by side.

I hope this resolution will expedite the bringing back of the bodies of these two unknown heroes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask this specific question: Does this bill cover Alaska?

Mr. SIKES. This bill covers all theaters of the war.

Mr. REED of New York. I am for the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida whether this bill sets a precedent by placing the jurisdiction for the return of all bodies in the War Department? This means that the War Department will have jurisdiction over bringing back the bodies of naval and Marine Corps personnel who were killed in action as well as the members of the Army. Is this likely to cause friction?

Mr. SIKES. This bill places responsibility in one agency for the fulfilling of this task. This precedent was set after World War I, when the War Department was given jurisdiction of this matter.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Then this bill does not establish a precedent.

Mr. SIKES. The precedent was established following World War I.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope this bill passes, for it is very necessary. After the last war I was one of the Members of the House who went to meet the last boatload of overseas dead that were brought back under legislation passed at that time. Unless this is done, there is going to be many a heartbroken, dissatisfied wife, father, and mother of these boys, who want their bodies brought back here; and we will also be left with a lot of scattered cemeteries all the way from the banks of the Rhine to the island of Pelelieu to be kept up at Government expense in a great many out-of-the-way places that will never be visited by the relatives of these servicemen. So I hope there will be no opposition to this bill.

Mr. SIKES. Knowing how much the gentleman from Mississippi has done for the veterans and their families, I appreciate his statement.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, all this bill does is to centralize authority for doing this work. This is most important. I am getting some mail on this subject, and I am sure every Member is getting mail on it.

It is most timely that we get to this bill. It has reference to our honored dead. They are the men who went across and gave their lives that this Nation might live. Neither expense, trouble, nor hardship should interfere in this sacred duty of the Congress to bring back the bodies at the request of the next of kin. I hope there will be no objection to the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I, too, am receiving many letters from fathers and mothers of boys who died overseas. They would like to know the mechanics of this thing, who will they apply to, in order to bring the bodies of their sons home? When will this legislation go into operation?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, it will go into operation as soon as the bill is signed by the President. It will have to go through the Congress and then be signed by the President. It will be handled by the War Department.

Mr. STEFAN. What then would be the time for the father or mother to write the Secretary of War stating they want the body of their son brought home?

Mr. BROOKS. In the last war this was handled by the Quartermaster Corps and it is assumed it will be handled by the Quartermaster Corps of the War Department at the present time. The next of kin, after this bill becomes law, should write to the War Department asking for details and for assistance.

Mr. STEFAN. As the gentleman knows from letters we receive, they want to know when to write and where. When will this become effective? After the President signs the bill?

Mr. BROOKS. After the President signs it. The reason for the urgency of this legislation is that those men are waiting to begin work.

Mr. STEFAN. Or should they write after our troops come home?

Mr. BROOKS. They should write right away, as soon as this becomes law.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I asked the gentleman in regard to Alaska. There are other places, including the Aleutian Islands, where these boys are buried. I just wanted to be sure that all of these places are covered, that is, all these places, the Panama Canal, and all these other places, are included in this legislation?

Mr. SIKES. Not only do we have the hearings which bear out the gentleman's desire that the bodies will be brought from whatever place outside the United States they may now be, but I also have a letter from the Secretary of War in which he specifically enumerates all theaters of war and indicates the procedure to be followed in bringing the bodies of our war dead back from those places. Later I shall ask unanimous consent to place that material in the RECORD of today's proceedings.

Since the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has just spoken, let me take this opportunity to commend him for his very fine interest in and activity for this measure.

Mr. REED of New York. May I ask the gentleman, Did the Secretary enumerate Alaska?

Mr. SIKES. He enumerated Alaska.

Mr. REED of New York. I wanted to be specific.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman asked a question just now that I think should be answered and that is whether or not the bodies would be returned to national cemeteries or to their homes to be interred in their local cemeteries. My understanding is they will be sent wherever their parents want them sent.

Mr. SIKES. That depends upon the request of the next of kin. If the next of kin asks that the bodies be brought back to their homes they will be brought back to their homes. If they ask that they be interred in a national cemetery, they will be interred in a national cemetery.

Mr. HARE. A problem will arise when there are no requests made. Now, what disposition will be made of those in case of failure to make a request for return of the body?

Mr. SIKES. In the event no request is made by the next of kin there is no authorization whereby the bodies so affected may be brought back. I would like to suggest that the question of bringing back unidentified dead may also arise, and to cover this point the War Department has suggested an amendment which will permit the Secretary of War to bring back the bodies of unidentified dead in case it is found more desirable to bring them back to this country than to move them from a present cemetery to a central cemetery. There are no provisions in this bill whereby if the next of kin does not request that the body be brought back the Secretary of War shall have the power to bring them back. It is understood that the Secretary has authorization to move the bodies to a larger or central cemeteries overseas where they can be better taken care of.

Mr. HARE. It is expected there will be burial grounds or cemeteries maintained in some of the foreign countries?

Mr. SIKES. Definitely.

Mr. HARE. To take care of those who do not make requests and also to take care of some who prefer to have them remain there.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the case of a man buried in a cemetery in England, and his parents desire that he should remain there, the bill would not disturb that situation?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I note the provision in this bill that the Secretary of War is authorized upon application of the kin to return the remains of those who died on or after December 7. I have in mind some men who died before December 7 who volunteered for the emergency and before the draft law went into effect in October 1940. What about the boys who had given up their lives before that time?

Mr. SIKES. Let me say frankly to the gentleman that I, too, am somewhat disturbed by the language specified, although the Army and the Navy have stated that this bill answers their needs for legislation to bring the bodies back.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What about the parents of the boy who gave his life before December 7 under the same conditions, as we know, in the islands of the Pacific, particularly the Philippine area? These boys volunteered because the country asked them to volunteer before the period that we put the draft into effect, October 1940. The draft was extended to October 1941, but the boys were in the service a full year prior to that time. Then they were sent overseas, and some that I know died over there. What are we going to say to the parents of those boys who died before December 7 when they find that they are not included in this bill? I wonder why we cannot go back and amend this bill to the date of the Selective Service Act, October 1940.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman that under the provisions of section 3, subdivision (e), the Secretary of War has the authority to establish certain regulations, and where he thinks it is equitable and proper that certain groups who otherwise would not come under the terms of the act be brought back, he is authorized to make such a regulation. For instance, he testified at the hearings that down there in one isolated instance some sailors had been lost and their bodies were buried in a very isolated portion of the globe. This would give the Secretary of War authority to pick up and return those bodies in the course of the work.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What objection has the gentleman to amending this bill to read "October 1940"?

Mr. SIKES. I will say to the gentleman that I am in complete sympathy with his objectives.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. So that the parents will have an opportunity to have their sons' bodies returned, the same as those who died before December 7.

Mr. SIKES. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman is attempting to do, and I see no objection to an amendment of the sort he proposes, and I suggest that he offer that amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I will offer that amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman accept an amendment that at least two of the bodies of the unknown heroes be brought back, instead of passing a separate bill for that? It has the strong endorsement of the American Legion in convention. It would call for one body from the Pacific theater and one body from the Atlantic theater.

Mr. SIKES. I would not like to assume responsibility for the committee and accept the gentlewoman's amendment. I feel that she is fully entitled to consideration of her bill, and I should be only too glad to be of any service that I can to see that she gets a proper hearing and consideration of her bill. I would not like to assume the responsibility for accepting it as an amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am sure nobody disagrees with the purpose of the bill, but may I inquire what the program will cost?

Mr. SIKES. I would be glad to answer that. The program will not be an inexpensive one. It has been estimated that it will cost about $700 per body to bring them back. That includes all costs, and involves an item of $50 which goes to each family to help defray the burial expenses. This item was not paid after the First World War. May I say that in the First World War the expenses were found to be about $400 per body. The increased cost is due to the fact that a better casket will be provided, to the fact that the bodies are more widely scattered, involving much air transportation, which we did not have before. It will be recalled that the bodies were in a comparatively small area after World War I and that there were railway lines leading to all ports of embarkation. In World War II our men fought and died in many places where there are no railroad or steamship facilities. Labor costs, which are an important item, are much higher than before. All items of expense which will be included in this program are going to cost more money than they did before. The entire program will cost in the neighborhood of $210,000,000 if all 300,000 bodies that are eligible are brought back.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman advise us whether the same treatment, the same accommodations, and the same arrangements will be given to the repatriation of the remains of a private as will be given to the remains of a general?

Mr. SIKES. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question because I, too, was interested in knowing whether the remains of a private would receive the same treatment as the remains of a commissioned officer or even of a general officer. I have been assured by the War Department that exactly the same treatment will be provided. I am sure the gentleman has been in American military cemeteries in France and knows that there has been no difference in the treatment shown our honored dead there. In death there is no rank. In American cemeteries, they are all American hero dead. I am assured that the same principle will be carried through in the handling and bringing back of these bodies.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the work to be done by the War Department personnel or is it to be done by contract?

Mr. SIKES. That depends somewhat on local conditions. The War Department will when possible use local labor. It may be necessary to use some contract labor. In some instances they will even use prisoners of war. However, all of this work will be done under the direction of the War Department and under commissioned officers of the United States Army. American licensed embalmers and technicians will be employed in handling the bodies. The actual removal of the bodies from the graves and the preparation of the bodies for shipment home will be done by those licensed embalmers and by American technicians so that we can be sure they are carefully, properly, and reverently handled.

Mr. COLE of New York. One further question: Is the gentleman convinced that the expression used in the bill that the next of kin is the one who has the right to determine whether or not the body shall be brought back is sufficiently clear and explicit so that there is no room for dispute as to who is the next of kin of the soldier?

Mr. SIKES. I believe that precedents have been clearly established in previous legislation in which the War Department has dealt with the matter of the next of kin. I do not anticipate any difficulty on that score.

Mr. COLE of New York. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. BOLTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, anyone who has been in the cemeteries abroad and who has seen the very reverent services given by the Quartermaster battalions that care for the bodies of our dead will not question the method of procedure that will be followed. May I ask if I am right in understanding that no bodies will be brought back without special request from the next of kin?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct, as the bill is now written; that is, they will not be brought back to this country.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that I understand that the program of the Department is that when this bill becomes law a memorandum will be sent to the nearest of kin of every soldier buried on foreign soil, asking for their wishes. When the memorandum is returned to the War Department the Department will know what are the wishes of the next of kin, and will then, under this bill, do its level best to comply with those wishes with reference to the remains.

Mrs. BOLTON. Understanding the tragic longing in the hearts of our people for the return to this country of the bodies of their beloved dead, I hope it will be possible to make it clear to them that there may be much heartbreak and tragedy in store for them if and when they make these requests. I speak with deepest sympathy and understanding after my experience in the European theater last year.

Mr. SIKES. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter and a memorandum from the Secretary of War, Mr. Robert Patterson, in which he outlines the procedure to be followed under this bill, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 3, 1945.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAY: The attached notes pertaining to procedures involving the repatriation program and the cost thereof are submitted in accordance with the request of the Honorable ROBERT SIKES, House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

REPATRIATION PROCEDURE AND ESTIMATED COSTS, WORLD WARS I AND II

1. WORLD WAR I REPATRIATION PROCEDURE

(a) An over-all command known as the AGRS in Europe was established in Paris, France. This command was broken down into three operating zones, namely, zone of Great Britain, zone of Germany, and zone of France. Some 6 or 8 months after the establishment of these zones, the entire operation was consolidated into the AGRS headquarters in Paris, and the zone organizations were discontinued. This was primarily due to the fact that the operational areas involved were of such limited extent that control and supervision could be maintained by a headquarters in Paris.

(b) The field operations were performed by from 10 to 12 field sections, each of which consisted of 4 groups. Each group contained one embalmer (civilian) and two technical assistants (civilian), and such other clerical and skilled personnel, such as checkers, convoyers, typists, etc., as were needed. As a rule a section would operate in a cemetery and evacuate all dead therein by preparing them for shipment to the United States or to a concentration cemetery which had been designated as one of the permanent national cemeteries overseas. The section had three commissioned officers assigned to it, consisting of one captain and two lieutenants. The lieutenants were inspectors of the groups, each lieutenant having two groups under his supervision. They closely observed the preparation of the bodies, identification, and casketing; prepared all required field records and forms and verified and necessary shipping addresses placed on the shipping cases.

(c) The captain of the section had complete charge of the operations and was responsible for all of the section's activities, its supplies, pay, etc. When operations were conducted in the larger cemeteries, two or more sections would be placed therein, and the senior officer would take command of the entire force and direct the operation, making the proper assignments to the different sections. The section commander, or officer in charge of operations, would secure all local permits necessary to perform the operations and also secure necessary releases from the owners of the land which had been used for cemeterial purposes. The use of the railroads, warehouses, and other facilities were frequently obtained prior to exhumation operations in cemeteries by a liaison agent from AGRS headquarters in Paris, or from the zone headquarters when such were in existence.

(d) The labor required for exhuming the dead and closing graves was obtained locally by contract. During the early part of the repatriation this labor was hired by the section commander, but as the operations developed, contracts were subsequently made at the headquarters, AGRS, for this class of labor in a specified cemetery and area. These contracts were usually estimated on price per body and stipulated that on the dates supplied, the contract labor would be available in the cemetery as designated. The contract labor proved more efficient than local hiring of same. This labor was not used in removing uncasketed bodies from the graves. The embalmer and his technical assistants would perform this operation. When the bodies were removed from the graves, they were placed on work tables, thoroughly examined for identification, cleaned, treated chemically with disinfectant, and then placed in a new blanket, and the bones were arranged in skeletonal conformation. The body was then carefully wrapped in this blanket, which was securely pinned so that there would be no displacement therein, and then carefully placed in the casket, and by means of pillows secured so that there would be no displacement in transit. An embossed strip containing the name of the deceased was attached to the wrapped body. A duplicate strip was also placed on the shipping case.

(e) These bodies, after being casketed and sealed in the shipping case, were taken by truck to a field morgue, if such had been erected in the cemetery, or to a building at the railhead where a morgue had been established. When the smaller cemeteries had been completely evacuated, the bodies would be shipped by rail to the designated port for return to the United States. During these operations after World War I, railroad service was available throughout the areas in which our dead were buried, so that the transportation of the casketed remains could be expeditiously accomplished. The entire repatriation operations of World War I proceeded in an orderly manner without any delay. The bodies for return to the United States were shipped from the various ports on United States vessels, and bodies to remain overseas were moved to the cemeteries designated as permanent national cemeteries, where burial was made without delay.

2. WORLD WAR II REPATRIATION PROCEDURE

(a) The basic cemeterial procedures covering exhumation, preparation, identification, and casketing of bodies will be the same as World War I. However, the global extent of the cemeteries and the destruction of railroads, ports, and warehousing facilities will make the task a far more difficult one.

(b) The section organization of World War I will be used in the World War II repatriation. It is contemplated establishing two over-all commands—one in Europe (Paris), which will have technical supervision and control over all AGRS operations in Great Britain and Europe, and the other over-all command will be in the Pacific and Asiatic areas (Manila). These over-all commands will be subdivided into zones which will include certain territorial areas permitting centralized control of all operations by the commander of the zone. In addition to these over-all commands, there will be six separate zone commands:

(1) Africa-Middle East.
(2) India-Burma.
(3) China.
(4) Alaskan Department.
(5) Caribbean and South American.
(6) Eastern defense command (Newfoundland, Greenland, Iceland, Bermuda).

These six zone commands will be under the direct control of the War Department.

(c) In accomplishing the repatriation of our dead of World War II, it will be necessary to use motor and water transport to a far greater extent than in the World War I operations. Air transport will also have to be used extensively due to the small cemeteries which are located in isolated sections of the globe and on far distant islands. The use of bases for preparation and casketing of the bodies will be necessary in many instances. Many bodies are being brought from their present location by air transport. The concentration of our overseas dead into larger cemeteries is now being accomplished where practicable, and on the European Continent there will be a limited number of very large cemeteries so that the operations therein will be concentrated and permit the utilization of a number of field sections, thus expediting the work with a minimum amount of movement of sections. The most difficult problem will be in the Aleutian Islands and the islands of the Southwest and Western Pacific areas. Air transport will have its maximum use in these areas.

(d) Labor requirements for exhumation work will be met by direct local employment so far as possible. Conditions in some parts of the world may make necessary the use of some contract labor, and possibly some prisoners of war.

(e) The repatriation plan for World War II dead contemplates its accomplishment by a War Department agency with the full cooperation of the Air Transport Command, Army Transportation Service, and the Navy Department. The plan further contemplates the assignment of members of the Chaplains Corps, Medical Corps, and such other technical personnel as may be needed by the operating agency for assignment for special duty. American civilian licensed embalmers and technical assistants, who are qualified as embalmers' assistants, will be employed and assigned to the operating sections. It is estimated that approximately 300,000 dead will be exhumed, either for return to their homeland or for concentration in national cemeteries overseas, should such be established.

3. COST

(a) The average cost per body of World War I dead for disinterment and return to the homeland or for concentration in a national cemetery overseas was $396.04. This cost included labor, mortuary supplies, funeral merchandise, transportation (rail, motor, water), overhead, administration and supplies, including rentals and equipment, as well as transportation of the escort which accompanied the body upon arrival in the United States to its designated final destination.

(b) It is estimated for World War II dead that this cost will be approximately $700 per body. The increase in cost is based on the following primary factors:

(1) Funeral merchandise and seamless metal casket is contemplated which will exceed the cost of World War I casket.

(2) The global dispersions of our cemeteries require longer and more difficult hauls, involving higher costs for transportation and travel time for civilian employees.

(3) High operational cost for air transport and special water transportation.

(4) Pay increases for civilian employees in conformity with increases effected by legislation and civil-service regulations since 1922.

(5) Allowance of $50 provided by act of April 17, 1938, for interment expenses.

(c) The estimated total cost of repatriation of World War II dead is approximately $210,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who have died since December 7, 1941, and whose remains are buried in places located outside the continental limits of the United States and could not be returned to their homeland for burial due to wartime shipping restrictions, and to centralize in one agency the task of evacuation and repatriation of such remains.

SEC. 2. All evacuation and repatriation activities herein provided for are hereby made a responsibility of the Secretary of War and all administrative and operational activities in connection therewith a function of the Quartermaster General under the direct control and supervision of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed, upon application by the next of kin, to return to the homeland for interment at places designated by the next of kin, or in national cemeteries, the remains of persons who died on or after December 7, 1941, and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States, and who were—

(a) members of the armed forces of the United States who died in the service;

(b) civilian officers and employees of the United States;

(c) citizens of the United States who served in the armed forces of any government at

war with Germany, Italy, or Japan and who died while in such service and who were citizens of the United States at the time of such service;

(d) citizens of the United States whose homes are in fact in the United States and whose death outside the continental limits thereof can be directly attributed to the war or who died while employed or otherwise engaged in activities contributing to the prosecution of the war; and

(e) such other citizens of the United States, the repatriation of the remains of whom would in the discretion of the Secretary of War, serve the public interest.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, said sums to be made available for civil functions administered by the War Department, "Cemeterial expenses, War Department," to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Quartermaster General.

SEC. 6. This act and the authority granted therein and all rules and regulations promulgated thereunder shall terminate 5 years after the cessation of hostilities with Japan, as proclaimed by the President, or upon such earlier date as may be specified in a proclamation by the President, or in a concurrent resolution by the two houses of Congress, as the date beyond which further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the public interest, whichever date is earliest: *Provided*, That as to any applications provided for under section 3 filed prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such rules or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto shall be treated as remaining in force for the purpose of providing for the repatriation of remains in proper cases.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after "War", strike out the remainder of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, and 8.

Page 3, line 17, after "War", strike out "and the supervision of the Quartermaster General."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES of Florida: On page 2, line 10, after the word "directed", strike out the words "upon application by the next of kin" and insert the following "upon his own initiative in the case of unidentified remains and upon application by the next of kin in the case of identified remains."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: On page 2, line 13, strike out the words "December 7, 1941" and insert "September 16, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 457 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the act (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 207]

Adams	Flannagan	Monroney
Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Geelan	Morrison
Auchincloss	Gerlach	Murdock
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	Murphy
Barrett, Pa.	Gifford	Norton
Barry	Granahan	O'Hara
Beall	Halleck	Peterson, Ga.
Bender	Hand	Philbin
Bennett, N. Y.	Hart	Powell
Boren	Hays	Quinn, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Healy	Ramey
Brehm	Hébert	Randolph
Brumbaugh	Hedrick	Resa
Buck	Heffernan	Rizley
Buckley	Heselton	Robertson, Va.
Camp	Hook	Rockwell
Campbell	Horan	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Okla.	Savage
Celler	Jonkman	Schwabe, Okla.
Clark	Keefe	Sharp
Clements	Keogh	Sheridan
Clippinger	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Combs	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
Courtney	Lane	Stevenson
Cox	Latham	Sumner, Ill.
Crosser	Lewis	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	Lynch	Tarver
Daughton, Va.	McConnell	Taylor
Dawson	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	McGlinchey	Torrens
Dingell	McKenzie	Traynor
Drewry	McMillan, S. C.	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	Maloney	White
Ervin	May	Wilson
Fenton	Merrow	Winter
Fernandez	Miller, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 315 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include copies of letters and newspaper editorials.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this quorum call was not of my making. Someone said I was responsible for the call so that I would have someone here while I made my speech. I am not going to make a speech nor will I make any extended remarks, because I understand there is no opposition to the rule and there should be no opposition to the bill. It is a Senate bill that passed by a vote of 65 to 7 after careful consideration by that body.

I presume you are all familiar with what the bill aims to do, what we must do. This bill is to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United Nations in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization. Under the agreements we have made, the President is obliged to make these appointments, and this bill authorizes him to do so. The bill should pass without any opposition.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the bill unanimously, and the Rules Committee, after listening to the gentleman representing the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the rule also by unanimous vote. In view of that fact, I shall not take up your time any longer, feeling that it is not necessary. Later on the bill will be explained. I might as well say to some of the gentlemen here that I understand that after the rule is adopted, and I believe it will be, general debate and consideration of the bill will go over until tomorrow. I make that observation because I know how busy every Member is in trying to arrange his matters in the office before leaving for your much-deserved recess of a few days, and I realize that those few days should be spent in the Member's district and in his home. Consequently, I have made this statement so that you may devote that additional time in your offices on the many pressing matters that come to you from day to day and which I know you desire to attend to before leaving for the short recess.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] to make a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one on the subject of loans to Great Britain and to include therein a newspaper item relating to the CIO and Mr. Thomas applying to Premier Attlee for help in the labor dispute; in the second instance to extend

his remarks in the RECORD in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project and to include resolutions adopted by the National Grange at Kansas City; and in the third instance to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and to include a statement by Governor Dewey in his annual report and also other matters.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include several letters.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret to embarrass the good gentleman from Michigan by asking him to yield to me at this point.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is no embarrassment to yield to my good friend the gentleman from Vermont.

J. EDGAR HOOVER DEFIES CRIMINAL MALFEASANCE — FIGHTS FASCISM — WARNS AGAINST "STRATOSPHERIC" THINKING—PANDERING COMMUNISTS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the inefficient and careless manner in which convicted criminals are guarded in our jails and penal institutions, not only in the District of Columbia, but countrywide, is shocking and in many cases represents criminal malfeasance upon the part of those charged with the proper safekeeping of these enemies of society.

The taxpayer has every right to demand that convicted criminals be guarded by men of high character, integrity, and intelligence. Law-enforcement officers must be alert to take advantage of every opportunity to focus the spotlight of public opinion upon the evil conditions which presently exist here in the District and elsewhere.

The abuses and maladministration of our penal systems which release murderers, sex-crazed degenerates, outlaws, and bandits on parole or "leave of absence" from our correctional institutions to commit serious crimes against our citizens is constituting a national disgrace.

THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST

There is an ever-broadening front dominated by the subverter and purveyor of alien isms who seek to transform the America we know and love to a land of class struggle. The fight against fascism continues. To the Fascist foe must be added another, the American Communist. These panderers of diabolic distrust already are concentrating their efforts to confuse and divide.

AGAINST LIBERTY FOR LICENSE

They are against the liberty which is America—they are for the license of their own. There can be no unity with enemies of our way of life. America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist. It behooves us to be on guard for an enemy that brazenly and openly has advocated the corruption of America; that spends sleepless nights working one propaganda line after another; that poses behind a dozen fronts; that squirms and twists his way into those great forces such as the church, the schools, and the ranks of labor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not a pretty picture, and if I had painted it, or the Committee on Un-American Activities were responsible for it, a lot of people would say there was nothing to it; but when the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, the brains, head, and director of one of the most successful branches of he service to fight and win the war, paints this picture, and says substantially and almost exactly the foregoing, then it is time for those who are so complacent as to be misled by the stratosphere thinkers disseminating mists of error and confusion to remember that Mr. Hoover knows what he is talking about.

In order that those interested may know what he said at the fifty-second annual meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police at Miami, Fla., as recently as December 10, I am including his address in full as an extension of my remarks. And if the coat fits, some people should put it on, for they are under suspicion already and might well take heed:

THE RECONVERSION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

There is a marked similarity between our meeting 6 years ago, as war was spreading in Europe, and our first peacetime meeting today. The firing has stopped on the battlefronts, but it is being resumed on the home front. We had a big job to do then, but a bigger one faces us today.

At our last peacetime meeting, it was my duty to convey to you the President's directive calling upon all law enforcement to protect our internal security, and to call upon you for assistance. The manner in which you answered your country's call to duty is a tribute to your love for America. Never in our national history have brighter pages been written by men working together for a common purpose.

Already, I have expressed my gratitude to many of you and today I want publicly to extend to all of law enforcement my heartfelt appreciation for your assistance in keeping our home front secure. It is also my privilege to extend to you the personal greetings and commendation of the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Tom C. Clark. As the chief law-enforcement officer of the Nation, he has asked me to convey his congratulations for a job well done.

The ability of all branches of law enforcement to cooperate and to pool their facilities proves once and for all that we needed no unified agency to insure the discharge of our responsibilities. I have said before, and I say again, that there is no place in our American way of life for a national police. Our first line of defense in peace or war is the local police agency. It is on the scene and can strike at lawlessness at its source. The role of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall continue to be that of a service agency to augment and bolster your efforts and to handle those matters which are Nation-wide in scope and beyond the reach of hometown protectors.

As we look to the future, we should also consolidate our gains. At the very inception of hostilities, we were all apprehensive of what might happen. That these fears did not materialize is a tribute to the forces assigned to maintain the peace at home.

In every period of national emergency it is normal and natural for human beings to become panicky and hysterical. There is not an experienced law-enforcement administrator in the land who was not criticized for seeming inaction. We could not publicly proclaim what we were doing and why. But in no civilized land in time of war were civil rights and personal liberties abridged less than here in the United States. The civil rights which we preserved then must be preserved in the future. The dragnets of World War I were unheard of in this war. The slacker raids did not recur. The lynchings and character assassins of World War I were checked. On the other hand, the sabotage which everyone said would occur did not take place.

Early in the war skeptics proclaimed that we were wide open to espionage. They held that nothing was secure and nothing was being done. The record is exactly to the contrary. We knew from the very outbreak of the war that espionage was under control. I do not mean that the enemy was not active. He was. Foreign powers tried to steal not only the atomic bomb but other military secrets. For years Nazi Germany had built an espionage machine and an army of fifth columnists, which proved to be the downfall of once proud nations. They spent money with reckless abandon and were constantly on the alert to train, develop, and unleash spies and saboteurs, not only in the United States but throughout the entire Western Hemisphere. The counterespionage program which we developed did more than encircle spies and render them harmless. It enabled us to learn of their weaknesses and their aims.

There is a universality to law enforcement in democratic countries. I am happy to report that the integrity and devotion to duty of peace officers in the United States has been matched by our neighbors to the north, to the south, and by our British allies. It was our happy privilege to be closely associated with the security and intelligence authorities in the British Isles, with that sterling organization in Canada which has captured the imagination of all Americans—the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—and with similar agencies in all of the countries to the south from Mexico to Chile.

There were few espionage cases which came to our attention which did not have world-wide ramifications; and FBI liaison agents, stationed from Canada to the tip of South America, received the highest degree of aggressive cooperation.

It can truly be said that so far as subversion is concerned there is no such thing as a domestic field. It is international. Japanism manifested in this country had its origin in Japan, nazism in Germany, and fascism in Italy, and without the wholehearted spirit of mutual assistance of all law-enforcement agencies, domestic and foreign, the FBI could not point to the proud record we have today. Let me illustrate. Germany, lacking an ever-necessary supply of platinum, turned to the black market in South America. One arch platinum smuggler was arrested in California. His trail led through several South American countries. In each the facts were communicated by the FBI to

the established law-enforcement agencies in those countries and the holes were plugged. In one espionage case which centered in New York, shipping information was getting out of the country. Contacts of the enemy were spotted in far-away Brazil and Chile. There the authorities quickly moved into action. Twenty-four clandestine radio stations were put out of business, 30 short-wave transmitters were seized, and in all 355 espionage agents were arrested in South America alone through the fine cooperation of the countries of that continent.

More than 23,000 enemy aliens throughout the Western Hemisphere were identified, interned, deported, or moved from strategic areas through the joint efforts of local law-enforcement agencies and the FBI. We not only thwarted enemy sabotage at home—none occurred in the entire Western Hemisphere throughout the entire period of World War II. We of law enforcement can be very proud of this record.

The wartime associations of law-enforcement officers of the different countries have brought about a spirit of understanding and friendship which will inure to our mutual advantage in the peacetime years which lie ahead. I cannot commend too highly all of the officers with whom we have been privileged to work, and I sincerely hope that the spirit of mutual assistance and understanding will continue.

We have faced many problems, burdened as we were with added duties, untrained personnel, and acute manpower shortages. The salaries paid to law-enforcement officers are scandalously low. Community leaders should hang their heads in shame when they condemn their local police without first facing the fact that the average officer could command a much higher salary in the industries he protects.

In replenishing our ranks we should enlist the aid of the public in improving conditions, in providing better facilities and in securing the modern implements of law enforcement. A community can have no better investment than in an alert, well-trained police department. It is false economy and a flagrant disregard of society's rightful protection to reduce essential enforcement services.

Our greatest advances have come through concentrated training programs. But we have scarcely begun to scratch the surface. Like every other popular movement, leeches and parasites have already tried to attach themselves to the field of police training. Here is a job that belongs in the hands of law enforcement. It is no place for professional promoters with quack nostrums to sell nor for stratosphere thinkers disseminating mists of error and confusion. Yet, I know of instances where ex-convicts with glib tongues have actually succeeded in taking part in training police and in surveying police needs. The International Association of Chiefs of Police can embark on no more important program in the postwar years than a widespread campaign to lift police standards through well-established training activities conducted by professional men of law enforcement who have dealt in the realities of the problem.

The need for increased effectiveness and the marshaling of whole communities on the crime prevention front becomes more important each day. Lawlessness has taken on such proportions as to even startle the imagination. The crime waves proclaimed in the daily press are not imaginary. They are real. They are bloody. If anything the press is guilty of understatement rather than overstatement. Let me be specific. In October of this year serious crime increased 19 percent over the same month last year. Of the more serious crimes, the increases reflect 32 percent more murders, 38 percent more auto thefts, 38 percent more robberies, 11 percent more larcenies, and 26 percent more burglaries. Crime rates are continuing to rise rapidly throughout the entire Nation.

The fingerprint files of the FBI reveal a criminal army of 6,000,000 individuals who have been arrested and fingerprinted—one out of every 23 inhabitants in the United States. You know only too well the constant recurrence of arrests.

After every great war or period of acute national emergency there has been a recession of moral fortitude. This one will be no exception. I hope, as you do, that the racketeers, overlords, the desperadoes, and the criminal scum who characterized the roaring twenties will not come back to the American scene. I fear, however, that this is wishful thinking. Once they get a start and find they can succeed we shall face very serious trouble.

Crime springs not alone from a state of mind. There are many factors that must be considered in discussing crime causation, such as the matter of economics, moral standards, and social conditions. To combat the rising tide of serious criminality which is sweeping the country we need a revival of old-fashioned discipline and courage.

The abuses and maladministration of our penal systems which release murderers, sex-crazed degenerates, outlaws, and bandits on parole or on "leave of absence" from our correctional institutions to commit serious crimes against our citizens is constituting again a national disgrace. A large percentage of the fugitives being sought by law-enforcement officers throughout the country have been the recipients of ill-advised clemency.

The inefficient and careless manner in which convicted criminals are guarded in our jails and penal institutions is shocking and in many cases represents criminal malfeasance upon the part of those charged with the proper safekeeping of these enemies of society. Almost daily we note hardened criminals escaping from confinement to endanger the lives of our citizens. The taxpayer has every right to demand that convicted criminals be guarded by men of high character, integrity, and intelligence. Law-enforcement agencies exist for but one purpose, namely, the protection of society. We of law enforcement must be alert to take advantage of every opportunity to focus the spotlight of public opinion upon the evil conditions which presently exist. In this, we must enlist the aid of a sympathetic press and a civic-spirited screen and radio.

SUBVERTERS AND PURVEYORS OF ALIEN ISMS

The responsibilities of law enforcement are ever broadening. Not only must we marshal our forces on the front of crime detection and apprehension, but there is an ever-broadening front dominated by the subverter and purveyor of alien isms who seek to transform the America we know and love to a land of class struggle. The fight against fascism continues. The shooting war has stopped, but these espousers of dictatorships still exist and they have been too well entrenched to become converts to democracy overnight. The evidences of Fascist survival are too plain to ignore.

THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST

To the Fascist foe must be added another, the American Communist. These panderers of diabolic distrust already are concentrating their efforts to confuse and divide by applying the Fascist smear to progressive police departments, the FBI, and other American institutions to conceal their own sinister purposes.

The Godless, truthless way of life that American Communists would force on America can mean only tyranny and oppression if they succeed. They are against the liberty which is America—they are for the license of their own. When they raise their false cry of unity, remember there can be no unity with the enemies of our way of life who are attempting to undermine our democratic institutions. The Fascist-minded tyrant whom we conquered on the battlefields is no different from the American communistic corruptionist who now uses the tricks of the confidence man until his forces are sufficiently strong to rise with arms in revolt.

America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist. If we want to improve upon our American form of government we will do it in our own way, in our own time and with our own blueprint. Therefore, it behooves us to be on guard for an enemy that brazenly and openly has advocated the corruption of America, that spends sleepless nights working one propaganda line after another, that poses behind a dozen fronts, that squirms and twists his way into those great American forces such as the church, schools, and the ranks of labor.

A NEW FRONT

As I speak to you today, the big guns of the Communist Party in the United States are aimed at returning veterans, openly boasting that here is a new front behind which they can hide. They have selected a worthy foe, for the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are too experienced in fighting America's enemies to be hoodwinked by these Communist swindlers.

Lest I be misunderstood, I do not for 1 minute detract from the heroic fight Russia waged against the invading Nazi hordes, to emerge as one of the great powers of the world. We must not let the antics of the American Communist prejudice us against this great Nation which has the right to any form of government she desires, nor must we judge the great Russian people by the lunatic fringe which represents the great majority of American Communists.

OUR RIGHT AND DUTY

Yes; we have a right and a duty to know what is going on in America. Law enforcement in the peacetime era must determine to do its best to prevent home-grown or imported Fascists and Nazis from reorganizing or regrouping under some other high-sounding, misleading name.

The rising trend in crime once again directs its attention to the home and the youth problem. More and more, I am convinced that the fault lies directly in the home. Parental responsibility is no longer in style. This causes me to suggest that a new approach is necessary. In the past, when a youngster committed crime, he alone was held responsible and went to reform school, a foster home, or was put on probation. The time has come when parents should be held responsible, not only to their own conscience but to society. Juvenile deliquency does not occur until adults first become delinquent. Law enforcement must find a way to do more to alleviate this problem. A widespread return of officers to the beat, concentrated efforts through crime-prevention bureaus, and a closer contact with community facilities will make it a more potent force for social betterment.

There is a need for more realism in meeting the crime problem. It is not pleasant, but the fact remains that it is the delinquent youngster of the war years who is now graduating into the ranks of seasoned criminals. The most recent figures reveal that 21 percent of all arrests are of persons under 21. More persons aged 17 are arrested than in any other age group. Those under 21 years of age represent 15 percent of all murderers, 36 percent of all robbers, 51 percent of all burglars, 34 percent of all thieves, 26 percent of all arsonists, 62 percent of all car thieves, and 30 percent of all rapists.

The whole problem becomes more serious when we observe the shocking spectacle of the rise in youth offenders during the war years. They are the ones who are now becoming the postgraduates of crime and are committing the more despicable offenses. The arrests of girls under 18 years of age have increased 198 percent since the last peacetime year of 1939, while arrests of boys

under 18 years of age have increased 48 percent for homicide, 70 percent for rape, 39 percent for robbery, 72 percent for assault, 55 percent for auto thefts, and 101 percent for drunkenness and driving while intoxicated.

These figures do not mean that all youth has failed; on the other hand, the generation ahead of them has failed. The best we can do to correct our mistakes is to aid the youngsters who have never had a chance in recapturing their rightful places and removing those forces which have contributed to their delinquency. The home, the church, and the school must be united in a common purpose. We need new altitudes of respect, both for the parent and for law. We need a rebuilding of the foundations which made this Nation the greatest in all history—bulwarks formed of more staple materials than those of apathy, selfishness, or indulgence. Our boys and our girls are the foundation of America—to grow as their parents and their surroundings direct.

THE RETURNING VETERAN—OUR ALLY

We have a potent ally in the returning veteran. Fathers, older brothers, and even mothers and sisters freed from defense plants can do much to restore the home to its rightful place.

The average veteran will come home a better citizen. He knows what America means. He has fought and sacrificed the best years of his life in order that democracy might survive.

I resent the libel that has been placed on the returning veteran by those who would lay the postwar crime waves at his doorstep. This misapprehension regarding servicemen stems from the fact that many weapons used in crimes of violence are either service pistols or other souvenir weapons the returning soldiers were allowed to bring home because of lax regulations. Many of these inevitably find their way into the hands of unscrupulous black marketeers who resell them to hoodlums and criminals.

Hundreds of thousands of such souvenirs have been brought into the country by returning war veterans. Consequently every community and all civic groups should start a campaign to keep dangerous souvenir war weapons out of the reach of killers and bandits. Nationally the Federal firearms statute should be strengthened so as to serve more adequately to protect society and make more difficult armed depredations upon law-abiding citizens by thugs.

At the very outbreak of war, in addressing you, I pointed out that oppression would help crystalize a fifth column. We singled out the guilty then and protected the innocent. Here was a practical lesson in Americanism which worked. The same principle should be applied to the veteran. Give him the understanding, friendship, and help he deserves while he faces a period of adjustment. Those few who take the law into their own hands must be treated firmly and be made to understand that neither they nor anyone else can be immune when they do as they please and fail to respect the rights of others.

As we face the new era that lies ahead, let us do so with the determination that the people we serve shall have our best efforts and the utmost of our protection. Let us realize our responsibilities to those who have fought and died that democracy might live, by dedicating every fibre of our being to the preservation of the America we love. Let us forever pledge that we shall keep here in America a way of life that is wholesomely democratic, where citizens walk consciously and fearlessly as free men.

I know of no greater cause; I know of no cause more entitled to receive the enthusiastic support of every American interested in the preservation of our country's institutions.

For some time, Mr. Speaker, I have made it my business to call the attention of Congress and particularly that of Vermonters to the facts so ably discussed by Mr. Hoover.

I have made some enemies, but more friends, by frequently referring to fellow travelers, Communists, parlor pinks, and others, who under all kinds of covers have made and are still making an attempt to socialize America. They are still at it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an opinion by the Northeastern Retail Lumber Dealers' Association.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of adopting the rule providing for the consideration of the United Nations bill. The charter has been adopted. Certainly we must do everything we can to try to work out a durable and satisfactory peace adjustment. I hope that the United Nations capital will be located in my own district, the historic district of Arlington, Lexington, Concord, and all that area where the first shot was fired for freedom. There is every reason it should be there.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that no one of the Allied countries, which made up a part of the United Nations, would do what our Navy Department recently did, namely, bring in an alien enemy Japanese captain of a submarine to testify at the trial of one of our own naval captains, Captain McVay. I believe it is unprecedented in a military court in any nation. It is certainly unprecedented in our own history.

Mr. Speaker, the mothers and sons of men in our armed forces are asking, if by chance their sons should be brought to trial, if an alien enemy Japanese would be brought in to testify against them, or an alien Nazi would be brought in to testify against them. The country is thoroughly aroused, Mr. Speaker. For myself, I am not only profoundly shocked, but I am very much alarmed. If the United States is going to follow the precedent it established a few days ago, I think the country had better do something about making a new policy. The Congress should not allow such an outrage against justice.

Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the following resolution:

Whereas the Japanese concepts are contrary to our own; and

Whereas the testimony of an enemy Japanese submarine commander during the war as a witness is entirely incompetent: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that in the trial of Capt. Charles B. McVay the testimony of the enemy alien officer, Captain Hashimoto, be expunged from the records of the court in order that the ends of justice may not be prejudiced.

I shall ask for the immediate consideration of my resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the description of the naval court trial as given by the New York Times be made a part of my remarks.

In that statement counsel for Captain McVay protested that this alien Japanese enemy officer should not be allowed to give testimony against our own naval captain. It goes on to state that his testimony would not be reliable, because in it he says that according to his religion he would be forgiven in another world for committing perjury or having lied. His testimony is manifestly incompetent and unreliable.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress does not take action at once, the entire country will rise up in protest against such procedure. Japan has shown itself to be barbarous and inhuman and has tortured our own men. I remind the Congress and the country that the war has not yet been ended. The country will not stand for one of our officers being convicted by the testimony of such an alien enemy.

The article in the New York Times is as follows:

JAPANESE TELLS OF SINKING UNITED STATES CRUISER BY TORPEDOES—FIRED SIX AT WARSHIP AND SCORED THREE HITS, SUBMARINE OFFICER SAYS AT MCVAY TRIAL—DEFENSE PROTESTS AT TESTIMONY FAIL

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, December 13.—Ignoring defense protests, a naval general court martial today permitted Commander Machitsura Hashimoto, skipper of the Japanese aircraft-carrying submarine *I-58*, to testify that he fired six torpedoes at the cruiser *Indianapolis*, scored three confirmed hits, and saw the vessel sink rapidly after 10 explosions.

Commander Hashimoto said that he was ready to use human-steered torpedoes, called Kaitens, but that this proved unnecessary. No effort was made, he said, to pick up survivors as prisoners. A total of 880 Americans were lost, and the 316 survivors were all officially listed as casualties.

The Japanese officer's calculation of his position when he fired the torpedoes differed by 55 miles from the position of the *Indianapolis* as given in the official report on her sinking.

The short, stocky Japanese naval reservist, wearing an ill-fitting civilian blue-black suit with a white shirt, the collar of which turned up, was the subject of a brief but heated controversy between opposing counsel before he took the witness stand and subscribed to two oaths.

The first oath was the traditional naval court martial oath in which the witness "affirmed" rather than "swore" to tell the whole truth "under pain and penalty of perjury."

Because he testified that he was a member of the Shinto religion, he was not asked to repeat the words "so help you God."

As an added safeguard, the Judge Advocate proposed, and the court agreed, that the witness should take the Japanese oath swearing "to tell the truth, neither adding thereto nor concealing any matter whatsoever," and this he did, both verbally and in writing. He drew his name in Japanese characters, and wrote it out in Roman characters.

Before the oaths were administered, however, Capt. John Cady, representing the accused, Capt. Charles B. McVay, commander of the Indianapolis, offered "formal objection to the idea of calling one of the officers of a defeated enemy who as a nation have

been proven guilty of every despicable treachery, of the most infamous cruelties and barbarous practices, in violation of all the laws of civil warfare, to testify against one of our own commanding officers on a matter affecting his professional judgment."

"I am sure that I express the feeling of every American citizen, especially those who so recently fought against the Japanese, in protesting at this spectacle," Captain Cady continued.

CALLS PROCEEDING GROTESQUE

"This objection is not and cannot be based on any legalistic grounds since our lawmakers have never imagined through the centuries of Anglo-Saxon law any such grotesque proceedings."

Capt. John Ryan, Judge Advocate, responded that he regretted the introduction of emotional aspects into the case, and declared that the Japanese officer had been called simply to testify as to what happened before the *Indianapolis* was hit without any idea of passing on the professional conduct of Captain McVay.

Later, when Captain Cady was cross-examining Commander Hashimoto, Captain Ryan started to object to a question as to whether it would have been more difficult to sink the *Indianapolis* if she had been zig-zagging. Captain Ryan started to get up, looked squarely at Captain Cady, gestured angrily with his hands, and sat down.

Before this passage took place, Rear Adm. Wilder Baker, president of the court, noted that Captain Cady had not offered legal basis for his objection to the Japanese witness, and the court recessed briefly, returning to announce that it had decided both oaths should be administered.

HEARING ROOM IS FILLED

As Commander Hashimoto was brought into the hearing room, which was filled for the first time since the court martial began, he bowed low to the two American interpreters, Commander John R. Bromley and Francis R. Eastlake, a civilian, and then to the president of the court, Admiral Baker.

Captain Cady insisted upon preliminary questioning to determine whether Commander Hashimoto knew the difference between truth and falsehood, and whether he appreciated that he could be punished for perjury if he did not tell the truth.

There ensued the following question and answer, with Captain Cady putting the question in English, and Mr. Eastlake translating the query to the witness and stating his reply in English.

Question. Hashimoto, what is your religious belief?

Answer. He is a Shintoist.

Question. Does he know the meaning of truth and falsehood?

Answer. He says he is fully aware of the difference between truth and falsehood.

"BELIEVES IN LIFE AFTER DEATH"

Question. Does his religion include a belief in life hereafter?

Answer. He believes that the soul exists after death.

Question. Does he believe he will be punished, in the hereafter, for wrongdoings and falsehoods?

Answer. According to his religion, he believes that he will be punished in life for any wrongdoing or falsehood, but upon death, there will be forgiveness.

Question. Does he have any knowledge of Christianity?

Answer. Yes, he has a slight knowledge.

Question. Does he know what perjury means?

Answer. Yes, he has full knowledge of it.

Question. Is there punishment under Japanese law for perjury?

Answer. He says he doesn't know all the details, but he is sure that he'll be punished if he testifies falsely.

Question. Is Hashimoto on the list of war criminals of any Allied power?

Answer. To his knowledge, his name is not on any list of war criminals.

After these questions, the defense offered no further objection when the court directed Commander Hashimoto to take both oaths, and the prosecution began to question him.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today it was my privilege to present the request under which the House of Representatives adopted House Concurrent Resolution 75, inviting the United Nations to locate their headquarters in the United States.

The day following, on motion of the distinguished Senator from my State [Senator GURNEY], the other body of the Congress acted in similar fashion.

The message of this concurrent and unanimous action was communicated to the United Nations Preparatory Commission meeting in London, where, it is reported, the action was appreciated and had a great deal to do with Saturday's vote that thrilled this Nation. For we have all noted with pleasure that the United Nations Preparatory Commission has voted to accept that invitation and to locate the headquarters in the United States.

Coming as I do from the district which embraces the Black Hills country, which was among the first of the communities to invite the United Nations to make their headquarters in their particular vicinity, naturally, I am especially pleased and feel that no better place could be found to forward the purposes of the United Nations than the Black Hills of South Dakota.

The primary consideration in the location of the precise site should be the degree to which the location will contribute to achieving the purposes of the United Nations. And it was on that specific premise that the people of the Black Hills country extended their invitation.

Time does not permit extended argument on this subject now, but suffice it to say that while the Black Hills are readily accessible, they are a part of the last frontier in America, and offer a relatively virgin country where the international zone could establish its own atmosphere in the midst of the most beautiful mountains of the country at the very heart of the North American continent.

We are seeking to give life and vigor to a great concept, Mr. Speaker, in the creation of the United Nations Organization and we should build on foundations which will permit the development of the new life we hope will come to the world.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I will take no more time on the rule than to say that it was stated this bill was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee. It comes from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the proceedings at the exercises commemorating the hundredth anniversary of Texas statehood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

CONSERVATION—A GREAT TIME IN HISTORY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I suppose throughout all history and among all peoples it has been the fashion to assert that the present age is the most portentous in all the annals of time. To each generation the world has doubtless seemed to hang in the balance, and that humanity has stood at the crossroads, with a choice to take either the path of progress or the road to deterioration and destruction. I should think that each generation has been correct in its convictions. For almost each year in the record of the human family has been a year of crises and a time of momentous decision.

Yet, even at the risk of repeating exactly what has been said by the spokesman of uncounted ages, it is difficult to conceive that there has ever been a time more auspicious for good or unspeakable evil than the time in which we are commissioned to represent the people of America in this great lawmaking body.

Stunning and dramatic events follow so closely upon one another that it is difficult to order them in the mind and gain some understanding of their implication. All of us here have seen a great world conflagration twice in a lifetime. In the field of political science we have seen an acceptance of social responsibility by our Government—the assumption of responsibility for the welfare of each individual citizen. In the field of human relations we have seen, in our time, an organized effort initiated to attack almost every ill that besets the human race. In the field of science we have seen the coming of the wonder drugs, the sulpha group, penicillin, and

all the rest. We have seen radio, television, the age of light metals, rocket planes, radar, and the world-shaking advances in the harnessing of the power that moves the universe—the dawn of the atomic age.

It would seem to me that all of the problems faced and decisions made by mankind in the years that have gone before are but a prelude to the decisions that must now be made if civilization is to be saved and permitted to continue its forward course. Mr. Anthony Eden most appropriately said at San Francisco that "this may well be the world's last chance." With the coming of the atomic bomb and all of the arsenal of frightful lethal devices which are certain to follow in its wake, it is abundantly and starkly clear that man has now devised the means for his complete and utter destruction. The time is measurably brief within which man must make advances in the field of human behavior and world cooperation to match his scientific progress, or all is lost. It is almost a masterpiece of understatement to say that our responsibilities are very, very great.

It would be a cowardly shirking of the facts not to acknowledge that we are faced by a multitude of discouraging facts and circumstances as we set about the fashioning of the new and better world for which so many have paid so fearful a price, and for which mankind everywhere hopes and dreams. It is only fair to state what we all know—that the opportunity for enduring peace is not as bright and reasonable as it was in the days following the First World War when all of the world except a little coterie of stubborn men in the United States Senate was under the spell of the exalted idealism of Woodrow Wilson. We cannot escape the realities that narrow nationalism is being manifested in many quarters of the world, and that wars and rumors of wars are a part of the daily world atmosphere in which we plan and move and work.

Despite the difficulties and obstacles, however, I believe there is rational reason to hope for the attainment of the goals we seek. The San Francisco Conference and the Charter that was fashioned there cannot be discounted. No matter how far apart they may be on details the great Allied Powers have demonstrated clearly that they desire to work together for peace. We do now have a structure on which a strong and tranquil world can be built.

The work begun in San Francisco has been continued in the Food and Agriculture Organization Conference at Quebec, where a hopeful beginning was made to achieve freedom from want for the whole world, and in the Educational and Cultural Organization of the United Nations, which even now is in session in London.

It seems to me that one of the most hopeful signs of the time is the interest being taken in the great problems of the day by the average citizen. I doubt if there has ever been a time before when the people of all nations everywhere have concerned themselves to so great a degree with the taking of an inventory of human values, and trying to see what is ahead for them and their posterity. I have great faith in the people and I believe that when the truth is made available to them that they will act on the truth in a way to insure the happiness and welfare of the whole world.

It is very natural that we should hear discussion on every hand about the United Nations Organization and about this threat of war and that one, and most particularly on the absorbing question of what is to be done about the control of the use of atomic power. However, concern for these more dramatic phases of contemporary life is apt to make us forget some of the problems just as basic and imperative to our continued existence and well-being, which do not seem so sensational on first consideration.

One of the problems in this latter category is that of soil, forest, and water conservation.

MAN AND THE SOIL

Man is a creature of the soil. As has been so often said, the material part of man is formed of a dollar-or-so's worth of chemicals which come from that thin, superficial layer of the earth's surface called the soil. Henry George said:

> Man himself, in physical body at least, is but a changing form of matter, a passing mode of motion, that must continually be drawn from the reservoirs of external nature.

Yes, man is a land animal. His habitat is the surface of the earth.

It seems strange that it is only in recent years that we have become really conscious of the soil—conscious of what it means to man and all his works. Man in his physical being is just as inevitably bound to the earth as fish are to the water in which they live and have their being. Man, indeed, can leave the land for very short periods—to go to sea and fly through the heavens for a few hours in planes. But to make even these brief excursions he must get the materials from the land with which to build his ships and planes and he must take his food and water from the land with him in order to sustain life. Man must soon return to the land to replenish his supplies lest he perish. Man is bound to the surface of the earth as if he were an integral part of it, and he is an integral part of it.

It is our custom to think of the earth as a very huge sphere, roughly 25,000 miles around and 8,000 miles through at the Equator. Yet the fact is that we are wholly dependent for our continued existence on a little thin strip of substance averaging 7 or 8 inches in depth on the earth's surface, which is being rapidly lost and dissipated and has been so lost and dissipated for centuries past. And this destruction goes on despite the very fine beginnings that have been made in the field of conservation by our own country and by others around the globe. It is estimated that even now that more than 700,000,000 tons of surface soil are carried regularly every year by the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico—the equivalent of 7,000 one-hundred-acre farms. And, of course, the destruction goes on upon a like scale everywhere. Nature's laws of humanity and the soil are inexorable. When the soil goes man will go with it with a finality of destruction more complete than that yet wrought by the dread atomic bomb. Beneath the few inches of soil which sustains our lives the earth is as cold and barren as the moon.

THE END OF THE WORLD

From childhood to old age it is man's habit to speculate on the end of the world—when it will come and in what manner. We read with awe of the calculations of astronomers and others of the scientific callings as to whether or not our earth may not explode, or be wiped out by collision with other heavenly bodies, or that our sun itself will slip its moorings in the universe and thus bring our doom. Of late we have been pondering with dread the possibility that man himself will literally destroy the earth with his own terrible contrivances.

Well, as far as man's story on earth is concerned the end of his world will come when he permits the destruction of the soil which nourishes him. It would be exactly as though the air he breathes should be taken from him.

THE LAND IS STILL THE FOUNDATION OF CIVILIZATION

We have come to be very proud of our great modern civilization which we have built with our own hands and ingenuity. We take joy in considering our skyscrapers, our streamlined transportation systems of land and ocean and sky, our works of art and literature and music, our intricate and efficient mechanisms of business, our vast distributive and manufacturing organisms, our miraculous inventions, the gigantic size of the pattern of our everyday lives. Bartering has given way to gigantic marketing enterprises; we speak of mediums of exchange in terms of billions of dollars, instead of hundreds. Man is indeed clever and energetic.

This kind of vast economy and staggering physical world which man has created tends to make more and more of our citizens blind to the realities of life—forgetful that the basis of the social pyramid is still, and always will be, the land, and, above all, the soil.

Like the particles and ingredients that form our bodies, everything we buy or sell, everything we work on or with, comes from the land and goes ultimately back from whence it came. In a very certain sense man can create nothing and can destroy nothing. He can add nothing to the universe nor subtract anything from it. All he can do is to change the form and location of some of nature's properties to his advantage or disadvantage. I have recently read where an American citizen of some eminence has smugly declared that he added a foot of rich topsoil to his farm by his own industry and cleverness in a single year. The scientific fact is that the rate at which nature builds an inch of soil under the most favorable circumstances has been estimated all the way from 300 to 1,000 years.

THE CONQUEST OF NATURE

One of the most ridiculous and mistaken conceptions of modern man is that contained in the phrase, "the conquest of nature." Society is paying a fearfully high price for this absurd notion, particularly in its attitude and misuse of the

land, the forests and the water resources of the world. The seafaring man who sails the tempestuous oceans of the world, the airmen in the skies, the scientists who humbly and patiently probe for the secrets of the universe, the farmers and raisers of livestock who daily deal in a practical way with the implacable forces of nature do not talk such nonsense as man's "conquest of nature." They know that when man approaches nature as an adversary that he invites his own destruction. They know that he who would gain nature's riches must first learn her laws and obey them implicitly.

It has been said that "Nature's books always balance. In the long run she never gives something for nothing or accepts nothing for something. Man may delude himself for a time that he is tricking nature into yielding something for nothing, but he inevitably ends up by getting nothing for something until the debt is settled in full." Nature is a relentless creditor.

A HOPEFUL OUTLOOK: FEDERAL SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

To call attention to the great problems of conservation and to point out the fearful hazards involved in an attitude of neglect, is not to say that nothing is being done. Particularly in our own great country a great deal is being done, and the outlook is hopeful. Just about the most important factor in soil and forest and water conservation is man. Man influences the character of the soil through his wise or unwise farming practices. It is within his power either to increase or decrease the productive power of the soil. Although, unfortunately for himself, he has too often elected to do the latter, under the leadership and inspiration of the Federal Soil Conservation Service of the United States and its internationally respected and renowned Director, Dr. H. H. Bennett, the farmers of the United States are actively carrying on a great program of conservation.

DR. H. H. BENNETT

It was Dr. Bennett who so graphically drew our attention to the fact that there are only about 4,000,000,000 fertile acres left in the world to support the 2,200,000,000 inhabitants of the earth—a little less than 2 acres per person. He it was also who did some plain speaking which has done much to make this country aware of its duties and responsibilities respecting the soil and other natural resources which are ours in trust. He told us that "the plain truth is that Americans as a people have never learned to love the land and to regard it as an enduring resource. They have seen it only as a field for exploitation and a source of immediate financial return." The American people owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Bennett and his associates for their farsighted plans and devoted endeavors in so important a sphere of our national life and welfare.

SOIL CONSERVATION GROUPS

I wish also to express my appreciation and admiration for the State committees and the local soil-conservation committees in the various States. Operating through democratic procedures these men on the farms and ranches of America are doing a great work for themselves, their children, and for the Nation. The challenge is that we shall proceed vigorously to build on the firm foundations laid by these pioneers.

THE DUTY OF CONGRESS

The duty of the Congress in the campaign is, of course, clear. We should continue to support every worth-while conservation effort as generously as circumstances will permit. We must press ahead on flood control, reforestation programs, and all sound projects which may be devised to protect and enrich our priceless heritage.

Just now those interested in soil conservation, and particularly those charged with the responsibility for leadership in the local groups, are calling on us to make such earth-moving machinery and power equipment as may be in the possession of the armed services and other branches of the Federal Government, and no longer required for the emergency, available to them to carry out the needed soil-saving and soil-building programs which have been mapped out. I can see no reason for delay or hesitation and I urge the Congress to promptly call up and act upon the Poage bill or take whatever appropriate action may be indicated to give this aid and lend this encouragement to so great a cause.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, December 13, I called to the attention of the Congress the effort of the Oklahoma Soil Conservation Board to organize and generate support for the transfer of the surplus machines and equipment to soil conservation districts. On the 8th of December in Oklahoma City at a meeting of the Oklahoma State Soil Conservation Board it was determined that on January 10 a committee headed by the governors of the various States will be asked to assemble in Washington to urge Congress to pass this legislation. My speech upon this question appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5511.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in January the United Nations Organization will be officially launched when both the Security Council and the General Assembly meet for the first time. Today the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and I are offering identical resolutions which call for speedy implementing of article 26, chapter 5, of the United Nations Charter. That article reads:

> In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

The advent of the atomic bomb, magnifies our need for control of the "diversion of the world's human and economic resources to armaments." Unilateral action would be dangerous folly, but the United Nations is conceived as the agency for such international regulation.

In spite of rescissions on our own appropriations, obligations already undertaken keep our armament spending at the rate of $6,500,000,000 per month. In addition, the United States possesses the atomic bomb and the most powerful Navy the world has ever seen.

Russia, on the other hand, plans to build a great new fleet and before long she will undoubtedly master the atomic bomb. Already she has a huge army based on conscription. Britain for the first time in her history will continue compulsory military training. However, reluctantly, the United States may be forced to follow suit.

Since national security depends on relative and not absolute military strength, the armament game is an explosive and competitive one. Each step leads to another. The air becomes poisoned with fear and war is easily kindled.

With our new powers of destruction, so vast and immediate, we have no time for fumbling. The ominous race must be halted at once by the organization which in war the United Nations conceived of as an agency for keeping the peace. The speed and firmness with which the Organization acts, may determine the fate of mankind.

As the most potent nation in the world today, it is proper that the United States, through its Congress, direct the attention of the United Nations to the immediate implementing of its Charter. Action should outlaw the use of the atomic bomb, abolish world-wide peacetime conscription, and set up international controls and an inspection system. This, as the Charter promises, would release our resources for constructive purposes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN], who introduced the first bill on this subject.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the determination prevalent in this country, as well as in others, that the United Nations Organization be given every necessary authority to act decisively to promote and sustain world peace, it hardly seems necessary that any time be spent in debating the measure before us. I think the purposes of the measure have the support of every Member of this House—unless there be some who still have not learned the hard lesson of our failure to engage in international cooperation after the last war.

I have a direct personal interest in this bill. I used this issue as one of my campaign talking points a year ago, and promised the people of my district that I would present and support legislation such as this. I introduced a bill on this subject last March, before the San Francisco Conference, and in October revised that measure and introduced a stronger one directly conforming to articles 42 and 43 of the United Nations Charter.

It was gratifying to find that my thinking was right in line with the thinking of the administration.

Despite the strong backing UNO is receiving from the people of this country, and the almost unanimous adherence to the United Nations Charter by the other

body of Congress last summer, the debate in there revealed a small, but determined, resistance to the United States assuming the full measure of its responsibility in its membership—and leadership—in the United Nations Organization. It is significant that that resistance was displayed among the remnant of the membership which before this war represented the isolationist forces in Congress. It is significant too that every amendment offered to the measure which would nullify in any degree our all-out responsibility for endeavoring to maintain the peace was voted down decisively, and that finally only seven votes were mustered against the bill. I expect that the House will approve this bill by no less decisive a vote than was given in the Senate. I hope so. The families of dead soldiers and the families of returning soldiers expect this Congress to lay down the law that every resource and power of the United States will in the future be energized to prevent the irritations that lead to war, and to stop at their inception any incidents that can spread to war. Whenever trouble breaks out in the future, America must be able to say to the world, and to any American generation that may be called on to take up arms, "We will try to stop this affair. We are determined it will not lead to war." And if our efforts fail, at least there will not fall on us the criticism that fell on us this time, that America closed her eyes, America spoke peace but did not have the courage to try to keep peace by stopping the aggressor.

There may be very difficult situations for us to handle in the years to come. The authority this measure delegates to our representatives to use our forces to stop an aggressor may result in the loss of American lives. We are prepared for that. But far better for us—or for any nation—that a small number of lives be lost and war prevented while it is in the making. Had the peace-loving nations of the world seriously banded together to stop Japan in Manchuria or in her early conquests of China, to stop Mussolini in Ethiopia, and Hitler at any one of several stages along his destructive path, the lives and property of nations, the economy of the world and the security of people that would have been saved and protected are beyond the ability of men to calculate. Now the world is faced with the gigantic task of rebuilding nations from the ground up, and restoring the souls and minds of men and women everywhere.

That I am sure we all acknowledge. The responsibility that is placed on this Congress is an awesome responsibility. We have no choice but to undertake it, and to undertake it in such a way that no man or woman anywhere today or tomorrow will doubt our determination that the catastrophe which befell this generation will never be permitted to occur again. And if it does occur, it will be because we had tried everything and there was nothing we could do to stop it.

It is difficult to comprehend any situation or set of situations which can lead to another war of the magnitude of the one from which we are emerging, which we cannot meet. But I am not a prophet. I do not know what can happen in the future, any more than I can foretell what wonders the use of atomic energy can perform.

In my humble way, I know that men of good will can work together for peace as well as for victory in war, and that working together for peace can have as mighty success as our cooperation in war has had.

Senate approval of this measure shows how far we have traveled along the road since 1919. There never was a chance for the obstructionists to stop this bill. But they had their day in court, just the same. I want to point out, too, that this is the only one of the major nations of the United Nations Organization which requires legislative implementation of the articles of the Charter. In that sense, the adherence given the Charter and the implementing legislation enacted by the Congress means that the people of America have given their consent. Thus the people of America have their voice in the conduct of our foreign affairs. In no other country do the people so directly and decisively speak their minds.

As Barnet Nover points out in his recent article in the Washington Post, The Irreducible Minimum, following the last war the opponents of the League felt that the Covenant went too far, and the Covenant, I would add, entailed far less responsibility on America than the United Nations Charter does. Today, Nover went on, the Charter represents not the maximum that can be done to bring about a workable world organization but the minimum, and the critics of the Charter are those who feel it does not go far enough.

Our representatives in the UNO must have free hands. They are directly responsible to the President and to the Congress—through confirmation by the Senate—except for such representation as may be selected from Members of Congress, and such representatives would be directly responsible to the people. The measure wisely grants no definite tenure of office. The representative serves at the pleasure of the President and in that way close check is constantly maintained as to the manner in which he carries out his duties and responsibilities and the wisdom with which he exercises judgment. Thus, a President elected with a change of political administration can retain a representative or appoint another, so that the constitutional prerogatives of the President in handling foreign affairs cannot be jeopardized through the appointment of our representatives in any of the bodies of the United Nations Organization.

The Charter was merely the first step in the development of the world organization. This legislation, the first to implement the Charter, is the second step. Others will follow. And since the Charter is a living document forming the foundation of a living organization, as the years go on there will be additional legislation, to correct, to implement, and to expand the United World Organization. Implementing and amendatory legislation will never stop, because when it does, the world organization will have ceased to function.

Of course, there will continue to be international cooperation, but without it we can expect nothing but the loose, and oftentimes chaotic, sort of international cooperation we have had up to now, when one or a group of nations endeavored to develop good relations with a group of others, but there was no emphatic effort for all to maintain good relations with all others.

What we need is a cohesion of separate policies so that a pattern of conduct can be established which will pertain to all countries. This legislation attempts to establish such a standard pattern in order to effectively meet any threat of aggression or war on a small scale, in order to prevent its wider spread.

Approval of this measure without crippling amendments will lay at rest any fears that America is unwilling to enter wholeheartedly into the task of developing a workable world organization. This Congress could give no finer Christmas present to the American people.

The vote of the Senate showed conclusively that the constitutional right of Congress to declare war will in no way be impinged upon by the passage of this act. The measure provides that the President must come to Congress before any agreement may be entered into with other nations regarding the size and employment of the emergency force we are to place at the disposal of the Security Council for use against an aggressor.

The measure clearly directs that our delegate act on the instructions of the President in the employment of that force to meet an aggressor emergency and that the President shall make special current reports on the decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures and on our participation in those decisions. The use of any forces or assistance outside of those we place at the disposal of the Security Council in accordance with any agreements made with the approval of Congress are prohibited.

The Hartford Times, in its issue of December 6, complimenting the Senate on its vote, admirably summed up the issues at stake:

> The American people are not expecting miracles from the United Nations. They do expect action to prevent war. They are looking for frank and open discussion of the causes of disagreement among nations, that they may be removed so far as possible. They are expecting joint action to prevent any nation from becoming an aggressor, from taking the law into its own hands, as it were, and thus precipitating the world into another orgy of death, waste, and disaster. If disarmament does not come speedily, if the lion does not lie down with the lamb within a year or two, we shall not be too disappointed, but will cling to what we have in the way of war prevention, and will strive to make it more effective.
>
> What the world must guard against is defeatism and apathy. It must believe that men can and will get together to settle their differences by lawful methods, and it must keep alive a keen interest in efforts toward that end. It will not be easy for a world divided into many political and religious groups to come together in the UNO or elsewhere on any altruistic program, but it can be done. Indeed, it must be done, else the time will come when there will be no civilization. The atomic bomb suggests that. The time is at hand when nations must be law-

abiding or cease to exist. That will be the penalty, the inescapable penalty, of defiance of world sentiment for peace.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the text of two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I hoped to follow my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS], on the floor, and would like to revert to what she had to say in her remarks. For I have on today introduced with her identical resolutions aiming to implement the disarmament provision of the United Nations Charter and expressing it as a sense of the Congress of the United States that American leadership should be given to that move. I join with her in what she had to say about this resolution.

On today I have also introduced another resolution identical with one introduced by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the text of which I am going to include in my remarks. This resolution states that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States and its representatives on the United Nations Organization should attempt to bring about by international agreement the abolition of compulsory universal military service in all nations.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me quite clear that unless by international agreement measures can be taken in the near future to lift from the shoulders of the peoples of the world the burden of armament which otherwise will oppress them, that with military development at the stage it has reached the burden might well become utterly insupportable in the future. There never has been a time in history, therefore, as propitious for these moves to be made. There is no nation in the world in as good a position as our own to make those moves. Let it be said that American leadership was exerted first of all in the direction of removing these burdens and in the direction of peace. Perhaps we shall fail to obtain the international agreements that we seek, but if we do fail we shall at least stand before the world as a Nation that has given every bit of effort it can give to a better way than ever increasing armament competition, ending as it always does in war. I believe, with all my earnestness, that a sincere effort in that direction on the part of America at this hour may lead to success. We have nothing to lose. We have everything to gain from a world at peace.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

Whereas the United States and 49 other nations at San Francisco solemnly resolved to combine their efforts to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and covenanted together to unite their strength and power to preserve peace in the world; and

Whereas a plan is being considered for establishing a system of universal compulsory peacetime military training in the United States; and

Whereas such peacetime compulsory military training is contrary to the American plan of government adopted by the founding fathers, and so successfully followed for the 169 years of national existence; and

Whereas we are requiring the defeated Axis Nations to abandon militarism, including universal military training, realizing that this policy has not prevented war but has developed a reliance upon force which has ripened into war; and

Whereas article 2, section 1, of the Charter of the United Nations contemplates disarmament and the regulation of armaments and article 26 requires that plans be formulated for the regulation of armaments and for the maintenance of peace with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources; and

Whereas Great Britain and the United States attempted to include in the League of Nations Covenant a provision abolishing compulsory peacetime military training by international agreement, and Russia strongly urged this action at the disarmament conference in 1926; and

Whereas with the defeat of Japan and Germany there will never be a more auspicious time than now for the United States, Great Britain, and Russia to secure an international agreement abolishing compulsory military training and service; and

Whereas such an international agreement would strongly undergird the United Nations Organization and aid materially in establishing mutual confidence between the nations on which international peace must depend: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the United States, through the President, the Secretary of State, the representatives of the United States and of the President in the United Nations Organization be, and they hereby are, authorized and requested immediately to prepare and seek the adoption of an international agreement for the abolition by all nations of compulsory universal peacetime military training and service, and that the United States further seek the cooperation of Russia and Great Britain in speeding such adoption.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States present to the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization a proposal for carrying out at the first meeting of the General Assembly the provisions of chapter IV, article XI, of the United Nations Charter, which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles covering disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the members or to the Security Council or both."

And be it further

Resolved, That the United States present to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization a proposal for carrying out at earliest practicable date the provisions of chapter V, article 26, of the United Nations Charter, which reads as follows:

"In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the military staff committee, referred to in article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the Honorable James A. Farley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a few minutes as it will not take more than that time to point out that the city of Chicago is the logical place for the establishment of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization. I have listened to what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and others have had to say and the reasons they have given as to why their respective cities should be selected but, nonetheless, I feel that Chicago can offer more advantages than all of the cities combined.

Chicago is most centrally located in the United States and to the countries composing the United Nations Organization. It possesses advantages that no other city has. It is recognized as the hub of the railroads of the United States and it will be the center of air transportation. It has the finest and best hotels in the world. It is situated on the shores of Lake Michigan and its most wonderful parks, boulevards, and extended shore-line drive are second to none in any cities of the world. Its splendid weather is such that the city is gaining in reputation as a summer resort. Its hospitality will be attested to by the hundreds of thousands of servicemen, servicewomen, and veterans from every section of the United States as well as the hundreds of thousands of visitors from foreign lands and our own country who visited and enjoyed the Century of Progress Exposition, all of whom acclaimed Chicago's hospitality.

Chicago offers to the United Nations Organization as a site for its headquarters Northerly Isle, which is less than a mile from the heart of the city and in close proximity to the finest and largest office buildings and hotels in the United States. It is close to world noted buildings such as the Adler Planetarium, the Shedd Aquarium, the Chicago Museum of Natural History, to Soldier Field—the largest field for public gatherings, athletic events, and other functions, in the world—and to beautiful Buckingham Fountain. While Chicago is a manufacturing city, it possesses some of the finest residences in the United States. If all the advantages of Chicago are given real consideration, and living up to its motto "I will," it will be selected as the permanent home of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am afraid Chicago is a little bit disqualified because of its continuous warfare with England, but New York City, the greatest city in the world, is a peace-loving city, and that is where the headquarters belong.

Mr. SABATH. I understand the gentleman's jibe when he remarks "Chicago is a little bit disqualified because of its

continuous war with England." I will say to the gentleman that Chicago has been and is at peace not only with England but with the entire world and is not responsible for any individual's statements. No matter whatever has been said or is being said by any individual, it matters not whom he might be, it should not be charged against Chicago. The gentleman does not speak for Chicago.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am speaking for New York.

Mr. SABATH. If that could be construed a disqualification, it would doubly apply to New York.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if we could not compromise on Plymouth.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I concede that is a historic spot, but surely the gentleman does not contemplate that the United Nations Organization should land on the rock.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the membership visit the great city of Chicago and show them the advantages it possesses, I am inclined to feel that a vast majority would advocate the selection of Chicago as I am humbly doing today.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE VIEWS ON FULL EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the so-called full employment bill, H. R. 2202, was understood by the people to guarantee to every American, able to work and wanting to work, a useful, remunerative regular and full-time job. While the bill stated that in time of need employment was to be created by extending to private enterprise legislative aid, it also provided for unlimited deficit spending.

That bill was endorsed by Director of the Budget Smith, Reconversion Director Snyder, Secretary of Commerce Wallace, Secretary of Treasury Vinson, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach. The hearings extended over 2 months, covering some 1,100 pages of testimony and though the gentlemen just named and legislative representatives of the A. F. of L. and the CIO endorsed it, and testified in its behalf, a distinguished member of the committee, a Southern Democrat, from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in debate on the floor of the House—RECORD, 11904—characterized it as unsound.

He was asked:

Mr. HOFFMAN. You did say a moment ago you were firmly convinced that H. R. 2202 followed the philosophy which would take us into state socialism, did you not?

He answered:

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is my objection to it, and I so stated.

The committee, by a vote of 17 to 3, rejected that bill, reported out a substitute which, while creating a new executive agency, sets up a new congressional committee, authorizing the expenditure of $445,000, adds nothing else to the existing authority or sources of information of either the President or anyone in the executive department.

My vote was cast against the substitute for, to me, it was just a gesture which would do nothing other than add new employees to the Federal pay roll, increase the national deficit, and add to confusion, merely duplicating executive agencies now engaged in statistical work and planning for Federal expenditures. It was just another part of the New Deal program, the slogan of which seems to be, to, on every possible occasion, no matter what the complaint or if there be no complaint, "to do something, do it quickly, create another agency or commission, borrow and spend additional funds."

Apparently founded to expose some of the heresies of Sidney Hillman's PAC, the Minnesota Peoples Political Action Committee sent me a communication relating to the merits of the proposed legislation. The Minnesota Peoples Political Action Committee, while it does not function in Michigan, is not an unknown to the Members of Congress; our colleague, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, told us something of this organization. Twice the Honorable JOHN S. GIBSON, of Georgia, told of the work the organization was attempting to do.

From Mr. A. J. Olson, chairman, Minnesota Peoples Political Action Committee, a farmer, I received the following letter and statement, which reads as follows:

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,
St. Paul, Minn., December 13, 1945.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: As you are a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, we respectfully direct your attention to the so-called Murray-Patman full employment bill, and to the substitute bill, S. 380. I enclose copy of a memorandum relating to these measures which has been transmitted to members of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

In order that you may have an understanding of the scope and purpose of our organization, I enclose a descriptive leaflet which lists our directors and their respective occupations. Our organization is composed of Republicans, Democrats, and Farmer-Laborites and its sole objective is the preservation of American principles of government through the election to public office of persons who believe in the American way of life.

It is our considered opinion that the Murray-Patman full employment bill and its substitute, S. 380, violate the very essence of Americanism, that the passage of either would lead toward fascism and that they contemplate further extension of Federal bureaucratic government which already is invading the freedom of our citizens. The added burden of expense will result in continued deficit financing and help to plunge us into inflation with its consequent destruction of value of every war bond, life-insurance policy, and savings account.

You have been so outspoken and courageous in your defense of the rights and interests of the people, we trust you will continue to place your voice and the weight of your influence on the side of the great unorganized mass of American citizens by opposing this bill. We are sure you will not be influenced by the campaign of misrepresentation, coercion, and intimidation which the proponents of the bill have resorted to.

Very sincerely yours,

A. J. OLSON, *Chairman.*

ST. PAUL, MINN., *December 1, 1945.*

To Members of the Minnesota Congressional Delegation:

The executive committee of the Minnesota Peoples Political Action Committee, by appropriate action, has instructed me to advise you of our complete opposition to the Murray-Patman so-called full-employment bill, a measure that has been aptly term "the first step toward a totalitarian-communistic state."

As you know, this bill obligates the United States to give every person in the United States a job. It is no temporary measure, but establishes a fixed, permanent policy.

Thus the WPA—a discredited and discarded idea—becomes permanent, the fixed policy of the National Government.

That the WPA failed and failed miserably to achieve its purported objective of curing unemployment, is known to every school child. It came out of the brain of crack-pot theorists who tried one experiment after another, each of which bogged us still further down in the mire of depression. Yet, here we have it again, under a new label, more elaborately conceived, more grandiose, but behind it all the WPA leaning on a rake handle.

But before the so-called public works get going this bill creates a new bureaucratic paradise. It contemplates a vast horde of new Government experts, theorists, inspectors, accountants, statisticians, economists, ad infinitum. This vast horde, in and out of Washington, are supposed to estimate (guess is a better word) the size and extent of the WPA projects required to employ all persons, male and female, young and old, citizens and aliens, who haven't gone to work on their own hook. And this bureaucratic dreamland will continue, for the survey continues from year to year.

The prodigious cost of conducting this annual survey and the added burden upon the taxpayers of the country is self-evident.

While it is possible, we admit, to get much of the necessary information from questionnaires—consider, for a moment, the extent of the information required, the millions upon millions of questionnaires—questionnaires to every householder, farmer, grocer, butcher, baker, and candlestick maker. And for what? To find out what grandma expects to buy for Christmas after next—will junior's present cost $3 or $4? That is the sort of thing the economists will have to have, according to the bill.

The war gave us some experience with questionnaires, applications for fuel, gas, tires, shoes, food—those will be as nothing when the Goverment tries to determine such abstractions as—

1. The estimated size of the labor force, including the self-employed.

2. The estimated aggregate volume of investment and expenditure by private enterprice, consumers, State and local governments.

Since Pearl Harbor our Government has dominated our lives. This was necessary to winning the war. We were complacent that peace would bring an end of regimentation. But the sponsors of this bill would increase Government interference with our lives—Government controls, mandates—directives, in an unending stream. Questionnaires, inspectors, snoopers, affidavits, subpenas—a fixed and inviolate part of democracy—Murray-Patman style.

It has become a rule of government that once we create a job for a bureaucrat it is never abolished. You may rest assured that

the horde of jobholders will be permanent leeches on our pocketbooks and savings.

We were led to believe that the great increase in Federal civilian workers was necessary to the war effort—that they would be dismissed with the peace.

But no. The European war ended in May. Federal civilian employment by the end of June rose by 126,130. In July we added 11,578 more; in August another 94,645. Federal civilian employment was 3,649,769 at the end of August. Compare this with 917,760 on November 11, 1918—the high of World War I, with 578,231 in 1932. Why this sevenfold increase in Federal jobholders? Where are the promised dismissals?

To the contrary, these workers now demand 30-percent increase in pay and the administration agrees to 20 percent more. Congress has yet to approve.

Evidently the sponsors of this bill believe there is no limit to the taxpayer's ability to pay or to their patience. Government debt equals the total value of the United States. Increase it at the risk of inflation—and you destroy the value of all life insurance, war bonds, savings accounts.

This means this thing must be financed through taxes. Can you, as a Member of Congress, envisage what will happen to a Congress that increases taxes to finance more WPA?

One-fourth of our national income goes to support governments—one dollar out of four for the luxury of being governed. Direct and indirect taxes take one-fourth of our earnings. The worker works 1 week out of every month free for the Government. The truck driver traveling 200 miles per day drives 50 miles free for the Government. The farmer grows a bushel of corn and gives the Government a peck. A stenographer types 25 pages out of every 100 for the Government before she has any take-home pay. Suppose we have the 6,000,000 unemployed and pay them $20 a week—a very conservative figure—it will cost $8,000,000,000 annually. Eight times the total cost of Federal Government before the war.

Just how long do the proponents of this bill (bureaucrats, long-hairs, crackpots) believe the worker, the truck driver, the farmer, the stenographer are going to carry them on their backs?

At present every four workers support a Government worker. If the advocates of the Murray-Patman bill have their way, this load will become ever greater. The cost of maintaining each Government worker must be borne by less than four producing citizens.

We are aware that some Members of Congress are making a sincere effort to curb the bureaucrats—but Congress as a whole cannot escape responsibility for their cost, arrogance, and inefficiency. It was the Congress that enacted the legislation that created the bureaucrats. If, in the face of the past record, Congress then adds the vast Murray-Patman army of leeches, it will be a sad commentary on representative government.

If possible, future implications of this bill are even more alarming than its immediate foreseeable consequences. From one of the sponsors—Philip Murray—we read these words: "I am sure this bill is not the last word * * * we in the CIO regard the Murray-Patman bill as minimum legislation."

The basic principle of the bill, the obligation of the Government to provide every citizen with a job, is lifted bodily from the Russian Constitution—but the Russian version provides that he who refuses to work shall not eat. Proponents of this bill have refused to include the "no work no eat" clause in this bill. This is similar to the demand for increased unemployment benefits during a time that Minnesota crops are spoiling because of manpower shortage.

We sincerely believe that you share our opposition to the un-American legislation; that you agree with us that it is a snare and a delusion—from its title to the last clause. They call it full employment, but it is full employment for tax eaters.

We are confident that you will remain steadfast in the interests of your constituents in the face of the pressure that we know must be on you.

Sincerely yours,

MINNESOTA PEOPLES
POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,
A. J. OLSON, *Chairman,*
By direction of the Executive Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include in one a newspaper article and in the other an editorial.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a newspaper article by Morris Reuben and in the other a newspaper article by Helen Essary.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include the citation accompanying the Distinguished Service Medal awarded to Capt. Sue S. Dauser, head of the Navy nurses, retired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean regarding the testimony of a Japanese alien against a Navy officer and a letter from a former chaplain, Chaplain Carruthers of the United States Navy, making a very vigorous protest against the testimony of alien Japanese against members of the United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

BOTH LABOR AND MANAGEMENT HAVE RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Archbishop McNicholas on labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that adequate wages and working conditions for labor in this Nation is a social and economic problem, not a political problem. And consequently labor should not depend upon nor adhere itself to either of the major political parties because by so doing it may create an injustice and raise political animosity from one or the other toward its membership. It should remain strictly nonpartisan.

The well being of the social and economic life of this Nation depends on labor receiving adequate wages and working conditions to properly clothe, feed, shelter, and educate their families. When this fails the economic and social life of the Nation is adversely affected. Most of our lower standards of education and lack of social and cultural development can be traced to low wages.

Labor is entitled to the same independence and security as to those who employ labor. There is no need for violence. There is plenty of need for sober, serious common sense between labor and management when disputes and misunderstandings arise. The wisdom and equity in the following speech recently made by Archbishop John T. McNicholas indicates the necessity of cooperation and understanding between labor and management. It also emphasizes the social obligations of management as well as the responsibility of labor to the public interest in general.

Labor laws enacted in haste and emotion that prejudice either side will bring more grief and no solution to the present future labor unrest in this Nation. It is the duty of Congress to see that that balance is maintained between labor and management.

Following is Archbishop McNicholas' speech as published in the December issue of the American Federation of Labor Federationist:

A CHURCH LEADER TALKS ABOUT LABOR

After this terrible world conflict, and after all that labor has done to win the victory, it is not surprising that workingmen should wish to take advantage of the hour to secure a justifiable share of recompense and profit for their labors in production.

The burden of taxation which must be borne by the whole American people will prevent in the future, let us hope, the amassing of fabulous fortunes by individuals and corporations.

If justice prevails and labor is given its just share of profits, individuals and corporations will be limited necessarily to reasonable gains. Investors are entitled to a reasonable profit and nothing more.

CORPORATIONS HAVE OBLIGATIONS

A corporation for profit is a social entity. It has social obligations. It depends on a group of the public to supply its workers. It depends on the public to use or to consume its products. The public has a right to know its transactions.

Labor, in the light of public knowledge, must not make unjust demands; capital must not selfishly take more than its share of profits.

Undoubtedly there should be a serious increase in wages for employees, unless there be a radical rearrangement of conducting business, but labor will make a mistake if in this hour it gives its whole attention to an increase of wages. Labor should examine the over-all picture; it should consider a long-time program. It is urgent that, besides the increase of wages, labor make other gains.

Labor and management should sit down regularly at the same conference table. Labor should have a voice and a vote in the meetings of the board of directors.

A certain substantial portion of the stock of a company should belong to labor—not, indeed, to individuals but to the whole group which constitutes labor. This arrangement will allow succeeding members of labor to share in the profits of a corporation as their predecessors did.

Labor and management should be friendly colleagues, not enemies. Management should not assume the role of dictator or consider itself endowed with a human dignity which is denied labor. The dignity of labor was made sublime by the poverty and labors of Christ.

Just as there are degrees of physical perfection and intellectual keenness in human

beings, so there are degrees of usefulness and capacity among men who labor. One man has one talent, another two, another five. The varied gifts of individuals and the varied quality of the work done by men make a hierarchy in the ranks of labor, which means that one man is recompensed more than another, and that one man has a greater share in profits than aonther.

There must, however, be a minimum standard. Every man is entitled to live according to the dignity of a human being. He is entitled—by fulfilling his part of the contract with management—to the means to live in keeping with human dignity. He is entitled—by fulfilling his part of the contract—to security—to a family wage which will enable him to found a home and maintain a normal family.

NOTHING SACROSANCT ABOUT CAPITAL

The church must say that there is nothing sacrosanct about the present mechanics of capital, but the church will always insist on justice for capital.

Some will say that the church is radical. She must be sanely radical to expound the fundamental principles governing labor, management, and capital, and to secure justice for the man who toils.

Labor is coming into great power in our country; if not tomorrow, then the next day. It should prepare for that responsibility. Hundreds of capable young men with good judgment should be given opportunities to study profoundly the basic principles governing labor, capital, management, and economics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain material supplied at his request by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. EARTHMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) was given permission to extend this remarks in the RECORD and include therein President Truman's statement on China.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on four subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two subjects, in one to include a letter and in the other a copy of a newspaper column.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give the House notice that I waive my special order for today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a copy of the bill H. R. 5012.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances on three subjects, including in each extension a statement.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Sun on price control.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

REPATRIATION OF REMAINS OF WAR DEAD BURIED OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL LIMITS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the House passed the bill (H. R. 3936) to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions.

A change was made in the date on page 2. I wish to offer an amendment to change the date on page 1 so as to conform with page 2.

I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby the bill was engrossed, read a third time and passed, in order to offer a clarifying amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: On page 1, line 5, after the word "since", strike out "December 7, 1941" and insert "September 16, 1940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial in one instance and in another instance to extend his remarks and include a letter from a former member of the armed forces.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. ABERNETHY), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

To Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for Monday, on account of illness.

To Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. HOCH), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) indefinitely, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on December 15, 1945, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4129. An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

At 10 a. m., on Tuesday, December 18, 1945, the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the bill (H. R. 4779), to enable debtor railroad corporations, whose properties during a period of 7 years have provided sufficient earnings to pay fixed charges, to effect a readjustment of their financial structure without further proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended. The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

867. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission on resale price maintenance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

868. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

869. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to grant certain additional basic authority to the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

870. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the

continental United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

871. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service from the period October 1, 1945, to November 30, 1945, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

872. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of Allied authorities of occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. A letter from Hugo A. Mentink, United States engineers, transmitting a copy of a Global War victory design for a new United States commemorative postage stamp issue; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

874. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his request that the case of Jose Meza be withdrawn from those 643 cases involving suspension of deportation, in letter of May 15, 1945; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

875. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his request that the case of Konstantin Hetsch be withdrawn from those 406 cases involving suspension of deportation, in letter of May 1, 1945; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

876. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his request that the case of Frederich Wilhelm Arndt be withdrawn from those 348 cases involving suspension of deportation, in letter of April 16, 1945; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

877. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting his request that the case of Salvatore del Gaudio be withdrawn from those 643 cases involving suspension of deportation, in letter of May 15, 1945; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

878. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill amending the act of December 11, 1926 (44 Stat. 918), entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Joint Resolution 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V-12 program; without amendment (Rept. No. 1448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution providing for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 122, to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1450). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 290, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V-12 program"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1451). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4982. A bill to enable the Department of State more effectively to carry out its responsibilities in the foreign field by means of (a) public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and (b) promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4319. A bill to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; without amendment (Rept. No. 1454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5012. A bill to dispense with the requirement that a veteran be unable to pay hospital expenses, in nonservice-connected cases, as a condition to hospitalization and domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 5013. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON:

H. R. 5014. A bill to authorize loans and grants to hospitals and public health centers for planning, constructing, and improving their facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5015. A bill to provide retirement pay for certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5016. A bill to extend the types of insurance into which national service life insurance may be converted, and to provide for payment, at the option of the insured, of the insurance in one lump sum; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5017. A bill to impose a duty of 2 cents per pound on patna rice imported for use in the manufacture of canned soups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5018. A bill to grant compensation to veterans of World War II who have had pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 5019. A bill to stop inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5020. A bill to provide compensation for sheriffs or other law-enforcement officers who transport mentally incompetent veterans to a Veterans' Administration hospital or home; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 5021. A bill to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 5022. A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 5023. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution authorizing the President, on behalf of the United States, to accept and recognize the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain categories of international legal disputes involving the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution favoring an international agreement abolishing compulsory universal peacetime military service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to implement provisions of the United Nations Charter regarding disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution to expunge the testimony of an alien enemy officer from the naval court records; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution to implement provisions of the United Nations Charter regarding disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 5024. A bill for the relief of Helmuth Heyl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Opal Riley and Robert R. Riley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of the estate of Drury Lee Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5027. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5028. A bill for the relief of George Ernsbarger; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5029. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Ellen Miyoko Kondo, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5030. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lim Shee Chang; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5031. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. Heine and Harriet W. Heine; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5032. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Kondo; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5033. A bill for the relief of the estate of Koichi Kondo; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5034. A bill for the relief of Charles Myers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5035. A bill for the relief of Maud Van Kleek; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 5036. A bill for the relief of Leroy C. Schamlenberger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Karl J. Lesemann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Lewis H. Rich; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5039. A bill for the relief of Bert L. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1417. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 51 members of the Anderson-Adkins Post, No. 19, of New Brighton, Pa., opposing passage of S. 1203 and H. R. 3522; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1418. Also, petition of the Town Council of the Borough of Fallston, county of Beaver, Pa., opposing the construction of the Erie-Ohio River Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1419. Also, petition of 123 citizens living at or near New Wilmington, Pa., protesting against any action to establish a system of compulsory military training for the young men and boys of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1420. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 26 residents of Capac and Yale, Mich., expressing their opposition to any form of peacetime compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend John W. Suter, D. D., dean of Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Behold, O God, this our beloved country: The old, the young, the little children; rich and poor, ignorant and learned; the laborers and managers of industry; workers in factory and mine, office, and home; a people of many traditions, many colors, divergent hopes and fears.

Behold America: Its mountains and plains, rivers and forests, its inland seas and shining coasts.

Upon this our land, upon these our people, pour down, we beseech Thee, Thy life-giving spirit of nobility and truth. Where there is strife, bring cooperation for the common good. Where greed and envy abound, control us with that divine perspective which sees in every man the dignity of a growing soul. Where interests clash, govern us with the higher impulse which seeks first Thy righteous kingdom.

Burn away all festering corruption and set us free to enjoy the glorious liberty of the children of God, that we may boast, not of our money or our might but of our privilege to be lifted on the cross of Christ as fellow redeemers with Him whose spirit sanctifies all Thy people.

Behold, O God, this our Nation; bless it, make it strong and pure, and fill it with the beauty of holiness. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. DOWNEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, December 17, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1689. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho;

H. R. 2647. An act to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery;

H. R. 3936. An act to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions;

H. R. 4149. An act to provide for the establishment of lawful entry into the United States of certain aliens not subject to deportation who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4628. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 4652. An act to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4769. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; and

H. R. 4649. An act to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a minority vacancy on the Special Silver Committee, caused by the death of our late colleague, Senator Thomas, of Idaho. In his place the Chair appoints the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

In like manner, there is a minority vacancy on the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. The vacancy has been caused by the release of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART]. In his place the Chair appoints the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

This is done at the suggestion of the minority floor leader.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

That the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be excused from further service upon the Committee on the Judiciary;

That the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads;

That the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads;

That the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Pensions;

That the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] be assigned to service on the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, and Pensions;

That the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations;

That the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency;

That the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be assigned to service on the Committee on Finance;

That the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] be assigned to service on the Committees on the Judiciary, Post Office and Post

Roads, Irrigation and Reclamation, and Public Lands and Surveys;

That the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] be assigned to service on the Committee on Military Affairs;

That the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] be assigned to service on the Committee on Military Affairs; and

That the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] be assigned to service on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RESALE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of State and the Surplus Property Administrator, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period October 1 to November 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION AGAINST PURCHASE AND SALE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

A letter from the president of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending the act of December 11, 1926 (44 Stat. 918) to prohibit the purchase and sale of public office (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE—REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission on resale price maintenance (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

CHEMICAL PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Surplus Property Administration on surplus chemical plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN — LETTER FROM FRANK TOM-PEE-SAW, PARSONS, KANS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In his capacity as Senator from the State of Tennessee, the Chair asks unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Frank Tom-Pee-Saw, representing the League of Nations North American Indians, Parsons, Kans., relating to a loan to Great Britain.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARSONS, KANS., *December 15, 1945.*

CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been advised that the President, Department of State, and officers of the Export-Import Bank have officially agreed to approve a loan to Great Britain in the amount of $4,400,000,000, consisting of cash, credit, and United States Army installations located in various parts of the British Empire, on a 50-year term, with an accruing interest rate of 2 percent annually, exempting interest payments for the first 5 years.

The League of American Indians desire to call to the attention of Congress, and the United States Senate in particular, that a British land company chartered in the United States as of the year 1805 under the title of the Connecticut Land Co. secured permission from the President of the United States authority to purchase by treaty from the Pottawatomie and Ottawa Indian Tribes of the United States one and one-half million acres of land lying along the south shores of Lake Erie for a consideration of $24,000 annually, in money and useful goods, for a period of 12 years, and, in addition, to deposit with the President of the United States sufficient funds to create an annuity of $175 per year for the Indian tribes named. Reference Treaty of July 4, 1805; United States Statutes at Large.

Examination of United States Statutes at Large and the annual reports of the Treasury Department subsequent to said date, year 1805, disclose that none of the funds promised to be paid by said Connecticut Land Co. under terms of the treaty were ever paid. We therefore respectfully request the United States Senate to deduct from any amount of funds agreed to be loaned to Britain the sum of $1,637,300, which represents principal and interest due said Indians over a period of 140 years.

Inasmuch as Britain has approved the United Nations Charter, the preamble of which provides for the setting up of conditions by which obligations arising under treaties shall be recognized and maintained, we now call upon Britain to meet that valid obligation.

I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK TOM-PEE-SAW,
Secretary.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred, as indicated:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit recipients of old-age assistance to reside in public institutions

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act prohibits the payment of old-age assistance to persons who are inmates of public institutions; and

"Whereas many needy aged persons do not have families or relatives with whom they can reside; and

"Whereas there is not a sufficient number of private boarding homes, convalescent homes, or institutions in which a recipient of old-age assistance may reside and receive adequate food, shelter, care, comfort, and companionship, at a price he can afford to pay; and

"Whereas commitments of many aged needy persons to State hospitals for the insane are based on minor mental disabilities connected with advanced age, together with their inability to find adequate living quarters or convalescent care in private homes or institutions at a cost which they can meet; and

"Whereas there are public institutions where a needy aged person may reside and receive adequate food, shelter, care, comfort, and companionship at a price he could afford to pay if he were permitted to receive old-age assistance; and

"Whereas additional public institutions of this kind could be provided if recipients of old-age assistance were permitted to reside in them: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, in first extraordinary session assembled (the house concurring herein)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized, to amend the Social Security Act to permit the needy aged to receive old-age assistance while being inmates of public institutions, provided, that they have not been committed to such institution by a court; that they pay for their care in such institution; and that they may enter or leave such institution upon their free choice; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado."

A resolution adopted by the directors of the Institute of Engineers of Puerto Rico, relating to the importation of experts paid from funds of the Puerto Rican treasury department; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS AGAINST ANTISTRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have been presented with memorials signed by 5,000 citizens of Muskegon, Mich., reading as follows:

We, the undersigned, being residents and voters in the State of Michigan, request our congressional representatives to oppose by their votes and influence all antistrike legislation as suggested by President Truman and others. We believe such legislation would be unconstitutional and as futile as the Smith-Connally Act. We are of the opinion that existing law, if enforced, and genuine collective bargaining would serve to bring industrial peace to America.

These memorials were gathered by the Port Cities Industrial Union Council, CIO, and were brought to Washington by its president, Mr. Chester Martin. I ask unanimous consent to present one of these memorials and request that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor which has jurisdiction of the subject matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorial will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4717. A bill to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 858).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program; without amendment (Rept. No. 859).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 4857. A bill to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 860).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4489. A bill to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 861).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BILBO (by request):

S. 1700. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1701. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Pennypack Creek in Philadelphia, Pa., with a view to providing facilities for light-draft navigation; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1702. A bill granting an increase in pension to Joseph Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1703. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Virginia McCormac Bunting, to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 1704. A bill for the relief of Capt. LeRoy Krom; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1705, to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, business and distribution, and transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIS:

S. 1706. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Amy E. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oscar A. Lundgren, Jr.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1708. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of the Willow River Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. CAPEHART introduced S. J. Res. 127, to provide for a commission to investigate and study the defense needs of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

CENSUSES OF MANUFACTURES, MINERAL INDUSTRIES, BUSINESS AND DISTRIBUTION, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, of distribution and business, and of transportation.

The need for authentic, up-to-date information of the nature which can be provided only by such censuses should be clear to every Senator.

Proposals for taking censuses of manufactures, of mineral industries, and of distribution and business already have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce and by the Census Bureau. The proposal for a census of transportation should have the endorsement of anyone who will take the time to think the matter through.

At the present time no Government agency has the sort of basic transportation statistics needed by the Congress, and by the executive departments, for rational transportation legislation, direction, and planning.

Transportation vitally affects the operations of every industry and individual, and is of intense current interest to Congress and to the executive agencies of the Federal Government.

The original census of 1790 covered population only. In later years the scope of census taking has been progressively broadened, as its importance in the national economy came to be recognized. Census taking has thus come to be acknowledged as the appropriate medium for collecting data, not otherwise available, for the use of the Congress, of executive branches of the Government, and of others, in their study of our national problems. The Bureau of the Census was specifically created by the Congress as a national fact-finding agency. Down through the years it has proved helpful in many ways. Clearly, the time has come when the Congress should add to the functions of the Census Bureau to provide for the obtaining of the basic facts concerning transportation, at periodic intervals. The taking of censuses on manufactures, mineral industries, wholesale and retail trade, and so on, will provide unique opportunity to ascertain the transportation services used by each. Concurrently, there should be a census of both common carrier and contract carrier transportation, by highway, by waterway, and by air. The bill which I have just introduced provides for such a census.

This bill does not cover a census of rail transportation, since statistics on rail transportation are now gathered and compiled, adequately, by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill does cover motortruck transportation, since the statistics on motor carriers gathered by the Interstate Commerce Commission are neither sufficiently comprehensive nor sufficiently detailed.

The importance of transportation in our national economy needs no argument. Nor is there any need to argue that the problems involved, in seeing to it that the true public interest is preserved in our national transportation policy, are both complex and serious. The solution of these problems is going to require a lot of straight, hard thinking. To be realistic, this thinking must be based on the most adequate body of factual data which it is possible for the Congress and the executive branches of the Government to assemble.

Recognition of the complexity of our transportation problems, and the need for searching analysis to arrive at proper solutions thereof, is demonstrated by the fact that the Senate now has before it at least two resolutions calling for transportation investigations. In the other House of the Congress, the Committee on Interstate Commerce is reported to be working actively on such an investigation.

Yet, as I have pointed out, no Government agency has in hand, or is currently gathering, anything approaching adequate transportation statistics. For example, nowhere are data available as to the relative use which manufacturers in a given line make of railways, highways, waterways, and air transportation facilities, in the assembling of materials and in the shipment of products. The same holds true of mineral industries, retail trade, wholesale trade, and other businesses.

In short, there is no way of measuring, on the basis of currently available data, the contributions which the various kinds of transportation are making to industry and business, either by kinds or by geographic locations. Nor are data available showing the extent to which manufacturers, businessmen, farmers, and others furnish their own transportation through truck ownership and use.

If the role of transportation in our national economy is of sufficient importance to warrant serious study by the Congress, and by several of the executive departments, it would seem entirely logical and in keeping with sound legislative procedure for the Bureau of the Census to be now instructed to assemble the basic facts on transportation.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1705) to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, business and distribution, and transportation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1297) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to promote the progress of science and the useful arts; to secure the national defense; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed in the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 1689. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase improvements or pay damages for removal of improvements located on public lands of the United States in the Anderson Ranch Reservoir site, Boise reclamation project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 2647. An act to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery; and

H. R. 4652. An act to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 4149. An act to provide for the establishment of lawful entry into the United States of certain aliens not subject to deportation when entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924; and

H. R. 4628. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 3936. An act to provide for the evacuation and repatriation of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States and whose remains could not heretofore be returned to their homelands due to wartime shipping restrictions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4769. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

THOUGHTS AND WISHES OF THE MAN IN THE STREET—ADDRESS BY ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have reprinted in the RECORD, because of two pages inadvertently omitted in the RECORD of November 23, an address delivered by Robert E. Hannegan, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a dinner of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association, at French Lick, Ind., November 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ON FEEDING THE GERMANS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter under the heading "On feeding the Germans," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY MONTGOMERY OSTRANDER IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 1592

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, a statement made before the Committee on Banking and Currency in support of Senate bill 1592, the housing bill, by Montgomery Ostrander, Washington representative of the American Veterans' Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

TESTIMONY OF AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 1592

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, the testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill, on December 17, 1945, given on behalf of the American Veterans of World War II by its national commander, Jack W. Hardy, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF OMAR B. KETCHUM IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 1592

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on the housing bill, Senate bill 1592, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 1415, the so-called Federal pay bill, is the business before the Senate.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Buck	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Shipstead
Byrd	Langer	Smith
Capehart	Lucas	Stanfill
Capper	McCarran	Stewart
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Mead	Walsh
Gossett	Millikin	Wherry
Green	Mitchell	White
Guffey	Moore	Wiley
Gurney	Morse	Willis
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hayden	Myers	Young

Mr. DOWNEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on important business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF DEFENSE NEEDS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to provide for a commission to investigate and study the defense needs of the United States, and for other purposes, which I ask be referred to the appropriate committee, and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 127) to provide for a commission to investigate and study the defense needs of the United States, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Congress must consider during the coming months the establishment of peacetime land, naval, and air forces, and the provision of equipment and supplies therefor; and

Whereas as a part of such defense needs it must be determined what is needed in the nature of military training, either compulsory or voluntary, on the part of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it is requisite that proper planning be had with reference to scientific and mechanical development in relation to the needs of our armed forces; and

Whereas it is the desire of Congress so to plan and correlate our national defense that every resource and development may be fully utilized in creating adequate preparedness with the least hardship and expense possible, and in a manner consistent with the future welfare of our Nation; and

Whereas it is the desire of Congress fully to use all available information and thought in determining this most important question, and to consider the problem of national defense in the aggregate and as a whole, rather than piecemeal: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to investigate and study the defense needs of the United States, to be composed of (1) the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and (2) 17 members to be appointed by the President. The members appointed by the President shall be so selected as to include persons familiar with the interests of religion, education, veterans, industry, labor, agriculture, and science.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to make a complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the future national defense needs and requirements of the United States, including (1) the type of military establishments needed and the desirability of unification thereof; (2) the scientific, research, production, manufacturing, and stock-piling needs thereof; and (3) the type and extent of individual military training necessary for the establishment and maintenance thereof. The commission shall report to the Congress, within 6 months from the date of the adoption of this joint resolution, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The members of the commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions of the commission.

(b) The commission shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties. The commission is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this joint resolution the commission shall be entitled to exercise the same powers and rights as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 831); and the provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend and testify or to produce books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, or other records and documents before the commission.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $50,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to read a paragraph of the joint resolution and speak briefly on it.

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to investigate and study the defense needs of the United States, to be composed of (1) the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and (2) 17 members to be appointed by the President. The members appointed by the President shall be so selected as to include persons familiar with the interests of religion, education, veterans, industry, labor, agriculture and science.

Mr. President, why do I propose the establishment of such a commission? We have just prosecuted to a successful conclusion World War II, the second world war in which we have been engaged in the last 27 years. The people of our country—and it is my opinion that it is true of Members of Congress—are today very much confused. I doubt if any Member of Congress or any individual citizen in the United States is exactly certain in his own mind with respect to his position on many subjects which have to do with our future national dedense.

Mr. President, every American, and every conscientious individual throughout the world is praying that we may have peace. Yet we find in our own country that our people, even those in authority, are very much confused. They are confused over the future of the atomic bomb. They are confused over whether the United Nations Charter will bring us peace as we are all praying it will. They are confused over the fact that our President has advocated compulsory military training in the face of the United Nations Charter. They are confused over the proposal that our Army and Navy be merged into one unit. As Senators know, the Navy is opposed to it. It is evident that the Army is in favor of it. Likewise, as a nation we are confused, and the world is confused, over what sort of instruments of war will be used in the next war, if one should occur—and we hope that it will not.

The net result is—and I believe I can safely make this statement without fear of successful contradiction—that our people and the Congress, and those in authority in Washington, are uncertain as to what we should or should not do. I am wondering if we do not need a cooling-off period. I am wondering if it would not be a wise thing to appoint a commission, as I have suggested, composed of members who are unprejudiced, unbiased, and who would look upon this subject from a distance.

Our form of government is a representative democracy. Why should we not give labor, agriculture, education, and religion a chance to study this problem? Why should not the great scientists of this country be given an opportunity to study the problem? It is the people's problem. In my opinion such representation would be desirable and wholesome. My opinion is that when the commission shall have completed its study—and the joint resolution provides that the study shall be completed within 6 months—sufficient time will have elapsed so that possibly we in the Congress and the Administration will have come to some fairly positive conclusions as to what should be done and what should not be done in respect to national defense.

My observation on the question of future national defense is that we are being asked to pass upon the subject piecemeal. We are being asked to look at one tree at a time. I should like to see the entire forest. I should like to see the entire blueprint, taking into consideration the atomic bomb, the size of our Army and Navy, the question of compulsory military training, the merging of our Army and Navy, and the question of how much money our Nation can afford to spend in the future on national defense. I should like to see the picture as a whole, rather than be asked as a United States Senator to pass upon the subject piecemeal.

In voting upon the bills before us at the moment, and measures which will be placed before us in the future, frankly, as a United States Senator, I should like to have the help of such a commission as is provided for in the joint resolution. I should like the help of our great educators, our great religious leaders, and our veterans. I should like to wait until the great majority of our boys have been discharged from the service. I should like to have their opinions upon these many subjects. In connection with the important question of national defense I do not believe that we should hastily pass legislation piecemeal without seeing the entire blueprint, as I have stated.

I sincerely hope that we can have a cooling-off period for the next 6 months. I do not believe that our country will be in danger during that period. I know of no nation which is likely to attack us. I know of no nation which would be so foolish as to do so. I should like to see the President appoint a commission of sincere, honest, conscientious Americans to study this problem and make a written report of their findings and opinions. That report should be made the basis of legislation. With such a report before us, in my judgment Congress would be able to act with greater confidence and more faith in the future than would be possible if we were to try to pass national defense legislation piecemeal.

Under the influence of the situation arising at the end of the war many persons today are, shall I say, a little hotheaded on many subjects relating to our national defense. I urge the Senate to pass the joint resolution in order that we may not do something in haste which we shall regret in the future. Let us take plenty of time. Let us give this problem the best we have. Let us invite a commission to help us study this problem. It is a problem of the people, but it is our responsibility. I urge every Senator to support the joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I have not had an opportunity to read the joint resolution carefully. I should like to inquire if there is anything in the joint resolution which would interfere with the procedure of demobilizing the Army and Navy and supplementing the Regular Army and Navy personnel.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would interfere with that procedure. The joint resolution merely provides for the creation of a commission composed of the chairmen of the committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs in both Houses, the ranking members of such committees, and 17 others, to study the problem as a whole.

Mr. WALSH. At the moment I have no reason to object to the joint resolution; but I suggest to the Senator that he be careful to see that there is nothing embodied in the joint resolution which would cause any delay to the Army or Navy in getting back to a peacetime basis. In my opinion it is very essential that the Army and Navy proceed to reconstruct on a peacetime basis, so as to have men available to take the places of those who are being discharged from both branches of the service. There should be nothing to interfere with the desire which we all have to see the reserves returned to their homes as soon as possible.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the Senator. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would affect in any way the problem which he has so ably described. It is not intended that the joint resolution should in any way interfere with our present laws and policies with regard to the Army and Navy.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, some Senators who were in the Chamber earlier today were compelled to retire temporarily. They wished to be on the floor of the Senate so as to be able to participate in this discussion, but they have not as yet returned.

So, Mr. President, at this time I think I shall call up the amendment which I have at the desk, providing for the appointment by the President of a commission to investigate the question of the salary structure of those in Federal employment. I now offer the amendment and ask that it be read. After it is read, if no Senator desires to debate it, I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on it immediately.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the amendment printed?

Mr. DOWNEY. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the "Federal Wage Commission" which shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President. Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the func-

tions of the Commission, except that no member of the Commission who is otherwise receiving compensation as an officer or employee of the United States shall be entitled to receive compensation as a member of the Commission.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete investigation with respect to salary and wage rates payable under existing law to officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government, and to report to the President and to the Congress at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations concerning any necessary modifications in or revision of the Federal salary and wage structure.

(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures for facilities, supplies, and services, as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

(d) The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after the date of filing of the reports required under subsection (b).

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment briefly. Many Senators on both sides of the aisle have stated to me that they think that whatever allowance we now make in the way of an increase in the salaries of Federal employees should be effective, for instance, for a period of only 1 year, that the Senate should not at this time make the increase permanent, and that pending the introduction of another bill having the same purpose there should be an investigation of the entire question of the salary structure for Federal employees.

I wish to say to the Senate that the subject is highly technical and highly complicated; and I think it would take five men at least 6 months, working constantly, to reach sound conclusions regarding it. I do not believe the Civil Service Committee has either the resources or the time to do the work. If a man were selected from the Bureau of the Budget and if someone else were selected from some other governmental agency and if three men were selected from outside industry, or if some similar arrangement were made, I believe they could make an extensive study and at the end of 6 months would be able to return to the Senate with something which would be distinctly worth while to us. Consequently, Mr. President, I have offered the amendment to meet that situation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the bill now pending is to expire within a year?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; I have not said that. But many Senators have said to me that they thought the bill should be a temporary measure.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator going to offer an amendment of that character?

Mr. DOWNEY. If the amendment I have now offered is adopted, I shall offer an amendment providing that the pay scale covered by the pending measure shall continue for only 1 year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only question which occurs to me is whether it is necessary for us to create a new commission to make the study referred to in the amendment. I understand that under the amendment a commission of five members would be authorized and appointed, that each of the members of the commission would be paid $12,000 a year, and that provision would also be made for the salaries of such employees as they might find necessary to have in order to prepare the report. It seems to me that in view of the fact that the Government now has the Civil Service Commission and other agencies which are equipped to make studies, the President would have authority to designate the necessary persons to make the study referred to in the amendment, without having the Congress create a new board for that purpose. I wonder what the Senator's point of view regarding that phase of the matter is?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I may say to my colleague that so far as I am concerned, what he has said will be sympathetically received. But I am sure a large majority of the Senate will believe that if an investigation is made of Federal wages and salaries, there should be on the board making the investigation at least three persons from without the Government, persons who come with an outside point of view. I do not believe a majority of the Senate would be satisfied to have the investigation made by a commission wholly composed of persons coming from governmental agencies.

So far as I am concerned, the Senator's suggestion would be satisfactory to me; but I believe the present form of the amendment will be more satisfactory to the Senate generally.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am a little concerned from the point of view of the number of employees in the Federal service. At this time, when the Senate and the Congress should be devoting considerable study to cutting down the number of Federal employees, it is somewhat disturbing to find that it is now proposed that the Congress create a new board to make a study which I think could be handled by existing agencies.

A short time ago the Congress passed a reorganization bill providing for the consolidation of various boards and a vast number of the agencies in the Federal Government which were built up during wartime. But the amendment would seem to be headed in the other direction; it would add to the number of Government agencies, rather than cut down the number.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator desires to offer an amendment providing that the Board shall be entirely composed of persons drawn from governmental agencies, I shall not object. But I believe we should have persons on the Board from groups outside the Government, persons who would make a dispassionate and disinterested survey. Unless the Senator offers to my amendment an amendment to require that all the personnel of the Board shall come from Government agencies, I shall be inclined to stand on the amendment as it is now written.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it seems to me an amendment of such importance should not be adopted without a larger attendance in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Myers
Ball	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hoey	Russell
Brewster	Huffman	Stanfill
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Byrd	Knowland	Vandenberg
Capehart	McCarran	Walsh
Downey	McMahon	White
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Willis
Gossett	Mitchell	Wilson
Green	Moore	
Guffey	Morse	

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will be necessarily absent for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. TAYLOR answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators at this somewhat important session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. CAPPER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay Mr. HART, Mr. MEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. RADCLIFFE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE FOR RETIREMENT IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICE laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 405) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, which was on page 2, line 6, to strike out all after "substitute" down to and including "benefits" in line 9.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am glad to turn from a somewhat controversial matter to one which I think is not controversial. The Senate recently passed a bill giving military personnel

the right to claim credit for their military service in the civil retirement system.

As the Senate passed the bill, a member of the military forces had the right to elect whether he would receive a credit for his military or his civilian pay. It was placed in the alternative. The House has stricken out the alternative provision, so the veteran would have the right to be credited only with what his civilian pay was when he left the civil-service employment.

Mr. President, the difference between the House and Senate is not serious, and I move concurrence in the House amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Can the Senator tell us as to the attitude of the committee generally toward the House amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. I can only say that it was discussed at some length before our committee, and there are different ideas pro and con. We finally decided to adopt the most generous viewpoint toward the member of the military personnel, but I do not think it is a matter of serious concern. In most cases probably the civilian pay would be higher than the military pay, but in the case of a person who was a major, or a colonel, or a general, if there should be such a one who would be claiming this right, of course, the military pay would be higher.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator's motion is to concur in the House amendment?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING MEN HAVING CHILDREN

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On November 8 I introduced a Senate joint resolution which later became known as Senate Joint Resolution 116. The purpose of it was to stop the drafting into the armed forces of men having children and to release men having children from the armed forces upon their application, if they assigned that as a ground. The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and on December 4 the Committee on Military Affairs acted adversely on a motion to report it favorably to the Senate.

At this time I wish to move to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of the joint resolution and that it be brought to the floor of the Senate and placed upon the calendar, to be taken up and considered by the Senate at a proper time.

Mr. President, I cannot but call the attention of the Senate—and I do so very earnestly—to the fact that for several days we have been taking action looking to the assistance of needy people in foreign countries. We have adopted a resolution to aid people in establishing their homeland, which was proper. Surely this Government is not going to forget its own people.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am unwilling to pass the regular order of business to allow the Senator to proceed with this controversial matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that I am merely going to make a motion, not for action upon the joint resolution, but merely to place it upon the calendar for action in the future when it may properly be brought up.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should have to raise a point of order on that. I hope the Senator will not impede the Federal pay legislation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that in 2 or 3 minutes I could say all I care to say. I shall speak no further on it than to call it to the attention of the Senate, and to say that it is one of the most burning questions. I feel that before the Senate adjourns for the holidays it should take this action, and place the joint resolution on the calendar, so that at a proper time it may be acted on. I do not wish to interfere with the regular order of business, but I make the motion, and ask for a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion at this time is not in order.

Mr. DOWNEY. I hope——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield further for an inquiry of the Chair?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield for an inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Chair rules that I am out of order in making this motion. Upon what ground am I out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can ask unanimous consent, but a motion would be out of order, because under the rule such a motion could only be made during the morning hour under the order of "Introduction of concurrent and other resolutions."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would the Senator from California yield for another inquiry addressed to him?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I hope the Senator will not make the point of order against my motion, because I am not asking that the important legislation to which I have alluded be passed upon, but merely that it be placed upon the calendar for future consideration. The motion can be voted upon in a minute, and the question I am presenting now thus be disposed of.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have no objection to the Senator making it in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. I understood the Chair to lay before the Senate a bill with an amendment by the House, and the Senator from California moved to concur in the House amendment. Is not the motion to concur in the House amendment debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; that is the pending motion, and it is debatable.

Mr. WHITE. I presume, then, that under that ruling the Senator from West Virginia is clearly within his rights in debating the motion.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I merely wish to know whether the Senator from California is going to make a point of order against the motion to discharge the committee in order to bring this joint resolution to the calendar.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have already stated I shall not do so, if the Senator will ask unanimous consent of the Senate to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It does not have to be in the form of a unanimous-consent request to get it before the Senate, unless the Senator objects to it. I ask that the motion be put as a motion to bring this joint resolution to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It requires unanimous consent. If the Senator will ask for that, the Chair will gladly present the request to the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senate is rapidly drawing to the conclusion of this session. To make a motion now, as the Senator from West Virginia does, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the member of the committee who was acting chairman during the absence in Europe of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], would seem to me not to be a recognition of the rights of a legislative committee.

I suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that, instead of attempting to make a motion which is clearly out of order, he state the reasons which impel him to make the motion, make whatever remarks he cares to present on the matter, and then, when the parliamentary situation is cleared up and the members of the Committee on Military Affairs have been given notice that the Senator proposes to move to discharge the committee, he make his motion. I certainly think that a quorum call would have to be made now to try to bring the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I have no objection whatsoever to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs being present. I wish he were here. A quorum call has just been ended, to which he did not respond. The Senator from Wyoming says that the Senator who acted as chairman during the absence of the Senator from Utah in Europe is not present. I am sure he has not looked about, because the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is present on the floor of the Senate as I speak now.

I did give notice that this matter would be brought up before the Senate on a

motion to discharge the committee. I think a great wrong is being done to the men in the service who have children, many of whom are sitting over in the Pacific area, some of them doing nothing. The Army and the Navy both have refused to discharge men on the ground that they have children, except those who have three children, and I think that before we take the Christmas holidays we can do nothing more in keeping with our duty than to see to it that this measure is placed on the calendar for the earliest consideration by the Senate.

I repeat, I am not asking for passage of the joint resolution at this time. I am merely asking that it be put upon the calendar for consideration. I hope the Senate of the United States will not turn down the motion at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Presiding Officer what the status will be if the motion shall be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The usual procedure, the Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian, is that what is proposed by the Senator from West Virginia should be done by submission of a resolution which must lie over for 1 day. That is the regular procedure. Of course, the Senate can proceed by unanimous consent. That is what the Senator from West Virginia is now requesting. He is requesting unanimous consent, as the Chair understands, that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, and that the joint resolution be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct, Mr. President. That is what my motion goes to. When the motion is made we cannot act on it today, but under rule XXVI, which appears on page 33 of the manual, the motion must lie over for 1 day at least before any action can be taken on it. All I request is that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be placed on the calendar so that the whole Senate may consider this very important and urgent matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, is it the object of the Senator from West Virginia in making the motion at this time to comply with the provision of the Senate rule that such a motion must lie over for a day?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes, Mr. President. It must lie over for a day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I heard correctly what the Senator from West Virginia said, I am sure he misunderstands the parliamentary situation. The Chair has correctly announced that a motion to discharge a committee should be submitted in writing and should lie over for a day. That is the regular rule of the Senate. The Senator does not wish to obtain action upon the measure, but he does seek to obtain action upon his motion to discharge the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator, who himself is a very distinguished and able member of that committee, should not undertake in this summary manner to move to discharge the committee at least in the absence of the chairman of the committee. I have suggested to him that, since the chairman of the committee does not happen to be present, the Senator might make his statement, which is a very important statement and has a very strong appeal. I know, as he knows, that the members of the committee have been very much concerned about the matter, and I am merely suggesting to the Senator that in the interest of orderly procedure he should not press for action upon his motion at the moment. Let us proceed with the unfinished business, and then, in due course, if——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. For what purpose?

Mr. REVERCOMB. To reply to the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOWNEY. I will yield to the Senator from West Virginia if he wants to ask that his request for unanimous-consent agreement be placed before the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is exactly what I wanted to ask for at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Mr. President, will have ample opportunity to state his position when this matter comes up for consideration before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, and that it be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has asked unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution which it now has before it, and that the joint resolution be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. In the absence of the chairman of the committee, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; objection was made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer a resolution providing for the discharge of the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of the joint resolution under discussion, and that the joint resolution may be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be received and will lie over for a day.

The resolution (S. Res. 207) submitted by Mr. REVERCOMB, was received and ordered to lie over, under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, at this time I wish to announce that I have filed in writing a motion to discharge the Military Affairs Committee from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116. I do not think it is necessary to make this announcement, but I do so in the presence of the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is now present on the floor of the Senate, and state that tomorrow, under the rule, I desire to take up that motion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if I am not out of order I should like to make a statement in reply to the statement made by the Senator from West Virginia. Of course, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I would not resist the request of any member of that committee to have the committee discharged from the consideration of a measure, but I would not be fair to the Senate if I did not point out why such action would be unwise, especially if the action is taken at such a time as this.

The joint resolution in which the Senator from West Virginia is interested, stated briefly, provides that fathers shall not be drafted. The withdrawal of the measure from the jurisdiction of the committee will make it possible for the measure to be placed on the calendar of the Senate and be acted upon. Before it can become law it would have to be passed by the House of Representatives and signed by the President of the United States. That would be impossible during the present session of the Congress, as everyone knows.

The procedure which the Senator from West Virginia is attempting to have followed can be brought into being by an order of the Selective Service System. It can be brought into being——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Permit me to make the statement first, Mr. President, and then we will know what we are talking about, if that is not an unfair request.

It can also be brought into being by a mere statement on the part of the Army that it does not wish any more fathers to be drafted. Then the Selective Service System would, of course, respond to that statement. These things were pointed out in committee, and the chairman said that he, of course, would be opposed to taking the long route of

attempting to bring about something by law which everyone wanted to see accomplished, if it could be accomplished, by action of the Army or the Selective Service System or otherwise.

Therefore the chairman spoke to the Secretary of War and he has spoken to the Selective Service Commission. The Executive order necessary is in the process of preparation. Whether it will be forthcoming or not I do not know. But I do know that the progress which has so far been made has advanced the attainment of the desired objective much further than it would be advanced even by the enactment of a law in the normal way, or by following the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia and discharging the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. President, I have no objection at all to the resolution which the Senator has filed. I do not in any sense resent its being filed. But I do think if the Senator from West Virginia is earnest and honest and desirous of accomplishing the purpose contained in his joint resolution that it would be better to let the processes which are now working continue to work before the Senator starts something which might interfere with those processes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me assure the Senator from Utah and every other Senator present that I am earnest and honest and sincere in this effort, so much so that I am calling up before the Senate tomorrow for full consideration the motion to discharge the Military Affairs Committee. Let me further say, without further debate today, that it is true that the War Department and the Navy Department and the Chief of the Selective Service System could do what the joint resolution proposes to do, but the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, knows as well as I do that they have not done it. The Senator further knows that when the joint resolution was introduced and referred to the committee letters were written by the War and Navy Departments and the Selective Service to the committee opposing the joint resolution. There is now in the record on this subject sufficient evidence to enable us to know that they are not going to do what the joint resolution provides. That is the reason why Congress should act, because the executive officers will not act upon the subject.

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE FOR RETIREMENT IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I appeal to Senators to let us proceed with the Federal pay bill without bringing in extraneous matters. Many think that the Senator in charge of the bill can stop such discussions. Of course, he cannot. I hope Senators will allow us to proceed.

Mr. President, before proceeding with the pay bill I request that the Senate vote on the motion heretofore made, which I now repeat, that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate bill 405.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California to give us a statement concerning the amendment, so I at least may know what we are talking about.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, twice already that statement has been made, so I am very happy to make it the third time.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the Senator from California that I have just returned from a meeting of conferees, and do not know what is under consideration. I think I am entitled to an explanation.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, several months ago the Senate passed a bill providing that members of the military forces should be entitled to credit for the time spent in the military service in calculating their civil-service retirement rights if they had previously been employed in the civil service. The Senate provided that a soldier or sailor claiming that right could take credit, at his option, alternatively for his military pay or his civilian pay. The House has decided in its wisdom that he should not be given the alternative right to claim credit at the rate of his military pay, but only at what his civilian pay was while he was under the civil service, and I ask the Senate to concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rate of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I would request a record vote upon the pending amendment to the pay bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from California proposes an amendment to Senate bill 1415. This amendment, I may say, was not considered by the Civil Service Committee. The amendment provides for the creation of "a commission to be known as the Federal Wage Commission which shall be composed of five persons appointed by the President. Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the exercise of the functions of the Commission."

It shall be the duty—

The amendment says—

of the Commission to make a full and complete investigation with respect to salary and wage rates payable under existing law to officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government, and to report to the President and to the Congress at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations concerning any necessary modifications in or revision of the Federal salary and wage structure.

Let it be understood, Mr. President, that this amendment refers not only to the employees under the classified civil service but likewise refers to the employees under what is known as the wage-board group. I think the submission of this amendment by the Senator from California emphasizes what the Senator from Virginia has been saying with respect to the pending legislation since it was taken up in the Senate on December 5, namely, that adequate information is not now available and that sufficient consideration has not been given to this very vital legislation.

If such an investigation as that proposed is needed and necessary—and I think the Senate and the House should have much more information than they now have with respect to this vital question—then the Senator from California is putting the cart before the horse. He should have the investigation before this wage increase legislation is passed, which provides an increase in the basic wages of the employees whom it affects, the increase to be a permanent one.

Mr. President, I merely want to say a word about the course of this legislation since it was reported to the Senate. It was reported to the Senate on December 5, and off and on has been debated by the Senate. The Senator from California has been very courteous and has yielded to a number of other Senators permitting them to take up for consideration bills in which they were interested, and which were of vital importance, I may say. But let me remind the Senate that this yielding on the part of the Senator from California has been a voluntary one. Not in a single instance, so far as I can recall in the five or six times he has yielded to the consideration of other legislation, has he requested a roll call or has he opposed to the point of submitting the matter to the Senate as to whether or not other legislation should supplant the legislation which was then pending. Then, Mr. President, after 10 days of this debate, this off-and-on debate, I may say, the Senator from California, on December 15, as I recall, proposed an entirely new substitute for the bill which the Civil Service Committee had reported to the Senate. I shall have something to say later as to the method by which that bill was reported. But the Senator from California, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, without any action on the part of the committee, and, so far as I know, without consulting any other member of the committee, on December 15 offered an entirely new substitute, with the exception of a single paragraph of three lines, for the bill he reported as chairman of the Civil Service Committee.

I cite that fact to show the confusion which exists with respect to this legislation. The chairman of the Civil Service Committee himself is not certain in his own mind as to what form the increase in compensation of employees of the Federal Government should take. The bill reported by the Civil Service Committee—and I may say not by a majority of the committee, but by only 5 out of 10 members—provided for a 20-percent flat increase, while the substitute proposed by the Senator from California on December 15 provided for a graduated increase, and was a complete change—a reversal of the position

taken by the committee and the Senator from California.

If any charges of delay are made in connection with this legislation, let it be said that the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, the Senator from California, offered a substitute and after it was discussed for an entire day he withdrew the substitute, and the bill originally reported by the Civil Service Committee is back before the Senate.

We read in the newspapers of this morning that the Senator from California proposes again to offer his substitute thus completely reversing once more the method which he advocated in the Civil Service Committee for the increase of these salaries.

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator wish me to yield to him?

Mr. LANGER. I should like to take the floor in my own right.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say to the Senator that I expect to speak for some time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to make it plain to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber that the pending amendment would create five or more jobs at $12,000 a year for members of a brand new commission which in my judgment is absolutely unnecessary. In addition, the five members who might be appointed would have full authority to hire anyone they might think it was necessary to hire in order to assist them. The amendment provides that they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses. There is no limit to the number of employees they could hire. As the ranking Republican member on the Civil Service Committee, I repeat that in my judgment this is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the Senator from North Dakota, who is the ranking Republican member on the Civil Service Committee, whether he knows of any testimony, evidence, or investigation on the part of the Civil Service Committee into the subject matter of the pending amendment.

Mr. LANGER. At no time has there been even a suggestion that a committee of three, five, seven, or any other number should be appointed by the President for this purpose.

I invite attention to subparagraph (b):

(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete investigation with respect to salary and wage rates payable under existing law to officers and employees in or under the executive branch of the Government, and to report to the President and to the Congress at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations concerning any necessary modifications in or revision of the Federal salary and wage structure.

In other words, those five members and the horde of assistants whom they might employ would be on the pay roll for the remainder of this year, all of 1946, all of 1947, and all of 1948. No time limit is set for the submission of a report. I wish to make it clear that I am unequivocally opposed to the amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has seen fit to indulge in much criticism of the conduct of the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service. Regardless of the motive from which the criticism springs, it does not advance the cause of government, of statesmanship, or of the Federal employee. If I were as culpable as the distinguished Senator would have his auditors believe such criticism would not accomplish anything for the Federal employees. Let me say this——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will not yield indefinitely. If the Senator wishes to make an oration he can do so in his own time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say this to the distinguished Senator: By presenting the amendment which he proposes to offer, and which is on the desk, he is totally shifting the method of calculating the increase in compensation of Federal employees, so that Senators will become confused in weighing the proposal in the bill and the proposal of the Senator from Virginia. I do not say that he has done so designedly, but that is certainly the effect. So far as I am concerned, I shall attempt to bring before the Senate a parallel proposal, following the same type of formula which the Senator from Virginia is using. The Senator can censor the chairman for doing so if he so desires, but the chairman believes that that should be done in the interest of clarity.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, these are the facts: The amendment which has been drawn by the Senator from Virginia follows exactly and extends the formula which was adopted for the increase which went into effect on July 1 and is now in effect. It proposes the same type of increase, except that the percentage is raised. The Senator from California, as a member of the Civil Service Committee, voted for that bill when it was reported last June.

There is nothing new or strange about the proposal. It so happens that the Senator from Virginia believes in a graduated scale. I believe that the increases should be graduated, and that there should not be a horizontal increase, as proposed by the Senator from California in both his bills—the one before us now and the one last June when he proposed a horizontal increase of 15 percent. The committee overrode him and adopted the formula which merely would be extended by the amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is it not true that the bill reported from the committee provided for a 20-percent increase over the basic increase which was given on July 1, 1945, while the Senator, in his proposal, would wipe out that basic increase and go back to a prior date?

Mr. BYRD. My amendment would go back to the formula which previously has been adopted by the Congress, and has been in use for nearly 6 months, so nothing new has been sprung on the Senate. Nothing new has been done. My amendment would merely extend the present law, which I may say has been eminently satisfactory—more so than the flat increase proposed by the Senator from California last June would have been.

Mr. President, I do not wish to criticise the Senator from California. I hope he will not think that I am doing so, because I am not. But he is the chairman of an important committee. Frankly, I feel that when the chairman of a committee reports a bill he should not offer a complete substitute for the bill without consulting members of the committee. I have never known of such a thing being done during the entire time that I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Virginia has clearly stated my objections to the pending amendment. Some of us felt that possibly the committee which was handling the bill was correct, and I was willing to do my share and contribute what little I could toward disposing of the bill. But daily, when we are ready to vote on the bill, we find ourselves confronted with a new proposal. I know there are some of us who are ready to vote on the question whether the bill reported by the committee should be passed. But once in a while we become somewhat confused.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that I do not think he will have such an opportunity, because the Senator from California is going to present a substitute for the committee bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am making. I am willing to vote for the bill which was reported by the Senator from California for the committee, but I am not willing to approve of a situation in which, every time a Senator suggests something other than the committee bill, the chairman of the committee comes forth with a new proposition which has not been discussed by the committee. As I have said, I am willing to vote now on the bill which was reported by the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote immediately on the bill. I think the bill is only a fair and equitable proposal, and I want it more than anything else.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia has a substitute which he intends to offer for the bill. It provides a totally different formula which I know has confused the Federal workers and

will confuse Senators. If the distinguished Senator from Virginia makes that proposal, I intend to move to amend it so that the Senate will understand what is being proposed. I do not believe it will be understood unless it is amended.

So far as I am concerned, I wish to have the bill passed as reported by the committee; I am prepared to vote on it immediately, and I shall request a vote on it now, if the Senator from Virginia does not desire to press his amendment, which is substantially in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me once more?

Mr. BYRD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in agreement with the Senator from California, but the Senator from Virginia has a right to present any amendment which he sees fit to present. Why not dispose of the amendment and defeat it if we can—and I think we can. But why have the chairman of the committee, who has reported a bill which many of us think is correct, suggest every day in the week that it has to be amended?

Mr. BYRD. I think the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico are well taken.

Mr. President, I simply wish to say a word to the Senate regarding the great importance of the proposed legislation which is being considered in such a confusing manner. The pending measure affects approximately two and one-half million employees, in that while it directly applies only to what is known as the Classification Act group, which constitutes 40 percent of the employees, it actually applies to all Government employees because if we increase the salaries of the 40 percent who are included within the so-called Classification Act group, it naturally follows that the other 60 percent will receive similar increases.

The wage board group, as of September 30, 1945, had 889,000 employees. The postal group had 437,000 employees.

The Classification Act group, to which the pending bill refers, had 1,100,000 employees, while all the others aggregated 1,187,000, making a grand total, as of September 30, 1945, of 2,613,000.

In addition to that, Mr. President, there are employees outside the continental United States. They number 500,000 or 600,000. If the 20-percent increase provided by the bill is applied to those employees, the total annual cost to the Federal Government will be $1,279,000,000.

Mr. President, the increase proposed by the bill is a permanent increase. There is nothing temporary about it. Once it is passed, it will remain on the statute books for many years to come, and, do not forget, it will continue in force after the cost of living goes down. While it is true that Federal employees do not receive increases promptly when the cost of living goes up, it is also true that they will continue to receive increases such as the one proposed by the pending measure long after the cost of living goes down—in the event that it does.

The pending bill would mean an increased cost upon the Federal Treasury, directly and indirectly, of $1,279,000,000 annually. I think that is a vital question. The amount involved is as much as the total cost of the Government was in 1916. Most of us remember the first billion-dollar Congress. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] probably knows more about it than I do. I think it was in 1915 or 1916 that we had the first billion-dollar Congress. The amount involved in this bill is one-fourth the total cost of the Government when I came into the Senate in 1932. At that time the total cost of the Government was $4,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. President, by reason of my efforts to obtain information so that we could write a fair, reasonable, and equitable bill, I have been put in the position of being opposed to fair increases, and the Washington newspapers have never lost an opportunity to try to make the Federal employees in Washington believe that I have taken that position. But that is not true. I advocated as forcefully as I could the 15 percent or 16 percent increase which was made on July 1 last. I have the privilege of representing a State which, I believe, has the largest percentage of Federal employees, in proportion to its population, of any State of the Union; and I wish to say that I am proud to have those people—the great majority of whom are splendid, fine men and women—working for the Federal Government.

I favor now an increase in proportion to the cost of living since 1921. I have said time and time again, and I do not take back one word of it, that I think there are entirely too many employees in the Federal Government. The Senator from California differs with me on that point. Of course, he is entitled to his opinion, and I am entitled to mine. I firmly believe that we should reduce the personnel of the Government, which is in excess of 3,000,000, as it now stands, to less than one-half that number, and that then the affairs of our Government would be conducted in a more efficient manner than they are now conducted. I believe in reducing the number of employees to a minimum and then paying the number who remain a fair and livable salary. I have worked to that end, Mr. President, notwithstanding the criticism which have been made of me, and I shall continue to do so. I believe that the Virginia constituents whom I represent, comprising many thousands of Government employees, feel that I am doing what I can to see that they obtain justice, and at the same time to do justice to the Government and to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia to the fact that I have never by any remark expressed any implication of criticism against the Senator from Virginia or in any way have doubted his sincerity.

Mr. BYRD. I did not mean at all that the Senator from California was doing it.

Mr. DOWNEY. In all fairness, I think both the Senator and I might agree that while there have been colloquies and controversies and perhaps some criticism directed against the chairman of the committee, the truth of the matter is that the chairman of the committee believes there should be a certain increase and the Senator from Virginia believes that the increase should be substantially less than that.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is the controversy between us.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has correctly stated it. I did not in any way intend to suggest that the Senator from California had criticized me, because so far as I know he has not done so. The only criticism I have made of the Senator from California is in regard to the manner in which he, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, has conducted the hearings and in regard to his anxiety and haste in reporting this vitally important bill without holding adequate hearings, and then, after reporting it, offering a substitute for a bill which 5 out of 10 members of the committee had requested him to report. It should be said that I voted against it. I assert, Mr. President, that that is an unheard of procedure in the Senate.

There are 16 classifications of the civil service, embracing all kinds of employees, including charwomen. Then there are the judicial branch and the legislative branch. I believe that a vital question of the kind which confronts us at the present time should be settled in committee instead of being settled by discussing it on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and myself were compelled to offer in the Senate a schedule of rates which had not been submitted to the committee because we had no opportunity to do so. Instead of a flat increase of 20 percent, we favored a graduated increase. The Senator from California knew that.

Mr. President, I have no criticism to make personally of the Senator from California, but I believe—and I say so from 12 years of experience as a Member of the Senate—that I have never known of a chairman of a committee to refuse a substantial membership of the committee an opportunity to examine witnesses. I shall not discuss the matter further. But I know that when a member of any committee of which I have ever heard, desired to have witnesses appear before the committee, he was permitted to have the witnesses come and give their testimony. We wanted certain witnesses to be given the permission to appear before the committee, and the Senator from California thought that such a request was arbitrary on the part of the Senator from Virginia. The Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Iowa, and I protested in the report against the witnesses not having been called.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the disposal of the pending bill. During the pendency of this bill, the Senator from California, of his own accord, has from time to time permitted other legislation to be considered by the Senate. That statement is in no way a criticism of him or his zeal in connection with

the dispatch of the pending bill. The other legislation to which I have referred was of vital importance, and I think the Senator from California properly yielded in order that the legislation might be considered. As I have said, I have no desire to delay consideration of the pending bill. I stated yesterday that I was willing that an hour be agreed upon at which time the bill could be disposed of. However, an objection was made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and an agreement could not be reached.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, with the objective of expediting the handling of the pending bill, which I know the Senator from Virginia and myself wish to do, may we not have some kind of an understanding that the Senator from Virginia will present his amendment? In order to clear the air I will withdraw the pending amendment, and if the Senator from Virginia does not desire to present his amendment we can then proceed to vote on the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator from Virginia and other Senators associated with him have the right to know whether the Senator from California proposes to offer a substitute for the bill. If he intends to do so I prefer to offer my amendment to the substitute. I saw in the newspapers this morning that the Senator had announced he would make a determined fight in behalf of a substitute, which he himself would present to the Senate for the entire bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as I have already stated, the bill as reported to the Senate provided for a straight 20-percent increase on top of the 16-percent increase in basic pay which we gave last spring. The distinguished Senator has lying on the desk an amendment providing for a totally different formula. I may say that perhaps it is a better formula than mine, but it is different. He would repeal the basic increase which was granted last July, and in lieu thereof and in addition thereto he would give, as I understand it, an increase of 36 percent upon the first $1,200, 18 percent on all sums from $1,200 to $4,600, and 9 percent on all sums above $4,600. I have before me a calculation, which I am very sure is correct, showing——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield in order that the Senator may explain my amendment. I think I should have the opportunity of explaining it myself.

Mr. DOWNEY. What I desire to say is that in the interest of clarity, I believe that the matter would be much more clearly understood by the Senate if I should meet the Senator on his own formula and present the kind of increases which I think should be granted over the rates which existed prior to last July, in order only to meet the present standard of living. In other words, in the amendment which I intend to present, if it seems proper to do so, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, I am seeking only a sufficient advancement in the various brackets to bring all employees from a practical standpoint up to a cost-of-living standard, plus something above that for the workers in the very lowest groups. Perhaps the Senator from Virginia has better judgment with regard to this matter than I have.

Mr. BYRD. I would not say that I have any better judgment.

Mr. DOWNEY. However, if it seems strategic to do so, it is my intention to offer the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from California changes front too often. There is nothing personal in that statement, and the RECORD will so show. When on December 15 the Senator offered his proposal, the RECORD will show that he said the formula proposed by the Senator from Virginia was better than his. Yet, only a few moments ago, he said that while the Senator from Virginia was not trying to confuse the Senate, the effect of his amendment was to confuse the Senate, and he commended the graduated basis.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, what the chairman of the committee intended to say was this: It would be confusing if the Senate had before it the original bill providing for a 20-percent increase over the basic allowance which had been granted, and then were presented with an amendment of the Senator from Virginia cast in an entirely different form.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think that is the most remarkable statement that I have heard for a long time. In other words, no Senator should offer an amendment which differs from the policy set forth in the pending bill. I do not approve of the flat increase proposed by the Senator from California, and never have approved it, and therefore I offer the amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am not complaining about that. I merely say that in order that the Senate may understand the two parallel proposals, the chairman of the committee intends to offer an amendment as a substitute for the Senator's amendment, cast in the same type of formula as his is cast.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator himself offered a substitute on December 15 for his own bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator that that was done with the belief that the Senator from Virginia was prepared then to offer his amendment.

Mr. BYRD. No; I told the Senator from California that I would not offer my amendment until he had offered his substitute.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not a member of the Civil Service Committee, and therefore I have not had the opportunity which would go with membership on that committee to make a study of the complex wage structure of the Government service. But I do not believe that it is necessary for any Member of the Senate to be a member of the Committee on Civil Service, or to make a very detailed study of this situation in order to know that today there are thousands upon thousands of employees of the Federal Government who are trying to live on wages and salaries which are disgraceful to a republic having the resources and productive capacity of ours.

The appeal which I should like to make to the Senator from California, who is in charge of this bill, and to the Senator from Virginia, who is a member of the committee, is that they do not become involved in a controversy over parliamentary procedure of who goes first or who goes second with his amendment, because the employees in the lower-income brackets who are working in Government service are, as every Member of the Senate knows, suffering as a result of the tremendous increase which has taken place in the cost of living.

The able Senator from Virginia and those who support him have from the beginning, as I understand, acknowledged that there should be some action taken in behalf of the employees of the Government, and the Senator from California has so stated over and over again on the floor. It is to be presumed that the Members of the Senate can evaluate these two amendments after they have been adequately explained by their proponents, and it seems to me a question of tweedledum and tweedledee as to whether the Senator from California offers his amendment and the Senator from Virginia offers his as a substitute, or vice versa. Even if there is some advantage to be gained depending on whether we vote on this matter from the standpoint of the Senator from Virginia or that of the Senator from California, affirmatively or negatively, depending upon how we stand upon this issue, I urge, prior to the Christmas season, that the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on this question after all this debate. I appeal to the two able Senators to agree upon some form of parliamentary procedure, and let us get down to the question of voting on these proposals. We have debated this subject on and off for weeks, and I make this appeal in all sincerity to both the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from California.

I say again, it is to be presumed that Senators will understand the main issues involved in the amendments as between that of the Senator from California and that of the Senator from Virginia, and I personally do not believe there is any great advantage either way, whichever proceeds first. But in the name of the employees of the Government who are suffering as a result of our failure to act upon this measure, I appeal to these two able Senators to get together and agree upon procedure, and let us, after a reasonable amount of debate, come to some determination of the issue.

I thank the Senator from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I repeat what I have said, that when the chairman of the committee reports a bill and then offers a complete substitute for it, the substitute should be perfected before amendments are considered. I think that is the proper parliamentary procedure.

If the Senator from California intends, as he announced in the press this morning, to offer a complete substitute for the committee bill, then it should be

offered, and other Members of the Senate should have the right to amend it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Wisconson, who as usual has made a powerful and logical appeal. I personally wish to abide by exactly what he has said. As chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, reporting the bill, I desire to state to the Senator that I think the Senator from Virginia is correct. I probably do not have the ethical right to offer an amendment in the form of a substitute for the bill. On the other hand, if the distinguished Senator from Virginia offers his amendment as a substitute, as a Senator I think I have a right then to seek to amend his amendment to bring it more in line with the committee bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me further?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With all due respect to the statement made by the Senator from California—and I understand the position he is in—it seems to me clear that the Senator from California, in the manner in which he reported the bill, cannot expect to get a vote upon the bill as it stands without some amendment being offered to it. The opportunity will not come to the Senate to vote for the bill as reported from the committee until all amendments in the nature of substitutes have been disposed of.

The employees of the Government who are suffering, especially those in the lower income brackets, cannot eat parliamentary procedure. The only benefit they can get is for the Senate ultimately to get down to business and settle the issues which are involved.

Any Senator who wishes to vote for the bill as it came from the committee can do so by voting against all substitutes, and thus arrive at a point, if he has a majority, where he can vote on the bill itself.

Since it is evident that there is to be a substitute offered, and that there is to be a substitute offered for the substitute, I hope the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from California will be able shortly and immediately to arrive at a conclusion, and let the Senate proceed to take some action. If a majority of the Senate do not wish any increase for these employees, they can vote the measure down, but I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who does not acknowledge that we are doing injustice to these employees of the Government, who do not have the right to strike, and who must, in the last analysis, take what the Congress and the Executive determine shall be their wage. I therefore hope that these two able Senators will be able to agree.

I repeat, I do not think anything will be lost to either side, as a matter of advantage. I wish to appeal to the Senator from California, since he is in charge of the bill, and since I know of his interest in the plight of the underpaid persons in the Government service, to take whatever action is necessary so that we may proceed to get to the issues in this matter and resolve them one way or the other.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me so that I may ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me ask the Senator from California if I have the situation correctly in my mind. As I understand, the Senator from California said a moment ago that if the Senator from Virginia proposes his amendment, the Senator from California then intends to propose a substitute for that amendment, which will follow substantially the same formula, except at a different rate. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. I anticipate I may do that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that the Senator from California stated just a moment ago that he did not approve of or agree with the formula principle set up in the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, that he preferred the straight across-the-board 20-percent increase contained in the original bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President, that is not correct. At least, I did not mean to say that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. DOWNEY. I very much prefer the 20-percent increase to the increase suggested by the Senator from Virginia, but I should be entirely happy to follow the general formula of the Senator from Virginia. I do not think it makes any difference, except I say his rates are much too low.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator from California to say a while ago that he preferred the original bill, which provided a straight 20-percent increase right across the board in all classifications, and that he would be willing to drop everything and accept that provision at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I should like very much to have that bill, and very much prefer that bill, because it would give a greater increase to the Federal employees than either of the amendments which are being discussed. I do not think it is very important which formula we follow, but I do think the amount the Federal workers will get is of vast importance.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was moved to ask these questions by what apparently would be the peculiar position of the Senator from California if he proposed his substitute to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia and his substitute prevailed. Then he would find himself with a bill on his hands which I understood him to say he did not approve of, and he would be using that bill to discard a bill which he had previously announced he favored.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator has misunderstood me. I have no objection to the formula used by the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I am very unhappy over what I consider to be the meager results of the formula.

If the Senator from Virginia will further yield, we are approaching a time when we cannot expect a quorum. I think I am going far beyond anything that ethics require me to do, but I will meet the request of the Senator from Wisconsin. I will agree with the distinguished Senator from Virginia, if it is what he wants, and is the only thing that will bring action, that I will not present any amendment or substitute to his amendment. If he will call it up, debate it, and then allow a short statement from me, we can proceed to vote on his amendment, if that is what he desires. Otherwise, if he desires to lay his amendment aside and vote in the next hour on the bill itself, I shall be happy to do that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending which I think will have to be acted on.

Mr. DOWNEY. If that is the Commission amendment, I have withdrawn it.

Mr. BYRD. Has the amendment that was pending been withdrawn?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I stated that in order not to delay the Senator in the consideration of his amendment I would withdraw the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has taken the position that the Senator from California, the chairman of the committee, should perfect the bill, and, therefore, in the event he desired to offer a substitute, that the substitute should be offered first. Is it the intention of the Senator from California not to offer his substitute even though the amendment of the Senator from Virginia prevails?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am not going to bind myself not to offer amendments later on. I will state to the Senator that I will not offer any amendment to his amendment, but will allow it to be voted on by the Senate without offering any substitute for it or any amendment to it.

Mr. BYRD. But if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia should be adopted it would be a substitute for the bill. If that amendment should be adopted, would that conclude the proceedings or would the issue then be between the bill as the Senator from California, as chairman of the committee, reported it from the committee, and the substitute which the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Connecticut propose?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Senator from California is not willing to bind himself further than this: He has agreed that he will not present any amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia, but will allow a speedy vote upon that amendment. The Senator from California cannot bind himself further than that.

Mr. President, I think it might very well be that then it would be a question between the bill as originally reported and the bill as amended.

Mr. BYRD. In view of the fact that the Senator from California has already offered a substitute, which was withdrawn by him, what is his objection to offering it again? I think the chairman of the committee, in the position he is now in, should perfect the bill which is before the Senate, and then if other Senators choose to do so they may offer other amendments.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think the criticism which was made of me by some Senators who oppose the bill that probably the chairman of a committee does not have a right to offer a substitute to the bill is correct, and I am not going to offer any amendment as a substitute for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. Unless there are amendments to be offered, am I correct in my understanding that the bill has reached the stage of engrossment and third reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no amendments pending. If there are no amendments to be offered, the bill is now at the stage where the Senate is ready to consider the question of the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill is still in the amendment stage, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but Senators should present amendments immediately if they want them considered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, carrying out the understanding with the Senator from California that a substitute will not be offered for the amendment, I now offer an amendment in behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], which takes the place of two amendments which have already been offered and have been printed. I may say, Mr. President, that there is no change in the language of the amendment. The language is just the same, except that the two amendments are consolidated into one amendment.

I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning on page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 16 on page 3, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That (a) the first sentence of section 405 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "Each of the existing rates of basic compensation set forth in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except those affected by subsection (b) of this section, is hereby increased by 36 percent of that part thereof which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part thereof which is in excess of $4,600 per annum."

(b) (1) The proviso to the fifth paragraph under the heading "Crafts, protective, and custodial service" in section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That charwomen working part time be paid at the rate of 88 cents an hour, and head charwomen at the rate of 93 cents an hour."

(2) Such section is amended so as to provide the following rates of compensation for positions in the clerical-mechanical service:

Grade 1, 88 to 95 cents an hour.
Grade 2, $1.01 to $1.09 an hour.
Grade 3, $1.17 to $1.23 an hour.
Grade 4, $1.31 to $1.45 an hour.

(c) The increase in existing rates of basic compensation provided by this section shall not be construed to be an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 7 (b) (1) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

SEC. 2. Section 602 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words "section 405 of this act", wherever they occur in such section, a comma and the words "as amended."

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in section 503, each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional compensation computed as follows: 36 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $4,600 per annum."

(b) The first sentence of section 521 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Each officer and employee in or under the judicial branch to whom this title applies shall be paid additional basic compensation computed as follows: 36 percent of that part of his rate of basic compensation which is not in excess of $1,200 per annum, plus 18 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $1,200 per annum but not in excess of $4,600 per annum, plus 9 percent of that part of such rate which is in excess of $4,600 per annum."

SEC. 4. Section 603 (b) of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945 is amended by inserting after the words "by reason of the enactment of this act" the words "or any amendment thereto."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment which has just been offered. Prior to the remarks which I have to make I should like to read a brief statement delivered to me by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who was called away by illness in his family, and who asked me to read this statement in his behalf with respect to the amendment and the bill. The statement of the Senator from New Jersey is as follows:

I have carefully examined the graduated scale of increases in wages for Federal employees, as presented by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and it is my earnest hope that the Senate may take action upon that amendment and adopt it in order that the relief and compensation suggested therein can be given to those affected by the amendment and the bill without delay.

I do not believe there is a Senator who does not wish to do the right thing for Government employees as related to all other people in the United States.

The fact that this amendment does not go so far as the recomendation of the bill presented by the Senator from California, chairman of the Civil Service Committee, is not nearly so important as the granting of some prompt relief to those who need it at the present time in connection with the cost of living.

I am not going into a long discussion of the merits of the case, but to my mind this amendment of the Senator from Virginia brings the compensation of all those getting $2,000 a year or less up to a point where their total increase will either be in excess of or approximately equal to the increased cost of living, as furnished by the best agencies we have to rely upon.

I should like to point out that our big job is not to increase wages and salaries, but rather to start production of all things needed by the people and stimulate this production in such a way that we will control the cost of living rather than let the cost of living get completely out of control and then try to catch up with it by increase upon increase in wages and salaries.

Increasing wages and salaries, and I might even say excessive earnings by those in business and industry, only leads to higher costs of all the things required by each of us for a reasonable and comfortable living. By following such a process we feed the flames of inflation, and I have no predications to make as to whether continuing increases in wages and salaries can possibly bring about equity as related to living costs.

I am in favor of prompt increases as provided in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, and there is no better time to make those increases than right now. If this is accomplished now, our next move should be to study the whole situation further as related to all of these employees and all other employees in the United States pertaining to the present cost of living as well as the future cost of living.

Congress must try to do equity with all Government employees as related to other employees in business and industry throughout the United States.

If we pass this amendment today there is nothing to prevent our continuing our study with reference to Government employees; and the Congress will have power to raise their wages further if a careful and thorough study of the situation convinces us that justice to Government employees demands further consideration as to their compensation when the Congress reconvenes next year.

Again I emphasize that the thing which is quite as important as bringing the salaries up to the proper level is to use our best endeavors to keep the cost of living from running away from any salaries or wages which we may establish from time to time.

I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Virginia, and it is my earnest hope that this amendment, which brings relief in keeping with the increased cost of living to those in the brackets of compensation where it is most needed, should be passed by the Senate and promptly approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, that concludes the statement of the Senator from New Jersey, which he requested to have read.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Looking at the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Virginia, and the

Senator from Connecticut, and comparing it with the schedule submitted, the schedule stops at $9,895. Under the proposed amendment I do not see anything which would prevent a man receiving a salary of $10,000 from getting an increase of 9 and a fraction percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there is nothing in this amendment which would prevent it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The present law provides for a limit of $10,000, and this amendment would not repeal that section of the law.

Mr. LANGER. So the increase would be limited to salaries below $10,000? I may add that I have not previously seen the amendment, and have not had an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. BYRD. The present law provides that no salary in excess of $10,000 shall be paid without special enactment by Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That was the provision of the bill which we passed last July.

Mr. BYRD. I am told by the legislative counsel that the Classification Act covers salaries up to $9,800. But the present law provides that no salary in excess of $10,000 shall be paid, except pursuant to a special enactment by Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator from Virginia mind explaining the difference between his proposal and that of the Senator from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield for that purpose?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Iowa may propose to explain it himself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What was the question?

Mr. LANGER. I asked the distinguished Senator from Virginia to tell us the difference between his proposal and that of the Senator from California.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for that purpose. I do not yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me make a very brief explanation. The pending bill provides for a flat 20-percent increase. The proposal made by the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Connecticut, and the Senator from Virginia takes as a basis the increases made effective July 1, 1945. As the Senator from North Dakota will recall, since he is a member of the Civil Service Committee, and was very helpful, I may say, in arranging this graduated scale, that law provides that the first $1,200 shall be subject to an increase of 20 percent. From $1,200 to $4,600, the increase is 10 percent; and above $4,600 the increase is 5 percent.

This amendment follows the same formula. It combines the two increases. It goes back to the rates as they existed on June 30, 1945. For the first $1,200 there would be an increase of 36 percent. From $1,200 to $4,600 there would be an increase of 18 percent; and above $4,600 there would be an increase of 9 percent. The result is a graduated scale, which the Senator from North Dakota has always favored. There would be a total increase of 11 percent on the basis of existing salaries. If the Senator will examine the chart, he will see, for example, that in the lower brackets, a salary of $1,440 on June 30, 1945, prior to either increase, would be increased to $1,915, or an increase of 33 percent. An $1,800 salary would be increased to $2,340; a $2,000 salary to $2,576. A $2,400 salary would go up to $3,048, an increase of $648 since July 1. A $2,600 salary would go up to $3,284. A salary of $2,900 would go up to $3,638. A salary of $3,200 would be increased to $3,992, or an increase of $792. If the Senator will follow through, he will see that the employees in the upper brackets will obtain a combined increase of approximately 16 percent, whereas the employees in the lowest bracket will receive an increase of 36 percent.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that the legislative employees who now receive a 10 percent increase for overtime will continue to receive that increase. The amendment will not repeal that increase, although the committee bill would repeal it, as I understand. I think it is just to have the 10-percent increase for overtime continued, because all the other employees of the Government are on a 5-day week, whereas the legislative employees certainly work 5½ days a week. So the amendment would make the increase continue to be available to legislative employees; the present provision allowing an additional 10 percent for overtime, which was adopted on July 1, 1945, and was to continue to July 1, 1947, will not be disturbed.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a few days ago, for a few minutes at the end of the day, I undertook to discuss from the floor of the Senate some of the preliminaries to the Federal workers salary-increase proposals which have been made. I shall not repeat that discussion.

I wish to say that I am sure there has been recognition by every member of the Civil Service Committee, so far as I know, that the increase in the cost of living has run ahead of such increases in pay as Federal workers may have received. That fact was recognized last spring, when we had united agreement regarding an increase in salary for Federal employees. As I mentioned the other day, that increase was made hurriedly, because the bill came in late and it was desired to have it go into effect on the 1st of July 1945. Therefore, the increases were made according to a formula which was adopted at that time but was not entirely satisfactory because it did not equitably treat various classifications of Federal employees, under the theory of the bill.

The theory of that measure—and it is the theory of the pending measure, as I understand it—is to meet the injustice occurring because of the emergency increase in the cost of living. I have never felt in my own mind that the pending measure is for the purpose of providing a general reestablishment of the pay schedules of Federal workers. The bill has never been approached from that attitude by the committee. No evidence—or, at least, no substantial evidence, so far as I could judge during my service on the committee—has ever been introduced on that score, nor have we canvassed the situation at all in regard to the question of any general rearrangement of Federal pay schedules. We have devoted our time to approaching the subject with the thought that especially those in the lower salary brackets in the Federal service have been suffering hardship because the pay schedules are not quite in line. Last spring we provided a salary increase of approximately 16 percent—it was 15.8 or 15.9 percent, I believe—to Federal employees generally. That was the total amount of the increase. But because the cost of the necessities of life hits the employees receiving the smaller salaries so much harder than it does the other employees, because 100 percent of all that is paid the employee with the smaller salary goes for necessities, the committee unanimously adopted at that time a formula whereby salaries up to $1,200 would be increased by 20 percent; salaries between $1,200 and $4,600 would be increased by 10 percent; and salaries over $4,600 would be increased by 5 percent.

Sometime in September or October—I do not recall the exact date, but it is immaterial—the pending bill was introduced by the Senator from California. In it he proposed a flat 20-percent increase—an increase straight across the board—in the salaries of all Federal employees under the Classification Act. I think it goes without saying, and I do not believe the contrary can be argued very strongly, that what we do for the Classification Act employees we shall have to do for all the other Federal employees. It does not approach the first semblance of fairness to say that we shall increase the salaries of Federal employees in one group but shall not consider doing the same for those in the other groups. The postal group employees, the railroad group employees, the Wage Board employees, and all other Government employees are entitled to the same treatment. So what we do for the group of employees who come under the Classification Act will have to be done, in all fairness, for the remaining two and one-half million or so Government employees.

As I have pointed out, Mr. President, the bill thereby becomes a billion-dollar bill. It thereby involves an expenditure of $1,000,000,000 in excess of what we are now expending, when it applies all the way down the line, to all employees.

A moment ago I said that, so far as I am concerned, I have never considered this bill as one rearranging the comparative pay schedules of employees of the Federal Government. I think I am justified in that statement, because the committee has never so considered the bill. It is a hardship bill, we may say, a bill for the purpose of making corrections or adjustments in the salaries of Federal employees, in view of the increase in the cost of living.

Last spring we decided—and there was practically no opposition in either the Senate or the House—that a graduated scale, under the theory of meeting the

cost of living, was a good yardstick; and we provided for it in the law. I feel that the same kind of yardstick is just as good today, and that it is the only way by which Federal salaries can be adjusted equitably, fairly, and definitely so as to meet the increase in the cost of living.

Controversy has arisen as between two or three proposals. The bill of the Senator from California was referred to the Civil Service Committee. Very suddenly—I am not complaining about this particularly, but I am merely reciting what happened—on November 2 or the day before, committee meetings were held. They were held on the 2d, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th of November. On those days there was a prearranged list of witnesses. A day or two after the hearing on the 9th, several executive meetings of the committee were held; and 5 of the 10 members of the committee voted for a favorable report on the bill to the Senate. There has been a considerable amount of controversy and discussion here regarding what happened in the committee, and why. Perhaps that is not so important at the moment, but I think it is important to say that, so far as I am concerned, during the hearings I had no other thought than that when they were finished in respect to the various phases of this question, the committee then would begin to consider how to adjust the proposed legislation so as to meet the increases in the cost of living which the testimony given at the hearings showed had occurred. Let me say that I attended every one of the hearings. However, opportunity to develop such adjustments was never given. I wrote to the chairman of the Civil Service Committee—I shall not read the letter now—regarding my attitude and my ideas about the matter, and protesting the way the bill was handled in the committee. My protest was largely directed to the apparent great speed with which the bill was hurried through the committee in the course of about a week's time, even though it will have repercussions throughout the Federal service and will involve actual expenditures of approximately $1,000,000,000 or $1,200,000,000.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure the Senator will agree in all frankness that the very exhaustive hearings held last spring on the pay bill developed a large volume of data, all of which were pertinent in respect to the issues involved in the pending bill, and all of which should have made every Member of the Senate completely conversant with every fact it is necessary to have in mind in order to decide this issue.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the Senator's opinion; he is entitled to have it. But let me call the attention of the Senate to the hearings. If any Member of the Senate will take the time and trouble to read the volume of hearings held on this bill, he will find that the entire period, with only occasional diversions, was devoted primarily to considering the question of increases in the salaries of employees in the higher brackets. I think the hearings are devoid of any evidence regarding the need for increases in the salaries of workers in the lower brackets or any evidence regarding what the amount of such increases should be.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure the Senator does not want to cast a reflection upon the great group of witnesses which his statement would seem to cast. As I recall, more than half of the time was consumed by representatives of great labor groups who testified almost wholly in favor of the proposed raises. Moreover, all witnesses, as I recall, expressed strong approval of the 20-percent increase. More than one-half of the hearings was devoted to the 20-percent pay increase, and if the Senator will examine the hearings he will see that that statement is true.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have examined the hearings; and I invite other Members of the Senate to read the hearings. When they have done so they will have found an emphasis, both by Government employees, their representatives, and heads of labor organizations, being applied in great measure to doubling the compensation of the Members of Congress, increasing the salaries of officials in the executive departments of the Government to $20,000 a year, and creating new classifications of salaries between $12,000 and $15,000 a year. They will also find a very meager portion of the testimony, and with very little emphasis in it, being devoted to the needs of the little fellow who has received in full the impact of the increase in the cost of living.

After the hearings were concluded, it was my understanding that the committee was about to go into some other phase of the question. It was also my understanding that we were to go into the question of how to graduate the increase and make of it an equitable salary scale. We did not do so. By the use of proxies—and I make this statement with no complaint—further hearings and investigation into the subject were denied, and by a vote of 5 out of 10 members of the committee, including proxies, the bill was reported to the Senate without alterations or changes, and without adequate consideration having been given to the important questions involved.

As a result of that action, and following the pattern of last spring which seemed to work very well, the Senator from Virginia very zealously devoted a great deal of time to the calculation of a formula by which employees in the lower brackets, for example, would receive a greater percentage of increase in salary than employees in the higher brackets. That was done on the theory that the employees in the lower brackets were in greater need of an increase, and that the proposed legislation was to correct a hardship and to meet an emergency.

The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] and I have joined with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who worked zealously. However, I assert that the lion's share of the work in connection with the schedule was performed by the Senator from Virginia, who repeatedly stated that while adjustments should be made we should not go wild in making them.

Mr. President, we do not have to go any further than the report of the committee in order to ascertain what was in the minds of the members of the committee when it started its work. We have heard from the proponents of the original bill that they desire to adjust salaries so as to meet the present cost of living. They want the present salaries of Government employees to be so adjusted that the employees will be enabled to meet the increase which has taken place in the cost of living. Therefore, they propose a 20-percent across-the-board flat increase. Let us see what the report, which was either written by the Senator from California or under his direction as chairman of the committee, has to say. On page 2 of the report, we find the following language:

Figures brought out at the hearing—

Meaning the hearing of last spring and the one held subsequently—

showed that the average annual straight-time earnings of Federal employees covered by the proposed act in January 1941 was $1,929. Following the passage of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, the average annual straight-time salary was $2,340.

In other words, in 1941 the average of straight-time earnings of the Federal employees, across the board, was $1,929. Today, under the act which went into effect the 1st of July last, that average is $2,340, together with the other emoluments which go with Federal employment, such as retirement pensions, vacations, certain medical and health attention, and other related matters.

Continuing with the report:

Judge John C. Collet, Stabilization Administrator, was quoted as stating that the cost of living since January 1941 had gone up 30 percent and that straight-time hourly earnings in the majority of industries are currently more than 30 percent above the January 1941 levels. Judge Collet's figures have been corroborated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and reveal that the increase in the cost of living has been more than enough to cancel the increase received by Federal employees under the provisions of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

Incidentally, we admitted that at the hearings. We admitted that an adjustment was needed.

I continue with a very important part of the report:

With the increase under the 1945 Pay Act, average straight-time annual earnings of the Federal workers have increased only 21.3 percent.

Mr. President, this is the report which was sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee. I do not know that he wrote the report with his own pen, but he was chairman of the committee, and the report was written under his sponsorship.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me finish my statement, and then I will yield.

The report continues:

On this calculation, an increase of 7.2 percent of the proposed 20 percent is necessary to bring straight-time annual earnings in line with the cost of living.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the report which was sponsored by the Senator from California, in support of the bill which he has proposed, he states as unequivocally as it can be stated that only 7.2 percent, based on what the Federal employees are now receiving, is required in order to bring their income up to the present level of the cost of living. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that that is what the report says the bill started out to do, and that is what the committee intended that it should do, namely, bring the present pay schedule up to the present cost of living.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not think the Senator is being entirely frank and accurate in his statement. At the time we held the hearings it was the official position of the Government that the increased cost of living had advanced 30 percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was just about to come to that point, but the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOWNEY. It is now the official position of the Government—and I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has accepted it—that the cost of living has increased 33 percent.

I may also say that the Senator from Iowa has not stated that the figures which he has read were based on the straight-time average annual earnings, and that the proper calculation—in the opinion of the chairman, at least—should be on the basis of straight-time hourly earnings. Inasmuch as the employees of the Government are now working 2½ percent more time than they were previously working, I think that factor should also be taken into consideration. The first increase which was given was a graduated one, and the employees in the lowest bracket received 20 percent more money while the employees in the upper bracket received only 9 percent more money. Consequently, an increase of approximately 24 percent will be required in order to bring the employees in the upper bracket up to the 33-percent increase in the cost of living.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, from the sounds which are coming from the other side of the Chamber it sounds as though the west wind were blowing.

The Senator from California is correct in his statement that since the publication of the report from which I have read certain governmental agencies have altered their figures and now claim that the increase in the cost of living is 33 percent. If that be true, it would alter the figures in the report by 3 percent which, in turn, would make necessary an increase of approximately 10 percent over what the employees are now receiving in order to bring them up to the present cost of living.

Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART], and myself, the over-all increase would be 11 percent. It would be 1 percent over the necessary increase to meet the cost of living. But it has the feature of being graduated, as stated a moment ago, so that the employees in the lowest bracket would receive a 13.3 percent increase above their present pay, or a total of 36 percent over their 1941 pay. That would bring them up either to 6 percent or 3 percent above the increase in the cost of living.

In the case of the higher brackets, for instance, under the pending amendment an employee receiving $8,000 would be increased to $9,350. In other words, with a 16-percent increase over his 1941 pay he would get $1,350 more cash in his pocket each year to meet the increased cost of living. If the bill is sound, if it is an emergency bill, if it is to meet the emergency of the increased cost of goods, clothing, food, and so on, then here is a man with a salary of $8,000 getting an increase of only 16 percent, but he receives $1,350 more cash at the end of the year to meet the rise in the cost of necessities.

Yesterday, the Senator from California produced a budget, which he argued at great length, based on a salary of $5,390. Copies of the budget were put on the desks of all the Members of the Senate, and there are certain classifications in it which all add up to the result that on this budget the particular employee is losing $1,971 every year on this $5,390 budget.

If the man were receiving $1,500 a year he would lose about $4,000 more than that each year, if he lived on the scale of living indicated. If he were getting $3,000 he would lose perhaps $2,000 or $2,500 a year living on that scale. This man apparently has picked a scale of living which is not justified by a $5,000 income.

If the Senator from California would continue his argument on this budget he might well say that a man receiving $1,400 should have $7,000 in salary in order to enable him to live in the same class house, to have the same conveniences, and enjoy the same luxuries. I see little reason why on the basis of the analysis we could not say that a $1,500 or $2,000 employee should not have his pay raised to $7,000 in order to meet the particular budget which the Senator from California submitted.

This country has been built on the theory that people have to live within their incomes, and have to earn in order to pay for what they want to acquire. Therefore I should say, so far as that budget is concerned, it is not evidence of any value in this particular case, unless it be evidence that the employee in question was actually living beyond the income he was receiving.

The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is not only eminently fair, but it gives an increased percentage for those in the lower brackets, because they need dollars to meet the increased cost of living just as the man in the high brackets does, but the same percentage of increase in the low brackets as in the high gives less dollars, comparatively, to the little fellow than it gives to the man in the high brackets, so that if the flat-percentage theory is used, the man in the high brackets has more dollars to meet the cost of living. I am of the opinion that among those in the higher brackets there is nowhere near the difference in the increased cost of living as there is in the difference of salary. In other words, a man in the high brackets uses a far lower percentage of his income to meet the cost of living than a man in the low brackets. That is the whole philosophy of the amendment, that is the whole philosophy of the graduated pay scale.

Mr. President, I think that is sound. I think it is equitable and fair. I think it does the job we have to do, and one we want to do. I think it meets the emergency situation, and it does not rearrange the comparative pay schedules between the various classes and classifications of the civil-service employment.

Mr. President, I see no argument whatsoever for a 20-percent across-the-board increase in pay unless we are proposing to rearrange the whole basic pay structure of the Federal Government. That is the only justification for a flat across-the-board increase, and I do not think the problem should be approached in that way. I see every justification for equalizing the increased costs and for equalizing the losses and the hardships Federal employees in the lower brackets have to suffer.

We have talked about the necessity for speed in enacting this proposed legislation. While I recognize that the chairman of a committee does not have complete and autocratic control over his committee, yet he is very influential, and when a committee chairman speaks out positively as to the probable time when legislation will be considered, we can usually assume that he is about right. I recall that a few weeks ago the chairman of the committee in the House which will have charge of the pending legislation, and which perhaps has similar proposals under consideration now, made the statement that in any event his committee would not consider the subject until some time late next spring. Somewhere I have a newspaper clipping alleging that to be his statement, and I presume it to be true that he did make the statement.

Mr. President, if that be the case, then we could far better have spent a few additional days in the committee, perhaps 2 or 3 weeks, going into the various phases of the pending bill in order to bring out an agreed bill, a bill which would be defensible in all its provisions, and one which I think this body would have very little trouble passing. As the matter stands now, it is my opinion that the overwhelming number of the Members of the Senate are confused about the whole proposal. Here we have a bill which comes from the Committee on Civil Service, and a great number of amendments have been offered; for instance, the congressional pay amendment, the amendment providing increased pay for the heads of executive

departments, an amendment proposing increases substantially doubling the salaries of Federal judges, and three or four other amendments. Every one of those amendments was presented to the Committee on Civil Service, and was either not acted upon by the committee, or not seriously considered from the standpoint of being voted out when the bill was reported. Yet they are offered as amendments to the bill.

The Senator from California immediately filed a graduated schedule of pay practically as a substitute for the bill, and after arguing it for at least a day, and after having discussed it prior to that time at length on the floor of the Senate, withdrew it.

Today again an amendment is brought forward proposing to set up a commission to study the whole question of Federal employment and Federal pay. It has not been considered by the committee. Its ramifications and its provisions have never been considered and have never been passed upon.

Altogether, we have been trying on the floor of the Senate to alter minutely and change a measure dealing with a subject which is involved in statistics which are actuarial, without benefit of considered study by the committee, and without the benefit of any solidarity or any agreement upon the methods.

Mr. President, there are one or two other matters I should like to mention. One is that the entire argument which has been presented in behalf of the bill as it was reported by the committee has centered around the cost of living in Washington. Apparently the pay schedule of the entire United States is going to be gaged by the standards in Washington, which everyone knows are fantastic, so far as living costs are concerned. That matter was not gone into in the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might say that in the committee hearings full data so far as numbers were concerned were presented as to the population areas in which Federal personnel are now working. I might say that as high as 80 or 85 percent come from the high-cost areas. The Senator is totally wrong in his last statement. In the State of California there are 317,000 Federal workers. In my opinion, living conditions are more difficult for the workers there and costs are higher. New York State, with its great cities, has the next larger number and conditions are practically the same there. Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Dayton, Norfolk, and other great areas, contain an overwhelming number of Federal employees. In my opinion at least 75 percent or 80 percent of them live in cities or in areas where conditions are approximately the same as presently in Washington, D. C. If the Senator is interested, he will find all the figures in the last table printed in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am interested. I have examined the tables. The Senator from California has been very courteous, and he is quite thoughtful about these various matters. I merely want to suggest to him that it might be well in his own interest to expunge from the RECORD completely the statement that living conditions are not good in California. I do not believe the chambers of commerce of southern California would like to have that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, that remark, I suppose, is meant to be facetious, but our returning veterans are having the most desperate time finding homes in all the metropolitan areas in California; as a matter of fact, a more difficult time than in any other State. Costs of living have increased there perhaps more than they have in Washington, D. C. With the Senator's permission, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this time the table showing the population categories in which reside our Federal workers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well.

Mr. DOWNEY. In cities of 500,000 and over, 44 percent; in cities of 250,000 to 500,000, 9 percent; in cities of from 100,000 to 250,000, 23 percent; in cities of from 25,000 to 100,000, 10 percent; in cities of from 5,000 to 25,000, 6 percent; and in cities under 5,000, only 8 percent of the Federal workers reside. Only 24 percent reside in cities of 100,000 population and under. The remainder are in the great metropolitan areas.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am sorry that in the opinion of the Senator from California I am so wrong about my conclusions respecting the bill. I have tried to bolster them by statements from his own report on the bill itself and by figures.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is there any statement in the report that substantial numbers of Federal employees are to be found in low-cost areas?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I was not discussing that point. The Senator has repeatedly said that I am completely wrong in my statement. I think he has made that statement with respect to three or four matters. I was merely passing on the subject in a general way. If I am wrong the record will correct me. If I am right, the record will make it clear. The point is, Mr. President, that these tables were put into the record after the hearings were concluded, and that while requests were made when the hearings first began that these data be brought to the committee so that we could look further into the matter, the committee never went into this subject, never made any particular examination of it. A few nebulous statements were made about it, but there was no examination into this particular phase of Federal employment so far as the committee hearings themselves were concerned. I ask the Senator from California whether that statement is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is correct, but, if the Senator will yield, I should like to make this additional statement. Mr. Flemming, representative of the Civil Service Commission, was in the committee room with our attorney and with our clerk, and Mr. Flemming, in obedience to the wishes and the demands of the committee, had these figures there with him. At that time the request was made of the chairman that we proceed with an investigation of regional wage discrimination, and the number of personnel in every agency of the Government. Upon the statement of the chairman that he did not think we should proceed with that sort of an investigation, the other Senators requested Mr. Flemming to leave the committee room and stated they would not participate any longer in the hearing. Mr. Flemming was not requested to present that data, and the Senators said they would not participate any longer in the hearing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On page 17 of the hearing, Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on the first day of the hearing had this to say:

> Senator BYRD. There is another thing which I think is extremely important. That is the question of the varying costs of living in different communities.
>
> I think we discussed that subject at the last meeting.

The Senator referred to the last meeting before this particular meeting.

> Did you make any investigations of the difference in the cost of living between Washington and, for example, Winchester, where I live? Have you investigated the differences in the cost of living between Washington, D. C., and other places in the country?

That question was addressed to Mr. Flemming of the Civil Service Commission.

> Mr. FLEMMING. No; we have not. The Bureau of Labor Statistics might have those figures.

Does that correspond, Mr. President, with the statement of the Senator from California that Mr. Flemming had these figures in his pocket with him when he was present in the committee? The fact is that they were requested, and Mr. Flemming agreed later, and I think within a page or two of the hearings beyond where I read it will be found that he said he would look them up and try to get them together and present them to the committee. But the figures were never presented to the committee or were never placed in the committee hearings until after they were concluded and the bill had been voted out, and we had no opportunity to examine into them or to make any determination on that score.

Mr. President, I shall now quote certain figures, not by way of opposition to reasonable increases or adjustments in the salaries of the Federal employees, but to show what public employment is in this country and what the rates of pay are. I am not going to comment on the justice of these things, but I am going to show that there is a differential, and the figures I shall give come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In the case of the Federal Government the figures are as of July 1 last. In the case of the States the figures are as of December 31 last.

The total United States Government pay roll for the year ending June 30, 1945, was $7,327,000,000. That includes the classified service, the postal employees and the so-called Wage Board employees.

The number on the rolls as of June 30, 1941, or July 1, was 2,915,472 in the United States, and 659,200 outside. On July 1 that was the group whose compensation made up the $2,400 average Federal salary.

Let us now see what the States of the Union have been doing: I think there has been no widespread alteration in State pay schedules since the first of last January, but these are the facts as given to me by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, so far as States and subdivisions of States are concerned, including, as I requested, the counties and municipalities and townships, and all the subdivisions of States.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics information and estimate for the quarter ending December 31, 1944, was that there were school employees in the States to the number of 1,262,000, and there were other employees in the States—administrative and executive employees—to a total of 1,785,000. The total number of employees was 3,050,000. The total pay roll of the States, including the schools and including the executive and administrative employees of the State governments and their subdivisions, was $3,129,000,000. The average pay, therefore, of the State employees and of the employees of all State subdivisions, was $1,026 per annum each.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield in a moment. I said at the outset of this comparison that I am neither defending that pay scale nor condemning it. That is not necessarily a part of the argument, except that it does show, rightly or wrongly, that the Federal employee is almost 240 percent better off on the average pay than the employees of the public governments in our States.

I might say for the information of the Senate that for a considerable period of time I have believed that our States and their subdivisions have paid woefully inadequate salaries to their public servants, with especial emphasis on salaries of school teachers. I have no defense for the low scale. But the point is that on the average the Federal employee is today 240 percent better off than State employees. That is, if we consider the average pay of the State employee as 100 percent, the pay of the Federal worker is 240 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I must admit that those figures are very surprising, dismal, and shocking to me. I assume that they are accurate, but I should like to ask the Senator if it is not possible that the average is brought down by part-time workers. Is it possible that the public agencies of America, including our school districts, pay an average wage of only approximately $1,000 a year? Can that be true?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that I believe that the average pay of school teachers throughout the Nation is inexcusably and criminally low. So far as that portion of the statistics is concerned, I can only say to the Senator that I cannot verify the figures. I requested that the statistics be obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. They were telephoned to my office, and I took them down in pencil. The Bureau said that it did not have information which it could say was 100-percent accurate. These figures are based upon quarterly estimates made from reports received by the Bureau. There may be some slight variations. I believe that the figures are accurate within a percentage point or two. A difference of a percentage point or two on $1,000 is not very much.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me point out to the Senate that if those are average figures, they probably mean that half the employees are receiving substantially less. People have not yet learned how to live on averages. I ask the distinguished Senator if the dismal and horrible condition which he has portrayed does not clearly reveal the reason why union labor groups do not wish to fritter away the right to strike, when public employees are held in peonage of that kind, and as a practical matter have no right to strike?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to hurry along with this discussion. I have no desire at this moment to enter into a discussion of the question which the Senator raises.

If there is any point that can be drawn from these statistics other than the comparison, other than the fact that the Federal employee is receiving two and a half times as much, on the average, as employees of the States, it might be this: An examination might show that the average State employee is able to get along on $1,026 a year, on the average, in the States, cities, or townships where the cost of living is not so great as it is in Washington. They might be able to get along better on that salary than could a person in Washington with a salary of $1,600 or $1,800 a year. I know that it is difficult to persuade people to come from the Middle West to take employment in Washington, because of the high cost of living here. Conditions are not quite the same in other cities. The cost of living in Washington is considerably higher than it is in many other cities and towns.

Those are some of the things which the committee desired to inquire into, as a matter of rounding out the information as to what increases, if any, Government employees were entitled to. Those are the things which we were not able to go into. Those are the questions which the committee cannot answer as a result of its studies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who has made an able argument relative to the opportunity which the committee would like to have had to inquire into the cost of living as related to the increase in salaries, that I myself am somewhat confused. I have always supported the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service in connection with increased compensation for Federal employees, because I felt that the white-collar workers represented a class which needed help.

I also suggest to the distinguished Senator from Iowa and the distinguished Senator from California that I believe that the discussion on the floor of the Senate for the past 3 or 4 days completely supports the concurrent resolution which I submitted last September, after we had one of these bills before us. The concurrent resolution provided for a joint committee of the House and Senate to conduct an impartial investigation and study of all measures looking toward salary increases. I believe that the debate here today is a complete justification of the concurrent resolution which I submitted.

Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Iowa will permit me to do so, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks Senate Concurrent Resolution 33.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee to be composed of 15 Members of the Senate (not more than 9 of whom shall be members of the same political party) to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 15 Members of the House of Representatives (not more than 9 of whom shall be members of the same political party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall (1) make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the adequacy of salaries paid under existing law to civilian officers and employees in or under the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, including elected officials and judges; (2) shall consider all measures pending in either House which provide for increasing the compensation of such officers and employees; and (3) shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date the result of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such ex-

perts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

Mr. WHERRY. In section 2 the concurrent resolution provides that the proposed committee shall—

(1) make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the adequacy of salaries paid under existing law to civilian officers and employees in or under the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, including elected officials and judges.

Before the Judiciary Committee we have proposals for increasing judicial salaries. Before other standing committees of the Senate there are proposals to increase other salaries. There are proposals for increasing salaries in the executive departments. Some of our help has been taken away from us because salaries in the executive departments are apparently out of line with salaries in the legislative branch. I refer particularly to the salaries of employees in our own offices, and also employees of standing committees. Salaries in the three branches of Government are not in line.

The concurrent resolution further provides that the committee—

(2) shall consider all measures pending in either House which provide for increasing the compensation of such officers and employees; and (3) shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa and to the Chairman of the Civil Service Committee, the distinguished Senator from California, that after this bill is passed, if we are to make salary increases in the legislative branch in line with increases allowed in the executive and judicial branches, an unbiased committee of the Senate and House should consider all the questions which have been discussed on the floor of the Senate. That will be the only way to obtain a logical and intelligent basis for salary increases.

Let me say further to the distinguished Senator from California that I should like to vote for the increases which he feels are necessary; and yet the evidence submitted leaves us in a state of confusion. If we had such a committee as I have suggested, all these questions could be thrashed out before the committee, and the recommendations of the committee could be submitted to the House and Senate. I am satisfied that if an unbiased committee had this question under advisement it would submit a recommendation which I am sure would be in keeping with the needs, and which would meet the increased cost of living and provide the relief asked for by Federal employees.

The chairman of the committee is about to offer an amendment providing for the establishment of a commission to make certain studies. I ask him to refer to the concurrent resolution which I have submitted, and to use his influence and that of his committee to see if we cannot have such a committee appointed, either before the recess or afterward, to consider future increases necessary to keep pace with the increasing cost of living, not only for employees of the legislative branch but also for employees of the executive and judicial branches of Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator's concurrent resolution was not referred to the Committee on Civil Service, was it?

Mr. WHERRY. No. It was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I am not in any way censuring the distinguished chairman for not supporting the concurrent resolution prior to this time, because it has not even been on the calendar. It is in the Appropriations Committee.

If the Senator from Iowa will further yield, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California if he does not feel that such a committee would have served the purpose which he is seeking, and would have recommended the relief which he is trying to obtain for Federal employees?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am glad to state that I am favorably predisposed to the concurrent resolution. However, I do not wish to commit myself finally with respect to it at this time. I am entirely sympathetic toward it. The Senator is so very convincing and persuasive that I always like to defer judgment until after I am out of his presence.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his very complimentary remarks; and I thank the Senator from Iowa for permitting me to interrupt him. I could not make a better argument in favor of the concurrent resolution than has been made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa this afternoon. I only hope that, regardless of the disposition made of the pending bill, such a committee as I have suggested may be established in the future, to which can be referred all legislative measures providing for salary increases in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, so that salary increases in all branches of the Government, which no doubt are badly needed by Federal employees, may be made upon an equitable basis.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. About 2 hours ago the distinguished and able Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] agreed upon the procedure for this afternoon. Since that time the Senator from Iowa has been engaging in an argument or discussion—I do not know which, because I could not clearly hear him. I should like to ask whether he is making an argument for the Byrd amendment, or merely talking to delay a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, does the Senator wish a serious answer to that question?

Mr. GUFFEY. I do wish a serious answer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It seems to me that the answer is self-evident. I am not answerable for the ability or lack of ability of the Senator from Pennsylvania to interpret my argument, but I am arguing for the Byrd amendment.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator cannot hear me—and I have been speaking loud as I can—I suggest that there are many empty seats on this side of the aisle.

Mr. GUFFEY. I shall be glad to move over.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me say that I feel that the proposal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is sound. I feel that the amendment proposed this afternoon by the Senator from California—suddenly proposed, it is true, and without the benefit of consideration by the committee—involves a sound concept, namely, the creation of some kind of a commission. I prefer to have the committees of Congress do what the law intends they shall do, namely, investigate these things themselves, rather than establish new commissions whose members shall receive salaries of $12,000, as the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out However, I think there is a present need for an entire revaluation of our civil-service and Federal-worker systems, including a comparative study of salary schedules and the duties assigned. On the other hand, I never have believed in shotgun legislation and I certainly do not believe in approaching legislation of such importance without having the committees which should have jurisdiction devote extensive and serious consideration to the problem. I did not take offense at the assignment of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska, although it seems to me it should have received consideration by the Civil Service Committee. As a member of that committee, I would have welcomed reference to it of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska, and I would have welcomed an opportunity for the committee to study it.

Mr. President, the issues seem fairly clear. I think the only issue now before us it whether the Senate shall adopt a straight across-the-board 20-percent increase in the salaries of civil-service workers in all classifications—one which will reflect itself almost automatically in the salaries paid to Federal employees in the other fields—or whether we are to do what the committee started out to do and what it did last spring and what it started out to do and what it did do this fall, namely, make fair salary adjustments for workers under the Classification Act, so as to enable those with small salaries, who spend all their income for the necessities of life, to receive salary increases in percentage larger than those received by employees who are paid the higher salaries and who spend smaller proportions of their salaries for the necessities of life. I think the Byrd amendment will do that fairly and substantially. It will grant increases of as

much as $1,400 or $1,500 to employees in the upper-salary brackets, and it will grant salary increases of greater percentage to employees in the lower-salary brackets. That will be done in order to meet the present emergency, although the bill is not entirely an emergency measure, inasmuch as the increases proposed will become a part of the employees' basic pay. I think the Byrd amendment should be adopted, and I think the bill with that amendment should be speedily enacted.

Of course, in view of the statement made a few weeks ago by the chairman of the House committee—that the House will not consider such legislation until late in the coming spring—I fear that the measure may not go into effect as soon as some of us think it should.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to state that I believe the Byrd amendment is sound. It does not rearrange the entire Federal pay structure. Such rearrangement should await the making of a thorough study by the committee and by the Senate itself, when and if we decide to consider the rearrangement of the salaries of Federal workers and the reestablishment of salary classifications.

The Senator from California has been discussing a substitute for the Byrd amendment, although he has not offered it, and I understand he will not do so. His substitute for the Byrd amendment is almost the same in principle as the Byrd amendment. The difference is that his amendment—or the amendment which was mentioned in today's newspapers and was discussed today on the floor of the Senate—provides for an increase entirely beyond the increase in the cost of living, and involves a change of basic salaries by way of promotions, we may say, in salary schedules for employees in the classified list.

I repeat the Byrd amendment is sound, and I believe it should be adopted. If it is adopted, I believe it will relieve the situation which is troubling the Federal employees and which in my opinion manifestly should be adequately and fairly and promptly relieved.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes in attempting to explain exactly what the Byrd amendment would accomplish. I cannot conceive that any Senator will wish to vote for the Byrd amendment if he knows what it would do to the Federal employees. It would place the Federal employees in such an inequitable position, as compared to that of every great group of industrial employees or farm workers, that Federal employes would be in a comparatively bad situation.

I think many Senators are confused because of the nature of the proposal contained in the Byrd amendment, so I shall briefly review the history of the pending pay legislation. In 1927 the Federal workers received a basic increase in salary. They did not receive another basic increase in salary until last spring. They received that basic salary increase 4 years after the increase in the cost of living occurred.

By his amendment, the Senator from Virginia would wipe out that basic salary increase. He would have us require the Federal workers to go back to the same basic standards which were in effect in 1927. His amendment would give Federal workers in the $1,200 salary group a 36 percent increase. The cost of living for the workers in that group has increased approximately 36 percent, because they spend a disproportionate amount of their income upon food and clothing, the former having increased 42 percent and the latter 46 percent. So the formula adopted by the Senator from Virginia in his amendment would just about restore Federal employees in the $1,200 salary group to the position they formerly were in; in other words, it would give them a salary increase which would approximately correspond to the increase in the cost of living. So the members of that group then would have approximately the same buying power which they had back in 1927, or certainly the same which they had on January 1, 1941.

Then the Senator from Virginia proposes, by his amendment, to increase by 18 percent the salaries of all Federal workers whose salaries fall in the bracket between $1,200 and $4,600, and he would increase by 9 percent the salaries of Federal workers whose salaries are in excess of $4,600. It is immediately apparent that Federal employees receiving salaries of twice $4,600 would fall short of receiving an increase which would give them the same real buying power which they had on January 1, 1941.

The Senators who oppose the pending bill have differed with me in regard to many matters, but they have presented to the Senate a table which, in my opinion, accurately represents what the amendment they propose would do. Let me say that if this proposal was made to any labor group in America the workers would walk off the job the following day. This proposal is so much worse than any which any great corporation has made to its employees that it cannot in equity be compared to them. Every offer which corporations thus far have made to their employees has been much fairer, in equity, to the workers than is the proposal involved in the Byrd amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In view of the statement the Senator from California has just made, let me ask why he filed a similar schedule and a similar proposal as a substitute for the bill, varied by only 2 or 3 percent?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I cannot follow the workings or operations of the mind of the Senator from Iowa. This proposal would increase the basic compensation according to this formula: 36 percent for the $1,200 bracket, 18 percent for the $1,200 to $4,600 bracket, and 9 percent above that bracket. My proposed formula is 40 percent of the first $1,200 and 30 percent thereafter. The adjustment would be made not in accordance with a graduated scale dropping first to 18 percent and then almost down to nothing, but 30 percent. I am not complaining against the kind of formula to be used. I am complaining because the increase under the proposed formula is so weak that it leaves the workers in the upper category far below the proportionate wages which they received in 1941.

The figures, which are very honestly and accurately presented by the Senator, but which I think will come back to plague him in years to come, clearly indicate how grossly inequitable and unfair the proposal is to the Federal workers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, Mr. President, I do not blame the Senator from California for not being able to follow my reasoning. I frankly admit that I cannot follow his reasoning any better than he can follow mine. But I want to correct a statement which he made, and which I believe he made inadvertently. I understood the Senator to say that the percentage increase over 1941, under the Byrd amendment, began at 36 percent and dropped to 9 percent. It starts at 36 percent but drops to 16.41 percent.

Mr. DOWNEY. No; the Senator does not understand the proposal. The figures which the Senator is looking at on his own chart show this: Taking those three graduated scales, a man receiving $8,500 a year would receive a 16.41 percent increase over the basic wage which he received back in 1927.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe that is what I stated.

Mr. DOWNEY. If that is what the Senator said, very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have been listening for many days to this running debate. I should like to ask the following question: Is the Senator from California trying to convince the Senator from Iowa, or is the Senator from Iowa trying to convince the Senator from California? If not, what is the object of the debate? Both Senators seem to be the only ones who are interested in the outcome of this debate. The remainder of us apparently have our minds made up.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I believe that the statement of the Senator from Colorado is true. I have not seen an average of 10 Senators on the floor during this debate. The question which is involved is a difficult one to understand. The distinguished Senator from Iowa, doubtless through inadvertence, just finished making a very confusing and a mistaken statement. I totally agree that probably nothing I may say will affect the Senator from Colorado. But, if he will listen for a few minutes more, I shall appreciate it. I have not argued for more than 3 hours on this vital subject, and I do not believe that at any time during my remarks more than seven or eight Senators were in the Chamber. So I ask the Senator from Colorado please to bear with me.

Mr. President, what the Byrd amendment does is to give to the worker in the lowest category an increase sufficient to meet the increased cost of living, but it strips the Federal workers in other categories to such an extent that the compensation of the worker in the top bracket is increased over the basic wage existing since 1927 only by 16.41 percent. Instead of bringing his compensation up 33 percent it is increased by only 16.41 percent.

Mr. President, let us take the Byrd-Hickenlooper figures and consider the

group which was receiving $3,200 a year on June 30, 1945. Under the basic rate which has existed since 1927, the Byrd formula would increase the percentage of the group to which I have referred by 24.75. In the $6,000-a-year group the increase would be 19.50 percent. Considering the tremendous increase in the cost of living, namely, 33 percent, how can Senators justify saying to the man who was receiving $6,000 a year prior to the last basic raise that we are now going to increase his salary by less than 20 percent?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in order to make it clear, I think I should state that the percentages in the last column of the table do not include the increase on account of within-grade promotions. As the Senator from California knows, that increase was approximately 5 percent as applied to the total personnel.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have used the charts which the Senator has furnished which deal with the basic rates, and my statement was with reference to the basic rates. It is true that the time which the Federal worker has been putting in has increased, and there have been some within-grade promotions as well as perhaps some upgrading.

Mr. BYRD. To the extent of approximately 5 percent. At the bottom of the table will be found the following language:

> Percentages indicated reflect the aggregate of increases under Public Law 106 and the proposed amendment, but do not reflect within-grade increases or promotions.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, even when considering all those figures and not taking into consideration the extra hours worked by the Federal worker, the Byrd-Hickenlooper-Hart formula would provide far less than an amount commensurate with the increased cost of living.

Perhaps 30 or 35 different awards have been made by industry, including the last one which was made by the Sinclair Oil Co. Every one of those increases gave to the worker an amount at least sufficient to restore the standard of the cost of living. Most of them gave to the worker an addition of approximately 10 or 12 percent, based on the theory that the great corporations with swollen profits were in position to make some concessions. The lowest offer yet to be made was that of General Motors Corp. which would restore the compensation of the automobile worker sufficiently to enable him to meet the increase in the cost of living.

But, Mr. President, we are considering a great group of workers who do not have the power or right to strike. I say categorically to the Senate that if we accept the Byrd amendment we will be forcing our workers into such an unfavorable position that the resultant situation will be one which has not even been suggested by any corporations or other portions of industry. If that is what the Senate of the United States wants to do, of course, I must unhappily acquiesce. If the Senate wishes to take a group which does not have the power to defend itself and place it in a uniquely unfavorable position, then that must be done.

Mr. President, I merely add to what I have already said that an increase of 20 percent straight across the board, which was recommended by the committee, would give to the workers in the lower brackets approximately 10 percent more than the cost of living, and to the workers in the highest category it would give approximately 5 percent less than the cost of living. The American people, by an overwhelming poll, have stated their belief in the righteousness of the proposed 20 percent increase. In my opinion, Mr. President, the Byrd amendment should be rejected by the Senate, and the bill as reported should be passed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Under the Senator's bill is a $10,000-a-year man to receive an increase in his salary?

Mr DOWNEY. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to the bill whenever the proper time arrives. The amendment will be offered to maintain the ceiling of $10,000.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. BYRD asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Huffman	Pepper
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Shipstead
Byrd	Langer	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Mead	Wagner
Gossett	Millikin	Walsh
Green	Mitchell	Wherry
Guffey	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MEAD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MEAD. It is my understanding that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is now before the Senate, and that a yea vote is a vote for the Byrd amendment, and a nay vote is a vote in favor of the bill as reported by the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote in the negative would be a vote against the Byrd amendment. That is as far as the Chair will rule at this time.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOBEY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] who, if present, would vote "yea" on the pending amendment. As I propose to vote in the affirmative, I am, therefore, free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] which I transfer to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and permit my vote to stand. I am not advised how the Senator from Alabama would vote, if present.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and allow my vote to stand. I am not advised how the Senator from Kentucky would vote, if present.

Mr. DOWNEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this question with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. If present the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who would vote "yea," has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—47

Austin	Hart	Radcliffe
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Brooks	Huffman	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Capehart	Knowland	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Carville	McFarland	Tydings
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Gossett	Moore	Willis
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—19

Chavez	McCarran	Taylor
Downey	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Green	Mead	Tunnell
Guffey	Mitchell	Wagner
Kilgore	Murdock	Walsh
La Follette	O'Daniel	
Langer	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—30

Aiken	Donnell	Murray
Andrews	Eastland	Myers
Bailey	George	Overton
Bankhead	Gerry	Reed
Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Bridges	Hatch	Smith
Briggs	Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Hill	Wheeler
Butler	Lucas	Wilson
Cordon	Morse	Young

So the amendment offered by Mr. BYRD on behalf of himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HART, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DOWNEY. On the final passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], which I transfer to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and will vote. I vote "yea." If present, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and will vote. I vote "yea." If present the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

Mr. DOWNEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained at an important committee meeting.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

I wish to announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] would vote "nay."

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea," has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] would vote "yea." He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea." He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea." He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would vote "yea." He is detained on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—62

Austin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Huffman	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Buck	Knowland	Stanfill
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Gossett	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Mitchell	White
Hart	Moore	Wiley
Hayden	Murdock	Willis
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—3

Connally	Ellender	O'Daniel

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Eastland	Overton
Andrews	George	Reed
Bailey	Gerry	Robertson
Bankhead	Glass	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Smith
Bridges	Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.
Briggs	Hill	Wheeler
Bushfield	Lucas	Wilson
Butler	Morse	Young
Cordon	Murray	
Donnell	Myers	

So the bill (S. 1415) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3603, known as the ship-sales bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that the Senator desires to proceed to the consideration of the ship-sales bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator whether he believes that the measure can be disposed of within a reasonable length of time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I can say to the Senator from Wyoming that I certainly believe so. Before today the bill had been before the Senate three times as a result of the courtesy of the senior Senator from California, whose bill was the regular order. On the last occasion when we were considering the bill, it was on the eve of vote on final passage, but literally at the last moment a question was asked about the bill. I do not think any considerable length of time will be necessary to dispose of the bill today. I do not know of any question in connection with the bill which will require probably much time for either discussion or action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a very important bill dealing with the War Powers Act, an act which would be very greatly changed by the action taken in the House. It must be passed before the end of the year, because the act expires by operation of law. If the ship-sales bill is to provoke debate, I should prefer to try to see whether I can obtain consideration for the other bill. However, my understanding is that the ship-sales bill is not likely to provoke much debate.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is very definitely my impression that it will not, and that the discussion on the bill will be very brief.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I would have no objection to taking up the extension of the Second War Powers Act today, but I would object very strongly to trying to complete consideration of the measure today. It involves a number of very important questions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that if it is made the order of business today, it ought to be with the understanding that it will be debated tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I move to lay the ship-sales bill on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TOBEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. TOBEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Bilbo	Huffman	Radcliffe
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Byrd	Knowland	Stanfill
Capehart	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Carville	McCarran	Taylor
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
Gossett	Mead	Walsh
Green	Millikin	Wherry
Guffey	Mitchell	White
Gurney	Moore	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] to lay the bill on the table. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TOBEY. I ask for a division.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, what is the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to lay the bill on the table. On this question the Senator from New Hampshire has requested a division.

On a division the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that there will not be a vote tonight.

I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. What is the amendment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the situation is that the language of House bill was stricken out by the committee, and the committee wrote in lieu thereof an amendment in the nature of a new bill. That committee amendment was submitted to the Senate. The Senate amended it in a few respects, and then the committee amendment as thus amended was adopted. The bill as thus amended was ready for final passage.

Then the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], as I recall, moved that the bill be recommitted, stating that he wished to have an opportunity to present an amendment. That motion was temporarily laid aside. That was the situation when the Senate took a recess.

So the present situation is that the committee amendment as amended has been adopted, and a motion has been made to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk read the amendment which some Senators are trying to have reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not understand that the motion of the Senator from Maryland is being pressed. It was understood that a motion to reconsider might be made, but no such motion was made.

So, as I understand, the question now is on the final passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Wyoming that I would move to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was adopted. I made that motion the other day, but no action was taken on it at that particular time.

That is the situation today. Again I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I must oppose the motion. That was not my understanding at the time when this bill was being taken up again; I did not understand that an attempt would be made to have my amendment reconsidered. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not here at this time; but my understanding was that, so far as was then known, no Senator would request reconsideration, but that we would proceed to vote on the bill itself.

If a motion is to be made at this point to reconsider, that changes the situation considerably. I shall have to oppose a motion to reconsider.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that I told the Senator from Wyoming, who is not in the Chamber at this time, that I would make the motion to reconsider. I shall not discuss it, but I am going to keep faith with the Senator from Wyoming and I shall make that motion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator makes the motion, will he support it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So the Senator from Maryland, on behalf of my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], will ask the Senate to reconsider its action; will he?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is entirely correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senate does reconsider its action on the committee amendment as amended, what does the Senator from Maryland then propose to do?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If the Senate reconsiders that action, there will then be

an opportunity to offer other amendments to the committee amendment. I believe the Junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment which he desires to offer without debate; and to that amendment I shall not object. There is another amendment which I promised the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] I would offer. I shall offer it in his name without discussing it. Such procedure will take only a few minutes unless discussion develops.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a matter of fact, could not the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Maryland, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey, offer the amendments without having the Senate reconsider the vote by which my amendment went into the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That could be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. As the Chair has stated, the committee amendment must be reconsidered, if it is to be opened to further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that that can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may the amendment be explained? I am sure I do not know what I am going to vote on, and I have been here almost all the time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thought I heard the Presiding Officer state that the objective of the motion to reconsider could be attained only by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair rules that at this stage an amendment can be offered only by unanimous consent.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment explained, so that we shall know what we are voting on and what we are reconsidering. I should like to have the clerk read it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, let me say that this matter has been discussed at considerable length, and I feel quite sure that the Senator from North Dakota will be satisfied with a brief statement from me regarding the bill.

The history of the bill, stated briefly, is——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I understand the question propounded by the Senator from North Dakota. Let me say in response to his question that the situation—and I ask Senators to correct me if I am wrong—is this: Because the Senator from Maryland entered into an agreement with my colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] with respect to certain amendments which he is to propose, it is necessary for him, before those amendments are presented, to have the Senate agree to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to. So the only purpose of the motion to have the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was agreed to is to provide an opportunity for the Senator from Maryland to present the amendments. No amendment is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I understand. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland again yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In regard to the parliamentary situation, again I wish to ask if it is possible for the amendment which the Senator from Maryland says the Senator from Virginia is to offer to the committee amendment and the amendment which the Senator from Maryland is to offer for the Senator from New Jersey, to be presented and adopted as part of the measure by unanimous consent, without having the Senate reconsider the action which it took the other day on the committee amendment as amended. I also wish to ask this question: Provided the Senator from Maryland is willing to accept those amendments and provided it can be done by unanimous consent, it will not be necessary, will it, for the Senate to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was placed in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that that can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Maryland has moved that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment as amended was adopted. It seems to me that on a motion to reconsider the vote by which a particular amendment was adopted, it is entirely proper for a Senator to ask—as the Senator from North Dakota has done—that the amendment affected by the motion to reconsider be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendment as amended will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the bill (H. R. 3603) it is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert beginning, on page 25, in line 17, the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1945."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) It is necessary for the national security and development and maintenance of the domestic and the export and import foreign commerce of the United States that the United States have an efficient and adequate American-owned merchant marine (1) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times; (2) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (3) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; (4) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel; and (5) supplemented by efficient American-owned facilities for shipbuilding and ship repair, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine, and to facilitate the adjustment of the merchant marine from war service to peacetime operations and that in carrying out the measures of this act, nothing shall be done to hinder or restrict lawful, independent steamship operation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is it in order to call up an amendment which a Senator has on the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is not in order to do so at this stage.

The clerk will resume the reading of the amendment.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act the term—

(a) "Commission" means the United States Maritime Commission.

(b) "War-built vessel" means an ocean-going vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more, owned by the United States and suitable for commercial use—

(1) which was constructed or contracted for by or for the account of the Commission during the period, beginning January 1, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945; or

(2) which, having been constructed during the period beginning September 3, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945, was acquired by the Commission or the War Shipping Administration during such period.

(c) "Prewar domestic cost," as applied to any type of vessel, means the amount determined by the Commission, and published by the Commission in the Federal Register, to be the amount for which a standard vessel of such type could have been constructed (without its national defense features) in the United States under normal conditions relating to labor, materials, and other elements of cost, obtaining on or about January 1, 1941. In no case shall the prewar domestic cost of any type of vessel be considered to be greater than 80 percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of the same type.

(d) "Statutory sales price," as applied to a particular vessel, means, in the case of a dry-cargo vessel, an amount equal to 50 percent of the prewar domestic cost of that type of vessel, and in the case of a tanker, such term means an amount equal to 60 percent of the prewar domestic cost of a tanker of that type, such amount in each case being adjusted as follows:

(1) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel is not in class, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the cost of putting the vessel in class.

(2) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel lacks desirable features which are incorporated in the standard vessel used for the purpose of determining prewar domestic cost, and that the statutory sales price (unadjusted) would be lower if the standard vessel had also lacked such features, there shall be subtracted the amount estimated by the Commission as the amount of such resulting difference in statutory sales price.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with. A copy of the bill is on the desk of each Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota heard the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. LANGER. No; I did not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I asked unanimous consent that the reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with. A copy of the bill is on the desk of each Senator. The bill is one which was discussed in the Senate for several days. It consists of many pages, and neither the Senator from North Dakota nor any other Senator is listening to the reading by the clerk of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the clerk is reading very nicely. I see no reason why he should not continue to read the committee amendment so that we can understand it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A copy of the bill is on the desk of every Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will proceed with his reading of the committee amendment.

The clerk resumed the reading, and read as follows:

(3) If the Commission is of the opinion that the vessel contains desirable features which are not incorporated in the standard vessel used for the purpose of determining prewar domestic cost, and that the statutory sales price (unadjusted) would be higher if the standard vessel had also contained such features, there shall be added the amount estimated by the Commission as the amount of such resulting difference in statutory sales price.

(4) There shall be subtracted, as representing normal depreciation, an amount computed by applying to the statutory sale price (determined without regard to this paragraph) the rate of 5 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date of the original delivery of the vessel by its builder, and ending with the date of sale or charter to the applicant in question, and there shall also be subtracted an amount computed by applying to the statutory sales price (determined without regard to this paragraph) such rate not in excess of 3 percent per annum in the case of a vessel other than a tanker, and not in excess of 4 percent per annum in the case of a tanker, for such period or periods of war service as the Commission determines will make reasonable allowance for excessive wear and tear by reason of war service which cannot be or has not been otherwise compensated for under this subsection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is quite obvious that no Senator is paying any attention to the reading of the bill. It is also obvious that very few Senators in the Chamber have the slightest idea what amendments the Senator from Maryland proposes to offer. It is also quite clear that inasmuch as it is now almost 5 o'clock, no possibility will be afforded of determining what the action of the Senate will be tonight.

It is of the utmost importance that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill now on the calendar extending the War Powers Act of 1942. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated earlier in the afternoon that he would not want to have the bill acted upon tonight, and I agreed with him in that regard. But it is altogether obvious that we are only wasting the time of the Senate by requiring Senators to sit here and listen to a reading of House bill 3603. While Senators who are in the Chamber have copies of the committee amendment on their desks, they are not reading them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the pending business before the Senate be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 851, House bill 4780, to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I object to the motion and hope that it will not prevail. The pending bill has been before the Senate on three separate occasions and this is the fourth, and if Senators would not attempt to prevent its consideration by efforts to bring before the Senate other measures, the bill could be disposed of. I want to help the Senator from Wyoming in every way I can, but at this time I think we should continue our consideration of the pending bill and finally dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed with the reading of the committee amendment.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading and read as follows:

No adjustment, except in respect of passenger vessels constructed before January 1, 1941, shall be made under this act which will result in a statutory sales price which (1) in the case of dry-cargo vessels (except Liberty type vessels) will be less than 35 percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of the same type, (2) in the case of any Liberty type vessel will be less than 31½ percent of the domestic war cost of vessels of such type, or (3) in the case of a tanker will be less than 42 percent of the domestic war cost of tankers of the same type. For the purposes of this act all Liberty vessels shall be considered to be vessels of one and the same type.

(e) "Domestic war cost" as applied to any type of vessel means the average construction cost (without national defense features) as determined by the Commission, of vessels of such type delivered during the calendar year 1944, except in case of any type of vessel the principal deliveries of which were made other than in the calendar year 1944, there shall be used in lieu of such year 1944 such period of not less than six consecutive calendar months as the Commission shall find to be most representative of war production costs of such type.

(f) "Cessation of hostilities" means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, or the date so specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, whichever is the earlier.

(g) "Citizen of the United States" includes a corporation, partnership, or association only if it is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended. The term "affiliated interest" as used in sections 9 and 10 of this act includes any person affiliated or associated with a citizen applicant for benefits under this act who the Commission, pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed hereunder, determines should be so included in order to carry out the policy and purposes of this act.

SALES OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO CITIZENS

SEC. 4. (a) Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, at the statutory sales price. If the Commission determines that the applicant possesses the qualifications necessary to enable him to operate and maintain the vessel under normal competitive conditions, and that such sale will aid in carrying out the policies of this act, the Commission shall sell such vessel to the applicant at the statutory sales price.

(b) At the time of sale, the purchaser shall pay to the Commission at least 25 percent of the statutory sales price. The balance of the statutory sales price shall be payable in not more than 20 equal annual installments, with interest on the portion of the statutory sales price remaining unpaid, at the rate of 3½ percent per annum, or shall be payable under such other amortization provisions which permit the purchaser to accelerate payment of the unpaid balance as the Commission deems satisfactory. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance with interest shall be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessel sold.

(c) The contract of sale, and the mortgage given to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the purchase price, shall not restrict the lawful or proper use or operation of the vessel.

CHARTER OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO CITIZENS

SEC. 5. (a) Any citizen of the United States may make application to the Commisison to charter a war-built vessel, under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission, for bare-boat use. The Commission may, in its discretion, either reject or approve the application, but shall not so approve unless in its opinion the chartering of such vessel to the applicant would be consistent with the policies of this act. No application by an American citizen for the charter of war-built vessels under the jurisdiction of the United States Maritime Commission shall be rejected for the purpose of (A) denying lawful operation of any kind or (B) restricting or eliminating competition in ocean shipping in the foreign trade of the United States.

(b) The charter hire for any vessel chartered under the provisions of this section shall be fixed by the Commission at such rate as the Commission determines to be consistent with the policies of this act, but, except upon the affirmative vote of not less than four members of the Commission, such rate shall not be less than 15 percent per annum of the statutory sales price (computed as of the date of charter). Except in the case of vessels having passenger accommodations for not less than 80 passengers, rates of charter hire fixed by the Commission on any war-built vessel which differ from the rate specified in this subsection shall not be less than the prevailing world market charter rates for similar vessels for similar use as determined by the Commission.

(c) The provisions of sections 708, 709, 710, 712, and 713, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, shall be applicable to charters made under this section.

SALE OF WAR-BUILT VESSELS TO PERSONS NOT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Any person not a citizen of the United States may make application to the Commission to purchase a war-built vessel (other than a P-2 type or other passenger type and other than a bulk dry-cargo Liberty

type), under the jurisdiction and control of the Commission. If the Commission determines—

(1) that the applicant has the financial resources, ability, and experience necessary to enable him to fulfill all obligations with respect to payment of any deferred portion of the purchase price, and that sale of the vessel to him would not be inconsistent with any policy of the United States in permitting foreign sales under section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended; and

(2) after consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, that such vessel is not necessary to the defense of the United States; and

(3) that such vessel is not necessary to the promotion and maintenance of an American merchant marine described in section 2; and

(4) that for a reasonable period of time, which in the case of tankers and "C" type vessels shall not end before 90 days after publication of the applicable prewar domestic cost in the Federal Register under subsection 3 (c) of this Act such vessel has been available for sale at the statutory sales price to citizens of the United States, or for charter under section 5 to citizens of the United States, and that no responsible offer has been made by a citizen of the United States to purchase or charter such vessel;

then the Commission is authorized to approve the application and sell such vessel to the applicant at not less than the statutory sales price. Notwithstanding paragraph (4) of this subsection, not to exceed 10 "C" type vessels, except C-3's, may be sold to noncitizens at any time after such date of publication at not less than the statutory sales price.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no war-built vessel shall be sold to any person not a citizen of the United States, except in accordance with subsection (a), or upon terms or conditions more favorable than those at which such war-built vessel is offered to a citizen of the United States, but where the vessel so sold is being transferred to foreign registry and flag, the mortgage securing the unpaid balance of the purchase price and interest thereon shall contain provisions according to such mortgage the priorities over other liens and encumbrances accorded such mortgages on merchant vessels under the laws of such registry and flag.

ORDER OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 7. (a) In exercising its powers under this act and under other provisions of law with respect to the sale and charter of war-built vessels, the Commission shall give preference to citizen applicants over noncitizen applicants, and as between citizen applicants to purchase and citizen applicants to charter, shall, so far as practicable and consistent with the policies of this act, give preference to citizen applicants to purchase. In determining the order of preference between citizen applicants to purchase or between citizen applicants to charter, the Commission shall consider, among other relevant factors, the extent to which losses and requisitions of the applicant's prewar tonnage have been overcome and shall in all cases, in the sale and charter of a war-built vessel, give preference in such sale or charter, as the case may be, to the former owner of such vessel, or to the person for whom the vessel was constructed but to whom delivery thereof was prevented by the United States. In determining the order of preference between noncitizen applicants to purchase the Commission shall consider the extent to which losses in prewar tonnage of the various member nations of the United Nations, incurred in the interests of the war effort, have been overcome, and the relative effects of such losses upon the national economy of such member nations.

(b) After the cessation of hostilities operation of vessels in commercial service by the United States, either for its own account or through operating agents under agency agreements, shall, except as specifically authorized by law, be continued only to the extent necessary to effect orderly transfer of vessels to private operation.

EXCHANGE OF VESSELS

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission is authorized to acquire, in exchange for an allowance of a credit on the purchase of any war-built vessel under section 4 or any vessel acquired through exchange under subsection (d) of this section—

(1) Any vessel owned by a citizen of the United States, other than a vessel purchased under this act; or

(2) Any vessel owned by a foreign corporation, if—

(A) the vessel was constructed in the United States, and has, after December 7, 1941, been chartered to, or otherwise taken for use by, the United States; and

(B) the controlling interest in such corporation is, at the time of acquisition of such vessel hereunder, owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States, and has been so owned for a period of at least 3 years immediately prior to such acquisition; and

(C) such corporation agrees that the war-built vessel purchased with the use of such credit shall be owned by such citizen or citizens and shall be documented under the laws of the United States.

Such allowance shall not be applied upon the cash payment required under section 4. A war-built vessel shall be deemed a "new vessel" for the purpose of section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and section 510 (e) of such act shall be applicable with respect to vessels exchanged under this section to the same extent as applicable to obsolete vessels exchanged under section 510 of such act.

(b) (1) If, prior to December 31, 1946, the owner of a vessel eligible for exchange under subsection (a) makes a firm offer binding for at least 90 days, to transfer the vessel to the Commission in exchange for an allowance of credit provided in subsection (a), the amount of such allowance shall be the fair and reasonable value of the vessel as determined by the Commission under this section. In making such determination the Commission shall consider: (A) The value of the vessel determined in accordance with the standards of valuation established pursuant to Executive Order 9387 (8 F. R. 14105) as of the date of such offer, (B) any liability of the United States for repair and restoration of the vessel, (C) the utility value of the vessel, (D) the effect of this act upon the market value of such vessel, and (E) the public interest in promoting exchanges of vessels as a means of rehabilitating and modernizing the American merchant marine. In no event shall the amount of such allowance, in case of dry cargo vessels and tankers, exceed (A) (1) if the vessel or vessels tendered in exchange are of equal or greater dead-weight tonnage than the war-built vessel or vessels being acquired, 33⅓ percent of the statutory sales price (unadjusted) of the war-built vessel or vessels, or (2) if the vessel or vessels tendered in exchange are of lesser dead-weight tonnage than the war-built vessel or vessels, such proportionate part of 33⅓ percent of the statutory sales price (unadjusted) of such war-built vessel or vessels as the dead-weight tonnage of such vessel or vessels, tendered in exchange bear to the dead-weight tonnage of such war-built vessel or vessels, or (B) the liability of the United States in connection with the repair or restoration of such vessel under any charter to which the United States is a party, whichever is the higher. In the case of passenger vessels tendered in exchange, the amount of the allowance shall not exceed the percentages of statutory sales price computed under (A) (1) and (2) above by gross tons instead of dead-weight tons, or such liability for the repair or restoration of such passenger vessel, whichever is the higher. In any case where the vessel tendered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall not exceed the price paid the United States therefor plus the depreciated cost of any improvements thereon. No vessel may be exchanged under this section which pursuant to the terms of any charter with the United States has been restored to condition by the United States, or for the restoring of which pursuant to the terms of such charter a cash allowance has been made to the owner.

(2) If, after such offer is made, and prior to its acceptance, or prior to the acquisition of the vessel, by the Commission, the vessel is lost by reason of causes for which the United States is responsible, then in lieu of paying the owner any amount on account of such loss, the offer shall, for the purposes of subsection (a) and this subsection, be considered as having been accepted and the vessel as having been acquired by the Commission under subsection (a) immediately prior to such loss.

(c) The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer in complete or partial settlement of any claim against the United States (1) for just compensation upon requisition for title of any vessel, or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel which was acquired for use by the United States, but only to the extent such vessel is available for sale to the claimant.

(d) In the case of any vessel constructed in the United States after January 1, 1937, which has been taken by the United States for use in any manner, the Commission, if in its opinion the transfer would aid in carrying out the policies of this act, is authorized to transfer to the owner of such vessel another vessel which is deemed by the Commission to be of comparable type with adjustments for depreciation and difference in design or speed, and to the extent applicable, adjustments with respect to the retained vessel as provided for in section 9, and such other adjustments and terms and conditions, including transfer of mortgage obligations in favor of the United States binding upon the old vessel, as the Commission may prescribe.

ADJUSTMENT FOR PRIOR SALES TO CITIZENS

SEC. 9. (a) A citizen of the United States who on the date of the enactment of this act—

(1) owns a vessel which he purchased from the Commission prior to such date, and which was delivered by its builder after December 31, 1940; or

(2) is party to a contract with the Commission to purchase from the Commission a vessel, which has not yet been delivered to him; or

(3) owns a vessel on account of which a construction-differential subsidy was paid, or agreed to be paid, by the Commission under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and which was delivered by its builder after December 31, 1940; or

(4) is party to a contract with a shipbuilder for the construction for him of a vessel, which has not yet been delivered to him, and on account of which a construction-differential subsidy was agreed, prior to such date, to be paid by the Commission under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

shall, except as hereinafter provided, be entitled to an adjustment in the price of such vessel under this section if he makes application therefor, in such form and manner as the Commission may prescribe, within 60 days after the date of publication of the applicable prewar domestic costs in the Federal Register under section 3 (c) of this act. No adjustment shall be made under this section in respect of any vessel the contract for the construction of which was made after September 2, 1945, under the provisions of

title V (including section 504) or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, listening to the reading of the bill, I find we have now passed the point which is very interesting to me, that is, the matter of the selling of the tankers. The House left the provision at 100 percent. The bill before us had it down to 60 percent of the prewar domestic cost. I was satisfied that was entirely too low, and that the American people would be robbed if the ships were sold at such a price as that.

Discussing the matter with the Senator in charge of the bill, he has agreed to substitute the figure "75" for "60," and let it go to conference. The Senator in charge of the bill accepts the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator supporting the amendment which has been on the desk for about 3 days.

Mr. LANGER. It was not brought up.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was on each Senator's desk for 3 or 4 days. I am glad the Senator joins with us, and if the Senator in charge of the bill accepts it——

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I will accept the amendment, whether offered by the Senator from Washington or the Senator from North Dakota. I am entirely willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate the Senator yielding to me for a moment. It is very apparent that we are not going to finish with the pending bill this evening, or, if we finish with it, it will be the last business transacted today.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there was introduced today in writing, and will mature, under the rules, tomorrow, a motion to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the consideration of a joint resolution, so that it may be placed on the calendar of the Senate. The joint resolution deals with stopping the drafting of fathers and bringing about the release of fathers from the armed service.

At this time I wish to move that at the conclusion of the pending business that motion shall be a special order of business, to be proceeded with by the Senate. I make that motion at this time. I ask for action on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make a parliamentary inquiry as to why a motion made by me that at the conclusion of the pending business a special order of business be considered, cannot be taken up at this time. I understand that the Chair ruled it to be out of order. For what reason is it out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reason it is out of order at this time is that it is a motion to discharge a committee and it must lie over 1 day. The motion has been filed and will be competent the first day the Senate has a morning hour.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not understand the reason assigned. I do not understand the necessity for the Senate having a morning hour. Rule XXVI provides for a motion to discharge. I do not know of any rule that would require the motion to be taken up only in the morning hour. The motion was filed in writing today to mature tomorrow, and what I am asking is that the motion be made the order of business following the conclusion of the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today is a legislative day, and the Senator's motion would not be in order now because it was just filed today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not asking that it be taken up today, Mr. President. I am asking that when the time has matured that it be made the special order of business following the pending business, that is, when the pending business has been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I now ask unanimous consent that the motion be put at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Does the Presiding Officer understand that the Senator from North Dakota has consented that the reading of the committee amendment may be discontinued?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The committee amendment has been adopted. Now, after consultation with the Senator who was asked by the Senator from Wyoming to look after the matter in his absence, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the bill which would not involve the necessity of reconsidering the committee amendment at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have a statement of what the amendment is.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on page 28, in line 3, I move to strike out the figures "60" and to insert in lieu thereof the figures "75." That amendment is similar to the one offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That, as the Chair understands, is not the amendment the Senator from Maryland wishes to offer now.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I regret, Mr. President. My attention was diverted by an inquiry on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. LANGER. My amendment is on page 28, in line 3, to strike out the figures "60" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "75."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I will not oppose that amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now move that the reading of the bill be discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska withdraw his objection to the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object to the amendment, but when unanimous consent is asked I want to know specifically what it covers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, in line 3, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "60" and to insert the numerals "75."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, it is proposed to strike out lines 15 to 18, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 14. The Commission shall transmit to the Congress (1) within 10 days after the expiration of each calendar week a report containing detailed information with respect to each sale or other transfer made during such week under this act, including a description of the vessel transferred, the cost at which such vessel was constructed or acquired by the United States, the terms of such transfer, and the identity of the transferee; and (2) on July 1, 1946, and every 6 months thereafter, a report summarizing the information contained in weekly reports transmitted during the preceding 6-month period and containing information concerning any activities or transactions under this act which have not been covered by any previous report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it necessary to ask unanimous consent for consideration of the amendment?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I so understand the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment? The Chair hears none.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to read from a letter addressed to me by Representative JOHN J. COCHRAN, of Missouri, under date of December 15, 1945, as follows:

For 10 years I have been beating an attempt to raid the Treasury of six to seven billion dollars by Carden and Herd, from whom the Government purchased seven Austrian ships in 1917.

Representative COCHRAN speaks of billions of dollars. It must have been millions of dollars. We are so used to dealing with billions of dollars that it is easy

to make such a mistake. I continue to read:

When the bill was in the House an amendment was offered but it was defeated. I ask the Comptroller General to look over the bill and see whether or not there was anything in the measure that would enable these men to secure ships in settlement of a claim which had been denied by the Court of Claims. His reply is attached.

I hope the bill as it passed the Senate will not enable Carden and Herd to receive any benefit whatsoever as a result of the act.

Mr. President, I am told by the Senator from Maryland that an amendment is in the bill whereby this particular claimant cannot receive any benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from Representative COCHRAN and also one from the Comptroller General of the United States on the subject.

There being no objection, the letters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1945.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I understand that you are taking an interest in H. R. 3603, the ship-sales bill.

For 10 years I have been beating an attempt to raid the Treasury of six to seven billion dollars by Carden and Herd, from whom the Government purchased seven Austrian ships in 1917. When the bill was in the House an amendment was offered, but it was defeated. I asked the Comptroller General to look over the bill and see whether or not there was anything in the measure that would enable these men to secure ships in settlement of a claim which had been denied by the Court of Claims. His reply is attached.

I hope the bill as it passes the Senate will not enable Carden and Herd to receive any benefits whatsoever as a result of the act.

Sincerely yours,

JACK COCHRAN.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 12, 1945.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COCHRAN: I have your letter of October 4, 1945, in which you refer to the pending bill providing for the sale of surplus war-built vessels (H. R. 3603) and to an amendment thereto which Congressman HOBBS asked to have added by unanimous consent to an amendment previously adopted. You state that you were not present at the time, but that objection to the said amendment was offered by Congressman CASE. You request my opinion as to whether the said amendment, if adopted, would admit such claims as the Carden and Herd case.

Section 8 (b) of the bill as it passed the House on October 2, 1945, reads:

"The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer to any citizen in complete or partial settlement of any claim of such citizen against the United States (1) for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use: *Provided*, That the value or price attributed to any war-built vessel made available under the provisions of this subsection shall not be less than the price at and for which such vessel may be sold under the provisions of this act."

The amendment to the said section 8 (b) offered by Congressman HOBBS—apparently that referred to in your letter—would insert a semicolon after the words "United States" and would strike out the following: "(1) for just compensation upon the requisition for title of any vessel which he owned or (2) for indemnity for the loss of any vessel owned by him and taken by the United States for use. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 2, 1945, p. 9285.) Thus, insofar as is here pertinent, the section, if amended as proposed by Congressman HOBBS, would read: "The Commission is also authorized to make available any war-built vessel for transfer to any citizen in complete or partial settlement of any claim against the United States; * * *."

As you know, the so-called Carden and Herd case involves a claim against the United States arising out of the First World War under circumstances summarized very briefly as follows:

On April 5, 1917, the claimants, Messrs. Carden and Herd, entered into a contract for the purchase of seven Austrian ships from their Austrian owners for $6,476,073. Thereafter, on April 6, 1917, the claimants entered into a contract for resale of the ships to a syndicate which had been formed for that purpose for $7,371,141 cash, plus the right of Carden and Herd to operate the ships at the going rate of 5 percent of the gross freight receipts. On April 23, 1917, before the transfer of the ships to the syndicate, certain representatives of the Government negotiated with Carden and Herd with a view to acquiring the ships from the claimants for use in the prosecution of the war with Germany. As a result of such negotiations the previous sale to the syndicate was rescinded by the claimants, and the ships were turned over to the Government at cost plus expenses. The claim is based upon an allegation that one of the terms of this sale of the ships to the Government was that Messrs. Carden and Herd would be allowed to operate the ships, which right the Government never granted.

The claimants originally presented their claim to the War Department Claims Board under the Dent Act, which Board found that by reason of a misunderstanding between the parties there had been no meeting of the minds sufficient to give rise to an express contract and that consequently a contract implied in law arose under which the United States was obligated to pay the claimants the fair market value of the ships acquired from them. However, the Board held that it was without jurisdiction to render an award. The claim was thereupon appealed to the Secretary of War who rendered an award of $550,000 to cover the out-of-pocket loss.

In 1930 the claimants appealed to the Congress, and, after extensive consideration, jurisdiction was conferred upon the Court of Claims by the act of June 13, 1934, to hear the case and render judgment on its merits. The Court of Claims decided adversely to the claimants. Thereupon, steps were taken to have legislation enacted to permit the claimants to appeal their claim to the United States Supreme Court, a right not accorded them in the previous jurisdictional act. This bill was defeated in 1940 and again in the present session of Congress.

Section 8 (b) as it now reads would authorize the Maritime Commission to "make available for transfer" a war-built vessel in complete or partial settlement of claims against the United States for just compensation arising out of the taking of a vessel for title or for indemnity for the loss of a vessel taken by the United States for use. These two types of claims presently are for settlement by either the United States Maritime Commission or by the War Shipping Administration, and payments made pursuant to such settlements are from funds appropriated to those agencies for that purpose. And, of course, the subject provision, if enacted in its present form, would have the effect of saving the respective appropriations of the said agencies to the extent that ships could be used instead of money, as well as the effect of making it possible for such agencies to settle such claims other than by way of payments subject to audit in the accounts of accountable officers by the General Accounting Office. However, at least, the provision as it now reads covers only certain claims cognizable by the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

If amended as proposed, the said section 8 (b) would contain no limitation or restriction whatever upon the type of claim which could be settled by making payment in vessels instead of money. It would be my interpretation that, even then, the section would not confer upon the Maritime Commission authority to settle any claims which otherwise would be for settlement by some other department or agency but it might be construed as authorizing the Commission to make available for transfer a war-built vessel in full or partial satisfaction of a claim against some other department or agency. However, since the said Carden and Herd claim might be considered as having arisen out of the operations of the defunct United States Shipping Board, whose contractual obligations were assumed by the Maritime Commission pursuant to section 203 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U. S. C. 1113), the best categorical answer I can give to the question posed in your letter is that it well might be possible for claims of the nature of the Carden and Herd claim to be settled, should the said section 8 (b) be amended along the lines indicated. Of course, it is almost inconceivable that any such action would be taken in respect of that particular claim in view of its history and background; but I do perceive a real danger in providing authority by which claims of like nature—though possibly not so well known to the Congress—might be settled.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] was desirous of offering. He is not present in the Chamber, and I told him I would offer it on his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39 it is proposed to strike out lines 11 through 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In any case where the vessel offered in exchange was acquired from the United States, the exchange allowance under this section shall, unless subsequent to its sale by the United States it was acquired by a bona fide purchaser for value, in no event be greater than the price at which the vessel was acquired from the United States plus the depreciated cost of any capital improvements thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, has the amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not.

Mr. BREWSTER. This amendment represents a change in the language of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. This is an amendment offered on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. The language of the amendment is the language which is now in the House bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was not this a matter which was discussed rather thoroughly in the committee and the committee report contained different language?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The committee report contained different language; yes. There was not very much discussion of the point in committee, but we decided in committee to modify the House language.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. What the Senator from New Jersey desires is that we should restore the language of the House bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the desire of the Senator from New Jersey, and also his absence. I am a little disturbed over the promptness of the committee in abandoning its position, which it had very firmly taken. As I understand, the point is that while we forbid anybody to sell a ship back to the Government at a greater price than what was paid, plus the depreciation of any improvements, yet all that is needed to be done is to sell it to a bona fide purchaser and they can get anything they like for it. In other words, it makes a farce of the amendment. I think the committee amendment is entitled to a little more respectful consideration than is indicated. As the Senator knows, we went over this matter very thoroughly. If we are going to have any provision to protect the Government, let us have it. Let us not say that a bona fide purchaser can buy a ship and that is the end of it.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Let me emphasize to the Senator from Maine that I am offering this amendment at the request of the Senator from New Jersey. He told me that he could not be present, and I am offering the amendment in his name in pursuance of his request. It is not my amendment, nor that of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the amendment cannot be considered.

The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the amendment offered on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey certainly is a very fair amendment. There is no reason why a man who buys a ship from the Government and then trades it in to the Government should be allowed a greater price than he originally paid to the Government.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is what the bill itself provides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the amendment is not before the Senate.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 3603) was passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 851, a bill to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4780), to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what was the vote which was just taken? We did not have an opportunity to hear what was asked. I ask that the Senate reconsider the vote just taken, until we know what we are doing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote just taken, and for an explanation as to what was done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will allow the Senator who has the floor to speak, he will learn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I decline to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask what vote was just taken, and what the subject matter was upon which a vote was had, when there was so much confusion on the floor of the Senate that we could not hear what was going on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote was on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to proceed to the consideration of House bill 4780, to amend the Second War Powers Act of 1942.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Presiding Officer. That was the motion which was made, and we could not hear it. Those of us on this side of the Chamber wished to know what it was, because we did not have an opportunity to hear what was proposed before the vote was taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me for just a moment, I think it will be unnecessary to yield.

Mr. President, I do not intend to ask that we proceed to the consideration of the bill tonight. It will be my purpose in a moment to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and then let the session go over until tomorrow, when this bill will be the unfinished business.

I am very glad to yield now to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to ask for a reconsideration of the vote taken a moment ago, because none of us had an opportunity to hear or consider the motion. I ask unanimous consent—and I direct my request to the Senator from Wyoming—for a reconsideration of the vote just taken. Here we are in the closing minutes of today's session. In the confusion resulting from Senators moving about the Chamber a question is put and it is all over before any Senator has an opportunity to hear or consider it. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press its request. It is now almost half-past 5. Tomorrow when the Senate is in session there will be ample opportunity to bring up any other matter which the Senator has in mind, or to proceed to any other consideration. Before making the motion, I thought it was understood by the leadership on both sides. I consulted with the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I consulted with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I consulted every Senator who is in a position of leadership. It was the understanding of the leadership on both sides that when the ship-sales bill was out of the way the motion which I made would be made. There was no intention of shutting off any Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator knows full well, I am sure, as do other Senators, that my principal interest is the consideration of a motion to discharge a committee of which both the Senator from Wyoming and I are Members, the Military Affairs Committee, from the further consideration of a certain measure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am being foreclosed by a motion made this afternoon, amid great confusion, to proceed to the consideration of another bill and make it the order of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me assure the Senator that he is not being foreclosed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I say this——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is merely not paying attention to the rule. We must obey the rules of the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I intend to obey the rules.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we are to have orderly procedure we must obey the rules. The rule of the Senate is that if a motion is made to discharge a committee the motion must be presented in writing and must lie over for a day.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The day has not yet expired. The reason for that rule is to permit all the members of the committee to become aware of the motion. The Senator presented his motion earlier in the day, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Utah [Mr.

THOMAS]. Later the chairman of the committee came into the Chamber. As I recall, the Senator from West Virginia was not present at that time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the chairman of the committee made a statement with respect to the subject matter. All in the world that orderly procedure demands is that the Senator await his time, in the regular order of procedure. Then he shall have his time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me set the Senator right. The RECORD of today's session will show that I made a motion earlier in the day, immediately following a quorum call. It is true that the Senator from Utah, chairman of the committee, was not present, but the ranking member of the majority was present. The Senator from Wyoming was present and spoke upon the subject.

Let me say further that shortly thereafter the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs came into the Chamber, and the Senator from West Virginia filed his motion in writing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At that time, while the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee, was in the Chamber, the Senator from West Virginia rose and called his attention specifically to the motion, which was in writing.

I do not wish the inference left that there is any attempt to avoid advising the committee completely with respect to the motion. As a matter of fact—and I am sure the Senator from Wyoming will bear me out—this morning I told the members of the committee who were present, among them being the Senator from Wyoming, that I intended to take the matter to the floor of the Senate and ask for the discharge of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Today I filed the motion in writing. I am not asking that it be taken up today. I am not asking that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of my motion; but if the Senator's position is to prevail, if the motion which was put in the confusion, and upon which we were denied the privilege of speaking, prevails, it means no morning hour tomorrow. The Senator knows that full well. He knows that we shall have no opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask in fairness—and I have no other basis upon which to place the request—that the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Wyoming was agreed to be reconsidered. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote. If the Senator will let me make the motion during the morning hour, he can then proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would not the Senator be satisfied to make his motion tomorrow, since we can take no action on it tonight?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should be delighted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is all there is to it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I have an agreement, then, that there will be no objection to considering my motion tomorrow after it is developed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I cannot agree on behalf of other Senators. There is not a quorum present. I am in no position to make such an agreement, but the Senator's rights are fully protected. I am not in a position to say that he may or may not obtain consideration for his motion. I cannot speak for other Senators; but tomorrow when the Senate is in session, whether there be a morning hour or not, I shall not raise any objection to the consideration of his motion. I can speak only for myself.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator knows, speaking for himself, that if the vote by which his motion to make the war powers bill the pending business was agreed to is reconsidered there will be a morning hour, and that unless that is done there will not be a morning hour. A morning hour is necessary for me to obtain consideration of my motion tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the fact that a matter is made the pending business preclude a morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It depends upon whether there is a recess or an adjournment. If there is a recess, it does. If there is an adjournment, it does not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me, it all depends upon whether the Senate takes a recess or adjourns tonight. I shall not speak for or against an adjournment. The Senator may do that. If the Senate adjourns, he will have his morning hour. I shall not object to it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to address a request to the leadership of the majority that a motion be made for an adjournment tonight, so that we may proceed with the morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not the leader of the majority. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to an adjournment. Let the Senator make his motion to adjourn after we have concluded the executive business, and let the Senate decide. I cannot assume to decide for the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not know who is momentarily in charge on the other side of the aisle—whether it is the Senator from Mississippi or one of the other distinguished Senators on that side. But it seems to me the whole problem will be solved satisfactorily if the procedure suggested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is followed—in other words, if a motion to adjourn, rather than a motion to take a recess, is made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly; of course that is so.

Mr. WHITE. I am not prepared to take over the responsibilities of leadership for the majority; but unless some Senator on the other side of the aisle is prepared to make the motion——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall assume the responsibility of making the motion.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before I make that motion I wish to call attention to another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor.

TRANSPORTATION BY RAIL OF RETURNING MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a letter which I have received from the president of the Association of American Railroads. His letter, dated last night, makes it clear that 90 percent of all the berths and all the seats on railroad trains leaving the Pacific coast for the East are now being used to transport soldiers and sailors to their homes. It also shows that in spite of that fact, so many soldiers and sailors are landing on our shores that there are not sufficient facilities to transport them. The striking thing about the letter is that on the date when it was written—December 17—the arrivals of military personnel on the West coast numbered 47,846; today, December 18, 38,468 will arrive; on December 19, 28,373 will arrive—or nearly 115,000 military personnel in 3 days. The Army and the Navy are bringing the soldiers and sailors back from the Pacific areas more rapidly than the railroad facilities of the country can transport them to their homes—and that in spite of the fact that the railroads of America have done a superlative job.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request, I am glad to give you the figures on the movement of returning servicemen by rail, especially from the Pacific coast ports.

In the 7 days ending December 14, the railroads moved from those ports an average of more than 21,000 men a day, approximately three-fourths of them to points east of the Rocky Mountains.

During the 7-day period ending December 21 it is anticipated that arrivals of servicemen on the Pacific coast will average more than 31,000 per day. This is in addition to the anticipated arrival of approximately 16,000 men a day during the same week in Atlantic ports.

Today—December 17—arrivals on the west coast will number 47,846. Tomorrow there will be 38,468, and another 28,373 on December 19—nearly 115,000 men in 3 days. That's more than either the railroads or the military shore establishments on the west coast can handle and move currently, so that many thousands will no doubt have to be held on board ship in the Pacific coast harbors until the accumulated backlog of

arrivals can be moved to their homes. During the same 3 days it is expected that 53,875 men will be landed at Atlantic coast ports.

It is gratifying that the Army and the Navy have been able to bring the soldiers and sailors home so much faster than they had originally planned. This week, for example, the daily arrivals on the Pacific coast will be more than double the average anticipated during the peak of the movement. This is a transportation load heavier and more highly concentrated than was carried at any time during the war. It coincides, moreover, with the Christmas holiday travel rush.

To handle it all, the railroads have 10,217 coaches of all-steel construction, suitable for long-distance through service, 6,800 regular pullman sleeping cars, and 1,400 special troop sleeping cars. They would have had more but for wartime limitations on the use of materials which, for 4 years, made it impossible to secure additional passenger cars. They had hoped to have, by this time, another thousand troop sleepers which were ordered last spring, but delivery of these cars was delayed by reason of a strike in the plant supplying the beds for them. It is now expected that it will be February before their delivery is completed.

More than one-third of the coaches and approximately four-fifths of all sleeping-car beds are now in direct military service in troop trains. In addition, large numbers of service people are being moved on regular trains. In fact, as was shown by a recent 3-day check, 90 percent of all the berths and seats moving east from the Pacific coast in all trains are occupied by military travelers. The railroads have added another 1,000 coaches to the pool assigned to organized troop-train movements—which will cut the space available for individual travel, whether military or civilian, by that much more.

Most returning servicemen have long journeys to make from the Pacific coast to their homes. To move them at all, every sort of equipment has had to be pressed into service for the eastward haul, much of it being sent west in special trains of empty cars. There simply is no way, with the equipment which the railroads have been permitted to acquire during the war years, to handle as speedily and comfortably as we should like the great tide of men coming home, but, with what they have, the railroads of the country will do all that can be done.

Very truly yours,

J. J. PELLEY.

PURCHASE BY FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES DIRECTLY FROM THE TREASURY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator that I have been waiting all day for an opportunity to make a few remarks in regard to the continuation of the authority of the Federal Reserve System to buy up to $5,000,000,000 worth of Government securities directly from the Treasury, without going into the open market, as proposed in a portion of the bill providing for renewal of the War Powers Act. I shall not attempt to read the statement to the Senate at this time. I did not wish to read it earlier in the day because I did not desire to delay action on the Federal employees' pay bill.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the short statement I hold in my hand may be printed at this point in the RECORD, where it can be read and understood by perhaps more Senators than those who are present in the Chamber at this time; and I also ask unanimous consent that in connection with the printing of the statement there may be printed a news story touching on the subject, as published in the financial section of the December 11, 1945, issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. HICKENLOOPER ON CONTINUATION OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM TO BUY UP TO $5,000,000,000 OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES DIRECTLY FROM THE TREASURY WITHOUT GOING INTO THE OPEN MARKET

Mr. President, we are now being asked to renew the Second War Powers Act which contains powers affecting the most fundamental rights and interests of the people.

In the last minute press of legislation before the Christmas recess, it will be difficult to give this far-reaching measure the careful attention it should have. I am taking this occasion, therefore, to direct the attention of Members of this body to at least one provision in this bill which should be considered even more carefully than other provisions because it concerns practices that threaten the soundness of our monetary system.

I refer to the provision that would continue for another entire year (December 31, 1946) the power of the Federal Reserve to buy up to $5,000,000,000 of Government securities without going into the open market. In the New York Times of December 11, 1945, the Treasury and Reserve officials are reported to have asked that this power be made permanent, which is another way of asking that deficit financing and inflation be made permanent.

The bill which will come before us is H. R. 4780. The House thought fit not to continue these loose fiscal practices beyond June 30, 1946, but the Senate Judiciary Committee added another 6 months to make it December 31, 1946.

With respect to all these powers the question naturally arises whether it is necessary to continue them in time of peace, and what danger there may be to our system of government in so doing. This is particularly true when it comes to practices affecting the soundness of the Nation's finances.

I want to take a moment to sketch the history of this power of the Treasury to force up to $5,000,000,000 into the Federal Reserve System. When the Banking Act of 1935 was passed it was recognized that, along with preceding emergency legislation, the act greatly increased the power of the Federal Reserve System to buy Government securities. This was done partly by technical provisions to free the use of Government securities as collateral for Federal Reserve notes, and partly by concentrating power in the Reserve Board to purchase Government bonds.

Aware that there were dangers in giving these added powers to a Government board, section 14 of the Federal Reserve Act, which relates to open-market operations, was amended to provide that the Reserve System could buy Government securities only in the open market. They could not be forced to take Government paper direct from the Treasury.

The reason is a very sound one for the safety and health of the Nation's monetary system. When the Reserve banks buy Government securities directly from the Treasury the operation is not subjected to the test of selling securities in the open market; and the Treasury is able to dip into the funds of the Reserve System with no check. The funds in the custodianship of the Reserve System may be thought of as trust funds. They are the country's banking reserves, and their use ought to be subjected to very careful consideration and tests. For another Government agency like the Treasury to use those funds directly is a good deal like permitting a trustee to borrow trust funds.

There is a certain amount of safeguard in providing that when the Treasury wants money it has to sell securities to investors, to insurance companies, to banks, and others. This means that the Treasury at all times must try to follow policies which give these buyers of Government bonds confidence. At the same time it compels the Treasury to steer clear of easy money devices that may wreck the country.

If the Treasury can short-circuit these wise checks on its operations through the power to borrow directly from the Federal Reserve System, it is in fact very much like permitting the Government to print greenbacks and paying its expenses that way. The procedure of the Government's borrowing directly from the central bank was the mechanism used in France and Germany in the great inflation in those countries in the early 1920's. It has proved itself historically a very dangercus mechanism.

The Second War Powers bill allowed, for the period of the war, the Reserve System to buy securities from the Treasury up to $5,000,000,000. There was some excuse for this because the war financing problem was so difficult that both the Treasury and the Reserve System needed a good deal of freedom to produce the necessary money. As a matter of practice, the power was not used very much, only a few hundred million dollars, so that even in that extreme situation the power did not prove to be necessary. In peacetime, however, the power will hang as a constant threat of inflation over the Nation's money system; and this raises the serious question whether such a power should be continued.

The committee report covers this subject as follows:

"The War Powers Act of 1942 gives the Treasury the power to sell directly to the Federal Reserve banks not to exceed $5,000,000,000 worth of securities at any one time. Without this provision, it would be necessary in some cases to buy the securities in the open market and the Treasury would be required to pay substantial sums in fees and commissions, which are avoided by the exercise of this power."

This statement says nothing about the great principle involved in this whole question—the great danger to the country of continuing in the hands of government inflationary money practices without any outside check. The committee directs attention only to a relatively minor point; the few dollars of costs which might be involved in the very small commissions which a buyer of securities pays. To say that these are substantial sums is untrue. A dealer in Government securities ordinarily gets a commission of one-thirty-second of 1 percent, and in a great many cases it is less than that, particularly at times when the Federal Reserve buys which ought to be at times when the market is weak and when it is profitable to make purchases. The commission would fall on the seller.

To center the continuance of a power of this nature on an argument over financing fees while neglecting the great principle of sound national finances is a gross distortion of values. I should like to point out also that this matter was considered only by the Judiciary Committee and was not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is the committee best informed in these matters and best able to exercise competent judgment on the highly technical problems.

I question seriously the wisdom of continuing this particular power even for another 6 months in the present inflationary condition of the country. If ever we are to get off the shifting sands of loose fiscal policy, certainly now, when the Nation is flooded with money, is the time to do it.

[From the New York Times of December 11, 1945]

FEDERAL AGENCIES SEEK TO PURCHASE BONDS OF GOVERNMENT LOANS UP TO $5,000,000,000

WASHINGTON, December 10.—Spokesmen for the Federal Reserve System and Treasury Department asked today for permanent authority to permit the Federal Reserve to purchase up to $5,000,000,000 in Government obligations of the Treasury without going into the open market.

The Senate Judiciary Commitee was told that this authority could be used greatly to reduce financing costs, especially for short-term operations. One of these is temporary deficiencies in estimates of income-tax revenues.

Ronald Ransom, vice chairman of the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors, informed the committee such power now existed under the so-called Second War Powers Act of the President.

He noted that in approving extension of the war powers bill the House had extended this for 6 months beyond December 31. Mr. Ransom asked an extension of at least 1 year if permanent authority is not granted.

T. J. Lynch, vice counsel for the Treasury Department, joined in this request. He said that the Treasury had asked this in a letter to the House.

LEASING OF HURRICANE CREEK (ARK.) ALUMINA PLANT AND JONES MILLS (ARK.) ALUMINUM PLANT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under date of December 17, 1945, there has been addressed to me by the Surplus Property Administrator, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, a letter with respect to an offer which has been made by the Reynolds Metals Co. for a lease of the Hurricane Creek (Ark.) alumina plant and the Jones Mills (Ark.) aluminum plant, both of which are owned by the Federal Government. The details of the offer by the Reynolds Co. are set forth in the letter.

I may say that the Surplus Property Administrator has complied with the law which requires that plans for the disposal of plants costing more than $5,000,000 shall be submitted to Congress. The report has been made, and the letter to which I refer deals with an offer to enter into a lease, the authority to make which has been granted to the Surplus Property Administration without the necessity of a report to Congress. There is a great deal of interest in the matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 17, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In accordance with the request of Mr. Kurt Borchardt, the details of the offer made by the Reynolds Metals Co. for the leasing of the Hurricane Creek, Ark., alumina plant and the Jones Mills, Ark., aluminum plant are as follows:

	Jones Mills aluminum plant	Hurricane Creek alumina plant
1. Original cost to Government	$29,258,000	$39,331,000
2. Cost basis upon which Reynolds wishes to pay rentals	13,370,000	27,300,000

These costs are based on the assumption that present-day reproduction costs would be 30 percent less than original cost to the Government. In case of the Jones Mills plant, Reynolds will lease only half of capacity of plant, since the power-generating facilities are capable of supplying only 50 percent of capacity. Power facilities originally cost $9,000,000, which, together with one-half of the cost of the remaining reduction plant, would make the total original cost of the facilities Reynolds would use come to $19,100,000.

3. Annual capacity in million pounds: 144, $1,556; however, Reynolds would use only 50 percent of this.

4. Rental offered:

	Jones Mills aluminum plant		Hurricane Creek alumina plant	
	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount
First year	4	$534,800	4	$1,092,000
Second year	5	668,500	5	1,365,000
Third year	6	802,200	6	1,638,000
Fourth year	7	935,900	7	1,911,000
Fifth year	8	1,069,600	8	2,184,000

The rentals are based on an increasing percentage of the estimated reproduction cost as listed in item 2. However, the rentals for Hurricane Creek are a maximum amount, and would be calculated on the proportion of actual production for the year to the capacity of the plant, but in no case less than 25 percent of capacity. Thus, if actual alumina production in the first year were 778,000,000 pounds, or 50 percent of capacity, Reynolds would pay only $546,000 rental.

5. Average rental paid over life of contract per pound of capacity, $1.11 to 15 cents.

6. Length of lease: 5 years with option to renew for two more years at the rental rate paid in the fifth year.

7. Right to cancel lease before expiration:

(a) By the Government: No rights except for nonfulfillment by lessee of other conditions of lease. Reynolds, however, agrees to sell alumina at cost plus 6 percent, but at not over $40 a ton to any purchaser not having alumina production facilities of his own up to the total Reynolds productive capacity minus Reynolds requirements for its own plants.

(b) By Reynolds Metals Co.: Upon 6 months' notice, after the expiration of 2 years.

8. Option to purchase: Reynolds would be given the option to purchase the plant under the usual RFC formula, based on reproduction cost less depreciation; the option to expire on notice of cancellation of the lease or 6 months before expiration of the lease, whichever comes first.

9. Other conditions: Plants are to be turned over to Reynolds in operating condition with lease and rentals to begin with commencement of operations. Reynolds will pay all real-estate taxes and insurance, furnish all working capital, and assume all losses, if any, from operations. The Government will acquire all license rights under patents heretofore used in operation of the plant, provided it can acquire these at a reasonable figure from Alcoa. Government will protect Reynolds from any claims arising out of patents or damages which may be asserted by nearby property owners as arising out of operation of the plant.

The lease does not involve the Government in any subsidy of operations or in any sharing of losses, and, in our opinion, renders a reasonable return to the Government.

At present, the RFC is negotiating with the Aluminum Co. concerning the use of patents at a reasonable price. Under our regulation 10, before the Reynolds offer can be accepted, the plants will have to be advertised publicly for sale or lease and any other bids received as a result of the advertisement will have to be reviewed by the RFC and Reynolds' offer will still require final approval by this Administration, and by the Department of Justice pursuant to the provisions of section 20 of the act. We shall keep you fully advised as to further developments, and we shall be glad to discuss the Reynolds' offer with you or the members of your subcommittee before giving the offer our final approval.

Sincerely yours,

W. STUART SYMINGTON,
Administrator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES IN UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. VANDENBERG conferees on the part of the Senate.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL—VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith without my approval the bill (S. 693) to provide for the payment of the sum of $25,000 to the Saunders Memorial Hospital, of Florence, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses alleged to have been sustained as the result of the failure of the United States Army Engineer Corps to carry out a contract to lease or purchase such hospital.

It appears that in 1942 the Army Air Forces desired to construct a hospital at the Army Air Base at Florence, S. C. Dr. John D. Smyser, who was the medical director and superintendent of Saunders Memorial Hospital located in that city, offered to lease the hospital to the United States.

A series of negotiations took place between Dr. Smyser and representatives of ourselves. If no other bids are received, the

the War Department, which resulted in the execution by Dr. Smyser of an option to lease the Saunders Memorial Hospital to the United States for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, subject to a right of termination by the Government at any time upon 30 days' notice. The War Department later reached the conclusion that it would be less expensive to construct a new hospital than to acquire and rehabilitate the Saunders Memorial Hospital, and declined to take up the option or to enter into a lease. No contract either to lease or purchase the premises was ever entered into by the Government.

It is asserted that in the meantime Dr. Smyser had made arrangements to turn over the hospital to the United States and had discontinued certain activities in his institution. The bill under consideration would compensate him for the losses said to have been sustained as the result of making these arrangements and curtailing the activities of his hospital.

The option taken by the United States created no obligation to enter into a lease. No lease was actually made and no legal obligation arose on the part of the Government toward the Saunders Memorial Hospital. The fact that the hospital authorities made premature preparations on the assumption that a lease would be made does not create either a legal or a moral obligation on the part of the Government to compensate the hospital for the losses alleged to have been sustained by it.

An almost identical bill (H. R. 1737, 78th Cong.) was pocket vetoed by President Roosevelt on June 30, 1944 (90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6713). Thereafter, an act was passed (act of Dec. 23, 1944, Private, No. 588, 78th Cong.), authorizing the claimant to bring suit against the United States in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina in reference to this matter. The claimant failed to take advantage of the rights accorded to him by that act within the time specified therein.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1945.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. Louis L. Bennett, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st of November 1945, while serving as commanding officer of Coast Guard training station, Groton, Conn., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized; and

Capt. Joseph E. Stika, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st of November 1945, while serving as commanding officer of the Coast Guard group, Alameda, Calif., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Clarence E. Gauss, of Connecticut, to be a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia, for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

By Mr. WALSH:

From the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Robert J. Hoey, a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from October 1, 1940; and

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps.

From the Committee on Finance:

Sundry persons for appointment or promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Chaplain Luther Deck Miller (brigadier general, Chief of Chaplains), United States Army, to be major general.

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Homer Allen Higgins, to be State medical officer for Arkansas and State medical adviser for Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack H. Duncan to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the United States Naval Mission to Peru.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Karl S. Day to be brigadier general, for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate in respect to each of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

INDIANA

Daniel E. Haley, Hamlet, Ind., in place of P. E. Barnes, resigned.

KANSAS

Alice M. Howe, Mount Hope, Kans., in place of W. R. Ives, transferred.

MARYLAND

Bettie J. Porter, Ellerslie, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Charles N. Williams, Bartlett, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Elmer W. White, Carroll, Ohio, in place of G. M. Schmidt, transferred.

Joela P. Minnick, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of D. B. Snyder, resigned.

Lorraine A. Franco, Lansing, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jennie J. Rosini, Dunlevy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

George J. Schnur, East Butler, Pa., in place of H. D. Farnen, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Homer Allen Higgins to be State medical officer for Arkansas and State medical adviser for Oklahoma, with compensation at the rate of $5,180 per annum.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Carr McLemore, Surrency.

MINNESOTA

Howard M. Drinkwalter, Zumbro Falls.

NEBRASKA

Salem Abraham, Ainsworth.
William G. Hoffman, Bladen.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane M. Phillis, Fombell.
Clarence C. MacKenzie, Hatboro.
Lillian J. Biggerstaff, Hunkers.
George R. Frey, Kutztown.
Grace F. Brant, Plumville.
Verna Heppe, Sheppton.
David J. Scales, Jr., Susquehanna.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Jack H. Duncan to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the United States Naval Mission to Peru, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Karl S. Day to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary service from November 29, 1945.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Christ, the world's Redeemer, born a little child and yet a king, grant us to cherish the power of hoping and believing, which keeps us facing the years with glad expectancy. We pray that we may feel the urge of divine compulsion with a broadening vision of Him whose earthly journey began in lowly Bethlehem, with eyes looking beyond the hills of time. Thou infinite spirit of life and love, we would catch the unmeasured opportunity offered by the Son of Man and concentrate our greatest interest and expend our most passionate endeavors in defeating the spirit of selfishness and greed. Come, Thou long-expected Jesus, born to set Thy people free; open our ears to the hymn chanted in love that casts out fear, that purifies and lives to save and strengthen the purposes of men.

"Though Christ a thousand times
In Bethlehem be born,
If He's not born in thee,
Thy soul is all forlorn."

In the name of our Lord and Master, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4649. An act to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack; and

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

ESTATE OF HUBERT M. CARTER

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 464), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the estate of Hubert M. Carter, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Hubert M. Carter.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including a letter from the Director of the Census relative to the need and request for certain statistical data.

Mr. BARRY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Lessing Rosenwald appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to oppose the flood resolution which calls for the opening of the doors of Palestine to Jewish refugees. Jews are fleeing from new pogroms in Poland. Jews cannot return to their erstwhile homes because of the festering sores of an intense anti-Semitism. Immigration barriers are up all over the world. There is no place where they are not unwanted save in Palestine. Yet Rosenwald urges delay while thousands fall daily from starvation on the roadsides or languish in concentration camps.

Delay is fatal. The winter's blast cannot be stayed by Rosenwald or a committee of inquiry. From his own safety, Mr. Rosenwald is blind and deaf to the needs of his people. Shades of his Father! In his case, the apple has indeed fallen far from the tree. I agree with Aeschylus, "A prosperous fool is a grievous burden."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two statements from marines in China.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post, another from the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union, and a third from the Oregonian.

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a short newspaper article and in the other excerpts from a letter.

Mr. COLMER (at the request of Mr. ABERNETHY) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include therein a newspaper article from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SAVAGE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a part of a speech made by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by James Farley.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of a letter he addressed the Attorney General of the United States under date of December 10, relative to gas rebates in the Detroit area and a copy of reply dated December 14, 1945, to which are attached several exhibits.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter which he wrote the chairman of the Committee on Postwar Economic Policies and Planning.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, is now in Moscow meeting with representatives of England and Russia for the purpose of ironing out differences of opinion so that a chance for a lasting peace may be made more of a certainty on this earth. Many in this Congress may disagree on the best procedures for insuring a lasting peace, but I believe that all will agree that an attack on such an organization as the National Council of American-Soviet

Friendship at this time is worse than a blunder, since it nullifies the efforts of our Secretary of State. Such an attack has, however, been made against the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship by the action of the so-called Committee on Un-American Activities, who have demanded to see the books of this organization for purposes of investigation.

The demand of the Un-American Activities Committee is an insinuation against the integrity of a group of Americans who have banded together in a sincere effort to encourage much-needed better understanding between our Nation and the Soviet Union. Similarly, the request of the Un-American Activities Committee to see the books of Friends of Democracy is a blow against another democratic organization, since this latter group has done as much as anybody to uncover attempts of various Fascist groups in America to undermine this Nation while we were engaged in war against the Axis Powers.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MARINE CORPS WEEKLY REPORT

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of demobilization is one arising on every hand. I think it well at this time to commend the Marine Corps for the innovation which they have just inaugurated; namely, to give Members of Congress a weekly report on their demobilization activities. With this information before us we will be able to answer many questions better than we have in the past.

This weekly report is in the nature of a continuing inventory of men and movements by which Congress can quickly ascertain the progress being made in returning and discharging members of this service.

This example might well be followed by the other services, especially as the reports relate to high-point men and doctors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the resignation of Colonel Streeter, Director of the Women Marines.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Flint News Item.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with his bill to limit the quota on watches.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one remarks concerning the demobilization of the Army; to include in one remarks on the subject of lumber policies of OPA; and in one remarks on the subject of Chinese foreign policy, and to include a resolution upon one subject.

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Lumber Trade Journal.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Grand Coulee power for railroads.

Mr. GERLACH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a constituent entitled "Charity Should Begin at Home."

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include a newspaper article in each.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Houston Chronicle.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from World War II veterans.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a telegram from the Fort Wayne Jewish Community; in one an editorial from the News Sentinel, and in one remarks on the OPA policy.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the St. Mary's Daily Press.

GUAM SOLDIERS NEED ADDITIONAL FOOD

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WE WILL ALWAYS HAVE A U. S. A. IF WE DO NOT GIVE IT AWAY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we will always have a U. S. A. if we do not give it away. I was very much interested in reading over the statement emanating from the State Department in reference to the grant of a loan to Great Britain of $4,400,000,000. Now, it is nice to do something for somebody else, but it is about time that we think of America. It is about time that we do something for this country; that with a debt of $265,000,000,000, with everybody after the Federal Government today, it is time to do something for America. I love America and I want to help her. It seems to me that we ought to know what our program is going to be before we lend that money to Great Britain. Remember this, Great Britain owes about $6,500,000,000 from the First World War. She never paid. This proposal to loan $4,400,000,000 accompanies a cancellation of a debt of $23,000,000,000 under lend-lease to Great Britain. This proposed loan has no interest charge for the first 5 years. We pay the interest. If Great Britain cannot pay any interest in any others of the 50 years for which the loan is made, she can notify us and default in the interest. Our people pay that interest. I ask you, Will Great Britain ever pay the principal? Her record of payment of debts to the United States of America does not bear out the fact that she will.

Her propaganda for this loan in all the theaters and papers is great. My love for America is too great to be led to grant the so-called loan, I think it is another gift. You cannot grant the gift, for your children will have to pay for it.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, once again I call the attention of the House to the fact that the surplus property we thought was going to provide our veterans with farm machinery and tractors is not going to them. I receive telegrams practically daily pointing out that in my State of California the veterans are being handicapped in purchasing farm machinery and tractors which are badly needed. I hold in my hand a list from the Surplus Property Sales Department of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at San Francisco showing how this property may be obtained. Under miscellaneous hardware, for instance, where a lot is offered, bids must be for the entire lot; in other words, if a veteran wants to buy 1 hammer and they have 20 hammers, he has to put in a bid for all 20 hammers. I wonder how long we are going to continue this kind of a program. Under the surplus property sales, the veterans are not getting the promised material, as provided for by Congress, but instead are getting the run-around. I am very glad to know the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], chairman of the Committee on Executive Expenditures, of which I am a member, has agreed to hold early hearings in 1946 to investigate surplus-property sales and cure the evil.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a statement of Mr. Stuart Symington, Surplus Property Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SERVICE INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement and a table relative to national service benefits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a stranded soldier in the Philippines.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by John Green, international president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, at the parley now being held at Colorado Springs between management and men of the shipbuilding industry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the approval of the Journal tomorrow the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the special order granted to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] I may address the House for 30 minutes with permission to yield time to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Milwaukee Council.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and include newspaper articles and letters.

PROPOSAL FOR A SINGLE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, early in 1943 a commander in the United States Navy wrote a letter, and an article he had prepared, to his mother in which he pleaded for the creation of a single department of defense. That correspondence was turned over to me for possible use. In other words, his considered and unbiased reasoning for the creation of such a department was placed in my hands. During the progress of the war I withheld the material. It is entirely proper to now make it public. I read parts of that letter, written from the Pacific:

I am enclosing something that is as important in my mind as the Monroe Doctrine or the Declaration of Independence. If I have learned anything from nearly 17 years of service in the Navy, it is the real source of weakness in the make-up of our armed forces. The enclosed article is self-explanatory. I could write a book on it. It is not for this war; it is to protect us from the next war. Surely there must be those who realize its necessity. If I should turn up missing, or dead, get it published somehow and get it started in the right places.

Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent to insert this article, written by the naval commander, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virgania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO MINIMIZE CAUSES OF LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is being criticized because of its failure to bring out legislation designed to minimize the causes of labor disputes, prevent, or settle strikes. The President sent down a plan or outline of proposed legislation the other day and the Speaker referred it to the Committee on Labor. That committee has been criticized many times because of its failure to act. My purpose is to call the attention of the majority side to the fact that when the issue of enacting legislation drawn to aid in the settlement of our present industrial troubles came last Saturday before that committee, seven members of the committee, four Republicans and but three Democrats, voted to hold further hearings and to try to get out a bill of some kind to make an attempt to comply with the President's request. The Democrats on that committee refused to go along with their President though they had a clear majority on the committee. It is their fault, the fault of the Democratic leadership, that we have no attempt even to write remedial legislation at this time.

DR. J. D. WHITESIDE AND ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2930, a bill for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital.

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $1,888 to Dr. J. D. Whiteside of Aberdeen, S. Dak., and the sum of $4,596.16 to St. Luke's Hospital of Aberdeen, S. Dak., in settlement of their claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses incurred by Mr. E. J. Gebhart, of Orient, S. Dak., as a result of injuries sustained by him on February 6, 1937, when he was harnessing a team of horses preparatory to entering on his duties as a rural mail carrier.

It appears that on the date in question Mr. Gebhart left his house at 7:15 a. m. and went to his barn to harness a team of horses and then proceed to the post office at Orient, where he was due to report at 8 a. m., for the purpose of obtaining and delivering the mail for his rural route; that, in harnessing the team of horses, one of them kicked him on the right knee; that he performed his required duties on the date in question and continued to do so until October 10, 1937, when, because of the injury to his knee, he went to St. Luke's Hospital and remained there continually until June 21, 1941.

Mr. Gebhart filed a claim with the Employees' Compensation Commission for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses, but the claim was disallowed by the Employees' Compensation Commission upon the ground that Mr. Gebhart was not injured while he was engaged in the performance of his official duties, since the accident occurred at about 7:15 a. m., whereas, he was not due to report at the post office for duty until 8 a. m.

It seems to me that the Employees' Compensation Commission has taken an appropriate position in opposing the enactment of a measure which would provide relief on account of an injury sustained by an employee of the Government prior to the time he reported for duty, and which would establish an undesirable precedent for a recognition of claims of a like character that have been denied in the past, and of claims

of the same character that may be presented in the future, in the administration of the Employees' Compensation Act.

I feel obliged, therefore, to withhold my approval of the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1945.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and accompanying bill referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the States of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1580, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the resolution, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] for 1 hour and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, S. 1580, is one of the most important steps to be taken by the United States in preparing for effective participation in the United Nations Organization. Broadly speaking the bill prescribes the domestic internal arrangements within our Government for giving effect to our participation in this enterprise and sets up the machinery for complying with certain of the major international commitments which the United States assumed upon ratification of the Charter. It does not in any sense create new obligations or alter in any way the obligations provided for in the Charter.

Such rapid progress has been made in bringing the United Nations Organization into effect that the first session of the General Assembly will convene next month. This session will open in London January 10 to perfect the organization of the United Nations, and later in 1946 another session of the Assembly will be held at the permanent headquarters of the Organization to consider problems of substance. The location of the permanent headquarters is to be finally decided at the meeting in London in January In view of the imminence of the General Assembly's session—which will probably convene before the next session of Congress—it is important that this legislation be passed promptly.

The bill provides for the offices to carry out the representation of the United States in the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the other organs and agencies of the United Nations. Senate confirmation is required for the representatives in all of the principal organs.

Two amendments were made by the committee to section 2. The first provides that Members of Congress who may be designated as representatives to the General Assembly receive no compensation for their services in that capacity.

The second amendment would permit the President, without the requirement of Senate confirmation, to designate an officer of the Government to attend a particular meeting of the Economic and Social Council or Trusteeship Council instead of the regular representative in the event of the absence or disability of the regular representative or in connection with a specified subject matter. These are both simply perfecting amendments.

The committee also struck out a Senate amendment which would require Senate confirmation of the principal representatives in the specialized agencies established by the United Nations Organization. The committee felt that this provision did not relate to offices created under this legislation and that it would be ambiguous and unworkable in practice.

Section 3 of the bill provides that the representatives of the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations act at all times under the instructions of the President.

This provision was considered especially important in order to dispel any notion that the representative on the Security Council might act independently of the President in the important decisions of the Security Council. Section 4 requires from the President regular reports to the Congress concerning American participation in the Organization and special current reports to Congress concerning decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement action.

Section 5 of the bill has to do with economic sanctions and vests the President with the necessary internal authority to carry out decisions of the Security Council to use enforcement measures short of the use of armed force to settle disputes which the Council considers to constitute threats to the peace. While the powers vested in the President by this section are very great, they are necessary to carry out the obligations incurred under the Charter and are essential to our effective participation in the Organization. It should be remembered that in view of the veto power possessed by the United States, the Security Council cannot take any enforcement action, whether of an economic nature or involving the use of armed force, unless the United States concurs in the vote of the Security Council.

Section 6 has to do with the use of armed force. First, this section authorizes the President to negotiate with the Security Council a military agreement to carry out our obligations under the Charter to supply armed force for international police action. This agreement is to be subject to approval by Congress. The bill states that the President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of Congress to make available to the Security Council in order to carry out decisions of the Council under article 42 of the Charter the armed forces provided for in this military agreement.

The position of the Congress is fully protected by the requirement that the military agreement to preserve the peace must be passed upon by Congress before it becomes effective. Also, the obligation of the United States to make forces available to the Security Council does not become effective until the special agreement has been passed upon by Congress.

Section 7 authorizes necessary appropriations. It provides for the waiver of civil service and classification laws and related matters which the committee feels will permit the most effective participation.

In summary, the bill has been most carefuly prepared to meet our obligations under the Charter in a manner consistent with the constitutional requirements of the United States. The traditional relationship between the executive and legislative branches of our government is fully preserved. The bill should be promptly enacted as further evidence of our leadership in cooperative efforts for world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time right now.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, for many years following the last war many people, and particularly many of us whose privilege it was to have been over in Europe when that war ended, reflected on Armistice Day as the outstanding day of the year. It was the day on which the greatest, the most horrible, the most tragic and deadly war in history up to that time came to a conclusion, a war which we on our side fought with the idea of preserving democracy and creating permanent peace.

Unfortunately, while we won that war gloriously, it was not our similar good fortune to win its aftermath. Consequently, many people in this country, and I am sure in others, indulged in serious thought when it was realized that despite our hopes and prayers and efforts at that time, the world was confronted with still a greater and much more horrible and deadly war. Many people in the United States and throughout the world devoted serious thought to creating some machinery, indulging in some effort that would prevent a repetition of this tragedy. So the United Nations Conference at San Francisco was called. It created a charter which was ratified by the other body of this Congress in July, and it is highly appropriate, I think, that legislation implementing the ratification of that charter by the other body reaches the floor today. It does so as the first similar endeavor in which this House has ever indulged in history, I think, 2 days following the anniversary of the commencement of the last offensive of the German Army—an offensive which was

very deadly, very expensive to us in precious lives as well as matériel, and, frankly, very frightening to us. It was, however, the offensive which used up the reserve that Germany would otherwise have had to throw in and prevent our rapid march after we crossed the Rhine.

Incidentally, those American heroes who participated in the defense of the Bulge—or the Runstedt offensive, as those charming people of little Luxemburg, which was so nearly swallowed up by it, call it—have been as much maligned as any heroes and soldiers in the history of our country. I refer particularly to the One Hundred and Sixth Division, commanded at that time and since its activation by my good friend, Gen. Al Jones, and in which there fought his son, Captain Jones and Capt. Jack Collins, an appointee of mine to West Point. We know now, despite what was erroneously said by some then, that those boys stood there on a 27-mile front which, of course, it was absolutely impossible to hold against such an onslaught. They stood there in their tracks like stone walls until they died or were captured. Their heroic conduct against such insurmountable odds will always constitute one of the most glorious, most brilliant pages in American war history. I also consider it highly appropriate that this first effort of its kind on the part of this House should reach the floor 10, or I believe 11, days after the conviction of the first criminal high officer of a combatant army for his acts of omission—I refer, of course, to General Yamashita, who was convicted in Manila 11 days ago—and at a time also when all of the ranking culprits of Germany who are alive and captured are on trial at Nurenberg largely for their sins of commission rather than omission.

This occurs when a new concept of international law is being created by those trials, a concept of international law which makes the leaders of a country and of its Army and Navy responsible for their acts of omission in not preventing atrocities, as well as for those of commission, a concept of international law which I believe will contribute much toward the success of this effort on the part of the decent nations of the world to prevent war in the future.

As I say, this bill simply implements the ratification of that Charter. As the chairman has so well pointed out to you, it provides for the appointment by the President of an ambassador to the United Nations, a deputy ambassador to the United Nations, and representatives in the organs of the United Nations such as the Economic Council, the Trusteeship Council, and so forth.

It also provides, in implementing article 41 of the United Nations Charter, that the President may take whatever steps he may be requested to take by the Security Council to prevent war. I believe it is expressed "without the use of force"; in other words, economic sanctions, the breaking of diplomatic relations, which of course the President can already do, the stopping of transportation, radio communications, trade, and what not.

Then it provides, also in implementation of the Charter, that the President may sign an agreement with the Security Council providing the number of the armed forces our country will contribute toward the United Nations pool to preserve the peace. Mind you, while this bill provides for the signing of that agreement, it must come back to the Congress for ratification after it is signed. When that happens, after the President signs an agreement with the Security Council, and this body and the other body ratify it, then the troops so provided are subject to the command of the Security Council wherever, whenever, and in whatever number needed.

Do not overlook the fact, however, that force is the last resort. While it is not mentioned in this bill, the United Nations Charter provides that nations which find their interests in conflict must first attempt to iron out their differences between themselves. If that fails, then sanctions, economic and otherwise, to which I referred a moment ago, are indulged in by the countries, under the direction of the Security Council. Then if those efforts, that is, all other efforts except the use of force, fail, the armed forces under the direction of the Security Council will be brought into action. In war? No; in an honest and sincere effort of the decent peoples of the world to prevent war, just as you quarantine your house against yellow fever or just as you kill a mad dog when he attacks your child.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I think the gentleman is doing a wonderful job of pointing out the salient facts in the bill. I agree with him that that is the way to handle the situation to prevent wars. I wonder if the gentleman can enlighten us a little as to how the commander in chief of the pool to which we shall contribute armed forces is to be selected.

Mr. JARMAN. By the Security Council, there will be an organization under it similar to our Joint Chiefs of Staff during this war. I dare say it will really select the commander in chief.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is there any provision in this bill providing for a way in which these conflicting nations get together to settle their own differences first?

Mr. JARMAN. Doubtless the gentleman will recall that I specifically said that was not in this bill, but it is in the Charter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When they desire to take action with reference to sanctions and so forth or to call into being this force to defend against an aggression, must that be by a unanimous vote on the part of the Council?

Mr. JARMAN. With reference to the use of force; yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is, it must be the unanimous action of that council of the five so-called great powers. Is that correct?

Mr. JARMAN. I believe it is a unanimous vote of the five powers plus a majority vote of the other powers which at the time are members of the Security Council.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But any one of the five great powers can veto any action taken?

Mr. JARMAN. That is true.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What time, if any, is given to these nations which cannot agree to agree?

Mr. JARMAN. On a matter of consultation such as that, there could not possibly be a time limit placed on it. There is no time limit on it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Under this bill, is there any way for our delegate to put this Nation into war?

Mr. JARMAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, when those forces are called together and he votes for us to contribute men and ships to prevent any aggression or to stop it, would that be putting us into war?

Mr. JARMAN. In reply, I call the attention of the gentleman to my last statement before yielding to the gentleman from Washington. It was that should it become necessary for the Security Council to use those forces of the United Nations, it would not be a question of war but a sincere effort to prevent war, just as we quarantine our house, I believe I said, or kill a mad dog who is attacking our child.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But if the other side would fight back, of course, you would have a war, would you not? Suppose they would not submit peaceably to the efforts to put down an aggression by force and they fought back. Then we would be in a war.

Mr. JARMAN. If it is spread sufficiently, it would be a war, but it would not be aggressive war.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, I agree with the gentleman. I voted for the Fulbright resolution and I want us to take every step that we can consistently take that will insure against aggression and promote a lasting peace.

Mr. JARMAN. I am sure such a distinguished gentleman as the gentleman from Kentucky would naturally feel that way.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is the gentleman from Kentucky confusing the power of the delegate with that of the President who would have the right to say when the troops were to go in?

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Kentucky was correct. While the President has the authority under this bill to sign that agreement with the Security Council that we will furnish four divisions, let us say, or such and such an air force, after that is done, then it must come back to this Congress for approval. After that approval, whatever the force is is subject to the command of the Security Council and neither the President nor the Congress has any jurisdiction over it. But we are represented on that Security Council.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am not a member of your very great committee. The hearings were very limited. There

were only two witnesses, I believe, who were heard by your committee. What comes to the Congress? What is brought back to the Congress? What do they vote on before any troops are ordered or sent any place?

Mr. JARMAN. As I said in the beginning, this bill authorizes the President to sign the agreement with the Security Council. As to the number of troops it will send, nobody can say, but I mentioned four divisions.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, any number that the President and the other nations would agree on?

Mr. JARMAN. Whatever the Security Council agrees on.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And with the President.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; as far as the United States is concerned, but the President has nothing to do with what the United Kingdom or any other country furnishes.

Mr. BLOOM. But it must come back to Congress.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Now, after the President takes that action, what does the delegate do?

Mr. JARMAN. The delegate does nothing.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But before the delegate does anything, must that agreement come to Congress?

Mr. JARMAN. That is the next step. It must be approved by the Congress.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Then, if the Congress has approved that step, immediately, in 5 or 6 months or in 1 year——

Mr. JARMAN. Or in 2 weeks.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Any time after the Congress acts on it or approves it, then this delegate could designate the number of troops that would go into this pool?

Mr. JARMAN. After the Congress agrees that the United States shall furnish a certain number of troops, the delegate has nothing to do with it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. When does the delegate take over?

Mr. JARMAN. The delegate does not take over.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Well, what does he do when this act of aggression starts? Who says how many troops are to go in?

Mr. JARMAN. The Security Council, of which our delegate is one member. But our delegate will not do it. The Security Council will do it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As a unit?

Mr. JARMAN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On that point, could any one of the five great nations veto the action that our delegate or some other delegate proposed?

Mr. BLOOM. It is agreed upon by the Congress.

Mr. JARMAN. Your question is, "After the Congress has agreed upon the force to be sent, could one delegate prevent the use of that force?"

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am assuming the maximum force. Suppose the delegate from the United States should make a motion that we take action to prevent this act of aggression, and then some other delegate said, "I object." Could any one of the five great powers or could we object to bringing any number of our men into action to stop that aggression? As I understand, the Charter provides that any one of the five great powers has the veto power against taking any action over aggression. Is that correct?

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. STARKEY. Is it not also true that even after the Congress has agreed to the agreement reached by the President with the other nations, still this international police force cannot be used, no part of it can be used, unless the President indicates to our representative on the Security Council that they shall be used?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is in error about that. After the Congress ratifies the agreement signed by the President with the Security Council those troops are at the disposal of the Security Council. Neither the President nor the Congress can prevent their use.

Mr. STARKEY. Does it not require a majority vote of the five powers to use that police force? The United States is one of those five powers. Then, if we do not agree to the use of that international police force, neither our force nor any other force can be used?

Mr. JARMAN. That is quite right, but in that case it would not be the President directly doing it, but the member of the Security Council.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Like the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] I voted for the Fulbright resolution and for every step to prevent war, and therefore I am friendly to this resolution.

Mr. JARMAN. Just as I said of the gentleman from Kentucky, I would know that the distinguished gentlemen would be friendly to it.

Mr. DONDERO. What bothers me is when does the question of whether we enter war or do not enter war come back to the Congress under this proposed legislation?

Mr. BLOOM. What war?

Mr. JARMAN. The chairman rather appropriately asks, "What war?"

Mr. DONDERO. Any war.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no war.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what we are confronted with. Suppose war should break out in Europe between two governments that cannot be stopped by the international police force, as we call it under this bill, then when if ever does the question come back to the Congress of the United States whether we should enter or not?

Mr. JARMAN. Really, I have not thought that through very seriously. I believe the answer to the gentleman's question is that insofar as four divisions, let us say, insofar as those four divisions are concerned, I do not believe it would ever come back to the Congress. They are already committed; but before the United States could furnish other troops or declare war it would have to come to Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Beyond the four divisions of troops they would have to come to Congress?

Mr. JARMAN. They would have to come to Congress, yes. Of course, I merely use four divisions as an illustration without any idea at the moment what the requirement will be.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, it would be for Congress to pass upon the question then?

Mr. JARMAN. That is true. That, as I say, is rather a curbstone opinion, but I believe that is the situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Then at least to that extent Congress does not divest itself of the right to declare war or not to declare war.

Mr. JARMAN. In no respect does Congress divest itself of the right to declare war.

Mr. BLOOM. At no time.

Mr. JARMAN. It simply contributes these theoretical four divisions to the pool to be used if necessary to prevent war. Should the effort to prevent war fail they are committed and could not be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this measure. It is a bill which implements our participation in the organization of the United Nations. It provides for the selection by the President by and with the advice of the Senate of a representative and a vice representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, and empowers the President from time to time to appoint five representatives who shall participate in the General Assembly, which has been referred to as the United Nations' "Town Meeting of the Air." That is the extent of the General Assembly's power and authority, the power to speak and perhaps influence and mold public opinion and, let us hope, marshal the moral and spiritual forces of mankind on the side of peace.

I am not much bothered about the question of whether or not this measure is an avenue over which we may travel into war. The powers of the President of the United States under the Constitution of this country are so great that as Commander in Chief of our armed forces any President who has the power to direct the Army and the Navy—and they all have it—can put this Nation into war. There is no debate about that. I am not worried for the further reason that the big powers, the so-called Big Five—I would say the Big Two if I wanted to be realistic, for there are just two great land powers in the world, the United States and Russia, and two great naval powers in the world, the United States and Great Britain. Any one of these so-called Big Five powers can veto any action against any act of aggression on its part or any action on the part of the United Nations, as I understand it, to curb any act of aggression on the part of any nation. Unless these great powers are actuated by good will and by a sincere determination on their part to observe the laws of common humanity,

decency, righteousness, justice, and fairness in this world, there is no power that can be superimposed upon them other than the power of the arbitrament of the sword. Suppose the United Nations were now functioning, and the little nation, Iran, filed a complaint with the United Nations that Russia had dismembered that country, taken over one of its most valuable provinces, and set up a government at the head of which was a man who had long been a refugee in Russia. We would not want to fight over that. It is a shocking thing that a little nation should be dismembered, a little nation which at the darkest hour of Russia's existence in world history, perhaps, permitted this Nation, Great Britain, and Russia to enter its territory with armed forces and bring our efficient corps of engineers there to build a railroad through Iran from the Gulf of Persia down to the borders of Russia, over which this country poured billions of dollars worth of supplies without which Russia could not have effectively participated in this war.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. It is true, is it not, that this little nation to which the gentleman refers, Iran, will have an opportunity as soon as the United Nations Organization convenes in January to present its case in full detail before all of the other nations of the world in the General Assembly?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true.

Mrs. LUCE. And present to it all of the facts of the case whereby we may seek further agreements in the United Nations Organization?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes. It embodies a pious hope. In other words, if a murderer comes into my house and takes all I have and maybe kills me, I could say my prayers and get ready for the next world, but that would not do me much good as that act of aggression. It would probably prepare my soul for exit from this world and my advent into the next, but it would not stop the burglary and prevent my death.

Mrs. LUCE. Does not the gentleman think the value of debate will be as great in the General Assembly as it is on the floor of this House?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is probably true. I hope that will be true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of the question propounded by the Member from Connecticut, suppose Iran does come in.

Mr. JENNINGS. Iran is in.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But suppose it comes before the Council and files a complaint against any one of the other nations and the Council finds the complaint is justified. We will say that Russia is an aggressor nation, what action can the Council take?

Mr. JENNINGS. None whatever. It can only address its claim to the Council, to the Organization, and we could indulge in some pious platitudes with Russia, but that would be as far as we would get under the set-up, and I would not want to go farther because I do not want to fight Russia. There is no good reason why this Nation and Russia should not live in peace. We have traditionally been friends.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. I think everyone admits that at the moment when there is a possible conflict or when the contention is so great that conflict breaks out between any of the great nations, then the United Nations Organization will cease to function. It will not function as long as the veto power exists within the Council. Is the gentleman in favor of doing away with the veto power?

Mr. JENNINGS. No. I do not want war with any one of the great powers nor with any nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. If I can secure more time I will yield.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, then, that all the Council amounts to, all the whole Organization amounts to, is a wailing wall to which Iran may come and file its complaint and cry?

Mr. JENNINGS. I cannot yield further. I am satisfied that what has been contributed is perhaps better than what I am offering, but I am like a mummy, I am pressed for time.

Coming back to this question of the Big Five, our President, I think, very aptly and very wisely said the other day that the Big Five ought to quit functioning as a Big Five or as a Big Three. He suggested that we set up this organization and quit having these meetings around the corner by representatives of the big nations. Well, now, that would be fine.

Something happened this week that is somewhat disturbing. I thought that China, under Chiang Kai-shek, the President of that country, had made a very notable contribution in this war. Mr. Roosevelt thought so. Mr. Truman evidently thought so. I believe the whole world, if properly informed, thinks so. But we rapped Chiang Kai-shek rather severly on the knuckles just this week and said to him: "Now, do not look for any more help from us to subdue anybody that is offering you armed resistance in the confines of China. If you do, you will not get any more help from this country." That is at least what I regard as a public insult from one great power to another. It would be a fine thing if we could stop the civil war in China without the overthrow of the government we have recognized and that fought on our side against Japan. I do not profess to be an international expert but I do hope that our Secretary of State who, at the eminent peril of his life, apparently to settle this Iran trouble, and maybe make arrangements to give Russia our atomic bomb that they do not need and should not have, flew even without an overcoat through a blizzard over to Iran, that when he gets back, will not have to eat off the mantlepiece for the next 6 weeks. I hope that he gets along fine over there and really accomplishes something. I am going to vote for this measure because it is carrying out the commitments I have heretofore made as a Member of this House, redeems the pledge of my party's platform and the pledge of all parties' platforms, and because it embodies the hope, the conscience, and the prayer of the people of this country that peace may be maintained in this world and that we may not have another blood bath within the memory of any living man. I believe it is the best and the sanest step that has yet been taken for the accomplishment of world peace through a world organization, and for these reasons and others that I might assign I shall vote for it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, this measure is one of several steps that the House of Representatives must courageously take to breathe life into the United Nations Organization. It is our first chance under our constitutional system, as members of the popular branch of the Congress, to express our sentiments about it.

Next to our family relationships, to our religious convictions and to the preservation of our own country, nothing in the whole world matters so much to us as does the realization of the bright hopes that arise from this new world organization. What we do today may or may not be the most momentous thing we have ever done in our individual lives. World betterment undreamed of may come of it.

With the advent of Christmas, our minds today are not in this Chamber but they have already, in fact, traveled ahead of our physical bodies to the hearthstone of home, where the approaching festivity will be celebrated. We are about to divest ourselves of our year-around realism, to revel for a brief season in the most unbelievable sentimentality.

The solid thing, however, of this joyous time is embedded in the prophetic words of "peace on earth and good will to all men"—so joyfully chanted and spoken in the Christmas season and so often dismissed as visionary and unachievable for the somber days of the next year.

To use the legislative vernacular, we are today implementing the age-old hope of Christmastide. I hope that those who hear me will catch the overreaching significance.

I am not so naive as to believe that what we are doing here today is assuredly to open the doors of paradise. If you ask me whether this organization will prevent war, I must realistically say that no one in this Chamber can answer. But I do know that it has within it the means by which war can be prevented. Whether it will function as we wish it to function will depend, I submit, on the public sentiment that is mustered all over the world to enforce its decrees. That is where you and I shall either fail or succeed gloriously. Whatever your political predilections, and whatever misgivings you may entertain, I contend that it is the primary duty of all of us

to help in the creation of a favorable atmosphere for its deliberations, present, and future. Any other course, counting the high goals it envisions, would make us, even to the least of us, unworthy.

I am impressed today with one thing, that the idea of world cooperation to achieve peace is not easily killed off. You and I saw the first real world effort for this purpose go down ingloriously in miserable failure. Yet some 25 years after, the same idea, perhaps dressed in a different style, is again taking on form and substance. It is, I submit, unconquerable in its appeal to mankind, for mankind does not often resurrect failures. It has brought to its patronage scores of outstanding men sitting in this Congress who, 25 years ago, were deeply antagonistic. It has, even after this stunning futility, collected about it untold thousands of plain men and women as converts. Such an idea to outlive its many bitter foes in the twenties and gain in its adherents must have in it solid validity.

And may I suggest that the persistency of the idea may be attributed to the historical fact that it marches with universal trend of the world from chaos to a state of law and order. At this, some of you will unthinkingly scoff.

One hundred years ago men were meeting each other in duels. Today, such battle is abhorrent, universally condemned by all mankind. Yet in its day it was honorable and proud to issue or accept the challenge for mortal combat.

Between families, law and order has come slowly but almost universally.

Between states within a confederation such as ours, disputes are settled within the calm and deliberate precincts of an all-powerful and all-respected court, whose decrees go unchallenged.

Certainly, this steady march from anarchy and chaos some day will, in the very orderly evolution of our world society, capture and hold the nations of the world within its principles and purposes. So to me the final reduction of the world to a state of law and order is bound to come, and the sole question remaining is when.

The other night I attended a seminar conducted under War Department auspices to discuss atomic power, and if it were not for one offhand observation that I shall mention, I might have left the seminar not one bit the wiser. This speaker, who had to do with the actual experimental work, related that every time an objective, however minor or major, was assigned to a group of five scientists, exactly four of them agreed it could not be done.

Perhaps it was the next night that I looked at an English film that depicted the fight of scientists in deep Africa to control and extirpate the grasshopper plague that has regularly devastated those undeveloped parts of the world. I was a little reassured by this picture, because I had reluctantly voted for eradicating grasshopper destruction in our western country, with a slight feeling that I was too gullible. In this picture the trained scientists summoned into their councils the black chieftains, so powerful in their control of the simple minds of the natives, to solicit their help in conquering this scourge that had kept their tribesmen of every succeeding generation in poverty all through the centuries. The talking radio reported their solemn replies to these appeals, and they ran like this: "The grasshoppers have come year in and year out for centuries. Yes; they have brought ruin that has produced starvation and death. They will come again. It is the will of God."

These two stories tell dramatically of the barriers and the lack of faith that must be overcome, not alone among black barbarians but among civilized men, when they come face to face with movements such as this that seek to change and to alter things that always have been, and in the ordinary mind, alas, always will be. It is against this sort of resistance, this lack of faith, that the new and hopeful United Nations Organization must struggle and contend. Where will your weight be found?

After World War I, more optimistic and more enthusiastic then in my outlook, I contributed my share to mold sentiment of my neighbors for American participation in the League of Nations. The defeat that came was so overwhelming that even my youthful ardor cooled and I fell victim of a deep and regrettable conviction that the idea was forever dead. I was wrong, egregiously wrong.

As I look back over the course of things, I see today that the nations which criminally and wantonly wrecked it and flaunted its principles after coming within its folds—Italy, Japan, and Germany—are now literally wiped from the face of the earth, stripped of military power, and convicted as the greatest enemies that sorrowful mankind has ever known.

Is it too much to say that the defeat of these outlaw nations was encompassed because they disowned and disavowed the principles that formed the very cornerstone of the League of Nations? And may I add this thought, that the pity of it all for the future peace of the world, is that the League of Nations was not privileged to declare global war against these outlaws, in the name of its member countries.

Had this occurred and had the conquering armies carried beside their own national flag the flag of the League of Nations, we should have encircled that institution with a halo, exalted it as the preserver of the peace of world, and breathed a new life in it that would have won for it the loyalty and the attachment of free peoples all over the world. Institutions gather strength and power only as they behave in the performance of their mission. One world war won under the name of the League of Nations might have clinched peace for all time, and certainly would have made unnecessary the birth of the institution we usher in today.

In our moment, when we are harassed and vexed by the weight and perplexities of legislation, we are prone to speak of our services here in terms of dollars and speculate whether the game is worth the candle. No one in his right mind but knows that body and soul must be kept together. On the other hand, I tell you in the deepest sincerity that the personal satisfaction which would come from the favorable issue of this undertaking, facilitated by the little part you and I have played in it, would outbalance and outweigh all the Treasury could pay me in salary, pension, or any other conceivable perquisite. You and I, if this shall occur, will have marched with history, to its most glorious goal.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1580, the bill to provide for representatives of the United States to the United Nations Organization. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the world's hope for continuing peace must be placed in the only international mechanism that exists—the United Nations Organization which was born of the conference at San Francisco.

Now from the very days of Dumbarton Oaks, I had the most serious doubts, which many of us here share, about the real effectiveness of the mechanism of the United Nations Organization to prevent another world war. I still have those doubts, chiefly born of the existence within the Security Council, of the veto power. It should be plain that, at the very moment when the world will most need the so-called peace-enforcing machinery of the Security Council to operate, the moment when tensions have become so severe between the great nations that war is imminent, that mechanism cannot work because of the veto power which enables any great nation to forbid it to work.

The bill before us is basic legislation, which seeks to implement certain security measures of the Charter to which we agreed at San Francisco. I am for these measures; therefore, I am for implementing them by this bill.

The most controversial sections of the bill are those which deal with the President's power to put actively into the field certain contingent police forces, which the Security Council agrees are to be used against a so-called aggressor nation.

But surely common sense—born of a proper understanding of the esmasculating implications of the veto power—should tell us that these contingent forces will probably never be used by the United Nations Organization. Because of the veto power, which makes it impossible for them to be used against one of the voting great powers, they can only be used against a small nonvoting nation. They cannot even be used against a small nonvoting aggressor nation, in whose successful aggression one of the great powers is interested—again because of the great nation's veto power. Not only would these contingent forces never be used—they need never be used against a little nation. Common sense again tells us that three telephone calls from Moscow, Washington, and London could stop any small nation bent on aggression in its tracks. The economic sanctions which our country alone, no less the combined economic sanctions of all the other great nations could evoke, long before military contingents need be called upon, would be so great that no small nation could hold out against them for a month. The whole dispute about these military

contingents and their use by the Security Council, is, therefore—or so it seems to me—pretty unrealistic, in a world of sovereign nations using the veto power. You ask then, why I am so hopeful about the UNO? Why do I believe its offices can be used to prevent war among the major nations? First, because I am hopeful that there will be some abatement of the veto power in the Security Council. But secondly, I believe there is great hope for peace in the mechanism of the General Assembly, where all the small nations will be represented.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentlewoman.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Gladly.

Mr. SAVAGE. I agree with the gentlewoman from Connecticut that perhaps the veto power may affect relations at times, but does the gentlewoman believe if we are successful, even in the General Assembly, in maintaining peace for several years to come, there will be more confidence in this kind of machinery and that eventually there will be a much greater chance of eliminating the veto power than there would have been at San Francisco?

Mrs. LUCE. I agree most heartily with the gentleman. We must do everything we can to make this Organization function as it now stands, and to improve its powers for peace by loyal and imaginative participation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield for a question?

Mrs. LUCE. Gladly.

Mr. DONDERO. Suppose one of the five signatories to the agreement should commit an act of aggression against a small nation, and that small nation appealed to the United Nations Organization for relief. Then suppose either the General Assembly or the Security Council wanted to take action to use force to stop the aggression, and one of the five—the guilty one—vetoed that action. Is there anything that can be done?

Mrs. LUCE. Nothing that I know of, beyond the economic sanctions, negotiations of the dispute, the threat of war, accordingly as these procedures would be suggested by outraged world opinion, as a result of full debate within the Assembly itself. That is the value of the Assembly. It would, or could, become the vocal conscience of the peace-loving world.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Of course, there are so many things that could take place before there is a disturbance of the peace. Sanctions and everything else would be tried to get this nation, big or small, to see the light and stop it from doing anything to disturb the peace. There are so many things that take place. If the gentleman would read sections 41 and 42 of the Charter, you will see there are so many sanctions and other things which take place before it gets to the point of disturbing the peace.

Mr. DONDERO. They might even use economic sanctions against an aggressor nation.

Mr. BLOOM. They do.

Mrs. LUCE. Yes; all that is provided for. I am told that this bill is open for amendment. But I sincerely hope it will not be amended, because hasty, unconsidered amendments may perhaps result in delay in its passage in the Senate. However, if there had been more time for this House to offer amendments, I should have offered one on page 5, line 2, expressing Congress as favoring the inclusion of instructions to our representatives concerning the establishment of disarmament machinery in the UNO.

That amendment would be, in effect, a resolution already introduced by me.

Mr. Chairman, on November 14 in the House I introduced a very short resolution—only 46 words long. So I will ask your indulgence while I read it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery within the existing framework of the United Nations Organization for international control and reduction of armaments and weapons, especially those involving atomic power.

I introduced that resolution for two reasons: First, to attract the attention of my colleagues to one, if not perhaps the most important, aspect of international security—disarmament. Secondly, to attract their attention to the fact that the United Nations Organization is the only means by which international disarmament can be achieved.

Now, at the San Francisco Conference the need for disarmament among the nations was overshadowed by the need for the organization of their security. During the tragic twenties and thirties, the peace-loving nations had let their armaments dwindle, but without protecting themselves by any other mechanism for security, or for enforcing the peace if it were threatened. A false slogan, "The way to disarm is to disarm," attracted too many pacifist-minded people. All through the twenties and until the late thirties, the peaceful member nations of the League of Nations went in for disarmament increasingly, but failed to create or strengthen any peace-enforcing machinery within the League. We know how fatal this mistake proved to be.

It was natural, therefore, that at San Francisco the organization of the Security Council to prevent aggression, and the military contingents which it was to have at its command, loomed with far greater importance than the organization of disarmament. This time the statesmen were going to make sure that collective security came first. And they were right.

Now there were, to be sure, several pertinent paragraphs in the UNO Charter which looked to the eventual limitation and reduction of armaments. But the fact is that no actual, functioning disarmament machinery was set up under the Charter. There was the general belief in San Francisco, that when the security machinery was functioning, and military contingents had been established for joint police action, there would then be a gradual, indeed a natural, international reduction of planes, tanks, guns, ships, and mass destruction weapons.

And then, just a month after the San Francisco Conference ended, the United States dropped two atomic bombs upon Japan. And the world entered the atomic age, faced by the hideous prospect of a new and more dreadful arms race than it had ever before seen.

The atomic bomb blasted open our minds, first, to the unlimited capacity of science to produce new means of mass destruction and, second, to the desperate need for controlling and reducing such weapons—in short, for disarmament.

President Truman and Prime Ministers Attlee and King recognized the danger of a new arms race in their communiqué of November 15 when they said, "Nor can we ignore the possibility of the development of other weapons, or of new methods of warfare which may constitute as great a threat to civilization as military use of atomic energy."

Today every radio listener and newspaper reader knows what kind of war we would face if the machinery of international security set up by the UNO fails, and if we also fail to control and reduce such weapons. But do we realize today that international machinery for disarmament and control is not functioning in the UNO? We must realize it because if this condition continues, with chemical and electronics laboratories setting the pace, the world will inexorably enter a fantastic armament race, and we will henceforth live in an atmosphere of international fear and suspicion, whose only end can be the very war we fear. The temporary security we have today, because we have the secret of the bomb, would gradually give way to abject terror tomorrow, as we came to realize other nations had produced even as deadly, if not deadlier, weapons. Moreover, such an arms race would have unhappy by-products. It would destroy scientific freedom, regiment labor and industry, and set up military fascism.

The May-Johnson bill, which is still in the House, is an illustration of the curb on scientific freedom that would result from a fear psychology, and the necessity of regimenting science for an arms race. Certainly freedom of enterprise and rising standards for free labor would be sacrificed if it were necessary for this country to enter an unbridled race for the possession of the greatest number of weapons of death, and, as I say, we know the end—catastrophe.

Now, I want to make it very clear that I am not proposing the control and limitation of weapons, including atomic weapons, as any substitute for the security measures which are to be found in the Charter. As I said at the beginning of this debate, I support all of these measures. Furthermore, I realize that the problem is not simply how do we cut down or outlaw this or that weapon; the real problem is how do we cut out or outlaw war itself.

Nevertheless, the atomic bomb has projected the subject of disarmament as a prime part of the security problem itself. Just as national disarmament cannot safely come without comparable measures of international security, so

these measures of security cannot develop safely within the psychology of a national arms race. The problems of disarmament and security are twin problems.

I have read you House Concurrent Resolution 101, my 46-word resolution, which would, if passed, put this whole Congress and the Nation vigorously behind the idea of using the UNO to achieve disarmament and control of all weapons, including the atom bomb.

Now, I had a purpose in making this House Concurrent Resolution 101 so brief and general. It is specific, in that it insists that the UNO create whatever international machinery should be created for the international control and reduction of armaments, with particular emphasis on the new weapons which science has so recently demonstrated it can produce without limit. But it does not specify which body of the United Nations would set up such appropriate machinery, nor does it say whether this machinery should be a commission, or what form it should take. The wisdom of the UNO members will decide this.

Personally, I should favor the setting up of such machinery by the General Assembly. The UNO Charter contains a nice balance between the Security Council and the General Assembly. Article 24 defines the functions and the powers of the Security Council as follows:

In order to insure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility, the Security Council acts on their behalf.

Then follows a series of articles which confer upon the Security Council authority to promote the pacific settlement of disputes and to prevent or stop aggression. Article 11 partially defines functions of the General Assembly as follows:

The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the members or to the Security Council or to both.

So, you can say, therefore, that the General Assembly, in which all nations are to be represented equally, may formulate general principles of peace and security, while the Security Council, a small, quickly moving body, is to deal with actual specific emergencies which may arise that threaten the peace.

We all know today that the atomic bomb calls for the immediate formulation of additional principles of security. So concerned are all the nations, great and small, with the threat of atomic energy and other scientific means of destruction, that there is a general demand that the Assembly meeting next month appoint the commission on atomic energy called for by the Truman-Attlee-King communiqué. It may be that the diplomatic negotiations, say between Secretary Byrnes, Bevin, and Molotov in Moscow, which have just begun, will throw the appointment of the commission into the hands of the Security Council. I believe this would be a very grave error. I feel that most people in the United States, and in the smaller nations particularly, believe that so important a commission, upon whose recommendations and operations may depend the very lives of millions and millions of people of all nations, large and small, should be appointed by the General Assembly, wherein they are all represented. The authority of appointment for such bodies clearly rests under article 22, which provides that:

The General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Obviously the recommendations of such an atomic and armament commission will be of two kinds: one, security—the control of atomic energy to prevent its use for war purposes, and permanent disarmament machinery. These recommendations would be carried out by the Security Council, and its Military Staff Committee. Two, the constructive use of atomic energy for the control of disease, and as a new source of national power and wealth. These recommendations would find their way to the Economic and Social Council. I should anticipate a similar procedure for action under the spirit of my resolution.

Here, I should like to point out again that both the General Assembly, and the Security Council are authorized to deal with disarmament. I have already quoted article 11 of the Charter, which authorizes the General Assembly to consider the general principles of security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and to make recommendations with regard to such principles to the members or to the Security Council, or both. Clearly, then, the Assembly, or a committee of the Assembly, can formulate principles for disarmament and recommend them to the Security Council.

Article 26 of the Charter gives to the Security Council the formulation of plans for the establishment of a system for disarmament. This article reads:

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in article 47, plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

Because disarmament is a continuing part of increasing security, it seems logical that any permanent disarmament machinery should function with the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee.

But the recommendations for appropriate machinery for disarmament should begin with the Atomic Energy Commission, which we hope will be appointed by the General Assembly next month. According to the three-nation communiqué, this commission is to make a series of specific proposals, one of which is "for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable for mass destruction."

The UNO Commission should then recommend to the General Assembly and to the Security Council the establishment of appropriate machinery to carry out now—this year and next, and every year—the elimination of weapons adaptable to mass destruction.

The League of Nations, which was making a better beginning in disarmament than is generally realized, found that continuous machinery was necessary because the limitation of armaments is not something that can be achieved by one agreement. Obviously the reduction of arms must be constantly integrated with regular and continuing inspection, and all other phases of the effort to achieve security.

We must not, we dare not, drift into an arms race, with its mobilization of laboratories, its regimentation of industry, and the spirit of aggressiveness which will be born of such a race. The brains of our scientists, the hands of our workers, the skill of management, must all be used for the happiness of mankind, not for the production of new and more terrible ways of destroying ourselves.

All I have hoped to accomplish by my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 101, is the mobilization of public opinion in this country for the ending of such an arms race, and the establishment of United Nations Organization procedure for disarmament as quickly as possible. It is just one step, but a sure step in the direction of peace. I am today supporting S. 1580, which concerns implementing certain security measures in the UNO. I hope all those of my colleagues who yearn for world peace, will support House Concurrent Resolution 101, for disarmament measures in the UNO and urge hearings upon it in the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Many important decisions, which will make or break the UNO, will be taken within the next few months. I have today projected the issue of disarmament, in discussing the bill before us, because I believe it one of the most important issues in the security problem, which is the first problem the United Nations must face. We can and will face it with the help of an aroused public opinion which demands peace, and if this Congress expresses itself as willing to use the machinery we created for it at San Francisco.

For I believe that our hope of peace is bound up with the United Nations Organization If it fails, anarchy and tragedy will be our lot. If it succeeds, the world may move on, in security, to new heights of physical prosperity and moral elevation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have before the House today for consideration one of the most momentous questions that this House has considered since I have been a Member, and perhaps one of the most momentous that will come before the House in future years.

I have been surprised to note that for much of the time today that this bill has been under consideration up to this point not more than 50 Members are on the

floor of the House and at no time today have I seen as many as 75 out of the 435 Members when we have been considering a measure that deals with the future welfare of our country and the peace of the world.

No one could be more strongly opposed to aggression on the part of our Nation or any other nation than I and neither could anyone be more sincerely interested in or deeply concerned about the future peace of our country and the world. This is the feeling of the American people generally and especially of those of us who have had boys in this great war. With this sincere purpose in my mind and heart I have voted for measures looking to the establishment of an association of nations within the framework of our Constitution that would prevent aggression and preserve a just and lasting peace.

I became a Member of Congress soon after World War I closed, and when the League of Nations was adopted and approved by the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. We did not become a member of the League. The American people by an overwhelming majority disapproved the League of Nations in 1920. It was urged that the League of Nations was the great panacea for world peace. But it is sad to record that before the ink was dry on that great document many of the signatory nations of the document were at each other's throats and engaged in bloody wars.

Germany, Italy, and Japan all signed the covenant, and a few years thereafter they became the three great aggressor nations of the earth. It was due to no fault of the United States that the League failed. The failure must be laid at the door of the signatory nations of the covenant.

Japan invaded Manchuria, a part of China. The United States called upon France and Great Britain, who had large possessions in and about China, to join with the United States to stop that aggressor. But they declined to aid in that effort and some time thereafter Italy devastated and raped little Ethiopia. We tried to stop that; but England and France and other signatories of the covenant refused to cooperate and that little country was devastated and overrun by Italy, another member of the League.

Germany, a third member of the League, followed the aggression of Japan and Italy and overran Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other countries. Russia attacked Finland and took the Baltic States and part of Poland.

CONGRESS ALONE CAN DECLARE WAR

I sincerely and honestly believe that the measure before us is violative of this provision of the Constitution of the United States which expressly provides that Congress alone shall have the power to declare war. There has been set up a Security Council made up of the United States and various countries. The so-called Big Five of that Council are Russia, China, Great Britain, and the United States. The bill provides that the President shall appoint a representative of the United States, at a salary of $20,000 annually and a deputy representative at a salary of $12,000. We set up another great world bureaucracy. Will it be as big as UNRRA, with 8,000 officeholders? This representative speaks and votes for the 140,000,000 Americans on matters relating to aggression, the extent to which the United States shall participate in policing the world, and in furnishing men and equipment, and in my opinion the Congress becomes subordinate to this representative as to the Security Council. There is nothing in this bill that limits in any way the number of men that we shall furnish to police the world and provide an army and navy to proceed against any so-called aggressor. There is no indication as to how many billions of dollars this program may cost the American people.

These questions will be determined largely by this Security Council. The representatives from the four other great powers in this Council act with the representative of the United States. I am wondering if we shall be called upon—as we were in the UNRRA—to assume approximately 75 percent of the load, as we were called on to furnish 75 percent or more of the men and even a greater percent of the matériel for the drive on the western front, or 80 or 85 percent of the men and matériel that we were called upon to furnish to carry on and win the war in the Pacific.

Russia has no national debt, Great Britain has a national debt about one-third of ours. Our representative and the other members of this Council can declare a country an aggressor and can send any number of our armed forces into that struggle. This may mean peace and on the other hand it may mean another world war.

In such proceedings the Congress does not have any say. Conditions will have developed so that we will be in the war without the consent of Congress and if this measure is adopted, Congress will not be called upon in the future to declare war as provided in the Constitution. We shall have indirectly delegated that power to our representative on the Security Council. This representative is not required to consult the wishes or desires of the American people or to consult public opinion. We may be into a big war overnight.

If there has been one serious fault with Congress in the last several years it has been that Congress in too many instances has surrendered its constitutional powers and has abdicated instead of legislating. The Congress is made up of 531 Members. They are the duly selected representatives of the American people. No greater power is given than the power to declare war and to take the sons and daughters of the Nation and put them into a bloody and costly war.

I am unwilling to abdicate and turn over to some representative chosen by the President the power to determine the issue of peace or war for our country.

There is another measure coming up in the near future affecting this same subject. That is, to approve or disapprove the special agreement or agreements that the President may make with the Security Council as provided in section 6 of this bill. It is my intention to vote against this measure because it is unconstitutional, and so that I may be free to act in this matter before our country is finally committed beyond recall to a program against the welfare of the people of the United States and against a real program to promote the peace of the world.

ARE THE FOUR OTHER GREAT POWERS COOPERATING FOR PEACE?

The American people have been greatly disturbed over events that have occurred since we defeated Italy, Germany, and Japan. There is evidence on every hand that France, Britain, and Russia are playing bloc and power politics. Britain insisted on having a king and government in Italy, a king and government in Greece, and a king and government in Yugoslovia friendly to her and to protect her life line in the Mediterranean. On the other hand, Russia put in her oar and caused quite a lot of friction in those countries, mostly through communistic influence. Just as soon as we helped to take the heel of Germany off the neck of France they insisted on invading and taking over the free governments and free people of Syria and Lebanon. Great Britain has involved us with Holland to subjugate the 50,000,000 people of Java, who have been under the harsh and autocratic rule of the Dutch for over 300 years. It was claimed that we were having no part in this war against the people of Java, but it recently came out that the high command of Great Britain and the United States agreed to help the Dutch to regain mastery over the people of Java. We have perhaps 200,000 or more American soldiers in China where the two factions are engaged in a struggle over mastery in China. This civil war has gone on for a century and it was carried on during this war while our boys were in China fighting to free the people of China from the heel of Japan and since we have equipped the people of China with planes, guns, tanks, and other war materials they apparently are doing more fighting now than they did while the war was going on with Japan.

The war has been over in Europe for about 8 months and in Japan about 4 months, and I see no substantial evidence that our allies have made a real effort to write a treaty of peace and end this bloody and costly war. No one knows what claims the powers making up this Security Council will make or what situation we may find when we do get down to the serious business of writing a treaty of peace. This gives me very great concern. We have seen the Atlantic Charter, that was held up as the beacon light to our soldiers and sailors to fight and win this war, thrown into the discard. What about the freedom of the pree, freedom of speech, and freedom from fear in the Baltic States, in Java, in Greece, in Italy, and some other countries? I am unwilling to commit myself and our country until I am more convinced than I am today that I am acting in the best interest of the American people and promoting in the best way world security and world peace.

VETO POWER FATAL

The San Francisco Charter has one definite and fatal weakness, and that is the veto power given to each one of the

five great powers on this Security Council. Russia refused to go along unless that veto power was written into the Charter. Nearly threescore of the leading men of the Nation in all walks of life, who were strongly in favor of world cooperation and an association of nations to stop aggression and to assure lasting world peace, recently met and declared that the San Francisco Charter was already outmoded and would not accomplish the objectives for which the people of the world fought and in which they are so deeply interested. Let us not forget that this Security Council is the Council on which we have a representative that determines the question of aggression, peace, and war. Now, let us assume that France did become an aggressor against Syria or Lebanon or against Indochina, that she is now attempting to oppress, and our representative should offer a resolution declaring France an aggressor nation. In order to stop any action against France her representative would simply have to state that France objects. This would be the veto power for France, and would prevent any action against France, however wrongful her aggression might be. Suppose the representative from Great Britain should declare Russia an aggressor in taking over the Baltic states or in taking over Iran or any other country. The representative from Russia would simply have to declare that Russia is opposed to the resolution, and that would stop any action on the part of this Council against Russia, and so it would be if Great Britain, China, or the United States should be charged with aggression. The aggressor himself could try his own case and simply declare that his country was opposed to any such action and that would prevent action.

But let us suppose that Yugoslavia attempted aggression on Hungary or on Greece and some one of these five members should offer a resolution to proceed against Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia is in the sphere of control of Russia. The Russian representative could merely state that Russia was opposed to any action against Yugoslavia, and there the matter would stop. This is a fatal weakness of the San Francisco Charter which created this Security Council. On the other hand, suppose the United States should hold that Great Britain or Holland were aggressors against some country or countries, the British representative could object, and that would stop any action. In my opinion, there must be a modification of the San Francisco Charter before this document will inspire confidence in the people of the world.

The action of our own country and other countries have greatly shaken the confidence of many people in this program. We are calling upon the administration to bring our boys home from all over the world; yet if this measure and the bill that follows it are adopted, it may send a million of our boys and girls to every part of the world; and, of course, if we should become involved in a war, it would mean many millions more, with such an outlay of money that would certainly destroy this country. Does it show faith in this great peace movement to see countries of the world, including our own, increasing their standing armies and their regular navies? We have millions of men under arms, yet we continue the draft, bringing into the Army 75,000 to 100,000 men a month, young boys and married men with families, and on top of that the President says we must have universal compulsory military training. We propose to increase many times our Regular Army and Navy with equipment. This will cost the American people approximately $11,000,000,000 annually. Does this tend to weaken faith of the American people in this program for world peace, the thing that we desire almost more than anything else? I have and I shall continue to vote for all measures that will in my honest opinion promote world peace and, at the same time, serve and protect the interest of the people of the United States.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, first a personal word. I received a message from my home on Sunday, December 2, informing me of illness in my family; I left by plane that day, and did not get back until yesterday. I did not have time to secure leave of absence before my departure, and I understand it is not customary to request retroactive leave of absence but I wish to state to the House the reason for my not being present during this period.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very peaceful debate on a simple matter. This is merely machinery implementing something we have already approved. We have joined the United Nations Organization which we led in creating, and we must make our membership effective. Providing for our representation is a necessary step. There are one or two observations, however, I would like to make.

This is the first step in setting up an international bureaucracy under UNO. We are providing for the authorization of an unlimited number of representatives and an unlimited amount for their pay and their expenses. We have already found by past experience that we must watch international government as well as national government in order to guard against the bureaucracy which grows up apparently wherever government exists.

UNRRA, which was the first international organization to be created and to commence operating during this war period, has already set up an international bureaucracy. It has over 8,000 employees, many of them at high salaries, and the Congress has found itself without any effective way of curbing or controlling this bureaucracy. Maladministration, mismanagement, red tape, overlapping, the sort of thing we call "bureaucracy," had occurred and will occur in international government as well as domestic government. UNRRA reeks with it. When we were trying to find out what to do with it the administration followed UNRRA's own propaganda, saying that we could do nothing about it, that any attempt of the nation that contributes 72 percent of the supplies to improve or limit UNRRA by congressional action impairs "the moral position of the United States" and "would have a most detrimental effect on the successful functioning of this and other international organizations." These quotations are from the majority report on the last UNRRA bill.

We are being asked here in the present bill to give authority to the UNO security council to call into service forces which we have not yet authorized.

This bill in section 6 very carefully limits the power of the President or of our representatives as to using forces that Congress has not authorized. We provide in section 6 the following:

> The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution.

You would think by that language, and by a further proviso at the end of section 6 that nothing herein shall be construed as an authorization to the Security Council to use any force in addition to those provided in the several agreements, that the position of Congress reserving our vote on the forces to be provided had made clear. However, if our experience with UNRRA is to be a precedent we may find that is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To return to the United Nations Organizations is it not true also that the President directs the vote of the one member who can vote with the Assembly, the Security and the Economic Councils and trusteeship. Only one vote is cast by the United States representative; he has no discretion as to how he shall vote; he must cast his vote as the President of the United States directs?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is true as to UNO, and also as to UNRRA. Right at this point I want to explain how the vote of the American member on the UNRRA Council becomes a moral commitment binding on the Congress. President Truman, who ought to know better, has construed our original limited authorization for participation in UNRRA as a binding commitment. In his message to Congress on October 4, 1945, he said:

> The United States pledged to UNRRA, by act of March 28, 1944, $1,350,000,000.

Congress did not pledge any amount at all, but merely authorized future appropriations to UNRRA. Nevertheless, our own President has construed that mere limited authorization as "a pledge." In the original UNRRA resolution which we passed authorizing participation by our Government is this language, in section 6:

> In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:
>
> That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Resolution No. 80 adopted by the UNRRA Council at its third session in London last summer, provides:

That the Council recommends: an additional contribution, approximately equivalent to 1 percent of the national income of the contributing country.

The motion for this resolution was made by Mr. Clayton, our representative.

Under UNRRA this mere recommendation, suggested by our American representative, has become a moral commitment which Congress has not dared to question, and both Houses have authorized the second 1 percent recommended, which amounts to an additional $1,350,000,000 for our country. We want to take care to preserve the right of Congress for a second guess at the security forces. We ought to make it clear, and we have done it by legislation as specific as possible, that we are not tying our hands in the future.

Here is the issue that is involved. If by the action of an American representative not a Member of Congress the hands of Congress are tied and we have an international commitment that we must honor, a way has been found to circumvent Congress, and paralyze representative government in international affairs.

I am one of those who believe that we must and shall and will participate in international organizations and carry out our international obligations, but I do not believe that the Congress should abdicate or should delegate its responsibility and its duties in order to carry out that cooperation.

Another observation should be made about this bill. By the device of authorizing the President to make an agreement, subject to congressional approval, we are getting away from the two-thirds vote required for treaties. We are not evading the Constitution, we are merely using another part of the Constitution, in conducting our foreign relations. Instead of the treaty-making power, we are using the law-making power to authorize and ratify international agreements. I approve of this method of procedure. I merely wish to remind my colleagues of the vast significance of this step we are taking today.

When an agreement for armed forces comes back to Congress, not just the Senate, for approval, I hope we will remember to preserve our independent judgment in cooperating with the Executive and with other nations. I hope we do not abdicate our legislative responsibility. No international council should be in a position to commit the Congress of the United States as to action which Congress has reserved for its own decision, under our Constitution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VCORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this bill and what it represents places before us the most momentous question of many centuries. It is not mere debate on a simple bill to provide implementation of American participation in the United Nations Organization. It is much more than that. The world finds itself today in what undoubtedly is one of the most profound crises in all its history.

I do not know how many Members read Dorothy Thompson's column that appeared night before last in the paper, in which she discussed the discouragement and anger of the common people of the world. There was a good deal of basic truth in what she said, because I am fearful that not only in this country but in many others there is a disillusionment and cynicism among the people which must be dispelled.

Never in the history of the world have the people been confronted by such tremendous power as they face on every hand, on the one hand the power of huge monopoly corporations which may yield or not yield an opportunity for small business to exist, and on the other hand, the power of organizations of workers, farmers, doctors, and everybody else, each one seeking to preserve the rights and advance the cause of its particular group, but each one representing power. Yes, and then we have power in the hands of government greater, perhaps, in many, many countries than has ever existed before in history, except in the instances of Germany and Japan, whose absolute power has been destroyed.

Finally, there is military power, the greatest power of all, military power with the atomic bomb in its hands capable of destroying not only human life but also the productivity of land and the possibility of rebuilding cities, and most serious of all with the power in its hands of destroying democracy and free institutions of government in nation after nation. So the cause of the ordinary individual in the world today is the one I should like to plead for in the few minutes at my command.

The matter of the veto power in the Security Council has been mentioned. I think it well for us to recognize not only that the veto power was insisted upon most strongly by another nation than our own but also that had that veto power not been included we should have had a more difficult time securing ratification in the United States. Yet I believe the veto power ought not to be there, and I think we ought to tell the people in the clearest possible way that until the veto power is eliminated, until every nation in the world, great and small alike, is subject to the universal law of peace, we will not have arrived at the place where we shall have an organization capable of preserving peace.

On yesterday the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS] and I introduced resolutions urging the American representatives to the United Nations to implement at the earliest possible date the provisions of the Charter itself calling for action for disarmament. There is only one feature of disarmament that I want to speak about, and that is this. The possibility of effective disarmament, the possibility of future peace depends more than upon any other factor upon one thing. That one thing is knowledge, knowledge for the ordinary people of the world, the people of the United States, the people of France, and Britain and China and Russia, and all the little nations of the world, knowledge as to what every nation on earth is doing as to armament and military preparation; yes, knowledge of what every nation, including the Soviet Union and every other dictatorial nation is doing. Establish that and we shall have a foundation upon which we can build disarmament agreements that will be kept. I believe it can be done. Establish the right of people through an international agency to have universal, world-wide knowledge as to what military preparations are going on in every nation. Give to that international agency the unlimited right to enter every nation, to inspect, survey, investigate, know, and report to the people of the whole world. Yes; I am talking about the abolition of military secrecy. Substantially so, because I believe it to be the irreducible minimum of the requirements for peace.

America stands today at the pinnacle of world power, but America's strength in past years has been due more to her moral leadership and standing than it has to her physical or economic power. May it always be so, Mr. Chairman.

Therefore, may the leadership in the direction of lifting what otherwise will unquestionably become an insupportable burden and ever-increasing and ever-spiralling military expenditure, may the honor of taking the first and most effective steps toward lifting that burden rest with our own Nation. This bill ought to be passed, of course. It should and I hope will be passed without opposition. But in passing it, we should realize we are only opening the door that leads to a vast room in which are all the problems and difficulties that have ever plagued mankind through the years. One by one those problems must be dealt with and dealt with on a plane of leadership and vision as to the future, great enough, broad enough, and consecrated enough to be the match for the terrific problems and confusion that the world knows today. I believe there is no place where that guidance can be found except in the fundamental teaching of the religion that we profess.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this resolution as it comes from the Senate. I am, however, concerned about some of the machinery that is set up to handle the problem. I am apprehensive about how it will work. I am not happy about some of the provisions of the veto power. I am of the opinion that if trouble should arise between one of the great powers and some smaller countries they would proceed and there would be a war between that country and some smaller nation or nations. I do not think there is any machinery here outside of the economic sanctions and the power of public opinion which could possibly prevent another world war when major powers are concerned. I have always been an individual who has felt that if I can sit down, talk, and look the other fellow in the eye, with whom I have had some differences, that many of our differences resolve themselves. I

think the strong point in this attempt by the United Nations is that of sitting down around the table and talking over the problems of the world and the problems that involve that particular country. If that is done honestly and sincerely, and in addition to that there is a desire for peace, that peace can be attained. I am also convinced that if the world is to see any prolonged period of peace and prosperity, then it is going to be necessary to have some way to control military training, to control this great armament race of producing bigger and better instruments of destruction.

So far I have not seen any evidence of any nation that was willing to cut down on the size and type of implements of destruction. I am also convinced, if nations are to remain at peace, we have to incorporate some of the teachings of the Christ Man given to this world more than 2,000 years ago. A few years ago I walked down into the basement of a little Coptic church in Cairo, Egypt. Some of you may have been there. I remember the steps of that church, worn thin by the millions of people who had walked down to that shrine. In the basement of that Coptic church you will find a little stone cradle where Mary had taken the Christ Child. Why? To hide Him from some individuals who wanted to kill the Christ Man because it was said He was coming to teach some revolutionary things in the world of that time. There in the basement of that Coptic church in Cairo, Egypt, in the shadow of the pyramids, the then cradle of civilization of the known world, the Christ Child was taken to hide Him away from angry rulers who wanted to crucify Him. And they did crucify Him in the prime of life because He taught it was "better to give than to receive" and "to love thy neighbor as thyself."

I am convinced that if the world is going to have any type of lasting peace, we must adopt some of those teachings. We cannot go on producing large and terrible instruments of destruction, with huge armies threatening each other, without sooner or later stepping into some terrible war. I do feel perhaps that this machinery we are setting up to provide for the future actions of the nations of the world has a possibility perhaps of preventing future wars, but I do hope that some way will be found to enter into a disarmament program, a program where all nations of the world may live together in peace and harmony, and love their neighbors as themselves.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no doubt we all agree with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] in the hope that the spirit of Christianity will rule the deliberations and actions of UNO. So far as I know we are all against sin. We all believe in Christianity. But I do not go far enough to believe that if Christ and his teachings and his followers have not been able in 2,000 years to bring universal peace, any organization that we may now frame will do that thing in the immediate future. I am under no misapprehension as to the sentiments of the House or the other body. I realize that one who votes against this measure today is about as popular as a carpetbagger in the South immediately following the Civil War. But that is no overwhelming reason, as far as I am concerned, for supporting this measure. I realize, too, that our great statesmen from Michigan are supporting this measure, that the senior Member from Michigan, representing the State in the other body, said that this was the great adventure. It is, and it will be. But neither he nor I will ever bear arms to carry out any decision of the Security Council. It is quite evident that no Member of this House will ever be called upon to pay the price that may be exacted in following this measure through. Thousands of lives have been sacrificed in the vain hope that we might establish, maintain universal and enduring peace. Many treaties and alliances have been made with that objective in mind. All have failed. That is no reason why we should not make another effort, but the desire for peace should not lead us down a path that will bring us continuous war; give opportunity for oppression of smaller nations. Sometimes folks say, "If you don't want this, what do you want?" I can put my position in a very few words. Is is this: We should continue as we are, the greatest and strongest Nation in all the world, continue on that way, making ourselves ever stronger on the military front, on the production and economic front, and then sit back—yes, you heard me—sit back and as the greatest and strongest Nation in all the world—be in a position to say to the future quarreling nations of Europe, or of any other part of the world, if we think their quarrel is unjust, that if they do not settle their quarrels in a just manner that perhaps our strength, our overpowering strength, may be thrown on the side of the weaker nation, if there lies justice, or with the nation with the just cause of complaint. Then, if we did that, other nations, knowing our disinterestedness, our strength, our power, might abide by our suggestions. But instead of that, we are advised that we must go in, surrender at least a portion, not only of our sovereignty but of our freedom of action, and be bound by the decision of the Security Council. Can we not trust ourselves to do justice? Would not our free, unhampered judgment and action be more certain to keep peace than the compromise decision of the Security Council?

If, perchance, one of the five permanent members of the Council should act as an aggressor against and invade, take over, one of the smaller nations—say Finland or one of the Balkan States—even though the other four members of the Council condemned that action, the Council would, under the terms of the Charter, be unable to use its police force to right the wrong.

Under the procedure suggested by me we, because of our power to carry on a war, because of our productivity and our wealth, would, if unhampered by membership in the Council, be able to exert the power to bring peace, to maintain peace.

In the case which I have cited, in the Council we would be powerless; outside, we might well be the deciding factor, able to enforce peace without the actual use of force.

Churchill, who should know, frankly stated that we were the greatest, the most powerful military nation in all the world. We know, and every nation in this world knows, that our ability to produce and transport munitions of war, the fighting ability and the courage of our men, were the decisive factors in this war. We are today and we will in the future be in world affairs, if we use common sense and good judgment, in the position of the umpire on the baseball field or the referee on the football field, who has the authority to send to the showers an offending player. Neither we, if a member of the Council, nor the Council itself would have any authority to punish an aggressor if it was one of the Big Five. Outside the Council, our ability to produce, our military strength, would insure peace. Speaking softly in the interests of the right, of peace, our "big stick" might guarantee peace.

If I am wrong in the conclusion that the Council cannot use the international police force against one of the Big Five, I hope some member of the committee having this bill in charge will correct me. My understanding is that if all means to maintain peace fail the Security Council can then employ force if it wishes to punish the aggressor nation, to bring the disorderly nation to time; provided, however, the international police cannot be used against any one of the five. It was said earlier in the debate that any one of the five permanent members of the Security Council could veto that action. Am I right? I wish the chairman of the committee would tell me. Assume, for example, that Russia or Great Britain interfere in the internal affairs or the government of one of the lesser nations, and that the Security Council found that the larger power, Great Britain or Russia, was wrong and ordered it to cease its activities, to restore territory which it had taken, could the Security Council then order aggressive action against the nation so interfering?

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman has asked a long question. But let me say this, I do not think the gentleman in his statement meant that we were surrendering any power.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman does not want to answer, that is all right; I will proceed.

Mr. BLOOM. No; wait a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot wait for a general discussion. Under section 3 of article 27 of the Charter, in the case I have cited the Council would be powerless on the very occasion where the need was the greatest. Small nations do not start world wars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will take it up under the 5-minute rule. It is a simple question.

Mr. BLOOM. No; it is not so simple.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not too well pleased with this legislation. I believe, however, we have gone down the road to the point where in order to keep former and greater commitments we shall have to approve this legislation. While it looks in the right direction in the hope for world peace, unless the United Nations Organization amends its present charter, I am fearful that it will fail to keep the peace of the world. We are now the strongest nation in the world, and in the setting up of the world Charter to the present time we have yielded ground that has been in direct opposition to our moral standards and to the governing policies of this country. I am certain that the time for appeasement has passed.

THE ATOMIC BOMB MAKES WORLD PEACE IMPERATIVE

Today the most important problem before the world is to determine a workable organization that will guarantee world peace.

It assumes greater importance than ever before because it will require a world organization for peace to control the atomic bomb. If we fail, world wide, to control the use of the atomic bomb an aggressor nation could bomb us with devastating results or could smuggle in and plant time detonating bombs and destroy our major cities, and major production plants in a few hours. Nations will be able to shoot giant rocket bombs across the ocean into our cities.

The atomic bomb becomes the most important problem in the world today, for unless we control it all other plans are almost futile and unnecessary. We cannot put this question aside for later decision. Our scientists, in unlocking the destructive power of atomic energy, have moved the world forward a century in a few months. The administration, the Congress, which might be termed our political scientists, must embrace the opportunity to protect our Nation and civilization against destruction by moving forward with greater speed. We must not waste time because probably within 2 years or 5 at the most, other nations which do not believe in the application of the Golden Rule to government as does the United States, will prepare for war and may decide to conquer the world.

Peace-loving nations must get together or perish. This raises the question of what kind of control can peace-loving nations set up which will bring the atomic bomb under control where it cannot be used for the destruction of civilization and mankind. Obviously, it must be done by a federation of nations and the United Nations Organization, which is already well on the way, seems to be the logical organization through which to solve the problem.

While the United Nations Organization is a praiseworthy attempt yet some of the ablest thinkers in America feel that unless it is strengthened and amended it cannot succeed in bringing world peace nor can the atomic bomb, which is now in the possession of the United States and Britain afford to have the secrets of its production given to the United Nations Organization under its present set-up. In fact, President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee, speaking for the Anglo-American people, have taken the position, and wisely so, that we shall not turn over the secrets of the atomic bomb to other nations until we can have definite assurance that it is safe to do so.

While our national leaders and the American people realize the great necessity of having the full cooperation of Russia if a world-peace program is to succeed, we might as well face the fact that the attitude of the leaders of Russia up to the present time has been one of objections, suspicion, and continuous delay. Notwithstanding we gave them billions of dollars in lend-lease, in food, trucks, tanks, and military equipment and supplies with the sacrifice and might of our American soldiers which have saved them from destruction and defeat by Germany, their attitude in previous conferences has given our State Department, our President, and the Congress grave concern. Since Russia helped to create the UNO Charter she has violated in letter or spirit its provisions protecting the rights of the peoples of smaller nations on her borders.

We cannot trust the control of atomic energy to them under present conditions and we cannot hope to outlaw world wars through the United Nations Organizations as now set up because the veto power of the five great nations now existing in the United Nations Organization. The Charter is entirely too weak as now constituted.

APPEASEMENT HAS FAILED

Russia, in the conference of Foreign Ministers in September, in which they attempted to further implement world peace refused to cooperate until the conference had to adjourn. In order to save the United Nations Organization, Secretary of State Byrnes, with a staff of American diplomats, is now in Moscow in an effort to get an understanding with Russian officials and in order to discuss the control of the atomic bomb and strengthen the United Nations Organization for world peace. We have followed a policy of appeasing Russia all the while. There must be an end to appeasement. It has failed.

The question arises, How can America and the Nations of the world who want peace, come nearest to enforcing it and protecting themselves and withhold the secret of the atomic bomb from Russia if she refuses to come into a world organization wholeheartedly and on the level with the other nations of the world?

A second question arises, Can we enforce world peace if she fails to cooperate under such conditions?

Some of the ablest thinkers in the Nation, all of whom want Russia to participate, believe that world peace can be enforced without the immediate cooperation of Russia. That school of thought produces the following argument and suggestions, which I desire to discuss more fully.

First. That the United Nations Organization should amend its Charter to do away with the veto power of the Big Five.

Second. That a quota by nations should be agreed upon limiting the amount of heavy armament such as tanks, planes, guns, and battleships; that a world quota should be set as to the amount and number of heavy implements of war which could be made such as guns, tanks, planes, and battleships in any year. Out of the total of such heavy fighting implements of war, the United States would be allowed to produce 20 percent, Britain 20 percent, Russia 20 percent, France 10 percent, and China 10 percent. Then an armament trust would be set up which would provide for the production of the other 20 percent for the collective supply and use of some 40 smaller nations which singly are unable to protect themselves against an aggressor, but which collectively would have sufficient power to protect any of these small nations from an aggressor. Such munitions, where possible, would be manufactured in the smaller nations and where not properly equipped would be manufactured by the larger nations in trust for the use of the smaller nations.

In addition to the 20 percent of new production allowed to each, the United States, Britain, and Russia and the 10 percent allowed to each France and China, these nations will have on hand their present implements of war which, of course, will rapidly become obsolete.

This limitation of armament would prevent an armament race in the future at the expense of the people of the nation, and with such an organization distributed all over the world, and such power in the hands of peace-loving nations, you would have the nearest possible guaranty for world peace.

Those who support this plan feel that the United Nations Organization, by amendments, should provide to carry it forward.

To carry out this plan another amendment would have to be offered to the United Nations Organization which would provide that inspectors working under the authority of the United Nations Organization should have free access to inspect any and all of the laboratories of any nation and inspect the manufacturing equipment of war materials from the mines to the finished product. It seems questionable whether Russia would agree to such inspection as that nation, up to the present time, has steadfastly refused to allow the outside world to know what is going on within her borders. She has pulled down the iron curtain so to speak, against the rest of the world.

While over 1,000 of her engineers have been admitted to the United States within the past few months, and have been permitted to go through any of our factories except those manufacturing atomic bombs, yet it is said that there are only 60 Americans in Russia today and none of them are allowed to go further than 45 miles away from Moscow into the country.

Some people who have made the best study possible under conditions are firm in their belief that Russia believes that time is on her side, is running favorable; and that time is against Britain and America, is running unfavorable.

There are those whose opinion cannot be taken lightly who believe that the real plan of Russia is to completely dominate the continent of Europe and all of Asia; to establish herself across the life line of Britain at the Suez Canal; to control the Mediterranean, with a free outlet to the Atlantic through the Baltic which she now has; that Russia feels that she can gain this control within the next 10 or 20 years and that she will not tie herself up in a United Nations Organization which will make the realization of such plans more difficult.

Those who advocate the quota plan for all nations inviting Russia in, would offer a third amendment to the United Nations Organization providing for a world police force and this world police force would be furnished by the 40 smaller nations under the direction of the top military authority of the United Nations Council.

This division of power among smaller nations which would be known as the shock troops would prevent the possibility of world military domination and would at the same time insure the protection of the smaller nations.

The reserve power of 20 percent in the United States, 20 percent in Britain, 10 percent in France, 10 percent in China, plus the 20 percent vested in these smaller nations would bring into action against Russia assuming she would not come into this plan, or any aggressor, four-fifths of the military power of the world.

It is thought that once such an organization got under way Russia would be forced to remain in the United Nations Organization with these amendments, rather than to stand in the dangerous position of being the one nation in the world which decided to remain out, and it is further argued that if she remained out and became an aggressor nation she would commit national suicide.

Such a plan would preserve the absolute sovereignty of the United States without giving any of it up. The United States could keep its present military equipment and could continue to produce 20 percent of the Nation's quota, the limit to which any of the larger nations could produce. And in the event the 20 percent of world power placed in the hands of the smaller nations, under the direction of the Security Council, were not able to subdue an aggressor nation such as Russia, if the United States decided to go to war to help put down aggression, it would be up to the Congress of the United States to declare war.

We might as well face the fact, that Russia now has, to all intents and purposes, the control of 160,000,000 people in eastern Europe, plus the greater strength of her own country of over 200,000,000 people.

If she desires she can expand until she takes all of the continent of Europe and Asia. She can set herself across the lifeline of the British Empire, she can do all of those things. She can expand in the east and dominate China, Japan, India, when we move out, take the Philippine Islands, and, in my opinion, no United States Congress would vote a declaration of war against her after she had built up such enormous strength. It would be too late. Conditions should be set up now, which will prevent such expansion on her part.

If Russia should plan such an expansion and in 10 or 20 years decide to rule the world, she could bomb us by rockets from the air and could plant atomic bombs through the cooperation of the Communists in this country, in most of our big cities and our big industrial supply plants, and surprise us with explosions throughout this country that would reduce the Pearl Harbor sneak attack by comparison to the size of a giant firecracker.

Within 10 years, with its unlimited resources and with the totalitarian government which works men unthinkable hours for a bare existence, she will become stronger than the United States.

It is estimated that Russia's population will reach 250,000,000 by 1970, the United States 150,000,000, while the population of France and England is rapidly declining.

TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE

Today the United States is much stronger than Russia. Britain and other countries are strong in war potentials. If the United States would act now to amend the United Nations Organization to do away with the veto power of the Big Five and adopt this quota plan, of course, Britain and her Empire would join us immediately. With them doubtless would join practically all of the nations of the world outside of Russia, and we hope Russia.

The organization could be made effective within the next 2 or 3 years possibly before Russia could develop the atomic bomb. When it is a going concern doubtless Russia would come in and open up her nation to the world as other nations for full and free inspection in order to determine that all nations were abiding by the quotas. When that time came, and even before, the United Nations Organization could go on record against the use of the atomic bomb, rocket bombs, and other scientific inventions for war of a like character will be discovered, protect civilization from destruction, and possibly make certain world peace with a gradual reduction of armaments. Many able thinkers believe it can be done now with or without Russia; that later may be tragically too late.

When, through the work of the scientists, we have moved forward with implements of destruction possibly a hundred years within the last 2 years, if we are to control the use of atomic energy for peacetime and not for the destruction of the world, those who advocate the quota limitation say that it is imperative that the move be made quickly and that an organization of this kind be made effective and workable to insure lasting world peace.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have had no greater pleasure in supporting any legislation on the floor of this House since I came here than to support this bill. The people of America place their hopes on the United Nations Organization and on international cooperation and I feel that we are making great progress. I am sure that the sentiment of the House today is good. The Senate has done a wonderful job and I am sure that the Congress in this case is going to carry out what the people of America would like to have us do.

The details of the bill have been pretty well explained and it is my purpose merely to say that this is the opportunity that the people for 25 years have been struggling to gain. By our action today we are going to show the world that we are willing to cooperate for peace. This is the greatest single step forward that civilization has ever made. The people of the State of Washington elected me with the understanding that I would support legislation to help maintain a permanent peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support S. 1580 now before us for consideration, a bill to implement the United Nations Organization for world peace. I think it is most significant and opportune that this bill should come before us at this time when Congress stands on the eve of a recess to return home and join the people of our Nation and other peace-loving Christian peoples of the world in celebration of Christmas, the birthday of the Prince of Peace.

It is the first time in the history of our republic when our Government joined in an international organization to bring peace and preserve peace on this earth. For 2,000 years our world, dating from the Christian era, has suffered and the teachings of the white-souled Man of Galilee have been defeated by war. Our prayer for its success will be registered today with our vote for its passage.

In my opinion, the weak spot in this bill is the veto power reserved to any one of the five great nations. That power means an aggressor nation could impose its will on a small nation, the Security Council would determine to use force against the aggressor, and that power could veto the action. I understand that had to be agreed to at San Francisco in order to bring about the United Nations Organization. Whether that be so or not, I do not know. But it does bring to my mind what happened in a Cabinet meeting of President Lincoln during the Civil War. He came to the Cabinet one morning with a proposal. To his great surprise, every member of the Cabinet opposed him, and he simply said, "You are all against me. I must be wrong." Let us hope that when an aggressor nation under the veto power provided in this legislation finds that the other four great powers of the world are against it such nation might take the same position Lincoln took and say, "You are all against me. I must be wrong." I join in and share the hope expressed by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] in the resolution which she introduced, and also in the resolutions introduced by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOORHIS], and others that there should

be found some way within the machinery of this organization to disarm the world.

To that I would add another suggestion. While we are busy disarming the world by providing for world armament we should provide for abolishing all universal military training or compulsory military training. I say that whether you are for or against compulsory military training.

I want to call your attention to the fact that, so far as it has been brought to my attention, no nation on the face of the earth has ever been spared the ravages of war because it adopted compulsory military training. To the contrary, the one nation that did adopt that policy most aggressively today lies prostrate before an unfriendly world, an outcast in the family of nations, and twice in 25 years has been decisively defeated. Compulsory military training did not save Germany nor any other nations that adopted it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I share the gentleman's great hope and prayer that we might have some international solution for peace. But I, too, am greatly disturbed about this single-nation-power in the Security Council. That single nation might well be and probably will be an aggressor nation. So it is merely a door out which defeats the very thing we are all working and hoping for.

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is the weak place in this legislation, although, as the gentleman suggests, it is the escape clause.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I have two suggestions. In the first place, the peace-loving peoples of the world have proclaimed against militarism ever since I can remember. What is militarism? There can be but one answer. It is universal compulsory military training in times of peace, with the armaments that go with it. That is militarism, and it always brings on war.

But let me suggest to the gentleman from Michigan, with reference to this veto power, that it also means that the United States has the veto power; does it not?

Mr. DONDERO. So I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Whenever the Congress of the United States serves notice to its representatives on that body referred to as UNO that it will not back up a proposed movement against a country that is unjust in the minds of the American people, then that representative will exercise our veto power, if he is wise, because if he does not, it will mean the end of his tenure of office.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I say that the gentleman who has the floor is particularly well qualified to comment, as he has, on the fact that these nations and the people in them want peace. May I ask the gentleman if he has not been to practically every country of Europe in the last 4 or 5 months and seen the conditions personally?

Mr. DONDERO. I have, in company with my able and good friend from Pennsylvania and especially the countries which have been ravaged by war in the last 4 years.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, he overlooked one outstanding example of militarism that has been carried to its logical conclusion with the most disastrous results, and that is Japan. Japan's whole policy for the last 50 years has been built around its program of militarism, universal compulsory military training with all the armaments that go with it and all the resources of the nation devoted to that end, with the result that today Japan lies not only discredited in the eyes of civilization, but defeated if not destroyed as an independent country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for this legislation, as I presume and predict the vast majority of the Members of the House will do. It seems to me that if we are to take our place in the United Nations Organization we have no alternative today except to vote in favor of the resolution before us.

Like many of you, I am not entirely satisfied with the provisions and the pattern of the United Nations charter at the present time. I think that is highly understandable. It is a new piece of work. It has not yet had an opportunity to really begin to function so that the various bugs and difficulties which will be revealed by experience can be carefully examined and corrected.

There will be a lot of discussion in days to come about this so-called international police force, about this military contingent which our American representative on the Security Council is authorized under certain conditions to vote into action. On January 30 of this year, I recommend that there be created an international peace patrol of the air. I think that the way to have an international police force is to have it internationalized, with each country making a specific contribution to that international contingent, and then placing the entire contingent at the disposition of the United Nations Organization as an international enforcement unit when, as, and if it is required.

I do not like the idea of mixing up the internal defense establishments of the United States with the United Nations Organization international police force. It seems to me that the UNO police force should be a separate entity, and it should be internationalized.

I rather like the idea that Mr. Ely Culbertson has been developing in that he proposes this international police force be built up through recruitments made from the smaller nations of the world, the countries who unhappily are not included in the Council, the countries which do not have any veto power. Let these countries which are not members of the Big Five provide the recruitments to a well-paid, well-equipped, well-trained international police force, to be directed and put into action if needed by the United Nations Organization as a completely internationalized police force.

I certainly like the idea advanced by the lady from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] today, that is, that in talking about international police forces and in talking about the maintenance of peace we have to recognize that one way to approach the problem is through international disarmament, and probably we can achieve more in the long run if the United Nations Organization uses its consultative opportunities to bring about horizontal disarmament throughout the world, which will leave the countries in relatively the same military position from the standpoint of strength as they were at the time of VJ-day, than if we devote our major attention to building up international military might.

I think that the fair criterion to follow, the best rule of thumb to apply, is one that will keep each country in about the same position from the standpoint of military strength in the future that it had at the time it was making is major contribution to the war effort. It will leave our present enemies stripped of all power to make war and hold each country in the same relative military position it had on VJ-day.

It would leave Russia, the United States, Great Britain, and China, with the same relative strength that they have now, militarily. By decreasing armaments horizontally, we can save the taxpayers around the world untold millions and billions of dollars and provide the opportunity for these governmental expenditures to be placed into constructive, serviceable procedures instead of utilizing them in the unfortunate armament races which up to now have always eventuated in war. Let us hope the UNO may be devoted to the making of wars less probable if not impossible.

I yield to the challenging gentlewoman from Illinois who now addressed me and desires to make an observation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If this Nation has become a Nation which does not hate slavery in foreign countries more than it hates wars, it has changed in the last 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary, shall receive annual compensation of $20,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and shall perform such other functions in connection with the

participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council who shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, shall receive annual compensation of $12,000, and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of the representative.

(c) The President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate may appoint from time to time to attend a designated session or designated sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States, one of whom shall be designated as the senior representative. Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period of appointment as the President may specify.

(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations at such salaries, not to exceed $12,000 each per annum, as he shall determine: *Provided*, That the advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment of any person to represent the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations or the principal representative in such other specialized agencies as may be established by the United Nations Organization.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 18, strike all of line 18 down to and including line 2, on page 3, and insert:

"(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States, one of whom shall be designated as the senior representative. Such representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives who is designated under this subsection as a representative of the United States to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: On page 2, line 18, strike out lines 18 through 24, and on page 3, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States, and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative. Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum for such period as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under this subsection as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment amends the Senate bill so as to provide that when Members of the Congress sit in the Assembly or are appointed to the Assembly they will not receive any additional compensation, that is, the five members of the Charter called for, to be allowed as representatives in the Assembly. But at the time it did not provide for alternates to be approved or to be appointed by the President. So this substitute amendment allows the five representatives and five alternates to be appointed, and all ten of them would have to be confirmed by the Senate. That is from the report by the Executive Committee of the preparatory commission that is now sitting in London. Provision has been made to allow these alternates to sit as well as the representatives.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I notice under your amendment a Member of Congress would not draw any more than his regular salary as a Member of Congress.

Mr. BLOOM. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That also preclude him from receiving the expense allowance.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Which is provided for other representatives in another part of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. No. The provision is that he cannot draw two salaries, but when Members of the House and Senate went to San Francisco they were allowed expenses, and the Member who might be appointed as a representative to the Assembly, or an alternate, would be able to receive his expenses and traveling expense. That is provided for in the legislation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In what legislation is it provided for? It is not in this bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; in section 7.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Where is it provided in this bill?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Compensation is not regarded as expense. It has been so held by the courts.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not disagree with the gentleman on that, but there is nothing in this bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I understand the gentleman to ask where the expenses of the delegates are provided for?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Where does it provide, in lieu of the exception you put in, that if a Member of Congress is appointed as a representative, he would be entitled to the same expense as some other person?

Mr. BLOOM. That would naturally follow.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It would follow because the provision saying he shall receive no compensation does not include expenses. Expenses are provided for in another place in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What about the alternates? Are they to receive compensation the same as the Members?

Mr. BLOOM. If they are appointed, other than Members of Congress, they would receive a salary; but the Members of Congress will not receive any salary. They only sit when the representatives themselves are not able to serve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, of course you know that our Government's peace program is no peace program. The movement for it is led by the same old warmongers, still masquerading as princes of peace, who involved us in war while pretending their purpose was to keep us out of war. Like lend-lease and other bills which involved us in war while promising to keep us out of war, this measure will involve us in every war hereafter. You know that there are going to be plenty of wars hereafter if you look at some of the small nations which, thanks to American aid and influence, are being enslaved: Indonesia, Persia, Korea, Burma, Turkey, Poland, the Baltics, and the Balkans. History shows that the people in these countries prefer death to slavery. The American people also always prefer death to slavery to foreign governments.

You know, of course, that this measure gives congressional authority for surrendering the American people to an all-powerful world supergovernment which will be controlled by imperialistic foreign governments, England and Russia. Advocates insist that it is not going to be a world superstate, but what else could you call it? It is so coordinated with other world organizations, including the Bretton Woods organization controlling all the money in the world, that it can and will reduce the American people to the same level of servitude now endured by millions in downtrodden imperialistic empires.

This measure obviously authorizes the surrender to the new world supergovernment of enough American men and military might to conquer any nation in the world, including the United States, in the same way the Southern States were conquered in the Civil War. The time when the American people will have it in their power to resist the illegal and unjust decrees of the superstate will have passed when Congress passes this bill making the new world supergovernment more powerful than any government in the world, including our own. Unless we want our own armies shooting and bombing us, we shall have to knuckle

under like the people of India and Poland and swallow the drafting and rationing, the depreciation of our currency, and the lowering of our standard of living which this supergovernment will ordain.

That the decrees of this world supergovernment will be illegal and unjust to Americans, we already know from sad experience. And what good will the American veto power do us? Look at how the American representative on UNRRA, Mr. Clayton, contrived to put through a motion giving Russia $250,000,000 to which Russia was not legally entitled. Russia and England, the imperialistic Governments controlling this world supergovernment, have managed to pick American pockets all through the war we fought to save them. And what have Americans gotten out of that war? Nothing but communism and corpses and this new eunuch world plunderbund, which is already despised even before it sets up its splendiferous new offices in Hollywood, or some less appropriate city.

Our American form of government as preached and practiced by Thomas Jefferson is the form of government best calculated to bring justice, peace, and prosperity to each and every American citizen and indirectly to the whole world. But no form of government is foolproof and no form of government is knaveproof. What else could we expect but rule by political racketeers and the consequences of misgovernment when 30 years ago we abandoned the Jeffersonian policy of neutrality and economy which had kept this a government of the people by keeping it a government small enough that the people could control it, oversee it, and afford it. Thirty years ago we began demonstrating that Jefferson was eternally right when he warned that the danger most likely to destroy the American people and its government would be that foreign governments would stir up factions among us led by American citizens putting the interests of some foreign government ahead of their own United States.

Today we have so many persons in high office whose hearts beat with adulterous love for some foreign government, Britain, Russia, China, or the new world supergovernment, that our poor bewildered Government acts like a person with a split personality and no instinct either for justice or self-preservation. This schizophrenic policy has already cost us millions of American lives and billions of dollars worth of precious goods. This measure makes it certain it will cost us more. Yes; we have joined the eternal dance of death on the bloody European battlegrounds which our ancestors left in disgust. We now follow such a militaristic policy that in the next war, it is predicted, our traditionally neutral and therefore safe Nation, will be the first nation to have its cities destroyed, like Sodom and Gomorrah.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can bear to sit here and participate in this shameful roll call—if there is a roll call. Your modern Congressmen call themselves Democrats and Republicans but how carelessly they throw away the magnificent American independence of the democratic American Republic which generations of patriotic Americans have labored and fought to preserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not share the pessimism of the former speaker, Miss SUMNER of Illinois, about the results of this "Tower of Babel" we are setting up. Nor do I share the enthusiasm of those rank, rapid, and unreasonable internationalists who imagine that it is going to bring about the millennium.

"Towers of Babel" have crashed amidst confusions of tongues ever since the days of the Genesis. We know the fate of the Treaty of Westphalia as well as the fiasco of the League of Nations.

I am for peace. I tried with all my might to get the leaders of my Government, including the President, as well as the heads of other governments, to pursue a course that, in my humble opinion then, and in my deliberate judgment now, would have prevented this World War and saved the lives of 10,000,000 men who have gone down beneath the sword of modern despotism.

I will try anything to prevent a recurrence of such a catastrophe. The world wants peace, and I am willing to try almost anything that has even the slightest prospect of bringing about that result.

I do not like to hear people talk about what has happened in the past, and at the same time overlook the aggressive attitude of our own country on former occasions.

I remember about 20 years ago when our marines were sent to Nicaragua. Is there a Member present who can tell me what they were sent there for? If so, please stand up, or speak up and say so. By keeping your seats and maintaining your silence, you admit that you do not know. Then I will try to tell you. We were told that they were sent there to see that they held an honest election in that country. One Senator asked why in the heck they were not sent to Pittsburgh or Philadelphia. My information is that they were sent to collect the debts owed to a couple of banks in New York City that had lent money to the Nicaraguan Government. After the president had been run out of the country, Mancado, the vice president, announced that if he became president he would repudiate those bonds. American marines were sent down to see that Mancado did not become president of the Nicaraguan Republic until he agreed to approve those bonds. You know, or ought to know the rest of the story.

In 1930, when Mr. Stimson was Secretary of State, in Mr. Hoover's Cabinet, a great upheaval occurred in Brazil, a most wholesome upheaval, because Brazil had sunk to the lowest level politically it had ever reached in its history.

Old Washington Louis, then President of Brazil, had around him a group that had perpetuated his regime in office by every questionable, if not corrupt, means.

Dr. Vargas was at that time governor of the state of Rio Grand Du Sul, a great southern state that produces cotton, wheat, cattle, corn, and a great many industrial items. The President did not offer for reelection, but ran one of his henchmen to succeed him.

Dr. Vargas ran against him, and they stole the election from him. Dr. Vargas led the people of Brazil in a revolt and 17 of the 20 states joined that revolt.

They were trying to close the revolt with as little bloodshed as possible, when, to the surprise of almost everyone familiar with the situation, the administration here in Washington lifted the embargo on arms to the federals in Brazil and authorized the sale and shipment to them of airplanes that were being manufactured for the use of our own Army and Navy. I understand those planes were shipped and on their way to Brazil immediately. Whatever happened to them I do not know.

In addition to that, the administration sent a battleship to Rio de Janeiro. That was done without any UNRRA, or any UNO, or any Tower of Babel, or any authority from Congress. It was virtually an act of war.

When that battleship steamed into the port of Rio de Janeiro and the soldiers, sailors, and marines of Brazil saw it, they immediately reversed their arms, went over to the rebels in a twinkling of an eye, surrounded the Capitol, arrested the President, who had not gone out of office, threw him in jail, and telegraphed Dr. Vargas to come on and take the oath of office. Dr. Vargas got into an airplane, flew to Rio de Janeiro, took the oath of office, and has been President of Brazil ever since.

These are two cases of intervention that came very near involving us in a war with the entire Spanish-speaking peoples of Central and South America.

I have pointed out before that John D. Rockefeller was said to have given the League of Nations money with which to construct the building to hold its meetings in, which was characterized as an attempt to saturate the international mind with Standard Oil.

A few years later they had a row in South America over the oil interests in Bolivia. You remember 20 years ago the stir we had about Tacna-Arica, two small areas on the west coast of South America that these big oil companies wanted to get through. They wanted to run their pipe lines and rail lines through there to the Pacific Ocean. The country that owned those two little spots would not give them up or let their lines through unless they would come in and pay taxes, as they should have done. You remember, we sent General Pershing down there to try to work out a settlement, but he failed; and the project was abandoned.

Later, however, some wiseacre conceived the idea of driving down through the Gran Chaco, which was a part of Paraguay, and securing an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean.

In 1868 there was a great controversy in South America over boundary lines. They decided to arbitrate the issue and called upon Rutherford B. Hayes to serve as arbitrator. And let me say, across party lines, that Mr. Hayes was one of the finest Americans who ever occupied the Presidency; and I say that as a southern Democrat, after all the vituperations that have been heaped upon him by members of my own party. It was President Hayes who took the Federal troops out of the South and helped to restore peace between the two great sections of the country. He decided that the Gran Chaco belonged to Paraguay. All seemed to be satisfied with the decision and nobody questioned it until Bolivia decided to drive down through the Gran Chaco to get an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean without even consulting Paraguay.

Accordingly the Bolivian Army started down through the Gran Chaco, but to their surprise Paraguay had developed a general named Estogarribia, the greatest military leader South America has seen since the days of Simon Bolivar. They called him the Napoleon of South America. He gathered his forces together and drove the Bolivian Army out of Paraguay.

What did the League of Nations do? Why, the League of Nations came out and condemned Paraguay as the aggressor.

A certain southern Senator who has now gone to his reward exposed the whole proceeding on the floor of the Senate and the heads of the governments of South America got together and stopped the war—a course which I begged President Roosevelt to follow at the outbreak of the war in Europe, into which we were finally drawn.

The League of Nations did not fail because we were not in it, as some people contend. It blew up from the inside, for the same reason that the Tower of Babel collapsed, a confusion of tongues. They even refused to join us in a movement to stop Japan when she started into Manchuria. They refused to stop Mussolini when he started into Ethiopia. They refused at every point to exercise the power they had, and with which we did not interfere.

This United Nations Organization which is coming to America—they say it is coming here—is not going to have the power of a supergovernment, as some people fear. Congress will see to that. It cannot expend the moneys of this country, or use the armies of this Nation, without the Congress of the United States voting both the authority and the appropriation; nor can it exercise power over the internal affairs of this country.

We want peace among the nations of the earth, and not an intervention policy. If they expect to use this organization as an intervention instrument to help some greedy interventionist go out and rob an oilfield or plunder a manganese mine or seize the property of defenseless peoples they are going to be disappointed.

By the way, just before we sent the battleship to Brazil in 1930, I noticed where the rebel army was approaching a manganese mine just out from Rio de Janeiro that belonged to the United States Steel Co.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not care how long the gentleman talks, but is there going to be any disposition to cut off debate here later on? There is no one over on the Democratic side. How about the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sure there will be no disposition to cut off debate. This is a very vital measure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Take 10 minutes if you want to; I do not care.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want to take much time, but I think the Members of the House ought to have time to discuss this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. When I saw that this rebel army was approaching that manganese mine, and that it belonged to the United States Steel Corp., I said, "Look out for the marines." It was not a week until that battleship was sent to Rio de Janeiro, with the results I told you about a moment ago.

This new organization must not be used as an instrument for selfish interests to barge in and plunder the weaker peoples of the earth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said we are not going to permit this, that, or the other. I remember when the gentleman stood on this floor in 1937 and said he was not going to permit the CIO and its violence to go South, but it went down there.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not say that. The gentleman misunderstood me. The CIO was already down there at that time. I said we would not stand for certain acts of violence; and I meant what I said.

The American people are not going to permit this instrument to be used for intervention purposes to drag American boys into wars all over the world. The peace-loving nations of the earth, the peace-loving peoples of the earth, look on this as a movement toward maintaining the peace of the world, and that is what we want.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentleman think the UNO will have a part in trying to solve the problems of imperialism and give the down-trodden nations a chance to get their own freedom?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly do not think they will be prone to intervene, especially when we have a veto, and try to subject other nations to unjust or undeserved indignities.

If it should start out on such a policy it would soon collapse—probably amidst a confusion of tongues.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to a turning point in world affairs. The world cannot stand another war such as the one through which we have just passed.

I believe in disarmament or in reduction of armaments to the lowest level commensurate with national safety.

As I said a moment ago, I am not for universal compulsory military service in times of peace, with all the armaments that go with it, because that is militarism, which has brought on most of the troubles of the world.

I am for maintaining our machinery to make the atomic bomb. Then we will not need a large standing army; for no nation on earth will dare attack us. Let us keep the secret of what President Truman calls the "know how," lock it up, and give the world to understand that we are not going to use it. There is not another nation on earth that could even make the machinery with which to make the machinery to make the bomb in 5 years, and it would take them 10 years to make the bomb. We would be so far ahead of them they would never catch us—especially if we have sense enough to maintain an adequate Air Force.

What we are after is this: We do not want to see the boys of the next generation slaughtered all over the world, and we are willing to go along and try out this experiment.

But I can tell you now if it is used as an instrument of aggression or oppression, the American people will refuse to support it, and the Congress of the United States will refuse appropriations for its maintenance.

What we want is peace among the nations of the earth in order that we may recover from the shock of war, the great economic and physical disaster to which the world has been subjected in the last few years, and to lay the foundation for a new era of peace, progress, and prosperity for all mankind.

America will not have to surrender any of her sovereignty in order to take the lead in this onward march of modern progress which we hope will take us into that golden age of which Tennyson dreamed when he said:

* * * I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;

Far along the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder-storm;
Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this bill for the active participation of the United States in the United Nations Organization should be given the unanimous endorsement of this House.

It is particularly fitting that the matter should come up for our consideration only a few days before the birthday of the Prince of Peace. What a present it should be to lay on His altar. Throughout these 1945 years, men everywhere have cried for peace with trembling unorganized hands. International courts have been set up, only to fail because public opinion had no common agency to enforce their decrees.

That vague and indefinite thing, known as international law, has appealed to the minds and hearts of men for peace, only to go unheeded because that law itself was warped to the purposes of unscrupulous men and nations.

Our own unilateral neutrality laws have failed, because they failed to cure conditions elsewhere in the world which finally jeopardized the very existence of our form of government and way of life.

So, now we turn to our last chance—the creation of a world organization, a world congress if you please, backed by arms to enforce its decrees, as the only remaining panacea for our trembling doubts and fears in this terrible atomic age.

Let no one doubt it, we are fighting here today to prevent the total destruction of humanity itself through the agency of another war.

Many here have their doubts as to whether this world body will work. I must admit that when I see and hear the evidences of national greed and selfishness, I, too, have doubts. This organization may finally fail, but remember this—if it lasts only long enough to save one generation from the horrors of another war, it will have served well. If it lasts that long, the odds are that it will pull the long grade.

There are some here who object to the use of United States troops under the direction of the President, as a contribution to the police force of this world body. May I say to these that no organization, large or small to preserve law and order, can be effective without a police force to carry out its decrees. Power to punish the lawless must be there. Fear of punishment is the greatest deterrent to crime. That applies to nations as well as men.

Mr. Chairman, in consideration of this bill we should remember that no chief of police in any town of the United States could effectively preserve law and order if he has to go for approval to his town council before he can use his police force to prevent a breach of the peace. Neither can the President of the United States effectively cooperate with this, the United Nations to preserve the peace, if his hands are tied.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the future historian, when he comes to consider the action of the Congress which is about to be completed, may well pause and wonder. I venture that he will regard this action as one of the most stupid and ruinous any nation ever undertook.

If the public really understood the meaning of this grandiose scheme to establish a United Nations Organization and to make the United States a member of it, it would never be approved by the Congress; indeed, it would never have been proposed in the first instance.

A vote for this measure is a vote for permanently underwriting with the sweat and toil of our people the economies of the other so-called member nations of this Organization. Further, it is a vote for guaranteeing with the blood of our sons and daughters the preservation of British imperialism. The nucleus of this international Organization is a military alliance between the United States and Great Britain, the rest being mainly window dressing.

Also, to vote for this proposal is to give approval to world communism. Why else would it have the full support of all shades of communism everywhere?

This measure strikes at the very heart of the Constitution. It provides that the power to declare war shall be taken from Congress and given to the President. Here is the essence of dictatorship, and dictatorial control over all else must inevitably tend to follow. The President is to be given absolute power to, at any time he elects, and upon any pretext whatsoever, snatch our sons and daughters away from their homes to fight and die in battle, not only for so long as he pleases but as may suit the majority members of the International Organization. Bear in mind that the United States will be in the minority so that policies relating to the length of time our soldiers will be kept in foreign lands in any future wars will rest more with foreign nations than our own.

If the heartaches and sorrows of the soldiers and their kin of this war are great because of needless delay in having them returned to their homes, what will be the heartaches and sorrows should a designing head of the Government in the future avail himself of the powers conferred upon him by this measure? Except for the fact that the soldiers, together with their mothers and fathers and wives, have been able to importune the Congress and administration to act in bringing our boys home as quickly as possible, hundreds of thousands of them would still be languishing in foreign parts. Except for this pressure, Congress and the administration would not have acted.

Can it be expected that the vast dictatorial powers that go with this measure and that will of necessity flow from it will leave a national legislative body of sufficient potency to serve as a medium by which the public may express its will? We may be certain that the power of our citizens to have their wishes carried out will be greatly lessened.

Just as new dealism has sought to cure with national political machinery every social and economic disease, real, imaginary, or invented, in our country, so it proposes now to cure those ills of the world with international political machinery. Just as it has not only failed to really cure any of our domestic afflictions with political machinery but has aggravated and worsened them, so this giant international political machinery which this measure sets up must inevitably do the same with respect to the dislocations and abnormalities of our international relations.

The net effect of new dealism in the United States has been to destroy competition, free enterprise and liberty, to foment class war, to exterminate the Constitution, to encourage the development of communism, and create a giant bureaucracy to eat out the substance of the people. Working through the United Nations Organization, it will do precisely the same in the international domain.

The very fact that the central aim and purpose of the United Nations Organization is a British-United States alliance foredooms it not only to failure but disaster as well so far as preventing international strife and wars are concerned.

Alas, even the United Nations Organization in its nascent state, in its making, before it has received the blessing of Congress, has exposed its feet of clay. Quoting a statement by Lord Halifax relating to the fighting in Indonesia in an address at a banquet of the English Speaking Union at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, as quoted by the Washington Times-Herald of December 15, 1945:

> Some people in this country are inclined to blame us for what is happening. But what are the facts? We did not send our troops to Java on our own initiative. They went there to carry out work which had been assigned them by the combined Chiefs of Staff. The decision was not British but Anglo-American.

This statement was confirmed, according to the Times-Herald of December 18, 1945. In that issue the following appears:

> An official spokesman for the State Department last night backed the statement of British Ambassador Halifax that the United States shares with Britain the responsibility for operations of British Empire military forces in the revolt-torn Dutch East Indies. The State Department spokesman said Halifax's statement of joint Anglo-American responsibility for current military operations against Javanese nationals "is the truth." "The decision to send Empire troops into Java was not solely British, but was Anglo-American. The troops were sent there to carry out work which had been assigned to them by the combined Chiefs of Staff at the time of the Japanese surrender."

If Lord Halifax and the State Department spokesman are correctly quoted, then what becomes of all the angelic claims made by the designers and zealous promoters of the United Nations Organization? Just what kind of bottom does it really stand on? Is any American so wretchedly minded as to believe this policy is a good policy for his country, and that it will serve as a foundation stone

for lasting peace and good will toward all men?

Poor Indonesians. Their only crime is that they long to be free, as our forefathers once longed to be free, and from the same tyranny. But no freedom is to be allowed them. They must be shot down by mercenaries, just as were the heroes of the Revolution. The Javanese are to be brought to their knees with the help of those brave men's posterity who have enjoyed the great blessings of the victory against the Empire and its mercenaries. The sons of the heroes of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge now join their oppressors in aiding and abetting the bloody work of cutting down the natives of the East Indies to keep them from achieving what? The independence which has formed the main pillar of the greatest of all American traditions.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, everything has been said I cannot add anything except to say I do not share the gentleman's gloom and his prophecy of doom. I feel very hopeful and very happy that at this season of the year, 2,000 years after the Prince of Peace came to this earth, we are now working out an international arrangement by which we will make an effort to keep the peace of the world. It may fail but I do not share that prophecy. Why talk about its failing? Why not hope and pray that it will succeed? And if the American people and the peace-loving people around the world will put their hearts and souls into it, it is bound to succeed.

There is no use in bringing up all the sad failures of the last 2,000 years of the world's history. Humanity has gone through a lot of things that never should have occurred. God forbid that we should forever live in the state of mind that because we have been through that kind of thing we cannot rise above it but must eternally live with it.

The matter before us today is not the United Nations Organization; that is already settled in the form of a treaty passed by the Senate by a vote of 82 to 2, I believe. The legislation before us today implements that treaty, and this legislation passed the Senate by a vote of 67 to 7. The Senate of the United States has placed this country along with 50 other nations in a group to establish the United Nations Organization, and the House of Representatives for the first time in the history of this Government, I am told by the Library of Congress, is called upon to implement the world organization for peace in which we have entered.

So at this season of year when we should all be thinking of Christmas and the Prince of Peace let us hope and pray this Organization will succeed. If we approach it from that angle I believe there is greater possibility for it to succeed than if we think pessimistically about it. It seems absurd to think we can unite with other nations so successfully in war and carry it to a final glorious victory but cannot unite with those same nations for peace.

I believe, God being with us, that if this Nation will throw its strength behind the United Nations Organization, it will finally work out a world organization that we can implement from time to time and bring to the earth the day we all long to see, the day of peace and tranquility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I have not the slightest doubt that the gentleman from North Carolina and many of those who vote to implement this plan will be quite willing to forget the past after future wars which may grow out of this action here today have ended. The young men who meet death in those wars will not remember, but before they die they may think of us as some who died in this war thought of those who wrote the Treaty of Versailles.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is always entertaining, always is informative, and sometimes instructive, but it does not follow that he is always infallible. He called our attention to two or three occasions when we became involved in war because our Government sought to protect the financial investments of certain corporations. That was regrettable, it was wrong, and I doubt if anyone today knowingly approves of protecting financial investments by the sacrifice of our young men. But what the gentleman from Mississippi would do by going into UNO is to transfer from the financial powers which have heretofore involved us in war that war-making power to an international organization so that we not only serve the interests of our own corporations but we will follow through and our men will serve and fight to protect the interests of other and foreign organizations, to protect the financial investments perhaps of the British Empire, the Dutch East Indies, or Russia.

There is just one more thing I want to call to the gentleman's attention and that is this: Day after day on the floor of this House he and others, and I join with them in that, have advocated the return of our men from across the seas. We have been anxious to get them home, we have been insisting that they come home. Well and good, I go along with that demand, but now Members take the floor and while complaining of UNO insist that we join an organization, one of the principal duties of which is to keep and maintain abroad and forever—I do not know how many thousand or hundred thousand of troops, in an American Army, Navy, and Air Force, none of them under the command of those who seek to uphold the Stars and Stripes, but under the command of an international organization, under another flag, the flag of UNO, if you please. If that inconsistency can be wiped out, all right. I cannot see it myself.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I noticed today quite a number of references to the Bible, carrying us back to that happy event of the birth of the Saviour and quoting scripture.

I wonder if they recall one of the prophecies that at the end of time when everything is over, at that time there will be wars and rumors of wars. I want to ask the question of anyone how long this will keep us out of war, how many men will we be called on to furnish, how much money? I have not heard a word about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is up to the Council, a group in which we are one of the Five Powers, and it determines how many of our men and how much of our money will be used.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will it be decided as it was in this war on a 1-percent basis or that we furnish 73 percent of the men, and finally, as in the case of Africa, over 85 percent?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is up to the Council to tell us how many dollars, how much material, and how many American young men shall be sent to fight on this international front. Other nations have four votes to our one. That is one of the things to which I object.

They have used our materials, our money, our men to fight their wars. There should be an end to it. Our people are demanding that their sons and husbands be brought home. By this plan which the House will adopt we pledge ourselves to send other thousands into not an American Army but into an international army under command of an international staff. If I am the only man in the House to do so, I will vote against it. I will not go along.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. A number of speakers here have mentioned with quite some piousness the birthday of the lonely Nazarene, but I do not think many of them have mentioned up to this point that it was probably the first international police force of all times that crucified the lonely Nazarene. It was the Roman legions that were in this land foreign to their own that crucified the lonely Nazarene whom we revere as the founder of Christianity. That leads me to the further observation that if great international police forces are set up we might again see the spectacle 2,000 years later of an international police force crucifying Christianity that the lonely Nazarene died for years ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They may crucify the American Government.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Ever since the end of World War I the American people have listened with hope to the speeches that have been made on this floor. Many times these many years they have heard again and again the arguments offered by the opposition today that our participation in international cooperation would not bring peace. They have heard these arguments with a sense of frustration because the thinking that produced them would still the processes of peace for

America and for the world as well. I do not pretend to be a perfectionist, nor have I heard anyone else who favored the United Nations Organization, or the bill before you claiming either as perfect. But all of us have learned from the lessons of history during the last and present generations, that isolation means a road that has given us two wars in one generation. We are hopeful, those of us who are for this measure, that we are implementing the United Nations Charter to make for peace. So that we may be reminded of what our Senate voted for when we accepted the United Nations Charter, let me read from the very first chapter of that document:

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

I hold no fear of any action our representative on the Security Council may take when, under the provisions of this bill, he takes a position which is directed by the President of the United States, elected by a majority of the people as is the democratic custom of our country. The representative on the Security Council makes recommendations to the Assembly. He does not perform the duties incumbent on him by the terms of this bill except when the threat of war or aggression occurs.

Much has been said about the League of Nations and its inability to insure the hope of the world that aggression would be stopped and war avoided. But it must also be admitted, in fairness, that our country was not a member of the League. I do not entirely attribute these wars to our failure to join the League, but every reasonable person must agree with me that the influence of America, leading the world, as she could, might have prevailed so that these aggressions would not have taken place.

Now America is a part of the United Nations Organization. From time to time this Congress will pass legislation implementing the United Nations Charter. This bill permitting us to proceed promptly with police powers to prevent aggression is the first of these measures. Now countries will think many, many times before starting trouble anywhere. You and I know that even small wars in small countries make for big wars. We do not want small wars.

Much has been argued here and elsewhere that financial interests operated to encourage aggression, that members of the League of Nations were reluctant to take steps that might have prevented the spread of war, because there were economic considerations involved. I stand with those who have faith that the people of the world do want peace. Americans want peace. Americans in the future will want peace. We must have faith in our own Government and in our own people. We must have faith that our representative on the Security Council will act only in the interests of peace.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has expressed faith and hope in the United Nations Organization and its future and what it is to do. I wonder if his faith and hope are well grounded in view of Russia's actions today in the Middle East, in Turkey and Iran, and Britain's actions in Palestine and other places in the world?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I get the implication of your question, sir. I am convinced that by our representation in this Organization we can favorably answer the question of the gentleman. You ask me for a guarantee. I told you when I first started to speak that I was not a perfectionist. All that I am asking, all that the people of America are asking is for a chance for peace. This measure offers that chance. It offers us the chance to immediately avail ourselves of the opportunity to protect peace by stopping aggression. If the effort fails, at least we will have had our chance. We shall have tried.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] to the committee amendment.

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 20, strike out lines 20 to 24, and on page 4 strike out line 1 and the words "United Nations Organization" on line 2, and insert "annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified meeting thereof in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, this committee amendment merely provides that the President shall have the right to appoint special members to sit in these different Council meetings without the consent of the Senate where it calls for a specialization of some member who knows that particular subject that the different councils are hearing at the time. It is merely with reference to special meetings and not for the regular meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 4, line 16, after the words "or the Secretary of State", add "or any other member of the President's Cabinet."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call this particular section of the bill to the attention of the Congress and reread it. This is in the part that appoints the President's representative to any organ or agency of the United Nations. As it now stands, it says nothing shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, who is only one of the Cabinet members of the President, from representing the United States.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The provision which the gentleman seeks to amend, subsection (e), is supplanted by subdivision (d), which was not in the bill when it was originally written. If the gentleman will read the committee amendment which has just been adopted, he will find that it provides "any officer of the United States," and that would include all Cabinet members, Chief of Staff, or anyone else, of course.

Mr. FULTON. May I interrupt the gentleman to ask him why it simply says "Secretary of State" here?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I was saying, when the bill was first written up, the committee amendment was not included. The committee amendment which has just been adopted goes beyond even any member of the Cabinet and says "any officer of the Government."

Mr. FULTON. I accept the gentleman's suggestion and point out that that makes it stronger by providing that no member of the President's Cabinet shall be eliminated. Because if you leave the Secretary of State here alone, there is an inference then that it shall not be any other member of the President's Cabinet. It is limited solely to the Secretary of State by inference. I want that plainly set out. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think if we had not adopted a committee amendment, the gentleman's contention would be good, but I think with the committee amendment the President can appoint any officer of the Government, whether he is a member of the Cabinet or not.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman if it now says the President or the Secretary of State, and the President has the power to appoint any other person, such as you say, does it do any harm to clarify it by putting in "The Secretary of State or any member of the President's Cabinet"? I think it strengthens it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I do not think any injury would be done but I think it would be unnecessary. My position is that it is already taken care of.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me it does strengthen it a great deal, and I wish the chairman of the committee could accept the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania, because at times it is vital to have perhaps the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Treasury appear there, or some other Cabinet member. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is very alert, as always, to see the possibility of a limitation in section (e). Mr. Fulton is vitally interested in seeing that a real United Nations Organization is worked out to insure permanent peace, as he is one of those Congressmen brought back to this House from combat in this war in the South Pacific, and he has been working hard in this Congress for good international relations. The gentleman had a very gallant record in the Pacific and he has a fine voting record in the House for legislation aiding servicemen and for the prevention of future wars through international cooperation.

Mr. BLOOM. If it were not provided for in the substitute amendment which I offered, we would put it in. We considered this. It is in again in section (d). Why have an amendment? We have to pass this bill. It is in there twice already, so I do not see why we should amend the bill at this time and put something in there to strengthen it when it is already there. There is no question about it. If it did not, I would be one of the first to suggest that we accept the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman answer this question: Why, then, do you have this particular paragraph (e) in there talking of the President and Secretary of State, if it means nothing? On your statement it means nothing.

Mr. BLOOM. The reason that is in there is that it was in the bill before the committee substitute was approved this morning. That was already in there. This morning the Foreign Affairs Committee accepted this substitute, so it is in there twice. The gentleman admits it is in there once, but I say it is in there twice. There is no reason why it should go in again. It is in there twice, and why should we start to amend this bill at this time?

Mr. FULTON. May I say this, then, that by saying simply "the Secretary of State," by inference it eliminates all of the other Cabinet Members. If the bill was not accurately drawn to begin with so that there is an excess provision in it now, it certainly should be put into proper shape right at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. The only thing is that this new amendment is offered after the alternates were suggested by the preparatory committee in London at this time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I suggest that the President and Secretary of State are mentioned in this bill, due to the fact that the President and the Secretary of State, under our form of government, can only represent this country in the matter of foreign relations.

Mr. FULTON. May I answer the gentleman that this is not representing them on any particular high level, because this section (e) says any organ or agency of the United Nations. So that it might be much lower than the President or the Secretary. It might be a representative. It might be a meeting on foreign products. It might be a meeting on business, as the lady from Massachusetts has very aptly stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 26, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 4. The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

SEC. 5 (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more that $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6. The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said Charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); cost of living allowance under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communication services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract, if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); local transportation; equipment; transporation of things; rent of offices; printing and binding; official entertainment; stationery; purchase of newspapers, periodicals, books, and documents; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, pursuant to House Resolution 457, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 15, answered "present" 1, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—344

Abernethy	Eberharter	Kelley, Pa.
Allen, Ill.	Elliott	Kelly, Ill.
Allen, La.	Ellsworth	Keogh
Andersen, H. Carl	Elsaesser	Kerr
Anderson, Calif.	Elston	Kilday
Andresen, August H.	Engel, Mich.	King
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Kinzer
Andrews, N. Y.	Ervin	Kirwan
Angell	Fallon	Kopplemann
Arends	Feighan	Kunkel
Arnold	Fellows	La Follette
Auchincloss	Fenton	Landis
Bailey	Fernandez	Lane
Baldwin, Md.	Fisher	Lanham
Baldwin, N. Y.	Flood	Larcade
Barden	Fogarty	Lea
Barrett, Wyo.	Folger	LeCompte
Barry	Forand	LeFevre
Bates, Ky.	Fuller	Lemke
Bates, Mass.	Fulton	Lesinski
Beall	Gallagher	Link
Beckworth	Gamble	Luce
Bennet, N. Y.	Gardner	Ludlow
Bennett, Mo.	Gary	Lyle
Biemiller	Gathings	Lynch
Bishop	Gavin	McConnell
Blackney	Gerlach	McCormack
Bland	Gibson	McCowen
Bloom	Gifford	McDonough
Bolton	Gillespie	McGregor
Bonner	Gillette	McMillan, S. C.
Bradley, Pa.	Gillie	McMillen, Ill.
Brooks	Goodwin	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Gordon	Mahon
Brown, Ohio	Gore	Manasco
Bryson	Gorski	Mansfield, Mont.
Buck	Graham	Marcantonio
Bulwinkle	Granger	Martin, Iowa
Bunker	Grant, Ala.	Martin, Mass.
Burch	Grant, Ind.	Mathews
Burgin	Green	Merrow
Butler	Gregory	Michener
Byrne, N. Y.	Griffiths	Miller, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Campbell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mills
Canfield	Hagen	Monroney
Cannon, Mo.	Hale	Morgan
Carnahan	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mundt
Case, N. J.	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.
Case, S. Dak.	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Hancock	Neely
Chapman	Hand	Norrell
Chelf	Hare	O'Brien, Ill.
Chenoweth	Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.
Chiperfield	Harness, Ind.	O'Neal
Church	Harris	O'Toole
Clason	Hart	Outland
Clements	Hartley	Pace
Clippinger	Havenner	Patman
Cochran	Healy	Patrick
Coffee	Hébert	Patterson
Cole, Kans.	Heffernan	Peterson, Fla.
Cole, Mo.	Hendricks	Philbin
Cole, N. Y.	Henry	Phillips
Cooley	Herter	Pickett
Cooper	Hess	Ploeser
Corbett	Hill	Plumley
Courtney	Hinshaw	Poage
Cox	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Cravens	Hoch	Price, Ill.
Crosser	Hoeven	Priest
Cunningham	Holifield	Quinn, N. Y.
Curtis	Holmes, Mass.	Rabaut
D'Alesandro	Holmes, Wash.	Rabin
Davis	Hook	Rains
De Lacy	Hope	Ramspeck
Delaney, James J.	Howell	Randolph
Delaney, John J.	Huber	Rankin
D'Ewart	Izac	Rayfiel
Dirksen	Jarman	Reece, Tenn.
Dolliver	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Dondero	Johnson, Calif.	Resa
Doughton, N. C.	Johnson, Ill.	Richards
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson, Ind.	Riley
Douglas, Ill.	Johnson, Luther A.	Rivers
Doyle	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Durham	Judd	Robinson, Utah.
Dworshak	Kean	Rodgers, Pa.
Earthman	Kearney	Roe, Md.
Eaton	Kefauver	Rogers, Fla.
Rowan	Starkey	Rogers, Mass.
Ryter	Stefan	Rooney
Sabath	Stewart	Sasscer
Sadowsky	Stigler	Savage
Schwabe, Mo.	Stockman	Scrivner
Shafer	Sullivan	Sharp
Sheppard	Sundstrom	Short
Sikes	Taber	Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.	Talle	Slaughter
Smith, Maine	Thom	Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.	Thomas, N. J.	Snyder
Sparkman	Thomas, Tex.	Spence
Springer	Thomason	Tibbott
Tolan	Torrens	Traynor
Trimble	Vinson	Vorys, Ohio
Vursell	Wadsworth	Walter
Wasielewski	Weaver	Weichel
Weiss	Welch	West
White	Whitten	Whittington
Wickersham	Wigglesworth	Wilson
Winstead	Wolcott	Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.	Wood	Woodhouse
Woodruff, Mich.	Woodrum, Va.	Worley
Zimmerman		

NAYS—15

Bradley, Mich.	Hull	Rich
Buffett	Jones	Robsion, Ky.
Clevenger	Mason	Smith, Ohio
Ellis	Pittenger	Sumner, Ill.
Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.	Winter

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—72

Adams	Geelan	Morrison
Barrett, Pa.	Gossett	Murdock
Bell	Granahan	Murphy
Bender	Gwynne, Iowa	Norton
Boren	Hays	O'Hara
Boykin	Hedrick	Peterson, Ga.
Brehm	Heselton	Pfeifer
Brumbaugh	Horan	Powell
Buckley	Jackson	Ramey
Camp	Jenkins	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson, Va.
Carlson	Jonkman	Rockwell
Clark	Kee	Roe, N. Y.
Colmer	Keefe	Rogers, N. Y.
Combs	Kilburn	Russell
Crawford	Knutson	Schwabe, Okla.
Curley	Latham	Sheridan
Daughton, Va.	Lewis	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	McGehee	Stevenson
Dickstein	McGlinchey	Sumners, Tex.
Dingell	McKenzie	Talbot
Drewry	Maloney	Tarver
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Taylor
Gearhart	May	Voorhis, Calif.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Brumbaugh.

Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Combs with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Ramey.

Mr. May with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Rockwell.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Gwynne of Iowa.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Horan.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I can qualify.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall?

Mr. HAYS. My attention was diverted. If my name was called I did not hear it. If I could qualify I would vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues said I misunderstood the Speaker. I was in the Chamber when the roll was called and failed to hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening for his name?

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I was listening. My attention was diverted, Mr. Speaker.

If my presence in the Hall does not qualify me, then I will not press the request.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the legislation just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL H. R. 4922

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4922) to incorporate the American Field Service be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PALESTINE JEWISH HOMELAND

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 466, Rept. No. 1462), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 113), relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House

with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INDUSTRIAL USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 465, Rept. No. 1461) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF SERVICEMEN AND FOR VETERANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 462 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order Senate Joint Resolution 122. Realizing that the membership desires to attend to many important matters before leaving for home, I am not going to detain you long.

The joint resolution provides that upon request of the National Housing Administrator, any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of structures or facilities which are no longer required by such agency and which in the determination of said Administrator can be utilized to provide temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or for single veterans attending educational institutions, in accordance with title V, may, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, transfer such structures or facilities to said Administrator without reimbursement for such use.

The resolution provides for an authorization of $160,000,000 for that purpose and I hope that this will to some extent at least relieve the serious condition that exists.

The House joint resolution that has passed the Senate unanimously was introduced by the Senator from New York, Mr. MEAD. I am hopeful that by the passage of this resolution authorizing the use of all structures and facilities and equipment material which no longer is needed for military purposes will start construction of from 100,000 to 150,000 homes, which are sadly needed.

Mr. Speaker, you recollect that I started to call attention to the shortage of housing in the District of Columbia and also the shortage that is bound to occur all through the Nation, and though I urged, pleaded, and insisted that steps be taken to relieve the then threatening condition, I have been unable to obtain the cooperation which I urged. Congress has appropriated millions upon millions for the housing of war workers during the war; and had the United States Housing Administration been given the cooperation it sought, and had its recommendations been followed, there would be no such tremendous shortage in housing today. Some months ago I urged and recommended to the President, the OPA, and other agencies that priorities be given for housing construction, that ceilings be put on all material going into home construction. Notwithstanding the demand of the real-estate organizations, I fought against removing the ceilings on rents and retaining the price ceilings on homes. When I was informed that it is contemplated to export large quantities of lumber that could be used for housing, I prepared and have introduced a resolution restricting such exportation of lumber or building material until the shortage of housing will no longer exist in our country.

I feel that this joint resolution, as I said, will materially be helpful, and I urge immediate adoption of the rule and at the same time the passage of the joint resolution today—I mean today—and as the Members of this House are fully cognizant of the fact that thousands upon thousands of our returning soldiers are unable to obtain places in which to live, I feel that my urgent request will be heeded and this meritorious resolution will pass today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the able chairman of the Rules Committee has fully explained this rule. There is no objection to it. It is an open rule and provides for 1 hour's general debate, after which time the bill will be open for amendment.

As I stated, there is no objection to the passage of the rule or the bill on this side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be quite as important at this moment than that we do something for the alleviation of the situation of the veterans. Representing as I do one of the largest districts in the country, including much of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, I know first-hand the real need there is in our metropolitan centers for housing to take care of returning veterans and their families. As the committee states in its report, "the housing situation for veterans is no longer just a problem, it is an acute national emergency." Therefore, I am particularly happy to support S. 122, which is a fine move toward meeting that emergency.

For some time I have been very much concerned over the situation and have been stressing to those responsible the need for prompt action to provide this necessary housing for the veterans.

The measure we are considering merely authorizes appropriations for this purpose. I trust we will not only provide the authorization but that it will be promptly followed by the necessary appropriations. Many of our veterans and their families are now being denied the privilege of living normal lives, because they have to crowd in with others and have no home of their own. The veteran deserves something better than this. The use of barracks and temporary housing units can be facilitated by this means, and though inadequate, will at least give a semblance of home to the men who up to this time have been unable to find a place to live. Of course, this is but temporary relief, looking toward an adequate building program.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by CARLOS ROMULO, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address entitled "Builders of the Future." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $109.80, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of information regarding the treatment of a veteran in the hospital which gives evidence of mistreatment. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an affidavit concerning the treatment of this soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the negotiation of a loan by this Government to the British and an acceptance by them of its terms without reference to this Congress is most unusual. It is, of course, well known that Congress will have to approve it before it becomes effective, but the strategy employed is further evidence that the New Deal doesn't give a "hoot" for this body. It proposes to "blackjack" the membership into favorable consideration of this loan and already paid Government propagandists are thumping the drums in an effort to create a favorable public opinion. Then John Q. Citizen will be expected to put the heat on the Congress to accept the plan. To date, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has no information on this transaction, and yet, we are asked to "rubber stamp" the whole deal.

The people are alarmed, Mr. Speaker. Petitions, letters, and telegrams are reaching my desk, and a demand is made that this Congress protect the Treasury of the United States against raids on it by any and all nations. I cite just one example of the kind of letters that I have received:

DEAR SIR: I am writing you as our Representative in Congress to ask you in the name of common sense and the welfare of all the people of this country to oppose any loan of further gifts of any money or materials in any form to England or any other foreign power. I am of the opinion that it is time the Congress begins to realize the utter folly of squandering the entire national wealth of this Nation. If we must squander any more of it for God's sake let's do it on our own people.

Please do all you can to oppose any further loans to any nation. Everybody I talk to is much upset about the present administration selling out or giving our country to England.

If this country has so much surplus money then let's reduce taxes instead of paying the bills for all other nations. In closing I hope you will do all you can to oppose and stop this idiotic scheme to give our birthright and heritage away to England.

Yours sincerely.

Here is just one telegram:

Why should United States taxpayers be implored to purchase bonds to loan proceeds to Great Britain?

We will agree, Mr. Speaker, that what we need in this matter is more light and less heat, and it is my hope that the leaders in this House at least will inform the Members of the true situation by revealing all of the facts. Until we have these facts, it will be impossible to act intelligently. It is now my purpose to call attention to some other facts which have a considerable bearing upon this whole question and which relates directly to our ability to meet the request of the British for almost $4,000,000,000. Can we afford to make this loan?

Some weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, that elder statesman, Bernard Baruch, suggested that it was time for this country to sit down and take a look at its balance sheets. As usual, that advice has not been followed. Nevertheless, we can take a look at these balance sheets by examining the daily financial statements furnished by the Treasury Department. Here is a picture of our national debt in round figures as of November 30, 1945—a total gross debt, including contingent liabilities, in excess of $600,000,000,000. Breaking this figure down, Mr. Speaker, we find the following:

Direct public debt beginning this year	$230,630,233,709.36
Contingent liabilities (same period)	24,548,752,812.62
Unliquidated obligations	67,057,064,000.00
Total guaranteed loans	6,545,526,493.00
Insurance loans	308,116,643,131.00

Not until one gets into this subject does he realize the full import of our financial position. The figures indicate it is a precarious one, and we may soon find our "dream house" down on our heads. To think we can spend and spend, loan and loan, without the danger of financial collapse is sheer folly. Unless our experts can show that there is no danger to our economy, I shall resist approval of this loan. The record is quite clear that we are not in a financial position to make it.

Mr. Speaker, it is assumed by everybody, including Congressmen, that approval of the British request means that other nations will ask for American money. France already has been granted a substantial loan by the Export-Import Bank, and Russia is expected to ask for about $5,000,000,000. Let us look at the record. We must be realistic and approach the problem on a sound business basis. If we fail to do that, all will be lost. Take three of these countries and look at the history of each since World War I, and how they have met their obligations to us:

Great Britain, on principal (unpaid)	$4,368,000,000.00
Unpaid interest	2,047,664,782.58

Now, that adds up to more than $6,000,000,000, or more than is now requested.

France, on principal (unpaid)	$3,863,650,000.00
Unpaid interest	704,349,164.40
Italy, on principal (unpaid)	2,004,900,000.00
Unpaid interest	44,807,284.34

Without burdening the record with more statistics, I want to point out that the total amount of principal and interest due from all nations who borrowed during and after World War I is a grand total of more than $14,000,000,000. These are American taxpayers' dollars which will never be returned to the Treasury of the United States. Defaulters, whether nations or individuals, are poor credit risks, and yet, we are again asked to duplicate those loans on a very liberal basis. That looks like very poor business to me.

Now what are the British asking for, Mr. Speaker? They want three billion seven hundred and fifty million of our dollars, plus lend-lease materials to the extent of another six hundred and fifty million, which runs the total amount to almost $4,500,000,000. This amount, too, Mr. Speaker, will be hard-earned American taxpayers' money, if the loan is made. We are the trustees of these funds and are charged with the specific responsibility of conserving our assets for the difficult days of reconversion that are ahead.

In a current issue of a national magazine, one writer employs a familiar technique, such as has been used in other propaganda efforts. He points out the extreme position Britain is in, how interest rates on World War I loans were prohibitive, how "broke" she is now, and how she risked everything for us. Then he endeavors to show that this loan is to our advantage because it means more business. This is the same story and the same tune that we heard 25 years ago. Finally, he admits that the money will be used to prime the British Empire pump. That sounds suspiciously like the New Deal pump-priming methods and they will get us to the same place, eventually—to more priming. It is the way of all socialistic effort to control the economic well-being of people.

Mr. Speaker, I have no animosity toward the British. They are a great people, but there is no sound reason why this Nation should bail them out of one war and then out of another and then be asked to reestablish their economy with our money. It strikes me that we scare too easily. These threats of boycott of our goods by the sterling bloc is just propaganda or else Bretton Woods and all the other international agreements are worthless.

Mr. Speaker, again I call attention to the fact that the only knowledge Members of Congress have about this proposition is what we have read in the newspapers. We have had no information whatever, and on the basis of the record to date, there is no justification for approval of the so-called British loan. We like to believe that we are in a sound financial position but there is grave doubt about it; never have we had such a national debt as exists today. Of one thing we can be certain and that is the necessity for us as a nation to become strong financially. It is the only hope of the world. An insolvent United States would make for world chaos—not world order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, veterans' centers in my district report that at least one out of every four returning

veterans applying for aid seeks housing facilities. The center in Paterson, N. J., describes the veterans' housing problem as desperately acute. The suggestion has been made that some of the older public-school facilities be prepared for emergency service and appeals have been made to home owners to accommodate houseless veterans and their families wherever possible.

As the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds states in its report accompanying Senate Joint Resolution 122, now before us, the housing situation for veterans is no longer just a problem; it has reached the stage of an acute national emergency. As I understand it the bill we debate is addressed entirely to the emergency aspects of the picture, seeking to assure and make possible the maximum utilization of all structures and facilities of the Federal Government, not now required for other purposes, in providing temporary housing for families of men still in the armed forces and for veterans and their families pending the resumption of a substantial and sustained volume of new permanent house construction required to meet the needs of the country. In other words, this is not a new Federal program of construction of temporary homes; it concentrates on the use of already existing facilities with a minimum diversion of men and materials.

War housing will be used in this program. I have never liked it although I realize it was emergent and, generally speaking, served the purposes for which it was projected. I do not think most of these units are worthy of our returning veterans and we must emphasize in passing this bill today we are merely striving to bridge a gap. Private enterprise must do the long-term job and Government must not stand in its way. In this connection I desire to present to the House a telegram I received last Tuesday. It reads as follows:

PATERSON, N. J., *December 11, 1945.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Veterans' housing problem in Paterson desperately acute. Pledges of trade-unions and contractors to perform if materials made available. We earnestly solicit your continued zealous cooperation to effect release of needed materials.

PATERSON SERVICE CENTER.

The New Jersey State Building and Construction Trades Council, of which Sal Maso, of Paterson, N. J., is president, in convention in Atlantic City, November 9–10, devoted hours of consideration to the veterans' housing problem. Many of the council's members served in the Army and Seabees during the war. They pledged themselves to render every possible aid to contractors "to provide suitable, proper, and decent housing for the State's returning heroes."

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a congressional district in the United States where the housing shortage is more acute than in my district in Michigan.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 122 which amends section 502 of the act approved October 14, 1940, which had to do with housing in connection with the national defense. This amendment will authorize an additional appropriation of $160,000,000 for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families. Under the amendment the funds can be used for veteran housing upon the request of the National Housing Administrator or any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of structures or facilities which are no longer required by such agency and which, in the determination of the Administrator, can be utilized to provide temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen, for veterans and their families or for single veterans attending educational institutions in accordance with title V of said act. It also provides that notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such structures or facilities may be transferred to such Administrator without reimbursement for such use. In addition, it makes certain provisions for emergency housing for veterans attending educational institutions. With the return of millions of veterans into private life, many of them with families, the problem of housing has become a No. 1 problem in our country. In many sections of the country it has become impossible for these returning veterans to find housing for themselves and their families. The educational institutions have been compelled to turn away many veterans seeking to pursue their education in accordace with laws we heretofore passed, by reason of the inability of the institutions to find suitable accommodations for housing these veterans. As stated in the report on this bill:

More than 3,000,000 members of the services had been discharged by October 1, 1945. It is expected that about 10,000,000 additional men and women will be released between October 1, 1945, and December 31, 1946—with the rate averaging about 1,300,000 per month during November through February. Full allowances have been made for those who return to farms, who already have established homes, who double up voluntarily, and those who will be housed in existing and new vacancies in existing housing (private and public) and new privately constructed housing. Even with these allowances, it appears that about 1,140,000 married veterans will be actively seeking housing which will not be available unless we find a way to further increase the housing supply during this period.

This extreme pressure on our short housing supply will be added to the pressures already exerted by an overcrowded population. It is estimated that the backlog of doubled civilian families amounting to 1,200,000 as of October 1, 1945, with conservative allowances for an increase in civilian requirements, will be increased to 3,240,000 doubled families by the end of 1946. This means a total of almost six and one-half million of our nonfarm families will be doubled up. This represents a larger number of families than the total number of families in our three largest cities combined. It is more than 18 percent of all nonfarm families in the country.

To help in meeting this urgent situation it is proposed to provide a program of 100,000 temporary housing accommodations through the reuse of federally owned structures and facilities. The program is to be undertaken under the authority of title V of the Lanham Act and concentrates on the reuse of that part of the National Housing Agency's supply of war housing which it is estimated will become available in time for such reuse this winter. It includes some 75,000 existing family units to be moved and about 11,000 temporary family units to be provided by converting approximately 60,000 existing dormitory units. It also involves the provision of 14,000 temporary family units through the conversion and reuse of existing barracks and other structures and facilities now under the control of other Federal agencies and no longer required for use by them. To carry out this latter phase of the program, it is necessary to authorize the transfer of these structures and facilities to the National Housing Agency so that they may be then utilized to provide temporary housing for veterans. The committee has recommended an amendment to the joint resolution to accomplish this purpose.

It has become increasingly clear that local communities are unable to assume complete responsibility for the transportation or re-erection of these housing units in cases where their use for veterans requires their relocation. Local participation will be sought wherever possible, although in those cases where it is secured, it is likely to be confined to the acquisition and preparation of a site upon which the housing may be reerected and the management of such housing after it is reerected on the site. On this basis, the costs of the proposed program are somewhat less than would be required if the Federal Government should be required to assume all of the costs of providing the temporary housing on the new site. The committee have also recommended an amendment to the joint resolution which would facilitate the making of arrangements with these local communities for the management of the temporary housing made available under the proposed program.

At present title V of the Lanham Act does not contain an authorization for appropriations to carry out the purposes thereof. It does provide, however, that funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization in title I are available to carry out the purposes of title V, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The unused portion of the authorization in title I of the Lanham Act amounts to $35,627,000. In order to authorize the appropriation of additional funds that would be necessary to carry out this program, the joint resolution further amends title V of the Lanham Act to authorize an appropriation of not exceeding $160,000,000 to carry out the purposes of title V.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill will receive the full approval of the House, and may receive early consideration by the Senate, and be transmitted to the President without delay so that it may become effective at an early date in order to relieve the acute housing problem facing our veterans in the winter season now upon us.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is necessary to bring to the attention of the House today a most unusual and in my judgment improper procedure adopted by some Members of the body at the opposite end of the Capitol with regard to the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Board. May I read a letter sent to the Civil Aeronautics Board on December 12 by 18 Senators representing 11 Western States?

We Senators from Western States consider it vital to the most effective development of commerce between the United States and the Orient that our Western and Pacific States be afforded the most convenient access to all the trans-Pacific air routes.

We believe that the establishment of a north Pacific air route from the continental United States to the Orient is clearly required by the national interest.

We are firmly convinced that to adopt the examiners' proposal made for a single north Pacific air route over Canada via the Twin Cities would seriously retard the development of the West.

Since all portions of the United States can be better served by an all-American route to the Orient via the Pacific Northwest gateway, the interests of the entire western half of the United States should not be subordinated to a foreign route to the prejudices of the national interest.

We urge that an all-American north Pacific air route to the Orient be established through the natural Pacific Northwest gateway.

Sincerely yours,

GUY CORDON, WAYNE MORSE, BURTON K. WHEELER, JAMES E. MURRAY, E. P. CARVILLE, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, DENNIS CHAVEZ, CARL A. HATCH, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, ELBERT D. THOMAS, ABE MURDOCK, GLEN TAYLOR, ERNEST MCFARLAND, CARL HAYDEN, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, WARREN MAGNUSON, HUGH B. MITCHELL.

Mr. Speaker, nobody can rightly object to the Senators' desire to have this air route to the Orient originate from one of their own States in the West, but the method used in this instance seems clearly out of order. Last spring the Civil Aeronautics Board held extended hearings on the matter of an air route to the Orient. All applicants were given adequate time to present their cases, their evidence and their arguments. The same opportunity was given to any other interested parties, whether State governments or local governments or civic bodies or individuals. Then the hearings were closed and the official examiners of the Civil Aeronautics Board after studying all the evidence and making independent studies made their report to the Board several months ago with a recommendation that a route be established from Chicago via the Twin Cities and Alaska to the Orient.

This recommendation, of course, did not preclude another route from the Pacific Northwest to the Orient, but it took into account the fact that at first the great bulk of the traffic would be from the East and Midwest of America. If later there is adequate traffic from the Pacific Northwest, as I am confident there will be, then, of course, an additional route will be authorized along the course advocated by the Senators.

After the examiners had made their report and recommendation of a route from Chicago via the Twin Cities and Alaska to the Orient, the report and recommendation were served on all parties concerned. They were permitted to file briefs for or against the recommendations and I understand many of them did so.

Over 6 weeks ago, from October 29 to November 6, oral hearings were held by the Board and again everybody who wished had a chance to be heard and also to file a brief or letter expressing views for or against the recommendation of the examiners, and I understand some Senators did so at that time, which, of course, was wholly within their proper province.

Then 6 weeks after all the procedural steps had been completed and the matter was before the CAB for decision, 18 Senators sent the above letter to the Board urging it to disregard its own examiners' recommendations and instead consider primarily the interests of the Western States. They say that the interests of the West should not be subordinated to those of the East and the Midwest, but apparently it is all right for the interests of the East and the Midwest to be subordinated to those of the West.

My objection to their letter has nothing to do with the advantages or disadvantages of the particular air route to the Orient which they urge on the Board. I do think someone ought to object to the method they chose for promoting their views. Surely it is entirely out of order for Congress to pass a law establishing the Civil Aeronautics Board as an independent quasi-judicial agency, instructing it to take nothing into consideration in making its decisions except the merits of a case, and then turn around after all the evidence is in and subject it to what amounts not to new evidence but to terrific pressure—almost 20 percent of the Members of one legislative body, asking the Board to disregard the reports and the recommendations of its own examiners. That puts the Board in a most difficult position. It makes it almost impossible for the Board to give a wholly unbiased decision or one free from suspicion. If it rejects the recommendations of its own examiners that it establish the first northern air line to the Orient via the direct route through the Twin Cities and over Canada—the route the B–29's have flown from Tokyo—and decides instead to establish it from the Pacific Northwest, then inevitably many will wonder how much the political pressure had to do with the decision. On the other hand, even if the Board members come to believe the route should go via the Pacific Northwest, they will naturally hesitate after this letter to make that decision in opposition to their examiners' report, lest they be accused of yielding to pressure.

Mr. Speaker, with all the difficult decisions the Civil Aeronautics Board will have to make in the years ahead, involving millions of dollars to the air lines affected, we dare not compromise its position. Members of the Congress should not set up an agency supposed to be wholly independent in its judgments and then write letters urging it not to be independent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I commend my colleague for calling this matter to the attention of the House. I feel that the establishment of this air route should not be for the political convenience of any group, but that it should be established upon its merits.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. If all the evidence indicates that it should go elsewhere than my State, I will say not a word; but to bring such powerful pressure upon the Board, after all the procedural steps have been completed, seems to me wholly improper. I hope it will not happen again.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. May I bring out at this point that Great Falls is one of the towns that is being considered in this matter, and we object to this procedure in the matter of making a decision on the route from this country through Alaska to the Orient.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman objects to the procedure of bringing pressure upon the Board, after all the evidence has been presented, not to accept the recommendations of its own examiners?

Mr. D'EWART. We object to that.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to hear that the gentleman agrees with the view I have expressed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the rule under consideration relates to a matter of extreme importance throughout the country. I know the Members of the House appreciate the importance of the pending legislation, and that it will pass rapidly. The passage of this bill is necessary in order to permit the appropriation of about $190,000,000 that is in the appropriation bill to become operative. That is the importance of the immediate passage of the legislation under consideration.

I want to talk on another important matter that relates to family life, a matter in which a substantial percentage of the Members of the House are deeply interested, and that is the kerosene situation and the home heating oil situation that exists along the eastern seaboard, particularly in New England, New York, and down into New Jersey, Delaware, and parts of Pennsylvania.

The New England kerosene situation has reached a very acute stage at this time and has been in an acute stage for the past month. There are two factors which have caused this. When I say New England, I also include New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and part of Pennsylvania. There are two factors which have caused this situation to exist. One is the fact that a lower percentage of kerosene has been produced from crude oil by the refineries which are mostly owned by the large oil companies in order to get more gasoline. The second factor is the export demand for kerosene to be shipped to people overseas where the major oil companies are getting a brokerage fee, as I am informed, prompting them to

ship overseas rather than to people in the United States. That situation has aggravated the condition. I have taken this matter up with the Office of Price Administration. I am hopeful that within a few days action will be taken that will afford some relief because certainly relief is vitally necessary. There are millions of persons involved who are facing acute distress at this time unless something is done immediately.

The best information I have is that the OPA will probably increase the cost of kerosene. I agree with Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, who said in a radio speech a few days ago that what should be done is to reduce the price of kerosene. But we know the difficulties involved in reducing prices once prices are established. While I favor that, nevertheless I hope the action which will be taken by the OPA in the near future will be such as to bring about relief which is so vital to millions of Americans who live in the colder sections of our country.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the suffering is more acute in Massachusetts than in other States because the demand there for kerosene is greater than in any other State?

Mr. McCORMACK. One thing is certain, and that is it is acute there. I certainly do not challenge the statement of the gentlewoman that it is more acute in Massachusetts, but a convincing case is made out because it is acute in all the New England States, including New York and two or three other States of the Union. When we have a cold spell in Washington, it is going to be very acute here as well.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows as a result of my talking with him during the last 2 weeks that the situation that has been called to our attention by those dealing in these fuel oils is going to be extremely critical in New England unless some decision is made immediately by the OPA to clear the situation up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. He called my attention to this matter and introduced me to a friend of his. As a result of that I made inquiries, and everything that the gentleman from Massachusetts and his friend to whom he introduced me a few weeks ago said has been confirmed by the inquiry I made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three more minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to proceed with my own observations, it is my understanding that the major oil companies who own most of the refineries receive more money in shipping kerosene and oil overseas than they do by shipping it into New England, New York, and other areas of the United States on the eastern seaboard, that need it during the winter months. There is no reason why with the profits that these companies make they cannot operate their refineries in such a way that they will take care of the needs of the people during the winter season and thus provide for the people who depend entirely upon kerosene and home-heating oils for their very existence. It is an unfortunate if not disgraceful situation that exists, where the greed of large oil companies will cause acute distress to exist.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I am glad my colleague has brought up this subject. Last week when I took the matter up to see if we could not get some relief, I was assured by the Petroleum Division that the kerosene situation would be straightened out in a few days, and then they would take up the other fuel oils. But I understand nothing has been done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, we know what the situation is. You can process crude oil and you can get 7-percent kerosene or 4-percent kerosene. It makes all the difference in the world when you are shipping abroad and getting brokerage fees for doing it. We have to increase the price of kerosene and make people pay a half a cent or a cent more in order to induce the big companies to produce kerosene and ship it to New England.

During the war Secretary Ickes did a great job, with his assistant, Ralph K. Davis. We have removed war restrictions, and that is all right with me, but I expect the big companies to have regard for the over-all situation that confronts the people of America—the demands of the people of America—and to assume their responsibility. I hope they will do it and do it quickly in order to bring relief to the poor families in the cold sections of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require, to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, if this pending legislation is administered in the same broad spirit with which the act has been drafted; if the Administrator will pursue this subject with the diligence and wide discretion which Congress intends, then this will be a godsend to the veterans of my district and this country. It is, of course, not the answer to the long-range problem, but it is a necessary and wise action which I hope will be of great assistance in the present acute emergency.

Paragraph B of this act reads as follows:

> Upon request of the National Housing Administrator, any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of structures or facilities (including lands, improvements, equipment, materials, or furnishings) which are no longer required by such agency and which, in the determination of said Administrator, can be utilized to provide temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or for single veterans attending educational institutions, in accordance with this title V, may, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, transfer such structure or facilities to said Administrator, without reimbursement, for such use.

This language is broadly conceived to vest the Administrator with jurisdiction to take over any facility from any Federal agency having jurisdiction of it, which is no longer required by that agency, to provide temporary housing for veterans or their families. While undoubtedly the act is principally aimed at the wartime structures provided under the act of 1940 as amended, its language is quite broad enough to take over any structure under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government no longer needed by the agency presently having control. There can be no excuse for not interpreting this to cover houses, barracks, hotels, camps or any other facility owned, leased or otherwise controlled by any agency of the United States. I have been so assured by those in charge of the bill, and I will seek to clarify this further today.

I would support the measure in any event for the good of veterans all over the country, but particularly because it seems to me that it will solve some pressing problems in my district, and if Federally occupied structures or hotels may be available in the city of Atlantic City, it will help with a very serious problem there which has been giving me a great deal of concern.

My cooperation has been sought by the Emergency Housing Committee of that city recently appointed by Mayor Joseph Altman, and naturally I am anxious to give them every bit of help that I can, and I am anxious that the Federal Government lend every assistance that it can to municipalities in this emergency.

Nothing will ultimately solve the housing shortage except the construction of literally millions of new houses, but long before this can be accomplished, we certainly owe it to our returning soldiers to house them in decency and in privacy. It is my earnest hope that the passage of this resolution will be of great assistance to this end.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete accord with the statements made by the majority leader with respect to the lack of kerosene in the New England area.

Why the people of the New England area should be deprived of such fuel as kerosene provides is an unanswerable question. There is no occasion and no reason for it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the pending resolution for additional housing facilities for veterans and their families.

The whole problem is summed up by the report of the able chairman of the

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], when he says:

The housing situation for veterans is no longer just a problem; it has reached the stage of an acute national emergency.

Senate Joint Resolution 122 plans to expedite the construction of houses for veterans and their families. This, as well as other legislation, should pass without any unnecessary delay. The report of Mr. LANHAM'S committee leaves no room for argument on this matter. We all know that there is a serious housing shortage. We know it ought to be corrected. The way to answer the question is to build more houses. In this connection the private building industry should be permitted to function, supplemented only by a Government program of housing development, when private enterprise cannot do the work. It is a big job to remedy the housing shortage.

Fair-minded people will not blame the governmental agencies for existing conditions. We had a housing shortage when World War II started, and there has been no construction of new buildings since that time. Old buildings have not been replaced, and the demand for new buildings has gone unfulfilled. World War veterans and others have married, while the war was going on. It was not possible to build new homes. The war had to be won, and there was neither labor nor material available for a building program. Every available person was working in a war plant, or was in the Army, and all materials of almost every kind were used for war purposes.

Now that the war is over, everything possible ought to be done to encourage the building of new homes. Men engaged in construction work should be given the green light. Wartime controls should be lifted or modified to permit a building program to be gotten under way. The fewer governmental regulations, and the less red tape, the better. The Government should not go into the business of building houses or commercial establishments. We do not need any new bureaus or boards or commissions, or any additional Government employees to supervise and harass experienced men who want to put up houses. Put on price ceilings, if necessary. But don't adopt the Office of Price Administration as an administrative agency. If you do so, private initiative will wither and die. The OPA theory that it is a crime to make a profit will ruin every effort to build homes for the homeless, and defeat every plan to help, not only veterans who need a place to live, but thousands of other American families who are also seeking dwelling places. So let us keep away from OPA. Let us give free enterprise a chance to furnish building materials, and free contractors and free labor an opportunity to function, and you will be surprised how quickly new homes will be constructed for these returning veterans, and for other citizens of this Republic. The war is over. The Administration ought to recognize that fact, and give people a change to go to work in productive pursuits.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention for just a moment to the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who spoke on the subject of aviation. I am one of the friends of aviation in this House. I think it is a shame that efforts along political lines would disrupt the program in that branch of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, every real friend of aviation is interested in this rather unusual situation as stated by our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. His presentation of facts should not go unchallenged if progress is to be made in the field of aviation. If I understand the matter correctly, a responsible governmental agency has conducted hearings with reference to the proposed location of international air routes, findings or recommendations have been made after hearings where interested witnesses could be heard. The location of one of these routes is to be through the State of Minnesota, because the facts show that such line of travel is the best for the aviation development. Then suddenly a protest comes along from people of influence and power that the governmental agency made a mistake; that for no apparent reason Seattle, Wash., or some other city should be on the line of travel in our intercourse with the Far East. This demand that the Government department change its decision, reverse its findings, and yield to the irresponsible suggestion of some unknown fancy or idea, unsupported by fact or reason, does not appeal to me. I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, in protesting that sort of procedure. The American people will join us, too, when they realize the dangers to aviation, if this new method of locating air routes is to prevail.

If, as has been stated to me, Duluth, Minn., is on the direct route to Tokyo and if a Government board so determines after a hearing, the line of travel goes through Duluth, Minn., and not some other town far removed from the direct approach required by air-transportation development. But we are not now concerned with the location of the towns that are on the air routes as we are with the methods employed to locate those air routes.

It would be a great misfortune if politics were to influence the decision, or any other consideration enter into it. The Civil Aeronautics members have apparently done a painstaking job, and have sincerely tried to promote the cause of aviation by mapping out proper routes. The interests of the public have been paramount. Selfish interests have been disregarded. This agency will have my active help in the good work it is trying to do. We must not permit propaganda efforts at the eleventh hour to undo the good work that has been accomplished.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have taken the floor several times to urge immediate action on housing for veterans. Unfortunately, my pleas and those of a few other Members seemed to be falling on deaf ears. Most Members refused to recognize a great crisis was developing, that our returning veterans were finding it much harder to find a place to live than it was to get back home, difficult as that seemed to most of them.

The first break in the solid opposition occurred a couple of weeks ago when we debated the deficiency appropriation bill. The august Appropriations Committee had refused to grant any funds for moving temporary war housing which was vacant in many areas to cities where it could be utilized for veterans. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] offered an amendment to appropriate the sum of $24,500,000 to defray part of the cost of a program for the transfer of 25,000 units. A great hue and cry was raised against this amendment. The old shibboleth of "wasting the taxpayers' money" was raised by those who refused to face the facts. Fortunately the gentleman from Texas received the militant support of several Members, including myself, and the amendment was passed after a hard struggle. This was the first concrete support the veterans obtained.

In the meantime, the housing crisis has grown daily in intensity. The Senate has passed a resolution which is now before us authorizing the use of 100,000 units of temporary war housing for veterans, with the Federal Government meeting all the costs of transportation and reassembly.

Passage of this resolution will be the first real act of simple justice to provide housing for veterans. It is only a beginning. While I am glad it is evident we are about to pass House Resolution 462 which will make Senate Joint Resolution 122 in order and then pass the resolution, I want to warn we are only scratching the surface. The bandwagon support for this resolution will not solve the housing problem.

It is high time we were also passing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill and the Patman housing bill, which is now pending in the Banking and Currency Committee.

I predict that every Member who goes home during the holidays will find such a critical housing situation he will come back ready to take immediate action on these measures.

This country should be ashamed that we have no housing ready for our battle-scarred and weary veterans. The least a grateful Nation can do for our boys is make certain they have a decent place to take their families and resume a peaceful life.

I, for one, serve notice that I intend to push the housing question vigorously immediately on the opening of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, surely every Member of this House is fully aware of the acute and distressing situation facing returning veterans and their families because of the lack of housing facilities. Every Member is anxious to relieve this situation as much as possible by all reasonable means available. The passage of this resolution with its authorization and a subsequent appropriation in the deficiency appropriation bill, while affording relief in only a small measure, will at least make available for veterans and their families structures under the jurisdiction and control of Federal agencies which can be utilized to provide temporary housing until private building can help supply the need.

This need is acute and so urgent I feel confident that this resolution will be passed unanimously, and I urge its support.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include three newspapers items.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, there is a critical shortage of housing throughout the United States for the distressed families of our servicemen and for veterans and their families.

The immediate adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 122, which would authorize an additional appropriation for this purpose, would materially help to relieve these distressing conditions.

We are told that the housing situation for veterans is no longer just a problem, it has reached the stage of an acute national emergency and immediate action on the part of the Federal Government is clearly required.

More than 3,000,000 members of the services have been discharged up to October 1, 1945. It is expected that an additional 10,000,000 men and women will be released between October 1, 1945, and December 31, 1946, with the rate averaging about 1,300,000 per month from November through February. One can readily see therefore that conditions will grow worse instead of better, unless immediate action is taken.

Therefore it becomes necessary for us to pass this resolution at once, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing adequate housing to meet the demands.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 122, which is designed especially to authorize an additional appropriation of $160,000,000 for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families. The vote should be prompt and unanimous. I compliment the distinguished chairman and committee members for acting so speedily in the premises and also for bringing this important bill to the floor even at this late hour of this busy day.

Representing the Eighteenth District of California, as I have the honor of doing, and reminding you that my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, is the favored spot of the great naval installations and the anchorage pool of the Pacific Fleet, with the protecting arms of the Federal breakwater extending for miles across that great harbor's front door, you will clearly understand we have an immediate and growing and acute housing problem thereabouts for these veterans. California being favored as it always has been in weather and other natural advantages which are so attractive to folks, has not experienced an outgoing of its wartime population. These war workers are sticking close to a good place to live with their families. So, Long Beach and the surrounding area is crowded to the eaves with civilians as well as with veterans and their families.

Of the 3,000,000 members of the armed forces who had been discharged by October 1, southern California has held and received more than its quota. This is not complained of, excepting that we are not a bit happy that these veterans and their loved ones do not have decent housing conditions.

The Navy, Army, and civilian officials are all cooperating, but there is need of this bill passing at once. No, it will not be nearly enough, for 100,000 units for the Nation-wide need is insignificant. But it will be a big drop of water in a big pool of need. I understand there are not any of the PWH houses in Los Angeles County presently. But they can be moved there from Nevada, Utah, and Arizona, where they are no longer needed. They are only for temporary use. This is as it should be, for builders and materialmen should get together as soon as possible and begin construction of more homes and less commercial or other enterprises. It does no good to release material for homes if it is directed into more amusement houses or cocktail parlors. Homes for the veterans and others are far more important.

It is estimated another 10,000,000 veterans will be released by December 31, 1946, with the average reaching 1,300,000 per month in November and December 1946. There is no time to lose. We are too tardy already to have any feeling of satisfaction of meeting the need.

Get these temporary houses for the veterans at earliest dates. But do not stop with them. Get—and get them now—whatever is needed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 122, an act to provide an appropriation of $160,000,000 for the purpose of providing housing for veterans.

The deplorable conditions of these returned veterans and their families is a shame and disgrace. In my own district in the Los Angeles area some 60,000 housing units are needed. These veterans are not only former residents of California, but come from practically all the States of the Union.

While this appropriation is far from adequate, it is an important move in the right direction. Shabby treatment of the veteran and his family is unnecessary in a country as rich as ours and a poor exhibition of our gratitude for the service they have rendered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 122 which will authorize an additional appropriation of $160,000,000 for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes. Housing in the country is acute. It is to be regretted that Congress has not seen fit to act before this to provide sufficient funds to make available for veterans and their families such war housing as is adaptable to their needs.

Some of us have urged long ago that Congress have the foresight and prepare for this emergency. Of course, this is only a stop-gap measure, and totally inadequate to cope with the great need for veteran housing.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have visited in West Virginia and while there I talked with officials of the State University at Morgantown, Potomac State School at Keyser, Davis and Elkins College in my home community, and the West Virginia Institute of Technology at Montgomery. They told me of the very real need for housing on their campuses to provide facilities for veterans, estimated to be 20,000, who desire to take courses at West Virginia institutions. I am in favor of this legislation, not only to care properly for these students—but also in a larger sense to provide immediately the housing necessary for those returning veterans who seem unable to secure adequate housing in the communities to which they have returned to work and rear their families.

In connection with this phase of housing for veterans, who desire to go to college, I enclose the following telegram received this morning from the Governor of West Virginia:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *December 17, 1945.*

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Press reports indicate Mead bill will come up for House passage Tuesday. West Virginia educational institutions desperately need 300 portable houses or dormitory rooms comparable thereto for returning veterans and their families. Federal aid for moving these units to our campuses is imperative as no money is available from any source for this transportation. Your support of this bill and careful consideration of problem with a view to our State acquiring its proportionate share of these houses and of this appropriation will be appreciated.

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, I received, a few days ago, a letter from a recently discharged veteran, who has five battle stars. He was distressed over the housing shortage as it applied to himself and to apparently hundreds of thousands other men who are returning from the theaters of duty and the camps in this country and throughout the world. He brought to my attention the following article from the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Sun-Telegram of December 9, 1945:

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND VETS FACE HOMELESS YULE IN HOUSING SHORTAGE

WASHINGTON, December 8.—Federal officials, appalled at the prospect of a homeless Christmas for at least half a million veterans, today appealed to Mr. and Mrs. America to share their homes with returned servicemen and their families.

State and municipal agencies joined in the plea to householders to open their doors to the discharged warriors, innocent victims of the worst housing shortage in the country's history.

The stringency is rapidly growing worse instead of better, with little prospect of effective relief through next year.

Much as the Federal Government deplores the plight of the vets, said John B. Blandford, Jr., Federal Housing Administrator, the problem is a local responsibility. He has written to 25,000 mayors, urging the speeding up of new construction. In the meantime, he asks families with space to spare in houses or apartments to offer it to homeless vets—before Christmas.

FAMILIES DOUBLE UP

So acute is the lack of housing, he went on, that 1,500,000 families already have doubled up. And, he predicted, 2,000,000 servicemen and their families will have to do the same during next year because they won't find homes of their own.

With city after city reporting vacant apartments and homes a rarity, the War Department has just announced that 1,000,000 men will be discharged during December. Of this total, 730,000 will pour out of transports from overseas into cities already jammed to the bursting point.

The newcomers, in far too many cases, will join an army of despair—men and women who have tramped the streets day after day in a vain quest for a place in which to live. Among them are many wounded just out of hospitals.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of housing for our veterans has become so acute that I fear many of them on reaching home will decide that their difficulties in getting back to this country and demobilized were less than the difficulties which face them on their return. It is true that it could not be wholly avoided. It was not possible during the war to provide them with all the things they needed in order to win the war with maximum speed and minimum loss of life, and at the same time have the labor and lumber and metals and fixtures required to build homes for them.

But there is no excuse for delay in exerting every possible effort to correct the situation now. Housing is our problem No. 1. We must promptly pass this bill and all other palliative measures. Even more important is it that we bring to bear on the problem the best brains and most experienced men that the building industry and trades can provide, as well as those men who during the war have proved our most efficient breakers of bottlenecks. It will take the combined efforts of management, labor, Government, and the veterans themselves, to handle this tough problem. We proved we could perform miracles during the war when we all worked together, putting first things first. We can perform one here, too. But it will prove as hard as any we have had and it will require imagination, unity of purpose, and cooperative effort of the highest order. Now is the time for all with most experience in this field to come to the aid of the veteran and of the country, and for the appropriate agencies of the Government and committees of the Congress to come forward with effective plans, and legislation if needed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. BOREN (at the request of Mr. WICKERSHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be immediately adopted because of the fact that the most critical situation that confronts the country at the present time is the question of providing proper housing for veterans.

Although only about 4,000,000 veterans have been discharged, from every corner of the country we hear that homes are not available. It is a problem that must be solved.

In my own city of St. Louis a Citizens Committee has been organized and is making every effort to alleviate a very bad condition; even going so far as to try to secure trailers from the War and Navy Departments.

This is emergency legislation and I hope that before the Congress adjourns for the holidays this joint resolution will not only be passed but the money authorized therein will be appropriated.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, of all the outrages I have yet to encounter, the spectacle of the veteran being unable to obtain a home in his community for himself and his family is the worst.

This bill before us gives the veteran at least the hope of a brighter future. The word I am receiving from home indicates extreme dissatisfaction on the part of the veteran in the way he is kicked from pillar to post when he tries to find a home.

I believe Congress will go a long way to solve the country's lack of housing. It is important to us all that nobody suffers from cold and hunger here in America. The returning soldier is looking for a chance to earn his living and a place to live. Those in authority must give him the opportunity.

I hope this veterans housing bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this rule. By all means let us hasten to amend section 502 of the National Defense Housing Act to take care of today's needs and difficulties.

In Jefferson County, Ala., a very representative section of the United States of America, our public officials are appealing to me to help in every way to meet the rising tide of petitions for homes for our returning veterans. This legislation will be quite a help if properly passed and put into activity.

This is fast becoming a real emergency and the pity of it is that it falls upon the necks of our men and women who have served and sacrificed for Uncle Sam through his greatest war.

In my opinion there will prove to be only a few Members of Congress who are not glad to go along with this legislation. The shortage of building materials is still one of the after-war gaps we must speed in filling. Our present pace is too slow and there are few things we are confronted with and some things we are going to have to do, but that is another speech. All I now say is, let us act on this rule, promptly and affirmatively.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution under consideration by the House at this time, H. R. 462, should be adopted unanimously. The passage of this legislation will make available over 100,000 housing units for veterans returning from World War II.

The housing situation in the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana has reached a critical stage. Thousands of war workers have moved into our area during the last 5 years, and by reason of this great influx homes have been scarce in Gary, East Chicago, Hammond, Whiting, and other areas of the Calumet district.

Now when over 35,000 servicemen are returning and are about to return from the military forces, our housing problem calls for an emergency solution. Home building has been curtailed during the war on account of restrictions and shortage of materials, and we now find ourselves almost 10 years behind in residential construction.

I understand that there are over a million and one-half married men now in the military service, and an equal number of veterans will be married in the coming year. This will add a total of 3,000,000 homeless families to the already great number who cannot find dwellings.

This resolution which authorizes the appropriation of an additional one hundred sixty million for the reuse of existing structures and facilities for home purposes will only begin to solve our difficulty.

It is incumbent upon our Government to do everything possible to provide for and aid the returning serviceman until he can become reestablished in civilian life. House Resolution 462, now under

consideration, should be unanimously passed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 122 to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 122, with Mr. THOM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a brief explanation of the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 122. It relates to a very distressing situation in this country or ours, when veterans, servicemen, and their families are finding it almost impossible to procure living quarters and in very many instances all over the country are sleeping in hotel lobbies, in union stations, and still other less desirable places that may be available.

We passed an amendment which I offered to the deficiency appropriation bill when it was pending in the House, a mere start toward the solving of this problem, but it was all that could be done at that time.

We of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds are anxious to do all we can under the jurisdiction of our committee to give the needed relief. To that end we have enacted a law which I introduced to add title V to the Lanham Act. That title, which was approved on the 23d of June of this year, provides that veterans, servicemen, and their families can use the vacant war housing built under that act and that vacant war housing when situated in rural and inaccessible places can be moved in order to be used by these veterans and servicemen, and their families. It also provides that even new temporary construction can be built, but that is not now in prospect and we have no desire whatever to interfere with private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, in order to make this housing available and in order to make available for this purpose Army and Navy barracks or any other temporary governmental structures that can be moved and used, subsection (b) is included in this resolution, and also subsection (c) in order that educational institutions may come within the provisions of the relief afforded by title V of this act.

It is important that we pass this joint resolution today for the reason that we shall have before us tomorrow the conference report on the deficiency bill which carries an appropriation contingent in large part upon the passage of this authorization. Let me bring to your attention the fact that the passage of this authorization will make, according to the best computation we can get, 100,000 units available for these veterans, servicemen, and their families. These will be the buildings that will be moved from inaccessible places to places where they can be used.

There will be the obligation upon the local communities and upon the schools making application for these houses to furnish the land upon which they shall be placed and to get the necessary utilities to them.

We provide also in subsection (c) for the disposition of this housing, which is all temporary in accordance with the terms of the act; however, there is a saving clause in that act which would make this housing available until housing can be made otherwise available under the normal procedures of our American practices.

Let me make this further explanation, in order that it may be understood by one and all, as to the method by which in the distressed places, and we have them in every part of this country, the vacant houses are to be acquired. They are to be acquired upon the application of States, political subdivisions, educational institutions, and cities that may desire them to relieve this situation.

Title V, I may say, is restricted absolutely to veterans and servicemen and their families. This application will be made in each instance and will be presented to the regional office of the FPHA in which the particular community or educational institution is located. That is the procedure to follow in getting these houses where they may be needed.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am interested in this measure on behalf of Bowdoin College in my district. Assume that is passed and the appropriation is made tomorrow, can the gentleman give us indication how long it will take to get some assistance?

Mr. LANHAM. I made that inquiry of some of the authorities of the National Housing Agency, and they told me that they would get to work in days—not weeks or months, but days—because it is a very pressing and a very urgent problem that we have before us. The authorities are anxious to begin it at once, and the speed in getting approval of this Senate joint resolution is necessary in order that, when the deficiency bill passes, these applications may be promptly processed and this housing made available to the veterans and the servicemen and their families just as rapidly as possible.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman may remember that when we passed the $24,500,000 item in the deficiency bill I asked him how many units it would provide, and he said about 20,000. This will provide for another 100,000, as I understand.

Mr. LANHAM. This will provide for about 100,000 in the aggregate, but it removes the burden upon the cities and educational institutions included in the appropriation which we placed in the deficiency bill in the House.

Mr. IZAC. Then the FPHA is going to bear the whole expense of moving these temporary buildings?

Mr. LANHAM. And assembling them and painting them and supplying them with the necessary equipment and household conveniences usually employed.

Mr. IZAC. So all that is necessary is for the political subdivision to apply for them, and then the FPHA will take care of them.

Mr. LANHAM. And have the local communities furnish the land upon which they will be placed and to bring the utilities up to them. I may say that title will be conveyed with certain conditions and reservations, and there will be some rentals coming into the Federal Government. It is anticipated that $10,000,000 will be recouped in a year out of this appropriation.

Mr. IZAC. The gentleman also understands that there are about a million veterans coming back in December alone, probably three-quarters of a million in November, and a similar amount in January.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. Does the gentleman really think that 100,000 units is going to take care of the needs?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not, but all on earth that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is authorized to do is to make available to these veterans the property that we have under our jurisdiction, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. IZAC. May we expect more in the future?

Mr. LANHAM. It is to be hoped so, but such legislation necessarily would not come from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which is concerned primarily with buildings for Federal purposes. This was a war emergency act and these houses were built for the in-migrant workers at the war plants. Certainly this situation that faces the veterans and the servicemen and their families is unprecedented and an aftermath of the war, so we are trying to make these 100,000 units available. I hope that more can be done, but what we are doing is the best our committee can do under existing circumstances.

Mr. IZAC. If the gentleman will permit me one further observation, I am just afraid that before private industry will take up the slack and provide the

housing that is needed for returning veterans, there will be a whole lot more than 100,000 units needed; perhaps it will run into the millions.

Mr. LANHAM. That is all true, but I will say to the gentleman from California that, as far as our committee is concerned, we have gone as far as we can now. As a mater of fact, under title V there are now 20,000 families of veterans and servicemen that are living in these vacant houses, where they are available for occupancy. The purpose of this bill is to get these houses out from these rural sections and to get some of these barracks that are no longer used by the Army or the Navy, and to convert them so that they can be used by the veterans and the servicemen and their families.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder what position the gentleman and his committee are taking in regard to shipments of lumber and prefabricated houses to other nations at this time when we need the houses so badly here?

Mr. LANHAM. I will say that from the standpoint of our committee we have insisted that the construction which had been built in accordance with the terms of the Lanham Act be kept in this country, and by title V we made it available to veterans and servicemen. So I have no knowledge that any of this particular material has been shipped abroad, and I do not think it has.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman's committee is trying to make these houses available to veterans, and at the same time we are shipping from this country, I understand, prefabricated houses by the thousands and lumber by the millions of feet all over the world. It does not appeal to me that we should be doing that under the present conditions when we need housing and lumber so badly. Certainly somebody should take hold of that.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know that that is being done, but whether it is or whether it is not, it has nothing to do with the pending resolution, in which we are trying to make available the housing that has been constructed under the Lanham Act.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I ask the gentleman how small communities where there are veterans without housing will benefit under this resolution?

Mr. LANHAM. They will make an application just as any other community would to the FPHA of the region in which situated.

Mr. LECOMPTE. They are long removed from some of the war housing of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. LANHAM. This housing can be moved as far as 1,000 miles. It has been estimated that in meeting the applications for the reuse of this housing the average move will probably be about 200 miles.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman thinks the small towns will get an even break with the cities in getting housing for their veterans under this plan?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. It is our desire, of course, that no discrimination be made, and that all over the country this be used insofar as it can be used to afford relief.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If it does that, I think it is a splendid act.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. As I understand, the gentleman's committee has taken jurisdiction only with respect to temporary housing. You do not undertake to afford veterans any opportunity to get residences in prewar established and now abandoned surplus forts, so-called?

Mr. LANHAM. That is not the function of our committee. As I have stated, our committee in normal times is concerned merely with building the structures that are necessary for Federal operation, like departmental buildings, post offices, and things of that kind. This act has arisen as an incident of our war emergency and is known as the Lanham Act.

Mr. PLUMLEY. In order that I may make this very clear to my constituents, you do not undertake to do anything with respect to making it possible for anybody to occupy Fort Ethan Allen outside of Burlington, Vt., for residential purposes?

Mr. LANHAM. I think the gentleman, who is my good and distinguished friend, realizes that the matter about which he is talking is beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PLUMLEY. That is just what I wanted the gentleman to say. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that you will take these Army and Navy barracks apart and divide them to make houses out of them.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any idea how many houses can be made under this plan?

Mr. LANHAM. Under this entire plan, 100,000. If the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will look at the report she will see the enumeration in the letter from the Administrator as to how those houses will become available.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would have this report published in the RECORD.

Mr. LANHAM. That might be a little bit extensive.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very valuable.

Mr. LANHAM. However, the report is available.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. May I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the language of paragraph (b), that upon request of the National Housing Administration, any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control—not necessarily ownership—of structures or facilities, and so forth. May I ask the gentleman whether he would agree with my interpretation that that is broad enough to include many other types of structures, including hotels, for example.

Mr. LANHAM. I think it is broad enough to include anything that may be available to these agencies, over which they have jurisdiction, that will relieve this serious housing problem for veterans and servicemen and their families.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman made some reference to the pendency of the amendment in the deficiency bill. Does the gentleman mean that the Senate amendment makes the passage of this bill necessary before the appropriation can become effective?

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to my friend from South Dakota that there is remaining of the appropriation under title I of the Lanham Act, under which this building construction was done, between $30,000,000 and $35,000,000.

The Senate amendment in the deficiency bill carries one hundred and ninety-one million dollars-plus. I am hopeful that the conferees of the House will agree to that amendment despite the fact that there is no authorization. But in order to obviate any parliamentary difficulty and in order to have legislative action upon which that amendment in the Senate on the deficiency bill may be based, I think it is important to have this authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman mean that if this resolution passes the House, it will constitute a legislative authorization so that the Senate amendment would be in order as part of the conferees' report and not require a separate vote?

Mr. LANHAM. I am hopeful it will at least be very, very persuasive to the conferees of the House in view of this most distressing situation we have in the country concerning these returning veterans, servicemen, and their families.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand the conferees expect to complete their action within a short time this afternoon.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope the conferees in view of these statements that have been made here by so many of the Members of the House who agree that this is a most serious problem, will readily agree to the amendment of the Senate on the deficiency bill.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I commend the gentleman for the constant and courageous fight he has made to bring this issue clearly on the floor of the House when many Members felt that it was not a vital issue?

May I ask the gentleman whether this resolution would in the future make it

impossible for cities to purchase some of these houses as the city of Milwaukee recently has under the FPHA?

Mr. LANHAM. It would not. Some of this property has been purchased by cities. The law provides for the disposition of this property. But we are trying to reserve this temporary housing to be used for these veterans, servicemen, and their families.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Under this resolution, no new housing will be provided?

Mr. LANHAM. No new housing is provided and it is so specified. Consequently, it does not in any way interfere with the operations of private enterprise because title V to which this relates makes these vacant houses available with proper appropriation only for veterans, servicemen, and their families.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. And there would be no drain on our present short supply of such things as lumber, pipe, and so forth under this resolution?

Mr. LANHAM. None whatever, because this material is already available in previous construction.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and the other members of the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor at this time. It is much needed legislation, it is urgent, it should not be postponed, and I am hopeful that Congress will take favorable action on this bill today and favorable action on the appropriation to put it into effect before the week is over. Conversation will not protect a veteran and his family from the cold winter winds. Procrastination will merely aggravate an already serious problem. There are now more than 10 times as many veterans walking the streets looking for homes as this bill will provide for, but this measure will provide for 1 out of 10, and I am for that 1. We should provide for him now.

As I see it, from the gentleman's report, it is a national emergency and we must take cognizance of it. I see that in the next few months they expect 1,140,000 married veterans to be seeking housing, and we are only providing 100,000 units. Is that correct?

Mr. LANHAM. That is true, but that is all we are in a position to provide through our committee.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I understand. The situation certainly justifies the use of these 100,000 units.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. Indeed, it does.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. We have 10 applications for every house that is provided.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. Permit me to say that we are hopeful that we are going to take proper steps in order that private enterprise can build houses for these veterans who are able to buy houses, and that the return to our normal practices and procedures will relieve this general housing situation. This resolution will not fully meet the problem, of course, but it is as far as we can go through our committee in making housing available in this period of distress for the veterans and servicemen and their families.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I understand that the regional offices already have made preparations for putting this resolution into effect, and that the national office is going to decentralize the whole thing so that the regional directors of the FPHA can give a "Yes" or "No" answer in the field without having to come to Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. I have been so advised by the authorities of the National Housing Agency.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. This would provide 100,000 temporary units. Is that correct?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Under the original Lanham Act, some of the houses constructed were not temporary but were permanent.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. They will be sold under the act and some of them have already been sold.

They, of course, cannot be moved.

Mr. RIVERS. But will the veterans have priority on any of those where they are vacant?

Mr. LANHAM. I hope they will, but they are available through purchase. If they are able to purchase them I hope they can get them.

Mr. RIVERS. Is there any minimum number which they can apply for.

Mr. LANHAM. The application will be made, of course, by each community or school in accordance with its needs, and housing supplied to the extent that the application requirements can be met from the housing that is in relative proximity. Applications, to the extent they can be filled, of course, will be filled.

Mr. RIVERS. The regional offices cannot turn down a community because of the smallness of the application?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, no. There is no disposition to do that. We have got to assume there is going to be fair administration. The national housing authorities certainly appreciate the seriousness of this problem which has been brought so forcefully to their attention many, many times.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I understand this legislation applies only to those houses that have been declared surplus. Is that right?

Mr. LANHAM. No. There has been no declaration as to whether they are surplus or not, because the surplus property law does not apply, in view of the fact that where a statutory provision has been made for the disposal of property, there is no necessity to resort to the Surplus Property Act. This applies to the vacant war housing formerly occupied by war workers at these various plants.

Mr. GRANGER. Is it confined to that kind of housing entirely?

Mr. LANHAM. It is confined to that type of housing entirely, because our committee has no jurisdiction over other types.

Mr. GRANGER. Does not your committee know that there are whole communities of houses that are vacant, that are not declared surplus? Can you tell us why they are not?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, the gentleman knows that does not come under the jurisdiction of our committee. I would like to have him propound that inquiry to the committee which has jurisdiction of that matter.

Mr. GRANGER. Surely your committee is more interested in housing than any other committee I know of.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that no housing legislation has emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds except for Federal structures, built for the operation of the various agencies of the Federal Government. This is the only instance when housing for occupancy by families has come from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and this act was an emergency war measure in order that these plants might operate.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. The city of Newark and other communities in this country have had the foresight to already purchase some of these properties?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. I understand the gentleman is going to support an amendment, which will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois, which will reimburse the cities that have already done that.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand that an amendment to that effect will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McMILLEN]. Of course, that would apply only to this temporary housing. Where they bought demountables they are regarded as in a permanent category, and the gentleman's amendment would not apply to them.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I understand the veteran will be charged a nominal fee per month.

Mr. LANHAM. Title V provides that the veteran will be called upon to pay such rental as he can afford to pay. In other words, we are trying to meet this situation, insofar as it is possible for us to meet it, from property that is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. As to what would be a suitable fee, or what he could afford to pay, is that in the discretion of the municipality or the educational institution?

Mr. LANHAM. It has been determined, of course, by the authorities of the National Housing Agency, but it has not been burdensome, and we have not been receiving any complaints in that regard.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. In many cases these barracks could be used where they stand.

Are those instances embraced in this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; and there are 20,000 families of veterans and servicemen occupying this war housing today under the Lanham Act. Wherever such houses are available for occupancy these veterans, servicemen, and their families are now occupying them—20,000 of them.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What will happen to the buildings after the crisis is over—after they have served their purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. They will have to be disposed of in accordance with the terms of the agreement in which the National Housing Agency will enter with the colleges and cities, and the original provision in the law with reference to the disposition of these houses is carried also in Senate Joint Resolution 122.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. In other words, the title would still remain in the Government.

Mr. LANHAM. The title would be transferred upon the condition of compliance with the requirements of the law with reference to removal.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DOYLE. About how long will it be before the information will be available on application as to what is available and where?

And, also, if there are iceboxes and such equipment in the houses now, will they be moved with the house gratis to applicants?

Mr. LANHAM. They will; and there will be a stove in each one and they will be repainted and have all the normal conveniences that you find in any house that you rent; that equipment will be in these houses.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. LANE. As I understand the provisions of this resolution which is to assist and aid distressed veterans and their families, such as the many, many thouands in my congested area, to allow them and to give them the opportunity to use these abandoned Army barracks that we have along the Atlantic coast and harbor defenses; is that right?

Mr. LANHAM. That is covered in subsection (b) of this resolution.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. On what basis will the allocation of these units be made throughout the country? Will that be within the discretion of the National Housing Administrator? Or will each State be given a certain number of units?

Mr. LANHAM. It will be impossible, of course, for each State to be given so many units. It will depend upon where the houses are situated, and that is pretty well all over the country, and how far they will have to be moved. But to the extent that any situation can be relieved it will be relieved.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. And the discretion as to allocation rests with the Administrator?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; and naturally it would, because they know the situation, where the houses are, and how far it is practical to move them. They will be given discretion and to the extent that it is possible to serve each community and school that will be done.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I wonder if I may just ask the gentleman this question: The question has arisen down in my district, at Orlando, Fla., they have a large air base and a great deal of housing available, but it is not the type of housing that could be used by families, it is barracks. The question came up as the gentleman will remember on the deficiency bill when we restored the $24,500,000 as to whether the Housing Authority would have authority to remodel barracks so that families could use them. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that such authority is carried in this resolution?

Mr. LANHAM. It is carried in this resolution in subsection (c) where they can be paneled and shipped and made available; and the authorities who appeared before our committee said there would be no difficulty in using those barracks for the purposes stated.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If I may just ask this further question, the commanding general of the base at Orlando said that he would be delighted to have his officers who were living in housing outside of the base come back to the base if the quarters were remodeled so that they could use them for families, and release some emergency housing we have there for veterans who are returning. This officer further said that if the Government wanted to take over some of those barracks on the base and remodel them for the accommodation of veterans and their families it would be agreeable to him. Would that be possible under this bill?

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure some satisfactory arrangement could be made with the administrative officers, because it is their purpose as it is our purpose to try to solve this problem as far as we may.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McMILLEN].

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, Sgt. Vito R. Bertoldo, the son of a coal miner, returned to my home city, Decatur, Ill., about 2 months ago and for more than 6 weeks was unable to find a house to live with his wife whom he married before going into the service some 4 years ago. He finally obtained an unsatisfactory apartment.

That same boy is in Washington today and a few hours ago, President Truman at the White House, pinned on his uniform, the Congressional Medal of Honor. Sgt. Vito Bertoldo was surrounded by his family at the awarding and also present was James A. Hedrick, mayor of the city of Decatur, Commander John Stelle, national commander of the American Legion, and Emory McIntosh, a pal who fought with him with the First Battalion, Two Hundred and Forty-second Regiment of the Forty-second—Rainbow—Division.

The citation stated that "Sgt. Vito Bertoldo fought with extreme gallantry on January 9 and 10, 1945, at Hatten, France, while guarding two command posts against the assault of powerful infantry and armored forces which had overrun the battalion's main line of resistance." The citation further stated he left protection and in full view of his adversaries exposed to 88-millimeter, machine guns, and other firearms stood for 12 hours then moved back and from a building fired through a window only 75 yards away from the enemy guns and finally mowed down the entire group of more than 20 Germans. He stood his ground alone for more than 48 hours without rest or relief, killing more than 40 hostile soldiers and wounding many more during his grim battle against the enemy hordes. I have been informed that his services were among the most distinguished of any in our entire country who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

This young soldier is only one of many hundreds of thousands of returned veterans who have been or are now without shelter for himself and family.

I believe it was about a year ago that the Gallup poll sent out ballots requesting the pollee to state whether or not he had made any real sacrifice during the war and the emergency. I feel that it is a near national disgrace that 64 percent of the pollees replied that they had not made any real sacrifice while more than 10,000,000 boys and girls were offering their lives for our country including those who were remaining at home with comforts and in many instances luxuries beyond which we had formerly had.

It seems to me that the provisions of this bill are little in comparison to what we owe to our returned veterans. Any necessary sacrifice should now be made to provide a temporary home for those who have returned from the battlefields of Europe and the Pacific.

I have opposed and shall continue to oppose the passage of many bills providing for further Federal spending that increases the national indebtedness. Until deficit financing ceases the greatest of caution should be exercised in adopting provisions for further spending of the taxpayers' money. We are on the brink of bankruptcy and financial chaos.

This debt, however, we owe and is now overdue, and I am, as a member of the Public Building and Grounds Committee, giving my unqualified support to the resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 122—now under consideration that will provide an already delayed critical need for the relocation of houses and units in schools and municipalities where they are so badly needed.

I am going to submit an amendment to the resolution, copies of which I have for any Members who may desire them, which I desire and in no way should interfere with the passage of the resolution. It merely provides that municipalities and schools that have heretofore paid the expense to disassemble, trans-

port, and reerect temporary houses, shall be reimbursed for those expenditures, as the present bill provides that the schools and municipalities shall only be required to provide the land on which these houses are to be reerected. It would otherwise amount to penalizing the schools and municipalities who were forward enough thinking and alert to provide the necessary money for reerecting these units.

It is my fervent hope and expectation that this bill will be passed by the House with few or no dissenting votes and furthermore that the Members will give due consideration to the amendment that I shall propose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. This sounds like a highly worthy amendment to an important piece of legislation. It would merely equalize the situation for certain educational and nonprofit institutions.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman for her observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there will not be a vote against this piece of legislation. It is a national scandal and a national disgrace that we have really made no preparation for our returning veterans. The men in Italy remained for 158 days at the very front in winter without replacement. I talked with a man yesterday who spent 120 days in one of the other theaters of war without replacement. This bill will, in a measure, take care of some of our men. Much more should be done than this. I wish, Mr. Chairman, that a man like Mr. Jeffers, who was the head of the rubber-control program during the war, could head a civilian organization in order to take care of these men and help find jobs for them and look after them in every way.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. McDONOUGH.]

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the Committee except to say that I favor passage of this resolution, and I want to tell the Committee some of the problems we are facing in Los Angeles. The bill will provide for approximately 100,000 units. The mayor of the city of Los Angeles was in Washington last week and stated that he could use 100,000 units for veterans housing in the Los Angeles area alone. That sounds like a terrific number of temporary housing units to provide for veterans, but let me tell you what is happening. In Los Angeles veterans are living in the Union Station, because there are no houses for them. A shipload of veterans arrived at the port of San Pedro recently from the South Pacific, to be unloaded and dispersed to their homes, and they had to march them back aboard ship because there was no place to house them. The situation is more acute there than perhaps any other part of the United States. The Red Cross had to relieve a number of families who were living in automobiles. There has been talk of using this housing for students on the campuses. I favor that, but I believe the first use should be for veterans and their families who are not attending universities. Then I want to speak a word of caution regarding the amendment that is pending; that is, if part of the $160,000,000 is taken to reimburse the cities and States for what they have already spent on veterans' housing, it is going to reduce the number of units provided by this resolution. There should be no reduction of the 100,000 units provided in this resolution, because more than that are needed. As Mr. LANHAM said, we can later request additional appropriations to take care of additional needs. But I do not want to see a single unit reduced from the amount that can be provided by this resolution, and I am sure that all of us here feel the same way about it. I think the $160,000,000 should be administered with the view in mind that the veteran with a family, a child and wife, should be given first preference and the student question can remain in abeyance for a while. That is the kind of aid we should give our veterans.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] and his committee are to be very highly congratulated for bringing this measure to the House today. But, as has been well said, it only provides for 100,000 units. What I would like to know is where are the other committees of the House and what are the other committees of the House doing? They should be taking action to provide for additional housing for our returning servicemen and for those who are still here and who must undouble, so to speak, moving out of their parents' homes and reestablishing places for themselves. I hear from men out in the Pacific that there are hundreds of thousands; yes, hundreds of millions of board feet of lumber lying on the islands out there. Why can that lumber not be returned? Why should those building materials not be returned? What committee of the House is it that has to do with such things? Can the gentleman from Texas or his committee do something about it? Let us get the materials back here so that we can start building and get some housing built.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PATTERSON. I saw this lumber with my own eyes in the Hawaiian Islands, Caledonia, and other islands of the Pacific. That is what the gentleman has reference to, I presume?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do have reference to that.

Mr. PATTERSON. That should be sent to the United States for our veterans.

Mr. HINSHAW. I had a letter yesterday from a gentleman in the Hawaiian Islands who tells me that he thinks there is enough lumber stacked up there to build 100,000 new homes. That is only one place in which that lumber is located. I do not know what committee has to do with it but I suggest that the proper committee of the House get busy and get us those building materials.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HEALY].

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, when this question was first considered in regard to the appropriation of money for demountable housing the going was very tough. The Committee on Appropriations refused to include $24,500 for veterans' emergency housing in the deficiency appropriation bill. Since that time a sort of snowball seems to have been started. I am indeed gratified to note that the House now appears to be unanimously in favor of an additional $160,000,000 appropriation for veterans' housing.

The particular point I want to make is this. The Director of the Housing Authority of the city of Los Angeles, Mr. Howard Holtzendorff, is in Washington now, right on the job. He has already made application for as many of the temporary housing units as can be obtained for the city of Los Angeles. Assuming that this appropriation goes through, Mr. Blandford, the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, has already indicated that Los Angeles will receive only 3,000 units. This gives us a good idea of the job that is still facing us when we know that in excess of 50,000 housing units are immediately needed for servicemen, veterans, and their families. The shortage of housing for all others is in excess of 200,000 units.

Assuming that this appropriation goes through, we can say that a fairly good job has been done on emergency temporary housing. We must now break all bottlenecks so that a program of new home construction gets going at top speed, especially on homes priced under $10,000.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, as you know, one of the major problems confronting the country today is the problem of stimulating construction of housing, the reconversion of industrial plants, the continued maintenance and repair of existing construction and the modernization of existing construction to provide additional housing facilities for returning war veterans and for prospective American homeowners and businessmen who must play their part in the reconversion program if we are to get back to a normal economy and provide employment for all of our people.

Apparently, the subject of housing and construction is one of the problems to which the entire administration and industry, in general are giving their best thought, at the moment, but some of our Government agencies are certainly going to have to change their viewpoints if we are going to be able to solve this construction and housing problem.

The President, as you know, has recently made certain recommendations in respect to housing and the allocation of

materials to housing; but in the judgment of a lot of people that are very close to the housing and construction problem, the President has been somewhat ill-advised because it does not serve the purpose of the construction industry nor solve the problem of the veteran to allocate materials which are not being produced in sufficient volume to do the job. The President says, for instance, that we are going to allocate 50 percent of the lumber production to housing. I would like to point out that 50 percent of nothing is nothing. While I do not think the situation is that bad, and I do believe the system of allocation may cause a small amount of materials to be channeled to housing, neither the President nor any of his advising agencies have come up with anything which the lumber industry believe to be a practical solution to the major problems of the construction industry and the building industry; namely, that of getting them an adequate supply of materials and an adequate supply of labor with which to do the construction job.

The retail lumber industry, which is a distributor of building materials throughout the Nation and which is perhaps the largest factor in the homebuilding field when we consider all the communities in the country, would gladly, without any orders from Government, channel its materials to homebuilding and to essential construction but it cannot get the materials.

I repeat and I believe that someone must be practical about these problems and someone must recognize that production and labor are the main problems and someone must do something about them. Congress from time to time has been ignored by departments, and I feel sure that is what is part of the trouble now.

After talking to people in business, I believe I can speak with some authority and without fear of contradiction when I say that in lumber, a major building material item, one of the chief bottlenecks to production is the unrealistic pricing policy of the Office of Price Administration. To be specific, Mr. Chairman, and to indicate to you the manner in which these policies are holding back the program of home building in this country, I would like to point out that the mill or manufacturers' price regulations in lumber are today set up on a basis intended to procure lumber on a price basis which was developed for a wartime economy. In other words, the items of lumber are priced to help the military procure the items needed to win the war and despite recommendations by the lumber industry over a long period of time that these prices should be adjusted for a peacetime economy so that the manufacturers could profitably make the items of lumber required to build houses; namely, ceiling, siding, flooring, sheathing, and 2 by 4's, it is still more profitable for them to manufacture and market items of lumber which do not serve to fill the needs of the homebuilding industry. No wonder we cannot build houses so badly needed for our veterans and others.

To be more specific by way of an example in fir lumber, a 1-by-4 rough board carries an $8 premium over 1-by-4 flooring which we need for home building; 1-by-4 clear green, rough fir, $8 higher than 1-by-4 flooring; 1-by-6 and 1-by-8 clear green, rough, $8 more than siding and rustic; export lumber $7 more than domestic purchases; railroad lumber $5 to $10 more than construction lumber; select structural timbers with "fancy paragraphs" at $5 to $10 more than boards and dimension for construction purposes. The manufacturer cannot be expected to make flooring at a higher cost of manufacturing when he gets $8 more for not doing it at all. Add to this price premiums being granted by the Office of Price Administration for the export of lumber; add to this price premiums being granted by the Office of Price Administration for some species of lumber for the railroads; and add to this the fact that in southern yellow pine, the major species of lumber used in home building, you have a high percentage of black market caused by price difficulties, which is preventing lumber from going to the normal channels of distribution and to home building; or if it does go to home building through the black market, the veterans and the consumer are paying an exorbitant price.

I believe the administrative policies of the Office of Price Administration must either have an immediate and thoroughgoing change in order to stimulate production of lumber as well as other items necessary to building homes or none of the actions being taken by other agencies of Government will be effective in really solving the problem of the prospective home owner.

The black market condition that exists in yellow pine lumber and in red cedar shingles is rapidly spreading to the other major species of lumber which are needed by the construction industry.

The Office of Price Administration's enforcement policies are completely unrealistic in that they are not successful and give no real evidence of doing anything to stop these practices. In other words, price control on lumber is rapidly breaking down and if there is not a common-sense approach to the problem by the Office of Price Administration, there are many men in the lumber industry who believe that the country and the construction and home-building program would be better off were price control abandoned because we must get production. It is the only thing that will solve the problem confronting the construction industry.

There is only one thing that will stop inflationary trends in the building field and that is the construction of new buildings and more buildings. Price control, therefore, seems not to be the answer, when we all know that abundance of buildings will surely have the tendency to force prices down and that the black market can only be stopped by more production. More production cannot be attained until and unless we have realistic pricing by the Office of Price Administration on the products urgently needed by the home-building industry.

I include herewith a recommendation of representatives of the retail lumber industry to be made part of the record:

RECOMMENDATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF RETAIL LUMBER INDUSTRY

Whereas the major problem confronting the Nation's domestic economy at the present time is that of stimulating construction of housing, reconversion of industrial plants, maintenance and repair, and modernization; and

Whereas it is vitally necessary that this problem be solved without delay; and

Whereas one of the two principal obstacles in the path of a solution of this problem is the production of lumber and building materials; and

Whereas, in our opinion, the chief obstacle to the stimulation of production of lumber and building materials is the unrealistic administrative policies being pursued by the Office of Price Administration which are actually curtailing production because of a failure of these policies to establish a proper price relationship between the items required for construction and the other items of production of the manufacturers,

Therefore the representatives of the retail lumber industry here meeting recommend to the softwood distribution yard industry advisory committee that it immediately meet with the officials of the Office of Price Administration and strongly protest the present critical lumber and building materials situation, its relation to the national construction and home building program, the lack of enforcement at manufacturers' levels, the unrealistic price relationships in present manufacturers' ceiling schedules, and the principle of absorption as being applied to the retail lumber dealer; and

We further recommend that the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association immediately present this critical situation to the Congress and to the public, by vigorously utilizing every means at its disposal, and that the city, State, and regional associations of retail lumber dealers throughout the country support this action.

DECEMBER 12, 1945.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. (a) To carry out the purposes of this title V, and for administrative expenses in connection therewith, any funds made available under title I of this act are hereby made available, and for such purposes there is also authorized to be appropriated the sum of $160,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein authorized to be used for the purposes of this title shall be used to construct any new temporary housing.

"(b) Upon request of the National Housing Administrator, any Federal agency having jurisdiction or control of structures or facilities (including lands, improvements, equipment, materials, or furnishings) which are no longer required by such agency and which, in the determination of said Administrator, can be utilized to provide temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or for single veterans attending educational institutions, in accordance with this title V, may, notwithstanding any other provisions

of law, transfer such structures or facilities to said Administrator, without reimbursement, for such use.

"(c) Without regard to the provisions of any other law, but subject to the removal provisions of section 313 of said act, said Administrator may transfer, for such consideration and subject to such terms and conditions as he deems feasible under the circumstances, any temporary housing (intact or in panels suitable for reuse) under his jurisdiction to any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, for use or reuse in producing temporary housing for families of servicemen, for veterans and their families, or, in the discretion of the Administrator, for single veterans attending educational institutions."

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois: Strike out the period at the end of line 8 on page 2 and insert a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization which has incurred expenses in the relocation (including the costs of disassembling, transporting, site preparation, and reerection but not including the costs of site acquisition or the installation of off-site utilities) of temporary housing or other facilities (but not including demountable houses) under the jurisdiction or control of the National Housing Administrator for reuse in providing temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families shall, upon application therefor, be reimbursed for such expenses by said Administrator out of the funds made available by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (H. R. 4805), to carry out the purpose of this title."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McMILLEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. LANHAM. This matter was discussed in the committee. It does not involve very much of these funds. These educational institutions and cities have acquired the property very recently. It is thought that it would make fish of one and fowl of another not to have such a provision. We are hoping for additional funds later as they may be needed and as further housing may be available. I may say that the discussion in committee and among committee members was not unfavorable to the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. The adoption of your amendment leaves it optional with these institutions and colleges as to whether or not they want to retrieve any of the money which they have paid for this property?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Further, it does not reimburse them for any of the permanent structures they may have bought. It does not reimburse them for any expenditures for sites for housing or for the utility connections.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. It is limited to the exact terms of the resolution which requires educational institutions and cities to furnish the site but not pay for the transportation of these homes and the reerection of them. It just follows the resolution exactly, but it seems to me it would be manifestly unfair for these municipalities and schools who just a few weeks ago, or at least only a few months ago, after VJ-day, dug into their own pockets and provided these homes for the veterans. We ought not to penalize them for having the foresight and willingness to go ahead and rebuild these houses and now pass a bill which does not take them into consideration. I do not want to interfere with the bill at all. It has every merit. In other words, I do not want this amendment to interfere with the passage of the resolution, but it does seem to me manifestly unfair not to reimburse these municipalities and schools for what they have done themselves without the help of this bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this amendment really corrects an oversight and an omission in the resolution as originally drawn. Is that not true?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I feel it does.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It merely equalizes the situation as between those who will now apply for this housing and those who have already applied.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It in no way decreases the number of units that are available at this time, but merely equalizes the financial situation as between those who have applied already and those who will apply.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. It reduces it in this way, that those who have already expended this money will be reimbursed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. And you would be putting them on exactly the same footing as those people who will apply under this law when it is passed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am concerned about the effect this amendment will have with respect to taking away from the $160,000,000 any portion of it for even one unit in any part of the United States. Let me say, with the indulgence of the gentleman who has the floor, that the city of Los Angeles has appropriated half a million dollars and the county of Los Angeles half a million dollars and the State of California is appropriating $1,000,000 for the purpose of supplementing any Federal aid for housing veterans. If that practice goes on throughout the United States in other States and cities, this whole $160,000,000 could be consumed without a single unit being built under the resolution we are passing. I favor an amendment to the deficiency bill that will provide for reimbursement to these cities afterward but not out of this resolution because we are running into too serious a situation here with respect to the housing for veterans to take any money out of this resolution.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. In reply to the gentleman from California, and my distinguished chairman will bear me out, this will only require some fifteen or twenty million dollars to reimburse these cities and schools who have been patriotic enough without any aid from anybody, with many of them tax ridden, and who received no help from the Federal Government for exactly the same houses to be used for the same purposes. It seems to me we have to be fair and just to those people who have done that regardless of the benefits under this resolution. We should be honorable about it and I do not think it is unless we give them back their money.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK to the McMillan amendment: On page 1, line 3, after "expenses in the", insert "acquisition or."

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, the McMillen amendment apparently deals only with instances where these barracks are relocated. The amendment to the amendment which I have offered would provide reimbursement in expenses where a school or public agency has acquired buildings and left them where they are. I think the fact of relocation should not be the criterion as to whether they should be reimbursed or not.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The vacant housing that has been used for veterans and servicemen and their families under title V has not cost the communities anything.

Mr. BUCK. In the case of an Army barrack which has been abandoned by the Army, where a city wishes to take it over and make it into living facilities, is no cost involved?

Mr. LANHAM. We have had no jurisdiction whatever of Army barracks. That is being introduced into this resolution now for the first time. None has been acquired under title V of this act. It is a very different situation from the situation to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McMILLEN] referred. Under title V of this act, no Army barracks have been provided for any city or any community or any school.

Mr. BUCK. My understanding is that the State of New York has acquired the Fox Hill Barracks; whether they have already contracted to pay for this I do not know.

Mr. LANHAM. They may have, but that would be through negotiating with the Surplus Property Board. There has been nothing of that kind in this act.

We have been dealing, and the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois deals, only with this vacant war housing constructed under the Lanham Act. We have had no jurisdiction of these Army barracks. Consequently, I think it would be most unfair to take a part of these funds to pay for some negotiation that has been had with the Surplus Property Board about property that is not concerned under the act.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that if the McMillen amendment is adopted, you will actually then offer to the United States as a whole, in every congested populated center, 85,000 possible units and not 100,000. The gentleman stated it would take about $15,000,000 to take care of the reimbursement of those communities. At the estimated cost of each unit by the committee for the tearing down and reconstruction, it was something around $1,800. I have estimated $1,000. If it took $15,000,000 out of that, it means 15,000 units out of 100,000, that will be denied for housing.

I do not object to any appropriation under the deficiency appropriation bill at any future time to reimburse those cities for the amount they spend. I would certainly favor it and would speak in favor of it, because my State has appropriated almost $2,000,000 on account of this thing. Now, you are proposing to take out of the $160,000,000, $15,000,000 which will reduce the number of housing units for veterans. It is not the right thing to do, and I definitely urge you to vote against it.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. There is $191,000,000 that can be allocated. This resolution provides for $160,000,000. There are $30,000,000 that will be allocated for the same purpose in the deficiency appropriation bill. Is that not right?

Mr. LANHAM. $24,000,000.

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. There is $191,000,000, not $160,000,000.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. LANHAM. Furthermore, $10,000,000 will be recouped in rentals, and insofar as the further appropriation is concerned there would have to be legislative authorization for it. Unless we got legislative authorization there could be no further appropriation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is speaking of the passage of the resolution as a whole. I do not object to that. I object to the resolution being amended to reduce any part of the money that will provide for housing for veterans. That is what it will do in spite of the fact that additional funds will come through the deficiency bill, and I urge the defeat of the amendment on the premise that we are trying to do a job here for veterans and not one of reimbursement to States or cities for what they may have already spent in their communities. This resolution is to provide housing for veterans. I think we are going to hear from some of the veterans' organizations if we take any portion of the $160,000,000 for any other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 122 to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 462, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have permission to revise and extend their remarks; and I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. VANDENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—BILL SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1580), to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in said organization, with a House amendment, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BLOOM, LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and EATON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I missed the roll call on the passage of the United Nations Organization bill because of a most important appointment. I asked to be called in the event of a roll call on the bill. The call was delayed, and I walked into the Chamber just as the result of the vote was announced.

I regret exceedingly that I was not here. My speech on the floor indicates my position on the bill. I am very encouraged that it passed by so large a majority.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] who has permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD during the sitting of the committee may at that point in the RECORD include a resolution from the Lumbermen's Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES COME HOME TO ROOST

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about this matter of subsidies because I am extremely hopeful that when the Members of the House leave Washington for the recess, which I understand is contemplated this week, and before they come back they will give consideration to a subject which I believe is as important as anything that has ever been before the United States. The subject of subsidies is one which has troubled every nation at this particular stage in its career.

Mr. Speaker, 2½ years ago when the administration came forward with its consumer-subsidy proposal for controlling wartime food production, the plan was opposed by a great many thinking Americans. This opposition included representatives of the major farm organizations, most of the food industry itself, the majority of the Republicans in Congress, and thoughtful producers of the farm products involved.

The Republican congressional food-study committee expressed the sentiments of the minority in the House when it argued strongly against such subsidies. Its opposition was based on three principles—first, that such subsidies are morally unjust; second, that they are economically unsound; third, that historically they are disastrous.

The moral injustice of this vast and expensive food-subsidy program has been apparent from the outset. The net result is to pass on to taxpayers of the future, including our returned war veterans, a part of our national grocery bill, incurred at a time when we were well able to pay the full price for every pound of food we ate.

The economic senselessness of such a program was not immediately apparent to those who did not take the trouble to think the problem through. It is now so obvious that its results are frightening. What are the economic effects of this tremendous subsidy program, involving payments from the Public Treasury of more than $2,000,000,000 a year?

The first effect was to disrupt the normal channels of food production and distribution at a time when the highest efficiency of that industry was sorely needed. That efficiency had been created by generations of trial and error. It had been tempered in the heat of free business competition. With one sweep, the historic know-how of the food industry was brushed aside. Generations of experience in efficient food production and distribution were thrown out the window by the introduction of an entirely new economic theory. This is the theory so dear to the hearts of the slide-rule boys of the bureaus, that sound business policies should be abandoned in favor of Government regulation, and that producers and processors are to be compensated through Government subsidies for losses incurred. This created chaos within the food industry and contributed materially to the food scarcity.

The more tragic effect of consumer-food subsidies, however, was to create the very forces of inflation against which the OPA and other Government agencies were supposed to be fighting. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, how this administration can scream loudly and continuously against inflation, while at the same time it takes deliberately, one after another, the economic steps which lead inevitably to inflation.

The food subsidy is a good example. The causes of inflation, we are told, are unused purchasing power in the hands of the public, a currency cheapened by an overbearing public debt, and a scarcity of products for which there is consumer demand. During the war, the national income reached a height never attained before. Americans had more money to spend than they ever had, and less goods on which to spend it. Certainly, they could have afforded to use part of this enormous income in paying a fair price for the food they consumed. Few people realize how little this would have been. Money so spent would not have piled up to add weight to the pent-up purchasing power which is now supposed to be hanging over our heads like the sword of Damocles.

This natural outlet for war-swollen incomes was not permitted to operate. Instead, the administration insisted on consumer food subsidies, historically a plan doomed to failure, from the days of the falling governments of Rome and Greece, to their counterpart government in Washington today.

By means of food subsidies the retail prices of many food commodities were kept at an unnaturally low level. Billions of dollars, which should, in all common sense, have been spent for these commodities, in the orderly process of food production and marketing, were not spent, and so went to create additional unused buying power which was used for black-market luxuries or is now still hanging over our heads.

Billions of dollars were added to our already staggering national debt—the grocery bill we are passing on to the future. The job of paying out all this subsidy money required hundreds, and probably thousands, of additional Government employees who might have been constructively used elsewhere in this war effort, and whose salaries added more millions to the cost of running the Government. The subsidies provided the third ingredient of the inflation recipe, Mr. Speaker, by so disrupting the food industry, as I have mentioned above, that scarcities were unnecessarily and artificially created in the subsidized commodities. A list of the foods most highly subsidized, and a list of those foods which have been scarcest these past 2 years, will prove to be almost identical. This is not just a coincidence; it is historical. The shortages and the scarcities have been artificially and unnecessarily created by this absurd consumer subsidy program.

Meat packers are being paid out of Government funds—out of money that has been and is yet to be collected from the taxpayers—an average of about $30 for every thousand-pound steer they kill. I need not remind you that meat has been scarce. Sugar is heavily subsidized and is subject to complete Government control. Sugar is scarce and is still rationed. The dairy industry has been paid a subsidy of almost $700,000,000 a year and the prices of dairy products have been so manipulated that the farmer gets only about half as much for butterfat and for butter as he does for fluid milk. That is the reason why there has been a shortage of butter, while there was so much fluid milk in some places that thousands of gallons a day were poured down sewers. An increase of not over 1 cent per quart would have been a normal and adequate increase to meet increased costs of production. The administration forced a larger subsidy on the industry.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many sound moral and economic reasons why these subsidies should never have been adopted that it is hard to understand why the administration should ever have insisted on this program. There are only two apparent reasons.

The first is that subsidies are a device by which those theorists in Washington, who would impose on this country a brand of State socialism, have obtained complete and absolute control over our most vital industry—food production. Those subsidies have been and are still being used as the club by which the food-production industry is forced to bow to the will of Government regulators.

OPA has professed an eagerness to do away with retail rationing when surpluses occur. OPA realizes that a free American people will not submit willingly to that kind of dictatorship after the emotional appeal of wartime patriotism can no longer be used. The American people deserve to know, however, that rationing has not been abandoned. It has merely been removed from public view and hidden at the processor and distributor levels of the food industry rather than in retail stores. Mr. Bowles is carefully laying the foundation for a perpetual OPA in this country and one of the preparatory steps is to hide the rationing of food products at the processor and wholesale levels.

The housewife may not need coupons, but she still feels the effects of this rationing when she find that, with or without coupons, she is unable to buy commodities which are being controlled on the wholesale level. The storekeeper will tell her his "quota" for the month has been sold. This condition will continue just as long as OPA has access to vast amounts of the taxpayers' money which it can use (in the form of subsidies) as a club to compel compliance of the food industry with its restrictive quotas and regulations.

The only other discernible reason the Administration had for insisting on these subsidies was that, at the start, they appeared to the New Deal political strategists to be good politics. One of the gravest charges that can be made against the whole New Deal regime is that time and again it has played politics with the groceries American housewives need to feed their families. One unsound measure after another has been forced through a reluctant Congress simply because New Deal political strategists believed it would make votes for them at subsequent elections, regardless of the disastrous effect such actions might have on the welfare of the consumers. There maneuvers have fallen heaviest of all on the families of workers in the lower wage brackets who cannot afford to eat most of their meals in restaurants or pay exorbitant prices for black market food, but must get along as best they can on what they can get in the corner grocery.

Consumer food subsidies are in that category. It sounded good in 1944 to be able to say "We are keeping the price of bread down. We are keeping the price of meat almost at prewar level. We will not have any 25-cents-a-pound sugar during this war." It mattered little that the

low price of bread was maintained only by means of a huge subsidy to flour millers, paid from taxes, and an OPA price structure which permitted bakers to make up, in higher prices on pastries and other goods, the money they lost on bread. It made no difference that meat should become almost unobtainable at any price; that 90 percent of it moved through the black market. It made no difference that while OPA's theoretical ceiling price of meat stayed down, the actual price of what meat could be obtained was far above legitimate ceiling prices, and far above the amount such meat would have cost on an open market.

It mattered not, apparently to the OPA, that all this was to be achieved by requiring our veterans when they return from the war to pay part of the bill for the food we consumed in their absence. It did not seem inconsistent to the administrator of the OPA, apparently, to add billions of dollars to unused purchasing power while screaming at the top of his—Mr. Bowles'—lungs against the dangers of inflation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the subsidies are coming home to roost. We here on the Hill have a high and sympathetic regard for the present Secretary of Agriculture, our distinguished former colleague from New Mexico, Mr. Anderson. He is finding this problem of consumer subsidies to be the most serious problem he is encountering in his efforts to bring a semblance of order into the confused and chaotic picture of food production and distribution. The subsidy program represents the tail of the proverbial bear. The administration knows it must let go, but is fearful of the results. So are we here on the Hill. So are thoughtful farmers and farm leaders in every part of the United States.

We see the immediate inflationary effects of this ill-advised consumer subsidy program which result from the wartime accumulation of unused purchasing power. Mr. Speaker, the inflationary results which are now piling in upon the creators of this program must lead even these advocates of governmental control to doubt the ultimate political expediency of the subsidy program.

During the war, when this Nation was well able to pay its food bill, a generous but short-sighted administration grabbed the dinner check, borrowed a few more billion dollars from the taxpayers, and insisted that the farmers—the original producers of all that we eat—take part of their payment in Government subsidies. Farmers are straight-thinking individuals. They didn't like the idea of Government subsidies. They preferred to sell their products at fair prices, rather than sell them below the costs of production, and accept a handout from the Government. The subsidy program may have fooled the consumers but it did not fool the farmers. I doubt if it fooled the majority of the consumers. But farmers were given no choice in the matter. They were handed the subsidies, or else.

The Secretary of Agriculture realizes that these subsidies must be terminated. We realize it here in Congress. But how to do it? That is the question. The Nation's farmers are faced with the rising costs of everything they use and of all the labor they employ. They were opposed to subsidies in the first place. They cannot now be expected to absorb this subsidy difference, if the subsidy is withdrawn. They will insist, and justly, that if Government subsidies are withdrawn the prices they receive for their products be adjusted upward to compensate for this loss in income. This adjustment would have been easy, normal, and practically unnoticed had it been allowed its usual course.

This presents us with an inflationary factor of grave importance. The price of farm products could have been increased during the war without hardship to anyone, so that the farmer would have received a fair return for his product without any Government subsidy whatever. Had that been done, the prices of farm products would now be leveling off as new machinery, returning farm help, and decreased military requirements permit supply to catch up with demands. The peak of wartime food prices would have passed and the inflationary pressure from that direction would now be decreasing. Instead, by means of subsidies, there has been created an inflationary situation for which the Administration has as yet no answer.

The inflationary force which will come from the necessity of maintaining farm income, however, will be trifling compared to that which will be unleashed by the effects of subsidy discontinuance on consumers. The Nation is now going through the throes of readjustment from wartime to peacetime conditions. The transition has been characterized thus far by a widespread series of strikes and labor stoppages. It is the worst labor situation this country has experienced for many years, as industrial workers seek to maintain their wartime income levels. These strikes themselves are a serious inflationary danger—not because of the relatively small inflationary effect which will result from increased worker income; not because they inevitably must result in higher prices of end products—but chiefly because of interruption to full peacetime production.

Basically, there is only one reason for commodity inflation—a scarcity of the products people want to buy. There is one real cure for inflation—production so ample and so speedy that supply catches up with demand and consumer requirements are met. Industrial strikes stop production; transportation strikes stop distribution. Competition provides a more effective price ceiling than OPA can ever maintain in normal times. Regardless of the merits of the objectives for which labor is striving, strikes at this time are inescapably preventing the production which can prevent serious inflation in this country, and at this moment they constitute our gravest danger in that direction.

It is reasonable to assume that by the beginning of next summer labor and industry will have worked out a settlement of their wage differences, that our delayed reconversion will be in progress, that production will again be under way in quantity, and that there will again be the prospect of a sufficient supply of consumer goods to halt inflation. About that time, however, food subsidies are scheduled to be removed. The administration has found no better solution than simply to eliminate by direct action this monstrous program which should never have been entered into.

The American Institute of Food Distribution, one of the most authoritative organizations in the entire food field, says that the removal of food subsidies early next summer will result in an overall increase in food prices of probably 10 percent above present levels.

According to the institute, here is the way food prices will be affected when subsidies are ended:

Meat—an over-all increase of 15 to 20 percent. Ham will go up about 6½ cents a pound; bacon about 6 cents; and round steak about 9 cents a pound.

Bread—white flour will advance in price 9 or 10 cents for 10 pounds. The added cost of other bread ingredients such as milk shortening will probably require a rise of 2 cents a loaf.

Milk is due to go up at least 1.3 cents a quart and probably 1½.

Cheese prices will jump from the present average of 34 cents a pound to 50 cents or more.

Canned vegetables will have to sell at higher prices to take care of the loss of subsidy payments to canners. Tomatoes will have to be increased 2 cents a can, string beans about 1 cent, peas 2 cents, and corn 1 cent.

Fats and oils prices are affected by two subsidies—hog payments and a subsidy on vegetable shortening. There will have to be general price increases.

No figures are available, says the Institute, for estimating the added cost of unsubsidized foods. Department of Agriculture experts believe that when prices of subsidized items increase, prices for other foods will follow suit.

Such increases could easily have been absorbed or prevented during the war. The increased production and distribution, which was prevented by the uneconomical program under Mr. Bowles, would have put prices of consumer supplies on the downhill by now, in many commodities. Next summer it will be a different story.

Mr. Speaker, one does not need to be a prophet to predict the effect that such a drastic increase in food prices next summer will have upon our economy. Labor will ask, if such an increase in food prices does occur, for a compensatory increase in its wage to make up for this increase in the cost of living. Assuming that by next summer, the Administration has worked out no better way to decide labor-management differences than by having labor strikes, and thus halt production, can we look for anything other than that result?

Our economy, just then beginning to get on its feet on a peacetime basis, but still unable to provide a full flow of consumer goods to help stem inflation, will again be thrown into idleness and confusion. Production will again stop as painful and laborious negotiations for wage increases are carried out. Consumer goods will become scarcer, prices will go higher, and we will be off again on the unending spiral of inflation. I would be glad for some member of the Administration to tell us where it will stop.

Mr. Speaker, the discredited pigeons of the New Deal food subsidies are coming home to roost. They may have garnered a few votes for the Administration in the 1944 election, but I predict that before next year is out even the most ardent OPA theorist will admit that they were poor political strategy.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bridge subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DON'T DESTROY HOUSES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with all the shortage of housing for war veterans and reconversion workers and Mr. Blandford of the National Housing Agency giving only conversation and speeches, I have asked the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that war veterans and reconversion workers be permitted to purchase certain surplus houses in my district. At the Plum Brook ordnance works near Sandusky, Ohio, there are 27 beautiful staff houses, some used and occupied by Army officers and other personnel. These beautiful residential houses, and I want you to see the pictures of them [shows pictures] cost nearly $200,000 in their present condition.

The answer to my request to assist in the housing situation for war veterans, reconversion workers and others in this area says:

We have been informed by the authorities at Plum Brook that these houses and building have become saturated with dynamite dust and that it is their intent to destroy these buildings which have become a safety hazard.

These beautiful houses are in the same area as privately owned farm homes nearby.

Yet they want to destroy $200,000 worth of houses. It is just another bureau excuse for throwing away tax money.

This is the same Plum Brook ordnance works where the National Housing Agency gave away more than $100,000 worth of unused dormitories for the sum of $4,500.

I am asking that these costly houses be not destroyed but given to the use of war veterans, reconversion workers, and others needing houses near the Plum Brook ordnance plant at Sandusky, Ohio.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), on account of illness.

Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) on account of illness.

Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa (at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. DAUGHTON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. SOMERS of New York, indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN (at the request of Mr. ROWAN) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Thursday, after the disposition of all matters on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack; to the Committee on Printing.

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; and

H. R. 4649. An act to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States; and

H. R. 4649. An act to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 19, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, January 25, 1946, on H. R. 4781.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 464. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to the estate of Hubert M. Carter, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4590. A bill to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 3580. A bill to authorize municipalities and public-utility districts in the Territory of Alaska to issue revenue bonds for public-works purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 3614. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 33 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 3657. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 32 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1460). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 465. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4590, a bill to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1461). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 466. Resolution for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1462). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 113. Concurrent resolution relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOWELL (by request):

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, with respect to the determination of bargaining units; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5041. A bill to provide domiciliary care and medical and hospital treatment for members of selective service local boards; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5042. A bill to grant pensions to certain disabled women veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5043. A bill to grant first preference to servicemen and veterans in the purchase of surplus property useful in the establishment and maintenance of their own small business, professional, or agricultural enterprises; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5044. A bill for the relief of officers of the Army who were members of the first two classes at civil affairs training school, University of Chicago; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK (by request):

H. R. 5045. A bill to provide eligibility for annuity at age 70 after at least 5 years of service in lieu of 15 years of such service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation from the United States of lumber and other building material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5046. A bill for the relief of J. B. Robinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5047. A bill for the relief of Edna Rita Saffron Fidone; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5048. A bill to carry out the decision of the Secretary of War (November 30, 1920), directing payment of compensation due certain employees for work performed in the execution of contracts for the manufacture of war materials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5049. A bill for the relief of the estate of Obaldino Francis Dias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5050. A bill for the relief of Minnie P. Shorey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 5051. A bill for the relief of Lt. Mary L. Barrett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 5052. A bill for the relief of the estate of George Grittendon and others; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 5053. A bill for the relief of the estate of Jasper A. Mealer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 5054. A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of the estate of Carl F. Schwab; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1421. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Willetta A. Chapman and other citizens of Ohio, for the adoption of H. R. 752, H. R. 2082, and House Resolution 354; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1422. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of 310 residents in and around Thief River Falls, Minn., urging the passage of an adequate old-age-pension law, unhampered by liens and other charges against the residents thereof; to the Committee on Pensions.

1423. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Peter V. Cacchione, chairman, Kings County Committee Communist Party, Brooklyn, N. Y., regarding our policy in China and urging withdrawal of American troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1424. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Local 568, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the recall of all United States troops from China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1425. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the creation of a Federal Department of Welfare, and strengthening of services to children; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1426. Also, petition of the national council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for legislation to speed up the settlement of existing differences between labor and management; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, in the midst of the caroling joy of this happy season, when universal good will bathes even frigid zones with the warm breezes of the heavenly tropics, may we see with new eyes, as again the Christ Child comes to a world where ill will has wrought such horror, that He is set for the falling and rising of nations—that He does not stay in the manger—He walks in our world of pretense and greed and self-seeking—and that where He goes the judgment of God goes with him. Who shall stand when He appeareth? For he is like a refiner's fire. As He is truth, so His presence floodlights our falseness; as He is wisdom, so His presence uncovers our selfish follies; as He is love, so His presence bares the smoldering hate that we try to hide from one another.

O Thou whose eternal love is refining fire, Christmas tells us that we men and all our works are in the furnace. Cleanse our hearts to abide this day of Thy coming. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 18, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and Mr. EATON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES (H. DOC. NO. 392)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, and the Chair suggests that it might be advisable to have a quorum call.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Connally	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Downey	Hill
Bilbo	Ellender	Hoey
Brewster	Ferguson	Huffman
Brooks	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Bushfield	Gossett	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Green	Kilgore
Capehart	Gurney	Knowland
Capper	Hart	La Follette
Carville	Hatch	Langer

Lucas	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McCarran	Pepper	Tunnell
McClellan	Radcliffe	Tydings
McKellar	Revercomb	Vandenberg
McMahon	Russell	Wagner
Maybank	Saltonstall	Walsh
Mead	Shipstead	Wherry
Millikin	Smith	White
Mitchell	Stanfill	Wiley
Moore	Stewart	Willis
Morse	Taft	Wilson
Murdock	Taylor	Young
O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on important business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The message from the President of the United States will now be read.

The message was read by the Chief Clerk.

[For President's message, see p. 12398 of House proceedings in today's RECORD.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and will be printed.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING MEN HAVING CHILDREN

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call up for consideration the written motion which I filed yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Consideration of the motion would not be in order at this time. We are under the head of Petitions and Memorials in the morning business of the Senate, and the motion to which the Senator has referred must be postponed for a few minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I was advised that the motion could be taken up only during the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be laid before the Senate by the Chair immediately following the call for introduction of concurrent and other resolutions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I shall ask for recognition by the Chair at that time.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 18, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho," approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE — FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 131)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $5,575,000, fiscal year 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH FACT-FINDING COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the North Dakota Committee of One Hundred and Six for a Missouri Valley Authority on December 1, 1945, at Jamestown, N. Dak., relating to the appointment of a fact-finding commission for scientific research.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas

1. Control of the forces of nature should be a permanent and everlasting objective and which is an ever-challenging problem to man.

2. That such attempts to control the forces and resources of nature must of necessity be feasible and economical and done in such a manner that the benefits to be derived from such a project shall benefit the greatest number of people.

3. That before construction on a project of this kind be started our every resource of scientific research be bent to the task of investigating and fact finding to determine the objectives and benefits that may be derived from such a project, especially as they will affect the social and economic well-being of our people.

4. It appears to this committee that there has been insufficient research work proposed or done in connection with the proposed Army Engineers-Reclamation Bureau construction plan, particularly as to what will be its effect upon the welfare of the people throughout the river basin.

5. That in the development of any Missouri River plan, consideration must of necessity be given the following objectives:

(a) Development of soil conservation practices on a broad scale.

(b) Development of rural and industrial electrification to the extent that potential power can be made available.

(c) Development of economically feasible irrigation.

(d) Development of economically feasible navigation.

(e) Development of parks and broad recreational facilities.

(f) Development of wild life values.

(g) Development of higher ground-water levels.

(h) Development of a river basin plan that will inundate the minimum economically valuable land areas.

(i) Development of flood control.

6. That in the course of research as referred to above which must precede any extensive construction, a study must be made of the natural resources that will be affected, both physical and biological, and the probable destruction we will have of such resources as:

(a) Coal deposits.

(b) Grasslands.

(c) Timberland.

(d) Productive cultivated agricultural lands.

(e) Oil deposits.

(f) Agricultural and business properties and improvements.

(g) Wildlife.

7. It appears to this committee that all of the Federal research agencies who must study and carry out research programs in the Missouri Basin to determine the above-outlined objectives have as yet not been given an opportunity to do so.

8. It further appears that no such comprehensive research work is even contemplated by the Army Engineers-Reclamation Bureau before they plan beginning their construction work.

9. According to the report made by Warren J. Meade, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and internationally reputable geologist, when employed by the Army engineers in 1932 to make findings as to the feasibility of constructing a dam at Garrison such proposed construction was reported impractical from an engineering standpoint and unsafe for residents of the basin.

10. It appears from the testimony of the Solicitor General of the Department of Interior that an act of Congress will be necessary to permit the taking and using of Indian lands of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and that no such act of Congress modifying the Indian Lands Treaty has been introduced or enacted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently and respectfully request:

1. That the President of the United States immediately appoint a fact-finding commission supplied with adequate resources for scientific research.

2. That this commission study all existing proposals in the light of their economic and sociological impact upon the various resources we have enumerated and their relation to a coordinated over-all plan and report such finding and recommendations to the President.

3. That such commission specifically investigate the engineering feasibility of the proposed Garrison Dam project and that such investigation be made by independent technicians, engineers, and geologists who have had no prior connection with either the Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the T. V. A. in view of the findings reported by Warren J. Meade that the proposed Garrison Dam was unsafe.

Respectfully yours,

O. W. ZETTER,

Secretary, North Dakota Committee for MVA, Bismarck, N. Dak.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HUFFMAN, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 991. A bill for the relief of Marion M. Hill; with amendments (Rept. No. 863);

S. 1400. A bill for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 864);

H. R. 873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 865); and

H. R. 1251. A bill for the relief of the Irvine Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 866).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 207. A bill for the relief of Edgar Kaigler; without amendment (Rept. No. 867);

H. R. 919. A bill for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer; without amendment (Rept. No. 868);

H. R. 1250. A bill for the relief of Roy S. Councilman; without amendment (Rept. No. 869);

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb; without amendment (Rept. No. 870); and

H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Eli Richmond; without amendment (Rept. No. 871).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 323. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 872);

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 873);

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 874);

H. R. 915. A bill for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 876).

H. R. 1348. A bill for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 885);

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Viola Theriaque; without amendment (Rept. No. 875);

H. R. 1879. A bill for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 877);

H. R. 3124. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante; without amendment (Rept. No. 882); and

H. R. 3277. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 879).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 400. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen; without amendment (Rept. No. 886);

H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Oscar N. McLean; without amendment (Rept. No. 881); and

H. R. 3303. A bill for the relief of A. M. Strauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 878).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 884).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Percy Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 883); and

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 880).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe; without amendment (Rept. No. 887).

INCREASE IN CAPACITY OF PANAMA CANAL—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, I report favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, and I submit a report (No. 862) thereon. This bill passed the House of Representatives on November 26 last.

In connection with the report, I wish to say briefly that House bill 4480 simply authorizes the Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, to make a study and survey, and to report as a result thereof, with respect to the possibility of improving and increasing the capacity of the present Panama Canal in order to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense. The bill contemplates reporting to the Congress concerning the building of a sea-level canal or the completion of a third lock, the construction of which was authorized by the Congress in 1939, I believe. Work on that lock was discontinued after we became involved in the war, of course, when we needed to turn our attention to more important matters.

The amendment which the Committee on Interoceanic Canals reports merely directs the Governor of the Panama Canal, following the survey, to report concerning the building of canals at other locations. The committee felt that the possibility of building other canals should be considered in connection with consideration of the question whether a sea-level canal should be built at Panama.

The Governor of the Panama Canal, who appeared before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which has charge of the legislative affairs of the Canal, testified, I believe, that the estimated cost probably would be in excess of $1,000,000. However, the bill merely provides an authorization, and the funds will have to be appropriated later. It will require about 2 years to complete the survey, and so it is important that the bill be promptly considered, and passed at an early date. I should like to have the Members of the Senate give some attention to the report today, for I hope to be able to call up the bill tomorrow. I believe that only brief discussion of it will be necessary.

I may say further that we hope the bill will be passed promptly by the Senate. On November 25 the House of Representatives passed the bill unanimously, as I recall.

It was unanimously approved by our committee yesterday, with but a slight amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1710. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1711. A bill for the relief of Luiz C. Paiva; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1712. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1713. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Helma Ester Alfred; to the Committee on Pensions.

OFFICE OF TECHNICAL SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1248) to establish an Office of Technical Services, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN, DECEASED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. JOHNSTON), I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RETURN AND DEMOBILIZATION OF TROOPS—WAR DEPARTMENT STATEMENT

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release by the War Department giving the latest figures concerning the return from overseas theaters and the demobilization of United States troops, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PLEA FOR UNRRA HELP FOR HUNGARY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "A Plea for UNRRA Help for Hungary," which appears in the Appendix.]

AUTHORSHIP OF PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain information concerning the authorship of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge to America," delivered by Charles A. Lindbergh, at the forty-second aviation anniversary dinner of the Aero Club of Washington, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., December 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUGGESTIONS OF ENLISTED MEN FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ARMY—EDITORIAL FROM YANK

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial dealing with suggestions of enlisted men for improvement of the Army, published in the December 8, 1945, issue of Yank, which appears in the Appendix.]

THAT LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "That Loan to Great Britain," published in the Arkansas Democrat, of Little Rock, Ark., of December 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

LITHUANIA IN ECLIPSE—ARTICLE BY DR. W. ELMER EKBLAW

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lithuania in Eclipse," by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, of Clark University, published in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

REFUSAL OF GENERAL VAUGHAN TO USE GOVERNMENT CAR—EXCERPT FROM THE COLUMN, INSIDE WASHINGTON

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the column Inside Washington by Jim H. Brady, in reference to the refusal of Brig. Gen. Harry W. Vaughan, military aide to the President, to use a Government car and driver, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING MEN HAVING CHILDREN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded and the Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 207, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 207), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the resolution which has just been read. The purpose of the resolution is to discharge the Military Affairs Committee from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116), to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

I feel that a reading of Senate Joint Resolution 116 would clearly set forth its purpose.

Mr. President, I inquire if promptly at 2 o'clock we must vote on Senate resolution 207? Will the Chair make a ruling?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). If the resolution is still under discussion at 2 o'clock it will automatically go to the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It will automatically go to the calendar if it is still under discussion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, if the Senate has not completed action on the resolution by 2 o'clock it will go to the calendar, and the Senate will proceed to consider the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has stated correctly the parliamentary situation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, as I understand, if the ruling of the Chair is correct, if the Senator from West Virginia holds the floor until 2 o'clock, his motion carries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is what I understood to be the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the resolution would then go to the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is all the Senator from West Virginia is asking for. That is equivalent to a discharge of the committee, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will clarify the ruling. Senate Resolution 207 and not Senate Joint Resolution 116 would go to the calendar.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the resolution to discharge the committee would go on the calendar but not Senate Joint Resolution 116? As I understand, that resolution would remain in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Chair has now made his ruling so clear that even I can understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So long as he occupies his present point of vantage, the present occupant of the chair desires to make his rulings clear.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, had the understanding of the Senator from Utah been correct that the joint resolution would go on the calendar, I assure him that I would not have consumed the entire morning hour, but would have divided the time equally with him. I hope that in the present situation we may have a disposition of this subject, and that no Senator will take the floor for the purpose of filibustering the matter to an indecision.

I shall speak briefly on the subject and shall first read from the joint resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

Allow me to say at this point that it will be noticed that changes were made by me as shown in italics and lined type on the committee print. The joint resolution was voted upon by the Military Affairs Committee in the form in which it now appears, including the italicized language.

I continue reading:

That there shall be discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such force who has on the date of enactment of this joint resolution one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this joint resolution shall not apply to anyone who has volunteered into the Army or the Navy subsequent to October 6, 1945, or to anyone who is a member of the Regular Army or the Regular Navy.

The date October 6, 1945, was fixed because on that date the new voluntary enlistment law went into effect. So the joint resolution is not meant to apply to anyone who volunteered under the new voluntary enlistment act which went into effect on October 6, 1945.

The remainder of the proviso that the provisions of the joint resolution shall not apply to anyone who is a member of the Regular Army or Regular Navy was incorporated because the War Department pointed out that the joint resolution, as originally introduced, would cause the discharge of men who were in the Regular Army and the Regular Navy. That is one of the criticisms which was made of the original joint resolution in a letter from the War Department, and the objection has now been removed.

I have here on my desk a letter from the War Department, a letter from the Navy Department, and a letter from the Director of the Selective Service to which I shall refer later.

SEC. 2. Discharge of any man upon the ground hereinabove described shall be made only after application of the service member himself; and a discharge shall not be granted to any person charged with an offense and awaiting trial by court martial or who shall be serving a sentence under conviction by court martial.

That section was placed in the joint resolution largely because of the point raised in the letters of the War and Navy Departments that it would automatically discharge a man. So now it is provided that in order to obtain a discharge upon the ground of being a father and having a family to support a serviceman must make his own application.

It was further stated as a complaint against the joint resolution that it would require the discharge of persons awaiting trial for offenses or who were serving sentences under court-martial convictions. There was no intention of doing that, but, in order that there may be no question about it, it has been written now in the joint resolution that such persons shall not be affected by the resolution if it is enacted into law.

SEC. 3. That this joint resolution shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this joint resolution, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and Navy.

SEC. 4. That any person discharged under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be given and granted an honorable discharge, unless for cause found to be not entitled to honorable discharge.

SEC. 5. That after the date of enactment of this joint resolution no person who has one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 5, of course, stops the drafting of fathers. Let me say to you, Mr. President, that at this time men with children are still being drafted, they are being taken into the Army, and being sent abroad to serve in the armies of occupation. I am making this argument today not so much for the men themselves——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree with the Senator from Oregon that not only are men with families being drafted but the allotments the Government provides from the compensation now afforded to the men in the armed services are so meager as to make it impossible in many instances for the families to live a life of health and decency?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I know that is correct, for the statement is corroborated by letters from the men themselves and from their wives, the mothers of their children who are left without their fathers.

Mr. MORSE. While I am on my feet I should like to say that I highly endorse the position the Senator from West Virginia has taken. I think the Congress has an obligation to perform with regard to this particular legislation. We should take action before this session adjourns, but I think the Senator will agree with me that the chances of getting action are very remote. It is merely another one of the failures on the part of this Congress and the Democratic administration to meet some of the crying domestic needs which are confronting the Nation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon, and I am delighted to have him make the statement he has made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me how many men would be potentially eligible for release under his resolution?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Army has said in a letter it wrote to the Military Affairs Committee that it would affect at the date the letter was written approximately 23 percent of those then in the armed forces. The statement that today 23 percent of those in the armed forces, in the Army, are men having families to me is startling.

As I have said, the joint resolution does not affect the members of the Regular Army but only those who have been inducted in the service or who volunteered during the fighting days for the duration of the war plus 6 months; it does not affect those who volunteered after October 6, 1945.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me if I ask another question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the light of the information he has just given me indicating the extent to which fathers are now in the service, would the Senator think that if this resolution were passed it would require an entire rearrangement of all the other discharge rules and procedures?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not see why it should any more than the reduction of points or any more than the rule which was issued providing for the discharge of fathers with three children. That rule is in existence, and an order to release a man with one child would not upset the plan any more than an order to discharge a man with three children.

Taking up the idea that I was about to express when interrupted I wish to say that I do not bring this matter up so much because of the men themselves who may be concerned. There is no distinction between them as to whether they have three children or one child or no children; but the purpose of the resolution is to enable the Government to perform a duty it owes to families back home who are without proper support and without the guidance of a family head. I have received hundreds upon hundreds of letters, many from the wives of servicemen, many from the men themselves, and some from persons in the community where servicemen's families reside, pointing out to me the dreadful situations which have arisen because of fatherless homes and because fathers are held in the service.

Opposition is voiced by those who voted against the proposal in the committee. I say that the motion to discharge is necessary because the Military Affairs Committee by a vote of 6 to 3 declined to send the resolution to the floor and place it on the calendar for consideration by the Senate. The committee is but a creature and a servant of the Senate, and the Senate has the right at any time to discharge the committee and bring the subject to the floor for discussion and action by the Senate upon it. I think it is too important a matter and something that touches too deeply the very domestic life of this country to be frozen in a committee, and that it ought to be considered on the floor of the Senate where it can be discussed and decided. The Senate can then come face to face with it and make a decision as to whether it wants to keep from homes in this country the men it took into the service to fight this war, now that the fighting has ended.

I recall too well that when the question of drafting fathers came up it was then said that as soon as the war was over they would be released. I believe this to have meant when the fighting was over. I recall a statement made at that time by the then Chief of Staff, General Marshall. When before the committee he was asked the question: "Do you want the induction of fathers or do you just want men?" he said it made no difference to him whether they were fathers or not, whether they were married or single; he wanted men. I think that statement, Mr. President, expresses the genuine view of the military upon this subject. They want men. As I heard the statement, they were referred to as "bodies." I quote that word because one of the high officers of the Army used it.

That is all right from the military point of view. It is all right for the military leader to say, "I want men, and it makes no difference to me whether they are fathers or not." But the Congress and the Federal Government cannot take that view of this subject. I submit it must regard the homes of this country; it must regard the security of those homes and it must regard the security and well-being of the children of the men who are held in the armed services.

I have here the letters, which I wish to read, which were sent to the Committee on Military Affairs by the Army and the Navy and also by the Director of Selective Service. I think these letters will reveal the attitude of the services; and the Congress must consider whether, in dealing with this question, it will take that attitude or whether or not it must go beyond the military views and deal with the men in the service on a broader and more just basis, looking to the well-being of our people.

I read a letter dated December 3, 1945, addressed to the Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate. This is from the Selective Service System:

> DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: In response to your request of November 13, 1945, for a report on Senate Joint Resolution 116, a joint resolution to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes, I submit the following for the consideration of your committee:
>
> Section 4 provides that after the date of enactment of this resolution no person who has one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home, shall be inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. This provision could be accomplished administratively by amending our regulations to provide a more liberal basis for deferment of registrants.

I shall return to that sentence and discuss it when I finish the letter.

> I am generally opposed to any restrictive legislation when the same result can be obtained through administrative action.
>
> For the foregoing reason it is respectfully recommended that the proposed legislation be not favorably reported by your committee.
>
> The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
> *Director.*

Mr. President, what does this letter mean? What is the substance of it? General Hershey says, "We could accomplish the same thing by a directive." Of course we could, but he will not issue the directive, although his office has been requested time after time to do it. The very reason why this legislation is necessary is that he will not act administratively.

Then we have this revealing sentence in the letter:

> I am generally opposed to any restrictive legislation when the same result can be obtained through administrative action.

Of course he is. Was there ever anyone in the administrative side of this

Government who did not want the broadest power to act? But who has the responsibility to the people of this country—General Hershey or the Congress? We know that the Congress has it. We know he is not answerable directly to the people. We know that only by the action of Congress can his administrative powers be limited or directed.

Naturally he, as in the case of any other administrative officer, opposes action by Congress. But Congress must, for the general welfare of the people, and not for General Hershey, act upon this legislation and reach a conclusion upon it.

General Hershey has not and apparently will not by his own act issue a rule against drafting fathers. They continue to be drafted. Then he comes to us and says he opposes the legislation because he can issue such a rule. But he does not do it. We are interested in what he does and not what he can do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. It is, of course, the responsibility of Congress, under our Constitution, to raise and maintain the Army of the United States. The fact that the Army has refused to listen to the wishes of the people and to the strong argument which has been made why servicemen who are fathers should be released certainly, it seems to me, is abundant reason for the Congress itself taking up and debating this question at the earliest possible moment, instead of allowing it to lie in the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Indiana. Of course, it is the duty of Congress to consider and decide this question. It has been delayed too long. The joint resolution should be passed before the Christmas holiday is taken.

There are sitting over on the Pacific islands thousands of servicemen, many of them fathers, who desire to return home. All of them who can be returned should be brought back, and I submit that when a man who has children asks that he be returned home, the fact that he is a father should be made the basis for favorable action.

Mr. President, we will not return this country to a reconverted, peacetime basis with homes unsupported and the fathers absent from them. There is no sentimentality about this. There is a real, genuine, factual need in this country that these men be brought back to care for their children and their families. Congress is keeping them in the Army unless it passes a measure of this kind, which makes fatherhood a ground for discharge.

Now I wish to read a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Gates. The letter is dated December 4, addressed to Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and reads:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Senate Joint Resolution 116, to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes, was referred by your committee to the Navy Department with request for report thereon.

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to provide for the prompt discharge of members of the military and naval forces having one child or more to whom he bears a bona fide family relationship. It would not apply to any person volunteering into the service subesquent to September 1945.

That date should be October 6, 1945, I may say.

The resolution is intended to supplement existing demobilization programs. Persons covered by the bill would not be subject to the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

The Navy Department is generally opposed to the proposed joint resolution and similar bills providing for the discharge of particular categories of personnel. The discharge formula now in operation is considered equitable when the over-all picture of the many groups of naval personnel is borne in mind. The Department is mindful of its dual responsibility of maintaining sufficient personnel to permit the efficient functioning of the Naval Establishment and of its duty to demobilize as rapidly as possible, and on as fair a basis as possible. The discharge plan is under continuous surveillance and releases are being effected as fast as the operational situation and the availability of facilities will permit. The Navy intends to continue in its efforts to expedite the tremendous demobilization task with all possible zeal.

It is noted that the bill requires the discharge of every member of the military and naval forces of the United States who has, on the date of the enactment of the joint resolution, one child or more. The only exception to this is "anyone who has volunteered into the Army or Navy subsequent to September 1945."

October 6 would be the correct date.

This is inartistically worded because the requirement for discharge refers to all in the "military and naval forces" and the exception applies to volunteers into the Army and Navy. Thus, for example, the exception would not include the Coast Guard. Furthermore, this formula disregards the desires of particular individuals to stay in the armed forces. Under the language above, the only way in which the armed forces could retain an individual with children who wanted to remain would be to discharge him and reenlist him, and even this construction is subject to some doubt.

Let me digress at that point in the reading to say to the Senate that as the joint resolution is now written no such point as that can be raised against it. A serviceman who is a father would not be automatically discharged. First, he himself would have to apply for his own discharge. Secondly, it would be necessary to discharge a man in order that he might reenlist. He could stay in because only by his own request could he be released from the service.

I continue to read from the letter:

No comment is made concerning the provision relating to the prohibitions against inducting bona fide fathers, as it is considered to be a question which should be submitted to the Director of Selectice Service for comment and recommendation.

For the foregoing reasons, the Navy Department recommends against the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 116.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. GATES,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. President, I wish to say that every particular criticism pointed at the joint resolution has been answered and met. The changes have been made and are shown in italics, and if the criticisms pointed out in particularity by the Acting Secretary of the Navy are still his criticisms, then he should have none to the joint resolution as it is now before the Committee on Military Affairs and attempted now to be brought before the Senate, with the possible exception that the services want to fix their own categories of discharge. Of course, they want to fix them. They want to be left alone to do that. But we have a duty on the subject which we should perform regardless of the desires of an administrative officer.

Again that raises the question: Are we going to listen to the desires of the executive department? We should be advised by them; but are we going to listen to their expressions of desire when we know or feel in our hearts that they are doing something wrong, something which is detrimental to the general well-being of the people of this country? I say we must act on our own judgment, and that is the reason why we must act.

Mr. President, there is a similar letter from the Secretary of War. I shall not read it, because it is very similar to the letter from the Navy Department, with a few changes. At this point I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the War Department may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 3, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 116, Seventy-ninth Congress, to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 116 would require the discharge, as rapidly as facilities will permit, of every member of the military and naval forces, or any component of either, who has, on the date of enactment, one or more children with whom he maintains, or but for his service would maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home. Persons who have voluntarily enlisted in the Army or Navy since September —, 1945, would be excluded. Sections 2 and 3 of the proposed joint resolution provide that the discharges directed by section 1 shall be in addition to those made on other grounds or bases; and that persons discharged under the provisions thereof shall receive an honorable discharge unless found not entitled thereto for cause. Section 4 of the joint resolution provides that after the date of enactment no person who has one or more children with whom he maintains, or would but for his service maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home shall be inducted under the

Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The terms of Senate Joint Resolution 116 are very broad and, with the single exception of those voluntarily enlisted since September —, 1945, would require the discharge of all personnel having children with whom they maintain, or would maintain, a bona fide family relationship. This would include officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, as well as both commissioned and enlisted personnel of the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps. It is also to be noted that the resolution would require the discharge of men undergoing hospitalization, awaiting trial by courts martial, or serving sentences adjudged by courts martial.

After long and careful consideration of the numerous possible factors involved, the War Department evolved the point system for the discharge or release of personnel from active duty. The factors which were included were (a) length of service, (b) length of service overseas, (c) awards and decorations, including those for participation in battles and campaigns, and (d) number of children—12 points for each dependent child. At the present time, enlisted men with 60 points or over are eligible for discharge.

Effective December 1, enlisted personnel with 55 points, as computed on September 2, 1945, will be eligible for discharge. In addition, those with (1) 4 years or more of honorable military service or (2) with three or more children under 18 years of age dependent upon them for support will be eligible. Previously established factors for the discharge of enlisted men will also remain in effect, under which an enlisted man is eligible for discharge if he (1) is 38 years of age, regardless of the period of his military service, or (2) is between 35 and 38 years of age and has completed 2 years of honorable military service, or (3) has been a prisoner of war and/or escapee out of United States control for 60 days or more. Personnel in this country who are no longer needed and who do not qualify for overseas duty are also discharged even though they do not have enough points for release under the point system. With the exception of personnel possessing certain scarce or critical skills, no enlisted men with 36 points, or 21 or more months of honorable service since September 16, 1940, will be sent overseas for permanent duty. Enlisted men with 50 or more points, now on furlough in the United States from stations overseas, are being discharged as they report back to their places of duty.

The system of release of officers from the military service is substantially similar to that provided for enlisted men.

At the present time separations from the Army are being made at the rate of over 1,000,000 men per month. Relatively few fathers are now being inducted (less than 3 percent in October), and the number of persons in the military service who have children is being reduced rapidly. On September 1, 1945, there were about 1,800,000 such individuals in service, and it is now estimated that figure will be reduced to approximately 1,000,000 by December 1, 1945. Enactment of this resolution would require the immediate discharge of approximately 22 percent of the individuals in the Army on December 1, 1945, many of them ahead of others having longer service and higher scores. Such action would result in the disintegration of the Army to an extent making it questionable whether it could fulfil its mission, either at home or abroad. Moreover, the enactment of this resolution would disorganize existing administrative procedures for the separation of personnel. In consequence, the rate of separations would be reduced, rather than accelerated, and many individuals who are eligible for separation under existing procedures would be required to remain in the Army longer.

Section 3 of the proposed joint resolution would effect no change in present policies of the War Department. All men discharged are given an honorable discharge unless, for cause shown, they are found not to be entitled thereto.

Section 4 of the proposed joint resolution would have a relatively limited effect. Men with three or more children are no longer being inducted, and those now in the service will be eligible for discharge on December 1, 1945. As indicated above, less than 3 percent of those inducted in October 1945 had any dependent children.

The War Department is unable to determine the fiscal effects of the proposed joint resolution.

For the foregoing reasons, the War Department recommends that Senate Joint Resolution 116 be not favorably considered.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The letter written by the Secretary of War does point out this criticism:

The terms of Senate Joint Resolution 116 are very broad and, with the single exception of those voluntarily enlisted since September 1945—

It should be October 6, 1945—

would require the discharge of all personnel having children with whom they maintain, or would maintain, a bona fide family relationship. This would include officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, as well as both commissioned and enlisted personnel of the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps. It is also to be noted that the resolution would require the discharge of men undergoing hospitalization, awaiting trial by courts martial, or serving sentences adjudged by courts martial.

That criticism, Mr. President, has been met, as will be seen, in the language of the bill which is italicized. I repeat, in the first place an individual can be discharged only upon application. In the second place, if a man is charged with an offense the joint resolution does not apply to him. If he is serving sentence under conviction by courts martial, of course the joint resolution does not apply to him, and it is so specifically stated.

Mr. President, I desire to accord full time and opportunity to those who will oppose this joint resolution, with the hope that they will permit this matter to come to a vote. The able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee rose earlier today when he believed that the ruling of the Chair would automatically place this joint resolution upon the calendar, and he said at that time that if I could consume the whole morning hour that I would gain my objective. That was a misunderstanding of the ruling of the Chair. I want to say, as I have said before, that I would not do that. I will divide the time evenly so that the opposition may be heard. And now I am going to ask the opposition to take the same view and permit this matter to come to a vote before 2 o'clock when the morning hour closes. For that reason I am cutting my remarks short today so that the opposition may have even more time than I have consumed in presenting this cause.

I appeal, Mr. President, to the Members of the Senate to consider this question seriously, and to say whether or not for the welfare of this country they are going to permit the armed services to continue to draft men who have children and to hold them in the service.

I have here, and I wish I had time to read them, a number of letters from men in the service setting forth that they are stationed on far-away islands in the Pacific, in most instances doing nothing, while their wives are writing them of distressing conditions at home, of need and difficulty in meeting the costs of living. Those men want to return to their children. Regardless of their feelings about the matter, but solely from the viewpoint of their Government and the welfare of this country, they ought to be back here supporting their families because their case is somewhat different from that of men without dependents. A man with a family must come back to the United States and take up his work again, not only to make a day-to-day living, but to try to make a secure position for himself and his family, and in order that he may provide for his children the comforts and advantages which we feel that every child in America should have. A child cannot obtain such advantages without the guidance of a father in the home.

So at this time, Mr. President, without going further into the subject, I yield the floor for the purpose of permitting the opposition to speak on this question, with the hope that we may bring this matter to a vote and meet the issue squarely before 2 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BILBO in the Chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hill	Radcliffe
Ball	Hoey	Revercomb
Barkley	Huffman	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	Knowland	Stanfill
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Carville	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Downey	McMahon	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hayden	O'Mahoney	Young
Hickenlooper	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LT. FRANK BURKE, RECIPIENT OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to announce to the Senate that Lt. Frank Burke, of Jersey City, N. J., who yesterday was awarded by the President the Congressional Medal of Honor, is now in the Gallery. I am sure the Senate is pleased and honored to have him here today, with his family and friends. I understand that on last April 17, Lieutenant Burke, serving as a transport officer, started out to pick a forward motor pool site at Nuernberg, Germany, and wound up duelling the Nazi die-hard defenders with a light machine gun. I have learned that in face to face fighting at that time he shattered two counterattacks, resulting in the killing or wounding of some 40 Germans.

(Senators rose and applauded.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 405) to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DRAFTING OF MEN HAVING CHILDREN

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in beginning my brief remarks I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] for the courtesy he has shown me and, therefore, the committee, because the committee stand is what I wish to discuss in addressing myself to the question now before us. The Senator from West Virginia is one of the most consistently hard-working members of our committee, and whenever he makes a suggestion the committee gives it due consideration.

The matter before us is strictly a parliamentary question, insofar as the discussion today is concerned. For that reason, rather than for any other, I think I should be grateful to the Senator from West Virginia, because the question which I asked the Presiding Officer when he made a ruling in regard to the parliamentary situation resulted in having the Presiding Officer rule, if I correctly understood the ruling, in such a way as to change what is ordinarily the parliamentary process of the Senate, namely, that all Senators are given an opportunity to discuss any proposition. If it were possible for a Senator to get a measure in which he was interested before the Senate merely by consuming all the time during the morning hour—as I understood the ruling of the Chair to suggest—of course the fundamentals of our parliamentary rules and procedure would be overcome.

Therefore, the question before us is a simple one, namely, whether the Military Affairs Committee shall be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116. Mr. President, yesterday I stated that that is a question for the Senate to decide. The Senator from West Virginia said that his objective is to give the Senate an opportunity to make a decision. He suggested that I allow the question to be voted on by the Senate. But the Senator's objective is more than he has stated, or else I do not understand him. Under the parliamentary situation, if the Military Affairs Committee is discharged, a resolution which has not been reported by the committee would be placed on the calendar for discussion and consideration by the Senate. That resolution would be considered on its merits by the Senate, and would be discussed by Senators without the resolution having had the advantage of committee consideration. It seems to me that the request which has been made is contrary to the fundamental procedure followed in transacting the business of the Senate and would, if it should become the practice of the Senate, result in much bad legislation.

Mr. President, I shall state the parliamentary situation. The objective of Senate Joint Resolution 116 is to prohibit the further drafting of fathers plus, of course, to lay down a policy with respect to a future drafting law, as well as to provide an arrangement whereby fathers who are now in the Army may be discharged if they so desire. When that question comes before the Senate, if the Military Affairs Committee decides that the resolution should be resisted, of course, I, as chairman of the committee, will try to defend the action of the committee as best I can. If Senate Resolution 207 prevails, and Senate Joint Resolution 116 is considered by the Senate without previous committee action having been taken, then I, like other Senators, will discuss the merits of the joint resolution at the proper time. I will either support or resist it on the basis of my own opinion, and not on the basis of committee action.

Mr. President, I believe that in a way I have covered the parliamentary situation as it exists.

In order that the RECORD may be made clear in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 116, in the event it comes directly before the Senate, and in order that Senators may have what information the committee has in regard to it, I shall read from a report to the committee which was made at the committee's request by the Secretary of War. Before doing so, out of fairness to the Senator from West Virginia, I must say that the report was submitted to the committee before the amendment suggested by the Senator to Senate Joint Resolution 116 was made. As I understand, if the Senate considers the resolution without committee action first having been taken, the Senator from West Virginia will want us to consider his resolution as amended, instead of as he submitted it in the first instance.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The chairman of the committee will remember that the resolution was rejected with the amendments. The amendments were made before the committee took action on the resolution and rejected it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, Mr. President; there is no question about that. The committee did not take action in regard to the motion to report the resolution either in its original or amended form.

Mr. President, in order that the Senate may have the information which the Secretary of War thought it was essential for the committee to have in regard to the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of War be printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 3, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: The War Department is opposed to the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 116, Seventy-ninth Congress, "To direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes."

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 116 would require the discharge, as rapidly as facilities will permit, of every member of the military and naval forces, or any component of either, who has, on the date of enactment, one or more children with whom he maintains, or but for his service would maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home. Persons who have voluntarily enlisted in the Army or Navy since September —, 1945, would be excluded. Sections 2 and 3 of the proposed joint resolution provide that the discharges directed by section 1 shall be in addition to those made on other grounds or bases; and that persons discharged under the provisions thereof shall receive an honorable discharge unless found not entitled thereto for cause. Section 4 of the joint resolution provides that after the date of enactment no person who has one or more children with whom he maintains, or would but for his service maintain, a bona fide family relationship in his home shall be inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 as amended.

The terms of Senate Joint Resolution 116 are very broad and, with the single exception of those voluntarily enlisted since September —, 1945, would require the discharge of all personnel having children with whom they maintain, or would maintain, a bona fide family relationship. This would include officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, as well as both commissioned and enlisted personnel of the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, and Enlisted Reserve Corps. It is also to be noted that the resolution would require the discharge of men undergoing hospitalization, awaiting trial by courts martial, or serving sentences adjudged by courts martial.

After long and careful consideration of the numerous possible factors involved, the War Department evolved the point system for the discharge or release of personnel from active duty. The factors which were included were (a) length of service, (b) length of service overseas, (c) awards and decorations, including those for participation in battles and campaigns, and (d) number of

children—12 points for each dependent child. At the present time, enlisted men with 60 points or over are eligible for discharge.

Effective December 1, enlisted personnel with 55 points, as computed on September 2, 1945, will be eligible for discharge. In addition, those with (1) 4 years or more of honorable military service or (2) with 3 or more children under 18 years of age dependent upon them for support will be eligible. Previously established factors for the discharge of enlisted men will also remain in effect, under which an enlisted man is eligible for discharge if he (1) is 38 years of age, regardless of the period of his military service, or (2) is between 35 and 38 years of age and has completed 2 years of honorable military service, or (3) has been a prisoner of war and/or escapee out of United States control for 60 days or more. Personnel in this country who are no longer needed and who do not qualify for overseas duty are also discharged even though they do not have enough points for release under the point system. With the exception of personnel possessing certain scarce or critical skills, no enlisted man with 36 points, or 21 or more months of honorable service since September 16, 1940, will be sent overseas for permanent duty. Enlisted men with 50 or more points, now on furlough in the United States from stations overseas, are being discharged as they report back to their places of duty.

The system of release of officers from the military service is substantially similar to that provided for enlisted men.

At the present time separations from the Army are being made at the rate of over 1,000,000 men per month. Relatively few fathers are now being inducted (less than 3 percent in October), and the number of persons in the military service who have children is being reduced rapidly. On September 1, 1945, there were about 1,800,000 such individuals in service, and it is now estimated that figure will be reduced to approximately 1,000,000 by December 1, 1945. Enactment of this resolution would require the immediate discharge of approximately 22 percent of the individuals in the Army on December 1, 1945, many of them ahead of others having longer service and higher scores. Such action would result in the disintegration of the Army to an extent making it questionable whether it could fulfill its mission, either at home or abroad. Moreover, the enactment of this resolution would disorganize existing administrative procedures for the separation of personnel. In consequence, the rate of separations would be reduced, rather than accelerated, and many individuals who are eligible for separation under existing procedures would be required to remain in the Army longer.

Section 3 of the proposed joint resolution would effect no change in present policies of the War Department. All men discharged are given an honorable discharge unless, for cause shown, they are found not to be entitled thereto.

Section 4 of the proposed joint resolution would have a relatively limited effect. Men with three or more children are no longer being inducted, and those now in the service will be eligible for discharge on December 1, 1945. As indicated above, less than 3 percent of those inducted in October 1945 had any dependent children.

The War Department is unable to determine the fiscal effects of the proposed joint resolution.

For the foregoing reasons, the War Department recommends that Senate Joint Resolution 116 be not favorably considered.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ROBT. P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to read only one paragraph of the letter.

At the present time separations from the Army are being made at the rate of over 1,000,000 men per month.

The President's message this morning said that separations from the armed services were being made at the rate of a million and a half a month.

Relatively few fathers are now being inducted (less than 3 percent in October), and the number of persons in the military service who have children is being reduced rapidly. On September 1, 1945, there were about 1,800,000 such individuals in service, and it is now estimated that figure will be reduced to approximately 1,000,000 by December 1, 1945.

This is the part of the letter which I think should be emphasized.

Enactment of this resolution would require the immediate discharge of approximately 22 percent——

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 207, under the practice of the Senate for many years, will be placed on the calendar, and the Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business, H. R. 4780, which will be stated by title by the Clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4780), to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the pending business, which is the bill to extend the War Powers Act of 1942. The bill actually should be called a bill to promote reconversion and facilitate the return of military personnel to the United States.

The bill was passed by the House with certain amendments, came to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and there one amendment was adopted extending the period of the effectiveness of the War Powers Act from June 30, 1946, to December 31, 1946. However, in order to make it clear that the purpose of the administrative agency and the purpose of Congress is to continue——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to proceed, I shall make a very brief statement, and shall not detain the Senate very long.

The committee amended the bill to provide an extension until the end of 1946 instead of until June 30, 1946, as provided in the bill as it passed the House. But in order that there might be no question as to the legislative intent, that it was the intention of Congress and the intention of the executive agency to lift all controls as rapidly as possible and to retain only such controls as may be necessary for reconversion, and for the preservation, I may almost say, of small businesses, the committee wrote into the report very specific statements. I wish now to read to the Senate those statements, which will be found on the first page of the report on the bill:

It is understood by the committee in recommending the extension to December 31, 1946, instead of to June 30, 1946, as passed by the House, that it is the intention of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and of the various agencies affected to lift all controls as rapidly as possible.

It is also understood by the committee that it will be the purpose of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion not to ask for another extension of the Second War Powers Act but, within the extended period provided by the pending act, to make specific recommendations to the Congress if future conditions should indicate that any controls should be maintained for a longer period. The Civilian Production Administration also gave assurance to the committee that industry committees would be consulted in all cases in which the extended powers are to be exercised.

Mr. President, this is not only a declaration of faith but it is the declaration of faith which can be sustained by a record of good works.

The evidence which was before the House committee at the time we began the hearing indicated—as I pointed out in the report—that the peak number of orders issued at any time during the war by the agencies which are affected by the bill was approximately 4,000, and that of these only about 220 were still in effect. However, I asked Mr. Klagsbrunn, the Deputy Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to prepare an accurate statement, so that I might present it to the Senate, with respect to the lifting of controls and the reduction of personnel. The record is really, I think, rather surprising.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr, O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to ask the Senator if the controls released may not, under this extension, be reimposed. May not the orders which have been released now be reimposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Technically, of course, they could be reimposed.

Mr. MOORE. And some of them have been reimposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Some of them may have to be reimposed, but I think the record before the committee, as I shall show presently, is such as to allay all fears that that may be done. That is why I asked Mr. Klagsbrunn to give me a record of precisely what has been done in the lifting of controls.

The peak number of orders by the War Production Board and the Civilian Production Administration, as it is now called, amounted to just a little more than 700. On the 1st of December 1945 only 70 were still in effect.

The OPA had 16 orders and directives issued under the War Powers Act, and of these only 2 now remain.

The Office of Defense Transportation had 3,001 orders at the peak. There now remain only 5.

The Solid Fuels Administration had 13. There now remain only 6.

The Department of Agriculture had 94 basic orders and 194 suborders, of which only 43 basic orders remain, and 174 suborders, and of these 144 have been suspended.

So that the over-all picture with respect to the agencies affected by the bill is that the peak number of orders was 4,018, that there remain in effect 300, of which 144 have been suspended, leaving only 156.

Mr. President, when that is taken into consideration, in connection with the statements from Mr. Klagsbrunn which I quoted in the report, and the statement of Mr. Small, the Administrator of the Civilian Production Administration, I think there is quite sufficient to indicate that the purpose of the agencies affected is to continue to lift these controls just as rapidly as will be at all possible, and not to reinstate any unless in the public interest it is clearly necessary to do so.

Then let it be remembered that there has been written into the report, and stated by the representatives of the organization, that consultation will be had with industry representatives in every case with respect to any of these orders. This is the statement of Mr. Klagsbrunn, speaking for Mr. Snyder:

> We believe we are working ourselves out of the war controls and out of the dislocations of the war emergency very quickly. * * * We are not saying that we want controls to go on indefinitely, or on into our domestic peace economy. It is only during the period in which we are correcting the dislocations of the war economy. * * * If dislocation controls were necessary for a longer time, it would be for the Government to come up to Congress for those controls and ask for fresh legislation. It would not be a matter of continuation of a war control.
>
> It is our view, as we have shown, we think, by our own actions in cutting out controls, that we should continue the same process in the elimination of the present controls over a reasonably short period.

Mr. Small made this statement in answer to interrogations by me, as I was presiding at the hearing:

> Mr. SMALL. My own feeling is, Senator, I am a very strong advocate of the Government lifting these controls and setting industry free at the earliest possible moment. Every order and every control that we have on our books is reviewed frequently.
>
> As a matter of fact, I go over every 2 or 3 days to find out, and to reinforce my own feeling, that this control and that control must be kept on. The burden of proof is on the man who wants to keep the control on the people, to say that this problem is so acute on this particular phase, whatever it is, that it is so acute that we must keep this on.

Mr. President, that is the clear tenor of the testimony, it is the clear tenor of the statement of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and it is the clear tenor of the committee report. It is an expression of the legislative intent by Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is fair to place the burden on the persons who want to keep the controls to show that conditions are so acute? Why is it not better to have the Congress the judge of that over a fairly short period? Why is it not better for that reason to leave the date June 30, 1946, rather than to change it to December 31, 1946?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because of the conditions which I am about to explain with respect to certain items. Let me say, for example, that of the two orders which the OPA still has in effect one is on sugar and the other is on tires. Those are the only rationing orders which OPA still has in effect. With respect to sugar we all know that the supplies of sugar for continental United States have historically come principally from the Philippines and from Cuba. Some have come from Puerto Rico. Then we have had our own domestic production of cane and of sugar beets. The war cut off absolutely all importations of sugar from the Philippines, and there is no prospect that such importations may be restored within 6 months. To grow sugar in the Philippines for importation into the United States, it will be necessary to stabilize the economy in the Philippines, to plant the crop, to harvest the crop, to refine the sugar, or to send the raw sugar to the United States to be refined. So we are not going to be able to depend upon our historic source of supply for over 1,000,000 tons of sugar a year from the Philippines.

With respect to Cuba, as it has happened because, again, of the shipping situation, Cuba became the principal source for all the United Nations for their supplies of sugar. The Government of the United States bought the entire Cuban crop for distribution, a part of it to us, a part of it for war purposes, for various kinds of manufacture, and a part for exportation to our allies. Let it be remembered that our entire beet sugar producing area was shut off from the Allies, except that from the Irish Free State, where the cultivation of sugar beets was begun, recently, there was I think a little trickle into Great Britain. But our supply of sugar is short. There is no prospect of it being brought up within the period of extension to June 30, 1946.

So I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, in order that the people of Massachusetts, as well as the people of Wyoming, may have an equitable distribution of the available sugar supplies the President's power ought to be extended.

With respect to tires, again we are dependent either upon synthetic rubber or upon imports of raw rubber from the Dutch East Indies and from Malaya. Is it necessary for me to point out that rubber is a commodity in short supply. Is it necessary for me to point out the unlikelihood that the Malay Peninsula and the Dutch East Indies may recover from the ravages of war in time to export rubber before the expiration of 6 months in sufficient amount to enable us to provide the raw rubber, the natural rubber, which every expert tells us is necessary to make synthetic rubber really usable? A certain percentage of raw rubber, natural rubber, is necessary to get the best results from synthetic rubber at the present state of the development of the art.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator the same question in another way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ah, now the Senator is coming back to his Massachusetts training and wants to ask the question in two or three ways. I was born there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And we are always glad to have the Senator come back there.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Someone has said that the way a Yankee always answers a question is by asking another.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the future when I ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming I shall make no preface to my remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is asking the question of a transplanted Yankee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All the other price controls of OPA will expire on June 30, 1946. How could it do any harm to have these two items with relation to priorities come up when the whole OPA question is discussed next spring?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They will come up inevitably when the OPA question is discussed next spring. When the Committee on Banking and Currency undertakes next year to pass upon the life of OPA it will then decide the question, and if the Committee on Banking and Currency should then determine that the life of OPA should be terminated, it will have the power to do so. Nothing in this bill prevents it. If it should then be the determination of the Senate and the House that rationing should be cut off, why the power is precisely there. It must be remembered that the Committee on the Judiciary is not attempting to invade the jurisdiction of other legislative committees which would normally pass upon the various subjects which are contained in this bill. And nothing in this extension would prevent the Congress or any committee of the Congress from recommending the termination of OPA powers or any other powers.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Assuming that this bill is passed, extending the Second War Powers Act until December 31, 1946, even though the Congress and the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency should consider the OPA question next summer, and even if Congress should refuse to extend the OPA law, the powers herein granted would still be in effect, and under the powers herein granted the President could issue executive orders continuing these controls irrespective of whether the Price Control Act was continued or not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The power of the President to issue executive orders is not affected by this bill at all. That is something which is not contained in it. I submit to the Senator that to assume in the face of the marvelous record of lifting controls that it would be the purpose of the President, against every declaration he has made, to undertake a program of reinstituting controls would be, would to the least be, a most unrealistic assumption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not assuming that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say again to the Senator that with the specific expression of legislative intent in the bill, I think

that every Member of this body may rest secure in the confident belief that the passage of this measure will only have the effect of allowing those who are handling various bureaus in good faith to continue to lift controls as rapidly as is possible in the public interest. In only a few instances are these controls necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the Senator gained the wrong impression from my question. I realize the necessity of the enactment of this measure to extend the powers proposed to be extended. I do not think we could at this time by any means safely withdraw them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. That was my own judgment, and that was the judgment of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the present administration has certainly indicated by its actions that it intends and desires to discontinue all these controls just as rapidly as possible. That is its record up to date. I have no doubt of the intent to continue to pursue that policy. The only question I was raising was this: OPA expires in June 1946. If we adopt the committee amendment we will extend the time to December 1, 1946, and even though the Congress did not renew the OPA Act in June 1946, under these powers, if extended by the adoption of the amendment until that time, the President could by Executive order continue rationing of articles, irrespective of what action the Congress took concerning the OPA.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whatever may be the legal situation, I think the Senator has correctly stated it. The realistic situation is quite the contrary. I say that if Congress should repeal the OPA, then the President would not attempt to set up the OPA again by Executive order.

I may say with respect to OPA as a whole now, not with respect to OPA as affected by this bill, that I sought to get the information on this subject, and it is a surprising, I think, and rather encouraging record which we have before us. On August 15, 1945, at the military termination of the Japanese War, the total number of persons on the OPA pay roll was 63,217, and the number of district offices was 93. On December 1 of this year the number of persons on the OPA pay roll has been reduced to 37,729, and the number of district offices had been reduced from 93 to 65.

In other words, without any suggestion from Congress, without any compulsion, the OPA has already closed 28 district offices, and has already laid off the pay roll almost 30,000 persons.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator name any important object on which price control has been removed in any way?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But price control is not affected by this bill.

Mr. TAFT. No. I maintain that priorities are inevitably and inextricably confused with price control, but together they form the method of controlling industry in the United States. The two should be considered together, it seems to me. Take the question of meat. Rationing of meat was removed, but price control was maintained, which, to my mind, encouraged the black market in meat beyond the hope of recovery. I believe that rationing of meat should have been retained, and that price control should have been abolished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will grant, will he not, that that is not relevant to this discussion.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is relevant to this discussion, because OPA will end the 1st of next July. In connection with the question of what controls ought to be continued, both priorities and price control should be considered at one time. The Price Control Administration is already engaged in propaganda to continue its services and powers over price control for another year. I believe that both in this field and in the field of price control it may be necessary to continue some powers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator and I are in agreement.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has cited the case of rubber. I believe that very likely it will be necessary to continue controls with respect to certain commodities; but merely because it is necessary to continue controls with respect to certain commodities I do not think we need to continue indefinitely powers over all industry in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree; and the committee has made it clear that there will be no indefinite control. When the Senator tells the Senate, as he has just done, that in his opinion rationing of meat should have been repealed, but that price control should have been retained, he makes an argument for the continuation of the power of OPA to ration meat.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly; and I am in favor of continuing that power until the 1st of next July. I believe that by May—that is a long time from now, and things are changing rapidly under present conditions—we may find it to be unnecessary to continue any powers, or necessary to continue only certain powers. But the Senator justifies the bill on the ground of sugar, and on the ground of rubber. I should say that it could be justified on the ground of building materials, which he has not mentioned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been interrupted. I have not been able to go all the way down the line.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator would continue indefinite powers over all products. It seems to me that those who ask for the continuation of these extraordinary powers should be asked the question, With respect to what products is it necessary to apply controls? A continuation of the powers ought to be limited to the particular commodities of which there is a great shortage, or commodities which in some way are affected by the war condition. The door ought not to be wide open for the Government to step into any field it may decide to invade.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the committee has obtained a complete meeting of the minds, and has made its declaration that there will not again be a request for the extension of the War Powers Act.

Mr. TAFT. The committee had so stated; but there is nothing, so far as I can see, which would prevent the President from calling Congress back a year from now and saying, "We must renew these powers." When the administrators are reminded of what they previously stated, they will say, "We were wrong. We are sorry." That will be the end of it. Promises a year in advance to abandon powers at the end of the year are not worth the paper on which they are written. Such promises do not amount to anything. When we call attention to them a year later, we are told, "We were wrong. We have changed our minds. Conditions are different from what we thought they were going to be." I do not believe that we can justify a continuation of these powers on the basis of some alleged promise of an administrator who may be out of office tomorrow. I do not believe that we can justify the extension on the theory that we are not to have another extension.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot escape the conclusion that the Senator is conjuring up unrealistic fears in the face of a record which is not to be denied—the record that of 4,018 orders and directives, all have been withdrawn but 156, including those which have been suspended.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, many of those orders were orders directly concerned with the production of war material. They were suspended. There is no longer any reason for them. But I venture to say to the Senator that just as the control over building material was taken off and later restored, we shall see a whole series of restorations of priority orders. While these powers were intended only for war, they are very valuable in connection with any control which anyone wishes to impose in time of peace. Many special interests will be urging that such controls be reimposed. Businessmen will be here urging that they be reimposed. Labor unions will wish certain controls reimposed. It seems to me that we ought to continue the powers only with respect to certain commodities which we feel are affected by a direct hangover from war, commodities with respect to which the powers ought to be continued. Since we are not taking that course now, I think we ought to do it next May. I do not believe that we ought to extend the powers for more than 6 months, so that we may have an opportunity to make a selective extension, as I think we should do in the case of price control when that question arises.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator's position is very clear.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska whose voice I heard first, and to whom I have become accustomed to listening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator is most kind. I know with what zeal the distinguished Senator is supporting the proposed legislation. I do not wish to participate in the debate at this time, because I desire to listen to the entire statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

I believe that he ought to make an explanation as to the committee recommendations. I should like to have the RECORD show that I was not in attendance in the committee at the time the question of the extension of the War Powers Act was before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I was engaged in the work of the Small Business Committee, attempting to obtain clothing for our GI men. I appreciate the work which the Senator has done. It is very important that the amendment to the War Powers Act be passed before the end of this session. I believe that the Senator even wrote the report alone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wrote the report, if I may plead guilty to it.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I wish to make is that the entire membership of the Judiciary Committee was not in attendance. Some of us could not be present. I should like to have the RECORD show that while I appreciate the work of the distinguished Senator who is now presenting the legislation, yet I am not in accord with the proposal to extend the act for 1 year. If I had been in attendance at the committee meetings I would have voted accordingly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if later in his remarks he will make some statement with respect to the necessity of prolonging the extension of the powers for longer than 6 months. The House provision calls for an extension for 6 months. Many businessmen have told me that they did not consider 6 months to be sufficient time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. That was the understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. I also wish to ask the Senator—perhaps it may not be relevant to the present discussion—if he will discuss the impression made upon the committee by those in charge of the administration of the act in connection with the attempt to make certain adjustments of situations which had previously been called to their attention.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will very well remember that he came to the committee with two representatives of the cotton processors. There was discussed in the committee an amendment which those gentlemen intended to offer to the committee, but the discussion proceeded in such a satisfactory way between those gentlemen and Mr. Smalley, Director of the Civil Production Administration, that the sponsors of the amendment withdrew the amendment. They stated that they would not ask the committee to consider it, and that they were completely satisfied with the assurances which they had received of consultation with the industry itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask the Senator further if he does not believe that the same thing might happen in many other instances when such conditions are called to the attention of those administering the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure it will; and I will say that if it did not happen I would be one of the first to take the floor and denounce those who failed to carry out the clear intent of Congress. But I do not believe that will be necessary.

Mr. President, let me briefly run over all the titles covered by the bill. It must be remembered that the War Powers Act, when originally presented, covered a very broad field, and several amendments were inserted on the floor. Some of them had to do with controls. Some of them had to do with assistance to our military forces, and so forth.

The first title deals with the emergency powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission over motor and water carriers, and the like. As indicated, the Office of Defense Transportation now has only five orders in existence. I believe one of them has to do with air transport. But this provision also deals with authority to bring back to the United States in the most expeditious manner the military personnel who are scattered all over the world. The War Shipping Administration, which is covered by this provision, has special problems, in connection with which it is felt that these powers should be continued.

Title II is an amendment of the act of July 2, 1917, dealing with the acquisition and disposition of property. Under this provision of the law, as originally adopted, the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments had the right actually to seize and take possession of property, both real and personal, before condemnation proceedings had been instituted and completed. That provision is repealed by the bill which is now before the Senate. The power to seize property before condemnation is completely withdrawn. The only thing which is left is the power to dispose of property already taken over. That is why I call the measure a reconversion act. It makes it possible for the War Department and the Navy Department, for example, to lease real property and plants which they have, which are necessary to be kept in standby condition. Without this provision the War Department, for example, would be governed by another law—one which authorizes the making of leases; but a lease issued under such a law would have to contain a clause giving the Secretary the power to terminate the lease at will. Of course, civilian industry cannot be built up by the issuance of leases which are terminable at will by the Secretary of War. Under the power granted by the bill he would have the right to issue a lease for 5 years, thereby giving the confidence, the certainty, and the security which are necessary if reconversion is to be brought about. There would also be authority, for example, to relocate pipe lines and water lines—an authority which would expire if this law expired. Clearly, that is a power which should not expire on the 30th of June. It will be physically impossible for the Army and the Navy to dispose within 6 months of the properties which they have thus acquired. Why, then, should not we grant the extension for a full year which the committee has recommended? It is a grant of power which is wholly in the interest of reconversion.

Title III has to do with priorities powers. That is the only question which has been discussed thus far; and since there has been some discussion of it, I shall pass it for the moment, and shall return to it later.

Title IV has to do with the purchase by the Federal Reserve banks of Government obligations. Until 1935 the Federal Reserve banks had the right to make direct purchases from the Treasury of obligations of the Government. That right was changed by the law of 1935. The War Powers Act restored the power, but it placed a limitation of $5,000,000,000 upon the amount of Government securities which could be held at any one time by the Federal Reserve banks. The record under that war power shows that the largest amount ever held at any one time was less than $1,400,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that is true and if we have gone through the war without having the Federal Reserve System purchase, under the powers which are proposed to be extended, more Government securities than the amount mentioned by the Senator, what is the reason for continuing the maximum at $5,000,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the House of Representatives considered only the extension of the power, and no one brought up the question of the amount; and in the Senate committee no one suggested any change in the amount.

Speaking for myself, I would say that it is probable that this power is more necessary now than it was during the war period. Witness the fact that the sale of the last Government bond issue has been very much slower than the sale of any of the preceding issues. Today the national debt is greater than it has been at any previous time. The national debt is still rising. The Senator may remember that on the floor of the Senate when the tax bill was under consideration I objected to cutting down the Government's tax receipts by approximately $6,000,000,000 at the same time we were trying to sell $11,000,000,000 worth of debt.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will further yield, let me say I thought he was most correct in the position he took on that point.

As I understand the powers which are granted to the Federal Reserve Board under the measure now being discussed, they have nothing whatever to do with the conduct of Government bond-sale drives, such as the one which is now coming to an end.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; certainly not. But I think it is of the utmost importance that when any one of the innumerable issues of Government securities which are outstanding comes to its end and must be refinanced, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve

banks shall have authority to step in and purchase them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am yielding to the Senator from Utah. When he concludes I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, without desiring to have the discussion continued unduly, I should like to clarify in my own mind this point: As I understand the power under consideration—the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase Government obligations, subject to the limitation that not more than $5,000,000,000 worth of Government securities may be held at any one time by the Federal Reserve banks—that matter involves the financing of the Government at a time when it is anticipating the receipt of several billion dollars in taxes. The taxes may not come in as rapidly as is anticipated, and because of that the Treasury may have to resort to the procedure referred to, in order to tide it over for a very brief period of time, in anticipation of taxes. Is not that the primary purpose of the proposed extension of authority, rather than to have anything to do with the sale of Government bonds during the bond-sale drives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course it has nothing to do with the sale of bonds. I mentioned the sale of bonds and I mentioned the national debt merely to illustrate the fact that today the fiscal condition of the country is immeasurably worse than it was when this power was first granted.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what prompted my question.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me further, I wish to ask another question. Suppose Congress approves the proposed loan of $4,400,000,000 to Great Billion—Great Britain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, did the Senator say a loan to "Great Billion"?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, the word "billion" is so commonly used nowadays that I was very close to saying it. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, under the powers proposed to be extended, would it not be possible for the Federal Reserve System to finance the entire loan to the British Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I confess that the Senator is getting a little beyond my depth. I will say that the loan to Great Britain cannot be made, in the first place, without the approval of the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the United States Government should issue securities for the purpose of effectuating that loan, certainly under these powers the Federal Reserve banks could purchase those securities. But my understanding of the loan is that it will constitute a credit in the Treasury of the United States upon which Great Britain will draw, and that there is not the faintest prospect that if Congress approves such a loan, it will all be made at any one time.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I still yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to ask one more question, Mr. President. It is my opinion that under the extension of powers which it is proposed to grant to the Federal Reserve System, the entire British war loan could be financed. I do not know at the present time whether it should be done, but I invite the attention of the Senate, and of the Senator from Wyoming in particular, to the fact that this is a very convenient method and procedure on the part of the Federal Reserve System of financing great loans such as is now being contemplated in regard to Great Britain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the loan will necessarily have to be referred to Congress for its approval, I assume that the bill or the joint resolution which will constitute the approval will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of which the Senator from Utah is a very distinguished and able member.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In that committee it will be possible for the Senator from Utah, as well as other members of the committee, to offer amendments in respect to the loan if, indeed, the committee approves the loan.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is dealing with the subject of extending this extraordinary power which has been given, in effect, to the Federal Reserve Board, in order to force $5,000,000,000 of Government securities on the Federal Reserve banks regardless of whether they want them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The power really should not be characterized as an extraordinary one, because such was the power of the Federal Reserve banks until 1935. So there is nothing extraordinary about it except in its magnitude.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; but in 1935 such power was not in the Federal Reserve Board. Prior to that time the Federal Reserve banks were independent. In 1935 the open-market committee was appointed. Power was given to say to the Federal Reserve banks, "You must buy Government bonds in the open market" or, "You will be restrained from buying bonds in the open market." When that power was granted it was expressly provided that it should extend only to the right of compelling the Federal Reserve banks to buy bonds in the open market.

As I see it, Mr. President, the only possible restraint on the Government to issue paper money is in the $5,000,000,000 limit. Of course, while that limit exists, the power is not entirely unlimited. At one time we tried to place a limit of $2,000,000,000, and 30-day paper. That effort was defeated, and ultimately a five-billion-dollar limit was established.

I do not object to continuing the power for only 6 months, but there is a movement under way to make it permanent, and to that I strenuously object. At the present time I do not think it constitutes a sufficiently important factor to warrant amending the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's opinion is the same as mine, and it illustrates a fundamental proposition. There can be no grant of power, however small or great it may be, which is not open to abuse. It has been said that from the day the Constitution was ratified, the President of the United States had more power than had most monarchs. But the history of our Government has not been a history of the abuse of power by the President. In carrying on the war we granted extraordinary powers of the greatest breadth to the Army, to the Navy, and to the civilian agencies. The great glory of our country, Mr. President, and the great glory of our system, lies in the fact that those powers were not abused. Of course, there were times when the exercise of power had a very disadvantageous effect upon individuals. One of the reasons why I stand here, and why I stood in the committee, advocating the extension of the powers is because I can point to instances showing that these powers which were used for the purpose of carrying on the war can now be used for the purpose of reestablishing business enterprise which suffered by reason of the necessary exercise of the power while the war was in progress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if I heard correctly the Senator from Utah, he said that the purpose of this method of financing the Treasury is to cover the deficits which will continue until taxes can be collected. So long as we are operating at a deficit, and do not balance our Budget, we will never bring about the result to which the Senator has referred. In other words, there will always be a deficit, and the taxes collected will not be sufficient to cover the loan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, allow me to interrupt the Senator and say that he has not stated the real purpose. I will read from the testimony of the expert of the Federal Reserve bank. What the Senator states as a possibility is not likely to occur.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts took issue with me in my explanation, and said that what I stated was not the purpose of the extension of this power. I took it upon myself, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, to interrogate the expert who was put on the telephone as a result of a call which I made to the Federal Reserve Board during the consideration of the bill. I very carefully framed my question in order to find out the real purpose. I will state very frankly to the Senator that the explanation which I received was that the essential purpose of the extension of this power was the very purpose which I have explained, and that the power had been exercised almost primarily for the purpose of financing the Treasury over periods of deficits in anticipation of tax receipts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should not have said that it was the only purpose.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the only purpose in granting this power is to finance the Treasury over a short period of time in anticipation of the collection of taxes, I absolutely have no objection to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me to show what the purpose is,

as stated in the words of the expert who testified? I do not know much about this matter except what I read in the testimony, and what I heard from the witnesses who appeared before the committee.

The testimony of Mr. Goldenweiser was——

Mr. MURDOCK. From what is the Senator about to read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am about to read from page 32 of the House hearings.

The testimony to which I refer reads as follows:

Mr. E. A. GOLDENWEISER. I am E. A. Goldenweiser, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve System. Since we have a public debt of $260,000,000,000, there will be many occasions when much of it has to be refunded. The Treasury has to make estimates of the amount of revenue that it will get on a certain day, and in the very uncertain conditions that are going to prevail it could easily miss its guess by a few hundreds of millions, or even by a few billion dollars, and in that case the Treasury would find itself in a hard-pressed position for a short time in meeting this delay, even during the period while the checks go through the process of collection.

In a period of this sort it is a great convenience for the Treasury to overdraw its account on the Federal Reserve, which is what these certificates amount to in the final analysis. It is the authority to the Treasury to overdraw its account for a short time in conditions where their miscalculations or other unforeseen elements in revenues are such that they find themselves short of funds for a few days.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that what Mr. Goldenweiser has stated is what I probably could not explain as well as I should be able to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is always able to make himself understood.

Mr. MURDOCK. When I made my telephone call I asked for Mr. Goldenweiser and I was given to understand that he was in New York at that time. His very able assistant, however, was put on the telephone and his explanation was almost identical, I might say, with what Mr. Goldenweiser stated, except that he stressed the fact that the Government, in anticipating tax revenues, might find itself, as Mr. Goldenweiser stated before the committee, in difficulty and that the method under discussion was a very convenient one for taking the securities of the Government, depositing them in the Federal Reserve banks, and thereby establishing demand deposits. I hope that the use of this method will be limited to that purpose rather than to have an extension of present functions for the purpose of financing a large loan to Great Britain, or to any other country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will undertake to see that this method is not used to finance loans when the loan bill comes before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to finish the question I desired to propound. The sales referred to are direct sales from the Treasury to the Federal Reserve banks. The interest rates are set as a closed transaction; they are not set by the open market.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There was testimony before one of the committees, which I have read, to the effect that one of the problems under the national housing bill, which was introduced a few days ago, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, was that the interest rates would be so low that they might affect insurance premiums, because the companies would have to charge more. Therefore the witness testifying questioned the bill setting interest rates so low.

If the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks, in a closed transaction, not in the public market, set their interest rates, it may affect interest rates everywhere, it may affect insurance premiums, and everything else of the same character. My question is, if that be true, or even half true, is it not better to limit the proposed act to 6 months, and let us look it over again next June?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I personally doubt that that is necessary, because the past is the guaranty of the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the table which I now hand to the reporter, showing holdings by the Federal Reserve banks of special short-term Treasury certificates purchased directly from the Treasury since March 1942.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Holdings by the Federal Reserve banks of special short-term Treasury certificates purchased directly from the Treasury since March 1942

[In millions of dollars]

	Amount
1942:	
June 16	58
June 19	70
June 20	47
June 22	34
June 23	94
Sept. 15	324
Sept. 16	189
Sept. 17	286
Sept. 18	76
Sept. 19	53
Nov. 27	139
Nov. 28	329
Nov. 30	422
Dec. 1	98
Dec. 10	16
Dec. 15	145
1943:	
Jan. 29	115
Jan. 30	202
Mar. 2	3
Mar. 4	174
Mar. 5	354
Mar. 6	543
Mar. 8	591
Mar. 9	648
Mar. 10	632
Mar. 11	790
Mar. 12	940
Mar. 13	1,043
Mar. 15	1,302
Mar. 16	1,250
Mar. 17	981
Mar. 18	836
Mar. 19	778
Mar. 20	768
Mar. 22	603
Mar. 23	700
Mar. 24	512
Mar. 25	432
Mar. 26	384
Mar. 27	304
Mar. 29	104
Mar. 30	40
June 15	805
June 16	659
June 17	350
June 18	256
June 19	212
Sept. 8	11
Sept. 9	126
Sept. 10	243
Sept. 11	246
Sept. 13	214
Sept. 14	179
Sept. 15	424
Sept. 16	258
1945: Mar. 15	4

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will ask the Senator to pardon me just a moment. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was on his feet several moment ago and I could not yield to him at that time, and should like to extend the courtesy to him now.

APPOINTMENT OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to be entirely fair to the Senator. I wish to present a conference report the consideration of which will take only 2 or 3 minutes, in my opinion. It is a report on the bill we passed a few days ago providing for the appointment of our representatives to the United Nations Organization. The first meeting will take place on the 10th of January, and the situation is rather unusual; so I ask the Senator whether he will not yield so that I may take his matter up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified meeting thereof in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United

Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative."

And the House agree to the same.

TOM CONNALLY,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just one word, Mr. President. The only difference in disagreement was as to the matter of the confirmation of appointees to represent the United States. Additional language was added to the bill, as follows:

The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

The Senate inserted a provision that Representatives and Senators should be confirmed as all other appointees were confirmed. Some question was raised as to whether or not confirmation in the case of a Senator or Representative might be construed as appointing him to another office, and thereby creating a vacancy in his office as a Member of Congress. After very thorough consideration the committee decided that that was not the case.

Mr. President, I have here a memorandum which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD. I shall not read it, but it contains a ruling by Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty holding that a temporary appointment of this particular kind does not constitute an office. The ruling was brought about by the appointment of Representative Burton and Senator Smoot to the Debt Funding Commission following the First World War. The memorandum contains a number of court decisions on other cases. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, not as a part of my remarks, but as a memorandum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs considered whether the amendments made on the floor of the Senate to section 2 (c) of S. 1580—by providing for Senate confirmation of the representatives to the General Assembly and the payment of compensation to them—resulted in the creation of an office under the authority of the United States within the meaning of the constitutional provision against Members of Congress holding Federal office. The provision in question, which is article I, section 6, of the Constitution reads as follows:

"No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time, and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office."

In the light of the available precedents, and in order to minimize any possibility of ineligibility on the part of the Members of Congress to act as representatives to the General Assembly, the House amended section 2 (c) so as to provide that Members of Congress should not be entitled to receive compensation for serving in this capacity. On this basis it is believed that no such ineligibility has been created.

One of the most important precedents in which this whole question was thoroughly explored is the case of the appointment of Senator Smoot and Representative Burton to serve on the World War Foreign Debt Commission in 1922. This Commission was created by joint resolution of Congress providing for a Commission consisting of five members under the chairmanship of the Secretary of the Treasury to be appointed upon Senate confirmation. The functions of the Commission were, subject to the approval of the President, to refund or convert or extend the time of payment of any obligation of any foreign government to the United States arising out of the World War. Attorney General Daugherty rendered an opinion to the effect that the Members of Congress could validly be appointed to act on the Commission despite the provision of the Constitution. The following excerpts indicate the reasons on which this opinion was based:

"I have failed to find any judicial interpretation of the section of the Constitution now under consideration, and in the absence of such finally authoritative interpretation, great weight must be attached to the practical construction put upon the Constitution from the beginning of the Government. In such practical construction a distinction has always been made between special employment on the one hand and offices on the other, and between offices—using that term in a general sense—which serve only a temporary purpose, and those which have duration and permanency. From the very beginning of the Government Members of the Senate and the House have, from time to time, been asked to render services for the Government upon commissions of various kinds, and it has never been decided that such temporary employment for a special purpose and to serve an immediate exigency constituted a civil office within the meaning of the constitutional provision above referred to.

"The Supreme Court has held in a number of cases (*United States* v. *Hartwell* (6 Wall. 385); *United States* v. *Germaine* (99 U. S. 508); *Auffmordt* v. *Hedden* (137 U. S. 310)) that the word 'office' 'expresses the idea of tenure, duration, emolument, and duties.' Its duties must be 'continuing and permanent, not occasional and temporary.' In the last-cited case the office then under consideration had no general functions, nor any employment which had any duration as to time or which extended over any case further than the power to act on that particular case. It was held by the Supreme Court 'that the incumbent did not hold an "office" within the meaning of article II, section 2, of the Constitution.'

"Where, therefore, a position does not have continuancy and permanency and its function is restricted to a single matter, the position seems to be that of an executive agent and not an 'office' within the meaning of the Constitution.

"Many cases could be cited in other jurisdictions and the views of text writers could also be readily adduced to justify the theory that the idea of an office 'clearly embraces the idea of tenure, duration, fees or emoluments, rights, and powers, as well as that of duty.'

"Applying this distinction between an 'office' and a temporary trust to the act of Congress which created the World War Foreign Debt Commission, I would say that for several reasons it excludes the application of the word 'office' as above defined.

"The commissioners receive no compensation.

"Their tenure of office is limited in time and is restricted to a single object.

"The subject matter of their duties is work in which the Congress has a peculiar interest and as to which it is finally responsible; for if the adjustment of the debts due to the United States by foreign nations shall ultimately be accomplished by treaty, the latter must receive the sanction of the Senate and therefore there is propriety in a Member of that body participating in the negotiations. So far as the adjustment of the debt does not depend upon treaty obligations, the question as to what adjustment will be made of it is for Congress to determine, and it has seen fit to delegate the difficult task of adjustment to the Commission, with the approval of the President. This increases the propriety of having a Member of the Senate and of the House participate in such adjustment.

"Moreover, the Commissioners can take no action except with the approval of the President. Their duties, therefore, are primarily those of negotiators for the terms of such adjustment, and, secondarily, as an advisory body to the President of the United States."

The Senate Judiciary Committee, to whom the question was referred, recommended against the confirmation of the nominees on the basis of the alleged constitutional ineligibility. A minority report, however, agreed with the views of the Attorney General. After a full debate of the matter on the floor of the Senate, Messrs. Smoot and Burton were confirmed by a vote of 47 to 25. There are numerous other cases in which Members of Congress have been appointed on commissions to settle international disputes such as boundary commissions or other arbitration commissions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understand the President has sent to the Senate certain nominations of delegates to the forthcoming meeting of the United Nations Organization. If that be true, I shall have to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Wyoming for about 2 minutes so that as in executive session the Senate may confirm the nominations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the time arrives for the Senate to go into executive session, I will say to the Senator from Texas, I hope I shall not be on my feet. I shall be present, however, to listen to the words of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations referred to by the Senator from Texas have been received.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will ask the Presiding Officer to lay the President's message before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before

the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In conformity with the provisions of S. 1580, I am sending to the Senate herewith for its advice and consent nominations of the American representatives and alternate representatives for the first part of the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations which is to convene in London early in January. I am also sending to the Senate herewith the nominations of the American representative to the Security Council which will also meet in London sometime in January as soon as that body has been established through the election of its nonpermanent members by the General Assembly.

Section 2 (d) of the pending bill wisely provides that the President, or the Secretary of State at the direction of the President, may represent the United States at any meeting of the United Nations regardless of those provisions which call for the appointment of representatives by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. At my request the Secretary of State will, for at least a portion of the session, attend the initial session of the General Assembly. For that reason I am sending to the Senate the nominations of only four representatives to the General Assembly. The Secretary of State will, during the period he is present, act as the senior representative of the United States to the General Assembly. The nominations of the alternates will insure that there will at all times be five representatives of the United States qualified under the provisions of S. 1580.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 19, 1945.*

[Enclosures: Nominations.]

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 19, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 19, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate the following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia.

TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from the State of Texas.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from the State of Michigan.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.

In the absence of the President or the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius will be the senior representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 19, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate the following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

SOL BLOOM, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

CHARLES A. EATON, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania.

John Foster Dulles, of New York.

John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHITE. Were these nominations received today?

Mr. CONNALLY. They were received today.

Mr. WHITE. Did the Committee on Foreign Relations act on them this morning?

Mr. CONNALLY. The committee has authorized me to report them favorably, which I now do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I understood that nominations had to lie on the table for 1 day before action.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not insist on that rule. I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the nominations as in executive session.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object to none of them except that of Mr. Stettinius. I have no objection to any of the others, but I prefer to take them up separately, and I want a chance to be heard on the nomination of Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then, I ask for a vote on all the others at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not take that action, because we have before us a very important bill, and we were about to dispose of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not disposed to take up the Stettinius end of the matter, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand, but I think in the interest of orderly procedure, if the Senator from Texas will permit me to conclude my statement on the War Powers Act, the results will be very much better. We have had 2 weeks of example of what confusion is promoted by switching subjects before they have been determined by the Senate. I hope the Senator will withhold his request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly, I shall do what the Senator wishes. I thank the Senator for having indulged me thus far.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I shall conclude in half an hour if Senators will not continue to ask me so many questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Without objection, the nominations are all confirmed with the exception of that of Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I do not think there was a motion put or suggestion made or unanimous consent request made for confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Texas made such a request.

Mr. TAFT. I understood he was going to proceed with the request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am at a loss. I am not clear on the matter. I do not know whether the motion was put or not. It was my purpose to move the confirmation of all the nominations except that of Mr. Stettinius, but on the intervention of the Senator from Wyoming I was ready to let the matter go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair made the statement "without objection," and of course if there is objection the nominations are not confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I make the objection, Mr. President. It seems to me that nominations of such tremendous importance ought to lie over for a day for the consideration of the Senate. I shall vote for all of them, but I do not like the precedent set of having important nominations presented and passed on immediately, when many Senators have not even heard the names, do not know that the nominations have been made. I think we should insist on the regular order. I do not insist that the names go to the committee. I do not think they should at all, but I do think the nominations should lie over 1 day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for just one word?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say a word in reply, Mr. President. I do not suppose it will make any difference to the Senator from Ohio, but the Senator from Texas is leaving the city tonight, and he was very anxious to conclude this matter. But I suppose on objection——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, I shall be glad to take his place tomorrow and urge the confirmation of all the nominations, including that of himself, but I think as a matter of practice it ought not to be done today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the

Senate numbered 18, 35, 42, 48, 54, and 88 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 59 and 103 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming has placed in the RECORD a list of the limited amounts in which this power has been availed of during the war, when, as I understand, the Federal Reserve Board has overdrawn its account with the Federal Reserve banks, in some cases up to $1,300,000,000, and, as I understand, only for special short-term Treasury certificates, and not for any long-term bonds? Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to say that I think that was the purpose of the original law, and I offered an amendment which proposed a limitation of $2,000,000,000 and 30-day certificates. If that amendment had become a part of the law the Treasury would have operated within its terms. But the danger is not when bonds can be sold. The danger comes when bonds cannot be sold. What happened in Germany and in France when they had this power and forced on the central banks their notes when they could not sell them to the public, was simply to build up an inflation which was extremely dangerous. Therefore I think this power should not be permanent, and it ought to be more severely limited than as now provided. Yet the $5,000,000,000 limitation is an effective limitation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct, but the fact that it never reached the amount which he suggested in his original amendment of $2,000,000,000, is another striking illustration of the fact that the power we granted was not abused.

Mr. TAFT. No; the power was not abused but I wanted to point out that it has not been necessary to exercise it to the limit. What has been done is to force the Federal Reserve banks to buy $22,000,000,000 or $23,000,000,000 of Government bonds, which they hold today, which is pure and simple inflation. I mean it has created that much purchasing power with no corresponding production or anything else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is perfectly correct.

Mr. TAFT. That power, it seems to me, has been rather abused. I trust very much that the Federal Reserve banks may get rid of that tremendous proportion of Government bonds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that when Congress year after year passes bills such as the housing bill, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, which was enacted into law within the past few days, creating new demands upon the resources of the United States, we are building up the national debt. There is your inflation. That is done in the face of a national debt of $260,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. But $100,000,000 a year for housing, or $75,000,000 for hospitals must be balanced by taxes. There is no excuse for issuing bonds to cover such an expense. I may say that $100,000,000 a year for housing, which is probably the most important necessity of American life, if we ever appropriate it, seems to me to be a very minor part of $22,000,000,000, which will probably be the approximate amount of Government expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. And the problem with which we are confronted is a problem which can be settled only by the Banking and Currency Committee and by the Finance Committee. The step that was taken by the Finance Committee and by the Senate within the last few weeks to cut our tax receipts at the very time that our national debt was piling upward was the very reverse of the fight upon inflation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have been very much interested in the explanation the Senator has been making and in the various reasons he has given for the bill. But we are pressed in the matter of time. Some of us have to go to conference at half past 3, particularly the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself. We have prepared an amendment to which I understand there is no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no objection on the part of the Senator in charge of the bill. The Senator is referring, I think, to the amendment which he proposed to offer to title X of the War Powers Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I say first that title X is not a part of the bill before the Senate, because in the form in which it was pased in the War Powers Act, it was permanent legislation, and granted powers? If the Senator desires to amend that title I shall be very glad to have him explain the amendment, and I will say to the Senator that when the time comes to offer the amendment I shall be very glad to support it. I am sorry that although the Senator spoke to me about the amendment before the Committee on the Judiciary met, I utterly neglected to call it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can state the case to the Senate in a moment. Title X, which we propose to amend, relates to the naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States in the present war, and reads:

> Any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who has served or hereafter serves honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States, including its Territories and possessions, shall have been at the time of his enlistment or induction a resident thereof, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws except that (1) no declaration of intention and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; (3) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational test.

It was entirely proper to do that while we were at war, when men were risking their lives to fight for us. Then we gave them these easy terms of citizenship. But now the war is over. No one is going to be required to fight for us. I took the matter up with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, and we proposed to change the law by striking out this provision:

> The petition shall be filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the effective period of those titles of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, for which the effective period is specified in the last title thereof.

And substitute in lieu thereof:

> And (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1946.

That is, any alien who has entered our Army would have all of next year in which to perfect his citizenship.

Then there is the further provision in the amendment:

> No person shall be naturalized under the provisions of this title unless such person had served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the date of enactment of this section:

That is to say, if he enlists in our Army from now on he will not be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of the title.

Mr. President, I shall offer the amendment, so it may be acted upon, and if accepted it will be out of the way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the amendment which the Senator offers is not the printed amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The printed amendment is exactly what I am offering. I should like to offer the printed amendment and if there is no objection to it we will get it out of the way and the Senator from Georgia and I can leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment must first be acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wanted to be sure that the amendment now offered is in harmony with the bill as reported by the committee. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment must first be acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is not a committee amendment.

The Senator has asked unanimous consent to offer the amendment. I have no objection, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that he be permitted to offer an amendment? The Chair hears none. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by title X of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (relating to naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war), is amended as follows:

(1) Section 701 of such title is amended by striking out "and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the effective period of those titles of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, for which the effective period is specified in the last title thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1946."

(2) Such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 706. No person shall be naturalized under the provisions of this title unless such person has served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the date of enactment of this section."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

On page 2, line 10, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

On page 2, line 14, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. Under the terms of the proposed amendment, could an alien who had served in our armed forces be naturalized without ever having been in the United States?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what the law now provides.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thought the present law required that he be in the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The provision in the present law is as follows:

Any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who has served or hereafter serves honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States, including its Territories and possessions, shall have been at the time of his enlistment or induction a resident thereof, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws except that (1) no declaration of intention and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; (3) the petitioner shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his petition in his own handwriting, or meet any educational test; and (4) no fee shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certification of naturalization, if issued.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That means that he must at one time have been in a Territory or State.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Under the War Powers Act, any alien, even though he were a visitor here, under a visitor's visa, if he were legally admitted to the country, and if he entered the armed forces of the country, would have to meet none of the tests of naturalization.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the committee ever considered permitting a soldier in the Army of the United States to be naturalized if he has never been in the country?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that that can legally be done. This amendment would not affect such a case. We did have a special law in the case of natives of the Philippines who went into the armed forces of the Philippine National Army. They were allowed citizenship in the United States, but that privilege has since been terminated by law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that an extension of the privilege along the lines I have suggested might be unwise?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not proposing to extend it. We are proposing to terminate it. Under the general war powers bill presented by the Senator from Wyoming an alien could go into the armed forces of the United States next May and be entitled to become naturalized as an American citizen merely by virtue of the fact that he had gone into the armed forces, though he did not do so in a time of danger.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make a correction, nothing that has been proposed by the Senator from Wyoming affects this question.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not intend so to infer. I did not mean to say that the pending bill affected the situation. It does not affect it in any degree, because under the War Powers Act any person would have a right to enlist in the United States Army or Navy, up until the time when hostilities were officially terminated, either by act of Congress or by Presidential proclamation, and thereby become entitled to naturalization as an American citizen.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Provided he had once been in the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Provided he had once been legally admitted to the country. The amendment provides that that privilege shall be terminated upon the approval of the pending bill. In other words, a person could not enlist in the Army after the approval of the act and thereby be entitled to citizenship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, in the opinion of the Senator the act should not be amended so as to permit a man who went into the Army in January 1942 to become a citizen if he had never been in a Territory or State of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Personally, I would strongly oppose such a proposal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose of the amendment is to terminate the power to grant citizenship, and not to extend it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the next title is title V, which constitutes a waiver of the navigation and inspection laws. This is necessary if we are to continue to expedite the transportation of our military personnel from foreign soil to the United States. The waiver of certain inspection rules is necessary in order to make effective use of all the vessels which are available to the Army and Navy, and because of the fact that the military occupation of foreign areas is not likely to be terminated by the 30th of June, the committee was of the belief that this power should be extended.

Title VI of the War Powers Act is not affected by the bill which is now before the Senate. It involves the power to requisition. By previous legislative action Congress has extended the power of requisition to June 30, 1946, and nothing in this bill extends that power or affects it in any way, so no further extension is required.

Title VII is the title which exempts from the Hatch Act persons who are voluntary members of ration boards and other Government agencies—those who are patriotically contributing their services toward the carrying out of various activities.

Title VIII of the original War Powers Act has already expired, and there is no proposal here to continue it.

Title IX of the original act was the title which provided free postage for sailors, soldiers, and marines. That provision has been made permanent law by the passage of the act approved October 6, 1945. Therefore, this bill provides that it shall be eliminated from the War Powers Act.

Title X deals with the naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces. The only amendment is the amendment which the Senate itself has now adopted. The committee proposed none.

Title XI deals with the acceptance of conditional gifts to further the war program. The bill before us limits it exclusively to the acceptance of gifts which are in the interest of our military personnel abroad. I might say, for example, that the Government of France has made a contribution of $20,000,000, I believe, which went into the gift account in the Treasury Department, and which is being used for the purpose of supplementing the income of our soldiers in France. The GI and the officer, no matter what his rank, each receives every month 850 francs out of this fund, in addition to the pay which he receives from the Government of the United States. Eight hundred and fifty francs amounts to approximately $17. The purpose of this provision is to enable the American soldier abroad to adjust himself to the existing exchange. That, I submit, is a power which should not be made to expire on the 30th of June.

Title XII deals with the coinage of 5-cent pieces. Because of the shortage

of copper and nickel during the war, the War Powers Act authorized the coinage of 5-cent pieces composed 50 percent of silver and 50 percent of copper. That power would not expire until December 31, 1946. The bill before us makes that power terminate as of December 31 this year, so it is a cutting down and not an extension of one of the war powers.

Title XIII of the War Powers Act deals with the inspection and audit of war contractors. That is in the nature of permanent legislation. It is not affected by this bill in one way or the other.

Title XIV deals with the ultilization of vital war information. For example, it allows the Civilian Production Administration to obtain from the Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce statistics which otherwise would not be available.

The next title is Title XV, the time limit and the short title. It is to this title that the committee amendment has been reported, granting an extension to December 31, 1946, instead of June 30, 1946.

The law expires on the 30th of December this year, unless extended. We are rapidly drawing to the close of this session. We are rapidly approaching the 31st of December. I say, without any equivocation or reservation, that in my judgment the extension of the power for a full year is definitely in the public interest; that the power granted will not be abused; and that if there should be any danger of abuse the Congress could readily correct it. Precautions have been taken which will guarantee full conference with various industry committees; and, above all, there is the record which has been made by the war agencies affected by the bill. That record is such as to make it clear, in all reason, that we can depend upon the assurances which have been given by everyone in the executive branch, from the President down, that the purpose is to lift these controls as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr O'MAHONEY I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before the Senator from Wyoming takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to try to answer it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Knowing the Senator's jealous regard for the powers and prerogatives of the Congress, may I ask why he feels that it is necessary to make this extension until the 31st of December 1946, and what harm could come from a review by the Congress prior to the 30th of June 1946?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will answer the Senator in this way: I have just recited all the titles in the bill. In all of them, with the exception of title III, there is a perfectly obvious reason why the extension should be granted to the 31st of December of next year. Consider, for example, the authority to continue to receive francs for the benefit of our military personnel in France. Why should we cut that off?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, knowing the Senator's regard for the preservation of the powers of the legislative arm of the Government, if it is obvious on the face of the titles which he has recited that they should be extended, I am simply asking what harm could come from a review of the entire situation by the Congress before the 30th of June 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not think any particular harm would come, but I think the better practice would be to grant this extension so that the Civilian Production Administration, particularly, will be in a position to protect the public interest.

Let me give the Senator an example. Consider the case of tin. We all know that tin is in short supply. We know that it is not produced in the United States. We know that we must depend upon importations from Malaya, Sumatra, and Java. If the power of the Civilian Production Administration to allocate tin to all of those in the United States who wish to use the short supply of tin should be repealed as of the 30th of June 1946, it would be repealed, first, before the tin supply which we need had been made available; and in the second place it would be a mistake because it would immediately create conditions under which those in a position to hoard tin could do so to the disadvantage of the little businessmen all over the United States.

So, bearing in mind that when a particular power of this kind is dying as of a certain deadline, the inevitable reaction of those who are affected by allocations and priorities is to say, "Well, this power will die in just a few weeks, so we shall pay no attention to it." I am convinced that with respect to lumber, tin, rubber, and other items, it will be necessary in the public interest that these powers be extended for a full year, and that, therefore, because of the effect upon clothing for example, or the effect upon brick for small brickyards all over the country, a failure to extend the power would be against the interests of the small businessman, against the interests of those who are not in the position of some of the large industries which are able to obtain their own supplies.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for his statement. Will he further yield, to permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In view of the fact that very shortly there will be a recess of the Congress for the holiday season, is the Senator convinced that if the amendment is attached by the Senate it will be concurred in by the House of Representatives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I cannot say as to that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has stressed the urgency of making the extension. I think we all concede that. But I apprehend that within the next 48 hours both Houses of Congress will be doing business by unanimous consent, or else not doing business at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can only say to the Senator that the Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary who was in charge of the bill in the House of Representatives, and who made the report in the House of Representatives—the distinguished and able Representative from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]—was on the floor of the Senate this afternoon during the discussion of this bill. He talked to me during one of the interruptions, and he gave no indication that there would be any difficulty. I may say to the Senator that if any difficulty arises, I think it can be straightened out.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a moment ago I observed that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was temporarily out of the Chamber, and I asked a page to request him to return, inasmuch as I wished to make a few remarks in which I thought he would be interested. I observe that he has now returned to the Chamber, from the reception room.

The statement which I desire to make is quite brief. Three weeks ago on Sunday, I left Washington on business, after having on the preceding Friday obtained permission of the Senate to go. On the Saturday before I left Washington, I noticed a news account of a radio address which had been delivered the night before by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. In that address, according to the newspaper account, the Senator from Arkansas rather severely criticized, if not condemned, what he termed our foreign policy or our confused foreign policy or our lack of foreign policy. I do not recall the exact terms of condemnation which the Senator from Arkansas heaped upon our State Department and perhaps upon the President of the United States and perhaps upon ourselves, who have a part in formulating the foreign policy of the United States.

On the Saturday before I left Washington, I commented upon that radio address by the Senator from Arkansas. I said, in substance, as I remember now—I think I correctly recall the substance of my remarks—that I deplored the fact that the able Senator from Arkansas had seen fit to make an address of that nature over the radio, rather than on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose today to rehash ancient history, and that is ancient history now; but I wish to say that all my life I have had a fundamental principle, namely, never to give needless offense to anyone. From what I learned about what occurred on the floor of the Senate on Monday, following my departure from Washington, it occurred to me that the Senator from Arkansas had taken offense at my comment. I wish to assure him—and all Members of this body, so far as that is concerned—that it is never my purpose to offend any Senator personally or to criticize a Senator personally. I did not do so in the comment I made. I did deplore—I think I can now quote the language I used at that time—that a Senator of the United States would criticize and condemn his own Government's policy in a manner of as grave concern as is the foreign policy of this Nation, the relations of our Nation with the other nations of the world, in a place where his statement could not be challenged, could not be debated, and could not be questioned.

That comment by me was not at all a personal criticism of the Senator from Arkansas. Probably the thought never had occurred to him. Many of us from time to time go out over the country and speak in behalf of principles and matters which we advocate, and in doing so we use the radio, which is natural and proper. But, Mr. President, I repeat that there is nothing more grave, there is nothing more serious, than our relations with the other nations of the world. When Senators of the United States speak on this subject, their voice should be carried all around the world. The subject is one which should not be commented upon lightly. I still insist that Senators might well bring their criticisms here to the floor of the Senate, where there exists the greatest forum in all the world for public speech and debate, and where Senators may discuss any subject. I am now speaking of general policies, and not with respect particularly to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I have about concluded the statement which I wanted to make on this, the first day of my return to the Senate after an absence of some time. I assure the Senator from Arkansas that what I have said was intended in no way as a personal reflection upon him. He and I have seen eye to eye on almost all questions, and I hope that we shall continue to do so. I have great confidence in him, and I respect him for his ability and his patriotism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from New Mexico to the effect that nothing was intended in a personal way in his criticism of my having made a speech over the radio. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from New Mexico did not disagree with the sentiments which were expressed in my speech, but only with regard to the place at which the speech was delivered. I had expected, of course, that the Senator would challenge some of my opinions with reference to the confusion which currently exists in connection with our foreign relations. Since the speech was made I have not observed any substantial change in our foreign policy. After the Senator has had time to contemplate the present trend in our foreign policy I hope that he will enlighten me, as well as other Members of the Senate, by showing me wherein my statements were erroneous.

MAJ. GEN. LEONARD F. WING

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to record the sad fact that a great friend and a very distinguished citizen, one of our foremost generals of the war, passed away this morning at the untimely age of 52 years after having fought all through the Pacific campaign. He was Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Wing. His death is of public interest not only because of his service but also because of the unique character of the status which he held in the Army. He was the first National Guard officer to attain the rank of major general.

General Wing entered the war in February 1941 with the Forty-third Division, which was then a National Guard outfit. His unit was preserved by replacements throughout the war. It participated in the Battles of Guadalcanal, the North Solomons, New Guinea, and Luzon. He entered Japan with General MacArthur.

This great man performed a service for humanity and made the supreme sacrifice, although his death did not occur until he had reached his home at Rutland, Vt., where he has left a widow and three children. His death was a consequence of his service for humanity.

General Wing's merit was evidenced by four decorations, namely, the Distinguished Service Medal as Forty-third Division commander, Legion of Merit for service as assistant division commander, Silver Star for gallantry in action on July 11, 1943, and the Bronze Star Medal with one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Fortunately, I have before me an editorial from the Montpelier Evening Argus of, I believe, January 29, 1945, which affords some understanding of the kind of service in which General Wing's unit was engaged. The editorial is entitled "Vermonters battling at Luzon." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONTERS BATTLING AT LUZON

Battle-tested Vermonters, hailing from Montpelier and from communities the length and breadth of the State and who have had their baptism by fire at Guadalcanal, New Britain, and New Guinea, are now serving as an element of the First Corps and carrying out the heaviest burden of the fighting at Luzon. It is something of irony and pride that the famed Vermont Forty-third Division, built upon the foundation of the peacetime National Guard, should be weaving an epic of glorious history through some of the fiercest of the Pacific campaigns against the Japs. Some of the members of the Forty-third have already returned to their Vermont homes, with honorable medical discharges and with the Pacific campaign still a living memory to them. Some of them have made the supreme sacrifice; they will never return. Those of their comrades remaining in the Forty-third are continuing their roles in the great Pacific story, determined to fight it out to the last chapter with the triumphant climax of the Japs defeated forever as a war power.

The Luzon saga marks the second amphibious campaign for the Forty-third, which captured the New Georgia group of the Solomon Islands in the summer of 1943. After this nerve-shattering 83-day jungle campaign, the division, necessarily reoutfitted, returned to a much-needed rest area and was sent to New Zealand for some time to recoup its vigor. The Forty-third afterwards went to New Guinea, where it played a big part in helping hold the line against Japanese who had been trapped by MacArthur's leapfrog landing along the rugged coast. On this particular assignment relatively little fighting had to be done, but in the current Luzon battle the Forty-third have drawn what is believed to be the stiffest of Japanese opposition.

Gen. Leonard F. Wing, of Rutland, is the commander of this division, which is made up largely of troops from Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut, and it is generally assumed that he is in active command now. Recently the general was ill and was hospitalized for a time.

The campaign for control of the Philippines, in regard to which MacArthur's historic words "I will return" were said, will undoubtedly prove one of the decisive battles of the Pacific, and the Vermont troops have the confidence of the entire Green Mountain State that they will render as good an account of themselves in this battle as they have in preceding ones.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, all who know of the great service rendered and the sacrifice made for humanity by Gen. Leonard F. Wing sympathize deeply with his family in their great bereavement.

ADMINISTRATION AND LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for several days I have attempted to call a bill which is noncontroversial. I have consulted with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I do not think that there will be any controversy with regard to the bill. Inasmuch as it will be difficult to develop a quorum, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 704 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment to House bill 4780.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that there is not a quorum present in the Chamber. We have a calendar which is loaded down with bills. I know of several bills on the calendar which have been reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. If each Senator who is interested in a bill should now, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, rise and follow the example of the Senator from Arkansas by asking unanimous consent to set aside the unfinished business and to proceed to the consideration of his particular measure, obviously we would get nowhere. The most important bill before the Senate now is the unfinished business of the Senate. I happen to know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desires to speak with reference to it. Under the unanimous-consent rule, I am forced to object to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from Wyoming did not object to laying aside consideration of the pending bill in order to consider other bills. I agree with the Senator that the procedure in the Senate has been very difficult. I may add, for the benefit of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], that the presence of so few Senators in the Chamber during the past few weeks while he was absent, is the best example I can cite of the inadvisability of making speeches on the floor of the Senate.

I wonder if the Senator can recall any time during the past 10 months when a sustained debate of any significance was held with the exception of the one which was held in connection with the United Nations Charter when for a few days

there was a sort of desultory discussion. With that exception, I do not recall any sustained debate in the Senate with regard to foreign relations, and I do not recall that the Senator from New Mexico, with the exception of a few statements which he made, addressed the Senate at any length. I do not recall any sustained debate having taken place in which there was a real analysis of any of the major fundamental issues then pending before this country.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that what he has just said is most unfortunately true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, it is the last place where it is possible to get a development of such ideas. That is one reason why there is no inclination to make a speech on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator will agree that instead of being the last place, the Senate of the United States should be the first place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It should be, I agree, but it is the same way with the little bill to which the Senator from Wyoming objects. For 3 or 4 days I have been told, "Yes; tomorrow the calendar will be called." This is a little bill to which there is no objection, so far as I know, from any Member on either side of the Senate, and I have consulted several on the other side. The subject matter with which it deals is rapidly being dissipated. I think about 60,000 acres are being disposed of. The purpose of the bill is to enable returning soldiers, about whom we talk so much, to purchase farms.

Since I introduced the bill last spring I suppose at least half the land which it was intended to cover has already been disposed of, and if we continue a few more months, there will be absolutely nothing worth while left. It will be in a position similar to that of the surplus property from the war. I have yet to find one soldier who has found a jeep, or truck, or anything else. Yet the procedure in the Senate continues to go the way which in effect blocks most of the bills which are submitted for consideration.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. When order of business 790, Senate bill 704, came up in regular order at the last call of the calendar I interposed an objection, because I did not know how the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry felt about the bill. I have consulted the minority members of the committee. They have heard the bill discussed in committee, and are agreeable to its passage. I therefore join with the Senator from Arkansas in asking that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that this bill may be considered and passed. I am sure it will not take more than 5 minutes to dispose of it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly should object to setting aside the unfinished business. I think the worst procedure I have ever seen in the Senate has been that of the last 3 weeks, during which a number of times we have laid aside one bill before we finished with it, and proceeded to another.

Mr FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I certainly will object. Incidentally, Mr. President, I understand the calendar will be called tomorrow, and there is no hurry about this particular bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have understood all week that the calendar was to be called the next day.

Mr. TAFT. The pending bill amending the Second War Powers Act is the only bill which must be passed at this time. So far as I can see, its consideration can be finished in 10 minutes, and I see no reason why we should not proceed with the regular order.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ORDER DISCONTINUING THE DRAFTING OF FATHERS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr TAFT. For what purpose?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to make an announcement to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have just been advised that the Selective Service System has issued an order stopping the drafting of all fathers. The order was issued this afternoon. I wish to say that it is very gratifying to me to know that this step has been taken. It should have been taken a long time ago, but now that it has been done, that much of the purpose of the joint resolution I introduced has been accomplished. I hope that they will go further immediately and look after the fathers who are now in the service.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only controversial matter in connection with the renewal of the Second War Powers Act relates to the committee amendment, which is now before the Senate.

The House considered this whole matter much more thoroughly than did the Senate. The committee held hearings, but only the House hearings have been printed. I suppose there were some hearings in the Senate committee; I do not know. They have not been printed, in any event.

After long and serious consideration the House decided that the extension should be made for 6 months, and not for a year. The House bill, as it came to the Senate, provided for an extension for 6 months. The Senate committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, proposes to extend the War Powers Act for another 6 months. I think there are many reasons why there should be no such further extension.

The most important provision of the bill is that dealing with priorities, giving the President unprecedented power over the industries of the United States. The priorities powers, together with the price-control powers, practically give the Government the power to dictate the daily action of every industry in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago that the hearings before the Senate committee had not been printed. They have been printed.

Mr. TAFT. They have been printed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. They were less extensive than the House hearings, and they did not represent the careful consideration which the House has given to the matter.

The priority powers cover every kind of material and every kind of transportation, and affect the daily life of every individual and the daily transactions of every business. I think all of us are agreed that these powers should be abandoned just as fast as they can be abandoned. I do not think the Congress would properly perform its obligation by extending for a full year the powers of the President, without any limitation, leaving him with all the powers he has had during the entire war, not attempting to limit him to materials such as rubber, tin, and a few other things which we know are scarce, but giving him indefinite power to regulate all industry throughout the United States.

I cannot see any possible harm from reconsidering this matter next May. Today things are in a state of rapid flux, they change overnight, they change in the course of a month. Where we had a surplus, we find a deficiency, and where we had a deficiency, we find a surplus. I cannot see any harm in reviewing the necessity for these extensive powers next May.

Mr. President, that is particularly true when we realize that we must consider then the power of price control. It seems to me the two powers tie in together. It seems to me should decide at that time what commodities are scarce, what powers should be continued, and what powers should not be continued.

There is one other reason why I think December 31 next year is a poor date for this power to expire. In some respects it may be necessary to continue the powers even beyond that time. We are to have a recess next summer, we hope, over the 1946 election. It would be most unfortunate if we had to be called back after the election merely because this particular act was about to expire, and the President found some necessity for continuing it beyond the expiration date fixed.

I believe we should very definitely determine before the first of next July what we are going to do at that time for the next year. I think it is going to be necessary to continue then some of the price controls and some of the priority controls, but I think the powers should be confined at that time to a limited number of articles which are scarce, and

that otherwise industry should be entirely relieved from the controls.

The statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is that the Administration says, "Well we are abandoning these controls, and we are going to continue to abandon them." I think they did abandon them rather rapidly, particularly those relating to the manufacture of war materials, but from now on I believe we will find they are going to be steadily restored. People will want a priority on particular services, as the veterans now want a priority on housing materials. I think they should have such a priority. But we are going to have new peacetime demands to which it will be perfectly possible to apply these war powers. Before we get through we shall have a demand for the permanent continuation of many of the powers.

Mr. President, I believe very strongly we will accomplish every purpose sought if we follow the House, if we extend the act for 6 months only, and if at the end of that time we consider selective continuation of priority controls and price controls.

I therefore hope the committee amendment will be rejected, and that the House provision will be restored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bilbo	Knowland	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Tydings
Gossett	Mead	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Wagner
Gurney	Mitchell	Walsh
Hart	Moore	Wheeler
Hatch	Murdock	Wherry
Hayden	O'Daniel	White
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Pepper	Willis
Hoey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Huffman	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Russell	
Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. A vote "yea" is a vote in favor of the committee amendment extending the time 12 months. A vote "nay" is a vote in favor of the 6 months' extension provided in the House bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that a vote "nay" is a vote against an extension of 1 year. A vote "yea" is a vote for extension of 1 year.

Mr. TAFT. A vote "nay" is a vote against the extension for 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, for which I ask immediate consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if this is the conference report on the appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator whether the amendment which the committee recommended with respect to the protection of the rights of the Indians was agreed to in the report?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was agreed to by the House, and it had been agreed to by the Senate conferees. We must first adopt the conference report. The committee has instructed me to move two amendments, one of which is to strike out "one thousand eight hundred and thirty" where it occurs twice. The motions will be made after the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator to say that the Senate committee amendment protecting the rights of the three Affiliated Tribes remains in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. It remains in the bill.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio desire to ask a question?

Mr. TAFT. I had hoped that this would not be a controversial matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it will be.

Mr. President, I submit the conference report.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 38, 39, 39½, 40, 51, 53, 55, 67, 68, 69, 75, 89, and 101.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 30, 33, 34, 43, 44, 49, 52, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 70, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, and 127 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the sum "$750,000,000", strike out the proviso down to the period in line 17; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$730,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 4 of said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That none of the funds available under this head for administrative expenses shall be used in paying the salary of any person engaged in making or processing loans in excess of $500,000 to any State, any subdivision thereof, any municipality therein, or any public authority, for construction purposes, unless in pursuance of a specific authorization, except, however, that this provision shall not apply to any application or loan approved or made prior to December 15, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert '$1,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$212,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 5 of said amendment strike out the sum "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000."

In line 7 of said amendment strike out the sum "$101,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$93,000."

In line 9 of said amendment strike out the sum "$12,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: *"Provided*, That such additional amount of $90,000 shall not become available for obligation until a contract shall have been concluded with the lessor allowing Federal occupancy for a period of not less than eighteen months with the rights to extend the period of occupancy an additional period of eighteen months or less, the rental charge for any period of occupancy not to exceed the rate heretofore agreed upon; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$601,540" and insert in lieu thereof $320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,766,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$132,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,216,210"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$266,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,748,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "$164,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and the immediately succeeding additional appropriation for the construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities, shall be merged with the existing appropriation for the construction of such facilities and remain available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$187,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,242,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,640,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,780,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$111,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 35, 42, 48, 54, 59, 88, and 103.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to pursue a little further the question with respect to the Indian amendment. I understand from the clerk of the committee that the amendment is in disagreement.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The amendment is in disagreement, but the language concerning the Indians is not in disagreement, except as the whole amendment is in disagreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, the disagreement affects only the height of the dam.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is purely a technical disagreement, so far as the Indian amendment is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4805, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 19, 1945.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 35, 42, 48, 54, and 88 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount of $15,000,000 named in said amendment insert "$7,500,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: *"Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir at a higher maximum pool elevation than 1,830 feet, or for constructing dikes or levees which would be required by a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam, unless an operation at a higher level should be authorized hereafter by law; *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I now move that the Senate agree to the amendment of

the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the language "one thousand eight hundred and thirty" wherever it appears in said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one thousand eight hundred and fifty."

A majority of the committee has instructed me to make this motion, and I ask that the motion be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, before the motion is put I should like to make a statement. I believe that North Dakota will be eternally grateful for the action of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations supporting the 1,850-foot Garrison Dam. About 25 years ago the State of North Dakota realized the necessity of having planned water development. Devils Lake, one of the cities now suffering, had a large lake. In fact, there was navigation by steamboats on the lakes at that time. At the present time there are only inches of water in the lake. It is a stinking lake close to the city of Devils Lake. The only water supply of the city is now by means of shallow wells. Close by is another city of about 2,000 population—Fessenden—which has no water supply at all, and must haul its water.

North Dakota also has realized the necessity of having water for irrigation and for power development. It has realized the necessity of helping other States in flood control.

The bill as passed by the Senate would provide an 1,850-foot dam. The extra 20 feet of height would provide approximately 6,000,000 extra acre-feet of water, or about one-third more than the 1,830-foot height. In my opinion and in the opinion of the people of North Dakota it is the only means by which North Dakota can be assured of needed irrigation and power development. In the whole State of North Dakota at the present time we have only about 90,000 kilowatts capacity for generating electricity. If we are to carry on our REA program to provide electricity for all the farms in North Dakota we must have this additional water and power development.

Continuing with the history of this program, about 12 years ago North Dakota established a State water commission, and since that time has appropriated approximately one and a half million dollars in support of this program or approximately $3 for every man, woman and child. This commission is unanimously agreed on the program.

In the development of this program for North Dakota we have had considerable difficulty. The Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have always disagreed as to programs. In order to develop a unified program and settle these differences, a conference was held in Omaha, Nebr., on August 22. At that conference there were representatives of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, and the governors of all the 10 States affected. Out of that meeting came a unanimous agreement for an 1,850-foot dam. At that meeting were four representatives from the community of Williston. Two of those gentlemen agreed at that time to support an 1,850-foot dam. Since then, at the instance of a wealthy rancher—banker who would be injured—and I cannot blame him—the city of Williston has been influenced to make presentations against the dam.

In my opinion, if the dam were finally built at 1,830 feet, not only would the State of North Dakota suffer in irrigation and power development, but the development of the entire valley would suffer. It would be impossible to develop the Missouri River under the present system of the four agencies.

I may also state that I have received a telegram from one of the prominent citizens of Williston, whose name I do not wish to divulge. The telegram reads as follows:

I spent hours pleading with city commission and chamber of commerce attempting to convince them that they should support Governor Aandahl's 1,850-foot dam with Army engineers assurance of adequate protection, but the d—— fools continue to believe we have intelligent Senators and Congressmen who can be trusted with determining the height of the Garrison pool after the Army has done its experimenting.

Certainly after the Army engineers have demonstrated their ability in this war North Dakota ought to have confidence in them. The Army engineers have assured the city of Williston that they will provide every protection to the city and that it will not be injured in any way. The State of North Dakota has faith in the program of the Army engineers for the construction of this great earthen dam. If any danger were involved, cities below the dam, including Bismarck and Mandan, with three times the population of Devils Lake, would be in jeopardy if the dam were to go out. If such a thing should happen those cities would be ruined; but I believe that we should have confidence in the Army engineers.

I have received a telegram from the Greater North Dakota Association, which reads as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *December 18, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:

Sending following telegram to Congressman CANNON today and urge your cooperation. The Greater North Dakota Association, a State-wide chamber of commerce, assures you vast majority in State favor 1,850-foot water level Garrison Dam according to plans of Army engineers and approved by State water conservation commission as No. 1 project and key to State's water-development plans for irrigation, power, flood control, municipal water supplies. This is plan also approved by interagency committee and all Federal agencies at Omaha August 22. Plan includes protection city of Williston and irrigation projects there through dikes, and displaced Indians and farmers will be protected, so we urge your support for 1,850-foot water level for greatest benefit to greatest number

GREATER NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION,
B. E. GROOM, *Secretary.*

Mr. President, if the Congress of the United States is to enter into this controversy as an engineering agency, I suggest that the Congress at least send out a committee to investigate this problem in North Dakota. Surely North Dakota would not be so selfish as to interfere with other interests involved in the development of the Missouri River Valley.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks many telegrams from practically every city in North Dakota, from chambers of commerce, farm organizations, and others.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *December 8, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator:

West Fargo must have water to expand Nation's fifteenth livestock market. City of Fargo future growth dependent upon additional water supply. Feel imperative to future welfare of State that water level of Garrison Dam be maintained at 1,850-foot level according to plans of Army engineers.

F. A. IRISH.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 7, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Very much favor high dam at Garrison.

LAKE ELECTRIC CO.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 7, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Capitol Building:

Believe you would be representing the best interest of North Dakota by supporting high Garrison Dam.

RAY A. YOUNG.

COOPERSTOWN, N. DAK., *December 7, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Cooperstown City Council strongly urges effort reinstating 1,850 as height of Garrison Dam and effort on your part to expedite construction according to plan of Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation in accordance with recommendations of our own State water commission.

O. F. COOPERUD,
City Auditor.

FARGO, N. DAK., *December 8, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Army engineers worked for years with national experts on plans for the Garrison Dam in order to make it give greatest service to entire State. Now small group of untechnical men ask Congress to lower water level in a manner which would lose million acres irrigation, destroy possibility of diversion for water needed for municipalities. Urge you work to restore water level to 1,850 feet.

CLARKE BASSETT.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Garrison Dam can well be the making of North Dakota if Congress follows through on plans of Army engineers for an 1,850-foot level. We urge you to do everything in your power to accomplish this end.

B. O. REFVEM.

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Realizing that we must have the Garrison Dam at the 1,850-foot level to develop our water reserves in North Dakota, we urge your support for this height.

NEW ROCKFORD KIWANIS CLUB.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
We believe that it is most beneficial to North Dakota and we strongly urge your support to reinstate the 1,850-foot level for the Garrison Dam.

DAVIS CHEVROLET CO.,
F. M. DAVIS,
D. T. DAVIS,
W. C. DAVIS.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Building:
We feel that the major portions of North Dakota are better served from all standpoints by the 1,850-foot level of the Garrison Dam and are grieved by the 1,830-foot limitation now present in the approprations bill.

FINNEYS DRUG,
J. W. JOHNSON.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
I am very much interested in the height of the proposed Garrison Dam and will appreciate using your influence toward the 1,850-foot level. This level will be of the greatest benefit to the greatest number of dairy and livestock farmers in the State. Thanks.

CARL NELSON.

ROLLA, N. DAK., *December 11, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:
Board of directors of Rolla Commercial Club urges you to support 1,850 level Garrison Dam, Missouri River development.

ROLLA COMMERCIAL CLUB.

FARGO, N. DAK., *December 8, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:
Urge that you endeavor to effect the elimination of the 1,830 restriction on the Garrison Dam appropriation. This amendment nullifies fully 50 percent of the effectiveness of the Garrison Reservoir and hazards the diversion of Fort Peck water for the Missouri-Souris program, Devils Lake, and all of the eastern part of the State. We are interested to the extent that the water resources of the State shall benefit all of the people of the State.

FRED C. HAGEN,
Commissioner of Water Works and Sewage.

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK., *December 8, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
The city commission in regular meeting assembled this 7th day of December 1945, unanimously adopted the following resolution and directed the auditor to transmit copies of the same to our two Congressmen and our two Senators:

"Whereas the needs of North Dakota for power and irrigation cannot be adequately developed with a Garrison Dam less than 1,850 feet: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the New Rockford City Commission does hereby go on record protesting the now proposed 1,830-foot level."

By order of the city commission.

L. E. LESKE,
City Auditor, New Rockford, N. Dak.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 3, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge the deletion in the Senate of amendment restricting height of dam, to legislation pertaining to funds allocated for start of Garrison construction. This amendment nullifies 50 percent of effectiveness of Garrison Reservoir. Eliminates possibility of diversion and irrigation from Garrison. Makes for loss of power head to ineffective amount. Reduces Garrison to silt pool. Jeopardizes effectiveness of any development of Missouri source program. Cannot understand apathy displayed by ROBERTSON and LEMKE in permitting this to go through without a fight. Plays directly into hands of South Dakota who have advocated large development at Oahe site.

Lieutenant ORLANDY.

MANDAN, N. DAK., *December 7, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
The Garrison Dam represents a project which affects the entire State of North Dakota and is extremely important to the State. The height of the dam was set at a conference of the interagency committee, representing 10 States and 4 Federal agencies, and decision made after careful consideration of all angles. We do not believe that Congress should be influenced by the protests of an individual community. The Representatives of our State should work with the State water commission, which represents the entire State, in restoring the height of the dam to the original figure. We trust that you will do everything in your power to accomplish this.

MANDAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Re proposed change in height of Garrison Dam. This community 100 percent in favor of State water commission and Army engineer plan for 1,850 maximum pool level. We feel that reduction of pool level to 1,830 would entirely nullify benefits which community and surrounding territory would otherwise receive.

Urge your utmost effort to restore 1,850-foot level when measure for preliminary funds is brought to your attention.

CARRINGTON KIWANIS CLUB,
C. W. YODER, *President.*
FRANK JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:
Re proposed change in height of Garrison Dam. This community 100 percent in favor of State water commission and Army engineers plan for 1,850 maximum pool level.

We feel that reduction of pool level to 1,830 would entirely nullify benefits which this community and surrounding territory would otherwise receive.

Urge your utmost effort to restore 1,850-foot level when measure for preliminary funds is brought to your attention.

DON L. TRACY, *Mayor.*

NASH, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:
The rural-electrification program will be severely handicapped in North Dakota if the amendment by the House of Representatives on the height of Garrison Dam is permitted to be enacted into law. If North Dakota farms are to be electrified area coverage it is most essential that we have an abundance of cheap power available. The only way we can obtain such cheap power is through construction of the Garrison Dam as originally outlined by North Dakota Water Commission. Please lend every assistance toward having height of dam restored to original height.

NORTH DAKOTA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
P. J. DONNELLY, *President.*

CARRINGTON, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:
Re proposed change in height of Garrison Dam. This community 100 percent in favor of State water commission and Army engineer plan for 1,850 maximum pool level.

We feel that reduction of pool level to 1,830 would entirely nullify benefits which this community and surrounding territory would otherwise receive.

Urge your utmost effort to restore 1,850-foot level when measure for preliminary funds is brought to your attention.

JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
A. HEINITZ, *President.*

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Urge you support Garrison Dam at 1,850-foot level. Unless this height is obtained water for 75 percent of people in North Dakota will not be available. Present House bill would reduce power development, but more serious, there would be no water to divert into James and Cheyenne Rivers. Urge you to do all in your power to secure high Garrison Dam which would benefit more than 75 percent of people in North Dakota.

JOHN F. OLSON,
Mayor, City of Jamestown.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
The Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We believe 1,850-foot Garrison Dam level most beneficial all concerned.

LIGNITE COMBUSTION ENGINEERING CORP.,
C. C. LARSON, *President.*

BISMARCK, N. DAK.
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator:
Dam must be original height for any real benefit to North Dakota.

CLEM CASEY.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 7, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:
Think engineers' plan for 1,850-foot Garrison Dam should not be stymied.

W. T. WEST.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We urge deletion of amendment restricting height of dam which would eliminate possibilities of diversion and irrigation from Garrison.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Regarding Garrison Dam: Please give full consideration. The 1,850-foot level is necessary to benefit central and eastern North Dakota.

F. A. LAHR.

ST. JOHN, N. DAK., *December 10, 1945.*
Senator YOUNG:

Six hundred members urge you to support original bill for Garrison Dam at 1,850-foot level.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
JOHN A. VLASIN,
Chapter President.
C. M. BRYANT,
National Vice President.
DANA WRIGHT,
National Director.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 7, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Must these States suffer irreparable loss to save a few townships? Keep engineers' original height.

F. T. CUTHBERT.
W. N. NORTZ.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We want the 1,850-foot Garrison Dam. At that height the increase in power will increase our irrigation acreage and benefit more people in North Dakota. The success or failure of the North Dakota project depends on cheap power rates.

UNIVERSAL MOTOR CO.
EARLE F. TUCKER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

A 1,850-foot dam absolutely essential for best interests entire State because of power development and adequate storage for irrigation. Hope you give it your full support.

E. D. SALTZMAN.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe 1,850-foot Garrison Dam level most beneficial all concerned.

LIGNITE COMBUSTION ENGINEERING CORP.,
C. C. LARSEN, *President.*

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I am very much concerned about the Garrison Dam and I am asking you to give your support for the 1,850-foot project.

H. J. DUEMELAND.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator M. R. YOUNG:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

S. I. MONTEITH.

CANDO, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG:

Use every effort to stop the restriction on the heights of the dam for the Missouri River diversion legislation.

CANDO CITY COUNCIL,
J. M. TORSON, *Mayor.*

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

From information I have been able to gather it appears to me that it would be detrimental to the best interests of the State of North Dakota to have the congressional Snyder amendment to the Garrison legislation approved by the United States Senate. I would therefore urge you to work for the deletion of such amendment when it comes before the Senate.

A. W. AYLMER, *Lawyer.*

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you check carefully amendment restricting height of dam which would seriously delay, if not ruin North Dakotas chance for irrigation and diversion from Missouri.

F. L. DURAND.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urge deletion of Snyder amendment to Garrison construction legislation feel it will be a definite detriment to majority State of North Dakota.

R. M. STOUDT.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

For the good of North Dakota please use your influence to have amendment deleted restricting height of Garrison Dam.

R. E. MCKENZIE.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

GREG LEDUC.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

A. E. GOLDAMMER.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator M. R. YOUNG:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

Dr. O. J. EINERSON.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

OLE SUNDEEN.

LAKOTA, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator M. R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

Lowering of Garrison Dam makes it useless in our territory.

ABE THAL.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Restating flood-control appropriation in the House bill a good job, but the amendment reducing the dam level causing plenty of adverse criticism. Urge you to have the level restored to 1,850 feet so that the full possibilities of this construction will be available to the largest part of the State.

V. L. GILBREATH,
Secretary Bismarck Association Commerce.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Fine job to get the appropriation Garrison Dam. However would urge your further support reestablishing the 1,850-foot level believing most beneficial to the State of North Dakota.

R. A. TRACY.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I believe in the 1,850-foot dam at Garrison to be most beneficial to North Dakota, therefore urge your support and influence to have the 1,850-foot level reenacted in the bill.

ARTHUR SANDIN.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your efforts to get dam restored to 1,850-foot level.

A. C. VAN WYK.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly solicit your support of the 1,850-foot Garrison Dam. We feel that the greatest benefit will be derived by the States as a whole with an 1,850-foot dam.

ANDERSON HARDWARE CO.
PAUL G. BREWER.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 6, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

It seems to us that the great increase in potential power output and irrigable area would make the 1,850-foot dam at Garrison far outweigh the inconvenience or loss to the relatively small minority who object. We sincerely hope that you will hear both sides of the story on this issue.

JOHN W. LARSCN.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

It appears our Members of the House forgot there was any place in North Dakota except Williston when it came to action on the Garrison Dam. Please don't make the same mistake when it comes before the Senate. North Dakota needs the 1,850-foot dam.

G. E. MINER.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Your support of the 1,850-foot dam is needed by 95 percent of the people of North Dakota. Please give the high dam your support.

MILTON G. KELLY.

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors unanimously endorse resolution of State water conservation commission dated November 30. House action limiting Garrison Dam level to 1,830 feet considered extremely regrettable. Urge you do all in your power to delete limitation amendment when bill reaches Senate.

DEVILS LAKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
D. J. DONAHUE, *Secretary.*

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you will make every effort to delete amendment limiting Garrison Dam height from deficiency appropriation bill. Need 1,850-foot level to insure success of entire State water program. Limiting height sabotages 25 years of effort for diversion.

DEVILS LAKE DAILY JOURNAL,
M. R. GRAHAM, *Publisher.*

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge that State water commission recommendation of 1,850-foot level Garrison Dam be followed.
RAMSEY COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
GEORGE MIKKELSON, *President.*

DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK., *December 4, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG:
Correct Mistake of LEMKE and ROBERTSON. Must have 1,850-foot level Garrison Dam to raise level necessary in second largest inland storage basin in United States to supply water for needs of eastern part State.
W. E. HOCKING, *Mayor.*

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *December 5, 1945.*
Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator:
Nice job getting the appropriation Garrison Dam. However, we are for the 1,850-foot dam and urge your support to eliminate the level amendment tacked on in the House of Representatives.
A. E. BRINK,
T. O. QUANRUD.

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *December 3, 1945.*
Senator MILTON YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
A vote of the dam level of 1,830 feet is a vote against 85 percent of the people in the State of North Dakota. Use your head.
BOB EDDY.

CANDO, N. DAK., *December 17, 1945.*
Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:
We favor 1,850-foot level for Garrison Dam.
CANDO COMMERCIAL CLUB.

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks numerous editorials from newspapers in North Dakota condemning the action of our Members in the House.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Foster County Independent of December 13, 1945]

RESTORATION OF 1,850-FOOT LEVEL ON GARRISON DAM IS ADVOCATED

Controversy has developed which may delay start of construction of the Garrison Dam and retard the irrigation program which Army and reclamation engineers have outlined.

Approval in Washington of the Garrison Dam at an 1,830-foot level was announced last week and set off the fireworks. The State water commission and Army and reclamation engineers had set the maximum height of the dam at 1,850 feet, to permit irrigation of a greater part of the State of North Dakota. Through the efforts of a group of Williston men, the height of the dam was approved at 1,830 feet.

The argument for the 1,850-foot level was brought out recently by Kenneth W. Simons, Bismarck, vice chairman of the State water conservation commission. "Surveys now under way show that 800,000 acres of land can be irrigated from Garrison if the plan of the Army engineers and the interagency commission is carried out," he declared.

Much of North Dakota will be handicapped in its development if the height of the Garrison Dam is dropped from 1,850 to 1,830 feet, Simons asserted.

He said the action of Congress in reducinging the height of the dam throws the entire State water program out of kilter and will greatly reduce the value of the structure to the people of central and eastern North Dakota.

IRRIGATION POSSIBILITIES

The total areas susceptible to irrigation from Garrison doubtless will run above a million acres, but for every foot the reservoir level is dropped a sharp curtailment must be made in the potential irrigated acreage. Reasons for this are many, Simons said, but one of the simplest is that it costs money to pump water and every foot of additional lift makes some land uneconomical to irrigate while it would be considered satisfactory if the levels were lower.

Pointing out that the taxpayers of the State have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in the development of the State water plan, Simons said it would be a tragic error if it were to be upset now because of ill-considered action in Congress.

Simons said the proper height of the dam was determined after careful study by both Army engineers and those representing the State and that it is unwise for Congress to change their findings without giving proper consideration to all the factors. He said, "It is a great deal like having a committee of doctors decide on the course of treatment for a patient after careful study of his case and then have someone who knows nothing about it, rush in and cut off the patient's leg."

Last week the Kiwanis Club of Carrington wired Senator WILLIAM LANGER asking his support in getting the 1,850-foot level restored.

[From the McClusky Gazette of December 13, 1945]

LOW-LEVEL DAM DECLARED THREAT TO NORTH DAKOTA WATER PLAN

North Dakota's entire water conservation program is endangered by an amendment inserted into the flood-control bill as it passed the lower House of Congress November 30, is the statement of the State Water Conservation Commission.

The amendment fixed the height of the proposed Garrison Dam at 1,830 feet above sea level despite the fact that the Interagency Basin Committee, representing every Federal agency in the Missouri Basin, has approved an 1,850-foot plan and that the water commission also had endorsed on behalf of the State of North Dakota.

Kenneth W. Simons, Bismarck, vice chairman of the North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, represented Gov. Fred G. Aandahl at a Washington Senate subcommittee hearing Friday afternoon when the height of the proposed Garrison Dam was under consideration. Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman, Omaha Army district engineer, also attended the meeting at the request of the Governor to present detailed engineering facts.

In a formal resolution made public by Governor Aandahl, commission chairman, the State body said the lower level would "greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir, and that it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir, which is necessary for the successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project."

"Surveys now underway show that 800,000 acres of land can be irrigated from Garrison (in the central part of the State), if the plan of the Army engineers and the interagency commission is carried out," Mr. Simons said in an address before a Bismarck service club.

Much of North Dakota will be handicapped in its development if the height of the Garrison Dam is dropped from 1,850 to 1,830 feet, Simons asserted.

He said the action of Congress in reducing the height of the dam throws the entire State water program out of kilter and will greatly reduce the value of the structure to the people of central and eastern North Dakota.

The total acres susceptible to irrigation from Garrison doubtless will run above a million acres, but for every foot the reservoir level is dropped a sharp curtailment must be made in the potential irrigated acreage. Reasons for this are many, Simons said, but one of the simplest is that it costs money to pump water and every foot of additional lift makes some land uneconomical to irrigate, while it would be considered satisfactory if the levels were lower.

Pointing out that the taxpayers of the State have spent "hundreds of thousands of dollars" in the development of the State water plan, Simons said it would be a tragic error if it were upset now because of ill-considered action in Congress.

The proper height of the dam was determined after careful study by both Army engineers and those representing the State, Simons said, and added that it is unwise for Congress to change their findings without giving proper consideration to all the factors. He said "it is a great deal like having a committee of doctors decide on the course of treatment for a patient after careful study of his case and then have someone who knows nothing about it rush in and cut off the patient's leg."

[From the Renville County Farmer of December 13, 1945]

STATE'S WATER PLAN THREATENED BY LOW-LEVEL GARRISON DAM—WILLISTON POLITICIANS RESORT TO TRICKERY, THOMPSON CLAIMS

North Dakota's entire water conservation program is endangered by an amendment inserted into the flood-control bill as it passed the lower House of Congress November 30, is the statement of the State Water Conservation Commission.

The amendment fixed the maximum height of the proposed Garrison Dam at 1,830 feet above sea level despite the fact that the interagency basin committee, representing every Federal agency in the Missouri Basin, has approved an 1,850-foot plan and that the water commission also had endorsed on behalf of the State of North Dakota.

In a formal resolution made public by Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, commission chairman, the State body said the lower level would "greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control, and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir, and that it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir, which is necessary for the successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project."

It is to the latter project that the State commission looks for the development of more than 1,000,000 acres of irrigation in the Minot area.

The resolution asserts that "the rights and the protection of property of the people in the Williston area were fully considered and amply provided for" when the level was fixed at 1,850 feet. The attitude of the water commission was set forth in the following statement:

"In any development program of this kind, we must expect some opposition from persons who, even fully paid for their property, do not like to move or be disturbed. Their rights must be recognized and paid for or protected to the fullest extent but the North Dakota Water Commission cannot let the whims of such individuals stand in the way of the greatest benefit to our State nor should Congress let it stand in the way of the greatest benefit to the Missouri Basin."

This was a veiled reference to certain individuals at Williston where the opposition to the 1,850-foot dam has centered. That

this is the case was made plain in a supporting statement issued by S. W. Thompson, Devils Lake, long-time member of the commission and father of the Missouri River diversion program. He said the commission's whole program is endangered by the unconsidered action of Congress and loosed a blast at what he called "back-stage plotting and legislative connivery."

Thompson, in his statement, said: "Not only does it greatly diminish the usefulness of the Garrison Dam but it strikes a mortal blow at the Missouri-Souris irrigation project upon which we have counted to irrigate more than a million acres of land in northwestern North Dakota.

"Under the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers," he continued, "water from Fort Peck is to become available for irrigation only when other storage is available to meet the needs of downstream States. The height limitation written into the bill reduces the amount of water to be stored at Garrison to such an extent that the Army engineers, mindful of the downstream interests of other States, will refuse to relinquish their claim to the water in Fort Peck upon which we depend to supply the Missouri-Souris project.

"In addition, it either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of irrigating approximately 1,000,000 acres of land in central North Dakota. It either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of diverting water from the Missouri into eastern North Dakota to meet the critical water supply situation facing many areas there.

"The action of the House came as a complete surprise to us since no hearing was held on the matter and we were not advised the height of the dam was an issue. It was not even mentioned until the limitation suddenly appeared in the amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill which restored the money for flood-control purposes.

"The proper height for the Garrison Dam was fixed by Army engineers after exhaustive study. The commission's own engineers and a consulting engineer employed for the purpose reached the same conclusion independent of the Army engineers. The proper height for the dam was agreed upon by all the Government's technical experts, representing the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. It was approved by all of the States in the basin, speaking through the Governors of four States who also are members of the interagency committee. But the lower House of Congress apparently did not even look at this record. Its Members quite evidently were deceived by a piece of legislative trickery as crass as any which ever threatened the welfare of a large number of people.

"The demand for this action came only from a few persons in the city of Williston, led by Bill Davidson, banker and sidewalk farmer. They put their selfish interests ahead of the welfare of the State. One of our own Congressmen actively aided them in their efforts, according to press reports, while the other stood supinely by and saw the interests of North Dakota sold down the river without protest.

"We sincerely hope full and open hearings will be held in the Senate so all the facts may be presented. This issue is too important to be decided by the back-stage plotting and legislative connivery. It must be decided on its merits and all of the people of the State, not merely a selfish few, must have the opportunity to be heard.

"Four major dams have been proposed for construction in the Missouri River. We have been happy that the best dam site and the dam chosen for initial construction is at Garrison. We want it built as soon as possible, but it will be a tragedy for this and for succeding generations if it is not constructed so as to be of the greatest possible value to the people of North Dakota and to the Missouri basins as a whole."

[From the Turtle Mountain Star of December 13, 1945]

PROTESTING MOVE TO LOWER GARRISON DAM AND REDUCE BENEFIT

Lively interest in whether we are to have an MVA plan of Missouri Valley development has been overshadowed by the recent proposal to lower the level of the proposed Garrison Dam.

S. W. Thompson of the North Dakota State Water Commission, who has been plugging for Missouri River development for 25 years, goes so far as to claim that 95 percent of the State of North Dakota will be deprived of any benefits from the huge program if the dam is lowered as threatened.

A House amendment to the supplementary appropriation bill limits the Garrison Dam pool elevation to 1,830 feet, and forbids the use of any money to build dikes or levees to protect areas from flooding if any higher level is used.

PLAN WAS FOR 1,850 FEET

All plans so far had been for a 1,850-foot level, with no objections until quickly and unexpectedly the House inserted and approved the amendment. The original level has the approval of the Interagency Committee, representing the four governmental departments, Agriculture, Interior, Army, and Power Commission.

All sections of North Dakota except the Williston area, it is asserted, want the higher level for the very good reason that little of the State will derive water benefits if the level is lowered as proposed. Williston was to be protected by levees and dikes from any threat of flooding under the original plan.

In his strong letter of protest to Congressman LEMKE, who is said to be backing the Williston move to lower the dam, Mr. Thompson set up the following objections, among others:

CITES OBJECTIONS

"The result would be that the Garrison reservoir would have only about one-half the contemplated storage, with the final result as follows: (1) Power development within the State would be reduced enormously; (2) no diversion could be had from the Garrison Dam to the eastern half of the State except by pumping, the cost of which would be prohibitive; (3) the Missouri-Souris project would perhaps not be built because water for irrigation from Fort Peck will not be available for irrigation unless there was adequate storage provided below; (4) the Baldhill Reservoir north of Valley City would mean nothing without added water from the Missouri River; 50,000 acres of irrigated land at Jamestown and another 50,000 at New Rockford would have no water supply; the areas from Garrison south, both in the easterly and westerly directions, could not be developed for irrigation; many cities that are now hauling water from a supply which may become dry at any time would be forced out of existence; such cities are equally as important as Williston.

MENTIONS SOUTH DAKOTA PROJECT

Mr. Thompson is afraid that the North Dakota Congressmen, who are understood to be backing the lowering of the Garrison Dam, may be favoring a proposal to build the big dam at Oahe in South Dakota. This dam would provide ample power for South Dakota, would provide water for a million acres of irrigation for South Dakota, but neither Oahe nor Fort Peck furnish power development for North Dakota, nor will they furnish sufficient water to develop our agricultural resources.

Mr. Thompson thinks the amendment to lower the Garrison Dam, out of deference to Williston, is selling North Dakota down the river and that all the big dreams for more water for dry areas of our own State will come to nothing, unless individuals, civic groups, cities, and towns let our North Dakota Senators in Washington know that a great error is being made.

[From the Wells County Free Press of December 13, 1945]

STATE'S WATER PLAN THREATENED BY LOW-LEVEL GARRISON DAM

North Dakota's entire water conservation program is endangered by an amendment inserted into the flood control bill as it passed the lower House of Congress November 30, is the statement of the State Water Conservation Commission.

The amendment fixed the maximum height of the proposed Garrison Dam at 1,830 feet above sea level despite the fact that the interagency basin committee, representing every Federal agency in the Missouri Basin, has approved an 1,850-foot plan and that the water commission also had endorsed on behalf of the State of North Dakota.

In a formal resolution made public by Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, commission chairman, the State body said the lower level would "greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir, and that it would reduce the amount of water available from the Fort Peck Reservoir, which is necessary for the successful development of the Missouri-Souris diversion project."

It is to the latter project that the State commission looks for the development of more than 1,000,000 acres of irrigation in the Minot area.

The resolution asserts that "the rights and the protection of property of the people in the Williston area were fully considered and amply provided for" when the level was fixed at 1,850 feet. The attitude of the water commission was set forth in the following statement:

"In any development program of this kind, we must expect some opposition from persons who, even when fully paid for their property, do not like to move or be disturbed. Their rights must be recognized and paid for or protected to the fullest extent, but the North Dakota Water Commission cannot let the whims of such individuals stand in the way of the greatest benefit to our State nor should Congress let it stand in the way of the greatest benefit to the Missouri Basin."

This was a veiled reference to certain individuals at Williston where the opposition to the 1,850-foot dam has centered. That this is the case was made plain in a supporting statement issued by S. W. Thompson, of Devils Lake, long-time member of the commission and "father" of the Missouri River diversion program. He said the commission's whole program is endangered by the unconsidered action of Congress and he loosed a blast at what he called back-stage plotting and legislative connivery.

Thompson, in his statement, said: "Not only does it greatly diminish the usefulness of the Garrison Dam, but it strikes a mortal blow at the Missouri-Souris irrigation project upon which we have counted to irrigate more than a million acres of land in northwestern North Dakota."

"Under the agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers," he continued, "water from Fort Peck is to become available for irrigation only when other storage is available to meet the needs of the downstream States. The height limitation written into the bill reduces the amount of water to be stored at Garrison to such an extent that the Army engineers, mindful of the downstream interests of other States, will refuse to relinquish their claim to the water

in Fort Peck upon which we depend to supply the Missouri-Souris project.

"In addition, it either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of irrigating approximately 1,000,000 acres of land in Central North Dakota. It either will make impossible or greatly increase the expense of diverting water from the Missouri into eastern North Dakota to meet the critical water-supply situation facing many areas there.

"The action of the House came as a complete surprise to us since no hearing was held on the matter and we were not advised the height of the dam was an issue. It was not even mentioned until the limitation suddenly appeared in the amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill which restored the money for flood control purposes.

"The proper height for the Garrison Dam was fixed by Army engineers after exhaustive study. The commission's own engineers and a consulting engineer employed for the purpose reached the same conclusion independent of the Army engineers. The proper height for the dam was agreed upon by all the Government's technical experts, representing the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. It was approved by all of the States in the basin, speaking through the Governors of four States who also are members of the interagency committee. But the lower House of Congress apparently did not even look at this record. Its Members quite evidently were deceived by a piece of legislative trickery as crass as any which ever threatened the welfare of a large number of people.

"The demand for this action came only from a few persons in the city of Williston, led by Bill Davidson, banker and sidewalk farmer. They put their selfish interests ahead of the welfare of the State. One of our own Congressmen actively aided them in their efforts, according to press reports, while the other stood supinely by and saw the interests of North Dakota sold down the river without protest.

"We sincerely hope full and open hearings will be held in the Senate, so all the facts may be presented. This issue is too important to be decided by back-stage plotting and legislative connivery. It must be decided on its merits and all of the people of the State, not merely a selfish few, must have the opportunity to be heard.

"Four major dams have been proposed for construction in the Missouri River. We have been happy that the best dam site and the dam chosen for initial construction is at Garrison. We want it built as soon as possible, but it will be a tragedy for this and for succeeding generations if it is not constructed so as to be of the greatest possible value to the people of North Dakota and to the Missouri basin as a whole."

[From the Benson County Press of December 7, 1945]

Congressmen LEMKE and ROBERTSON pulled one on the State when they let the Williston folks use them to disrupt the plans for the Garrison Dam in the House when the appropriation bill was amended to set the height of the dam at 1,830 feet.

It is rather amusing to see such astute politicians let a minority group in North Dakota put one over on them. But it is also indicative of the determination of the Williston faction to spike the whole project if they cannot protect their relatively minor irrigation projects.

The difference of a few feet in the height of the dam at first sight would not seem to make much difference. If we can believe the statement of the engineers it would reduce the capacity of the dam by one-third. It would mean that less water would be available for diversion into the Sheyenne and James Rivers and that means the Devils Lake Reservoir. These ideas mean nothing to the Williston group, if their few thousand acres are endangered.

Maybe Williston supporters elected LEMKE and ROBERTSON. It may also be that they can return these men to Congress. We hope they don't come around here asking us to vote for them. They sort of kicked the voters of this part of the State in the face when they did not oppose the amendment, and one of them took the floor covering the reduction in the height of the dam.

The diversion portion of the development program for the Missouri River has been one of our pets for a long time. Now when its realization is closer than ever before, it hurts to have it handled like this by the men who are supposed to be working for the best interests of the entire State.

This messing around with the affairs of the entire valley system, and the damage that one small faction can do, is just another good argument for control by a Missouri Valley Authority.

[From the Bismarck Tribune of December 6, 1945]

AMENDED HEIGHT OF GARRISON DAM ATTACKED ON THREE FRONTS

IN WASHINGTON

Reasons why North Dakota's State Water Commission wants a "high" dam in the Missouri River near Garrison will be presented to a Senate Appropriations Committee by Kenneth W. Simons, commission vice chairman and editor of the Tribune.

Simons flew to Washington Wednesday night to testify before the Senate committee, holding hearings on the House-passed deficiency appropriation bill which includes $2,000,000 for initiating construction of the $130,000,000 Garrison Dam.

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, chairman of the water commission, said Simons would officially represent the commission at the hearings and would present the commission's viewpoint in seeking elimination of a House amendment which would limit the height of the dam itself to 1,830 feet above sea level.

The State water commission went on record this week as opposing the 1,830-foot height limitation and urging that the Senate strike it out.

The commission wants the dam built to permit an operating pool level of 1,850 feet above sea level and the United States Army engineers want to build the dam to permit such an operating level. A group of residents of Williston, which would be at the upper end of the reservoir, want the lower level. They contend that the 1,850 level would constitute a danger to Williston and nearby irrigation projects. The Army agreed earlier this year to construct dikes to protect Williston and the irrigation projects.

In a formal resolution adopted by the commission, the commission said limiting the dam height to 1,830 feet would mean that the normal pool level would have to be "materially below this level to reserve room for floodwaters."

"Such low level," the resolution said, "would greatly reduce the capacity for hydroelectric power development and flood control, and materially reduce the feasibility of irrigation and diversion from the Garrison Reservoir."

IN BISMARCK

A protest meeting over the amended height of the Garrison Dam was held Wednesday night in the World War Memorial Building under the auspices of the Bismarck Association of Commerce.

More than 50 Bismarck businessmen attended the session and went on record as being opposed to the House amended height of the dam. The height, as agreed upon by the interagency committee was 1,850. The House, in its deficiency appropriation bill, limited the height of the dam to 1,830.

J. J. Walsh, secretary of the State Water Commission, told the merchants of the advantages of the 1,850-foot level, pointing out that the power potentialities of the dam were reduced by one-third by lowering the height of the dam 20 feet. He also claimed that the amount of land which could be brought under irrigation would likewise be reduced.

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl told what had already been done on the dam and urged all those who attended the meeting to contact their Congressmen to impress upon them the need of maintaining the height of the dam at 1,850 feet.

Dr. Sinclair Harper, consulting engineer, Berkeley, Calif., Thursday was completing review of the United States Army Engineers' preconstruction planning for the Garrison Dam.

Dr. Harper and a group of United States Army engineers, representatives from the engineers' district office at Omaha, Nebr., arrived here Wednesday and were to go to Pierre, S. Dak., late Thursday to review foundation explorations for the proposed Oahe Dam. Lt. Col. John W. Sibert, Jr., area engineer in Bismarck, is conducting the party on its tour.

Dr. Harper, former chief engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, is a regular member of the board of consulting engineers which has been reviewing studies made for the Garrison Dam. That board met here last September 10 and 11, but Dr. Harper was in Afghanistan as a consultant engineer for that country's government and was unable to be present at the Bismarck meeting.

Dr. Harper's activities on the various waterways of this Nation are subject of a recent magazine article, River Doctor, by Lewis Nordyke.

Representatives of the Omaha office who were with Dr. Harper include Maj. Wendell E. Johnson and F. H. Kellog, M. E. Stalker, H. O. Egeberg, P. T. Bennett and E. R. Kendall.

IN FARGO

Early diversion of water from the Missouri River to eastern North Dakota may be seriously interfered with or even precluded if the 1,830-foot pool level limitation for the Garrison dam be established. Lt. Col. Delbert B. Freeman, Omaha, Nebr., district Army engineer, said here Wednesday night.

Colonel Freeman declared that any loss of storage capacity in the Missouri River would provide that much less water for diversion for irrigation purposes or replenishing of underground and surface water supplies to eastern North Dakota. He also said downstream interests who are interested in adequate storage for flood control and navigation, are concerned about the possibility of the Garrison Dam storage being materially reduced.

(The Missouri Basin inter-agency committee, consisting of representatives from 10 States and 4 Federal agencies, last August unanimously approved a design for a dam to an elevation of 1,874 feet which would permit the reservoir to be operated at a level of 1,850 feet.)

Colonel Freeman said "if the reference to a pool elevation of 1,830 feet refers to the maximum normal operating pool elevation, it means a loss of 7,000,000 acre feet of the cheapest storage in the basin. If the reference means maximum operating pool elevation, it means even greater loss of storage."

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from R. A. Wheeler, lieutenant general, Chief of Engineers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: At the conclusion of the hearing before your committee yesterday with regard to the War Department items in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946, you requested that I advise the committee of my views with respect to the amendment offered by Representative LEMKE as a substitute for the proviso now contained in the act limiting the height of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir. As I am scheduled to be out of Washington next week on official business, you excused me from further appearance before the committee. I am, therefore, presenting my views in this letter, which General Crawford will deliver to the committee. He will also be available for any further questioning you may desire.

If the committee and the Congress desire to include in the act language restricting the development of the Garrison project, the substitute language suggested by Representative LEMKE is less objectionable, in our opinion, than the language contained in the act as passed by the House of Representatives, since the substitute language would permit the initiation of construction of the dam in accordance with the authorized project. However, for several reasons which I shall discuss below, I believe it inadvisable for the best over-all development of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin that any restriction be placed by law on the Garrison project at this time. I therefore recommend that neither the proviso now in the act nor the proposed substitute be enacted.

The determination of the pool elevations in the Garrison project is a highly involved technical matter, and if the Congress desires to fix the maximum pool elevation I believe that the legislation should be considered initially by the particular committees established to deal with this type of legislation where all of the technical interests concerned can make full presentation of their views.

The coordinated plan for the Missouri River Basin as developed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and authorized by the Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act definitely contemplated that the final storage capacities of the main stem reservoirs and precise elevations and heights of reservoirs and dams will be agreed upon after further studies have been made and after consideration of the desires and objections of persons affected by the proposed developments. Several months ago the States in the Missouri River Basin, the Department of the Interior, Federal Power Commission, Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers formed the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee as the means for settling on a cooperative basis all problems which may arise in working out the details of the Missouri Basin projects. This committee considered the height of the Garrison project at its regular meeting on August 16, 1945, and the proposal for a maximum normal operating pool at elevation 1,850 was discussed. It was agreed unanimously by the interagency committee that the Garrison Dam should be constructed to a height which would permit operation at a maximum normal pool up to elevation 1,850, but the decision as to the maximum normal pool at which the project should be operated was not made. As this Department is one participating in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and has agreed to the committee action as outlined above, I cannot properly acquiesce in the establishment of a limiting height for the Garrison pool in view of this joint agreement that has already been reached.

This Department now believes that it will be feasible to protect Williston and the existing irrigation projects in that vicinity by a system of dikes and drainage wells. However, here will be a period of 8 or 10 or more years from the time the dam construction is initiated until pool levels approach the higher elevations now under discussion, during which time the studies and investigations of optimum pool levels will be continued, thus providing more information, both from theoretical studies and from actual operating experience.

In our studies of the elevations of the Garrison Reservoir, we consider that project as one of the most important elements in the authorized plan for developing the water resources of the entire Missouri River Basin. That plan is region-wide and each project must be considered in its relationship to the regional plan. In this connection I wish to quote a paragraph from President Truman's letter of November 10, 1945, to Mr. Ora Bundy, president of the National Reclamation Association, which reads as follows: "At this time I would like to make one further suggestion. The key to success of any regional resource development will be found in how active cooperation is organized between the people of the region, their civic and commercial organizations, and local and Federal Governments. TVA has remonstrated successfully one way in which this can be done. Another experiment in which four Federal agencies are participating—the War Department, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission—is now making another demonstration. The manner in which these agencies work together, and at the same time work with local political units and private organizations, will be watched closely."

It is my strong conviction that the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee can resolve all of the questions which have arisen with respect to the Garrison project and which will certainly come up as other elements of the Missouri Basin plan are undertaken and placed in operation. To accomplish this the interagency committee must have free rein to develop its procedures and come to agreements. It would, therefore, appear to be unwise to circumscribe the scope of that committee's functions through legislative action prescribing the elevation of the Garrison Reservoir.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I plead with the Senate to insist on its position, thereby giving protection to the State of North Dakota in its electrical and power development and irrigation projects.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is there any controversy between the House and the Senate as to this matter?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; the controversy still remains as to whether the dam shall be 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet high.

Mr. LANGER. Then let me say to the Senator that the water commission which has been referred to was created while I was Governor of North Dakota. The dam was very important to us then, and it is most important now. I hope the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will do all in his power to see to it that the differences between the House and the Senate are amicably adjusted, even if it is necessary for the Senate conferees to recede from the position of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT OF 1942

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I correct in understanding that the amendment now pending is that in line 20, on page 2 of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bilbo	Knowland	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Stanfill
Byrd	Langer	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Tydings
Gossett	Mead	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Wagner
Gurney	Mitchell	Walsh
Hart	Moore	Wheeler
Hatch	Murdock	Wherry
Hayden	O'Daniel	White
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Hill	Pepper	Willis
Hoey	Radcliffe	Wilson
Huffman	Revercomb	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Russell	
Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that on the vote about to be taken, a vote "yea" will be a vote to sustain the committee amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to state my understanding of the situation. As I understand, a vote "yea" will be to extend these war powers until December 31, 1946, and a vote "nay" will be to limit them to June 30, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 20. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, if present and voting, would vote as I intend to vote. I am, therefore, free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

I wish to announce further that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I announce also that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "nay," has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—30

Carville	Hayden	McKellar
Chavez	Hill	McMahon
Ellender	Huffman	Maybank
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Mead
Gossett	Johnston, S. C.	Mitchell
Green	Kilgore	Murdock
Hatch	McCarran	O'Mahoney
Pepper	Stewart	Wagner
Radcliffe	Taylor	Walsh
Russell	Tunnell	Wheeler

NAYS—31

Austin	Langer	Tobey
Bilbo	McClellan	Tydings
Brooks	Millikin	Vandenberg
Byrd	Moore	Wherry
Capper	O'Daniel	White
Gurney	Revercomb	Wiley
Hart	Saltonstall	Willis
Hickenlooper	Shipstead	Wilson
Hoey	Smith	Young
Knowland	Stanfill	
La Follette	Taft	

NOT VOTING—35

Aiken	Capehart	Lucas
Andrews	Connally	McFarland
Bailey	Cordon	Magnuson
Ball	Donnell	Morse
Bankhead	Downey	Murray
Barkley	Eastland	Myers
Brewster	Ferguson	Overton
Bridges	George	Reed
Briggs	Gerry	Robertson
Buck	Glass	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Guffey	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Hawkes	

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that the announcement has been made by the Chair, and the request comes too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The third reading of the bill is in order.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. MCMAHON and Mr. O'DANIEL asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4780) was passed.

AMENDMENTS TO GI BILL OF RIGHTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the second sentence of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and outpatient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings; or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes.'

"SEC. 2. Section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out the second paragraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Any veteran entitled to a prosthetic appliance shall be furnished such fitting and training, including institutional training, in the use of such appliance as may be necessary, whether in a Veterans' Administration facility, other training institution, or by outpatient treatment, including such service under contract and including necessary travel expenses to and from their homes to such hospital or training institution.

" 'The Administrator may procure any and all items mentioned herein, including necessary services required in the fitting, supplying, and training in use of such items by purchase, manufacture, contract, or in such other manner as the Administrator may determine to be proper without regard to any other provision of law.'

"SEC. 3. Section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) The Administrator is further authorized at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid full-time representatives of such organizations.'

"SEC. 4. Section 302 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to establish, from time to time, boards of review composed of five commissioned officers, two of whom shall be selected from the Medical Corps of the Army or Navy, or from the Public Health Service, as the case may be. It shall be the duty of any such board to review, at the request of any officer retired or released from active service, without pay, for physical disability pursuant to the decision of a retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board, the findings and decisions of such board. Such review shall be based upon all available service records relating to the officer requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such officer. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit, and the officer requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board of review in person or by counsel. In carrying out its duties under this section such board of review shall have the same powers as exercised by, or vested in, the board whose findings and decision are being reviewed. The proceedings and decision of each such board of review affirming or reversing the decision of any such retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board shall be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, and shall be laid by him before the President for his approval or disapproval and orders in the case.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and who either shall have served ninety days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than four years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: *Provided further*, That no such education or training shall be afforded beyond nine years after the termination of the present war.'

"(b) Paragraph 2 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'2. Any such eligible person shall be entitled to education or training at an approved educational or training institution for a period of one year plus the time such person was in the active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, but in no event shall the total period of education or training exceed four years: *Provided*, That his work continues to be satisfactory throughout the period, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution: *Provided further*, That wherever the period of eligibility ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such quarter or semester has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester.'

"(c) Paragraph 3 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'3. (a) Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training, full time or the equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept or retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue: *Provided*, That for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator, he may change a course of instruction: *And provided further*, That any such course of education or training may be discontinued at any time, if it is found by the Administrator that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution, the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory.

"'(b) Any such eligible person may apply for a short, intensive post-graduate, or training course of less than 30 weeks: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have the authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, That (1) the limitation of paragraph 5 shall not prevent the payment of such agreed rates, but there shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which the cost of the course bears to $500, and (2) not in excess of $500 shall be paid for any such course.

"'(c) Any such eligible person may apply for a course of instruction by correspondence without any subsistence allowance: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, (1) That the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply to correspondence courses; (2) that one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such course shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility; and (3) that the total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses for any veteran shall not exceed $500: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the use of approved correspondence courses as a part of institutional or job training, subject to regulations prescribed by the Administrator.'

"(d) Paragraph 5 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'(5) The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full time or part time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have such customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event there shall be charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to $500: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: *And provided further*, That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of tuition and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time.'

"(e) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, the first sentence of paragraph 6 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year.'

"(f) Paragraph 7 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'7. Any such person eligible for the benefits of this part, who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII, may elect either benefit or may be provided an approved combination of such courses: *Provided*, That the total period of any such combined courses shall not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.'

"SEC. 6. Section 4 of Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That returned books, supplies, or equipment may be turned in to educational or training institutions for credit under such terms as may be approved by the Administrator, or disposed of in such other manner as may be approved by the Administrator.'

"SEC. 7 (a) The proviso in paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of four years shall be approved except with the approval of the Administrator, nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond nine years after the termination of the present war.'

"(b) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for two months after his employability is determined, each veteran shall be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended: *Provided*, That the minimum payment of such allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, shall be, for a person without a dependent, $105 per month; and for a person with a dependent, $115, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $10 for one child and $7 additional for each additional child, and (2) $15 for a dependent parent: *Provided further*, That the rates set out herein shall not be subject to the increased authorized by Public Law Numbered 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: *And provided further*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement in writing showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such written statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the subsistence allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just.'

"SEC. 8. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

"'CHAPTER V—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOANS

"'SEC. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of ninety days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title. Any loan made by such veteran within ten years after the termination of the war for any of the purposes, and in compliance with the provisions, specified in this title, is automatically guaranteed by the Government by this title in an amount not exceeding fifty per centum of the loan: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000 in the case of non-real-estate loans, nor $4,000 in the case of real-estate loans; or a prorated portion thereof on loans of both types or combination thereof.

"'(b) Loans guaranteed under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, subject to the conditions and limitations of this title and the regulations issued pursuant to section 504: *Provided*, That the liability under the guaranty within the limitations of this title shall decrease or increase pro rata with any decrease or increase

of the amount of the unpaid portion of the obligation: *Provided further*, That loans guaranteed under this title shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding four per centum per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than twenty-five years, or in the case of loans on farm realty in not more than forty years: *And provided further*, That (1) the maturity on a non-real-estate loan shall not exceed ten years; (2) any loan for a term in excess of five years shall be amortized in accordance with established procedure; (3) except as provided in section 505 any real-estate loan, other than for repairs, alterations or improvements, shall be secured by a first lien on the realty, and a non-real-estate loan, except as to working or other capital, merchandise, good will and other intangible assets, shall be secured by personalty to the extent legal and practicable.

"'(c) An honorable discharge shall be deemed a certificate of eligibility to apply for a guaranteed loan. Any veteran who does not have a discharge certificate, or who received a discharge other than honorable, may apply to the Administrator for a certificate of eligibility. Upon making a loan as provided herein, the lender shall forthwith transmit to the Administrator a statement setting forth the full name and serial number of the veteran, amount and terms of the loan, and the legal description of the property, together with the appraisal report made by the designated appraiser. Where the loan is automatically guaranteed, the Administrator shall provide the lender with a loan guaranty certificate or other evidence of the guaranty. He shall also endorse on the veteran's discharge, or eligibility certificate, the amount and type of guaranty used, and the amount, if any, remaining. An amount equivalent to four per centum on the amount originally guaranteed shall be paid to the lender by the Administrator out of available appropriations, to be credited upon the loan. Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any guaranteed loan nor the assignment of the security therefor.

"'(d) Loans guaranteed hereunder may be made by any Federal land bank, national bank, State bank, private bank, building and loan association, insurance company, credit union, or mortgage and loan company, that is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Any loan at least twenty per centum of which is guaranteed under this title may be made by any national bank, or Federal savings and loan association; or by any bank, trust company, building and loan association or insurance company organized or authorized to do business in the District of Columbia; without regard to the limitations and restrictions of any other statute with respect to—

"'(1) ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;

"'(2) maturity of loan;

"'(3) requirement for mortgage or other security;

"'(4) dignity of lien; or

"'(5) percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

"'(e) Any loan proposed to be made to an eligible veteran by any lender not of a class specified in subsection (d) may be guaranteed by the Administrator, if he finds that it is in accord otherwise with the provisions of this title, as amended.

"'PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES

"'SEC. 501. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing residential property or constructing a dwelling to be occupied as his home or for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements in property owned by him and occupied as his home, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment of the property purchased or constructed or improved;

"'(2) That the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

"'(3) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'PURCHASE OF FARMS AND FARM EQUIPMENT

"'SEC. 502. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing any lands, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, supplies or implements, or for repairing, altering, constructing or improving any land, equipment, or building, including the farmhouse, to be used in farming operations conducted by the veteran involving production in excess of his own needs, or for working capital requirements necessary for such operations, or to purchase stock in a cooperative association where the purchase of such stock is required by Federal statute as an incident to obtaining the loan, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any such purposes in connection with bona fide farming operations conducted by the applicant;

"'(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

"'(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

"'(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'PURCHASE OF BUSINESS PROPERTY

"'SEC. 503. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for the purpose of engaging in business or pursuing a gainful occupation, or for the cost of acquiring for such purpose land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, tools, inventory, stock in trade, or for the cost of the construction, repair, alteration, or improvement of any realty or personalty used for such purpose, or to provide the funds needed for working capital, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any of the specified purposes in connection with bona fide pursuit of gainful occupation by the veteran;

"'(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such business or occupation;

"'(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such business or occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such business or occupation; and

"'(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or the cost of such construction, alterations, or improvements, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'REGULATIONS

"'SEC. 504. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this title, as amended, as are necessary and appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, and may delegate to subordinate employees authority to issue certificates, or other evidence, of guaranty of loans guaranteed under the provisions of this title, and to exercise other administrative functions hereunder.

"'SECONDARY LOANS

"'SEC. 505. (a) In any case wherein a principal loan, for any of the purposes stated in section 501, 502, or 503, is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it pursuant to applicable law and regulations, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator, subject otherwise to the provisions of this title, may guarantee the full amount of the second loan: *Provided*, That such second loan shall not exceed 20 per centum of the purchase price or cost: *And provided further*, That regulations to be promulgated jointly by the Administrator and the head of such agency may provide for servicing of both loans by such agency and for refinancing of the principal loan to include any unpaid portion of the secondary loan with accrued interest, if any, after the curtailment thereon equals twice the amount of the secondary loan.

"'(b) Any person who is a veteran eligible for the benefit of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such Act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

"'PROCEDURE ON DEFAULT

"'SEC. 506. In the event of default in the payment of any loan guaranteed under this title, the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator who shall thereupon pay to such holder the guaranty not in excess of the pro rata portion of the amount originally guaranteed, and shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty: *Provided*, That prior to suit or foreclosure the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator of the default, and within thirty days thereafter the Administrator may, at his option, pay the holder of the obligation the unpaid balance of the obligation plus accrued interest and receive an assignment of the loan and security: *Provided further*, That (1) nothing herein shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the veteran as may be agreed upon by the parties to the loan and approved by the Administrator; and (2) the Administrator may establish the date, not later than the date of judgment and decree of foreclosure or sale, upon which accrual of interest or charges shall cease.

"'LOANS ON DELINQUENT INDEBTEDNESS

"'SEC. 507. Any loan made to a veteran, the proceeds of which are to be used to refinance any indebtedness of the veteran which is secured of record on property to be used or occupied by the veteran as a home or for farming purposes, or indebtedness incurred by him in the pursuit of a gainful occupation which he is pursuing or which he proposes in good faith to pursue, or any delinquent taxes or assessments on such property or business, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) Such loan became in default or the delinquency occurred not later than ten years after the termination of the war;

"'(2) Such refinancing will aid the veteran in his economic readjustment; and

"'(3) The amount of the guaranteed loan does not exceed the reasonable value of the property or business, as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraised designated by the Administrator.

"'INSURANCE OF LOANS

"'SEC. 508. (a) Any loans which might be guaranteed under the provisions of this title, when made or purchased by any financial institution subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia, may, in lieu of such guaranty, be insured by the Administrator under an agreement whereby he will reimburse any such institution for losses incurred on such loan up to 15 per centum of the aggregate of loans so made or purchased by it.

"'(b) Loans insured hereunder shall be made on such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator may prescribe within the limitations set forth in this title. The Administrator may fix the maximum rate of interest payable on any class of non-real-estate loans insured hereunder at a figure not in excess of a 3 per centum discount rate or an equivalent straight interest rate on nonamortized loans.

"'(c) The Administrator shall pay the same amount on each loan insured hereunder as he would be required to pay under the sixth sentence of section 500 (c) hereof if the loan were guaranteed rather than insured.

"'POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"'SEC. 509. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title as now or hereafter amended and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator may—

"'(1) Sue and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"'(2) Subject to specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest or any portion thereof, security or other provisions of any note, contract, mortgage or other instrument securing a loan which has been guaranteed or insured hereunder;

"'(3) Pay, or compromise, any claim on, or arising because of, any such guaranty or insurance;

"'(4) Pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien or demand, however acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption;

"'(5) Purchase at any sale, public or private, upon such terms and for such prices as he determines to be reasonable, and take title to, property, real, personal, or mixed; and similarly sell, at public or private sale, exchange, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of any such property; and

"'(6) Complete, administer, operate, obtain and pay for insurance on, and maintain, renovate, repair, modernize, lease, or otherwise deal with any property acquired or held pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That the acquisition of any such property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction of, on, or over such property (including power to tax) or impair the rights under the State or local law of any persons on such property.

"'(b) The powers by this section granted may be exercised by the Administrator without regard to any other provisions of law not enacted expressly in limitation hereof, which otherwise would govern the expenditure of public funds: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this section if the amount of such contract exceeds $1,000.

"'(c) The financial transactions of the Administrator incident to, or arising out of, the guaranty of loans pursuant to this title, and the acquisition, management, and disposition of property, real, personal or mixed, as incident to such activities and pursuant to this section, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

"'EFFECTIVE DATE

"'SEC. 510. This title, as amended, shall be effective from the date of enactment: *Provided*, That any application for guaranty of a loan filed within ninety days after such date may be approved under the title as it existed prior to amendment: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to affect any contractual right under any certificate of guaranty issued thereunder.'

"SEC. 9. Section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. Title VI of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"'SEC. 1506. Persons who served in the active military or naval service of any government allied with the United States in World War II and who at time of entrance into such active service were citizens of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, and if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of titles II, III, IV, and V of this Act or of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who served in the active military or naval service of the United States: *Provided*, That any such benefit shall not be extended to any person who is not a resident of the United States at time of filing claim or to any person who has applied for and received the same or similar benefit from the government of the nation in whose active military or naval service he served.

"'SEC. 1507. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1503, any person while on terminal leave, or while hospitalized pending final discharge, may be afforded the benefits of titles II and III of this Act, or vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, subject to all conditions thereof except actual discharge: *Provided*, That no subsistence allowance shall be paid in such cases under title II of this Act or Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. This section shall be effective from June 22, 1944.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
ED. C. JOHNSON,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSING FACILITIES FOR SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 8, after "housing" insert "*And provided further*, That any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization which has incurred expenses in the relocation (including the costs of disassembling, transporting, site preparation, and reerection but not including the costs of site acquisition or the installation of off-site utilities) of temporary housing or other facilities (but not including demountable houses) under the jurisdiction or control of the National Housing Administrator for reuse in providing temporary housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families shall, upon application therefor, be reimbursed for such expenses by said Administrator out of the funds made available by the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (H. R. 4805), to carry out the purpose of this title."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in the conference report on the first deficiency bill, 1946, there appears the following statement as to an amendment which, I understand, is still in disagreement:

> Amendment No. 48, making an appropriation of $191,900,000 for veterans' housing: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate with the understanding that the amount of $191,900,000 shall be construed as including any unused funds under title I of the Lanham Act which may be made available for veterans' housing.

I presume that the conferees meant the unused part of title I of the Lanham Act authorization, because there was an authorization of $160,000,000 in the resolution which passed the Senate a few days ago, and there was a $35,000,000 authorization in title I of the Lanham Act. Together they make a total of $195,000,000. I presume that reference is made in the conference report to the unused portion of the money under title I of the Lanham Act authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion was made by the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 122.

The motion was agreed to.

ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN WIVES AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 867, House bill 4857.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4857) to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the acting majority leader whether the calendar will be called tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if at all possible, it is our intention to dispose of the strategic minerals bill, and then call the calendar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to make an announcement.

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have just cast my eyes over the vote which was taken a few moments ago on the committee amendment. I find that the motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was rejected was made by a Senator who voted against the committee amendment; namely, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Therefore, Mr. President, I challenge the vote and move a reconsideration of the vote by which the motion to reconsider the amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Senator from Nebraska voted with the prevailing side, and had a right to make the motion which he made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Senator from Nebraska vote with the prevailing side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He did. He voted "nay" and the nays prevailed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think we should not consider the various bills which Senators are asking the Senate to consider until tomorrow, providing that we may be assured that there will be a call of the calendar. I suggest that the calendar might be called even before the strategic minerals bill is considered.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming believes that the disposition of the strategic minerals bill will not take very long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My thought is that it will not take very long.

Mr. HILL. Then, after the disposition of that bill it will be my intention to have the calendar called.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator mean tonight?

Mr. HILL. No; tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am in charge of a bill of tremendous importance. I refer to Calendar No. 871, House bill 4717 to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration. I hope that by tomorrow I will have an opportunity to have the bill considered. It is a bill which would reorganize the medical department of the Veterans' Administration. I am sorry to have such an important bill on the deadline.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee of the Veterans' Committee of the Committee on Finance, of which the able Senator from Colorado is chairman, I wish to join with him in urging the majority leadership to make certain that an opportunity will be afforded to have the bill considered before the Senate takes its holiday recess. A great deal of criticism has been voiced through the press and other channels concerning the type of medical care which is being afforded the veterans. The situation which has been criticized cannot be corrected, however, until a reorganization takes place of the medical department of the Veterans' Administration. The subcommittee heard both General Bradley and General Halley, and I believe the full committee also heard them. The bill was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and unanimously by the full committee, and I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to take a recess until the bill has been considered and disposed of.

Mr. TAFT. I think the bill can be passed under the 5-minute rule. I think we should clear away all the bills on the calendar we can dispose of, and then take up the strategic minerals bill.

Mr. HILL. I myself believe, inasmuch as the bill referred to by the Senator from Colorado was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and by the full committee, that when the bill is reached on the calendar no difficulty will be experienced in having it passed. I will say to the distinguished Senator, however, that if any difficulty is experienced I shall cooperate with him in any way that I can to the end that the bill may be disposed of.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad of the assurance that the calendar is not to be called this evening, for I think it is altogether too late to undertake a call of the calendar. There is a very large number of bills on the calendar. Earlier in the day two Senators, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], spoke to me about two bills in which they have an interest. I have checked with minority members on this side so far as I could do so, and I find no objection either to the bill urged by the Senator from Georgia or the bill urged by the Senator from Arkansas. So far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to see the two bills disposed of this evening, if we then might call it a day.

Mr. HILL. It was the thought of the Senator from Alabama to yield the floor at this time so that the Senators referred to might ask for consideration of their respective bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has not disposed of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4857, to expedite the admission into the United States of certain alien spouses?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Georgia explain the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was preparing to explain it. The bill is an emergency measure to be limited to 3 years of operation. It is designed to expedite the admission into the United States of women who have become the wives of American soldiers who have served overseas. It relieves them of some of the expense of very cumbersome machinery which usually attends the securing of a visa, and also waives the medical examination on the other side.

Dr. Parran has testified before a committee of the House that examination on the other side would require quite an expense, because there are almost 100,000 of these women. The medical examination will be made on this side, and if any defects are noted the public health officer of the community in which the wife of the veteran will reside will be notified to that effect. The bill also simplifies the admission of children of men who served overseas.

Every safeguard is provided to insure that only the wives and children of veterans who married overseas will be admitted, and there is protection provided by the very thorough medical examination on this side.

I am advised that within the next 2 or 3 weeks there will be some shipping available for these women. They will have to wait until all the high-point military men have returned. The bill will not delay the return of one soldier or sailor who has the points prescribed by the War or Navy Department. It merely relieves the wives of veterans of the necessity of waiting for days around the American consulate, and relieves the Government of the United States of the necessity of sending overseas a large number of public-health officers to make a preexamination before application for visa.

Mr. President, I think this is the least we can do for the men who fought our wars overseas, who have married aliens, and who now wish to have their wives join them in this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4857) an act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizens, members of the United States armed forces, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION AND LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to call up order of business No. 790, Senate bill 704. The bill was introduced last March and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the calendar number?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Calendar No. 790, on page 6 of the calendar.

The purpose of the bill is to permit the Department of Agriculture to give preference to veterans in the disposition of lands, primarily lands under the Farm Security Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 704) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "war", to insert "and present project occupants", on page 2, line 20, after the word "Congress", to insert "and to present occupants of such lands", and at the end of the bill to strike out section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. Until such time as the functions, powers, and duties of the War Food Administrator or the War Food Administration are terminated, the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by this act shall be exercised by the War Food Administrator.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to assure the maximum preferential disposition to veterans of the present war and present project occupants, is hereby authorized and directed to maintain, administer, and utilize, for such period as he may deem necessary until disposal thereof as hereinafter provided, not to exceed 3 years from the date of termination of the present war, such of the lands (improved and unimproved) comprising or incident to those resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and other like enterprises heretofore initiated for similar purposes and financed, in whole or in part, with funds made available to the Secretary, War Food Administrator, Farm Security Administration, Resettlement Administration, or Federal Emergency Relief Administration, as he determines are suitable for ultimate disposition in economic farm units. Nothing contained herein shall be deemed to authorize retardation of the expeditious liquidation of other land or property comprising or incident to such projects insofar as is deemed practicable by the Secretary consistent with the purpose of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall sell or cause to be sold, from time to time, those of such lands as are suitable for disposition in economic farm units, at the earning capacity value as determined by him and otherwise on such terms as he may deem advisable, to veterans, as defined in the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Public Law 457, Seventy-eighth Congress and to present occupants of such lands, who meet the requirements of eligibility specified in title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 7, secs. 1000–1006), as amended.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, including, without limitation, the maintenance and operation of the project properties and making betterments and improvements deemed necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 812, Senate bill 752, the stock-pile bill, but I shall not ask for its disposition tonight. I make the motion merely that the bill may become the unfinished business.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of Senate bill 752.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by its title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national-defense purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the acting majority leader about the program. There are on the calendar several small bills which Senators wish to have considered. It is my understanding that the calendar will be called tomorrow. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The understanding is that we will proceed to dispose of the strategic materials bill. From the information I have I do not think it will take very long to dispose of the bill, and as soon as we dispose of that measure, we will proceed to a call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the acting majority leader for his statement. The only draw-back is that it is not a definite assurance that the calendar will be called at all.

Mr. HILL. No; I cannot say it is. It might be that if we encountered a long debate on the strategic minerals bill we might not have a call of the calendar. The calendar is called by unanimous consent anyway, as the Senator knows.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event the bill shall take longer than he now anticipates, may we have assurance that the acting majority leader will ask for a call of the calendar so that other bills may be considered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if, as I do not anticipate, this measure shall take a longer time than I now believe it will, and thereby prevent the Senate from considering other bills, I shall not object to its being laid aside for the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate take up for immediate consideration House bill 1793, to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, under the arrangement which has just been reached, I shall have to object to the consideration of any other bills on the calendar this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the acting majority leader will yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can the Senator furnish the Senate some information as to when the conference report on the GI bill of rights will be acted upon? I believe the senior Senator from Colorado may have the information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report has already been agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Seybourn H. Lynne, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Thomas A. Murphree, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence E. Gauss to be a member of the Board of Directors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis L. Bennett to be commodore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Stika to be commodore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 19, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons now foreign-service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Hector C. Adam, Jr., of New York.
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
William E. Cole, Jr., of New York.
George E. Miller, of New Jersey.
Elim O'Shaughnessy, of New York.
Charles O. Thompson, of Alaska.

Bernard C. Connelly, of Illinois, now a foreign-service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Jay Dixon Edwards, of Oregon, now a foreign-service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as foreign-service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harry H. Bell, of New Jersey.
Donald C. Bergus, of Indiana.
Thomas D. Bowie, of Minnesota.
Miss Lora C. Bryning, of Washington.
Robert E. Cashin, of Missouri.
David P. Coffin, of Massachusetts.
Dwight Dickinson, of New Jersey.
Robert J. Dorr, of California.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
David I. Ferber, of Arizona.
William J. Ford, of New Hampshire.
David L. Gamon, of California.
Thomas A. Goldman, of the District of Columbia.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr., of Wisconsin.
Spencer M. King, of Maine.
George T. Lister, of New York.
Rupert A. Lloyd, of Virginia.
Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.
Douglas W. Overton, of New Hampshire.
Henry C. Ramsey, of California.
Ralph A. Schweitzer, of California.
Richard M. Service, of California.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Massachusetts.
Harvey R. Wellman, of New York.
George M. Widney, of Alabama.
Louis A. Wiesner, of Michigan.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia.

TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from the State of Texas.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from the State of Michigan.

Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.

In the absence of the President or the Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius will be the senior representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly.

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946:

SOL BLOOM, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York.

CHARLES A. EATON, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania.
John Foster Dulles, of New York.
John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Edmund A. Flagg for appointment as executive, Communications and Records Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of executive, Communications and Records Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $5,180 per annum.

Colgate Hoyt for appointment as Assistant Chief, Veterans Personnel Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Compensation for the position of Assistant Chief, Veterans Personnel Division, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, will be at the rate of $6,230 per annum.

IN THE ARMY

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Brig. Gen. Thomas Jefferson Davis (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Assistant The Adjutant General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Adrian R. Marron, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Robert N. S. Baker, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Webster M. Thompson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Andrew I. McKee, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Lisle F. Small, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Hunters Point, San Francisco, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Capt. George T. Paine, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1945.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Clarence E. Gauss, to be a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS OR PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED AFTER NAME

To be assistant dental surgeon

Joseph E. Unsworth, effective date of oath of office.

To be senior assistant surgeons

Emory S. Moore, Jr., August 20, 1945.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 10, 1945.

To be pharmacists

Raymond D. Kinsey, July 1, 1944.
Thomas C. Armstrong, July 1, 1944.

To be senior dental surgeon

Hubert H. Martin, August 15, 1945.

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Donald L. Truscott, August 3, 1945.
Frederick S. Loe, Jr., August 2, 1945.
John C. Heckel, August 3, 1945.
Eugene H. Hess, August 3, 1945.
William B. Treutle, October 1, 1945.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Ernest C. Anderson, December 26, 1945.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, August 21, 1945.

To be temporary senior assistant surgeons

Vactor O. Connell, July 1, 1945.
Ardell B. Colyar, December 1, 1945.

To be temporary surgeons

Gilcin F. Meadors, December 1, 1945.
Clarence K. Aldrich, November 1, 1945.
Paul C. Campbell, Jr., September 1, 1945.
Lloyd R. Hershberger, July 1, 1945.
Louis Jacobs, December 1, 1945.
Allen B. Eschenbrenner, September 1, 1945.
Robert V. Holman, January 1, 1945.
Lloyd S. Rolufs, July 1, 1945.

To be temporary medical directors

Carl E. Rice, December 1, 1945.
Alfred J. Aselmeyer.

To be temporary senior assistant dental surgeon

William B. Treutle, August 24, 1945.

To be temporary sanitary engineers

Callis H. Atkins, December 1, 1945.
Fredrick C. Roberts, Jr., August 3, 1945.

To be temporary scientist director

Willard H. Wright, June 26, 1945.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. Francis Joseph Corr
Capt. Walter Abner Huntsberry

To Finance Department

Maj. Herbert Spencer Jordan

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels

Stuart Adams Hamilton, Chemical Warfare Service, subject to examination required by law.

Barnwell Rhett Legge, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Edward Mallory Almond, Infantry.

Charles Paul Stivers, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Oliver Lincoln Haines, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.

Oscar Irvin Gates, Field Artillery.

Percy William Clarkson, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Robert Chapin Candee, Air Corps.

Yarrow Daniel Vesely, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.

Lee Saunders Gerow, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.

Shuey Earl Wolfe, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Chaplain Luther Deck Miller to be major general (brigadier general, Chief of Chaplains), United States Army.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED AFTER NAME

To be first lieutenant

Robert J. Hoey, October 1, 1940.

To be second lieutenants from dates indicated

Charles P. Weiland, April 10, 1941.
Edward R. Polgrean, August 4, 1941.
William M. Watkins, Jr., October 14, 1941.
Richard R. Amerine, October 16, 1941.
Herbert A. Peters, February 9, 1942.
Robert R. Ayres, Jr., February 9, 1942.
Louis F. Ferguson, March 12, 1942.
Homer S. Hill, March 12, 1942.
Lawrence L. Herzog, March 14, 1942.
Jack B. Winters, March 17, 1942.
Scott G. Gier, March 25, 1942.
Cloyd R. Jeans, March 25, 1942.
Dean S. Hartley, Jr., April 3, 1942.
Wilbur F. Evans, May 1, 1942.
Robert L. Cremer, May 15, 1942.
Austin Wiggins, Jr., May 15, 1942.
James H. Phillips, May 22, 1942.
Elswin P. Dunn, June 8, 1942.
John M. Walker, Jr., June 18, 1942.
David R. Moak, June 25, 1942.
Edmond P. Hartsock, July 18, 1942.
Ralph E. Robinson, July 18, 1942.
Charles E. Call, October 1, 1942.
Emmett O. Anglin, Jr., November 1, 1942.
Phillip C. DeLong, December 16, 1942.
Edwin H. McCaleb III, February 1, 1943.
Bruce J. Matheson, February 1, 1943.
Thomas H. Miller, Jr., March 1, 1943.
John H. Glenn, Jr., March 16, 1943.
Earl W. Johnson, March 16, 1943.
George W. Brewer, April 1, 1943.
Loren K. Bronleewe, April 1, 1943.
Thomas J. Burnam, April 1, 1943.
David Cleeland, April 16, 1943.
Lynn W. Griffitts, April 16, 1943.
John E. Hansen, April 16, 1943.
George F. Bauman, May 16, 1943.
Stewart R. Lauer, May 16, 1943.
Joseph A. Mitchell, May 16, 1943.
George E. Jenkins, June 1, 1943.
Stanley J. Posluszny, June 1, 1943.
Richard H. Rainforth, June 1, 1943.
Eddie C. Torbett, June 1, 1943.
Thomas T. Tulipane, June 16, 1943.
Boyd "M" Phelps, July 1, 1943.
Harold D. Shields, July 1, 1943.
James C. Frew, July 16, 1943.
Richard M. Moore, July 16, 1943.
William K. Treynor, July 16, 1943.
Albert F. Dellamano, August 1, 1943.
Robert E. Wellwood, August 1, 1943.
Claude O. Barnhill, Jr., August 16, 1943.
Robert S. Hemstad, August 16, 1943.
Elmer E. Luther, September 1, 1943.
Dwight E. Mayo, September 1, 1943.
George H. Elias, October 1, 1943.
Frank K. Reilly, Jr., November 1, 1943.
Walter E. Daniel, December 16, 1943.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE COAST GUARD

Louis L. Bennett to be a commodore, to rank from November 1, 1945, while serving as commanding officer of Coast Guard training station, Groton, Conn., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Joseph E. Stika to be a commodore, to rank from November 1, 1945, while serving as commanding officer of the Coast Guard group, Alameda, Calif., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Arthur M. Matthews, Alicia.
Fred G. Williams, Bismarck.
Barbara L. Payne, Patmos.

CALIFORNIA

Mabel L. Hulsey, McArthur.
Lilburn G. Rice, Upper Lake.

KENTUCKY

Daisy H. Hampton, Artemus.
Verne W. Dunham, Dover.
Vernon Hall, McDowell.
Mattie S. Catlett, Mount Eden.
Clyde W. Rice, Tyner.

MAINE

Mary E. Burbank, Maplewood.

MICHIGAN

Earle S. Treend, Gobles.
Ward Gibbs, Sixlakes.

MINNESOTA

Lucile M. Bell, Lake Elmo.
Peter F. Hipp, New Brighton.
Lillian S. Mahlum, Nisswa.

OHIO

Herbert D. Holshoe, Homerville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Allan R. Newman, Chamberlain.
Margaret A. Jones, Cresbard.

UTAH

Cedena A. Cloward, Aurora.
Erastus R. Curtis, Orangeville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1945

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice in Him whose whole life was sacred and whose labors were divine. The star that poured its radiance upon the waiting world in memory bears us back to childhood's happy hours, when the Christmas snow blotted out a world of loathsome sin. In our observance of this holy day, grant that it may be free from the god of mammon, or that our people should make it a pagan festival. Never was there a time when we needed more to make a pilgrimage to the manger, out of whose poverty came the greatest riches of earth, pouring contempt upon class distinction, bigotry, and false idealism.

O Mary's Holy Child, reveal to this world, sated with strife, that an unselfish life is infinitely more than mere livelihood. O Son of God, who lived not in a palace but for the poor, help our country to rise from the shades of materialism into the Christmas dawn. We pray for the regenerating spirit, the faith and love which make us inheritors of these riches; this is the surety of the Christ birth.

We pray for our President, the Speaker, the Members, and all associated with the Congress. May they have the gladness of Christmas, which is hope; the spirit of Christmas, which is peace; the heart of Christmas, which is love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3603. An act to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1415. An act to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald entitled "Coffee-Cup Tempest."

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chelsea Record.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 209]

Abernethy	Gearhart	O'Hara
Adams	Geelan	Peterson, Ga.
Allen, Ill.	Gibson	Pfeifer
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillespie	Philbin
Andrews, N. Y.	Granahan	Powell
Barden	Grant, Ala.	Quinn, N. Y.
Barry	Gregory	Rains
Bell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Gwynne, Iowa	Reed, Ill.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hancock	Resa
Bland	Harless, Ariz.	Rich
Boren	Harness, Ind.	Richards
Boykin	Hart	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	Rizley
Brehm	Healy	Robertson, Va.
Brown, Ohio	Hedrick	Rockwell
Buckley	Heselton	Roe, N. Y.
Camp	Hinshaw	Rogers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Holifield	Rooney
Carlson	Holmes, Mass.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Hook	Sadowski
Celler	Horan	Schwabe, Okla.
Chapman	Hull	Shafer
Chelf	Izac	Sharp
Chiperfield	Jackson	Sheridan
Clark	Jennings	Short
Clippinger	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	Jonkman	Slaughter
Cole, Kans.	Kee	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Keefe	Snyder
Combs	Kefauver	Somers, N. Y.
Courtney	Keogh	Stevenson
Cox	Kilburn	Stigler
Curley	King	Sumner, Ill.
Daughton, Va.	Knutson	Sumners, Tex.
Dawson	Latham	Talbot
De Lacy	Lemke	Talle
Dickstein	Lesinski	Tarver
Dingell	Lewis	Taylor
Domengeaux	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas, Calif.	McDonough	Thomason
Douglas, Ill.	McGehee	Torrens
Drewry	McGlinchey	Towe
Durham	McKenzie	Traynor
Ellis	McMillen, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Elsaesser	Maloney	Vorys, Ohio
Ervin	Mansfield, Tex.	Vursell
Fellows	May	Walter
Fernandez	Monroney	Weaver
Flannagan	Morrison	Winter
Fuller	Murdock	Wolcott
Gardner	Murphy	Wood
Gary	Norrell	Worley
Gathings	Norton	Zimmerman
	O'Brien, Mich.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 258 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONVENING OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. J. Res. 294) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 14, 1946.

LET US BRING OUR FIGHTING MEN HOME

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That means that this is an adjournment sine die?

Mr. McCORMACK. Until January 14.

Mr. RANKIN. It means an adjournment instead of a recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, this resolution does not set the date of the adjournment.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand it does not, but it does mean that when we do adjourn it is to be an adjournment and not a recess.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, when we reconvene it will be another session of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, I am going to vote against the resolution for the simple reason, as I have pointed out before, that we have some legislation that I think ought to be passed before we go home, to permit the men who have served for 18 months or more in the armed forces to be discharged on their own motion, or, on their own application, to permit those men who have dependents at home to look after to be discharged on their own application, and to permit those boys who want to return to school to be discharged on their own application.

If this measure is carried over until after the 14th of January, the chances are we will not get a vote on it for months.

You have stripped the farms of this country of their young men; and if you postpone this proposition until spring, it means that many of them will be denied the opportunity to make crops next year. It is just as important for these young men to come home as it is for Members of Congress to go home for the holidays.

I am going to oppose any adjournment until you give us a vote on this measure to permit these boys to come home, when they are no longer in the armed forces.

General MacArthur some time ago said that he would not need more than 200,000 men in Japan at the outside, and, if I remember correctly, he said he could get along with 60,000. If General MacArthur can get along with 200,000 men in Japan, surely with Russia and France and England all helping in Europe, we can get along with 200,000 men in Germany. Then why keep in the armed forces six or seven million men, standing around in uniformed idleness, at Government expense, who are begging to come home to look after their own affairs? I say it is an outrage and I shall oppose any adjournment until something is done about it.

This resolution means that Congress will be away for about 4 weeks. The rest of you may do as you please, but I cannot support it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. There is nothing to object to. The joint resolution is before the House for consideration and has been debated.

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York. He has made a good fight on this proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. This is a matter that confronts all the American people. It ought to be taken up here and discussed, and not rushed through in this hasty manner. We ought to have time to discuss it on the floor. I resent having it rammed through in this way.

The SPEAKER. We are proceeding in the regular order. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman form New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I just want to say that I hope the gentlemen here, before they go home, will at least take the trouble to sign discharge petition No. 8. Let us get some action on this matter. We are breaking the morale of the Army, that has made a magnificent fight. They are beginning to wonder if the House of Representatives has any interest in them or in getting them home. We are breaking the morale of their families. Something ought to be done. I do not know how any man who fails to sign that petition can offer a reasonable excuse for not doing so.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I have a discharge petition on the desk, No. 10, in which I am very, very much interested. I have no objection to this adjournment until the 14th unless I have to go back and get that signed anew. Will that carry over?

The SPEAKER. It will carry over.

Mr. FOLGER. If it will I am all right.

The SPEAKER. Everything remains on the calendar just as it is now.

Mr. McCORMACK. The next session would ordinarily start on January 3. We have practically completed our legislation. For the record, may I say that it is only fair and proper that this resolution be adopted. If we did meet on January 3 there would be no legislation to bring before the House much before the 14th of January.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that on the day before yesterday I was detained downtown and did not have the opportunity to join you in expressions of regret at the resignation of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. It has been my privilege to serve with him for 16 years. Everything that was said about him here I join with you in echoing, because he has been an able, a conscientious, and a fine legislator, as well as a great friend. I am sorry I did not have the opportunity of saying so when others were talking about his leaving.

I would like briefly to take my hair down with my friends in the House of Representatives this morning, because, as you know, on December 31, 1945, my resignation will take effect and I will no longer be a Member of this body. My recollection of the House of Representatives goes back to 1911 when, as a young boy who had been out of Georgia only once before, I came to Washington with the Honorable William Schley Howard, who was a new Member at that time from the same district I now have the privilege to represent. I became chief clerk in the House Post Office over in the Old House Office Building. President William Howard Taft had called an extra session of the Congress to meet in April of that year, and in March Mr. Howard brought me up here and got that position for me. Whatever I have accomplished in political life has largely been due to the kindness, generosity, and friendship, as well as the good advice of my friend, Mr. Howard, who some of the older Members of the House will remember as having served 8 years in this body. There are only two Members of the House now serving who were in the Congress when I came here as a clerk in 1911. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and our distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] are the only two remaining Members who were here at that time. Champ Clark was Speaker of the House at that time, and Oscar Underwood was the Democratic leader as well as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I remember on the Republican side the distinguished Representative from Illinois, Mr. Mann, who perhaps knew more about legislation than any one man I have ever known who has served in this body. He broke himself down trying to keep up with all the legislation that was passed here.

The distinguished former Speaker, Mr. Cannon of Illinois, was also a Member at that time. Back in those days, the executive branch of the Government consisted of only 300,000 employees. We had above 3,000,000 employees in 1944 and in that coordinate branch of the Federal system. Congress in those days remained in session on an average of about 10 months out of the 24 months for which a Member of the House was elected. The result was that Members had the opportunity to attend to other matters, practice law, stay at home and mingle with their constituents. It was a very, very different type of service from that in which we are now engaged. For a short time in 1912, I served as secretary to Mr. Howard. As my thoughts go back to those days, I can well remember that if we had as many as 15 letters in a day we had a big mail. We only had one clerk who was paid $1,800 per year. Most of the correspondence concerned rural routes or, in our part of the country, Spanish War pensions, or free seed. Most of the legislation concerned appropriation bills and tariff bills. We had only one regulatory body at that time, as far as I recall, and that was the Interstate Commerce Commission. As CLIF WOODRUM said here the other day, the Members used to gather in the old Congress Hall Hotel and they really had the time to become friends and to know each other. They were not so busy as we are today, making it almost impossible for us to fraternize with each other in the way I know we would all like to do.

I went home in 1912 and studied law and did a great many other things. In 1926 I helped manage the campaign of a man named Leslie J. Steele, who defeated Hon. William D. Upshaw in the campaign that year. Mr. Steele took his seat here in 1927 and served until July 1929, when he died in the city of Washington. Mutual friends of the late Congressman Steele, Mr. Howard and myself, had a meeting, and they asked me to become a candidate for Congress. One of the things that entered into my decision at that time was the fact that I was informed, and I think reliably so, that the Congress was prepared and all ready, had all plans made, to increase the pay of its Members to $12,500 per year. I mention that for a specific reason, and I will come back to it later.

I had no illusions about the service in the Congress. I cannot plead guilty to getting into some thing that I did not know anything about. I knew it was a tough job but I did not realize how tough it was going to become in the years that have passed since that time.

I came here as a new Member of Congress in October 1929, when Mr. Herbert Hoover was President, and our late friend, Nicholas Longworth, was Speaker of the House. Mr. John Q. Tilson was majority leader and Mr. Jack Garner was minority leader. I served under Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, and our present beloved and illustrious Speaker, Mr. Rayburn.

It has been a pleasure to serve in this body with the hundreds and hundreds of men who have passed through its membership since I have been here. I sat down at home the other night and figured out how many were left of the 434 that I joined in the fall of 1929, and there are less than 55 of those 434 Members left. The turn-over is pretty fast.

I want to express my appreciation, not only to the Speaker of the House for his courtesy to me as a Member of this body, but also to my leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]; to the minority leader, my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, and to each and everyone of them, because it has been a privilege to serve with them and to know them. They have always been courteous and kind.

I served here also during the time when the Honorable Bert Snell was minority leader and when on our side the men who later became Speakers were our majority leaders.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairmen of the committees on which I have served. They have been uniformly kind, courteous, and helpful. It has been a great privilege to serve with them. I have particularly enjoyed my service on the Labor Committee, first with the late Billy Connery, whom we all loved, and then with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the present chairman.

My service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, first with Judge Davis, Tennessee, who is now a member of the Federal Trade Commission, and recently under the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, than whom there is no finer gentleman in this House.

I enjoyed my service on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, whose chairman is the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Recently in this Congress I have served on the Committee on Education, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. I once served on the Roads Committee for a short time, and also on the Claims Committee for 10 years. I greatly enjoyed the work on that committee, although it is arduous and I had to give it up.

I especially want to thank my majority leader for selecting me 3 years ago to be Democratic whip of this House. It has been a most interesting service and one that has brought me into closer contact with the Members on my side of the aisle, and I have greatly enjoyed that service.

I wish also to express my appreciation to Will Robinson, of Utah, who is my chief assistant, and to the 15 zone assistants who have made possible whatever we have been able to accomplish with that organization.

Also I wish to thank the officers and employees of the House for their uniform courtesies, and for the friendships which I have formed with them. One of them, the postmaster of the House, Finis Scott, was my boss when I first came to Washington as a clerk in the

post office; I worked under his direction there.

I am also going to miss my association with the men and women of the press gallery. I have come to know them quite well and to know what conscientious people they are in trying to report accurately the proceedings of this great legislative body. They have a tough job trying to keep up, just as we do.

I wish to talk to you a few minutes now about the House of Representatives and the Congress, but more particularly the House, because I think I know something about the problems the Members of the House face. I, of course, have no personal knowledge about the situation in the Senate. The burdens of the Members of the House of Representatives during the years I have known something about it which, as I say, dates back to 1911—of course I have a more intimate knowledge in the past 16 years—those burdens have been tremendously increased by factors over which we have no control. Those factors in part are the growth of the population of the country. The number of Members in the House of Representatives has not changed since the reapportionment based on the census of 1910. This means of course that each of us here is today representing a great many more people because the population of the country has grown tremendously. There has been a wide extension of the activities of the Federal Government during the past 30 years and particularly during the past 16 which I have served here, and that in itself including as it does the establishment of many new agencies has brought to each Member of the House increased burdens and the necessity for additional work. The length of the sessions has also increased the burdens of the Members of this body. Just this morning I checked up on the length of the sessions of the Sixty-second Congress, which was the Congress that came into being in 1911. I found that although it had one extra session, making three in all, the three sessions totaled only 400 days. In the last Congress, the Seventy-eighth, this body was in session 695 days. This means, of course, that the Members are here in Washington practically all the time and it complicates the duties of the membership and increases the burdens under which they labor.

There has been another change in the service of this Congress which I believe it is well to note and I believe the people ought to understand—I am afraid they do not—and that is increase in the complexity of the problems with which the Members of this body must deal. As I stated a while ago, when I was secretary to Mr. Howard in 1912 legislation in this body encompassed only a few subjects, primarily appropriations and taxes. Today we are dealing with every known human activity not only in this country but with matters which affect every nation of the world and the peoples of every country. It is a much bigger job, a much more difficult job, a much more trying job to be a Member of this body today than it was in 1911 or 1912, or even in 1929 when I entered this Congress.

The work has been complicated, as I stated, by the additional days of service in both Houses of Congress, by the additional contacts made necessary by the Members of this body with the executive branch and by the added problems of the people, which means more mail to be answered, more questions to be taken up, more visitors to Washington and to your offices.

The methods of campaigning today are more trying on a Member of Congress and more expensive than in the earlier days. The radio alone has brought increased expenses to Members who seek reelection. I think something ought to be done about this situation and after I get out of the Congress I am going to take advantage of every opportunity I have to tell every public audience I can speak to that they should let you know they want you to remedy the conditions which are making service in this body such a burden on its Members.

In the first place, the pay of the Members of Congress is entirely inadequate. If it was not too much in 1925, it is too little today. No one else I know of is working for the same pay today that they received in 1925. It would not be so bad if the $10,000 received by the Members of Congress were used for the same purposes which people working in private industry use their pay for; but you and I know that it is not possible. Actually what you are working for, as compared with a person in private life, is less than $5,000 per year. That is a shame and a disgrace, and the people of this country would not want it to continue, in my judgment, if they knew the facts, and they ought to know them. This is the time to act. It was deferred in 1929. The depression came and the opportunity was lost. The people are for it now. It should be done.

I say that every expense incurred by a Member of Congress in the discharge of his official duties should be reimbursed to him. We do that for the executive branch of the Government. I will cite you an illustration of how we suffer under this disadvantage as compared with those in the executive branch of the Government.

Last April while we were in recess I went home and during my stay there the Military Order of the World War had a luncheon celebrating Army Day. A distinguished gentleman from Washington, who is head of one of the agencies here, made the principal address. I sat next to him at the speaker's table. He was a little late getting in. He came in followed by three men who worked for the United States Government in the branch office of that agency in Atlanta. One of them was carrying a brief case, the other one looking after his travel reservations and so forth. He had a book in his hand that he used to write out an order for a ticket. They do not need any money. The third one was driving him around in an automobile at Government expense.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, there I was representing a half million constituents, staying in a hotel room at my own expense, no secretarial staff, no assistants, not even anyone to help me answer the telephone which was ringing about as fast as it could. It just does not make sense, Mr. Speaker. We appropriate the money to take care of those in the executive branch of the Government and we ought to staff our own offices and our own committees adequately so that we can render the service which the people want and are demanding from the Members of Congress. There ought to be better paid assistants. Only a year and a half ago I lost a fine young man who had been with me for 15 years. That kind of experience cannot be duplicated. There was nowhere I could turn to replace him, and the result was that after he left I had to put in at least 2 hours a day longer doing things which could be done just as well and were done just as well by him over a period of years. The reason I lost him was because at that time we were limited to $4,500 a year as salary for our chief assistant. He was offered $6,000 at home. I do not blame him for going. He did the right thing, but it is foolish for us to let those things happen; and the people in my district have suffered because I could not retain the services of that experienced assistant.

I think we ought to have an office in the District staffed at all times so that when we go home we will have some assistants there and in order that the people in our districts may have a place where they can go to get information and make the necessary contacts.

There is one other subject I think I know a little something about; I had a little experience with it in this House, and that is the question of what to do about old-age security or retirement. That is the principal reason, my colleagues, that I am leaving this House. I am approaching the time in life when I have to think about the consequences that come to all of us if we stay here long enough, and there certainly is no reason for a man to stay here until he suffers the consequences that we know have come to many men who have served here long and faithfully, only to go out in their old age with no means of livelihood and no chance to make a decent standard of living. This Congress ought to provide some form of retirement for its membership, and I hope you will do it. My friend the gentleman from Virginia, CLIFF WOODRUM, said that the bill that has been reported and that will probably be considered next year is not adequate. That may be true. The committee had some difficulty even reporting that bill. It can be perfected later. It certainly is a start in the right direction, and I do hope, although I am going out, and I will not be here at the time, that that matter will be taken up and thoroughly considered. Tell your constituents when you go home for the Christmas recess just what this situation is, just what your problems are, and explain to them what this bill does. If you get a copy of the report, you can give them all the information they may want to have about it, and I believe that the people of this country will back you up when they understand the situation.

I am confident they will. Certainly there is no reason in the world so far as I can find out why this group of public servants should be the only ones in the Federal Government without any form of old-age security. Sometime in my early days one of my friends sent me a motto which read something like this: "The way to have friends is to be one." I have often thought about that motto, and it seemed to me it was a good one to follow. I have tried to follow it here among my colleagues in the House. As far as I am concerned, there has been no Member of this body with whom I have served that I have not had the greatest respect for and that I did not like personally. I hope that as I leave here I may take with me the friendship of each one of you. I have enjoyed my contacts with you, and I am going to be continuously interested in the welfare of the Members of this body. If I can contribute anything to your welfare as a private citizen, I expect to do it. I am going to carry with me memories that are dearer to me than anything that life can hold. In connection with that feeling I just want to read an extract from Diary of a Dude Wrangler, written by Struthers Burt, which appeals to me as expressing the feeling I have regarding the memories I am taking away with me from this body. He said:

> The remembrance of beauty, the beauty of a thing, or of personal relationships, or of a country, has always seemed to me the chief end of life. The present cannot be held; it slips through our grasping fingers, becomes immediately the past. The future may be neither beautiful nor worth remembering; certainly its beauty will be accompanied by ugliness and tragedy. But what has happened is ours and cannot be taken away from us; and the mind, like the gauze screen through which gold is run, transmutes in retrospect almost everything into loveliness. Remembrance is the one sure immortality we know.

As I leave my colleagues in the House I am taking with me many memories, remembrances of each of you, which I shall cherish as long as I live.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of BOB RAMSPECK to become executive vice president of the Air Transport Association is to me personally, and to every Member of Congress, the cause of deep regret. I will lose the legislative associations of a close personal friend. Congress loses a valued and devoted colleague. The Nation will be deprived of the services of an able legislator and exemplary public official.

Bob has served with me in the House since October 2, 1929. During the last 3 years he has been the Democratic whip. These years of close association have given me the privilege of personal contact with a man who through his invaluable and unselfish devotion to the high duties of his office has indelibly imprinted upon me as upon all deep regard for his sterling qualities as a friend, adviser and leader among men.

He has worked unceasingly during his long service to strengthen the Administrative machinery of the Government. As chairman of the Civil Service Commission he has been a stanch defender of the rights of Government employees under civil service and a vigorous protagonist of a stronger and greater Government through civil service.

Besides his arduous duties as Democratic whip, and chairman of the Civil Service Committee, he has been active and untiring in his efforts during the war to develop and maintain, as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, an American merchant marine adequate for the purpose of our national defense in war as well as in peace. He has exhibited unusual vision in the performance of this office both in protecting the American shipowner and in safeguarding the rights of the American seaman. He has as a member of the Committee on Labor endeavored with sincerity and wisdom to establish and develop a national labor policy with a sole objective—the good of the country.

Few legislators have resigned from Congress who have experienced a more colorful background. His love for politics in the right sense is known to all. His strong and forcible motives have been evident in his every word and act, whether for his friends, his country, or his fellow man. There has been no time or place in his life for complacency, self-sufficiency, or indifference to existing conditions. Bob always looked ahead. In a world at war, with shifting concepts of government and social obligations, he was positive in his opposition to known abuses and a vigorous advocate of known improvements. Few men have been so fitted by talent and temperament to carry the heavy burdens of public office which have been his. His ready grasp of daily problems, his great capacity for the mastery of the intricacies of government, his extraordinary power of simple statement, his genial smile of friendliness, united with a long-sustained intellectual effort and a tireless zeal for the full performance of any task he has undertaken have ever marked his brilliant career.

Now, as he lays aside the mantle of the legislator, with a natural and sincere feeling of regret, I unite with his colleagues and his country, in paying tribute to his public service, whose duties he has so wisely comprehended and so ably performed. He carries with him the good wishes and high hopes of all who have been fortunate to know him.

To BOB RAMSPECK, service delayed has meant service denied. With painstaking care and unflagging energy, he has always pressed forward in his work for his fellow man. As a progressive legislator and diplomatic statesman, his has been a work of love for duty and its fulfilment. During the years no resentment has every marked our association, no differences of opinion have hindered our work. He has been single-minded in his devotion to the duties of his office. We have witnessed the spectacle in the last few days of two of the outstanding Members of the House addressing us in probably their final speeches in this body, one a man with 16 years of honorable and constructive service, and the other a man with 23 years of honorable and constructive service. Personal necessity, their obligation to themselves and families, compel them to resign and deny to this body, to their districts, to their States, and to the Nation, the full benefit of the great capacities that they possess, capacities increased as a result of their years of service. They retire voluntarily due to economic pressure. There are many other Members of this body confronted with the same problem. I may take the House into my confidence and say that I at the present time could resign from the House and accept a position paying each year a very substantial salary. It is a tremendous pressure when I realize that the journey of life is passing and that some time in the not too remote future my years of productivity will be over so far as a return to civilian life is concerned. We do not expect the salary or compensation that private employ can pay. Government should not pay that, and none of us expect it. On the other hand, it is for the best interests of the people of the country to see that Members of Congress, their public officials, are at least paid that compensation which gives them a reasonable minimum security in accordance with the position they occupy and the responsibilities devolving upon them.

Few people realize that we are subject to the income tax. Most people think we are not, but we are. Few people realize that our expenses here in the Capitol city are not a deductible item. Our actual living expenses for living quarters—never mind food—most people think is a deductible item from our gross income—it is not. A businessman coming to Washington can deduct all his expenses as a part of his business expenses, and properly so. But few people realize that Members of Congress who have to maintain their own home, come down here and all of their expenses, even for their actual expenses of living quarters, are not deductible from their gross income. Few people realize that the telephone bills of Members of Congress are greatly in excess of any allowance—in fact, we have no allowance for telephone bills. If I might make a personal reference, my telephone bill last year was $1,878. Nighty-eight percent of that was for official calls in connection with my work as a Member of Congress. I do not say this for sympathy because I do not want sympathy. I would like to continue to render public service. That is what most of us are here for. Of course, we sought it, but we like to render public service. Someone has to do it. On the other hand, it is for the best interests of the people of a constituency and of the country to retain in office men who have stood the test, men who are qualified, men who are able, men who are experienced, and men who have courage. We regret to see these two men go. On this occasion, we regret to see BOB RAMSPECK go. But out of this may come a lesson. Through this occasion a message may be conveyed to the people of the country as to the reasons which compel these men to depart from public service, thereby taking from this body two outstanding legislators and statesmen to the detriment of the best interests of the people. I hope

we face the task. On three occasions in public life I have had the opportunity to vote for an increase in salary for myself. On two occasions, as a member of the Legislature of Massachusetts, and once, indirectly, as a Member of this body. I have never yet failed to vote for an increase. I welcome the opportunity. As a matter of fact, instead of $15,000, we ought to increase the salary of Congressmen to $20,000; but in any event it should be $15,000.

We regret these two men leaving, but out of their leaving may come good for the people. It may awaken public opinion to the realization of what faced these two outstanding legislators and prompted them to retire from Congress, and which also faces all Members of this body, and will face public officials in the future. It is for the best interests of the country to at least give their public officials economic security, not only for the present but in the future when their productive years have gone by.

BOB RAMSPECK, you leave here with the affection and esteem of all your colleagues of today and of yesterday, who have served here with you. You have left the imprint of decency, the imprint of ability, service, courage, the imprint of a man who came here with love of the Constitution and of every provision of the Constitution, whose every word and every act during your service has been an exemplication of that fact.

We are sorry to see you go, but in our regrets there goes with you our congratulations and our best wishes for the maximum of success possible for you and your wife and your family, down through the journey of life.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute of the recognition of service to a distinguished Member of this House who is about to leave us.

During the 9 years I have had the honor of serving on the Civil Service Committee of the House, of which ROBERT RAMSPECK is chairman, I have never seen a more tireless and ardent worker than our colleague, ROBERT RAMSPECK.

Although we have not agreed at all times with respect to legislation that came before us, I want to say, as ranking minority member, I have found him to be considerate of those of us who were not always in accord with his views.

Employees in the Federal Government have had no better friend in Congress. He has at all times been loyal to the civil-service employees in Government.

I had the honor last evening of attending a testimonial dinner given in honor of the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee. This dinner was sponsored by our various organizations of Government employees. I say to you it was a most inspiring event.

I do not know of any man who has carried a heavier load of legislation during the past few years in this House than the distinguished Member we honor today. It is a full time job to be chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service.

In addition thereto, he has been an active member of other committees. He has also held the office of majority whip of this House. I want to say, too, that as majority whip he has been fair to Members on both sides of the aisle and so I join with other Members of the House, BOB RAMSPECK, in wishing you the best of luck. You and your family have our kindest wishes. We wish you Godspeed. Do not forget that for you the latch string is always out at the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, ability, industry, integrity, courage, personality and, last but not least, forthrightness have made BOB RAMSPECK a power in the House. The late Speaker, Champ Clark, once said that Congressmen are made, not born. BOB RAMSPECK has made his way from a clerkship in the House to a position of leadership as a Member. This was no mere accident and every step in the climb has been deserved. In this great democratic group, Members are, generally speaking, impartially appraised by an impartial jury. One can only progress if, in the opinion of his colleagues, he merits advancement. BOB RAMSPECK has always been one of the working Members of the House. Therefore, he has been advised as to legislative proposals throughout his entire service. He possesses a wealth of information about Congress. He is a loyal Democrat, usually voting with his administration, but never offensively partisan. It has been my good fortune to know him well, especially on the floor of the House. As the majority whip and oftentimes as the acting majority leader, we of the minority know that his word is as good as his bond.

It is unfortunate for the Congress to lose his type of leadership. However, I am sure we all join in wishing him success, happiness, and a life of usefulness in his future activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, during my almost 13 years of service in this House I have been privileged to share the friendship and the working contacts with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who leaves this body voluntarily on December 31. I labored next to him on the Civil Service Committee, over which he has presided for many Congresses in such splendid fashion. I have served beside him also on the Labor Committee, where his fine leadership has meant much in solving vexing problems.

I know of no Member of this House who is more highly esteemed and genuinely beloved than BOB RAMSPECK. I believe we have been steadied by his counsel and strengthened by his courage. Personally I shall miss him very much as he leaves Capitol Hill to undertake most important activities in the growing field of air transportation.

To BOB RAMSPECK is given freely from the membership, not only our continuing respect, but also our confidence that in private industry he will use the same attributes of ability, intelligence, and integrity which have made him most effective in public business. It has been a happy opportunity to serve with this splendid citizen. He has given much to the Congress and to the Republic.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, to hear BOB RAMSPECK talk, those who have not had the privilege which has been ours might be led into the mistake of regarding him as a patriarch instead of what he is, a youthful patriot.

Or, even if old friends appraise the rich content of his experience, the extent of his service, and ponder the depth of his ripe wisdom, they might think that he had seen the first Trojan horse, yet lived to serve until the day before the latest model of that ancient wooden beast is to be demolished in the Rose Bowl while the defeat of the four horsemen of Troy is being accomplished.

Be that as it may, today we are dedicating another panel of the Wailing Wall, where we lament almost daily the loss of invaluable Members of Congress.

Thus, on this occasion Alabama joins her tears with those of Georgia, both States proud to have been at one time parts of Virginia, whose distinguished son we honored yesterday.

Today a grateful Nation bewails the voluntary retirement of BOB RAMSPECK from this scene of his labors, for he has graced, as well as honored and strengthened, this body.

There are few men who have had bred into them the power of his native sunshine, and fewer still who have put such power into the service of his district, State, and Nation so quietly or more brilliantly. He has fought tirelessly and effectively in the cause of righteousness with selfless devotion. His life and character merit the query—

> And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, BOB RAMSPECK carries with him, in his new and important field of service, our best wishes for success. His outstanding service and usefulness here in the House for more than 16 years is greatly appreciated by his loyal constituents, his State, and his country.

He is one of the most popular and beloved Members of the House. As a young lawyer, as a member of the Georgia Legislature, as a Member of Congress, and in every walk of life, he has always been held in the highest esteem and had the confidence of everyone. On all great problems, you knew where he stood; he never evaded an issue or made excuses. He was never happier than when helping some Member of this Chamber. He is capable and broadminded, and one never loses his friendship by differing with him. His unselfishness, his love for men and for fair play, his brilliant mind, great energy, and tact, all contributed largely to his success as Democratic whip of the House and one of the leaders of his party.

It is regrettable that we have to lose such a valuable man from Congress during these days of emergency.

We members of the Georgia delegation appreciate the high and deserved compliments paid here today to our colleague, BOB RAMSPECK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] who is about to leave this body to lend his vast and successful experience to private industry, when he was recognized as one of the most efficient secretaries on Capitol Hill. During the succeeding years I have observed with pleasure and satisfaction his leadership in party councils.

It is indeed regrettable that with his passing we are losing a third outstanding southern gentleman, whose character and ability we know so well and value so highly, during this session of Congress. We have lost the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Satterfield, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and now the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a facility of expression that allowed me to convey appropriately my own complete judgment on the important and illimitable services of this outstanding statesman, faithful and sincere Representative, and, above all, at all times a gentleman.

The three southern gentlemen have built up in this Congress a record and a reputation of which they and their constituencies may be justly proud. I hope that the few other Members representing the great and beautiful Southland, the mother of so many illustrious statesmen, will in the future recognize some of their defects, exchange their intolerance for a broad-minded tolerance, and thereby establish for themselves as enviable and as great a reputation, as was made by the subject of these remarks, a record that will be a credit to themselves, an additional credit to the Southland, and of the remainder of our country.

As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not at my command the words necessary to express adequately my high evaluation of the worth and work of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]; but let me say that I wholeheartedly subscribe to and endorse what has been beautifully and truthfully said by our majority leader and others who have preceded me with respect to the praiseworthy achievements and admirable record of this lovable servant of the Republic that the House of Representatives is about to lose. Our loss is the gain of private enterprise.

We shall enduringly miss him not only in our trying and important work in this Chamber but also in deliberative councils where he has come to be known for his fairness, logic, and persuasiveness, and conciliatory qualities. May the future hold for him nothing but happiness and contentment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise largely because I am apparently the second ranking Member on the minority side of this committee. We have had a lot of casualties on the minority side and we have had a dreadful lot of them on the Committee on the Civil Service.

Primarily, however, I want to pay my respects to a man who made it much easier for me to attempt to do something in this Congress. I doubt if there was ever a more ill-at-ease, frightened, worried man who came into this body than I when I came in in 1943. BOB RAMSPECK made it easy for me to understand that if I was seriously trying to do a job, I could do it in his committee. I want to thank him for that and say that is a quality in a chairman that well can be developed and continued in this body.

Finally I want to point this out that people generally get that which they pay for, and in connection with the leaving of Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. WOODRUM, and Mr. Satterfield and others I should point out to the public that you get diamonds at Tiffany's and you get cut glass at Kresge's.

The people will continue to lose able men from their Congress until we set a standard of value on our services, which will cause the people to respect the job of being a Member of the Congress of United States and deter private enterprise from hiring away the people's best qualified representatives in the people's most important branch of government, the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I see BOB RAMSPECK leave this House. I think the Congress and the Nation are losing the services of one of the finest citizens this country has ever known. I feel a deep sense of obligation to BOB RAMSPECK who helped me immeasurably when I came here this year for my first term in the Congress. His patience with young Congressmen and the help he has given all new Members in getting acquainted with the rules of the House, both written and unwritten, is truly remarkable, and I feel I owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I also feel I owe a great debt of gratitude to BOB RAMSPECK because I was for about 3 years an employee of the Federal Government. I know of the splendid work he has done in protecting the rights of Federal employees and in making the Federal service attractive to the best people we have in this country. His name is revered by all Federal employees.

The gentleman from Georgia leaves a great void in this House by his resignation. He has sensed and understood the great social and economic forces that are at work in our land far better than many other Members. His fairness to all, his splendid liberal spirit, his devotion to duty, are all characteristics every Member might well emulate.

I wish BOB RAMSPECK every happiness in the world and success in his new enterprise and earnestly hope that he will visit us from time to time and give to us his sage counsel and advice.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, it is just a few days short of a year that I first walked into the office of BOB RAMSPECK. I met there a quiet, pleasant, friendly person who has left on me an indelible mark, a mark of leadership, a mark of friendship, a mark of a man that we need in this House. With unmistakable evidence of division developing in the country, we need men of his caliber, men we all trust, men we all like and feel we can all count on in the pinches. It is a deep personal regret to me to see him feel compelled to leave this body. I join with others in regretting his departure and wishing him well.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as one of the newer members of the Committee on the Civil Service, I have a great debt to pay to BOB RAMSPECK for his courtesy, his understanding, and his ability to lead and guide a new Member through the labyrinthian ways of this House without appearing officious or overbearing. It must be a great sense of satisfaction to him to terminate his public duties with the knowledge that throughout the width and breadth of this land he has contributed more to the "little people" who work for the Government than any one man. Through his efforts the standards of life and living of Federal employees have been raised. He has gone into their homes, and the blessings of these "little people" whom he has helped will follow him through life—a tribute to be envied by all who serve here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse everything that has been said by the previous speakers in behalf of our good friend ROBERT RAMSPECK of Georgia. Every word that was said is deserved. I have known ROBERT RAMSPECK now close on to 12 years. All during that time I have welcomed his counsel. He has been constructive in his thinking and progressive in his views. As one who has fought for a liberal program for benefit of the average citizen of this Nation so that his standard of living will be such that real democracy will prevail, I know that at times in a spirit of trying to do things for the underpriviledged I sometimes go beyond the bounds of calm deliberation and approach in my enthusiasm. BOB RAMSPECK has steadied me many a time with his calm manner and kindly advice. I wish him well. We hope that more men will come to the House of Representatives of the caliber of BOB RAMSPECK. Good-by, Bob.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion which is highly important. I do not know that we can add to or detract from the future accomplishments of BOB RAMSPECK by what we may say here today, but to my mind this is an hour when we should not become impatient or restive lest this time should not have been well employed. I think it is worth a great deal to the Members of the House. I think it is worth a vast deal to

the country to know that by his intellectuality, devotion to duty, hard work, and kindliness of disposition BOB RAMSPECK has endeared himself to every Member of this body. What I get from it is that it is a pattern to me and to others that if we would actually justify the same opinion of ourselves we must work for it. In the 4½ years I have been here I have found that BOB RAMSPECK has taken most seriously the responsibilities which membership in this body imposes upon each one of us, and has acted his part well. He is entitled to go from here with the highest esteem and respect of every Member of this body and with the thanks of the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in the nineteenth century, shortly after the War Between the States when the Southland was suffering from the devastation of a conflict which ravished our land and destroyed our economy, there came forth from the State of Georgia a great leader, man of excellent vision who, in the face of destruction and misery, saw a vision and a new hope for the South. He traveled eastwardly, and in a series of addresses called The New South set the pattern of what the South hoped to do in the rebuilding of the Southland in a new era. He expressed the aims and ambitions of a reborn people. That man was Henry Grady. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in this twentieth century the man who is leaving the House of Representatives shortly may be likened unto that great man, Henry Grady. In my opinion BOB RAMSPECK has represented the new spirit and the best progressive leadership and the liberal vision of the Southland. Not only are the people of his district losing an excellent Representative in the House of Representatives, but we in Tennessee and throughout the Southland feel we are losing a fine and capable Representative who stands for the highest ideals of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the South are not reactionary and backward. The South is progressive, virile, and on the march to a great era of advancement. The work here in Congress of BOB RAMSPECK should be an inspiration to other young men of ability and confidence in our future to enter and do their best in public life. I regret exceedingly that BOB RAMSPECK feels he must leave and bring to a close his very useful career as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORRELL). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, just a moment will I take. The gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK, in my opinion is as fine a type of legislator as I have ever known. He has the things that make for competence in legislation. First, he has integrity—unsullied. Next, he has more than usual ability. Next, he has energy. I might say to you as I say many times to schoolgirls and schoolboys when I talk to them, there is not so much difference in the abilities of people. If one person has good common sense, and uses it, he is just as smart as anybody because that is all the sense there is. It is what you do with it that counts. Energy is about 75 to 90 percent of the battle.

When I have wanted to know what was going on before any committee of which the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK was a member, I could find out talking to him because he kept up with the business of the committee. I deeply regret his going from a personal standpoint because he and I have been close personal friends. I want to take this opportunity of thanking him from the bottom of my heart for his helpfulness to me in trying to do a very difficult, a very arduous, and a very onerous job. He has never failed me. The great State of Georgia appeals to me and always did. I read about it as a boy. I have visited it as a man. It has contributed tremendously to the welfare and glory of these United States through its outstanding men, both past and present, who have made the history of Georgia great and who have been helpful in making and keeping this country great. I could say of the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK, as I said of another colleague of ours the other day, you can take from the beginning of Georgia to now, Stephens, Toombs, Lamar, Crisp, and a score of others who have been outstanding men in history in the service that they have rendered—the gentleman from Georgia, BOB RAMSPECK in my opinion is their equal.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there must come to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] an exquisite sense of joy that arises out of the consciousness that he holds securely the full confidence of his fellows and the country. It has pleased me that so many of his colleagues have sought the opportunity to testify to his high character, his very great ability, and to his general excellence. He is deserving of it all, for he has made it a habit of his life to live the Golden Rule and to do well his every appointed task. No confidence ever reposed in him was misplaced, for he never betrayed a trust, and no honor was ever bestowed upon him which excited the least envy in others or threatened to spoil that sweet humility always exhibited in his daily life. I pronounce him to be very much of a man—a model man. It is well that many honors have been justly bestowed upon him, but it is not the stamp of the king that determines the fineness or weight of a metal. I have seen our friend, BOB RAMSPECK, time and again subjected to all the tests on the floor of this House with the result that he always came out pure gold and full measure. We shall miss him and though regretting to see him go our affections and our best wishes go with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, we shall all miss our good friend, BOB RAMSPECK. He has endeared himself to us by his genial nature and his outstanding service. Many difficult problems have come to him for solution, but he has met them patiently and efficiently. Length of legislative service and experience makes men correspondingly valuable in this body. We always part with regret from any Member eminently qualified in this regard to perform legislative tasks and duties. This sentiment is accentuated in the case of BOB RAMSPECK because of the abiding affection we have come to feel for him.

I have served with BOB RAMSPECK since he came to the Congress. I have been specially impressed with his exemplification of one unusual virtue in particular, and that is his tolerance of the opinions of those who disagree with him on public questions. He has always graciously accorded to each of his colleagues the right and privilege of individual judgment. Both personally and officially he leaves us with our respect and admiration. May good fortune attend him all along his way.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I was reminded of olden days while listening to the remarks of our good friend, BOB RAMSPECK, who is about to leave this body. I, too, was a secretary when BOB was in the office of Congressman Sly Howard, of Georgia.

As our good friend told us, there is a vast difference now than over 30 years ago, and there will continue to be an increase in the office work of the representatives in Congress.

BOB is blessed with an outstanding personality, and as a result you cannot find a man or woman in this House who would not call him their friend. As it has been properly said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], his loss to this House is one that is going to be felt. I will miss his companionship and I want to join with all in wishing him a long, happy, and successful career in his undertakings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress it was my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Civil Service under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. Service under him was always a pleasure.

I have watched him during the 9 years I have been a Member of this body. I have never known anyone to approach legislation more intelligently, to analyze it more honestly, and to fight more earnestly for his convictions than BOB RAMSPECK.

His leaving Congress is a loss to the whole country. At this time we can ill afford to lose from the public service such men as BOB RAMSPECK and CLIFF WOODRUM.

May his future be bright and may success continue to reward his efforts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to see men of the caliber of CLIFF WOODRUM, of Virginia, and BOB RAMSPECK, of Georgia, leave this House. Both have risen to their present high place by reason of their integrity and by hard work. I have had opportunity to be associated more closely with Mr. RAMSPECK than with Mr. WOODRUM. By his quiet, friendly understanding he has been a help and an inspiration to me, a new Member of this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RESA].

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, the departure of Mr. RAMSPECK from the Congress of the United States brings to all who knew him a keen realization of the extent to which a man's characteristics can exert an influence upon his fellow men. The breadth and accuracy of Mr. RAMSPECK's knowledge of legislative matters, the quiet thoroughness with which he applied this knowledge in his work, and the clarity, simplicity, and straightforwardness of his speech, as well as the soundness of his thinking, will always be remembered by his colleagues against the background provided by his unfailing kindly and gracious manner. It is only a well-merited compliment to his qualifications that business has beckoned to him to assume a role in the world of commerce where the rewards for his services will be more commensurate with their worth. I deem it a great privilege to join with others in wishing him continued happiness and success.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I personally very greatly regret the retirement from the House of my dear friend BOB RAMSPECK. As a Member of the House for many years he has been industrious and most efficient. He has rendered unusual service to his district and to the country. He was trained in routine congressional work and he has grown in political stature and wisdom as he has reached a high place in the legislative history of the Republic. BOB RAMSPECK is able, capable, honest, and courageous. As a diligent student of public problems he has exerted a wide influence in shaping and enacting legislation.

He has been the most successful and satisfactory democratic whip within my recollection. As the majority whip during the greatest of all wars he has been of inestimable assistance not only to the members of his party, but to the House. His advice and counsel have been sought and followed by his colleagues.

BOB RAMSPECK was one of the most efficient committee chairman in the House. His committee work was thorough. He was remarkably successful as a legislator.

BOB RAMSPECK is a loyal friend. He has been faithful to every trust. He retires from the House with the universal esteem of his colleagues and with a record of outstanding achievement. He will not only be missed in the House, but the country is losing one of the ablest Members of the House of Representatives as he leaves public life.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege little less than a duty to express my appreciation of the services of our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. I have had the privilege of knowing many fine men who have served in this House in the 29 years I have been here. Many of these men had superior qualities which were well recognized by its membership. If it were possible for me to do so, I might attempt to prepare a list of men whom I have regarded as among the most useful in each Congress since 1916. It would be a difficult task to attempt to discriminate justly as to the qualities and worth of the Members of this House or of any previous Congresses. If I did attempt to prepare even a limited list of men who have performed the most useful service here, I would include our colleague from Georgia in that list.

I have observed his work for the 16 years he has been in this House. He is a combination of industry, energy, patience, understanding, common sense, and fine ability. He has made many contributions to the improvement of legislation that has passed through this House. He has done a fine service for the Congress and for the country. As he completes his services here, it is creditable to ourselves that we should pay him a deserved tribute. The membership of the House, as well as his State, can justly feel a pride in the service he has given the country. Our country could well welcome many more like him to this House to serve in the years ahead, which now seem to be so pregnant with importance to the Nation and to the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When a good man retires from Congress it is cause for universal regret and this is particularly so when a man leaves with the outstanding ability of BOB RAMSPECK. During his 17 years' service in Congress has rendered conspicuous service. He has been responsible for legislation being enacted which brought material advancement in the lives of millions of Federal workers. He has been a tireless champion of the cause of Civil Service. We can ill afford to lose men of the ability, integrity, and character of BOB RAMSPECK. That the future shall unfold to him many years of happiness and prosperity is the sincere wish of all of us who have been privileged to enjoy his friendship.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, what is happening to our good United States Congress? Too many Congressmen are going away, voluntarily going into other fields. As if they were marching out in a single platoon we see BOB RAMSPECK, CLIFF WOODRUM, SAMMY WEISS, SAM DICKSTEIN, and half a dozen more. Not one of these shall we miss more than BOB RAMSPECK. He is my legislative neighbor and warm, close, personal friend. I shall feel his loss even more keenly than many of the rest of you. You have no idea how much BOB RAMSPECK has been worth to us fellows who came up from our section of the country after he got to Congress.

Perhaps we call many a man noble when the adjective is too big for the man but never in my life was I more sure of my ground than when I say ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, is a truly noble man. What a help he has been around these halls! We selfishly hate to have to bid him good-by.

Each is given his bag of tools,
A shapeless mass, a book of rules;
And each must make, ere life is flown,
A stumbling block or a stepping stone.

BOB RAMSPECK is a natural born placer of stepping stones. I know, for I have enjoyed the security of the footing he has helped to provide. As a Democrat, I want to say that I am very happy that he is still with us, a good, stanch, valuable Georgia gentleman and Democrat, as kindly in spirit as Georgia's soft climate and as stanch in democracy and character as Georgia's marble hills.

I notice it seems to be the habit of Congressmen to drop in a little poetry on such occasions as this—especially when a beloved Member passes to other fields. This is a practice I never indulged a great deal on the floor of Congress, but here are the closing lines from Henry Van Dyke's poem, Work, and they fit BOB RAMSPECK like a cap for his fine head:

To suit my spirit and to prove my powers
Then shall I cheerful greet the laboring hours,
And cheerful turn when the long shadows fall
At eventide to play and love and rest,
Because I know for me my work is best.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I first observed the influence of the gentleman from Georgia 10 years ago when my work with the Department of Agriculture brought me in contact with his fellow Georgians. "BOB RAMSPECK represents a city district," they said, "but he knows the farmers' problems." His vision and sympathies have always been broad. He has demonstrated in his 16 years in the House a devotion to the welfare of all the people that has endeared him not only to the State of Georgia but to great numbers of Americans who recognize his worth and his service to the Nation. His career has strengthened the public service and has added to the prestige of Congress. His example of industry, kindliness, and loyalty will continue to be an inspiration to us.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 18, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On December 18, 1945:

H. R. 4649. An act to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 38, 39, 39½, 40, 51, 53, 55, 67, 68, 69, 75, 89 and 101.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 30, 33, 34, 43, 44, 49, 52, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 70, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126 and 127, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agreed to the same with amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the sum "$750,000,000", strike out the proviso down to the period in line 17; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$730,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in line 4 of said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That none of the funds available under this head for administrative expenses shall be used in paying the salary of any person engaged in making or processing loans in excess of $500,000 to any State, any subdivision thereof, any municipality therein, or any public authority, for construction purposes, unless in pursuance of a specific authorization, except, however, that this provision shall not apply to any application or loan approved or made prior to December 15, 1945"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,469,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$212,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In line 5 of said amendment strike out the sum "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000".

In line 7 of said amendment strike out the sum "$101,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$93,000".

In line 9 of said amendment strike out the sum "$12,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,250".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That such additional amount of $90,000 shall not become available for obligation until a contract shall have been concluded with the lessor allowing Federal occupancy for a period of not less than eighteen months with the right to extend the period of occupancy an additional period of eighteen months or less, the rental charge for any period of occupancy not to exceed the rate heretofore agreed upon"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$601,540" and insert in lieu thereof "$320,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,766,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$132,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,216,210"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$266,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,748,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the sum "$164,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$82,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "; and the immediately succeeding additional appropriation for the construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities, shall be merged with the existing appropriation for the construction of such facilities and remain available until expended"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$187,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,435,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,242,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amndment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,275,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$44,640,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,780,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$111,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,385,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 18, 35, 42, 48, 54, 59, 88, and 103.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
C. WEYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1 to 9, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates $83,500 for sundry objects; reappropriates an unobligated balance of the 1945 fiscal year mileage appropriation; fixes the rate of compensation of two employees, and provides for the installation of intercommunicational facilities, all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Provides for payment of salaries by Senate and House disbursing officers falling due on a Saturday to be made on the preceding workday, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $1,183.47 for expenses incurred in connection with the National Memorial Stadium Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Validates compensation payment over an 80-day period to an employee of the Joint Committee on Printing, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15, relating to the Architect of the Capitol: Appropriates an additional $19,000 for Capitol buildings, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the appropriation of $25,000 proposed by the Senate for the erection of a statue of George Washington on the Capitol Grounds.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the Judiciary: Appropriates an additional $20,000 for salaries of criers, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriate an additional $750,000,000 for UNRRA, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate. It is understood that the appropriation is subject to all of the provisos attached to section 201 of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1945.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to the Bureau of the Budget: Appropriates for the fiscal year 1946 an additional amount of $56,800 for salaries and expenses and $5,000 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22, relating to the Office of Alien Property Custodian: Provides for a further draft of $50,600 upon agency funds for administrative expenses, fiscal year 1946, instead of $101,200, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23, relating to Office of Defense Transportation: Appropriates $165,000 additional for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24, relating to the Civil Service Commission: Appropriates an additional amount of $600,000 for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1946, instead of $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Restores the limitation proposed by the House upon the use of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for administrative expenses for salary payments to persons engaged in making loans for construction purposes which have not been specifically authorized, amended to except loans of $500,000 or less, and applications or loans approved or made prior to December 15, 1945.

Amendments Nos. 26, 27, 28, and 29, relating to the Federal Power Commission: Appropriates for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1946, an additional amount of $250,000, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $200,000, as proposed by the House, with proportional adjustments of amount limitations, and appropriates an additional amount of $25,000, fiscal year 1946, for flood-control surveys, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $181,575 for plans and specifications for construction at Howard University, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31, 32, 33, and 34, relating to the Public Health Service: Provides for an additional expenditure from available funds of $90,000 for rehabilitating the Neponsit Beach Hospital, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of $320,000 for foreign quarantine service, fiscal year 1946, instead of $601,540, as proposed by the Senate, and $70,000, as proposed by the House and appropriates an additional amount of $950,000 for operating expenses, National Institute of Health, fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $875,000, as proposed by the House, and makes the appropriation available for purchase and issue of certain compounds for use in research projects, as proposed by the Senate.

The amount agreed upon for the foreign quarantine service contemplates the procurement of surplus federally owned X-ray equipment and reimbursement (not to exceed $50,000) therefor.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37, relating to the Social Security Board: Appropriates an additional amount of $1,766,625, fiscal year 1946, for salaries, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, instead of $1,850,750, as proposed by the Senate, and $1,682,500, as proposed by the House, and appropriates an additional amount of $132,500, fiscal year 1946, for miscellaneous expenses, instead of $140,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $125,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 38 to 41, inclusive, and 43 and 44, relating to the Federal Works Agency: Appropriates an additional amount of $12,500,000, fiscal year 1946, for public-works advance planning, as proposed by the House, instead of $25,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; restores the House provision barring loans for the construction of projects, plans for which have been wholly or partly financed by the appropriation, public-works advance planning; appropriates an additional amount of $1,216,210, fiscal year 1946, for Virgin Islands public works, instead of $554,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,878,420, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates for damage claims, Public Roads Administration, $473,528.31, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $296,867.45, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, and 47, relating to the Interstate Commerce Commission: Appropriates an additional amount of $266,000 for general administrative expenses, fiscal year 1946, instead of $206,000, as proposed by the House, and $306,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates an additional amount of $82,000 for motor transport regulation, fiscal year 1946, instead of $164,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the National Labor Relations Board: Appropriates an additional amount of $300,000, fiscal year 1946, for salaries and expenses, National Labor Relations Board, War Labor Disputes Act, for reimbursing the appropriations "Salaries" and "Miscellaneous expenses", fiscal year 1946, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50, relating to the Veterans' Administration: Modifies, as proposed by the Senate, existing limitations applying to the appropriation "Administrative, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services" with respect to passenger-carrying vehicles, visual educational information and descriptive material, newspapers and periodicals, and attendance upon meetings and conventions associated with the welfare of veterans, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, and 55, relating to the District of Columbia: Strikes out the appropriation of $4,600 for plans and specifications for a building for employees' living quarters at the Glenn Dale Tuberculosis Sanatorium, proposed by the Senate; appropriates $70,000 for constructing a third floor and permanently roofing the hospital and administration building at the District Training School, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriation of $5,000, fiscal year, for motor-vehicle parking agency, proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the appropriation of $15,000, fiscal year 1946, proposed by the Senate, as a special emergency fund in connection with public recognition extended to returning military or naval personnel or visiting dignitaries.

Amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, and 63, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Appropriates an additional amount of $187,500, fiscal year 1946, for salaries and expenses, foreign plant quarantine, instead of $125,000, as proposed by the House, and $250,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of $300,000, fiscal year 1946, for national forest protection and management, as proposed by the Senate; increases from $275,000 to $373,700, as proposed by the Senate, the amount which may be expended for the agricultural wage

stabilization program under the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration, 1946," and appropriates $25,000,000 for the supply and distribution of farm labor for the period ending December 31, 1946, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $14,000,000, as proposed by the House, and provides, as proposed by the Senate, that any official determination of the cessation of hostilities in the present war shall not hinder the admission into the United States of agricultural labor required for the conduct of the farm labor supply program.

Amendments Nos. 64 to 69, inclusive, relating to the Department of Commerce: Appropriates $300,000 for declassification and technical services, fiscal year 1946, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House, and $344,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,435,000 for compiling census reports, and so forth, fiscal year 1946, instead of $1,970,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,295,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of $182,000, fiscal year 1946, for establishment of air-navigation facilities, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate an additional amount of $350,000, fiscal year 1946, for departmental salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and an additional amount of $30,000, fiscal year 1946, for field-office service, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The additional amount of $465,000 pertaining to the Bureau of the Census is intended to cover a sample census of population and statistics respecting commodities shipped on vessels engaged in foreign trade.

Amendments Nos. 70 to 87, inclusive, and 89 to 92, inclusive, relating to the Department of the Interior: Appropriates $111,630 for payment of Sioux Indian claims, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates under Bureau of Reclamation, as follows: For salaries and expenses (other than project offices), $500,000, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House, and $800,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for general investigations, $1,000,000, instead of $500,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for the Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $5,900,000, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,800,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase being toward construction of the proposed second Phoenix-Tucson line; strikes out the appropriation of $197,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Kings River project, California; appropriates for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $5,750,000, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $6,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, $500,000 of the increase being for the Brush-Sterling Holyoke transmission lines; appropriates for the Columbia Basin project, Washington, $10,275,000, instead of $10,050,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for the Colorado River development fund (expenditure account) $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates for the Fort Peck project, Montana, $800,000, instead of $480,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,335,000, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates for the Missouri River Basin $10,780,300, instead of $10,269,100, as proposed by the House, and $11,402,300, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $511,200 being for functions in connection with the project of the Office of Indian Affairs and Geological Survey. Provides for the procurement of 100 additional passenger automobiles, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates additional amounts, as proposed by the Senate, under the Geological Survey, as follows: Topographic surveys, $13,900; geologic surveys, $800; gaging streams, $321,100, and classification of lands, $800. Strikes out the appropriation of $485,000, proposed by the Senate, for the drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. Appropriates $111,650 for national parks, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $123,300, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates an additional amount of $20,000, fiscal year 1946, for control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates $150,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I.

Amendments Nos. 93 and 94, relating to the Department of Justice: Appropriates an additional amount of $29,350, fiscal year 1946, for Office of the Assistant Solicitor General, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $37.50 for damage claims arising out of activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 95, 96, and 97, relating to the Department of State: Appropriates an additional amount of $23,000, fiscal year 1946, for representation allowances, foreign service, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional amount of $4,385,000, fiscal year 1946, for foreign service auxiliary (emergency), instead of $4,000,000, as proposed by the House, and $4,770,000, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates an additional amount of $2,750,000, fiscal year 1946, for international conferences (emergency), instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House, and $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 98, relating to the Treasury Department: Appropriates an additional amount of $1,000,000, fiscal year 1946, for Division of Disbursement salaries and expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 99, 100, and 101, relating to military activities, War Department: Appropriates $274,127.43 for damage claims, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $118,144.91, as proposed by the House, and strikes out the proposal of the Senate to modify the text of the current appropriation for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps with respect to technical units.

Amendment No. 102, relating to civil functions, War Deparment: Appropriates for flood control, general, $84,659,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $81,759,000, as proposed by the House, the increase being accounted for as follows:

Additions:

Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa	$3,000,000
Hulah Dam, Okla	1,000,000
Sangamon River, Ill	400,000
Elimination: Mansfield Hollow Reservoir, Conn	1,500,000

Amendments Nos. 104 to 127, inclusive, relating to judgments and authorized claims: Appropriates $6,632,194.10, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,432,946.59, as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2, rule XX, the managers on the part of the House and Senate have agreed to recommend to their respective Houses concurrence in amendments of the Senate as follows:

Amendment No. 18, relating to an addition to the Executive Mansion and appropriating $1,650,000 in connection therewith: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 35, relating to public health services, Philippine Islands, and appropriating $1,000,000 in connection therewith: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 42, providing for a Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn., and appropriating $5,575,000 therefor: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 48, making an appropriation of $191,900,000 for veterans' housing: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate with the understanding that the amount of $191,900,000 shall be construed as including any unused funds under title I of the Lanham Act which may be made available for veterans' housing.

Amendment No. 54, providing for the engagement of technical services for conducting a survey for city relief sewers, District of Columbia: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 59, making available an additional amount of $15,000,000 for the school-lunch program: That the House concur with an amendment, making available an additional amount of $7,500,000.

Amendment No. 88, appropriating $15,000 for services and expenses incident to the Arkansas River compact: That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate.

ACTUAL

Amendment No. 103, relating to the Garrison (North Dakota) Reservoir.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill as it passed the House carried appropriations aggregating $1,434,732,379.12. As it passed the Senate it had been increased to a total of $2,409,090,755.98, an increase over the House figure in round numbers of a billion dollars. To be specific, $974,318,376.86.

The greater part of the increase was contained in two items, $750,000,000 for UNRRA and $191,900,000 for housing.

The Senate receded from an amount totaling $20,889,125, and we submit the conference report today with complete agreement on everything we could have agreed on except for technical obstacles. Under section 2, of rule XX, it was necessary to bring back to the House for separate vote eight amendments, which involve a total of $197,490,000. We shall take them up in their turn when we have disposed of the conference report.

Apart from UNRRA and veterans' housing, the Senate added a number of amendments of general interest and of considerable importance.

One provides $1,000,000 for enabling the Public Health Service to assist the public-health organizations of the Philippine Islands in reconstituting and reactivating public-health services in the Philippine Islands.

Another increases the amount available for the popular school-lunch program. The Senate proposed to increase the amount now available from $50,000,000 to $65,000,000. The conference committee agreed to increase the amount to $57,500,000.

For the farm labor supply program, the House provided $14,000,000. The Senate increased the amount to $25,000,000, and the conference report is in agreement with that action. The farm-labor outlook is not encouraging, and it would be a catastrophe if help were not available for planting and harvesting.

For gathering essential statistical data by the Bureau of the Census, the House

allowed $1,970,000. As we bring the bill from conference, the amount is increased to $2,435,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations in the last 4 years has reported more legislation than ever has been reported by any other committee in the history of the House. It is appropriate, therefore, to review briefly in the closing hours of 1945 the war record of the committee. In these 4 years, under the pressure of wartime legislation, we have introduced time- and money-saving innovations. We have materially increased the efficiency of the routine of the committee. We have established a system of investigation which has contributed to the economy of administration of the departments and has saved billions of dollars in appropriations. We have developed a routine which has reduced the time of the hearings; confined the testimony to the items before the committee and greatly reduced the amount and cost of printed material in the published hearings. We have standardized committee procedure to eliminate unnecessary delay and diversions and to expedite consideration of the departmental estimates from the time received from the Bureau of the Budget until reported to the House.

We have incorporated in our bills provisions under which continuing studies have been made of all appropriations, and under which reports have been filed at regular intervals, showing the status of appropriations, contractual authorizations, expenditures, commitments, and unexpended balances.

Acting on the information thus obtained, the committee has secured the enactment of bills rescinding appropriations and contractual authority in excess of $56,000,000,000 more than $52,000,000,000 in one bill, the largest sum ever disposed of in any way, in any bill, in the history of governmental budgets.

And we have similarily included in this bill, and in this conference report, legislation in restraint of Federal expenditure which should exert a profound and salutary influence on both State and National finances during the reconstruction period on which we are just entering.

These provisions prohibit the making of loans by Federal agencies to States or subdivisions of States and are discussed in the conference report under Senate amendments 25 and 40.

The first will be found on page 2 of the report and as perfected in conference and finally submitted to the House for approval is as follows:

Provided, That none of the funds available under this head for administrative expenses shall be used in paying the salary of any person engaged in making or processing loans in excess of $500,000 to any State, any subdivision thereof, any municipality therein, or any public authority, for construction purposes, unless in pursuance of a specific authorization, except, however, that this provision shall not apply to any application or loan approved or made prior to December 15, 1945.

The second was proposed to be amended by Senate amendment No. 40, but the Senate conferees receded in conference and the provision is retained in the bill and submitted in the conference report in the language originally passed by the House as follows:

Provided, That no loans shall be made or participated in by any Federal agency for the construction of any public works, plans for which have been wholly or partly financed out of this appropriation, except in pursuance of a specific authorization.

There seems to be a general impression throughout the country that, now that the war is over, the Federal Government will resume the free handed practice which obtained during the depression, of making loans and grants, either matched or unmatched by sponsors, for the construction of local facilities and improvements. Everywhere aggressive and enterprising commercial clubs, chambers of commerce and luncheon organizations are industriously planning the construction of water and sewage systems, court houses, airfields, hospitals, libraries, streets and curbing, stadiums, parks, playgrounds, and what not, to be financed wholly or in part by Federal loans or contributions, preferably by grants or loans to be repaid in the millennium. Although there is yet no notable lack of employment, they are preparing to corner local labor and all available building materials and construction equipment for ambitious public improvements to be undertaken as soon as they can get funds from Washington.

This impression that the Federal Government is going to start another WPA program in which it will distribute largess to cities and political subdivisions and States all over the Union has been heightened by the fact that we have provided money for planning purposes, and that any municipality or other unit can make application for money with which to employ engineers and architects, conduct surveys, and make the blueprints for public construction of the character as in prewar days. The law which authorized these appropriations specifically states that the Government is not obligated to provide construction funds, and that we expect the community to pay the planning money back when they start construction; in other words, it was not proposed to give a dollar to anybody or a dollar to any community under this activity. We merely advance money to make plans, and when those plans are made and construction is started, the money is to be paid back to the Federal Government. We specifically included the statement that the Federal Government was not, and is not, obligated to contribute one dollar either in loans or grants for construction or any other purpose. Notwithstanding that unequivocal notification, we are daily in receipt of inquiries as to when we are going to begin to give money away.

For example, I am in receipt of the following letter:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
December 4, 1945.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: The capital budget for the city of New York, as recently submitted to the city council for adoption, proposes total expenditures of $535,688,000 for the coming calendar year. The budget anticipates that the Federal Government will contribute $217,218,000 in grants for these capital improvements.

This association believes that the expectation on the part of the city to receive this amount is overly optimistic and entirely out of line with congressional policy, and has so expressed itself.

We will have a representative at the public hearing before the city council on the budget to be held early next week, and would appreciate a statement setting forth what, in your opinion, is the certainty that the Federal Government will contribute any such extensive amounts to the localities for the construction of public-works projects.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

In response to this inquiry I telegraphed:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y.:

Re letter, of course no one can speak for the Congress or for the future but any program involving contributions by the Federal Government to States and municipalities in another PWA program is so impractical under our changed financial status as to appear prohibitive. When we have settled all war accounts, interest on the public debt alone will exceed entire average prewar budget. Any State or municipality in the Union is in better financial condition than the Federal Government. While there may be sporadic incitement to spending sprees, and in event of serious unemployment 3 or 4 years hence the necessity for moderate road, flood control, and public building programs, the practical business sense of the American people will prevent further unessential expenditures and gratuities inviting inflation and repudiation.

Every day we are in receipt of inquiries from counties and cities asking how much the Federal Government will contribute to the construction of hospitals, schools, and other utilities.

Some of them write with sensible candor and say if the Federal Government is not planning to assist in the erection of such facilities they propose to issue their own bonds and build them themselves; that if the National Government is not planning to assist in such construction they will proceed on their own credit and responsibility, but if there is to be another Federal construction program they do not want to spend their own money and then see their neighbors get the same advantages from Federal funds. Such inquiries are practical and pertinent and are entitled to a dependable answer. The country should have an authoritative statement on the future policy of the Government in this respect, and the legislation in this bill is intended to point as accurately as we are in a position to point at the present time in the direction which the Congress proposes to proceed under existing conditions.

There is every reason for restricting such loans and grants. The most obvious reason is the stupendous magnitude of any such program carried to its ultimate conclusion. There are more than 3,000 counties and innumerable cities and towns in continental United States, not to mention the insular possessions, which would want to be included in such a program. If provision is made for one or for one class, provision must in all fairness be made for all. And the composite sum which would have to be provided

would be staggering even if we did not owe a dollar of national indebtedness

And when we take into consideration the fact that the Nation owes already the greatest debt in history, any such program becomes wholly impracticable. The only way to stop it is to stop it before it begins. And the only time to stop it is now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are printing money today at a furious rate. We are trying to borrow money by selling bonds, and we are having a harder time to sell those bonds than ever before. There used to be a saying, current among the money brokers of my community. "Well, Smith & Co. have got too much paper out." That meant that Smith & Co. had been borrowing more money than their financial statement warranted. Whenever they decided a borrower had too much paper out, they waited for him to pay some of his debts before they lent him any more.

Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has got too much paper out. That is why it is no longer possible for him to borrow money with the ease with which he used to borrow it. When a man has too much paper out and the holders of his notes go to the bank to discount this paper, it takes heavier and heavier discounts, to get the banks to take his paper over. When a man's credit is sound, and he is not overborrowed in proportion to his assets, the banks will discount his paper at a reasonable percentage, but if he has too much paper out, if he owes so much money that the time and amount of its liquidation is doubtful, his paper has to bear a heavy discount.

Uncle Sam has too much paper out in the form of bonds and paper currency. When business opens up, in the period of reconversion, a great many of these bondholders will bring their paper, their bonds, in to be discounted by the local banks. The danger is that the same thing will happen that happened after the last war—that Uncle Sam has so much paper out that people who hold his bonds may have to take 86 cents on the dollar. That is what Uncle Sam's paper sold for after the last war. You took a $100 bond to the banker to cash it in, and instead of paying you the $100 you lent the Government on that bond they gave you only $84.

Every bank, every life-insurance company, every investment concern in this country, is loaded with Government bonds. If they fall only a few points, much less 16 points, as they fell after the last war, financial catastrophe will follow. There is only one way to keep this paper good, and that is to balance the Budget and to begin to pay our debts and stop spending unnecessarily. If we enter upon another program of WPA, if we begin to finance every school, hospital, airport, sewer system, and courthouse in the country, we will not even be able to borrow the money to do it, much less pay it back.

In order to guard against such a contingency the committee has taken this decided step. We have put into this bill the above provisions.

The effect of these provisions is to take control of such funds out of the hands of departmental agencies and place it in the hands of the Congress. Under the Constitution the people control the purse strings of the Nation through their elected representatives, and these provisions shift control of large lump sums from Federal bureaus and corporations to the direct control of Congress, and with control of the money control of the policies under which such vast sums are disbursed.

Such control also carries with it control of remedial measures for unemployment. One of the stock arguments advanced by all applicants for Federal grants and loans today is that they will reduce unemployment. They ignore the obvious fact that there is not now, and will not be for some time, any extensive unemployment requiring drastic Federal advances.

The country is in need of every character of consumer goods. You cannot buy a shirt, a typewriter, a suit of clothes, an automobile. The most ordinary necessities are unobtainable. The shelves of the merchants are bare, the warehouses are vacant, the pipe lines are empty.

We have the factories; we have skilled workmen; we have the raw material to manufacture these goods, and we are going to start right away to produce them. That is going to require all the labor of the country for 3 or 4 years to come. But when we reach the saturation point and the warehouses are full and the shelves of the retail stores are filled, then, if at all, is going to come the economic shock which may be expected to follow the war. Then, if at all, unemployment will develop. When it comes, if come it does, we will have spent under this loan and grant program all the money we have to spend to relieve any possible unemployment situation. We will have spent the money on these projects which these States and municipalities want to build now. If we ever expect to spend any money to relieve unemployment and take up the slack in employment, we should wait until the time when we have saturated the consumer-goods market of the country and all the factories must slow down to normal rates of production.

There is another disadvantage in rushing ahead with such a construction program at this time. The great bottleneck in housing reconstruction today is in the lack of materials. There is not a community that is not clamoring for housing. But they cannot get the lumber. They cannot get the hardware. They cannot get the sewer pipe. If we encourage every community to start full speed ahead today on federally fostered construction, we defer the day when the man who wants to build a home, when the veteran returning from the war and must have shelter for his new family, can get it.

In order to give priority for the construction of dwellings, we must defer such a public building spree as is proposed in the loan and grant programs prohibited by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, by way of résumé, much has been made of the action of the House in overriding recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations on three items in this bill. Such comments overlook the fact that the items on which the committee has been overruled are infinitesimal in comparison with the recommendations of the committee which in the last 4 years have been adopted by the House and the Congress.

As time recedes and the history of the war is seen in its final perspective, the policies and recommendations of the committee, 99 percent of which have been adopted by this House, will be found to have influenced in no small degree and, it is to be hoped, not disadvantageously, the fiscal policy of the Nation and the financial stability of the United States Government.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman. He has made some very alarming statements. I am in favor of some of the provisions of this bill, like building veterans' hospitals, river and harbor projects, and so forth; but is it not true that this House passed this deficiency bill and appropriated money for UNRRA which had already been authorized in an authorization bill. Then the bill went to the other body and, out of a clear sky, $750,000,000 more on top of what had been authorized was appropriated in the other body, even before any hearings, and even before any authorization bill for that purpose was passed.

Then, I want to ask the gentleman if the conferees have approved of what I understand is an irregular and almost unheard-of procedure if these different steps are true. Is that $750,000,000 in this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to give a brief résumé of the situation with reference to UNRRA.

We recently passed House Joint Resolution 266, appropriating an additional $550,000,000 for UNRRA. The original authorization was $1,350,000,000, and only $550,000,000 of that authorization was left. However, you will recall that it was represented to this committee and to the House and to the country that the original authorization was insufficient: Starvation and death, which are stalking throughout Europe today, are of such magnitude and such urgency that the first authorization would not take care of it. So the House immediately entered upon the discussion of a bill for further authorization of $1,350,000,000. The Senate, after that authorization had been passed by the Senate and House, included in this bill we have under consideration an additional $750,000,000 for UNRRA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself three additional minutes.

It is unnecessary for us to discuss UNRRA at this late day. This is the

fifth time it has been before the House. It first came before the House in a bill to authorize $1,350,000,000, and the House passed it by a large majority. It again came before the House in the form of a bill to appropriate $800,000,000 to discharge our obligations, and again this House, by an overwhelming vote, approved of UNRRA and appropriated the $800,000,000. It came before the House a third time in the form of an appropriation bill to provide $550,000,000 for UNRRA. Again the House approved UNRRA almost unanimously and voted the appropriation. Then it again came before the House the fourth time, in the form of a bill reported by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, authorizing a second $1,350,000,000, approved UNRRA almost unanimously—by the passage of that bill—or at least by a very large majority. Four times it has been before the House and each time the House has approved it; and now it is before the House for the fifth time.

Everything has been said on the subject that can be said. Everybody has made up his mind, and talk at this time would not change a single vote. So I do not propose to discuss it further. It has been amply debated and everybody understands it, and you have before you the proposition of putting Europe again upon its feet, of saving millions of lives, and of providing for the future prosperity of the world, including the prosperity of America.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman mentioned the limitation of $500,000 on RFC. That also will apply in regard to the proposed loan to Britain, will it not, and to China, and Russia, or any other nation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no connection whatever. This is a loan for the construction of local facilities.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand that, but will the gentleman take the same position relative to foreign loans?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let us not cross that bridge until we come to it. The gentleman wants to talk politics and we are not talking politics now, we are talking business.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not talking politics at all; I am asking for information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot yield further to the gentleman. If he wants to ask some question about the bill, I shall be glad to answer him, or anybody else, but this is not a time to indulge in partisanship. It is a matter in which partisanship should not enter.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rose to ask for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will take two additional minutes in order to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. When we understand and appreciate the emergency which confronts us with the authorization of the second billion for UNRRA, having in mind the emergency, the procedure that was adopted in the Senate of adding $750,000,000 to the deficiency bill, the House conferees concurring, it certainly is justified by the circumstances; and in an emergency is not unusual, it has happened before where emergency conditions existed with reference to other appropriations. Furthermore, I understand the Appropriations Committee, by a majority vote, voted that we request the Senate to take this action. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The subcommittee voted unanimously to take that action.

And the gentleman's statement is concurred in by a large majority of the House. On four different occasions, on four aye-and-nay votes, the House has approved the gentleman's position. I am glad to have the position of the House on the subject so clearly and so effectively stated by our distinguished majority leader.

May I ask how much time the gentleman from New York desires?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I should like 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot conscientiously support——

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. With $1,000,000,000 added to this bill I believe there should be a quorum present to hear the discussion. A billion is still a lot of money.

Mr. TABER. It used to be.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 210]

Abernethy	Combs	Hébert
Adams	Courtney	Hedrick
Allen, Ill.	Daughton, Va.	Heselton
Andersen H. Carl	Dawson	Holifield
	Dickstein	Horan
Andrews, N. Y.	Dingell	Jackson
Auchincloss	Drewry	Jennings
Barden	Ellis	Johnson, Okla.
Barry	Elsaesser	Jonkman
Bell	Ervin	Kee
Bender	Fernandez	Keefe
Bennet, N. Y.	Flannagan	Kilburn
Boren	Gallagher	Kirwan
Boykin	Gathings	Knutson
Brehm	Gearhart	Latham
Brown, Ohio	Geelan	Lewis
Buckley	Gillespie	McGehee
Byrne, N. Y.	Granger	McGlinchey
Camp	Gregory	McGregor
Cannon, Fla.	Gross	McKenzie
Carlson	Gwinn, N. Y.	Maloney
Celler	Gwynne, Iowa	Mathews
Clippinger	Halleck	May
Cole, Kans.	Harless, Ariz.	Morrison
Colmer	Hart	Murdock
Norton	Robertson, Va.	Stevenson
O'Hara	Rockwell	Sumner, Ill.
Peterson, Ga.	Roe, Md.	Sumners, Tex.
Pfeifer	Roe, N. Y.	Sundstrom
Phillips	Rooney	Talbot
Powell	Russell	Tarver
Rains	Schwabe, Okla.	Taylor
Ramey	Sheridan	Vursell
Reece, Tenn.	Short	West
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Va.	Wood
Rich	Snyder	
Rizley	Somers, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a New York school teacher.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate to the fullest the things which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said with reference to the condition of the Treasury. It is worse, I believe, than he has painted it, because there are in addition to the direct debt, contingent liabilities which are estimated as high as $300,000,000,000. This means our total debt including contingent obligations at the present time is close to $600,000,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The contingent liabilities and the debt combined total $636,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. I cannot go along with this conference report. The Senate raised the amount carried in the bill by practically $1,000,000,000 and brought the total up to $2,300,000,000.

I have just as much sympathy as anyone with starving people; on the other hand, I must have some sense of obligation to the people of the United States. We are presented today with a request for $750,000,000 for UNRRA and, as far as I can see, if they use any sense in the disbursement of the funds they will have $296,000,000 left after they have given all that they want to provide through the month of July. Five hundred million dollars would be sufficient. I cannot go along with this report. I would be willing to go along with it if it provided $500,000,000 but I cannot go along with it when it provides $750,000,000.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I have just had some telephone calls from mills in Kansas City, Mo., which are working at full capacity right now and they tell me that last night without any warning at midnight the Commodity Credit Corporation reversed its policy by which that Corporation had been selling wheat to these mills. Unless they can get wheat from the Commodity Credit Corporation

they are going to have to shut down within 2 or 3 days.

I have just talked with Mr. Farrington, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and inquired why the Corporation took this step which is going to close down these flour mills. He tells me it is because of his foreign commitments. I asked him if that included UNRRA, and he said that certainly UNRRA entered into it to a large extent.

I think most of us are in favor of supporting UNRRA and giving this necessary relief, but, at the same time, there is a certain amount of common sense, there is a certain amount of looking out for ourselves that should be gone into. I wonder if this additional $250,000,000 that they are asking for may be reflected in this policy that is causing such an expansion that our domestic mills in Kansas City and elsewhere will have to shut down within the next 2 or 3 days?

Mr. TABER. I would not be surprised but what that were true. I want to give you the full picture.

I brought out these facts from Mr. Lehman and Commander Jackson when the chairman of the committee and I were alone in the room the other night when we were holding hearings. If they received this $750,000,000, according to their own estimate, they would have $850,000,000 left on the 1st day of February. Their February shipments are said by them to be $254,000,000, and they will not be able to deliver those shipments to the starving folks until April. That would be for April use. That will leave $596,000,000. Now they want $230,000,000 to ship in March and it cannot be delivered until May.

A hundred million dollars is all they need when it comes spring. They should taper it off and get down to reason. They would have $496,000,000 left then, and if they had a hundred million dollars in April to use in June, that would be sufficient. If they used another hundred million dollars for shipments in May, to be used in July, that would carry them to the 1st of August, and their crops should be in by that time.

I want to call attention to another thing and that is that the contributions of other nations have not been as rapid as our own. In the first block of contributions they will have funds that will let them carry through until the 1st of April without having another dollar, so that other nations' second pledge will not be touched until May.

As I stated, I was willing to go along with $500,000,000, which, in my opinion, would carry them beyond any question to the 1st day of August; and I can see no sense in trying to carry them beyond that date and I can see no justification for my going back on the people of the United States and the Treasury of the United States by appropriating funds for an organization that does not need it.

I realize, frankly, that this is not a popular stand, but when a man takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States it is up to him to do what is right in view of the facts that are before us. I cannot conscientiously go along with this conference report. It would not be honest.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The other day I was called into a conference which was attended by a man who has charge of UNRRA in one of the European countries. He informed us that 90 percent of UNRRA goods are sold in that country through the merchants, the merchants receiving a 5- or 10-percent profit on the sale for handling it. He indicated that there was quite a balance in the state bank there of UNRRA money which eventually is going to be used for some rehabilitation or agricultural purposes. What I want to find out is if the gentleman's committee can inform the House what the balances of UNRRA are as the result of sales of UNRRA goods.

Mr. TABER. UNRRA has no balances resulting from the sale of goods that I have been advised of, and I do not believe they have any.

I feel obliged, I will state to the House, to oppose this conference report because of the situation presented. It is absolutely unjustifiable.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me more than passing strange that anyone should be called upon to defend an appropriation to implement UNRRA when the House has so repeatedly and emphatically expressed its approval of the relief work of that Organization. We are today just carrying into effect what the House has repeatedly said it wants to have done. All of us during the prosecution of the war against tyranny and oppression, have voted, astronomical amounts of money to kill and destroy. It was necessary to do this, but to me and I think to millions of Americans it would be a welcome change to appropriate this relatively insignificant amount to cure and to heal. The urgency of making this appropriation now is shown by the palpable facts of the situation. If we are to extend the maximum relief to the people who need it and to get the maximum benefits from our beneficence, speed is necessary. We should see that they receive as soon as possible, in addition to money to relieve starvation, seeds, fertilizers, agricultural implements, and other contributions by which they may assist in their own rehabilitation. All of this means that orders exceeding $700,000,000 must be placed within the next 3 months of the coming year. Time is of the essence.

To my mind it is a sufficient argument for this appropriation, and the only one that should be necessary, to say that unless it is passed, thousands of human beings, including a great many innocent little children, undoubtedly will soon die of starvation. The snows of Christmas now envelop the earth and there could be no more appropriate time than now to manifest our warmth of human sympathy in keeping with the spirit of the season by taking action to rescue and relieve these poor suffering people.

Let no one doubt that this is the will of the people of America. Every Member of Congress has received hundreds of communications asking that we support the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in its humanitarian effort. I dare say that the number expressing an opposing view has been negligible. There can be no doubt that the heart of America is in this legislation that is before us today. We might well apply to the situation the words of Shakespeare—

The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath. It is twice bless'd:
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

Let us be merciful today to these poor starving people.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to let Governor Lehman make the remainder of my speech. I wrote to him asking him to tell me whether this appropriation of $750,000,000 is necessary, and how necessary it is and how urgent it is. I know of no one who can speak with more impressiveness and more authority on that point. With the indulgence of the House, I shall now read Governor Lehman's letter, which was handed to me a few moments ago by a messenger. He says:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND
REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 19, 1945.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: In reply to your inquiry over the telephone yesterday, I am setting forth below a brief summary of the reasons why UNRRA urgently requires an appropriation of at least $750,000,000 at this time:

1. By the middle of February UNRRA will have completely used up all of the supplies and services financed out of the first $1,350,000,000 appropriation made by the United States. That includes the recent appropriation of $550,000,000 which has just been made.

2. By the middle of March UNRRA will have completely consumed all the supplies and services financed out of the contributions made by other countries, now totaling approximately $500,000,000.

3. In February, March, April, and May UNRRA plans to ship more than $700,000,000 worth of supplies from the United States for which it does not now have the money. It is imperative that those shipments be made on schedule. If we are to bring this relief operation to an end, we must ship food and clothing to Europe and China quickly enough to get the people through the winter, and we must deliver enough seed, fertilizer, and agricultural equipment in time for the spring planting. In that way we hope to be able to get the needy countries back on their feet by fall. If we do not deliver these supplies on schedule, the next harvest may be as bad as the last one, and we may have to continue furnishing relief indefinitely.

4. In order to ship the scheduled $700,000,000 worth of supplies in February, March, April, and May, UNRRA must order the necessary commodities at once. The Department of Agriculture and Treasury Procurement, which procure supplies on UNRRA's behalf, must be furnished with orders amounting to $315,000,000 in the month of January alone, to be paid for out of money UNRRA does not now have. In February UNRRA must furnish the procurement agencies with orders amounting to an additional $254,000,000. In March it must furnish orders amounting to $230,000,000. That means that it must place orders exceeding

$700,000,000 within the first 3 months of next year. It cannot place those orders until it receives the money from the Congress.

5. The money needed to pay for the shipments planned through next May is needed now because it takes from 4 weeks to 4 months between the time the Government procurement agencies receive an order from UNRRA and the time that the supplies are loaded on board ship. The procurement agencies have to find suppliers and sign contracts with them. The suppliers must obtain the goods, goods must be shipped to port, and at the port they must be loaded on board ships. All those things take time.

6. UNRRA plans to stop sending supplies to Europe at the end of December 1946 and to stop sending supplies to the Far East at the end of March 1947. Those cut-off dates were fixed on the assumption that by this spring UNRRA would be able to supply the essential materials, such as seed, fertilizer, trucks, and the like, which will be needed if the receiving countries are to get back on their own feet.

7. This is the crucial moment in the battle. Just as in military matters, speed is the essence of strategy. To delay making a substantial appropriation until a later date is to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT L. LEHMAN,
Director General.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are just a few things I should like to allude to in the conference report. With respect to UNRRA, we recently authorized, and the President signed the bill for, another 1 percent of national income or $1,350,000,000. He indicated in a message to the committee that three-quarters of that amount would be obligated before the 30th of June 1946, or roughly $175,000,000 a month. The money is going to be spent, and I do not know if it makes so much difference whether at this time we give them $500,000,000 or $750,000,000. I think the important thing is to make it possible for them to keep their pipe lines filled and to keep a rather even flow of supplies moving in the direction of the distressed countries. You noticed how disagreeable it was outdoors this morning. Well, it is going to be infinitely more disagreeable in some of these distressed countries because there will be just as much snow but it will be a great deal colder; and there will be little or no fuel. I do not want to take any action that in any way whatsoever may choke off supplies at a time when they are needed. Winter begins earlier in some of these countries and lasts a great deal longer. So my interest is in the relief of distress at a time when distress, difficulty, and suffering and sacrifice is at its highest. We agreed in subcommittee that $750,000,000 was about the right amount. That is the amount that is now carried in this bill.

I want to allude for a moment to one or two other items that are here. You may have noted that we boosted school lunches to $57,500,000, assuming that the conference report is approved, which contains a compromise item of $7,500,000.

For a good many years we have been providing $50,000,000 for school lunches, but it was disclosed to us by the Secretary of Agriculture, through the instrumentality of a letter to the Senate committee, that in January 3 States will be out of money; in February another 12; and then in the succeeding months other States will be unable to participate in the school-lunch program. The Senate, accordingly, wrote in an additional $15,000,000, and in compromise it was made $7,500,000.

Perhaps I should suggest to you that this amount is matched by $90,000,000 in State funds, so that of the total amount the Federal Government shares one-third, the States share two-thirds; but I allude to it for the good reason that while we have been going on at the level of $50,000,000 a year I am satisfied that this additional money for school lunches will mean an increase in that item in the regular supply bill in 1947, and perhaps further increases in future years.

We gave the Civil Service Commission an additional $600,000, although they asked for more. The reason for it is that in the single month of November there were 336,000 veterans who made application to the Civil Service Commission informally as to their rights under the Veterans' Preference Act, and over 100,000 filed formal applications for benefits under the Preference Act. That means that at least 12,000 veterans every day took the trouble to inquire about their preference rights, and at least 3,000 veterans every day went to the trouble of filing a formal application. It may be that $600,000 will not be sufficient to carry through, but that is a responsibility that this Congress imposed upon the Civil Service Commission, and I know of nothing else we could do except to vote additional funds.

You may observe also that where the House provided $14,000,000 for farm labor, the Senate increased that to $25,000,000, and shared $7,000,000 for the extension services. One would think that with all the work, and with so many men coming back from overseas, there would be an abundance of farm labor, yet every farm organization and every man who is especially conversant with that situation in the different agricultural States in the Union came before the House Committee and testified that it is impossible to get men on the farms today, notwithstanding the fact that in some cases the monthly wage rate has gone up two and three fold. So we had no choice except to vote sufficient funds for the purpose of importing labor from other countries. This seems something like a paradox that with at least 1,300,000 veterans being demobilized every 30 days, that in New York and in Illinois, in the South, in the cotton area, in the sugar-beet area, and elsewhere, sufficient labor is not available to bring the crops from the fields.

I do hope this will be the last time that the Congress will have to vote funds for the purpose of importing labor from other countries in order to bring the crops from the fields.

There is one item in this bill that has been very generally overlooked, and that is this: The House Appropriations Committee adopted and the House approved a provision which cut back all of the funds of the National Labor Relations Board for the enforcement of the Smith-Connally Act. You will remember that not so long ago we had House Resolution 3937 before us, and by a vote of 200 to 182 the rule for its consideration was defeated, largely because we were assured that the bill would not be called up.

The first part of that resolution dealt with the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act. Yet here is in a sense a very effective repeal, approved by the House and approved by the Senate, whereby no more funds will be made available after the effective date of this act, for the enforcement of any portion of the Smith-Connally Act that comes within the domain of the National Labor Relations Board. In other words, the day the President affixes his signature to the enrolled bill that goes down to him, the National Labor Relations Board will no longer conduct strike ballots as provided in section 8 of the Smith-Connally Act because there will be no money for that purpose, and they believe that when Congress has taken money out of that appropriation it is in the nature of a mandate that they should no longer conduct any strike ballots. So, for practical purposes, the provision that is contained in this bill is going to do exactly what the first two sections of H. R. 3937 purported to do, the bill on which the rule was defeated in this House earlier in the week.

There is one other item to which I should allude, that relates to the Garrison Dam up in the Dakotas. I think I should allude to it because the chairman is going to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment that is agreeable to those who come from that near Northwest area.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great controversy and I believe some misunderstanding as to what is involved. It is a projected flood-control project that is going to cost a lot of money. A controversy arose as to the elevation of the pool of water that is to be maintained behind the dam. The gentlemen from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE and Mr. ROBERTSON] and others of this body have a vital interest in this matter and are concerned about the water levels that may be maintained. What they are concerned about is the elevation of the water behind the dam. They insist that it should not be carried to an elevation of more than 1,830 feet, for if this pool goes up to 1,850 feet as some of the gentlemen in another body indicated it may, the city of Williston, N. Dak., with seven or eight thousand people, would be practically inundated and property values would be destroyed. It would cause probably 200,000 acres of land to be inundated, and if some restriction is not written into this bill it is just as sure as the sun coming up in the morning that they will go ahead with construction, and when the time comes years hence to fill up that pool they will fill it to a level that is indicated by the War Department engineers unless the

restriction is inserted by the Congress. Some fine morning those folks out there will wake up with a notice in their hands to the effect that they can get out and that they can make suitable claim for damages to the Federal Government for whatever damage is caused by the 1,850-foot level. I do not believe that authority and that power to interfere with the livelihood of many thousands of people out there ought to be vested in the hands of the War Department engineers without further study.

It is a question of policy, and there is no reason why it should not be resolved by the Congress. When the chairman offers the amendment to concur with an amendment setting that level for the elevation of the water in the pool, I hope the House will vigorously support the amendment and therein also support the Members of this body who have been working insistently day in and day out to protect the welfare of their people back home.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired, all time has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, during the original consideration of this bill the amount of the appropriation for temporary housing for veterans under discussion was $24,500,000, confined to expenditures for paneling small, temporary homes. I spoke at some length concerning this entire subject of housing for veterans. Today, as we come from the conference with the Senate, the amount for veterans' housing has been increased to $191,900,000, but the scope for the expenditures has been considerably widened. The amount now available for carrying out the purposes of title V of the Lanham Act is based upon the following conditions:

(1) That an emergency program is clearly required because no long-term activity can affect the supply of new housing to become available in the next few months when the housing shortage is most acute;

(2) That in order to avoid diverting materials from badly needed permanent construction, only existing federally owned war housing and other facilities and no new structures be used to meet the needs of applicants eligible under title V to occupy such housing; and

(3) That there should be substantial local participation in the reuse of these structures.

(4) That the emergency program should be limited by the supply of Federal structures available for this purpose and by the capacity of the Federal Government to get the housing under way in the next few months.

Within this framework it has been estimated that solely by the reuse of federally owned structures 100,000 family dwelling units can be provided which will be available for occupancy during the calendar year 1946.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes, 83, noes, 25.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 7, line 7 insert the following:

"Addition to the Executive Mansion: For an addition to the Executive Mansion; for alterations, improvements, and furnishings, and for improvement of grounds, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, to remain available until expended $1,650,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is submitted to the House in compliance with the requirements of section 2 of rule 20. The disagreement is a mere technicality and the amendment is considered separately in order to comply with the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 13, line 18, insert the following:

Public-health services, Philippine Islands: To enable the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, fiscal year 1946, to assist the public-health organization of the Philippine Islands in reconstituting and reactivating public-health services and programs in the Philippine Islands, including personal services in the District of Columbia; personal services outside the District of Columbia without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of 25 passenger automobiles and 10 aircraft; travel; printing and binding; purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating, drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commissioned officers and transportation of their dependents on change of station, $1,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is likewise the technical submission of an amendment under the Rules of the House, and I therefore move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 16, line 24, insert the following:

"PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

"Federal office building, Nashville, Tenn.: For the acquisition of a site in Nashville, Tenn., by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, and the construction thereon of a new Federal office building for the use and accommodation of the United States, including the Veterans' Administration, $5,575,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this item calls for $5,575,000 for a public building in Nashville, Tenn. It is the only item of public buildings involved in the bill. It is the setting up of a special privilege for a building that is not authorized by law; therefore, it had to be brought back in disagreement for a separate vote of the House.

Maybe we have $5,575,000 kicking around that we can throw into this kind of a deal; but I cannot go along with that method of procedure. We owe some obligation to the people of the United States to keep down the expenditure of public funds.

I hope that this item will be defeated. There is no more reason for a building at this point than there is at a thousand other places in the United States. There is no more emergency there than anywhere else. It is absolutely unnecessary for use to go into that kind of a thing now. What we ought to do at this time is to put an embargo on buildings of this sort in order that the construction of dwelling houses and apartment houses may go forward so that people who are without housing can move in. This is directly an antihousing proposal and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Missouri will be rejected.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This item would be in conflict with the program to try to get equipment and materials to build houses for our returning veterans, would it not?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. DONDERO. What kind of a building is this?

Mr. TABER. A great big public building.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York that this is the only appropriation authorized for public buildings, but I disagree with the gentleman from New York to a considerable degree in his statement that there is not an emergency existing in this case that does not exist in hundreds of other places. There are other emergencies, no doubt, but that does not make the situation any the less urgent.

This item was put in this bill primarily to meet a situation that exists in Tennessee in reference to the regional headquarters for the Veterans' Administration.

The regional headquarters of the Veterans' Administration in Tennessee has been located at a mental hospital not in the capital city; a hospital that is removed from the main arteries of transportation, and it has been extremely inconvenient for the veterans to reach that place for consideration of their claims.

The Veterans' Administration has ordered the establishment of a regional office in Nashville. The Administration

has made surveys and frequent attempts to find adequate space to house this regional office. It has been utterly impossible up to this time to find suitable space in the city. The Federal offices in Nashville require about 110,000 square feet and the Veterans' Administration needs 81,000 square feet, and they need this amount of space as quickly as possible.

A temporary solution has been found by placing the regional office temporarily at Thayer General Hospital, an Army hospital located in the suburbs of the city and the regional office will move to those quarters shortly. This amendment would appropriate a sufficient amount of money to take care of the Veterans' Administration regional office and a Federal building to replace the old customs house that is far too small and far from adequate in taking care of other Federal offices. I might say also in reply to the gentleman from New York that I can appreciate his feelings, and I can appreciate the attitude of any other Member of the House who might have a situation similar to that existing in his district. A letter was sent to the White House today by the Bureau of the Budget approving this item, and recommending that it be submitted to the Congress, and it has been submitted. It comes to us now in the form of this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure my colleague will bear me out in the statement that practically all of this item is for the care of the veterans. The Members of the Tennessee delegation, including the two gentlemen on the minority side, have been working for months and months to get the regional office of the Veterans' Administration for Tennessee located in Nashville. The difficulty has been that they could not find space for it. It is an extreme emergency matter and one that should be promptly approved.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my colleague from Tennessee. He and all other Members of our delegation both in the House and in the Senate have been extremely interested in this situation.

I do not believe it is economy for us simply to delay these matters when it is a pressing emergency situation. I am in favor of going ahead as quickly as possible and doing this thing. I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 62 noes 60.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 151, answered "present" 1, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—172

Allen, La.	Gore	O'Toole
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	Outland
Bailey	Gossett	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Granahan	Patman
Barden	Grant, Ala.	Patrick
Barrett, Pa.	Green	Patterson
Bates, Ky.	Hagen	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Hare	Philbin
Biemiller	Harris	Pickett
Bland	Hart	Price, Fla.
Bloom	Havenner	Price, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Hays	Priest
Brooks	Healy	Quinn, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Hébert	Rabaut
Bryson	Heffernan	Rabin
Bulwinkle	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Bunker	Hinshaw	Randolph
Burch	Hobbs	Rankin
Burgin	Hoch	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Holifield	Resa
Cannon, Mo.	Hook	Richards
Carnahan	Huber	Riley
Celler	Izac	Rivers
Chapman	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Cheif	Johnson,	Roe, Md.
Clements	Lyndon B.	Rogers, Fla.
Cochran	Kefauver	Rowan
Coffee	Kelley, Pa.	Ryter
Cooley	Kelly, Ill.	Sabath
Cooper	Keogh	Sadowsky
Cox	Kerr	Sasscer
Cravens	Kilday	Savage
Crosser	King	Sheppard
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Slaughter
Daughton, Va.	Kunkel	Sparkman
Davis	Lane	Spence
De Lacy	Larcade	Starkey
Delaney,	Lea	Stewart
James J.	Lemke	Stigler
Delaney,	Lesinski	Sullivan
John J.	Link	Thom
Domengeaux	Lyle	Thomason
Douglas, Calif.	Lynch	Tolan
Douglas, Ill.	McCormack	Torrens
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Traynor
Earthman	Madden	Trimble
Eberharter	Manasco	Vinson
Engle, Calif.	Mansfield,	Voorhis, Calif.
Fallon	Mont.	Walter
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Flood	Marcantonio	West
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	White
Folger	Mills	Whitten
Forand	Monroney	Wickersham
Fulton	Morgan	Winstead
Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.	Woodhouse
Gardner	Neely	Worley
Gary	O'Brien, Ill.	Zimmerman
Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.	

NAYS—151

Anderson, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hale
Andresen,	Corbett	Hall,
August H.	Crawford	Edwin Arthur
Angell	Cunningham	Hall,
Arends	Curtis	Leonard W.
Arnold	D'Ewart	Halleck
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dirksen	Hancock
Barrett, Wyo.	Dolliver	Hand
Bates, Mass.	Dondero	Harness, Ind.
Beall	Dworshak	Henry
Bennett, Mo.	Eaton	Herter
Bishop	Elliott	Hess
Blackney	Ellsworth	Hill
Bolton	Elston	Hoeven
Bonner	Engel, Mich.	Hoffman
Bradley, Mich.	Fellows	Holmes, Mass.
Brumbaugh	Fenton	Holmes, Wash.
Buck	Fisher	Hope
Buffett	Fuller	Howell
Butler	Gamble	Hull
Byrnes, Wis.	Gavin	Jenkins
Campbell	Gerlach	Jensen
Canfield	Gibson	Johnson, Calif.
Case, N. J.	Gifford	Johnson, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Gillespie	Johnson, Ind.
Chenoweth	Gillette	Jones
Chiperfield	Gillie	Judd
Church	Goodwin	Kean
Clason	Graham	Kearney
Clevenger	Grant, Ind.	Kinzer
Clippinger	Griffiths	LaFollette
Cole, Mo.	Gross	Landis
Lefevre	Pittenger	Stockman
Luce	Ploeser	Taber
Ludlow	Plumley	Talle
McConnell	Poage	Thomas, N. J.
McCowen	Reed, N. Y.	Tibbott
McDonough	Rees, Kans.	Towe
McMillen, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.	Vorys, Ohio
Mahon	Rodgers, Pa.	Vursell
Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Mass.	Wadsworth
Martin, Mass.	Schwabe, Mo.	Wasielewski
Mason	Scrivner	Welchel
Mathews	Shafer	Whittington
Merrow	Sharp	Wigglesworth
Michener	Simpson, Ill.	Wilson
Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.	Wolcott
Mundt	Smith, Maine	Wolfenden, Pa.
Murray, Wis.	Smith, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.
Norrell	Smith, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
O'Konski	Springer	
O'Neal	Stefan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Winter

NOT VOTING—108

Abernethy	Gearhart	Peterson, Ga.
Adams	Geelan	Pfeifer
Allen, Ill.	Granger	Phillips
Andersen,	Gregory	Powell
H. Carl	Gwinn, N. Y.	Rains
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Ramey
Auchincloss	Harless, Ariz.	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Hedrick	Rich
Bender	Heselton	Rizley
Bennet, N. Y.	Horan	Robertson,
Boren	Jackson	N. Dak.
Boykin	Jennings	Robertson, Va.
Brehm	Johnson,	Rockwell
Brown, Ohio	Luther A.	Roe, N. Y.
Buckley	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, N. Y.
Camp	Jonkman	Rooney
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Russell
Carlson	Keefe	Schwabe, Okla.
Clark	Kilburn	Sheridan
Cole, Kans.	Knutson	Short
Colmer	Kopplemann	Sikes
Combs	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Latham	Snyder
Curley	LeCompte	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	Lewis	Stevenson
Dickstein	McGehee	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	McGlinchey	Sumners, Tex.
Doughton, N. C.	McGregor	Sundstrom
Drewry	McKenzie	Talbot
Durham	Maloney	Tarver
Ellis	May	Taylor
Elsaesser	Morrison	Thomas, Tex.
Ervin	Murdock	Weiss
Fernandez	Murphy	Welch
Flannagan	Norton	Wood
Gathings	O'Hara	Woodrum, Va.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Stevenson against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Gwynne of Iowa against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.

Mr. Doughton of North Carolina with Mr. Short.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Cole of Kansas.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Elsaesser.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Ramey.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Horan.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Ervin with Mr. Rockwell.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. May with Mr. Gwinn of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 19, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22 as follows: "Veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, $24,500,000," and insert:

"Veterans' housing: To enable the National Housing Administrator to carry out the purposes of title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1501), $191,900,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, without regard to the provisions of any other law, but subject to the removal provisions of section 313 of said act, said Administrator may transfer, for such consideration and subject to such terms and conditions as he deems feasible under the circumstances, any temporary housing (intact or in panels suitable for reuse) under his jurisdiction to any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization, for use or reuse in providing temporary housing for families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, or, in the discretion of the Administrator, for single veterans attending educational institutions."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 30, line 2, after "$320,000", insert ", and in conducting a survey for city relief sewers the Commissioners are authorized to employ engineering and other professional services by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and civil-service and classification laws."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: On page 32, after line 23, insert the following:

"SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"The limitation of $50,000,000 for the objects and for the purposes of the item 'School lunch program' contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946, is increased by $15,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 59 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount of "$15,000,000" named in such amendment, insert "$7,500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 88: On page 43, after line 4 insert the following:

"Arkansas River compact: For payment of the compensation, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, including time performed in travel, and expenses, including travel, of the person appointed by the President, pursuant to Public Law 34, Seventy-ninth Congress, to participate as the representative of the United States in the negotiation of a compact between the States of Colorado and Kansas relative to the division of the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, to be available until June 30, 1947, $15,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to the contrary, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer of the Army as such representative without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer who shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: On page 56, line 25, strike out "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for constructing the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir beyond dimensions which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet or for constructing dikes or levees which would provide for a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam", and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 103 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir at a higher maximum pool elevation than 1,830 feet, or for constructing dikes or levees which would be required by a higher pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam, unless an operation at a higher level should be authorized hereafter by law: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam."

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to House Document No. 383. It contains questions and answers with regard to the Revenue Act of 1945. I think you will find it very useful not only for yourselves but for your constituents. Copies of this document will be available in the document room beginning about tomorrow.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLOOM submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "annum, as he shall determine, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified meeting thereof in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations

with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative."; and the House agree to the same.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the designation of representatives of the United States for sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The House amendment also contained a provision authorizing the appointment of alternates, which was not in the Senate bill, and provided that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States designated as a representative or alternate for the General Assembly should be entitled to receive any compensation for his services in such capacity. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized the President to appoint other persons to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and required that some of these persons could be designated only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate bill contained a requirement, which was not in the House amendment, that the principal representative in specialized agencies established by the United Nations Organization should be confirmed by the Senate. The conference agreement omits this provision, but does require Senate confirmation for the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or any other commission of the United Nations upon which the United States is entitled to representation. The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, authorizing the designation, without the advice and consent of the Senate, of any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council or in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations at specified meetings in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified meeting, in lieu of the regular representative. This provision is retained in the conference agreement.

SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 1580.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. MARTIN of Mass. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain the changes in the bill and the difference between the House and the Senate bills?

Mr. BLOOM. The only change is that the Senate asks that a new paragraph be inserted in the bill. All of the amendments in the bill as passed by the House yesterday remain the same. The new paragraph is rather short and is as follows:

The advice and consent of the Senate shall also be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

That is to say that in case the United Nations shall appoint a commission for atomic energy or anything else as important as that, the representative on that commission will have to come back and be confirmed by the Senate. That is the only change.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DENTAL CARE FOR PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 715) to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the proper recognition of the Dental Corps in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy. A similar bill passed the House some 6 or 8 months ago, but was not enacted into law by the Senate. During this session of Congress, the Committee on Naval Affairs had the matter up again. We think the bill is in somewhat of a more improved form than it was when it passed the House during the last session of Congress. It simply gives to the Dental Corps the recognition which the Dental Corps feels it should have in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The bill is presented by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the author of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all Members of the House are aware of the splendid performance record which has been compiled by the dentists who have served with our armed forces during the war.

It is impossible to pay too high a tribute to the dentists who have served with our Navy during the great struggle. These great men are continuing to perform the duties assigned them. As long as America's warships cover the seas of the world, there will be the finest of the dental profession ministering to the needs of our fighting men.

This measure, S. 715, aims at providing to the men of the dental profession serving with our Navy the position which is justly their due. This measure is by no means intended as an award for the services the dentists have performed. It is but a recognition of the need for a dental division to be supervised and manned by dentists. It is, in short, an expression of the intention of Congress that the men in our Navy shall receive the best possible dental care.

The members of the Navy Dental Corps have all been educated in the science of their profession. Their skill is a specialized one. In order that this profession may render the best possible service in the Navy it is essential that it receive intelligent consideration and attention from men who know and understand the details of the profession. Dentistry, in civilian life, is no longer considered a mere adjunct of the medical profession. It is an independent science which is playing a role of ever-increasing importance in the lives of everyone. It is now common knowledge that the skill of the dentist can frequently minimize or eradicate the incidence of ailments which in former days have been thought to be ills which could respond only to the touch of the medical profession.

It is of utmost importance that we provide within the Navy the greatest possible freedom of action for the members of this profession in order that Navy men may have all the advantages which such autonomy will make possible.

There is the question of morale of dental officers and dental personnel. This is worthy of serious consideration. These men have most important functions to perform. In the performance of those functions it is of the utmost importance that they receive the sympathetic consideration of commanding officers who understand their problems. The morale of these dental officers and personnel affects all the men in the service to some degree.

The passage of this act will go far to improving that morale. It will promote efficiency in the operation of the Dental Corps. It will promote economy since it will do away with procurement and operations by men—though well-meaning—who lack the essential knowledge without which it is impossible to understand the needs of the dental profession.

It is immediately apparent from the report on this measure that the ground has been well covered. The committees of the Senate and the House have gone into the matter thoroughly. Both committees have been impressed by the need for action here. Your interest in the men in the service—for whom I know you want the best of everything—requires that you support the passage of this essential measure.

During the hearings on this bill it was suggested that the Navy could work out the reorganization of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in such a manner as to resolve all the objections there are to the present set-up. By such a proposal—from the Bureau itself—there is an admission that something is wrong—that at least some of the complaints of dental officers are well-founded. The Bureau has admitted there is need for change—for improvement in the present organizational set-up of the Bureau. But, the Bureau argues, if you will give us time we shall correct all these existing injustices. I submit to you gentlemen, there has been plenty of time. There has been years of time. Since the original of this bill was introduced there has been a lot of time to make the necessary changes.

We have frequently been accused of doing harm through delaying action. Let us not fail again to take the steps which are proven necessary.

The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery admits the situation now is not good. It proposes to elevate the Dental Corps to a position which is proper—to provide it with a certain amount of autonomy in its operations. We appreciate that attitude on the part of the Bureau but let us assist the Bureau in its noble efforts by enacting this measure and demonstrating to the Bureau how we want it to proceed in its reorganization, at least insofar as the Navy Dental Corps is affected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery shall be reorganized so as to provide for greater integrity of the Dental Service in accordance with the provisions hereof.

SEC. 2. The dental functions of such Bureau shall be defined and prescribed by appropriate directives of such Bureau, and by any necessary regulations of the Secretary of the Navy, to the end that the Dental Division of such Bureau shall study, plan, and direct all matters coming within the cognizance of such division, as hereinafter prescribed, and all matters relating to dentistry shall be referred to the Dental Division.

SEC. 3. The Dental Division shall (1) establish professional standards and policies for dental practice; (2) conduct inspections and surveys for maintenance of such standards; (3) initiate and recommend action pertaining to complements, appointments, advancement, training assignment, and transfer of dental personnel; and (4) serve as the advisory agency for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery on all matters relating directly to dentistry. An officer of the Dental Corps of the Navy shall be detailed as the Chief of the Dental Division. Such officer, while so serving, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a rear admiral.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Navy shall provide by regulations for establishing on ships and on shore stations dental services to be under the senior dental officer who shall be responsible to the commanding officer of such ship or shore station for all professional, technical, and administrative matters in connection therewith: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to impose any administrative requirements which would interfere with the proper functioning of battle organizations.

All laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed, and nothing contained herein shall act to reduce the grade or rank of any person.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 417 was laid on the table.

INDUSTRIAL USE OF SILVER OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell or lease for manufacturing uses, including manufacturing uses incident to reconversion and the building up of employment in industry, upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem advisable, to any person, partnership, association, or corporation, or any department of the Government, any silver held or owned by the United States at not less than 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce: *Provided*, That at all times the ownership and the possession or control within the United States of an amount of silver of a monetary value equal to the face amount of all outstanding silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be maintained by the Treasury.

SEC. 2. This act shall expire 2 years after the date of its enactment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely continues the authority that the Secretary of the Treasury now has under Public Law 137, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, which authority expires on December 31 of this year. It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may sell a portion of the unallocated free silver owned by the Treasury for industrial purposes, in order to speed up reconversion.

It provides that he cannot sell this silver at a less price than 71.11 cents per ounce. The Secretary of the Treasury desires the authority. It was reported by the committee without objection and without a record vote.

I include with my remarks the report on the bill as follows:

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER BY INDUSTRY

Mr. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

This bill will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, during the period of 2 years from the date of its enactment, to sell or lease for manufacturing uses, including those incident to reconversion and expansion of employment in industry, silver held or owned by the United States. Sales may be made to any person, partnership, association, or corporation or to Government departments, and the price must be not less than 71.11 cents an ounce.

The effect of this bill is to extend in somewhat modified form the act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 520), as amended (31 U. S. C., Sup. IV, 734c), under which the Secretary of the Treasury has sold and leased silver for use in the prosecution of the war. Since its enactment, war and civilian industries have consumed all available supplies of silver, both imported and domestically mined, and at no time have these supplies proved sufficient to meet the industrial demand in full. During the first year this act was in effect, more than 40,000,000 ounces of silver were sold by the Secretary of the Treasury to meet the deficiency in the supply of imported and domestically mined silver. During its second year of operation, the sales increased to 68,000,000 ounces and during the past 5½ months there have been sales in excess of 42,000,000 ounces. Without this additional source of supply, it is clear that silver-consuming industries would have had to curtail their production.

The quantity of silver which industry will consume during the next few years will be affected by numerous factors, many of them unpredictable. Everything that bears upon the level of industrial activity, the number of persons gainfully employed, and the quantity of goods available for sale will have its effect on the industrial consumption of silver. Nevertheless, it is obvious that there is not at the present time enough silver coming into the market to meet the demand of legitimate industry and, should the supply fall short of that demand, reconversion will be interfered with and a serious obstacle will be placed in the way of achieving high levels of production.

We should not permit unnecessary shortages of materials to delay conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy nor to hold down the level of production. Enactment of H. R. 4590 will assure the industries that use silver of a continued source of supply during the next 2 years and thus permit them to go forward with plans for expansion to meet the backlog of orders now in their hands.

The Secretary of the Treasury has leased 877,715,117 ounces of silver to the War Department and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for nonconsumptive use in war plants. More than half of this silver is in the atomic bomb plant in Tennessee, and the balance is used in bus bars located in aluminum and magnesium plants throughout the country. The enactment of this bill will also permit the extension of these leases if technical difficulties involved in the return of the silver make redelivery impossible during the period fixed in the present law.

As of December 13, 1945, the Treasury held approximately 1,580,000,000 ounces of silver as security for silver certificates, and 436,776,875 ounces of free silver. One hundred and seventy-three million ounces of the free silver are to be monetized under an authorization of the Secretary of the Treasury of July 5, 1945, leaving 263,776,875 ounces available for coinage and for industrial uses.

Enactment of this bill has been recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury in a letter to the chairman of the committee as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1945.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of December 5, 1945, requesting a report on H. R. 4590, to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States.

Enactment of the bill will enable the Treasury to continue selling silver to American industry for manufacturing uses. It is unlikely that domestic production of silver and imports of silver will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of industry for a considerable period of time. A shortage of silver for industrial use would interfere with reconversion and the maintenance of high levels of production and, accordingly, authority for the Treasury to sell silver to industry would greatly assist in the adjustment from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

With respect to leases, the bill would permit the extension, if necessary, of two leases which are now outstanding and which will terminate 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. The War Department holds nearly 475,000,000 ounces under lease and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation holds slightly more than 400,000,000 ounces. The silver is used in bus bars located in aluminum and magnesium plants throughout the country and in the War Department's atomic bomb plant in Tennessee.

For the reasons stated above, the Treasury Department recommends that H. R. 4590 be enacted.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE: On page 1, line 10, after the words "not less than", strike out "71.11 cents" and insert "$1.2929."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in offering this amendment I am guided largely by the present situation in the use of silver that has been obtained by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will raise the price of Government-owned silver to be sold to the jewelers and manufacturing trade to the value of the silver in the standard silver dollar. The people of this country have accepted, and there is now in use, over $2,000,000,000 in silver money in the form of silver dollars and silver certificates at the coinage value of $1.29 per ounce.

The Treasury has recently lend-leased 600,000,000 ounces of silver to the British Empire, practically all of which the British have proceeded to coin and put into circulation, in most cases at a coinage value higher than the price this amendment proposes to establish, as you will note from the following table obtained from the Treasury Department:

Value of ounce of silver in silver currency in the British Empire

Australia	$1.1146
Indian rupee (11/12 fine)	.8728
Indian rupee (0.500 fine)	1.5950
Canada	1.6666
Egypt	1.2797
Ireland	1.4790
New Zealand	2.0688

Every ounce of silver that the Government owns should be put into circulation as money which will reduce the amount of bonds our Government must sell to pay current expenses and the added interest by that much.

If the manufacturing and jewelry trade must buy Government silver, why should not they pay as much for it as the people who accepted the United States or British money in exchange for their goods and services? If there is any industry that has profited during the war period and are making enormous profits now, it is the jewelry trade. Step into any jewelry store and compare prices now with those before the war, and you will easily verify this statement. Jewelry stores have increased by the thousands since the war began, and the price of all kinds of silver jewelry and silverware has gone up.

Let me quote from an article I have just read today in the Pathfinder, dated December 19, 1945:

PRICES AND PLAIN TALK

On New York's swank Fifth Avenue the casual shopper could pay $32.50 for a child's linen suit; $150 for men's pajamas and matching robes; $95 for nightgowns; $155 for a woman's slack suit (sweater extra); $1,936 for a silver fish platter.

Think of $1,936 for a silver fish platter. Price silver jewelry anywhere and you will find the price all out of line and way higher than the coinage value of the good old American silver dollar. The last time I was in New York, I was surprised to find a lot of the ordinary run of old-style silver dollars bearing the head of the Goddess of Liberty prominently displayed in the shop windows at $2 each. I was at a loss to understand how an ordinary silver dollar could be sold for $2 even in New York when any holder of a dollar silver certificate can have it redeemed and obtain a silver dollar in exchange. The image of the head of the Goddess of Liberty on the old-style silver dollar, hard to obtain in New York, may have been the reason for the inflated price.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield briefly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have examined this bill and I note it comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency. The distinguished gentleman from Idaho is chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to which this type of legislation should be referred. I would like to know why the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures did not have this bill for consideration.

Mr. WHITE. I think the bill is entitled to come to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. By a long line of precedents, that committee has always had legislation of this kind, with the exception of the fact that when the price of silver was set that legislation was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, due to the tax feature in the silver legislation. This bill does not contain a tax feature, and I do not understand why the bill was not referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

This is such an important piece of legislation that I cannot understand the policy of the leadership in rushing a bill of this kind through the House without consideration. This subject takes more explaining than I can make to the House in the brief 10 minutes at my disposal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recall that he has in mind a country-wide investigation to determine the uses to which silver may be put economically. Would not that be in line with this bill?

Mr. WHITE. That would be right in line with this bill. This bill should have been referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, so we could have investigated the situation of silver, a subject that is often misunderstood and at best but little understood by the people of the country and the Members of the House. Under the law today there is no price set at 71.11 cents for silver. The law provides that when a miner brings his silver to the mint it will be minted into silver dollars, that the Treasury will retain 45 percent of those dollars and give back to the miner 55 percent.

Since the Silver Purchase Act was passed in 1934, the Government has obtained 506,125,000 ounces of domestic silver, for which it has paid $362,196,000.

According to information just obtained from the Treasury which is inserted here:

DECEMBER 19, 1945, 10:45 A. M.

Mr. Neff, Treasury, dictated the following on purchases by the mints and assay offices of newly minted domestic silver:

Year:	*Ounces*	*Dollars*
1934	21.8	14.1
1935	38.0	27.3
1936	61.1	47.3
1937	70.6	54.6
1938	61.6	42.2
1939	60.7	40.1
1940	68.3	48.5
1941	70.5	50.1
1942	47.9	34.0
1943	5.5	3.9
1944	.125	.096
1945	506.125	362.196

NOTE.—The ounces and dollars are in the millions, for example the first 21.8 is 21,800,000, etc.

Prices	*Cents per ounce*
1934 to Apr. 9, 1935	64.64
Apr. 9 to Apr. 23, 1935	71.11
Apr. 23, 1935, to Dec. 31, 1937	77.57
Dec. 31, 1937, to July 1, 1939	64.64
July 1, 1939	71.11

Mr. Neff said he would call back to give ounces and dollars for the 11 months in 1945. These amounts are negligible.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further observation?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We all recognize the gentleman as one of the great silver experts of the country and we are sorry his committee did not have an opportunity to consider this bill so he could have elucidated more fully to us what the silver situation is.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the smiling chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill came to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the ordinary processes of reference of legislation. We did not seek it.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. SPENCE. We had no intention of interfering with the gentleman's jurisdiction, but the bill having been referred to our committee and we having assumed jurisdiction we believe we are entitled to present it in the House; and I want to see the bill passed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

Now it is proposed by this bill that we take the silver that has been accumulated by the Government, and by every right should be put in circulation as money, and hand it over to the jewelers, a class that has made more money during the war than any other, at a price of 71.11 an ounce.

My amendment calls for this silver to be sold at the coinage price of silver, at $1.29. I hope the committee will support my amendment and that the money of the taxpayers that is invested in silver may not be used to let the jewelers make a profit represented between the 71.11 price and the $1.29 monetary value of the silver to the people who accept silver certificates. We have 200,000,000 silver certificates in circulation at $1.29 and I see no reason at this time when the taxpayers are overloaded with debt why we should make a concession to the jewelers and silversmiths by selling this silver to them at 71.11.

I ask that the committee support my amendment to make the sale price of this silver $1.29.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho. We all understand he is one of the great monetary experts of the country and we would not dare dispute him upon monetary questions. But this is not a monetary question, it is a business proposition; it is a question of trying to do something to get silver into the hands of industry to help in a little measure solve the unemployment problem next year. It is inconceivable we would let huge quantities of silver lay idle in the Treasury and force many thousands of people out of work. Silver factories, jewelry factories, watch-case factories and many kindred industries. The motion-picture industry is also interested. The silver-mining interests would stand in their own light if they permitted these customers to be destroyed. I do not believe the Congress wants at this time to set prices which would be contrary to the Treasury.

I am in favor of this bill and hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this bill is to get this metal into the hands of the silversmiths. The monetary question is not involved. This is merely a continuance of existing law which expires at the end of this month.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We have already passed this bill three times in the House by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. This has to do with the OPA ceiling prices and if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho is adopted, this particular line of activity might as well go out of business?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is true.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 4, noes 160.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

House Resolution 465 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the second sentence of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The Administrator is authorized, for the purpose of extending benefits to veterans and dependents, and to the extent he deems necessary, to procure the necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking, pursuant to existing statutes.'

"SEC. 2. Section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out the second paragraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'Any veteran entitled to a prosthetic appliance shall be furnished such fitting and training, including institutional training, in the use of such appliance as may be necessary whether in a Veterans' Administration facility, other training institution, or by out-patient treatment, including such service under contract and including necessary travel expenses to and from their homes to such hospital or training institution.

"'The Administrator may procure any and all items mentioned herein, including necessary services required in the fitting, supplying, and training in use of such items by purchase, manufacture, contract, or in such other manner as the Administrator may determine to be proper without regard to any other provision of law.'

"SEC. 3. Section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Administrator is further authorized at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid full-time representatives of such organizations.'

"SEC. 4. Section 302 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to establish, from time to time, boards of review composed of five commissioned officers, two of whom shall be selected from the Medical Corps of the Army or Navy, or from the Public Health Service, as the case may be. It shall be the duty of any such board to review, at the request of any officer retired or released from active service, without pay, for physical disability pursuant to the decision of a retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board, the findings and decisions of such board. Such review shall be based upon all available service records relating to the officer requesting such review, and such other evidence as may be presented by such officer. Witnesses shall be permitted to present testimony either in person or by affidavit, and the officer requesting review shall be allowed to appear before such board of review in person or by counsel. In carrying out its duties under this section such board of review shall have the same powers as exercised by, or vested in, the board whose findings and decision are being reviewed. The proceedings and decision of each such board of review affirming or reversing the decision of any such retiring board, board of medical survey, or disposition board shall be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, and shall be laid by him before the President for his approval or disapproval and orders in the case.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph 1 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, and who either shall have served ninety days or more, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, or shall have been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability, shall be eligible for and entitled to receive education or training under this part: *Provided*, That such course shall be initiated not later than four years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later: *Provided further*, That no

such education or training shall be afforded beyond nine years after the termination of the present war.'

"(b) Paragraph 2 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'2. Any such eligible person shall be entitled to education or training at an approved educational or training institution for a period of one year plus the time such person was in the active service on or after September 16, 1940, and before the termination of the war, exclusive of any period he was assigned for a course of education or training under the Army specialized training program or the Navy college training program, which course was a continuation of his civilian course and was pursued to completion, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies, but in no event shall the total period of education or training exceed four years: *Provided*, That his work continues to be satisfactory throughout the period, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution: *Provided further*, That wherever the period of eligibility ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such quarter or semester has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester.'

"(c) Paragraph 3 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'3. (a) Such person shall be eligible for and entitled to such course of education or training, full time or the equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution at which he chooses to enroll, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept or retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue: *Provided*, That, for reasons satisfactory to the Administrator, he may change a course of instruction: *And provided further*, That any such course of education or training may be discontinued at any time, if it is found by the Administrator that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution, the conduct or progress of such person is unsatisfactory.

"'(b) Any such eligible person may apply for a short, intensive post-graduate, or training course of less than thirty weeks: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have the authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, That (1) the limitation of paragraph 5 shall not prevent the payment of such agreed rates, but there shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which the cost of the course bears to $500, and (2) not in excess of $500 shall be paid for any such course.

"'(c) Any such eligible person may apply for a course of instruction by correspondence without any subsistence allowance: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall have authority to contract with approved institutions for such courses if he finds that the agreed cost of such courses is reasonable and fair: *Provided further*, (1) That the provisions of paragraph 5 shall not apply to correspondence courses; (2) that one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such course shall be charged against the veteran's period of eligibility; and (3) that the total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses for any veteran shall not exceed $500; *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the use of approved correspondence courses as a part of institutional or job training, subject to regulations prescribed by the Administrator.'

"(d) Paragraph 5 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'5. The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full time or part time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided*, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have such customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event there shall be charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to $500: *Provided further*, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: *And provided further*, That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of tuition and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to elegible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time.'

"(e) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, the first sentence of paragraph 6 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year.'

"(f) Paragraph 7 of part VIII of such Regulation is amended to read as follows:

"'7. Any such person eligible for the benefits of this part, who is also eligible for the benefit of part VII, may elect either benefit or may be provided an approved combination of such courses: *Provided*, That the total period of any such combined courses shall not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.'

"SEC. 6. Section 4 of Public Law Numbered 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That returned books, supplies, or equipment may be turned in to educational or training institutions for credit under such terms as may be approved by the Administrator, or disposed of in such other manner as may be approved by the Administrator.'

"SEC. 7. (a) The proviso in paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of four years shall be approved except with the approval of the Administrator, nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond nine years after the termination of the present war.'

"(b) Effective on the first day of the first calendar month subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act, paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for two months after his employability is determined, each veteran shall be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended: *Provided*, That the minimum payment of such allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, shall be, for a person without a dependent, $105 per month; and for a person with a dependent, $115, plus the following amounts for additional dependents: (1) $10 for one child and $7 additional for each additional child; and (2) $15 for a dependent parent: *Provided further*, That the rates set out herein shall not be subject to the increases authorized by Public Law Numbered 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 27, 1944: *And provided further*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement in writing showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such written statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the subsistence allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just.'

"SEC. 8. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'TITLE III—LOANS FOR THE PURCHASE OR CONSTRUCTION OF HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PROPERTY

"'*Chapter V—General provisions for loans*

"'SEC. 500. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of ninety days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be eligible for the benefits of this title. Any loan made by such veteran within ten years after the termination of the war for any of the purposes, and in compliance with the provisions, specified in this title, is automatically guaranteed by the Government by this title in an amount not exceeding fifty per centum of the loan: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount guaranteed shall not exceed $2,000 in the case of non-real-estate loans, nor $4,000 in the case of real-estate loans; or a prorated portion thereof on loans of both types or combination thereof.

"'(b) Loans guaranteed under this title shall be payable under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, subject to the conditions and limitations of this title and the regulations issued pursuant to section 504: *Provided*, That the liability under the guaranty within the limitations of this title shall decrease or increase pro rata with any decrease or increase of the amount of the unpaid portion of the obligation: *Provided further*, That loans guaranteed under this title shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding four per centum per annum and shall be payable in full in not more than twenty-five years, or in the case of loans on farm realty in not more than forty years: *And provided further*, That (1) the maturity on a non-real-estate loan shall not exceed ten years; (2) any loan for a term in excess of five years shall be amortized in accordance with established procedure; (3) except as provided in section 505 any real-estate loan, other than for repairs, alterations or improvements, shall be secured by a first lien on the realty, and a non-real-estate loan, except as to working or other capital, merchandise, good-will and other intangible assets, shall be secured by personalty to the extent legal and practicable.

"'(c) An honorable discharge shall be deemed a certificate of eligibility to apply for a guaranteed loan. Any veteran who does not have a discharge certificate, or who received a discharge other than honorable, may apply to the Administrator for a certificate of eligibility. Upon making a loan as

provided herein, the lender shall forthwith transmit to the Administrator a statement setting forth the full name and serial number of the veteran, amount and terms of the loan, and the legal description of the property, together with the appraisal report made by the designated appraiser. Where the loan is automatically guaranteed, the Administrator shall provide the lender with a loan guaranty certificate or other evidence of the guaranty. He shall also endorse on the veteran's discharge, or eligibility certificate, the amount and type of guaranty used, and the amount, if any, remaining. An amount equivalent to four per centum on the amount originally guaranteed shall be paid to the lender by the Administrator out of available appropriations, to be credited upon the loan. Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude the assignment of any guaranteed loan nor the assignment of the security therefor.

"'(d) Loans guaranteed hereunder may be made by any Federal land bank, national bank, state bank, private bank, building and loan association, insurance company, credit union, or mortgage and loan company, that is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Any loan at least twenty per centum of which is guaranteed under this title may be made by any national bank, or Federal savings and loan association; or by any bank, trust company, building and loan association or insurance company organized or authorized to do business in the District of Columbia; without regard to the limitations and restrictions of any other statute with respect to—

"'(1) ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;

"'(2) maturity of loan;

"'(3) requirement for mortgage or other security;

"'(4) dignity of lien; or

"'(5) percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

"'(e) Any loan proposed to be made to an eligible veteran by any lender not of a class specified in subsection (d) may be guaranteed by the Administrator if he finds that it is in accord otherwise with the provisions of this title, as amended.

"'Purchase or Construction of Homes

"'SEC. 501. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing residential property or constructing a dwelling to be occupied as his home or for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, or improvements in property owned by him and occupied as his home, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for payment of the property purchased or constructed or improved;

"'(2) That the contemplated terms of payment required in any mortgage to be given in part payment of the purchase price or the construction cost bear a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and that the nature and condition of the property is such as to be suitable for dwelling purposes; and

"'(3) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'Purchase of Farms and Farm Equipment

"'SEC. 502. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for purchasing any lands, buildings, livestock, equipment, machinery, supplies or implements, or for repairing, altering, constructing or improving any land, equipment, or building, including the farmhouse, to be used in farming operation conducted by the veteran involving production in excess of his own needs, or for working capital requirements necessary for such operations, or to purchase stock in a cooperative association where the purchase of such stock is required by Federal statute as an incident to obtaining the loan, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any such purposes in connection with bona fide farming operations conducted by the applicant;

"'(2) That such property will be useful in and reasonably necessary for efficiently conducting such operations;

"'(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the nature of the proposed farming operations to be conducted by him, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that such operations will be successful; and

"'(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'Purchase of Business Property

"'SEC. 503. Any loan made to a veteran under this title, the proceeds of which are to be used for the purpose of engaging in business or pursuing a gainful occupation, or for the cost of acquiring for such purpose land, buildings, supplies, equipment, machinery, tools, inventory, stock in trade, or for the cost of the construction, repair, alteration or improvement of any realty or personalty used for such purpose, or to provide the funds needed for working capital is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) That the proceeds of such loan will be used for any of the specified purposes in connection with bona fide pursuit of gainful occupation by the veteran;

"'(2) That such property will be used in and reasonably necessary for the efficient and successful pursuit of such business or occupation;

"'(3) That the ability and experience of the veteran, and the conditions under which he proposes to pursue such business or occupation, are such that there is a reasonable likelihood that he will be successful in the pursuit of such business or occupation; and

"'(4) That the purchase price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or the cost of such construction, alterations, or improvements, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'Regulations

"'SEC. 504. The Administrator is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this title, as amended, as are necessary and appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title, and may delegate to subordinate employees authority to issue certificates, or other evidence, of guaranty of loans guaranteed under the provisions of this title, and to exercise other administrative functions hereunder.

"'Secondary Loans

"'SEC. 505. (a) In any case wherein a principal loan, for any of the purposes stated in section 501, 502, or 503, is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it pursuant to applicable law and regulations, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator, subject otherwise to the provisions of this title, may guarantee the full amount of the second loan: *Provided*, That such second loan shall not exceed 20 per centum of the purchase price or cost: *And provided further*, That regulations to be promulgated jointly by the Administrator and the head of such agency may provide for servicing of both loans by such agency and for refinancing of the principal loan to include any unpaid portion of the secondary loan with accrued interest, if any, after the curtailment thereon equals twice the amount of the secondary loan.

"'(b) Any person who is a veteran eligible for the benefits of this title, as provided in section 500 hereof, and who is found by the Secretary of Agriculture, by reason of his ability and experience, including training as a vocational trainee, to be likely to carry out successfully undertakings required of him under a loan which may be made under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, shall be eligible for the benefits of such Act to the same extent as if he were a farm tenant.

"'Procedure on Default

"'SEC. 506. In the event of default in the payment of any loan guaranteed under this title, the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator who shall thereupon pay to such holder the guaranty not in excess of the pro rata portion of the amount originally guaranteed, and shall be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the obligation to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty: *Provided*, That prior to suit or foreclosure the holder of the obligation shall notify the Administrator of the default, and within thirty days thereafter the Administrator may, at his option, pay the holder of the obligation the unpaid balance of the obligation plus accrued interest and receive an assignment of the loan and security: *Provided further*, That (1) nothing herein shall be construed to preclude any forbearance for the benefit of the veteran as may be agreed upon by the parties to the loan and approved by the Administrator; and (2) the Administrator may establish the date, not later than the date of judgment and decree of foreclosure or sale, upon which accrual of interest or charges shall cease.

"'Loans on Delinquent Indebtedness

"'SEC. 507. Any loan made to a veteran, the proceeds of which are to be used to refinance any indebtedness of the veteran which is secured of record on property to be used or occupied by the veteran as a home or for farming purposes, or indebtedness incurred by him in the pursuit of a gainful occupation which he is pursuing or which he proposes in good faith to pursue, or any delinquent taxes or assessments on such property or business, is automatically guaranteed if made pursuant to the provisions of this title, including the following:

"'(1) Such loan became in default or the delinquency occurred not later than ten years after the termination of the war;

"'(2) Such refinancing will aid the veteran in his economic readjustment; and

"'(3) The amount of the guaranteed loan does not exceed the reasonable value of the property or business, as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator.

"'Insurance of Loans

"'SEC. 508. (a) Any loans which might be guaranteed under the provisions of this title, when made or purchased by any financial institution subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia, may, in lieu of such guaranty, be insured by the Administrator under an agreement whereby he will reimburse any such institution for losses incurred on such loan up to 15 per centum of the aggregate of loans so made or purchased by it.

"'(b) Loans insured hereunder shall be made on such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Administrator may prescribe within the limitations set forth in this title. The Administrator may fix the maximum rate of interest payable on any class of non-real-estate loans insured hereunder at a figure not in excess of a 3 per centum discount rate or an equivalent straight interest rate on nonamortized loans.

"'(c) The Administrator shall pay the same amount on each loan insured hereunder as he would be required to pay under the sixth sentence of section 500 (c) hereof if the loan were guaranteed rather than insured.

"'Powers of Administrator

"'SEC. 509. (a) With respect to matters arising by reason of this title as now or hereafter amended and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator may—

"'(1) Sue and be sued in his official capacity in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal;

"'(2) Subject to specific limitations in this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of principal or interest or any portion thereof, security or other provisions of any note, contract, mortgage or other instrument securing a loan which has been guaranteed or insured hereunder;

"'(3) Pay, or compromise, any claim, on or arising because of, any such guaranty or insurance;

"'(4) Pay, compromise, waive or release any right, title, claim, lien or demand, however, acquired, including any equity or any right of redemption;

"'(5) Purchase at any sale, public or private, upon such terms and for such prices as he determines to be reasonable, and take title to, property, real, personal, or mixed; and similarly sell, at public or private sale, exchange, assign, convey, or otherwise dispose of any such property; and

"'(6) Complete, administer, operate, obtain and pay for insurance on, and maintain, renovate, repair, modernize, lease, or otherwise deal with any property acquired or held pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That the acquisition of any such property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction of, on, or over such property (including power to tax) or impair the rights under the State or local law of any persons on such property.

"'(b) The powers by this section granted may be exercised by the Administrator without regard to any other provisions of law not enacted expressly in limitation hereof, which otherwise would govern the expenditure of public funds: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this section if the amount of such contract exceeds $1,000.

"'(c) The financial transactions of the Administrator incident to, or arising out of, the guaranty of loans pursuant to this title, and the acquisition, management, and disposition of property, real, personal or mixed, as incident to such activities and pursuant to this section, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government.

"'Effective Date

"'SEC. 510. This title, as amended, shall be effective from the date of enactment: *Provided*, That any application for guaranty of a loan filed within ninety days after such date may be approved under the title as it existed prior to amendment: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to affect any contractual right under any certificate of guaranty issued thereunder.'

"SEC. 9. Section 1505 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 10. Title VI of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"'SEC. 1506. Persons who served in the active military or naval service of any government allied with the United States in World War II and who at time of entrance into such active service were citizens of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, and if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of titles II, III, IV, and V of this Act or of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who served in the active military or naval service of the United States: *Provided*, That any such benefit shall not be extended to any person who is not a resident of the United States at time of filing claim or to any person who has applied for and received the same or similar benefit from the government of the nation in whose active military or naval service he served.

"'SEC. 1507. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1503, any person while on terminal leave, or while hospitalized pending final discharge, may be afforded the benefits of titles II and III of this Act, or vocational rehabilitation training under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, subject to all conditions thereof except actual discharge: *Provided*, That no subsistence allowance shall be paid in such cases under title II of this Act or Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress. This section shall be effective from June 22, 1944.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

J. E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
ED C. JOHNSON,
ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
E. D. MILLIKIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3749) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same.

The substantial differences between the House amendment and the proposed conference substitute are noted in the following statement.

PROCEDURE

The House bill provided that the Veterans' Administration should have the same authority and discretion as the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service in the appointment of civil-service personnel, and provided that the provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as to priorities for materials should apply to any State institutions to be built for the care or hospitalization of veterans. The bill as agreed to in conference omits this provision.

The Senate amendment amends section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act so as to make permanent the authority of the Administrator under that section to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter. The House bill omitted this authority entirely. The bill as agreed to in conference includes the Senate provision.

The House bill liberalized the provisions of section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including necessary travel expenses. There is no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The bill as agreed to in conference retains the House provision.

The Senate amendment contains a provision amending section 200 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to authorize the Administrator at his discretion to furnish necessary space, suitable office facilities and stenographic assistance for the use of paid full-time representatives of veterans' organizations, with reimbursement on an actual cost basis. The section as agred to in conference authorizes the Administrator, in his discretion, to furnish space and office facilities, if available, but omits the requirement for reimbursement.

Section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended in the House bill to permit review boards to review action of boards of medical survey. The Senate amendment adds authority to review findings and decisions of disposition boards. Both of these amendments are retained in the conference agreement.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Senate amendment eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service; retains the provision in the House bill that extended the time from 2 to 4 years to initiate a course and the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war; and strikes out the 25-year-age limitation on presumption of interruption of education. The bill as agreed to in conference retains the Senate changes.

The Senate amendment strikes out the references in the law to a refresher or retraining course and in effect provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years. The bill as agreed to in conference contains this amendment.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contain provisions authorizing short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions. The Senate amendment, however, strikes out the word "vocational" limiting the training courses provided for and the conference agreement also omits this limitation. It is also made clear that the cost of any such course may not exceed $500.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for instruction by correspondence courses. The House bill added correspondence schools to the list of approved institutions but provided that the Government should pay for these correspondence courses quarterly as the course is completed and that no correspondence school should be approved unless it was already in existence. The Senate amendment provides for instruction by correspondence courses subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veterans' period of eligibility; and further limits the total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses to $500. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment precluded payment of subsistence allowance while pursuing a correspondence course. The bill as agreed to in conference follows the Senate provision.

The Senate amendment amends existing law to permit the Administrator to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions if he finds that customary

charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans, by agreement with each institution on an over-all plan and based on a showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The bill as agreed to in conference retains the Senate provision, with an amendment permitting the estimated cost to be fixed (by regulation if desirable) instead of the actual cost (only by agreement) and further permitting a veteran to elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of $500 paid.

The House bill increased subsistence allowances from $50 to $60 per month in the case of veterans without dependents and from $75 to $85 per month in the case of veterans with dependents. The Senate amendment increases these amounts to $65 and $90, respectively. The Senate rates are retained in the conference agreement.

The Senate amendment provides for approved combination of courses under part VIII (education and training) and part VII (vocational rehabilitation) of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), with the proviso that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility. This provision is included in the bill as agreed to in conference.

The Senate amendment adds a proviso to section 4 of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, which was added by section 402 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, authorizing the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally. The conference agreement retains this provision.

The Senate amendment permits the Administrator to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII. These provisions are retained in the bill as agreed to in conference.

The Senate amendment contains an amendment revising paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.) to provide that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (the education provisions). It establishes a minimum rate of $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 additional for a child and $7 for each additional child and $15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability. The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with a low rate of pension. The bill as agreed to in conference retains this amendment.

LOAN PROVISIONS

The House bill extensively revised title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It extended the time within which application for a loan might be made, from 2 to 6 years after separation from the military or naval forces or after termination of the war, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 8 years (now 5 years) after the termination of the war. It further provided that the eligible veteran may apply to any of the established lending agencies set forth in the bill for a loan for the purposes specified in title III in any amount that may be agreed upon between the lender and the veteran, and when the loan is made by the lender he would be automatically guaranteed up to 50 percent of the loan by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. It was provided that the aggregate amount guaranteed should not exceed $2,000 and that no loan should be renegotiated until 30 days after the veteran's discharge. The House bill provided that an honorable discharge should be the veteran's certificate of eligibility to apply for a guaranteed loan, and veterans who have a discharge other than honorable or dishonorable would receive from the Administrator upon request after discharge a certificate of eligibility. Upon making the loan the lender would endorse upon the back of the discharge or certificate, in lieu of discharge or certificate of eligibility, the date and amount of the loan and would transmit to the Administrator a statement setting forth the name and serial number of the veteran, amount and terms of the loan, and the legal description of the property. No approval of the loan would be required by the Administrator. The House bill, in connection with loans for homes, farms, or business property, substituted for "reasonable normal value thereof as determined by proper appraisal," contained in the present law, the language "reasonable value thereof as determined by the lender's appraisal." In the event the veteran defaulted in payment of his loan and after suit or foreclosure and sale the deficiency was determined, then upon notification from the lender, the Administrator would pay to the lender its guaranty not in excess of $2,000 and not in excess of the deficiency, and be subrogated to the rights of the lender to the extent of the amount paid on the guaranty. It was provided that prior to suit or foreclosure the lender was to notify the Administrator and within 30 days thereafter the Administrator might at his option pay the lender the unpaid balance of the loan plus accrued interest and receive an assignment of the loan and security and thereafter sue or foreclose in the name of the Veterans' Administration.

The Senate amendment, while preserving the existing procedure under the loan provisions, also makes substantial changes in existing law. It permits a veteran to apply for guaranty of a loan within 10 years after the termination of the war; authorizes the Administrator to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year; extends the maturity limitation from 20 to 25 years generally, and in the case of loans on farm realty to 40 years; makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot; omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals; broadens the present language of the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose; broadens the business loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially; broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, but with restrictive provisions; extends the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration and the like; and adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure loans for business purposes on a plan similar to that provided for modernization and repair loans under title I of the Housing Act (such insurance to be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage, and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution).

The bill as agreed to in conference seeks to combine and integrate the two procedures set out in the House bill and the Senate amendment, respectively. It liberalizes the title substantially in accordance with the Senate provisions, but in place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by private lenders must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed. More specifically, the conference agreement contains the following provisions:

Section 500: Any loan made by an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. The aggregate amount of guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed $2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan $4,000, or a proportionate amount in combination loans. The interest may not exceed 4 percent. The maturity of amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following:

(1) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;

(2) Maturity of loan;

(3) Requirement for mortgage or other security;

(4) Dignity of lien;

(5) Percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

As noted above, lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sections 501, 502, and 503 are amended to conform to the principle established in section 500, and the latter two sections are broadened materially in accordance with the Senate version.

Section 504, authorizing the Administrator to make necessary regulations, is retained, with limitations conforming to the procedure adopted.

Section 505, relating to secondary loans, is retained with amendments to conform to the new procedure, but the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

Section 506, relating to procedure on default, is retained substantially as in the House bill.

Section 507 is the Senate provision respecting loans for the payment of defaulted indebtedness or delinquent taxes, but with an amendment to conform to the remaining provisions of the title.

Section 508, respecting the insurance of loans made by supervised lending agencies, is taken from the Senate amendment with an amendment authorizing the insurance of any loan which otherwise might be made

under the amended title III, the Senate provision having confined this to loans under section 503.

Section 509 is the provision in the Senate amendment extending the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, and is retained with minor clarifying amendments.

Section 510 is designed to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the amended act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS

The House bill provided that any proposed regulation to carry out the purposes of the act other than interagency administrative rules or orders should, before becoming effective, be submitted to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives. If neither committee acted within 15 days the rule or order would become effective and if approved by either committee it would become effective immediately upon such approval; and if disapproved by either committee it would not be issued. In the event of conflicting committee actions the earlier action would govern. There is no corresponding provision in the Senate amendment. The bill as agreed to in conference omits this provision.

The Senate amendment limits the application of section 1505 of the law, relating to charges and deductions against benefits under any adjusted compensation law, to benefits received by or paid for a veteran under title III of the act, relating to loans. The House bill left the law unchanged. The conference agreement repeals section 1505 in its entirety.

The Senate amendment extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied Nation concerned. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The bill as agreed to in conference includes this provision.

The Senate amendment also extends the benefits of titles II and III of the act and of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. There was no corresponding provision in the House bill. The bill as agreed to in conference includes this provision.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE

The title of the bill as amended by the Senate reads "An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes." The House recedes.

JOHN E. RANKIN,
A. LEONARD ALLEN,
JAMES DOMENGEAUX,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members may understand just what this bill does, or what changes it makes in the present law, I desire to explain it briefly.

This measure, H. R. 3749, contains some very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is authorized, at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid, full-time representatives of veterans' organizations specified in section 200, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to refresher or retraining course removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed $500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to $500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an over-all plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed—by regulation if desirable—instead of the actual cost—only by agreement—and the veteran may elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of $500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII—education and training—and part VII—vocational rehabilitation—of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies, or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, PUBLIC LAW 16, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Extension of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of

subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended—the education and training provisions, title II, supra. It establishes a minimum rate of $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 per month additional for a child, $7 for each additional child and $15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability—such rate for a veteran without dependents being $92.50 per month. The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

First. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

Second. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed $2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan, $4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type.

Third. The interest may not exceed 4 percent.

Fourth. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year.

Fifth. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years.

Sixth. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot.

Seventh. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals.

Eighth. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose.

Ninth. Broadens the business-loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially.

Tenth. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions.

Eleventh. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration, and the like.

Twelfth. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3 percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

Thirteenth. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following—as to any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such governmental loans: (a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property; (b) maturity of loan; (c) requirement for mortgage or other security; (d) dignity of lien; and (e) percentage of assets which may be invested in real-estate loans.

Fourteenth. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Fifteenth. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

Sixteenth. Provision is made to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed: Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

With practically all of these changes I agree. Many of them are most salutary, and should have been included in the original act.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one phase of this conference report that I do not agree with and for which I cannot take responsibility.

Under the bill as passed by the House and the Senate last year, in other words, under the present law, the money supplied to ex-servicemen for school purposes or the money lost by reason of loans to them, or the money paid as unemployment compensation, was to be deducted from any future adjusted compensation. That provision was eliminated in the conference, over my protest. I disagree with it most violently, because it will probably double the compensation paid to men who come home and do nothing, get on the pay roll as unemployed, and draw $1,040 for 1 year, for 52 weeks, and then probably later when an adjusted compensation bill is passed they will get not only the $1,040, but in addition as much as is paid to men who came home and went to work, or get as much in addition as the man who borrowed nothing or who did not get to go to school.

In other words, I think it is a discrimination against about 90 percent of the servicemen of this country coming out of this war. If we pay any adjusted compensation at all, there is nothing that can be done about it unless the House desires to vote down this conference report. If they do that, then I have an amend-

ment to offer to restore that provision and to accept the balance of the conference report. I make this statement to you because it is going to be said, "Oh, this bill does not bind any future Congress."

That is not an answer to anything. No bill ever binds a future Congress. Congress can change the law at any time, but the chances are that it will not be changed, and the further chances are that this discrimination will face every Member of Congress from now on every time he meets an ex-serviceman who has done his duty in this war and who came back and asked for nothing but went home, stripped off his uniform, and went to work.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to mean that one veteran may come home and take advantage of the opportunity under the GI bill to go to school for 4 years at Government expense, and another boy may come home and perhaps go back on the farm or into his little business and get no Government assistance? Then when an adjusted compensation bill comes along they would both be paid the same under that bill? In other words, one boy might get several thousand dollars through his education while the other boy would get nothing, yet when an adjusted compensation bill was passed they would both draw the same?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I agree with the gentleman that it is a rank discrimination against the great majority of the men coming out of the service.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I think the gentleman's position is perfectly sound. I believe if we want to be fair with the veterans we should reject the conference report and then the gentleman could offer his motion, and it should be accepted by the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me that this money for education or for unemployment should not be charged up against any future bonus. I am receiving no protests from the men who do not plan to ask for an education, but I do hear that if it is to be charged up against the men at some future time they will not take their education. I feel very strongly that this conference report ought to be accepted. We are recessing Friday or Saturday until the 14th of January. I believe the Senate conferees are very insistent upon this provision. I fear we will get no amendment to the GI bill of rights if this conference report is not accepted. Many men want to take their education, want to start their courses early in January, and want to take advantage of the $4,000 guaranty on loans on homes and on farm land. I can see no discrimination.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts cannot see that there is any discrimination, because she offered this motion, but I can show the gentlewoman discrimination and I can show it very plainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think others agreed with me heartily. The gentleman signed the report of the conferees. I think everybody else agreed with me. I have always felt it was an unjust discrimination to demand payment in the future when the men may need the money, if a bonus is paid.

Mr. RANKIN. It was well known to the conferees that I did not agree with it. I am not willing to underwrite such a discrimination against the vast majority of the servicemen.

This unemployment compensation provision, if this measure goes through, will encourage men to stay unemployed. It is causing a great deal of trouble in some sections now. Remember this, the servicemen in the factories where these strikes are going on are not getting any of this benefit at all and they will not get any if this bill goes through.

If this conference report is voted down, what I propose to do is offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment that will simply restore that provision of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I hope, in compliance with the request of the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, that this report is voted down and that the amendment he will propose is adopted. I think it is the opinion of the vast majority of the members of this committee that this provision should stay in this law. It was known at its inception as the equalizer amendment because we knew of instance after instance where a man living at a certain house went into the service and on the same day a youngster from next door went in, in the same organization. The older man, possibly a little more fortunate, due to his years and experience, may have a business or employment to which he can return. He will have no occasion to ask for the $1,040 unemployment-readjustment allowance. He has a home, either paid for or substantially paid for. He will have no occasion to ask any agency for the guaranty of a portion of a loan. He also has completed his education and will have no occasion to ask for any of the benefits which may very easily in many cases run as high as $5,000 or $6,000 on a 4-year educational program. He has served in the same outfit and on the same fronts with the youngster. They come home on the same day. There have been a lot of proposals already for adjusted compensation. That is a matter that must be seriously discussed, worked out, thought out, and given a great deal of prayerful and careful consideration. This older man comes home. Assume that this amended bill becomes law, and that a bill granting $2,500 adjusted compensation is passed. The older man can make his application for the $2,500 adjustment compensation. The younger man can make an application for it. That $2,500, with $1,040 for unemployment allowance, $6,000 for education, plus a $4,000 loan, the younger man could receive benefits approximating $11,000 to $13,000 as compared to $2,500 adjusted compensation for the older man. I have received scores of letters on this bill. At no time for any man who has been in the service has there been any objection by any of them to this provision of the bill. The objection is coming—where from? Why, it is coming from some of the schools who thought perhaps they might not get as many students as they want if the veteran exercised the prerogative which he should exercise as a mature man as to whether he was going to work or going to school. It is coming from one or two men down at the Veterans' Administration who say this is complicating some of the school reports—and the reports are complicated. But the trouble there is due to the fact that they have written administrative regulations which are not in conformity with the spirit, the intent, and purpose of this bill as originally passed.

I firmly believe that section 1505 is not anything except an act of real justice and it eliminates discrimination and prevents any one person from getting more benefits than someone else who has served at the same time and at the same place and for the same period of time.

Mr. Speaker, one provision of the amended measure, too long delayed, is that increasing allowances to the veterans with service-connected disabilities requiring education to make it possible for him to take his rightful place as a self-supporting citizen. However, this increase should have been separately considered as an amendment of Public, 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, and not in connection with the Readjustment Act.

One other beneficial amendment is one which, I am sure, will be discussed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], that simplifies loan procedures—a reform needed for some months—due to complications arising under burdensome regulations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret to be in disagreement with the distinguished chairman of this committee. I usually find myself in agreement with my chairman. I have a high regard for him. I am forced to take this position, because I fear that if you vote down this conference report, you will kill this bill. You might as well face that fact. I was firmly convinced, as a member of the conference committee, that the Senate was not going to change its position on section 1505 as now desired by the chairman. The Senate wanted to strike out section 1505 as to everybody except the veteran who is getting a loan.

In other words, they propose not to charge it up to the veteran receiving an education; not to charge it up to the veteran getting unemployment compensation, but to charge it up to the veteran

getting neither of those benefits but who gets a loan. I do not see the justice of it. I took the position in conference that section 1505 ought to stay in the bill as a whole or take it out entirely. Either charge it up to everybody or take it out with respect to everybody. I do not see how you can justify applying it to one man and not to another. I just do not see how you can do that. Therefore, I took the position that it ought to stay in the bill as to everybody and the person who receives a loan on which a loss occurs or who get educational benefits, or who gets unemployment compensation should all be subject to section 1505, or section 1505 ought to be stricken from the law entirely. It was apparent that the Senate conferees would not change their position. I repeat they took the position section 1505 either ought to come out of the bill or else cover only the loan feature of the law. I could not reconcile that position and, therefore, so far as I am concerned, the only thing I could agree to do under these circumstances was to take it out of the law entirely. Now I do not know what you are going to do. If you vote the conference report down, as the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi wants you to do, you may kill this bill. I ask you not to do that. I want the bill out. We are ready to leave here and want this bill passed.

We want the benefits of this bill. We want the liberalized benefits for the veterans. These liberalized benefits cover education and loans. We propose in this bill to increase benefits as to loans so that we may guarantee up to $4,000 on loans secured by real estate. That helps the veteran at the forks of the creek. It also helps the veteran in the towns. Only about 700 farm loans have gone over. I want you gentlemen from the farming sections to know that if you vote this conference report down you are making it difficult for the farm loans to go over. They are not going over now. The figures show it. We are trying to remedy that situation in this bill. To increase the guaranty up to $4,000, we hope, will help. To lengthen the duration of the loan will help. To simplify the loans will help most. We are trying to do all of that.

They may not work with this amendment, but we believe the loan feature of the law will be considerably better.

Also, this conference report includes the amendments on the education feature of the law. We increase the subsistence allowance from $50 per month for men without dependents to $65, and for those with dependents it is increased from the present $75 to $90 per month. I tried hard to get it increased above those figures, but could not. But this will help considerably. The age limitation is also removed so that as the amendments stand, any person may get educational benefits from 1 to 4 years, if he had 90 days' service. There are other features in the amendments which make this a better law. There are some amendments that did not meet with my full approval, but we have to reach an agreement with the other body to get a final bill.

I urge the Members of this House not to vote down this conference report. I want this bill out. I want it passed. I want to get through with it before this Christmas recess. We are right at the Christmas time. It is a mighty good time to pass this bill. It will be a great Christmas present to these men and women who have served in this war. I urge you with all the sincerity of my soul not to make the mistake of killing this bill. If the conference report is voted down, it may be tantamount to killing the bill. Certainly it will greatly delay it and there is no telling when, if ever, these desirable amendments will be passed.

The distinguished chairman of the committee says the Senate will backtrack, in effect. He thinks the Senate conferees will agree on his motion to reinstate section 1505 in full as it is. There is not a chance in the world, in my opinion, that any such thing will be done. I know the Senate conferees, and you know them—the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator GEORGE; the distinguished Senator from Texas, Senator CONNALLY, and those other distinguished Senators. I know how strong a position they took on this question. Frankly they wanted section 1505 out of the law entirely. They did agree to leave only the loan feature in section 1505. I have pointed out how unsatisfactory it would be to leave only the loan feature in and take out the others. From what I conceive the Senate position to be, I do not think there is any chance for them to agree to the contention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

They changed their position on the loan feature. They made the discharge certificate the certificate of eligibility. That is the thing the House has been fighting for all the time. That is the thing we wanted. We wanted to simplify the loan feature so that the loans will go over. The Senate conferees reluctantly agreed with us and went along with us. They asked us to go along with them on section 1505 by striking out that section entirely. To have insisted that that remain in the law in full meant no agreement and no bill, and I think that is the situation still existing.

The gentleman from Mississippi wants you to vote down the conference report so that he can offer a motion to reinstate section 1505 in its original full form and that is exactly the thing the Senate conferees have repeatedly and unanimously refused to do. So, if you do that, we get nowhere. As I understand my chairman's position, that is what he would like to do, but in view of the situation that obtains, I am forced to oppose his move. Let us vote approval of this conference report. I think it is the only way to get a bill through at this time and the only way to get these badly needed amendments in the GI bill of rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] is unduly excited.

In the first place, the Senate conferees agreed to a compromise that involved only the educational features. If the gentleman from Louisiana had stayed with me, in my opinion we would have got that solution. But now we have got over 300,000 men on the unemployment rolls. You leave this out, and you are paying them $1,040 each, more than you pay the man who goes home and goes to work.

Now, the gentleman talks about Members of the House dissenting. This will go back to the Senate, and, in my opinion, it will be approved in 30 minutes. If the conference report is voted down, I expect to offer an amendment to put this provision back in the bill in order to eliminate this discrimination which the bill as now written would bring to more than 90 percent of the ex-servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, nothing has been said as yet about other provisions of the bill. I think they should be before you before you make up your mind about 1505.

This conference report first broadens the power of the Administrator in giving aid to the amputees who need the use of prosthetic appliances. Next it broadens the power of the Administrator and the Board of Review in regard to veterans who have to go before that Board to have their discharges reviewed and changed if they think any injustice has been dealt them.

Next it gives to the representatives of veterans' organizations recognition in that they can put into the veterans' hospitals and the veterans' facilities a representative to act as a sort of liaison agent between the boy in the bed and the veterans' organizations.

In regard to the education title it increases the subsistence of a single veteran from $50 to $65 per month and of one who is married or has a dependent from $75 to $90 per month. It completely removes the limitation of age 25 in order to have the veteran qualify for education. In other words, any veteran who served more than 90 days between September 16, 1940, and the termination of the war or discharge will be eligible to all the provisions of the education title.

Next it adds a provision that veterans may take a course in an approved correspondence school. The limitation there is not to exceed $500 no matter how many years he takes the correspondence course.

Again in the education title the tuition is made cumulative in this way: A veteran, we will say, had 2 years at medical school, law school, or an engineering school at the time he went into the service. Because of his length of service he is entitled to 4 years' schooling, but he only needs 2 years to get his degree and be able to go to work at his profession. We have provided that, if for instance, the tuition is $700 a year, $200 above the $500 originally allowed, that the boy, having a credit of $2,000 for 4 years' service, may, if he wants to go to school 2 years instead of 4, draw on his accumulated credit and receive $700 each year for tuition for 2 years as long as he does not exceed the $2,000 total.

Passing now to the loan title, the loan title has been amended in that on all loans secured by a mortgage on real es-

tate the guaranty is raised to $4,000. The guaranty remains $2,000 on all unsecured loans.

As has been stated by the gentleman from Louisiana, the honorable discharge certificate is now the certificate of eligibility and that will cover approximately 90 percent of all veterans. Those who do not have an honorable discharge certificate can go to the Veterans' Administrator and get a certificate of eligibility provided they were not dishonorably discharged.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I merely want to comment that this one particular feature simplifies the loan.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed I am sure I will cover it.

As to section 1505, in order to get these other provisions, improvements in the loan title, it was necessary to adopt the Senate provision, taking their view of 1505 or take it out of the bill entirely.

In the matter of the automatic guarantee, it applies to loans made by national banks, State banks, credit unions, building and loan associations, mortgage companies and insurance companies that are authorized to do business and have complied with the State or local statutes setting them up. They may make the loans and there is an automatic guaranty in this bill provided they do not loan more than the value of the property as fixed by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. They are not bothered with any further red tape, that is the end of it, the loan is automatically guaranteed if made in accord with the terms of the law. The honorable-discharge certificate is the certificate of eligibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In addition to that we have removed the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" and now the property is appraised at the reasonable value today, and not "the reasonable normal value" which has been one of the bones of contention in the administration of the loan title.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to agree to the conference report on H. R. 3749. I believe the House and Senate conferees have improved the bill granting additional benefits to the veterans which they richly deserve. These are amendments that I wanted to get into the bill when it was before the World War Veterans' Committee.

The Congress on December 19, 1945, approved and sent to the President, H. R. 3749, an act containing very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is authorized, at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid, full-time representatives of veterans' organizations specified in section 20, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war, whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year-age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to refresher or retraining course removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro-rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed $500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to $500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an overall plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed—by regulation if desirable—instead of the actual cost—only by agreement—and the veteran may elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of $500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII—education and training—and part VII—vocational rehabilitation—of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, PUBLIC LAW 16, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Extension of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (the education and training provisions, title II, supra). It establishes a minimum rate of $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 per month additional for a child, $7 for each additional child and $15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability (such rate for a veteran without dependents being $92.50 per month). The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the

sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

First. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veteran's Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

Second. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed $2,000 and in the case of a real estate loan, $4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type;

Third. The interest may not exceed 4 percent.

Fourth. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year.

Fifth. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years.

Sixth. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot.

Seventh. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals.

Eighth. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose.

Ninth. Broadens the business-loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially.

Tenth. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions.

Eleventh. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration and the like.

Twelfth. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3 percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

Thirteenth. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restructions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following—as to any loan at least 20 persent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such Governmental loans: (a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property; (b) maturity of loan; (c) requirement for mortgage or other security; (d) dignity of lien; and (e) percentage of assets which may be invested in real estate loans.

Fourteenth. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Fifteenth. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted;

Sixteenth. Provision is made to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed: Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted-compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Is it not very important that the age limitation has been removed so that older men whose education was interrupted may continue their education?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have covered that.

Next we have a provision in here on private loans, on loans of individuals, only the guarantee in that case is not automatic; the loan must be approved in that case by the Administrator.

We have broadened the provision for loans on second mortgages.

Lastly, in regard to the provision there, it is now up to the lender to elect whether or not he wishes to lend his money under the guarantee provision or take insurance that he can get from the Veterans' Administration at a discount of 3 percent in lieu of the guaranteed loan. That was put in to make loans more available for the veterans.

We took out the 2-year limitation in which the veteran might apply for his loan after discharge or after the termination of the war and made it 10 years.

Now, coming to 1505, I want to say I agree with the chairman that I would much prefer to have it in the bill, but I want you to know that as we passed the bill in July of this year section 1505 was left in there as in the original law. It went over to the Senate and that body amended it by taking out everything except the loan title. In other words, the Senate removed all of 1505 except that portion that would apply to a loan.

Your House conferees took this position: How could we justify giving the exemption to all except those who get a loan in the event of a bonus in the future. Here is a lad who received a four or five thousand dollar education, and another boy who secured a loan with a guarantee of $4,000, but he is unfortunate and loses his business or his farm. The Government has to make good and pay the guarantee for him. A bonus comes along and for the boy who got the loan it is deducted from his bonus but for the boy who got the education it is not deducted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the same thing would apply to a boy who would get up to $1,040, $20 a week for 52 weeks' unemployment compensation. A bonus would come along and that would not be deducted, the education part of it would not be deducted, but the poor boy who got a loan and could not pay it back would have it deducted.

We said to the Senate conferees that we could not stand for that discrimination. This is what happened: They came back and said that there is a distinction between a loan, compensation, and education. They said that education is something that builds up the community. They tried to make a fine-haired distinction, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] will bring out in his question. Finally, they were opposed to this automatic guarantee, they were opposed to the honorable discharge certificate part of it, and it came down to the question that perhaps we would have had to report in disagreement. We either had to accept the Senate version of 1505, agree to take it out completely, or they would not agree to the provisions in the loan title.

Everything the gentleman from Mississippi has said is correct. As I stated, I would like to see it in, but in order to get a bill we had to agree to one of two alternatives, either accept the Senate provision or take out 1505 entirely. We were not unanimous, but the majority of the conferees on the part of the House agreed to take it out entirely and get the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to ask the gentleman's frank opinion on this: If at some future time there is voted by the Congress adjusted compensation for veterans, does the gentleman really think there will be deducted from that compensation any benefits veterans have received under the GI Act for whatever purpose?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not know. This Congress cannot bind a future one. Regardless of whether 1505 is left out, any future Congress can do as it pleases. The reason this has come up and is a problem now is that there was some evidence it was discouraging certain veterans from going to college without that being taken out or accepting the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. He and I have agreed rather thoroughly on this legislation. I agree with the provision that he referred to and if this conference report is voted down and my amendment is adopted, it will not disturb a single one of them, except the one to which he referred.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] raised this question, Do you think that any future legislation will take any of this out of the adjusted compensation?

What I am trying to do is restore that provision that is in the present law, and if it stays there, you will not have to legislate on it. Now the gentleman's statement is an admission that if this conference report is adopted, then you are going to discriminate against about 90 percent of the men who fought in this war.

Mr. JUDD. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; you are. You are paying unemployment compensation, or you are paying extra money for schooling, or you are paying for losses on loans—to about 10 percent of the men in the service, and 90 percent of the men, just as good soldiers, sailors, and marines, as the world ever saw, men who came home to their families, stripped off their uniforms and went to work, you discriminate against to the amount of the extra pay these others receive.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, my only point is this: Are not the definite advantages of accepting this conference report and getting this bill passed now of much greater value to the veterans than any possible disadvantages or discrimination that the gentleman alleges might occur if at some future date adjusted compensation legislation is passed?

Mr. RANKIN. Do not get excited. The Senate will accept this amendment in 30 minutes, in my opinion. It will not go over to January. The Senate is still in session. They will not let this bill go over on this proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, of course it is unpleasant to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Mississippi. Section 1505 should never have been put in the law and it should now be taken out. I do not believe that the Congress wants the veteran to pay his own unemployment compensation. It is no more discriminatory to the other veterans than it is under the social-security law to the millions of men who stay on the job working, and do not have to draw unemployment compensation. That is not discrimination. Neither do I believe this Congress intended that the veterans should have to pay for their own education. That is not what we promised them. We promised them when they went into the service, when they offered their lives in defense of their country, that when they came home, if they wanted it, they would have the opportunity of an education in any school or college or university in this country. Look at the injustice of this. If a veteran attends a college in his own State, the Government has to pay one tuition. If he wants to go to college in another State, they have to pay a higher tuition. Do you mean to tell me that that should be charged against that veteran? Do you mean to tell me that this Congress ever intended that the soldier or sailor himself had to pay his unemployment compensation when he came home and could not get a job. Do you mean to tell me that you want to tell the veterans of this country, "Yes, we have passed the GI bill of rights; yes, we have provided an education for you, but we want you to know we are going to make you pay for it." I do not think this Congress and the people of this country ever intended such a thing, and you should adopt this conference report and thereby knock section 1505 out of the present law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That was in the law last year, and the gentleman from Georgia voted for it.

Mr. PACE. I voted for the GI bill because we had to vote for the conference report or else, and the gentleman knows it. It should never have been put in there, and this is our first opportunity to knock it out.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman knows, too, that the veterans who fought this war want this section 1505 stricken out.

Mr. PACE. Absolutely, they want it stricken out and it should be. I agree with my colleague thoroughly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Practically everyone in my State does.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just spoken said we never intended that the veteran should pay for his own education or should pay for his unemployment compensation or should pay for a default on the loans. Of course, we did not, and we do not intend to in this bill. But who is going to pay for it? The 90 percent that do not take advantage will have to pay for it. That is exactly who will have to pay for it, because it has to come out of the taxes. So whether he pays or not, the 90 percent are going to be injured by this additional pay.

Mr. RANKIN. It took the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a long time to get excited over this proposition, because it has been in the law for over a year, and he voted for it.

But the amount they get for education will probably amount to several times the amount of the adjusted compensation. Now, really all we propose to do is to provide that what he receives for education be deducted from his adjusted compensation, provided an adjusted compensation is paid later. Even then he would come out far better than his comrade who does not get to go to school; for the amount paid on his schooling will probably amount to many times the amount of his adjusted compensation.

We are not sure any adjusted compensation bill will be enacted, but I will tell the gentleman from Georgia now, and I will tell all the rest of you, that if you adopt this conference report I am going to do my best to make you vote on a bill to pay every one of these boys who served 90 days or more $20 a week for 12 months, just what you are paying a man for doing nothing.

I want to say another thing to the gentleman from Georgia. Cotton is rotting in the field in Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and other States because some people were taking advantage of this law who could have been in the field at work, and would have been if this provision were not in the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The only reply I can make is that in my State they are offering the veterans employment and, if they do not take it, they cannot get unemployment insurance.

Mr. RANKIN. I know how that is working. I know what is going on. I have the figures before me for every State in the Union, and I think the gentleman from Georgia has been misinformed.

I do not have to apologize for my services to the veterans. I have fought their battles here for more than 20 years. I fought their battles here when some Members of the House who are now clamoring so loudly ran out on them on the economy bill.

If this conference report is adopted in its present form, it is going to be a grave injustice to the veterans that you are going to have to answer for in the years to come.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I find in talking to the Members here on the floor that there is some misunderstanding. I wanted to be clear that the conference report has all of 1505 removed. In other words, if the conference report is adopted, there will be no inequality from one veteran to another. It is just out of the bill. Personally, I would rather have seen it stay in the bill. We either had to take it out or else leave it in for one portion of the veterans only and not all of them. As it is now, it is completely out. I say this, Mr. Speaker, simply to let them know what the provisions are.

Mr. RANKIN. My proposition is to restore that section of the present law.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This seems to be a very highly controversial matter. I am just wondering what has been and is the attitude of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the DAV on this important question.

Mr. RANKIN. As far as I know, they have not expressed themselves on it.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I intend to vote for this conference report, but it seems to me we are making a mountain out of a molehill. As far as this section 1505 is concerned, in the future if any adjusted service compensation bill is passed by this House, that provision could be reinstated in that particular bill. But on the loan feature we are losing sight of one important fact, that while these lads are receiving their education at the expense of the Government, those who are borrowing money from the Government are paying 4 percent, when it is contemplated by our Government to loan foreign governments money at a much lower rate of interest.

Mr. RANKIN. If this conference report is adopted, will the gentleman support a bill to pay all the men who served 90 days or more $20 a week?

Mr. KEARNEY. The same amount?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. No; I will not. I will support a bill based on length and type of service.

Mr. RANKIN. This is not based on length and type of service. If I had my way, if this were an open rule, I would offer an amendment now to pay them all alike. This measure requires that the man must have served 90 days, because it is supposed that the mustering-out pay takes care of the first 90 days. I would offer an amendment now to make it apply to all men who have served 90 days. Then if later adjusted compensation were paid, that could be taken into consideration.

But I say this provision in the conference report is most violent discrimination against the man who comes home and goes to work and asks for nothing except to get his uniform off and get back into civilian life.

Mr. KEARNEY. I cannot see any justice, Mr. Speaker, in paying the same amount under an adjusted-service-compensation bill to a man who served 90 days in a camp in this country as compared to one who has been in the front lines for months and years.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what you are doing, except that you are leaving out the man who comes home, strips off his uniform, and goes to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Is it not true that if a veteran is on compensation and is offered a job and refuses to take the job, he automatically is off the compensation roll anyway?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but that does not happen very often. But I will tell you what it is doing. All these servicemen working in those factories that are on strike are getting nothing from the Government, and will get nothing under this conference report. That is all because they have not built up their reserves, as they call it. But the man who has been working all the time gets his unemployment compensation pay. A serviceman must stand there and get nothing, and he will stand there and get nothing if this conference report is adopted. But if we paid this $20 a week compensation to all men who served the required length of time, then these men would be getting theirs, whether they worked or not.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I notice in the conference report the section relating to education has been materially changed from the provisions originally in the educational feature in the Readjustment Act. I think one reason we have gone astray is because we do not call it by its proper title, which is the Serviceman's Readjustment Act. That is its purpose, to help them readjust themselves on their return. It was sold to the Congress and the American public on that premise, that we were taking every year a million or more young men of 18 years of age and depriving them of their opportunity to get an education. This was an attempt on our part under a system of readjustment to make them whole, as it were, and send them back to school with some maintenance so that those who wanted to could help themselves through. In this conference report all of that phraseology which said that they would be entitled to an education if it had been interfered with, impeded, or delayed, has been stricken out. The original bill said it would be automatically assumed that a man who went into the service under the age of 25 had had his education interefered with or impeded. Those words are all out. As I understand, as the conference report now has it, any man who was in the service can go to school whether his education was interfered with or not. My impression was that this was a bill for the benefit of veterans and not for the benefit of the educational institutions of this country.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would like an explanation from the chairman as to why that change was made in the conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Simply because we had a raid of college professors or college presidents. Somebody said this ought to be dubbed "the bill for the relief of college professors." They made a drive on us here to get that law changed. As a matter of fact, whether the conference report is adopted or not, the man who goes to college will get his expenses paid. If no adjusted compensation bill is passed in the future, it will make no difference to him. But if one is passed, my contention is he should be willing to have taken out of that pay which is given him by the Government at least a portion of the money that has been supplied in that way.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Therefore, since no Adjusted Compensation Act has been passed, the gentleman from Georgia is mistaken, is he not, in the belief that Congress is not keeping faith with that young boy who left college because the voting down of this conference report would not keep that boy from getting that education, would it?

Mr. RANKIN. No; he is being treated far better than the servicemen of the First World War were.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to the statement which has just been made, there is anticipated an adjusted compensation law because section 1505 anticipates that by its very wording. There should certainly not be any penalty imposed on the man who educates himself through the benefits under the bill so that he would have to pay for it out of any adjusted compensation bill later.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate the optimism of the gentleman from California, who is a new Member of the House. His argument shows it. A few years ago when I forced through my amendment to raise the base pay of the men in the armed forces to $50 a month, I heard a similar argument. After the last war it was agreed by everybody in Congress that we owed the servicemen adjusted compensation. Do you know how long it took to get it? It took 17 years. We went through four elections and two depressions before they ever got that adjusted compensation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. As I understand, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], do not agree about the effect of taking section 1505 out of the bill. The gentleman from Mississippi thinks it is discrimination. The gentleman from Iowa says it is not discrimination. I understand the gentleman from Iowa wrote this particular section in the first instance.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no, the gentleman from Georgia misunderstood him. He said the Senate amendment would have brought about vast discrimination as between the men who go to school or draw unemployment pay and the ones who secure loans. But this measure, this conference report discriminates against the 90 percent of servicemen who neither go to school, borrow money, or secure unemployment compensation under the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to ask about the formula for the real estate loans. It appears a change has been made so that you determine it upon the reasonable value, rather than the normal value?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. HAYS. I am sure that is an acceptable provision, but I do want to ask about the determination of the appraisal, because there is an impression that now the ceiling is off, and that the lender and the borrower can agree upon any sum, and the Administration is not bound thereby, but, as I read the conference report, that is not true, and I wanted to confirm that.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is correct.

My amendment, if adopted, would carry the very provision on that point that was agreed upon in conference.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi feel that the amount of the loan which will be insured is sufficient to allow a larger purchase of farms?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes. We raised that to $4,000 instead of $2,000.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am in accord with many things the gentleman has said in the past, but I want to ask him if he does not feel that if future bonuses are earmarked on this college education question it will tend to discourage vocational training and college education of the veteran in the future?

Mr. RANKIN. No. Besides it is not a bonus. It is adjusted compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 134, noes 23.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the bill H. R. 4590 and to include a report.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks during consideration of the rule on the Palestine resolution.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects each.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the silver bill and include certain communications.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KUNKEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech he made before the Ohio Chamber of Commerce on last Friday.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks on two subjects and include an editorial and a resolution.

PALESTINE JEWISH HOMELAND

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed gratified that the Members desire to consider the bill made in order by this resolution. So as not to delay its consideration, I shall use no further time unless the gentleman from Michigan wishes to be heard.

Mr. MICHENER. This is the Palestine resolution?

Mr. SABATH. This is a rule making that resolution in order.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it the understanding that if no time is taken on the rule the resolution will be explained by the committee reporting it?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; except that I am obliged to make an observation, but I will be brief.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope that committee will advise the House fully as to the attitude of the State Department on this most important piece of legislation touching this international subject.

I realize this is a concurrent resolution only and that it has no force or effect other than a moral one, but our country has always respected its moral commitments almost as much as it has its legal commitments.

I have no requests for time on this side, but I hope the matters I have suggested will be made clear to the House.

Mr. SABATH. I am satisfied they will be.

The Sixty-seventh Congress, on June 22, went on record as favoring the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine and providing that nothing be done to prejudice the religious rights of Christians and all other non-Jewish communities.

Every Member knows that I have abstained from, though I have been frequently urged, to speak on Palestine and on the unfortunate lot of the Jewish people of whom, as reported, nearly 6,000,000 have been ravaged, tortured, starved, and burned alive by the bestial, murderous "super-race" of Nazis. There are only about 1,250,000 Jews left in Europe, many of them still in camps on bare subsistence, and deprived of most of their belongings and their homes destroyed.

This resolution provides that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country but only

to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities. Thus they would be given opportunity for colonization and development so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

This resolution really expresses the views and the sentiments and the desire of our President, who is now endeavoring to secure the entry of about 100,000 of these persecuted, suffering people into their homeland. Within the last 35 years the Jews have turned the barren lands into extremely fertile soil by irrigation and have built modern cities and great institutions of science and learning. With extraordinary application and by hard work they have increased the value of all the surrounding property and lands, which are bound to inure to the benefit of the Arabs. Therefore, I cannot quite understand why there should be any opposition from them to the admittance of the Jewish people to what they consider their homeland, but, unfortunately, not only the Arabs but many Christian people have also from time to time shown, unjustifiably, their prejudice against them.

Have not the Jewish people given to the world the moral and ethical principles which are the foundation not only of their own religion but of Christianity itself? Have they not given the greatest Teacher for good, who advocated justice, charity, and brotherly love and whose teachings not only I, but the other Jewish people follow? In this country years ago there were some who charged that Jews controlled the international banking systems of the world, including the United States. That has been proven, I am sure, to be a falsehood, because that control is only about 5 percent. I know of only one outstanding banking institution in the United States in which there is Jewish participation and that is not controlled by Jews. That is the Kuhn, Loeb Co., which is controlled by Christians. That being disproved, now Jews have been charged by many unscrupulous bigots with being Communists. Surely they are not both financiers and Communists.

I fully appreciate that when they were driven from their fields and agricultural pursuits due to jealousy in years gone by and were herded into the ghettos, they were forced to devote themselves to commercial pursuits. This is the reason so many in this and other countries have not followed their cherished and much-loved agricultural pursuits. In years gone by discord and dissension have been propagated in various kingdoms to start anti-Jewish propaganda, but such is not the case in our beloved country. Why, then, do men try to utilize the Jew baiting and propaganda unless it is done to attain political and financial ends?

Mr. Speaker, knowing the membership as I do, I have the utmost confidence that the House will pass the resolution by an overwhelming and nearly unanimous vote.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine, now under consideration, should receive the unqualified support of all the Members of the Congress.

It is indeed regrettable that it becomes necessary to even consider legislation of this kind. It is a sad commentary on the efforts to secure international peace that one of our major allies in the last war has seen fit to break its pledged word. Liberty loving people everywhere are surprised to find the new British Labor Government in agreement with the policy of the British white paper.

The new British Government was enthusiastic in its campaign pledges for a solution of the Palestine problem, and it is now appalling to learn that it has rejected its former promise for the reestablishment of Palestine as a Jewish homeland.

We Americans have little use for double talk—the apparent language of British international diplomacy.

The ruthless persecution of the Jews in Europe has aroused the sympathies of the American people. As every Member of Congress knows, this persecution has not been of recent origin, but has extended down through the generations. In spite of this persecution, the Jewish mind and heart has grown with deep-seated affection to Palestine, the home of Jewry and the birthplace of Christendom. It is time that the world aid this minority race to establish a permanent homeland. The hour has come when justice must be done, when oppressions cease, and the doors of Palestine be opened as a haven to the millions who seek its shelter.

At the time of the Balfour Declaration, 23 years ago, the Sixty-seventh Congress went on record to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

America's mind has not changed, but it is unfortunate that on account of political causes Great Britain has done an about face. Unless the British Government sees fit to carry out its former promise, Palestine will become a community surrounded by a wall of politics without the just protection of the nations of the world.

When world leaders gather about a peace table to draw up articles which should protect the world against future wars, their agreements will indeed be shallow if the principles of independence, democracy, and justice regarding Palestine are not included.

The issue is not between Arabs and Jews in Palestine—it is a political issue between the rulers of the other nations surrounding Palestine, a question of maintaining the traditional balance of power in that region.

I hope and trust this resolution will be unanimously passed by the Members of the House.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for reporting this Concurrent Resolution 113 to the House for action today. I appeal to the membership to pass this resolution, as it is high time that we fulfill our obligations.

No nation can escape its share of the dreadful responsibility for what has happened in Europe. Millions upon millions of Jews were killed, many after horrible tortures, for no reason whatsoever except their religious belief. It was impossible for us even to believe or imagine that such dreadful acts could be perpetrated on such a large scale by maniacs led by a diseased mind. Today, we plead for the lives of a hundred thousand Jews who are no more than living skeletons, whom we have liberated in Europe. They can find no peace in the places they once called home. Germany, the Balkan countries, central Europe are not places of refuge for them. They look to Palestine, and what do they find?

In the face of this tragedy Great Britain dares to shut the gates to their immigration, in spite of its solemn promise. A promise was made by Great Britain to open the gates of immigration into the Holy Land so that Jews could establish there a national homeland. Had that promise been kept, then the thousands upon thousands of Jews whose bones litter the fields of Europe, and thousands upon thousands more whose ashes have been scattered to the four winds, might be living today in peace in Palestine.

Great Britain must not refuse to grant this request of our President for immigration certificates for these dying Jews of Europe.

We in the United States owe a duty. We in Congress must pointedly and frankly tell Great Britain we expect that nation to keep its solemn pledged word. We are determined that our voices shall be heard—even in London.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the Flood resolution calling for free entry of Jews into Palestine. I call attention to the fact that this resolution does not propose a state which will exclude other parties which have a just claim to participate in the affairs of Palestine. The preamble of the resolution declares:

> It being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

I have studied at first hand as a member of the Wickersham committee, the plight of the pitiful remnant of displaced Jews in Europe, and I see in this resolution a means of providing them with a haven and refuge in which they can rebuild their shattered lives.

No one who has beheld the abject misery in which they were living in Europe during the midsummertime and knows how their suffering would be intensified by the rigors of wintertime, could hesitate for a moment in demanding for them a more tolerable existence.

That more tolerable existence is ready for them in Palestine. Within a few days I was transported to Palestine and saw there what these persecuted people might be enjoying if only immigration restrictions now enforced could be lifted at once.

The Flood resolution now before us demands that Palestine be opened to "free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and

economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development." From what I observed in Palestine, I am convinced that the same initiative and energy which raised Tel Aviv out of the desert sands can provide other Tel Avivs in other parts of Palestine.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are having the opportunity to vote on House Concurrent Resolution 113. As long ago as 1922 the Sixty-sixth Congress unanimously passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

We in the United States on numerous occasions have publicly evidenced our sincere wish and desire to do our utmost to provide a national home for Jewish people in Palestine. This resolution will be an evidence of our intention to do all within our power to bring that about. This resolution merely provides:

That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialties, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. Speaker, the brief statement set forth in the report of the committee definitely shows the merits of this resolution, from which I quote as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the concurrent resolution do pass.

The plight of the Jews in Europe and the indefinite status of Palestine formed the subject of a number of resolutions introduced in recent years and referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Your committee, while cognizant of the appointment of a joint Anglo-American committee of inquiry into the subject and while it commends the President for his interest in the matter, feels at the same time that it is appropriate and timely for the Congress to give expression to its views on the need for the restoration of Palestine as the Jewish national homeland.

Accordingly the Foreign Affairs Committee, by a unanimous vote, has decided to report favorably House Concurrent Resolution 113.

In the opinion of your committee the language of this resolution reflects a long series of authoritative expressions of American policy and the views of the American people on the subject of Palestine.

This policy and these views go back to January 21, 1919, when the following recommendation was made by the intelligence section of the United States delegation to the Paris Peace Conference:

"That the Jews be invited to return to Palestine and settle there, being assured by the Peace Conference of all proper assistance in so doing that may be consistent with the protection of the personal (especially the religious) and property rights of the non-Jewish population, and being further assured that it will be the policy of the League of Nations to recognize Palestine as a Jewish state as soon as it is a Jewish state in fact."

In harmony with this position, President Woodrow Wilson on March 3, 1919, declared:

"I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth."

In the course of recent years, this policy was repeatedly endorsed by numerous Members of Congress, notably in a petition addressed to the President of the United States on November 2, 1943, by 70 Members of the Senate and 194 Members of the House of Representatives, and, on July 2, 1945, by 54 Members of the Senate and 251 Members of the House of Representatives, as well as by the governors of 37 States.

This policy was also endorsed by the national conventions of the Democratic and Republican Parties meeting in Chicago in 1944.

It also received the personal endorsement of the late President Roosevelt on October 15, 1944, and, during the same week, of the Republican Presidential candidate, Mr. Dewey.

Passage of this resolution will also furnish the occasion for the Congress to express itself forthrightly on the horrible plight of the Jews of Europe, 5,700,000 of whom were victims of Hitler and his madmen, according to the indictment presented by the Allied War Crimes Commission. The war is over and the need for a Jewish homeland, where the Jewish survivors of these persecutions can live and breathe as free men and women, and where they can establish a free and democratic commonwealth is greater than ever. Your committee feels, therefore, that the time is at hand when the long-standing pledges to the Jewish people should be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolution will receive the unanimous support of the House as a Christmas good-will offering on the part of the American people to help provide a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 113.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 113, with Mr. FOGARTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the concurrent resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I believe that all of the Members of the House are very well informed with reference to this concurrent resolution. It is exactly the same resolution that passed the Senate the other day with only one dissenting vote.

The gentleman from Michigan asked a question, and that is about the only thing I want to talk about at this time, and that was whether we received any report from the State Department regarding this matter. May I say to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that when it comes to a simple resolution of this kind that has no effect of law, we do not ask the State Department for its opinion regarding such resolution. It is merely an expression of the Members of the House with reference to their ideas regarding the matter contained in the resolution.

The most important part of the resolution is that there should be permitted free entry of Jews into Palestine. The President has already requested of Great Britain that 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine immediately. That is the President's opinion and naturally the State Department takes its instructions with reference to our foreign policy from the President of the United States.

I would like to point out at this time that this resolution does not call for a Jewish commonwealth, a Jewish state, or anything of that kind which was included in previous resolutions that received the approval of the Congress. This resolution says only "a national home for the Jews." I would like to point out to the gentleman from Michigan that that is the law today. That is the same language contained in the Balfour declaration; it is exactly the same language as contained in the treaty of 1924 between the United States and Great Britain. There is no difference in the wording of it at all.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The thing I want understood, and I think the gentleman knows I inquired about it in the Rules Committee, is as to the attitude of the State Department in reference to this purely international matter which is of concern to the diplomats of the country and the President. I would like to have the gentleman tell the committee whether or not the State Department and the administration have expressed an opinion to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, so that if we vote for this resolution we are not rebuffing the administration and the State Department. Some dispatches appearing in today's paper would so indicate. Of course, the great Committee on Foreign Affairs would not bring a resolution before the House dealing entirely with foreign affairs, until that committee had at least consulted and knew the attitude of the State Department. I am asking for this information.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I think I have answered that, but I would like to say further to the gentleman, to give you an idea of how the Committee on Foreign Affairs acts in a resolution of this kind, that we did not get an opinion from the State Department on the Fulbright resolution, and that has been acclaimed all over the world as one of the greatest resolutions of its kind ever passed by the Congress. We never do

that, and it never has been done before. This resolution is the law today because it is in the Balfour Declaration and in the Palestine mandate as well as in the treaty of 1925. That treaty specifically states that nothing in the treaty entered into between England and the United States can be changed without the consent of the Government of the United States. Now England has changed that treaty, and we say it is wrong. They have closed the gates of Palestine to the Jews which is in express violation of the terms of the mandate and the convention between the United States and Great Britain.

The violation of the mandate is even more tragic in the light of the deplorable condition of the Jews of Europe who seek to go to Palestine in order to reconstruct their lives and in order to live as free men and women.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that he asked a question of me yesterday when I was before the Committee on Rules, and I thought I gave him from a legislator's angle a most satisfactory answer. I thought it was so satisfactory that the gentleman would not be prone to again ask the question today. Does the gentleman want me to give the House the answer I gave him yesterday?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; because it was so indefinite. The gentleman said that he "assumed" that the State Department knew about it, but he had no definite information.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is nothing indefinite about it. I thought my answer to the gentleman was very frank and very specific and direct to the point. What I said to the gentleman yesterday was this, that I was unable to state what the State Department's position is, but from a legislator's angle there were certain facts from which we were justified in drawing deductions. The fact remains, as I said to the gentleman yesterday, that a resolution was introduced in the Senate. That is a fact. Nothing was heard from the State Department; at least, I have heard nothing. The fact is that the Senate committee considered it. We assume the State Department knew that fact; at least I did, and I assume they did. Nothing was heard. We know as a fact that the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs considered it, and they drafted this compromise resolution. That is another fact. Nothing was heard. We also know that the full committee reported it out. That is another fact. We also know that the Senate acted upon it. That is another fact. Those are all public facts from which we are drawing inferences. We also know as a fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] introduced a resolution in the House. I think nobody will contradict the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has held hearings. That is another fact. I think nobody will contradict the fact that they reported the resolution out. That is another fact.

I do not want to overwhelm the gentleman with facts, but I have a few more. The Committee on Rules held a hearing yesterday. We can all draw inferences from that that the State Department is aware of those facts. I have heard nothing from the State Department. The inference I draw from that is, with all those established facts, that the State Department was overwhelmed with the justice of the case, which they ought to be, for they had no opposition to the passage of this resolution. At least, as a legislator I have no evidence from the State Department which I must consider, and that being so, I have no evidence with plenty of facts from which we can draw the inference that, if the State Department has any facts in opposition to this resolution, that they would communicate them to the leadership of the House, and no such facts have been communicated.

Mr. MICHENER. Possibly I am a little direct.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further for the moment. I do not want the other side to use all my time.

Mr. MICHENER. I appreciate that the gentleman has control of the time.

Mr. BLOOM. I have the floor. I am going to yield, but I want to find out what is happening to my time. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time has been consumed, because the other side has been using all of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. BLOOM. Now, I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. MICHENER. All I wanted to say was this: Possibly I am a little direct. The State Department is a part of the executive branch of the Government. It is charged with the duty of making our foreign bargains and conducting our foreign affairs. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs usually consults with the State Department.

Mr. BLOOM. No. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. MICHENER. If it does not, it should, and the House should know it. If this committee refuses to tell the House how its own State Department feels on this matter, then I think we ought to vote down this resolution until we have that information.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not like the gentleman from Michigan to make the statement that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is doing something or has been doing something it should not have done. I say that on concurrent resolutions of this kind the State Department is not asked for its opinion. I take as an example the Fulbright resolution. The State Department was not asked for an opinion on the Fulbright resolution. We do not ask for opinions when it comes to a simple resolution that does not become a law. This is merely an expression of opinion, which the House is entitled to make. That has been the rule and the custom of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not think it is proper for the gentleman from Michigan even to suggest that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has done something or is doing something that is not regular.

Furthermore, this resolution is on all fours with what the President of the United States has suggested, that Palestine should be immediately opened for 100,000 Jews to meet the emergency in Europe today. Further, the language of the resolution is exactly the same as the law made by a treaty signed by President Coolidge in 1924 with Great Britain, which includes verbatim the Palestine mandate. The mandate specifically states what is in this resolution.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. I am informed that when a similar resolution was reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs a year ago and then sent to the Committee on Rules the State Department and the War Department were consulted as to their views, and that they said then that they disapproved of the resolution, and it was then tabled. Why was no such similar course of inquiry followed this time by the Rules Committee?

Mr. BLOOM. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, to answer the question.

Mr. SABATH. May I answer the gentlewoman from Connecticut by saying that after the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported that resolution last year, I think it was—and it was a stronger resolution; there were provisions in there that this resolution does not contain—I received word from Secretary of State Stettinius and General Marshall, and even from the White House, that they thought it would be wise at that particular time not to report the resolution, although the Committee on Rules was in favor of and ready to report it, as the gentlewoman knows. When that information came to me, and I received word that we should delay its consideration, I did not grant a rule because I believed then and I believe now, my country first above anything else. I yielded to the request and no action was taken. But this is a different resolution.

Mrs. LUCE. Is the gentleman saying that the present resolution is meaningless?

Mr. SABATH. I am merely explaining that I had no request or statement from the State Department nor from the Secretary of War or the White House that they were opposed to this resolution. If they had been opposed, I know that they would have notified me the same as they did on the last resolution. Have I made myself clear?

Mrs. LUCE. Quite clear.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to explain further to the gentlewoman that there was no request made to the Committee on Foreign Affairs at that time. At that time after it was reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, please remember that that resolution called for a Jewish commonwealth. There was a great deal of discussion as to what a Jewish commonwealth really meant and

how it would operate. After we reported this resolution out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we went to the Committee on Rules. In the meantime, General Marshall and Secretary Stettinius went before the Senate committee and stated they preferred at that time not to have the resolution acted upon.

Mr. SABATH. We were at war at that time.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; we were at war at that time. There is no emergency now of any kind.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; certainly.

Mrs. LUCE. I would like it to be quite clear that I am for this resolution, but it is a most troublesome matter for those of us who are for it as a matter of principle and what seems to us justice and decency in racial relations to hear the rumor current all through Washington that the State Department and the War Department still think that a political crisis exists in the Near East which this resolution will aggravate, why is there presently no word from either the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or of the Senate which would really clarify the point of view of the State Department?

Mr. BLOOM. May I say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut that perhaps there is a lot of rumor as the gentlewoman says. But I have never heard of it. But it is a fact, not a rumor, that hundreds of Jews, millions of Jews in Europe today have no place to go. The only place they can go where there is no doubt that they will be safe is Palestine. Palestine is where they are wanted and where they will be welcomed.

Mrs. LUCE. That was equally true last year.

Mr. BLOOM. Now, if we want to help these poor Jews who are dying and being murdered today in Europe, about which there is absolutely no question—I know it to be a fact—this resolution might do some good. If England is closing the gates of Palestine the same as it is doing today and these Jews have no other place to go, it is our duty to at least express our opinion that these Jews should be permitted to go to Palestine where they have a right to go and where the law says they have a right to go according to our treaty. I have studied this question and I have kept quiet on this floor many, many times when I wanted to speak. But I know now that this is the only decent thing we can do, to at least express our opinion that these poor Jews who are being murdered now throughout Europe shall have an opportunity to go to Palestine in order that their lives may be saved. That is what I have to say on this resolution. This is the law as expressed in the treaty between Great Britain and the United States. The law was enacted in order that Palestine could be a haven for distressed Jews.

Mrs. LUCE. I am in complete accord with the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Does the gentleman have any assurance that these unfortunate Jews who will be sent to Palestine will not be murdered by the Arabs?

Mr. BLOOM. Well, Mr. Chairman, of all the ridiculous statements I have ever heard here, that is one of them. We are taking that chance. Are you going to vote against the resolution?

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I am for the resolution but I would like to have the assurance that it will not cause these Jews to be treated no better than they are at the present time.

Mr. BLOOM. Are you going to vote against this resolution because while you want to save the Jews you are afraid they may be killed by the Arabs? We will take that chance. You let us alone. The Jews of Europe, the people most concerned, are willing and eager to take that chance.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I saw in the papers where the gentleman wanted to send the armed forces of the United States over there.

Mr. BLOOM. That is not true. You know it is not true. That is not true.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, prior to the time a group of us Congressmen went to several foreign countries, especially to Palestine and the Arabian countries, Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Egypt, and these Arab-occupied countries, I signed the Zionist petition, but today, after seeing first hand and knowing the conditions as I do, I absolutely would not; not only in the interest of the United States but in the interest of the Jews themselves.

The Jews in Germany, Poland, and in other occupied countries today are receiving better attention than the civilians there. In the face of the shortage of housing facilities in Palestine and lack of an understanding with the Arabs, they cannot improve their condition by going to Palestine at this time, antagonizing those countries where it is estimated there are from forty to seventy million Arabs; 1,350,000 Arabs in Palestine alone, compared to 650,000 Jews there. They are endangering not only national unity but their own lives. It is something that should not happen. Many of the Members who have advocated this who, like myself, were good friends of President Roosevelt, have not quoted what he said. Neither of the Presidents have advocated anything like this resolution, without the consent and the agreement of the Arabs. If you want to throw dynamite into nitroglycerin, just pass this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that President Truman has also suggested that a hundred thousand Jews should go into Palestine?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. By and with the consent of the Arabs.

Mr. BLOOM. Did the gentleman read this resolution? We have conditions in this resolution.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. But this is predicated on the assumption that our President favors it.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman think that we Jews ought to know what is best for us? We have investigated. I want to say to the gentleman that I have evidence that Jews in Poland today are being killed just the same as they were in the war. The Jews in Germany are not living as well as the gentleman says.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman has said there was not any evidence of any danger in Palestine. After we came back, I pointed out the danger that was likely to occur in Palestine, and since then there has been a great deal of bloodshed. If you run over the Arabs in this manner, you will have more.

This can be handled in a proper manner, by mutual agreement with the Arabs in Palestine, and the Jews, and you would not have any trouble. Not knowing the conditions, you cannot judge them unless you see them over there. I am telling you again you are putting your own people in a precarious situation by adopting this resolution. Our own servicemen may be called to Palestine to settle the controversy. Few people in the United States realize the great importance of the great oil fields located in six or eight countries of the Arabic world. The future peace and economic security of the world may rest with those who have control of the oil valves of this vast area which has a proven oil capacity of 5,000,000,000 barrels, and an estimated probable reserve of twenty to fifty billion barrels. American interests hold operating leases and option contracts running to the year 2000. The American and British oil companies control another large portion of the area. At the time the leases were obtained, other countries, including Japan, France, Holland, Germany, and others were bidding for same. The oil is so strategically located that it may actually become the determining factor of future wars or peace. Please refer to our committee's report made on the floor of this House October 15, 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like very much to have both parties stop bluffing the Jewish people and bluffing the country. I think we have before us today a resolution that is fair. It is not binding but expresses the sense of Congress that wants justice for the Jewish people. I feel it will do no harm. The Jews certainly will be no worse off than they are today. I believe it will help the situation. If the Members will read the resolution, it provides on page 11:

> Establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Certainly, nothing could be more fair than that, and I do not think the Arabs can object to establishing Palestine as a democratic commonwealth. I think testimony before our committee by the Arabs proves that they did object to an entirely Jewish commonwealth.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that if the President of the United States and the State Department and the Army and Navy wanted us not to

pass this resolution, they would have told us. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, they should tell us if they have them. There is not any danger in it to this country. Time and time again they have asked us not to pass legislation because the security and the safety of the country were at stake. I believe they would tell us now, that the President would send us a message if he objected.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution will pass. The Jewish people really have suffered untold tortures during the past years. We should try to do something for them.

The testimony before our committee pointed to the fact that not so many Jews would enter Palestine, but it is a place where they can go if they wish and where, in my opinion, they should go. I hope the resolution will pass.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this resolution and feel it should be adopted. In view of the discussion as to whether the State Department and the President concurred in this resolution I think the committee should have the following information, and I quote from page 12170 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 17, a statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body. He said:

> Mr. President, the point I am making, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey, is that the President of the United States does not want this resolution adopted. He so told the Foreign Relations Committee—not in person, but he told me over the telephone and authorized me to tell the committee, and I did tell the committee what he said.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further, I am very sorry. Too many members of the committee have asked for time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But the gentlewoman from Massachusetts gave me a minute, and my time has not expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did not realize the gentleman's time had not expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me finish the quotation. The balance of his statement reads:

> He stated, "I do not regard adoption of the resolution as advisable. I do not want to see any sort of resolution adopted until the Commission can conduct its inquiry and submit its report." I reported that to the committee.

The distinguished senior Senator, Mr. CONNALLY, also stated:

> The Secretary of State appeared before the committee and testified that the resolution ought not to be adopted, and that it was not wise, and that he opposed it.

It seems the House Committee on Foreign Affairs failed to call the State Department. I do feel, in spite of the opinion of the State Department, that this resolution should be approved, and I will vote for its adoption.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that if the President of the United States did not want us to pass this legislation he certainly should have told the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or the chairman of the Rules Committee. It was a very simple and easy thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is with a good deal of hesitation and trepidation that I rise at this time to express some views upon the Palestine situation, not merely upon this resolution.

The mandate was originally entrusted to Great Britain by the League of Nations and also by ratifying action of the United States as primarily a humanitarian program. As such it was doubtless welcomed by people all over the world. That the people of the Jewish faith in Europe have suffered in ghastly fashion there can be no doubt whatsoever. It makes one's heart ache to hear what they have gone through. That they are in need of relief or a refuge where they can find relief there can be not the slightest doubt.

I have stood willing to support any measure which would bring relief to them whether it be in Palestine or elsewhere, and I am still ready to do so. I have been deeply concerned, however, in recent months at noting that the original objective of this movement has in effect been superseded to a considerable degree by another objective, and that objective is political. I cannot boast of intimate knowledge of the political situations in the Near East. However, I cannot resist attempting to cast my view ahead down through the years. I would not make this attempt were it not for the fact that in recent months it has been announced again and again by a large number of proponents of this and similar resolutions that in addition to the humanitarian objective they are aiming toward a political objective, that is, the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish state. I see that repeated time and again in advertisements, but it was more definitely cleared up in the hearings held before the Foreign Affairs Committee on this particular resolution the other day when in response to questions, some of them put by myself, the representative of the great movement here in the United States in support of this and similar resolutions admitted that ultimately it was their intention to bring about the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. There is your political objective. Relief having been accomplished the intention will persist in the hearts of these people to establish such a state. Indeed, a leader of the movement who is its agent in Palestine has already stated that the term "national Jewish home" is synonymous with Jewish state.

Why is it that I am concerned about this? And here I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I am treading, perhaps, on delicate ground. In this country a person of the Jewish faith is an American citizen first and I hope to heaven he will always be regarded as such. He is entitled to his belief in his own religion and no one should ever interfere with it; but he is first an American citizen in our eyes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hope and pray that that same state of affairs shall finally exist all over the world. It has existed in some countries, the United States and Great Britain for example, and with certain exceptions in the western European democracies. It has not existed in other countries, some of which call themselves civilized.

Frankly, the thing I dread about this political objective is that if it is attained it will tend to segregate people of the Jewish faith away from their neighbors and, perhaps, furnish fuel to that stupid, unforgivable, horrible thing known as anti-Semitism. I do not want to see those who are obsessed with that idea, and it does exist, we might just as well admit it, to our dismay, I repeat, I do not want those who are obsessed with that hideous prejudice to have an additional peg upon which to hang their hats.

I say that the establishment of a separate Jewish state will tend to further segregate the Jewish people all over the world from their neighbors. That is the thing that has been in my mind for several months. And I would feel much happier about this whole Palestine situation if the proponents of this resolution and especially the Zionists would drop their political objectives. There, I fear, is the dynamite.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I ask the gentleman if that is not indicated by the language of the resolution itself, which in part reads:

> For colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home.

It is not far from that to state, is it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is on the border line.

Mr. FOLGER. And dangerous within itself, along the line the gentleman has pointed out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If we are perfectly candid about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself half a minute.

In answer to the gentleman from New York, I do not want the Members to think that this is something new that he is talking about, because on March 3, 1919, President Wilson declared:

> I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth.

That is nothing new. They have always spoken of that since the time of the Balfour Declaration up to the present time, and that has nothing to do with this resolution at all.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as did my colleague from New York, so I also come to the well of this House with a good deal of trepidation. I am opposed to the resolution on the ground that this is not the time to be pressing for action on it. In my opinion this is not a question of helping Jewish refugees in Europe; it is a political maneuver and should be defeated. Adoption of this resolution will not result in expediting homeless Jews to Palestine. At the expense of repetition, perhaps, I want to quote a little more in detail than the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] did a few minutes ago, with reference to the attitude of the President and the State Department. I think this House should know the attitude of the President and the State Department. I am quoting now from an article that appeared in the New York Times under date of December 13, and I am going to read direct quotes attributed to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. He said:

President Truman made it quite clear to me and to the Foreign Relations Committee that he did not desire the passage of any resolution on the subject at this time. He reported that it would be inadvisable. He stated that the passage of any resolution would greatly embarrass him in his international conferences, seeking a solution. He stated that the passage of a resolution might tie his hands.

These views of the President were concurred in by Secretary of State Byrnes, who opposes the passage of any resolution at this time.

In this situation I could not obtain my consent as chairman of the committee to vote for a resolution which would embarrass the President in the performance of his international duties, and would be a hindrance in bringing about an understanding with Great Britain. In my view, the passage of the resolution is not in the interest of the Jewish people. My belief is that the resolution will injure the cause of the Jewish people and that it will bring about a situation making it very difficult for the President to make any progress whatever in the solution of the matter.

It has not been revealed, at least I have not heard it said, that the President has appointed a committee in conjunction with an English committee called the Anglo-American Committee to investigate this whole Palestine situation and to report back to the President within 4 months. I say that we ought to wait. Why this rush, why this hurry, when we all must admit, I believe, that as far as the resolution itself is concerned it is purely advisory.

We ought not to forget also that this is a slap not only at the President and the Secretary of State but at Great Britain. Where is all this talk now about unity and support of the President and the State Department and our allies? We do not hear it in this debate. There is some pressure at work somewhere, we do not know where.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is a member of the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Are any of the Democrats on that committee on speaking terms with the State Department? I wonder why the House has to be in doubt with regard to a very delicate international question. It seems to me that some member of the committee could have communicated with the State Department and the House could then know whether or not we are slapping somebody in the face.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I take it from the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Texas that we are slapping them in the face.

Mr. COOLEY. That is a clear indication that the President is opposed to the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would say so, and I do not think it will be denied on this floor.

Mr. COOLEY. The chairman of the committee has assured the House that the President has asked for the resolution, in substance.

Mr. BLOOM. The chairman stated that the President has asked for 100,000.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. He has not asked for this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. He asked that England permit 100,000 Jews to go into Palestine.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That has nothing to do with this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. It is in the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted me, I include the following excerpt from article in the Fortnightly, December 1944, by Sir John Hope Simpson, who was appointed by the British Government in 1930 to report on immigration and land settlement in Palestine:

It is difficult—indeed impossible—to reconcile the provisions of this mandate with those contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations, under which it purported to be issued, which laid down that the well-being and development of the inhabitants of Palestine at the time of its occupation form a sacred trust for civilization, and that they could be provisionally recognized as an independent nation, subject to the rendering of advice and assistance by a mandatory. It is on these grounds, among others, that the Arab population has, from the earliest days of the mandate, claimed that the mandate is devoid of authority. They feel that Great Britain is exercising a mandate, not on behalf of the population of Palestine, but on behalf of a foreign power—the Zionist organization of the world. They have seen that power pouring Jewish immigrants into Palestine by the tens of thousands, purchasing very large areas of land hitherto held by the Arabs, holding it under conditions which preclude resale, and leasing it only to Jews, and even to them only on condition that none but a Jew may be employed on the land so leased. It is no matter for wonder that the Arab community of Palestine lives in a state of constant fear of the possible conditions of an unknown future.

The Jewish settlements in Palestine have been a remarkable achievement. Most attention has been drawn to the agricultural settlements. These have been widely advertised, possibly in view of the insistence in article 6 of the mandate that close settlement by Jews on the land should be encouraged, possibly also, in part, because the romance and adventure inherent in these settlements are a stimulus to generous support of the movement. The emphasis placed on this branch of the work of the Zionist organization is, however, disproportionate. As is pointed out in the report of the royal commission, "the proportion of workers on the land (earners) to the Jewish population * * * today is 6.4 percent." The great mass of the Jewish immigrants are not workers on the land, but residents of the towns. The population of one town, Tel Aviv, far exceeds in number the total population of all the agricultural settlements. This is not to say that the Jewish settlements are unimportant. They are the very remarkable result of the combined application of outstanding technical skill, abounding energy, and practically unlimited resources provided by the generosity of Jewish communities in many lands. But the great majority of the Jewish population of Palestine today consists of skilled and unskilled workers in industry and on public works, industrialists, tradesmen, persons living on their private resources, and professional men of all types. The number in these last two classes is very large, and in some directions that of professional men is out of all proportion to the needs of the community. Evidence was tendered to the royal commission that in Tel Aviv there was 1 doctor to every 161 persons, in Palestine as a whole 1 doctor for every 560 persons, while in the United Kingdom there is 1 doctor for about 1,085 persons.

Industrial development is an essential to the prosperity of the Jewish section of the population, which has grown from 55,000 in 1918 to at least 500,000 at the present time. In 1942 the value of the output of industrial workers was £30,000,000. Apart from war supplies, iron and steel articles, textiles, leather goods, foodstuffs, chemicals and pharmaceutical preparations, drainage pipes, and glass, essential oils, and lorries were produced by Jewish industry in Palestine. This phenomenal development has been due to three main causes—the provision of cheap capital by what Professor Bentwich describes as "philanthropic—capitalist instruments," protection of industry by carefully regulated tariffs, and the important monopoly for the production of electric power and light granted by the government to Mr. Pinhas Rutenberg, a Russian Jewish engineer, and now exploited by the Palestine Electric Corporation. Some of the conditions of this monopolistic concession are remarkable, not least the postponement of payment of customs duty on imported material "until the profits of the company, after writing off amortization, depreciation, and reserve, are first sufficient to enable the company to pay a dividend of at least 8 percent per annum tax free."

For the years 1920–36 the principle of economic absorptive capacity governed the number of immigrant Jews on the labor schedule. This principle was first laid down in the Churchill memorandum of June 3, 1922. "This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals." It was reaffirmed in the letter dated February 13, 1931, from the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, to Dr. Weizmann, which the Prime Minister described as "the authoritative interpretation of the white paper." In that letter it was stated that the criterion which would guide the Government in fixing the number of Jewish immigrants would be the principle of economic absorptive capacity. It is, however, clear that if philanthropic capital is available, irrespective of profit, electric power in quantity at very low cost, and protection by means of tariffs and exemption from taxation, industry could be artificially expanded to great dimensions, and absorptive capacity provided for very large numbers of Jewish immigrants. It would, indeed, be in the power of the Zionist organizations so to manipulate absorptive capacity as, in their judgment, circumstances might require.

This question was considered with care by the Palestine Royal Commission, which pointed out the dangers inherent in the application of that principle alone. They gave their reasons for reaching the conclusion that political and psychological factors should also be taken into account in determining the numbers in the labor schedule, and that a political high level should be fixed at 12,000 per annum for the next 5 years. The importance of the decision and its effect on the development of the national home may be judged from the fact that in the period from the beginning of 1933 to August 1936 the number of Jewish immigrants exceeded 156,000—a figure much greater than the total of recorded Jewish immigration from 1920 to 1932, inclusive. The reason for this remarkable movement in the year 1933 and succeeding years is to be found in events in Germany. The Nuremberg legislation to safeguard the purity of the German race and the abominable treatment of the Jews in Germany under the Nazi regime resulted in a mass movement of refugees from that country, and Palestine came to be regarded as the chief haven of refuge for German, and later also for Austrian, Jews. As anti-Semitism spread in its more acute forms to other areas of Europe, that position became even more important, and great pressure was exerted on the Palestine Government and on the Government of the United Kingdom to open the door to Palestine still wider. In view of the refusal of other countries to admit refugees save in inadequate numbers, the demand was natural, but it ran counter to the policy recommended by the Royal Commission and subsequently adopted by the British Government. In the years 1937 to 1942, inclusive, the number of immigrant Jews was 50,197.

The immigration of the Jews into Palestine has been conducted with outstanding ability. The Jewish Agency and the National Federation of Labor (Histadruth) have organized the recruitment, transport, and settlement of those admitted on the labor schedule, with amazing success. Criticism has been made in the past by the orthodox section of Jewry in Palestine that politics rather than religious devotion have been considered by the recruiting authorities, and it is, in fact, remarkable that whereas in the older settlements which were founded before the time of the Balfour Declaration the synagog was the center of the village life, in the later settlements that position is occupied by the village school. Politics are now far more obvious than religious enthusiasm, and, to quote Dr. Toynbee, Zionism is "in essence a secular, economico-political expression of Jewish national aspirations." The Zionist movement today is definitely an urge of political nationalism, and the Jewish settlement is no longer regarded as a settlement of Palestinian Jews in Palestine—if it were ever so regarded—but of national Jews in Eretz Israel. Therein lies the tragic impossibility of reconciliation between immigrant Jew and aboriginal Arab.

Judging by recorded statements of Zionist leaders it is fair to conclude that, at the outset, the policy of Zionism did not aim at political dominance in Palestine. At the tenth Zionist congress, held at Basle in August 1911, the president made a statement, from which the following is extracted:

"Only those suffering from gross ignorance or actuated by malice, could accuse us of the desire of establishing an independent Jewish Kingdom. * * * The aim of Zionism is the erection for the Jewish people of a publicly recognized, legally secured home in Palestine. Not a Jewish state, but a home in the ancient land of our forefathers where we can live a Jewish life without oppression and persecution. What we demand is that the Jewish immigrant to Palestine be given the opportunity of naturalizing as a citizen without limitation and that he can live unhindered in accordance with Jewish customs * * * that and nothing else is our aim."

In the introduction to his History of Zionism—written during 1918—Mr. Sokolov, at that time president of the Zionist organization, wrote:

"It has been said, and is still being obstinately repeated by anti-Zionists again and again, that Zionism aims at the creation of an independent Jewish state. But this is wholly fallacious. The Jewish state was never a part of the Zionist program."

Dr. Weizmann is reported to have declared at a meeting of Government officials in Palestine held on April 27, 1918:

"All fears expressed openly or secretly by the Arabs that they are to be ousted from their present position are due either to a fundamental misconception of Zionist aims or to the malicious activities of our common enemies."

Finally, Dr. Weizmann in an address to the Zionist organization in 1931, of which he was then President, said:

"The Arabs must be made to feel, by deed as well as word, that, whatever the future numerical relationships of the two nations in Palestine, we on our part contemplate no political domination. But they must also remember that we on our side will never submit to any political domination."

That principle was also adopted by the British Government, and was announced, before the mandate was actually granted by the Council of the League of Nations, in the Churchill memorandum of June 3, 1922. It included the following sentences:

Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used such as that Palestine is to become "as Jewish as England is English." His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contemplated * * * the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language, or culture in Palestine. They would draw attention to the fact that the terms of the Balfour Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish national home, but that such a home should be founded in Palestine.

Had the Jewish authorities been content with the original object of settlement in Palestine—"a Jewish life without oppression and persecution" in accordance with Jewish customs, the national home would have presented no difficulty. The Jews could have entered and settled as so many did in the P. I. C. A. settlements—founded in many cases long before the Balfour Declaration—in friendly relationship with their Arab fellow citizens, and themselves loyal citizens of Palestine. The unfortunate fact is that the Jewish immigration today is not composed of Jews who, on religious grounds, wish to return to the land of Zion, in order to lead a Jewish life, without oppression and persecution, in accordance with Jewish customs. Rather is it composed of Jews, largely devoid of religious conviction, animated by a spirit of political nationalism, and determined to secure domination in Palestine, the homeland of the Arab for at least 1,300 years. No effort has been made to coalesce with the existing population. On the contrary, there is extreme divergence between the virile occidentalism of the immigrant and the conservative orientalism of the mass of the resident population. After its description of the organization of Jewish policy in Palestine the Royal Commission writes: "It would be difficult to find in history a precedent for the establishment of so distinct an imperium in imperio."

The policy of His Majesty's Government for the future government of Palestine is that contained in the Statement of Policy issued in May 1939. It was issued after consultations with Jewish and Arab representatives, including among the latter representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the Yemen. The salient feature of this white paper is the decision to limit the further immigration of Jews into Palestine to 75,000 in the 5 years from 1939; after that period no further immigration of Jews will be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it. In other words, at long last the British Government has recognized that Palestine is an Arab land, and that it shall remain an Arab land unless the Arabs decide otherwise. The second most important point regards the future constitution of the Palestine State:

"At the end of 5 years from the restoration of peace and order, an appropriate body representative of the people of Palestine and of His Majesty's Government will be set up to review the working of the constitutional arrangement during the transitional period, and to consider and make recommendations regarding the constitution of the independent Palestine State."

The intention of the British Government is that within 10 years Palestine shall be an independent state in treaty relations with Great Britain. Inevitably the majority in that State will be Arabs, but the Jewish population of the national home in Palestine will be a forceful and well disciplined minority. If they are prepared to accept that position and to live in Palestine as loyal Palestinian citizens, their influence will be very great, and the advance of Palestine will be rapid. If they refuse to cooperate, they will doubtless be able to make things difficult for the Palestine government, without gain to themselves.

In view of the latest statement of policy by His Majesty's Government, the position and authority of the Jewish Agency in Palestine will not be required in the interest of the national home, now securely established. The existence of that authority has emphasized the apartness of the Jewish section of the Palestinian population in the past, and has also led to a suspicion on the part of the Arab population that the interests of the Jews were more forcefully represented than those of the Arabs for the consideration of the Palestine government. The Royal Commission recorded its opinion that among the factors causing the outbreaks of violence on the part of the Arabs was the Arab belief that—

"The Jews can always get their way by means denied to the Arabs. * * * Based in general on the status of the Jewish Agency both in Jerusalem and in London, this belief was greatly strengthened by the publication of Mr. MacDonald's letter to Dr. Weizman in 1931."

In future the representation of Jewish interests in Palestine may very safely be left to the local organizations which are staffed by able men, and to the high commissioner and his government. There is no possibility of a coalescence of the Jewish and Arab sections of the population so long as the former are in a specially privileged position in relation to the Palestine government.

Though Palestine may properly be regarded as the spiritual home of every devout Jew, there is no proper ground to conclude that it is the haven of refuge for Jews unjustly persecuted. The solution to persecution in Europe is to prevent it. If that be impossible, the havens of refuge should be in those countries, such as Great Britain, the United States of America, and the U. S. S. R., among others, who sympathize with the sufferers and have a sense of the dignity of man as man. It is unfair and indeed hypocritical to express sympathy, while refusing to accept the sufferers into one's own country and compelling their acceptance in Palestine, where they are not welcomed. Were the doors of Great Britain, the United States, the U. S. S. R., and France thrown open, the problem of persecuted Jewry would be immediately solved.

"The best service which well wishers of the national home can render it, is to rec-

ognize frankly that the situation in Palestine has reached a deadlock and to bend their minds to finding a way out." The way out is indicated in the statement of policy of 1939.

Excerpt from the Sun, Baltimore, November 30, 1945, setting forth President Truman's change of attitude on Palestine resolution:

TRUMAN DROPS HIS BACKING OF ZIONISTS' PLAN—REVERSES PLATFORM ON WHICH HE AND F. D. R. WERE ELECTED

WASHINGTON, November 29.—A sequel to the recent disclosure of President Roosevelt's promise to ibn-Saud not to side with the Jews against the Arabs in the Palestine controversy was provided here today as President Truman bluntly declared his opposition to the Zionist position.

His opposition—relayed to a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee November 19—had remained an official secret until he himself revealed it at a press conference this morning.

The stand he took put him in opposition to the Democratic platform on which he and President Roosevelt were elected a year ago and to the Wagner-Taft resolution endorsing a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, which he had backed as a Senator.

LEGISLATORS ANGERED AT STAND

It also reversed a stand Mr. Truman had taken last month when—in the midst of his negotiations with Prime Minister Attlee to refer the Palestine question to an Anglo-American commission—he gave Senators WAGNER (Democrat, New York) and TAFT (Republican, Ohio) the green light to reintroduce their resolution.

In addition, Mr. Truman's unqualified assertion of opposition today to that resolution created a political quandary for Democratic Members of Congress from such States as New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California, who looked to their virtually unanimous support of the resolution to boost their chances of reelection next year.

They had made their anger so clear to James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, when he relayed Mr. Truman's position to the Foreign Relations Committee 11 days ago that he emerged from the secret meeting white-faced and tight-lipped.

WAGNER REFUSES COMMENT

Senator WAGNER would not comment tonight on Mr. Truman's reversal of position but predicted that "the Foreign Relations Committee will report the resolution favorably and it will be passed by the Senate." The subcommittee to which he had referred is scheduled to make its report to the full committee Monday, he added.

Mr. Truman announced November 13 his agreement with Mr. Attlee to set up the Anglo-American commission and said he hoped it would work "with the greatest speed" because the situation faced by displaced Jews in Europe during the coming winter allows no delay in this matter."

He said today that he was not yet ready to name the commission's American members and that, in fact, no agreement had yet been reached as to how large the commission should be. He hoped, he said, that agreement on the commission's size would be reached later today and that Mr. Byrnes would be able to announce it. No such announcement was forthcoming, however, before the State Department locked up shop for the night.

NO OPPOSITION AS VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Byrnes announced yesterday that—as a result of negotiations begun some days after the Truman-Attlee agreement of November 13—it had been decided to give the Anglo-American commission 120 days from its inception to make its studies and file its recommendations and report. On that basis, the winter to which Mr. Truman referred in his November 13 announcement will have ended before the commission acts.

"Some people who have been interested in the Zionist movement said you gave prior approval or acquiescence to the Wagner resolution for a Jewish commonwealth; did you have any conversation about that?" Mr. Truman was asked today.

He had some conversation on that subject and was not opposed to the resolution when Vice President, Mr. Truman replied.

SAYS CONDITIONS CHANGED

"Do you favor the resolution?" he then was asked.

He does not, he answered, adding that conditions have changed and that if the resolution were passed now there would be no reason for appointing a fact-finding body—i. e., the Anglo-American commission.

Senate records show no resolution backing the Zionist position on Palestine was pending in the Senate while Mr. Truman, as Vice President, was its presiding officer. The Wagner-Taft resolution of 1944—which President Roosevelt had pigeonholed after the November elections—died with the Seventy-eighth Congress. It was not reintroduced until October 26 this year.

Before introducing it, Senators WAGNER and TAFT, it was learned today, conferred with both President Truman and Secretary Byrnes in mid-October and got the green light from them. Mr. Truman reminded them that he had supported just such a resolution while a Senator last year.

OPPOSITION FROM CONNALLY

They also were told at that time by Truman and Byrnes, it was learned, that creation of the Anglo-American commission—which Mr. Truman cited today as the reason for his reversal—already had been agreed upon in principle between London and Washington.

Senator WAGNER, it was further learned, made a last-minute check before introducing the resolution October 26. He telephoned Mr. Byrnes a few minutes before the Senate convened, asked if it would be all right to offer the resolution that day, and was told "Go ahead."

It encountered almost immediate opposition within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from Chairman CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas), who said the President was against it—a report Mr. Byrnes subsequently confirmed at a secret committee session.

A. F. OF L. HEAD APPEALS TO ATTLEE

Meanwhile, William Green, A. F. of L. president, today cabled an appeal to Prime Minister Attlee to "immediately stop" the "policy of death and destruction of Jewish people in Palestine" by British troops. He said he had been shocked by reports received from the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine that "Jewish civilians in Palestine were the victims of tear bombs, rifle butts, and bayonets used by British troops, and as a result a number were killed, a large number wounded, and many were arrested."

"It seems inconceivable," his cablegram added, "that Jewish people who migrated to Palestine in order to save themselves from utter destruction in certain totalitarian nations in Europe would be killed and injured by armed forces of Great Britain, whose obligation and duty was to save their lives and protect them against those forces which sought their utter annihilation."

Excerpt from the New York Times, December 13, 1945, part of an article written by C. P. Trussell relating to Senate action on the Palestine resolution:

WASHINGTON, December 12.—By a vote of 17 to 1 the Foreign Relations Committee approved and reported to the Senate today a resolution calling on the United States to "use its good offices" to the end that Palestine be opened for the "free entry of Jews" to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities.

The measure provides further that this Government shall support "full opportunity for colonization and development," so that Jews "may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine and the Jewish national home and in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

The lone dissenter was the committee's chairman, Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, a supporter in 1922, as a Member of the House, of the resolution favoring the establishment in Palestine of a national Jewish homeland. After the committee had acted in closed session today, Mr. CONNALLY cited the appointment on Monday by President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee of an Anglo-American committee to study the Palestine situation and report within 120 days, and he declared:

"President Truman made it quite clear to me and to the Foreign Relations Committee that he did not desire the passage of any resolution on the subject at this time. He reported that it would be inadvisable. He stated that the passage of any resolution would greatly embarrass him in his international conferences, seeking a solution. He stated that the passage of a resolution might tie his hands.

CONNALLY DEFENDS DISSENT

"These views of the President were concurred in by Secretary of State Byrnes, who opposes the passage of any resolution at this time.

"In this situation I could not obtain my consent as chairman of the committee to vote for a resolution which would embarrass the President in the performance of his international duties, and would be a hindrance in bringing about an understanding with Great Britain. In my view, the passage of the resolution is not in the interest of the Jewish people. My belief is that the resolution will injure the cause of the Jewish people and that it will bring about a situation making it very difficult for the President to make any progress whatever in the solution of the matter."

Statement by the Arab Office as to its position regarding the Palestine question:

THE ARABS INSIST ON THEIR RIGHTS

The Balfour Declaration was a unilateral document, not binding on the Arabs either morally or legally.

The British Government never intended this declaration as a charter for converting Palestine into a Jewish state. Officially this was made clear in the British white paper of 1922 and again in the white paper of 1939. In the latter it is specifically stated:

"His Majesty's Government therefore now declares unequivocally that it is not part of their policy that Palestine should become a Jewish state. They would indeed regard it as contrary to their obligations to the Arabs under the mandate, as well as to the assurances which have been given to the Arab people in the past, that the Arab population of Palestine should be made the subjects of a Jewish state against their will" (Cmd. 6019, p. 4).

While many official promises have been made to the Arabs by the British Government, Arab rights do not rest on any such political promises or declarations.

The Arab claim to Palestine rests on these simple facts: (a) large Arab majority, (b) formerly uninterrupted possession for 13 centuries, (c) unity in traditions, culture and language. It is the inherent right of any people so domiciled in a land to maintain jealously its hold on that land.

Before the First World War there were 10 Arabs to 1 Jew. But today there are 10 Arabs to 4 Jews.

Zionists at present are bent on converting the Arab majority in Palestine into a minority. They are denying Palestine democratic government until such Jewish majority is attained. If we accede to the demand for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jewish refugees into Palestine, it will not be long before the Jews become a majority there.

For centuries Arabs and Jews have lived in peace and harmony in Moslem and Arab lands. It is in the interest of all Jews who are already in Palestine and everywhere in the Moslem world that everything should be done to allay the suspicions, the fears, and resentment of the Arabs.

Palestine is regarded by all Arabs as an integral and inseparable part of the Arab world. If the Zionists insist on pursuing their program to its logical but perilous conclusion their act will arouse intense and bitter opposition among all Arabs—Moslems and Christians—and will create a bloc of 60,000,000 Arabs and 300,000,000 Moslems against the Jews.

Zionism is neither a humanitarian nor a religious program. It is a political program. The Jewish problem is a European problem. The refugee problem is also a European problem. Neither of these problems has been created by the Arabs. The Arabs of Palestine should not be held alone responsible for the solution. It does not lie in the artificial establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, but in the assurance of true democracy and the guaranty of security throughout the world.

We ask you Americans:

1. Would you want to give the so-called homeless and stateless Jews a sovereign homeland within your borders?

2. Would you tolerate constant outside interference and dictation in your internal affairs?

3. Would you permit foreign governments to control your immigration policy?

ZIONIST CLAIMS AND ARAB REFUTATIONS

1. Zionists rest their claim to Palestine on historical grounds.

So do the Arabs. The fact is that the Arabs have been there for centuries and are there now. Jews left Palestine in A. D. 71.

2. Zionists claim Palestine on religious grounds.

So do 300,000,000 Moslems, to whom it is the second holiest land.

3. Zionists claim that the Arabs cannot be entrusted with the rights of minorities.

When Christendom was persecuting Jews, the Arabs tolerated them and gave them refuge. Christian Arabs are one with their Moslem brethren in opposing Zionism.

4. Zionists claim that the Arabs cannot be entrusted with the protection of the holy places.

A Moslem family, the Nusaibehs, of Jerusalem, have been entrusted by the Christians with the custody of the keys of the Holy Sepulcher for several generations.

5. Zionists claim that since Palestine constitutes less than 1 percent of the Arab world, the Arabs should concede this "notch" to their Jewish cousins.

Most of the Arab world consists of deserts. The State of Vermont is less than 1 percent of the area of the United States. Would the people of Vermont be willing to vacate it and move into other parts of the United States upon an order from a foreign power or group of powers?

6. Zionists claim that the Arabs benefit from their colonization of Palestine.

With reference to Jewish colonization of Arab land, Sir John Hope Simpson, in his report (Cmd. 3680), said: "It ceases to be land from which the Arab can gain any advantage whether now or at any other time in the future. * * * He is deprived forever from employment on that land. * * * Nor can anyone help him by purchasing the land and restoring it to common use. The land is in mortmain and inalienable."

7. Zionists claim they brought the benefits of western civilization to the Arabs of Palestine.

Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Iraq, and Turkey have prospered and made remarkable progress without benefit of Zionist immigration. In the last 60 years the population of Egypt has tripled.

The Arabs have not benefited at all from Jewish education because the language of instruction in all Jewish schools is Hebrew.

As to medical facilities Arabs do not frequent Zionist hospitals. According to the last report of the Palestine Government to the League of Nations, out of 11,880 patients admitted to Zionist hospitals, 4 were Moslems, 7 were Christians, and 11,869 were Jews.

8. Zionist claim that with intensive industrialization a large Jewish population is possible in Palestine.

According to Mr. Paintor, of the Reader's Digest, Jewish enterprises in Palestine are only 40 percent self-supporting. Thus far, Zionist intensive industrialization in Palestine has been possible only through charity and discriminatory tariff.

(1) "The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development." (From President Wilson's Fourteen Points.)

(2) "Your Majesty will also doubtless recall that during our recent conversation I assured you that I would take no action, in my capacity as Chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people." (President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his letter to King ibn-Saud, April 5, 1945.)

(3) "We believe that all peoples who are prepared for self-government should be permitted to choose their own form of government by their own freely expressed choice, without interference from any foreign source. That is true in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, as well as in the Western Hemisphere." (President Harry Truman in his speech on Navy Day, October 27, 1945.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolution. I am sorry, as indeed everyone must be, that we do not have clear information as to the position of the State Department and the Executive. From the fact they have not said anything about it, either one way or the other I must interpret their silence as being favorable to the resolution. Certainly the administration, if it was opposed, had a duty to say so plainly. That is an obligation because the administration should know about our foreign trends and they should not fail to keep Congress advised. So I must conclude the administration is in favor of this resolution although for some reason or other it is strangely reticent. This is unusual reticence because they have not failed to give us plenty of advice in the past.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Did the gentleman not hear read the statement of a gentleman in the other body to the effect that he had been specifically told that they did not want this resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I also heard that statement contradicted by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In view of the fact that there is a 20,000,000,000 to 50,000,000,000 barrel oil reserve in these Arab countries of 40,000,000 people, does not the gentleman think the future economy and peace of the world are tied up in it in that whoever controls that oil valve over there controls the peace and economy of the country in the future?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not getting into any discussion about the oil rights in the Near East. That is a question by itself.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. That is important.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am for this resolution because I believe it is right. I believe these poor, unfortunate, persecuted, oppressed Jewish people must have some place where they can find peace and security. We in the United States for the last 25 years have on many occasions recorded our belief in permitting Jewish settlement in Palestine. I am supporting the resolution also because it was incorporated in the Republican platform in 1944. Our party recorded itself definitely in favor of a homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted. It is only, as anyone can readily see, a recommendation to the President that this great humanitarian objective shall be brought about. The final responsibility is, of course, with the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it your idea that this is simply carrying out the commitment England made 25 years ago?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is trying to put into effect the promises that the Jewish people have had since the last World War. It was originally promised by Great Britain in the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. A specific commitment was made by England, was it not, that the Jews would be allowed to go in there?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Balfour Declaration was a definite commitment for a Palestine home for the Jews. No one can dispute that.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I agree with the gentleman that we owe the Jews something. There is one exception that I want to make, and that is to the statement by the chairman of the committee that Jews are being killed in Poland and Germany. I believe that is a misstatement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that I do not know about that. However, as long as Poland has been mentioned, I want to express my conviction that I would like to see a little more justice to the Polish people, too. Certainly there is room for more consideration for our gallant Polish allies—allies who stoutly fought on during the darkest days of the war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I saw the extermination factories at Buchenwald. It was there they gave the Jews the works. They died by the thousands. I also saw on the Continent of Europe thousands and thousands of displaced persons, most of them Jews, looking for homes. I hope in the name of suffering humanity that during this Christmas period the House will stand firm for this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this resolution because it expresses clearly the intent and purpose of this Congress on a very controversial question which has been before us for a long time. The Jewish people are entitled to the assurance of this Congress that we favor action by the British Government to conform with the terms of the Balfour resolution which has too long been sidetracked. When we pass this resolution we are providing a haven for thousands of Jewish people in Europe who have no place to go and who desire to be reunited with their relatives and friends from whom they have long been separated.

A CONGRESSMAN'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, nearly 2,000 years ago a child was born in a manger. The birth of Christ Jesus meant the same thing to the shepherds, to the wise men and to Mary and Joseph that this sacred event means to us in these far distant times. It meant—and it means today—simply this: Peace on earth, good will to men.

It has been to the eternal sorrow of the world that the beauty and the truth of the Christmas message has been imprisoned in the hearts of men even as, through centuries and through eons, the power to move the universe has been imprisoned within the atom. This Christmas is the first Christmas in 5 years when this country of ours has not been engaged in war. Many of our boys will be at home. Many more will live only in the waking and sleeping thoughts of their loved ones. In either case, the responsibility is ours. We must make ourselves the protons of our God, break through the atomic shell that imprisons the enduring truths which were born with Christ and which are Christ, so that "the peace that passeth all understanding" will be released for all men, all women, all children on every continent. It is our privilege, at Christmas, 1945, to contribute—as earlier generations have never been able to contribute—to the universal cause of peace and righteousness for which Christ was born, for which He lived, and for which He died.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, in view of the confusion which has prevailed, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs one specific question, if he will answer it, and that is whether or not he can state to this Committee that the Chief Executive is in favor now of the passage of this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, I hope I did not give the impression that the President is in favor of this resolution. But I did say that the President has asked England and requested England repeatedly to permit 100,000 Jews to go to Palestine.

Mr. HAND. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to assure the chairman that I am thoroughly in favor of this resolution. But can you answer my question yes or no?

Mr. BLOOM. I do not speak for the President at all. I do not know what the President thinks about it.

Mr. HAND. You cannot answer the question in any way? You cannot answer the question?

Mr. BLOOM. I cannot answer it. I do not know anything about it at all.

Mr. HAND. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the passage of this resolution at this time.

Before the passage of this resolution by the other body, I introduced a resolution in the House containing exactly the same provisions, word for word. I think it would be in line with the promises we have made for the last 20 years to pass this resolution, to bring all the effort we can to alleviate the conditions of these oppressed people. I think we would be derelict in our duty if we did not declare to the world that it is our intention to use our utmost efforts to carry out the promises that were made in the Balfour Declaration, in the treaty that was made, and in the repeated resolutions that were passed by this Congress, regardless of practical considerations which might be brought in about other interests from an economic standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, the most sickening aspect of what is called western Christian civilization, which extends from our Pacific shores to those borders where the Soviet Union begins, is the mass hypocrisy that prevails within it on the subject of racialism. National and international hypocrisy—and to some measure each of us is implicated—on the question of Jews, Negroes, and other racial and religious minorities, of all the stenches that rise from this earth, is undoubtedly the greatest stench in the nostrils of God.

Now the Members who are voting against this resolution today give, in general, two reasons for their course of action. Their sincerity I certainly do not question, though I think they are wrong.

First, they say that they fear the passage of this resolution will make political trouble, leading to the necessity for our military intervention in the Near East.

In giving this reason for the basis of their vote, are they not playing the game of which we have all been guilty at some time or other in this House, of being rostrum secretaries of state and cloakroom generals?

Indeed, I agree with those who claim here that if the State Department and the War Department felt that the passage of this resolution would put an eventual burden on American arms, or a serious strain on our relations with the Arab and other nations of the Near East, they would have clearly so notified the Foreign Affairs Committees of the Congress, in writing. To say that they are in reality against this resolution, but have failed to testify to their disapproval openly and on the record, is, in effect to accuse the State Department of being either uncertain of the international implications of this resolution or of being afraid to speak up against it, lest it cost the administration Jewish votes in the next election. I do not like to believe that the State Department is either guilty of undecision or ignorance of the repercussions this resolution must have in the Near East, nor do I feel we should accuse it of political pandering for Jewish votes, just because its position today on this legislation is obscure. I prefer to believe its silence gives sincere assent to this resolution.

The second reason given here today for voting against this bill is that its passage will be bad for the Jews; that it will eventually aggravate anti-Semitism in the Near East, and abroad. That may be as it may be, but there are hundreds of thousands of Jews who would rather live in Palestine, live and breathe and eat and sleep and work there, and be badly thought of abroad, than to die as they will do, if they do not get there, and be thought a little better of. No doubt there are those like the gentleman from New York who sincerely believe that the attempt to create a homeland in Palestine will create more anti-Semitism, and for that reason are against this resolution for the sake of the Jews. But anti-Semitism will not be abated by the mere solution of the Palestine question, one way or another. Those who wish to think ill of the Jews will always be zealous in their search of reasons, and reasons will never be lacking, for there is no race on this earth which has not given cause for offense to other races, as there is no individual within a race who does not often give cause to his brother to dislike him. We are all of us, individuals, nations, and races, devilishly apt in finding reasons to praise ourselves and to belittle others.

The tragic result of such thinking is the disastrous belief that every man is his brother's enemy, no nation is a peaceful nation but a defeated or enthralled one, and in this instance that no Jew is a good Jew but a dead one. Some people who feel that way will express it

in more diplomatic language. They will seize upon the opinion that to give the Jews in Europe sanctuary or a homeland in Palestine will fan the fires of anti-Semitism and, expressing a desire to save Jews, condemn great numbers of them to homelessness, persecution, and death.

It is high time that we in America were brutally honest with ourselves about this Jewish question. There are only three things that we can do about the Jews.

First, we can, if we will, open our immigration doors to the Jews by establishing a quota for America of suffering European Jewry, and then let this number come to our country. Other nations can do what they wish about their quotas—if any. But our consciences will then be satisfied that we really do care about saving Jewish lives. To speak without acting is simply to massage our sore consciences with meaningless humanitarian utterances.

Or second, we can, if we will, insist that by diplomatic measures our administration must find a place of refuge for the Jews in Europe or in Africa, or in the place they prefer, which is Palestine, and then guarantee their right to this place, if necessary, by force of arms.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. BLOOM] seemed indignant when it was suggested by some Member on this floor that he had said America should guarantee, by force of arms, the commonwealth sought by this resolution in Palestine.

Now, if the spirit of this resolution be right and humane and just, and if it proposes a solution to this question of which this whole Congress sincerely approves, then this Congress and this Nation should be prepared to back its approval to the utmost. I do not believe that there would be the slightest danger of war in the Near East, if the will of America in this question were firmly expressed and firmly upheld. What makes the situation in the Near East explosive is our lack of firmness and our failure to uphold our will. We talk hot for Palestine and blow cold the minute we are challenged to prove that we mean it. Is it any wonder that we are creating, with our hot talk and cold actions, a situation in that part of the world which gives joy to our enemies, who claim that we are hypocritical in all our democratic promises, and grief to our friends who have believed them, and that leaves all the peoples of that part of the world in turmoil and uncertainty? The Near East is, and always has been, an international tinderbox, but if and when the flames of riots or war break out there the wind that will fan them to a holocaust will be the wind of hypocrisy on the Palestine question. There will never be peace in the Near East until the Palestine problem is settled. Let us settle it in a manner worthy of a great idealistic nation, according to our consciences, firmly and without diplomatic equivocation and double talk.

Should we have to make some small display of American arms to prove that we meant it? I do not think we should ever need to do so. But let us reflect that American equipment—equipment marked "made in America"—is being used today in Java to shoot down the natives there who are seeking their independence. When are we going to get around to keeping to the dispairful peoples of the world the high promises made in the Atlantic Charter? Shall we make more promises to the ears of suffering Jewry with this resolution, and break it to their hearts the minute it looks as though the promises we give are going to be the slightest bit troublesome? Far better to make no promises at all.

For there is a third thing we can do about the Jews—we can let them die and wash our hands of their immemorial and current tragedy, simply because we think that it is to our national interest not to become involved for their pitiful sakes, with more powerful peoples in the Near East. But the one thing we dare not do, as an honorable Christian nation, or Congress, is to weep crocodile tears over the cruel fate we have then helped to seal for them.

I hope that this resolution will not be considered as some seem to feel, a pious but meaningless gesture, which will soothe our consciences but commit us to nothing; a resolution which, in the words of many, "can do no harm, and may catch or hold some Jewish votes." I hope it will pass and mean what it promises—a permanent homeland for suffering Jewry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I believe this resolution will pass. I deplore in our own country any anti-this or anti-that or anti-the-other. I believe that the passage of this resolution will not make people anti-Jewish. It will hold out and give a haven of refuge and of peace to the Jewish people. I remind the House that the Prince of Peace, whose birthday we commemorate next Tuesday, was a Jew. I believe it will pass and I hope unanimously.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, relying upon the wisdom and stanch patriotism of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House in this matter, insofar as its present status with the State Department is concerned, I am for the passage of this resolution now.

There is no time like the present for appropriate expressions of good will, good faith, tolerance, and understanding of the problems of minority groups or peoples.

The Balfour paper, the treaty of 1925, these form a documentary foundation for the hopes and aspirations of these peoples. But what good is an international paper if it is treated as though it did not exist.

This resolution is not in effect a law when passed. It is only the sincere, clear, expression of the American Congress for the hearts and heads of the American people.

The Senate yesterday passed the self-same wording with only one negative vote. We should not do less with so few Members on the floor to vote at this late hour.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I also have seen the poignant conditions of this stateless people who have suffered most keenly from the Nazi terror and the urgency of their need. I cannot believe we can quibble over such a homeopathic resolution as this, which surely can do no harm but may, in expressing our sympathy, do some good.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as I have sat here and listened to the argument on this resolution, the technicalities advanced by some of my friends, and their mental ingenuity in opposition to this meritorious and humane resolution have amazed me. With all due respect to my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], it is very difficult for me to follow him, and I invariably do in his reasoning, to the extent that he advanced today that the passage of this resolution, and assuming that later there were established a Jewish state in Palestine, would increase anti-Semitism. It is rather difficult for me to follow also my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] in the brief observations he made. As far as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is concerned, there are several observations he made which I believe the historical facts leading up to this resolution contradict. He said, "This is not the time to press for action." That is what we heard a year ago. He said, "Why rush this through?" This is not being rushed through. Resolutions in various forms have been before the committees of both branches of the Congress for at least a year and this is only the culmination of a history going back over a year of efforts along this line. Furthermore, the resolution has been considered by the Senate committee. Everybody knows about it. Certainly it was carried extensively in the newspapers. I was conversant with it and I knew of the action of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The gentleman also said that the President has appointed a committee and we should wait for the report of that committee. The President himself has not said that, so far as 100,000 unfortunate Jews of Europe going into Palestine is concerned. The appointment of the American members of the Anglo-American commission was made with the understanding that the President would press his efforts in relation to trying to get 100,000 unfortunate Jews into Palestine. I know that. That was carried in the newspapers, but I know it myself from direct conversations I have had.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to look to the substance of this resolution and get away from the technicalities of it. Now, looking at the substance of it, what do we find? We find that 6,000,000 people have been killed during the last 4 years because of the accident of birth. It is only the act of God that none of

us, outside of those American Jews who are Members of Congress, were born of Jewish blood. Through accident of birth 6,000,000 people were exterminated. That is the evidence that has been presented within recent days in the Nuremberg trial; that is the evidence coming from official sources in Nazi Germany and admitted by our own representatives at that trial.

The substance of it is what appeals to me, the human side of it, and, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut well said, as I interpreted her statement, it is a challenge to Christianity. This is a challenge to the western civilization which is the Christian civilization.

What does the resolution do? There is nothing in it that should disturb anybody voting for it. In one of the whereases it is stated:

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees.

What is wrong with that? The other important part of the resolution is that the United States "shall use its good offices." We have done that repeatedly and on many other occasions in the past. Certainly, this humane and just resolution ought to pass and we should not permit mere technicalities to interfere with its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this resolution is in my name. I have the honor of being a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I regret that I could not take the time during general debate to answer a number of the interrogatories directed to the committee. However, I think the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader and the gracious, distinguished, and brilliant lady from Connecticut have disposed of them far better than any powers I possess.

I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New York and to the committee as well that there is not in this resolution, as it is before this House or as it was passed in the Senate, the intent either of the framers of the resolution or, as I see it and hear it and understand it elsewhere, that there be created in full bloom from the head of this Congress a political entity, a Jewish state. I want to hasten to add this, that I have the highest regard for the sincerity, the earnestness, and mental honesty of the gentleman from New York and I know exactly what he means. Segregation is a term of aspersion. These Jewish people want to go to Palestine. There is no intention or purpose to create here an international ghetto, nor is there any intention to create here a temporary ghetto, a mere expediency. The Zionist leader, Dr. Neumann, appeared before our committee. In the colloquy in answer to the gentleman from New York there is discussion relative to the Zionist movement of the creation of something in the nature of a dominion status. There is as well discussion for the creation of something that may be in the nature of that which exists with relation to Ireland and the British Empire. I asked Dr. Neumann this question: "Doctor, do you and the Zionists resist any of these propositions?" He said, "No; none." Lloyd George, when Prime Minister, in interpreting the Balfour Declaration, made it clear in reply to interrogatories similar to the statement of the gentleman from New York that he had no objection to such a proposition in due course.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman confuses me. I am strong for this resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. PLOESER. I believe in the Balfour Declaration and in the treaty.

Mr. FLOOD. Excellent.

Mr. PLOESER. I believe in it from a moral standpoint, and I never misinterpreted in my own mind as to what "national home" meant. I thought it meant a state. I endorse that, too, if that is the desire, but the gentleman says that it does not mean that.

Mr. FLOOD. I go to some pains to assure the gentleman that he misunderstood me. I concur in the statements made by the gentleman in support of the purpose and intent of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, feeling that the hour has arrived for Congress to give appropriate and timely expression to its views on the need for the restoration of Palestine as the Jewish national homeland, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 113, which was reported out by the unanimous vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, on December 18. It is this resolution that is before us today for final action, and it is in support of this resolution that I now speak.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the language of this resolution reflects a long series of authoritative expressions of American policy and the views of the American people on the subject of Palestine. In the course of recent years this policy was repeatedly endorsed by numerous Members of Congress, notably in a petition addressed to the President of the United States on November 2, 1943, by 70 Members of the Senate and 194 Members of the House of Representatives and, on July 2, 1945, only 5 months ago, by 54 Members of the Senate and 251 Members of the House of Representatives, as well as by the governors of 37 States. This same language is to be found in the resolution passed on Monday of this week by the Senate by a vive voce vote with only one vote against it. At this point in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I insert the text of the resolution:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they

may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

I would like to make it clear that the support that I have received in bringing this matter to the floor has been nonpartisan. Before the Foreign Affairs Committee hearings this week, both the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], were eloquent in their pledge and avowals to the spirit and the intention and the purpose of this resolution. Likewise, from both sides of the aisle my colleagues have expressed gratification with this action. That is a true and heartening response from you who speak for your people, for this declaration is expressive of a deep-seated sentiment in favor of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, which is widespread among the American people and represents, as I have said before, a striking reaffirmation of the traditional American policy. It was only because of the war that this Congress did not earlier state its position. It was the wish and the desire of the membership to do so, but for the good of the common defense, for matters of state, it was thought best not to do so. But time is now of the essence and the contrary is rather the fact. I feel that we are impelled to reiterate our position at this time by the horrifying reports which have been pouring in concerning the mass slaughter of European Jews—acts of brutality which have shocked decent humanity everywhere. Thank God some of these vile creatures who perpetrated these acts, the leaders at least, are being brought to justice and retribution finds its way. But these terrible facts not only call for condemnation of these godless beings who would make a god of the omnipotent state, and for sympathy for their victims, but also demands of us a statesmanlike, constructive policy which would provide a more secure and dignified future for the Jewish people in the democratic world of tomorrow.

This resolution refers to the action of the Sixty-seventh Congress on June 30, 1922, when by unanimous action this purpose was upheld. The urgency of the situation is identified by the request of President Truman for right of entry for 100,000 Jews into Palestine and the general improvement of economic and other conditions resulting, historically, from such influx in the past. Reference is then made to the Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry as to conditions in Palestine and Europe as they relate to the conditions of the Jews, and finally in the resolving clause, the action of President Truman is commended and the United States is called upon to use its good offices to the end that Palestine be opened for the free entry of Jews to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities. The measure provides further that this Government shall support "full opportunity for colonization and development", so that Jews may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine and the Jewish national home and in association with all elements of the population establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

I might say, at this time, that as far as I am concerned, personally, this resolution does not go far enough; but in the best interest of the purpose sought to be accomplished, and for the greatest good of the greatest number of those who believe in law, agreements and treaties, as well as justice and humanity, I embrace this instrument. I am convinced that great good will come, and that immediately, from the passage of this declaration and certainly no harm can arise. I feel strongly that this is the psychological moment when the sweeping opinion of this mighty assembly will tip the scales in favor of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for a people who have suffered to an extent beyond the magic of words to describe.

Here there is no purpose to create an international Jewish ghetto, so that evil, degrading curse of anti-Semitism might be encouraged. It is the Jewish people themselves who wish this haven. Here there is no purpose to create overnight a political entity; but rather to seek a democratic commonwealth through the evolution of time and circumstances which will combine through democratic processes to permit such an establishment "in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights." This is no racial or religious separatism. There is no concept of race-state or church-state relationship. A homeless people wish to go home. This is not the time to engage in a play on words, intention must not in the fullness of its spirit be sacrificed to mere form. Let us not succumb to the attractive blandishments of dialectics, never mind which came first, the chicken or the egg, or how many angels can dance on the point of a needle—people—human beings, are starving and dying and our honor to our promises, our pledges and our covenants are at stake.

At the same time, I have the deepest and most understanding respect for those who honestly and sincerely fear that this action will encourage rather than allay the vice of anti-Semitism. And in supporting this resolution, in the desire to have some action taken, your nobility of spirit and your statesmanlike conduct is to be even the more commended. I speak for millions in expressing this regard and gratitude to you.

All of the great talk at high levels about mandates, declarations, white papers, and international relations, simmers down to a case involving the lives of human beings and the future of a people. That states the problem succinctly. Appeasement as a national policy has never worked. Everywhere that it has been tried, it has failed. This is as true in Palestine as elsewhere.

There is every indication that events are moving swiftly, though cautiously, in the direction of evolving a definite program with relation to Palestine. The recent statement of the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, indicates that the objective of a Jewish national home is not beyond the acceptance of His Britannic Majesty's Government. A firm American stand, if diplomatically presented, would mobilize liberal British opinion. In fact, sections of the British public have appealed to American sympathizers to help them in their efforts to bring about a change of policy. As in so many other fields of international policy, so here, also, the issue is not between nations, but between emerging world democracy and the forces of reaction, hate and decay.

Today, in this historic hour, when the general structure of international security has been outlined, and the fate of the nations of the world is about to be decided, let us again stand united in our pledge to the Jewish people so that remnant of Israel in Europe may be saved and assured of a national home as a free and democratic commonwealth.

The Christian world approaches the eve of Christmas. Truly in this year of our Lord 1945, this birthday of the Christ child, will be a joyous feast day. There is present the spirit of freedom and rebirth that is so inspiringly set forth in the ancient cry "Peace on earth, good will among men." On this Christmas eve the Christian peoples and the Jewish peoples and all other peoples stand delivered from the plague of destruction, from the scourge of oppression and from the chains of bondage. A terrible era, desecrated by the Pharaoh curse which extended to all mankind, and the wild ride of the horsemen of the Apocalypse has come to a close; an era in which people were decimated, in which millions perished and the living were scattered to the four winds, doomed to misery, wandering, and want. On this Christmas let us sing of the miracle of deliverance and of the realization of the hoped for journey to the promised land. Let us hold out to the Jews of the world the pledge fulfilled, of the mission of the ancient Jewish homeland, in our own day, bursting upon them miraculously to provide once again the homeland and the refuge from hatred and death. Let the Christian world join in a great feast of fulfillment.

As Americans, we cannot avoid the moral problem that Palestine and the immigration of the Jews pose for us. We joined ourselves with the British in the approval of the Balfour Declaration. We joined in recognizing the British mandate over Palestine. By our passivity in the early days of Hitler's rule in Europe, we were moral partners in the disintegration of the world democratic will—a disintegration that became clear in its results—as testified to by so many of our colleagues here in the House—at Belsen, Dachau, and Buchenwald. By our action in the war, however, we became moral partners in the commitment to salvage as many of Hitler's victims as we could, and make further victimizing impossible. This, then, is an American problem as well as a British. This is the answer to those few who say, "Why should we bother? Palestine is a British headache; it is none of our business." We do not have a legal mandate in the matter; but we have the mandate of human conscience which is just as strong as any League of Nations parchment. Let us not look to a project to give the refugee Jews merely

a new and temporary ghetto, but give them their old and permanent home, where they are wanted and will be cherished, where they can make a living and a life. The Holy Land, the birthplace of the Christian and Jewish religions, can with all justice be given back to the people from whose travail a great religious impulse incorporated in two great religions had radiated throughout the world for thousands of years. It is our mission to spread further than ever before among the people of the earth the belief which all Americans cherish so deeply—that no man's liberty of conscience must be questioned as long as he does not question that of his neighbor and that men of varying faiths may live together in harmony and good will.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to this House, whose deep love of freedom is reflected in its great generosity and devotion to the suffering of humanity, to help in this realization. I ask this for the sake of the living remnant of a great people. I ask it for the sake of the dead. I ask it for the sake of the Jewish people everywhere, so that there may be some end in sight to its sorrow and pain. I ask it, at this very hour of the turning point in the history of the world, because Palestine is the only land that can receive and redeem not hundreds but hundreds of thousands. I ask it because this is the hour of unique opportunity, of direct necessity, of greater urgency. This is the hour, Mr. Chairman, for the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to point the way as a beacon, to a haven of peace after the long voyage home, to declare that Palestine offers the strongest bridgehead to the shores of true freedom and true deliverance for our brothers in the great brotherhood of man who are sons of Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 113—and ask its immediate and unanimous adoption.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I make this observation about something that was mentioned earlier, that is, the courage the Committee on Foreign Affairs has shown in bringing out this resolution. I do not think it is any business of the State Department or anyone else. We should legislate in this Hall and not depend on the State Department.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman for his usual helpful remarks.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the unkindest cut of all which could be offered in presentation of one's position or against another's position in the matter of this resolution is the indication or intimation that any man worthy of occupying the high position as a Member of the House of Representatives of the free United States of America would be moved in his action by anything relating to religion, race, creed, or color. I deny and I challenge the accusation, whether it be made with reference to one's action on the right side of the aisle or the left. It is a matter of judgment as to whether at this particular time we are doing a service or a disservice to the very people we would all like to help in every way under the sun. It is the opinion of the speaker at this time that there is great danger that it may prove to be a serious disservice.

There is no probability or potentiality, connected with this resolution, which would offer help, aid, or security to the Jewish people of the world who are in distress and toward whom every one of us has the deepest sympathy and for whom every single one of us has the greatest concern. Why press this resolution at this time in face of the fact that the President of the United States has made arrangements by which the United States of America, in its deep concern for all the peoples of all the world, has provided what is referred to as a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry with the admonition and requirement that that committee shall act promptly and shall report within 120 days the result of the inquiry which shall have been made. We will have the benefit of that report when that time shall have expired. I think it is quite unkind also to stand and deny that the President of the United States has requested that we do not superimpose ourselves upon his efforts in this great and important matter by passing the resolution in the face of the provision he has made for this Anglo-American inquiry and its report. My position is that we will do a great disservice for the people we are trying to help. I have no disposition to act on the basis of race, creed, or color, as I have demonstrated with regard to the Negro race in this House. I do not have to answer for bigotry as to any race or creed. We may do the greatest disservice, by the adoption of this resolution, to the very people whom we want to help. This can be no more than a gesture and one that could be costly to them as well as to our country, of which many of them are citizens. Why not give this President's committee an opportunity to work out the problem intelligently.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take too much time, but I want to clear up one or two misunderstandings that have developed during this debate.

At the inception I want to speak of a prophecy made many centuries ago by the great Hebrew prophet, Isaiah, when he said:

> Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return and come with singing into Zion.

I pray that that prophecy may now be fulfilled.

You ladies and gentlemen of the House would do well to adopt this resolution, consonant with that prophecy of that great Jewish prophet Isaiah.

Remember, the immigration bars are up all over the world. There is no place on God's greensward where the Jew is not unwanted, except in Palestine. There he may live in dignity, unafraid. Now a cruel colonial policy of the British Government seals the doors of Palestine. The Jews have a right to go to Palestine. It has been proclaimed time out of mind their national home. The mandate that Great Britain was given over Palestine was given with the understanding that Great Britain would exercise only trusteeship, not ownership, over Zion, to the end that there would be established, through the instrumentality of His Majesty's Government, a Jewish national home.

We adopted in this Chamber in 1922 a resolution almost word for word with the resolution you are going to adopt today, whereby we proclaimed again Palestine as the Jewish national home, and we entered into a solemn treaty with Great Britain in 1924 where we reiterated that Palestine was again to be the national homeland for the Jews.

We further stated by that treaty, and agreed with England, that England would not have the right to discriminate on the basis of race or religion with reference either to the immigration into Palestine or land ownership in Palestine. But in 1939 Great Britain adopted the nefarious and infamous Malcolm-McDonald white paper, which flatly, blatantly, and with the greatest perfidy violated the treaty with the United States, violated the mandate that Britain had over Palestine, violated the Balfour Declaration. Britain did in that white paper discriminate against the Jews only. Nor was this discrimination on religious and racial ground. The mandates committee of the League of Nations, when England asked whether she could have the right to issue that white paper, not only said to Great Britain, "You have no right to issue that white paper precluding the Jews from Palestine, but we denounce in no uncertain terms your attempt to deny Palestine to the Jews."

Now we are trying to rectify those errors by this resolution. We call Britain to task for her perfidy. We challenge her to continue her injustice to the Jews. There has never been any doubt over the years that "Jewish national homeland" means a Jewish commonwealth. The Big Four, after the first World War, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Wilson, and Orlando placed that interpretation on Jewish national home. Marshal Smuts, Lord Wedgwood, Harding, Coolidge, Roosevelt, all spoke of a Jewish democratic commonwealth.

Churchill himself, when he denounced the white paper on Palestine in 1939 which first limited and then barred completely Jewish immigration into Palestine, called it a filing of petition in moral bankruptcy.

Attlee, Morrison, and Bevin, Labor Party leaders, loudly proclaimed before election that they would see to it that there would be: First, unlimited Jewish immigration into Palestine; second, the ultimate establishment of a democratic Jewish commonwealth; third—and here they went further than anybody else—the shifting of Arabs out of Palestine to let the Jews enter.

Our own two major political parties in the last Presidential campaign came out solidly for a commonwealth and both Presidential candidates endorsed that plank in the platforms.

A Jewish state simply means a state where the Jews will be in a majority. It

means they will not live in a ghetto subject to the wiles, machinations, and maneuver of the leaders of a hostile majority.

It was never intended that Palestine should be set up as an Arab state. That is what "perfidious Albion" desires.

There is no idea in a commonwealth of a theocracy. There is no idea of a religious state. It simply means a state where the Jews will be in a majority and need not forever live in a ghetto.

Contrary to the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], a commonwealth does not mean all Jews must go to Palestine. That is absurd. Some of our smug, self-satisfied economic Bourbon Jews say that. They speak falsely. The American who is a Jew remains firmly, indissolubly an American. The American who is a Jew is an American first, last, and all the time. No one can argue to the contrary. It would be absurd to argue that the Irish-American who advocates the unification of Ireland must go back to Ireland, or because a Polish-American is in favor of a "greater Poland," he must go back to Poland. Contrary to the observations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], there is no danger of a greater segregation. Unfortunately, anti-Semitism is so deep that it will exist no matter what we do with this resolution.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] asks why the rush? He speaks of the Anglo-American commission of inquiry. That is only a dodge and a stall for British delay. Whenever the British are forced to make a decision, they invoke the trick of a commission of inquiry. There have already been numerous commissions and reports—the Crane report, the Peel commission, the mandates commission, the Harrison report, the Eisenhower report, the Rifkind report, the joint distribution committee report.

All facts are known. There is no need for any more reports with consequent delays. The Jews are languishing in concentration camps. They are dying by the thousands by the roadsides. Their disembodied spirits could not wait for inquiries. The winter's cold does not wait for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]. Death awaits no one, not even the recommendations of the Anglo-American commission of inquiry.

We must now have action to implement promises.

Let Britain dare to refuse to abide by the resolution we passed today. She will then stand condemned before the court of public opinion the world over.

Somebody spoke of our doing a disservice to the Jews if we pass this resolution. The Jews themselves are the best judges of the worthwhileness of this resolution. They want it. They do not fear the Arabs. The Jews can take care of themselves. They have before.

If permitted to have their own brigade as well as a few airplanes and tanks, they could easily disperse and defeat the horsemen and camel riders of the desert. No one has asked for the use of American troops in Palestine. They are not needed there.

Pass this resolution as an act of mercy, as an act of justice, as an act of righteousness.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOGARTY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 113, pursuant to House Resolution 466, he reported the resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the resolution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the motion comes too late.

The SPEAKER. Just a moment.

The Chair really thinks the gentleman from New York is too late with his motion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was seeking recognition, Mr. Speaker, vocally at the time.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman says he was on his feet for that purpose, the Chair, of course, will accept the gentleman's word.

Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WADSWORTH moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 36, noes 133.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which House Concurrent Resolution 113, relating to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews, were vacated and the resolution was laid on the table.

FREIGHT FORWARDERS DESIGNATED CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 914) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 19, sec. 1551) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 551. BONDING OF CARRIERS.—Under such regulations and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, any common carrier of merchandise owning or operating a railroad, steamship, or other transportation line or route for the transportation of merchandise in the United States, or any freight forwarder, as defined in section 402 of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, title 49, sec. 1002 (5)), upon application, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be designated as a carrier of bonded merchandise for the final release of which from customs custody a permit has not been issued."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Senate bill S. 914, which was passed in the Senate October 22 and reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means in the House December 17, without amendment, is an important, although simple, amendment to section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The nature and purpose of the bill is more fully explained in the report of the committee. Specifically, it simply authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to designate freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise, along with railroads, steamship lines, and other common carriers. The purpose of Section 551 as it reads now is to protect bonded merchandise while in the possession of a common carrier. Bonded merchandise consists usually of imported articles received at various ports of entry in the United States and immediately shipped to their respective destinations where the required duty is paid.

As stated in the committee's report, only those common carriers who own or operate railroad, steamship, or other transportation lines or routes are eligible to transport such imported merchandise in bond. But for more than 10 years the Treasury Department has interpreted this section as being applicable to freight forwarders, and many freight forwarders have, pursuant to the statute, been designated as carriers of bonded merchandise. This conception of the statute was not questioned until recently when the Treasury Department advised a company engaged in freight forwarding that its bonding would be discontinued because the old regulation was deemed to have been upon a misconception of section 551 of the Tariff Act.

Now it transpires that all freight forwarders are threatened with a loss of their bonds and will no longer be eligible to carry bonded merchandise. This presents a very serious situation, which must be corrected immediately because the Treasury Department has indicated that they can no longer designate freight forwarders as bonded carriers after December 31, this year.

The bill will not change any present administrative practice or policy. It creates no new power or authority in the Secretary of the Treasury, and from the standpoint of the Department is entirely acceptable.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read and the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news release under today's date relative to FHA loans to veterans.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, previously permission was given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a copy of a letter I addressed to the Attorney General of the United States on December 10 relative to the gas rebates in the Detroit area and a copy of his reply dated December 14, 1945, to which are attached several exhibits. The Public Printer advises that the material will make approximately 5 pages in the RECORD and that the cost will be $260. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent that this material may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension will be made.

There was no objection.

SHORTAGE OF HOUSING

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, when the emergency of war came upon us, the Nation responded with a determination and with a virility that astounded the world. We met that emergency. We needed ships, planes, tanks, and guns. We needed factories in which to build them. We built these factories. We produced the necessary war materials—without delay. There is another emergency upon us now, and it is an acute one. I refer to the shortage of housing. The problem is most serious, and yet we appear helpless in the face of that emergency. Why cannot this Government meet this situation with the same determination, with the same spirit, and with the same energy with which it met the great war emergency? We must build houses and build them now. We can build them, and we can build them now.

I need not discuss at length the seriousness of the housing situation. Recently I read in the New York Times the report of the mayor-elect's emergency committee on housing. In that report the committee states that some form of shelter must be provided in the city of New York for at least 40,000 families—for 140,000 persons. Add to that report the statement of Mayor LaGuardia that at a recent conference of mayors it was disclosed the same situation exists throughout the country. It is disheartening to read in the same report that, except for makeshift expediencies, there can be no hope of any new housing ready for occupancy until 1947. I cannot accept that conclusion. We need not accept it. I repeat, we must build, and build now. It must be done, and it can be done.

What is holding up this building program? I can understand why private industry will not build. They tell us you cannot expect a man to build, not knowing what return he will get on his investment. Likewise, how can you expect private industry to build when industry cannot now know whether essential building materials will be available? Nor can the cost of construction be figured, not knowing what the cost of materials and what the cost of labor will be. Mayor LaGuardia, in his radio speech of last week, pointed out the seriousness of the situation when he stated that he could not let a contract for construction of a housing project because no contractor could estimate today what it would cost to build. The reasons for the delay may be good or bad—but that is beside the point. The fact is that there is no real construction in progress now. What are we to do? Are we to stand by and do nothing to break the bottleneck? Are we to do nothing to provide relief, not only for returning veterans and war workers but for the tens of thousands of our citizens who need shelter? I say that if we approach this problem as vigorously as we approached the problems that confronted us at the outbreak of the war we can solve it, and we must solve it at once.

When the Government decided that it needed those tremendous war materials, we cast aside every obstacle in our way. If the Government needed a building site, it took it. If it had to build a plant, it ordered it built. Nobody could, or did, stand in the way of the advancement of the war program. Nothing and nobody need stand in the way of our solving the emergency building problem now.

I therefore propose that the Congress vest in the President of the United States, or in any agency which he may designate, the power to build such housing accommodations as he may deem necessary, in such manner as he may deem advisable, and in such places as he may deem for the best interests of the country. I recommend that he use his war powers in order to accomplish this objective. Contracts should be let at once subject to renegotiation. The President should have the power to requisition whatever material may be necessary. No lack of power should stand in his way to accomplish the necessary objective.

I know there are many who object to Government intervention in a field that they deem reserved for private enterprise. The program I propose, however, will not interfere with private enterprise. The buildings will be built by private industry and I propose that after they are constructed, the Government sell those buildings to private management, reserving the right to manage them only until such time as it is able to sell. This program will constitute no interference with private enterprise. It will merely utilize the great powers of Government to remove obstacles now in the way of immediate large-scale construction.

I have introduced a bill today to accomplish the following purposes:

First. To authorize and direct the President of the United States through such agencies as he may designate to commence construction of housing facilities in any part of this country that he may deem necessary and essential for the public welfare.

Second. To requisition such material wherever it may be for the purpose of carrying out the building program.

Third. To condemn such sites and acquire such land as may be necessary for that program.

Fourth. To let out contracts to private industry on any basis he may deem most expeditious for the purpose of this construction.

Fifth. Upon the completion of any structure, to sell it to private management for the best price obtainable, reserving the right to manage until the sale is effectuated.

Only through Government intervention and the Government exercising of its wide powers can we provide the needed housing.

I am not concerned about the cost of the program. If I have any experience in real estate at all—and I have been chairman of the Mortgage Commission of the State of New York, having supervised the management of over 4,000 buildings, the reorganization and refinancing of over 20,000 mortgage issues, and having had control of $700,000,000 worth of mortgages—I feel confident that the loss that the Government may sustain as a result of this program, if indeed any at all, will far be offset by the good it will do in solving the problem that confronts the country today. This great emergency arises out of the war and it becomes the duty of our Government to meet it.

It may be desirable to lend England $4,000,000,000. I know it was necessary to give UNRRA $2,700,000,000. I claim it is just as important, in fact, it is imperative that we provide for the urgent needs of our people.

Recently a young lady who visited the Capital made the remark that "within the walls of the Capitol Building anything can be done." She is pretty nearly right. We can, if we will, build houses now. We should and we must.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD in another instance.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RANDOLPH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication on Navy demobilization addressed to all Members of Congress.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to include as part of her remarks certain information.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include certain excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in committee today and to include certain excerpts, statements, and several articles.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and to include editorials and news articles.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my message of September 6, 1945, I stated that I would communicate with the Congress from time to time during the current session with respect to a comprehensive and continuous program of national security. I pointed out the necessity of making timely preparation for the Nation's long-range security now, while we are still mindful of what it has cost us in this war to have been unprepared.

On October 23, 1945, as part of that program, there was presented for your consideration a proposal for universal military training. It was based upon the necessities of maintaining a well-trained citizenry which could be quickly mobilized in time of need in support of a small professional Military Establishment. Long and extensive hearings have now been held by the Congress on this recommendation. I think that the proposal, in principle, has met with the overwhelming approval of the people of the United States.

We are discharging our armed forces now at the rate of 1,500,000 a month. We can with fairness no longer look to the veterans of this war for any future military service. It is essential therefore that universal training be instituted at the earliest possible moment to provide a reserve upon which we can draw if, unhappily, it should become necessary. A grave responsibility will rest upon the Congress if it continues to delay this most important and urgent measure.

Today, again in the interest of national security and world peace, I make this further recommendation to you. I recommend that the Congress adopt legislation combining the War and Navy Departments into one single Department of National Defense. Such unification is another essential step—along with universal training—in the development of a comprehensive and continuous program for our future safety and for the peace and security of the world.

One of the lessons which have most clearly come from the costly and dangerous experience of this war is that there must be unified direction of land, sea and air forces at home as well as in all other parts of the world where our armed forces are serving.

We did not have that kind of direction when we were attacked 4 years ago—and we certainly paid a high price for not having it.

In 1941, we had two completely independent organizations with no well-established habits of collaboration and cooperation between them. If disputes arose, if there was failure to agree on a question of planning or a question of action, only the President of the United States could make a decision effective on both. Besides, in 1941, the air power of the United States was not organized on a par with the ground and sea forces.

Our expedient for meeting these defects was the creation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On this committee sat the President's Chief of Staff and the chiefs of the land forces, the naval forces, and the air forces. Under the joint chiefs were organized a number of committees bringing together personnel of the three services for joint strategic planning and for coordination of operations. This kind of coordination was better than no coordination at all, but it was in no sense a unified command.

In the theaters of operation, meanwhile, we went further in the direction of unity by establishing unified commands. We came to the conclusion—soon confirmed by experience—that any extended military effort required overall coordinated control in order to get the most out of the three armed forces. Had we not early in the war adopted this principle of a unified command for operations, our efforts, no matter how heroic, might have failed.

But we never had comparable unified direction or command in Washington. And even in the field our unity of operations was greatly impaired by the differences in training, in doctrine, in communication systems, and in supply and distribution systems, that stemmed from the division of leadership in Washington.

It is true we were able to win in spite of these handicaps. But it is now time to take stock, to discard obsolete organizational forms and to provide for the future the soundest, the most effective and the most economical kind of structure for our armed forces of which this most powerful Nation is capable.

I urge this as the best means of keeping the peace.

No nation now doubts the good will of the United States for the maintenance of a lasting peace in the world. Our purpose is shown by our efforts to establish an effective United Nations Organization. But all nations—and particularly those unfortunate nations which have felt the heel of the Nazis, the Fascists, or the Japs—know that desire for peace is futile unless there is also enough strength ready and willing to enforce that desire in any emergency. Among the things that have encouraged aggression and the spread of war in the past have been the unwillingness of the United States realistically to face this fact, and her refusal to fortify her aims of peace before the forces of aggression could gather in strength.

Now that our enemies have surrendered it has again become all too apparent that a portion of the American people are anxious to forget all about the war, and particularly to forget all the unpleasant factors which are required to prevent future wars.

Whether we like it or not, we must all recognize that the victory which we have won has placed upon the American people the continuing burden of responsibility for world leadership. The future peace of the world will depend in large

part upon whether or not the United States shows that it is really determined to continue in its role as a leader among nations. It will depend upon whether or not the United States is willing to maintain the physical strength necessary to act as a safeguard against any future aggressor. Together with the other United Nations, we must be willing to make the sacrifices necessary to protect the world from future aggressive warfare. In short, we must be prepared to maintain in constant and immediate readiness sufficient military strength to convince any future potential aggressor that this Nation, in its determination for a lasting peace, means business.

We would be taking a grave risk with the national security if we did not move now to overcome permanently the present imperfections in our defense organization. However great was the need for coordination and unified command in World War II, it is sure to be greater if there is any future aggression against world peace. Technological developments have made the armed services much more dependent upon each other than ever before. The boundaries that once separated the Army's battlefield from the Navy's battlefield have been virtually erased. If there is ever going to be another global conflict, it is sure to take place simultaneously on land and sea and in the air, with weapons of ever greater speed and range. Our combat forces must work together in one team as they have never been required to work together in the past.

We must assume, further, that another war would strike much more suddenly than the last, and that it would strike directly at the United States. We cannot expect to be given the opportunity again to experiment in organization and in ways of teamwork while the fighting proceeds. True preparedness now means preparedness not alone in armaments and numbers of men, but preparedness in organization also. It means establishing in peacetime the kind of military organization which will be able to meet the test of sudden attack quickly and without having to improvise radical readjustment in structure and habits.

The basic question is what organization will provide the most effective employment of our military resources in time of war and the most effective means for maintaining peace. The manner in which we make this transition in the size, composition, and organization of the armed forces will determine the efficiency and cost of our national defense for many years to come.

Improvements have been made since 1941 by the President in the organization of the War and Navy Departments under the War Powers Act. Unless the Congress acts before these powers lapse, these Departments will revert to their prewar organizational status. This would be a grievous mistake.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff are not a unified command. It is a committee which must depend for its success upon the voluntary cooperation of its member agencies. During the war period of extreme national danger, there was, of course, a high degree of cooperation. In peacetime the situation will be different. It must not be taken for granted that the Joint Chiefs of Staff as now constituted will be as effective in the apportionment of peacetime resources as they have been in the determination of war plans and in their execution. As national defense appropriations grow tighter, and as conflicting interests make themselves felt in major issues of policy and strategy, unanimous agreements will become more difficult to reach.

It was obviously impossible in the midst of conflict to reorganize the armed forces of the United States along the lines here suggested. Now that our enemies have surrendered, I urge the Congress to proceed to bring about a reorganization of the management of the armed forces.

Further studies of the general problem would serve no useful purpose. There is enough evidence now at hand to demonstrate beyond question the need for a unified department. A great many of the reasons for establishing a single department have been brought out already in public discussion and in congressional committee hearings. To me the most important reasons for combining the two existing Departments are these:

1. We should have integrated strategic plans and a unified military program and budget.

With the coming of peace, it is clear that we must not only continue, but strengthen, our present facilities for integrated planning. We cannot have the sea, land, and air members of our defense team working at what may turn out to be cross purposes, planning their programs on different assumptions as to the nature of the Military Establishment we need, and engaging in an open competition for funds.

Strategy, program, and budget are all aspects of the same basic decisions. Using the advice of our scientists and our intelligence officers, we must make the wisest estimate as to the probable nature of any future attack upon us, determine accordingly how to organize and deploy our military forces, and allocate the available manpower, matériel, and financial resources in a manner consistent with the over-all plan.

Up to the present time, the make-up and balance of our armed forces have not been planned as a whole. Programs and budget requests from the Army and Navy have been formulated separately, on the basis of independent concepts of mission and function. These separate programs and budgets have not been considered together until after they have passed out of military hands and even out of the hands of the Secretaries of War and the Navy. The whole job of reconciling the divergent claims of the Departments has been thrust upon the President and the Congress.

This war has demonstrated completely that the resources of this Nation in manpower and in raw materials are not unlimited. To realize this is to comprehend the urgent need for finding a way to allocate these resources intelligently among the competing services. This means designing a balanced military structure reflecting a considered apportionment of responsibility among the services for the performance of a joint mission.

From experience as a Member of the Congress, I know the great difficulty of appraising properly the over-all security needs of the Nation from piecemeal presentations by separate departments appearing before separate congressional committees at different times. It is only by combining the armed forces into a single department that the Congress can have the advantage of considering a single coordinated and comprehensive security program.

2. We should realize the economies that can be achieved through unified control of supply and service functions.

Instances of duplication among Army and Navy activities and facilities have been brought to the attention of the Congress on many occasions. The degree of unity that was accomplished during the war in strategic planning and in theater command is in striking contrast with the separatism that prevailed in the whole range of supply and service functions.

It will never be possible to achieve absolute coordination of the supply and service functions of all services. Neither the War Department nor the Navy Department has been able to eliminate all duplication even within its own organization. But there is no question that the extent of waste through lack of coordination between the two Departments is very much greater than the waste resulting from fauity coordination within each. If we can attain as much coordination among all the services as now exists within each Department, we shall realize extensive savings.

Consolidation of the Departments will, for example, reduce the volume of supplies that need to be procured. Supply requirements, for example, begin with a calculation of so many items per man to be supplied. But to this basic figure must be added margins of safety, to account for items in storage, transportation lags, break-downs in delivery, emergency demands, and so forth. In these margins, savings can be made through unified systems of supply. As the volume handled in any supply system grows, the percentage factor which has to be added for reserves is reduced.

In the same way, both the Army and the Navy must add a margin of safety to their requirements for production plants, depots, hospitals, air training fields, and other types of construction common to both services. When the requirements are pooled, the total amount of margin may be reduced. The same is true of personnel. Each service must add a margin of safety in estimating its requirements for doctors, nurses, skilled mechanics, and other types of specialists. The total margin is greater if the computations are made separately. Another source of economy will be the pooling of facilities and personnel in localities where at present both services have to operate, but where from the nature of the circumstances, facilities and personnel are not fully used.

Other examples of duplication could be cited. Businessmen have to deal with separate buyers, who may use separate specifications for items which could as well have the same specifications. Separate inspectors are stationed in their

plants. During this war, instances occurred where the purchase of all available quantities of certain items by one service resulted in acute shortages in the other service. Parallel transportation and storage systems required extra overhead.

As the war progressed, it is true that increased cooperation reduced the extent of waste and conflict. But voluntary cooperation in such matters can never be expected to be fully effective. A single authority at the top would inevitably achieve a greater degree of economy than would be obtained under divided direction.

3. We should adopt the organizational structure best suited to fostering coordination between the military and the remainder of the Government.

Our military policy and program are only a part of a total national program aimed at achieving our national objectives of security and peace. This total program has many aspects, and many agencies of the Government must participate in its execution.

Our military policy, for example, should be completely consistent with our foreign policy. It should be designed to support and reflect our commitments to the United Nations Organization. It should be adjusted according to the success or lack of success of our diplomacy. It should reflect our fullest knowledge of the capabilities and intentions of other powers. Likewise, our foreign policy should take into account our military capabilities and the strategic power of our armed forces.

A total security program has still other major aspects. A military program, standing alone, is useless. It must be supported in peacetime by planning for industrial mobilization and for development of industrial and raw-material resources where these are insufficient. Programs of scientific research must be developed for military purposes, and their results woven into the defense program. The findings of our intelligence service must be applied to all of these.

Formulation and execution of a comprehensive and consistent national program embracing all these activities are extremely difficult tasks. They are made more difficult the greater the number of departments and agencies whose policies and programs have to be coordinated at the top level of the executive branch. They are simplified as the number of these agencies can be reduced.

The consolidation of the War and Navy Departments would greatly facilitate the ease and speed with which the armed forces and the other departments could exchange views and come to agreement on matters of common concern. It would minimize the extent to which interservice differences have to be discussed and settled by the civilian leaders whose main concern should be the more fundamental job of building over-all national policy.

4. We should provide the strongest means for civilian control of the military.

Civilian control of the Military Establishment—one of the most fundamental of our democratic concepts—would be strengthened if the President and the Congress had but one Cabinet member with clear and primary responsibility for the exercise of that control. When the Military Establishment is divided between two civilian Secretaries, each is limited necessarily to a restricted view of the Military Establishment. Consequently, on many fundamental issues where the civilian point of view should be controlling, the Secretaries of the two Departments are cast in the role of partisans of their respective services, and real civilian control can be exercised by no one except the President or the Congress.

During and since the war, the need for joint action by the services and for objective recommendations on military matters has led inevitably to increasing the authority of the only joint organization and the most nearly objective organization that exists, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff are a strictly military body. Responsibility for civilian control should be clearly fixed in a single full-time civilian below the President. This requires a Secretary for the entire Military Establishment, aided by a strong staff of civilian assistants.

There is no basis for the fear that such an organization would lodge too much power in a single individual, that the concentration of so much military power would lead to militarism. There is no basis for such fear as long as the traditional policy of the United States is followed that a civilian, subject to the President, the Congress, and the will of the people, be placed at the head of this Department. The safety of the democracy of the United States lies in the solid good sense and unshakable conviction of the American people. They need have no fear that their democratic liberties will be imperiled so long as they continue fulfilling their duties of citizenship.

5. We should organize to provide parity for air power.

Air power has been developed to a point where its responsibilities are equal to those of land and sea power, and its contribution to our strategic planning is as great. In operation, air power receives its separate assignment in the execution of an over-all plan. These facts were finally recognized in this war in the organizational parity which was granted to air power within our principal unified commands.

Parity for air power can be achieved in one department or in three, but not in two. As between one department and three, the former is infinitely to be preferred. The advantages of a single department are indeed much clearer when the alternative is seen to be three departments rather than the present two. The existence of three departments would complicate tremendously every problem of coordination that now exists between the War and Navy Departments, and between the services and the rest of the Government.

The Cabinet is not merely a collection of executives administering different governmental functions. It is a body whose combined judgment the President uses to formulate the fundamental policies of the administration. In such a group, which is designed to develop teamwork wisdom on all subjects that affect the political life of the country, it would be inappropriate and unbalanced to have three members representing three different instruments of national defense.

The President, as Commander in Chief, should not personally have to coordinate the Army and Navy and Air Force. With all the other problems before him, the President cannot be expected to balance either the organization, the training or the practice of the several branches of national defense. He should be able to rely for that coordination upon civilian hands at the Cabinet level.

6. We should establish the most advantageous framework for a unified system of training for combined operations of land, sea, and air.

Whatever the form which any future war may take, we know that the men of our separate services will have to work together in many kinds of combinations for many purposes. The Pacific campaign of the recent war is an outstanding example of common and joint effort among land, sea, and air forces. Despite its successes, that campaign proved that there is not adequate understanding among the officers and men of any service of the capabilities, the uses, the procedures, and the limitations of the other services.

This understanding is not something that can be created overnight whenever a combined operation is planned and a task force organized. The way men act in combat is determined by the sum total of all their previous training, indoctrination, and experience.

What we seek is a structure which can best produce an integrated training program, carry on merged training activities where that is appropriate, and permit officers to be assigned in such a way that an individual officer will learn first-hand of other services besides the one in which he has specialized. The organizational framework most conducive to this kind of unified training and doctrine is a unified department.

7. We should allocate systematically our limited resources for scientific research.

No aspect of military preparedness is more important than scientific research. Given the limited amount of scientific talent that will be available for military purposes, we must systematically apply that talent to research in the most promising lines and on the weapons with the greatest potentiality, regardless of the service in which these weapons will be used. We cannot afford to waste any of our scientific resources in duplication of effort.

This does not mean that all Army and Navy laboratories would be immediately or even ultimately consolidated. The objective should be to preserve initiative and enterprise while eliminating duplication and misdirected effort. This can be accomplished only if we have an organizational structure which will permit fixing responsibility at the top for coordination among the services.

8. We should have unity of command in outlying bases.

All military authority at each of our outlying bases should be placed under a single commander who will have clear responsibility for security, who can be

held clearly accountable, and whose orders come from a single authority in Washington. Reconnaissance planes, radar sets, and intelligence and counter-intelligence measures at a United States outpost are not intended to serve separate services for different purposes. Unification of the services offers a far greater guaranty of continued unity in the field than does our present organization.

9. We should have consistent and equitable personnel policies.

There have been differences in personnel policies between the Army and the Navy during the war. They began with competitive recruitment for certain types of persons, and continued in almost every phase of personnel administration. In rates of promotion, in ways of selecting officers, in the utilization of Reserve officers, in awards and decorations, in allowances, and in point systems for discharge, the two services have followed different policies.

This inconsistency is highly undesirable. It will be reduced to a minimum under a unified organization.

Any bill which is enacted to carry out these recommendations cannot provide immediately the ultimate organization plan to accomplish unification. It can only prescribe the general organization of the authorities at the top levels of the unified department.

I recommend that the reorganization of the armed services be along the following broad lines.

(1) There should be a single Department of National Defense. This Department should be charged with the full responsibility for armed national security. It should consist of the armed and civilian forces that are now included within the War and Navy Departments.

(2) The head of this Department should be a civilian, a member of the President's Cabinet, to be designated as the Secretary of National Defense. Under him there should be a civilian Under Secretary and several civilian Assistant Secretaries.

(3) There should be three coordinated branches of the Department of National Defense: One for the land forces, one for the naval forces, and one for the air forces, each under an Assistant Secretary. The Navy should, of course, retain its own carrier-, ship-, and water-based aviation, which has proved so necessary for efficient fleet operation. And, of course, the Marine Corps should be continued as an integral part of the Navy.

(4) The Under Secretary and the remaining Assistant Secretaries should be available for assignment to whatever duties the President and the Secretary may determine from time to time.

(5) The President and the Secretary should be provided with ample authority to establish central coordinating and service organizations, both military and civilian, where these are found to be necessary. Some of these might be placed under Assistant Secretaries, some might be organized as central service organizations, and some might be organized in a top military staff to integrate the military leadership of the Department. I do not believe that we can specify at this time the exact nature of these organizations. They must be developed over a period of time by the President and the Secretary as a normal part of their executive responsibilities. Sufficient strength in these Department-wide elements of the Department, as opposed to the separate service elements, will insure that real unification is ultimately obtained. The President and the Secretary should not be limited in their authority to establish Department-wide coordinating and service organizations.

(6) There should be a Chief of Staff of the Department of National Defense. There should also be a commander for each of the three component branches—Army, Navy, and Air.

(7) The Chief of Staff and the commanders of the three coordinate branches of the Department should together constitute an advisory body to the Secretary of National Defense and to the President. There should be nothing to prevent the President, the Secretary, and other civilian authorities from communicating with the commanders of any of the components of the Department on such vital matters as basic military strategy and policy and the division of the budget. Furthermore, the key staff positions in the Department should be filled with officers drawn from all the services, so that the thinking of the Department would not be dominated by any one or two of the services.

As an additional precaution, it would be wise if the post of Chief of Staff were rotated among the several services, whenever practicable and advisable, at least during the period of evolution of the new unified Department. The tenure of the individual officer designated to serve as Chief of Staff should be relatively short—2 or 3 years—and should not, except in time of a war emergency declared by the Congress, be extended beyond that period.

Unification of the services must be looked upon as a long-term job. We all recognize that there will be many complications and difficulties. Legislation of the character outlined will provide us with the objective, and with the initial means whereby forward-looking leadership in the Department, both military and civilian, can bring real unification into being. Unification is much more than a matter of organization. It will require new viewpoints, new doctrine, and new habits of thinking throughout the departmental structure. But in the comparative leisure of peacetime, and utilizing the skill and experience of our staff and field commanders who brought us victory, we should start at once to achieve the most efficient instrument of national safety.

Once a unified department has been established, other steps necessary to the formulation of a comprehensive national security program can be taken with greater ease. Much more than a beginning has already been made in achieving consistent political and military policy through the establishment of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. With respect to military research, I have in a previous message to the Congress proposed the establishment of a Federal research agency, among whose responsibilities should be the promotion and coordination of fundamental research pertaining to the defense and security of the Nation. The development of a coordinated, Government-wide intelligence system is in process. As the advisability of additional action to insure a broad and coordinated program of national security becomes clear, I shall make appropriate recommendations or take the necessary action to that end.

The American people have all been enlightened and gratified by the free discussion which has taken place within the services and before the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Congress, the people, and the President have benefited from a clarification of the issues that could have been provided in no other way. But however strong the opposition that has been expressed by some of our outstanding senior officers and civilians, I can assure the Congress that once unification has been determined upon as the policy of this Nation, there is no officer or civilian in any service who will not contribute his utmost to make the unification a success.

I make these recommendations in the full realization that we are undertaking a task of greatest difficulty. But I am certain that when the task is accomplished, we shall have a Military Establishment far better adapted to carry out its share of our national program for achieving peace and security.

HARRY TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 19, 1945.*

UNIFICATION OF WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential message on the need for unification of the War and Navy Departments to establish a single Department of Defense, just read to this House, is to me most gratifying. The gentleman from Alabama, Chairman MANASCO, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has given assurance that consideration by his group, of which I am a member, will be held early next year on H. R. 550, which I have continued to introduce since 1939. I trust that the Congress, by appropriate action, will in the near future enact the necessary legislation which our Chief Executive advocates. The proposal is sound and vital to America's future welfare. The country is solidly behind such a meritorious program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW, until January 10, on account of personal business.

To Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HEDRICK (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), on account of sickness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1415. An act to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings on H. R. 4781 on Thursday and Friday mornings, January 24 and 25, 1946, at 10 o'clock.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5056. A bill to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 5057. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to provide that the disposal of surplus property to veterans be given priority over all other disposals of surplus property except transfers of surplus property to other Government agencies for their own use; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 5058. A bill to provide military or naval training for all male citizens who attain the age of 18 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 5059. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5060. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 5061. A bill to provide a method of relieving the existing acute housing shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5062. A bill to make more effective the veterans' preference under the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 5063. A bill to repeal section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5064. A bill to amend section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5065. A bill for the relief of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5066. A bill to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. J. Res. 295. Joint Resolution to provide for a proper ceremony commemorating the flag which flew over the Capitol on declaration of war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, and which has now been flown in those surrendered countries, and for the creation of a commission to provide a proper celebration of such flag and to preserve and perpetuate war flags and symbols and all the records pertaining thereto; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to provide for the mobilization of scientific skills and industrial facilities to perfect and manufacture atomic energy for use and application to peaceful productive purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5067. A bill for the relief of John C. Schoch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 5068. A bill for the relief of Foster Boat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5069. A bill for the relief of Mattie A. Horner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5071. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Foster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Arthur De Filippis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5073. A bill for the relief of T. N. Carlton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1427. By Mr. CHENOWETH: Memorial of Colorado General Assembly, requesting Congress to amend the Social Security Act to permit the needy aged to receive old age assistance while being inmates of public institutions, provided, that they have not been committed to such institution by a court, that they pay for their care in such institution, and that they may enter or leave such institution upon their free choice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1428. Also, memorial of Colorado General Assembly, requesting Congress to conduct an investigation of conditions existing in connection with the administration of the national forests, to the end that legislation may be passed removing existing evils and giving all areas of Federal land for grazing purposes the same uniform, reasonable, and just treatment; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1429. Also, memorial of Colorado General Assembly, requesting Congress to provide UNRRA with a sufficient appropriation to insure its continued existence; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1430. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Lafayette, Ind., favoring the immediate release of fathers from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1431. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of members and friends of the Berean Missionary Baptist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., in opposition to compulsory military training and the sale of liquor near our military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1432. By The SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman and president of the California Bay Area Indian Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to holding back all bills at present before the House, as well as all incoming bills, pertaining to California Indian claims of 1851-52; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1945

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. J. D. Grey, D. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, New Orleans, La., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Gracious Father, for Thy manifold blessings vouchsafed unto us we thank Thee. Thou hast dealt graciously with our beloved land. Grant to all our people grateful hearts that we may praise Thee in peace as we implored Thy aid in war. Give us a spirit of unanimity and a sense of dependence upon Thee. Grant wisdom and guidance to Thy faithful servant, our beloved President; give Thy blessing upon our Congress this day and every day to the end that sagacity and wisdom shall characterize their deliberations; guide us through these days that try men's souls that Thy will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In the name of Him who is above all, even Christ Jesus our Saviour and Lord, do we humbly ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; and

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent reso-

lution (S. Con. Res. 44) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPLY TO POSTMASTER GENERAL HANNEGAN'S ADDRESS AT FRENCH LICK, IND.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I had hoped to take about 15 minutes of the time of the Senate to reply to what might be called semislanderous remarks which were placed in the RECORD and which referred to myself. They are contained in a speech made by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Hannegan.

On November 17, 1945, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee delivered an address at French Lick, Ind., in which he attempted to vilify the Republican Party, its members, and me in particular. That address was inserted twice in the RECORD, once on November 23, when several pages were omitted, and again on December 18.

I consider it an honor to have been the target of this mud-slinging attempt by this individual.

I do not know Mr. Hannegan, the Postmaster General. Folks who do know him say he is a fine, clean chap personally. But politically he is adept in the tactics of Machiavelli. He believes in the doctrine that the end justifies the means. Thus, he wants the country run by his Democrat friends forever. Therefore, whatever the means, be it falsehoods, misrepresentation, chicanery, boss rule, will accomplish his purpose is O. K. with him.

It is not mere coincidence that Mr. Hannegan singled me out in particular for his assault. Only a short time before I had exposed his vile attempt to cheat a wounded veteran in Wisconsin of a position as postmaster to which the veteran was entitled by virtue of obtaining the highest rank on a competitive examination and by virtue of his veterans' preference—a wounded veteran of two wars who came out of the recent war with the rank of major. As a result of my exposure, Mr. Hannegan, through the President, was forced to backtrack and withdraw the nomination of another individual whom they had expected to ram through an unwary Senate.

Mr. Hannegan entitled his French Lick address "Thoughts and Wishes of the Man in the Street." Were this not the Christmas season, I might be tempted to declare that Mr. Hannegan, standing in the muck, is at too low a plane to know the wishes and thoughts of the man in the street.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to yield for just a moment. When the Senator started his address I was in the chair and did not hear what the complaint against Mr. Hannegan was. Would the Senator mind repeating that for my benefit?

Mr. WILEY. I will come to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator declines to do that? Is it not fair that the head of the Post Office Committee know what is being charged against the head of the Post Office Department? I should think the Senator would not object to repeating what he said just a moment ago.

Mr. WILEY. I did not quite understand. If the Senator will listen to what I have to say, he will see that I am complaining about the remarks which were made by Mr. Hannegan in his French Lick speech, which has been placed in the Senate RECORD twice, and then I particularly referred to a post-office matter and said that perhaps that was one reason why he thought he had to go out of his way to pick on me in his speech.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator mind stating when the speech was put in the RECORD so that I can find out about it.

Mr. WILEY. It was put in the RECORD day before yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much. Will the Senator tell us who put it in the RECORD so that we can find the speech?

Mr. WILEY. It was placed in the RECORD by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator has the page on which it appears, will he inform us as to that?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. It begins on page A5612 and extends to page A5614 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I had said that the speech of Mr. Hannegan which was put in the RECORD was entitled "Thoughts and Wishes of the Man in the Street," and I had just stated that were this not the Christmas season I might be tempted to declare that Mr. Hannegan, standing in the muck, is at too low a point to know the wishes and thoughts of the man in the street. But moved by a spirit of Christian charity I might say that I hope Mr. Hannegan's mudfest is not a preview of his party line in 1946. If it is, Mr. Hannegan will find that in attempting to befoul his opponents, he has instead further blackened himself and his own party. Thus, more certainly than ever, his party will be automatically swept up and away by a righteous electorate in next November's collection of the Democratic garbage which has been accumulating for 12 years.

I hope for the sake of our country that the November 1946 campaign will be more fair and open-handed than was indicated by Mr. Hannegan's French Lick talk. Perhaps this is more wishful thinking, considering Mr. Hannegan's past record and the record of the odorous city machines which he represents and which support his party.

It is particularly fitting that I briefly discuss Mr. Hannegan's address in this, the Christmas season, for the record shows that his Democratic Party has been posing as an imitation Santa Claus for over a decade with the people's funds. The facts show that his party has been plundering America's resources of the present and the future in order to give so-called favors to one segment of American society and then to another, but never to the public as a whole.

His party has been piously pleading for the common man, all the while saddling the common man with the greatest debt, the most malicious restrictions and regimentation, the most treacherous snooping that has ever occurred in the history of our country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No; I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator declines to yield?

Mr. WILEY. At this time.

In his address Mr. Hannegan stated:

> Now what does this Republican Senator [referring to the junior Senator from Wisconsin] want? * * * Only this—throwing overboard the principles of the Democratic Party.

This is a surprise to me. Yes, I have long since thrown overboard the practices of expediency, of opportunism, of political quackery, of robbing Peter to pay Paul—which Hannegan calls principles.

Mr. President, Mr. Hannegan has not merely tried to besmirch me as an individual, he has tried through such tactics to besmirch the Republican Party of which I am proud to be a member.

Therefore, I should like to make a brief point by point categorical denial of a few accusations with which Mr. Hannegan attempted to smear me.

First. Contrary to Mr. Hannegan's misrepresentations, I have never attempted in any way to vilify either President Truman or his predecessor. I have attempted to present the facts of their records, and let the facts speak for themselves. And in none of my political campaigns have I attacked personalities as divorced from the issues. Rather I have thought my listeners were entitled to a discussion of the principles involved.

Second. Contrary to Mr. Hannegan's misrepresentation, I have never fought the principle of legitimate collective bargaining, or any of the other inherent rights of labor.

I have, however, fought the racketeering element in labor, as well as in management. I have, however, fought to protect the rights of labor and management and, most important of all, the public, against the menace of ruinous strikes which are destroying the birthright of our servicemen and of all of us.

Third. Contrary to Mr. Hannegan's misrepresentation, the Republicans who fought to spare us from involvement in the horrors of war while preparing us against war, were not the blind, dumb, and unhearing in pre-Pearl Harbor days.

Rather, it was the Democrats of the Hannegan type who precipitated us unprepared into the struggle, who precipitated us into violations of international law, who were the blind, the dumb, and the unhearing. It is they who stand accused before history of meddling, of deception of the people, of lulling the people to sleep with false slogans.

Prior to Pearl Harbor, I personally supported appropriations for defense in excess of $39,000,000,000, whereas only $16,000,000,000 of such appropriations had been spent up to the time of Pearl Harbor. Had this money been judiciously used by the administration, 3,000 lives might not have been lost at Pearl Harbor, and no one can tell what blood, sweat, and tears of the American people might have been saved.

I draw attention to this fact: It is not the Republican minority which has raised the pre-Pearl Harbor issue. It was the Democratic chairman, Mr. Hannegan, who precipitated this argument, who has attempted to smear pre-Pearl Harbor noninterventionists.

Why do the Democrats of the Hannegan type inject this issue at this time? Why do they hurl smoke into the people's eyes? Why do they twist the facts? The answer is that they want to confuse the people, to turn the people's eyes from the $300,000,000,000 of Government debt, from the domestic corruption, the ineptitude, the waste, the failure to secure cooperation, stability, and industrial peace and full production.

Mr. Hannegan recounted the same misrepresentations employed by the PAC and the Democratic Party, which joined in an unholy alliance in the 1944 Wisconsin election to defeat me. The PAC sent out millions of folders and misrepresentations in print.

Mr. President, I stand on my record of opposing unwarranted intervention in the war prior to December 7, 1941, of opposing breach of faith with our own people, and breach of international law. The people of Wisconsin confirmed my stand and reelected me on my record, in spite of the Hannegan and PAC opposition.

Mr. President, why does Hannegan bring this issue, the pre-Pearl Harbor issue, before the public, just before Christmas? The answer is that 140,000,000 people are to be diverted from the troubles at home. Yes; it is the old, old idea of trying to get us into foreign war in order to overcome or forget domestic troubles. But the American people are not blind, the people of Wisconsin were not blind a year ago last fall, and they will not be blind next fall.

I am certain that if, today, the precious time of the Senate permitted, I could point by point present the facts justifying each of the pre-Pearl Harbor actions of the noninterventionists, including myself, to the complete satisfaction of any fair-minded observer. The time of the Senate does not permit this to be done. I am, however, going to send a pamphlet describing my foreign policy record as a Christmas gift to Mr. Hannegan. Perhaps it will impart some light to him.

Mr. President, I have been grateful for the opportunity to make this statement. I have not made it in my own defense, because the people of Wisconsin believe and I believe that my record needs no defense. Nor does the Republican Party need defense.

Justice, however, demands that these general points be presented in answer to the wretched allegations of the Democratic chairman. His party had best look to its own defense, for the righteous wrath of the American people is rising, the tide is turning, and the prodigal spenders, grafters, and chiselers will be swept from the offices they have befouled.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Josef Geiger and Eugenie Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to atomic energy; to to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WILEY:

A resolution adopted by the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the GI Bill of Rights Act so as to allow members of the armed forces the right to accept part-time work for pay without having such remuneration credited against the benefits received from the Federal Government for rehabilitation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C., together with resolutions adopted by that organization at its meeting in Washington, D. C., on December 1, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolutions be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1945.

DEAR SIR: National legislative measures covered by the attached resolutions will receive the active support of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. These resolutions were adopted by the board of directors of the General Federation at its meeting in Washington, D. C., November 28-December 1, 1945.

Very respectfully yours,
Mrs. LAFELL DICKINSON,
President.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Whereas the convening of the labor-management conference now in session in Washington aroused great hope in the people of the United States that solutions might be found for differences which in the past have caused frequent and open conflict between these two groups; and

Whereas the present stalemate of the labor-management conference is a matter of vital national interest, loss to management, a hardship to labor and a set-back to reconversion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled November 28, 1945, calls upon the members of the conference, its sponsors, and the President of the United States to use every means at their command to bring the conference to agreements whereby an equitable profit for industry is assured; a fair wage for labor is attained, and the vital interest of the consuming public is protected; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the labor-management conference, be warned that they and their groups will be faced with the condemnation of the Nation if selfish interests and personal antagonisms are permitted to sabotage the conference.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled December 1, 1945, reaffirms its endorsement of full participation by the United States in the United Nations Organization and in special agencies for international cooperation in fields including education, health, relief, and trade; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors urges prompt ratification by the United States of:

1. Constitutions of such international organizations as may be established by the United Nations;
2. Adequate financial support for all such agencies;
3. Active participation in their work.

LIVING MEMORIALS

Whereas it is the custom of the American people to develop and provide memorials to their war veterans, living and dead; and

Whereas living memorials, such as parks, playgrounds, pools, forests, outdoor areas, recreation grounds, and community centers are all of a character to serve both the present and future generations in building character and physical fitness, so essential for the preservation of the American way of life for which our servicemen fought; and

Whereas such living memorials will serve youth, returning veterans, and others of the community, day after day, and throughout the years, thus keeping alive the memory and traditions of those who serve in the defense of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges all member clubs to lend full cooperation in planning such living memorials to those who served in the present war, and that the local clubs and districts be designated to institute action in furthering the planning and developing of these living memorials; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs be empowered to take appropriate action in securing the cooperation of national, State, and local officials and groups in carrying out the intent of this resolution.

NEW EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

Whereas health, welfare, and education services are basic to the needs of all the people, and

Whereas at present such Federal services are scattered through at least 33 agencies of the Government; lack adequate coordination; are often in competition with one another; and are expensive to administer: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs approves the creation of a new executive department headed by a member of the President's Cabinet to promote the national interest in health, welfare, and education and to administer Federal programs in these fields.

PRICE CONTROL

Whereas in no war in the history of the United States has the general public been protected so successfully from runaway prices and general and serious inflation as has been the case during the war just ended; and

Whereas the United States now faces graver dangers of uncontrolled inflation than during the war or at any time in its history: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs supports continued Federal legislation for equitable wage ceilings and price control on basic commodities such as food, shelter, and clothing as being essential to the common good and to sustained prosperity during the period of readjustment.

MILITARY TRAINING

Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs has stood consistently before the Nation as an outspoken proponent for strengthening the forces of democracy that a world of law and order may prevail; and

Whereas the atomic bomb has brought new but as yet confused conceptions of what constitutes adequate safe and necessary preparation for defense and what will be the new requirements in material, and in the number and the training of men: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in reiterating its belief that the United States must remain strong with a trained manpower scientifically reinforced and ready to be called upon in an emergency, urges its member clubs to study all proposals for providing adequate defense and for training of men so that intelligent judgments can be made of specific measures designed to meet these purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs declares its conviction that any plan for military training for the youth of the United States, to be acceptable, must combine educational advantages and spiritual safeguards for youth while so engaged.

SOCIAL PROTECTION DIVISION

Whereas there is evidence that the gains made against prostitution and allied conditions during the war are definitely threatened with loss; and

Whereas this loss would undermine the strength and soundness of marriage and family life; and

Whereas character education by home, church, and school must be supported by community action in enforcing laws regarding prostitution; and

Whereas the Social Protection Division of the Federal Security Agency has cooperated successfully with communities in developing policies and programs in this field: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the continuance of the Social Protection Division of the Federal Security Agency with the necessary status to permit it to work effectively; and be it further

Resolved, That the board express its conviction that Congress should devise means whereby the principles stated in the May Act be continued through laws designed to furnish similar protection in times of peace.

OPIUM ADVISORY COMMISSION

Whereas under the League of Nations for 20 years the Opium Advisory Committee functioned successfully in suppressing the abuse of narcotic drugs throughout the world: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs commends the State Department for its action in recommending the creation of an Opium Advisory Commission which should report directly to the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations Organization independently of the health, welfare, or other section; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors urges continued effort on the part of the Department of State until the creation of such Opium Advisory Commission is accomplished.

WORLD-WIDE MONITORING SERVICE

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has discontinued its world-wide monitoring service, and

Whereas the ending of OWI listening posts has shut down the only other official Government service concerned with international broadcasting, and

Whereas this leaves the Government of the United States, which has a direct stake in the news and policies of other nations, without any official information from the short-wave radios of the rest of the world: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs petitions the State Department to insure that the world-wide monitoring service formerly conducted by the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of FCC should not be dropped but should be continued by the Federal Government as an essential step in the conduct of its postwar affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State Department for immediate consideration.

REPRESENTATION IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Whereas article 8 of the Charter of the United Nations states that "The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs," thus providing for the eligibility of women on policy-making bodies of the United Nations Organization, and

Whereas each member nation of the General Assembly is entitled to five representatives: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the appointment of a qualified woman as one of the five members to represent the United States of America in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization.

EMPLOYMENT

Whereas it is the opinion of the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs that no plan has as yet been advanced which will result in adequate protection of the mutually interdependent interests of business, labor, and the consuming public in the problems of employment: Therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs approve the establishment of a national policy for the creation of maximum opportunities for employment in order through it to maintain a high level of production and purchasing power with Government machinery supplementing free enterprise if or when necessary.

WAR VETERANS

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs support and aid Governments, Federal, State, and local, in the rehabilitation of war veterans.

UNRRA

Call to action: That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled, December 1, 1945, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., immediately send a message to Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, stating that this organization deplores the delay in passing the $550,000,000 appropriation for UNRRA to which our country has been legislatively committed and which therefore involves the honor of our Nation and it urges prompt action.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs is already unanimously committed to the pending House bill awaiting action and asking for the new appropriation of $1,350,000,000 for UNRRA and reaffirms its intention to press for action on this measure.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 1325) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 888) thereon.

PRINTING OF FORTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as a conference is to be held very soon which I must attend, and therefore I cannot be present in the Senate, from the Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution authorizing the printing of the annual report of the Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. I further request that it be now considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 208) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-eighth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1945, be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have consulted with the members of the committee with respect to the printing of this report. It has been customary for about 40 years for the Senate to have the report of the Society printed. The Government Printing Office is occupied fully with the printing of Government business. This society has a very large membership, and I have been asked by the committee to suggest that hereafter the society itself provide for the printing of its report. I make that statement to the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1714. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1715. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 1716. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the

surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1717. A bill for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1718. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain federally owned aircraft, currently available as surplus, to State aviation authorities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1719. A bill to provide, through aid to the States, for surveys of the need for public educational plant facilities, for the preparation of drawings and specifications for such facilities, and for their construction or acquisition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a laboratory to be devoted to the scientific study and development of artificial legs and appliances therefor; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4590) to authorize the use by industry of silver held or owned by the United States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HARDSHIPS OF POLISH NATION AND PEOPLE—SYMPATHY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WALSH submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas throughout centuries of struggle and sacrifice the people of Poland have established their unmistakable place in the family of nations and have demonstrated their capacity for self-government; and

Whereas Poland was one of our most faithful allies in the great conflict just ended, and fought courageously and gallantly to preserve ideals of democracy and liberty; and

Whereas conditions developing in Poland today, in the judgment of many, are threatening the sovereignty, self-determination, and autonomy of the Polish nation; and

Whereas these conditions reflected in the United States and elsewhere bring into controversy the war aims of the United Nations and may possibly constitute infringement and denial of the basic freedoms for which the war was waged, thereby endangering permanent peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring), That the Congress hereby extends deepest sympathy to the Polish nation and people for the hardships, trials, and sufferings they are sustaining and, mindful of our desire to promote freedom and self-determination among all the nations of the earth, both great and small, the Congress pledges its assistance and good offices to the Polish cause and to the cause of all other nations desiring and seeking freedom, and expresses the hope that the accredited diplomatic representatives of the United States may urge the justice of the Polish cause upon the United Nations and may move as speedily as possible to arrange for the negotiation of permanent treaties of peace, which will insure autonomy, freedom, and democratic institutions to Poland and all other nations aspiring to these basic rights.

OUR SOIL AND THE NATIONAL FERTILIZER BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Soil and the National Fertilizer Bill," delivered by him at the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., December 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PARITY IN HEALTH AND EDUCATION FOR FARM PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Parity in Health and Education for Farm People, delivered by him to the Associated Women of the American Farm Bureau Federation at Chicago, December 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him from the Chairman of the Social Security Board, relating to Senate bill 1653, together with a statement by himself on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF PHILIP H. HILL BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY REGARDING SENATE BILL 1592

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Philip H. Hill before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to Senate bill 1592, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH EXCHANGE CONTROLS—LETTER FROM ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, some weeks ago I offered for the RECORD some correspondence I had with the State Department with reference to the attitude of the British Government toward what I thought was a discrimination against our nationals in their efforts to rehabilitate facilities which had been demolished during the war. I asked that the State Department, in the consideration of the British loan, exact from the British Government a more liberal attitude toward our nationals in these matters, and at the same time I brought up another question which had to do with a loan which was made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the British Government, the status of which loan now, if it is liquidated in this country, would give to the British about $500,000,000 in dollars which they need.

In reply to the letter I wrote on the thirtieth of November, I have now a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, which I should like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 17, 1945.

The Honorable E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MOORE: I refer to your letter to Mr. Clayton of November 30, 1945, concerning our financial discussions with the British.

I am sure you will be satisfied with the arrangements we have worked out with the British with regard to the relaxation of their exchange controls and the early abolition of the sterling area dollar pool. I may state that in our discussions we have continually had in mind the problems raised by the existence of the sterling area, including those to which you had previously called our attention. As to the actions of the British Government to which you refer concerning the importation of materials and equipment into the sterling area by American companies, the two governments are well on the way to an understanding on this matter and I have reason to believe that it will be satisfactorily straightened out.

I shall see that the detailed questions which you raise, particularly those relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation s loan to the British, are carefully studied and that the Department's views on them are communicated to you as soon as possible.

I sincerely appreciate your interest in this whole matter and the trouble you have taken to discuss these issues with us in such detail.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

PRESIDENT'S FACT-FINDING PANELS IN OIL REFINERY AND AUTOMOBILE LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the suggestion that President Truman's so-called fact-finding panels in the oil refinery and the automobile labor disputes should use profit-and-loss statements as a yardstick for fixing wages is an example of the impracticability of his fact-finding proposal. The suggestion is fundamentally unsound, and presages what may be expected if the Congress passes the President's bill.

The proposal is unadorned socialism and only a short step behind communism. It is the opening gun for an indirect socialization of all industry. The division of profits through the medium of wages implies a proprietary interest. The proposal is as unsound from labor's standpoint as it is from the investor's. If wages are to be fixed on the basis of past high earnings in certain units of industry, then what is labor's position in those units with small earnings or even losses? The only yardstick by which the true level of wages may be properly determined is the productive value of the wage earners. In a free economy wages must be commensurate with the productive value of the employee. Whether the employer's earnings are large or small is one of the competitive hazards of private enterprise. If labor is to insist that earnings in this or that case are to be the factor on which wages are to be determined, then labor must be willing to take the good with the bad, and be willing to reverse the principle in cases of small earnings or losses. The suggestion is not only economically unsound, but it is wholly impractical. The factor of earnings as a wage yardstick would mean that everybody would want to work for the man who was making money and no one would work for the man who was not making money. Manufacturer A sells a product at $100 per unit; by reason of efficient operations and the superior quality of his product his sales are large and he shows a good earning. The wages of his employees are high. Manufacturer B makes the same product, sells it for the same com-

petitive price, but because of inefficiency, his earnings are low. Under the proposal B's employees are poorly paid. The fallacy of the plan is obvious. In a competitive labor market B would be forced to pay the going wage; otherwise A would take his employees and B would be forced to close up. The answer to high wages is profitable production. When the earnings of industry generally are high, wages are high and all employers in the industry are forced to meet the competitive wage.

Of course, if we are to adopt the theory of the corporate state in which the units of all industry are to be operated as a single government enterprise, then it might be possible to measure off a percentage of earnings as wages. But so long as we maintain a system of private enterprise, with wholesome interunit competition of industry, the fixing of wages on the basis of earnings is wholly impractical and tends to the Socialist objective of reducing all to a common level.

RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am sorry I was not present in the Senate on Monday last when Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 was considered and adopted. Unfortunately, I was detained out of the city, and was not able to return in time. I had planned to make some comments in connection with the concurrent resolution at the time it was considered, and I now ask unanimous consent that the statement I had prepared be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Only three Members of the Senate are still here today who voted for a resolution in June of 1922 favoring the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people. I came here 9 months later. But before that I had taken an interest in this problem, and in succeeding years I continued to give it my attention. Both in my home State, and in the East, in the years following the Balfour Declaration I urged that our Government, which was founded on a principle of affording help to suffering and persecuted people everywhere, do all it could to relieve this minority.

The persecution of this religious and racial group is no new thing in Europe. I well remember the stark cruelty of the pogroms in Russia and Poland; the more refined cruelty afforded by such an exhibition as the trial of Mendel Bilas in Kiev, and the economic and social persecution of these people throughout a large part of Europe. I remember discussing these problems with the late Justice Brandeis, one of the greatest minds and finest hearts America ever produced, who throughout the years diligently gave of his great wisdom to this world problem.

It seems to me that the so-called civilized governments of the world have too long delayed a solution of this problem. And for that reason I am gratified that President Truman has undertaken action which may lead to an equitable solution. The President has made two proposals respecting homeless Jewish refugees in Europe. The first of these is that 100,000 of these Jewish refugees should, as promptly as possible, be permitted to enter Palestine. Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 commends the President for this stand. I support that proposal as not only desirable but necessary.

I say that because I saw something and heard something of their situation while I was in Europe this past summer. The Senate should remember, I believe, that more than 5,000,000 Jewish people—men, women, and children—have been killed in Europe during the last few years. Scarcely a million and one-half of them are left—homeless, wandering human beings in the areas that were under German control. These are the survivors of the dead Jews—and I believe that the impact of this tragedy of suffering and death on the million and a half who remain is so heart-rending that extraordinary steps should be taken to afford them relief as rapidly as possible. So the President's first proposal is desirable and necessary because it will afford immediate relief to 100,000 homeless persons, and it will give hope and confidence to the hundreds of thousands of others that they may eventually have a home in place of their present tragic homelessness.

President Truman's second proposal was to arrange for a joint Anglo-American commission to investigate the Palestinian problem as a whole. The joint commission apparently must secure data and reach a conclusion on three points. First, what is the total number of homeless Jews in the European area. Second, what proportion are looking for a home in Palestine. Third, does Palestine have or can it have absorptive capacity for that number and what steps are necessary and desirable in order to insure a sufficient absorptive capacity.

On the first and second points, the facts appear to be fairly clear. Whether the number is a little more or little less, it is fairly well known now that the number of homeless, refugee Jews on the continent of Europe is approximately one and one-half million. Many persons who are prominent and reliable have already investigated and reported that a large proportion of the homeless European Jews want to go to Palestine.

The third issue before the joint commission is a more detailed and technical one. The absorptive capacity of Palestine has heretofore been reported on and many persons believe that it has a large absorptive capacity. However, the joint commission will have the problem of listening to the experts on irrigation, on reclamation, on agriculture, and on industrial possibilities in Palestine. The joint commission will then be in a position to indicate what specific steps can and should be taken to provide maximum absorptive capacity in Palestine and whether those steps will provide an absorptive capacity large enough to absorb the homeless Jews who now wish to go to Palestine to have their homes there.

I called the Senate's attention last October to the fact that I was very much surprised and pleased with the development of the Palestine area. It was a revelation to me of what an energetic and determined people can do, aided, of course, by the funds of interested people from all over the world. We spent a night in Tel Aviv, certainly the cleanest and most modern city in the Middle East. The agricultural progress since my last visit to that area 8 years ago, the citrus groves and other crops, and the industrial progress indicates clearly what can be done. I said on the Senate floor 2 months ago that I could see no excuse for anyone saying that the Jewish people should not be permitted to go to Palestine to buy land and settle there, and I repeat and reiterate that statement.

One point, I believe, deserves particular emphasis now. It seems to me that there is no need to wait for hearings by the joint commission, or its report, in order to carry out President Truman's first proposal—the settlement of 100,000 homeless European Jews in Palestine. While the commission is engaged in its study, these 100,000 should be afforded entry into the warmer climate of Palestine as promptly as possible.

No words can begin to describe the sufferings to which these broken fragments of Jewish families in Europe have been subjected. The question is not alone one of giving them food rations or clothing or temporary shelter in Europe. After what they have been through it is highly important that they should be allowed to proceed to a permanent home as soon as possible. The restoration of their spiritual as well as their physical life will then become possible. And the fact that 100,000 homeless Jews are promptly admitted into Palestine will give new hope and courage to the remaining homeless Jews in Europe. It will inspire and inspirit them. It will keep alive their confidence that there still remains on this earth a great nation whose people continue to believe in the principles of justice and humanity and happiness for all mankind.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the pending business is Senate bill 752, known as the stock-pile bill. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, after an intensive public hearing by the committee, at which all Government agencies concerned and industry were represented. There was a very full discussion. The bill, as reported, meets, I think, the desires of all those who have given study to the measure. The committee has presented, because of the parliamentary situation, a single amendment in the nature of a substitute, and, Mr. President, before I proceed with a description of the substitute amendment I should like to have it declared the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the natural resources of the United States in certain strategic and critical materials being deficient or insufficiently developed to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for common defense, it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of this act to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency.

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall establish, within such agency of the Government as he shall designate, a Strategic Materials Stock Piling Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board). The Board shall consist of a Chairman (hereinafter referred to as the Chairman), to be appointed by the President, by

and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the following members with whom the Chairman shall advise and consult: The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his department to serve as his representative on the Board. The Chairman shall receive a salary of $10,000 per annum and is authorized, within the limits of funds which may be made available, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and to make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Chairman and the Board under this act. Without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Chairman may appoint such engineers and other experts as may be necessary to carry out his functions. Upon the request of the Chairman, the head of any agency may detail personnel in his agency, including commissioned officers and enlisted personnel in the armed forces, for service under this act subject to the direction of the Chairman.

"(b) The Chairman may perform the duties and functions imposed upon him under this act through such agencies, acting under his direction, as he may designate, and the Chairman shall reimburse such agencies for any expenditures so incurred and for any services so performed out of the funds available to him under this act.

"(c) To the fullest extent practicable the Chairman shall appoint industry advisory committees selected from the industries concerned with the materials to be stock piled. It shall be the general function of the industry advisory committees to advise with the Chairman and the Board with respect to the purchase, sale, care, and handling of such materials. Members of the industry advisory committees shall receive a per diem allowance of not to exceed $10 for each day spent at conferences held upon the call of the Chairman, plus necessary traveling and other expenses while so engaged.

"SEC. 3. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, the President with the advice of the Board, shall determine from time to time (1) which materials are strategic, (2) the quality and quantities of such materials needed to effectuate the purposes of this act, and (3) the dates by which such quantities should be acquired. The authority conferred upon the President by this section may, in his discretion, be exercised through such officers and agencies as he shall designate.

"SEC. 4. The Chairman, with the advice of the members of the Board shall—

"(a) direct the purchase of strategic materials pursuant to the determinations as provided in section 3 hereof, which shall be made, so far as is practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demand and at a price not in excess of the current open market price;

"Such purchases shall be made with due regard to the objectives set forth in section 1 of this act, and except where the Chairman with the advice of the members of the Board, shall determine that the objectives cannot thereby be achieved, purchases under this act shall be made in accordance with title III of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520), but may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Where the Chairman finds that the domestic production of any materials is economically feasible he may direct the purchase of such material without requiring the vendor to give bond;

"(b) provide for the storage, security, and maintenance of startegic materials for stockpiling purposes on military and naval reservations or other locations, approved by the Chairman;

"(c) provide through normal commercial channels for the refining or processing of any materials acquired or transferred under this act when he deems such action necessary to convert such materials into a form best suitable for stock piling, and such materials may be refined, processed, or otherwise beneficiated either before or after their transfer from the owning agency;

"(d) provide for the rotation of any strategic materials constituting a part of the stock pile where necessary to prevent deterioration by replacement of acquired stocks with equivalent quantities of substantially the same material;

"(e) dispose of any materials held pursuant to this act which are no longer needed because of any revision of a determination made pursuant to section 3 of this act, as hereinafter provided;

"No such disposition shall be made until 6 months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to Congress of a notice of the proposed disposition. Such notice shall state the reasons for such revised determination, the amounts of the materials proposed to be released, the plan of disposition proposed to be followed, and the date upon which the material is to become available for sale or transfer. The plan and date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of the material to be released and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets: *Provided*, That no material constituting a part of the stock piles may be disposed of without the express approval of the Congress except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of that material for use in time of war;

"(f) submit to the Congress, not later than 6 months after the approval of this act, and every 6 months thereafter a written report detailing the activities with respect to stock-piling under this act, including a statement of foreigr and domestic purchases, and such other pertinent information on the administration of the act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

"SEC. 5. The stock piles shall consist of all such materials heretofore purchased or transferred to be held pursuant to this act, or hereafter transferred pusuant to section 6 hereof, or hereafter purchased pusuant to section 4 hereof, and not disposed of pursuant to this act. Except for the rotation to prevent deterioration and except for the disposal of any material pursuant to section 4 of this act, materials acquired under this act shall be released for use, sale, or other disposition only (a) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such release is required for purposes of the common defense, or (b) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President.

"SEC. 6. (a) Pursuant to regulations issued by the Chairman, every material determined by the President to be strategic pursuant to section 3 hereof, which is owned or contracted for by the United States or any agency thereof, including any material received from a foreign government under an agreement made pursuant to the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended, or other authority, shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined by such agency to be surplus to its needs and responsibilities, to the stock piles established pursuant to this act, so long as the amount of the stock pile for that material does not exceed the quantities determined therefor pursuant to section 3 hereof. The Chairman shall exempt from this requirement (1) any material which constitutes contractor inventory if the owning agency shall not have taken possession of such inventory; (2) such amount of any material as the Chairman, with the advice of the members of the Board, determines (i) to be necessary to make up any deficiency of the supply of such material for the current requirements of industry; (ii) are held in lots so small as to make the transfer thereof economically impractical; or (iii) do not meet, or cannot economically be converted to meet, stock-pile requirements determined in accordance with section 3 of this act. The total material transferred to the jurisdiction of the Chairman in accordance with this section during any fiscal year beginning more than 12 months after this act becomes law shall not exceed in value (as determined by the Chairman on the basis of the fair market value at the time of each transfer) an amount to be fixed by the appropriation act or acts relating to the acquisition of materials under this act.

"(b) Any transfer made pursuant to this section shall be made without charge against or reimbursement from the funds available to the Chairman, except that expenses incident to such transfer may be paid or reimbursed from such funds, and except that, upon any such transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any corporation organized by virtue of the authority contained in the act of January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the fair market value as determined by the Chairman of the material so transferred.

"(c) Effective whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel any notes pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of existing law shall be deemed to be reduced by the amount of the notes so canceled.

"(d) Subsection (b) of section 14 of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Subject only to subsection (c) of this section, any owning agency may dispose of—

"'(1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair;

"'(2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items;

"'(3) any product of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations, or of any public works construction or maintenance project, carried on by such agency; which does not consist of materials which are to be transferred in accordance with the Strategic Materials Stock Piling Act, to the stock piles established pursuant to that act.'

"(e) Section 22 of the act of October 3, 1944 (58 Stat. 765), is hereby repealed.

"Provided, That any owning agency as defined in that act having control of materials that, when determined to be surplus, are required to be transferred to the stock piles pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall make such determination as soon as such materials in fact become surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

"SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of Geological Survey, is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States, and the quantities or grades of which are inadequate from known domestic sources, in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply, to devise new methods for the treatment and utilization of lower grade reserves, and to develop substitutes for such

essential ores and mineral products; on public lands and on privately owned lands, with the consent of the owner, to explore and demonstrate the extent and quality of deposits of such minerals, including core drilling, trenching, test-pitting, shaft sinking, drifting, cross-cutting, sampling, and metallurgical investigations and tests as may be necessary to determine the extent and quality of such deposits, the most suitable methods of mining and beneficiating them, and the cost at which the minerals or metals may be produced.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations of the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of any agricultural materials determined by the President pursuant to section 3 of this act to be strategic and critical, or substitutes therefor.

"SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The funds so appropriated, including the funds heretofore appropriated, shall remain available to carry out the provisions of this act until expended and (exclusive of sums allocated for the purposes of section 7) shall be expended under the direction of the Chairman.

"SEC. 9. Any funds heretofore or hereafter received on account of sales or other dispositions of materials under the provisions of this act, except funds received on account of the rotation of stocks, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 10. Strategic materials purchased from foreign sources for stock piling pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be admitted into the United States free of any tariff duty, import tax, or other impost applicable to importations. If any such imported strategic material is disposed of pursuant to section 4 of this act, and if such disposition is made at a price based on the cost to the Government of such strategic material rather than the market price current at the time of sale, there shall be added to such price the amount of any tariff, duty, import, tax, or other impost which would be due were such strategic material imported at the time the sale is made.

"SEC. 11. For the purposes of this act the term 'strategic materials' shall not include petroleum or petroleum products.

"SEC. 12. This act may be cited as the 'Strategic Materials Stock Piling Act'."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say briefly that everyone recognizes the elementary fact that power, fuel, and minerals are the sources of industrial progress as well as of the ability to wage war. After World War I the United States found itself very much handicapped because of the fact that it had not been prepared by the accumulation of materials of the kind needed to carry on the war, and Mr. Baruch, who was head of the War Industries Board in 1919, submitted a recommendation to the President that stock-piling legislation should be enacted. His recommendation was disregarded because the country, and perhaps the world, thought that there would never again be another war.

In 1939 the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], introduced a bill to authorize stock-piling. It was passed by the Congress, but was not promptly taken advantage of by the Government, and the result was that we were caught in World War II without an adequate supply of strategic and critical materials. The surplus-property bill, which became law in 1944, provided that with respect to the stock piles on hand they would be subject to disposal 1 year after the submission of a report to Congress by the Army and Navy Board on Strategic and Critical Materials. That report was filed on the 3d of January of this year, and therefore, unless we act, these materials now on hand will be the subject of disposal after the 3d of January next. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that this bill be passed.

Heretofore fuel and iron ore have been the principal base of war and of industry. In the future it is very likely that electronics may be one of the most important of industries. The sad fact is that the United States lacks all the principal minerals and materials which are necessary for the electronics industry.

Let me briefly say, Mr. President, that although the original stock-piling bill was enacted in June 1939, full advantage was not taken of it and as a result, during the war, it was necessary for us to buy abroad about 65 different minerals and materials because we did not have them or had not developed domestic sources from which they could be produced. Of the 65, 27 were not in supply in the United States at all.

Mr. President, there are two reasons why this bill should pass. The first is that we should not again, if emergency should arise, be caught in the desperate plight in which we were when World War II overtook us. In spite of the lesson of World War I, we were unprepared with a strategic supply.

The second reason is that for the purpose of maintaining industrial leadership of the United States we should undertake immediately to provide a supply of these highly important materials from domestic sources so far as possible, and from foreign sources when necessary.

I shall not burden the Senate with a lengthy discussion, but I do recommend to every Member of this body a reading of the hearing upon this bill. It is printed; it is available; and it is illuminating and educational.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To what extent does this bill take into account and undertake to accomplish foreign trade by purchasing from foreign countries strategic materials in exchange for our goods?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not do that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not go into that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. This is not a foreign trade bill. It is purely a stock-piling measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can appreciate that, but I still think that our foreign trade and commerce might be stimulated and promoted to some extent by our purchases and stock piling of strategic materials of which there is a shortage in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In such a transaction, if we could sell to foreign countries some of the surplus of our goods which will be available for export, it might work to the advantage of the countries which have the raw materials which we desire as well as to our interest to dispose of and to export in foreign commerce goods of which we have and can produce a surplus.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct; and that would be the inevitable result. For example, today we have in the United States, from our own resources, less than a 5 years' supply of antimony, industrial diamonds, lead, platinum, quartz crystals, and tin. The surprising thing is that there has not been a major discovery of either lead or copper in the United States for 20 years. Our copper supply has been depleted, so that we have left only 40 percent of the original reserves.

The Senate might be interested if I were to recite the names of some of the strategic and critical materials with respect to which we have so depleted our resources that we now have less than 50 percent of our original reserves. At the top of the list is petroleum. We have only 41 percent left of our original estimated petroleum reserves. With respect to copper, the figure is 40 percent; zinc, 35 percent; tungsten, 30 percent; manganese, about 30 percent; and the prewar grade of bauxite, 28 or 29 percent. It is a rapidly diminishing supply.

I digress here to say that the bill would authorize the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey to undertake explorations intended to provide substitutes. For example, we have in the United States vast deposits of alumina clay, from which aluminum can be made when properly treated. One of the purposes of the bill would be to enable the Government bureaus best fitted for that task to undertake the research and exploration essential to increase that development.

The evidence before the committee was to the effect that the very excellent deposits of iron ore in the Lake Superior region have now been reduced to about 35 percent. However, when we take into consideration low-grade ores, we have left about 68 or 70 percent of our original reserves. We still have supplies of iron ore, and we still have the fuel which will enable us to continue to be the leading industrial Nation of the world. There are some other nations, notably Sweden, Brazil, and India, in which there are large deposits of high-grade iron ore, but none of those countries have the necessary supply of fuel, without which the iron ore is not susceptible of the most efficient use.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator for his very clear presentation of this subject. I am very much interested in all aspects of it. I should like to ask him a question concerning a matter which has given me a great deal of concern. The Senator

has already mentioned the fact that our reserves of iron ore in this country are now down to approximately 40 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said 35 percent with respect to the high-grade ore. However, if we count the low-grade ores, the percentage is probably 68 or 70.

Mr. WILEY. In this war we have dissipated our natural resources. The question divides itself into two parts. First, we know the need of America and of the world for scrap iron in preparation for war. A great deal of our scrap iron has gone into the manufacture of vehicles and other things which are lying as scrap on all the battlefields of the world. Is anything being done to husband those resources and bring them back to this country, whence they came? They can be utilized in peacetime as well as in wartime. That is the first question. Has anything been done along that line?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator has raised that question. I have had the question up with the War Department. The Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has been studying it. Only yesterday I had a conversation with the Under Secretary of War, who told me that a statement is now in course of preparation which will be addressed to the Committee on Military Affairs, and probably will reach me today or tomorrow. I shall place it in the RECORD. It deals with a part of the subject.

Of course, it should be pointed out that the gathering of scrap all through Europe and its transportation back to the United States would involve tremendous expense. To what extent it would be practicable to order the gathering of such material and its return to the United States, I am not prepared at the moment to say. But I can assure the Senator that the Committee on Military Affairs is very much alive to the situation, and if any practical means can be worked out by which that material can be brought back or can be used in a more effective way, it will be done. The exchange of such material for other materials which we need would be one way of handling the problem. The question is a live one, but it has not been touched in this bill, because that would not be practicable.

Mr. WILEY. That is the first part of the question; and I am very happy to know that it is being given consideration. In all likelihood before many months many of our ships will be through conveying our troops, and they will be coming back from distant ports empty unless we can provide ballast.

The second part of the question is this——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me point out that to gather such material we would have to use a tremendous amount of manpower.

Mr. WILEY. I realize that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I doubt very much whether we should use the manpower of the Army for the purpose of gathering scrap. If we were to undertake to gather it by employing foreigners we would naturally be assuming a very heavy expense.

Mr. WILEY. Some of the material is the finest scrap in the world. It is not merely scrap iron.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true. There is a great deal of scrap aluminum.

Mr. WILEY. Scrap aluminum and other materials.

The second part of the question is this: What are we doing in relation to ascertaining the hidden resources in the islands for which we have shed our blood before we relinquish control over them? Is anything being done to find out whether they have hidden resources?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The function of the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey under this bill would be to seek out deposits, wherever they might be, within our jurisdiction; and I assume that if the appropriations were sufficient that would be done.

Mr. WILEY. Does that cover the islands and the territory which we have captured from the enemy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, this bill deals only with the area which is actually under the jurisdiction of the United States. It might be a little difficult, and might involve questions of foreign relations, to undertake to make the explorations of which the Senator speaks. I am sorry to say that I do not know whether they are actually being carried on or not. I rather imagine, however, because of the tremendous effort which was made by the War Production Board, and particularly by the Metals Section of the War Production Board, to find sources of minerals all through the world that very little has been overlooked.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was just giving a list of the materials with respect to which our commercial reserves are very low. I had last referred to bauxite. With respect to vanadium, we have only 29 percent; chromium, 21 percent; gold, 21 percent; lead, 19 percent; silver, 19 percent; and mercury, only 3 percent.

Mr. President, those seem to be the basic facts. The bill which is before the Senate meets with the complete approval of the committee, with the exception that after the bill had been reported the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] suggested an amendment dealing with agricultural materials. He desires to have an amendment adopted to the committee amendment, on page 22, beginning in line 8, after the word "agricultural"; his amendment, if adopted, would strike out everything from that point down to and including line 10, and would insert the following:

> Material or for using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any material determined by the President, pursuant to section 3 of this act, to be strategic, or substitutes therefor.

I think the amendment is a most excellent one, and I hope it will be adopted. I ask that it be stated at the desk, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22 of the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out all after the word "agricultural" in line 8, down to and including line 10, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

> material or for using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any material determined by the President, pursuant to section 3 of this act, to be strategic, or substitutes therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator describe the financial machinery of the bill and how it works?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Section 8 of the bill contains an authorization to make appropriations. That section reads as follows:

> SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as the Congress, from time to time, may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The funds so appropriated, including the funds heretofore appropriated, shall remain available to carry out the provisions of this act until expended and (exclusive of sums allocated for the purposes of section 7) shall be expended under the direction of the Chairman.

The making of appropriations, therefore, will be wholly within the control of Congress from time to time, and a showing will have to be made to the Appropriations Committee of the need for the particular appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. In other words, the Senator is not suggesting any limitation on the total appropriations which may be made; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; we did not.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, such a provision is customarily included in many measures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. Why does the Senator think it is not necessary to have a limitation as to the authorization?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is felt that the matter is one of such vagueness and so altogether impossible to estimate that it would be better to leave it to the judgment of each Congress to which a request for such an appropriation might be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator give us any estimate as to what may be the cost of the program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I could not do so. I will say to the Senator that the information before the commitee was to the effect that in acquiring stock piles for the war—that is to say, in buying the materials abroad, and so forth—the cost was approximately $2,000,000,000. Of course, that was a very high figure. It was made high because of the great expense of operating under war conditions—the great expense of shipping, and all that. Therefore, I would believe that that figure would be an over-all maximum. Of course, it would all depend

upon future contingencies and what Congress might decide to do in the future.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, it is contemplated that some of the material might deteriorate and that it might be necessary to have turn-overs to some kinds of materials.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill provides for rotation.

Mr. TAFT. What will be the arrangement for that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The money will go into the Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. The money will go into the Treasury and the Congress will appropriate more money for whatever materials it may be necessary to replace; is that the situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator feel that there is any chance that that might develop into Government operation of an industry or the assumption by the Government of the exclusive importation of a particular product, or anything of the sort?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; I am quite sure that would not be the case. Throughout the bill provision is made to make certain that the current needs of industry will be provided for, that the stock piles accumulated will not be in excess of the current needs of industry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not mean that stock piles will thus be accumulated for the current needs of industry; does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; but they will not be in excess of the current needs.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means that the Government will not acquire such materials to such an extent as to interfere with the acquisition of them by industry; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to be sure that the bill will not provide that the Government can go into the business of acquiring such materials for industry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the bill does not provide for that. The bill provides that the Chairman of the Board shall consult with industry advisory committees in regard to such matters. I think the bill amply takes care of the matters the Senator has in mind.

Mr. TAFT. I am concerned that the operations under the bill shall be devoted solely to accumulating the materials which the Government might need for war purposes, and I am concerned that the operations shall not be devoted to acquiring materials for industry. It seems to me important that the Government shall not through this means go into the business of operating industries, in respect to the acquisition of such materials for them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; that would be altogether foreign to the purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, in line 8, it is proposed to change the semicolon to a colon, and to add the following: "*Provided*, That for the purpose of encouraging the development, equipment, and operation of domestic metal and mineral reserves of significant amount but currently incapable of competition with foreign sources of supply, and to enable domestic marginal producers to establish themselves in the production of essential metals and minerals of which otherwise there would be no adequate domestic source of supply, the chairman may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, contract to purchase for stock-piling purposes, and may thereafter purchase in accordance with such contract, all or any part of the total production of any critical or strategic material or materials from any domestic mine, in the form of ore or otherwise, and pay therefor a price not more than 25 percent above the going market price at the time such contract is entered into; but no contract entered into pursuant to this subsection shall be for a term in excess of 3 years."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I could ascertain by listening to the reading of the amendment, I judge that it is a general proposal for a subsidy for metals and minerals by means of the purchase of such materials above the market price, if necessary. Certainly, I would seriously object to making the subsidy policy, which it was necessary to pursue during the war, a permanent policy of the American Government. I have understood that we were trying to get rid of subsidies for special products.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment is not mandatory in any sense of the word. Its purpose is to make certain that an adequate supply of essential minerals or metals for war emergency will be secured. It should be remembered that we are going into the market to secure these materials, and that foreign countries are able to produce them at much less cost than we can produce them with American labor. American labor may be thrown into competition with producers abroad. All this amendment would do would be to insure to the Chairman of the Board and to the Government of the United States the authority to pay 25 percent more than the world market in the event the world market were impressed with foreign slave labor, or peon labor, as the case might be. I think that such a provision is eminently necessary if we are to secure to this country the assurance that in time of need we may have war-essential metals or materials.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORT BY PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how long it will take to conclude the matter now under discussion, but I have a concurrent resolution which is important, and I wish to secure action on it at once.

Mr. TAFT. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send forward the resolution, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kentucky believe that consideration of the concurrent resolution will result in lengthy discussion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe that the resolution will bring about lengthy discussion, but it must be acted upon today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am under the impression that the pending bill can be disposed of very quickly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must return to the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack by 2 o'clock this afternoon. I promised the other House to have the resolution messaged over to them as soon as possible so that they could act on it quickly.

When the original concurrent resolution was submitted, January 3, 1946, was fixed as the limit of time within which the committee should make its report. It is obvious that the committee cannot conclude its work by that date, and that an extension of time must be granted. There was a lack of uniform agreement within the committee with reference to the length of time which may be required. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] felt that a longer period of time would be required than the period ending the 15th of February, and because of that belief he voted in the committee against the resolution. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was in doubt about it, and therefore did not vote. I may say that counsel for the committee were also in doubt with reference to the matter, and when Mr. Mitchell submitted his letter a few days ago indicating the resignation of the legal staff, he rather strongly intimated that at the present rate of progress which the committee was making several months would be required for it to complete its work. But in fixing the time to be allowed for the committee to proceed further, it is necessary to fix a goal and agree upon a date, because it would be inconceivable for us to extend indefinitely the time within which the committee must report. I say frankly that whether the committee can conclude its work by the 15th of February, I would not at the present time hazard a guess; but we do feel that with proper speed—we have already agreed to hold hearings more hours each day than we have been

holding them—and with the elimination of any unnecessary prolongation of time, we can at least conclude the evidence by the 15th of February, and if it is then necessary to have further time in which to make our report we can come back to the Senate and to the House with a request for an extension of time.

With that explanation, Mr. President, and without going into any of the matters involved in the investigation, I hope the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have no intention of opposing the resolution. I have listened to my senior colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Senior in service.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I have been told that a Senator may be wrong, but is never in doubt, and that I should not allow the RECORD to show the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky that I was in doubt. I was quite clear in concurrence with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that it was very doubtful that we could complete the hearings by February 15. In fact, I am clear in my own mind that we cannot do so. On the other hand, I recognized the problem involved, and I was quite ready to defer in silence to the judgment of our distinguished chairman in his hope that we might make progress. For that reason I refrained from voting either way.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I am correct in stating that the Senator's state of mind was in such confusion about the matter that he did not vote either way. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. My state of mind was not one of confusion.

Mr. BARKLEY. The objection of the Senator to the word "doubt" reminds me of a distinguished former Senator from Kentucky, Joseph C. S. Blackburn, who said on one occasion, "He who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned."

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Secretary facilitate the expeditious transfer of the resolution to the other House so that it may be acted upon promptly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will take due notice.

STRATEGIC RESERVES AND MILITARY SUPPLIES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to present a very brief report from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program of which I have the honor to be chairman. It deals with strategic reserves and military supplies. I think it will be a contribution to the debate in which the Senate is now engaged.

I believe the Senate, in general, is aware that one of the principal activities of the committee since the end of hostilities has been the examination of the disposal of assets in the form of supplies, installations and facilities which have been created in connection with the war, the liquidation of which will have an important bearing upon the total cost of the war to the American people.

The committee has held a series of hearings, both executive and public, investigating the agencies responsible for the declaration and disposal of Government-owned surpluses. Those hearings have dealt with various phases of surplus property disposal, such as the manner in which preferences for States, municipalities and other tax-supported institutions, small business, and veterans have been administered. Others have dealt with the speed with which the disposal agencies are moving surpluses into the civilian economy. Still others have dealt with instances of discrimination and unbusinesslike practices.

I do not wish to discuss before the Senate, in any detail, these phases of the committee's activities at this time. I wish to report briefly on another aspect of surplus property disposal, namely, the rate of declaration of surpluses by the holding agencies. More specifically, I wish to discuss the committee's activities in connection with the plans of the War Department for maintaining reserves of supplies and equipment for its peacetime operation.

The committee became aware of what is known as the strategic reserve plan of the War Department. Because the effect of this plan would be to limit the amount of supplies which the War Department would declare surplus, the committee immediatel, instituted an investigation. It has held two executive hearings and two public hearings on this subject. In my opinion, this investigation has resulted in a concrete improvement. The Senate and the public are entitled to know more about the problems that were involved and the accomplishment that has been achieved than is now known generally.

Out of the tremendous quantity of supplies and equipment which have been produced for fighting this war, the War Department planned to retain huge quantities of supplies for the purpose of equipping and maintaining the Army during the period of demobilization, during the period of occupation of Japan and Germany, during peacetime years, and for the first year of the next war. This was not merely a plan in the thinking stage, but was embodied in a directive of the War Department, dated September 14, 1945. This directive, in essence, prohibited officers charged with the declaration of surpluses from declaring any surpluses in the items in which these reserves were to be maintained until the total quantity planned for these reserves had been accumulated.

In order to clear up any misunderstanding as to the meaning of the word "reserve"—a word which has previously been misunderstood by the press and the public—I wish to make plain at this time that "reserves" as used by the War Department, in connection with its plans for maintaining supplies, does not mean that the War Department has on hand and under its control the quantities set up in reserve. The word "reserve" as used by the War Department merely means the quantity which the War Department would like to have in order to fulfill the programs which it has in mind. The word which would indicate the quantity which the Army now has on hand or under its control would be "inventory" or "stock on hand."

The stocks on hand, as revealed to the committee by the War Department, do not approach the quantities of reserves which they would like to have. This simply means that in the items in which strategic reserves were planned to be accumulated there would be little likelihood that any of them would be declared to be surplus. Unfortunately, this distinction between reserves and stock on hand was misunderstood by a part of the press. A table of reserves in 12 selected civilian-type items was introduced at our first public hearing. It showed what the War Department would like to have on hand for the purpose of meeting future needs. However, in a part of the press it was reported that the War Department did have those quantities on hand. This was erroneous.

The War Department sought to correct this impression by issuing a release December 5, 1945, the day after the preliminary report of the Hodges Board was made. It was proper that the War Department should seek to correct this error. However, in its press release the War Department went too far and made statements which at a subsequent hearing were admitted to be misleading by War Department officials who testified, none of whom accepted any responsibility for the release.

This release stated that, instead of the tremendous quantities which had been shown as total reserves and had been misinterpreted by the press to mean the stocks on hand, the War Department, on the other hand, had on hand only very small quantities of such items, which were stated by the War Department to be sufficient only to last for a very short time, ranging from 12 days to 18 months. What the release neglected to make plain was that the quantities used for that computation were simply the stocks in depots in the United States. It neglected to state that in addition the War Department had vast quantities of those items in posts, camps, and stations in the United States, in the hands of troops in the United States, in depots in foreign combat theaters, and in the hands of troops in foreign combat theaters.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I correct in understanding that the release was issued through the press relations agency of the War Department?

Mr. MEAD. That is my understanding.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it impossible to determine who was responsible for it?

Mr. MEAD. We could not ascertain the one responsible at the very large hearing which we held at that time. There were a great many representatives of the War Department present. They were familiar with the release, but not one of them would assume responsibility for it.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I inquire whether the committee is continuing its explorations in an effort to fix the responsibility for it? I noted it in the press at the time, and I think it is of the highest importance that the responsibility be determined.

Mr. MEAD. We have asked that a full story of the release be made a part of our record.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, and repeat, what the release neglected to make plain was that the quantities used for that computation were simply the stocks in depots in the United States. It neglected to state that, in addition, the War Department had vast quantities of those items in posts, camps, and stations in the United States, in the hands of troops in the United States, in depots in foreign combat theaters, and in the hands of troops in foreign combat theaters. Thus, for example, instead of having only 3.7 months' supply of blankets, as the Army release stated, the fact is that under the revised Hodges' board plan the Army will have sufficient blankets to supply it until June 30, 1949, and will be able to declare 2,000,000 blankets surplus immediately. Similar figures would apply to other items listed in the War Department release.

Although the committee understands and sympathizes with the War Department's desire to correct a public misunderstanding, it condemns the issuance of misleading and erroneous statements such as those contained in the official War Department release above referred to. The public is entitled to know the facts and to know all the facts and not to be misled by half truths.

As to inventory, or stock on hand, neither the War Department, nor the Navy Department has been able to give the committee the total world-wide figures of supplies and equipment under the control of those departments. The only reliable figures which the War Department has been able to furnish to the committee are those showing the total quantity in depots in the United States. As to other supplies under the control of the War Department, no complete and accurate records are available in Washington. Outside the depots in the United States there are vast quantities of supplies and equipment in the hands of troops in the United States, and in posts, camps, and stations in the United States, concerning which Washington does not have the figures. In addition, there are millions of tons of supplies in depots in combat theaters outside the United States. The commanders of these theaters are understood by the committee to have fairly accurate figures about the depot supplies within their commands. In fact, in the committee's investigation in Europe, conducted last summer, such figures were furnished to the committee in Paris and in Caserta, Italy. However, the theater commanders do not have accurate figures as to the supplies and equipment in the hands of the troops in their theaters. Estimates of these quantities have been furnished to the committee.

In order to get a general idea of the ultimate total of supplies which will be declared surplus by the War Department, we would have to know first what the Army now has everywhere in the world; and, second, what it will need for reasonable future use; the difference between these two being the amount that should be declared surplus. The War Department's strategic reserves affected the second of the above factors, namely, the amount of supplies to be retained for the future use of the Army. In connection with these strategic reserves, it is important to note that they were to be filled only from quantities of materials now under the control of the War Department.

The War Department did not plan to procure new supplies to fill these reserves, but did not intend to declare surpluses of any of the items on the strategic reserves list from stocks of supplies presently under Army control until such reserves had been filled. Under the reserve formula, which had been set up by the War Department directive dated September 14, 1945, some items would be kept by the War Department for use as late as 1970. The committee entertained serious doubts as to the advisability of attempting to maintain large reserves of supplies over a long period of years, particularly with respect to civilian items which are now urgently needed in our civilian economy. The War Department was unable to satisfy the committee that it had studied the expense involved in carrying out its strategic reserves plans. It had compiled no figures before adopting the strategic reserves plan as to the cost of such items as preparation for storage, transportation to storage, handling and storage costs and servicing over a period of years, depreciation as a result of obsolescence and interest in public funds tied up in such stagnant supplies over a period of years.

The committee has recently received estimates that as to the civilian-type items which the War Department planned to store it would cost about $150,000,000 to transport them to storage depots, another $150,000,000 to recondition and prepare them for storage, and about $14,000,000 a year to store them. It was also estimated that the value of such civilian items in reserve would be about a billion dollars. The interest on the public funds which would be tied up in these items would be an additional considerable amount when piled up year after year. Even these rough estimates as to the cost of keeping these stocks for a strategic reserve, however, had not been computed by the War Department before the reserve program was decided upon.

On November 5, 1945, after the War Department knew the committee had begun its investigation, a special board was appointed to review the strategic reserve program. This board, under the direction of Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, was known as the Hodges' board.

The Hodges' board submitted an interim report of its findings to the Chief of Staff on December 4, 1945, recommending that the Army release supplies of civilian-type items for the civilian economy, except those quantities required to meet military needs during the demobilization and that part of the occupational period up to June 30, 1949, and the quantities necessary to fill certain foreign requirements. At the committee's public hearing on December 14, 1945, the Honorable Kenneth C. Royall, Under Secretary of War, announced that this interim report of the Hodges' board had been unanimously approved by the War Department. The effect of the Hodges' report was to eliminate all reserves of civilian-type items for the peacetime Army after June 30, 1949, and the strategic reserve for the next war.

The effect of the elimination of strategic reserves in civilian-type items can be best illustrated by the following table. This table sets forth a few typical civilian-type items held by the War Department, and shows the size of the reserves to be filled under the War Department's original plan, the amounts reduced as a result of the Hodges' report, and the amounts immediately available as surplus.

	Original reserves planned by War Department	To be eliminated from planned reserves under Hodges plan	Amount immediately available as surplus
Tractors, crawler type, class II	4,231	3,914	1,574
Shovel cranes, ¾ cubic yard	650	637	289
Service boots	27,323,000	27,323,000	771,000
Wool blankets	54,071,000	52,222,000	2,000,000
Flashlights	1,979,000	1,654,000	82,000
Bleaching material pounds	17,346,000	17,346,000	4,681,000
Pocket watches, railroad grade	3,091	3,022	768

This was a tremendous change and was accomplished promptly. War Department representatives have advised the committee that this will result in the immediate declaration as surplus of $400,000,000 worth of civilian-type items now held in the United States by the War Department. That in itself is, in my judgment, a noteworthy accomplishment to the credit of the committee. These civilian supplies, according to the War Department, should be in the hands of the disposal agencies by not later than January 1. It is estimated that future declarations arising from this source will at least equal this amount.

It should be noted that these surpluses are in addition to the amounts which normally would have been declared surplus anyway. It should also be noted that the transportation, renovation, handling and storage costs, and other expenses involved in maintaining these stocks over a long period of years will not now have to be met and will, therefore, be saved.

The committee has frequently found it necessary to criticize executive agencies. This, of course, is inherent in the very nature of the committee if it is to discharge forthrightly and effectively the obligation imposed upon it by the Senate to examine the administration

and expenditure of the enormous appropriations and powers Congress has accorded to the executive agencies for defense purposes.

For this reason, I am particularly gratified to be able to commend the War Department and certain of its officials for the vigor and promptness with which this problem was attacked and the courage with which a far-reaching decision was made. In just about 30 days, an established policy was reexamined and completely modified. The result has been made to make available to the civilian economy when most needed a huge quantity of supplies. This now presents a challenge to the disposal machinery which has the responsibility for feeding rapidly and smoothly into the national economy the supplies which have now been made available.

I particularly commend the Under Secretary of War, Kenneth C. Royall, for promptly placing in effect the recommendations of the Hodges Board. I also commend Gen. Courtney H. Hodges for assuming and promptly and courageously discharging a difficult, and possibly an unpopular, task. I also commend Brig. Gen. Theodore M. Osborne, plans and supplies officer, Army Service Forces, for his expert knowledge of the Army supply system and his appreciation of sound business-like methods of large-scale procurement and supply.

The committee feels that in the elimination of the long-range storage program for civilian items by the War Department a long step forward has been taken in solving the problem of Government surpluses.

ACQUISITION OF STOCKS OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 752) to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to the pending amendment. As I read the amendment, it proposes to provide a subsidy on the part of the Government to nonpaying metal producing mines which cannot themselves make a go of it. In other words, it is directed principally to the marginal mines.

That simply means that it is proposed to take money out of the Treasury and pay it for maintaining and sustaining those particular mines, which cannot carry themselves and cannot stand upon their own strength. As a member of the committee which considered the bill now before the Senate, I wish to say that this very subject was discussed in the committee, and it was the very general consensus of the committee that nothing of this kind should be done.

Mr. President, what is proposed is a subsidy, purely and simply a subsidy, permitting the Chairman of the Board to enter into contracts with mine owners to pay them 25 percent more than the market price of the ore which they may produce. That puts those mines not only in competition with foreign mines—we are not interested in that—but in competition with our domestic mines which can produce the metals. It is my earnest hope that in this bill, which provides for stock-piling, we shall not embark upon a subsidy program. Marginal mines for the production of strategic metals grew up during the war. They were necessary then. They were paid a price which permitted them to operate because under the demand for war metals that could be done to meet the exigencies of wartime need. But that condition no longer exists, and there is no duty upon the Government to carry these mines, these privately owned enterprises, by means of subsidies.

Mr. President, there is another phase to this matter. No doubt the time will come in the exhaustion of our minerals when marginal mines will be operated, and be operated upon a sound basis, in such a way that they can pay for themselves and pay for their own operations.

So it is my hope, and I express it now, that the views of the committee will be followed upon this subject, and that the amendment offered by the able Senator from Nevada will not prevail.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the amendment were to stand at all in the position of interfering with the successful passage of the bill I certainly would not insist on it, but it seems to me that an erroneous view has been taken by the Senator from West Virginia and perhaps by the Senator from Ohio. The amendment does not provide for a subsidy in any sense of the word. The amendment would make sure that the authority in charge of this matter would have, if, as, and when necessary, war-essential materials or minerals. If they can be produced domestically in sufficient quantity to insure the Nation a supply in time of need, then there will be no occasion for paying the 25 percent or any part thereof. If, on the other hand, we are going to jeopardize American labor by saying that we will import peon- and slave-produced minerals and metals from foreign countries to supply the market, then, of course, we will close all the American mines and turn all the American labor out of the mines, and bring the metals and the minerals from abroad as we did during the very war just concluded.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment, if the Senator will permit me to continue. I mean no discourtesy. I am not one who will join with others on the floor to defeat this bill. On the other hand, I am not one who will lend my voice nor my effort nor my accord to bring in slave-produced commodities from abroad. We are now approaching that very era, if I am not mistaken, because many countries remote from our shores are today in a sad condition, and in those countries any wage standard will be sufficient to furnish bread. Are we going to place American labor in such a position that it must meet such competition if, as, and when we need American labor to produce American necessities, when we can produce them by paying merely a small subsidy, if, indeed, it may be called a subsidy? That is the object, the aim, and purpose of the amendment. But if it is seriously opposed I shall certainly not jeopardize the passage of the bill by insisting upon the amendment at this time, because the passage of the bill is so essential.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that I join the Senator wholeheartedly in the idea of not creating a situation which would bring in foreign minerals in competition with those produced in this country or with those capable of being produced in this country. I join with the Senator in that completely. Also, I am in thorough accord with him that we should do nothing which would place the labor of America in competition with foreign labor. No one can doubt my position on that subject. I brought that out in the reciprocal-trade-agreements debate on the floor of the Senate when I opposed those agreements and the law under which they were made and authority to make them was given. I opposed the making of agreements that permitted importation of foreign-made goods in competition with the products of the workers of this country. But let me say, there is a way to keep out those minerals, to keep them away from competition in this country, and to prevent cheap foreign labor from competing with American labor, and that is by placing a tariff against the importation of such metals.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that in the last 12 years, to my certain knowledge, we have not found that way to be effective.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If we had a proper tariff against them we could keep them out of the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Rather than have that done or anything done to jeopardize the passage of the bill, I withdraw the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada withdraws his amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read a third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 752) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 871, House bill 4717.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill at this time because I think it is very meritorious and that it should be passed. I do not think it will take more than a minute or two to consider it and pass it. I will say that immediately after the bill is passed, it is my intention to ask that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar, and we can take up the bills as they appear on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for his statement. Mr. President, I inquire what is the status of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been stated by title for the information of the Senate. The question is on the request of the Senator from Colorado for the immediate consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4717) to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this bill is of tremendous importance, and that is why I want to have it taken up at this time outside the call of the calendar, because it might evoke some discussion. I do not know why it should, however, because the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance handling veterans' legislation voted unanimously in favor of the bill, as did the Senate Finance Committee. However, this bill does completely reorganize the Medical Division of the Veterans' Bureau. It is far-reaching in its effect, and for that reason I thought the Senate should have an opportunity to discuss it freely, if any questions are to be raised with respect to it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In view of the very thorough consideration which the bill has received at the hands of the subcommittee and the fact that it was unanimously adopted by the subcommittee, members of which represent practically all different schools of thought in the Senate, and the further fact that the bill has been unanimously reported by the great Finance Committee of the Senate, I believe the Senate is prepared to pass the bill immediately. I say that much to the Senator, without any further explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not care to make any further explanation of the bill; but I should like to have printed in the RECORD portions of the statements of General Bradley and General Hawley before the Senate Committee on Finance. In my opinion, their reasons are all-compelling. For example, they stated that the need in the Veterans' Bureau is for 3,400 doctors; that they now have 2,300, and that they are very likely to lose 600 or 700, leaving only 1,700 doctors, whereas 3,400 are needed. The purpose of the bill is to provide proper medical attention for veterans. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from the statements of General Bradley and General Hawley.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir.

We have a very critical situation in the medical department of the Veterans' Administration right now.

There is a great shortage of doctors. We feel that we cannot get them to serve with us under the present inducements which we can offer them.

We feel that this bill, H. R. 4717, which has passed the House, does offer inducements which will give us a reasonable chance, we think, of securing more doctors to help us out in this emergency.

This bill actually offers about five things that we think will be added inducements to doctors who may not now consider our service.

In the first place, we could hire these doctors and rate them upon appointment, according to their experience and ability.

Secondly, we could promote them on the basis of their abilities rather than on the position held. If we could do that we would not have to wait for a position rated by the Civil Service Commission in a higher position before we could promote a good man.

As it stands now, we sometimes have to move a man a considerable distance to another hospital in order to find a vacancy which would promote him. This bill will enable us to promote according to ability, so that the position will not be rated upon his position entirely. It will give the doctors a better chance to practice modern medicine.

It will authorize our doctors, not to exceed 5 percent of them, to take refresher courses up to 90 days. That would enable a physician, if he wanted to, to be sent to Mayo Clinic or Johns Hopkins or anywhere else for a short course in order to get him up to date.

The bill will encourage a man to progress in that it authorizes him an allowance up to 25 percent of his base pay if he is able to qualify as a specialist before a specialty board.

This board would not just be one of ours but an approved specialty board.

This will also give us the authority to establish residences for doctors, on about the same basis as is done in the large civilian hospitals.

Incidentally, the bill provides means whereby we can drop doctors who turn out to be incompetent or inefficient, or for misconduct, much easier than we can do under the present civil-service laws.

We feel that time is very important. We feel there should be no delay.

At this time, some 15,000 to 18,000 doctors have left the services. We have gotten very few of them; they have shown very little interest in the Veterans' Administration.

Now, a lot of these doctors leaving the services are at a time when they must make a decision whether they are to go into civil practice or join up.

We feel that we must offer them something, and we must offer it to them pretty soon, if we are going to take advantage of this period of time during which they are making their decision.

We think, therefore, that it is highly important that we get this bill through as quickly as possible.

I believe General Hawley will tell you when he comes to testify, that this is not 100 percent of what we would like to have. However, it does offer most of the things that we think is necessary to get if we are to obtain these doctors.

I repeat that we think that the time element is much more important than some small details which might be added or taken out.

The CHAIRMAN. I presume it goes without saying that you will have a tremendous load and a great responsibility ahead of you, in taking care of the veterans of World War II.

General BRADLEY. We are having that load and responsibility at the present time. We should have 3,400 doctors in order to carry on our installation adequately.

Actually, we have 2,300. We are going to lose a lot of those now, because they are in uniform. Some 700 of them have been loaned to us by the Army and there is an additional 1,000 in uniform that were with us.

If we are going to lose between 700 and 1,000 out of the 2,300 we have, it would cut us down to 50 percent of the doctors we need.

We are trying to overcome this shortage situation by attempting to get help from civilian doctors in medical centers. Unfortunately, only a limited number of our hospitals are close enough to subcenters to be able to use that help. Thus, no matter how much help these medical centers may want to give us, there will still be a shortage in the staff of most of our hospitals.

* * * * *

General HAWLEY. The situation as regards physicians, and to a lesser extent dentists and nurses, in the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration is now critical, and is becoming steadily worse.

Already short one-third the required number of physicians to operate existing hospitals, further shortage seems inevitable as physcians, now lent to the Veterans' Administration by the Army and Navy, are separated from the service. On the other hand, the number of physicians required is increasing month by month.

For several reasons it is impossible, under civil service, to provide physicians of the proper quality in the numbers required. Civil-service rates of pay are not attractive. The rating of the position, rather than of

the physician who occupies the position, retards promotion of younger and better qualified men. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rid the service of incompetent physicians.

H. R. 4717, in our opinion, is not an ideal bill. But it is infinitely preferable to the present law governing appointment of physicians to the Veterans' Administration, and it is undoubtedly the best measure that will be agreed upon by the majority of interests concerned. It has, in our opinion, some objectionable provisions; but it is also our opinion that the delay that would result from an effort to change these provisions would be more serious than the provisions themselves.

The most urgent consideration right now is time. Between 15,000 and 20,000 physicians have been separated from the armed services; and more are being separated each day. Many of these men are at the crossroads of their professional careers. If reasonably attractive offers can be made to them at this present moment, a goodly number of highly qualified physicians will be attracted to the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration. As it now is, only an insignificant few have displayed any interest.

I measure the effect of my words when I say that unless H. R. 4717 is enacted into law at once—before the Christmas recess of the Congress—the Medical Service of the Veterans' Administration will suffer further grave consequences which may well be irreparable. In the interest of the thousands of disabled veterans who have, by their sacrifices, earned better medical care than they are now receiving, I urge immediate action upon this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4717) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 858) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4717 to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill be passed.

Your committee and a subcommittee thereof have most carefully considered the proposed legislation and held hearings on H. R. 4717, and in the light of the testimony presented by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and other data furnished the committee feel there is urgent need for this legislation.

This legislation to accomplish the general purpose as set forth in the bill has the approval, in principle, of the President and has been strongly recommended by the Veterans' Administration as being essential and vital, and that such legislative relief is one of the most urgent needs.

Your committee has determined on all of the facts that such legislation should (1) incorporate adequate provisions as to organization and authority without military aspects; (2) provide by statute certain positions with adequate salary stipulations, with specified salary ranges for doctors, nurses, and dentists, and a special salary range for attendants; (3) authorize appointments to certain specified positions without regard to civil service, by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; (4) provide a civil-service system of retirement in preference to a military system; (5) retain classified civil service for positions not specifically exempted therefrom by the bill; (6) incorporate authority to dispense with the services of unsatisfactory or disqualified employees in certain categories without the restrictions of the laws and regulations pertaining to civil service; and (7) incorporate such special provisions as are necessary to insure an adequate and complete medical and hospital service in the Veterans' Administration, as intended by the bill. H. R. 4717 will meet these objectives.

To reveal the urgent need of a more satisfactory organization and for special provisions to attract necessary personnel, your committee is advised that position vacancies as of October 24, 1945, in the medical and hospital personnel in all categories numbered 9,031, and anticipated shortage for January 1, 1946, was 15,738. Out of the total of 9,081 vacancies October 24, 1945, 6,680 pertain to doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants. Out of the total of 15,738 vacancies anticipated for January 1, 1946, 11,910 pertain to doctors, dentists, nurses, and attendants.

The Veterans' Administration is handicapped in filling many of these vacancies because it is unable to offer satisfactory inducements to prospective employees. The employment salaries are subject to civil-service restrictions and there cannot be included any of the additional benefits, such as certain special allowances, opportunity for advancement, or other requisite advantages offered elsewhere.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Section 1 of the bill would abolish the medical service in the Veterans' Administration as at present constituted and would establish in its stead a Department of Medicine and Surgery under a Chief Medical Director. The functions of the Department of Medicine and Surgery would be those necessary for a complete medical and hospital service to be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall include the Office of the Chief Medical Director, Medical Service, Dental Service, Nursing Service, and Auxiliary Service.

Section 3 provides that the Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the Chief Medical Director, one Deputy Medical Director, eight Assistant Medical Directors, and such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by the act. It provides for appointment by the Administrator of the Chief Medical Director at a salary of $12,000 a year, the Deputy Medical Director at a salary of $11,500 a year, eight Assistant Medical Directors at a salary of $11,000 a year each, the Director of Nursing Service at a salary of $8,000 a year, a chief pharmacist, chief dietitian, chief physical therapist, and chief occupational therapist, each at a salary of $6,000 a year. These appointments will be for a period of 4 years subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

Section 4 provides for appointment by the Administrator of additional personnel as he may find necessary for the medical care of veterans in the following groups:

(a) Doctors, dentists, and nurses; and

(b) Managers, pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and scientific personnel and other medical and dental technologists.

Section 5 prescribes the conditions of eligibility for appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. The first requirement is that any person so appointed must be a citizen of the United States. There are then provided the professional and other qualifications for doctors, dentists, nurses; and in the auxiliary service—managers of hospitals, homes, or centers—pharmacists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, and other auxiliary employees. It is provided that persons may be appointed under this act while on terminal leave from the armed forces and may be paid for their services rendered under such appointment notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary.

Section 6 provides that the appointments of doctors, dentists, and nurses shall be made only after their qualifications have been satisfactorily established in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator and without regard to civil-service requirements. There is provided a probationary period of 3 years with necessary administrative provisions for review of employment records and for separation from the medical, dental, or nursing services if the person is found not fully qualified and satisfactory. Provision is made for promotion of doctors, dentists, and nurses on the basis of examinations and automatic promotions may be made within grade. Doctors, dentists, and nurses in the present medical service will be continued in their present positions until their qualifications are determined as heretofore indicated. Provision is also made for including in the computation of service for civil-service reinstatement purposes, service performed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery by persons appointed to positions therein, who at time of appointment shall have a civil-service status, and whose employment in such Department is terminated. However, this provision will not permit restoration of any position abolished by section 1 of the act.

Section 7 establishes the grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions of doctors, dentists, and nurses provided in section 4, subsection (a). The Administrator is authorized to prescribe by regulations the hours and conditions of employment and leave of absence of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

Section 8 authorizes the Chief Medical Director to rate any doctor appointed under section 4, subsection (a), as a medical or surgical specialist, but no person may at any one time hold more than one such rating. It provides for the conditions under which such ratings shall be granted, the duration of such rating, and that a person rated as a medical or surgical specialist shall receive in addition to his basic pay an allowance equal to 25 percent of such pay, but the pay plus the allowance may not exceed $11,000 per annum.

Section 9 provides that persons appointed to the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall be subject to the provisions of and entitled to the benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

Section 10 applies to any person employed in a position provided in subsection (a) of section 4 of this act and provides that the Chief Medical Director, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, shall appoint disciplinary boards, provide for their organization, the procedure to be followed, for the conducting of investigations and answering of charges. It provides for disciplinary action by the Administrator on recommendation of the board in those cases where charges are sustained. The decision of the Administrator shall be final.

Section 11 provides for appointments under civil-service laws, rules, and regulations of such additional employees, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14 of the act, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. It is provided that employees in the medical service as at present constituted, other than those provided in section 3, subsection (a) of section 4, and section 14, shall receive original appointments to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in their present civil-service status upon certification of satisfactory service by the manager of the hospital, home, or center where such person

is presently employed. It is provided that the per annum salary range for attendants shall be $1,572 minimum to $1,902 maximum.

Section 12 provides that the Administrator shall establish a special medical advisory group composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, nominated by the Chief Medical Director. The board shall advise the Administrator through the Chief Medical Director and the Chief Medical Director direct relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans, and other matters pertinent to the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Provision is made for regular calendar quarterly meetings, and for the number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members.

Section 13 provides expenses, except membership fees, of employees described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4, detailed by the Chief Medical Director to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical and related sciences, subject to available appropriations. The Administrator is authorized to place employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery described in section 3 and subsection (a) of section 4 on duty for a period not to exceed 90 days in a year in schools of the Army, Navy, and Public Health Service, and in civil institutions with the consent of authorities concerned, for the purpose of increasing professional knowledge or technical training. It is provided that not in excess of 5 percent of the personnel of the Department may be placed on such duty at one time. Provision is made, subject to available appropriations, for tuition, transportation, and educational fees of persons so placed on duty. Any person authorized to attend such course shall be required to reimburse the Veterans' Administration the expenses thereof if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after the completion of such course.

Section 14 provides for employment by the Administrator, upon recommendation of the Chief Medical Director and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of certain types of personnel on temporary full-time, part-time, or free basis, and other types on a temporary full-time or part-time basis, but no temporary full-time appointment shall be made for a period of more than 90 days. This section also provides for the establishment of residencies and appointment to such positions without regard to civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations; the conditions of such employment; and the customary amounts and terms of pay during the period of such training. Residency training in most specialties would embrace training outside the hospital in connection with the school, part of the time not being spent on work directly productive for the Veterans' Administration. It is not practicable to appoint such personnel to an established position, such as the doctor, junior grade. This authority is granted in order to retain uniformity with actual practice throughout the United States in connection with residency employment because the average pay scales in residency employment are less than the scale for the minimum entrance salary of positions such as doctor, junior grade.

Section 15 provides that the Chief Medical Director, with the approval of the Administrator, unless specifically otherwise provided, shall promulgate all regulations necessary to the administration of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and consistent with existing law, including regulations relating to travel, transportation of household goods and effects, and deductions from pay for quarters and subsistence; and to the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property of the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Section 16 provides that this act shall be effective from the date of its approval.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at this time I should like to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4489, Calendar No. 870, which was reported by the Finance Committee at the same time as the bill just considered and passed by the Senate. It is a bill which may produce some controversy, and yet it is very important that it be passed this year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I notice that the bill is on the calendar. It will be reached on the call of the calendar. It may be that it can be passed without objection. Many Senators are anxious to proceed with the call of the calendar. It was pretty well agreed last evening that as soon as the strategic minerals bill was out of the way we would proceed with the call of the calendar. If for any reason the bill cannot be passed on the call of the calendar, I shall cooperate with the Senator in obtaining consideration of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at the request of the acting majority leader I withdraw my request.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I was about to ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. If the Senator is interested in any particular bill, it will be reached on the call of the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Frankly, I wished to call up for consideration Senate Resolution 207, which is No. 872 on the calendar. I know it will precipitate some debate; and judging from the consideration which the resolution has had in the past few days, I fear that when it is reached on the call of the calendar it will be objected to by the acting majority leader. The resolution deals with expediting the discharge from the service of men with families. I should like to have the resolution considered at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot yield for that purpose at this time. I think it was pretty well understood yesterday that after the Senate had disposed of the strategic minerals bill it would proceed to consideration of measures on the calendar to which there was no objection.

I ask that the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning where the last call ended, with Calendar No. 788.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to express my opposition to that procedure, because I wish to take up Calendar No. 872, Senate Resolution 207, dealing with the discharge from the military service of fathers. We know what will happen when the calendar is called. If the calendar is to be called now, I ask that I may be recognized before the day is over, to present a motion to take up Senate Resolution 207 in the event that it is objected to on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have that opportunity.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 788.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 566) relating to the domestic raising of fur-bearing animals, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "all" to insert "clarification and administration of"; in line 5, after "regulations", to insert "pertaining to"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "or", to insert "the"; in line 2, after "animals", to insert "or their products by the producer", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of all clarification and administration of acts of Congress, Executive orders, administrative orders, and regulations pertaining to—

(a) fox, rabbit, mink, chinchilla, marten, fisher, muskrat, karakul, and all other fur-bearing animals raised in captivity for breeding or other useful purposes shall be deemed domestic animals;

(b) such animals and the products thereof shall be deemed agricultural products; and

(c) the breeding, raising, producing, or the marketing of such animals or their products by the producer shall be deemed an agricultural pursuit.

SEC. 2. (a) All the functions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, which effect the breeding, raising, producing, marketing, or any other phase of the production or distribution, of domestically raised fur-bearing animals, or products thereof, are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) Appropriations and unexpended balances of appropriations, or parts thereof, which the Director of the Budget determines to be available for expenditure for the administration of any function transferred by this act, shall be available for expenditure for the continued administration of such function by the officer to whom such function is so transferred.

(c) All records and property (including office furniture and equipment) under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior used primarily in connection with the administration of functions transferred by this act are hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is a typographical error in the bill on page 1, line 3. The word "all" before the word "clarification," should be stricken. I offer an amendment to strike out the word "all" in line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator give us a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The purpose of the bill is to transfer to the Department of Agriculture that segment of the Wildlife Service which has to do with the domestic production of fur-bearing animals commercially, in order that farmers who are engaged in producing fur for commercial purposes may have the benefit of the activity of this service

synthesized and integrated with that of the Department of Agriculture, which deals generally with agricultural problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Huffman	Radcliffe
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Brooks	Knowland	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Smith
Byrd	Langer	Stanfill
Capehart	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Taft
Carville	McClellan	Taylor
Ellender	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McKellar	Tobey
Fulbright	McMahon	Tunnell
Gerry	Maybank	Tydings
Gossett	Mead	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Wagner
Guffey	Mitchell	Walsh
Gurney	Moore	Wheeler
Hart	Morse	Wherry
Hatch	Murdock	White
Hayden	Myers	Wiley
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Willis
Hill	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent on important business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On December 19, 1945:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended.

On December 20, 1945:

S. 1580. An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 4805, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 20, 1945.

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate what the amendment is?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. As the Senator knows, there has been a prolonged fight regarding a dam in the northern part of North Dakota, and the conferees on the part of the House and those on the part of the Senate have now held two conferences regarding it.

The question is whether the dam should be constructed at a height of 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet. The House insists upon 1,830 feet and the Senate insists upon 1,850 feet.

The conferees have tried to arrive at an agreement and have not been able to do so. Yesterday the Senate agreed to an amendment which was sent to the House and there disagreed to. My motion is that the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment 103. We hope that when the conferees again meet an agreement may be reached. If the motion to which I have referred is agreed to I shall then move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, ask for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was on the telephone when the Senator from Tennessee took the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator to state what is the status of the Senate amendment affecting the rights of the Indians of the Three Affiliated Tribes?

Mr. McKELLAR. That matter is included in the amendment relating to the height of the dam.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The only amendment in disagreement, I take it, is the one relating to the height of the dam.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. If that matter could be settled there would be no difficulty with reference to the subject about which the Senator has spoken. But in order to reach an agreement it will be necessary for the Senate to recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment 103. Then the entire matter can be taken up again, and when that is done, we hope to do better than we were able to do before.

I may say that the situation is a very difficult one. So far as I know, there has been no opposition to the Senator's amendment. I do not think any opposition will be encountered. The controversy relates to the height of the dam, whether it should be 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the pending motion of the Senator is to enable the conferees on the part of the Senate to return to a conference with conferees on the part of the House, and reach some kind of an agreement relative to the height of the dam.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to make a short statement because I must leave very soon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator be good enough to let the Senate act on my motion?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to inquire what was done with the amendment relative to the Conemaugh Dam.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were three dams in the Senator's State in which he was interested.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; the dam about which I have inquired is not in my State, but in Pennsylvania.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were several dams involved, and the amendment concerning one of them was not agreed to. The conferees did agree, however, to the amendment with reference to the Conemaugh Dam.

Mr. President, I ask that the Senate act on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate recede from its amendment to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment 103.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 103, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

DELAY IN DISCHARGE OF VETERANS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I invite attention of the Senate to the deplorable conditions now existing in our transportation system as they affect the returning veterans. I have received several messages on the subject. I am sure that other Senators have received similar messages, as well as letters, in regard to the demobilization of veterans so far as transportation is concerned. I have before me a communication from a veteran whose home is in St. Paul. He received a 40-day leave and then was ordered to California to be discharged and return to St. Paul.

Here is another communication from a veteran whose home is in Seattle. He was in Seattle and was instructed to go across the country to New York, receive his discharge, and then return to his home in Seattle.

These are not the first messages which have come to my office, and I am sure that messages of a similar nature have come to the offices of other Members of the Senate. It has been necessary for veterans to travel thousands of miles in order to be discharged from the service before going permanently to their homes.

It is no wonder that the traveling facilities of the railroads are being taxed to the limit. We must assume that the blame for this situation is to be placed on the system used by the Army in demobilizing its men. The situation has brought about serious and most tragic consequences. I invite the attention of the Senate, and particularly the attention of members of the Military Affairs Committee and of the Interstate Commerce Committee, to the conditions to which I have referred, and hope that the information which I have given will trickle down to the War Department so that other veterans who are to be discharged may be handled more quickly and be required to travel less distances. An arrangement should be made for them to obtain their discharge papers at points near their homes. A system of that kind would result in a saving of great expense to the Government, and would relieve the transportation system of the country, which is now taxed beyond its limit. It seems to me that the present situation demonstrates one of the most glaring inefficiencies of the War Department.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senator. I do not understand the onus which the Senator seeks to place on the War Department. The men who are being discharged are located in camps or military reservations far from their homes. What would the Senator from Minnesota have the War Department do in order to relieve the situation about which he complains?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think it is reasonable to assume, for example, that a serviceman whose home is in Seattle and is to be discharged should be discharged in or near Seattle. His discharge papers should be sent him in Seattle instead of New York. If such a system were inaugurated, it would result in saving the necessity of going across the country to New York and then later returning back across the country to Seattle.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator means that the serviceman is already near his home on one side of the continent, for example, and the War Department requires him to be transported across the continent, or to some distant place for discharge, I agree that an effort should be made to discharge him at a point near his home.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator must realize that many of the servicemen who are being discharged are not near their homes. As I understand, there is a seriously congested situation on the Pacific Coast because of the fact that many returning veterans are returning from islands in the Pacific and from other points in that area. That situation, of course, presents many vexing problems. But so far as discharging a serviceman near his home is concerned, and thereby saving him the necessity of traveling great distances, as well as saving expense to the Government, I believe that it should be done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is all I am asking for. It should have been done a long time ago.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States, communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, announced that on today, December 20, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1580) to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such Organization.

FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) relative to the formation of an International Health Organization, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That there should be the speedy convening of such a conference and the early formation of an International Health Organization as one of the objectives of the United Nations Organization, and that the President is hereby requested, on behalf of the Government of the United States, to urge upon the United Nations Organization the prompt convening of such conference and the formation of such an Organization.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on what page of the calendar is the clerk reading?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On page 6.

Mr. LANGER. What was the last order of business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next bill will be order of business 792, Senate bill 346.

FEES OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (S. 346) to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States Commissioners, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (ch. 252, 29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. The fees of United States commissioners for the following services in connection with criminal cases shall be as provided in the following subdivisions of this section. The provision of the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 shall not apply to payment of compensation to United States commissioners so as to increase the amounts of their fees as herein provided for.

"(a) In each case in which a complaint in writing and sworn to shall have been lodged with the commissioner, for all services rendered prior to the presentation of the accused before the commissioner, a fee of $2.50, said fee to accrue when the complaint is filed.

"(b) In each case in which the accused is presented before the commissioner for binding over, for all services rendered after the presentation of the accused a fee depending upon the number of such cases disposed of by the commissioner during the quarterly accounting period either by discharge or by binding over, as follows:

"(1) $7 for each of the first 25 cases so disposed of;

"(2) $6 for each of the next 25 cases;

"(3) $5 for each of the next 50 cases; and

"(4) $2 for each of all cases over 100.

"(c) In each case in which the accused is presented before the commissioner not for binding over but only for purposes of bail, whether or not bail is taken or a commitment is ordered, a fee of $2.50.

"(d) For all services in connection with each formal, written application for a search warrant, whether the application be granted or denied, a fee of $4.

"(e) For all services in connection with the application by a convict for examination under 18 United States Code, page 641, a fee of $4.

"(f) For all services in each case in which the commissioner under the authority of section 1 of the act approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1058; U. S. C., of 1940, title 18, sec. 576), and under the rules promulgated by the Supreme Court under the authority of section 2 of said act (U. S. C., of 1940, title 18, sec. 576a), conducts the trial or on a plea of guilty imposes sentence, a fee of $10 in lieu of all other fees herein provided.

"(g) For all purposes of this section, each accused shall be considered as a 'case'."

SEC. 2. Each United States commissioner shall be entitled to the following-named fees for the following services in connection with civil cases:

(a) For attending to a reference in a litigated matter in a civil cause or in admiralty in pursuance to an order of the court, $5 a day.

(b) For taking and certifying depositions to file in civil cases, 10 cents for each folio; for each copy of the same furnished to a party on request, 10 cents for each folio.

(c) For the purpose of computing the compensation of commissioners as provided in this amendment, services performed in a case in connection with the issuance of an attachment and subsequent hearing in Internal Revenue matters as provided for in United States Code, title 26, section 3615 (e), and services performed in a case in connection with settling or certifying the nonpayment of a seaman's wage, as provided for in United States Code, title 46, sections 603 and 604, shall be considered as cases under section 1 (b) above and shall be charged for and compensated accordingly.

SEC. 3. No commissioner may receive compensation for his services in that capacity exceeding $7,500 per annum.

SEC. 4. None of the provisions hereof shall apply to United States commissioners in the Territory of Alaska.

SEC. 5. This act shall become effective on the first day of the month succeeding its approval and shall apply to all cases arising thereafter. A case shall be deemed to arise when it first requires action of a commissioner.

SUPPLIES FOR UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (S. 344) to prescribe and furnish to United States Commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall supply to United States Commissioners without cost to them blank forms of such content as he shall consider best adapted for the transaction of their business and docket books of approved content in which to enter the record of all proceedings before them. Upon the approval of the senior district judge of the district in which he serves, each Commissioner shall also without cost to him be furnished by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts with a copy of the United States Code, which shall remain the property of the United States. Commissioners appointed after the effective date of this act shall be furnished with the official impression seal required by the act of June 28, 1906 (ch. 3573, 34 Stat. 546). All property furnished to any Commissioner under this act shall, upon the termination of his term of office, be transmitted to his successor in office, if any; otherwise disposed of as the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall direct.

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (S. 345) concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States Commissioners was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fees of United States Commissioners prescribed by law shall be paid out of the Treasury upon the approval of their accounts for such fees by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Such payment shall, however, be subject to the final settlement of such accounts in the General Accounting Office and to any adjustments of prior payments necessitated thereby.

QUALIFICATIONS OF REFEREE IN BANKRUPTCY

The bill (S. 343) to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States as amended so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35, chapter 541 of the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 555), as amended March 3, 1911 (ch. 231, sec. 291, 36 Stat. 1167), and June 22, 1938 (ch. 575, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 857; 11 U. S. C. 63), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Individuals shall not be eligible to appointment as referees unless they are (1) competent to perform the duties of a referee in bankruptcy; (2) not holding any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State other than United States commissioners, commissioners of deeds, justices of the peace, masters in chancery, or notaries public; (3) not relatives of any of the judges of the courts of bankruptcy or of the justices or judges of the appellate courts of the districts wherein they may be appointed; (4) resident within the territorial limits of the court of bankruptcy and have their offices in the districts for which they are to be appointed; and (5) members in good standing at the bar of the district court of the United States in which they are appointed: *Provided, however,* That subdivision (5) hereof shall not apply to referees holding office on September 22, 1938."

SERVICE OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY AND NATIONAL PARK COMMISSIONERS AS UNITED STATES COMMISSIONERS

The bill (H. R. 2465) to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISCHARGE OF INDIGENT CONVICTS

The bill (S. 342) to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend certain laws governing Federal prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 692; 18 U. S. C. 641), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5296. When a poor convict, sentenced by any court of the United States to be imprisoned and pay a fine, or fine and costs, or to pay a fine, has been confined in prison 30 days, solely for the nonpayment of such fine, or fine and costs, such convict may make application in writing to the nearest commissioner of the United States court in the district where he is imprisoned, or, if confined in a Federal penal institution, to the warden of such institution, setting forth his inability to pay such fine, or fine and costs, and after notice to the district attorney of the United States, who may appear, offer evidence, and be heard, the commissioner or the warden as the examining authority to whom such application is addressed shall by appropriate administrative proceeding inquire into the matter. If on examination it shall appear to the examining authority that such convict is unable to pay such fine, or fine and costs, and that he has not any property exceeding $20 in value, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on execution for debt, the examining authority shall administer to him the following oath: "I do solemnly swear that I have not any property, real or personal, to the amount of $20, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on civil process for debt by the laws of (naming the State where oath is administered); and that I have no property in any way conveyed or concealed, or in any way disposed of, for my future use or benefit. So help me God." Upon taking such oath, such convict shall be discharged; and the examining authority shall file with the institution in which the convict is confined a certificate setting forth the facts. Any such convict to whom the warden shall fail or refuse to administer the oath may apply to the nearest commissioner for the administration of the oath upon a proceeding de novo as above provided, and upon taking such oath shall be discharged. In case the convict is found by the examining authority to possess property valued at an amount in excess of said exemption, nevertheless, if the Attorney General finds that the retention by such convict of all of such property is reasonably necessary for his support or that of his family, such convict shall be released without further imprisonment solely for the nonpayment of such fine, or fine and costs; or if he finds that the retention by such convict of any part of such property is reasonably necessary for his support or that of his family, such convict shall be released without further imprisonment solely for nonpayment of such fine, or fine and costs, upon payment on account of his fine and costs of that portion of his property in excess of the amount found to be reasonably necessary for his support or that of his family."

TERMINATION OF RATIONING OF BUTTER, OLEOMARGARINE, FATS, OILS, AND MEAT

The resolution (S. Res. 185) favoring the termination of the rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, oils, and meat was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Department of Agriculture should order the Office of Price Administration to cease rationing of butter, oleomargarine, fats, and oils, and meat as soon as is practicable, but in no case later than December 1, 1945.

The preamble was agreed to.

TERMS OF DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The bill (H. R. 3167) to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code, to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERM OF THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

The bill (H. R. 4100) to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY OF CITIZENS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The bill (S. 1288) to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not exceeding 20 persons at a time from from the American Republics (other than the United States) to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. Not more than three persons from any one of such republics shall receive instruction under authority of this act at the same time. The persons receiving instruction under authority of this act shall receive the same pay, allowances, and emoluments, to be paid from the same appropriations, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, except that the mileage allowance payable to such persons for travel performed in proceeding to the United States Military Academy for initial admission shall not be limited to mileage for travel within the continental limits of the United States. Such persons shall, except as may be determined by the Secretary of war, be subject to the same rules and regulations governing admission, attendance, discipline, resignation, discharge, dismissal, and graduation, as cadets at the United States Military Academy appointed from the United States, but they shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or position in the United States Army by reason of their graduation from the United States Military Academy: *Provided*, That any persons permitted to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy under authority of this act shall not be subject to the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. After the date of enactment of this act, no person shall have authority to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to permit citizens of the American Republics to receive instruction at professional educational institutions and schools maintained and administered by the Government of the United States or by departments or agencies thereof," approved June 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 1034). Any person who is receiving instruction at the United States Military Academy on such date of enactment under authority of such act of June 24, 1938, may, in the discretion of the President, be permitted to continue to receive such instruction and, if so permitted, shall thereafter be deemed to be receiving instruction under the provisions of section 1 of this act.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 161) authorizing an investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER DAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "Day", to strike out "and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in universities, colleges, schools, and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE MIDSHIPMEN'S COBBLER AND BARBER SHOP AT THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 2556) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUS OF FUNDS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE MIDSHIPMEN'S TAILOR SHOP AT THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The bill (H. R. 2553) to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN PERSONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1631) a bill to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 12 of the Missing Persons Act (act of Mar. 7, 1942; 56 Stat. 143, 146), as amended (50 App. U. S. C. 1012), is hereby further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That in lieu of transportation authorized by this section for dependents, the head of the department concerned may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed."

(b) This amendment shall take effect as of September 8, 1939.

SEC. 2. (a) The first section of the act of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786; 50 App. U. S. C. 831), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end of such section the following: ": *Provided further*, That in lieu of transportation authorized by this section for dependents, the Secretary of the Navy may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed."

(b) This amendment shall take effect as of October 1, 1940.

SEC. 3. (a) The act of November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593; 50 App. U. S. C. 833a), is hereby amended by inserting the following new section and by renumbering the present section 5 as section 6:

"SEC. 5. In lieu of transportation authorized by this act for dependents, the Secretary of the Navy may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed."

(b) This amendment shall take effect as of December 7, 1941.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314, 315; 50 App. U. S. C. 763, 764), is hereby amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following subsection (3):

"(e) In lieu of transportation authorized by subsections 3 (b), 3 (c), 4 (a), 4 (b), and 4 (c) of this act for dependents, the Secretary of War may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished, when such travel shall have been completed: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to travel performed by dependents on and after the respective effective dates of the afore-mentioned subsections."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend four wartime emergency statutes (acts of March 7, 1942, October 14, 1942, November 28, 1943, and June 5, 1942), authorizing the transportation under certain wartime conditions, of dependents of certain personnel of the armed services, so as to permit payment on a commuted basis of the costs of such transportation, thus conforming to the basic authority for such payment contained in section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. This applies, of course, to servicemen and their dependents?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Both of the Army and Navy?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES BY FIRES

The bill (S. 1605) to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $7,283.87, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires occurring in a Quonset hut at naval operating base, Navy 151, on January 9, 1945; in barracks at United States naval air facility,

Hitchcock, Tex., on May 22, 1945; in Quonset hut 38, Patsu four-one, on February 3, 1945; in building 215, Marine Corps air depot, Miramar, San Diego, Calif., on March 15, 1945; in Quonset hut at naval air station, Attu, Alaska, on January 29, 1945; in barracks at naval air station, Key West, Fla., on January 1, 1945; in barracks at Manna Group, American Samoa Islands, on July 19, 1944; in Quonset hut 5, Tolosa, Leyte, Philippine Islands, on March 19, 1945; at officers' quarters 4 at United States Naval Mobile Hospital 9, on January 2, 1944; at Harrowbeer Airport, Plymouth, England, in January 1945; at officers' quarters OSS, Para-Military School, Chrea, Algiers, on June 2, 1944; at officer quarters I, naval air facility, Navy 129, on March 3, 1945; at Dewey unit, ships service building, naval training center, Sampson, N. Y., on January 15, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. GRAVES BLANCHARD ERSKINE AS RETRAINING AND REEMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATOR

The bill (S. 1590) to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator without affecting his service status and perquisites was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U. S. C. Annotated 62), or any other provisions of law, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Maj. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, a general officer in the United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, and Major General Erskine's appointment to, acceptance of, and service in that office shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the United States Marine Corps or any component thereof or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he holds the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, Major General Erskine shall retain the rank and grade of major general which he now holds in the United States Marine Corps and he shall receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer serving on active duty with the rank and in the grade of major general in the United States Marine Corps, or any component thereof; and in the event the salary prescribed by law for the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator exceeds such pay and allowances, Major General Erskine shall receive directly from the Department of Labor the difference between such pay and allowances and such salary.

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, Major General Erskine shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (naval or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the United States Marine Corps, or any component thereof.

SEC. 3. The appropriations of the Department of Labor shall be available for reimbursement to the Marine Corps of all pay and allowances received by Major General Erskine from the Marine Corps or its agencies while he is serving as Retraining and Reemployment Administrator.

SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF CERTAIN DECEASED OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 50) to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service without administration of estate, which has been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That, hereafter, in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted persons of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, where no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow, widower, or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow or widower; second, if decedent left no widow or widower, or the widow or widower be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow, widower, or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, widower, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement by the accounting officers.

SEC. 2. Section 507 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 682) is amended by striking out the words "the amount due the decedent's estate is less than $1,000 and."

SEC. 3. The following statutes or parts of statutes are hereby repealed: The last paragraph under the heading "Back Pay and Bounty" in chapter 200, Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, 317 (which paragraph is the fourth paragraph on page 373), as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs the purpose of settling these estates without administration?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to authorize the payment of the entire amount due the estate of deceased officers and enlisted personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, to the decedent's widow, widower, or legal heirs, where no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate.

Existing law—act of May 27, 1908, 35 Statutes 373, as amended—34 United States Code 941—limits to $1,000 the amount due the estate of a deceased officer or enlisted man which may be paid, if no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, to the widow or legal heirs in the order of precedence prescribed therein. Existing law does not specifically authorize the payment to a widower of amounts which may be due a deceased member of the Women's Reserves. The bill, as amended by the committee, specifically authorizes payments of amount due to a decedent's widower.

In the majority of cases the amounts involved are not sufficiently in excess of $1,000 to warrant the additional cost of administration. Furthermore, the delay occasioned in the settlement of final accounts by the requirement of administration necessarily has an adverse effect upon the families of the deceased individual.

Therefore, in order to save the widow, widower, or legal heirs the trouble and expense of securing letters of administration and to make prompt and expeditious settlement of accounts of deceased personnel, the Navy Department favors complete elimination of the limitation in the settlement of final accounts without the requirement of administration of the estate.

Section 2 amends section 507 (a) of the Public Health Act (58 Stat. 682), approved July 1, 1944, and makes this act conform to the present bill. This section was incorporated in the bill at the request of the Administrator, Federal Security Agency. A letter from the Administrator to the chairman of the committee, dated December 3, 1945, is attached hereto, marked "A."

Section 3 of the bill repeals the existing statute relative to the Navy, on this subject matter, as it was believed desirable to enact a new and independent statute rather than amend the present law which originated as a legislative provision in an appropriation bill.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS IN THE NAVY

The bill (H. R. 3759) to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY GOLDSTEIN AND JOSEPH MALLARDI

The bill (H. R. 2102) for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OHIO BRASS CO.

The bill (H. R. 1979) for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BESSIE M. CAMPBELL AND CHARLES J. CAMPBELL

The bill (H. R. 2762) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. S. P. BURTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and to insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF W. F. SMOTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1835) for the relief of W. F. Smothers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUGO EFFINGER, IN BEHALF OF WILLIAM L. EFFINGER

The bill (H. R. 3496) for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPRINGFIELD COOPERATIVE BANK

The bill (H. R. 2321) for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. ANDERSON, ROY JEFFERDS, AND GUS KLOCKENKEMPER

The bill (H. R. 2306) for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNARAE WEISS

The bill (H. R. 2746) for the relief of Annarae Weiss was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EUGENE U. BOLSTAD

The bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HANNAH HIDDE AND DORIS HIDDE

The bill (H. R. 2401) for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MYRTLE C. RADABAUGH

The bill (H. R. 3967) for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EAGLE PACKET CO., INC.

The bill (H. R. 1976) an act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, deliver, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN NISSELSON

The bill (H. R. 936) for the relief of John Nisselson of Brooklyn, N. Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RASTUS L. DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 2054) for the relief of Rastus L. Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE BODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Catherine Bode, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$500" and to insert "$250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

A. F. FITZPATRICK

The bill (H. R. 2510) for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FINCK CIGAR CO.

The bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of the Finck Cigar Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS FROM FLOOD NEAR BEAN LAKE, MO.

The bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County in the State of Missouri during the month of March 1934 was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I wish to find out why these people waited 11 years before they applied for relief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was reported by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is out of the Chamber at the moment. The Senator from Louisiana has been presiding over the Senate, and has left the Chamber temporarily.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over temporarily, with the understanding that when the Senator from Louisiana returns it may be called up again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, reverting to Calendar No. 841, House bill 3073, I wish to withdraw my objection. I find that the claims arose in 1934. They have been in litigation in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri. A few weeks ago a decision was rendered in favor of the claimants, and the bill is simply for the purpose of carrying out the judgment of the court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIC FISCHER AND ELSE FISCHER

The bill (H. R. 3273) for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE NEPPLE, AND ESTATE OF EARL W. NEPPLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 683) a bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, and for the relief of Marie Nepple, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States on account of the death of Earl W. Nepple, and to Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually, the sum of $418.68, in full settlement of all claims for expenses incurred by her as a result of the death of said Earl W. Nepple, resulting from an accident involving an airplane of the United States Army which occurred near Wittman, Ariz., on June 22, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually."

MALCOLM K. BURKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1106) for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That notwithstanding the provisions of section 1441, Revised Statutes, should Malcolm K. Burke enlist in or be inducted into the United States Navy or United States Naval Reserve, and thereafter, in the judgment of the President, establish his fitness to perform the duties of a naval officer, the President is hereby authorized in his discretion to appoint the said Malcolm K. Burke to the grade of ensign in the United States Naval Reserve and to issue to him a temporary appointment in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), with the dates of rank, in both his permanent and temporary status, held by him on August 30, 1944: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Malcolm K. Burke to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION TO EXPORT-IMPORT BANK TO EXTEND OPERATIONS TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The bill (H. R. 4683) to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUS OF UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICERS DETAILED TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113), to preserve the status and perquisites of

officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1222 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 576), or any other provision of law, the President may detail not more than five commisisoned officers of the Army on the active list to duty in the Department of Agriculture at any one time, and any such detail of any such officer shall not affect the status, office, rank, or grade which he may occupy or hold in the Army, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, eligibility for promotion, or benefit incident to or arising out of such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That no such detail shall exceed 4 years in duration. The applicable appropriation of the Department of Agriculture shall be available for reimbursements for all pay and allowances received by such officer from the Army while serving on detail in the Department of Agriculture.

AWARD OF MILITARY AND NAVAL DECORATIONS

The bill (S. 1523) to modify the time limitation governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations prescribed by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 845, 871), and the act of August 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 743, 744), with respect to the time within which the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Medal, and devises in lieu thereof, may be issued and the time within which statements or reports suggesting or recommending such awards may be made shall not apply to any case in which (1) the act or service justifying the award was performed during the period commencing December 7, 1941, and ending with the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war and (2) the recommendation for official recognition of such act or service was initiated not later than 6 months after the latter date. The term "date of the termination of hostilities in the present war" means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is earlier.

CHANSLOR-CANFIELD MIDWAY OIL CO. SUBSURFACE RIGHTS

The bill (H. R. 1236) to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIBBLE GENERAL HOSPITAL, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 2965) to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF STATUTORY PROHIBITIONS AGAINST EMPLOYMENT OF NONCITIZENS

The bill (S. 1618) to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator who objected permit me to say a word?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the general statutory law prevents the payment of compensation to any alien by our Government. The Navy Department desires to employ some individuals who have special scientific and research knowledge who became available by reason of the war, and who are from foreign countries, who participated in the war, and who have very valuable information. The first request made of our committee was of a general nature permitting the employment of aliens. We offered an amendment, which has just been read, which is as follows:

That statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to any person whose employment by the Navy Department shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be necessary in order to obtain for the benefit of the military services of the United States special technical or scientific knowledge or experience possessed by such person and not readily obtainable from any citizen of the United States.

The Navy Department says that there are several aliens in this country who possess very exceptional and special scientific knowledge.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection. I was mistaken in the bill under consideration. I thought it was Calendar No. 853.

Mr. WALSH. The original bill was very broad. As now amended its provision is limited to these persons who possess special scientific knowledge.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1618) to exempt the Navy Department from statutory provisions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to any person whose employment by the Navy Department shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be necessary in order to obtain for the benefit of the military services of the United States special technical or scientific knowledge or experience possessed by such person and not readily obtainable from any citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WITHDRAWAL OF SHOTGUN-PURCHASING PRIVILEGES OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 1551) relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator who objected will give us a chance to make an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. LANGER. I withhold it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not object to the bill. From a reading of its text it is a little difficult to comprehend just what its purposes are. At the present time, under the present interpretation of a law of Congress, whenever the Army has a surplus of shotguns, they are sold only to commissioned officers. An enlisted man cannot buy one. Private citizens have no opportunity to buy one because the guns are parceled out to the commissioned officers. That practice is not supported entirely by statute, I may say, but it comes from an interpretation of a statute. The statute that provides for commissioned officers having an opportunity to buy uniforms has been interpreted to restrict to them only the purchase of shotguns. Of course, that is not a wholesome situation. I could tell the Senator of several cases of surplus shotguns being sold for $17 to commissioned officers, who turned around and sold them for $85. In other words, a commissioned officer under existing law has a monopoly on the purchase of surplus shotguns from the Army, and this bill opens up the sales to everyone.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I had an erroneous idea of what the bill provided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1551) relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nothing contained in section 9 of the act of August 31, 1918 (40 Stat. 957; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 10, sec. 904), relating to the sale of equipment to officers of the Army, or in the provision of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 751; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 50, sec. 70), relating to the sale of articles of ordnance property to officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, shall be construed to authorize the sale to such officers of Government-owned shotguns.

R. W. WOOD

The bill (H. R. 1481) for the relief of R. W. Wood was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. MAGEE AND FLORENCE V. MAGEE

The bill (H. R. 2154) for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBEMARLE HOSPITAL AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2333) for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens.

Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIRGINIA PACKARD

The bill (H. R. 215) for the relief of Virginia Packard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS JACQUELINE FRIEDRICH

The bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. R. STONE

The bill (H. R. 4116) for the relief of M. R. Stone was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EUNICE C. HARDAGE

The bill (H. R. 3834) for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY ELIZABETH MONTAGUE

The bill (H. R. 3052) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING AT NASHVILLE, TENN.

The bill (S. 1649) to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in Nashville, Tenn., and to construct thereon a new Federal office building for the use and accommodation of the United States, including the Veterans' Administration. The aggregate cost of such site and building shall not exceed $5,575,000.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3995) to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department was considered, ordered for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4587), to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is the House version of a Senate bill, S. 1554, with certain amendments, and, in order that we may follow through, I shall read a statement, in answering the question of the Senator from Ohio.

On December 17, 1945, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 4587, which provides for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army. The companion bill to H. R. 4587 (S. 1554) is presently on the Senate Calendar.

The purpose of these bills is to authorize a limited increase in the officer strength of the Regular Army in order that a relatively small number of outstanding temporary officers can be commissioned at once in the permanent Military Establishment. The present law authorizes a Regular Army commissioned strength of 16,719, to be attained in 10 equal annual increments by July 1, 1949. These bills would increase the authorized strength by approximately 8,000 additional officers, thus raising the maximum authorized commissioned strength of the Army to 25,000.

There are being discharged from the Army daily between 2,000 and 4,000 temporary officers who have performed war service. Many of these capable temporary officers are interested in the Army as a career, but, under present circumstances, the Army is unable to offer them permanent commissions. It is manifest that unless the appointment in the Regular Army of these individuals can be accomplished before they become absorbed in civilian pursuits the opportunity to obtain their services in the Regular Army will be lost. The experience gained by these officers during the period of war would be of inestimable value to the permanent Military Establishment in the future, and it is imperative that the required authority be immediately provided to permit their entrance into the Regular Army. The proposed increase in the number of officers is in no wise intended to influence the final determination of the size of the postwar Military Establishment. It is impossible at this time to anticipate the ultimate peacetime commissioned strength of the Regular Army that will be required because of the existence of many uncertain factors. However, it is evident that the number of officers that will be needed will exceed 25,000. Based on past experience, a minimum of 25,000 officers is required for an enlisted strength of 250,000 to 300,000 men.

Mr. President, if I may be allowed to place the remainder of the statement in the RECORD, as we have prepared it, it will save the time of the Senate.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined that the number involved in these measures is consistent with proposed postwar plans which are presently being considered by that agency.

These bills would make no major change in the existing organization of the peacetime Army. They provide for the integration of the additional officers in the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in a fair and equitable manner and would avoid the creation of a "hump" in the promotion list such as that resulting after the integration of additional officers following the First World War. The bills provide authority, which terminates on a date 8 months following the effective date of the act, for the appointment of the additional officers in the grades of second lieutenant through major, inclusive.

S. 1554, as reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, would permit the appointment to the grade of second lieutenant of persons between the ages of 18 and 28, and the appointment to the grade of first lieutenant of persons between the ages of 21 and 35. In order to prevent the existence of such a large variance between the ages in which persons may be appointed to those grades, which might give rise to serious morale difficulties in the future, section 5 of H. R. 4587, as passed by the House of Representatives, precludes the appointment to the grade of second lieutenants of persons under the age of 21 years and the appointment to the grade of first lieutenant of persons under the age of 24 years. The average age of promotion-list officers, including graduates of the United States Military Academy, who were appointed to the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Army in the years 1930 through 1939, was approximately 24 years. The average age of such officers upon promotion to the grade of first lieutenant was approximately 27 years. H. R. 4587, as passed by the House of Representatives, would make the age of persons upon appointment under that bill to the grade of second lieutenant and first lieutenant more consistent with the average age of such officers now in the Regular Army. The War Department has received approximately 48,000 statements of interest from temporary officers, of which only approximately 250 are from officers under the age of 21 years. Accordingly, less than one-half of 1 percent of the temporary officers who have expressed an interest in the Army as a career would be affected by the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Therefore, I recommend that this provision of H. R. 4587, as passed by the House of Representatives, be accepted by the Senate.

Under existing law, the number of promotion-list colonels in the Regular Army is limited to not exceeding 705. There was added to H. R. 4587 by the House of Representatives a new section 8 which provides for a proportionate increase in the authorized number of colonels, in accordance with the increase in the over-all authorized commissioned strength of the Army as provided by the bill. This increase would make possible a better flow of promotions for the present Regular officer and the newly integrated officer, as it would raise the number of promotion-list colonels from 705 to 1,054. Unless a proportionate increase in the authorized number of colonels is provided, the restriction which now exists in the number of vacancies in the grade of colonel would be eventually intensified. Accordingly, it is believed that this provision of H. R. 4587 contains considerable merit.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have canvassed the subject quite thoroughly, and I am sure no one objects to the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the evidence before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs shows, the bill was not only carefully considered and recommended by the War Department, but it was also carefully considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As we know, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are a body composed of representatives of both the Army and the Navy—in fact, there is equal representation between the Army and the Navy on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The bill has the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the recommendation of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, as well as the favorable report of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Am I correct in understanding that the bill does not purport to designate the size of the Army and the number of officers it shall have, in peacetime?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It has nothing to do with the peacetime Army, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. The reason for the bill, as I understand, is that under existing law the permanent Army is limited in the number of officers it can have, though of course during the wartime there was a great expansion by taking in Reserve officers; so, in order to increase temporarily the number of Regular Army officers it is desirable that the present law be changed so as to permit the appointment in the Regular Army of this additional number of officers to take the place of retiring Reserve officers.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1554, which deals with the same subject, will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just passed I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Reserve officers' organization and a letter in reply to the questions raised in the Reserve officer's letter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, LEMOORE ARMY AIR FIELD,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING OFFICER,
Lemoore, Calif., December 5, 1945.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senator from South Dakota,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Attached hereto is a copy of an informatory War Department TWX, dated November 15, 1945, pertaining to appointments in the Regular Army. Also attached is the Army and Navy Journal's interpretation of the bill as outlined by the War Department, specifying in detail the purpose. As past president (1942, none elected since, so am still acting president, the reason for no election since being that all our members have been in the armed forces) of the Air Corps Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, the undersigned is forwarding this information to you, because it is sincerely believed that the two bills mentioned there, Nos. S. 1554 and H. R. 4587, are discriminatory to Reserve officer personnel and not in the best interests of the United States Army or the United States of America.

These two bills deviate from the age in grade bill which the War Department fought so strongly for and eventually succeeded in passing in the year 1940. Why the War Department would change their minds to this extent is not known.

The provisions of the bills are obviously discriminatory against Reserve officer personnel. First, they do not take into consideration the fact that Reserve officer personnel have and still do hold grades higher than that authorized in the bill; some of our personnel are general officers; a great many full colonels, and most of the other Reserve officer personnel who were in the service prior to December 7, 1941, are at least lieutenant colonels. Why the War Department does not intend to take in Reserve officers in all grades is not understood.

Further clarification should, it is believed, be made on the point as to whether, if one accepts a commission in the lower grades indicated, they will be immediately promoted again to their present temporary grade or not, the point being that West Point or other permanent officers holding temporary rank of colonel or higher whose permanent rank in many cases are first lieutenants will retain these temporary grades for many years perhaps, but if I or other Reserve officers in my category accept a permanent position in a reduced grade based on length of service as outlined in the bill, we are reduced at once to the lower grade. Do we remain in the lower grade or not? The bill does not specify.

There is apparently no consideration given for length of service prior to December 7, 1941, or the type of service rendered during the current war, and it is not clear whether or not any consideration is given for overseas service, combat service, decorations earned, efficiency ratings, or any other evidence of superior performance as an officer in the United States Army as a whole. Even though these considerations are not included in the bill, some provisions should be made to have the War Department establish a policy to take these points into consideration when selecting officers for Regular Army commission.

It is believed that when these bills, or any other legislation pertaining to Reserve officer personnel, are brought before the committees for hearings, outstanding Reserve officer personnel or legitimate representatives of Reserve officer organizations should be not only permitted but required to be present at the hearings and authorized to express their views with respect to the legislation affecting the future permanent establishment for the best interests of the country. I am willing and anxious to present my views against this present legislation.

Briefly, I am for an increased Regular Army Establishment. However, I believe, to avoid the First World War hump, provisions should be made in the bill to provide for the commissioning of Reserve officers in all the grades, including general officer grades. They should rank with, but below, Regular Army personnel of equal grade and active service.

It is believed that if these two bills are passed as is, all of the present Regular Army personnel will rank all of the newly commissioned officer personnel. It is a well-known fact that the Regular Army officers were jumped in grade every 60 to 90 days in the early parts of the war, whereas Reserve officer promotions lagged considerably behind, the natural result being that Regular Army personnel with 3 to 5 years' service, in almost every instance, ranked Reserve officer personnel with 5 to 10 years' extended active duty service.

The bill appears to the undersigned to have been devised, not for the purpose of benefiting the country, but for the express purpose of taking into the Regular Establishment a sufficient number of officers in lower grades from present Reserve personnel to support the present Regular Army personnel, most of whom are West Point officers in inflated higher grades than their length of service should normally justify in the postwar Army, thereby precluding the necessity of reducing the present Regular Army personnel of the permanent establishment more than one grade, if any.

The organization which I represent is strictly against this bill and its present provisions. It is believed that since we represent the rated officer personnel of the Organized Reserve of the Army Air Forces, that we are entitled to be heard and permitted to present our objections to this type of special legislation. You may recall in 1939 and 1940, that the undersigned, along with Colonel Rafferty and many others appeared before your committee on many Reserve officer bills, but with specific reference to the flight-officer bill, which at that time the War Department fought very strenuously and subsequently were able to get the bill shelved in the House committee, later revised the bill, cutting out all of its provisions for promotion and retirement benefits, and passed it as a wartime measure, which never has nor never will be any more than a deviation from the sergeant-pilot rating, which we were at that time much opposed to, and the Army eventually agreed could not possibly work.

I assure you there is nothing personal connected with this letter. It is written in the honest belief that the bill should not be passed without many changes and it is, therefore, recommended that the members of your committee be apprised of the contents of this communication for that purpose. I am willing and anxious to appear as a witness at the hearings, or if my services are not desired, it is recommended that the War Department be required to furnish witnesses from Reserve officer categories who have actually served prior to the war on a voluntary basis, and who have served overseas under unusual hardship and danger and preferably officers who have engaged in actual combat.

For your information, the undersigned served overseas 34 months. I commanded the Three Hundred and Seventy-sixth Heavy Bombardment Group for 15 months, during the period when the German Luftwaffe was the most active—November 1943 to February 1945. I can name as many as you wish who have served as honorably, or more so. You may recall that the Reserve officers in my category endeavored to secure suitable legislation for commission in the permanent establishment some years back and received little, if any, support from Members other than yourself and four or five others. At the same time, when the emergency was declared, we were the people who were called upon first to train incoming personnel and fight the early stage of the war. Most of us were shipped overseas within the first 90 to 120 days after war was declared.

The Navy now proposes legislation calling for the blending in of Reserve officers in all grades; why not the Army? Why do not the two services support parallel legislative programs? They both serve the same purpose.

I must apologize for this letter being so lengthy; however, it is difficult to outline my objections and reasons for not favoring this bill in a shorter communication. It is hoped that you will give this serious consideration and will discuss these bills with other members of your committee, purely with the idea in view of bringing out the entire facts concerning legislation of this nature, in order to have an equitable distribution of experience throughout the postwar Army. If you are not too busy, an early reply would be deeply appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

T. Q. GRAFF,
Colonel, Air Corps.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1945.

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: Due to the temporary absence of Major General Persons from his office, I am taking the liberty of replying to your letter of December 17, 1945, concerning your great personal interest in the enclosed communication which was received by you from Col. T. Q. Graff, headquarters, Lemoore Army Air Field, Lemoore, Calif. Colonel Graff states that S. 1554 and H. R. 4587, which provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, discriminate against Reserve officers who would receive permanent commissions under this legislation.

The fundamental problem which confronted the War Department in endeavoring to devise a plan for the appointment of additional officers in the Regular Army was the evolution of a scheme for integration which would be equitable as to both the newly integrated officers and the present members of the officers' corps. To achieve

that result it was necessary to consider not only the grades in which new appointments were to be made initially, but also the careers of those officers over a span of years in terms of opportunity for promotion and assignment to command. It was recognized that, because of the large number of classes of persons who might be affected and the variety of the patterns of individual service records, it would be impossible to devise any uniform plan which would not be subject to some criticism on the basis of its application to special categories of individuals. The War Department does not contend that the plan presented is perfect, but does believe that it will operate with greater equity for the great bulk of individuals affected than any other plan suggested or considered.

The system provided by these bills for the integration of the additional officers into the present officers' corps of the Regular Army was designed by the War Department after very careful consideration and study. It is believed to be most fair and equitable. Under these measures the new officers would be placed in permanent grades on the basis of their age or experience. Such grades would be commensurate with the permanent grades presently held by officers in the Regular Military Establishment of like age or experience. The determination of the grade to be held by a person who is appointed in the Regular Army would be made in the following manner: At the time of appointment each person is granted credit for—

(1) All actual Federal commissioned service performed by him in the Army of the United States from December 7, 1941, or (2) a constructive service credit equal to the years, months, and days by which his age exceeds 25 years. After computation of the actual and constructive service credit is made, the greater figure is applied, and the appointment is accomplished in a grade in accordance with the schedule of years of service prescribed by existing law for the promotion of Regular Army officers of the arm or service in which such person is appointed. Under this system no person would receive a grade lower than that which he would have attained had he been appointed in the Regular Army at the age of 25 years and if he had served continuously on the active list thereafter. Persons in the younger age groups, whose actual Federal commissioned service exceeds the constructive service would receive credit for all active service performed since December 7, 1941, and would be placed in grades commensurate with their experience. Moreover, any person who has been honorably separated from active military service since May 12, 1945, would not be penalized as he would receive credit of constructive service from the date of his separation to the date of his appointment in the Regular Army. It will be readily seen that the proposed integration plan is wholly consistent with the existing promotion system in the Regular Army.

Colonel Graff inquires if persons who are appointed to permanent grades under these measures would thereafter retain their higher temporary grades, and suggests that the bills be clarified in this connnection. Such persons will be allowed to retain their higher temporary grades as long as other officers of the Regular Army are permitted to hold higher temporary grades. You may be assured that all Regular Army officers, including those appointed pursuant to the provisions of these bills, will receive equal treatment when reductions of temporary grades are effected. Sufficient legal authority now exists for this purpose, and it is believed that the suggested amendment to the bills is unnecessary and inadvisable.

It is further stated by Colonel Graff that no consideration is given in the bills to the length of active service performed by Reserve officers prior to December 7, 1941. The purpose of these bills is to provide for the appointment in the Regular Army of persons who have served honorably as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the present war. Should credit be granted for any service other than war service, it would be necessary to count all active service performed by civilian component officers prior to the date of appointment. Many members of the present officers' corps of the Regular Army have performed active duty during peacetime as Reserve and National Guard officers but have received no credit for promotion purposes for such service. These bills would make no change in the present organization of the Regular Army and it would be unfair to allow this credit only to the newly integrated officer. It is believed that any such adjustments within the Regular Army structure should be the subject of separate legislation.

The additional officers to be integrated into the Regular Army will be selected on a standardized competitive basis. It is believed that this system will result in the selection of the most qualified officers. Those temporary officers who have had outstanding combat records and efficiency ratings will necessarily have the better opportunity for selection under this system.

The War Department is fully cognizant of the difficulties which resulted from the creation of the "hump" in the promotion list after the integration of the additional officers following the First World War. The proposed measures are specifically designed to prevent the duplication of that unfortunate situation. The additional officers will not be commissioned in blocks as was done after World War I, but will be integrated throughout the grades of second lieutenant through major, inclusive by files. Should any of the additional officers be appointed in the grade of lieutenant colonel, the "hump" which presently exists in that grade would be intensified.

In view of the above, I am sure you will agree that S. 1554 and H. R. 4587 were not designed to give the present members of the Regular Army any advantage over the persons proposed to be appointed thereunder in the permanent Military Establishment.

I hope that the above information will be sufficient for your purposes. I assure you it is always a pleasure to be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, G. S. C., Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just passed I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a statement with respect to the general officers and other officers in the Army in the various grades.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGULAR ARMY OFFICER STRENGTH

The authorized commissioned strength of the Regular Army for the fiscal year 1946, as provided by the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 558), is 15,728.

The actual commissioned strength of the Regular Army, as of October 31, 1945, was 15,090.

It is anticipated that the next class to graduate from the United States Military Academy will fill all vacancies in the authorized commissioned strength.

The following table shows the number of Regular Army officers on the active list as of October 31, 1945, by permanent arm and service and permanent grade.

	Major generals	Brigadier generals	Colonels	Lieutenant colonels	Majors	Captains	First lieutenants	Second lieutenants	Total
General officers	11	33							44
Infantry			184	1,099	348	436	851	608	3,526
Cavalry			83	283	101	99	184	44	794
Field Artillery			113	493	226	273	463	282	1,850
Coast Artillery			86	266	122	174	384	169	1,201
Corps of Engineers			55	167	103	144	338	261	1,068
Air Corps			34	344	244	453	1,253	800	3,128
Signal Corps			14	101	34	33	121	82	385
Quartermaster Corps			27	295	49	35	103	11	520
Ordnance Department			45	121	44	70	48	30	358
Finance Department			4	77	15	13	7	1	117
Adjutant General's Department			14	50	12	4			80
Judge Advocate General's Department			1	48	7	42			98
Chemical Warfare Service			14	38	11	15	16	7	101
Philippine Scouts			2	15	5	2			24
Total	11	33	676	3,397	1,321	1,793	3,768	2,295	13,294
Medical Department:									
Medical Corps			300	32	257	600	36		1,225
Dental Corps			85	9	21	147			262
Veterinary Corps			62	6	14	32			114
Pharmacy Corps			2	2	18	21	10	14	67
Total			449	49	310	800	46	14	1,668
Chaplains			29	3	18	69			119
Professors, U. S. Military Academy			6	3					9
Total			35	6	18	69			128
Aggregate	11	33	1,160	3,452	1,649	2,662	3,814	2,309	15,090

NOTE.—Includes missing in action, captured, and interned. Does not include retired officers on active duty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I find these interesting statistics in the RECORD: We have 3,397 lieutenant colonels and 1,321 majors. We have more lieutenant colonels than we have second lieutenants. We have more lieutenant colonels and colonels than we have first lieutenants. I did not care to make any fight on this particular measure, but I wish to serve notice on the Senate, the Army, and everyone else concerned that we must proceed along sensible lines in expanding the Army, and that we should not proceed to have an Army of colonels. That is not the right kind of an Army to have in this country, and I am sure that our people will not support that kind of an effort. Perhaps this proposal does not altogether affect that point, and yet it

does not restrict new officers coming in to the grade of second lieutenant, as it should. The bottom of the line is the place where we should increase the number of commissioned officers in the Army. I serve notice that at some later time, whenever this point arises again, I shall continue my fight against having an Army of colonels.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee on the companion bill, Senate bill 1554.

There being no objection, the report (No. 747) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1554) to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and, as amended, recommend that it do pass.

AMENDMENT

On page 3, in lines 5 and 6, delete the following: "at least 21 years of age."

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize an immediate increase in the commissioned strength of the Regular Army, solely as an interim measure, pending determination by the Congress of the size and composition of the postwar Military Establishment. The increase would be integrated into the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army and would make no change in the present peacetime organization of the Army.

Present law authorizes 16,719 officers. The current bill would authorize a total of 25,000 officers, and appointments would be made in such arms or services as the President may prescribe, in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, and major, from among qualified persons of good moral character who have served honorably as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the present war in grades equal to or higher than those they will receive if appointed in the Regular Army.

The bill as submitted by the War Department, in section 4 (a), stipulates that persons appointed shall be male citizens of the United States at least 21 years of age. Believing there is good officer material under that age, your committee has amended the bill to eliminate that restriction and the War Department is agreeable to the change.

The proposed legislation will not cause an immediate increase in cost to the Government, as the persons appointed will be temporary officers of the Army of the United States now on active duty or replacements for such officers who are being relieved from active duty. The War Department is unable at this time to determine what the fiscal effect of the bill will be in future years.

LETTER FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The letter from the War Department recommending this legislation follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 2, 1945.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: There is enclosed herewith draft of a bill "to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes" which the War Department recommends be enacted into law.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize an immediate limited increase in the commissioned strength of the Regular Army solely as an interim measure pending determination by the Congress as to the size and composition of the postwar Military Establishment, integrated into the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army. It would make no change in the present peacetime organization of the Army.

Present law (secs. 6 and 8, act of April 3, 1939, 53 Stat. 557; 10 U. S. C. 481b, 487a) authorizes a Regular Army commissioned strength of 16,719, to be attained in 10 equal annual increments by July 1, 1949. Although the ultimate peacetime strength of the Regular Army cannot be determined at this time, it seems clear that a substantial increase over the present commissioned strength will be necessary. The minimum number of officers which will be required is conservatively estimated at not less than 25,000. It is desired to attain that strength by the making of additional appointments in the Regular Army chiefly from non-Regular officers having outstanding records of active commissioned service during the present war. Unless the appointment of such persons can be accomplished at an early date, many of the most promising officers will return to civil life under the current demobilization program, and the opportunity to obtain their services as officers of the Regular Army will be lost by the War Department.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the increase of the commissioned strength of the Regular Army to 25,000. The proviso contained therein would continue in effect the present provision under which all graduates of the United States Military Academy may be commissioned without regard to the existence of vacancies. Section 3 would authorize the President to appoint additional officers in the Regular Army, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to bring actual strength immediately up to the strength prescribed in section 2. Appointments would be made in such arms or services as the President may prescribe, and could be made under any existing provision of law, or as authorized in section 4 of the bill.

Section 4 would provide new authority, which would terminate on a date 8 months following the enactment of the bill, under which the President could appoint additional officers in the Regular Army, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, and major. Appointments could be made only from among physically qualified individuals of good moral character, not less than 21 years of age, who have served honorably as commissioned officers in the Army of the United States during the present war in grades equal to or higher than those which they would receive under section 5 if appointed in the Regular Army. Section 5 would provide for their integration into the present Officers' Corps of the Regular Army in grades commensurate with their age and experience, and in a manner deemed equitable to the individuals selected and designed to avoid the creation of a "hump" in the promotion list such as that which resulted after the integration of additional officers following the First World War.

The initial grades of persons appointed under section 4 would be fixed in accordance with the schedule of years of service prescribed by existing law for the promotion of Regular Army officers of the arms or services in which such persons are appointed. For that purpose, and for the purpose of future promotion, sections 5 and 7 would credit each such person, at the time of appointment, with service equal to (1) his total actual active Federal commissioned service in the Army of the United States from December 7, 1941, to the date of such appointment, or (2) a constructive credit equal to the time by which his age on the date of appointment in the Regular Army exceeds 25 years, whichever is greater. The base age of 25 years used in computing constructive credit for service is the average age at which Regular Army officers now in service were appointed as second lieutenants. Accordingly, no such person would receive a grade, or a place on the promotion list, lower than that which he would have attained if he had been appointed as a second lieutenant in the Regular Army at age 25 and had served continuously on the active list thereafter. Persons, such as those in the younger age groups, whose actual active Federal commissioned service exceeds the constructive credit for service would receive full credit for all such active service performed since December 7, 1941, and would, therefore, receive grades and places on the promotion list commensurate with their experience.

The proviso contained in section 5 would prevent discrimination against persons honorably separated from active service between May 12, 1945, and the date of appointment in the Regular Army under section 4 by crediting them with service from the date of separation to the date of such appointment. Section 6 would prevent the appointment of any person who would be over age in grade.

The proposed legislation will not result in any immediate increase in cost to the Government as the individuals appointed will be temporary officers of the Army of the United States now on active duty or replacements for such officers who are being relieved from active duty. The War Department is unable at this time to determine the fiscal effect of the proposed legislation in future years.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the report emphasizes the fact that the bill does not affect the grades beyond that of major. It does not include any colonels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It does not go beyond the grade of major, but under our automatic system of promotions, whenever a man is brought into the Army as a major—and he can be brought in as a major in his last year of service—it is not long before he becomes a colonel. That is what I object to. If we are to bring new blood into the Army, and if we are to increase it, we ought to do so at the lowest level, and not at the top, unless we are to have an army of colonels.

CONTINUANCE OF NAVY'S V–12 PROGRAM

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V–12 program was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] a question. Is the Navy V–12 program the same as the Navy ROTC courses in our colleges and universities?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. This joint resolution seeks to continue the V–12 program, which embraces the ROTC program of the Navy, from March 1 to July 1. The present appropriations lead to the termination of this activity on March 1. The colleges which have the ROTC, and the students themselves, are very much disturbed over the closing of this program in the middle of a term of school.

As the Senator knows, with the termination of the V–12 program the young men will go back to civil life, and they must begin to pay their own expenses in the schools. So on March 1, 20,000 of

these boys would revert to seamen in the Navy if they were unable to continue in college at their own expense. The Government impliedly indicated to these young men when they joined this unit that they would be given training which would lead to a commission. By continuing the program for 3 months, taking the $10,000,000 required out of other funds of the Navy, the Navy will be permitted to graduate some of the officers in July. After July other young men who have not completed their studies can go to the State universities or other universities, where they will have to pay their own way. I know that the Senator from New Jersey has been importuned by many of these young men, and by the colleges, which are very desirous of having the program continued.

Mr. SMITH. That was the reason for my question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New Jersey. The boys in the ROTC program, both in the Army and in the Navy, have been trained together. The Navy and the Army have stood together throughout the various lines of training in medicine, engineering, and so forth. What is to become of the boy who is in training in the Army?

Mr. WALSH. The Army reverted to its peacetime training program months ago. There is no training now in the Army comparable to the naval V–12 unit.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. The Army training is still going on, and the Army boys should graduate when the Navy boys graduate.

Mr. WALSH. I do not understand that there is now any ROTC program in the Army that is similar to the Navy program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course there is an ROTC program in the Army.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nevada is correct. There has been an ROTC program in the Army for several years.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly. Those boys are standing right beside the Navy boys. I happen to have an intimate knowledge of the situation. The Army boys will be graduated or will go out of training in March. What is to become of the Army boys? Are they going out of training, or is the program to be continued?

To my way of thinking, the boys in both services should be treated alike. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that they have not been treated alike. In the Army there has been miserable confusion in the treatment of these boys. The Navy has treated its boys with fine respect, but the Army has done nothing at all for the Army students. Is the Navy to be permitted to graduate its boys, and at the same time are we to throw out the Army boys, who have stood alongside the Navy boys during months or years of training? What is going to happen?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I believe I was mistaken in saying that the Army did not have any ROTC program. What I meant to say was that many months ago the Army did away with what corresponds to the V–12 program of the Navy. It was a preliminary educational training looking to entrance into the ROTC. As the Senator knows, the Navy has kept the program alive and has continued it up to the present time. It is now confronted with the decision as to whether, on March 1, it will suddenly and quickly close these schools and send the boys back to enlistment in the Navy as seamen, or into civil life to be drafted. The Navy feels that it has an obligation to continue the program until July 1. I am sorry I cannot answer the Senator's question directly, because I am not familiar with the Army program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that I happen to be intimately acquainted with this situation. I know that there has been an attempt to place the boys in the Navy and those in the Army on a comparable basis. They have not been dealt with by the Army as they have been dealt with by the Navy. The Navy has been exceedingly courteous and helpful to the boys in the Navy program. They have had fine training.

Mr. WALSH. I am pleased to have the Senator make that statement, because the records presented to our committee indicate high praise and commendation of the V–12 system from the colleges and from the boys themselves.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct, and I praise the Navy on the floor of the Senate for the treatment which it has given its boys. The Army has not given the same sort of treatment to its boys.

My question is, What shall we do with the boys in the Army who have carried on the same line of work as have the boys in the Navy? Shall we say that one class shall be fish and the other fowl? To my mind this joint resolution should go over, and the boys should all be treated alike. Unless something is done I shall object to the joint resolution from now on until the Army boys are given consideration.

Mr. WALSH. I am sure that the Senator does not wish to deny the Navy boys a temporary continuation of their education.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but I do not wish to punish the Army boys either.

Mr. WALSH. I suggest that the Senator direct his inquiry to members of the Committee on Military Affairs and ask them what the status of the Army training program is, and what is being done.

The reason for the joint resolution is that the boys will be out of the institutions and on their way home by March 1. The proposed continuation of the program is only until July 1. It would be very unfortunate if the joint resolution were not passed now, so that the boys can make arrangements to remain where they are until July 1 and then seek the general educational institutions where they will have to go. I hope the Senator will not object to the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does not the Senator agree that the same treatment should be accorded to the Army boys?

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection whatever.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall object until they are put on the same basis.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a comment?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The ROTC is a civilian system of education. It was created pursuant to the Morrill Land-Grant College Act, and it is operated by civilian colleges, in which instructors from the Army are located for that part of the education which is purely military in its nature. But I do not understand that during the war any special legislation with respect to the ROTC has been enacted, although legislation with respect to the Navy's V–12 program has been enacted during the war period. The ROTC program has been running so long and so efficiently that when this war began we had 90,000 trained officers, the product of civilian institutions all over the United States, and they formed the backbone of our officer system in the Army of the United States—not the standing Army, but the Army of the United States. If we had not had them, I simply do not know how we could possibly have equipped our troops with sufficient officers.

There is nothing about the Army, so far as I know, or the Army's programs or plans which at the present time involves any change of the ROTC system. It is an admirable one. A young man who gets ROTC education is paid some compensation at the same time, and after he is commissioned a second lieutenant—after taking the required ROTC courses right along with his academic courses—he may continue his military studies by attending a camp for a certain length of time; and after he has thus further qualified himself, he is commissioned a first lieutenant in the Army. He is not bound by law to engage in extended military service unless he offers himself for it. If he makes that offer and if the Government has a place for him in the military system, he undoubtedly will have an opportunity, especially since we have provided for furnishing the necessary number of officers during the interim.

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 5-minute rule, the time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 290?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall object.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will agree to an additional 5 minutes' discussion of the resolution. We are now considering measures on the Consent Calendar, and I do not think there will be much discussion of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] may have expired, but other Senators may be recognized for 5 minutes to discuss the resolution; is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to be recognized for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think the impression was created that the time of the Senator from Massachusetts on the measure had expired. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts on the resolution may have expired, but other Senators may be recognized for 5 minutes each, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to hold the floor for only a moment. My only thought in regard to this matter is that the ROTC program has been a fine military training program. In my judgment it should be commended and it should be continued. I am firmly of that opinion. I would vote for any system which would continue the ROTC program in the schools and colleges of this country. I make that statement most emphatically.

The question in my mind is whether this applies to the Navy only. I do not so understand. So far as I understand, it also applies to the Army.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand the situation, it is somewhat as follows: The Army inaugurated the ASTP, and it was on all fours with and of similar character to the Navy's V–12 program.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Army liquidated the ASTP long ago, but it is now augmenting and continuing the ROTC program, which is a permanent one.

The only issue here involved, as I understand, is whether those who remain in the Navy's V–12 program shall have their studies cut off in the middle of the coming semester or whether they shall be permitted to continue them until they have completed the semester by the 1st of July.

Mr. WALSH. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that either he has been misinformed or I have. Perhaps I have; and if so, I wish to be corrected. The ASTP is continuing. I happen to know that that is the case because my own son is participating in the program. So there is no question about what I have said. The program is continuing, and these boys will graduate in March; and the Navy boys are standing right by their side, taking the same training; it is all ASTP training.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In line with what has just been stated by the Senator from Wisconsin, I should like to say that I hope the Senator from Nevada will not press his objection; and at this time I wish to submit to the Senate a letter which I have received from the President of the University of Southern California, Dr. R. B. von KleinSmid. I believe his letter will throw some light on the situation. As the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, without this legislation the Navy V–12 program will have to be liquidated in the middle of the semester, rather than continue long enough to enable these boys to finish their courses.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to ask the Senator a question which may settle the whole matter: Is it necessary to put this measure through at this time? Cannot we make a study of the situation and see what it means? Is it necessary that the matter be acted on today?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Those who are familiar with the program feel that it is essential to have the measure go through now, because these young men must plan ahead; and, as the law now stands, the program will be liquidated in March and the effect will be that they will be forced to stop their education in the middle of the term.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not also true that the Army program of the same type will be liquidated in March?

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator is that I do not have the facts as to that. If they are as the Senator has stated, I shall be glad to join him in endorsing some other legislation which will be designed to correct that situation. But I think it would be a mistake to hold up this measure at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator from California that I wish to have all these boys treated alike—both those in the Army and those in the Navy. If the programs are to be liquidated in March, let both of them be liquidated then. If they are to continue, let both programs continue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD the letter which I have received from the president of the University of Southern California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from California, but I wish to state that I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to read into the RECORD at this point the letter to which I have referred. It is as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, December 10, 1945.

The Honorable W. F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: It is my information that the Senate is in receipt from the House of Representatives of the naval appropriation bill containing that item which finances the present active duty V–12 program.

Such a cut in appropriations for the continuance of this program will greatly handicap the students now enrolled whose schedule is definitely set for the balance of this academic year—handicap them, I believe, far beyond the understanding and desire of Congress. In the case of many of these students, the entire program is set to fulfill naval requirements rather than purely academic requirements. This means that such students have crossed department lines in their individual programs and cannot adjust themselves except at great disadvantage until the close of an academic year, even then many difficulties will arise. Many of these students moreover will be compelled to leave college approximately March 1 without completing the academic year, since they will be unable to proceed on the new financing basis.

Of course, it is understandable that appropriations for Navy activities will be reduced. However, it seems to me that, since trained Navy men will continue to be in great demand, we can ill afford to retrench at the point of the Navy educational program.

I should be happy to receive your reaction in this matter and to know what you deem likely will be done about it.

With all good wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

R. B. VON KLEINSMID,
President.

So, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, the ending of the program will interrupt the courses and studies of these young men.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my time will expire in a moment. I do not wish to object to the consideration of the measure, but I shall be forced to object to its consideration at this time, as I view the matter. I think these boys should be treated equally. The Army program and the Navy program should go along together.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a little to what the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont has said. Let me say that the ROTC colleges are still being maintained. Recently Congress enacted legislation which enables boys who served in the Army to become junior and senior members of the ROTC, if they desire to do so, so that they may receive credit in the ROTC for their Army service, and eventually may be eligible to receive commissions in the Army. We believe that we should permit them to have a chance to go to such schools and to become officers rather than to permit only boys attending college and taking ROTC courses to become officers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the distinguished Senator from Vermont said, the ROTC program really had its conception in the Morrill Act which brought the land-grant colleges into being in 1863. In 1920 that act was augmented and enlarged. Since 1920 the Congress has not enacted legislation which would impair the legislation enacted in 1920. In other words, the ROTC will continue in the land-grant schools and colleges under the act of 1920.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I hope the distinguished Senator from Nevada will not object to consideration of the measure, because we have received no request from the Army for similar institutions.

but at the University of South Carolina a naval ROTC is now functioning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, it is my opinion that this joint resolution should be passed. It will not impede in anyway the Army program. When the appropriation rescission bill was considered by the House this particular item was eliminated. The Senate restored it. In the conference the Senate receded and the item was eliminated. The House later saw its error and passed the joint resolution only the other day, very quickly and unanimously. If the resolution is not passed this afternoon, or before the Senate adjourns for the Christmas holidays, this entire naval V–12 program will be stopped on March 1, and the colleges have already been so informed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my understanding is that of two boys, for example, one being in the Army and one being in the Navy under the ASTP, one will go out in March, and the other will not. Why should that situation be allowed to exist when both boys are receiving the same training, under the same regulations, and in the same school?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may answer the Senator's question in this way: If there are not sufficient funds in the hands of the Army to carry on the work of the Army schools from March to July, I suggest that the Senator introduce a bill on the first day of the next session of Congress, and take care of the situation in that way.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why not allow the pending resolution to go over until we can make a study of the matter. For 3 years these boys have been carrying on this work. They have been at the same desk doing the same work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that a notice has already gone from the Navy to several colleges, including one in southern California and several in Massachusetts, to cancel this program. Other boys will be put in the places in the colleges of those who go out, either from civilian life, or from the ranks of the veterans. The boys who are already three-quarters through their course will be thrown out and will lose their opportunities to become officers. They will be compelled to enter the Navy as seamen.

Mr. McCARRAN. What would the Senator do with a boy who is in his senior year and ready to graduate in March?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say that if there are any Army boys in the same category, let the Senator submit a resolution on the subject on the first day of the next session of Congress in January, and I will support him to the best of my ability.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think consideration of the pending joint resolution should be postponed until we have an opportunity to make further study of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I understand that in the event the objection prevails to the consideration of the joint resolution, after the call of the calendar, the Senator may make a motion to have the resolution considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; if the Senator is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at Princeton University both military and naval courses have been given during the entire time of the war. Since the First World War, we have had at that university a regular military ROTC course. It is still being given. The temporary naval and military courses have been discontinued. But the naval ROTC course to correspond with our regular military ROTC course, was inaugurated only 6 or 8 months ago. It is suddenly threatened with termination in March. I have an urgent letter from the president, and one from the vice president of Princeton University, stating that they must know at once what is to be done because these boys are halfway through their courses, and it may be that suddenly they will be prevented from continuing their studies. A few days ago I had printed in the RECORD a letter from the president of Princeton University, a copy of which I sent to the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee. As I understand, no discrimination whatever is being practiced against any military men. Special military and naval courses have been carried on for 2 or 3 years and were discontinued at the end of the war. At Princeton we have a military ROTC of over 20 years' standing which is being continued. President Dodds said that no change would be made with regard to it. It is only the naval men who will be affected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the joint resolution does not deal exclusively with the naval ROTC. It deals also with the ASTP, which is a part of the military ROTC. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. SMITH. I am sorry to have to disagree with the Senator. The ASTP, as I understand it, has nothing to do with the regularly established military ROTC.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on the basis of the explanation which has been given by the Senator from Massachusetts, I cannot distinguish with regard to what the resolution would apply. I wish that I could.

Mr. SMITH. This is a special naval ROTC which was established to parallel the military ROTC in the various colleges. I know that when the project was first proposed, the universities in New Jersey wanted to have such training inaugurated, and Princeton was one of the colleges selected for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. These boys should be treated exactly alike, and the boys on the Army side who have taken the same training should be extended the same privileges as the boys on the Navy side.

Mr. SMITH. I am sure that if any discrimination had been practiced, I would have received a complaint from President Dodds, because Princeton University has had both classes of boys. We are proceeding with our training of the military ROTC boys, and we hope that we will proceed with the training of the naval ROTC boys as well.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, these programs have always been treated separately. Separate appropriations have always been made for them in the various colleges.

I may say that it is the War Department's intention to restore the senior ROTC units to the former peak number of 141 as rapidly as possible. Given authority some 60 days ago, it already has in operation 13 college ROTC units, and plans to have this number expanded to approximately 100 reactivated within the ensuing scholastic year. All professors of military science and tactics have been appointed, or will be by the end of this school year. It is planned to provide from 25,000 to 30,000 officers annually for the postwar Army through ROTC graduation.

During the war curtailment of the ROTC program did not extend downward into the first 2 years. This basic instruction was continued throughout the war. In the advanced years, and, also, in senior ROTC's, the fact that 18-year-olds were selected made it impracticable to carry on these courses. Thus, junior ROTC units were kept alive in the two lower grades all the time. The senior units were necessarily suspended. The basic courses mentioned above were operated in conjunction with the Army specialized-training program.

Mr. SMITH. I wish only to add that so far as Princeton University is concerned, it never gave naval ROTC courses until recently.

I hope, Mr. President, that the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay consideration of a resolution of this kind, but I think both groups of students should be treated alike, and that each should be given the same privileges and the same advantages. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 290?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMMUNITIES FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 1, line 3, to strike out—

That, for the purposes of this act, the term "international organizations" shall include only public international organizations of which the United States is a member and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order or orders as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided: *Provided*, That the President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such

action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke any such designation, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this act.

And insert:

TITLE I

SECTION 1. For the purposes of this title, the term "international organization" means a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided. The President shall be authorized, in the light of the functions performed by any such international organization, by appropriate Executive order to withhold or withdraw from any such organization or its officers or employees any of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided for in this title (including the amendments made by this title) or to condition or limit the enjoyment by any such organization or its officers or employees of any such privilege, exemption, or immunity. The President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke the designation of any international organization under this section, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to extend to international organizations, in which American membership has been specifically authorized by Congress, the right to enjoy in this country approximately the same privileges and immunities as those which are enjoyed by the representatives of foreign governments. In other words, the principle involved is that the UNO, being an organization made up of a number of foreign governments, as well as our own, if established in this country should enjoy the same status as an embassy of the British Government, for example, or that of some other government.

The Senate Finance Committee has rewritten the bill in many respects for the purpose of safeguarding against the possibility of abuse of privilege. The amendment which is now before the Senate proposes that the privileges shall be extended only to international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to a treaty, or under authority of an act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation. The President is authorized to cancel the privilege if he finds it necessary to do so, or he may cancel any individual privilege, exemption, or immunity in the event it appears that any of the organizations, in their functioning, go beyond the purpose of the act.

We were somewhat concerned that they might try to engage in commercial enterprises, or be authorized to do so, and we did not wish in such event to give them any exemption from taxation that is not given to private concerns operating in the same field.

Mr. President, I have one amendment which I wish to offer, but I shall wait until the committee amendments are disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, before the word "immunity", to insert "the same."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 23, after the word "process", to insert "as is enjoyed by foreign governments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 24, after the word "that", to strike out "they," and insert "such organizations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 1, after the word "taxable", to strike out "year" and insert "years."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 11, after the words "United States", to strike out "or" and insert "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 9, to strike out:

(18) International organizations: The term "international organizations" means public international organizations of which the United States is a member and which are designated by the President by Executive order as being entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities.

And insert:

(18) International organization: The term "international organization" means a public international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 24, after the words "end of", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph"; in line 25, after the words "at the end of", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph"; and on page 9, line 3, after the word "new", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 5, after the word "organization", to insert "entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 12, after the word "in", to strike out "subparagraph," and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 22, after the word "in", to strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 2, after the word "territories", to strike out "and shall be entitled to the same exemptions and immunities from State or local taxes as is the United States Government."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that the other House attempted to exempt the organizations from State and local taxes.

The Senate committee felt that that was wholly beyond the power of Congress, and therefore we eliminated the provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 11, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out:

substituting the following language:

"(7) An alien officer or employee of an international organization, his family, attendants, servants, and employees."

And to insert "inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'and (7) a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act, or an alien officer or employee of such an international organization, and the family, attendants, servants, and employees of such a representative, officer, or employee.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 9, after the word "as," to insert "a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 12, after the word "such", to strike out "officer" and insert "representative officer."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 16, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on line 8, to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 13, line 13, after the word "their", to strike out "immediate families residing with them" and insert "families, suites, and servants"; and on line 15 to strike out "Act" and insert "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, to insert the following:

SEC. 10. This title may be cited as the "International Organizations Immunities Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 14, after line 2, to insert a new title, as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

If a claim for credit or refund under the internal revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127

(a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war losses) for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1946. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1946, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of such code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

SEC. 202. Contributions to pension trusts.

(a) Deductions for the taxable year 1942 under prior income tax acts: Section 23 (p) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the words "January 1, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1942", and by striking out the words "December 31, 1942" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1941".

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable as if it had been made as a part of section 162 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1942.

SEC. 203. Petition to The Tax Court of the United States.

(a) Time for filing petition: The second sentences of sections 272 (a) (1), 732 (a), 871 (a) (1), and 1012 (a) (1), respectively, of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by striking out the parenthetical expression appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(not counting Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the ninetieth day)".

(b) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of September 8, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 12, it is proposed after the word "fingerprinting" to insert the word "and", and after the comma on page 10, line 13, it is proposed to strike out the words "and selective training and service."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since the committee meeting it has been pointed out to the committee that an exemption from selective training and service may be given by the President of the United States to aliens who are residents of this country under the terms of the Selective Service Act. Therefore, instead of attempting to deal with the subject in this bill, we determined it should be left to the President's discretion, acting under the Selective Service Act. That is agreeable to the Selective Service System, and while the State Department did not quite like it, they are willing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what would happen if the act were repealed?

Mr. TAFT. Then there would be no question of our exempting from our selective service any foreigners who might be members of an international organization, because there would be no selective service.

Mr. President, title II of the act, on page 14, contains technical amendments to the tax law which would have to be passed before the 1st of January. The House apparently had not discovered that had to be done, so the Senate Finance Committee has added these amendments to this particular bill, because this is in the nature of a revenue bill, a bill amending the income tax law.

Title II merely extends certain times, which would otherwise expire, for another year, to make one or two unimportant technical changes in the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM ARMED SERVICES — MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

The resolution (S. Res. 207) to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand objection was made, and I should like to make a short explanation of the resolution. I do not know who made the objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I made the objection on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I will withhold it for the moment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this is but a resolution to bring to the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 116. I realize that the majority leader has not been present in the Chamber during the last 2 or 3 days, when this subject has been under discussion. He was doubtless away from the Chamber on other duties.

This resolution is one to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, which deals with expediting the discharge from the armed services of men who have children. Up to this time the whole proceeding has been stopped or blocked by parliamentary procedure. For instance, day before yesterday, when it was first brought up, I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution, and it was objected to. Yesterday when I brought it up in the morning hour, as required under the rules, and the ruling of the Chair, I took up only part of the time in support of the resolution, and left to the opponents of the resolution half the time. With the hope that consideration would be given and that a vote might be reached.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, exercised his power to speak upon the measure up to 2 o'clock, the end of the morning hour, and therefore a vote could not be taken, and automatically Resolution 207 went upon the calendar.

Let me say to the majority leader that the measure on the calendar is a resolution to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs and place upon the calendar the main resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 116, which provides for the discharge from the armed services of men with one or more children, upon application, with certain exceptions. This would not disturb or upset or change any other ground of discharge. It would merely be an additional ground. I wish very much that the joint resolution could by unanimous consent be placed upon the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the matter will have to go over. There is not time now to discuss it, and therefore I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INCREASING CAPACITY AND SECURITY OF PANAMA CANAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize and investigate means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, which had been reported from the Committee on Interoceanic Canals with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the parenthesis, to strike out "and such additional investigation as he may deem necessary and to report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947," and to insert "He shall also make such study without drafting plans or sketches as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements. He shall report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

DOMESTIC RAISING OF FUR-BEARING ANIMALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 788, Senate bill 566, and I further ask that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered. I have an amendment which I wish to offer, but I happened to be out of the Chamber for a moment when the bill came up and did not have an opportunity to present my amendment, or to ask for its consideration.

Mr. HILL. I notice the bill was introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I wonder if it would not be a good idea to have the Senator from Wisconsin present when the Senator makes his request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am making my request whether any Senator is here or not. I think my request is a legitimate one. The Senator from Wisconsin knows I am going to make it, of course, but I am making my request on behalf of myself.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the Senator from Wisconsin knows the Senator from Colorado is going to make the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; but whether he knew it or not, I would make it.

Mr. HILL. I note the Senator from Wisconsin has just entered the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have made a request that Senate bill 566 be taken up in due course, and that the action whereby it was passed be vacated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would not, under a unanimous-consent call of the calendar, interpose any objection to a request for reconsideration, a bill having been passed in the Senator's absence, but I should like to have the Senator not ask to have the bill put back on the calendar, but give us an opportunity to consider what it is the Senator wants to present in connection with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to do that. I should like to have the call of the calendar finished, but I want an opportunity to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. After talking with the Senator, I understand that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar he was going to ask unanimous consent for reconsideration, and that it then would be his purpose to offer an amendment. While I am unalterably opposed to his amendment, of course I would not wish to foreclose him the opportunity of offering it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My request is merely that the action of the Senate in passing the bill be vacated. It will still be on the calendar, and subject to be called up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me that I am going more than halfway to meet the Senator in not interposing any objection to reconsideration. Let him offer his amendment, if he desires to do so, and let the Senate pass on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I want to do, but I am surprised that the Senator feels he is granting me a favor by letting me object to the action of the Senate in giving unanimous approval to a bill in my absence. All I am asking is that the action taken in my absence be vacated and that the status be not changed. I do not understand that is any favor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator is offended because I thought I was trying to be courteous and accommodate him, I withdraw whatever I said which carried that implication. What the Senator is asking is that the bill be put back on the calendar. All I am saying is that if we can finish the calendar and then take the bill up, I shall then not interpose any objection to reconsideration. Let the Senator offer his amendment and we can discuss it, and the Senate can then determine what course it wishes to pursue with regard to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, that is perfectly satisfactory, except I want it understood that Calendar No. 788, Senate bill 566, did not pass the Senate by unanimous vote. When the calendar is finished, I expect to call it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the next order of business on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 760, Senate bill 1483, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act provided for suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States including the Territory of Alaska," approved May 3, 1943, be recommitted to the Committee on Mines and Mining for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PREFERENCE FOR REFINERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to Calendar No. 565, Senate bill 680, which is a bill unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to provide a preference for refiners who do not have their own source of petroleum, and give them a preference to buy the royalty oil of the Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it seems to me that since we have an understanding that there should be a call of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, Senators ought to permit the call of bill on the calendar to be concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill to which the Senator from Wyoming refers is to be found among bills on the calendar before the bill with which the call of the calendar began today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Wyoming has asked unanimous consent for consideration of a bill on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I feel constrained to object at this time. When the call of the calendar is completed the Senator may ask for consideration of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is called for. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

IRVINE CO.

The bill (H. R. 1251) for the relief of the Irvine Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDGAR KAIGLER

The bill (H. R. 207) for the relief of Edgar Kaigler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VIOLA THERIAQUE

The bill (H. R. 1836) for the relief of Viola Theriaque was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELI RICHMOND

The bill (H. R. 2644) for the relief of Eli Richmond was considered, ordered to a third reading, read third time, and passed.

FAIRVIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 90, PRATT COUNTY, KANS.

The bill (H. R. 915) for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS F. GRAY

The bill (S. 323) for the relief of Thomas F. Gray was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cancel the charge, in the amount of $1,043.95, entered on the accounts of Thomas F. Gray, as postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., by reason of the disallowance by the General Accounting Office of expenditures representing the salary of the said Thomas F. Gray as acting postmaster during the period from September 15 to December 8, 1942, such service not having been authorized by the Civil Service Commission.

GLADYS ELVIRA MAURER

The bill (H. R. 919) for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REV. NEAL DEWEESE AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BESSIE S. EDMONDS

The bill (H. R. 873) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. M. STRAUSS

The bill (H. R. 3303) for the relief of A. M. Strauss was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROY S. COUNCILMAN

The bill (H. R. 1250) for the relief of Roy S. Councilman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KATIE SANDERS

The bill (H. R. 3277) for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$8,500" and insert "$2,335."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OSCAR N. McLEAN

The bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of Oscar N. McLean was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. J. L. LAMB

The bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GISELLA SANTE

The bill (H. R. 3124) for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERCY ALLEN

The bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of Percy Allen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY P. KING

The bill (H. R. 2332) for the relief of Henry P. King was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES L. PHILLIPS

The bill (S. 1423) for the relief of Charles L. Phillips was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles L. Phillips, of East Greenwich, R. I., the sum of $81, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for medical services rendered to a patient who was injured when struck by a truck owned by the Navy Department at East Greenwich, R. I.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATE OF GORDON T. GORHAM

The bill (H. R. 1348) for the relief of the estate of Gordon T. Gorham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARION M. HILL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 991) for the relief of Marion M. Hill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5 before the name "Marion", to insert "Mr. and Mrs."; in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$4,175"; in line 7, before the word "claim" to strike out "his" and insert "their", in line 8 before the word "minor" to strike out "his" and insert "their"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill, of Wheeler, Ala., the sum of $4,175 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their minor son, Arless Atchely Hill, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a Government-owned vehicle driven by an employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the performance of his official duties, near Wheeler, Ala., on December 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill."

MRS. LONA WILSON

The bill (S. 1588) for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lona Wilson, of Malta, Mont., the sum of $119, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the replacement costs of certain abstracts of title to lands, which abstracts were furnished by her to the Resettlement Administration upon its request on June 1, 1936, but were not returned to her and have been reported lost by the Resettlement Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ELISABETH ANDERSEN

The bill (S. 400) for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elisabeth Andersen, of Wilmington, Del., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by her when the automobile which she was driving was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on the Littleton Road, Morristown, N. J., on the night of July 25, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Mathew Mattas; and

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Albert Cantalupo; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. CHENOWETH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) extending the time for the submission of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 715. An act to provide for more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; and

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

ROBERT R. ROWE, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1400) for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "Kentucky", to strike out "$32,500", and insert "$6,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert R. Rowe, Jr., of Louisville, Ky., $6,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert R. Rowe, Jr., against the United States on account of severe personal injuries sustained by him on April 29, 1944, when he was struck by a United States

Army tractor and trailer at West Chestnut Street and South Twenty-sixth Street, Louisville, Ky.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANKLIN P. RADCLIFFE

The bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). That concludes the call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A few moments ago, before the present occupant took the chair, fearing that just what has now happened would occur, I asked to revert to Calendar No. 788, Senate bill 566. I was afraid that the statement would be made by the Chair that "the call of the calendar is now concluded."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair made that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wanted the RECORD to show that this bill did not pass by unanimous consent of the Senate. I ask, therefore, an opportunity to have the bill reconsidered. The sponsor of the bill agreed to that, and since I had that understanding I supposed that I would have an opportunity, before the Chair declared the call of the calendar concluded, to ask for reconsideration.

Mr. LUCAS. I raise a point of order against the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the chair at the time the matter came up about which the Senator from Colorado is speaking. The Chair will state that the RECORD shows that the bill was passed. It does not show whether the bill was passed unanimously or otherwise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President the procedure on the call of the calendar always is to call it for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, and as bills are called, if there is no objection they are passed. If objection is made, they go over. Nothing unusual with respect to the call of the calendar has happened on this occasion. Certainly, I have no objection to reconsideration of the bill in which the Senator from Colorado is interested; but I had absented myself from a hearing in order that I might be in the Senate Chamber and participate in what I understood was to be a discussion over the confirmation of some important nominations, and it is important perhaps now to move that the Senate go into executive session for that purpose. That, however, does not preclude any Senator from asking reconsideration of the passage of any bill called on the calendar, and I assume there would be no objection in the Senator's case, and he might offer his amendment and have it acted on by the Senate. But the nominations in question are very important——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was afraid that the very thing which has happened would happen, so I asked, while the calendar was being considered, that the action of the Senate be vacated, which would show that that certain bill had been passed by a unanimous vote. I was denied that opportunity. Then as soon as the calendar was concluded I was on my feet trying to gain recognition.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator understands that I have no desire to try to deprive him of his right. The Senator may move now for reconsideration. He does not need to ask unanimous consent. He can move to reconsider.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that preserves all the rights of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to say to Senators, Mr. President, that the Senate will resume legislative session when the Executive Calendar is concluded. I do not know how long the Executive Calendar will require, but it is important that it be acted upon, and for that reason I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia wished to make a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make the following parliamentary inquiry. If we proceed to executive session, will we afterward be precluded from going into legislative session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has just stated that after the executive session has been concluded he proposes to move that the Senate return to legislative session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might say to all Senators who are interested in measures which are pending, or which they want to bring up, that it is contemplated that the two Houses will act on a concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of this session either tomorrow or Saturday. I am not able at the moment to say on which day it will be offered. But obviously the holding of an executive session now to dispose of these important nominations which must be disposed of promptly would not in any way preclude the continuance of legislative session either this afternoon or certainly tomorrow. The Senate will be in session tomorrow and, so far as I can now anticipate, for the whole day, and we may even be in session Saturday. The reason for prompt action in regard to the nominations is that they are important. They may involve some discussion—I do not know how much—but it is desirable that they be considered and disposed of at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I raise the point because I feel that the matter I desire to present is one in which all of us, regardless of party, are interested. It is deeply important to all of us. I understood from the preceding occupant of the chair that I would have an opportunity to present this matter. I do not want to be deprived of that opportunity. That is the reason for my inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's position, and I wish to say that the holding of the executive session will in no way deprive any Senator of the right to present any matter he wishes, except for the time being while we are in executive session considering nominations on the calendar.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senate will be in session tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it the disposition of the Senator to proceed to the consideration of the bills on the calendar which have not been called up for action today?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that in the multiplicity of other matters which have been engaging my attention it has not occurred to me whether there would be any bills back of the last call that the Senate would desire to take up and consider. But it is not intended that any Senator who has a bill on the calendar, either one which was passed over today or one which was passed over on a previous call of the calendar, should not have an opportunity to have the bill taken up if he desires to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that there are only three pages of such bills, and they could undoubtedly be called rather quickly.

Mr. BARKLEY. We might either do that later today or tomorrow. We might go back and call the calendar from the beginning up to the point where we began today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator in his endeavor to proceed to consideration of the nominations on the executive calendar, but I know that to the particular bill in which I am interested there is no objection. As I understand, it was previously passed over only because I did not happen to be on the floor to make an explanation; and I have no doubt that other bills are in exactly the same position.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; and it is not the fault of anyone.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not blaming anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot all be here all the time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not even to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will cooperate to have the bills which were not called today called again before we take a recess for the holidays, so that any Senator who is interested in a bill may have an opportunity to obtain consideration for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the conferees have finally agreed on the deficiency bill, and we hope to be able to submit the report a little later. We could agree to the conference report even in executive session.

Mr. BARKLEY. My hope is that the executive session will not require more than a few minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appreciate that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I insist on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Adrian R. Marron, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Robert N. S. Baker, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Webster M. Thompson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Andrew I. McKee, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Lisle F. Small, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as manager, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Hunter's Point, San Francisco, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty; and

Capt. George T. Paine, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Terminal Island (San Pedro), Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Patents:

Leo P. McCann to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office; and

Otto B. Roepke to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS—NOMINATION OF EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is this the nomination for the Security Council or for the General Assembly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the calendar there are two nominations of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. The nomination which was read was the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. to be representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am frank to admit that I find myself in a rather difficult situation in reference to the nomination of the Senator from Texas, Mr. Connally; Mr. Stettinius; the Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg; and Mrs. Roosevelt as American representatives to the United Nations Organization.

Each of these nominees represents a fine American. Mrs. Roosevelt is a lady who represents the qualities of American womanhood at their best. The Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan are two of the most luminant lights which this august body possesses, and whether I always appear to agree with their political views or not, I recognize their fine attributes as Americans and as outstanding men.

With respect to Mr. Stettinius, I should say that my opinion of him is on the record. I look askance at his connections, which I consider to be those associated with the rapidly declining system of special privilege—a kind of financial plutocracy which is no longer in tune with the age and which, in my opinion, no longer fits the best interests of the American people. Though I consider that Mr. Stettinius's connections would render him unsuited by training and inclination to the high office of Secretary of State or any other high office where his duties would have an immediate effect upon the material welfare of the people at large, my reservations do not extend to Mr. Stettinius himself as a man. Indeed, I consider him a very fine man and a very fine American. I quarrel only with the sort of thing he must be trained to represent, because of his associations with high finance and big business.

I am also on the record, Mr. President, in reference to the United Nations Organization. I am not against world organization and never have been. I am one of those who espoused it long before many others who voted for the United Nations Organization thought fit to do so. However, I voted against the United Nations Organization because I considered it to be, in plain English, "a phony" foisted on the American people through a total lack of consideration of the real issue and the real circumstances which all of the nations of the world must now face. I see no reason now to change my opinion. With the coming of the atom bomb it is clearer than ever that the United Nations Organization can have no function and will fail even more miserably than the old League of Nations failed. Though all of the countries have pledged themselves, aggression has not stopped. We see the Russians in eastern Europe. We watch the British shooting down the natives of Java, holding down Greece by force, and in other ways comporting themselves contrary to either the spirit or letter of the agreements made between us on which a world order was to be based.

These nations are not alone in their actions. All of us in one way or another appear to be guilty. It is perfectly apparent that there is no machinery contained in the United Nations Organization which can control such wicked and unlawful acts as these and that they will continue until real world organization is established, or at least real hemispheric organization along federated lines such as I proposed in a speech made on this floor a year ago.

I notice now that some of my esteemed colleagues have gone on record as demanding the junking of some of the founding principles of the United Nations Organization. They now say that the major principle of veto power by any big nation makes an absurdity of the entire United Nations Organization. I see that some of my illustrious colleagues have gone out for a world government power, which is quite a different thing from the present United Nations Organization.

The United Nations Organization can never be placed into operation. As it is, it will merely be an instrument by which the big imperial powers will maneuver to carry forth their policy of exploitation of those who cannot defend themselves against them. In the end it will mean a real contest for power between these big competing countries, in which we will find ourselves in the middle.

What I am desperately afraid of is that we have already chosen our side and that we are moving forward into World War III in consequence.

Everyone says that there cannot possibly be a World War III, but people are talking about it coming, nevertheless.

I look with the greatest sadness at the present policy of ours in declining to face the issue on certain moral as well as material grounds.

I repeat that the United Nations Organization cannot function. It is a square peg made to fit a round hole, and is a production of pure bunk, home-made chaff.

Its great weakness is that it lulls the American people and other peoples of the world into a false sense of security. I warn my colleagues in this great body that that security does not in effect exist and cannot exist through the machinery proposed through the founding of the United Nations Organization.

I therefore assume that in voting approval of the nomination of these four illustrious Americans I am merely voting a sort of an honorary bestowal on them in recognition of their qualities and stature as citizens of this Republic and that since the United Nations Organization can have no function neither can they.

Since they are notable Americans, I see no reason to withhold my own recognition of this fact, and, therefore, I vote approval, but I wish it specifically to be known that by this vote I do not render indirect approval of the United Nations Organization itself or of the monumental hypocrisy, being the pretense that it is capable of establishing a world order which will give the people of the United States the security and peace they long for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, perhaps it is inappropriate for me to have anything to say about the personnel of the American delegation to the first and critical meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, since the President has named me as a part of it, and particularly since the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has been so generous in his personal references to me. But in the absence of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am the only other Member of the Senate who is in a position to testify at first hand regarding the labors of former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., at the San Francisco Conference in connection with the great adventure in international peace and security in which it is here proposed by the President that he shall continue. Therefore, I think I owe it to the Senate to testify in respect to the pending nomination. In any event, Mr. President, I owe it to candor and to my very high regard for a great American whom I have seen tested, and who met the challenge of every test in this field of international contact.

There need be no speculation about the eligibility of Mr. Stettinius to sit in either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations Organization. The facts speak for themselves. He is no experiment. He is the seasoned veteran who has already done as much for the world's hope for organized peace as any other living man in this or any other land. At San Francisco Mr. Stettinius was one of the four permanent Chairmen of the Conference. He was the sole chairman of the Executive Committee and the Steering Committee, upon which fell the preponderant weight of responsibility for driving this great enterprise to a successful conclusion. It was a terrific burden. It required genius, efficiency, and high dedication.

It required relentless tenacity in support of great ideals. It required impressive personal character. It required widespread trust among the representatives of 49 other nations. Mr. Stettinius met these requirements. Without him, there might not have been a final Charter to attest his success.

That, Mr. President, is not all. The American delegation took some great American ideals to the Golden Gate—ideals which it believed indispensable to a plan for peace with justice in this wartorn world. In some of these aspirations we collided with strong counter views and almost implacable opposition. There was never an instant when the then Secretary of State did not indefatigably defend and assert these American ideals. There was never an instant's hesitation in his sturdy defense of the American viewpoint and of the broadest possible dedication of the San Francisco Charter to the American conception of democracy. Upon at least one occasion he stood his ground in the finest pattern of stalwart traditional American diplomacy. I was grateful to him then. I am grateful to him now. But what is infinitely more important, his country should be grateful—and it should deeply welcome his continued service as an American spokesman in the society of nations.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference, at an informal dinner attended by the President of the United States, all of Mr. Stettinius' colleagues joined in presenting him with an illuminated parchment which stated to him at that historic moment the conception of his colleagues of the work he had done for America and for the world. I wish to read the brief statement embellished upon that parchment as the verdict of those who had had the best and the closest opportunity to assess and measure and weigh the capacity of Mr. Stettinius for labors in this field. I read:

TO EDWARD R. STETTINIUS, JR.,
Secretary of State,
United States of America:

We who have worked as your comrades under your leadership at the San Francisco Conference wish to thank you with all our hearts for what you have done here for your country and for mankind.

We have been proud of your courage, your determination to achieve a new world order, your unfailing persistence through moments of dark perplexity, your poise and good temper, your tactful reconciliation of those who have differed and doubted.

We are confident that in the future you will continue to render distinguished service to the United States and the United Nations and for all these years to come we offer our warmest good wishes to the chief who has lead to the Charter through the City of the Golden Gate.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION.

Mr. President, I would be remiss to the obligation thus pledged to the former Secretary of State if I did not rise at this moment to assert my complete faith that it would be fantastic ingratitude for the Senate to decline to confirm his nomination to this position.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall content myself with just a word or two with reference to this nomination. I never knew Mr. Stettinius until he came to Washington a few years ago in a public capacity, although the name had been familiar to me for many years.

Mr. President, it is not difficult for one who was born and reared in hard circumstances, who had to fight his way in childhood, in boyhood, and in manhood to get his feet firmly planted on the soil and to be able to stand erect with his chin up in the face of all circumstances, however difficult and trying. However, it is unusual for a man born in affluence to find his heart so attuned to the conditions in his own country and throughout the world that he feels called upon to abandon the pursuit of wealth in order that he may devote his talents to the alleviation of the conditions of millions and millions and millions of men, women, and children, and may make a contribution to the elevation of the standard of life, national and international. I do not know that under our present standards we are required to sell all our goods and give to the poor in order that we may demonstrate our friendship and our loyalty to ideals; but in the case of Mr. Stettinius, it seems to me that he has shown to a degree the same sort of devotion to public ideals that was shown by George Washington, who is said to have been the richest man of his day in America and who might well be said to have belonged to the aristocracy of wealth in the colonial life of America.

We have all praised and heaped encomiums on Thomas Jefferson, who was born in an aristocracy of intellect and who espoused the cause of the common people. We might recite numerous instances of outstanding Americans who from the very beginning of our history until this hour, notwithstanding the fortunate circumstances in which they

were born and under which they grew up, have espoused the cause of humanity.

It seems to me that Mr. Stettinius belongs in that class. He is a man of the highest ideals, a man of the deepest moral convictions, a man of vision, a man who has contributed his ability and talents, who has contributed of his time and of his wealth, to the elevation of the standards of the peoples of the world.

So I concur, not only fully, but enthusiastically, in the praise of Mr. Stettinius' work at San Francisco just uttered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I also add to that my statement that I believe that in the various capacities in which Mr. Stettinius has served the people of the United States as a public servant during the last few years, he has not been excelled either in enthusiasm, in devotion, in ability, or in constructive results by any other man who has served in any similar position in public service.

Mr. President, I join in the hope that the nomination of Mr. Stettinius to the high position to which he has been called may be unanimously confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to ask a parliamentary question of the majority leader: Is it the plan to have each of the nominations confirmed separately?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Of course, ordinarily we might confirm them en bloc; but in view of the importance of this matter and in view of the fact that the Senator from North Dakota desired to speak upon this nomination, it is being considered separately.

Mr. BILBO. Very well. I wish to make some observations on Calendar No. 3771. I shall wait until it is reached.

Mr. BARKLEY. At this time we are passing only on the nomination of Mr. Stettinius, which appears as Calendar No. 3770.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I had the good fortune to attend the San Francisco Conference together with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and I had the opportunity of talking with many of the delegates to the Conference from countries throughout the world. I had an opportunity to observe Mr. Stettinius in the performance of his many duties there, and I simply rise to add my praise of him to what has been said and to express the hope that his nomination will be confirmed without a single opposing vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that this particular nomination is a single nomination to a single position. Of course, Mr. Stettinius is also nominated, along with others, to other positions. But the nomination now under consideration is a single nomination to a single place, and Mr. Stettinius is the only person who has been nominated to that place.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader if there is any particular reason why a deputy has not been nominated for Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say frankly that I am not in position to answer the question because I do not know.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any specific requirement that an appointment of separate individuals must be made to these positions, but it was my understanding that our representative on the Security Council would not also be on the General Assembly. Many of us feel that the functions to be performed in the two offices will be quite different. Why is Mr. Stettinius also to serve on the General Assembly?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will permit me, I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that Mr. Stettinius has been nominated as the representative of the United States of America to the "first part of the first session of the General Assembly." That session will be held before the Security Council has been created and completed in its membership, the completion of its membership being the first task of the General Assembly. Mr. Stettinius will sit in the General Assembly only until such time as the Security Council has been completed and is prepared to function. I entirely agree with the Senator from Arkansas that when the Security Council and the General Assembly are both in operation, it will be highly incongruous for our representative on the Security Council to sit in the General Assembly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that we should appoint men with qualifications which would enable them to continue as our representatives over a period of years. It seems to me that this proposal would result in a waste of good experience on the part of someone who might continue as our representative on the General Assembly.

While I certainly have no objection to Mr. Stettinius being our representative on the Security Council, I do not approve of this interim appointment for a period of time during which some other man with equal qualifications might well be representing us and prepared to continue to represent us in the General Assembly in the future. I do not see why it should be necessary to take up an issue, even at the initial meeting, with a man who will represent us in the Security Council.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the question of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in regard to the failure of appointing a deputy for Mr. Stettinius, I may say that the legal set-up under which the appointment was made does not specifically require the appointment of a deputy. I presume that the President might appoint one if he saw fit to do so, but he is not required to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I inquired if there was any special reason why a deputy had not been appointed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know of no such reason.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say that I was glad to hear the senior Senator from Michigan state that the appointment of Mr. Stettinius, or anyone else, to the Security Council and at the same time to the General Assembly will not become a precedent. I think that under some circumstances the offices are antithetical, and that a precedent of the kind to which the Senator has referred should never be established in connection with this organization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF TOM CONNALLY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of TOM CONNALLY, United States Senator from the State of Texas, to be a representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am certainly going to vote for the confirmation of the Senator from Texas, but I wish to make it plain that by that vote I do not concur in the sentiments which have been expressed by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee when, in debate recently, he stated that we do not want a world government, and that we are not prepared for a world government. I disagree with those sentiments, and I feel that many of our people, perhaps a majority of them, believe that a world government is absolutely necessary if humanity is to be preserved from extinction.

I wish to make it clear that I do not concur in the sentiments which were expressed by the able Senator from Texas. I am hopeful that if the sentiment for world government becomes strong in the United Nations Organization, the Senator from Texas will make an effort to represent the sentiments of the people of America, and not act on the basis of his own feelings in the matter. We have received expressions from Mr. Bevin, Foreign Secretary of the Government now in power in England, with regard to the matter. He said that he was ready to talk world government with anyone. Anthony Eden has also expressed himself favorably on the subject. Only a day or two ago I read in the newspapers that Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, had stated that in his belief world government seemed to be the only solution to the problem of maintaining world peace.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

The legislative clerk read the nomination of ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, United States Senator from the State of Michigan, to be representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATION OF MRS. ANNA ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, when writing the Constitution of the United States, the founding fathers provided, in article II, section 2, of the Constitution, that the President of the United States shall have the power to nominate all important officers of the Federal Government, and that after such nominations have been confirmed by the Senate he may make his appointments.

I find in Senate bill 1580 that the delegates to the first session of the General Assembly shall be nominated by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, and confirmed as such.

Under that statement of facts, every Member of the Senate must give his advice and consent to the appointment if he agrees to the nomination.

I have found no difficulty whatever in giving my advice and consent, as a Senator, to the appointment of the four distinguished American citizens whose names precede that of the person whose nomination is now before the Senate; but for good and sufficient reasons—to my mind, satisfactory reasons—I cannot give my advice and consent to the appointment of Mrs. Roosevelt to be our representative at the first session of the General Assembly.

Mr. President, I care not what course others may take in this matter, but in my representation of the sovereign State of Mississippi I know that I voice the sentiment of 98 or 99 percent of my people in registering my opposition to this nomination, which is a very important one indeed, inasmuch as the nominee is to serve as a representative and spokesman of the United States in the General Assembly of 50 nations of the earth.

I shall not now consume the time of the Senate in giving my reasons further than I have stated. My opposition to the nomination is based on the record of Mrs. Roosevelt's expressions in the press, on the hustings, and her services in recent years. My reasons for opposing her, as well as my reasons for announcing that I cannot vote for the confirmation of her nomination have been reduced to writing and will appear in a book to be published on the 1st of next March. For further information, I refer Senators to that publication.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with any colleague of mine in the Senate, especially with the able Senator from the State of Mississippi, but at times conscience makes it necessary that we disagree.

I have voted in this body for some very fine Americans for responsible positions of trust in this country. In my opinion when I cast my vote for the lady whose nomination is now being considered by the Senate I shall vote for just as fine an American woman, just as fine a Christian mother, just as fine a representative of what in my view are the true principles of the Democratic Party, as could be possible, and I think I shall have done my duty.

Notwithstanding my devotion to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I feel that this good lady will contribute to the meetings, in the place she is to take, even as much as the two Senators. I shall vote for the confirmation of her nomination with the greatest happiness.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the nomination of Eleanor Roosevelt among this group of representatives was so pleasing to me that I felt impelled to write to the President of the United States and express my wholehearted sympathy with the nomination.

As to the opposition expressed by the Senator from Mississippi, while I have high regard for the Senator personally, I disagree with him emphatically in many of his fundamental beliefs, and I think his opposition to this nomination is a splendid compliment to Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think all of us will agree that in our delegation to the United Nations there should be one woman, because women and children throughout the world are as much concerned as men could possibly be in the preservation of peace, and in the avoidance and ultimate elimination of war in the settlement of international controversies.

That being true, it was fitting that the President should appoint at least one woman on our delegation, and in casting about for that woman no doubt the President was actuated by the desire to select a representative woman, an outstanding woman, a woman whose life and whose life work had intimately touched the problems which will be on the doorstep of the United Nations Organization from the time of its beginning.

Whatever anyone may think of Eleanor Roosevelt's opinions on a variety of subjects on which she has expressed them, I think we are all prepared to admit that she has during her life, whether her late distinguished husband was in office or out of office, devoted herself to great causes which are close to the hearts of men and women, and one of the things for which I admire her as much as for anything else is that she never allowed the fact that she was the first lady of this land to interfere with her normal activities and her natural desire to contribute as much as she could to the welfare of the people.

She is a great American woman, and I believe that her presence and her influence upon our delegation, the fact that her late husband was as much responsible for the creation of this organization as any other one man, will serve as a reminder of the world's obligation to the sacrifices of all men and all nations in the great travail through which we have recently passed, and in our effort to find and stand upon a permanent solid foundation of peace and accord and civilization throughout the world.

I am glad to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mrs. Roosevelt for this position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

SOL BLOOM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of SOL BLOOM, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CHARLES A. EATON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of CHARLES A. EATON, a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to express my great affection for this nominee, whom I have known for many years, and who is the dean of the New Jersey delegation in the House of Representatives. He served with great distinction in San Francisco, and I am glad to pay this tribute to a great character and a great citizen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

FRANK C. WALKER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Walker, of Pennsylvania, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am not well acquainted with Mr. Walker, and I would like to have the majority leader, if he will, tell me a little about his qualifications to serve as our representative in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I presume the Committee on Foreign Relations had a meeting and considered the qualifications of the candidates.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I was otherwise occupied, and was not present at the time these nominations came up. I do not think that if I had been present my inclinations toward Mr. Walker would have been increased beyond the regard I already have for him. I think Mr. Walker was born in the State of Montana.

Mr. GUFFEY. He was born in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was born in Pennsylvania, moved to Montana, practiced law there a number of years, and then I believe moved to New York. He came to Washington under the appointment of President Roosevelt in 1933, as I recall, as the head of one of the relief organizations, the name of which I have forgotten. It was not PWA or WPA.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He was appointed to head a coordinating agency that was named by the President for the purpose of making effective the work of the National Industrial Recovery Administration and various other agencies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was trying to think of the precise name of the coordinating agency, which has escaped me for the time being.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I had reference to was whether the Senator knows of anything that qualifies him for this sort of a position. Has he had any experience in foreign affairs?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will tell the Senator, if he will give me a chance, just what I know of Mr. Walker's experience.

Mr. Walker was appointed Postmaster General by President Roosevelt, and served in that capacity until he resigned a year and a half ago, at which time Mr. Hannegan was appointed Postmaster General. He was also chairman of the National Democratic Committee for quite a while. I do not know that that necessarily qualifies a man to occupy a position of this sort, but it certainly does not disqualify him, in my estimation.

Mr. Walker is a man of broad experience in national affairs and in economic affairs, and is trained in the law and in business matters. He is a conscientious, upright, honorable, public-spirited man. He never came to Washington for the purpose of drawing a salary, because that did not induce him or entice him. He did not need it. He is a successful businessman and a successful lawyer.

It might be said that he never was an ambassador to a foreign country or occupied any position of that kind. There are many men in this country who are qualified to perform great services, and we never know they can do it until they are called on. Usually if they have the background and a desire for public service they respond to the opportunity and measure up to the requirements.

I believe that Mr. Walker is admirably qualified for the position to which he has been appointed, by experience, by inclination, by all the tenets of his heart, and by his patriotic outlook upon the obligations of our Nation and our people, and of all nations, in trying to work out a world of peace and accord.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe Mr. Walker intends to make this a career, or to follow it up, to be serious about representing this country on this delegation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what are Mr. Walker's intentions in that regard. I do not know that anyone appointed as a delegate to the Assembly, especially as an alternate—Mr. Walker is appointed as an alternate—intends to make it a career or, even if he intended to, could make it a career, because the President may from time to time change the representation on the General Assembly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the point. I noticed a statement respecting it in this morning's paper. I do not of course know whether the President said this, but it was stated in the morning newspaper:

> One administration spokesman denied there was political significance in any of the shifts. In this quarter it was said the President wants membership on the Assembly "passed around."

It seems to me, when so much effort has been made to bring the Organization to its present state, if it is going to amount simply to an opportunity to pass around a few rewards to people who have completed their life in general and are ready for retirement, that it cannot possibly succeed. Whether that is the purpose respecting this Organization or these particular appointments, I do not know. But I cannot see that it can be said that in the present case there is the slightest qualification for this particular job, because there is nothing more complicated and more difficult than to try to adjust the many divergent views that exist.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me respond to the Senator briefly. I did not observe the article in the morning newspaper to which the Senator from Arkansas alluded, respecting the passing around of these appointments to the General Assembly. It had been my understanding at the very beginning that the same persons would not perpetually hold appointments or representation in the General Assembly or on the Council. It may be desirable now and then to have a breath of fresh air in that great organization, so a new viewpoint might be observed there. It has been from the very start understood that all the nations might change their representatives now and then in order that there might be a currency in viewpoint among all the nations. I doubt the wisdom of insisting that everyone appointed initially upon the General Assembly or the Council should be a perpetual and permanent representative, because if they become too perpetual and too permanent, we will begin to call them bureaucrats.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator believe that a man who has served in many capacities, and has obviously been a great success in our domestic policy, at that age is likely to bring a breath of fresh air into the Council of the General Assembly? I will call attention to the fact that the average age of all five of these alternates is over 65.

Mr. BARKLEY. That does not annoy me in the slightest, Mr. President. Mr. Walker, while he has had an extensive and successful life in private business and in public affairs, is by no means a doddering old man. He is a man in the full vigor of physical as well as intellectual activity, and I am quite satisfied that for many years to come he will be able to render any service he may be asked to undertake.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. GUFFEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I rise to say a word in behalf of Mr. Walker. I have known him ever since he started to practice law in Butte, Mont., because he started to practice just a year or two after I did. He is a very able and a fine gentleman. He practiced law in Butte for a great many years, representing the Clark interests there for some time. He was a member of the legislature. Then his uncle, who was in the motion-picture business, called him to New York, and he went there and represented his interests. He afterward became treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. Then he became Postmaster General. He was also chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Walker is a very sincere, conscientious, and fine and able individual. I am not able to say anything respecting his capabilities and qualifications for this particular post, excepting this——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator say whether Mr. Walker shares the Senator's views respecting our foreign relations? Does the Senator know whether Mr. Walker agrees with him in his attitude toward the United Nations Organization?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say definitely that Mr. Walker does not share them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has he ever made a public statement as to his attitude toward the United Nations Organization?

Mr. WHEELER. Not that I know of, but I am quite sure that Mr. Walker does not agree with my views with reference to the United Nations, nor did he agree with my views on foreign relations prior to the time of Pearl Harbor. Notwithstanding that fact, I want to testify that he is, in my judgment, a very able, honest, and conscientious man.

I do not know his capabilities and qualifications for this particular post; indeed, I do not know what qualifications or capabilities are considered to be necessary, but I will say that in my humble judgment Mr. Walker has had as much experience in this line as any of the individuals who have been heretofore mentioned. I do not know of any of them who are experts on foreign affairs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Dulles has had experience in foreign affairs.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly Mr. Stettinius, who came here from the United States Steel Corp., had never had any great experience, nor had any of the others that I know of.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator think it might be advisable to have one or two members of the Organization who have had a little experience?

Mr. WHEELER. I am not disagreeing with the Senator with reference to that matter, but I do not know just what qualifications are necessary or required. I do say that Mr. Walker has had just as much experience in these matters as most of the others heretofore mentioned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, he knows just as little as any of them.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. Walker is a graduate of Notre Dame, from which he graduated with high honors. He later went to a law school and returned to Montana and practiced law. He was an admirer and friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt long before he became executive director of the National Emergency Council in 1933, and he fulfilled every responsible position the President called on him to fulfill. He is a man of integrity, a man of honor, and is thoroughly qualified, in my opinion, by his knowledge of domestic affairs and of world affairs. He agreed with President Roosevelt's world policy. I know that because I have discussed the matter with him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was the Senator from Pennsylvania present at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. GUFFEY. I was not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is any Senator present who was present at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I was present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator tell us how many Senators were present at that meeting?

Mr. PEPPER. In a matter of that sort my legal experience reminds me that the record is the best evidence. I think probably we might consult the roll. I think there was not a large number present, but these nominations were brought up and discussed, and a vote was taken, and the unanimous vote was to report the nominations favorably.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the Senator cannot enlighten us as to who were there. Was there any point made as to the qualifications of these nominees?

Mr. PEPPER. The nominations were discussed generally, both the principals and the alternates. Senators all had an opportunity to express their opinion respecting them. I would not say that there was a biographical sketch of each one, or that there was an FBI report considered by the committee, but the names were discussed and considered by the committee, and the chairman of the committee was authorized to report favorably the nomination.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When was this meeting held?

Mr. PEPPER. Yesterday morning.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And the Senator has forgotten who was present. Would the Senator tell us if any consideration was given to the selection of a physicist, who might be acquainted with the nuclear field, as one of the representatives?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know. I think the Senate committee took the position that it was within the province of the President to make the nominations, and it was in the province of the committee and the Senate to say whether the Senate would give its advice and consent to the nomination made by the President. So we did not propose the selection of any individual as a substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was no suggestion made as to any member from among those who served in World War II, was there?

Mr. PEPPER. On the same theory as that I just mentioned the committee did not consider suggesting any substitute for the nominees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I was not present, because I was in attendance at the hearing of the Pearl Harbor Committee. But I knew that the nominations were coming up, and I was fairly well acquainted with all those who were nominated. I authorized the committee to cast my vote, which is frequently done, in behalf of all of them.

I might say a word in response to another question asked by the Senator from Arkansas a little earlier as to whether Mr. Walker had had any experience in international organizations of this kind that would qualify him for this assignment. This is the first United Nations Organization that has ever been set up in which we were a part, and therefore there has never been an American appointed to a United Nations Organization or any similar organization. We were not a member of the League of Nations, and therefore we had no representation on the League of Nations. The fact is, of course, that during the last 25 or 30 years, since World War I, there has not been an international organization set up as this one is set up. We had no representation on any organization from which anyone could have gotten any similar experience.

Back before World War I we did have representation, I think, beginning in 1898 and the early 1900's, on the Hague Conference. But I imagine that none of those who were representatives on the Hague Conference in those years would be available to serve in this organization. The very circumstances under which we have lived in the family of nations has precluded us from appointing anyone on similar organizations where they might acquire the experience of which the Senator from Arkansas speaks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In response, let me say that obviously it is not experience on this identical kind of organization I had in mind, but we do have individuals who have had the necessary experience, such as Dean Acheson, who has had considerable experience in international conferences, the setting up of the UNRRA and the Food and Education Committee, and so on. At least, they are familiar with the other peoples of the world. I also point out that there are available, as I mentioned a moment ago, such men as we have had before the committee recently, such as Oppenheimer, Urey, and so on, in the nuclear field, all of whom have studied all over the world and are thoroughly familiar with the international field, which is the most important and difficult and the principal field before us. It seems to me that consideration should be given to one man of that class.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will realize that the Committee on Foreign Relations does not make these appointments, and has no jurisdiction to consider Mr. Oppenheimer, Mr. "Nuclear" [laughter], or anyone else who might be appointed to this Organization. We were passing on the nominations sent to us by the President of the United States, acting under his authority. I have no information which would lead me to believe that if we rejected Mr. Walker, Mr. Oppenheimer, Mr. Bush, or any other particular individual would be appointed as a substitute for him. We are to pass solely on the question whether we think Mr. Walker is qualified to act in this assignment. I think he is. He may not have the broad international diplomatic experience that some others may have; but we must recognize the fact that we are living in a new world, and that there are new assignments to which men may be unaccustomed, and we must take some chance of selecting a new man for a new job and trusting that he will perform the duties.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly my point. This is a new world, and a new assignment. It seems to me very inappropriate to select a man who has really retired voluntarily from active life.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who is that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This same Mr. Walker.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not know Mr. Walker, if he assumes that he has retired from active life. He has retired from public life in the sense that he retired from the Postmaster Generalship of the United States, but he has by no means retired from active life. If I am any judge of the average longevity of men of his type, it will be a long time before he retires from active life, whether in a public or private capacity.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to say a word in favor of Mr. Walker. I have known him for a great many years, and I believe that he is in the full vigor of manhood, both mentally and physically. I believe that he is fully capable of handling this or any other position to which he is likely to be appointed.

With reference to the Foreign Relations Committee, since the Senator raised the question, let me say that I was notified of the meeting. I was not so fortunate as was the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in knowing that these names were to be submitted. The minority leader [Mr. WHITE] and I were in the Foreign Relations Committee room until probably a quarter of an hour after the time for the meeting, after being notified.

Then he and I left together. At the time we were there we were told that there was a conference going on between

the two Houses, but I did not know that any names had been submitted. I left and went to my office on the assumption that there was not to be a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee yesterday morning.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CARVILLE. I have known Frank Walker since 1906. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] mentioned the fact that he went to Notre Dame. I went to school with him. We graduated in the same class, in 1909. I have followed his career. I know him as a very conscientious, capable, and honest man. He was close to President Roosevelt, and was his adviser. I know that he is a very outstanding, brilliant man, and I think he would be a fine representative for us on this Assembly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may address a question to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader when the first part of the Assembly will end. What will mark its end?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think there is any particular date fixed when it shall end.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand; but what is the function of the first part, as distinguished from the second or later part?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is my understanding that the Assembly will function in probably a sort of preliminary way before the Council itself is well organized and on its feet, and before it begins to function; and that whenever that time arrives probably the preliminary work of the Assembly may be merged into a more permanent personnel in the Assembly. But I do not believe that there is any particular date in any month which could be designated as the ending of the preliminary feature and the beginning of a more permanent function.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was not driving at the date. I was wondering what will mark the end of the first part and the beginning of the second part.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many functions must be performed by the Assembly in the way of getting things going. For example, there is the Social and Economic Council. There will be many separate organizations to be set up, and presumably the Assembly will function in a preliminary way until that is done and all the organizations are working independently, in a sense, although they will never be wholly independent of the Assembly and the Council.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, the nominees will finish their work at the conclusion of the first part of the Assembly. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not want to give the Senator a dogmatic answer. By and large, I believe that the temporary assignment will then be concluded.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator is saying.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate longer. I am informed that at the meeting at which such serious consideration was given to this question three members of the committee were present, aside from the two members whose names are before us, which is neither here nor there. I merely wish to make this point: I have no intention of questioning the veracity, integrity, or character of Mr. Walker. I am quite sure that he is an upright gentleman, but from all that has been said here there is not the slightest indication that he has had any actual experience in this field, or that he has heretofore had any desire to serve in this capacity.

So far as I can see, exactly the same thing may be said of Mr. Townsend. I am not in any way attacking the character of these gentlemen or their ability as businessmen or politicians. However, as Senators know, I have been very much interested in the United Nations Organization. It seems to me that the best way to nullify its effect and to kill it in the long run is to treat it as an opportunity to pass around a few favors or honors to persons who have been fine citizens, and who are still fine citizens, but who do not intend to make this kind of work their career, and do not seriously intend to give it any attention. I should say that in the natural course of things they intend to enjoy a short trip to London with their friends.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make a statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

If that is the attitude with which this Organization is to begin, I can see that obviously it is doomed to failure. I can imagine the effect upon other nations when they see our representatives, whom we assume are sent there for a purpose—not to be good fellows, not to discuss the mining situation in Montana, or whatever it is Mr. Walker is familiar with, or the strawberry crop in Delaware. I think it is a terrible shame that we should start with this attitude toward the most important Organization we have tried to achieve. Senators know that it does not matter how perfect the Organization may be; if the men who are sent to make it function are not qualified to make it function, it necessarily will fail.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I feel that the aspersions which the Senator from Arkansas has cast upon the character and personality of Mr. Walker——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator in what way I cast aspersions upon his character?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. By implying that he was accepting this appointment for the purpose of going on a pleasure trip to London. There is no justification for it.

Mr. President, I speak as one who knows Mr. Walker. I can say that every position of public responsibility which he has taken he has filled with a high degree of devotion to the public interest. If character and judgment are qualifications for a public trust, Mr. Walker has them. If ability and integrity are qualifications for public office, Mr. Walker has them. If education and understanding are qualifications, he has them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator tell us——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And if a liberal and informed mind is a qualification for public office, Mr. Walker has that also.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator permit me——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Arkansas that the attack which he has made against Mr. Walker, apparently arising out of complete lack of knowledge of Mr. Walker, is utterly without basis; and since the Senator speaks without knowledge of Mr. Walker, I believe admittedly so——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that he should withdraw the implications.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say to the Senator that I had assumed that under the provisions of the Constitution there was more than a perfunctory obligation on the Senate to advise and consent to these appointments. It is obvious that that is not true. It is obvious that even the Committee on Foreign Relations paid no serious attention to the nominations. Only five members were present. If that is true, of course, I am performing a wholly useless function.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I decline to yield at the moment. As for the alleged aspersion upon the character of Mr. Walker, I think the Senator goes a little far in implying that no person ever accepts an appointment except from the very highest sense of duty. I believe that all of us are human enough—and I certainly admit that I am—to be pleased to accept an appointment. I am also sure that all of us would believe that we were qualified to discharge any of the obligations which might arise in connection with a very pleasant trip.

I reiterate that I do not know Mr. Walker personally; but, so far as I know, no one who has been interested in this subject and has expressed himself on the subject of the United Nations, either on the floor of the Senate, on the radio, or otherwise, has even volunteered the suggestion that Mr. Walker has ever given an expression of his attitude toward the United Nations. It would seem very odd to appoint a man whose attitude no one knows. It is vaguely suggested that he was in agreement with President Roosevelt. He was chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I am sure that was a matter primarily involved with elections, and not with our foreign policy. I am sure that he has never held any office in the Department of State.

As I say, I have no inclination to cast any aspersions upon his character as a Christian gentleman; but I should like to point out that during the past 25 years

there have been many Christian gentlemen in this Government, in our State Department, and in all governments. But I do not think that that is sufficient to give any assurance whatever that this organization will operate successfully.

It seems to me high time that this country make some effort to develop people with experience and background to represent us in international conferences. Largely because of the fact that we have not tried to develop a corps of men who are experienced in the international field, three or four of our Secretaries of State have had no experience in that field prior to their service in the Department of State. I do not think we shall ever have an effective foreign policy until we develop persons with some experience in that field. That is my principal point.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As the Senator pointed out, the last three Secretaries of State had had no experience in foreign affairs prior to their service as head of the Department of State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator have Secretary Byrnes removed from his position because he had no previous experience in international affairs?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I could wish, and I have wished very strongly, that Secretary Byrnes, with all his abilities, had had 10 years' experience in international affairs and that he knew intimately the matters with which he is now concerned, instead of going to international conferences with no experience at all in that field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not recall that Mr. Byrnes during his service in this body ever was a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He devoted his time to the consideration of general legislative matters and financial matters, and he did fine work.

In line with my previous statement, let me ask whether the Senator would say that Mr. Stettinius, whose experience had been in the field of finance, did not make a good Secretary of State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say he would have made a much better one if he had had proper experience.

The trouble is that we are always met with the statement, "There is no one in our Government who has had any real experience in foreign affairs," and unfortunately that is a fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me ask the Senator a question about the Honorable Cordell Hull, who came from the State of Tennessee, a neighbor of the Senator's State. Would the Senator from Arkansas say that during all the troubles in Europe and elsewhere someone with international experience should have been appointed to the State Department to take Mr. Hull's place? Before Cordell Hull served as Secretary of State, he had had no international experience, as such. He had been a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, but he had had no experience in international affairs.

But I go further: If experience is the measuring stick, would the Senator from Arkansas or I be in this body? Did we have previous experience which would qualify us for our positions here?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that there is a very great difference between service in this body and the experience which I believe it is desirable for Members of this body to have had, and service in the international field, representing the United States, and experience in that field, which I believe is quite specialized. No analogy can be drawn between the two.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, it is specialized. But even more important than experience, what is needed now is a little old-fashioned American common sense, and I think that as a whole the personnel selected will provide that.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will indulge me a moment further, let me point out that, as the Senator from Kentucky has stated, we have nothing to do with the making of the nominations. If we had to make recommendations regarding them or if we had been asked, the situation might be different. If I had been asked, probably I would have recommended the man who introduced the Fulbright resolution. I would have done that. But we were not asked.

Now we are passing on the question whether we believe the President has submitted to us the nominations of persons who possibly can be true to America. I think they can.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that it is very disagreeable and I realize it is unpopular to voice any opposition to something which is done in the regular way.

The Senator mentioned several men who have been very great Americans, I think; but I wish to point out that, as it seems to me, our policy during the past 25 years did not turn out to be in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Evidently it was not, because during that time we have had two wars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That experience, coupled with the fact that we have seen fit to follow a policy of appointing to positions in our international service persons who have had no qualifications for such assignments, seems to be sufficient justifications for calling for a new policy, in the hope that in the next 25 years we shall not stumble into another war, because I certainly believe that if we find ourselves in another war, with atomic energy on the loose, it will be the end of our civilization and the end of the civilization of all the world.

That is the only reason why I have had any disposition to question the method which heretofore we have followed, namely, the appointment of good, honest persons with no experience to positions of the greatest importance in the international field.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I venture to assert that if we have another war in 20 years, the men in the State Department who have had experience in international affairs will not do the fighting. The men who will do the fighting will be those with no experience in the international field. Consequently, I believe those men should have something to say about our position in the international situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator has raised that point, let me say it would seem to me exceedingly appropriate to have chosen a veteran of this war. I just pick out one who was here recently, Charles Bolte, who represents the veterans of this country. He lost a leg in this war. He is a very intelligent young man and he has had experience. He represents the generation which has had to pay for the mistakes of many of the fine gentlemen the Senator from New Mexico has mentioned.

I am not trying to blame anyone. I think all of us were to blame. I am only seeking to find some way to avoid continuing the same old practice which I think naturally follows as a result of inertia, namely, continued observance of the long-standing policy of rewarding certain service with appointments which have a certain amount of honor.

Whether my statement on that point is an aspersion upon the character of certain persons, as the Senator from Wyoming has chosen to take it, I certainly do not know. I do not intend it to be. These things have been done customarily since the beginning of the history of our Nation. Probably I am not above accepting appointment to a position of honor for which I probably would not be qualified, although all of us are inclined to think we are qualified for such positions.

But it is my hope that in the present instance, when we are beginning to participate in the functioning of a new organization which certainly has possibilities of promise to all the world, we shall decide not to subject it to the same practices to which we subject many of our institutions here at home. In the case of our institutions at home, I do not object so much, because we live with ourselves and we can remedy mistakes. But I think it is exceedingly unfortunate for us to follow such procedures in our dealings with other countries, because I think the effect upon those countries is most unfortunate. If the men who are chosen to represent us in such positions are not the very best and most suitable men for such work that our country has, then I think those countries—such as Russia and others—will assume either that we do not have better men or that we do not care enough about the Organization to send our best men to it; and in either case they will say, "We do not have to bother about these Americans."

Of course we are just as much worried about whether Russia is to be isolationist as we are about whether we shall be. We are worried about whether Russia will work as hard as we expect to work to make the United Nations Organization function efficiently. No one knows about that. No definite decision regarding it has been made. In the Congress we have made a decision in that connection; but in my opinion the decision must eventually be made by the people, and

it cannot be made until we have had several years of experience.

So I think it is especially important that at the first meeting of the international organization we have men who are well known. I scarcely know Mr. Townsend. I am sure Mr. Townsend is not well known either in this country or elsewhere as a great authority in the field of international affairs or as having been particularly interested in this matter. Certainly he has not been nearly as interested in it as has the gentleman I have mentioned, Mr. Bolte.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I said that the Senator cast an aspersion upon the character of Mr. Walker because he clearly stated his assumption that Mr. Walker was accepting this appointment, not in a serious frame of mind, but for the purpose of taking a trip abroad.

I submit to the Senator that if he will frankly review the case he will acknowledge that he does not have a scintilla of evidence upon which to base such an assumption or upon which to make such an implication. When the story of this debate is told, it will be reported in the press of the country that the Senator from Arkansas rose from his seat in the Senate Chamber and stated that these men were being appointed in order that they might take a trip to Europe.

I know Frank Walker. I know he has never accepted a public appointment except out of a conviction of public responsibility. I know he accepted the appointment as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, not because he wanted it, but because the President of the United States asked and demanded that he take it. The President did so because he knew the character of Frank Walker. He knew he was a man of serious mind; he knew he was a man who would approach the responsibility which was placed in his hands and would discharge it to the utmost of his ability; and he knew from Frank Walker's record that he had the ability and the character to be an outstanding public servant. Those facts were true before.

As one who knows Frank Walker, as one who has been just as much interested in promoting the United Nations Organization as has the Senator from Arkansas, as one who, ever since the League of Nations was first presented, has been hoping and praying that there would be a world organization to prevent war—with that background, I say to the Senator that Mr. Walker is as capable as the Senator from Arkansas to hold this position; he is as capable as any other person the Senator has named. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas has made any suggestion to the President of the United States with respect to appointments to be made to these positions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that I made a suggestion, but it was not followed. If that is of any importance, very well. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wyoming has gone entirely too far in implying that I was seeking a place on the Assembly. I was not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I made no such suggestion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that such an appointment would be wholly inappropriate, even if offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, to be sure, I did not make any such suggestion.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for making the point which I think needed desperately to be made. The appointments to the General Assembly are important. As Senators have stated repeatedly, we regard the General Assembly as the most hopeful organ of the United Nations Organization. I think the Senator from Arkansas performed a public service by inviting the attention of the Senate to the way in which the nominations were made and rushed through the Senate committee. I regret very much the perfunctory way in which the matter has been handled.

In expressing my own views, I do not intend them as being a reflection on any member of this delegation because I have a high regard for all of them. But it is my opinion that a much better job could have been done in choosing the delegation to represent the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Minnesota in commending the Senator from Arkansas for the discussion which has taken place. I think it has been very helpful and that much good will come from it. There can be no doubt that a much stronger delegation could have been and should have been named to perform the very responsible and important duties which the American delegation will be called upon to perform in connection with the United Nations Organization. I think that when the delegation is evaluated, the comment will be widespread throughout the country to the effect that it would have been much better to have had the delegation composed of fewer politicians, and that more men who were recognized in the field of international relations should have been appointed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I do not wish to pursue the subject any further, because obviously it would have no effect whatever. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen nominations, with possibly one or two exceptions, handled in a perfunctory manner. I hope that the President will give much more serious attention in the future to such matters than he has given up to the present time. After the initial meeting of the General Assembly I hope that the President will give attention to the necessity of trying to appoint men with experience in some field which is relevant to the task to be performed, and who can be expected to continue their services from meeting to meeting so that their functions will be characterized by some degree of continuity.

In regard to Mr. Walker, I may say that I have no evidence, of course, that he does not expect to continue his services. However, I think that the circumstances of the man's life, such as his business associations, his age, and similar factors, would lead one to believe that he is not now taking up a new profession, and is not giving up his great business interests in order to devote himself to the future of the United Nations Organization. That conclusion is obvious in the absence of very definite evidence to the contrary. It is furthermore obvious that the Committee on Foreign Relations did not discuss the matter, and that the subject was disposed of when only two or three members of the committee were present. I do not mean to imply that an otherwise situation would have made the slightest difference so far as approving of the nominations is concerned. But I certainly would like to urge the President to give some attention to this matter. Other representatives will be appointed later. I hope the President will not pass the appointments around to friends who are nice gentlemen, honest, and deserving in many respects, but who are not particularly qualified to assume the duties which they would be called upon to perform. I am sure there are plenty of jobs in this country with which the President can satisy all of his obligations. I hope that he will not destroy the one hope which this country now has for the prevention of another war. If this project fails, Mr. President, I can see no purpose in all the wrangling which takes place here in the Senate, because if we do not make this organization effective, the atomic bomb will solve all our problems.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CARVILLE. Reference was made by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to the age of Mr. Frank Walker. I may say that Mr. Walker's age is about 58 or 59 years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that possibly I may be able to clear the atmosphere for the Senator from Arkansas. I have known Mr. Walker for many years, and have known him intimately for the past 4 years because I was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads while he was Postmaster General. I was thrown into intimate contact with him during that entire time.

In the first place, with reference to his being an old man, or at least with reference to the statement that he is an old man, and a decrepit, retired man from business, I may say that the Senator from Arkansas has been completely misinformed. Mr. Walker is one of the most active and vigorous men whom I know anywhere. He is not an old man, but instead, he is very vigorous and active, and still in middle life. Furthermore, I invite the Senator's attention to Mr. Walker's additional qualifications. He has been splendidly educated. He is a finished and accomplished scholar and gentleman. He is a student. He is a hard worker, physically and mentally. He is in every way qualified to fill the position to which he has been appointed.

Let us consider some of our Secretaries of State. Who ever made a better Secretary of State than Cordell Hull?

He never had any experience of the kind which the Senator from Arkansas has stated is absolutely necessary in connection with duties of the nature of those which will be performed by the present nominee. Mr. Hull had never had experience on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, nor on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Yet, by his good sense, by his level head, by his firmness in doing right as he saw it, by his great ability, his excellent education, and other qualifications which he possessed, he made one of the finest Secretaries of State this country ever had.

If I remember correctly, Mr. Hughes had never had any particular qualifications to fit him for the office of Secretary of State. He had never served on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He had never been a Member of either House. Yet, he made a splendid Secretary of State. No one could have filled that position with greater efficiency than did he.

Mr. Stettinius had had no qualifications of the kind to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred. Yet, he made an excellent Secretary of State.

I wish to say something further in behalf of Mr. Walker. Frank Walker is one of the most diplomatic men of whom I know. He is a man with a level head. He is a man with a good heart. He is a man who is in entire sympathy with what we are trying to accomplish. He is well versed in business and in world affairs. He is a learned man, a literary man, and in every way qualified for this appointment.

He has had no experience in an organization of this kind, as a member of a parliament of this kind. No one has had any. We had no representative on the League of Nations when it was meeting and surely Mr. Walker could not be rejected because he never served on an international organization of this kind.

I wish to say to the Senator from Arkansas that, as certainly as that he lives to see the Organization function, he will find Frank Walker one of the best, one of the ablest, one of the most efficient, members of the body to which he has been appointed. He is an exceedingly diplomatic man; he is level-headed to a degree, and he knows men. I guarantee that Mr. Walker knows all about the Senator from Arkansas. He is just that kind of a man. He keeps up with everyone. He knows the Senator from Arkansas even if the Senator from Arkansas does not know him.

It is said this matter was hurried through. That is easy to be done in a case of this kind, because all the Senators who have been Members of this body for a number of years know Frank Walker. I imagine that if we had a show of hands seven out of eight would say they knew Frank Walker while he was in Washington as Postmaster General. They knew him more or less intimately. I am almost tempted to ask if there is a Member of the Senate who knows Frank Walker, and who has known him during the last several years, who would not say he is in every way qualified for the position to which he has been appointed.

Those of us who know him, those of us who have worked with him, those of us who know what he stands for, those of us who know what he believes in, would not need the Foreign Relations Committee or the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any other committee, to tell us that we will make no mistake in confirming the nomination of this truly splendid American, this outstanding American, this man who is diligent in business, and has been serving the Lord all the time.

I say that Frank Walker will make just as good a representative in the General Assembly as any other member, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to say to the Senator from Arkansas, primarily because he raised the question, but to say to every other Senator as well, that I have the utmost confidence in Mr. Walker's ability, in his integrity, in his uprightness, in his effectiveness as a member of a parliamentary body, and as a truly great statesman.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am heartily in accord with everything the Senator from Tennessee has said, and I should like to ask him if he knows any man who has a finer sense of proportion and relative values than has Mr. Walker.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can answer the Senator truly that the implication of his statement is correct. Frank Walker has had so much experience in business, so much experience with men, so much experience with public affairs, that he is the ideal man for membership in this Organization. I never voted to confirm any man whose name has come before this body with a greater degree of satisfaction that I shall vote for the confirmation of Frank Walker's nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may be permitted just a moment before the next nomination is presented, a while ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] asked me in reference to the functions of the first part of the first session of the General Assembly. I was not able wholly to answer the Senator, although the answer I gave him was correct so far as it went.

The function of the first part of the General Assembly is that of organization, to get going and organized, to set up the various commissions and councils which it is their duty to form, to select headquarters, and within 3 or 4 months after that is done to meet at the headquarters which they have selected and proceed then under the Charter. Of course, they will have jurisdiction over many things when they get firmly established, and there are many committees and subcommittees to appoint and deliberations to be carried out.

The first meeting is to get the ground laid and the machinery working, and to pick the place where they will be located, so that when they begin functioning they will have everything in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, after the first part has been completed, that ends the period of service of this first group of appointees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the present appointments. Some of the delegates or all of them might be reappointed, if the President so desired.

Mr. MILLIKIN. During the debate on the enabling statute, I made an argument to the effect that it would be better if we could have permanent appointees in these positions, subject, of course, to the pleasure of the President. I think the debate today has foreshadowed the impracticability of selecting a new group of men to learn a new job with every new meeting or part of meeting of the Assembly. I hope the President in the future, after we get through with this first part of the first session, will, as he has a right to do under the enabling statute, make permanent and outstanding appointments, the appointees to hold office subject to his pleasure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Foster Dulles, of New York, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times day before yesterday, which is quite appropriate at this particular time, when we are discussing the United Nations Charter and the delegates to be appointed. The editorial is entitled "Iran," and reads:

IRAN

At the Teheran Conference, held in 1943 among Premier Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and President Roosevelt, the "Big Three" pledged themselves to maintain the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran. Furthermore, in recognition of her assistance to Allied victory, they agreed to help her overcome the difficulties created by the presence of Allied troops on her soil. Now, 7 months after the victory to which she contributed, and in territory held by Russian troops, one of her richest provinces has been detached from her control and declared to be "autonomous" by a revolutionary regime approved by Moscow and calling itself the "National Government of Iranian Azerbaijan," with a capital at Tabriz.

This is not only a poor reward for Iran's contribution to the Allied cause. It opens up the whole problem of the Middle East, where the interests of two of the Big Powers cross. It imposes a further strain on the confidence of the small nations in the purposes of the Big Powers. And it presents another Big Three conference with another Russian fait accompli.

The United States attempted to forestall such a development by suggesting the withdrawal of all Allied troops by January 1. But this suggestion was rejected by Russia, and in consequence by Great Britain. The withdrawal of American troops alone will scarcely solve the situation now. For the United States remains committed to the maintenance of Iran's territorial integrity, as Secretary Byrnes pointed out in his note to the Iranian Foreign Minister on December 1. Meanwhile, President Truman in his Navy Day speech declared that we shall not recognize any government imposed by force, and where it is impossible to prevent this we shall not recognize any government so created.

There the matter stands. It is greatly to be hoped that the Moscow Conference will initiate a solution consonant with the commitments made to Iran and thereby maintain that harmony among the big powers which is so essential.

Mr. President, at this time when so many say we must collaborate with this country and that country, I call attention to the fact that our allies are grabbing every piece of territory on which they can lay their hands, and they expect to keep that territory. I say that unless the promises made by the Big Three, in the Atlantic Charter and otherwise, to the small countries are kept, we cannot expect the peoples of the small nations or even the people of this country to have much confidence in any world organization which simply tries to maintain the status quo and condones the grabbing of territory by our allies.

JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Townsend, Jr., of Delaware, to be an alternate representative of the United States of America to the first part of the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be held in London, January 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the nominations of those who are to be representatives to the United Nations having been confirmed, I wish to make a statement which I do not think is pertinent to the personnel of those confirmed up to this point, but I think it is most important if we consider the stable operation of international policy as we hope it may be established. I have looked over the list of nominees. There are nine representatives to this organization, both the Assembly and the Council. Of those nine only two come from west of the Allegheny Mountains. Seven of them come from an area which on the map one could almost cover with a half dollar, depending on the size of the map. They come from a particular section of the country, the eastern seaboard, which, admittedly, for years has had a particular psychology and a particular attitude respecting international affairs.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is a section of the country west of the Allegheny Mountains, the great Middle West, north and south; the great Rocky Mountain region, north and south; the great Pacific coast region, north and south; and that in those regions there are people who are just as vitally determined as are those of the East, that international peace shall be established and maintained in the world, and, in my judgment, they are just as capable mentally and have experience which is just as broad.

While I am not objecting to the original set-up, and I do not believe that my statements are particularly vital to this recommended list, and I would not raise my voice in objection, I do say that I hope the President of the United States and the Senate, in the future, as the machinery of international cooperation, we hope, at least begins to function somewhat smoothly, will consider that we have a vast continent here, with some internal divergence of opinion, but with an equality of determination for peace that is equally existent west of the Allegheny Mountains, north and south, as it is east of the Allegheny Mountains, and with especial reference to a restricted locality east of the Allegheny Mountains. I hope that may be borne in mind and considered.

Before I close I may say that I agree with the Senator from Arkansas in much of his fundamental argument this afternoon. I shall not comment on the personality of the individuals whose nominations have been confirmed by the Senate; but I say the same thing that I stated when we undertook to set up a representation to the Assembly of the League of Nations, without dignifying it by having those members made permanent members, or confirmed by the Senate—and that has now been changed—I say that if this international organization is to function, the Assembly must have brought to it permanence, intelligence, and ability, and above all sincerity, because it is the forum of the small nations, and it will demand all the ingenuity and all the long-range judgment and experience that we and other nations can bring to it if we are to have any hope that it will function as the nations of the earth fervently hope it will in the direction of permanent international peace.

While I may disagree in some particulars with the Senator from Arkansas, and with some of his statement, yet I compliment him for the fundamental philosophy he has expressed, and I say that, in my opinion, he has made to the thinking upon these problems a contribution which will go beyond this year's or next year's sessions of the Senate.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Seybourn H. Lynne to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD—NOMINATION OF JOSEPH F. FARLEY

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the President this morning appointed Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley of the United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard. The Commerce Committee has favorably reported the nomination, and I ask that the nomination be considered at this time, owing to the fact that we may not have a quorum tomorrow, and the members of the committee are anxious to have the nomination confirmed. I understand there is no objection to this request on the part of either the majority leader or the minority leader.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, one of the embarrassing and difficult situations in which a Senator occupying one of the front seats finds himself occurs when he is called upon to answer a question as to when the rules of the Senate ought to be suspended, and when we ought to proceed directly to act. I appreciate that as we near the end of the session there is always great pressure of this sort. I hope that in these last 2 or 3 days we are not going to permit too great a regard for formalities, but that we should proceed in view of the realities of the situation that confronts us. I mean by that we are going to adjourn within 2 days, I hope perhaps earlier, and we cannot as a practical matter have the routine of the Senate followed in having nominations confirmed. I am not going to object in this particular case. I am perhaps influenced by the fact that I know Admiral Farley. I have known something of his work. I know how industrious he is and how intelligent he is, and how faithful he has always been in the discharge of his public duties. I think the Coast Guard needs him, and I think it would be an honor well deserved if his nomination is promptly confirmed. I am perfectly agreeable to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for immediate consideration of the nomination? The Chair

hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph S. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Executive Calendar been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Executive Calendar has been concluded; yes.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1471) to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 103: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the House amendment with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said House amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the actual construction of the Garrison Reservoir Dam, North Dakota, itself: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam"; and the House agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was read.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have an explanation of what was done relative to the amendments, in terms of what was done with the Garrison Dam. I am intensely interested, as are other Senators, in the Missouri Valley. I was not on the conference committee. I wish to have in the RECORD an explanation of what the conferees did relative to the construction of the Garrison Dam, whether or not it is to be 1,850 feet or 1,830 feet, or what was done about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not to be either.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am interested in.

Mr. McKELLAR. Both the House and Senate had appropriated $2,000,000 for this project; and, of course, that had to be retained, and it was retained. It can be used for the preliminary work on the dam, but not on the dam itself. It is not available for building the dam itself. The question whether the dam shall be 1,830 feet or 1,850 feet is left to the Congress in the future.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, as I understand, the agreement which was reached does not operate in any way to restrict legislation which has been passed relative to the height of the dam. If we have restricted anything, we have restricted the expenditure of funds only to the purposes set forth in the act, which are to build a townsite and some roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And in later sessions of Congress, if the moving party desires to see that the dam is constructed with a height of less than 1,850 feet, he will have the right at that time to make his presentation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The question of the height of the dam is simply postponed until a future session of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Until the moving party comes in and asks that it be lowered. As I understand the agreement there is no restriction on the present legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no restriction on the present legislation, because the Congress does not act concerning it. It merely postpones the question until the next session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 576) to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification, which was, on page 1, line 6, strike out all after "(1)" over to and including "Commission", in line 2, page 2, and insert "upon a finding by the Civil Service Commission on the basis of the personal record of the incumbent."

Mr. MEAD. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if it will be his purpose to have considered at tomorrow's session the first part of the calendar?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Or should I ask the indulgence of the Senate at this moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it will be entirely feasible. I desire sometime tomorrow to call that part of the calendar ahead of what was called today, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is the program, I shall not attempt to obtain action at this time.

DATE OF MEETING OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 294.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 14, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the joint resolution I wish to make a very brief statement. I desire to have the Senate pass upon the question so that Senators and Members

of the House may know what to expect so far as the beginning of the second session of this Congress is concerned.

As we all know, under the Constitution, Congress is compelled to reassemble in its annual session on the 3d day of January, no matter on what day of the week the third day occurs, unless by law it fixes another date. The 3d day of January occurs on Thursday. I have discussed the question of the time of reassembling with Members of the House in charge of such matters. My feeling was, and still is, that in the present state of public matters that Congress ought not to take a recess until the 14th of January. That means a recess of more than 3 weeks. With economic, industrial, and other conditions which have been brought to our attention as they are, and with labor questions in their present state, I had the feeling, and still have the feeling, that a recess of 2 weeks would be sufficient, and all that we would be justified in taking. I had suggested that we reconvene on the 7th or 8th of January, the 7th being Monday and the 8th being Tuesday. But the House has passed the joint resolution, providing that Congress shall reassemble on the 14th of January.

I have not changed my views on the subject. I think the country would be somewhat reassured if in these conditions Congress were here. I shall not offer any amendment to the joint resolution which has passed the House, fixing the 14th of January as the day on which the Congress shall reassemble. I hope that circumstances will not make us regret the unusually long Christmas holiday which is being taken under the joint resolution; but in order that Members may know what to depend upon, I think the Senate ought to vote on the resolution at this time, and I therefore ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment, in the light of national conditions the Senate cannot justify taking a recess until January 14. I regret that the distinguished majority leader does not see fit to propose an amendment. I am not sure that I would be in order in proposing one orally, but if I am, I should like to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress be made Tuesday, January 8, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if we were to go through the list of Senators who might offer testimonials as to why we should not adjourn until the 14th of January, but should return on the 8th, many other Senators would endorse the remarks of the majority leader and those of the Senator from Oregon. I think it is only fair to many Senators who have expressed a similar opinion to make that statement.

It was my understanding that a canvass of the views of individual Senators would be taken, and that we would abide by the decision, and not discuss the question. But if it is a question of how some of us feel, let me say that just as many Senators on this side of the aisle as on the other side feel as the majority leader feels. I believe that that statement ought to be made a matter of record. However, we have discussed the question, and, as I understand, we came to the conclusion that the date should be the 14th of January, and that we would not debate the question. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not accurate. There was no understanding as to whether the question should be debated. Frankly, I asked that a canvass be made on both sides of the aisle to determine whether an amendment which I contemplated offering, changing the date to January 8, would pass, and I was advised that it would not. Under those conditions, I accepted what seemed to be the inevitable, and asked that the Senate vote on the question of adjourning until the 14th of January.

I did not express the view that we should not discuss the question, because I intended to say what I have said whether any other Senator had made a statement or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in any way criticizing the majority leader for wishing to return on the 8th of January. However, let me say for the RECORD that when the canvass was made it was with the hope, as I understood, that most Senators would favor coming back on the 14th rather than the 8th. If any Senator desires to conduct a canvass of individual views of Senators on the question, he will find that many Senators share the view of the distinguished majority leader that the Congress should return on the 8th instead of the 14th. What counts here is how they will vote. I thought I was fairly well assured that it would be useless to offer an amendment to make the date the 8th of January. Therefore I was simply satisfying myself by expressing the view that the 14th is too far off, and then I expected to let the Senate proceed to vote on the resolution.

If the situation has developed to the point of having amendments offered, I think we might as well go over until tomorrow, because a number of Senators have left the Chamber, and I do not know whether some of them would wish to offer amendments or would wish to engage in debate on the subject.

But if we engage in a controversy as to the date, of course that will involve a controversy with the House of Representatives, and in that event I think we should have a better attendance of Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I think one of the determining factors in this situation is the attitude of the other body. If my information is correct, the leaders of the House of Representatives and the House itself have definitely gone on record as favoring a recess of Congress until the 14th of January. I do not know what sort of wrangle we shall find ourselves in if we amend the resolution and fix some other date. In that event there might not be any recess at all before the 3d of January, and in that case this session would merge into the new session of Congress.

Personally, I feel that the Members of the House of Representatives and the Members of the Senate, with Christmas at hand and New Year's soon to follow, are entitled to a recess of 3 weeks or thereabouts; and so far as I am concerned, I personally would oppose any amendment suggesting a change in that date. I think the action of the Senate should be in accord with the action taken by the other body in this particular, and I think we can depart with clear consciences for a recess extending to the 14th of January.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the question which arises in all our minds is whether, under the circumstances, an extra week of recess is sufficient justification for our entering into a controversy over it with the House of Representatives. Frankly, I thought there would be another conference between some of the Members of the House of Representatives and some Members of the Senate before action would be taken regarding the recess. However, that was not done. Perhaps I misunderstood. At any rate, the House of Representatives passed the resolution—and there was very little opposition in the House—containing the provision which I had originally understood would be in it.

I regret that we are faced with the necessity of either voting up or voting down a resolution which has been passed by the House of Representatives. I feel that the Members of both Houses are entitled to know as soon as possible what to rely upon in the way of a Christmas holiday. I hope we may dispose of the resolution now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills after the recess of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thought the Senator from Kentucky had finished.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but I am getting ready to finish if I can. I know what is in the Senator's mind; he desires to get before the Senate a motion to which he heretofore animadverted, proposing to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of a certain measure.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I have made the attempt several times.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought that if we were to have a session tomorrow, the Senator would not push for consideration of the matter this afternoon. I do not wish to have the matter taken up in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has had much to do with it. I hope the Senator from West Viriginia will defer his motion on the subject until tomorrow, because the chances are that the Senate will be in session all day tomorrow.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that for the last 3 days I have tried to get before the Senate the resolution providing that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the measure I have mentioned. My efforts to make the motion have been blocked every time by parliamentary procedure, with control in the hands of the then acting majority leader.

This afternoon I was assured by the Senator who then occupied the chair that I would be recognized, so as to have an opportunity to present my motion that the Senate take up the resolution.

Now I am asked by the majority leader not to bring it up. Let me say to him that if he will assure me that I will have the opportunity tomorrow to present to the Senate a motion to call up the resolution, Senate Resolution 207, dealing with facilitating the discharge of fathers from the armed services—if I may have that agreement and assurance from the Senator—I shall not make the motion at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator in regard to his understanding with the Member of the Senate who occupied the chair when the Senator advanced toward the rostrum and sought an agreement, in advance, that he would be recognized, that that very procedure illustrates the vice of such a practice, namely, that a Senator can have a private understanding with the Chair that at a certain time he is to be recognized——

Mr. REVERCOMB. It was not to be at a certain time.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senator could not know what other matters would be likely to come up.

I have come to the Chamber from attendance at the hearings of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. I left those hearings and came to the Senate Chamber so as to be here at the time when the nominations on the Executive Calendar were presented and considered in executive session. I wished to be here when the Senate disposed of the nominations, because I had been told—but probably erroneously—that there was to be an extended debate. There was, but it did not arise from the source from which I expected it at the time when I was notified to be in the Chamber. [Laughter.]

However, let me say that I cannot guarantee to the Senator that he will be recognized tomorrow. I will say that so far as I am concerned I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator to the end that he will be recognized by whoever is in the chair tomorrow, so as to have an opportunity to make any sort of motion he desires to make.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is not very satisfactory. I have been on my feet constantly today, seeking to be recognized by the Chair, but I have failed in that effort.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and I know other Senators who have been on their feet for weeks and months and still have failed to be recognized.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I realize that, but I am not one who likes to be subjected to such treatment when I am trying to present an important measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say that I have no purpose to thwart the Senator in his effort. I should point out that for the last month or 6 weeks I have been absent from the sessions of the Senate a considerable amount of time because I have been engaged in other work. So I am a little green insofar as recent proceedings in the Senate are concerned because I have had to be out of the Chamber so much of the time, and of course I do not wish to have advantage taken of me in view of that situation; neither do I desire to have any advantage taken of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who have been acting in my stead here and who are temporarily absent.

So let us call it a day, and stop for the day, and start out tomorrow on an even keel.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; I have started two or three days on an even keel and have found myself on the rocks at the end of the day. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is learning the lesson of patience, which everyone must learn if he aspires to be a great Senator, and I am sure the Senator has that aspiration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have that aspiration, and I have had a wonderful lesson. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I pledge my cooperation to the extent of my ability, but I cannot make assurances as to what action will be taken by whoever may be in the chair tomorrow.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that there is no one from whom I would rather have a pledge of cooperation, because when the Senator assures me that it will come, I know it will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. I am sure that when the matter is taken up, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and more Senators than those now present should be in the Chamber.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator knows that I have been waiting patiently.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator should not charge me with collusion in that respect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course not, but I say that many Senators are absent at this time because they expected that I would make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. But perhaps the Senator knew they would be absent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And so did the absent Members.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that the Senator will have ample opportunity tomorrow to make his motion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must move——

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the circumstances, if the Senator is unwilling to take as much of the pledge as I am at liberty to give, and which I have given in good faith——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, if there is a pledge involved I will accept it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not an iron-bound pledge signed in blood. I do not know that the word "pledge" should be used. I have said that to the best of my ability I would cooperate tomorrow in securing recognition of the Senator by the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will accept that statement. When the Senator says to me that to the extent of his ability he will cooperate, I know that I will obtain recognition tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

COMPILATION OF CERTAIN LAWS AND REGULATIONS AFFECTING VETERANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for reference to the Committee on Printing a resolution which proposes that a compilation of the basic World War I and World War II veterans' pension law, as amended, the so-called Economy Act of 1933, and the 10 organic veterans' regulations issued thereunder, as amended, and prepared by John C. Fischer, member of the national legislative committee of the Disabled American Veterans, be printed as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 209) submitted by Mr. MORSE, was received and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That a compilation of the basic World War I and II veterans' pension law, as amended, the so-called Economy Act of 1933, and the 10 organic veterans' regulations issued thereunder, as amended, prepared by John C. Fischer, member, national legislative committee, Disabled American Veterans, be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution I wish to say that I have received from Dow V. Walker, National Commander of Disabled American Veterans, a letter in which he points out that the document mentioned in the resolution is seriously needed by all the veterans' organizations,

and by all groups in this country having the responsibility of advising veterans in regard to their rights.

Mr. Fischer the able counsel of Disabled American Veterans, has prepared a very authentic and comprehensive digest of the material which is needed by the veterans. I am privileged to say that appropriate committees of the American Bar Association, as well as of the Federal Bar Association, strongly urge that this material be printed as a Senate document. I hope that the Committee on Printing will give me a hearing in regard to the matter at a very early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, the letter to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1945.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The most pressing need that I have found concerning veterans' legislation since I became national commander of the Disabled American Veterans is to have a current integrated statement of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, known as the Economy Act of 1933, and of the 10 veterans' regulations issued thereunder.

As far as I know, there has never been published a current up-to-the-minute compilation of this basic law and these 10 Executive regulations as amended by extensive congressional acts down through the years.

The vital need and importance of such a document at this time is generally admitted. To the end that such a compilation be available—not only to the Disabled American Veterans—but to all interested in the subject matter during these emergent times, I requested Mr. John C. Fischer, a member of my national legislative committee, and an authority on veterans' law, to prepare such a text which he has compiled in his own time and on his own initiative. This document is now available and I have checked the material carefully.

In the light of my experience in veteran affairs over the past 25 years, intensified by the added responsibility that has been thrust upon me, I believe the immediate publication of this current restatement of the basic law controlling benefits to America's veterans will fill a vital need.

To confine this publication to our needs and purposes would be selfish indeed.

With this in mind, I am respectfully requesting that you present this document to the United States Senate to the end that it be published as a Senate document.

Sincerely yours,

DOW V. WALKER,
National Commander.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Joseph F. Farley, United States Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIRST PART OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO BE HELD IN LONDON, JANUARY 1946

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.
Tom Connally
Arthur H. Vandenberg
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FIRST PART OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO BE HELD IN LONDON, JANUARY 1946

Sol Bloom
Charles A. Eaton
Frank C. Walker
John Foster Dulles
John G. Townsend, Jr.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Seybourn H. Lynne to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Joseph F. Farley to be Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, for a term of 4 years, and to be an admiral in the United States Coast Guard.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Fern Conklin, Fraser.
William Kloster, Ramah.
Martha C. Dana, Roggen.
Charlotte Johnson, Somerset.

FLORIDA

Rae Moore, Darlington.
Nell H. Connell, Weirsdale.

ILLINOIS

Raphael V. McGreal, Chatsworth.
Lucille G. I. Johnson, Malden.
Robert L. Ryerson, West York.

NEW MEXICO

Fannie T. Matthews, Columbus.
Mabel D. Woods, Farmington.

NORTH CAROLINA

Birdie Allen, Clemmons.

NORTH DAKOTA

Milton I. Abell, Fortuna.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harvey E. Felkel, Santee.

TEXAS

Lula M. Winfough, Darrouzett.
Roy L. Nickels, McAdoo.
Mary Newman Lemmons, Pantex.
Bernice E. McCoy, Prairie Lea.
John F. Dickinson, Riviera.
Reid B. Horney, Robstown.
Viola I. Havenhill, Twitty.

UTAH

Lois C. Sargent, Coalville.
Carma C. Cutler, Kanosh.

VIRGINIA

Linwood M. Latimer, Carrollton.
Alex Moore, Chuckatuck.
John J. Wilson, St. Brides.

WASHINGTON

Kenneth J. Van House, Burton.
Lora M. Antoine, Chelan Falls.
Lloyd G. Pike, Nooksack.
Edith M. Snook, Orting.
William Clifford Adkins, Sumas.

WISCONSIN

Carrie Vos, Kansasville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. E. Jerome Winter, St. Stephens Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

As the song of peace which the angels taught to the white-chalked hills of Bethlehem echoes once again over the world, teach us, O Prince of Peace, to know that peace is not in power, nor in the balancing of forces, but rather in Thy justice and Thy law. Grant that whatever power be ours we may use to protect and defend, and not to lessen or suppress, those human rights and liberties which are the inalienable gifts of Thy creation.

Enlighten us to see, since peace is the tranquillity of order, that in our relations with the vanquished we may leave no centers of unhealed infection from which tomorrow new wars could arise, but rather to extend to them a well-founded hope—commensurate with their contribution to peace—that they may one day be associated with all states in a great community of nations.

Grant, too, that we may never ask from any nation or member of the human family, however small, the renunciation of those substantial rights which, if it were demanded from us, we would find impractical.

Finally teach us that even in a democracy there must be an aristocracy—an aristocracy not of power and wealth and blood but of untarnished consciences, character, and virtue, and in this light may we see ourselves, not the mandatories of a mob whose interests prevail against the common good but as the representative of the whole people who do Thy will, that peace may reign through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 704. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 4805) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, No. 59, to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, No. 103, to said bill with an amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1890. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased; and

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide for a readjustment allowance for all veterans of World War II.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1580) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include letters, editorials, and newspaper articles.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a poem written by the Honorable James Patrick McGovern and in the other an address by the former mayor of Baltimore, the Honorable H. W. Jackson.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. BUFFETT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address by Lloyd C. Thomas.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 5 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the Palestine resolution.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1946

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk and consider in the House the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, relative to Senate amendments still in disagreement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: Strike out the language "one thousand eight hundred and thirty" wherever it appears in said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "one thousand eight hundred and fifty."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 103.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment which the House adopted provided that the maximum elevation at which the water could be maintained should be 1,830 feet. The Senate proposed 1,850 feet for this Garrison Dam in North Dakota. The difference would be that the town of Williston, of 7,000 people, and 90,000 acres of productive land would be wiped out. The people there and the congressional representatives from that section all want to insist upon the House position providing for 1,830. It seems to me that we should adopt the chairman's motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a vote on this proposition, I should like to have an explanation of it.

I understand it proposes to cut down a dam that is being built out on the Missouri River. I do not know whether it is a power dam or just what its purposes are. But if the House is going to be forced to vote on this proposition, I should like to have it read and discussed and find out what is in it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we went to conference on this proposition. The Senate and House conferees reached complete agreement on it. We brought that agreement back to the House and the House yesterday approved it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman tell us what river this dam is on?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is on the Missouri River.

Mr. RANKIN. How much power will it generate if it is completed to its ultimate height?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The power phase of it was not considered. If the dam is constructed higher than 1,830 special dikes are required to protect the city of Williston from inundation. The argument in favor of 1,850 is that the last 20 feet of water is more economically conserved than the first water impounded by the dam.

Mr. RANKIN. We had the same question up with reference to the Grand Coulee Dam. Some Members wanted to cut that dam off and make it a low dam. I opposed that because I said the power generated by the water that would be impounded behind the dam above that point would be the cheapest power that could be produced anywhere in the United States.

I have not gone into this proposition. I know there is always a great cry that you are going to flood somebody's land or going to have to move a cemetery, or invade a town every time you build a power dam to generate electricity for the American people. But remember this: When you cut this dam off you probably surrender the rest of the water power in that stream up to that point for all time to come.

For that reason I would like to find out how much power would be generated if it were made a low dam and how much

power would be generated if it were made a high dam.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The action taken by the committee is in conformity with the instructions given yesterday by vote of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. I wish to state to the Members of this House that there is no opposition on the part of anybody in North Dakota, or elsewhere that I know of, to the building of the Garrison Dam to 1,850 feet, or even higher, if the engineers wish to do so. The people of Williston and of Williams and McKenzie Counties want the maximum water level kept down to 1,830 feet unless operation at a higher elevation is necessary. They do not wish the Lewis-Clark or the Trenton-Buford irrigation projects or the city of Williston partly permanently flooded unless it is necessary to carry out the multiple purposes of the project. They feel the necessity of that should be determined in the future by the Congress.

The power question does not come in here, because I am assured by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation that if we wish we can develop 4,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours on the Missouri River project, and that by operating the Garrison Dam at an elevation of 1,830 feet, and that is all the power that can be developed from the entire project. It will furnish all the electrical power necessary for the entire Missouri River Basin States, and then some.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not mean that this one dam will produce 4,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year?

Mr. LEMKE. That, and the other dams on the Missouri River together with the dams to be built on the tributaries in the Missouri River project. I wish to say that the only reason ever given for raising the operating pool level beyond 1,830 feet is that there might be need sometime in the future for additional water for navigation or for some other purpose, but not now.

We want the dam built and we want it built at 1,850 feet or higher. The amendment that has been offered does not limit the dam to 1,830, but permits it to be built to 1,850 or higher. All that is asked by this amendment is that the engineers do not operate it at a higher pool level than 1,830 feet unless it is necessary, and that will not be known until at the end of 11 years, because it will take 11 years before that water in the pool will reach 1,830 feet above sea level.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman said a moment ago that the low dam would produce more than a billion kilowatt hours per year.

Mr. LEMKE. That is the entire Missouri River project.

Mr. RANKIN. You mean the entire Missouri River project?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. About how much more would it produce if this high dam were completed?

Mr. LEMKE. As far as I know, no additional amount at all. At least no engineer has ever said so, neither the Army engineers nor the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation. It is a pretty high pool when you get it up to 1,830.

I do hope we can get together on this. We want this development of the Missouri River Basin. It is important for flood control. It is important for irrigation. It is important to restore our water levels. The time has arrived for action, and in justice to our people I know that not a Member of Congress wants to flood any more than is necessary to accomplish the purpose of Public Law 534 and Senate Document No. 247.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that the passage of this bill at this time will not preclude them from building the dam as high as the engineers wish to build it.

Mr. LEMKE. No; we want them to go ahead and build it to 1,850 and even higher, but we do not wish the operating pool level to be higher than 1,830 feet unless it is necessary. We do not wish to wantonly destroy property unnecessarily.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 85, noes none.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION, HYDE PARK, N. Y.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, early in September of this year I brought to the attention of the Members of this body the preliminary efforts of various civic organizations of Dutchess County, N. Y., to have the permanent home of the United Nations Organization located at Hyde Park.

Dutchess County is most fortunate in that it has such a distinguished site to offer as the home of such an important organization. It also is fortunate in that the United States Government already has either title to, or control of, the greater part of this property.

The property, of approximately 5 square miles, includes the Roosevelt, the Vanderbilt, and the Rodgers estates, along with already constructed beautiful mansions and other useful structures.

The surrounding country is not overpopulated and is therefore ideally adapted for further development and expansion.

Hyde Park is the home and burial ground of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, which gives it a very special sentimental and warm appeal to the majority of the United Nations. Representatives of many of these nations have met with the late President at his ancestral home with a determination to save future generations from the scourge of war.

It is most encouraging to have read in the press this morning that "some small town in the eastern part of the United States with a historical and cultural association may be the choice of the United Nations Preparatory Commission."

Our Dutchess County delegates presented these features to the Preparatory Commission which recently met in London, and they report a very satisfactory hearing.

I sincerely hope that all members of the Congress of the United States will join with me in endorsing Hyde Park as the permanent home for the distinguished United Nations Organization, and I can assure you that the people of Dutchess County will extend a welcome hand of friendship and cooperation.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4780) to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"(c) Title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended by title X of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (relating to naturalization of persons serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war), is amended as follows:

"'(1) Section 701 of such title is amended by striking out "and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the effective period of those titles of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, for which the effective period is specified in the last title thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1946."

"'(2) Such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"' "SEC. 706. No person shall be naturalized under the provisions of this title unless such person has served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the date of enactment of this section" .'"

Page 2, line 3, strike out "'(c)'" and insert "'(d)'."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "'(d)'" and insert "'(e)'."

Page 2, line 14, strike out "'(e)'" and insert "'(f)'."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are these the only amendments added to the bill in the Senate?

Mr. HOBBS. There are several amendments, which are those that have been just read. There are only two amendments of substance. One is that under the Nationality Act of 1940 a service man or woman must apply for citizenship prior to December 31, 1946——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This simply sets a definite date by which time he must make application.

Mr. HOBBS. And it requires likewise that he must have served in the military or naval forces of the United States prior to the passage of this act. In other words, naturalization based on such service performed since the enactment of this new section, No. 706, is prohibited.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It confines it to those who participated in the war.

Mr. HOBBS. Practically.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this agreeable to the members of the Judiciary Committee who reported the legislation?

Mr. HOBBS. I have not been able to consult with all of them. I did consult with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], one of the ranking minority members on the committee. He approves it. I know of no objection from any source.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As far as immigration is concerned it is restrictive.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MICHENER. It does not open the bars.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have not had an opportunity to get the amendments or the report. This is the first time I knew it was coming up. I do not know what the amendments contain. Will the gentleman take a little time and explain them in detail to show clearly what people are included in this proposal to extend naturalization to those who served in our armed forces?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be delighted to do so. The bill as approved by our committee and by the House has been approved by the Senate in toto except that title X has had ingrafted upon it a provision which cuts down the right of veterans to naturalization by restricting the application to those who have served prior to the date of the enactment of this legislation; second, that they must apply prior to December 31, 1946.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What effect will that have on the quotas?

Mr. HOBBS. It has no other effect.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many persons will be included in this legislation?

Mr. HOBBS. The same number that is fixed by the Naturalization Act of 1940, the law as it stand now.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This goes beyond the quotas?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir, it does not enlarge quotas beyond existing law.

Mr. MASON. It has nothing to do with the quotas.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is correct; it has nothing to do with the quotas.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It would admit more persons?

Mr. MASON. It would not admit anybody.

Mr. HOBBS. It is restrictive rather than expansive.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is restrictive?

Mr. HOBBS. It is restrictive, not expansive.

Mr. MASON. It is more restrictive than what we passed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand this amendment is more restrictive than the bill reported by the committee and passed by the House.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the amendments which were passed by the House were agreed to by the other body with the exception that they clarify and restrict the naturalization provision as to soldiers?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; all of our armed forces, and I appreciate the gentleman's interrogation.

The last legislative action with reference to the extension of the Second War Powers Act was approved on December 20, 1944, 1 year ago today. This is a trivial but interesting coincidence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two short newspaper articles on veterans acquiring McLean Gardens.

Mr. BURGIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

Mr. ROMULO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short editorials.

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include a speech recently made by Governor Sparks, of Alabama, and a newspaper editorial relating thereto, and in the second to include a letter and statement from Bishop Charles M. Flint, of the Methodist Church, and also a newspaper statement relating to universal military training.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Woodrow Wilson and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of an editorial from the Washington Star.

McVAY COURT MARTIAL

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LARCADE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STATE DEPARTMENT'S POSITION ON SIAM

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the State Department took a firm, solid, correct, American position in defense of the little free state of Siam. The British Empire has been putting intense pressure on Siam for a number of years, and particularly in the last few weeks, to take it over. Large deposits of tin and rubber are found there, and Siam is the last free government of any kind in southern Asia. Britain wants the tin and rubber, and she does not like the idea of any Asiatic people being free and independent. Our State Department deserves commendation for its demand that no agreement be signed by the Siamese and the British without prior American knowledge and without completion of American discussions with the British of the terms of such an agreement.

LACK OF TRANSPORTATION FOR OUR SERVICEMEN

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RIVERS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BILLION-DOLLAR LOANS FOR WHOM?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUNDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in looking over the per capita debt of the United States and Great Britain, I find that from 1941 to 1945 the per capita debt of Great Britain has increased $884. The United States' per capita debt in the same war period increased $1,498—nearly twice as much increased per capita in the United States for every man, woman, and child to pay than what every man, woman, and child in Britain must pay. Therefore, I suggest that before Congress transfers $4,400,000,000 of Uncle Sam's assets by this loan that Britain does not expect to pay and Congress when it makes the loan does not expect Britain to pay, the President should present a genuine plan to balance the National Budget.

Second. I propose that Congress adopt legislation so that anybody who wants to subsidize British socialism and who wants to buy British bonds in America can do it. Those who buy will be the only ones hurt, if Great Britain cannot pay or British socialism fails.

Third. In case it is determined to give these dollars from the United States Treasury, I propose that Congress authorize a special bond issue, the proceeds of which shall be for the loan to Britain. I propose that the bonds pro-

vide the same maturity date, interest rate, and other terms and conditions under which Congress is asked to loan $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain. When the loan-gift requires Britain to pay no interest, then those special issue United States bonds should not require Uncle Sam to pay any interest to the bondholders; then and in that event Uncle Sam will not be burning the candle from both ends. In other words, when Uncle Sam gets no interest in the bargain loan-gift to Britain, Uncle Sam pays no interest to the bondholders of this special issue.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions.

Mr. IZAC asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Federationist.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Benefit for Veterans Under the Amended Readjustment Act.

Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials and newspaper articles.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to give a history of the so-called Johnson Act which it is now proposed to repeal so it will not stand in the way of loans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Clyde M. Longstreth, State commander of the American Veterans of World War II of the State of Iowa.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts in each.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, one the veterans and the unions and their relationship to each other, and the other the General Motors strikers.

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the American people and the Congress have gone further in the hope of establishing machinery for world peace than ever before in the history of this Nation. I am profoundly disappointed and discouraged, and I have talked with other Members who feel the same way, on reading in the press this morning about some of the appointments that have been made by the executive department. I am wondering how far the Congress of the United States in legislation of any kind can trust the wisdom of the executive department of this country. I am profoundly disturbed that Mrs. Roosevelt, the wife of the late President, has been appointed to this organization, because I do not believe it will help to bring unity of the people at home. I think it is a bad omen and a bad start.

It may bring disunity in the Senate when confirmation is asked. It lays the ground work for accusations that it is political appeasement to the left wingers in this country. Certainly the delegates whose tremendous responsibility is to try to preserve the peace of the world, should be of such experience and background as would rule out any political consideration; but to the contrary should be such as will command the united support of our people.

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKERS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, from the press other than that which is controlled there is a great leaning toward the strikers of General Motors. It comes from nonunion citizen groups and from many publications. There is most favorable comment from the great magazine America issued by the Jesuits, also from the Common Weal, the Wage Earner, and the Michigan Catholic. I am extending my remarks quoting these publications today.

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, DELEGATE TO UNO

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great amazement that I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago regarding the appointment of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as a delegate to UNO. In my opinion, there has been no appointment made by President Truman in recent weeks that will meet with greater approval by the majority of the American people. Mrs. Roosevelt has well established herself as a person of broad social sympathies and as a person who understands the problems that are facing a world that has been torn by war and is struggling desperately to get back on its feet on a peacetime basis. She knows the people of many countries. She understands the struggles and aspirations of the dispossessed and underprivileged people of this land and of all the other lands in the world. I, for one, want to commend the President of the United States for having the foresight and intelligence to name Eleanor Roosevelt as one of the American representatives to the UNO. I am confident she will prove a worthy representative of the best traditions of freedom and liberalism that are so closely associated with our Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

RESOLUTION ON POLAND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

UNO AND THE CONFUSION OF TONGUES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] seems to feel that the United Nations Organization, referred to as UNO, will develop into an international "Eleanor Club," as a result of Mrs. Roosevelt's appointment to that organization.

Indications are that the confusion of tongues has already set in. On yesterday this Congress in my opinion insulted Great Britain when it marched into Palestine, so to speak, and waved a red flag in the face of the British Empire, by adopting the Palestine resolution.

I wonder what we would think if the British Parliament adopted a resolution demanding that we turn Louisiana back to the French, Texas back to the Mexicans, and Ohio back to the Indians.

This morning the British Empire was attacked on this floor for interfering in Siam, while the headlines in the papers are screaming the statement that Russia is demanding a part of Turkey.

As I said before, this UNO may not end in a confusion of tongues, as Towers of Babel have done before, but it is not a good omen for it to begin with a confusion of tongues.

It is not a supergovernment, and if the American people are wise, we will maintain the secrets of the "know-how,"

as the President calls it, of manufacturing the atomic bomb, keep our own powder dry, and give the world to understand that we are going to look out for our own country while helping to maintain peace among the nations of the earth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter sent out to all the trade-unions affiliated with the building trades and construction industry in this country.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AIR ROUTE FROM CHICAGO TO TOKYO

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress recesses, I want to urge the Members of the House to read a letter that was signed by 18 Members of another body of this Government in which they ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to change its findings and its proposed decision for a proposed air route from Chicago through Minnesota, through Canada and Alaska, to Tokyo, looking forward to the postwar era of commerce and intercourse with foreign countries.

A remarkable thing took place the other day when 18 influential men said that that proposed route had to be abandoned, and a different route established in what looks to me to be influenced by political considerations. This Congress has created the Civil Aeronautics Board. This Congress ought to stand behind that board in its impartial and fair-minded efforts to do the best thing.

This letter to which reference has been made will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, December 18, 1945, where it is set forth in full by our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who addressed the House on this question. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 12292. There in Dr. JUDD'S remarks you will find a complete and fair statement of facts. It is worth while to study those remarks. Every Member of the House, either directly or indirectly, is interested in these proposed plans to have the legislative body direct an executive and administrative agency of the Government, which also exercises something like judicial functions, what it shall do, and how it shall do it. Mark you, this is to be done by mere direction of legislative officials acting in their individual capacity, and not in deliberative session, and when not assembled in their official capacity, where discussion can be had, questions asked, and an opportunity afforded interested people to express their views. Such a line of action is entitled to the most severe censure, and to say the least is most dangerous. If successful, the aviation program will be wrecked before it gets started. Yesterday, as chairman of the Minnesota delegation in Congress, I called a meeting of the Members, and appointed Congressmen JUDD, STARKEY, and GALLAGHER to prepare resolutions of protest against interference with the Civil Aeronautics Board functions. Resolutions prepared by that committee have been approved by the Members from Minnesota, and others, and are being submitted for your consideration today.

Unless and until there is some charge of unfairness or improper motive against the Board, it is entitled to our active support and commendation for faithful service to the American people. The route from Chicago through Minnesota through Canada to Alaska to the Orient, as determined by the Board, should be approved and adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that it may be in order for the Speaker during the remainder of this day to declare a recess or recesses, the reconvening of the House being subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a local CIO publication the statement is made:

> Michigan already has the largest collection of Congressmen who follow an out and out Fascist program.

I will not read the names. My name is there.

On another page, it calls upon the Speaker and the Department of Justice and the Committee on Un-American Activities to "investigate the activities of Congressman HOFFMAN," and asks further that "his seditious speeches be suppressed."

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes the gentleman has stated sufficient grounds for a question of privilege.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this publication by inference charges the Member from Michigan with the making of seditious speeches, it is my purpose now to make a typical talk similar to those which we may assume this publication has reference to in the article from which quotation has just been made. Then the Members of the House may pass judgment as to whether other like speeches are seditious.

NLRB ATTEMPTS DESTRUCTION OF NEWSPAPER SUPPRESSION OF FREE SPEECH

Mr. Speaker, revengeful because of criticism, the National Labor Relations Board, willfully misinterpreting and maladministering the National Labor Relations Act, attempts to vent its spite, to aid political friends, terrorize all who might oppose its methods and purposes.

The National Labor Relations Board, through Dorothy Craig, one of its field examiners, seeks to intimidate employers, newspaper publishers, and individuals who might venture to disagree with its views.

Regardless of the constitutional provision which protects free speech and a free press, the NLRB adopts the methods of a Hitler, first interpreting a statute to suit its own purpose; then sending out its investigators to coerce the press and the public into silence and finally, like Hitler's paid judges, hails those who do not willingly submit before it, where it functions as an investigator, prosecutor, witness, and judge.

When I tell you that the National Labor Relations Board is knowingly engaged in a deliberate attempt, by unlawful acts, to deprive the press and individuals of a constitutional right, and that one of its purposes is to aid its political supporters, the charge expresses so despicable an activity that you, living in a free country, will be loath to accept it.

But listen as the tale unfolds. Disregard my statements. Consider the indisputable evidence. Form your own judgment. This is the story:

In the city of Jasper, Ind.—population approximately 5,000—the Jasper Desk Co. is engaged in the manufacture of office furniture which moves in interstate commerce.

An attempt was made by United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, to organize its unaffiliated employees, who, at the time, preferred to remain independent.

The Labor Digest, an independent monthly labor newspaper, is published at Indianapolis, Ind., by Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., one Norman A. Zolezzi being the editor.

Zolezzi is also the chairman of the board of trustees of the Federated Unions of America, an independent labor organization in existence since 1916 and incorporated in 1934. Prior to the latter date, the organization was known as Employees Mutual Benefit Association.

The interests of the labor organization known as the Federated Unions of America no doubt are in conflict with the organizing programs of the AFL and the CIO and perhaps the United Mine Workers of America.

The Labor Digest, edited by Mr. Zolezzi, has been critical of other labor organizations and more especially of the National Labor Relations Board.

For example, in the February 1945 issue the editor wrote:

> AFL BRAIN-CHILD DISOWNED AS MONSTER
>
> For once we find ourselves in agreement with William Green, John L. Lewis, and the Tobin leadership of the teamsters. They don't like the National Labor Relations Board. And neither do we.

As a tool of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Labor Relations Board has made a further departure from the spirit of true government than any other bureau in New Deal Washington. And, Brother, that's saying a mouthful.

Lewis and many AFL leaders are now demanding repeal of the Wagner Act, which created the NLRB. They declare that it discriminates against all unions, except CIO unions, using the foulest tactics to do so. Their wrath is not diminished by the recollection that it was the AFL which wrote and sponsored the Wagner Act with intention to use it to strangle independent unions in exactly the same way it is now being used against them.

At this time a field examiner for the NLRB, Miss Dorothy Craig, is touring the territory served by the Labor Digest, on Government salary and at Government expense, to slander this publication to its advertisers and subscribers, because the NLRB does not agree with its editorial policy.

She has said to a number of individuals: "Why do you patronize the Labor Digest? Don't you know that it is one of the biggest rackets in this country?"

Is there anything in the laws of this land which would justify any agent of the United States Government in carrying on such a campaign of slander against a privately owned publication which is admitted to the United States mails under second-class privilege just the same as your home-town paper or the Saturday Evening Post? And, remember, this is being done as a governmental activity.

Miss Craig is a field examiner, working out of the St. Louis office of NLRB. As such it is her duty to investigate rival claims of unions for collective bargaining rights and, when necessary, to supervise elections to determine the preference of the majority in any employee group. Hers is as a semijudicial assignment.

Yet when Miss Craig was sent to a small industrial city in Indiana to arrange for an election, in which a dominant independent union, and the CIO were to be contestants, she first surveyed the situation, saw the CIO had no chance of winning, and then advised the CIO that instead of standing for an election, it should withdraw its petition and file a charge of "unfair labor practices" against the employer, charging him with favoring the established independent union. The Labor Digest printed the plain truth about this incident and thus incurred the anger of Miss Craig and her superiors.

Her first step was to seek an order giving her the right to demand all books and records of the Labor Digest. Since the Labor Digest was not, in any sense, a party to this dispute, the attorneys for the Labor Digest refused her demands. He next step was to call upon patrons of this publication and threaten them with dire consequences if they did not cooperate in ruining this modest private enterprise by withdrawing their business.

It is a pleasure to advise the NLRB and their skirted hatchetman that to date their effort to ruin has been helpful rather than harmful.

Nevertheless we submit that this governmental attack upon a private enterprise is more than an invasion of the freedom of the press. It is Gestapo brutality.

This is not a tempest in a teapot. The course of the NLRB is interfering seriously with our war effort—not only because it is productive of strikes but chiefly because it introduces turmoil and confusion and slowdown tactics in industry. If the issue was purely one of domestic concern, it could wait. But let's call a witness from the AFL, Mr Thomas Flynn, assistant to Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Teamsters and one-time assistant to the President of the United States.

"Our only recourse," Mr. Flynn writes in a magazine article, "appears to be to ask Congress to repeal the Wagner Act and wipe out the NLRB, which has become nothing more than a standing committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations."

Mr. Flynn then describes some of the trouble the NLRB makes for the teamsters' union. When his union has a contract with an employer, he says, it may present a petition for an increase in wages. The request goes to the War Labor Board for approval. This Board is always swamped so a long delay ensues. The union members become unhappy. In steps the CIO and capitalizes on this discontent. The NLRB follows as soon as the time seems ripe.

"Scarcely a day goes by," laments Mr. Flynn, "that we do not receive an order from the Board calling for a collective bargaining election from a place we have organized."

We could join more sincerely in Mr. Flynn's grief did we not know that his own organization grew from a membership of some 68,000 in 1932 to a membership of around 600,000 in 1944—largest in the AFL—through using the whip of the Wagner Act. Now someone else has the whip and the Tobin crowd don't like it. For all their inconsistency, however, we are wishing them luck in their current ambition to kill the most tyrannical piece of legislation this country has yet seen.

We may be misquoting, but we seem to recall an old adage: "When rogues fall out, honest men get their due."

Ninety percent of the employees of the Jasper Desk Co. belonged to the independent union. The CIO attempted to organize them and filed a petition for an election. It is alleged that, when Dorothy Craig, the NLRB field examiner, discovered that the CIO could not win an election, she advised the CIO to withdraw its petition and file an unfair labor charge against the company.

Previously, Zolezzi had advised an officer of the independent union that it had the right to have its name on the ballot to be used in selecting a bargaining representative.

During the organizing campaign of the CIO, a letter was sent to me by Mr. Zolezzi, editor of the Labor Digest, calling attention to the fact that the Board's representative, Dorothy Craig, was calling upon some advertisers in and subscribers to the Labor Digest.

Among others, Dorothy wrote H. A. Douglas Manufacturing Co., at Bronson, Mich., asking it as to whether it had subscribed to or inserted ads in the Labor Digest.

The company promptly replied that it had for a few years donated approximately $50 a year to the paper; that it had not at any time subscribed to the paper for any of its employees or given their addresses to the Digest, and that the donation was "purely a labor donation."

Prior to that time, Mr. Zolezzi had asked the Solicitor of the Labor Department for an opinion as to whether the Digest's opposition to other unions was a violation of the law.

Excerpts from correspondence showing the truth of the foregoing statements are attached hereto and marked exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

The natural result, and no doubt the intended result, was to intimidate those who subscribed to or inserted advertisements in the Labor Digest; to warn its editor and its publishers that, if it continued to criticize the NLRB, its advertisers and subscribers would learn that they stood in danger of persecution by the Board and its agents.

On February 21, 1945, I sent to the Labor Board here in Washington a copy of Zolezzi's letter (my letter is exhibit 4), asking it to advise me just what field examiner at St. Louis Dorothy L. Craig's objective was in making inquiries of advertisers in the Labor Digest, and suggesting that, so far as I had been able to learn, the purpose seemed to be to put the publication out of business so as to aid the CIO in its organizing efforts.

On March 6 the Board replied, protesting in substance that I was mistaken and that Dorothy was acting only in the customary and approved manner of a Board examiner. A copy of that letter follows and is marked "Exhibit 5."

The following day, March 7, I replied—exhibit 6—stating, among other things, that I never understood that it was an unfair labor practice for an industry to buy advertising and asking if, in reality, the Board was not trying to cut off the revenue of the Labor Digest so as to aid the CIO in its organizing campaign, and whether or not, if that was not its intention, that was not the effect of Dorothy's activities.

I also asked the Board to explain what bearing, if any, the insertion of advertising in a publication had to do with an unfair labor practice when neither the publisher nor the one inserting the ad was involved in any labor dispute and the ad made no reference to any labor dispute nor to any labor organization.

On March 12 another letter, dated March 10, came from the Labor Digest—exhibit 7—commenting on the March 6 reply of the Board.

On the same day, March 12, I introduced House Resolution 179—exhibit 8—asking that the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board be directed to furnish the House with certain information about Dorothy L. Craig and her activities in connection with her investigation of Labor Digest.

On March 16, in a letter directed to the chairman of the House Labor Committee—exhibit 9—the Board answered this resolution and, in substance, stated that Dorothy Craig had been field examiner of the Board since January of 1943; stated that she did inquire as to whether the H. A. Douglas Manufacturing Co., of Bronson, Mich., had paid for subscriptions to the Digest, and as to whether it had placed paid advertisements in that paper.

It further said that a charge had been filed with the Board, alleging that Norman A. Zolezzi and the Labor Digest were guilty of unfair-labor practices.

Under date of November 12, 1945, Zolezzi again made complaint to me. Excerpts from his letter follow and are marked "Exhibit 10."

A copy of a second amended charge, dated August 22, 1944—I do not have the first charge—a copy of a third amended charge, dated November 6, 1945; and a copy of a complaint issued by the regional director of the fourteenth region

of the National Labor Relations Board on November 8, 1945, are included and marked, respectively, exhibits A, B, and C.

This complaint evidently is the one referred to in Zolezzi's letter of November 12, referred to as "Exhibit 10."

Now comes a proposed stipulation, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit 11."

Please note that in the third paragraph of paragraph No. 1 of this stipulation, the Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is asked to admit that it has and is "acting directly or indirectly in the interest of respondent, Jasper Desk Co.," and that it is "an employer of the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the act."

Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., publisher of the Labor Digest, is requested to consent to an order of the Board that it and its agents, successors and assigns, when acting severally or in concert with Jasper Desk Co. and "or any other employer, or as agent for or in the interest of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, shall cease and desist from: (1) Dominating or interfering with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or of any other employer; (2) soliciting and collecting funds from respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act."

It would also be required by the terms of the stipulation to post in its place of business a notice announcing, among other things, that, and I quote:

> We will not solicit and collect funds from Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

The situation is so tied up in a maze of misconstruction and willful misstatement that a casual hearer or reader would not discover the viciousness of the Board's action. Let me restate the situation:

First. The Jasper Desk Co., located at Jasper, Ind., is engaged in interstate commerce, within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act.

Second. A majority of its employees were members of an independent union, an organization recognized by the NLRB.

Third. The CIO, also recognized by the NLRB, made an attempt to induce the employees to withdraw from the independent union, form a CIO local.

Fourth. Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., at Indianapolis, Ind., publishes the Labor Digest, an independent labor paper, friendly to the Federated Unions of America; opposed to and critical of the CIO and its policies; critical of the National Labor Relations Board and some of its activities.

Fifth. The H. A. Douglas Manufacturing Co., located at Bronson, Mich., is an advertiser in and a contributor to the Labor Digest, but has no other connection whatever with the Digest; is not acting, and never has acted, in concert with it.

Sixth. The Douglas Co. has no interest whatever in the Jasper Desk Co., or in any union of that company.

Seventh. Dorothy Craig, an employee examiner of the National Labor Relations Board, assists the CIO in its attempt to organize the workers of the Jasper Desk Co. and, in furtherance of that attempt, she made inquiries of the subscribers to and the advertisers in the Labor Digest as to the subscriptions they have made to or the ads they have inserted in that publication, and also as to the amounts which they have paid therefor.

Eighth. Because the monthly Digest and its publisher have opposed the CIO and criticized the NLRB, that Board causes charges of unfair labor practice in connection with the organizing efforts of the CIO at the Jasper Desk Co. plant, to be filed against Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., as well as against the Jasper Desk Co.

Ninth. The Board then gives the Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., the choice of either appearing before it in answer to the charges of unfair labor practice which have been made, or of signing a stipulation submitting to a cease and desist order, which would not only prevent it from publishing anything detrimental to the effort of the CIO to organize the employees of the desk company but would prevent it from publishing any news story, making any editorial comment on the activities of the CIO in connection with its efforts to organize the employees of the desk company or in connection with its efforts to organize the employees of "any other employer," or from "contributing financial or other support to the employees of any other employer." Note those words "or other support."

That sort of an order, obeyed, would effectually muzzle the Labor Digest and any other publication—daily, weekly, or monthly—now doing business in the United States of America, if applied to it. And unless the CIO news and other publications which carry news articles and editorials favorable to it come within the exception of subsection 2 of section 2 of the NLRA, they, too, would be subject to a charge of unfair labor practices every time the A. F. of L.'s actions were criticized.

Tenth. The order further would require Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns to cease "soliciting and collecting funds from any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act."

That order, if issued and enforced, would prevent the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, any and all newspapers published in the United States, soliciting funds from any employer, from any advertiser, from any subscriber, if that publisher, using those funds to publish, sell, and circulate its newspaper gave space to news stories or made editorial comment or permitted a columnist to make critical comment upon the activities of any labor union which had a dispute with an employer or where there was an organizing campaign on.

Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act—and I quote it in full—provides:

> SEC. 7. Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

Section 8 declares that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer—please note that word "employer"—to do certain acts.

Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., does not employ, has no connection with, any of the employees of the Jasper Desk Co. Yet the Board attempts to so construe the NLRA as to make the publisher of the Labor Digest an "employer" within the meaning of section 8 and hence subject to the unfair labor practices defined in section 8.

Inasmuch as we know—and it is admitted—that the relationship of employee and employer does not exist between any of the employees of the Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., you may wonder as to how the Board reaches the conclusion that it is an employer within the meaning of the NLRA and that, as such employer, it is interfering with the right of the employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations; to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing; to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

We all know that hundreds of publications throughout this country daily express opinions, publish news stories, which influence, or at least are designed to influence, employees in the exercise of the right guaranteed to them by section 7. That is only the exercise of the right to free speech, to publish a free press.

But the Board would deny that right to the press and to the citizen. It attempts to justify that practice by a reference to subsection (2) of section 2 of the NLRA, which provides that "the term 'employer' includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly," but then exempts the United States, State, political subdivisions thereof, any persons subject to the Railway Act, and any labor organization—when not acting as an employer—and all those acting in the capacity of an officer or agent of a labor organization.

Clearly, the Congress, in enacting the National Labor Relations Act, had no intention to make it unlawful for the press or for an individual who was not the employer of any of those engaged in a labor dispute to make comment upon the facts or the merits of the representative claims of those engaged in that dispute.

No doubt, the members of the President's GM Fact-Finding Board are employers. If they should find facts or make recommendations adverse to the UAW-CIO, they would, under the definition and the procedure followed by the

Board in this particular case, be either directly or indirectly acting in the interest of General Motors. Under the Board's interpretation of the law they would be guilty of an unfair labor practice.

Beyond question, one who purchases a General Motors car and pays for it is not only acting indirectly, but directly, in the interests of an employer—General Motors—and, if the purchaser should comment adversely on the present strike of the UAW-CIO, he would be guilty of an unfair labor practice, if the theory advanced by the Board in this case was followed to its logical conclusion.

All those papers which have accepted the advertisements of General Motors are acting either directly or indirectly in the interest of General Motors, an employer. Under the interpretation and administration of the act, as followed in this case, every newspaper publishing one of those ads or, for that matter, a news story which which could be interpreted as detrimental to the interests of the union, is guilty of an unfair labor practice.

When will the press of this country awaken to the situation and disclose it to the public?

When will this Board, conspiring as it does with the CIO to force employees into the dues-paying ranks of the CIO, be exposed for what it is?

When will those gentlemen with legal training who advise it as to the meaning of the law, be yanked out of their offices, the cobwebs swept out of their brains, and a little common sense instilled into them?

Is this attempt to muzzle a free press to go unchallenged?

EXHIBIT 1

THE LABOR DIGEST,
Indianapolis, Ind., February 13, 1945.

Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing for your perusal the copy of a letter which is being sent out by NLRB's field examiner. It is trying to scare all of our advertising accounts and our subscribers, because we try to speak the truth to labor. Is one to be persecuted for that and don't we still have free speech, in this country? The Labor Digest is not owned by a labor organization, though most of the independent unions throughout the country look to us for information as to what goes on in labor ranks that may benefit them. We would appreciate it if there's any help you can give us as to what right this field examiner has to send out such a letter. Isn't this gestapo tactics? The Labor Digest has supported the candidate we considered best for the job regardless of political affiliation, and will continue to do that as long as we exist. We'll always continue to support independent union principles until Congress makes it unlawful to do so. The Department of Labor's February 1 statistics show more than 57,000,000 women and men on pay rolls as of that date. CIO and A. F. of L. only claim 11,000,000 in their ranks. So we find ourselves on the side of the great majority of those who toil in their country. We will always continue to uphold the American way of life.

I realize you are a tremendously busy man, but I do hope you will take time to read the pages of the enclosed issue. We would like to know what right these so-called Government investigators such as Dorothy Craig have to try to destroy our right of free speech.

Is it within your power, Sir, to ascertain on what authority this red herring, Dorothy Craig, continues to harass us? She went so far as to inform the Holland furnace people that they have no right to pay for subscriptions for their employees to receive the Labor Digest. They have done this for more than 15 years. She informed Henry Boersma, Assistant to the President, that she was going to break up this big racket in America viz: The Labor Digest selling subscriptions to employers for their employees. Yet, we have a letter from the Department saying that he doesn't see where that is a violation of the Wagner Act since we have no connection with any labor organization in America. (Solicitor General of the Labor Department.) I am enclosing a carbon copy of his letter. I would appreciate your going into this matter for us and let's have a showdown and find out if the NLRB can carry on such a destructive campaign.

Sincerely yours,
THE LABOR DIGEST,
NORMAN A. ZOLEZZI,
Editor.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, May 20, 1938.

CHARLES D. KIDSON, Esq.,
Advertising and Circulation Manager,
The Labor Digest, Lansing, Mich.

DEAR MR. KIDSON: I have your letter of May 18 referring to my answer of September 9, 1937, to an inquiry of Mr. N. A. Zolezzi, editor of the Labor Digest. You again ask me whether it would be a violation of section 8 (2) of the National Labor Relations Act for an employer either to place an advertisement in the Labor Digest or to pay the subscriptions of individual employees to the Labor Digest.

As I stated in my previous letter, it would not seem to me that either of these business transactions with the paper would be contributing "financial or other support" to any labor organization, since it would be rather far-fetched to view your paper as either "a labor organization" or to construe a transaction in which actual consideration was given as a contribution.

I am afraid I must repeat, however, that I cannot give an official statement on this point. Neither can the President, the Secretary of Labor, or the Attorney General. By the express language of the National Labor Relations Act Congress has made it clear that so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, the National Labor Relations Board has exclusive jurisdiction to pass upon unfair labor practices arising under the provisions of the act.

I sympathize deeply with the position in which you and other employees of the paper find yourselves, but unless the Board renders a decision on this point, your only remedy is to convince your old customers that the fears they express are groundless. I do not altogether agree with you that these fears are sincere. As you know, the National Labor Relations Act imposes no criminal penalties upon an employer as the authority of the Board is limited to issuing cease and desist orders. Consequently, if any of these customers really wish to advertise in your paper, they would incur no risk other than the remote possibility that the Board might at some date order them to discontinue the practice.

Sincerely yours,
GERARD D. REILLY,
Solicitor of Labor.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
St. Louis, Mo., January 10, 1945.

H. A. DOUGLAS CO.,
Bronson, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: I am investigating a matter involving an Indianapolis publication, edited by Norman A. Zolezzi, called the Labor Digest. Investigation discloses that employees of your company have in the past received this newspaper at their correct addresses. Would you please advise me whether or not the subscription was paid for by the company, and, if so, when were these payments made? Since the company may not have subscribed or placed ads in the newspaper in the past few years, I should appreciate it if you would check your files back to 1937. Please designate whether payments were for ads or subscriptions.

I should appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Yours very truly,
DOROTHY L. CRAIG,
Field Examiner.

EXHIBIT 3

JANUARY 22, 1945.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
FOURTEENTH REGION,
St. Louis, Mo.

Attention Dorothy L. Craig, field examiner.

DEAR MADAM: In replying to your letter of January 19 relative to the Labor Digest and Norman A. Zolezzi, we wish to advise that we have in the past few years donated approximately $50 per year to this paper. We did not subscribe for any of our employees to receive this paper, and at no time did we give them addresses since the writer's time with this company. It was purely a labor donation.

We trust that this is the information that you desire.

Yours very truly,
H. A. DOUGLAS MANUFACTURING CO.,
KARL KREBSER,
Vice President-General Manager.

EXHIBIT 4

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1945.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
FOURTEENTH REGION,
St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: The enclosed letter is self-explanatory and I wish you would tell me just what Dorothy L. Craig, field examiner, St. Louis, Mo., objective is in inquiring of the advertisers who buy space in the Labor Digest, an independent labor publication, published at Indianapolis, Ind.?

So far as I have been able to learn the purpose seems to be to put that publication out of business so as to aid the CIO in its organizing efforts.

The enclosed is just one bit of evidence of a concerted effort on the part of employees of the NLRB to prejudice this publication.

Sincerely yours.

EXHIBIT 5

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1945.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOFFMAN: I have your letter of February 21, 1945, enclosing a copy of a letter received by the H. A. Douglas Co., of Brunson, Mich.

The sole purpose of the inquiry made of the Douglas Co. was in connection with the investigation of a charge filed by the United Furniture Workers of America in our St. Louis regional office. That charge alleges than Norman A. Zolezzi and others specifically named have engaged in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act by dominating and interfering with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, a labor organization, and by carrying on a campaign of vilification of bona fide labor organizations, and favoring

an employer-dominated labor organization through the medium of the Labor Digest.

As is our usual custom, the case was assigned by the regional director in St. Louis to a field examiner for investigation. The investigation is being conducted by Field Examiner Dorothy Craig who has not yet submitted a final report of her investigation.

Please be assured that neither this Board nor any of its agents is engaged in any campaign to embarrass any legitimate publication or to in any way prejudice it. On the other hand, when charges alleging that unfair labor practices have been committed are filed with this Board, it is our duty under the statute to investigate them fully. As stated above, such full investigation is now being conducted. When the report of the investigation has been received, if it appears that there is no merit to the charges, the case will be dismissed. However, if a violation is indicated, a formal complaint will be issued and the matter set for formal hearing before a trial examiner. Not until all the facts are formally before the Board in the record made at this hearing, will the Board be in a position to make a decision as to whether the allegations of the charge are supported by the evidence.

In the meantime, I am sure that the full cooperation of Mr. Zolezzi and the other respondents with our field examiner who is investigating the allegations of the charge will assure a proper disposition of the matter in accordance with the terms of the statute.

I trust the foregoing answers your inqury. If I can be of further help to you do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

H. A. MILLIS.

EXHIBIT 6

MARCH 7, 1945.

Mr. H. A. MILLIS,
Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C.

In re H. A. Douglas Co. complaint.

DEAR MR. MILLIS: Your letter of the 6th received today does not answer the inquiry I made in mine of the 21st, in which I asked the purpose of the inquiry made of the Douglas people by Dorothy L. Craig, Field Examiner, St. Louis, Mo.

Could the fact that the Douglas people inserted ads in the Labor Digest have a bearing upon whether Mr. Zolezzi has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2)?

I have never understood that it was an unfair labor practice for an industry to buy advertising in any publication. In reality are you not trying to cut off the revenue of the Labor Digest so as to aid the CIO in its organizing campaign? And if that is not what you are trying to do, is not that the effect of Dorothy's activities?

Will you please tell me what, if any, bearing the insertion of advertising in a publication has to do with an unfair labor practice, when neither the publisher nor the one inserting the ad is involved in any labor dispute?

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress.

EXHIBIT 7

THE LABOR DIGEST,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 10, 1945.

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Please be assured of our appreciation of your action in bringing the activities of Miss Dorothy Craig, of the National Labor Relations Board, to the attention of Congress.

Needless to say, we understand that your sole purpose is to see justice done and to prevent such activities on the part of the Board and its employees throughout the country.

The incompetence and inutility of the NLRB as a judicial body is clearly shown in the letter of Mr. Millis to you when he says that the Labor Digest was being investigated because of a campaign of vilification of bona fide labor organizations. That term, "bona fide," is always relied upon by the CIO and the A. F. of L. to prevent workers from forming or joining any other kind of union. Neither the NLRB nor any other governmental agency is competent to declare that only these two private organizations are the only ones that can ever be operated in good faith. The assumptions that they are such and that the CIO is even more bona fide than any other, should leave every American with the feeling of disgust.

Mr. Millis also disclaims any purpose to "embarrass any legitimate publication" by threats to injure its patrons. By what right does Mr. Millis set himself up as a judge of what is right or is not legitimate in the field of publication? I have never been able to find anything in the Wagner Act which gives the National Labor Relations Board power of censorship over publications which are not parties to any labor dispute.

I expect it will interest you, Mr. HOFFMAN, to learn that the Labor Digest never at any time discussed editorially the dispute between the Jasper Desk Co. and the CIO. Neither in our news columns nor editorial columns has anything ever been printed which was directed particularly at this dispute. We do champion the right of workers everywhere to form any kind of union that they may see fit.

Sincerely yours,

THE LABOR DIGEST,
NORMAN A. ZOLEZZI,
Editor.

EXHIBIT 8

[79th Cong., 1st sess. In the House of Representatives, March 12, 1945. Mr. HOFFMAN submitted the following resolution: which was referred to the Committee on Labor]

House Resolution 179

Resolved, That the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. Was Dorothy L. Craig a field examiner of the National Labor Relations Board during December of 1944, January and February of 1945?

2. Did she not inquire of H. A. Douglas Co., Brunson, Mich., asking whether that company paid for subscriptions to the Labor Digest, edited or published by Norman A. Zolezzi?

3. Did she not inquire whether that company had placed ads in the Labor Digest during the past few years?

4. Did she not also inquire of that company as to whether it had made payments for ads or subscriptions to that publication?

5. Has any complaint been filed with the National Labor Relations Board against either Norman A. Zolezzi or the publication, the Labor Digest?

EXHIBIT 9

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 16, 1945.

HON. MARY T. NORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. NORTON: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 13, enclosing a copy of a resolution, House Resolution 179, introduced by Representative HOFFMAN, on March 12, requesting certain information from the National Labor Relations Board.

For the information of your committee, I am glad to state the pertinent facts relative to this matter.

On August 22, 1944, the United Furniture Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, filed with our St. Louis regional office an amended charge, which alleged in part that Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, and others named therein, had engaged in and were engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8 (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act. This charge alleged, in part, that the respondents, including Zolezzi, had engaged in a plan of interference with the self-organization of the employees of a number of companies by carrying on a campaign of vilification of the United Furniture Workers of America, and other bona fide labor organizations, and by favoring employer-dominated labor organizations through the dissemination in a periodical known as the Labor Digest of propoganda designed to interfere with the rights of such employees. The charge also alleged that the respondents, including Zolezzi, unlawfully dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of, and contributed support to, Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, a labor organization of employees of the Jasper Desk Co. For your information, a copy of the amended charge is attached hereto.

As you of course know, the National Labor Relations Board is required by the National Labor Relations Act to conduct an investigation whenever it is charged that any person or concern has engaged in or is engaging in unfair labor practices. Thus, pursuant to our obligation under the statute and in normal course, this case was assigned by our regional director at St. Louis to Field Examiner Dorothy L. Craig, for investigation of the charges. In the course of her investigation, Field Examiner Craig inquired of the H. A. Douglas Co., Brunson, Mich., and others, whether they had paid for subscriptions to the Labor Digest, which is edited by Zolezzi, and further inquired whether such companies had purchased advertising in Zolezzi's publication. No charge has been filed with this agency against the H. A. Douglas Co., and, in the absence of such a charge, the Board could not, and has no intention of attempting to, institute proceedings against this concern. Inquiry was made of this company for one purpose, and for one purpose only, namely, to determine the nature and extent of the alleged unlawful conduct of Zolezzi, with respect to which, as already indicated, a charge has been filed.

The National Labor Relations Board has not, as charged by Mr. HOFFMAN, attempted to supervise the editorial policy of the Labor Digest or of its editor or the editorial policy of any publication, editor, or publisher, nor has it attempted to destroy the circulation of that publication or any other publication. The inquiries made by the field examiner were obviously not directed to any such end but were made in pursuance of our statutory duty to investigate charges whenever they are filed.

I am advised that the investigation has not yet been completed by the field examiner. When the investigation is completed, the field examiner, as is customary, will submit a final report to the regional director and the regional attorney, who will analyze the file to ascertain whether in their opinion the facts disclosed by the investigation indicate a violation of the National Labor Relations Act. If no violation is indicated, the regional director will dismiss the charges. If, however, it appears to our regional office that a violation has occurred, a formal complaint will be issued and the matter will be set for hearing before a trial examiner. At such hearing, all parties to the proceeding will be given full opportunity to present any facts pertinent to the case. The Board will not be acquainted with the facts until a formal hearing is held and a record made, at which time the Board will render a decision based upon the facts appearing in the record and

in accordance with the applicable principles of law developed by the Board and the courts.

Mr. HOFFMAN has directed certain inquiries to the Board with reference to this case, and such inquiries have been promptly and fully answered. For your convenience, I am attaching copies of this correspondence. As you will note, in my last reply to Mr. HOFFMAN I have answered categorically each question raised in the resolution which is before your committee. For the information of your committee, the questions asked by Mr. HOFFMAN and the answers which I have given him are as follows:

1. Was Dorothy L. Craig a field examiner of the National Labor Relations Board during December of 1944, January and February of 1945?

Answer. Yes; Miss Craig has been a field examiner of the Board since January 1943.

2. Did she not inquire of H. A. Douglas Co., Brunson, Mich., asking whether that company paid for subscriptions to the Labor Digest, edited or published by Norman A. Zolezzi?

Answer. Yes; I am advised that such inquiry was made.

3. Did she not inquire whether that company had placed ads in the Labor Digest during the past 4 years?

Answer. Yes; I am advised that such inquiry was made.

4. Did she not also inquire of the company as to whether it had made payments for ads or subscriptions to that publication?

Answer. Yes; I am advised that such inquiry was made.

5. Has any complaint been filed with the National Labor Relations Board against either Norman A. Zolezzi or the publication, the Labor Digest?

Answer. Yes; while there is some ambiguity in this question because of the use of the term "complaint," rather than "charge," it is obvious that the inquiry relates to whether or not charges have been filed with the Board against Zolezzi or the publishers of the Labor Digest. Charges have been filed against Norman A. Zolezzi and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., the publisher of the Labor Digest. Since the matter is still under investigation, no complaint has been issued by the Board against any of the respondents in this case.

The record of the National Labor Relations Board in dealing with Members of Congress and congressional committees will show that this Board has always been willing and eager to answer all inquiries promptly and fully and without equivocation. I think you will agree that this principle has been adhered to in my communications with Mr. HOFFMAN.

If I can be of any further service to your committee, please do not hesitate to advise me.

Sincerely yours,

H. A. MILLIS.

EXHIBIT 10

THE LABOR DIGEST,
Indianapolis, Ind., November 12, 1946.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: No doubt you will recall that last March or April you very kindly interested yourself in the case of Miss Dorothy Craig, an agent of the National Labor Relations Board, who had made it her mission to seek the ruin of the Labor Digest by calling upon its advertisers, throughout the Middle West and, by inference, threatening them with the displeasure of the NLRB unless they stopped advertising in this paper—this because she and other Board employees and officials did not like the critical editorial stand we took on some activities of the CIO.

This activity was begun on account of difficulty the CIO was having in organizing employees of the Jasper Desk Co., of Jasper, Ind. This organization campaign began about 3 years ago. The Labor Digest had never interested itself to the extent of even covering the dispute from a news standpoint—in fact had never mentioned the dispute in its columns. It did have subscribers in Jasper. In the fall of 1942, the CIO asked the NLRB to hold an election in Jasper to determine the bargaining agency for Jasper Desk employees.

Miss Craig visited the scene and attended a conference with CIO representatives. She told them she had investigated and that they had no chance to win an election. She counseled filing an unfair labor charge against the company. In preparation for this hearing she came to the Labor Digest and the books of the publication were placed at her disposal. Nothing came of this charge at the time, but the hounding of this paper began.

On advice of our attorneys we avoided any contact with the dispute. That did not stop the NLRB from its campaign of sabotage against us. We had thought the resolution you introduced in Congress had ended this now. Now—

Comes notice of a hearing in the matter in which the Labor Digest is made a party and a codefendant with the Jasper Desk Co.

Title of the proceeding is "Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc. (publisher of paper), and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO."

The item of the charge, which apparently applies to us is: "Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to interfere with the freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining."

Since the only "propaganda" that we distribute is the Labor Digest, an old and established publication dealing with labor topics, and entered at the post office as second-class matter, we are informed by our attorney that once a "cease and desist" order has been issued by a court we might be stopped from even publishing the mildest criticism of the CIO; or, in other words, muzzled and put out of business. Labor news and views is our stock is trade.

We have never heard of the American version of the OGPU going this far in its terrorism, but their anger with us seems to go very deep. It is, we feel, a high compliment to the effectiveness of the fight we have made on union despotism.

We shall, of course, go on fighting the CIO's brutal ruthlessness and thirst for power in every lawful way.

In the meantime we are, for the second time, compelled to undergo a heavy expense for counsel fees in a case with which we have no connection, except that some of those the union seeks to bully are among our readers.

It is interesting to note that we dare not even consult with our codefendant in this case since that would be collusive under the NLRB interpretation of the Wagner Act. And if we weren't guilty before, we would be then.

For your information, the town of Jasper has a population of about 5,000, with a half a dozen or so small factories. Its population is industrious and happy. It escaped the ravages of the New Deal depression. The Jasper Desk Co. employs a little more than 100 persons and has operated continuously. Its force was quick to resent the CIO invasion, as is clear on the face of the record. The CIO never dared to invite an election, but chose rather to create turmoil through the NLRB in complete harmony with the Communist line. Why we should have been chosen as whipping boy is not entirely clear. As far as we know, no one in Jasper gives a damn what happens to us.

Our circulation and our news coverage lies in much larger centers.

For your further information we have made inquiry, through a third party since this last attack, and have learned that the independent union at the little desk company has about given up the struggle to win the bargaining rights, so the only opposition the CIO now has is "no union." Only five persons attended the last meeting of the independent union.

So it becomes clear that our inclusion in this case is a pure case of spite on the part of the NLRB. Just an attempt to injure an effective critic of the Board's darling CIO.

We had thought President Truman was going to do away with the duplication of labor agencies and center them in the Department of Labor. When do you suppose this will happen to the NLRB?

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN A. ZOLEZZI.

P. S.—I am enclosing a copy of the complaint.

EXHIBIT 11

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the Matter of Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, Case No. 14–C–894)

STIPULATION

Charges having been filed by United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, with the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board, fourteenth region, St. Louis, Mo., alleging that Jesper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., have engaged in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsection (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act; the National Labor Relations Board, through its Regional Director, having duly issued and served its complaint and notice of hearing dated the 8th day of November 1945, service of which is hereby acknowledged by the parties, and it being the intention of the parties hereto to dispose of the matters which have arisen and to conclude all proceedings before the Board in this case in an amicable fashion:

It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and among Jasper Desk Co., hereinafter referred to as Respondent Jasper Desk Co., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereinafter referred to as respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc.; United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, hereinafter referred to as the CIO; Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, hereinafter referred to as Tri-State; Helen F. Humphrey, regional attorney, National Labor Relations Board, Fourteenth Region, and Keith W. Blinn, attorney, National Labor Relations Board, Fourteenth Region, as follows:

I

Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material herein, a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, and operating a plant in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, hereinafter referred to as the Jasper plant. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material herein engaged at its Jasper plant in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of office furniture. During the year 1945, respondent Jasper Desk Co. purchased raw materials valued at in excess of $100,000, of which approximately 40 percent was transported to its Jasper plant from and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana, and during the same period has manufactured finished products valued at in excess of $100,000, of which 75 percent was delivered and transported in interstate commerce to and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana from its Jasper plant.

Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is now and has been at all times material herein, a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Indianapolis, State of Indiana.

Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., at all times mentioned herein has acted and is acting directly or indirectly in the interest of respondent Jasper Desk Co. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is an employer of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co. within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the act.

Respondent Jasper Desk Co. and respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., admit for the purpose of this proceeding that their operations affect commerce within the meaning of section 2, subsection (6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act.

II

United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, and Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, are labor organizations within the meaning of section 2, subsection (5) of the National Labor Relations Act.

III

All parties hereto agree that the third amended charge, complaint, notice of hearing, and this stipulation shall constitute the entire record in this case and that said documents shall become the record herein by filing same with the chief trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board at Washington, D. C.

IV

All parties hereto waive their right to further hearing in this matter and to all further or other procedure before the National Labor Relations Board provided by the National Labor Relations Act or rules and regulations of the National Labor Relations Board, including the making of findings of fact and conclusions of law.

V

On the basis of the facts stipulated herein, the pleadings, this stipulation, and by agreement of the parties hereto, the National Labor Relations Board may enter its order in the following form in the above-entitled matter:

ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that:

1. Respondent Jasper Desk Co., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns shall:

(a) Cease and desist from:

(1) Dominating or interfering with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of its employees, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of its employees.

(2) In any manner combining, confederating, or conspiring, directly or indirectly, with respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(3) In any manner contributing financial support to, or soliciting the aid and assistance of respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(4) In any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing its employees in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, and assist United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, or any other labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid and protection, as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(b) Take the following affirmative action to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act:

(1) Withdraw all recognition from Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, as the representative of any of its employees for the purposes of dealing with respondent, Jasper Desk Co., concerning grievances, labor disputes, rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment, and completely disestablish Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1 as such representative.

(2) Post at its plant in Jasper, Ind., copies of the notice attached hereto, marked "appendix A." Copies of said notice, to be furnished by the regional director for the fourteenth region, shall, after being duly signed by respondent Jasper Desk Co.'s representative, be posted by respondent Jasper Desk Co. immediately upon receipt thereof, and maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by respondent Jasper Desk Co., to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(3) Notify the regional director of the fourteenth region in writing within 10 days from the date of this order what steps respondent Jasper Desk Co. has taken to comply herewith.

2. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, when acting severally or in concert with respondent Jasper Desk Co. or any other employer, or as agent for or in the interest of respondent Jasper Desk Co. or any other employer, shall:

(a) Cease and desist from:

(1) Dominating or interfering with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., or of any other employer.

(2) Soliciting and collecting funds from respondent Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

(3) In any other manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing the employees of respondent, Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, or other mutual aid and protection, as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

(b) Take the following affirmative action to effectuate the policies of the act:

(1) Publish conspicuously in the next regular issue of the Labor Digest a copy of the notice as set forth in appendix B attached hereto, said Labor Digest to be distributed to all persons on its regular mailing list as of November 1945.

(2) Notify the regional director for the fourteenth region in writing, within 10 days from the date of this order, what steps it has taken to comply herewith.

VI

The parties hereby consent to the entry in any appropriate United States circuit court of appeals of a decree enforcing the order of the Board as set forth above, upon application of the Board, without further notice of said application, and each of the parties hereby waives its right to contest the entry of such decree.

VII

It is expressly understood by the parties hereto that this stipuation does not constitute an admission by the respondent, Jasper Desk Co., and respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., of any of the allegations contained in the charge or the complaint herein, nor is it to be considered as an admission that the respondent, Jasper Desk Co., and respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., have committed any unfair labor practices, and respondent, Jasper Desk Co., and respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., expressly deny that they have violated in any manner the National Labor Relations Act as alleged in the charge and complaint herein.

VIII

The entire agreement between all parties hereto is contained within the terms of this stipulation, and there is no verbal agreement of any kind which varies, alters, or adds to said stipulation in any respect.

IX

This stipulation is subject to the approval of the Board, and shall become effective immediately upon the granting of such approval.

Dated at _____ this ____ day of _____ 194__.

JASPER DESK CO.,
By _____
_____
(Title)

ZOLEZZI ENTERPRISES, INC.,
By _____
_____
(Title)

UNITED FURNITURE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
By _____
_____
(Title)

TRI-STATE WOOD WORKERS LOCAL NO. 1,
By _____
_____
(Title)

_____

HELEN F. HUMPHREY,
Regional Attorney, National Labor Relations Board.

_____

KEITH W. BLINN,
Attorney, National Labor Relations Board.

APPENDIX A—NOTICE TO ALL EMPLOYEES

Pursuant to decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board, and in order to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act, we hereby notify our employees that:

We hereby withdraw all recognition from Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, as the representative of any of our employees for the purposes of dealing with us concerning grievances, labor disputes, rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment, and completely disestablish Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1 as such representative, and we will not recognize it or any successor thereto for any of the above purposes.

We will not dominate or interfere with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any labor organization of our employees and will not contribute financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of our employees.

We will not in any manner combine, confederate, or conspire, directly or indirectly, with Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining or coercing our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

We will not in any manner contribute financial support to, or solicit the aid and assistance of Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., or any other individual or group for the purpose of interfering with, restraining, or coercing our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

We will not in any other manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the

exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, and assist United Furniture Workers of America, CIO, or any other labor organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purposes of collective bargaining or other mutual aid and protection, as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

JASPER DESK CO.,
By ----------
---------- (Title)
Dated ----------

This notice must remain posted for 60 days from the date hereof, and must not be altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

APPENDIX B—NOTICE

Pursuant to decision and order of the National Labor Relations Board, and in order to effectuate the policies of the National Labor Relations Act, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereby publishes the following notice:

We will not dominate or interfere with the administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or with the formation or administration of any other labor organization of the employees of Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, and from contributing financial or other support to said Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, or to any other labor organization of the employees of Jasper Desk Co., or of any other employer.

We will not solicit and collect funds from Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, to be used in whole or in part for the purpose of interfering with the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

We will not in any other manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce the employees of Jasper Desk Co., or any other employer, in the exercise of the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining, or other mutual aid and protection as guaranteed in section 7 of the act.

ZOLEZZI ENTERPRISES, INC.
By ----------
---------- (Title)
Dated ----------

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the matter of Jasper Cabinet Co.; Jasper Chair Co.; Jasper Desk Co.; Jasper Glove Co.; Jasper Office Furniture Co.; Jasper Seating Co.; Jasper Veneer Mills; Jasper Wood Products Co.; Jasper L. Eckstein & Sons; Indiana Desk Co.; New Indiana Chair Co.; Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc.; Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, Stanley Williams, and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331-CIO—Case No. 14-C-894—Date filed: Aug. 22, 1944)

SECOND AMENDED CHARGE

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby charges that Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, at Jasper, Ind., have engaged in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) of the Natonal Labor Relations Act, in that:

1. Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, have engaged in numerous activities which did and were designed and calculated to interfere with employees of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., under section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act;

2. Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, Stanley Williams, prior to and since on or about January 1941 have engaged in a plan of interference with the self-organization of the employees of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., and with their freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining by carrying on a campaign of vilification of the undersigned union and other bona fide labor organizations and favoring employer-dominated labor organizations, by disseminating through their agents propaganda designed to interfere with the rights of such employees by a periodical known as the Labor Digest and by other means.

3 Jasper Desk Co., Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, from on or about September 1, 1943, and thereafter, acting together and through their agents, dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, a labor organization among the employees of the Jasper Desk Co., and contributed support to it.

4. Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Norman A. Zolezzi, William Trulock, and Stanley Williams, are and at all times mentioned herein, have been acting directly or indirectly for, in behalf of, and in the interests of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., and are employers within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the National Labor Relations Act.

By the acts mentioned above and other acts the above-named parties have interfered with, restrained and coerced and continue to interfere with, restain, and coerce the employees of Jasper Cabinet Co., Jasper Chair Co., Jasper Desk Co., Jasper Glove Co., Jasper Office Furniture Co., Jasper Seating Co., Jasper Veneer Mills, Jasper Wood Products Co., Joseph L. Eckstein & Sons, Indiana Desk Co., New Indiana Chair Co., and Midwest Manufacturing Co., Inc., in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them under section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act.

The undersigned further charges that said unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of said act.

UNITED FURNITURE WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 331-CIO,
By HAROLD J. JERGER,
Business Representative.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of August 1944 at Jasper, Ind.

TASKER HOWARD, Jr.,
Examiner, NLRB.

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the matter of Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO—Case No. 14-C-894

THIRD AMENDED CHARGE

Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, the undersigned hereby charges that Jasper Desk Co., Jasper, Ind., and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., have engaged in, and are engaging in, unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2), of said act, in that—

1. Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., from on or about September 1943 and thereafter, dominated and interfered with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers Local No. 1, Jasper, Ind., herein referred to as Tri-State, by the following acts:

(a) Instigating the formation of Tri-State;

(b) Participating in the administration of Tri-State;

(c) Furnishing information and contributing financial support to Tri-State; and

(d) Urging, persuading, and warning the employees of Jasper Desk Co. to join and assist Tri-State.

2. Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterpises, Inc., from on or about January 1942 and at all times thereafter, agreed, combined, and conspired to engage in, and did engage in, a plan to interfere with the self-organization of the employees of Jasper Desk Co. and with their freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining, by the following acts:

(a) Making known to said employees Jasper Desk Co.'s disapproval of and hostility to United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, herein referred to as the CIO, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor, and unions affiliated therewith;

(b) Making known to said employees Jasper Desk Co.'s opposition to their membership in or assistance to the CIO;

(c) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to interfere with the freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining;

(d) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to force said employees to join Tri-State;

(e) Contributing financial support to Tri-State;

(f) Threatened said employees with loss of employment or other reprisals if they joined the CIO, and

(g) Conspiring and agreeing to act in concert to violate the act by forming and sponsoring Tri-State.

Ey the acts set forth in the above paragraphs and by other acts and conduct, Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., interfered with, restrained, and coerced and continue to interfere with, restrain, and coerce employees in the exercise of their rights as guaranteed under section 7 of the act.

The undersigned further alleges that Jasper Desk Co. employs 150 workers in the manufacture of furniture and that said unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of said act.

UNITED FURNITURE WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL 331, CIO.
By HAROLD J. JERGER,
Business Representative, Jasper, Ind.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of November 1945, at Jasper, Ind.

[SEAL] A. P. DUDINE,
Notary Public.

My commission expires January 9, 1946.

EXHIBIT C

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, FOURTEENTH REGION

(In the Matter of Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., and United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO—Case No. 14–C–894)

COMPLAINT

It having been charged by United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, that Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., have engaged in and are engaging in certain unfair labor practices affecting commerce as set forth and defined in the National Labor Relations Act (49 Stat. 449), hereinafter referred to as the act, the National Labor Relations Board by the Regional Director for the fourteenth region as agent for the National Labor Relations Board, designated by the National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations, series 3, as amended, for its complaint against Respondent Jasper Desk Co. and Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereby alleges the following:

1. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material hereto a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, and operating a plant in the city of Jasper, State of Indiana, hereinafter referred to as the Jasper plant. Respondent Jasper Desk Co. is now and has been at all times material hereto engaged at the said Jasper plant in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of desks and office furniture.

2. Respondent, Jasper Desk Co., in the course and conduct of its business operations, causes and has continuously caused a substantial amount of material to be purchased, delivered, and transported in interstate commerce from and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana to its Jasepr plant, and causes and has continuously caused a substantial amount of products manufactured, sold, and distributed by it as a part of its business to be delivered and transported in interstate commerce to and through States of the United States other than the State of Indiana from its Jasper plant

3. Respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is now and has been at all times material hereto a corporation duly organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana, having its principal office in the city of Indianapolis, State of Indiana. Respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., was ostensibly formed and incorporated for the purpose, among others, of publishing a monthly paper known as the Labor Digest and forming and administering so-called independent unions, but in fact said respondent, Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is and at all times hereinafter mentioned has been engaged in the following activities:

(a) Forming employer-dominated unions within the meaning of section 8, subsection (2) of the act;

(b) Disseminating, through its agents and employees, propaganda designed to interfere with the rights of employees as guaranteed in section 7 of the act, and

(c) Engaging in numerous other activities designed and calculated to interfere with the rights of employees as guaranteed under the act and particularly section 7 thereof.

4. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., at all times mentioned herein has acted and is acting directly or indirectly in the interest of respondent Jasper Desk Co. Respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., is an employer of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co. within the meaning of section 2, subsection (2) of the act.

5. United Furniture Workers of America, Local 331, CIO, hereinafter referred to as the CIO, and Tri-State Wood Workers Local, No. 1, Jasper, Ind., hereinafter referred to as Tri-State, are labor organizations within the meaning of section 2, subsection (5) of the act.

6. Respondent Jasper Deck Co. and respondent Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., hereinafter collectively referred to as respondents, and each of them, acting through their officers, agents, and employees, from on or about September 1943 and thereafter, dominated and interferred with the formation and administration of Tri-State, by the following acts:

(a) Instigating the formation of Tri-State;

(b) Participating in the administration of Tri-State;

(c) Furnishing information and contributing financial support to Tri-State; and

(d) Urging, persuading, and warning the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., to join and assist Tri-State.

7. Respondents, and each of them, from on or about January 1942 and at all times thereafter, agreed, combined, and conspired to engage in and did engage in a plan to interfere with the self-organization of the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co., and with their freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining, by the following acts:

(a) Making known to said employees respondent Jasper Desk Co.'s disapproval of and hostility to the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor and unions affiliated therewith;

(b) Making known to said employees respondent Jasper Desk Co.'s opposition to their membership in or assistance to the CIO;

(c) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to interfere with the freedom of choice of representatives for collective bargaining;

(d) Distributing propaganda calculated and intended to force said employees to join Tri-State;

(e) Contributing financial support to Tri-State.

(f) Threatening said employees with loss of employment or other reprisals if they joined the CIO; and

(g) Conspiring and agreeing to act in concert to violate the act by forming and sponsoring Tri-State.

8. By the acts set forth in paragraph 6 above, respondents, and each of them, did engage in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsection (2) of the act.

9. By the acts set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, respondents, and each of them, did interfere with, restrain and coerce and are interfering with, restraining and coercing the employees of respondent Jasper Desk Co. in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 of the act and did thereby engage in and are thereby engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsection (1) of the act.

10. The acts of respondents set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, occurring in connection with the operations of respondents as described in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

11. The acts of respondents set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 above constitute unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) and section 2, subsections (6) and (7) of the act.

Wherefore, the National Labor Relations Board by the regional director for the fourteenth region on this 8th day of November, 1945, issues its complaint against Jasper Desk Co. and Zolezzi Enterprises, Inc., respondents herein.

WILLIAM F. GUFFEY, Jr.,
Regional Director, Fourteenth Region, National Labor Relations Board.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO RETIRE CERTAIN OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to appoint boards to bring about the involuntary retirement of officers of the Regular Navy. It does not have any application in general to Reserve officers. It only applies to retirement of the Regular officers of the United States Navy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have an instance that I know about of a marine lieutenant who was wounded on Okinawa, who is being retained in the service and paid for more than 2 months merely because he cannot go before a retirement board. I have been amazed at the delay of these retirement boards to take action on voluntary retirement, and I wondered whether there was anything that would cure that situation in this legislation.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the case that the distinguished gentleman cites has reference to a physical retirement before a board dealing with that question. This bill does not relate to that type of retirement. This bill relates to involuntary retirement where the Navy Department feels that they can, for the time being, dispense with the services of the officer.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, are there no provisions in the law giving such authority?

Mr. VINSON. Under the law today, the right of an officer to be involuntarily retired has been suspended by an act of Congress. Under the law up until that suspension, if an officer had been passed over twice by what is known as the selection board, he automatically would go out of the service. That has been suspended, so with that suspension on the statute books there is no way for there to be an outlet except when an officer reaches the retirement age of 64 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is this intended to cover inefficient officers, or retirement because of age or other conditions, or is it because there is a surplus of officers?

Mr. VINSON. It is intended to take care of officers where the Navy Department feels it can dispense with their services because, in all probability, it has other officers that can render the same service.

Mr. TABER. Does this bill have a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. VINSON. It does. There is no objection on the part of the Committee on Naval Affairs. It is recommended by

the Navy Department, and it has already unanimously passed the Senate.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the passage of the bill, but when these men retire do they go on retired pay?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. If an officer has been promoted during the war to a temporary rank, if in the judgment of the Secretary and the Board that passes on him he has earned the promotion to that temporary rank, it permits him to retire with the temporary rank and the pay of the temporary rank, which is 2½ percent of his base pay per year, not exceeding 75 percent.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I am leading up to is this: The Army and Navy of course have the same procedure when the men retire.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. They get so much of their base pay when they retire.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. COCHRAN. They never contribute one nickel toward any retirement fund. Is not that correct?

Mr. VINSON. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. They do not contribute anything, as Government employees do?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. There seems to be no objection from the general public to that.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. The last time I looked it up, the amount contributed by the Government for this purpose was around $100,000,000 for both services.

Mr. VINSON. I do not know how much the retirement pay is, but the gentleman from Missouri is absolutely correct. A naval officer or an Army officer receives 2½ percent per year for each year of service, not exceeding 75 percent of his base pay, and he never contributes one dollar to that retirement fund.

I am hoping when the House takes the civil service bill up after the Christmas recess it will grant to the Congress the same type of retirement which we have already granted, and rightly so, to the officers of the armed services.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know as I agree with the gentleman that we should follow that policy. But if a Member of Congress resigns now, he gets absolutely nothing in the way of retirement pay, no matter how long he has served here. Is that not correct?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, the gentleman is aware of that. Of course, it is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. When we take up that retirement bill which the gentleman from Georgia is the author of, I hope the House will take into consideration just exactly what it does in the way of appropriating money for the retirement of Army and Navy officers and do a little bit for themselves.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly; and I think at least the Congress should be put upon the same basis of retirement as the Army and Navy.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not agree with the gentleman there, but I think they ought to contribute.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In view of the gentleman's statement in support of the bill that the bill proposes to set up these boards in order to give the Secretary a chance to remove from the rolls naval personnel who are no longer needed on the basis of an efficiency rating, is there any safeguard against the man being elevated from the rank of captain to that of admiral or from a commander to captain just prior to being taken out of the service?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it would only apply to the officer who has had his name sent to the board by the Secretary. The Secretary will make up a list of names and send it to the board. The statement would be to the effect that in the judgment of the Secretary those officers' records should be inquired into, and if the board concludes that the Navy Department can get along satisfactorily without these officers, then the board would recommend to the Secretary that they be involuntarily retired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Is it reasonable to assume or is it the intent of the committee that has reported the bill that after the Secretary has himself screened the personnel to the extent that he is going to submit certain names to the board for their examination, that hypothetically at least it might be well that there would be no promotions in that particular group of names which is being submitted to the board from the time the list is submitted to the board until such time as the board shall have acted?

Mr. VINSON. I am frank to say it will probably accelerate the promotions because you will be letting men out and when you let them out you will be creating vacancies. But that is not the motive that prompts the introduction of this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is the point I was trying to get at.

Mr. VINSON. What prompts this bill is in plain language, to retire officers whom the Navy Department feels it can get along without.

There is no way today under the law to retire them as we have suspended the selection law.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Of course, if this unnecessary personnel is kept in the Navy, we must pay them their salaries and some other things besides, and if we put them out we cut down on expenses somewhat.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How much do we pay these officers who this board says should involuntarily retire?

Mr. VINSON. Under the law today, you would pay 2½ percent for each year they served in the Navy, not exceeding 75 percent of their base pay.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If this board can retire these men because of inefficiency and because they are not worth anything to the Navy, it would be for the best interests of the Navy that they be retired?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do I understand that officers whose service does not meet the Navy's standard are retired on 2½ percent for each year of service notwithstanding the fact they have not measured to Navy's requirements?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That does not justify it, does it?

Mr. VINSON. I think it does.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does it?

Mr. VINSON. I think it does. It has been the policy of the Congress when an officer is retired for any reason, unless he has been court-martialed or something of that kind.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Will not my chairman agree that these officers for the most part have served honorably and well for a long period of time?

Mr. VINSON. Why, they certainly have.

Mr. IZAC. And is it not a fact that their retirement should be no reflection on them?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all. I do not want the debate to show that there is any reflection upon the officers whose services the Navy Department thinks they can get along without.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HEALY. This bill which you propose sets up a new procedure for the retirement of officers under certain circumstances?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. HEALY. Is this procedure now in use by the Army?

Mr. VINSON. This procedure is just being invoked for the first time in the Navy. In all probability, certain provisions of it will be used by the Army.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Everyone in this House knows the tremendous effort, ability, and devotion of the gentleman from Georgia who has been addressing us and enlightening us on this subject. Personally, for the tremendous job he has had, especially all during the war period, I am a great admirer of the gentleman. However, is this not another example of the downright generosity of the Congress of the United States to other branches of the Government? Particularly, it stands out in contrast to the attitude we have toward ourselves, in recognition of similar service. The membership should take cognizance of our situation and handle it in a business-like manner. We have had plenty of demagogery in this body every time anything has come up for the downright benefit of the Members as servants of the Government of the United States, and let it be know there are no more faithful servants anywhere than in this very room. The midnight oil is no stranger to their offices.

It is very unfortunate that the press of the Nation is not as devoted to the needs of Congress as it is to telling the story of the efforts of Congress for the people.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the committee amendments, and that all committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill and amendments are as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy shall, whenever he deems it advisable, appoint boards of officers to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the line and staff corps of the Regular Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore and officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in the ranks of major general and brigadier general.

SEC. 2. (a) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Navy serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall consist of not less than five officers of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of rear admiral except that officers of the staff corps of the rank of rear admiral may be appointed as members of any board appointed for the consideration and recommendation of officers of the staff corps for retirement.

(b) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of major general shall consist, so far as practicable, of three line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of major general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in ranks above that of real admiral.

(c) The boards to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Marine Corps serving in the rank of brigadier general shall consist, so far as practicable, of five line officers of the Regular Marine Corps serving in ranks above that of brigadier general. If there be an insufficient number of such officers available, the deficiency shall be supplied by the appointment to the board of officers of the line of the Regular Navy serving in the rank of rear admiral or above.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convene boards of officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps to consider and recommend for retirement officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps serving in the ranks of captain and below in the Navy, and colonel and below in the Marine Corps, within such categories or groups of such officers as shall be specified in the precepts convening such boards. The members of such boards shall be senior in rank to any officer under consideration.

SEC. 4. The recommendations of each board convened pursuant to this act shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Navy with his recommendations to the President for approval or disapproval, in whole or in part.

SEC. 5. Each officer recommended for retirement pursuant to this act shall, if such recommendation be approved by the President, be placed on the retired list on the first day of such month as may be set by the Secretary of the Navy but not later than the first day of the seventh month after the date of approval by the President.

SEC. 6. When any officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps or the Reserve Components thereof has completed more than 20 years of active service in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or the Reserve Components thereof, including active duty for training, at least 10 years of which shall have been active commissioned service, he may at any time thereafter, upon his own application, in the discretion of the President, be placed upon the retired list on the first day of such month as the President may designate.

SEC. 7. (a) Each officer retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall be placed on the retired list with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty, if his performance of duty in such rank as determined by the Secretary of the Navy has been satisfactory. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by him while on active duty, he shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which he has served but not lower than his permanent rank: *Provided,* Officers retired pursuant to the foregoing sections of this act shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided,* That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further,* That officers whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active-duty pay.

(b) Nothing within this section shall prevent any officer from being placed on the retired list with the highest rank and with the highest retired pay to which he might be entitled under other provisions of law.

(c) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945, is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank.

SEC. 8. (a) Section 10 of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) Personnel appointed or advanced under the authority of this act may be continued in their temporary status during such period as the President may determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency or, in the case of reserve and retired personnel, not longer than the period herein specified or the date of release from active duty whichever is the earlier and in no case longer than 6 months after the termination of war or national emergency. Upon the termination of their temporary status such personnel on the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps shall assume their permanent status and those of the retired list and of the rtspective Reserve components, including the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, shall have, when returned to an inactive status, the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under a temporary appointment, unless entitled to the same or higher grade and rank pursuant to section 8 of this act, as now or hereafter amended.

"(b) (1) Personnel of the retired list returned to an inactive status with higher rank pursuant to subsection (a) shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(2) Personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and personnel of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve appointed or advanced under the authority of this act shall, when subsequently retired, if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher grade and rank or retired pay, be advanced to the highest grade and rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, they served satisfactorily under temporary appointments, and shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable in each individual case but based upon such higher rank.

"(c) Personnel of the classes described above who have been retired or released from active duty prior to the date of this amendment shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or release from active duty, as the case may be.

"(d) Personnel accorded higher rank pursuant to this section shall, if subsequently assigned active duty, be recalled to active duty in their permanent grades, ranks or ratings, to which they are entitled under other provisions of law.

"(e) The rank in which an officer was serving on August 12, 1945, or if a prisoner of war during World War II, the rank in which he was serving on November 1, 1945 is the highest rank in which the officer may be retired and upon which his retired pay may be based pursuant to this section, unless under provisions of law other than those contained within this section he is entitled to a higher rank on the retired list or to a higher retired pay, or unless at the time of retirement he is serving in a higher permanent grade or rank."

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as altering or amending any provision of section 7 of the act approved June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

SEC. 9. When any officer of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral has attained the age of 62 years, he shall be placed upon the retired list by the President with the highest rank, permanent or temporary, held by him while on active duty and with retired pay equal to 75 percent of the active-duty pay of such rank: *Provided, however,* That the President may, in his discretion, defer placing any such officer on the retired list for the length of time he deems advisable but not later than the date upon which such officer attains the age of 64 years, except that not more than 10 officers whose retirement is so deferred shall be on the active list at any one time: *And provided further,* That no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps shall be placed upon the retired list pursuant to this section until the 1st day of the sixth month following the date of approval of this act or until the date upon which he would be retired for age pursuant to law existing prior to the date of approval of this act, whichever may be the earlier.

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the same thereto, shall apply to personnel of the Coast Guard in relationship to the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to personnel of the Navy in relationship to the Navy: *Provided,* That wherever authority is given to the Secretary of the Navy, similar authority shall be deemed given to the Secretary of the Treasury to be exercised with respect to the Coast Guard at such time or times as the Coast Guard shall be operating under the Treasury Department: *Provided further,* That the boards to consider and recommend for re-

tirement officers of the Coast Guard serving in the ranks of rear admiral and commodore shall be composed of senior Coast Guard officers if available or otherwise as the Secretary shall determine.

SEC. 11. The following acts and parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 13 and subsection (e) of section 15 of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 951 and 952).

(b) Section 1444 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by that portion of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 579), reading: "except as herein otherwise provided, hereafter the age for retirement of all officers of the Navy shall be 64 years instead of 62 years as now prescribed by law"; section 2 of the act of January 28, 1929 (ch. 109, 45 Stat. 1142); and section 6 of the act of June 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 465).

(c) Subsection 12 (e) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 950).

SEC. 12. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall be declared to be ended by proclamation of the President or by an act or resolution of Congress.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 11, after the word "with", strike out the balance of line 11, all of lines 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and down through the word "rank", in line 19, and insert "his permanent rank: *Provided*, That if a board appointed pursuant to section 1 or section 2 of this act shall determine that an officer's performance of duty entitles him to a higher rank in which he has satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, the officer shall be placed on the retired list with such higher rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank."

Page 5, line 19, strike out after "(c)" the balance of line 19, all of line 20, and line 21 down to and including the figure "1945" and insert: "The highest rank in which an officer served on or prior to June 30, 1946, or if a prisoner of war at any time during World War II, the highest rank to which an officer was temporarily appointed pursuant to the provisions of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603)."

Page 7, line 1, after the word "status", strike out the balance of the line, all of lines 2 and 3, and insert "their permanent grade and rank."

Page 7, line 6, after the word "amended", insert: "*Provided*, That if a board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that their performance of duty entitles them to higher grade and rank in which they satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, they shall be placed on the retired list with such higher grade and rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank."

Page 7, line 24, after the word "be", strike out the balance of line 24, all of line 25, and on page 8, lines 1, 2, 3, and the first two words in line 4, and insert "placed upon the retired list with their permanent grade or rank: *Provided*, That if a board appointed by the Secretary of the Navy shall determine that their performance of duty entitles them to higher grades and ranks in which they satisfactorily served on active duty under a temporary appointment, they shall be placed on the retired list with such higher rank as determined by the board, but no officer shall be placed on the retired list with rank lower than his permanent rank: *Provided further*, That such officers shall receive retired pay computed at the rate prescribed by law and applicable to each individual case but based upon the rank with which retired."

Page 8, line 23, after the word "in", strike out "their permanent" and insert the word "the."

Page 8, line 24, strike out the words "to which they are entitled under other provisions of law" and insert "with which they were retired or returned to an inactive status unless under other provisions of law they are entitled to higher grades, ranks and ratings."

Page 9, line 3, strike out all after "(e)", all of lines 4 and 5, and including the figures "1, 1945" in line 6 and insert "The highest rank in which an officer served on or prior to June 30, 1946, or if a prisoner of war at any time during World War II the highest rank to which an officer was temporarily appointed pursuant to the provisions of this act."

Page 9, line 25, after the word "pay", strike out the balance of the line, and the words "duty pay of such rank" on page 10, line 1, and insert "at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay with longevity credit of the rank with which retired, multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of his pay while on active duty, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay: *Provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years of service by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied: *Provided further*, That an officer whose computation of pay on the active list is not based upon years of service shall receive as retired pay 75 percent of his active-duty pay: *Provided, however*,"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE WORLD ON CHRISTMAS OF 1945

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as Congress recesses for the season of Christmas it should be possible for us to devote a few moments to taking stock of our own and our Nation's duties in the light of the principles of the first Christmas day.

Every soldier, sailor, and marine who gave his life in World War II believed as he died that he was doing so to make a better world. He left to us the task of building that better world. Before God and the souls of these departed heroes we must be about that task. Nothing short of the very highest statesmanship will be adequate to accomplish it.

For we live in a world where by the advancement of science and the cold intellect of man we have placed ourselves in a position to commit race suicide, to destroy civilization, even to blow up the world if that is what we want to do. The only kind of statesmanship that can meet this danger is one that can release in the world a power stronger than the hates, prejudices, fears, and suspicions of men in all nations, stronger than anything known to man throughout all history. Just what that power is I shall tell before I am through. That it exists and is available to us if we will only commit ourselves to it I have not the slightest doubt.

Like a terrible curse there hangs over this chamber and over every home in the world today the shadow of the atomic bomb. Fear grips the hearts of men and among those who know most about it the fear is greatest. And yet the scientists who made the bomb had first to find a way to release from the very matrix of the universe a latent power placed there at the beginning of time by the hand of God Himself. We are afraid only because of the evil in the hearts of men, only because we ourselves are not good enough people to live so that we need not fear death.

Some day mankind is going to have to make a fundamental choice and some nation will have to make it first. That time had best be now; that nation our own. It will take courage, vision, and a willingness to suffer abuse on the part of the people who urge the right choice. This choice is between two diametrically opposite courses of action. The first of those courses of action can be described in rather specific terms about as follows: Another war is inevitable. No matter what we do, we must expect that sooner or later there will be another world conflict. No matter what the consequences to our own people, we must be prepared to destroy whatever enemies there may be in that war. We must seek further development of the atomic bomb and try to develop bombs which will destroy greater and greater areas, penetrate deeper and deeper below the surface of the earth, have more and more explosive power, and more and more power to destroy human life by radioactivity. Meanwhile we must also develop bacteriological warfare and must call it "military progress" when we find new ways to snuff out human life by scattering disease germs around the world. All this we must keep secret from other nations, knowing full well that they will do likewise and only hoping that their so-called progress will be less rapid than our own. We must likewise maintain all the traditional sorts of military establishments and armament not so much because they will be useful in an atomic war as because first we have always had them and, second, they will make us look bigger and more powerful to the other nations of the world. Oh, we must make efforts to have peace, but while we do so we must realize that they will fail and put our main effort into preparing for the war that is going to come.

With all due respect to the good statement issued on atomic energy by the President and the Prime Ministers of Britain and Canada and with all due respect to other sincere efforts on the part of our country to help build a peace, it must be said that so far the point of view which I have just outlined has been predominant in this Nation and probably in other nations since the day on which Japan surrendered.

But there is another course of action which has recommended itself in the past and been consistently rejected by the nations of the earth. It is one which today offers the only alternative to the armament race in atomic weapons culminating in the atomic war. Now, mankind does not desire to commit suicide. The common people of the earth in all countries, including even countries whose polices and practices we do not like, desire nothing so much as to live out their lives in peace and safety, raise their children

in hope, and teach them the precepts of right and wrong and religious truth. Briefly, this second course of action, which it is altogether in the power of mankind to choose in this hour, rests upon the following considerations:

That another war will destroy even in victorious nations everything their people might previously have valued. That in order to fight that war successfully it will be necessary, first, to destroy every vestige of democratic institutions in the nation which proposes to win it. That while it may be possible to destroy an enemy nation, it is inconceivable that that can be done without exposing the women and children of one's own nation to death. That, therefore, to follow such a course is to sacrifice for the sake of possible military victory the lives of a very great portion of the peoples of the earth. We are impelled, therefore, out of considerations of common humanity, to consider following a course involving certain risks from a military standpoint in order to put efforts to establish peace at the forefront of our minds and to place primary reliance instead of secondary reliance upon such efforts. We know this will mean the abolition of military secrecy and the sacrifice of some national sovereignty. We know it will require the drastic reduction of the world's armaments in all nations and their control for the common good of all mankind. The atomic bomb has made the entire world one defense area. It has put mankind into a rowboat in the midst of a great typhoon. It has put the whole human race in the position where it will either survive together or perish together and where there are no alternatives but these two. Therefore, this second course of action holds that we shall choose to survive in the only way left open to us, believing it to be the will of God that His powers as contained in the natural universe were intended for life rather than death.

But many people will say, "This is all far too idealistic. Look at the kind of world we are living in, hunger and suffering almost everywhere, unstable governments and sometimes corrupt ones, great nations and little ones where the freedom of the human spirit is still denied. There is civil conflict in China, oppression and injustice in the East Indies. And at home industrial strife and a serious disregard for the general public welfare."

And these same people will say, "These problems are greater and more serious than the world has ever faced before. How can we expect a new and better world to be built on such foundations?"

It was said in the Old Testament: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." And the key to releasing in the world that power stronger than the hates, prejudices, and fears of men of which I spoke at the beginning is for us to place the fear of the Lord first and the fear of the atomic bomb second in our minds.

There is a course of action which can be followed by both men and nations which can overcome even the problems of the present world. But there is only one gateway that leads to it. It is set before us over and over in the teachings of our Lord in the New Testament. That gateway is repentance. Nor will it do to require repentance of others before we are willing to practice it ourselves.

I am conscious and proud of the record of my country through the years. But if she and her people are to be big enough of soul to take leadership in times like these, we must begin our task with the kind of forthright recognition of our own national wrongs which will show the world that a new power is at work among men.

The first step then toward releasing that power is for us to confess that though others began the war, it was our own United States that developed the most devastating means of bombing not only military objectives but also cities and civilians. It was we who released atomic energy—we who reached for the power of the sun; we who dared God Himself when we did so. And so it is we Americans who must assume the duty of seeing that atomic energy is used in accordance with as basic a law of justice as the power in the atom is basic to the natural universe.

Nor need we be moved wholly by idealism and sense of duty. For no man who believes that there is a law of God at work anywhere will doubt that when a nation unlocks the fundamental power in God's storehouse of energy it necessarily will face a terrible retribution unless it is willing to run every necessary risk and exert the highest possible leadership in seeing that that greatest of God's natural gifts is used for the benefit of all mankind and made an instrument of lasting peace.

The problems which we face today may seem terribly confusing but the solution to them need not be so confusing. That solution is to do what is right. To find in the moral law of the universe a guide for our action and to follow it resolutely wherever it may lead, knowing that the least we can gain from such a course is a freedom from fear and the peace in our hearts which passes all understanding. And we shall also know that we have at least a chance to gain the kind of world for which those who lie dead upon the battlefield fought so hard and so valiantly.

There is the principle—simple, direct, and understandable. Let us see if it can be applied to the problems that beset us and to our doubts and concerns about the future. And having done this then let us see if it cannot be applied also to the problem of the atomic bomb.

Let us begin at home. It is clear, is it not, that what we need is to overcome the forces of division among our people and to exalt the common welfare of all citizens above the special interest of any particular group? The need is for more understanding and less greed, for more fact and less prejudice, for the development of a greater desire to serve in order that the lot of the humblest among us may be raised. The ideal of America was a nation which should give refuge to the oppressed and burdened of the world. They have come here from almost every part of the world to enrich the national life of our country. It is true that it would be unfair to those already here to fling wide the gates to immigration. It is also true that emigration has never solved the problem of any nation, however crowded it might be. Therefore a more helpful thing to other nations is to assist them to build their own economies so that they may support their people rather than to burden those already in America with an insoluble problem presented by a large number of new arrivals to our shores. But here we must forge a genuine national community among all citizens of this great Republic. For Americans of every sort there must be equality of educational opportunity, a break-down of hate and prejudice, a readiness to recognize the innate worth of every human being in the sight of God. These things are right. That is all we need to know.

Again one of our great problems in America has arisen because we did not have the intelligence or the understanding to find ways to bring the benefits of the bounty of God to those who needed them. Another way of stating the same thing is to say that when the farmers of our country have produced an abundance of food, we have many times permitted that very abundance to become the means of depressing farm prices to ruinously low levels and of causing large amounts of precious foodstuffs to go to waste. Meanwhile, millions of America's children have been in need of a sufficiency of food to enable them to grow into the kind of strong and healthy citizens which our country needs and which they have an inherent right to be.

The principle which we have started rather feebly to apply and which could give in large part the answer to this problem is this: That as long as the farmers of America produce an abundance of foodstuffs there should be no school children in the country who are hungry or undernourished. It should hardly be necessary to argue the rightness of such a principle, but it must be implemented by the establishment of a school-lunch and penny-milk program of sufficient breadth so that at one and the same time we can make a substantial contribution to the worth-while disposal of farm surpluses, and, what is more important, guard the health and the educational alertness of our children. Only in this way can America's great system of education be enabled to make its maximum contribution to the future strength and welfare of the Nation.

For a long time Congress has been temporizing with legislation to establish on a sound basis a school-lunch program which will be locally sponsored and initiated and to which the Federal Government can make worth-while contribution in the form of food. This is only one example of a manner in which the principle can be applied that there shall be no unnecessary need as long as there is an abundance of production, but it is an important and basic one and worthy of being included, I believe, with the other questions of great importance which I am attempting to discuss.

We now come to what may well be the very heart of the political problem in our country. For, generally speaking, political opinion divides itself between

those who believe that our salvation lies in governmental action and those who believe on the contrary that it is necessary to restrict all types of governmental action of whatever sort and for whatever purpose instituted to the least possible scope. Is there an irreconcilable conflict represented in these two points of view? Or is it possible that reasonable people can find an answer which will go far toward reconciling this political conflict and building up a solid core of middle-of-the-road opinion in our country which can be the truest safeguard of our free institutions and our constitutional form of government? I believe very earnestly that this conflict is not irreconcilable, for I think it altogether possible for us to recognize that there are certain functions of government which can contribute to the advancement of economic as well as political liberty, reduce the economic insecurity from which our country has suffered in the past, and make possible a continuous expansion of both consumption and production.

Such governmental action lies in the field of monetary controls, a true national system of social security and insurance against universal hazards of life, forthright action to prevent the growth or continuance of monopolistic power, a program for the orderly development in the interest of industry, agriculture and consumers of the natural resources of our country and a general fiscal and tax program which can be used as a regulator of the flow of the people's buying power and a means of guarding against the possibility of inflation and deflation, unhealthy booms and depression. None of these things need interfere with the fullest possible development of individual initiative and private enterprise. The better government does its job in these particular fields the less will be the likelihood of recurring periods of bankruptcy, failure of the market and ruination of farmers and businessmen alike. On the basis of a proper functioning of our Government in its proper field, we can build an assurance that it will not venture beyond that field but will leave to competitive business the major task of production and distribution in the United States.

I have only said enough to briefly indicate a central principle for political discussion and the determination of political policy. It is the principle of reason as applied to the central problem of our day but if ever there was a time when it was important and right for reason to be used instead of prejudice, name-calling and narrow pursuit of doctrinaire ideas, that time is now.

But now we come to another problem on our home front upon the solution of which the future even of our democratic institutions may, in part, depend. It is the conflict between those who own and those who work, between capital and labor, management and workers. Can we find keys to that problem? By the application of the simple principles that I have given, I believe we can.

The first of them is to develop and know the facts, to enable all the American people to judge industrial controversy on its merits rather than on the basis of prejudiced propaganda on behalf of one side or the other. One reason, as is currently being pointed out, why the Railway Labor Act has been so successful is because of its provisions for the appointment of fact-finding bodies as a last resort. For this means that both labor and management know that ultimately the true facts in the situation will be revealed to all the American people. The good will of one's fellow citizens is still the thing most cherished by all men and the strength of an informed public opinion can be made the most powerful of all influences making for speedy settlement of industrial disputes.

In the second place there are right answers to the wage problem—answers already suggested in the Congress itself. Very roughly those answers are to base collective bargaining upon two fundamental principles; first, that a living wage shall be the first charge upon industry and second, that a fair percentage of the actual earnings of a corporation should rightfully go to the workers who make its success possible. On this basis there can be developed a common interest on the part of both labor and management in increasing production for the welfare of the whole community. We will not solve this industrial labor problem by passing legislation which is aimed in inequitable fashion at one side only. We will help to solve it by eliminating wrong action on the part of anyone, whether it be labor, management, or anyone else. But most of all we can find the master key to its solution in the right principle that wages above a fair living wage shall bear a constant and fair relationship to the earnings of the employing corporation.

With this all too brief discussion of only a few of our fundamental problems at home, let us turn to the world and see how the application of the principle of doing right and following the law of God will shape the foreign policy of this country.

What have been the forces to bind together the communities, states, and nations of the world? Fundamentally, they have been those institutions which have ministered best to the needs of the people. Today America has an opportunity, unparalleled in all history to fill that role. If we give our friendship, in generous spirit, with the relief we supply we can build good will around the whole world. That world is a desperately needy one. Its roads are clogged with homeless people. Whole cities are almost childless simply because there has not been food enough to keep their children alive. During the war we have asked American farmers to push their production to the limit for the purpose of supporting the war, and they have done their job despite the lack of machinery, shortages of labor. Will we now ask them to reduce their production? Or will we assure them that if they once more aim for the maximum possible production we will purchase the food they produce beyond America's needs at fair prices and send it forth to meet the needs of the hungry peoples of the world? The task will not be finished when we have made our full contribution to United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That we are pledged to do. And we will keep, though tardily, our pledge. The very most desperate of the need UNRRA may meet. But there remains the opportunity to send through public or private agencies, ships of food to the hospitals or the children of Italy and France and Holland, the Philippines and China as a free-will offering to our fellow human beings. Thus we may prove again the great heart of this democracy of free people. Thus we may grasp an opportunity which no other nation in all the world can grasp. It is our chance to prove that victory to a Christian Nation means an obligation to minister to the suffering more than it means the right to rule. Nor can the conquered peoples be forgotten.

It is, in the last analysis, the moral leadership of the world that counts the most. And the acid test of that moral leadership will come in our treatment of the common people of the conquered countries. I would agree that their needs should come after those of the nations which fought by our side and which were overrun by the forces of tyranny. But it is inconceivable that democracy, which, after all, is the flower of a plant which is rooted in hope, can flourish in either Germany or Japan if there is evidence of a desire on the part of conquering nations to see the common people of those two nations suffer needlessly. It is true that most Americans have been against a ruthless policy in Germany. Many of us are today standing aghast at the suffering of millions of people in that part of the world. But we still permit barriers to exist against even the work of churches and other private organizations seeking to bring aid and relief to stricken, defenseless people there. What I am really calling for here is an effort as great as that made during the war to feed the armies of our own country and our allies. For such an effort can be an all-important instrument in building a better world on the right principle of the relief of stark human need wherever it exists. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

Over and over I have heard it said that Uncle Sam cannot continue to be a Santa Claus to all the world. With that statement I agree. Nor would it do the world any good for us to attempt such a role. The rebuilding of the economies of other nations may be assisted in some ways by this great Nation. But that job in the last analysis can only be done by the people of those nations themselves. The best we can do, perhaps all we should try to do, is to give them the strength now so they can carry on tomorrow.

And what about military policy? We know, do we not, that we ourselves fear the intentions of other nations when by their unilateral action they build armaments and develop their military strength? It is too much to expect that over the long run, at any rate, other nations will take a different attitude toward ourselves. The right military policy for America seems to me not difficult to find.

It should include first and foremost the most forthright effort to bring about universal reduction in armaments and international control of heavy armaments in order that what will otherwise undoubtedly become an insupportable burden of ever-increasing military expense for all the peoples of the world may be escaped. America has a duty to perform in helping to bring a war-torn world to peace. It is true that American military strength can be one of the most potent forces making for justice for small nations and for peace. But is it not clear that if this is to be the function of whatever Military Establishment this Nation maintains, the size and scope of that establishment should be determined not by our own will to power but, rather, on the basis of the peace-keeping tasks which our country may be commissioned to perform by the nations meeting together as they soon will do in the United Nations Organization? For then America's military strength would clearly be seen by all peoples as one of the instruments for the maintenance of peace. And before we change the fundamental institutions of our country by adopting a peacetime conscription system, certainly we should try with all the statesmanship at our command to secure the abolition of conscription systems in all the nations of the world. Perhaps we shall fail in such an attempt, but even in that failure we would win, I believe, the heartfelt gratitude of the simple people of all nations and we could then undertake such program of military training as we felt necessary, having made it absolutely clear that we were doing it not out of a desire for military strength for its own sake but only because other nations were not ready as yet to follow the constructive leadership which we had offered. And at the very least we should at once stop the manufacture of atomic bombs, experimental or otherwise, as demonstration of our faith that peace is possible.

Our country must be prepared to stand with resolute determination against any tendencies anywhere in the world to revive the aggression by military power which, begun by Japan when she entered Manchuria finally led step by step to World War II. We cannot afford appeasement of such aggression by any power. But we shall not effectively prevent it by placing ourselves in a position so envied and predominant as to cause other powers to seek to balance our strength. We can accomplish it by cooperative leadership of international peace forces.

It is one thing for America to expect to hold bases in the Pacific won by the blood of our men which are truly important to the defense of our own Nation. But it is quite a different thing for us to refuse to place under the control of international trusteeship areas or islands where considerable populations live. For there we should be asserting the same principle which we know will afford the right answer in the Dutch East Indies and many other parts of the world. We know, too, if we are honest that when we oppose, as we should oppose, domination by Soviet Russia over smaller countries our own record will be the test by which our sincerity is judged. And so we come back to the principle of doing right ourselves first and then standing before the world with clean hands, to protect the rights of smaller nations and demand that other great nations do likewise.

The basic moral principle of life is the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Whatever binds people together is right. Whatever divides them is wrong. Do we believe in these principles or do we not? That is the great question of this hour. Will we pursue a course which will make us so certain that we are ourselves following the will of God—that the influence of the United States will be able consistently to win the allegiance of people who have suffered under the cruelty and unreasonable domination of the armies of other countries?

Perhaps the outcome of the elections recently held in Austria is a part of the answer to this question. No cause is well served unless the welfare of the common people in the areas affected is well served. If others forget this, let it never be said that America has done so.

And now we come to the greatest event in at least a thousand years, namely, the coming of the atomic bomb. Let us remember that when that first atomic bomb exploded on Japan, mankind was catapulted into a brand new age—an age which for better or for worse will inevitably be dominated by the presence of atomic energy in it. All the rest of our policies put together must pale into comparative insignificance compared to what we do about this all-important matter.

One of the greatest poets of the First World War was Herman Hagedorn. He has sent me a poem which he has written about the coming of the atomic bomb. It has not yet been published but I am sure he will not mind my quoting from it four lines whose power will be evident at the first reading. Here they are:

We are little people and we must learn overnight to be great!
Our fathers built a nation on the determination of peoples from many lands to get along together.
We ourselves have dreamed of a world of nations learning to get along together.
And we have made a thing that has opened a chasm deeper and wider than the Grand Canyon between us and all other peoples!

The great question of this hour is whether we can bridge that chasm. A bridge half way across it will crumble and fall. The bridge must be thrown clear across the chasm which separates the United States as the possessor of the atomic bomb from other nations which under present circumstances are quite certainly endeavoring to develop these terrible weapons themselves.

The statement regarding the atomic bomb issued by the President and the Prime Ministers of England and Canada was a good statement so far as it went but it fell short of the transcendent greatness which these times demand. It should have been a statement which could have been concluded with ringing words somewhat like the following:

Let us be done with suspicion of one another. Let the world devote this most terrible of all weapons to the forging of a human unity. Let us make of the release of atomic energy a positive force for peace rather than a thing to be fearfully used in continuing international rivalry. America and Britain stand ready to join with any other nations in building a peace machinery so strong and with such universal effective authority that to it may be given the exclusive control over atomic weapons and the exclusive right to possess them.

No halfway measures will suffice. Our choice is between good and evil, between right and wrong, between life and death. In the columns of the great Catholic magazine America which has so often asserted truths which others feared to state, we find in the issue for November 17 an article entitled "Control of Atomic Energy," written by Father John LaFarge. From it I take the following paragraph as setting forth the proposal of the author for the action which the United States and Britain ought to take in this hour of decision:

They would issue an invitation to the nations of the world to undertake the custody not only of the bomb but of all atomic energy, all developments, scientific, commercial, military, etc., while leaving complete liberty for independent scientific research. The will of the people would once and for all be expressed by a completely international agency representative of the peoples of the world, with no special interests, national, commercial, or otherwise. It would be open to all peace-loving peoples without exception. The foundation stone of this agency's policy would be not only the outlawing of the bomb as such, but outlawing of war, international war. Since war is declared an outlaw, it must suffer the penalties of an outlaw. The international agency would be equipped with the right to pursue offenders, to investigate violations, to inspect possible sources of danger, etc., and to punish violators of the peace, present or future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Alabama very much.

Mr. Speaker, only a man with faith in the purposes of God could advance such a proposal. But only such men and such proposals can possibly be adequate to the needs of our time. Unless national sovereignty is modified and subordinated to the law of peace, there can be no peace. Unless there is universal international control of armament there can be no safety from the atomic bomb. Unless military secrecy is abolished everywhere there will be ever-growing suspicion, fear, and distrust until at last the atomic war bursts upon us. We must choose now between total war and total peace. And the irreducible minimum of the requirements for peace is that all peoples everywhere shall from now on know what every other nation is or is not doing to prepare for war. For on such a foundation and on it alone can be built a firm structure of international disarmament agreements which can be enforced and kept. Without such agreements, indeed without an agreement that no nation in the future may possess any

atomic bombs at all, it will be but a few short years before many nations will be armed with atomic weapons. And the universal testimony of every witness, military as well as civilian and scientific, is that from that day forward every advantage will lie with the most ruthless aggressor, the most crafty users of the sneak attack. That means that the advantage cannot lie with our country. In such a situation peace will have become a psychological as well as a military impossibility. A few short years remain in which we can, if we will, prevent world disaster.

Ever since Christ lived and died upon His cross for the salvation of mankind, men and women have known in their hearts that the motive force which is more powerful than armies and navies—yes; more powerful than all the atomic bombs that ever will be manufactured—is the readiness of men and the readiness of nations to sacrifice something of themselves and their special interests for the common good. The sacrifice that is now called for is the sacrifice of a portion of national sovereignty—the common good is the peace of the world. By the employment of that motive force we must, and we can, secure justice and peace. Nothing less will be equal to our task. Someone will say "but such a policy has never succeeded." And on the international scale perhaps that is right. But if such a policy has never succeeded, the reason certainly is obvious. It has not succeeded because it has never been tried. The time to try it is now.

Humanity through the centuries has been waiting for some great nation to stand forth in the hour of its most profound crisis for a sincere attempt to be made to try that method. It is rooted in every fundamental religious principle that mankind has ever known and it will embody the moral progress which can match the scientific progress represented by the atomic bomb.

Here then in the central precept of the religion of humble folk we can find, if we will, that power which is stronger than the hates and prejudices and fears and suspicions of men in every nation. Stronger than anything known to man throughout all history. Mightier than the atomic bomb.

And even if in the pursuit of such a policy we should fall short and war should again visit the earth, our children would nonetheless be able to face that disaster with the courage and faith that comes only to those who strive earnestly to live by eternal principles. It is better to risk physical death in a bold attempt to build a new world of peace than to face the certainty of spiritual and moral death, as well as physical death in the rut of the tradition of the war system.

The one thing above all others with which we must equip succeeding generations is a simple all-absorbing principle by which they can live and, if necessary, die, without fear. That principle is the moral law of the universe: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think the subject of inflation is of tremendous importance, and I was wondering if the gentleman feels that it is inflation to grant people an increase in wages under proper circumstances.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It all depends upon whether the increase in wages leads to an unwarranted increase in the price of commodities, I think. Some wage increase only give the wage earner what his family needs for a decent American living standard and certainly it is not inflationary to prevent an actual decline in take-home pay.

Mr. PITTENGER. Does the gentleman think that an increase in price necessarily means inflation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that all depends upon whether the supply of the particular goods in question is adequate to meet the demands, so that we have a natural regulator as between demand and supply. In some instances it is no doubt true that an increase in price of certain commodities is called for. General price increases would mean that we were getting into an inflationary situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has spoken about the farmers producing food to feed the world. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that the people of the world are also naked for want of cotton goods?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly I do realize their very great need of clothing.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman also realize that the price of cotton is held down so far below the cost of production that the cotton farmer cannot make a living raising it? I went out this morning to buy these handkerchiefs and paid 35 cents apiece for them. It would take 30 or 40 of them to weigh a pound. The cotton in that whole pound of handkerchiefs did not bring the farmer 25 cents. That spread is so great that not only are the cotton farmers being punished unmercifully but the rest of the world is being denied the use of cotton goods.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is quite correct. I would say that in my judgment that unwarranted spread between what the farmer receives for his crop and what ultimately has to be paid by the consumer is the major point, perhaps, in the solution of the problem of getting justice for the American farmer. I believe that by means of cooperatives a great deal can be done in overcoming that problem.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman has delivered a very inspirational address, one which I hope all Members of the House who did not hear it will take occasion to read.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to my good friend the gentleman from Tenessee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem recently written by Horace C. Carlisle.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; to include in one a Government release, and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three separate instances and to include certain communications.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of December 18.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FINDS THE GOING TOUGH

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a clipping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture, who is a very fine gentleman, has been sent out by the Administration on a Nation-wide tour to whip farmers into line for the elections of 1946 and 1948. Good salesman, as he is, he is finding it impossible to sell to the conservative rural folks of the country the gold brick he is peddling.

The subsidies paid to agriculture, amounting to more than $2,000,000,000 a year, has failed to buy the farm vote, or even hold prices in line. It is true they have held prices in line in some cases, according to the score posted, but certainly they have failed to maintain quality or quantity of the goods purchased by the consumer.

These billions have simply added to our already staggering national debt, and have simply passed our grocery bill on to future generations. Little of the money has found its way to the producer. The packers, however, received an average of $30 for every thousand-pound steer slaughtered. And still meat remains scarce. The dairy industry received about $700,000,000 per year. Still butter is scarce and the production of milk has reached its lowest level.

This device of the theorists in Washington, intended to sell the farmers a brand of state socialism, has completely collapsed, and farmers resent the whole business.

These billions have come out of the money collected, and that is still to be collected, from the American taxpayer.

The subsidy program represents the tail end of the proverbial bear, and now come home to roost, and how they do haunt the New Deal. The subsidy program may have fooled the consumer for the time being, but it never has fooled the farmers of this country. They were handed to the farmer, he was given no choice. It was a case of take it, or else.

Now the Secretary of Agriculture, as he faces the conservative farm groups in various sections of the country, finds himself going around in circles as is evidenced by his statements yesterday before a farm group in Milwaukee.

I insert in the RECORD an Associated Press news comment from the Washington Post on Secretary Anderson's Milwaukee speech:

FARM HOSTILITY CALLED PUZZLE TO PRESIDENT

MILWAUKEE, December 19.—Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson told a gathering of Wisconsin Democrats today that President Truman could not understand why the farmers, whose economic status, Anderson said, had been improved so much under a Democratic administration, should be so bitterly critical of Democratic farm policies.

"I think it's about time for the farmers to stop and consider some of the things that have been done for them the last several years," said Anderson. "Our policies have been designed to give the farmers a fair share of the national income, and we believe the farmers have no reason to feel as they do."

"If the farmers go to hell, we can't have a stable economy," the Secretary stated. "We can't possibly build up a national income if one segment of society goes down in the dirt. We must protect the farmer, and I hope that all segments of society will start to grind and produce."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain letters, telegrams, and a newspaper article relative to the retirement of Mr. RAMSPECK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE PRICE OF CITRUS FRUITS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like again to direct the attention of the House to the serious problem presented by explosive rises in prices of citrus fruits during the holiday season, following upon the government's suspension of price control over this staple item of food.

The latest development came this week. On Monday Judge Caskie Collett, the Stabilization Administrator, announced publicly that he had vetoed a proposal of Administrator Chester Bowles of the Office of Price Administration to re-establish the price ceilings which had been lifted on November 19.

On Tuesday, the very next day, prices of both California and Florida oranges and grapefruit zoomed upward at the auctions where these products enter the market. On yesterday, Wednesday, December 19, according to the telegraphic reports to the Department of Agriculture, three out of the six classes of citrus product increased again in price, and all six of them remained far above the pre-November 19 prices and in all but one instance substantially above the ceilings which had been in operation.

In my opinion this is a serious situation, not only because a lot of family breadwinners are shopping for oranges for Christmas stockings for the kids in the family, but because of its implications upon the whole field of the cost of living during the next few months. What happened in this instance is that the OPA and the Department of Agriculture, faced with the largest citrus crops in history, underestimated the buying power and the inflationary pressures of the situation. The rapid price rise after November 19 quickly convinced Chester Bowles that the Government had a bad case of inflation on its hands. But the Agriculture Department and Judge Collet disagreed. Judge Collet on December 17 issued a statement refusing to reimpose controls, in the course of which he said:

The Secretary of Agriculture urges that the industry be given further opportunity voluntarily to bring its prices within proper limits before price control be reinstated.

Judge Collet also said that "during the next few days it will become clearly evident where the responsibility rests."

The action of prices on Tuesday and Wednesday obviously answers Judge Collet's question. The industry has not kept prices within limits. I personally cannot blame the industry, because I don't believe they have the power to control prices adequately in such a situation where demand is so heavy. I believe this is an emergency in which the Government should act quickly to restore reasonable prices.

Judge Collet's action here applies to a temporary situation which will be corrected by mid-January, through heavy deliveries to the markets and through the normal post-holiday relaxation of demand for oranges and grapefruit, or else through reimposition of the former ceilings under the terms of the November 19 suspension order. That order automatically expires on midnight of January 14, unless joint OPA-Department of Agriculture action is taken to continue suspension of price ceilings.

It is bad enough, of course, that people have to pay a few million dollars more for Christmas oranges and grapefruits. But beyond that, Judge Collet's action and policy in this instance has cast a shadow upon the whole cost of living. It is high time that Judge Collet and this Congress as well face the danger of inflation, and adopt a policy of holding prices to reasonable limits on the necessities of life. This is the way to make certain that our veterans come back to a house they can afford, and a grocery bill that they can pay.

The citrus fruit experiment in inflation shows that you cannot have a little inflation. Once it gets started, it goes up like a jet plane. Here are some Agriculture Department and OPA figures which illustrate my point:

California oranges during the pre-November 19 period when the new crop was being marketed sold for an average price of $4.42 a box. After the controls were suspended, they reached a top price of $6.34 on last Tuesday—98 cents a box above the OPA ceiling price, a 43-percent increase. I do not believe that a 43-percent inflation can be called safe or even sane. This item furthermore was one which increased on Wednesday to a new high of $6.48.

Florida interior oranges increased from $3.85 a box before November 19 to $4.58 on December 18—a 19-percent increase which took the price 2 cents above the ceiling.

Florida Indian River oranges went up from $4.26 a box at the auctions prior to November 19 to $5.17—a 21-percent increase—by last Tuesday, and last Tuesday's price was lower than a previous peak this product had reached in the interim period.

Texas grapefruit jumped from $2.93 to $3.45—an 18-percent increase which leaves it slightly under the old ceiling price.

Florida interior grapefruit jumped from $3.10 to $3.65 a box in the same period—another 18-percent increase which went above the ceiling.

Florida Indian River grapefruit went up from $3.78 to $5.07—a 34-percent increase which carried it 94 cents above the ceiling. And on yesterday the reports show it went up another 5 cents a box to $5.12.

I do not believe I need to labor the point that these increases at the marketing level move all along the line to the ultimate consumer. You can go out to the market today and find out. And article in the New York Post this week illustrates what I mean, and I will quote it briefly:

A wholesale distributor of fruits came to Boston Monday with 10 carloads of oranges. That's all, just 10 carloads. Naturally, the retailers rushed to bid on the fruit, for Boston has been suffering the same shortages that we have. The first 6 carloads went in a few minutes at a price exactly double the price of a few weeks ago. The next 4 carloads sold at 150-percent increase. The bidders were pretty bitter about it too. They said the ceilings should have been maintained until the supply was more normal. A little tale about oranges, and yet it tells what happens when price ceilings are removed from articles that are scarce and in heavy demand. And it gives the real answer to the vital question When should price control and the OPA end? * * * Production of homes—and of oranges and of men's shorts and of shoes—is the basic answer, of course, but until production catches up, price controls must remain. And if they don't, the orange situation will be just the sickening beginning of a terrible story.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How does the gentleman reconcile the evidence he presents here with the fact that you can go down here in sight of the Capitol and buy oranges now at the same price that you bought them last year?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am sure if there is such a place there are plenty of housewives in this area who would be glad to know about it. The testimony I have from my own wife and from her friends in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area, where we live, is that the price of oranges has gone up very much there.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. For the information of the gentleman, I will tell him that within the past week I stopped at the country market out here where oranges are piled up on the sidewalk by the truckload and I bought one of these half-bushel bags of oranges for exactly the same price I paid for them all last winter. I am not quarreling with price control, but that is the information that seems to cast some doubt on the in-

formation the gentleman is presenting to the House.

Mr. BIEMILLER. The fact remains that I am presenting official figures as to these increases that nobody can dispute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I dispute them, as far as Washington is concerned, because I know.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Is it not true that the orange and the grapefruit crops this year have been greater than they have been in many years, and that therefore there seems to be little excuse for this tremendous jump in price?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin are correct. The reason the OPA originally dropped their price ceilings was because they felt that with the bumper crop there was every reason to believe that if controls were dropped there would be no increase. Yet the testimony keeps coming in—and I have much more here—which shows that in practically every area in the United States there was a tremendous increase in citrus prices following the lifting of price control by OPA. Then there was a gradual tapering down and prices were getting back to around the ceiling price set by OPA, but not back to the below-ceiling price at which the fruit had been selling. But immediately after Judge Collett's statement on Monday that he would not reimpose the ceilings, again the prices zoomed upward. That is the point I wanted to bring to the attention of the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. So far as I can learn from the people in New England the situation in my country is this: We are paying a prohibitive price for oranges that are so small that they cannot even be called oranges, as against the price we paid before OPA undertook to regulate prices. My folks do not like it. They are paying for these oranges which are advertised all over the country to be sold at so much a bushel, and they are not much bigger than these little lemons that they used to send up.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to intrude upon my colleague's time to ask my colleague from Vermont if he is not confining his discussion of size to some foreign country?

Mr. PLUMLEY. No. I am going to Florida rather than California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that if he would keep the frost down we would have no shrinkage in the fruit.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask my colleague from Wisconsin if he is not really more interested in this proposition as an indication of the shadow of things to come than he is of trying to say anything or do anything against the orange or the other citrus fruit growers of this country; that this is an example of things that must be watched very carefully or the people with the lower incomes will find themselves a little hungry one of these days if we have so many horses going in so many different directions.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his contribution; he is precisely correct. The point that is bothering me is this: Here is an indication of what can happen from premature lifting of price controls so that people in the low-income groups will find it impossible to get the products they need.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that people with incomes of $25 to $35 a week pay a very large percentage of their income for something to eat?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Precisely.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. With people getting $5,000, $10,000, and $15,000 a year, it does not make so much difference what they pay for it, but the great bulk, the average-income people, are liable to find themselves in a rather serious situation if this thing is not kept somewhere within the line of common sense.

Mr. BIEMILLER. They are already finding themselves in that situation in some instances, and I am most desirous that we in the Congress do everything possible to keep prices at a reasonable level so that persons with small incomes will not be adversely affected by a rise in prices on the basic items of our diet.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution extending the time for the submission of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

CONTINUANCE OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, which is on the Speaker's table.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 45), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTHEW MATTAS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment, insert "$8,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1031) for the relief of Matthew Mattas, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of $12,500 to Matthew Mattas for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck at Amsterdam Avenue and West One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Street, New York City, N. Y., on January 28, 1943. The Senate reduced the sum to $7,924.

At the conference a compromise of $8,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUFUS A. HANCOCK

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House to be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
HOMER A. RAMEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on an amendment by the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2578) for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as recommended by the House Claims Committee appropriated the sum of $2,500. However, this was reduced to $1,000 on the floor of the House. The Senate restored the sum of $2,500 for the personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained by Mr. Hancock as the result of an accident which occurred on July 1, 1941, when the car in which he was driving collided with a United States Army motorcycle on the Baltimore-Washington Boulevard in Howard County, Md.

At the conference the sum of $2,500 was agreed upon as being a reasonable allowance for Mr. Hancock's injuries and expenses incident thereto.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
J. M. COMBS,
HOMER A. RAMEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. G. STIGLER,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (S. 90) for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the Senate appropriated the sum of $7,882.97 to the estate of George O'Hara, who was killed as the result of a collision with a United States Army truck between Manito and Forest City, Ill., on December 6, 1943.

The House reduced the amount to $5,382.97 and at the conference the original sum as passed by the Senate of $7,882.97 was agreed upon.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. G. STIGLER,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT CANTALUPO

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Albert Cantalupo, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCGEHEE, KEOGH, and CHENOWETH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order to address the House this afternoon, but in lieu of taking that time, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am fully conscious of the fact that all of us have a great many plans for the time we shall spend at home during the Christmas recess. I am far from being one who likes to make recommendations, but I do want to make a sincere suggestion. It pertains to a problem which is of great concern to every one of us.

Yesterday we approved legislation which is intended to take some of the kinks out of the GI bill of rights. It is right that we should do this because the veterans are our major concern at the moment.

In addition to enacting legislation of this kind, however, there is a pressing problem which needs close attention. That is the disposal of surplus property in such a manner that veterans will actually receive the preference which this Congress declared should be theirs.

I respectfully suggest, therefore, that during the recess we canvass the situation back home and see if we cannot obtain sufficient facts to enable us to take care of the situation properly when Congress reconvenes.

I am particularly concerned with the items of surplus property which are now lying around in Army and Navy camps—and which have not yet been declared surplus and turned over to RFC for disposal. There have been a few ugly rumors about the handling of this property. In some instances we have heard reports that some property has been willfully damaged so that its destruction could be ordered. In some of these cases the property reportedly destroyed could be put to excellent use by discharged veterans.

It is my intention, while I am in Rhode Island, to visit the military establishments in my district in order to obtain a first-hand report on the situation. I urge you to do likewise, insofar as that is possible.

I am grateful for the hard work which has been done by Mr. Symington of the Surplus Property Office here in Washington. The plan which he has but recently announced demonstrates that he is familiar with the problem and is trying hard to bring about an equitable distribution of all surplus property to veterans who desire to avail themselves of their preference in surplus sales.

I desire to express my wholehearted approval of Mr. Symington's recommendation that a veteran be given the right to buy Government surplus property for his own personal use and that the veteran have priority over all claimants except the Federal Government.

If that recommendation were adopted more of our present difficulties in this matter would be eliminated.

The gentleman from Texas, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, has introduced legislation which would make this recommendation effective. I sincerely suggest that we make this bill must legislation early in the next session of this Congress.

I wish to make one other suggestion for your consideration. During the discussion on amending the GI bill of rights a great deal was said about a possible bonus for the veterans of World War II. Members of the House have actually introduced legislation to provide payment of a bonus to these veterans. I do not believe any of us would voice objection to such a bonus. We would feel compelled to support such a proposal either through genuine desire to acknowledge appreciation for the valiant services of America's heroes—or through fear of the political consequences of our failure to do so.

Whatever be our individual thoughts on the matter of bonuses for veterans we have to bear in mind that the bill must be paid in some manner. With the great numbers in our armed forces through the late war, we know the bill will be a gigantic one.

I propose therefore that in considering a bonus we endeavor as far as we possibly can to find means for paying the bonus out of funds other than the General Treasury.

With this thought in mind I intend to propose, after Congress reconvenes, that we enact legislation which will provide a decent bonus for all honorably discharged servicemen. I shall propose that the amount of the bonus in each case shall be determined by the length of time in the service, special consideration to be given to the time actually spent overseas. I think this latter stipulation is only fair and proper. There are many high-point men still in Europe awaiting

transportation to the States. These men cannot be home for Christmas. In any bonus plan, they should receive special consideration.

I shall further propose that the money to be appropriated for the payment of these bonuses shall be raised through a national lottery, based on the formula proposed in the legislation sponsored by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Mr. BLOOM.

Gentlemen, I am most sincere in making this suggestion to you. During the short recess we shall enjoy, it will be possible for most of us to obtain the reaction of our constituencies to such a proposal. I believe the plan is eminently fair. I believe it could be enacted without too much delay. We could thus clear the deck of the bonus problem without forcing the veterans of World War II to undergo the delay which their fathers experienced.

MEXIA COLONY PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1471) to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object other than to say that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] asked, when this bill was before the Committee on Agriculture, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] would include in his report the names of the men from whom the land was purchased originally. Is our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas in a position to furnish that information?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am prepared to give that information.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this land was acquired in the thrilling days of Tugwell and it cost $75 an acre. Now it is not worth $10 an acre. It seems to me that the Committee on Agriculture or at least a majority of them feel that we should pass it on to the great State of Texas in the hope that they will pay some taxes on it.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want the names of these individuals in the RECORD?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would ask the gentleman to do that on behalf of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The sellers of the property are B. H. Broyles, Mrs. Louise Broyles, Mr. B. S. Smith, and J. Sanford Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, convey, grant, and quitclaim unto Texas Rural Communities, for subsequent use by or transfer to the State of Texas acting by and through the State Board of Control, for the benefit and rehabilitation of convalescent or handicapped residents of the States of Texas, all right, title, claim, interest, equity, and estate in and to the real and personal property comprising the Mexia Colony project of Farm Security Administration, Limestone County, Tex., presently administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as trustee under an agreement of transfer, dated October 31, 1939, with Texas Rural Communities.

SEC. 2. Such transfer by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be subject to any legal rights existing by virtue of any lease or other agreement by the Secretary, his successors or representatives, as such trustee.

SEC. 3. Any such transfer shall not be deemed to impose any liability upon the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to his obligations under such agreement of transfer of October 31, 1939.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress will adjourn within a few hours. When it reconvenes for its second session shortly after the first of the year, I will have ready and will introduce a new income-tax bill.

The purpose of my bill will be to bring an entirely fresh concept of Federal income taxation before the Congress and the country. Its aim will be to place our revenue program upon a basis of a peacetime economy.

Our taxing program of today is based upon a war-emergency background. The senior Members of the House will remember the days of 1913 and 1914, when revenue-gathering seemed rather simple and taxation was not a burden either on individuals or on business enterprise.

When we entered World War I, emergency revenues were needed. Legislation was quickly prepared and enacted. From that date to the present moment we have developed a taxation program of successive revisions and amendments—one after another, resulting in what I think everyone agrees is a confused and unbalanced tax structure.

It is my considered opinion that our country needs a reformation of the Federal tax system. We must stop writing amendments on top of amendments. Our people back home do not want any more revisions of revisions. They do not want more patchwork. They want a single and sensible tax program, a program they can understand. They will applaud a Congress that enacts a tax law that is just and equitable.

One of the greatest needs today throughout our country is to allow every individual and every corporation to have more spendable income—more income free from tax. More spendable income means more money available for investment, and improvement, and for betterment of our national standard of living.

Manpower and machinery alone do not make for economic prosperity. Millions of our income taxpayers must be substantially relieved of their income-tax burden. I speak particularly of those whose incomes are close to or below the $3,000 a year figure.

In this period of labor unrest, one of the basic reasons why such strong demands for wage increases have been made by labor is the heavy burden of income taxes. Income taxes are part of the cost of living. In war years our income taxation was bearable to some degree. The high level of take-home pay made it so. Now the withholding of such a large percentage of earnings for income tax is a vital contributing factor to the current appeals by labor for wage increases for take-home pay which will allow men and women to have more spendable income.

We all look forward to 1946 as a year when we shall again have available to us those goods from our factories which make life more comfortable, a little less arduous. We look forward to having washing machines and automobiles, new heating plants for our homes, new clothes to wear, and many other items.

Is there any chance of obtaining the mass market needed for a high level of economic prosperity if millions of our taxpayers do not have enough spendable income to buy these goods?

In the bill I shall introduce, personal exemptions for single persons will be raised from $500 to $1,250. I am also advocating that the exemption for married couples be increased from $1,000 to $2,500.

This raising of exemptions will reduce the number of income taxpayers from 36,000,000 to around 18,000,000.

Some will say that such a reduction in the number of Federal income taxpayers is impractical, is not equitable, and places an unfair burden on those remaining on the tax rolls.

May I dwell for a moment on the result as I see it?

By raising the exemptions we shall automatically provide more spendable income for the goods required to maintain a reasonably high standard of living. It gives incentive to save, also, and among other things this should result in a wider market than ever before for new and modernized homes. It gives incentive to the individual to forge ahead. With this incentive, there is every reason to hope that a high percentage of those thus removed from the tax rolls will better their position in life and within a few years will come back to the tax rolls to pay their share, at a time when they are financially able to do so.

To those who would say that every citizen should support the operation of the Federal Government and that none should be exempt from paying income tax, my answer is: Through sales, excise and other taxes, all the citizens of our country contribute most substantially to the total revenue of our Government. Those in the lower earning brackets will continue to support the Government through these taxes. They should not

be asked to bear, in addition, a heavy burden of taxation on their income altogether out of proportion to their financial ability.

My bill proposes the continuance of the $500 exemption for each dependent.

With respect to corporations, it proposes to set up a $2,500 annual exemption from income tax. Deductions for charitable contributions, interest payments, taxes, as well as all other allowable deductions, will be continued. I am proposing that individuals and corporations be taxed upon a graduated scale, starting at 25 percent of the first $5,000 of net taxable income and extending upward to a taxation of 50 percent on all net taxable income in excess of the initial $25,000.

With the exception of the differences in exemptions which would be allowed single persons, married couples with dependents, the income tax paid by either individuals or corporations on the same amount of net taxable income would therefore be identical.

Can anyone say with any accuracy that there is a good, sound, equitable reason why the teacher, lawyer, merchant or farmer should have his income taxed at one rate and the business enterprise, known as a corporation, be taxed on an entirely different basis? Since income tax is necessary to our Government's operation, let us have a tax on income. If an individual has a net taxable income of $4,000 he should pay relatively the same tax as the small machine shop down the street that has a net taxable corporate income of $4,000. Income is income; so let us tax income and not apply a tax on individuals with the right hand and a tax on corporations with the left hand.

In addition, I shall propose that dividend income be exempt from taxation to the stockholder. The double tax of dividends should be eliminated, for it is not only unfair but uneconomic; it discourages venture capital in the form of stock issues, and puts a premium on corporate debt. The elimination of this unjust double taxation of dividends will in itself provide incentive and encouragement, so that there will be greater interest in investments, particularly in the new and risk-taking opportunities which must be provided as we complete reconversion and enter a period of peacetime effort.

Some of you may have sensed that the bill I shall introduce incorporates the proposal for a postwar income-tax program suggested almost a year ago by Frank Wilbur Main, of Pittsburgh. If it is adopted, my bill will enact into law the incentive income-tax plan conceived by Mr. Main. He is a constituent of mine and is one of Pittsburgh's outstanding citizens. Mr. Main is a certified public accountant and directs a Nation-wide auditing and accounting organization. His abilities have been recognized by his profession, which has honored him with many important duties, including the presidency of the American Society of Certified Public Accountants.

My bill will produce sufficient revenue for a balanced Federal budget, including the vital consideration of meeting our obligations to our veterans, plus allowing an orderly retirement of our indebtedness.

The peacetime Federal budget will probably be at least $25,000,000,000. With a budget at that figure, in order to have a vigorous and dynamic national economy, we must maintain in this country a national income of approximately $160,000,000,000. Even the briefest review of our country's economic life reveals that such assumption is based on recorded history. Any smaller sum of national income would put an unbearable strain on the economic life of our country, and it would encourage the very thing we desire to gradually eliminate as quickly as we can—deficit financing.

The bill I shall introduce, being geared to a peacetime economy, will increase spendable income, encourage investment of capital, stimulate employment, and so make possible a national income of approximately $160,000,000,000.

Each day, more and more war veterans are returning to take up civilian life. A generous proportion have already indicated their faith in our future by going into business for themselves. Hundreds of thousands of others have expressed the desire to own their own businesses. We must give these veterans the utmost in encouragement and incentive. We can do this by asking them to pay an income tax that is within their capacity to pay and still allow them to retain sufficient funds to conduct their enterprises, raise their families and contribute to the highest degree possible to a mass market for the products of industry.

The farmer, too, needs the opportunity to expand his acreage and increase his crops and herds. As the farmer prospers he is increasingly able to pay a higher income tax. Under my bill he will be given the opportunity of paying an equitable tax geared to his financial ability.

Today, the United States has the greatest productive capacity in its history. Purchasing power of a widely diffused nature has been developed. Human wants are practically without limit. Confidence—individual confidence, corporate confidence, and national confidence—is the ingredient that needs to be added.

How is that confidence to be created? In my judgment, the bill I shall introduce opens a pathway to the restoration of confidence. For if individuals and industry can be given an incentive—if they realize that encouragement is being offered—they will soon gain the confidence needed to guide them through this transition period into an era of peaceful prosperity.

I am convinced that the Incentive Income Tax Act of 1946, as proposed, will offer the incentive and the encouragement to individuals and to industry, and it will do more than any other single thing the Congress can do to create that feeling of confidence in our future which is so urgently desired by all our people today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. FORAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an address by the Judge Advocate General of the War Department and in the other an address by the Judge Advocate of the Navy Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the Galveston News.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two broadcasts to be made by him at a future date.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon by Rev. Paul Little, chaplain of the American Legion of California.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on today at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GIVING AWAY AMERICA

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there are those in the Government who have tried to give away nearly everything, except the Capitol dome, and I would not be surprised when it is missing.

Now, they want to give away our natural resources, they want to give away the fish and fishing industry in the Great Lakes, they want to give it away under the guise of protection, they want to give the control of the Great Lakes fish and the fishing industry to a foreign power.

The waters of the Great Lakes, the lands thereunder, and wildlife therein, belong to the adjoining States, up to the international boundary line of Canada.

At the present moment the Department of State, representing the President of the United States, is negotiating now to give control of these State waters to a foreign country.

The Department of State is carrying on secret meetings with England, for Canada, to give control and regulate the fish and marine food industry now in these State waters.

This would take from the people of the Great Lakes States and the United States the control of our fishing and fishing industry and put it under the control and power of England.

Three Canadians in a commission would have vote and voice in the control and regulation of each of the Great Lakes, even though nearly 80 percent of the fish resources and fish-food production of the Great Lakes is produced by Americans in the waters of the various Great Lakes States, and not British waters.

In addition, England would vote as to the boundaries between our own Great Lakes. This control of our own domestic State waters would not only cover the Great Lakes themselves but also the connecting waters, bays, and component parts of each of the Great Lakes; and

also Lake Michigan, lying solely within the United States, would be affected.

The foregoing matters are secretly carried on and are to be signed for America by the President of the United States, and by England by his Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President should stop in his effort to give away America. I have introduced the following bill to end the efforts to give away America and the vested rights of the people of the various States:

A bill to order the Department of State to cease its efforts to give control of the fisheries in the Great Lakes to a foreign country

Whereas the waters of the Great Lakes are owned by the contiguous States of the United States;

Whereas the fishes, fish, and marine food in the Great Lakes are owned by the various States and held in trust for the people of such States;

Whereas the Department of State is carrying on in secret negotiations with England for Canada to take from the individual States of the United States their ownership, proprietorship, regulation, and control of the Great Lakes;

Whereas the Department of State is negotiating to give the State control and regulation of all of the Great Lakes to an international commission;

Whereas the waters of the Great Lakes are State owned and not international:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Department of State and the President cease negotiations, activities, and attempts to give away the rights of the people in the fish, marine food, and fishing industry of the Great Lakes by the way of agreement, treaty, or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the address I made before the House concerning the international regulation of the fish and fishing industry on the Great Lakes, I am including a copy of a proposed treaty to be signed by the United States and by England for Canada:

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONVENTION

(Material deleted from May draft shown in black brackets; material added to May draft shown in italics; changes in capitalization, punctuation, and paragraphing not indicated)

[Preamble]

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada.

Recognizing that the fish of the Great Lakes and their connecting waters constitute an important source of food supply and a natural resource of great economic importance to the United States *of America* and Canada, that fishing operations and other factors in the waters within the jurisdiction of one country may adversely affect the supply in the waters within the jurisdiction of the other, that some species of fish in the Great Lakes have declined and that further declines are probable unless adequate provision is made for the development, protection, and conservation of the Great Lakes fisheries and for the maintenance of conditions which will permit the maximum yield, and that the conservation and effective management of these fisheries require cooperation between and joint action by the governmental agencies of both countries concerned with the administration of *these* [their] fisheries,

Have resolved to conclude a convention for this purpose and have appointed as their respective plenipotentiaries,

The President of the United States of America:

His Majesty the King of Great Brtain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada:

who, [after] having communicated to each other their *respective* full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed [upon the following Articles:] *as follows:*

ARTICLE I

It is agreed that the provisions of this Convention shall apply to *the following, herein referred to as the Great Lakes:* [1] Lake Ontario, [2] Lake Erie, [3] Lake St. Clair, [4] Lake Huron, [5] Lake Michigan, [and (6)] Lake Superior, [to] the connecting waters, bays, and component parts of each of these lakes, *and the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude.*

ARTICLE II

1. The High Contracting Parties agree to establish and maintain a joint commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be known as the International Commission for the Great Lakes Fisheries and to be composed of two National Sections, a United States Section and a Canadian Section.

2. Each High Contracting Party may also appoint an advisory committee for each lake consisting of representatives designated by each State or province, as the case may be, having jurisdiction on the lake.

3. The [salaries and] expenses of each section and of each advisory committee shall be determined and paid by their respective governments: *Provided*, That joint expenses incurred for administration or research or for other purposes shall be paid by the two High Contracting Parties in equal shares.

4. [The constitution of] The Commission, the National Sections, and the advisory committees shall be [based upon] *constituted in accordance with and shall be governed by* the provisions of *the* Schedule ("A") *annexed* [attached] to [and made a part of] this Convention. [The Commission, the national sections and the advisory committee shall be governed by the provisions of Schedule "A".]

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall formulate and recommend specific research programs, which may be undertaken by the appropriate agencies of the two governments in collaboration with the states of the United States of America concerned and the Province of Ontario, as well as such other institutions and facilities as the Commission deems advisable, for observations and studies of the Great Lakes fisheries, to guide it in exercising its functions provided for in Article IV of this Convention. Such programs may include the collection and analysis of statistical information to reveal the current conditions and trends of the fishery resources, studies and appraisal of methods for increasing the abundance of fish by artificial propagation and other means, and studies of any factors that may affect the fisheries of the Great Lakes, including silting and pollution. The Commission shall take such further steps as it considers practicable to coordinate and develop research which it may deem of value in connection with the Great Lakes fisheries.

2. The High Contracting Parties agree that, within one year from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Convention, [the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada] *each of them* will undertake such observations and studies, recommended by the Commission for joint or concurrent action, as [are] *they* consider [led by the High Contracting Parties] necessary [to] *for* the effective guidance of the Commission in the exercise of its functions.

3. It is understood that nothing contained in this Convention or in the laws and regulations of the High Contracting Parties or of [the] *any* state[s] or of the Province of Ontario shall prohibit the Commission from conducting or authorizing fishing operations and biological experiments at any time for purposes of scientific investigation.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commisison shall undertake to develop a comprehensive plan for the effective management of the fishery resources of the Great Lakes [and their connecting waters as specified in Article I] for the purpose of securing the maximum use of these resources [which is] consistent with their perpetuation.

2. The Commission may [determine and fix by] *make* regulations *fixing:*

(*a*) [the] open and closed seasons;

(*b*) open and closed waters;

(*c*) *the* size limits for each species of fish;

(*d*) the time, methods and intensity of fishing;

(*e*) the type and specifications of the nets, gear, apparatus and appliances which may be used;

(*f*) the methods of measurement;

(*g*) the extent and nature of stocking operations;

(*h*) the introduction of new species; and

(*i*) catch returns and other statistical records as may be necessary to give effect to the purposes of this Convention.

[Such] Regulations *made under this section* shall be uniform for each lake or equivalent in their effectiveness in the waters of each country as determined by the Commission. [For these purposes] The Commission may from time to time [issue] *make such* regulations for each lake separately and may establish zones within a lake and [issue] *make* regulations for the various zones of that lake in accordance with differences in conditions [All] Regulations [shall be adopted] for a lake or for a zone within a lake *shall be made* with due regard to the necessary interdependence of such regulations with the regulations [adopted] for other waters of the Great Lakes

3. The Commission may make recommendations to the appropriate federal, state, provincial and local authorities regarding measures for dealing with such other factors affecting the Great Lakes fisheries, including silting and pollution, as are not included under section 2 of this Article.

4. The United States Section alone shall exercise all powers and functions of the Commission in matters relating to Lake Michigan having due regard to the necessary interdependence of regulations [on] for that lake with those [adopted] for the other lakes. The Commission shall *likewise*, with respect *to the other lakes, have due regard to the* [Lake Michigan, take cognizance of] regulations *for* and *the* conditions of *Lake Michigan*. [that lake for the purpose of taking account of the necessary interdependence of regulations adopted for the other lakes.]

5. Regulations [recommended] *made* by the Commission for United States waters, and by the United States Section for Lake Michigan, shall not become effective until approved by the President of the United States of America.

6. Regulations [recommended] *made* by the Commission [with respect to] *for* Canadian waters shall not become effective until approved by the Governor General in Council.

ARTICLE V

1. The High Contracting Parties agree to provide for the enforcement, whether directly or through state and provincial governments or by both means, within their respective waters of the regulations [issued] *made and approved* under this Convention.

2. It is understood that in United States waters the regulations for each lake may be enforced in the first instance by the enforcement agencies of the states bordering thereon within their respective jurisdictions and in

Canadian waters by the appropriate enforcement agencies [of] *in* the Province of Ontario.

3. The Commission shall keep *itself* informed as to the effectiveness of enforcement, shall report to the High Contracting Parties with respect to any charges, allegations or conditions of unsatisfactory enforcement of which it is aware, and may recommend to the High Contracting Parties measures for the improvement of enforcement. Except as to Lake Michigan, upon the complaint of either National Section with respect to enforcement in any area of the waters of the other country the government of that country will take appropriate action to enforce the regulations [adopted] for that area and will continue such action as long as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE VI

Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing either of the High Contracting Parties, subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, or the Province of Ontario or any of the states of the United States of America bordering on the Great Lakes from making or enforcing *such* laws or regulations within their respective jurisdictions [which] *as* will give further protection to the fisheries of the Great Lakes [Provided, That such laws or regulations] *and as* are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention or with the regulations [issued] *made and approved* thereunder.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties agree to provide, subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, for the prohibition of the shipment, transport, purchase, sale import or export of fish taken from the Great Lakes in violation of the regulations [issued] *made and approved* under [the authority of] this Convention.

ARTICLE VIII

The High Contracting Parties agree that, [subject to the regulations issued under the authority of this Convention, and] subject to their respective constitutional arrangements, licenses to fish in the waters *of the Great Lakes within the jurisdiction* of any state or province [within the purview of this Convention] may continue to be issued by such state or province in accordance with its laws and subject to such fees as it may fix, [Provided, That] if such licenses and licensing are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention or with the regulations [issued] *made and approved* thereunder. [And *Provided* Further, That] Where [such] licensing of fishing activities is necessary to give effect to the regulations [issued] *made and approved* under [the authority of] this Convention, [if] *and* any state or province fails to establish *or maintain* licensing adequate for the successful control or management of any such fishing activity, the High Contracting Party having jurisdiction will take such measures as may be necessary to [maintain] *provide* the needed licensing in the area of its waters affected.

ARTICLE IX

The High Contracting Parties agree to provide for the enactment and enforcement of such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Convention and the regulations [adopted by the Commission under the authority thereof,] *made and approved thereunder,* with appropriate penalties for violations.

ARTICLE X

The present Convention shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and by His Majesty in accordance with the constitutional practice, and it shall *come into force* [become effective up] on the date of the exchange of ratifications, which shall take place at ———. The Convention shall continue in force for a period of ten years and thereafter until one year from the day on which either of the High Contracting Parties shall give notice to the other High Contracting Party of an intention of terminating the Convention.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and have affixed their seals thereto.

[SEAL] ———————

[SEAL] ———————

SCHEDULE ("A")

Special provisions relating to the (joint) commission, the national sections and the advisory committees

1. The United States Section shall be composed of three members, one a representative of the fishery agency of the Government of the United States of America, the second a person chosen by the President of the United States of America from a list of two or more persons named by the states having jurisdiction on the Great Lakes, and the third a person duly qualified to represent the public at large by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

2. The Canadian Section shall be composed of three members, one a representative of the public services of Canada, the second a representative of the public services of the Province of Ontario, and the third a person [not otherwise connected with the public services of Canada or Ontario but] duly qualified to represent the public at large by reason of knowledge of the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

3. (*a*) Each High Contracting Party may fix the terms of service of its members of the Commission and of the members of any advisory committees established by it pursuant to Article II *of the Convention.*

(*b*) Each High Contracting Party may fix the composition of the membership of any such advisory committee established by it, in order to give adequate representation to state or provincial conservation and fishery agencies, commercial fisherman, sports fishermen, and the public at large; but the members of such advisory committee shall be designated by the states or province having jurisdiction on the lake concerned.

4. (*a*) At the first meeting of the Commission and at every second subsequent annual meeting thereafter the members shall select from *among* themselves a Chairman and a Secretary both of whom shall hold office for two years. The Chairman shall be selected from one National Section and the Secretary from the other National Section. [*Provided that*] The offices of Chairman and Secretary shall alternate biennially between the National Sections.

(*b*) In the event that the Chairman or the Secretary is not present at a meeting of the Commission the other members may appoint one of their number to act in his stead. In case the Chairman or the Secretary ceases to be a member of the Commission, the Commission shall select from the members of the same National Section a new Chairman or Secretary to [assume] *hold* office for the unexpired term.

(*c*) The Commission shall adopt suitable by-laws or provisions for the conduct of its meetings and for the exercise of the functions and duties vested in it by [this] *the* Convention and may employ necessary personnel for the discharge of its functions.

5. [The] Each member[s] of the Commission shall [each] have one vote and the Commission shall determine for each lake other than Lake Michigan by majority vote of the entire Commission the fishing regulations and other decisions with respect to such lake. With respect to Lake Michigan, each member of the United States Section shall have one vote and decisions shall be by majority vote.

6. Any advisory committee which, pursuant to Article II *of the Convention,* may be appointed by each Government for a particular lake, shall be invited to all non-executive meetings of the Commission or its respective National Sections at which matters concerning that lake are to be considered, and shall, except in case of emergency, be given full opportunity to examine and to be heard on all proposed fishing regulations and other decisions relating to that lake. Emergency regulations and decisions taken without opportunity for examination and recommendation by the pertinent advisory committee or committees shall not be operative for more than one year and may not be renewed without full opportunity for examination and recommendation by the advisory committee or committees.

7. For the purpose of considering and adopting regulations regarding [(the)] fishing in the *Great* Lakes, the Commission, or in the case of Lake Michigan the United States Section alone, shall meet at least [(once)] *twice* a year *and one of these meetings shall be designated by the Chairman and Secretary as the annual meeting.* The Date and place of the annual meeting and of such other meetings as may be necessary at any time shall be agreed upon by the Chairman and *the* Secretary except that only the representative of the United States of America holding the office of *the* Chairman [(or)] *and the* Secretary shall call [(such)] meetings *of the United States Section* for Lake Michigan.

8. Prior to any meeting at which regulations for any [(lake)] *of the Great Lakes* are to be voted upon, a hearing or hearings shall be held by the Commission, or in the case of Lake Michigan by the United States Section, at a place or places [(adjacent to)] *near* that lake which shall be open to fishermen and other persons in either country interested in [(its)] *the* problems *of that lake*: Provided that in the event of emergency circumstances meetings may be held without [(preceding)] *such* hearings. Nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent either National Section from holding hearings within its own country at its discretion.

9. The Commission shall publish biennially, or more frequently as it judges desirable, reports of its activities and recommendations, as well as such publications as it may see fit of a scientific nature or other public information, and may also arrange to publish the results of the research of collaborating and associated agencies.

10. Regulations [(adopted by the Commission)] *made and approved* under Article IV of the Convention shall not become effective until one year from the date when the Convention comes into force.

11. For purposes of the application of [(this)] *the* Convention and regulations [(issued)] *made and approved* thereunder, the Commission may determine the boundaries between the lakes, and between the waters specified in Article I *of the Convention* and waters flowing into or from such waters, *and may also determine the lake or lakes of which the connecting waters or any part thereof and the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude shall be treated as forming a part.*

12. The provisions of this Schedule may be revised and amended from time to time by the Commission: Provided that:

(*a*) any revision(*s*) or amendment [(s which are)] inconsistent with [(any of its)] *the* provisions *of this Schedule* must be confirmed by *an* exchange or noted between the High Contracting Parties; and

(*b*) [(provided also that)] no revision or amendment [(may be)] inconsistent with the Convention, [(and *provided further,* in view of the diverse interests of the several states of the United States bordering on the Great Lakes, that no revision or amendment thus adopted shall diminish)] *or which diminishes* the extent of effectiveness of state *or provincial* participation and representation of state *or provincial* interests now provided under paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8 of this Schedule, *may be made by the Commission.*

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman appreciates, of course, that if this treaty goes into effect it will be an absolute grab of State rights, because all of our fishing on the Great Lakes has always been controlled by State laws. As I understand it it is proposed in this treaty that Canada and the United States will lay down the laws relating to fishing on the Great Lakes, and then turn around and tell the State authorities to control and enforce those laws; is that not correct?

Mr. WEICHEL. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I know that the gentleman is a very valuable member of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I assure him that I will join with him in requesting the chairman of that committee to call a hearing of that subcommittee immediately after the House reconvenes, and as far as I am personally concerned, I intend to buck that treaty with every ounce of breath I have in my body.

Mr. WEICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. How does the International Boundary Commission and the Canadian-American Fish Commission operate in connection with the new proposal? Do we not make appropriations here every year for that Commission?

Mr. WEICHEL. We make appropriations, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. And the gentleman has voted for those appropriations when they were brought up. We have discussed the activities of this Fishery Commission——

Mr. WEICHEL. Not this one. This is something new.

Mr. STEFAN. And then we will be bringing in a bill again very soon appropriating money for this Fishery Commission, of which we are members.

Mr. WEICHEL. This is something entirely new where they propose a treaty with England, on behalf of Canada, to have three Canadians and three Americans control and regulate the fishing on the Great Lakes. This is something entirely new.

Mr. STEFAN. Do we not also have that same situation regarding the Alaska fisheries relating to salmon and halibut? We have equal representation on both sides; three and three.

Mr. WEICHEL. But these are the State waters of Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Minnesota. These are State waters.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly we do not want Canada or Great Britain to interfere with States' rights.

Mr. WEICHEL. That is what this treaty proposes to do.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as the gentleman has pointed out, under this proposed treaty it will give Canada virtual control over the fisheries in Lake Michigan which are entirely within the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, that is unconstitutional. They cannot do that. Why pass a treaty like this?

Mr. WEICHEL. Well, that is what they are doing. They are ready to sign it.

Mr. STEFAN. We are opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. As now proposed, I will say to the gentleman, there is not one single commercial fisherman that knows anything about the aspects of commercial fishing on that Commission. They are all scientists.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think that is right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Neither do I.

INDUCEMENTS TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES TO MAKE A CAREER OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1438) to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON. This bill is presented to the House from the Committee on Naval Affairs by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. I will respectfully request the gentleman from California to answer what questions the House may desire to propound to him with reference to it.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, this bill might be called the enlisted men's bill of rights. We had it apply, of course, only to the Navy at first, but an amendment will be offered to take care of the enlisted men of all the armed services. It in effect offers a career to the enlisted men. After serving 20 years they become eligible to be placed in the Fleet Reserve for 10 more years. At the end of the 30 years they are totally retired on a pay of 75 percent of their base pay plus longevity.

At the end of the first 20 years these men are transferred to the Fleet Reserve on the basis of 2½ percent per year of their base pay plus longevity, and that gives them a very fine retainer. It is something for them to shoot at. It will make for permanency and a career for the enlisted men. I think it will prove to be perhaps the most effective measure we can pass to make the Navy sure of the 500,000 men we need in the postwar Navy.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, I do this to give notice that it is my intention to offer an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to persons to whom the provisions of section 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) now apply, the provisions of that section shall also apply to men who have been transferred to the Fleet Reserve subsequent to June 30, 1945, and to men who enlisted or enlist in the Regular Navy after July 1, 1925, and prior to a date 121 days after the date of approval of this act, and to men who, having been discharged from the Regular Navy after July 1, 1925, and prior to a date 121 days after the date of approval of this act, reenlisted or reenlist in the Regular Navy within 3 months from the date of their discharge.

(b) Section 203 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) is hereby further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding thereto the following proviso: *"And provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1179) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Men serving in the Regular Navy on June 25, 1938, who first enlisted in the Navy after July 1, 1925, or who reenlisted therein after July 1, 1925, having been out of the Regular Navy for more than 3 months, and men who first enlisted in the Regular Navy after June 25, 1938, may upon their own request be transferred to the Fleet Reserve upon the completion of at least 20 years' naval service. After such transfer, except when on active duty, they shall be paid at the rate of 2½ percent of the base pay they are receiving at the time of transfer multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, plus all permanent additions thereto: *Provided*, That the pay authorized in this section shall be increased 10 percent for all men who may be credited with extraordinary heroism in the line of duty or whose average marks in conduct for 20 years or more shall not be less than 95 percent of the maximum: *Provided further*, That the determination of the Secretary of the Navy as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized in this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the active-duty pay they were receiving at the time of transfer: *Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of sections 1 and 203 of this act, as amended, shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive: *Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive: *Provided further*, That nothing contained within this section shall be construed to prevent persons who qualify for transfer to the Fleet Reserve under the provisions of section 203 of this act, as amended, from

being transferred in accordance with the provisions of this section if they so elect: *And provided further*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto."

SEC. 3. Title II of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1178) is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section No. 208, to read as follows:

"SEC. 208. Whenever enlisted men of the Fleet Reserve, transferred thereto after more than 16 years' service, or enlisted men transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the Regular Navy, perform active duty, such active duty, except that which they are required to perform in time of peace under section 206 of this title, shall be included in the computation of their total service for the purpose of computing their retainer or retired pay when in an inactive-duty status, and in the computation of their retainer or retired pay all active duty so performed subsequent to the effective date of transfer to the Fleet Reserve or to the retired list shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retainer or retired pay and shall be based on the pay received by them at the time they resume an inactive-duty status, including increases in consequence of promotion, longevity, and conduct or extraordinary heroism, and if they shall have completed a total of 20 years or more of active service their pay shall be computed in the manner prescribed in section 204 of this act as amended. *Provided*, That active duty performed during any period of national emergency declared by the President shall be considered for the purpose of this section as not being active duty in time of peace, required by section 206: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps, shall apply to enlisted men of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and to enlisted men transferred from such Reserve to the retired list: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall operate to reduce the retainer or retired pay and allowances to which any enlisted man would otherwise have been entitled: *And provided*, That a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year for purposes of this section in computing years of naval service and base pay, plus all permanent additions thereto.

SEC. 4. The provision contained in section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat 364) which reads as follows: *"Provided further*, That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, 77th Cong.), are hereby suspended," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. (a) The authority conferred upon the President by the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), as amended, to appoint commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks is hereby extended to include authority to appoint chief petty officers of the Regular Navy who have completed not less than 3 years of service as chief petty officers to commissioned grades or ranks in like manner and under the same conditions and circumstances, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, as is provided in that act, as amended, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned grades or ranks.

(b) The authority conferred upon the President by the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), as amended, to appoint commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Regular Navy to commissioned grades or ranks is hereby extended to include authority to appoint any enlisted man of the Regular Navy who has not, on the date of such appointment, attained his thirty-third birthday and who has served continuously and immediately prior to such appointment in the Regular Navy for a period of not less than 4 years to the commissioned grade or rank of ensign in the line or staff corps of the Regular Navy in like manner and under the same conditions and circumstances, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, as is provided in that act, as amended, for the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned grades or ranks: *Provided*, That the authorized number of commissioned officers of the line and of each staff corps to which appointments pursuant to this subsection may be made will not be increased according to the number of appointments made, and officers appointed pursuant to this subsection shall not be carried as extra numbers in the grades or ranks in which appointed.

(c) In computing the years of service necessary for appointment to commissioned grade or rank pursuant to the act approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 422), and pursuant to this section, at least 1 year of such service shall have been in the Regular Navy. The remaining portion of such service may have been active duty in a reserve component of the Navy after September 8, 1939, and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President or established by act or resolution of the Congress.

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection 8 (c) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) An officer or enlisted man on the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who was placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher rank, subject to the provisions of subsection (e) hereof, be advanced on the retired list to such higher rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank."

(b) Subsection 8 (e) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) The benefits of this section shall apply only to an individual who incurs physical disability in line of duty in time of war or national emergency. In the case of those officers and enlisted men to whom subsection (c) hereof is applicable retirement in the next higher rank shall be effected upon a finding by a naval retiring board that the disability was incident to the service while on active duty in the higher rank and upon a rating by such board, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, at not less than 30 percent permanent disability. In all other cases officers and enlisted men shall be retired in accordance with existing law providing for the retirement of officers or enlisted men."

(c) Subsection 8 (g) of the act approved July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), is hereby amended ab initio to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case if the proceedings of the naval retiring board be commenced subsequent to a date 6 months after the termination of the temporary appointment or release from active duty of the individual concerned whichever may occur later except in the case of any individual whose temporary appointment shall have been terminated prior to the date of this amendment or who, prior to such date, shall have been released from active duty."

SEC. 7. Enlisted men of any component of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, discharged on or after February 1, 1945, for the purpose of enlisting in the Regular Establishment of any of the armed forces shall be entitled to the travel allowance as authorized in the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "subsequent to June 30, 1945" and substitute the words "prior to the date of approval of this act."

On page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out the words "serving in the Regular Navy on June 25, 1938,".

On page 2, lines 17, 18, and 19, strike out the words "and men who first enlisted in the Regular Navy after June 25, 1938,".

On page 3, line 13, after the word "of", insert the words "this section and of."

On page 3, lines 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20, strike out the words: *"Provided further*, That all enlisted men transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the provisions of this section shall, upon completion of 30 years' service, be transferred to the retired list of the Regular Navy, with the pay they were then legally entitled to receive."

On page 4, line 23, strike out the word "promotion" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "advancement in rating".

On page 5, line 2, after the colon insert the following words: *"Provided*, That such pay shall not exceed 75 per centum of the pay of the highest rating to which entitled under the provisions of this section."

On page 5, line 2, change *"Provided,"* to read *"Provided further,"*.

On page 5, lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, strike out the words: *"Provided further*, That the provisions of this section, except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Marine Corps, shall apply to enlisted men of the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve and to enlisted men transferred from such Reserve to the retired list."

On page 5, line 14, change *"And provided further"*, to read *"Provided further,"*.

On page 5, line 17, change the period to a colon, strike out the quotation marks, and add the following words: *"And provided further*, That persons of the classes described in this section who have been retired or returned to an inactive-duty status prior to the date of approval of this act shall be entitled to the benefits of this section from the date of retirement or return to an inactive-duty status."

On page 5, lines 18 to 24, inclusive, strike out all of section 4.

On page 9, line 8, after the word "discharged", insert the words "while on active duty."

On pages 6, 7, and 9 change sections 5, 6, and 7 to read sections 4, 5, and 6, respectively.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, and before the Clerk reports the amendment may I say that this is really a series of amendments. They cover several pages. Their effect is simply to extend to the enlisted personnel of the Army exactly the same benefits as contained in the bill. They simply make the benefits uniform.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. VINSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that there is no objection on the part of the committee to the amendments, and we ask that they be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 3, line 3, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 11, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 3, line 12, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 4, line 24, immediately following the words "on the", insert the word "enlisted."

On page 5, line 6, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 5, line 7, immediately after the word "pay", insert the following: "(including all permanent additions thereto)."

On page 9, beginning with line 20, strike out all down to and including line 2 on page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. An enlisted man of the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, who is discharged while on active duty on or after June 1, 1945, for the purpose of enlisting or reenlisting in the Regular Establishment of any of the armed forces, and any enlisted man of any component of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, who is discharged while on active duty on or after February 1, 1945, for such purpose, shall be entitled to the travel allowance authorized by the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895): *Provided*, That any such person who has received a furlough travel allowance pursuant to section 6 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), shall be paid in connection with such discharge only so much of the travel allowance authorized by the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), as amended (34 U. S. C. 895), as exceeds the amount of such furlough travel allowance."

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 7. Any person who has performed active enlisted service as a member of the Regular Army during the period from June 1, 1945, to a date 121 days after the approval of this act and who shall have completed 16 but less than 20 years of active service, may upon his own request be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and thereupon will be placed on the retired list of the Regular Army. An enlisted man so retired shall, except when on active duty, receive annual pay at the rate of one-third of the average annual enlisted base pay he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service, plus all longevity pay. The pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall be increased 10 percent for any enlisted man who is credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of War as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes."

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'SEC. 4. Whenever any enlisted man of the Regular Army shall have completed 20 but less than 30 years of active service, he may upon his own request be transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and thereupon will be placed on the retired list of the Regular Army. An enlisted man so retired shall receive, except when on active duty, annual pay equal to 2½ percent of the average annual enlisted base pay he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service multiplied by a sum equal to the sum of the number of years of his active service performed not in excess of 29 years, plus all longevity pay. The pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall be increased 10 percent for any enlisted man who is credited with extraordinary heroism in line of duty or for any enlisted man having 20 or more years' active service whose character and efficiency meet such requirements as may be prescribed in regulations by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of War as to the definition of extraordinary heroism shall be final and conclusive for all purposes: *Provided further*, That the total pay (including longevity pay) authorized by this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the average annual enlisted pay (including longevity pay) such enlisted man was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service.'

"(b) The number of years of service to be credited in computing the right to retirement and retired pay authorized by sections 7 or 8 of this act, or any other provision of law providing for the retirement of an enlisted man of the Regular Army, shall include all active Federal military service performed in the Army of the United States, the Navy, the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard, or any component thereof, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more to be counted as a complete year.

"(c) Any enlisted man retired under the provisions of section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.) shall, commencing the first day of the month following the effective date of this act, receive retired pay computed as provided in section 8 (a) of this act.

"SEC. 9. Any enlisted man who is transferred to the Enlisted Reserve Corps pursuant to the provisions of sections 7 or 8 of this act shall remain a member thereof until his active Federal military service performed prior to such transfer plus the period of his service in such corps equals 30 years, and while a member of such corps shall be subject to perform such periods of active duty as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

"SEC. 10. (a) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army retired under the provisions of sections 7 or 8 of this act or the provisions of section 4 of the act approved October 6, 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.), who performs or has performed active military service subsequent to retirement shall, upon relief from such active duty, receive retired pay in the amount received by him prior to his recall to active duty, or in the amount resulting from a recomputation, whichever is the greater. In such recomputation, credit shall be granted for the period of such subsequent active military service in determining his retired pay, and the amount of such retired pay shall be computed in the manner prescribed by section 7 or 8 (a) of this act, whichever is applicable depending upon his total years of active service.

"(b) Each enlisted man of the Regular Army retired under the provisions of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217; 10 U. S. C. 947), who performs or has performed active military service subsequent to retirement shall, upon relief from such active duty, receive retired pay in the amount received by him prior to his recall to active duty, or in the amount resulting from a recomputation, whichever is the greater. In such recomputation, the amount of his retired pay shall be 75 percent of the average annual enlisted pay (including longevity pay) he was receiving for the last 6 months of his active enlisted service.

"SEC. 11. No back pay for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act shall accrue to any person by reason of the enactment of sections 7, 8, and 10 of this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make a career of the United States military or naval service, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH (at the request of Mr. FORAND) was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there has been presented to the public through the newspapers and on the radio a proposal to lend over $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain. Before anything of that kind can be effective, it has to come to Congress and the Congress has to approve it and put up the funds. The major items of information that should be supplied, if anything of this kind is to be considered, have not been given to the press.

If such a proposal is presented to the Congress, it should be accompanied by these facts:

First. What is going to be done with the money? This information should be specific and not in generalities.

Second. If the things that it is proposed to do with the money are specifically enumerated, will that do Great Britain any good? In other words, is it to be used to rehabilitate Great Britain's factories to be operated by the Government and destroy British liberty—because such things can come only with a dictator and such operations are generally a failure, or is it to be used to rehabilitate private industry in Great Britain? If the latter, it certainly should be a private loan from commercial banks.

Third. Is it going to do the United States any good? Certainly the export of machinery and of raw materials and other things of that character at this particular time when our shelves are empty is not going to do the United States any good. How it is going to be of benefit to us should be thoroughly explained.

Fourth. Is it going to contribute to international good will or is it going to be like the debt after the last war and create ill will because the European countries were indebted to us? A debtor too often hates his creditor and the fact that he does owe money is a menace to good feeling between the countries. That was especially true of Great Britain and France after the last war.

Fifth. What other loans to other countries are in contemplation by the administration?

Our direct public debt as of this date is $278,000,000,000. Add to this the circulation of paper money $28,000,000,000 and the contingent contract liabilities which have been incurred but not yet matured as of this date at least $30,000,000,000. The insurance in force as of the end of 1944 was $308,000,000,000. The total of this runs $642,000,000,000 and that is a very conservative figure.

When we are approaching the 1947 Budget and when we are considering large loans to other people, these things

should be borne in mind as well as our capacity to pay.

The total tangible assets of the United States according to the Statistical Abstract of 1942, as estimated by the Bureau of the Census, was $341,000,000,000 for 1942. Maybe we have had inflation enough so that it has increased to $500,000,000,000 but that would be a very liberal estimate. The Economic Almanac indicates that in 1938 it was only $309,000,000,000. The national debt is not productive wealth. When we have to tax ourselves to pay interest upon it, it is not wealth by any stretch of the imagination but a burden that our children and our grandchildren will have to face.

I would hope for care in the presentation and consideration not only of our regular Budget estimates for 1947 but a special care with reference to foreign loans and gratuities.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain communications and excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the action of the Senate on the disagreement of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House of amendment No. 103 on the bill H. R. 4805 the first deficiency bill, 1946, and that the House insist on its disagreement, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report on the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SESSION OF THE HOUSE TOMORROW

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state it will be necessary to have a session of the House tomorrow.

CAPTAIN MCVAY, UNITED STATES NAVY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Times-Herald of today regarding the trial of Captain McVay of the United States Navy. I also ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a letter written to me by General Hawley and a release by him showing, to an extent, the number of hospitals that he plans to use, which were formerly Army barracks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a resolution which provided for expressing the sense of Congress that the testimony of Captain Hashimoto should be expunged from the naval court-martial record of Captain McVay.

I was profoundly shocked that an alien enemy captain should be brought as a witness for the United States Navy to testify during wartime, as the House well knows the war has not yet been terminated, against one of our own American captains.

We have time, Mr. Speaker, to consider and pass that resolution. I have yet to find one individual in the military services or in civilian life who does not deplore, and who is not shocked by, the bringing here in one of our planes from Japan of an alien enemy to testify against one of our own naval officers. The heading in the Times-Herald this morning is "Court Convicts Skipper McVay of Negligence."

The article goes on to state:

A Navy court martial yesterday convicted Capt. Charles B. McVay III of negligence in failing to order the cruiser *Indianapolis* to pursue a zigzag course before she was sunk by a Japanese submarine last July 30 with the loss of 880 lives. It absolves him of a second charge of inefficiency in failing to order the crew to abandon the ship promptly.

I wish to state here, Mr. Speaker, that Captain Hashimoto, of course, did not testify against Captain McVay on the second count, because he was not on the ship; but he did testify against him on the first count. As a witness brought here to testify for the Navy he stated the weather was clear. Other witnesses stated that at the time of the sinking of the *Indianapolis* the weather was cloudy. Captain McVay had issued orders that they were to zigzag in clear weather, but officers on the *Indianapolis* stated that the weather was not clear; therefore, they did not zigzag.

The article goes on to state:

The cruiser was sunk in the Philippine Sea while en route to Leyte from Guam, where she had delivered materials for the atomic bombs dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In accordance with the Navy program the court did not publicly announce the guilty finding on the zigzag charge. It had authorized only the announcement of the acquittal decision. Its announcement thus was confined to the verdict of innocence on the charge of failing properly to order the ship abandoned. The court's finding on the zigzag charge and its recommended sentence will be reviewed by the Secretary of the Navy who will announce the finding.

Mr. Speaker, the penalty for that ranges from censure to death, but it is believed that the latter sentence was not considered by the court.

Again Mr. Speaker, the article states:

Captain Hashimoto testified on the Navy's behalf that visibility was excellent and that he first sighted the cruiser by moonlight at a distance of 10,000 meters.

Very plainly, Mr. Speaker, it is the testimony of a Japanese enemy alien during wartime who stakes his word against the word of a number of officers on the *Indianapolis*, our own United States officers. Apparently the testimony of Commander Hashimoto, according to the sentence, was believed and was acted on. If credence was not to be given to his testimony why was he brought all the way from Japan to testify.

Other possible penalties include reduction in grade, demotion on the promotion list or dismissal from the service.

The court's finding on the zigzag charge and its recommended sentence will be reviewed by the Secretary of the Navy who will later announce the findings.

Mr. Speaker, I am more anxious than ever to have the House before we adjourn go on record as believing that the testimony of this enemy alien should be expunged from the court-martial records so that the Secretary of the Navy will not read it in his review of the case. Also in order that the President of the United States may not be obliged to read in the court record:

The Secretary of the Navy is empowered to mitigate any sentence recommended by the court, but he may not increase the sentence. Naval law prescribes that the case must go to the President should the sentence involve dismissal or death.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that is an added reason that the testimony of Hashimoto be expunged from the naval court records.

I understand that moving pictures were taken of this general court martial which will probably go all over the country. The families of the men in our services will see these pictures and will wonder if their sons may be convicted on the word of an enemy alien. This, in my opinion will interfere very much with any enlist-

ment plans that the Navy may have, and justly so, I feel.

The court's recommended sentence will not be made public. Officially, Captain McVay was found guilty of suffering a vessel of the Navy to be hazarded. The Navy had accused him of failing to direct the *Indianapolis* to zigzag in waters where enemy submarines might be encountered.

Captain McVay, who testified in his own behalf on Tuesday said he had not ordered a zigzag course because he did not believe it necessary in view of very poor visibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this matter is of the utmost importance. Never before in our history has an enemy alien been called in to testify during the war against one of our own military officers or personnel. It has never been America's idea of ethics and justice. Admiral Baker, president of the court, said the specifications of the charge that McVay had not issued timely orders to abandon ship were not approved, and then he goes on to speak of the testimony of Captain McVay regarding abandoning the ship.

There is another reason for expunging from the record the testimony of Captain Hashimoto, who, when he was asked if he knew the difference between lying and perjury, said that he did. That was at the opening of the court. He later said that according to his religion, the Shinto religion, that he would be forgiven for lying or committing perjury in the hereafter. Captain Hashimoto's testimony is incompetent, and he should not have been called. Captain McVay vigorously protested bringing him in to testify.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would just like to call to the attention of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts the fact that this is merely sort of a preliminary finding by the court, and it is not a final determination of the guilt or innocence of the defendant involved in the case. I also want to call attention to the danger of basing one's opinion entirely upon newspaper reports which, of necessity, must be confined to perhaps the highlights of the case, a case which took several days to try. We cannot sit in judgment and condemn a court in this instance, because we do not know whether the court gave any weight whatsoever to the testimony of this so-called Captain Hashimoto.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How would the gentleman like to have one of his relatives convicted on the testimony of an enemy alien during war? Why did the Navy call him in as a witness? It is incredible to me that the United States Navy would resort to the testimony of an enemy alien. That is my point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentlewoman has asked me a question. Here is a case in the process of decision. I do not think it is proper for the legislative branch of the Government, before a case has been decided, to start criticizing. I think we should await final determination of the case, at any rate, and then if the policy is wrong, Congress can act.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the precedent is established and allowed to go on other Japanese enemies may be allowed to testify against our American boys. While there is breath in my body, Mr. Speaker, I will always defend our military forces against testimony of an enemy alien, and fight so hard as I can to do it. I will protect the members of our forces always from testimony of enemy aliens. I will fight to protect Captain McVay from an incompetent alien, and fight to have expunged from the record the testimony of an enemy alien. That I shall do always, so long as I live. It is only a matter of justice to our servicemen. That always has been the American way—that always must be the American way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 752. An act to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stock of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include therein statements and excerpts, including a speech delivered by the Honorable Alfred Schindler, Under Secretary of Commerce, before the Building Industry Employers of New York State on the subject of low-cost housing.

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT STRIKES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, recently the President of the United States sent a message to Congress recommending immediate legislation which he hoped would prevent strikes in our great industries. By so doing he placed the matter in the lap of the Congress. Legislation in implementation of the President's plan was promptly introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Labor. With equal promptness the committee scheduled hearings and did hear the leaders of labor and industry. But last Saturday morning, by a close vote, the committee voted against reporting any such legislation until after Congress reconvenes.

I believe the country is looking to the Congress for action in this strike situation. I therefore want the RECORD to show that my vote in the committee was in favor of prompt action prior to the recess.

CAPTAIN McVAY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us are deeply conscious of the responsibility that rests upon us as American citizens to consider such disasters as happened in the sinking of this cruiser and the death of some 800, I believe, young Americans. I want to call attention to one or two things. When the commander of a ship or the commander of a battalion or the commander of an army takes on that responsibility he takes on the responsibility of giving the best he has in judgment and in training and in experience to the protection of those young men.

In the consideration of whether or not this gentleman discharged his full responsibility to the American people and to the families of those men who died so untimely, I think it is well for us to exhaust all the possibilities. It is distasteful to me, let me say, to have any Japanese brought over here to testify against any American, but let us not be unconscious of the fact that that court is made up of honorable gentlemen, who not only took an oath to the United States Government and to lay down their lives for it but in this particular instance took an oath to view this matter fairly and impartially.

If the truth were known, I am sure that this is perhaps as disagreeable to the members who sat on that court as it is to the gentlewoman or to me or to anyone else, but I also feel sure that the gentlemen who found the verdict did not rest it upon whether or not the Japanese thought that he was negligent, but upon all of the evidence, and they perhaps felt that this man did not discharge his full responsibility to his command and to the young men that depended upon him and his judgment and his training. I think we ought to consider those things, because the life of a young man in the American Army or the American Navy is a priceless and precious thing and must be protected to the fullest extent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is why I am appealing so to have the remarks of Captain Hashimoto removed from the record. Here in the House

Members of Congress hear a statement made. It may make a profound impression. Captain Hashimoto said that it was clear that night. That certainly made an impression on the court if they are thinking judicially and not thinking that he is a Japanese. It is all the more reason. I think, that his remarks should be expunged so that when the court proceedings go to the Secretary of the Navy and the President of the United States they should be out of the record so that can have nothing of his testimony in the record.

I am not talking about the gentlemen sitting on the court not being qualified. I want to be sure that no alien testimony will be allowed in this trial or the trial of any other person in the Navy or the Army of the United States.

Mr. LYLE. I have full confidence that the court will consider that. I am fully confident that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy will take that into consideration. Certainly they have all of the evidence before them and they can throw out that which they do not like and that which they do not believe.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope this does not establish a precedent from now on to permit an enemy alien to testify in a case of this kind. It does not seem fair to me. It is not my idea of American justice.

Mr. LYLE. Precedent or no precedent, I think very few men charged with the responsibility of conducting a trial in either branch of the military service would request an alien to testify in a case regardless of precedent. I think very few of them would do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But he has been brought on as a witness for the Navy to testify. He is an enemy alien and this is wartime. I do not know whether the gentleman realizes the point I am trying to make.

Mr. LYLE. I think I do. It is just as distasteful to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will realize that I am not discussing the findings of the court except insofar as Captain Hashimoto's testimony is concerned.

Mr. LYLE. The important thing is whether or not this gentleman discharged his full responsibility to those 800 unfortunate boys.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but Captain McVay now may be fighting for his life, and you do not want his life to be taken, do you?

Mr. LYLE. I do not want his life to be taken.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It may well be taken.

Mr. LYLE. But I want the responsibility placed for the untimely and unfortunate death of those American soldiers and seamen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But apparently according to other testimony the weather was cloudy and they do not have to zigzag in cloudy weather.

Mr. LYLE. Does not the gentlewoman feel that the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States would have the same sensibility to justice and the facts that the gentlewoman shows?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman have any objection to having the words expunged from the record?

Mr. LYLE. I do not have any objection to expunging the witness, frankly. As a matter of fact, I think it is unfortunate that he was not expunged.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not talking about the trial or the findings of the court, but what I am asking for now is that the testimony of Captain Hashimoto be removed from the record.

Mr. LYLE. I think it is not our responsibility.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is our great responsibility. We sent these boys to fight. We voted to send them to fight in the Pacific and in the Atlantic. We have the utmost responsibility for their welfare, for every single one of them.

Mr. LYLE. Oh, undoubtedly, and you know that I was over there fighting with them so I feel very keenly about that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman should help me get the resolution out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by himself.

AMERICAN WATCH INDUSTRY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, during the war the American watch industry—and it is about the only watch industry in the world outside Switzerland—devoted itself entirely to the manufacture of precision time devices necessary in the conduct of the war, and it required an unusually high class of skilled mechanics and laborers to produce the fine mechanisms which the Government required. As a result, the three leading American watch manufacturers were unable to manufacture any watches for the American trade and in consequence of that the Swiss watch manufacturers had practically the exclusive control of the American market. The importation of those watches into the United States increased tremendously during the war. Under war conditions and the emergency which existed the American watch manufacturers were only too glad to play its important part in connection with the winning of the war. However, the American watch manufacturers were thus unable to manufacture watches for the civilian trade. The Swiss watch manufacturers, which were very closely governmentally controlled in Switzerland, had a practical monopoly in the American market.

Now that the war is over it is only fair that the American watch companies should be given an opportunity, under fair and equitable conditions—and that is all that they ask—to obtain a fair share, under competitive conditions, of the American market. No one wants to stop the importation of watches from Switzerland. As a strong advocate of the reciprocal trade agreements and one who led the fight for the passage of such legislation from the first law to the last, I certainly never intended that any American industry would be completely destroyed. I sought for a fair and proper exchange of goods between countries, and in such a manner that American industry and American workmen are adequately and properly protected. It seems to me that the American watch companies are asking the minimum of conditions in making the request that they have of the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I am receiving—as doubtless other Members are—many telegrams and letters from retail jewelers throughout the country protesting against the proposed limitation on the export of Swiss watches to this country, which our State Department has asked the Swiss Government to accept on a voluntary basis outside the present trade agreement with Switzerland. These telegrams and letters, I may say, are inspired primarily by the American Watch Assemblers Association, an organization of importers of Swiss watch movements who do nothing more than buy foreign-made movements and case them in this country. This organization has wired retail jewelers, urging them to protest to their Senators and Representatives and to the State Department in opposition to such a quota. A similar request has been sent out by some of the importing companies.

In addition to these telegrams and letters, certain remarks have been made on this floor and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the subject, and it has occurred to me that, in view of some of the allegations being made, the Congress should be apprised of the real facts.

It will be recalled that in 1934 the Congress, at the request of President Roosevelt, enacted the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The purpose of that act, as stated in its preamble, was to promote our foreign trade by finding foreign markets for the products of the United States and to regulate the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of American production. To carry out such purpose the President was authorized to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with foreign governments and to proclaim modifications of tariff duties and other import restrictions pursuant thereto. It has been emphasized again and again that the act would not be used to injure or destroy any substantial American industry. Earlier this year the Ways and Means Committee, in its report on the bill extending the President's authority under the act, made reference to the care which was taken, not only in negotiating the trade agreements, but in protecting the interests of American producers once an agreement has been

entered into. On page 6 of the committee's report it is stated:

> The interdepartmental organization does not shut itself off from contacts with private interests even after a trade agreement has been signed and has entered into force. The Committee for Reciprocity Information stands ready at all times to receive the views of interested persons or organizations concerning any aspects of the operation of agreements. Informal conferences or hearings are arranged whenever anyone has a complaint to make.

By suggesting to the Swiss Government that the Swiss voluntarily limit their exports to 3,000,000 movements in the next 13 months, the State Department is simply undertaking to carry out its announced policy, which is in keeping with the purpose of the Trade Agreements Act, of guarding against irreparable injury to domestic producers. The suggested limitation would only apply during the reconversion period, and is primarily intended to give the domestic watch manufacturing industry an opportunity to reestablish its position in the American market after having devoted its entire facilities to war production.

Naturally, the Watch Assemblers Association has a selfish interest in the unlimited importation of Swiss watches, and hence their activity in inspiring these protests to Members of Congress can be understood. The State Department, on the other hand, must consider the larger national interest, which requires that a substantial domestic watch industry be preserved and maintained, not alone as an integral part of our national defense but as assurance against unreasonable price exactions by a worldwide Swiss watch monopoly.

The Swiss trade agreement was entered into early in 1936. In the preceding year approximately 47 percent of the jeweled watches sold in the domestic market contained Swiss movements, and this was about the average for the 6-year period, 1930 to 1935, inclusive. Under the Swiss trade agreement the rates of duty on Swiss watches were reduced on an average by a little more than one-third. As a consequence, the Swiss increased their participation in the American market to slightly over 60 percent in 1941. In 1942 the domestic industry was completely converted to war production, and from that time on the Swiss had the entire domestic market to themselves.

In the meantime, while the domestic watch manufacturing industry was playing its vital part in the winning of the war, Swiss watches were imported in unprecedented quantities to satisfy the abnormal demands of service men and women and highly paid war workers. Thus the domestic industry, by converting to war production, not only lost the normal market it would otherwise have had during the war years, but it has seen its future domestic market oversold for years to come. No other domestic industry has suffered similarly as a result of being engaged in war production. The market for automobiles, radios, and electric refrigerators, for example, has not been satisfied by foreign imports during the war years.

Parenthetically it should be stated that the contribution to the war effort made by the American watch industry was perhaps greater than many of us realize. The list of items essential for the war effort which was furnished by this industry are too numerous to mention here, but suffice it to say the principal items were marine chronometers, time fuzes for ordnance, aviation instruments, stop watches, navigation watches and other specialized timing devices, and instrument jewel bearings. Without these and other timekeeping devices it is absolutely impossible to conduct a successful modern war. The part played by the domestic watch-manufacturing industry has been given recognition by the Army and Navy in press releases. Also, it so happens that each domestic producer has been awarded the Army and Navy E, which is a record that may well be without parallel in any other industry.

Now that victory has been won both in Europe and the Orient, the American watch-manufacturing industry is reconverting to peacetime production. It seeks to reestablish its position in and regain a fair share of the domestic market. In this effort it is faced with tremendous odds. The Swiss have the advantage of having been in the market all throughout the war and of having never ceased civilian production. They also have the advantage of lowered tariff rates in the face of increased domestic costs of production. This advantage is accentuated by the increase in Swiss prices, which has the effect of further lowering the ad valorem equivalent of the present specific duties on imported watches.

The American watch-manufacturing industry called its situation to the attention of the State Department and requested that a quota be imposed on Swiss watch imports based on the average annual importations in the 10-year period 1931 to 1940, inclusive. The State Department, believing that a limitation on Swiss watch imports into this country is necessary for the American watch-manufacturing industry to regain a fair share of the domestic market, has proposed to the Swiss that they impose an export quota to this country of 3,000,000 watch movements over the next 13 months, which is considerably in excess of the 10-year prewar average of Swiss watches imported into this country. The Swiss have been requested to impose this quota voluntarily, but I understand the State Department has indicated that if a satisfactory reply is not forthcoming this Government may find it necessary to terminate the Swiss trade agreement.

The American Watch Assemblers, who, as I say, are an organization of importers, have protested this action by the State Department as an un-American proposal. To my mind it is a wholly American proposal. It is 100 percent in accord with the principles and purposes of the Trade Agreements Act and with the American concept of fair play. On the other hand, it is distinctly un-American for the Watch Assemblers to allow their own selfish interests to take precedence over the national welfare. I feel sure that the retail jewelers of America, when they have all the facts, will repudiate the efforts of the Watch Assemblers to seek congressional pressure for the rescission of the State Department's proposal.

The quota system of regulating foreign trade is not a new element in the reciprocal trade agreements program. Many foreign countries use this method of import control and we have used it ourselves in connection with some trade agreement concessions, notably on cattle.

Coming from a State which has long been identified with the production of fine American watches, I feel that the State Department should be commended for its zeal in seeking to preserve an essential domestic industry and to assure it a fair share of the home market. I trust that Members of Congress will not be swayed by the barrage of telegrams and letters inspired by the watch importers, but that they will instead give their approval to the State Department's proposal.

The allegation made by the watch importers that if the proposed quota is imposed, retail jewelers will receive only 3 Swiss watches next year for every 10 watches received this year in untrue and tends to give a distorted picture of the effect of the quota. In the first place, it is not reasonable to assume that there will be a domestic market for 10,000,000 jeweled watches in 1946. The recent unprecedented demand for watches has been due, as I have indicated, to the demands of service men and women and highly paid war workers. Now that the readjustment to peacetime conditions has begun and people have other outlets for their war earnings, the demand for watches is bound to sharply decline, particularly in view of the fact that the market has been saturated and oversold by reason of the abnormal wartime sales.

The purpose of the proposed quota limitation is to permit the American manufacturers to reestablish themselves in the domestic market, which means that retail jewelers will be able to buy and furnish the public with domestic watches of both the jeweled and nonjeweled variety. Thus, it is anticipated that the retail jewelers will have available to them sufficient watches to meet the consumer demand. If the unexpected should come to pass and domestic manufacturers are unable to furnish sufficient domestic watches to meet the demand in excess of the proposed 3,000,000 quota on Swiss watches and movements, I am sure that the domestic watch manufacturing industry would not object to the quota being increased. I say this because obviously the domestic watch manufacturers would not want to incur the ill will of the American public, or the retail jewelers which are the outlet for their product as well as that of the Swiss, by being responsible for their not having sufficient watches to meet their needs. Hence, the fear on the part of the watch importers that there may not be enough watches to go around if the suggested export limitations is agreed to is wholly unfounded.

While I am discussing this subject, I cannot let go unnoticed certain charges which have been made on this floor regarding the efforts of the American

watch-manufacturing industry to secure a quota limitation. It has been alleged that three of the American watch manufacturers are under indictment by the Department of Justice for entering into a conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws, and it is said that it is rather anomalous that the State Department would come to the aid of companies seeking to form a monopoly and which are under such a cloud. The fact is, however, that none of the American watch manufacturers have been indicted for conspiring among themselves to violate the antitrust laws, or to form a monopoly. Three companies have, it is true, been charged by the Department of Justice with having restricted commerce in connection with the distribution of their respective products. These charges have not been proven and are being contested by the companies concerned. The cases were instituted before Pearl Harbor but, because of the importance of these manufacturers to the war effort, the hearings were postponed for the duration of the war and the cases have not yet been brought to trial. Moreover, it has not even been alleged, let alone proven, that they were trying to form a monopoly.

Speaking of being under a cloud, it would seem that the watch assemblers would hesitate to make any charges against the American watch manufacturers in view of the fact that a number of watch importers have been prosecuted for violation of OPA price ceilings.

As regards monopolies, it may be of interest to the Members of Congress to know that the Swiss watch industry is itself a government-dominated monopoly or trust. If there were no domestic watch manufacturing industry, our people would be at the mercy of this monopoly.

The Swiss watch trust exercises a powerful influence on the expansion of watch-production facilities elsewhere in the world, since it controls the production and exportation of watch-making machinery, which is only produced commercially in Switzerland. American manufacturers have found it impossible to purchase Swiss watch-making machinery even by paying the high export tax, since apparently the Swiss do not wish the American industry to expand. We are supposed to have a reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland, but if this is reciprocity then the term needs a redefinition.

It has been said that the efforts to secure a quota on Swiss watches have been instigated by a group of only three American watch manufacturers, Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin, but the presentations regarding the matter have been signed by all eight of the American watch manufacturers.

The State Department has not acted in the quota matter solely on the representations made by these eight American manufacturers. The Committee for Reciprocity Information has also heard representatives of the watch workers union in support of the proposal and has heard representatives of the watch importers in opposition. Any other interested parties could have been heard upon application. No one has been denied an opportunity to be heard either for or against the proposal. The fact that the hearings have not been published is not unusual since it is not the practice of the Committee for Reciprocity Information to do so as regards any of the hearings it conducts.

The charge that the proposed limitation on Swiss watch exports would be contrary to the foreign trade policy of the administration is untrue. It is just as much a part of the foreign trade policy of this administration to protect domestic manufacturers in the reasonable enjoyment of the domestic market as it is to expand our foreign market. It definitely is not the policy of the present administration to destroy any substantial or vital element of our domestic economy. We have permitted other countries to set up quotas in connection with trade agreements and it is not inconsistent for us to seek the use of this device when deemed necessary. It is to be emphasized that if a quota is imposed in connection with the importation of Swiss watches, it will be done voluntarily by the Swiss Government and not as a condition of the Swiss trade agreement.

It is contended that we cannot, in order to insure a full quota of employment, maintain exports of upward of $10,000,000,000 unless we import as well as export. This may well be true, but it does not mean that we must sacrifice any industries which are vital to our defense and necessary for the maintenance of free competition, nor can we accomplish this purpose by putting domestic watch workers out of jobs.

In opposition to the proposed quota, it has been pointed out that we cannot maintain the huge tonnage of ships we have built up during the war unless we expand our exports and imports, and in this connection it is asserted that any type of quota such as that proposed with reference to Swiss watches would "knock the props out from under" our expanded merchant marine. It would be very interesting to determine just what portion of the cargo space of a single ship would be required to transport Swiss watch exports to this country. It is to be remembered that the bulk of Swiss exports are uncased watch movements, not completed watches, and that in the case of women's watch movements, a large number—perhaps a dozen—can be carried in an ordinary safety match box. Thus, it would take only a few suitcases to transport all the Swiss movements exported to the United States, and these could be handled by one man in an aeroplane. In fact, a large part of the Swiss watch movements come to this country by air express.

The watch importers have emphasized the fact that a large portion of the retail sales value of the imported watches goes not to Swiss exporters in payment for the watch movements, but to American labor employed in casing the watches, and for the purchase of cases, bracelets, boxes, advertising, and so forth, as well as for overhead, selling expenses, and taxes. The same is true of the gross receipts of the domestic watch-manufacturing industry, with this addition: that American labor is employed in producing the domestic watch movements and the materials and parts. In this connection it should not be forgotten that from 80 to 90 percent of the cost of production of a watch movement goes to labor. Thus, while the assemblers of imported Swiss watches may be to some extent an American industry, the domestic watch manufacturers are a 100-percent American industry. If we had only watch assemblers in this country and no domestic watch manufacturing industry, how could we protect American consumers from price gouging by the Swiss monopoly, and what would we do for timing devices in the event of another national emergency? Britain and Russia have learned their lesson in this connection and are establishing domestic watch industries under Government subsidy.

The charge that the imposition of a quota on Swiss watch exports to the United States would encourage watch smuggling is to charge the Swiss, in advance, with violating what would be their own voluntary agreement. Smuggling is now controlled through special export permits, copies of which are transmitted by the Swiss to the American authorities, and it may be assumed that the Swiss will continue to cooperate with us in meeting the smuggling problem. This they should do in any event as a matter of fair dealing between nations.

In conclusion, I want to again warn the Members of Congress not to be misled by the organized propaganda which is being circulated in opposition to the proposal for a limitation on Swiss watch imports. We cannot afford to be without a strong domestic watch-manufacturing industry, whether considered from the standpoint of national defense alone or from the standpoint of protecting our citizens from an uncontrolled foreign monopoly. If American watch manufacturers are to have an opportunity to regain a fair share of the domestic market, it is clear that some means will have to be devised to prevent the Swiss from dumping unlimited quantities of watches into the American market while our own industry is getting back on its feet. The only alternative to a quota limitation would be to restore the higher rates in effect prior to the Swiss treaty. It is the latter alternative, rather than the quota limitation, which is truly inconsistent with the foreign-trade policy of the administration.

The retail jewelers of America are in the business of selling watches. I feel sure that their customers would, in most cases, prefer to buy an American watch over a foreign watch if available. I am sure, also, that the retail jewelers of the country are interested in seeing that a strong domestic watch-manufacturing industry is maintained. I am confident that their better judgment will lead them to support the limitation on Swiss exports as proposed by the State Department, and that any telegrams they may have sent at the instigation of the Watch Assemblers Association do not represent their best judgment in the light of all the facts and circumstances. I believe that we should commend the State Department for its wise action in this matter, and it is to be hoped that the Swiss Government will deem it in its own best interest to accede to the State Department's request.

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week practically the entire membership of the House listened to our dear colleague, the Representative from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], deliver his final remarks in this body. On Wednesday we heard our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], speak to this body in his last address. In the remarks of both of those gentlemen they imparted to us what, in my opinion, amounted to very sound advice. They offered some constructive suggestions which I believe the Members of this House will take to their hearts and give to them the consideration they merit.

The remarks of various Members of this body which were made following the addresses of our colleagues, Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RAMSPECK, justly paid tribute to those two outstanding Members of this body. None of the encomiums which were expressed by the Members who followed the two gentlemen were exaggerated in the slightest degree. The loss to the membership of this House is personal, personal to me and I think personal to practically all of the other Members of this body. It is a loss to us from a legislative standpoint, a loss to the constituencies which they represented so well here for so many years; and a loss to the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, may I now say a few words about another Member of this body who will not be with us when we reconvene shortly after the first of the year? I am sure this Member of whom I now speak will not object to my saying that as yet he has not accomplished as great or as wide a distinction in this body or in the country as our friends and colleagues, Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RAMSPECK.

This is naturally true, of course, because his service in this body was of a much shorter duration. He has served here a comparatively short time—5 years. He is now in the midst of his third term. However, during the comparatively short time he has been here he has endeared himself to all the membership. He became as well known personally to all of us as any Member who ever served in this body for that length of time. He became just as valuable, I think, as any Member who served such a length of time in this body. Mr. Speaker, need I say I refer to my colleague and friend, Mr. WEISS, of Pennsylvania.

During his period of service he exhibited a great deal of industry. He was a regular dynamo of enthusiasm. He displayed qualities which few persons possess. He had the devotion to duty which is to be desired of every Member serving in any legislative body in this great country. He had especially deep consideration for the needs of his constituents back home. His general capabilities, his sound judgment, his wisdom and discretion on every issue which this Congress was called upon to consider, were demonstrated time after time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman in the observations he has made about our distinguished colleague who will leave the House and take a responsible judicial position in the State of Pennsylvania. He has been an able and outstanding legislator. During his service here his contribution to progressive legislation and the consideration of public questions has been very powerful. He has made a striking impression upon his colleagues, not only by his ability and his courage but by his personality.

We are sorry to see him go and I know that all of my colleagues extend our best wishes to him in the new field of activity he is to assume in the near future, a responsible judicial position in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of our majority leader and I am sure he expresses the thoughts and feelings of the entire membership of this body.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. With pleasure.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I wish to say along with my colleagues that I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] is leaving the House but that we congratulate him upon the position which he is to assume in the judiciary of Pennsylvania. I know he will carry with him to that branch the same understanding and the same interest in the problems of his fellow men that he evidenced in his service in this House. We know he will become one of the real outstanding jurists of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman's remarks are well taken and I certainly appreciate as I know all the other Members of this body will appreciate the sentiments he has expressed.

Congressman WEISS, "Sammy" as we all know him, has been compelled, like some other Members who have served so well in this body, to give up his duties here; not because of any lack of interest in the work, or lack of devotion to what he felt to be his duty; but because of what is natural in perhaps every one of us, that is, the desire to better our condition in life and, more than that, to better the condition of our families.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to state at this time that the judge to be, our distinguishd colleague, happens to have an office very close to mine on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building. I usually make a personal call on every new Member who takes an office near mine, and I surely have been very much impressed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] ever since his advent to this town.

A man's office is a pretty good indication of the man himself and what he is trying to do for his people. I think it is also appropriate at this time to call attention to the fact that not only has he been a good Congressman but that he has a splendid office force which has devoted itself with commendable energy in carrying out the work particularly affecting his constituents' interests.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman. His contribution is very much appreciated.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am especially glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to say that I, too, have become well acquainted with our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]. I can think of few Members, if any, to whom personally I would more dislike to say good-by as a Member of this body. He has been hard working; he has been conscientious in his work; he has devoted himself without stint to the business of this Congress. He has made a contribution, I believe, which is rather unique among all the Members and in the history of this body. I am sure that the best wishes of all of us go with him.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman from California very much for the kind expression of his thoughts and feelings for our departing colleague. I am sure he expressed the sentiments of myself and other Members.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with these few remarks I wish to bring out another point which I think may be of some interest to the membership and to the country. I wish to call attention to the fact that this young man of whom I now speak was born in Europe in the year 1902. He came to this country when he was 1 year old; he is now 43. During that short period of life, Mr. Speaker, he attained distinction in many ways: first, perhaps, was his interest in athletics. He was well known in the district where he resided and beyond as an outstanding athlete. A little later, but while still very young, he became a lawyer, and it was not long before he was recognized as one of the leading counselors in Allegheny County, Pa.

Ten years ago, in 1935, Mr. WEISS was elected to represent the people of his district in the State legislative halls at Harrisburg, Pa., as a member of the assembly. Here he served with much distinction for a period of 4 years.

Then he went on to a higher field, if I may be so bold to say so, and became a Member of the Congress of the United States. He is now finishing his fifth year of service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, during all of this time he was active in many other fields. His advocacy of all movements along civic lines, and his very deep interest in charitable endeavors and in charitable institutions was recognized throughout the district of western Pennsylvania. He was also a member of several educational boards.

So, in his very busy life, he has contributed a great deal to the advancement of the people in a social, economic, and educational way.

Recently, he entered himself as a candidate to become a judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County, Pa. Mr. Speaker, for that office there were five other candidates, but our friend, SAMMY, as we know him, led the field by a very comfortable margin. The office of judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County is considered one of the highest, if not the highest, gift within the power of the electorate of the county of which he is now a resident. Concrete proof that America is truly the land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague, our friend, our coworker, Mr. WEISS, our SAMMY, leaves this House with the esteem, the affection, the respect, and the good wishes of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman JAMES G. FULTON of Allegheny County, Pa., has asked me to speak his comments on his good personal friend, Congressman SAMUEL WEISS, as follows:

As a fellow Congressman of Congressman SAMUEL WEISS from Allegheny County, it is a pleasure as usual to comment on my fine friend and his untiring efforts, not only in the interest of his district and our county, but the country as a whole. SAM has certainly stood up for justice and fair play at all times, and we in Congress are sorry to see him resign. But the people of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County by almost a quarter of a million votes have elected SAM to our finest of courts, the eminent Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County. This promotion to increased public responsibility is well deserved, and we fellow Members in Congress wish SAM further success in the next step in his distinguished public career.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess until 4:30.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 4:30 o'clock p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 103: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the House amendment with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said House amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the actual construction of the Garrison Reservoir Dam, North Dakota, itself: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation for the Garrison Reservoir herein contained may be expended for actual construction of the dam itself until suitable land found by the Secretary of the Interior to be equal in quality and sufficient in area to compensate the Three Affiliated Tribes shall be offered to the said tribes in exchange for the land on the Fort Berthold Reservation which shall be inundated by the construction of the Garrison Dam"; and the House agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
PAT MCCARRAN,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of amendment No. 103 to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment No. 103, namely:

Amendment No. 103, relating to the Garrison (N. Dak.) Reservoir: Provides that no part of the funds appropriated on account of such reservoir shall be available for the actual construction of the dam itself, instead of establishing any pool elevation. The appropriation does not contemplate any actual construction work on the dam; merely the provision of certain preliminary features.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4805).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Will the gentleman explain this conference report to us?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The bill carried $2,000,000 for the Garrison Dam. The conference report merely provides that none of that $2,000,000 shall be used for actual construction of the dam but shall be devoted entirely to preliminary work.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. In other words, the $2,000,000 can be used for further exploratory and preliminary work at the Garrison Dam, but not for the dam proper?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. All matters relating to the height of the dam and the construction of the dam proper are deferred for further consideration by the regular committee in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. The status is about the same as it was, then?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is in status quo and remains so until the committee again takes it up next January.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. The position is not impaired by this action as far as the Garrison Dam is concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not at all. It is deferred without prejudice.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. That $2,000,000 that was to be used in connection with the Garrison Dam would have been used anyway for preliminary work?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. There is really no change in the application of the funds carried in the original bill.

Mr. LEMKE. There is no change in the situation, but the Garrison Dam can go and will go ahead just the same as if the House admendment had been adopted?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No time or advantage is lost, and the decisions as to the height of the dam and the height of the flow of water remain to be determined by the committee in the next session.

Mr. LEMKE. I understand that the hearings before the regular Committee on Appropriations of the Army will begin January 7.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Hearings start January 7, and will be open to any suggestion which the gentleman or any other Members of the Congress desire to make to the committee.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am for the conference report. As we reach the end of this season of controversy, which is only the beginning of an era in which the controversies of the past will sink into insignificance, I wish everybody in this House a very Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. The more bitter they are, constructively, against the things in which I believe, the more attention I will pay to them.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. On this matter of the Garrison Dam you intend to hold full hearings at which time there will be considered the question of the height to which this dam is to be erected?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one reason why the final determination is being deferred at this time. Ample time is to be given and everyone is to be heard and all phases of the matter will be taken into consideration. The committee will be glad to hear the gentleman or anyone who desires to be heard and the committee will give full weight to any recommendation they care to make on the subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unless someone desires to discuss the matter, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill notwithstanding any adjournment which the House may take.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

OPA RENT CONTROL

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the rent-control law was put into effect as the result of the war situation. The Congress, realizing some time ago there would be some inequities in the over-all situation, inserted a flexible provision into the law permitting those in charge of Rent Control Administration to give full consideration to the adjustments of rents where obvious hardship existed and to such other cases where by the use of flexible provision of the law we could take care of situations that would permit expansion of housing facilities.

Unfortunately, we have not had the wisest kind of administration, particularly in reference to the flexible provisions we have inserted in the rent-control law. I am going to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a report of a survey that is being made by a very reputable reporter of the Haverhill Gazette of Haverhill, Mass., bearing on the OPA rent-control policy, and how it is affecting the housing shortage in the city of Haverhill, Mass.

OPA'S RENT-CONTROL POLICIES AFFECTING HOUSING SHORTAGE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In Haverhill, as in nearly all parts of the country, one of the most serious problems is the housing shortage. There are several elements in this problem—shortage of materials, scarcity of labor, high cost, rent-control policies. The Gazette presents today the first of a series of articles on the element of rent control, a part of the general problem that is not talked about so much as other parts, but one that must be solved and that can be solved.)

(By Milton E. Connelly)

Rent-control policies are preventing an increase in the number of housing units in Haverhill by lessening confidence in property investments, taking some properties out of the rental market, and discouraging remodeling, and, if continued, will perpetuate indefinitely the shortages the controls were intended to regulate.

This is the opinion of Haverhill men—bankers, realtors, and property owners. It is an opinion shared, too, by contractors, dealers in building materials, and persons who have studied and are still seeking the solution to a dwelling-shortage problem that is the most critical in years and is growing progressively worse as more veterans return to civilian life.

It is an opinion expressed also by some manufacturers, who foresee a threat, remote now, but, nevertheless, existent, to industry in a city that cannot provide homes for its workers. These manufacturers see an immediate need for general remodeling, renovating, and modernizing homes, tenements, and apartments to raise general standards of living. But, they add, that, too, is being retarded by the rent control.

The housing shortage was expected. Haverhill at war, like America at war, experienced industrial expansion. Workers moved here from other places. More persons married. But, because of war restrictions, homes could not be readily built or remodeled into multiple-dwelling units.

VJ-day was observed 4 months ago, and yet Haverhill, like many other cities and towns, has not even started to dent the problem of finding homes for its returning servicemen and their families or for civilians who put up with crowded conditions during the war years.

ONE ANSWER TO PROBLEM

To the question, "Why?", investors, builders, and material dealers here say one answer is: "Continuation of Government controls and of administrative policies."

They point out that industry is meeting the problem of reconversion through relaxation of controls in less time than expected; if given an equal chance, these men contend, the building industry could do likewise.

For example, rent control recognized increased construction costs last month and said, in effect: "Go ahead and build and we'll set rents on a comparability basis plus increased construction costs, and we'll permit conversions from single to multiple dwelling units on the same basis, all of which means a boost of about 20 percent in rents."

That relaxation alone is not a solution of the rent-control aspect of the housing problem, observers here maintain. They claim the primary object is to restore confidence of the home owners, who want to create more housing units, and the investors, who are looking for a chance to get a return on their investment in real estate. Rent control through the war days failed to build up the confidence of these people and unless the administrative policy is changed, confidence will still be lacking.

Savings-bank men, realtors, and private individuals, when asked if intelligent relaxation of controls and a revision of administrative policies would assist in solving the existing housing shortage, agreed almost unanimous they would.

WHAT IS NEEDED FIRST

They contend the basic need in generating enthusiasm for new housing is to show the investor the way to make an honest profit from an honest investment.

"In other words," one building contractor said, "we've got to have, first, an individual who wants to build, and then convince him he can get a dollar back on the investment. We've got to do that before we can have any building irrespective of labor or material market conditions."

There are several local examples of how rent control since 1942 weakened confidence in future construction on a Government-controlled basis.

A man who has been in the construction and real-estate business all his life gives one. After the Western Electric Co., Inc., established its Haverhill shops in 1943, more than a year and a half following the freezing of rents, this man tried to organize a group of men to invest $50,000 in the construction of homes and apartments.

"We encountered some initial success," he said, "and raised as much as $38,000. It might have been enough to go ahead but when we found that our return from rents would not justify the investment, we destroyed the blueprints."

ONE BANK'S EXPERIENCE

The head of a savings bank mentioned one of several parallel situations existing in this city and surrounding towns. The bank was required to take over property which it did not want. But having acquired it the bank wanted to put an apartment in rentable condition. The rent level was so low that, if the bank had gone through with its plans, it would have been years realizing a return on the investment. And so the apartment remained idle.

Real-estate men know of several large homes in this city which could and probably would have been remodeled if a rent that was "fair and equitable," as the Federal law specifies, could be charged. But they were not.

There are examples, too, of how rent control has affected the confidence in home ownership not only of landlords but tenants. There are many tenants who have wanted improvements in their homes and were willing to accept an increase in rents to get them, but under rent-control rules they were never made because the landlord would have had to assume the costs himself.

There were other tenants who were forced to buy homes, to have a roof over their heads, forced to pay inflationary prices, because landlords wanted to get out of the real-estate business, when "fair and equitable" interpretation of the Rent Control Act might have interested them in keeping their property.

CONFIDENCE IS WEAKENED

It is such cases and those, too, of the landlord in Bradford, who early in 1942 cut the rent of a tenant who was out of work so that the tenant wouldn't run into debt only to find that a year later, when the tenant was making more money than the landlord, he couldn't boost the rent; or the war worker who dropped a check for nearly $100 on the counter in a real-estate office one day and paid $6 in rent with it, saying. "This rent-control law is the best one the Government ever passed," that caused the Haverhill observers to conclude confidence in rent control had been weakened to the breaking point.

And it is observations of local and State men that indicate modification of policies are necessary now to give building the shot in the arm it needs when materials flow more freely and labor is more plentiful. The bankers say they know of people who want to build, the contractors confirm it, and the men studying the situation say they know it to be a fact.

Backing up this Haverhill contention is that of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The Washington office of the board released this indictment of rent-control policies last week: "Rent control as administered is preventing an increase in the supply of housing, is forcing many properties out of the rental market, and is definitely discouraging creation or ownership of rentable housing. It is definitely contributing to inflation by artificially exaggerating the existing shortage."

(Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein an article.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Herald on the Al Smith Drive.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1469) a privileged resolution (H. Res. 459), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to read to the House a letter I have received from Major General Hawley, Acting Surgeon General. It is as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1945.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The shortage of beds for veterans is one of staff rather than of hospital plant. With the Veterans' Administration already needing 50 percent more doctors than it has, and unable to obtain more, it seemed a hollow gesture to the veteran to agree to take over surplus Army and Navy hospitals which could not possibly be staffed.

However, with the encouraging interest of many doctors in the provisions of H. R. 4717, and with the generous response of medical schools to our request for part-time assistance in staffing such of our hospitals as are conveniently located for such service, it now appears that we shall be able to use more of these surplus hospitals than we had first thought.

Within the past week we have requested two additional hospitals from the Army; and we shall request more, within the number of beds required, as the prospects for staffs improve. While I have no authority to make any commitment, the shortage of beds in the Boston area makes it necessary to give serious consideration to the use of an Army hospital in that locality.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. HAWLEY,
Major General, AUS,
Acting Surgeon General.

Mr. Speaker, I know that is good news to many of the Members who have surplus Army and Navy hospitals in their districts.

THE OPA AND FUEL OIL AND KEROSENE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the OPA released on yesterday a statement regarding fuel oil and kerosene. It is very unfortunate that the poor people and the returning veterans will have to pay more for their kerosene and oil than was anticipated. Personally, I cannot see why the situation was allowed to go so that they will have to pay more, but I am glad something has been done to partially alleviate the hardship through the New England and eastern seaboard States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy;

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; and

S. 1580. An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings on H. R. 4761 on Thursday and Friday mornings, January 24 and 25, 1946, at 10 o'clock.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

879. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

880. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

881. A letter from the Surplus Property Administrator, transmitting a supplementary report on chemical plants and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4497. A bill to create an Indian Claims Commission, to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Special Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint submits its final report pursuant to House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress (Rept. No. 1467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 459. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 4276) to provide for the construction of public buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5074. A bill to provide for the formulation of a national fertilizer policy and program; as a step in said program, to provide for adequate phosphate reserves for a phosphate plant heretofore authorized for construction at or near Mobile, Ala.; and for another fertilizer plant, the construction of which is hereby authorized, said additional plant to be constructed by the

Tennessee Valley Authority in the territory of the Tennessee Valley and to cost not more than $20,000,000; to specify certain policies for the public operations of said plants and to provide a basis for their operations by private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5075. A bill relating to the pay of stevedores, checkers, and dock clerks employed by the Department of War in the New York Port of Embarkation during the national emergency; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5076. A bill to provide veterans with notices regarding national service life insurance premiums upon their discharge or release from active duty; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5077. A bill to permit certain employment by the United States to be included as employment under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5078. A bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of Allied authorities of occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5079. A bill prohibiting the soliciting or accepting of fees for referring persons for employment by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5080. A bill to provide that former owners of farms and other real estate shall have the first right to purchase their former homes now being sold by the Surplus Property Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5081. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 5082. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 5083. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 5084. A bill to exempt certain annuity payments received by public-school teachers from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5085. A bill to extend the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to all honorably discharged servicemen and to provide for immediate payment upon discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5086. A bill relating to the public indebtedness of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 5087. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that they will serve as substructures for highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5088. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the design and construction of dams so that the will serve as substructures for highway bridges upon and across such dams, to authorize the granting of easements and rights-of-way in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5089. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5090. A bill to order the Department of State to cease its efforts to give control of the fisheries in the Great Lakes to a foreign country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the policy of Congress with respect to the matching of appropriations for foreign relief with like appropriations for the rehabilitation of American war veterans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to assist the Polish people in their aspirations for complete freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 467. Resolution requesting information about the amount of lumber and other materials in the possession or control of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. Res. 468. Resolution requesting information about the amount of lumber and other materials in the possession or control of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Honnell and Horton H. Honnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Pacific Fire Insurance Co. and American Orchestra Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5093. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert Whilden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Charles B. de Crevecoeur; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Edmund Frederick Lindner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 5097. A bill for the relief of Hanson, Orth & Stevenson, Inc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5098. A bill to extend retirement benefits of certain retired enlisted men of the Regular Army to Jacob Schneider, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5099. A bill for the relief of William D. Fry and Peggie Irma Fry; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1433. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. O. Ulviden, Route 4, Sioux Falls, S. Dak, and 76 other signers of the Rev. P. M. Troen parish, of Baltic, S. Dak., urging that legislation be enacted to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1434. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of E. C. Mueller, manager of the Corsicana Chamber of Commerce, Corsicana, Tex., opposing H. R. 2764; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1435. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Nellie G. Saunders, Rockland, Maine, and approximately 100 other citizens of that section, urging action on H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1945

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 19, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

"O holy Child of Bethlehem!
Descend to us, we pray;
Cast out our sin, and enter in,
Be born in us today!
We hear the Christmas angels
The great glad tidings tell;
O come to us, abide with us,
Our Lord Immanuel!"

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1945.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CHAVEZ thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1405. An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

S. 1438. An act to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States naval service a career, and for other purposes.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF FIRST SESSION OF SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 21, 1945, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. I send to the desk another concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and found truly enrolled.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES AND FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask unanimous consent that it be considered and adopted.

There being no objection, the order was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by order of the Senate, or by concurrent action of the two Houses.

Ordered further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the adjournment of the said session.

EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR REPORT OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate and House agreed to an extension of the limitation of time for the committee investigating the Pearl Harbor attack to report. By oversight, it did not refer to the provision of the original resolution which limited the committee in holding sessions or hearings during the sessions of the two Houses to such sessions as might be held prior to the 3d day of January. That was the limit fixed in the original resolution. The committee has already decided to resume hearings on the 31st day of December and to continue them. Inasmuch as the two Houses will be in recess until the 14th of January, it is necessary to amend the original resolution, and so I send to the desk the following resolution correcting that oversight and ask for its adoption:

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, agreed to December 20, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946; and such resolution is hereby continued in full force and effect until such date."

DEATH OF DONALD W. McKELLAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, word has just come that the brother of our distinguished colleague the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. Don McKellar, died this morning. I cannot allow the occasion to pass without expressing to Senator McKELLAR not only my profound sympathy and sorrow on the death of his brother, but I am sure that I express the feelings of the entire Senate upon this sad occasion.

The Senator from Tennessee left this morning at 8 o'clock for his home in Memphis because of his brother's illness. Evidently his brother died before he left the city or at least while he was on his way.

I desire to extend my profound sympathy over this sad news which has come into the life of our colleague from Tennessee, and to express to him my deep and abiding faith.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the word which has just come of the death of the brother of the Senator from Tennessee brings grief to those of us who have been privileged to know him. I think he was one of the most kindly, considerate, and courteous members of the secretarial force of the Senate whom I have been privileged to know. I found him always a gentleman, and I join with the Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, in expressing my deep sympathy to the surviving members of his family.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues who have just spoken and express my sympathy to our Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and to the family of the deceased. Of course, his brother was a very efficient official in the office of the Senator from Tennessee, and he was always pleasant and agreeable, but he has simply gone the journey that we all must take.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on December 20, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; and

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SPECIAL HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Secretary, showing credits, disbursements, and the balance on hand in the special helium-production fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON CHEMICAL PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on chemical plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION FOR VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN WAR DADS, NEWTON, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39, American War Dads, of Newton, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating $150,000,000 for hospital construction for the United States Veterans' Administration, as approved by Gen. Omar Bradley.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Be it resolved, That Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39 of the American War Dads, of Newton, Kans., urge immediate congressional appropriation of $150,000,000 for hospital construction for the United States Veterans' Administration as urgently requested by Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the United States Veterans' Administration, for necessary care of disabled veterans, and that location of such hospitals be made in medical centers to be selected by General Bradley or his Surgeon General, Paul R. Hawley, and that the substance of this resolution be wired forthwith to Hon. ED REES, Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER, and Hon. CLYDE M. REED, Members in Congress from Kansas."

I hereby certify that the above and foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39, of the American War Dads, at their regular meeting at Newton, Kans., on December 12, 1945.

CLAY E. HEDRICK,
President of Victor Hays Chapter, No. 39, American War Dads, Newton, Kans.

ATOMIC ENERGY—LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF WORLD AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, LEBANON, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a letter from Alexander Laing, of Hanover, N. H., together with resolutions unanimously adopted at a session of the World Affairs Conference called at Lebanon, N. H., on December 18, 1945, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolutions be printed in the RECORD together with the signatures attached thereto.

I might say, as I offer this letter and the resolutions, that I myself am entire-

ly in accord and agreement with the sentiments expressed therein.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

DARTMOUTH GROUP,
UNIVERSITIES COMMITTEE ON
POSTWAR INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS,
Hanover, N. H., December 18, 1945.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The enclosed resolutions were passed by unanimous vote at the evening session of the World Affairs Conference called at Lebanon, N. H., on December 16.

I should like to call to your attention the fact that the conference, in its origin and management, was the work of citizens of a typical small New Hampshire community. Such groups as that appearing on this letterhead gladly cooperated, but the great majority of the several hundreds of persons attending the conference came from similar small towns in New Hampshire and Vermont. The resolutions largely reflect the sentiment of impromptu speakers from the floor. The signatures represent only a voluntary sampling of those who voted for the resolutions.

It is our hope that you will communicate these resolutions to your colleagues as a significant expression of the will of the people in this region, and that they may be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,
ALEXANDER LAING,
For the Resolutions Committee.

(Enclosure)

We, citizens of New England, meeting in Lebanon, N. H., on December 16, 1945, believing that the people can win the peace, resolve that the Government of the United States should—

1 Cease immediately the manufacture of atomic weapons, and work for the control of atomic energy through international organization.

2. Fulfill its obligations under the United Nations Organization fully, and work to amend and improve the Charter of the Organization toward the objective of a world government, and specifically try to eliminate the veto clause as soon as possible.

3. Appropriate generous funds for UNRRA without delay.

4. Avoid all acts which might foster the fear of imperialism, and, as a first step, announce its intention to place under trusteeship of the United Nations Organization all bases which it may wish to retain, as an invitation to all other nations to take similar action for all dependent areas under their control.

5. Favor the creation of a joint rather than a unilateral trusteeship over each dependent area as a unit with a definite date for the termination of outside control; and we further

Resolve, That copies of these resolutions shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Senators and Congressmen representing those who have attended this meeting.

We, the undersigned, approve the resolutions adopted at this meeting:

Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Ganett; Orrien K. Reid; Elizabeth P. Reid; Marguerite Osborne; Wm. I. Ward; Doreen M. Ward; May P. Leavitt; H. P. Hough; Hazel S. Wolverton; Geo. R. Wolverton; Russell D. Foster; Muriel C. Foster; Mary C. Hewitt; Anne W. Lincoln; Hope M. Lincoln; John G. Gizley; N. D. Clough; G. T. Filosa; K. Churchill, M. D.; Charlotte Clough; W. Willard Hall; Geo. D. Wheeler; Ernest P. Carlon; Mary A. Carlon; H. Raymond Danforth; Harold C. French; W. A. Smith; Irving H. Gale; Leon Clark; Genevieve Clark; Mary J. Leach; Maude B. Marston; Mary E. Brown; Farwell A. Brown; Ewald Harrison; Walter A. Smith; Mrs. Walter A. Smith; Mrs. Louis P. Benezet; L. P. Benezet; Mrs. F. F. Patterson; Mrs. Helen K. Smith; J. Harold Moody; Mrs. J. Harold Moody; Mrs. Flora H. Leavitt; Marian Barrow; Ada Rhodes; Mrs. Lucy W. Harriman; Ruth P. Smith; Marion J. Carter; Jean D. Potter; Lilian C. Cole; Rev. Frank K. Neary; Kathleen Ellsworth; Mrs. Ethyle Hough; Maude McD. Wheelinright; Dilys Bennett Laird; Sophia Mumford; Margaret W. Pearson; James F. Cusick; Margaret R. Cusick; Mary E. Hough; Mrs. Cornelius Fersch; Mrs. Frank K. Neary; Cornelius Fersch; John Pearson; Frederik H. Johnson, Jr.; James D. Merritt; Eva M. Merritt; Mary J. White; Ruth E. Farr; Herbert Walls Hill; Florence H. Barrow; Edgar Barrow; Ruth L. Randall; Harold G. Randall; Martha E. Smith; Elva L. Brown; Alberto V. Infante; Fred W. Perkins; Leslie Infante; Mildred D. Hoyt; Charlotte E. Ford; Freda S. Harold; Hanna Terese Rowley; Dorothy Rising; Meg Barden, Alexander Laing.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1720. A bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1721. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Weaver; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1722. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Dessa A. Howell; and

S. 1723. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Hodgdon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1724. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1725. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Norman Nedrud;

S. 1726. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Arnold E. Payne; and

S. 1727. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Walter I. Ruggles; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1728. A bill to remove certain limitations on the use of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1729. A bill to expedite making homes available for veterans at lower costs and in greater volume and speed by facilitating private industrial production of homes through the use of surplus plants and facilities and new types of materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of George M. Vaughn; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate Joint Resolution 129, to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

SUSPENSION OF FURTHER INDUCTIONS UNDER SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which provides for the suspending of further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. My information is that the Army and Navy are both receiving voluntary enlistments at a rapid rate. The Army reported to me today that they had received through our volunteer system now in force 12,000 men during the month of September, 65,000 men during the month of October, and 185,000 men during the month of November, making a grand total during the last 3 months of 262,000 men.

I must call attention to the fact that during the month of September the machinery was not set up until late in the month and during the month of October it was only partially set up, and in November, when the voluntary enlistment machinery was in full swing—during that 1 month—185,000 volunteered to serve in the Army.

The Navy Department announced some 2 months ago that the selective service was no longer needed as a method of recruiting naval personnel. The present law, however, remaining in force, I am advised by the selective-service head that only approximately 1,000 a month throughout the United States are being inducted in the Navy and Marines. The voluntary system is proving successful and sufficient.

This is sufficient proof to me that it will not be necessary to continue the induction of men under the Selective Training and Service Act any longer, and for that reason I am introducing the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 129) to suspend further inductions under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of trade relations between the United States and Russia, delivered by Senator KILGORE at a dinner of the American Birobidjan Committee at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York City, November 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOMES FOR VETERANS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MITCHELL

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him in connection with the bill to expedite making homes available for veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT ALUMINUM PLANTS — STATEMENT BY SENATOR MITCHELL

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relating to the disposal of Government aluminum plants, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him relative to Senate bill 1716, creating the Columbia Valley Authority, and a copy of the bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON THE GENERAL HOUSING BILL BY FERD KRAMER

[Mr. MITCHELL (for Mr. WAGNER) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the general housing bill, Senate bill 1592, by Ferd Kramer, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on December 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CONTINUING SCANDAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE COMMONWEAL

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Continuing Scandal," from the Commonweal for December 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROLLED ATOMS OR CONTROLLED LIVES—ARTICLE BY JAMES H. McGRAW, JR.

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Controlled Atoms or Controlled Lives" by James H. McGraw, jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE TO UNO DELEGATES AND SENATE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on this, the last day of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, I feel it would be befitting the occasion to state a brief word with regard to the Christmas season and the important mission which two of our distinguished colleagues are to take next week on behalf of the future peace of the world.

When Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees, it is related in the Book of Books that "He went into a far country." That phrase connotes a country with different ways of living, thinking, and approaches to life and to God; it does not simply mean physical distance.

Abraham left the old gods behind him and looked to the God of spirit. Mankind's great forward steps have always been taken by leaders who have "gone into a far country," blazed trails into the unknown, material and spiritual. On such occasions the world literally turned a corner, just as it turned a corner on on August 6, 1945, when the atomic age opened. The Greeks in the time of Pericles, the world in the time of Jesus of Nazareth and Augustus, did likewise. Then, after the Roman Empire fell, for a thousand years—the Middle Ages—men did not travel into far countries.

Then the divine urge came again, and we had the age of Renaissance and the discoveries in all fields, the heavens and the globe. Then came the period of the industrial revolution, when mankind turned still another corner and traveled "into a far country." Following that there was the age of the political revolution, when America spearheaded the voyage and the world again set forth "into a far country."

And now our friends, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and Texas, respectively, are spearheading the movement whereby the world will turn still another corner—turning away, we hope, from war and finding the way to arbitrate and settle its difficulties through peaceful channels. Our friends are going forth to the first meeting of the United Nations Assembly and Council.

What a voyage this is to be—the greatest voyage of all time. Will mankind make a success of it? Will it be adequate to the challenges of this atomic age, or will it, like the prodigal of old, waste its substance in a riot of inadequacy, of inefficiency, and instability? I have faith that under the leadership of America, adequacy will be found—that adequacy which is around each of us, awaiting our grasp.

We cannot say of our brothers, the distinguished Senators from Michigan and Texas and their wives, that next week they will be going very far off geographically, because in this contracted world they will be only a few hours off by plane. But in a sense they are going "into a far country." They are setting forth on this great new adventure. And on this adventure they go with the blessings and the hopes of all mankind and the prayers of each of us here. Literally they go forth, exponents of the old, old Christmas song: "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

But they do go "into a far country" because they will be meeting on foreign soil with representatives of nations holding different concepts and having backgrounds entirely different from our own. But the very fact that our colleagues will be meeting, like the Three Wise Men of old, with others from all corners of the globe, meeting together with a common object in view, presents an inspiring omen for the success of this great new adventure. It is an omen as welcome, indeed, as the Star of the East at Christmastime 20 centuries ago.

And so, on this first Christmas in 6 years that the world has been at peace, I know that I express the sentiments of all my fellow Senators in this message: I bid Godspeed to these two voyagers of ours "into a far country" and pray that they be worthy of the benediction of the Master: "Blessed are the peacemakers: For they shall be called the children of God."

And may I extend to all my associates in the Senate—and by "associates" I mean not only the 95 Senators, but all who labor with us on this great job—my wish for a Yuletide rich in blessings. May I say, in the words of Tiny Tim: "God bless us every one," and bless this new world effort for world unity.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me concerning the agenda of a subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. The subcommittee which has been appointed by me will undertake to make an investigation in certain foreign areas with regard to surplus property in the hands of the armed forces outside this country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday, I informed the Senate of the recent activities of the Special Committee on National Defense in connection with surplus property. I referred briefly to the lack of information available in Washington as to quantities of supplies in the hands of the armed forces outside this country.

The committee has consistently taken the position that its work can be done effectively only by obtaining the facts wherever they may be, and has, throughout the course of its existence, made frequent field inspection trips.

Until the recess of the Senate, the duties of the members of the committee and the important legislation pending before the Senate made impossible the accumulation of evidence in the field on the disposal of surplus Government property, except on inspection trips which could be completed in a very few days. With the coming of the holidays, I have appointed a subcommittee, consisting of the senior Senator from Delaware, Mr. TUNNELL, as chairman, and the junior Senator from Washington, Mr. MITCHELL, and the junior Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND. I have instructed this subcommittee to make an investigation of certain foreign areas in order to obtain information which the committee has not been able to obtain in Washington. In serving on this subcommittee, these Senators are foregoing the holidays and the opportunity for relaxation and meeting with their constituents, which other Senators will have an opportunity to enjoy during the recess period.

The program of the subcommittee is an ambitious one. The time which has been allotted for its accomplishment is brief. At this point I desire to read into the record the subjects into which the subcommittee will inquire:

1. The quantity, character, and location of supplies and equipment of both the War Department and the Navy Department.

2. Estimates of supplies which will be needed for future military use:

(a) for the support of occupation forces, and

(b) for equipping and supplying permanent military and naval bases.

3. Any programs for the supplying of Allies.

4. Salvage and reclamation operations, investigating reports received by the committee concerning the destruction of usable supplies and equipment.

5. Utilization of ocean merchant shipping and other transportation facilities.

6. Disposition of the cargoes of vessels and the vessels themselves when not needed for military programs.

7. Declarations of surpluses.

8. Disposal of surpluses abroad:

(a) by the Interior Department in the Territory of Hawaii, and

(a) by the Foreign Liquidation Service elsewhere.

9. Permanent military and naval bases desired by the War Department and the Navy Department.

10. A follow-up investigation on the progress of the Navy's program for the investigation and improvement of its investigative and disciplinary agencies, as exemplified in the corrupt and illegal operations exposed by the committee to exist in the Navy's Pearl Harbor installations in the following instances:

(a) Blodgett meat case,

(b) Submarine ship stores case, and

(c) Civilian housing area No. 3 black market and gambling cases.

11. Nature and cost of installations erected wholly or in part with United States funds.

12. Activities of United States civilian agencies abroad.

13. Expenditure of United States funds or the use of materials, supplies, and goods derived from United States funds in foreign countries as a part of the national defense.

The itinerary is an arduous one and will involve long hours of flying, interspersed with frequent hearings with numerous witnesses, and the accumulation of records, statistics, and evidence. The arduousness of this itinerary can be seen from the number of points which will have to be covered, as disclosed by the schedule which I ask to be inserted in the record at this point:

ITINERARY—OVERSEAS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

(Localities in quotation marks indicate overnight stopping points)

Thursday, December 27, 1945: Leave Washington for Jeffersonville, Ind. Inspect quartermaster depot and hold hearing. Proceed in late afternoon to "St. Louis, Mo."

Friday, December 28, 1945: Inspection and hearing at engineers' depot at Granite City, Ill. Depart in late afternoon for "Los Angeles."

Saturday and Sunday, December 29 and 30, 1945: Conduct investigations at military and naval depots in the vicinity of Los Angeles and "San Francisco." Depart Sunday night for overnight flight to Hawaii.

Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, December 31, 1945, and January 1 and 2, 1946: "Hawaiian Islands." (Honolulu is the headquarters for the Army mid-Pacific theater.)

Thursday, January 3, 1946: (Losing a day in crossing the International Date Line, actually making this date Friday, January 4, 1946.) Leave Hawaii for Johnston Island, Kwajalein, "Guam."

Saturday, January 5, 1946: Visit Tinian and Saipan, returning to "Guam."

Sunday, January 6, 1946: Leave Guam for "Manila."

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, January 7, 8, 9, and 10, 1946: Manila (headquarters of the Army west Pacific theater). At this point, the subcommittee or some of its members will visit Okinawa, Tokyo (headquarters of the Army forces in the Pacific), and Shanghai (headquarters of the Army China theater). Details will be arranged after arrival in the Pacific.

Friday, January 11, 1946: Leave Manila for "Singapore."

Saturday, January 12, 1946: Leave Singapore for Bangkok, Rangoon, and "Calcutta."

Sunday, January 13, 1946: "Calcutta."

Monday, January 14, 1946: Leave Calcutta for "Delhi."

Tuesday, January 15, 1945: "Delhi" (headquarters of the Army India-Burma theater).

Wednesday, January 16, 1946: Leave Delhi for "Karachi."

Thursday, January 17, 1946: Leave Karachi for "Bahrein."

Friday, January 18, 1946: Leave Bahrein for "Cairo."

Saturday, January 19, 1946: "Cairo" (headquarters for the Army Africa-Middle East theater).

Sunday, January 20, 1946: Leave Cairo for "Athens" (headquarters for UNRRA in Greece).

Monday, January 21, 1946: Leave Athens for "Rome."

Tuesday, January 22, 1946: "Rome" (headquarters for the Foreign Liquidation Commission in Italy).

Wednesday, January 23, 1946: Leave Rome for "Leghorn" (headquarters of the Army Peninsular Base Section of the Mediterranean Theater of Operations).

Thursday, January 24, 1946: Leave Leghorn for "Frankfurt."

Friday, January 25, 1946: "Frankfurt" (headquarters of the Army European Theater of Operations).

Saturday, January 26, 1946: Leave Frankfurt for "Paris."

Sunday and Monday, January 27 and 28, 1946: "Paris" (headquarters for the Foreign Liquidation Commission in France). Depart Monday for "London."

Tuesday and Wednesday, January 29 and 30, 1946: "London" (headquarters for the Foreign Liquidation Commission in England). Depart Wednesday for Washington, D. C.

Upon its return, the subcommitee will report to the entire Special Defense Committee, which will thereafter present a report to the Senate. I am fully confident that the subcommittee will be able to bring back to the Senate much valuable information which will assist the Senate in the important decisions facing it.

ESTATE OF GEORGE O'HARA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An Act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment and the Senate agree to the same.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. G. STIGLER,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar to which I have been objecting for several months, and I wish to withdraw my objection. The bill does nothing but confer upon the district court in South Carolina jurisdiction to try a case. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1793, order of business 71.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1793) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to my mind one of the most important problems facing the Congress is the question of establishing a national aviation policy.

I have never been among those who hold that we have an adequate and satisfactory aviation policy today; and I have never accepted the view which certain officials in the executive branch of the Government have repeatedly expressed, that formulation of a national aviation policy is a matter which should be left to administrative and executive officials. In my opinion, this is a matter for the Congress, and the sooner the Congress recognizes its obligation and takes action, the better it will be for this Nation.

Mr. E. E. Wilson, president of the Aircraft Industries Association, has transmitted to me a copy of a report entitled "Recommendations on National Aviation Policy," submitted to the board of trustees of the National Planning Association by Mr. William A. M. Burden.

For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I addressed to Mr. Wilson under date of November 19, Mr. Wilson's note of transmittal which accompanied Mr. Burden's report, and the report itself, in full.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVEMBER 19, 1945.

Mr. E. E. WILSON,
President, Aircraft Industries Association, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: Returning to my office today after a trip to the West, I found on my desk a pamphlet containing Mr. Burden's recommendations with respect to a national aviation policy, together with your printed note of transmittal.

I am grateful to you for bringing this to my attention.

It is encouraging to find a special committee of the National Planning Association recommending the establishment of a national aviation policy. I have been advocating exactly that for some years now. Somehow I had gained the impression that Mr. Burden was among those who contended that we already have a national aviation policy. I am glad to know otherwise.

It is not clear to me who Mr. Burden or the National Planning Association proposes shall establish this national aviation policy. It has been my consistent contention that it should be established by the Congress. Certain agencies of the Government have in the

past contended that the job should be left to executive or administrative discretion.

Thank you again for calling Mr. Burden's report to my attention.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely.

AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

Aviation not only is a vital factor in national security but has become a dynamic force in our expanding economy.

Because of this it is felt you will be interested in the attached report of a special committee of the National Planning Association recommending the establishment of a national aviation policy.

The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based on a 9-month study of military and civil aviation by a carefully selected group of leaders from government, industry, labor, education, and the armed services.

E. E. WILSON,
President.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

(By William A. M. Burden, chairman, NPA Advisory Committee on the Aircraft Industry)

BACKGROUND

Early in March of 1945, the board of trustees of the National Planning Association, recognizing the necessity for far-sighted national aviation policies, appointed an Advisory Committee on the Aircraft Industry under the chairmanship of Edward Warner, vice chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. That committee was asked to prepare and submit a report on national policies for the reconversion and postwar development of the aircraft industry. On June 22, 1945, the Advisory Committee's interim report, The V-day Problem of Military Aircraft Procurement, accompanied by a joint resolution by NPA's agriculture, business, and labor committees on national policy and its committee on international policy, was published. On September 29, Mr. Warner was elected president of the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization and the nature of his new duties made it impossible for him to continue as an NPA chairman. His resignation was therefore regretfully accepted. The board was gratified that William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air and a member of the NPA Advisory Committee, agreed to assume the chairmanship.

The Advisory Committee is currently completing work on a final report, Aircraft Manufacturing Today and Tomorrow. Because of the immediate problems facing the Nation in connection with the reconversion of the aircraft industry, however, it was felt that preliminary recommendations of the Advisory Committee should be made available to the public as soon as possible. Following a recent meeting of the Advisory Committee, Mr. Burden summarized the conclusions and recommendations generally agreed to by the Advisory Committee. These conclusions will be elaborated upon and discussed in detail in its final report, which will then be submitted to the NPA board of trustees.

Mr. Burden's summary is made public by the board as a stimulus to discussion of an important national problem. The board has not endorsed the recommendations, and will not consider endorsement of the Advisory Committee's findings and recommendations until receipt of the final report.

H. CHRISTIAN STONE,
Chairman, Board of Trustees.

OCTOBER 22, 1945.

I. INTRODUCTION

Aviation has become a force whose effect on world security and economic development, and our own strategic position and domestic economy, requires planning at the level of national policy.

I. Aviation has reached the stage where it is the most effective military instrument for maintaining world security and where the threat of stratospheric envelopment makes it impossible any longer to base national security upon geographic isolation. Our protection against armed aggression now depends on adequate air power to be used as part of the combined force of an international security organization, or independently, if necessary.

The development of the atomic bomb has created considerable speculation as to the effect that weapon may have on the present concept of military air power. Review of the potential use of the atomic bomb as an aerial weapon has led to the committee's conclusion that it provides a means of attacking an enemy that may shorten radically the time required to destroy his ability for resistance. It is, however, regarded as an instrument of air power and not as a substitute for it.

Wartime developments in electronics (radar), jet and rocket propulsion, airfoil design for supersonic speeds, and nuclear physics all have direct application to aeronautics; that is, to airplanes and to self-propelled and guided missiles. Defense against such weapons requires aircraft and guided missiles, capable of fantastic speeds, which will be able to find, intercept, and destroy the opposing weapons in the air and at their launching bases. The Army and Navy Air Forces and the aircraft industry share the responsibility for the development of offensive and defensive guided missiles launched or dropped from aircraft or supported in flight by aerodynamic principles.

II. International air commerce offers the possibility of completely transforming world cultural and trade relations, of expediting economic development in all countries, and of immensely furthering the cause of mutual understanding and peace.

III. Our domestic economy, also, will benefit tremendously from increased aeronautical activity, commercial and private, and from the employment which will be provided by the domestic aspects of our aviation—manufacturing, scheduled air transportation, commercial and private flying, airport operation, and the like.

The report of the advisory committee on the aircraft industry of the National Planning Association will concern itself primarily with aircraft manufacturing. The subject, however, cannot be treated adequately unless the other two basic elements of aviation—namely, military air force and civilian air commerce—which provide the market for our aircraft factories likewise are studied. A strong aircraft manufacturing industry is an absolute prerequisite to the proper functioning of the other two interrelated elements of our aviation. It it the reservoir from which the strength of the other two elements is drawn. Prior to the war—in the years 1936 and 1937—the aircraft industry was 61 percent a munitions industry, that is, 61 percent of the output of the industry went to the armed forces. During the war, naturally, the industry became a 100-percent munitions industry. A major question now is to what extent the aircraft industry will continue to be a munitions industry, to what extent it will produce for commercial uses, and finally, what proportion of its present capacity will not be required for peacetime aircraft production.

The commercial and military aspects of the aircraft manufacturing industry are two sides of the same coin. On the military side, we should maintain production at a rate sufficient not only to sustain a high level of research and development and to supply our Air Forces with the best airplanes by way of current replacements, but also to make possible the rapidly expanded production which would be necessary to meet emergency requirements of international obligations and national defense. On the civil side, we should strive for the greatest possible development of air commerce in order that as much of our essential aircraft manufacturing industry as possible may be supported from this economically useful source. The public investment in aviation has yielded substantial returns to the Nation, first in the contribution of military aviation toward winning the war, and second in the increased efficiency which high speed transportation has brought to our national economy. In the future, the second form of return, particularly, should multiply itself many times.

II. MILITARY AVIATION

In considering plans for restoring the aircraft industry to a peacetime basis, with the inevitable sharp shrinkage involved, the primary concern must be to insure the ability of the industry (a) to develop and produce continuously improved aircraft, and (b) to expand production to meet any future emergency requirements for world security and national defense. Such considerations lead to four basic recommendations.

I. The research and development program must be of the size and scope required for continued development of superior aerial weapons, including piloted and pilotless aircraft, guided missiles, and the like.

II. Sufficient production of successful types must be carried out to permit the Air Forces fully to test such aircraft in tactical use; to keep the Air Forces continuously equipped with the most advanced aircraft available; and to afford the aircraft industry an opportunity for developing a production technology which will permit acceleration to volume production in a minimum of time. In order to maintain thoroughly modern Air Forces, the inventory of combat airplanes should be replaced at least every 4 years, with appoximately one quarter of the equipment being replaced each year by advanced types.

III. (A) A most essential element of continued air preparedness is comprehensive and detailed industrial mobilization planning in peacetime. Such planning, which should include provisions for the retention of reserve production capacity, must be under coordinated Government direction and must be carried on by experienced, qualified, and trained personnel in the aircraft industry, the Army Air Forces, and the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics.

(B) Ample funds for this planning should be provided annually by the Congress if mobilization requirements are to be met in a future emergency.

(C) In recommending measures to insure the ability of the aircraft industry to expand its production to meet the requirements of a future mobilization, it must be understood clearly that all such measures will be fruitless unless the means exist for producing and fabricating such basic materials as aluminum, magnesium, rubber, steel, and the like in the rapidly increasing quantities that would be needed in an emergency. No disposal of the Government's war plants or production equipment for such basic supply industries should be made without full prior provision for meeting the needs, in a future emergency, of the armed forces and of essential civilian industries.

IV. (A) The volume of annual production necessary to maintain the aircraft manufacturing industry at a level of management, engineering, tooling, and production know-how which will met the foregoing requirements can be determined only by a vast amount of research and study. The report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Demobilization of the Aircraft Industry, formed by the Assistant Secretaries for Air of the War Department, Navy Department, and the Department of Commerce, and now a subcommittee of the over-all Government Air Coordinating Committee, shortly will be

presented to interested congressional committees. It is based upon studies extending over the past 2 years and will set forth the peacetime measures that must be taken if the aircraft requirements of a future mobilization are to be met. The recommendations of the Interdepartmental Committee should be given full consideration by the Congress, the Surplus Property Administration, and the Army and Navy.

(B) We further recommend the encouragement of that healthy competition in design and development in the aircraft industry which made it possible for some 20 companies to provide the basis for expansion in the 1940-44 period.

In order to provide a proper legal basis for the aircraft procurement program contemplated by the foregoing, it is evident that the basic military procurement statutes (the Air Corps Act of 1926 and similar acts) will have to be revised and modernized to bring them into line with wartime procurement and production experience. Until this can be accomplished, it is recommended that authority for negotiated procurement contracts (including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts), as at present conferred by the War Powers Acts, be continued.

III. CIVIL AVIATION

Air transportation

The regulation of common carriers by air should be left entirely in the hands of the Federal Government, without attempts by the States to segregate any intrastate aspects thereof for purposes of safety or economic regulation. Double taxation of air transportation by the States should be avoided.

Maximum development and utilization of air transportation should be encouraged by dispatching by air, without surcharge, all domestic first-class mail where this will expedite delivery. Air parcel post should be inaugurated at postage rates having a proper relation to the ton-mile cost of the transportation.

Local intercommunity air transportation services should be encouraged where such services appear likely to approach self-support in a reasonable length of time. Such encouragement might be afforded by subsidizing one or two local experimental services in each of the major areas of this country. Initial subsidies should be on a sufficient scale to insure a sound operation, but the subsidy arrangements should be subject to review at the end of a reasonable period.

In view of the accelerated development that is now taking place in methods of propulsion and structural design of transport planes, Government regulation of rates and profits of air carriers (including the amount of depreciation allowed for tax purposes) should be administered in such a manner that carriers will be able financially to replace promptly their flying equipment as more advanced designs become available.

In the field of international air transportation, the principle of regulated competition between several United States flag air carriers should be adopted wherever economically feasible. This principle has been recognized by the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the North Atlantic Route Case.

International cooperation for the development of air commerce, furthered by the Chicago International Civil Aviation Conference of 1944, should be strengthened and extended with the aid of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the instrumentality established for this purpose. Emphasis should be placed upon the removal of restrictions limiting commercial rights in international air transportation.

Unscheduled commercial and private flying

These elements of our aviation offer an even greater commercial potential than scheduled air transportation. Their promotion should be accomplished by measures calculated especially to improve the safety and the utility of the smaller airplanes. By "utility" we mean a combination of economy, reliability, and convenience of use. It is accordingly recommended that the following measures be taken, with proper participation by the Federal Government:

I. Provision of a large number of carefully planned and located airports, together with airways improvements, navigation facilities, and traffic control.

II. Research and experimentation with respect to the smaller types of airplanes—especially new types of unconventional design—and their accessories. Improved safety should be a primary consideration.

III. Research on improved methods of pilot selection and training

In addition to the above-mentioned positive technical measures there should be a minimum of economic regulation of unscheduled flying, as well as the elimination of unnecessary technical regulation not contributing toward safety.

Aeronautical education

Civilian pilot training: The maximum development of civilian flying is so important to our national interests that proper action should be taken to insure that a substantial number of young men and women learn to fly each year. Their financial resources are limited, and until the cost of flight instruction is substantially reduced, they will need assistance in order to reach the goal of participation in aviation. It is therefore recommended that a Civilian Pilot Training Program for college-age youth be undertaken by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The program should provide Federal subsidization of part of the cost of flight instruction necessary for private pilot certification.

General aviation education: The work of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in stimulating aviation for American youth should be continued and strengthened. Such encouragement, guidance, and technical assistance should extend through all levels of education in order that knowledge of and skill in aviation activities may be widespread throughout the Nation, and a fundamentally sound foundation for the continued development of civil aviation may be assured.

IV. RESEARCH

Since adequate research and development are the prerequisite to aeronautical progress, such activities should be continued at a rate which will assure our technological and industrial leadership.

Legislation to promote scientific research and scientific education through a Government-supported National Research Foundation should be adopted. Such legislation should provide for research on problems of military importance, including the aeronautical field, as part of an over-all program. The function of the Government in this field should be to coordinate, but not to direct, activities. Government-financed fundamental aeronautical research should continue to be carried out by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Exploration of possible military applications of the results of research is the function of the Army and Navy. The program should be designed to supplement and strengthen, not to replace, these activities.

Applied research and development, where competitive excellence in applying basic principles to the design and development of aircraft and aerial weapons is of the first importance, should continue to be the responsibility of the industry. The final step, that of evaluating the finished product, is again in the hands of the armed services and commercial users.

V. SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Aeronautical matériel and plants should be disposed of in such a way as to preserve, as a national asset, the capacity of our permanent aircraft manufacturing industry for research, development, and production of aircraft and aeronautical devices of the very latest types.

Aviation plants, in particular, should be accorded special treatment when the preservation of their specialized characteristics is stated by the armed services to be essential to national defense. Indeed, title to plants (together with a sufficient quantity of general purpose machine tools) useful for these purposes should be left in, or transferred to, the armed services. Any leases of these plants should be made by the services in accordance with the policies of the Surplus Property Administration. The general principle of financial benefit to the Government (stated as one of the objectives of the Surplus Property Act of 1944) should not outweigh all other considerations in these particular disposals. Leases with rentals keyed to the volume of production are specifically recommended in such instances in order to enable aircraft manufacturers to carry war-built facilities during the period of reduced volume of business which will follow the war, so that they will be available for expansion in the event of an emergency.

Aeronautical matériel should be disposed of in an orderly manner, satisfying the legitimate market and using industrial channels in the normal way. While the disposal of surpluses in this manner will in some instances temporarily preclude the manufacture of items similar to those in surplus, the stimulus to aviation which will attend the widespread distribution of the less expensive surplus matériel should result in a substantial long-term benefit to the manufacturing industry. Also, the Government research program here recommended will mitigate the temporary loss of business to the manufacturer by stimulating the development of improved products.

Congress should make it mandatory that all surplus aeronautical matériel, of which disposal has not been made within 2 years following the cessation of hostilities, be relegated to the scrap heap and sold only for its basic material content.

Particular attention should be given to the development of aeronautical knowledge in the United States through the distribution of aeronautical surpluses for educational use.

VI. EXPORT POLICIES AND MARKETS

In the aircraft manufacturing industry, exports have accounted for a larger proportion of the dollar volume produced than have exports in almost any other manufacturing industry.

It is recommended that, in order to promote our aviation abroad, Government policy be directed toward the following ends:

I. Liberal policies with respect to licensing, for export and for manufacture abroad, of our latest and best designs, to the extent consistent with national security.

II. Effective cooperation of military, commercial, and civil air attachés of our Government abroad in prompt reporting of information with respect to aviation in foreign countries, as well as in the furtherance of our own aviation.

III. Technical assistance to friendly foreign countries, especially by making aeronautical training in this country available to nationals of other countries. The cost of such training should be borne partly by the foreign government and partly by our Government.

SILVER

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, those of us who are interested in remonetization of silver, and in establishing a sound monetary system for the United States, believe that the time has arrived when there should be no further depletion of the silver in the Treasury of the United States. The silver in the Treasury is by

law worth $1.29 an ounce. To sell that silver to private industry for less than its monetary value is to my mind unsound, uneconomic, and unworthy of governmental action.

Therefore it is our position that no more silver should be sold to private industry unless it be sold at its monetary value and its monetary worth; that all silver produced in the United States should be taken into the Treasury of the United States and there coined and put out, so that the taxpayers of the country will not be paying taxes on obligations of the Government of the United States issued in order to obtain private money.

Mr. President, the world is not producing silver in sufficient quantities to meet the demands of industry and the demands of our Treasury. We are many hundred million ounces short of the amount of silver necessary to enable us to meet our demands, not only for Treasury purposes but also for industrial purposes. The law passed by the Congress in 1934 requiring the Treasury of the United States to purchase silver until it arrives at a certain parity with gold, the fact that there is a shortage of silver, and the fact that we are not getting the silver into the Treasury—all these things militate against further proceeding along the lines of what is known as the Green bill, or selling silver to private industry for 71 cents an ounce. That which is worth $1.29 to the people of this country should not be sold for 71 cents. It is simply an error, an economic mistake, and it must go no further.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State Board of Control;

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 207, which has for its purpose placing upon the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 116, dealing with the discharge of fathers from the armed services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 207) to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion; and it is debatable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Is the question on agreeing to the resolution, or on the motion to take it up?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 207.

Mr. HATCH. The resolution provides for discharging the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116 and placing it on the calendar, does it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not feel it is necessary to go into an extended argument on this subject. I believe every Member of the Senate knows the purpose of the resolution. Throughout the course of this week, from day to day, phases of the subject have been debated and discussed. Because of parliamentary rules, the subject has not come before the Senate until this moment, and we are now considering Senate Resolution 207, which has for its purpose placing on the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 116.

Briefly, Mr. President, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 116 is to make the fact that a man has one or more children ground for his discharge from the armed services. At the present time the rule exists that having three children furnishes ground for discharge, but both the War Department and the Navy Department have declined to reduce the number of children entitling a man to discharge.

Passage of the joint resolution would not change in any way the existing grounds or methods of discharge. The joint resolution itself states that the men shall be discharged as rapidly as facilities will permit. They can be discharged only upon their own application.

The joint resolution would not apply to members of the Regular Army or the Regular Navy. Nor would it apply to those who have enlisted since October 6, 1945, the date when the new voluntary-enlistment law went into effect.

Mr. President, although this proposal is opposed by the War Department and the Navy Department at this time, and was originally opposed by the Selective Service, I feel that it is the duty of the United States Senate to inquire into the subject and make a decision as to whether or not family relationship should be grounds for a discharge. Among the grounds for discharge which are recognized is that of hardship cases. The services have reached the point where they say that if a man in the service has three children that is grounds for discharge. I take the position that it makes no difference whether a man has three children, two children, or one child. If he has a home which must be maintained, that fact should be given consideration by the Congress in determining whether or not that relationship should be additional grounds for discharge from the service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose?

Mr. MORSE. For the purpose of a question on the subject which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's understanding that a recent order of the Selective Service organization now exempts fathers from drafting whether they have one or more children?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that during this week, in the midst of the discussion of this subject, I was advised, and so stated on the floor of the Senate, that the Selective Service has seen fit to issue an order stopping the drafting of fathers. I am advised that that order has gone forth throughout the States of the Union.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree that if the principle is sound with regard to not drafting fathers, it is likewise sound so far as concerns the demobilization of fathers who are already in the service?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, I agree with the principle. Fathers who have been in the service for 3 years or more should be entitled to as much consideration as fathers who today would be subject to the draft. I do not believe that fathers ought to be drafted today, and I am very much gratified that the order has been issued by the Selective Service after so long a time.

Mr. President, I do not propose to debate at length the virtues of Joint Resolution 116. What I am trying to do at this time is to have the Senate consent to consider the question, so that it may be brought before this body for proper consideration.

Senate Joint Resolution 116 was introduced on November 8. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and on December 4 the Committee on Military Affairs considered the joint resolution and rejected it. As I have previously stated, all committees of the Senate are but the creatures and servants of the Senate. This is a matter of such prime importance that I feel that the Senate itself ought to give consideration to this burning question. It is not only a burning question for the men who are in the service and held there away from their homes and families. but it means more

to the children and to the homes from which fathers are kept than it may mean to the men themselves.

I recall when we started the drafting of fathers. It was done because it was felt to be necessary. They were taken from their families. We realized, perhaps, what we were doing at that time to the homes of this country. But, Mr. President, the fighting is over, and those men ought to be returned to their homes.

I have in my pocket several letters which I received in this morning's mail. During the past several weeks I have received hundreds of letters, many from mothers in homes which are affected, and some from persons who would not be affected by the passage of the joint resolution, but to whom the proposal appeals as just and fair. I have received many letters from overseas, both from the Pacific area and from the European area. To me the letters are very impressive, and bring home to me the realness of the subject. I do not wish to appeal in any way to sentimentality; but if there is sentiment involved in this question, it is a good sentiment, and one which I hope I shall never lose.

This morning I received two letters from China, one from Japan, and one from Korea, all from American soldiers. They are from men who are performing no service. I do not wish to do anything which would prevent bringing home men who have been in combat service; but the joint resolution would not have that effect, because today we have in the Army more than 4,000,000 men, and the release of men with children along with those who, as a result of their service, deserve release, is a step which ought to be taken by the Congress.

All week I have tried to get this subject before the Senate. On the last day of this session the subject comes before us again. We are going home for Christmas. We are going home to our families, and we are delighted with the prospect. While the passage of the joint resolution before the Christmas holidays would not result in the release of men to go home for Christmas, yet it would bring renewed courage to the hearts of many in the homes of America, and it would lift up the spirits of many a father in the service who is cast down by being held there against his will.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate should act, and let the House of Representatives act as soon as it will. We should perform our duty in this respect. I would not take any step which would in any way reduce our forces to the point where they could not perform their function in the defense of this country. But there are more than 4,000,000 men still in the service. The War Department itself gives the astonishing figure of 23 percent as representing the number of fathers in the Army, including officers and those detained under arrest. I am told that the same percentage holds true for the Navy.

Even if the joint resolution were passed, it would not result in the discharge of all fathers. Those who are members of the Regular Army could not be released; and those who have volunteered since October 6 could not be released. We would still maintain an Army of sufficient strength to meet any need. That fact, together with new enlistments in the services, would assure us that action under the joint resolution would not reduce the Army to a point where there would be any danger to the well-being and defense of the country.

In the last week of November enlistments in the Army alone under the voluntary enlistment system exceeded 8,000 a day. In the month of November 185,000 volunteered for service in the Army, and since the enactment of that law 250,000 have gone into the Army alone. In the light of those facts, can anyone see any danger of our not being able to build up the Army to a position of strength, and maintain it?

I look for the day—and at the present rate of enlistments that day is coming soon—when the Army will be entirely upon a voluntary basis, and enforced service in the armed services of our country will have ended. Impressed service is justified in time of war, but under our views of liberty and life in America impressed service has little place in the national picture in time of peace.

So today I make this appeal on the ground of the reason and righteousness of the cause. Men who have established bona fide relationships, and who have a child or children, should be permitted to return home when they make application to do so, not so much for their own good as for the good of the country and the maintenance of the American home.

As I have said, I do not wish to proceed at great length, because we have discussed this matter all week. I hope Resolution 207 will be adopted, so that Joint Resolution 116 may be placed upon the calendar for early consideration.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have noticed that in the discussion all during this week never once has the Senator mentioned—probably it was by inadvertence that he did not do so—the astounding figures given by J. Edgar Hoover in regard to the terrific increase in juvenile delinquency all over America because of the absence of some of these fathers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that point is well made by the Senator from North Dakota. Of course the absence of fathers from the homes will contribute to juvenile delinquency, and that statement has been made by Mr. Hoover, the head of the FBI. I wish to say that if we are going to have due regard for the homes and the well-being of the children of America, if we really wish to stop deliquency among juveniles, there is no sounder step which may be taken than to return to the homes the heads of the families, so that the fathers may be there to guide their children.

Mr. President, I wish I could have time on this the last day of our session, before we return to our homes, to reveal to the Senate the contents of the letters which I have received and to tell the Senate the stories they contain. If I had the time to do so, I do not believe a Senator on the floor of the Senate would oppose the resolution. The writers of many of the letters say they have no place to live, that they cannot meet the costs of living, even though they are doing all they can. Some of them write, "I am trying to hold my family together, and my husband writes to me from over in the South Pacific that he is sitting there and does not know when he will be able to come home." Others write to me that—"I have done the best I can do, but I am about to give up, and I do not know what is to become of us."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the point the Senator has just made needs emphasis and reemphasis. My mail, like that of the Senator from West Virginia, shows that there are a great many families of men in the service who cannot make ends meet on the basis of the meager allotments which this Government affords them while the fathers and husbands are in the service. I think it is a disgraceful thing that we keep the men in the service and do not provide their families with sufficient to enable them to maintain the standard of living in this country—the high standard of living about which we boast. I think this Government at least should agree to some such proposal as the one I made during this session, namely, to increase the allotments paid to the families of servicemen while the fathers and husbands are away.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Let me say to him that the question of meeting the cost of living is one phase, and a very important one, of the problem. I know it exists, not merely in one or two cases, but in many. In some instances the families of absent servicemen have moved into the homes of friends; in other instances the families have moved into the homes of kinspeople. In many cases the resultant situations are unbearable, as we learn by some of the letters we receive.

But, Mr. President, as mentioned a moment ago by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], we must consider something in addition to the matter of physical sustenance. We must also consider the matter of the maintenance of these homes and the guidance of the children, which is most important during their formative years.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I desire to congratulate the Senator on the course he is so effectively pursuing.

Next, let me say that, as I recall, at a previous time, during the war, we had under consideration in the Senate an amendment which would have stopped the drafting of fathers. I voted for that amendment. Aside from the killing and wounding of our men in the war, I do not believe that any damage which has been inflicted upon the people of this country has had more serious effects than that which has resulted to our homes and our institutions because of needlessly taking married men into the armed services. Therefore, Mr. President, the least we can do at this time is to get them out and to get them out as quickly as possible and bring them home to their families.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for stating the matter so ably and so pointedly, as he usually does in connection with any question he discusses.

The question here is whether the Senate is going to be fair enough to meet this question head-on, or whether the Senate is going to delay and block the accomplishment of the purpose we have stated by means of parliamentary procedure controlled by those on the majority side who have controlled it up to this time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to ask the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, whether there is any practical reason, from the Army's standpoint, for not discharging all fathers who are in the services.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a step which the Army and I and the Senator from Indiana might consider practical probably would not be considered practical by someone else. But under the Army's plan, married persons in the service are integrated into units. The point system is working. Everyone knows that, naturally enough, married persons with a number of dependents were among the last ones to enter the service, and the result has been that they have accumulated a lesser number of points than have the men who went into the service earlier.

Today the Army and the Navy are bringing home more men than can be transported across the country promptly when they arrive.

Let me also say that, of course, we all know that placing the joint resolution on the calendar will in no sense result in bringing home a single additional father. Everyone knows that. The House of Representatives will not act upon the measure during this session. Everyone knows, if I may answer the Senator, that without the making a single remark about the resolution in the course of debate on the floor of the Senate an order was issued yesterday or the day before by the Director of the Selective Service System stopping the drafting of fathers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must interrupt at this point, inasmuch as I have the floor. I must say to the Senator from Utah that he is mistaken when he says that, without having a word on the subject said on the floor of the Senate, an order was issued by the Selectice Service System stopping the drafting of fathers. We have been talking about the subject and about the resolution for days. We have repeatedly discussed the very thing which was done by the Selective Service System and the very thing about which it has delayed action for months and months after it has been requested to take it. The joint resolution was introduced on November 8, and on the 20th of December the Selective Service System issued an order. Mr. President, it has been discussed and it has been urged, and the joint resolution would have been on the calendar but for the opposition of the Senator from Utah and other Senators on the majority side.

Mr. President, in reply to the statement that our action on the resolution will not help in this situation, I wish to say it will be just one step toward achieving the desired end. As I said a moment ago, placing the resolution on the calendar will not enact it into law. The passage of the joint resolution by the Senate today would not bring a father home tomorrow in time for Christmas.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, all that I said was the adoption of the Senator's resolution and the passage of the joint resolution by the Senate today would not bring a single father home tomorrow. That is what I said.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Utah that it is but one step toward getting the fathers home that much sooner. The adoption of my resolution and the passage of the joint resolution by the Senate and its subsequent passage by the House of Representatives would bring the fathers home. Certainly the Senate will have performed its part by passing the joint resolution promptly; and as I have previously stated, such action will definitely have the effect of encouraging and strengthening those at home and giving them a little more heart to face the difficulties which they now must face, day in and day out, and it will left up the hearts of the men in the service who feel and who know that they should be with their families.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. For what purpose does the Senator wish to have me yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to answer the statement of the able Senator from Utah that the Selective Service System only on yesterday issued an order providing that no more fathers will be drafted. I wish to say that it is my opinion that the order was issued as a direct result of the many statements and many fine speeches which the able Senator from West Virginia has been making on the floor of the Senate for the past 30 days.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not want to talk against the opinion of anyone, nor against the facts with regard to the issuance of the order to which reference has been made. I do not make a statement in defense of anyone, or in opposition to any Senator who has spoken. The officials of our Government are human beings just as Senators are human beings. They act in accordance with the law, and they try to act in accordance with reasonable understandings.

The Director of Selective Service sent a communication to the committee which was read by the Senator from West Virginia, and put into the record. The communication stated that the Director of Selective Service was opposed to legislation being enacted in regard to this subject, because the matter could be settled by Executive orders or by proper directives. Therefore, if it is to be settled, let it be settled in that way. It would be a quicker method to pursue, and would not in any way upset the operation of the law.

The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee told the members of the committee that so long as there was an opportunity of a solution being arrived at in accordance with the suggestion which had been made by the Director of Selective Service, the committee should be in favor of finding the best proper method to follow, and that he would take the matter up with the Secretary of War and with the Director of Selective Service. He took the matter up with them that very afternoon. He did not wait until the next day. He made an appointment with the Secretary of War, and with him went over all the matters in respect to the issuance of this order. A decision was reached that we should move toward the end which had been suggested. Every Member of the Senate knows that he would condemn any administrator who issued an order affecting any person without first making a proper investigation with reference to the subject involved. I do not know whether the Director of Selective Service took 2 hours longer than he should have taken, or 2 days longer than he should have taken, but I do know that the order was ready to be issued before the request was made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we should all be fair about these matters. The people of the country should not be given an opportunity to feel that some member of the Committee on Military Affairs believes that he has a grievance against the chairman of the committee, or against the remaining members of the committee for not considering his resolution. The joint resolution was considered and it was not reported favorably. As it now appears before the Senate it has been modified.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must interrupt the able Senator from Utah. The modifications were made in the meeting of the committee. They were shown to those members of the Military Affairs Committee who were present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And the chairman of the committee said that he had no objection to a modified form being printed and that was done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; and the committee voted down the resolution containing the modifications.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is not my understanding, Mr. President. My understanding is that the modifications were put in after the action was taken on the resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I must correct the able Senator on that subject. After the modifications were made I expressly addressed myself to the chairman. The modifications were discussed. I asked that action be taken on the modified form of the resolution, and action was taken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not want to say anything in defense of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. I do wish, however, to say something in defense of the Secretary of War. I believe that we should

not criticize an administrator for taking time to consider these matters properly, especially when after he has given such consideration he does exactly what is expected of him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say with respect to the issuance of the order day before yesterday by the Director of Selective Service, terminating the drafting of fathers, that it makes no difference whether or not the issuance of the order resulted from the introduction of the joint resolution. The order was issued afterward. It makes no difference whether it came after the action of the committee upon the resolution, and it makes no difference whether it came after the debates and the discussions which took place on the floor of the Senate. It was done, and the good end sought was obtained. That is all I wanted. I should be very glad if today the Army would issue an order making fatherhood a ground of discharge. I want results. But that has not been done, and the officials of the Selective Service did not act until after this matter was brought to the floor of the Senate.

I may say further, Mr. President, that apparently there is no intention on the part of the War Department, or on the part of the Navy Department, to do what is sought to be done through the joint resolution. But that is not the question before the Senate. The question before us is whether or not we are going to meet squarely and directly and decide this issue.

Mr. MILLIKIN rose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to second the distinguished Senator's thought that this is not a matter of committee punctilio or War Department punctilio. There is before us only one question, namely, the question of getting fathers home to their families. It is a matter of common notoriety that the War Department was caught off base at the end of the war, and did not have plans for returning these men to their homes. At the very top of the list there should have been plans in being for starting those men on their way home on the first day after the last day of the war. But there were no such plans, and every day's delay is a tragedy. It is ruining homes and filling our divorce courts. It is time that we end it. If we could give up our Christmas holidays in order to expedite that which the Senator from West Virginia is urging, the time would be well spent and the little sacrifice which would be involved would be well made.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his statement. I heartily agree with him.

Mr. President, we are about to take an adjournment, and I was one of those who expressed a desire for a shorter period of adjournment than the Senate will take. I did not express the desire because I did not need a vacation of the length of time which the Senate will take, and I know that every other Member of the Senate needs the time as well as I. But we cannot justify taking the time, or any length of time, if we fail to decide this issue and walk out of the Chamber without having arrived at a proper solution of the problem. During the last week or 10 days the Senate has appropriated millions upon millions of dollars for the relief of people in foreign lands. The Senate passed a resolution favoring the establishment of a Jewish homeland. It was a good resolution, and I supported it. We have talked about stock-pile bills, and we have passed bills to pile up materials in this country. Yet, Mr. President, there are Members of the Senate who have apparently forgotten the men who fought for us. I hope the time has not arrived when the American Government will be so world-wide in its thoughts that it will forget its own people.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia for the fight he is making for a most important and vital cause. His perseverance has borne some fruit, as shown by the recent order of the Director of Selective Service, and I hope that his perseverance will result in accomplishing the objectives of his joint resolution.

I may say to the Senator that in my file are a number of letters which were received within the last few days. Those letters state that fathers of children today are waiting in ports of embarkation to be sent overseas. I cannot verify the statements contained in the letters, but I have them under investigation. I also have a number of letters in my file stating that the policy is being continued of sending fathers of children overseas to be used in the occupational forces abroad. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia has any information on that subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Iowa I may say that not only have I received letters on the subject, but I have talked with fathers in my office who came from various States, and were on their way to nearby embarkation points with the knowledge that they were to be sent abroad. Yes; the situation referred to by the Senator from Iowa exists, and up until the day before yesterday fathers were being drafted and sent overseas, and some from our shores today are overseas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to yield that I may make a comment or observation with regard to the degree to which we seem to have forgotten the rights of servicemen.

I have received a great many telegrams, the one in my hand being only an example, protesting the inability of servicemen to obtain transportation home. It is signed by seven persons, and points out that the port facilities of the west coast are jammed with boats loaded with soldiers who cannot be sent ashore because of the break-down, apparently, in the transportation facilities of the country and the failure to give these soldiers travel priority.

I point out to the Senator from West Virginia that when the war was on and we were sending these boys to ports of embarkation there was not the slightest hesitancy on the part of this Government to so arrange travel priorities and that civilians were required to stay at home, as they should have been required to stay at home unless their trip was essential. I think it is most regrettable, with these men available to go home, that the ODT and this administration have not so arranged travel during this period that civilians are required to stay at home in order that these soldiers can get home.

I am in entire sympathy with such telegrams as I have received signed by distinguished citizens of the west coast. A portion of this one reads as follows:

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Papers filled with stories of military personnel jamming west coast ports due to lack of transportation. It seems to us the time has come for Office of Defense Transportation to eliminate or basically curtail civilian travel.

That is one reason why I think the Congress could well afford to stay here in Washington during the Christmas recess.

We promised these men, when they went overseas, the world with a rope around it. We now leave them aboard vessels in harbors or jammed in fourth- or fifth-class railroad equipment while overfed civilians are riding in parlor cars and eating the best food. These servicemen have to subsist on meager rations even while on trains so we are advised. If necessary all civilian travel should be eliminated from Pacific coast and to points east from ports of landing.

I think the Senator from West Virginia deserves the commendation of the Senate for the fight he is putting up in endeavoring to clear up some of the gross inefficiency that still characterizes the demobilization program of the Army and Navy and of the administration.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much for his statement.

Mr. President, I do not feel that further argument is necessary upon this subject. Every Member of the Senate is aware of the condition; every Senator is familiar with the subject. So I ask for the adoption of this resolution today so that Senate Joint Resolution 116 may be placed on the calendar for the earliest possible consideration, since it cannot be considered until it is on the calendar.

I ask it in the name of what is right for the country; I ask it in the name of homes and families that are struggling under great hardship to meet the needs of life; I ask it in the name of the children of this country who need the guidance of their fathers, and I ask it in the name of those men who so often have said in their letters to me, as I know they have said in letters to other Senators, "I am needed at home; I want to be there; I want to take up where I left off. Now that the fighting is over I want to take up with my family again the work which was interrupted by my military service."

So, Mr. President, I hope that this resolution to place Senate Joint Resolution 116 on the calendar may be adopted by the Senate, so that when we walk

out of here for the short adjournment over the Christmastime at least we will have taken one more step toward the accomplishment of the good end that is sought by this resolution.

PROPOSED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LEGISLATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to the bill, S. 101, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin or ancestry. I ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, these amendments are intended to be proposed by myself, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] when Senate bill 101 is taken up by the Senate for consideration.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] hoped to offer one of these amendments and to make some remarks in favor of the early consideration of Senate bill 101, but, unfortunately, he had an engagement which he could not break, and he could not be here today. He asked me to state that he intends to speak on this bill early in the next session.

Mr. President, these are very simple but important amendments which we have proposed to Senate bill 101, the bill to create a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission.

One of the amendments would change the coverage of the bill. As it now reads it would apply to any labor union with six or more members or any employer having six or more employees. One amendment would substitute the number 25 for 6 in both places. We believe that would eliminate one major objection to the bill, namely that the Federal agency should not be concerning itself with the relatively small establishments where there is a very close relationship between the employer and employee.

The other amendment concerns the procedures for appeal to the courts from orders of the proposed commission. The procedures for an appeal to the courts from orders of the proposed commission would be changed by the amendment from the procedures provided for appeal from orders of the National Labor Relations Board, to those provided for appeals from orders of the Federal Trade Commission, with this important change:

> Provided, however, that the findings of fact by the Commission shall be conclusive only when supported by substantial evidence.

In other words, we propose to give the courts much greater scope in reviewing the facts of any case before the Fair Employment Practice Commission than they have in reviewing the facts in any case decided by the Federal Trade Commission. In trying to prevent discrimination in employment, we realize the Federal Government is entering a relatively new field, where generally accepted guideposts and criteria are lacking. It becomes, therefore, important to guard against arbitrary and unreasonable actions by the Commission by granting the courts this broader review authority.

Mr. President, I and my colleagues who are sponsoring these amendments believe this bill, S. 101, is one of the most important measures before the Senate, and I intend to do all I can to force consideration of this bill early in 1946.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that it is my purpose as soon as possible, directly after Congress reconvenes following the holiday adjournment, to move to take up Senate bill 101.

Mr. BALL. I am glad to hear that. I certainly shall support the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will yield further, may I ask him whether he has seen the Executive order issued by the President yesterday in respect to the FEPC.

Mr. BALL. Yes; I have.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Has the Senator also seen the directive which the President issued to the different departments of the Government with reference to fair employment practices?

Mr. BALL. Yes, and I should be glad to have the Senator place the Executive order and the directive in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico repeat his declaration. I did not understand it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I made the statement to the Senator from Minnesota and to the Senate that it was my purpose directly after the Senate reconvenes following the adjournment to make a motion to take up for consideration Senate bill 101, which is the fair employment practices bill, on which the Senator from Minnesota is now speaking.

I also asked the Senator from Minnesota whether he had seen the Executive order issued by President Truman yesterday with respect to fair employment practices and also the directive which the President issued to the different departments of the Government with reference to fair employment practices.

At this time, Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will allow me, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, either at this place or following his remarks, the Executive order issued yesterday by the President dealing with the matter of fair employment practices, together with the directive to the different departments.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am glad to get the information, and the Lord willing, I shall be here.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask that the order and directive presented by the Senator from New Mexico be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we have just won a great world war for freedom and democratic opportunity for the individual, at a cost of more than 250,000 American lives and 800,000 additional casualties. I have heard a great many Senators here on this floor express great concern over the fact that, despite our victory in the war, the bitter fact is that the freedom and opportunities, the rights and dignities of individual men and women are today being ruthlessly suppressed in many parts of the world.

Mr. President, I share the concern of my colleagues over that international situation. But I call the attention of the Senate to the bitter fact that 169 years after the Declaration of Independence, we still have here in the United States some 13,000,000 Negroes who are in fact treated as second-class citizens, who are denied the equal rights and opportunities promised to all citizens in that immortal document. I suggest that while we are rightly concerned with the suppression of freedom and opportunity anywhere in the world, it is even more imperative that we concern ourselves with their suppression right here in the United States.

Creation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, I grant, is only a small step toward that objective. All it will do is to provide for Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, and other minority groups who find themselves objects of discrimination which sharply limits their economic opportunities, a Government agency to which they can appeal for aid. The primary function of that Federal agency, as has proven to be the case with the agency created by Executive order during the war, will be educational: the bringing of employer and employee groups together with minority groups, the practical spreading of tolerance so essential to a democratic republic. To perform that function effectively, the Commission must have powers of compulsion, but likewise must exercise such powers only as a last resort, when all efforts at persuasion and education have failed.

Mr. President, I am aware that our colleagues from many Southern States are bitterly opposed to this and other legislation designed to implement the guaranties of individual rights in the Constitution and Declaration of Independence. If I am not mistaken, they are equally opposed to communism and other totalitarian doctrines. Yet the failure of Congress, year after year, to make even the slightest beginning toward correcting this injustice, is driving millions of Negroes into the arms of the Communist Party, which holds out to them the promise of complete racial equality. All of us here realize that this promise of communism is a snare, because if a Communist dictatorship ever rules America, it will mean slavery for all, the liquidation of all individual freedoms. I am sure that this is not the kind of equality—equality in slavery—for which Negroes are striving. What they seek and what we owe to them is equality in freedom and opportunity. But I cannot blame them if, embittered by the failure of their Government to act year after year, they finally help pull all of us down to and below their own level.

Mr. President, the Congress should act soon on this measure, not only in justice to nearly one-tenth of our people, but to protect the future democracy of this Republic. Proponents of dictatorship, whether of the political right or left, always thrive when they can succeed in turning race against race, creed against creed. We must guard America against the fate that overtook central Europe.

EXHIBIT A

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONTINUING THE WORK OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 20, 1945.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, it is hereby ordered as follows:

The duties and responsibilities imposed upon the Committee on Fair Employment Practice by Executive Order 8802, dated June 25, 1941, as amended by Executive Order 8823 of July 18, 1941, and by Executive Order 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall be continued thereunder for the period and subject to the conditions stated in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 156, 79th Cong., 1st sess., approved July 17, 1945).

As a part of its duties, the Committee shall investigate, make findings and recommendations, and report to the President with respect to discrimination in industries engaged in work contributing to the production of military supplies or to the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1945.*

In connection with the attached Executive order, the President has sent the following directive to the heads of all Government departments, agencies, and independent establishments:

"Cut-backs in Government employment have resulted in a considerable displacement of wartime workers in Washington and the field. The Civil Service Commission, in the interest of retaining capable and efficient employees wherever possible, has established a set of principles governing reduction in force and transfer of employees to peacetime activity. It has come to my attention that a considerable number of loyal and qualified employees have been refused transfer and reemployment by employing agencies solely because of race and creed. This condition is a violation of civil-service rules which have been issued by the President and in violation of existing law.

"I am writing to request that you make careful analysis of your personnel policies, procedures, and practices in order that you can assure me that they are in accord with national law and policy, and in order that all qualified workers in existing temporary war jobs will be considered fairly for appointments without distinction because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"In addition, your full cooperation with FEPC in all matters affecting the employment of minorities in Government is requested."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise to endorse the amendments to Senate bill 101, a measure to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, proposed by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. President, the amendments are offered with the one purpose of facilitating the passage of Senate bill 101. The amendment to raise the exemption number of 6 to 25 erases the complaint that the agency's operations would enter into intimate small employer-employee relationships; yet it brings under the jurisdiction of the bill the great bulk of employees and large employers and unions in business operations affecting interstate commerce. The substantial evidence clause should assure employers and unions alike that in the process of judicial review, they will be protected against any arbitrary findings or decisions. In addition, extension of the substantial evidence rule, as provided for in the amendment, will set a good example to administrative law procedure.

It is my considered opinion that the bill and its amendments comprise a fair bill, a reasonable bill, and a vitally needed bill. I do not mean that the bill should not be subjected to further amendment if some other amendment would advance its objectives. I would look with favor upon any amendment which could be demonstrated to be an improvement of the bill. But, as I have said, I think the bill, including the amendments introduced today, is a fair, reasonable, and vitually needed measure. We need a Fair Employment Practice Commission now more than we have at any other time. Yet, the fact is that, in effect, we have no FEPC at the present time. Such a situation is fraught with serious implications to our domestic well-being.

Mr. President, you will recall, as I think every one of my collegaues will also remember, the way this Senate labored last June and July to pass an FEPC appropriation for the wartime agency. For more than 20 days the House and Senate fought for the simple privilege of getting that appropriation before both bodies for a vote. For 3 days the Senate listened to a filibuster conducted by Democratic Senators to kill the appropriation. If those tactics did not kill the FEPC instantaneously, they did succeed, with the acquiescence of the majority leadership, in assuring slow death for the agency by cutting its appropriation in half.

I protested that kind of slow strangulation of an agency which had proved its worth in wartime and was up against an even greater urgency in the reconversion period. I protested that compromise by voting against it, and at that time I said:

> By decreasing the appropriation for FEPC to the amount which finally was granted in the unreasonable compromise proposed by leaders on the other side of the aisle, I think the FEPC was dealt a mortal blow. That is what was done by the compromise. I speak about it in order to make perfectly clear for the record and to the people of the country the true nature of this compromise.

Now I report to the Senate that what I said when I set forth my reasons for voting against the compromise has come to pass. What now passes for a Fair Employment Practice Committee is but a moribund agency, literally dying on its feet, and without any powers to carry out its directives.

Even after closing 12 of its 15 field offices, cutting back its over-all staff from 114 to 55, and reducing its operations to an insignificant minimum, the committee has on hand but $65,000, and it faces the prospect of having to close its doors soon after the turn of the year.

Mr. President, if the people think an FEPC was salvaged out of the protracted struggle of last June and July, I submit they have been grossly misled. What we have now is a Fair Employment Practice Committee in name only.

When I voiced my objection to the halving of the FEPC's funds last June, it was argued on the other side of the aisle that "with every deficiency appropriation we shall be afforded another opportunity to increase the amount in order to maintain the existence of the agency."

May I ask when? On Saturday of last week, the very day when the majority of the FEPC branch offices, including the New York office, were closing, we in the Senate passed upon the 1945 deficiency bill. That deficiency bill was voted through without having any Senator say one word about FEPC, and without the appropriation to it of $1 by way of deficiency appropriation. I am advised that through its Bureau of the Budget, the national administration determined that it would not seek any deficiency appropriation for this agency. The argument of the Democrats last June about a deficiency appropriation was just another political gesture made to hold minority race votes.

Mr. President, let me go on record by saying that the less than half measures, the endless waiting time, and the failure to fulfill the promises which were made on the FEPC issue constitute, in my judgment, a breach of faith with our professed national belief in equal rights for all our citizens. Some of my Republican colleagues who believe, as I do, that the Republican platform meant what it said when, during the last campaign, it pledged the enactment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission law, are convinced that early passage of Senate bill 101 is essential to maintaining a healthy body politic in America. It was in the spirit of that pledge that Senators on this side of the aisle almost solidly supported the appropriation for the temporary FEPC last June, both in the Appropriations Committee and on this floor. My party made a start toward fulfilling the letter of that pledge when it strongly supported Senate bill 101 in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

I also note that my party recently, in Chicago, reiterated its pledge, when its congressional leadership there declared in a formal statement:

> We believe that equality of opportunity should be available to all, regardless of race, creed, or beginnings. Every individual should be afforded an opportunity to prosper according to his talents, his abilities, and his diligence, subject only to a like right for his neighbor.

Mr. President, that very general and too broad statement has at least some advantage. It has the advantage of showing that my party still is preaching nondiscrimination. I am confident that my party will practice it; but it is a minority party in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and even though its congressional members should support this legislation 100 percent, the Republican Party alone cannot carry the bill through the Congress to enactment.

I call upon my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—the Democratic Party in control of both Houses of Congress—to join hands with us to bring this bill down from the calendar where it has languished since last May, and get a vote on it. Thus far, the record of the administration has been one of promises and more promises without a beginning of action. The time of the Seventy-ninth Congress is running short, and if enactment of this bill is not attempted early after Congress reconvenes in January, it will not be voted upon at this Congress. Postponement of this issue adds up to sure death for Senate bill 101.

Mr. President, the times will not wait for such an eventuality. There are great numbers of veterans from our minority races who are returning to civilian life, and for whom the GI bill of rights offers no protection against the punishment of economic prejudice. Reconversion is already returning the Negro, the Mexican, the Indian, the Jew, and the other minority workers to a status of the disinherited. Only last Monday of this week, the present FEPC reported to the President the fact of an alarming increase in the practice of discrimination against minority groups during the transfer of Government workers from the emergency war agencies to other departments of Government which will perform peacetime functions.

I wish to commend the President of the United States for the Executive order and the directive which he issued yesterday afternoon in regard to minority-group discrimination within Government agencies. I must be perfectly honest, however, and express the view that I do not believe the issuance of the Executive order was necessary. If adequately financed, the FEPC would have had power to proceed to make whatever investigation has been called for by the directive. I would be less than honest if I did not express a suspicion that the Democratic Party is, as it has the right to be, considerably concerned about the growing feeling in this country concerning its attitude toward the minority race problem and the FEPC issue. I think the minority races are beginning to read the record. They well recognize the record which has been made by the Democratic Party up to the present time on the FEPC issue. The record to date shows that it is the Republican side of the aisle in Congress that has attempted to secure passage of S. 101. It has been the Democrats who have used the filibuster to prevent a clear-cut vote on this issue.

I hope that such gestures as were made by the President yesterday will be backed up by the Congress of the United States in passing at an early date S. 101. Only votes by Democratic Senators and Democratic Representatives working in cooperation with Republican Senators and Republican Representatives can produce the necessary legislation to end un-American racial discrimination in our economy.

It is fine for the President to issue a friendly statement now and then to the minority groups in America but as the leader of his party they want more than kind words and stalling surveys of facts and conditions already known by FEPC. They want a permanent FEPC backed by an administration that will deliver on its promise to stem the tide of racial intolerance in employment in this country.

Mr. President, if there is Government discrimination in the Government's own reconversion program, how much more serious must the picture be in industry generally, where there is no Civil Service Commission? A report of one of the western field offices of the War Manpower Commission indicates a growing barrier to the reemployment of nonwhite workers resulting from the alarming increase in orders from employers of the white gentile only variety. It is estimated that half of the job orders are thus discriminatory while 70 percent of the applicants are nonwhite. Do not tell me, Mr. President, that such facts do not serve notice of a growing infection in our body politic. Racial tensions thus aggravated have an explosive potential beyond calculation.

By inaction, we till a field already far too fertile for ideologies antagonistic to our form of government. There is a sorry victory in store for us if we do not at once meet the challenge of job discrimination again spreading throughout our country. Indeed, our international status as a leading power is threatened by it.

Mr. President, I wish to digress for a moment and invite attention of the Senate to what I think is a great sociological fact. I refer to a great revolution which is taking place in the minds of men throughout the world. I believe that it is not beyond the realm of possibility that within the century we may find alinements of the peoples of the world being made on the basis of a color line. I assert that in the face of that very real possibility the white man in America must make certain that he practices as well as preaches the principles of nondiscrimination which are inherent in the American Bill of Rights and in our Constitution.

The record of the present FEPC indicates that the administration has allowed it to be reduced to nothingness without raising a finger to save it. A permanent FEPC is on the President's "must" list of legislation. Yet, the Democratic Party in Congress has shown little evidence of following through on the President's request.

This is the time for the people to know who is behind this bill and when something is going to be done about it. Republican Senators are ready to debate and vote upon S. 101. I call upon the majority Democratic leadership in this Senate, who have it in their power, to presently make it possible for us to vote on Senate bill 101.

In closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, two news releases of December 17, 1945, containing some interesting data with reference to what is happening to the FEPC, and how serious is the growing problem.

There being no objection, the news releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

The members of the FEPC today presented to the President the program which the committee proposes to pursue under the limitations of the funds and time left to it.

It was pointed out that only $63,606 remains for committee operations during the fiscal year, and that the committee wishes to complete its limited program as soon as possible. The committee disclaimed that its program is a substitute for effective congressional action in the field. Its statement that minority-group problems during reconversion are too vast for committee scope and resources, and that remedial action properly lies in the hands of Congress, received the President's assent.

The suggestion was made and approved that FEPC during its remaining months of activity place emphasis on discrimination within Government service, on the remaining war industries, and on examination of minority-group problems during reconversion.

The President indicated his support of committee plans to see that Government agencies apply the national policy of nondiscrimination during the reconversion period. He also requested the committee to examine discrimination within industry in areas where displaced war workers seek to find jobs in peacetime production. The committee for that purpose will hold a hearing in Chicago in February.

Members of the committee who discussed plans with the President were: Malcolm Ross, chairman, Miss Sara Southall, Boris Shishkin, and John Brophy. Members Milton P. Webster and Charles Horn were unable to attend because of transportation difficulties. After the meeting the following unanimous statement of committee members was issued:

"The necessary reduction in its staff since VJ-day makes impossible FEPC operations on a scale to meet the problems of minority group workers during reconversion. Therefore Committee activities will be concentrated in the fields where its resources can be applied with the best hope of lasting results.

"Government agencies should themselves be exemplary in applying the national policy of nondiscrimination. The current cutbacks and rehiring within Government service show sufficient disregard for that policy to warrant the Committee's action against those who disregard it.

"Evidence is also at hand of discrimination because of race and creed in the employment policies of many reconverting war industries and of some trade unions. The Committee is unequipped to handle this problem on any effective scale. However, the employment policies of the future are being set during the present change-over from a war to a peace economy. The Committee therefore proposes to examine what is happening to minority group workers during reconversion and to make its findings public.

"The Committee disclaims that this limited program is a substitute for effective, full scale enforcement of the national policy against discrimination. After nearly 5 years of experience the Committee concludes that the cure for the long-standing evils of inequality in industrial opportunity lies solely within the hands of the Congress.

"The Committee estimates that its resources for conducting its limited program, and its usefulness in pursuing it, will both come to an end within a few months."

With the war's end and diminishing war production, Negro workers stand in grave danger of losing disproportionately their wartime employment gains, Malcolm Ross, chairman of the Fair Employment Practice Committee, stated today. This is so, he added, because these and other minority workers were concentrated in those occupations and industries which have suffered the greatest

immediate cut-backs and have the least post-war future.

During the war, Negroes made considerable progress in the field of industrial employment, Mr. Ross explained. In 1942, they represented only 2 percent of all persons in war industries. At the beginning of the defense period in 1941, Negroes had formed from 25 to 38 percent of the relief rolls in many industrial centers. But by November 1944, as a result of the demands of war production and the national nondiscrimination policy, they were 8.3 percent of all war workers. Mr. Ross pointed out that over 1,000,000 Negroes had been added to the civilian labor force, and the number employed as skilled craftsmen, semiskilled operatives, and foremen had increased from 500,000 to 1,000,000. The Negro's greatest wartime advances were in such industries as aircraft, shipbuilding, aluminum and magnesium products, ammunition, explosives, small arms and pyrotechnics, guns, howitzers, ordnance accessories, tanks, mortars, etc. The greatest skill utilization came in the field of shipbuilding.

There is much to indicate that the Negro is already suffering disproportionately in the present period of demobilization, Mr. Ross continued. Figures available 1 month after VJ-day showed that although Negroes were 11 percent of all workers in industry, they accounted for 18 percent of the total decrease of employment. This means that not only were Negroes laid off in a disproportionate manner in war industries but also that they found fewer opportunities in other nonagricultural employment.

Reports from FEPC field men, covering this same early period, indicated the same kind of disproportionate drop in employment for Negroes, Mr. Ross said. In New York City 30 days after VJ-day, total war employment had dropped 22 percent while nonwhite employment had fallen off 45 percent. In Philadelphia on October 1, 1945, the local Urban League estimated that nonwhite losses were about 30 percent of the total disemployed at that time. In Cleveland between August 15 and September 15, nonwhite employment in war industries declined 28 percent while total employment dropped 19 percent. In the Portland, Oreg., area, where the Negro population increased from 2,000 to 25,000 during the war, and Negro employment rose to a peak of 8,000 workers with 97 percent of this total in wartime shipbuilding, 50 percent of all Negro workers had been displaced by September 15, with no prospects of reemployment in that area. More recently it has been reported by the USES that Negroes have been laid off in a disproportionate manner in the metal, chemical, and rubber industries. The decline of total employment in this period was 3.4 percent but the employment of Negroes fell 10 percent.

Mr. Ross cautioned that there is considerable recent data which show that discriminatory practices are reappearing. The Detroit USES reported that of the 18,000 job openings on hand in mid-November, 50 percent specified that no Negroes should be referred. Considering the aftermath of the last war there is grave danger of racial tension during this period of demobilization and reorganization. There are present indications that intergroup tension is on the increase in St. Louis, Detroit, Trenton, Portland, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of the President's Executive order of December 20, 1945.

There being no objection, the Executive order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER CONTINUING THE WORK OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, it is hereby ordered as follows:

The duties and responsibilities imposed upon the Committee on Fair Employment Practices by Executive Order 8802, dated June 25, 1941, as amended by Executive Order 8823 of July 18, 1941, and by Executive Order 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall be continued thereunder for the period and subject to the conditions stated in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 156, 79th Congress, 1st sess., approved July 17, 1945).

As a part of its duties the committee shall investigate, make findings and recommendations, and report to the President, with respect to discrimination in industries engaged in work contributing to the production of military supplies or to the effective transition to a peacetime economy.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1945.*

In connection with the attached Executive order, the President has sent the following directive to the heads of all Government departments, agencies, and independent establishments:

"Cut-backs in Government employment have resulted in a considerable displacement of wartime workers in Washington and the field. The Civil Service Commission, in the interest of retaining capable and efficient employees wherever possible, has established a set of principles governing reduction in force and transfer of employees to peacetime activity. It has come to my attention that a considerable number of loyal and qualified employees have been refused transfer and reemployment by employing agencies solely because of race and creed. This condition is a violation of civil-service rules which have been issued by the President and in violation of existing law.

"I am writing to request that you make careful analysis of your personnel policies, procedures, and practices in order that you can assure me that they are in accord with national law and policy and in order that all qualified workers in existing temporary war jobs will be considered fairly for appointments without distinction because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"In addition, your full cooperation with FEPC in all matters affecting the employment of minorities in Government is requested."

SUMMARY OF GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on December 19 the conference between the House and the Senate agreed upon the so-called amended GI bill of rights. The Veterans' Administration issued a statement in the form of a summary of what the bill does, and I ask permission to insert it in the RECORD, because I have been asked by several Senators to give them a summary such as that the Veterans' Administration has provided.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Congress, on December 19, 1945, approved and sent to the President H. R. 3749, an act containing very important changes in the so-called GI bill of rights, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, including changes in Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, pertaining to the rehabilitation of persons disabled in service since September 16, 1940.

Briefly, the important changes are:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The act makes permanent the authority of the Administrator to procure necessary space for administrative, clinical, medical, and out-patient treatment purposes, by lease, purchase, or construction of buildings, or by condemnation or declaration of taking. Under existing law this authority is limited to the present war and 6 months thereafter.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS, OTHER APPLIANCES, AND RELATED SERVICES

Provision is made to insure ample authority governing the procurement of prosthetic appliances and services in connection therewith to disabled veterans, including travel expenses.

SPACE FOR SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

The Administrator is authorized, at his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish, if available, necessary space and suitable office facilities for the use of paid, full-time representatives of veterans' organizations specified in section 200, Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, and such other national organizations recognized by the Administrator thereunder, in the presentation of claims under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

The present provision permits review of findings and decisions of retiring boards of the War or Navy Departments. The new act clarifies the intent by including findings and decisions of boards of medical survey and disposition boards.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Extension of time: The act extends the time from 2 to 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the war whichever is the later, to initiate a course; and extends the time within which education or training may be afforded from 7 to 9 years after the termination of the war.

Requirement of showing of interruption of education by service removed: The new act eliminates the requirement in the law that veterans show that education was interrupted by service, and because of such change, it strikes out the 25-year-age limitation on presumption of interruption of education.

Reference to "refresher or retraining course" removed: There are stricken from the present law the references to a refresher or retraining course, and in effect the new act provides that the veteran will be afforded approved education or training for a period of 1 year plus the time he was in the active service, not to exceed a total of 4 years.

Short intensive courses: There are authorized short intensive courses under contracts with approved institutions, with pro-rata acceleration, or foreshortening, of period of eligibility, but the cost of any such course may not exceed $500.

Correspondence courses: Provision is made for instruction by correspondence courses, without subsistence allowances, subject to contracts as to rates, charging one-fourth of the elapsed time used in following such courses against the veteran's period of eligibility. The total amount payable for a correspondence course or courses is limited to $500.

Adjustment of fees to public institutions: The Administrator is authorized to make an adjustment of fees in the case of public institutions, if he finds upon application by the institution that customary charges are insufficient to permit the furnishing of education or training to eligible veterans or inadequate compensation therefor, on an overall plan and based on showing of need of assistance to meet the educational demands under the Federal program. The estimated cost may be fixed (by regulation if desirable)

instead of the actual cost (only by agreement), and the veteran may elect to foreshorten his period of eligibility by having all customary charges in excess of $500 paid. Since section 1505 is repealed there is thereby removed the chief obstacle to the proper operation of these provisions.

Subsistence allowances increased: The monthly subsistence allowances are increased from $50 to $65 in the cases of veterans without dependents, and from $75 to $90 in the cases of veterans with dependents.

Combination of courses: Provision is made for approved combination of courses under part VIII (education and training) and part VII (vocational rehabilitation) of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, except that the total period of combined courses must not exceed the maximum period or limitations under the part affording the greater period of eligibility.

Return of books, supplies, or equipment: There is authorized the release of returned books, supplies, or equipment, to educational or training institutions for credit, or the disposition thereof otherwise, without regard to limitations on disposition of surplus property generally.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (PUBLIC LAW 16, 78TH CONG.)

Extenson of time: The Administrator is permitted to approve courses under Public Law 16, relating to vocational rehabilitation of service disabled, beyond the 4-year period fixed in existing law and there is also extended from 6 to 9 years after the end of the war the time within which training may be furnished, to conform to the amendments made in part VIII.

Monthly rates under Public Law 16 increased: The new act provides that the disabled veteran, while pursuing training and for 2 months after his employability is determined, will be paid the amount of subsistence allowance specified in paragraph 6 of part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended (the education and training provisions, title II, supra). It establishes a minimum rate of $105 for a veteran without dependents, $115 with a dependent, and $10 per month additional for a child, $7 for each additional child, and $15 for a dependent parent. Under existing law, while a veteran may receive additional pension while pursuing a course of training, the amount payable cannot exceed the rates for total temporary disability (such rate for a veteran without dependents being $92.50 per month). The effect of the amendment is to permit the disabled veteran to receive subsistence allowances at the sums payable under part VIII relating to education and training plus whatever pension he is entitled to under existing law, but with a prescribed minimum, to protect the disabled veterans with low rate of pension.

GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR HOMES, FARMS, AND BUSINESS PURPOSES

This title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is revised materially, the most important changes being as follows:

1. Any loan made by any of the prescribed lending agencies to an eligible veteran within 10 years after the end of the war in compliance with the terms and conditions of the title is automatically guaranteed in an amount not in excess of 50 percent of the loan. In place of the present predetermination of the Veterans' Administration that a proposed loan may be guaranteed it provides that a loan is automatically guaranteed by virtue of the lender and the veteran having consummated a loan in full compliance with the specific provisions of the title, one of which is that the purchase price or cost does not exceed the reasonable value as determined by proper appraisal made by an appraiser designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The terms of the loan may be as agreed upon by the lender and the veteran subject to the provisions of the law and regulations adopted pursuant to law. The Veterans' Administration upon determining that a loan has been automatically guaranteed is authorized to issue a certificate of guaranty. Loans to be made by lenders other than those supervised by State or Federal agencies must be approved in advance by the Veterans' Administration in order to be guaranteed.

2. The aggregate amount of the guaranty in the case of a non-real-estate loan may not exceed $2,000 and in the case of a real-estate loan, $4,000, or in a proportionate amount in combination loans or in two loans of either type;

3. The interest may not exceed 4 percent;

4. The Administrator is authorized to pay an amount equivalent to 4 percent on the amount originally guaranteed rather than payment of interest for the first year;

5. The maturity on amortized loans on real estate may not exceed 25 years, or in case of farm realty 40 years, and the maturity on non-real-estate loans shall not exceed 10 years;

6. Makes clear that the veteran may purchase a lot out of the proceeds of a loan designed to finance the construction of a home on that lot;

7. Omits the word "normal" from the phrase "reasonable normal value" in connection with appraisals;

8. Broadens the act so that loans can be made for every ordinary farming purpose;

9. Broadens the business loan provisions to permit any normal business enterprise to be financed initially;

10. Broadens the refinancing of existing indebtedness to cover all types of loans, with restrictions;

11. Extends and declares the powers of the Administrator to perform functions under the loan provisions, principally with respect to suits, payment of claims, compromises, property administration, and the like;

12. Adds a plan permitting the Administrator to insure any loan made by supervised lending agencies which otherwise might be made under title III, as amended. Such insurance will be issued in lieu of a guaranty, to be issued direct to the lending institutions under procedure giving them not to exceed a 15-percent coverage and to be issued only to supervised lending institutions or financial institutions purchasing such loans from the original lending institution. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, by regulation, terms and conditions and to establish the interest rate not to exceed 3-percent discount or a flat equivalent rate.

13. The guaranteed loans may be made by any ordinary lending agency which is subject to examination and supervision by an agency of the United States or of any State or Territory, including the District of Columbia. Restrictions of Federal laws are removed as to certain institutions subject to Federal supervision with respect to the following (as to any loan at least 20 percent of which is guaranteed under the title, and, of course, limited to such governmental loans):

(a) Ratio of amount of loan to the value of the property;

(b) Maturity of loan;

(c) Requirement for mortgage or other security;

(d) Dignity of lien;

(e) Percentage of assets which may be invested in real-estate loans.

14. Lenders not of one of the specified classes may make guaranteed loans only in the event the loan is approved in advance by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

15. The provisions pertaining to secondary loans, section 505, are modified to conform to new procedure, and the provision that the rate of interest on the second loan shall not exceed that on the principal loan by more than 1 percent is omitted.

16. Provision is made to protect contractual rights under loan guaranties issued under the original act, and to authorize the approval of applications filed at any time within 90 days after the effective date of the new act, in order to permit the continued processing of loan applications pending the issuance of necessary instructions and regulations under the amendatory legislation.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1505, relating to deductions from any future adjusted compensation repealed: Section 1505 of the law relating to charges and deductions of benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act against benefits under any adjusted-compensation law is repealed.

Citizens of United States who performed active military or naval service with Allied Governments: The new act extends to persons who served in the active military or naval service of Allied Governments and who were citizens of the United States at the time of entrance into such service, the benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as well as the vocational rehabilitation provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to the same extent as in the case of persons who served in our own armed forces. It is provided, however, that these benefits will be extended only to persons who are residents of the United States at the time of filing claim and who are not receiving similar benefits from the government of the Allied Nation concerned.

Persons on terminal leave or hospitalized pending final discharge: There are extended the benefits of education and training and guaranty of loans, and vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, to persons while on terminal leave or while hospitalized pending final discharge, with provision that no subsistence allowance would be paid in such cases under title II of the act or Public Law 16. This section is made effective as of June 22, 1944, the date of enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

THE CONTINGENT FUND OF THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably with an amendment, Senate Resolution 201, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. This resolution was offered by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and seeks to continue the provisions of Senate Resolution 77, which was adopted during the present Congress, dealing with payments from the contingent fund of the Senate for certain employees of the Federal Government who deal with inquiries and investigations of the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator is asking that the Senate take up a resolution at this time, which of course would result in the pending business being laid aside. I hope that will not be done.

Mr. LUCAS. I have several resolutions which are extremely important, and I was advised that perhaps the Senator from West Virginia might suggest the absence of a quorum, and we might not be able to get a quorum.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall not do anything to prevent the Senator from getting his resolutions up, if we can get Resolution 207 voted on. I do not intend to ask for a quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have just noted the remark of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that he means that we

shall take a vote on the issue in which he is interested without a quorum.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I intend to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not think that should be done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have voted many times on bills without a quorum present. We are here on the last day of the session, and I do not know what the situation will be.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for making this unusual request at this time is the understanding that perhaps a quorum would be called, and if that were done, and a quorum could not be obtained, these resolutions, which it is absolutely essential the Senate should adopt before we adjourn, would simply become obsolete, and we would have to take new orders when the Senate reconvened, and many of the commitees before the 14th of January would simply be dead. Some of them are important, and that is why I make the request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is presumed to be present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator from Illinois advise me whether it would take a long time to dispose of the resolutions?

Mr. LUCAS. I can conceive of debate only on the resolution involving the continuation of the Small Business Committee. As I recall, the committee asked for about $200,000. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate cut that by $50,000, and we have brought in a resolution providing that the Senate continue the committee, and appropriate $150,000.

In connection with this committee, I propose to request that the budget which has been prepared by the Small Business Committee be read to the Senate, in order that Senators may have a complete knowledge of exactly what the $150,000 is to be spent for during the coming year. That may take some time, and it might involve some discussion. But it is important, and that is the only reason why I have risen at this particular time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not wish to cut the Senator off, but if it is going to take any length of time, I shall be compelled to call for the regular order, because I have been put off from day to day. I will say to the Senator that, reserving that right, he may proceed, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I send to the desk Senate Resolution 201, which is the resolution I have just reported discussed, which was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, with the amendment proposed, for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 77 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, shall become effective on April 1, 1946, or upon the date of completion of the reorganization of Congress as may be recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, whichever date is the earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like an explanation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that this resolution merely continues the practice in which we have engaged for a long time of borrowing employees from various branches of the executive department of Gvernment to aid certain committees in handling various matters from time to time. Some time ago the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a resolution which I supported, terminating all such employment as of January 1. The senior Senator from Wisconsin is now engaged in the work of a committee which seeks to reorganize the procedures of Congress, or at least make recommendations in that connection. His committee has certain employees.

There is another point which is involved. The senior Senator from Wisconsin would like to have the time within which to make a report extended until April 1, or perhaps a little longer. As I understand his position, he seems to think that should that not be done, the Small Business Committee, for example, would be placed in the position of employing its own committee personnel, and placing them permanently on the rolls. It might have a tendency, perhaps, to give to the committee of the Senator from Wisconsin information which would not be in keeping with the best interests of the kind of report which it wishes to make. I believe that is about what the Senator from Wisconsin said. I am not sure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, my interest in submitting this resolution grows out of the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I am hopeful that that committee will make its report to the two Houses shortly after the new session of this Congress begins, on or about the 14th of January.

The effect of the resolution sponsored by the Senator from Nebraska, Senate Resolution 77, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, would be to cut off, on the 1st day of January, all personnel borrowed from executive departments and now attached to standing, select, or special committees of the Senate. I had the feeling that if the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska were to go into operation on the first of January it would force the Senate Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to pass upon the budget of the standing and select committees, and thus transfer to the permanent rolls of the Senate large numbers of persons, and that when the Committee on Organization made its report it would find the staffing of committees distorted as a result of the large number of persons who would thus become attached to the permanent rolls of the Senate. It was in the hope that we could defer this result pending the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and thus leave the situation in statu quo, and not create any further distortion in the staffing situation of the existing standing, select, and special committees of the Senate, that I was prompted to submit the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin. That is a thorough explanation. I regret that I was not present the other day when the Senator made his explanation. I did not quite understand it, but I do now.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, with that explanation I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to add one observation to the explanation given by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and that is that this resolution would permit the extension of Senate Resolution 77, to become operative April 1 instead of January 1, as so ably set forth in the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I should like to say, however, that this does not preclude any of the committees which expect to continue either as special committees or even as subcommittees of standing committees, from employing permanent help. This does not foreclose them from going to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate now, or at any time between now and April 1, and submitting a budget. I think that should be made clear.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It was my understanding with the chairman of the committee, who so ably supported the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, that this resolution would give temporary relief for a period of 90 days. After that time Senate Resolution 77 would continue in full force and effect.

I suggest that other committees do exactly as the Small Business Committee has done. Committees which expect to continue should submit their budgets to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate in plenty of time, under a formula laid down by the chairman of that committee, so that they may be passed upon in time to keep the committees going if they expect to continue beyond April 1.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for calling that matter to my attention.

I should like to make this observation about the resolution which was passed some time ago by the Senate: Every committee seeking money, especially special committees, must bring before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget of how, when, and where they expect to spend the money which they seek through an appropriation from the contingent fund. That resolution was adopted by the Senate, and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has nothing to do with it, except to seek the best method of compliance with a rule which has been laid down by the Senate. Up to date only one committee which is seeking money has complied with the order of the United States Senate on

that point. That is the Small Business Committee. If we are to have rules, we must follow them.

There is another reason why we agreed to accept the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wisconsin. Two or three committees had on their pay rolls employees from the executive branch of the Government, and were unable, as I have said, to give us a budget and submit before January 1 the kind of a statement which they desire to submit. That was another reason for extending the time.

Mr. President, unless we wish to repeal the rule which has been laid down by the Senate, every special committee which is seeking money is in duty bound to furnish to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate a budget showing how the committee expects to spend the money. I think it is only reasonable and fair that we should have that information in advance, because then the committee as a whole can best determine the amount to be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 201), which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the words "effective on" to strike out "July" and insert "April", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the provisions of Senate Resolution 77 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, shall become effective on April 1, 1946, or upon the date of completion of the reorganization of Congress as may be recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, whichever date is the earlier.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, has the Senator concluded with respect to the resolutions which he has to submit?

Mr. LUCAS. I have concluded with respect to Senate Resolution 201. I was discussing a resolution which I was about to present.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Very well.

PAYMENTS FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND FOR INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That section 2 of Senate Resolution 77, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to June 28, 1945, relative to payments from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with inquiries and investigations, hereby is amended by striking out the words "prior to the detail or assignment" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the end of each quarterly period."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not believe that there is anything controversial about this resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to it, and I think it should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

STUDY AND SURVEY OF THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 199, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, submitted by Mr. MURRAY on December 5, 1945, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an amendment, at the end of the resolution, to strike out "$187,800" and insert "$150,000" so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, as heretofore extended and supplemented, is hereby increased by $150,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is an important resolution. The evidence showed that in reality the committee expected about $200,000. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate decreased the amount to $150,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BUDGET OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, for the benefit of Senators who may be interested in special committees, as members or otherwise, the budget estimate of the Senate Small Business Committee. It is reported in full because it is of tremendous interest, and it may be of some value to committees which in the future will submit budgets.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET ESTIMATE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The budget request for the remainder of the year 1945 and for the year 1946 totals $200,984.96. It is based on experience, taking into account expenditures in behalf of small business made during the past year, estimated costs of continuing certain important work now under way and new work required to aid small and independent business in surviving during this next troublesome year of reconversion to peacetime operations.

The detailed break-down of budgetary costs is made in the accompanying table. In summary it appears as follows:

Budget for period

Office expenses	$5,100.00
Hearings and investigations	31,500.00
Travel and per diem	24,000.00
Program and personnel	140,384.96
Total	200,984.96

At the peak of its operations during 1945 the Senate Small Business Committee's staff numbered 45 persons, 21 of whom were professionals, 24 were clerical-stenographic. In approving the request for funds to continue the work of the committee at the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate urged that this committee employ its personnel rather than continue the practice of borrowing personnel from administrative agencies. The Senate Small Business Committee heartily endorsed this position. One of its members, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, introduced a resolution, supported by the chairman of this committee, which when passed by the Senate required that by the end of this year all personnel used by a committee must be paid for from that committee's funds. Except for special assignments, no agency personnel could be carried by a Senate committee. The Senate Small Business Committee has worked toward this end with diligence.

At one time during 1945, 25 persons receiving an annual pay of $104,820 were on loan from administrative agencies. At present 10 are in this status and steps have been taken to terminate the arrangement with administrative agencies by the first of the year, or sooner. The proposed budget contemplates that all persons working for the Senate Small Business Committee will be on its own pay roll.

This transfer to committee pay roll, together with the wartime pay increases awarded Government employees, explains in considerable part the item for programs and personnel in the present budget.

The proposed budget of staff is $48,000 less than the peak paid during 1945. In the past the committee has not been able to secure the services of senior qualified personnel who were engaged in more direct war effort. Some of these people now become available. Consequently, it is our intention to shift from the employment of more junior persons to fewer but better qualified people. Thus a reduction in staff is in progress, with peak employment during 1946 budgeted at 29 full-time employees, 13 of whom will be professionals, 16 clerical-stenographic workers. This means a reduction in numbers of full- and part-time staff from the 1945 peak of 16 people, at a time when the work undertaken by the committee is actually increasing.

The budget request for office expenses, hearings, and travel are based upon actual experience during the current year, the activity for 1946 being at a somewhat increased rate. The careful administrative control setup within the committee, together with the audit of the Senate, insures adequate oversight of these expenditures.

PROGRAM AND PERSONNEL BUDGET

Reconversion problems of small business

Relationships with OPA, CPA, Department of Agriculture, RFC, Department of Commerce, OWMR, Army, Navy, Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, SWPC, Federal Trade Commission, and Veterans' Administration on controls and reconversion problems and complaints covering (1) materials and equipment, (2) prices and ceilings, (3) rationing, (4) surpluses, (5) labor-management, (6) technical advice and know-how,

(7) contract termination, and (8) loan settlements.

Three staff members and three secretarial-clerical, $31,470.80.

Mining-minerals problems

The problems of small miners and prospectors during the reconversion period in relationship with CPA, OPA, FEA, Bureau of Mines, Public Roads Administration, Patent Office, DPC, Department of Agriculture respecting (1) contract termination, (2) mine loan settlements, (3) premium price plans, (4) mine access roads, (5) stockpiling of strategic minerals and metals, (6) Government purchases of minerals and metals, (7) sale of Government-owned ores and mining facilities, (8) assessment moratorium laws.

One staff member (part-time) and one secretarial assistant, $9,313.88.

Wholesale-retail distribution problems of small business

The relationships of increasing concentration of ownership and operation of the manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing of goods to the survival possibilities of small and independent businesses. Committee work will include studies, hearings, reports, legislative and administrative action. Facts on representative industries such as (1) food manufacturing and distribution, (2) farm implement manufacturing and distribution, (3) automobile distribution, (4) tire distribution, (5) petroleum products distribution, (6) motion picture distribution, (7) clothing manufacture and distribution, (8) the wine and liquor industry.

Two staff members and two secretarial-clerical, $20,584.90.

The financial problems of small business

Small business received some assistance in financing its wartime operations through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and to a lesser degree through RFC. With the reconversion to peacetime operations small business finds its needs for Government-backed long- and short-term loans very much increased. With the transfer of SWPC's loaning powers and funds to RFC new policies, procedures, and administrative set-ups must be worked out. They need to be carefully appraised by the Senate Small Business Committee to insure their fair application. Particular cases require special attention.

Access to equity capital is one of the important unsolved problems confronting small and independent enterprisers. The Senate Small Business Committee will develop this problem through studies, hearings, reports, and probable recommended legislation.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, $11,514.

Foreign-trade problems of small business

The Senate Small Business Committee has issued two reports describing the stake and problems of small business in foreign trade—World Markets for Small Business and American Small Business in Foreign Trade. These outline specific problems confronting small business which the committee is attacking, namely, (1) export insurance; (2) effectiveness of Webb-Pomerene associations and their improvement; (3) trade barriers—effects on small business; (4) clarifying customs regulations and simplifying reports and records to aid small business; (5) monetary loans and arrangements—their effect on small business; (6) Government aids for small business through reports, statistics, and adequate representation abroad; (7) fairs and exhibits representing small business; and (8) small business sharing in Government purchases for export.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, $10,821.

Transportation problems of small business

Underlying most problems of effective competition of small and new enterprises with larger and ofttimes integrated operators are fair and equal freight costs and schedules. The Senate Small Business Committee is studying and seeking solutions of problems respecting (1) freight-rate adjustments for small business; (2) regional freight-costs clarification; (3) the plight of small carriers, including highway and waterway carriers; and (4) adequate machinery for hearings and adjustment of grievances of small-business men.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, $11,647.28.

Office of the Executive Secretary

The executive secretary is charged with the responsibility of initiating, supervising, administering, and reporting the work of the Senate Small Business Committee under authorization of the chairman of the committee. The work done is technical in considerable measure, drawing upon economic and administrative training. The executive secretary acts for the chairman as instructed.

One staff head and two secretarial assistants, $16,178.40.

Administrative services

The staff of the Senate Small Business Committee is spread into two buildings, and in several locations within them. This increases the difficulty of supervision, requires duplicate files, messenger service, etc. The administrative services include these activities plus personnel records and reports, vouchers and business records, mimeographing, typing of reports, etc.

One administrative assistant, two voucher, mail and file clerks, one messenger, $13,108.20.

Information

A small information unit is maintained to prepare and clear releases, contact press and public, issue bulletins and notices, follow hearings, and distribute documents.

One staff member and one secretarial assistant, $7,234.40.

Editorial Unit

The publications of the Senate Small Business Committee require careful editing and preparation for printing.

Staff of one editor and one assistant, $9,204.

Details of budget for Senate Small Business Committee

	Basic	New basic and overtime	Total
RECONVERSION PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant, in charge: Vacant / Formerly Van Tassel	$7,240	$8,200.00	
Secretarial assistant: Vacant / Formerly Allen	2,640	3,314.00	$11,514.00
Industrial Complaints Unit:			
Principal liaison officer (Thurman)	6,540	7,507.00	
Junior liaison officer (Spicer)	2,700	3,380.00	10,887.00
Surplus Property Unit:			
Chief of unit (vacant—formerly Eccles)	5,640	6,470.50	
Secretary (vacant—formerly Emery)	2,040	2,600.40	9,070.90
Subtotal			31,471.90
MINING AND MINERALS INDUSTRY			
Consultant (part time) (Broadgate)	5,400	5,999.88	
Secretarial assistant (Fuller)	2,640	3,314.00	9,313.88

Details of budget for Senate Small Business Committee—Continued

	Basic	New basic and overtime	Total
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS			
Consultant, in charge (McBreen)	$6,540	$7,507.00	
Associate consultant (vacant)	5,640	6,470.50	
Secretarial assistant (vacant)	2,640	3,314.00	
Secretary (vacant)	2,040	2,609.40	$19,891.90
FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant (vacant)	7,240	8,200.00	
Secretarial assistant (vacant)	2,640	3,314.00	11,514.00
FOREIGN TRADE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant (Forbes)	6,540	7,507.00	
Secretarial assistant (Johnson)	2,640	3,314.00	10,821.00
TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS			
Consultant (Childe)	7,500	8,333.28	
Secretarial assistant (Lewis)	2,640	3,314.00	11,647.28
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY			
Executive secretary (Anderson)	9,000	10,600.00	
Junior administrative assistant (Banner)	2,880	3,578.00	
Secretary (Strubel)	2,040	2,600.40	16,178.40
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES			
Administrative assistant (Purdy)	4,620	5,491.00	
Principal voucher and file clerk (Groeper)	2,880	3,578.00	
Assistant file clerk (Hutchinson)	1,800	2,310.00	
Messenger (Day)	1,320	1,729.20	13,108.20
INFORMATION SECTION			
Information clerk (Guyon)	3,840	4,634.00	
Secretary (Lucas)	2,040	2,600.40	7,234.40
EDITORIAL UNIT			
Editor (Steckman)	5,000	5,890.00	
Assistant editor (Holshouser)	2,640	3,314.00	9,204.00
Total			140,384.96
Office expenses: Telephone, telegraph, supplies, photostating, etc., approximately $425 per month			5,100.00
Hearings (Washington and field):			
90 days of hearings (reporting service)			18,000.00
30 executive sessions and conferences (reporting service)			6,000.00
150 field investigations (reporting service)			7,500.00
Travel and per diem: $2,000 per month			24,000.00
Grand total			200,984.96

LIST OF PERSONNEL TO BE RETAINED—NAME AND PAY ROLL

Harry J. Evans,[1] RFC.
F. Preston Forbes, Commerce.
Scott K. Gray, Jr.,[1] RFC.
Stella J. Groeper, WPB and RFC.
George H. Soule, Jr.,[1] Navy.
L. Evelyn Spicer, WPB and RFC.

[1] To be released December 31, 1945.

Frederick W. Steckman, Maritime.
Margie L. Strubel, WPB and RFC.
Allen G. Thurman, Maritime.
Dewey Anderson, committee.
Marjorie Banner, committee.
W. C. Broadgate, committee.
Cyril E. Childe, committee.
Arnold Day, committee.
Carol M. Fuller, committee.
Catherine L. Guyon, committee.
Minnie B. Hoch,[2] committee.
Dorothy Holshouser, committee.
Katherine Hutchinson, committee.
Grace E. Johnson, committee.
Frances Lewis, committee.
Elizabeth P. Lucas, committee.
T. J. McBreen, committee.
Catherine G. McNamara, committee.
Grace F. Purdy, committee.
Charlotte Southmayd, committee.
Norma van Deinse, committee.
Sullivan W. Jones, committee.

Mr. Herman Edelsberg, assigned part time from FEA, will probably be released as of December 31, 1945.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] for his kindness.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress;

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions after the adjournment of the present session of Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution extending the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, providing for an investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 4480. To authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4489) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; and

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

[2] Release has been given.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. REVERCOMB's motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 207, to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in support of his resolution to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, which provides for the release from the armed forces of members who are fathers. I realize that this is a very difficult problem, and that those who are in charge of our armed forces are very sincere in their desire to serve the country well. They are very zealous in looking after the welfare of the country through the medium of the armed forces.

Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Congress to raise and maintain an army. At this time the war has ended, for all authorized fighting purposes. It is now the duty of the Congress to consider particularly the drain of the Army upon the civilian life of our country.

During this war we as a people have suffered tremendously and patiently. We have expended untold treasures. We have sacrificed the lives of a quarter of a million of our finest young men. We have interrupted the economy of the country, and have a debt of more than $300,000,000,000 facing us, which remains for the future citizens of our country to discharge.

Mr. President, the greatest sacrifice which we have made is the great harm which has been done to the American home during the past 4 years of war. In the reconversion process to peacetime conditions, which we wish to bring about as speedily as possible, nothing will demand our attention more speedily and more earnestly than the reconversion of the domestic economy of the country, and particularly of the home life of America. As we all know, in the last analysis the home is the foundation of our country's security and in the stability of the home lies our country's future. So it is pressing very heavily upon us now that at the earliest possible moment the rehabilitation of this very important part of our country's life and our country's welfare.

Mr. President, I can understand why the Army is yet very loath to give up the power which it has over the lives of these men. It takes that position no doubt because it wishes to discharge them in an orderly way and thus preserve their rights. But I do not believe the Army realizes the great loss and the great danger which have occurred to our country because of the absence of the fathers from their homes. We should consider this matter in a wholly rational and realistic manner, divested of all sentiment and all emotion. We should consider soon whether it is the best thing for our country to have fathers returned to their homes at the earliest possible time. I believe our country's welfare demands it.

Aside from that consideration, there is the matter of the cost of maintaining fathers in the service. They are the most expensive soldiers we have. It is time that we gave some attention to the costs which are mounting so tremendously high in this country. Therefore, one factor which we should consider is the reduction of the cost of the armed forces, and we can reduce it to a worth-while extent by requiring the return of the fathers to their homes.

Then, Mr. President, a great loss which has come to America in these 4 years is the loss in the morale of our people, the loss in our educational development, and the loss in the things which make for the comfort, safety, and security of the Nation. That loss, which is perhaps the greatest one, occurs in great part because of the absence of the fathers from their homes.

Therefore, I believe we should adopt the resolution today. I know it will not bring home a single father within the next 2 or 3 weeks; but I also know that when the time comes to consider the measure which is now lying dormant in the Committee on Military Affairs, we may review all the questions regarding the need. All this discussion as to the wisdom of discharging fathers can be deferred until that time. But let us get this measure on the floor of the Senate and bring it up for consideration by the Members of the Senate, upon whom, in conjunction with the other House, rests the responsibility not only of maintaining the Army, the Navy, and our other fighting forces, but of maintaining a peacetime civilian economy which will strengthen our country, and which has been so sorely depleted during the last 4 years of struggle.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend the junior Senator from West Virginia for his able argument and for the service he is rendering to our common country in pressing for action on this matter at this time, and I sincerely hope his resolution will be adopted.

Mr. MITCHELL obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARVILLE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make the point of order that the regular order of business should be proceeded with. I understand that I have a right to make that point. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington whether he wishes to place something in the RECORD?

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to introduce a bill and make a statement with regard to it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I must insist on the regular order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make an objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I make an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate proceed to

the consideration of Senate Resolution 207.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the point of order which has been made by the Senator from West Virginia debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How may a Senator be taken off the floor if he rises to debate the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator may object to the introduction of a bill, or the consideration of any matters other than the question before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Washington did not rise to do anything of the kind. He rose to debate the question. It seems to me that he is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington rose to introduce a bill. Objection was raised, and the Chair has been advised by the parliamentarian that the Senator is out of order.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When a Senator asks for unanimous consent to introduce a bill, is it not extremely contrary to all Senate practice for an objection to be made to the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the usual practice to grant the request, but any Member of the Senate has the right to object, and if an objection is heard——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understand that. But have I made my point clear that when a Senator asks for unanimous consent to introduce a bill it is extremely exceptional and contrary to Senate procedure to hear an objection being made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I inquire whether the Senator from Mississippi is about to speak on the pending question.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, allow me to respond to the Senator by saying that if I obtain the floor it is none of the Senator's business what I will talk about, because the pending question is open to discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator about to discuss the pending question?

Mr. BILBO. If I once obtain the floor I shall talk about anything that I want to talk about, because we have no such thing in the Senate as germaneness.

Mr. President, I wish to say in connection with the pending motion that no Member of the Senate is more anxious than I to see that fathers are returned to their wives and children at the earliest possible moment. I have been informed that there are more than 100,000 men on the west coast at this hour, some of them still on boats, who are on their way to their homes. There is no place to put them if they are allowed to land. There is no railroad transportation for them, no airplane transportation, or bus transportation. These men will be unable to reach their homes throughout the United States in time to spend Christmas with their families. That being true, I do not exactly appreciate the importance of pressing for action on the pending motion. I think that the Army and the Navy are doing everything they can, and are cooperating in every way possible in an effort to return servicemen to their homes.

I have a son who has a wife and two children. His wife and children live in California. He is stationed with the army of occupation at Esslingen, Germany. He has no opportunity to come home because his turn has not been reached. He is still on the job, and is performing his duties as a soldier and as a member of the American Army.

I have not tried to ask anybody to let him come home. He has not asked permission to come home. I know how anxious he is to come home and I know how anxious I am for him to come home. But he is on the job; he is finishing the job; he is in the army of occupation, and is trying to look after the interest of the Army in that part of Germany which has been assigned to the United States as one of the Allies.

I think our friend from West Virginia should be complimented in winning half his battle already. I understand that the War Department had already ruled, before the Senator made his speech or submitted his resolution, that no more fathers would be drafted. But, any way, that was in his mind when the Senator from West Virginia started out, and that part of his fight has been won. We will have no more drafting of fathers in this country into the armed forces.

I wish it were possible that we could stop the drafting of 18- or 19-year-old boys. I think that is a very serious question. The fact of the business is I believe that, with the proper inducements, the Army and Navy could get all the volunteers needed to take care of replacement troops and to carry on the activities of the Army and Navy. Naturally I am opposed to the conscription of 18- and 19-year-old boys. I opposed it at the beginning of the war and offered an amendment and made a speech against it, but those who were in charge said, "No", they wanted these youngsters because they were full of life and they were fool-hardy and would take any kind of a chance. They wanted that kind of soldiers in carrying on the war. I have always believed it wrong because it interferes materially with their education and their training for life. These boys are the chief cornerstones of the Republic; they are to be our leaders, and they ought to be prepared. If it should be necessary to draft them after they are 19 years old I would not offer such serious objection. However, I am against universal military training.

During the discussion under this head the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] introduced into the RECORD a release from the White House in which the President makes reference to the FEPC. He has ordered what is left of the FEPC to go forth and inspect and look into and poke their probosces into private industry in this country, and submit to him a report. With all due deference to the President I think he has gone far afield in issuing such an order to what remains of the FEPC to make an inspection of private industry to obtain information which he seeks. I think private industry ought to put up a sign at their places of business, "No trespassing," and the first one of these FEPC'ers who came around ought to be arrested for trespassing and put off the premises.

When a few days ago we renewed for 6 months the war powers of the President—and I was censured by some of my colleagues because I did not vote for a year's extension—I had a suspicion how some of these powers would be used, and here is the first instance of it.

I take issue with my friend who is faltering and crying, and shedding crocodile tears over the welfare and employment of the minority. If I had any tears to shed in this matter I would shed them for the 126,000,000 white people of this country, instead of for the 13,800,000 Negroes. My conception of fair employment is that there should be no discrimination on account of race, color or creed, ancestry or origin. The word "race" applies to the white race as well as to the black race, and right here in the District of Columbia we have an illustration how unfairly the employment problem has been handled, to the detriment of the white race.

In the District of Columbia there are two or three hundred thousand employees—I have been trying to get the exact figure—on the Federal pay roll under the civil service. Taking into consideration that ratio between the white population and the Negro population in the United States, about 9 percent of our population is colored.

I am not making these observations against the Negro, but I am making them in reply to the crocodile tears which have been shed here by some of the folk who want to make the FEPC a part of the permanent statutory laws of this country.

What is happening? Nine percent of the employees on the Federal pay roll in the District of Columbia should be Negroes. Let us play the game fairly. That is what I want to do. I have no objection to 9 percent of the employees being Negroes, but why discriminate against the white race, against 126,000,000 people, and let Negroes come in and get more than their proportionate share according to population in the United States? They boast of the fact that they have succeeded in putting Negroes on the pay rolls in the District of Columbia to the extent of more than 19 percent of the total number of employees.

What does that mean? It means that about 50 percent of the Negroes who are working in Government offices in Washington are occupying positions which, under a proper fair employment practices law, ought to be filled by white people.

My good friend the President of the United States has issued the wrong kind of an order to the heads of the departments in Washington. He should have issued an order to the departmental heads in Washington to make such transfers and such dismissals as to bring about a fair, square, equitable deal between the white and black races in the employment jobs in Washington.

But what is happening? This black market—I mean black cabinet in Washington, although there is not much difference between the two—the black cabinet in Washington is almost continuously in session. They are making it their business to integrate as many Negroes into Federal jobs in Washington as possible.

What is happening? Today they boast of the fact that they have 19 percent of the Government employees when they are entitled to not more than 9 percent. The FEPC and the black cabinet of Washington, headed by Ross of the FEPC—and as we know two-thirds of his employees in the FEPC were Negroes—have been hanging around the White House bulldozing and intimidating and bluffing the President of the United States in an effort to make him believe that the Negro is getting a raw deal under the departmental heads of the Government in Washington when, as a matter of fact, they have 50 percent or more employees in the Departments than they ought to have. So the President should have issued an order to the heads of the departments in Washington to adjust the equities between the white and black races in this country, between the white and black people, by firing about 50 percent of the Negroes now on the job and letting the white boys and girls have the jobs they are entitled to because of their proportion of the population of the United States.

If fair-employment practice is what is desired, then let us make it fair. Let us give the white man his share and the Negro his share of these Government jobs. The Negroes are entitled to only 9 percent of the jobs in the District of Columbia. Fifty percent should be removed, and the jobs given to the white boys and girls of America, instead of Negroes, whose employment has been brought about by every hook and crook possible, by the machinations and schemes of this black cabinet that is operating day and night in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I voted against the confirmation of Mrs. Roosevelt yesterday, and I shall give some of the reasons. The most disgraceful thing that has been done in the District of Columbia, a great southern city, a city south of Mason and Dixon's line, the Capital of a white nation, was when this damnable FEPC was started. A campaign was immediately put on to go into every department in Washington, and do what? Give the Negroes jobs? No; but to integrate the Negro into the social affairs and social contacts of the white boys and girls who were working in the departments in Washington. The order came down from the White House to go to the departments and rip out the partitions which had been there for a hundred years, and make the white men and boys and girls eat side by side at the same tables with the Negroes employed in the departments.

It was said, "Go tear out the partitions between the toilets and the washstands," which had been set aside and dedicated for the use of the colored men and women employed in these jobs, "and force the white boys and girls to wash in the same basins and use the same toilets in the departments in Washington," in a city in every part of which segregation is observed between the two races, the black and the white, which are so widely divergent in every respect. We have segregation in the hospitals, we have segregation in the parks, we have segregation in the schools, we have segregation in the restaurants, we have segregation in the theaters, we have segregation everywhere until we get into one of the departments where the FEPC, through Mrs. Roosevelt, could get on the job. That is the condition which obtains, and I have stated why it obtains.

The white people forced to this affiliation and association, all upon the theory of the craziest, wildest, most unreasonable, illogical theory advanced by Philip Randolph, Judge Hastie, and the Negro intelligentsia, led by Dr. Debose, who is the chief investigator and officer of the NAACP, of which Mrs. Roosevelt is now a commissioner, or trustee, an institution which is committed to the program of social equality between the white and black races, and miscegenation and intermarriage of the races.

A few days ago, when this good lady was making a speech at Howard University, she was asked the direct question, "Do you believe in the whites and blacks intermarrying?" She said, "To that question I will not say yes or no, but I believe in people doing as they please." If one can swallow that, my hat is off to his stomach.

Do Senators want to know who is behind the FEPC? Do they want to know who is sponsoring it? It is not the Republican Party; it is not the Democratic Party; it is being sponsored by these minority groups, the NAACP and the Negro intelligentsia of this country in their dream and plan and scheme to force by law the integration of the Negro into the white social life and contacts of the American white people. That is all there is to it; that is what it is all about.

Some of the politicians are so afraid to assert themselves in the interest of the white race, in the integrity of white blood, that they are afraid to take the correct position in this matter for fear they will lose some votes in an election to come. Of course, that does not apply to any of my colleagues, but I am talking about the politicians. That is the Negro in the woodpile.

Oh, it is said, "Bilbo is fanatical about the question of race relations." No. I have been a student of the question, and I think I know something about it. I have been writing it up and looking it up for 3 or 4 years, and gathering material for 15. My book is nearly completed, and I have tried to cover the case from beginning to end.

I am more alarmed over the race question in the United States than over the atomic bomb, because I am not blind. I see. I know what is taking place. There are States in the American Union which permit, by law of the State, Negroes and whites to intermarry, and today the average in the United States is more than 600 marriages a year between Negroes and whites. What does that mean? In a normal family of 5 it means 3,000 mulattoes, mongrels, turned loose upon the society of this country every year.

When we consider the illegal side of it, it is alarming, and that covers not only the States which permit marriage legally, but it covers other States. The situation is so alarming that Dr. Linton, who is professor of anthropology at Columbia University, 3 weeks ago announced in the press that at the rate of mongrelization of Negroes and whites in the United States the job will be complete in 9 generations, and there will be no whites, there will be no blacks, but all will be yellow. The only regret I have is that some people who live today cannot live for the next 300 years so that they could be yellow.

Mr. President, when that takes place, the boasted white American civilization, with its freedoms, will be gone, the boasted white race will be gone, and all that we are proud of today, and all that has made this country what it is today, the most powerful and the most wonderful country and civilization and Government in the world, will be gone, and the Government will be turned over to the hands of a bunch of mongrels 300 years from now, nine generations.

I have been saying for the last few years that this would take place in 500 or 1,000 or 1,500 years, but Dr. Linton says I am mistaken; that mongrelization is proceeding so rapidly that its completion will take place in 300 years, or nine generations.

Anyone who has sense enough to come in out of the rain knows that when a race is mongrelized its civilization is destroyed, its power is destroyed, its worth is destroyed, because no mongrel race ever amounted to anything. We know that this is hatching; we know it is going to take place; we know about when it is going to take place, yet some people are not willing to do anything about it.

Of course, an attack by atomic bomb would destroy the human race, it would destroy our civilization, and that would be that. But that would be a quick job. The only difference between the two is that one would be done speedily, and the other will be done slowly, but in either case civilization would be gone. So far as I am concerned, I would rather see my race destroyed by the atomic bomb than to see it destroyed by a process of mongrelization.

Mr. President, I am surprised that any Senator on this floor would be begging for the passage of the FEPC bill, especially the bill that is pending on the calendar. Some who think they would get a little advantage want to say that this is a southern question, and that I am speaking from a southern standpoint. No; the FEPC is not a southern question. It is a national question, and in the States of Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, where the ques-

tion has been put up to the legislature, the legislature very promptly killed the FEPC in these Northern States. Of course, it has never gone far enough even to be introduced into the legislature of a Southern State.

The clamor for the passage of this bill arises because of the pressure that is coming from segments of our population who have a certain number of votes in various strategical sections of the country. That is the reason. The enactment of the bill would not result in fair treatment, because it has been in force in the District of Columbia, and I have just finished telling what has happened here. The white race has been discriminated against, and today if there are 300,000 Federal jobs, there are about 30,000 jobs being occupied by Negro boys and girls which should be occupied by whites, if there were fair employment in the Federal departments in the District of Columbia. So do not talk to me about fair employment so long as this condition obtains in the District of Columbia. I am very sorry that my good President did not issue the right kind of order, to look into the injustices being done to the white race in the District of Columbia.

DEATH OF GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Word has just reached the Chair that General Patton passed away about an hour ago. The Chair wishes to announce that fact to the Senate at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the announcement which the Chair has just made is a very sad one. There is not a Senator who does not feel the full force of the loss of this great leader, not only a leader of our armed forces, but a leader of thought, one of the champions of peace, the great objective for which so many gallant sons followed him into the most dangerous and destructive battles of the greatest war. I am sure that the Senate will at some later time take formal action upon this announcement. What I have said can be only impromptu.

I shall not associate this sad event with what I am about to say concerning the pending resolution, although I see a close association, because of the great cause for which General Patton really gave his life, namely, the cause of peace.

DISCHARGE OF FATHERS FROM THE ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. REVERCOMB'S motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 207, to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) to direct and require the discharge of certain members of the armed forces, to prohibit the drafting of certain persons into the Army or Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have been astonished at the scope of the argument to which I have listened in advocacy of rushing into the weakening process which reduced this country to the military posture it occupied immediately following the First World War, and which was a direct cause of the Second World War. We would never have had a Second World War had the United States of America stood up and faced the responsibilities which this country then had, and maintained a military posture which would have given its voice in international affairs an authority and a significance which would have stopped the Japanese in their assault on Manchuria, stopped the Italians in Eritrea, and made Mr. Hitler hold back before he reached out, after watching these other experiments, and robbed the countries of his neighbors and their people. Had the United States been in such a position that when it spoke and asked Britain to step in and stop the assault on Manchuria, it could have made that demand effective, the whole movement toward world war would have stopped then. Today we hear men making an argument for immediate decimation of the armed forces of the United States both on land and water. Why? Merely because of an emotion which we all feel, for we have all had sons in this war and still have them.

Mr. President, not one word has been spoken—and I doubt if a thought has been given—as to the children of the men whose discharge is sought. I thought that we fought this war for the purpose of saving those children from going to war. Up to this time I have believed that the people of the United States believed that this job was not finished when we drove to their knees the Nazis and the Japs, but that we had to occupy their countries long enough to pacify them and absolutely prevent the resurrection of those mighty forces which we allowed to come into being following the First World War.

Really, my heart has felt sick at what I have listened to here today. Great statesmen are discussing this question as though the war were over and we could now, without any evil consequences, scatter our Army and our Navy. They know, as I know, that all our armed forces in all the services have become so decimated under the constant pressure of the people back home and here in Congress that it is dangerous to fly in a military airplane. We have not a sufficient number of men in the ground forces efficiently to take care of the inspection, repair, and maintenance of our bombers and other machines of that type.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether the Senator from Vermont has had the same experience I have had with respect to correspondence which comes across my desk almost daily. I find that the people in my section of the country are definitely demanding that we continue a strong army, a strong air force, and a strong navy. In other words, they are asking us not to repeat the mistake we made back in 1920; and yet they do not seem to understand that it requires manpower to do the very things which they are demanding. They want someone else to do the job.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, Mr. President. I believe that is true all over the United States. I know it is true in the little State of Vermont.

It is said that our Army and Navy have no intention of doing the things which this joint resolution would make them do. The pending resolution would discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, not because it has neglected to perform its function, but because it has performed its function, and has done so contrary to the wishes of the author of the joint resolution. Because of that fact we are confronted with the possibility, at least of the United States Senate passing a joint resolution providing as follows:

> That there shall be discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such force * * * who has on the date of enactment of this joint resolution one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bonafide family relationship in his home.

Mr. President, what would be the consequence of such discharge now? We have commitments in Europe and Asia which call for 300,000 ground forces in one place and 400,000 in the other. The demobilization of those forces has been so great, even under the controlled and orderly procedure of the point system, that the question is now being asked, not only by our people at home but also by those who have examined the ground, and who know what the task is, and the commitment which we have made, Can we carry it out today, with those forces decimated as they already have been under the pressure from home?

Mr. President, the joint resolution has not been before us for very long. It was introduced on November 8. By chance, on the next day there was published a report to the President of the United States by Byron Price, to whom was committed the function of looking over the situation in Europe and reporting to him the relations between the American forces of occupation and the German people. I wish to place in the RECORD, though it may weary the few Senators who are present, some extracts from that report bearing upon the proposition that already we have reduced our military forces in Europe to the danger point, whereas the problem which they are supposed to be trying to solve has become more and more complex:

> This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

That is one of the last paragraphs in the report, made almost on the same day that Senate Joint Resolution 116 was introduced in the Senate to tear away, without any order, from such forces as are left there every man who has a child at home, forgetting that in order to have that child at home spared the risk and the sacrifice of another war in which he must serve, we are in Europe trying to pacify an enemy who rose to his feet, though we had him down 25 years ago, and who, by rising to his feet, caused such desolation in the world that we shall never fully recover from it. We have

learned the lesson. Can we remember it 24 hours?

The fighting is said to be over. I am not sure that the fighting is over; but I am sure, certainly, that the war is not ended legally by either the issuance of a declaration or the adoption of a concurrent resolution. Notwithstanding that, before the war is over some Senators wish to have us take the toboggan which we took immediately after the First World War, and thus return the United States to a position of isolation and pacifism. Some Senators wish to have us say that we shall not stick our noses into other people's business—forgetting that in this war our commitment was to go through with it in such a way that not only would we drive the enemy to his knees but we would attain a peace which would prevail all over the world for a long time. That has been and still is our objective. Our objective is to protect the children of these men—and that is their objective, although some of them may not know it, and no doubt some of them do not. But I have seen and have talked with and have heard from many others who do know that that is their objective and who are willing to make whatever sacrifice may be required in order to suppress this Nazi terror in such a way that never again will it be able to rise to cast the world into war. They are willing to make that sacrifice, partly to save the children at home, but, more than that, to save the children of humanity all over the world for time to come.

Mr. President, we are just on the edge of that toboggan. It is very easy to slide down hill, but it is much harder to go up hill. We have an up-hill road to follow if we are to maintain the peace which now prevails. We already have made military commitments for that purpose. In addition to the commitment to pacify the enemy in Asia and Europe, requiring armed forces which we would now so weaken that that function could not be performed, we have committed ourselves to support the United Nations Organization with armed forces. Further than that, we are such determined advocates of a peace which shall save our people from going to war in the future that we have before us, yet to be considered, two measures which will directly affect the kind and number of the armed forces which we ourselves are to maintain and the way in which we shall furnish the personnel. Those two great measures have yet to be presented to the Senate. Now, before they are before us, we are in no position to rush headlong into a decimation of such forces as we have.

Our objective is not merely the little, narrow one of getting the fathers home. Fathers are exactly as patriotic as men who are single and married men without children; and the men without children have rights, as well as do the men with children, regardless of whether they are in the Army or outside the Army.

I have listened here in amazement to the claim that the married men who have one child or more than one could be released from the armed forces without discriminating against the men who do not have children. The matter was not stated exactly in that form, but that is the substance of the statement. Indeed, we find written in the resolution these very words—I read from section 2, to be found on page 2, beginning in line 3, of Senate Joint Resolution 116:

SEC. 2. That this joint resolution shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this joint resolution, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and the Navy.

Practical men, knowing that under the point system we are unable promptly to deliver from our coasts, after they arrive there, even the men who return from Asia and Europe, also know as a matter of history that because of transportation and other logistic problems, we have been unable to move them from the islands of the sea to our coasts. Therefore, can we now say, as we would say if the joint resolution were brought before the Senate and passed, that the resolution "shall not be deemed to affect the existing program," if Congress commands them, as the resolution would, to discharge from the military and naval forces of the United States as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit every member of such forces having one child?

Mr. President, it would upset the whole program. Theoretically and morally the entire program which has been worked out with great care and with the assent of the men in the armed forces would be completely upset.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator will recall that after the program in respect to discharge under the point system was adopted, both the Army and the Navy issued an order providing that if a man in the service had three children, that would be a ground for his discharge. If that did not upset the program, would the discharge of men with two children, of the men with one child upset it? In other words, the program under the point system can be added to, and that is the purpose of the joint resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the trouble with the statement of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is the implied "if" contained in it. It did upset the program and it did set back men who otherwise, under the point system, would have been able to return home sooner than they actually were able to return. That is my justification for saying that the joint resolution would have a similar effect.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show to some extent the relation of this question to our attempt to pacify Germany and, thus, our attempt—as a part of our duty in all this great cost and sacrifice—to establish a peace which will prevail, I shall read, but not consecutively, certain sections of memoranda contained in a report made on the day after the joint resolution was introduced in the Senate. I read these sections as a part of a report which is concluded in the following words:

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sure the Senator, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, knows that as of approximately the 1st of December there were about 900,000 troops still in Europe, and I believe the Senator also knows that General Eisenhower, now the Chief of Staff, has said that all that will be needed to perform the work involved in the occupation of Germany is 375,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know whether the Senator has any right to have such a belief. What I can say is that I know that General Eisenhower was much alarmed at the proposal of such a scheme as that now advanced.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The statement of the need for 375,000 troops has come from General Eisenhower and has been published in the press.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is all very well. I am not disputing that. The Senator asked me what I knew.

I shall now proceed to read portions of a memorandum sent to the President by Byron Price, who was appointed by the President to make the survey referred to in the memorandum. But first I shall read the letter sent by the President to the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy when he forwarded the report to them:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a copy of the report of Byron Price dated November 9. I asked Mr. Price to go to Germany to study the relationship between the American forces of occupation and the German people.

Mr. Price, as you know, is an able and experienced observer, and I believe that his report is worthy of the most careful consideration. You will note that the Price report embodies eight specific suggestions.

It is requested that the Secretaries of State, War, and Navy give careful consideration to this report, with a view to taking whatever joint action may be indicated.

Of course, the concluding paragraph of the report will bear repetition for the sake of emphasis:

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

The extract is as follows:

This report is submitted in response to your request of August 30 that I survey the general subject of relations between the American forces of occupation and the German people so that you might have the benefit of a wholly detached view of this highly important situation.

* * * * *

Considering all of the difficulties, which few people in this country are in a position to understand, General Eisenhower and his staff have done better than a good job governing the German population of the American zone. Mistakes have been made, and some confusions persist; but in general relations with the mass of Germans are on a sound basis. In so large and complex an operation no one should ask for perfect results in so short a time unless he expects miracles.

Mr. President, I count 7 Democratic and 10 Republican Members now in the Senate. That makes 17 in all, or 1 less than the number of members of the Military Affairs Committee. Mr. President, think of it. We have before us a motion

to discharge the Military Affairs Committee from further consideration of the joint resolution at a time when fewer Senators than the number which represents the membership of the Military Affairs Committee are present, while facts are being discussed relating to the occupation of Germany by armed forces of the United States, and questions which involve the further decimation of those forces. I hope the country will know what is taking place on the last day of this session of Congress, and how a great issue affecting the peace of the world is being forced through with less than a quorum being present in the Chamber, and without a request being made for a quorum call.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator well knows that the resolution pending before the Senate is to discharge the committee so that Joint Resolution 116 may be placed on the calendar and be acted upon at the proper time.

So far as the number of Members now present on the floor of the Senate is concerned, certainly Senators have had full notice of the pending measure because it has been discussed at various times during the present week.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is not an old measure. It is a new measure. The date which the joint resolution bears is November 8, 1945. What is of more significance, Mr. President, is this: The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate did not bury the joint resolution or put it on the shelf, but acted upon it in the usual way. I must admit that I cannot recall when, during my 15 years of service in the Senate, such a procedure as this has taken place.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall yield after I have completed my statement.

As I have said, I cannot recall—and I have asked other Senators if they could recall—a case in which the author of a resolution which had been referred to a committee of which he was a member, undertook, after consideration by the committee and after a vote of 3 to 6 had been registered against the resolution, to ask the Senate to discharge the committee from further consideration of the subject. I must say that this is the most unique procedure which has been attempted since I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Allow me to refresh the Senator's memory. I have not been a Member of the Senate so long as has the able Senator from Vermont, but does he not recall what happened in this very year, 1945, when there was introduced a bill requiring that at least 6 months of training be given to 18-year-old boys, after we had found that they were being sent into battle abroad with much less training, thereby jeopardizing not only themselves, but the lives of the men with whom they were associated? Does not the Senator recall that after the bill had been rejected by the committee by a vote of 6 to 3, and regardless of the rejection and the refusal of the committee to report the bill favorably, it was offered on the floor as an amendment to the Selective Service Act and was passed first by the Senate, and later by the House of Representatives?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not recall the matter to which the Senator has referred, but I accept his word for it. I think that that transaction was in line with the present transaction, and probably engineered by the same Senators.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I never regretted my support of the requirement that those boys be given adequate training before being sent into battle.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have no complaint to make against the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. For my own part, my record shows that I tried to see that our boys received adequate training. I believe that we gave to millions of boys of our great Army the most remarkable training that a country ever gave to its boys before sending them into battle.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that we should not vote on this important matter without a majority of the Members of the Senate being present. Therefore, I wonder if the Senator will yield so that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator withhold his point of no quorum for a moment?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I yield for no other purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Vermont yields in order that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield before——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wish to make a request on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. He desired to introduce a bill, and if we have a quorum call he will have no opportunity to introduce his bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a while ago I objected to the Senator from Washington introducing a bill because I wanted the Senate to proceed with consideration of the pending business. We are now proceeding with it; but I hope nothing will be done to prevent the Senator from Washington from introducing his bill. I make that statement because a while ago I objected to the Senator introducing his bill at that time, and I do not wish that he be indefinitely prevented from doing so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I would certainly have felt that the Senate had fallen into a state of hysteria if it had continued with consideration of the pending motion without a quorum being present. I am glad that the Senator from Indiana interposed his suggestion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I doubt whether we can obtain a quorum, and I wish to make a brief reference to the death of General Patton. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a few minutes?

Mr. CAPEHART. I withhold it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time when I yielded to permit the suggestion of the absence of a quorum—although meantime, because of a change in the parliamentary situation, a quorum call has not been had—I was undertaking to read from a report submitted by Byron Price to the President with reference to the relationship between the American forces of occupation and the German people. I shall not detain the Senate longer than to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my previous remarks, certain extracts from the report which I have marked with a marginal line.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorandum to the President:

This report is submitted in response to your request of August 30 that I survey "the general subject of relations between the American forces of occupation and the German people" so that you might have the benefit of a wholly detached view of this highly important situation.

* * * * *

Considering all of the difficulties, which few people in this country are in a position to understand, General Eisenhower and his staff have done better than a good job governing the German population of the American Zone. Mistakes have been made and some confusions persist, but in general relations with the mass of Germans are on a sound basis. In so large and complex an operation no one should ask for perfect results in so short a time unless he expects miracles.

* * * * *

The entire basic structure of military government in Germany, including the Potsdam Declaration, should be reexamined in the light of experience and new conditions.

* * * * *

The United States must decide whether we mean to finish the job completely, and provide the tools, the determination and the funds requisite to that purpose, or withdraw.

* * * * *

We must wonder what the relations between our dwindling army of occupation and the German people will be during these critical months. * * *

The German Nation had not simply suffered a military defeat. Not only its armed forces, but the government itself had disappeared, leaving anarchy behind. The whole national economy, including the most essential facilities of organized society, and the people's political ideologies and household goods as well, were buried under the rubble. It is doubtful whether any occupying army in history ever faced a task of parallel magnitude.

The situation would have been difficult enough had General Eisenhower been free to grapple with it as he pleased. He had not, and has not, that opportunity. The necessities of the military situation required, on the one hand, that the American Military Governor deal cooperatively and on a basis of equality in policy matters with the military authorities of Great Britain, Russia, and France; and pressures from home required

at the same time that the complex task of military government be undertaken with patched-up and constantly changing administrative machinery, from which some of the most capable administrators still are being demobilized daily.

* * * * *

Finally, some of the most capable Americans, who understood best the intricacies of the system, were discharged from the Army and came home on points. The results, which have been duplicated with variations in transportation, communications, and other essential services, can be surmised. Nor can blame for these results be placed on the Army of Occupation.

Despite these and other handicaps, order and comparative tranquillity have been reestablished within 6 months throughout an American zone having 18,000,000 inhabitants, so that the present crime rate actually is lower than in the United States. * * *

No one who knows the facts can fail to give General Eisenhower, his deputy, General Clay, and the staff of Military Government generally his continuing confidence and commendation. In no other zone in Germany has greater progress been made toward the declared objectives of the Allied occupation.

* * * * *

2. The proposed change-over of Military Government from Army to civilian control will be advantageous only if the very highest type of civilian administrators can be assigned to Germany. Second-raters not only would fail, but would involve this Government in untold new difficulty.

As individuals and executives, the Army officers now in charge of military government are a highly capable group of men. The only point in making a change would be to rid military government of the complicated Army forms and procedures, which were created for a vastly different purpose and are not sufficiently pliable to be adaptable to civil affairs. It is not the men in charge, but the Army system, with its necessary devotion to rank, channelization, and precise regimentation, which does not fit the needs of the situation.

In my opinion no change to top civilian control should take place earlier than June 1, 1946, the date originally recommended by General Eisenhower. The intervening time is none too long to permit a sufficient number of civilian replacements to be assembled and given the requisite training and experience on the ground in Germany.

* * * * *

Substitution of civilian personnel in Germany should have limits. I suggest that some military government officials, such as those in charge of public safety and some of those in the lowest rank, in direct touch with the German people locally, should remain in uniform.

* * * * *

7. Thus far there is no evidence of an organized underground resistance in the American zone, acts of hostility being largely confined to small-time local depredations. But caution cannot be relaxed.

The former Hitler Youth—young people of their teens—are potentially the most dangerous single element of the population. It may be hoped that the current effort to organize these crooked-minded children into nonmilitary societies and clubs after the American fashion will help turn them away from idleness and subversion.

It must be remembered, however, that many natural ties bind the Hitler Youth to the millions of recently discharged German soldiers, to criminal elements among displaced persons, and to the increasing company of Nazis out of office.

The suffering sure to come with winter may be expected to bring into the open whatever threat of real disorder and rebellion may now lie buried beneath the surface.

This is the wrong time to permit General Eisenhower's armed forces in Germany to be decimated and robbed of military effectiveness by demobilization.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, do I now have the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Vermont announced that he had yielded the floor, but it is not material to me who has it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the majority leader that the Senator from Vermont has not concluded his remarks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and of course the Senator does not have to yield to any other Senator to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have yielded for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator has yielded for that purpose he has given up the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not so understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. My understanding is that the Senator has yielded the floor. I insist that technically, he has been taken off the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. He yielded for the purpose of a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator may not designate the purpose for which he yields, if the purpose for which he yields would automatically take him off the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have no disposition to confuse the situation at all. I do not want to muddy the waters. That is not my purpose. If it could have been possible for me to finish my address I would have been glad to do so. But I was so pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Indiana recognize a situation which I think is very important in connection the dignity of the Senate, that I yielded to him upon his request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Recent rulings in the Senate have been to the effect that when a Senator who is making an address yields for the purpose of a quorum call, he yields the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no doubt about it. I am sorry that the Senator from Vermont felt impelled to cut short his most excellent address on the subject pending before the Senate, but he has done so. If the Senator from Indiana will permit me to make brief reference to the death of a great general, I will do so and then the Senator may renew his point of order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I accede to the Senator's request.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have the floor for a few minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from New Mexico has made a point of order. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order that no Senator may yield to another Senator for any purpose except to ask a question, and that only the Senator who has the floor is recognized by the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ruling of the Chair is that when a Senator yields for a quorum call he yields the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. And then any Senator who is entitled to be recognized must be recognized by the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If technically the Senator has the floor, he could not yield to me except for a question. Therefore, I ask the Senator to withhold his point of order until I can make a brief observation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield, providing I am not taken off the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator cannot technically yield to me or any other Senator if a point of order is made, except for a question, and I asked him to withhold his point of no quorum. I ask unanimous consent that he may do so without yielding the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ruling of the Chair is that the Senator from Vermont yielded for a quorum call. The Senator from Vermont or any other Senator who yields for that purpose cannot say who is going to be recognized. The Chair will recognize the Senator first on his feet addressing the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. A point of order. Whom does the Chair recognize?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is recognizing the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LUCAS. Therefore, the Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Indiana was recognized by the Chair. The Senator from Vermont sat down. The Senator from Indiana suggested the absence of a quorum, and has anything come up since then to change his position? He did not yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. He said, "Upon unanimous consent I will withhold the request," and unanimous consent was not granted. He has the floor, has he not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the Parliamentarian, the Senator had yielded to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Chair that the Senator from Kentucky asked unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Indiana yield to him for a statement, the unanimous consent was not given, and I inquire of the Chair if the Senator from Indiana does not yet have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana had the floor so far as making the point of order was concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART. I make the point of no quorum again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, Mr. President. I do not wish to get into any parliamentary complication over who has the floor. Before Congress adjourns, in view of the sad news we have heard, I should like to make a very brief observation with respect to General Patton. I asked that I might do that without taking the Senator from Indiana off the floor, and that request was never acted on. If advantage is to be taken of a technicality in order to deprive me of the opportunity to make a few remarks about General Patton, I shall not ask the Senator from Indiana to yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that me may make some remarks about General Patton?

Mr. CAPEHART. There never has been any objection to that, so long as we may have a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Indiana and I thank all other Senators. We all know that any Senator can make a point of no quorum at any time when he can be recognized, even though the Chair does not know what the intention is, but I appreciate this opportunity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

DEATH OF GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure that the whole Senate and the whole country have been shocked by the sudden news of the death of Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., one of the most gallant and one of the most heroic military leaders it has ever been the fortune of the United States of America to have in its armies.

It seems a great tragedy, one of those inscrutable things which take place in human history, that after one of the most brilliant careers in military history, after inspiring not only the troops whom he commanded immediately, but, by his example and his intrepid fortitude, his courage and daring, inspiring all the armed forces of this great Nation and the world in the victories which he won and helped to win in the war against the Axis Powers, this great general, this great American, should fall as the result of an accident, for which he was not to blame, and to which he made no contribution except that he was riding in the automobile involved in the accident which has resulted in his death.

Mr. President, I, along with other Members of the Senate, and I have no doubt along with millions of other Americans, have now and then had occasion to grow a little impatient over some of the episodes accompanying the life of General Patton.

> There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
> Rough-hew them how we will,

says the poet, and we are all creatures more or less of circumstances, we are creatures of that nature and that character with which God has endowed us. We all make mistakes, and we are subject to failures and foibles for which we may not always be responsible. But in spite of our mistakes, in spite of our short-sightedness and our shortcomings, our characters are ultimately to be measurer by the sum total of our contribution on the positive rather than on the negative side of life.

The American Army and the American Navy, the American military and naval forces, in all the history of this Nation have not contributed a more colorful leader of men than Gen. George S. Patton. He was not a follower; he did not send his men on in front; he led them. He led them in Africa; he led them in Italy; he led them in the crossing of the Rhine into Germany, and on up the hills and valleys. He never asked those who followed him to endure any hardship he was not willing to endure himself. He never asked any of them to endanger their lives to a greater extent than he was willing to endanger his own life.

So, today we come to this sad hour when this heroic, couragecus, colorful man is no more. While we mourn his death, while we grieve over his untimely end—because in the very prime of life he is stricken down by force of circumstances for which he was not responsible—nevertheless we rejoice at the outstanding example which he has set not only to all those who have worn and will wear the uniform of their country, not only to those who, in the quiet and sequestered paths of life, where the sunlight never beats, may know of his exploits and his deeds, but we likewise rejoice in the example he has set for us who sit here in this great Chamber today and mourn and grieve and weep, with downcast eyes and with tremulous voice, the departure of this great soldier, this great American. His courage was not only physical. It was likewise moral. In this hour of our Nation's history, in this crisis of mankind's history, when all nations, all tribes, and all religions may stand at the cross roads of humanity, moral courage is no less essential than physical courage. This great leader was unmindful of his own physical safety. By being unmindful of his own physical safety he gave an exhibition of moral courage which we may well emulate. We need moral courage in this hour of crisis and decision. I am not so certain that we do not need moral courage now to a greater extent than we need physical courage. What may happen to our bodies may be inconsequential and unimportant, but what may happen as the result of the example we may give of courage of the spirit and of the soul and of the mind in this great hour may be more than we can now portend in the history of democracy and democratic institutions in our own country and throughout the world.

While I mourn the death of General Patton, I rejoice to see the example he has set for us, the light that he carried on his torch, and the inspiration he has given us in physical, moral, and spiritual stamina to fight the battles which now beset us as a nation and as a world, and to pass on to generations yet unborn that inspiration and that spirit which is so essential if all that we love and have fought for is to be preserved.

I would not want this Congress to adjourn without saying these few words, which but feebly express the feelings of my heart and soul concerning the tragic and untimely death of this great leader of men, who inspired those who followed him beyond our ability to understand or express. Peace to his ashes! May his memory long live in the minds not only of those who fought under him and with him, but of those in this Nation and throughout the world who love courage, who love democracy, who love civilization, and rejoice in the belief that those who give their lives in behalf of a great cause really save their lives and do not lose them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak very briefly concerning General Patton without the loss of the floor to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the news just brought to us by the eloquent words of the Senator from Kentucky finds us grief-stricken.

General Patton had warmth of heart, indomitable courage, and power of the spirit that was greater, even, than the power of the sword. He takes his place beside the three or four greatest military leaders in the history of our country. His name, his accomplishments, and his character will be always an inspiration to the youth of our country, which owes him gratitude and honor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say a few words about General Patton without the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] losing the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the words of the distinguished majority leader. Word came to me soon after lunch that General Patton, "the fightingest commander of World War II," had succumbed to the injuries he had received in an automobile accident on December 9. All America is shocked and stunned by the news.

Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr., has now been promoted to glory. On December 14 I suggested on the floor of the Senate that President Truman nominate and the Senate confirm George S. Patton as a permanent three-star general. Now, as a final measure of tribute to this great soldier, I suggest that his promotion to the permanent rank of lieutenant general be made posthumously, dating back to May 8, the day before the end of combat in Germany.

Patton possessed the qualities which the Greeks called the fire of the gods, namely, enthusiasm. Anyone who has been privileged to talk with men who lived with Patton know that that statement is no exaggeration. More than that, he possessed another element, called inspiration. He could inspire men. That was the reason why, in my remarks on December 14, I called him the Son of Battle. I said:

We pray God that in the future, peace will remain a constant blessing to America and to the world. But if war comes, we need men like Patton, the lionhearted, the man who fights battles, not simply plans them, but the man who executes them; the man who inspires men to do the impossible and makes them unbeatable.

I respectfully further suggest that General Patton, above everything else, was a man of action. He lived in action. At the same time he was a scholar and a poet, a thinker, the kind of a man one loves as a comrade, because he raised up those who were associated with him, fed them with his inspiration, and gave them some of his enthusiasm. General Patton lived as a man of action. Let the deserved honor which I have suggested be given to him as of the date when he was a combat commander.

I respectfully further suggest that some form of memorial be set aside for General Patton at the Cavalry School at Fort Riley, Kans., or at the Fort Knox., Ky., Armored Forces School. Cavalry was, of course, General Patton's great love, and it was in armored cavalry combat that he achieved his undying fame. America grieves that George Patton passed to his eternal reward so far physically from the land of his devoted countrymen. He was far from his son at West Point and his two daughters in Washington, but his wife was at his side. The spirit of all America was with him. We had hoped, when news of his injury came and he seemed to be getting better, that he would carry through, but at last, apparently, the old mechanism could not hold his tremendous spirit. We know that George Patton has gone ahead to serve us in a higher realm, where the jibes and smears and underhanded assaults which a few misguided individuals directed at him are as naught.

He has gone ahead in the great journey we all must take. Hail and farewell to thee, valiant soldier "fightingest commander of World War II," stalwart American, great leader, undaunted man among men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. With unanimous consent that I may not lose the floor, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a distinguished officer, a friend of mine, Mr. Russell King, of Florida, used to tell me about a tank commander under whom he served in World War I. He spoke of the gallantry and chivalry and courage of the man.

This war came, and the name of this man rose to be one of the most illustrious stars that ever adorned the firmament of battle heroes. I regarded him as worthy as perhaps no other general of this war was of the mantle of Stonewall Jackson, for he had a genius for leadership and movement which was rare even in such a brilliant galaxy as this war produced.

Recently I had an opportunity to talk not only with private soldiers, but with fellow officers of this man, and officers in other armies who told me with unstinted admiration and praise of the almost inconceivable accomplishment of General Patton in this war. I remember how General Limnitzer, chief of staff recently to General Clark, paid his own tribute to the campaign which this officer led across Sicily, and wondered that it was capable of accomplishment.

I heard Gen. Bedell Smith tell about the great campaign that swept our forces across France and then brought Germany to an unconditional surrender, and time after time, in the mention of the crucial battles and conquests of that great crusade, the name of General Patton was uppermost in praise and commendation.

Now this soldier's soldier, this man with a soldier's heart, this man who personified action and courage and inspired leadership, is dead. He has gone to join the heroes of the great past who have made the pages of history bright with their illustrious deeds.

There is many a man today who followed him into the jaws of death, there is many an officer who counseled with him, people who loved courage and gallantry everywhere on earth, who are sad because this man, George S. Patton, has fought his last battle, and now has gone to rest with the heroes of all the past, to receive the laurels which, on both sides of the Great Divide, will be heaped upon him.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me so that I may place something in the RECORD, with the understanding that he shall not lose the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, to my mind the Senate of the United States is in the most ridiculous position it has ever occupied. Senators are not privileged to rise to their feet and pay tribute to a gallant soldier and a great American without having to obtain unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I object to any unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I feel that the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico are directed at me, and that they are most unfortunate and unfair to me, because I did not know that General Patton had died. I knew nothing about it. How was I expected to know anything about it? I simply asked that a quorum call be made, and nothing more. I resent the statement of the Senator from New Mexico, because I think it was directed entirely at me, and I think he owes me an apology.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent to insert something in the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from New Mexico objects to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HATCH. I objected to certain unanimous-consent requests which were made. I do not object to the request of the Senator from New York.

RESOLUTION BY BUFFALO CIVIC FULL EMPLOYMENT CO[illegible]TTEE — RECORD OF NEGOTIATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a resolution adopted by the Buffalo Civic Full Employment Committee on December 4, 1945.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The Civic Full Employment Committee agrees that the Smith-Connally Act is an ill-considered piece of legislation, hastily passed and poorly framed. It fails to achieve its ostensible purpose of improving labor relations. The degree of Government control involved has no place under peacetime conditions. The committee urges Congress to avoid any hasty, ill-considered action at this time and it proposes that administrative machinery for the settlement of disputes be set up along the following lines: (1) Labor and management should bargain collectively in good faith and exhaust every effort to settle their differences together before requesting Government intervention or resorting to a work stoppage; (2) before breaking off negotiations, a joint statement of issues and differences should be prepared, with outside assistance if necessary; (3) once negotiations are broken off, and before either party resorts to a work stoppage, the assistance of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor should be called into the dispute in an effort to settle it."

NOTE.—The committee is an official, nonpartisan body appointed by Mayor Joseph J. Kelly and the Common Council. The following are the officers and members of the committee:

The management members are:

Daniel W. Streeter, chairman of the committee; president of the chamber of commerce; president of the Municipal Civil Service Commission; chairman of the Erie County War Finance Committee.

Harold M. Hecht, president of the William Hengerer Co.; president of the New York State Council of Retail Merchants.

Rob Roy MacLeod, executive vice president of the Buffalo Niagara Electric Corp.

N. Osborne Siegfried, manager, Siegfried Construction Co.

Keith Williams, president, Pratt & Letchworth Co., Inc.

The labor members are:

Thomas F. Kitts, president, Lodge 244, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.

James Miller, secretary-treasurer of the Greater Buffalo Industrial Union Council—CIO.

Peter Rybka, business representative, Local 19184, Flour, Feed & Cereal Workers Union—AFL.

George Sturges, executive secretary of the Federation of Labor for Buffalo and vicinity—AFL.

Hugh Thompson, regional director of the CIO.

The public members are:

The Rt. Rev. John P. Boland, vice chairman of the committee, pastor of St. Thomas Aquinas Church; former chairman of the State Labor Relations Board.

Dr. Samuel P. Capen, chancellor of the University of Buffalo; past president of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York.

Leo V. Lanning, past department commander, American Legion.

The Rev. Canon Robert E. Merry, canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Judge Charles B. Sears, chairman of the Regional Council of the State Commission Against Discrimination.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have a chronological record of the negotiations in connection with the General Motors strike, and I should like to read it into the RECORD without in any way interfering with my able colleague.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, provided that by unanimous consent I may retain the floor.

Mr. MEAD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as indicated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, while I am reading this statement I understand that the officers of General Motors and the officers of the UAW-CIO are in conference in Detroit and I sincerely trust that out of that conference will come a procedure which will result in the settlement of the strike. We are approaching the Christmas holidays. We shall enjoy the Christmas holidays because of the victory over our military foes. We shall enjoy the holidays all the more if we can have industrial peace as well as military peace.

The negotiations have been in progress since early in August. They have continued through the intervening time until today. The conference today is the result of the action taken by the President. As I have previously said, I trust that out of this conference will come a determination to bargain collectively in good faith to settle this dispute around the conference table. Some of the men around the conference table participated in the military conflict which won the right to the "four freedoms" of democracy for the victorious nation, and some of their children participated in that military conflict. As a result of the comradeship and cooperation in that victory, I hope they will agree to the achievement of the victory of industrial peace by some democratic, voluntary methods.

Mr. President, the current wage dispute in the plants of the General Motors Corp. is a matter of profound public concern. It affects and obstructs the flow of interstate commerce. It impedes reconversion from war to peace production. Obviously the national welfare is involved. The public interest requires a fair settlement at the earliest possible moment. Such a settlement should be reached by the processes of free collective bargaining. In promoting early settlement and resumption of production an informed opinion in the Congress and among the public can play an important role.

Sooner or later—and the sooner the better—this dispute must be settled around a conference table or in a fair open hearing through voluntary arbitration.

I have read that the union—the UAW-CIO—has said to the employer, "30 percent—or else." Editorials and other comment have been based on this misunderstanding. This statement, I am informed, is the exact opposite of the truth. The union has proposed a 30 percent increase in hourly wage rates to maintain take-home pay without increasing prices. Walter P. Reuther, UAW vice president and director of the union's General Motors department, has stated, publicly in the press and on the radio that, if the corporation can prove that 30 percent higher wage rates cannot be paid without increasing prices and without cutting profits below the 10-year prewar average, the union will scale down its demands to the highest figure the corporation can pay without increasing prices. That seems to be a natural question for the conference table to resolve.

The corporation's position is that in wage negotiations there can be no consideration of prices or profits. It contends that the measurement the union proposes would require an infringement upon the "prerogative of management." It proposes that wage demands shall be considered "on their merits," without reference to the employer's costs, prices, profits, anticipated levels of production, and so forth. I am not going to pass on the merits or demerits of this question. But it is a matter that could be thrashed out at the conference table. The corporation has not defined the word "merits," as used in its November 26 letter declining the union's November 25 proposal to resume negotiations. The corporation's November 26 statement is of extreme importance, Mr. President, and for that reason I wish to quote this sentence, without at this time commenting on it in any way:

> Unless you [the union] are prepared to modify your unreasonable wage demand, abandon your attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our past profits, assumed future profits, and our selling prices, and are now prepared to discuss wage demands on their merits, we do not think that anything can be gained by further discussion of the wage issue with your union at this time.

Since that was written the corporation representative signing that letter has receded somewhat, stating that negotiation over picketing may in time go on to discussion of other phases of the present strike, presumably to include the wage issue itself. That is a start in the right direction and I hope the scope of the negotiations widens.

But meantime, days pass. Men and women walk the picket lines in front of a hundred GM plants in freezing weather, wages are stopped, savings are drawn upon, purchases are curtailed, and the production of the largest employer in the automotive industry is at a standstill. Cars are not coming upon the market—the public suffers.

I deem it worth while to review briefly the successive steps which have led to this situation. In doing so, I propose to be as objective as my natural sympathy for the aims and aspirations of organized labor will permit me to be.

On August 17—3 days after VJ-day—President Truman announced the administration's reconversion wage policy. Free collective bargaining between labor and employers was to be resumed. Wage increases were to be allowable up to the point where price increases would be required. Certain exceptions were made for substandard and inequitable wage scales. This was made official policy the following day, August 18.

On August 18, the day the new policy became effective, the General Motors department of the UAW-CIO, which during war production had made a record for uninterrupted work 14 times as good as the average for the entire industry, according to the voluntary statement of General Motors president, C. E. Wilson, at a press conference October 19, filed with the corporation demands for a 30-percent increase in wage rates without increasing prices. This increase, it was pointed out, was necessary in order to maintain wartime take-home pay and sustain purchasing power during the reconversion period.

For 1 month—a month of great uncertainty—the General Motors Corp. made no formal acknowledgment or reply to the union's demands, according to the statement by the union, dated November 19. Informally, corporation representatives stated that the corporation was not ready to begin negotiation on the union's demands.

On September 18 the corporation, without making any counterproposal, offered to begin negotiation "on dates that will be mutually satisfactory." The union immediately wired the corporation, offering to meet at once, and asked for the corporation's counterproposal. This raised the hopes of the general public.

On October 2, 6 weeks after the wage demands were filed, the first negotiation meeting was held. This meeting appears to have consisted of the corporation representative handing the union representatives a letter simultaneously published in newspaper advertisements which dismissed the union's wage demands as unreasonable, but without offering any counterproposal or any reply to the union's August 18 arguments and economic data in support of its demands. The corporation, I learned, refused to discuss its financial position or ability to pay higher wage rates.

At an October 5 meeting, the corporation again, according to the union's statement, refused to discuss its ability to pay higher wage rates, such as the 30 percent which it has dismissed on October 2 as unreasonable.

On October 8 a similar meeting was held. No progress, but the meetings were being held, which in itself was encouraging.

On October 12, the union again asked the corporation to submit a counterproposal by October 16, proposed that negotiating meeting be open to the public and stated that, in any event, on October 19, it would begin presentation of an economic brief in support of its demands.

On October 18, a day before the union was to begin the presentation of evidence and argument in support of its wage demand, the corporation mailed to wage and salaried employees a letter and other material advising them that, in the corporation's opinion, a strike was likely—perhaps a long one. Office help, not members of the union, were told to stay at home or take trips, leaving forwarding addresses so that pay checks could be mailed to them.

On the following day, October 19, the union began the presentation of its economic brief. The corporation, according to union statements, declined to discuss the brief as presented, its representatives saying that discussion would be reserved until the entire brief had been presented. Opening of negotiations was delayed approximately 90 minutes until the corporation representatives filed a statement to the effect that, if the union insisted on sessions open to press and radio, the corporation would conclude that the union had elected to break off negotiations. The union thereupon asked press and radio correspondents to leave. While this action prevented the public from knowing the facts it is noteworthy to find the negotiations continuing.

On the evening of the same day General Motors President C. E. Wilson attended a press conference at which he made a number of statements which subsequently figured in negotiations. He proposed that the Wages and Hours Act be amended to increase the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours, in order to compete with longer workweeks in other countries, so that, with the longer normal workweek, General Motors might increase wage rates 5 to 8 percent and work 48-hour weeks. Mr. Wilson is reported to have said in answer to questions that if General Motors did not get higher prices from OPA and longer hours from Congress, and if labor insisted on higher wage rates, General Motors would furnish dealers with sample cars and then shut down. Even those problems could be discussed although they could not be solved.

It was the October 21 publication of President Wilson's October 19 press conference statements that caused UAW-CIO Vice President Reuther to wire Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee, that "General Motors wants a strike." The text of Mr. Reuther's wire appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with the comments of the distinguished and able junior Senator from Montana.

From October 23 through October 26 the union representatives were presenting their economic brief in support of the August 18 wage demand. On October 23 General Motors representative told union negotiators that the corporation's ability to pay could not be a factor in the wage negotiations. He also made it plain that the corporation was preparing for a strike, when collective bargaining was the course to pursue.

On October 24 workers in General Motors plants voted 6 to 1 to authorize a strike. This vote was under the Smith-Connally Act. The union states that elections by secret ballot under the union's constitution, held by local unions, resulted in a 9 to 1 majority for strike authorization.

On the same day, October 24, the chairman of the Senate Education and Labor Committee inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first three sections of the union's economic brief. Subsequently the now senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] inserted the final section in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In bringing to the Members' attention the union's statement, the junior Senator from Montana described the corporation's proposed 45-hour workweek as unthinkable.

On October 26, as the union finished presenting its brief, the corporation asked for about 10 days in which to prepare a reply. It should be pointed out that these negotiations were being followed with the closest interest by an estimated 325,000 General Motors workers and also by the public generally. I mention this fact so that the effect of the next development may be properly measured.

The night of October 26, a few hours after the corporation had asked for 10 days in which to reply to the union's facts and argument, the corporation's vice president in charge of personnel stated over a national radio network: "The unreasonable demand of UAW-CIO has been rejected by General Motors."

On October 27 General Motors' President Wilson wrote to the union, proposing that the union join the corporation in requesting Congress to amend the Wage-Hour Act by lengthening the normal workweek from 40 to 45 hours. He repeated his October 19 argument that workers in other nations would be working longer hours.

The next day, October 28, the union rejected the 45-hour-week proposal, suggesting instead as more efficient a three-shift operation to insure maximum production and employment.

On November 7 the corporation presented its formal reply to the union's brief, after refusing to admit United States conciliators to the negotiating meeting, as the union had requested in its November 3 wire to Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach. The corporation in its brief asked the union to reconsider President Wilson's proposal that the union join the corporation in attempting to persuade Congress to lengthen the normal workweek under the Wages and Hours Act from 40 to 45 hours. The corporation also offered 8 to 10 percent wage increases to bring classified wage rates up in line with cost-of-living increases. According to the union's contention, as supported by the record of the meeting, the corporation refused to offer even a 1 percent wage increase coupled with a stipulation that it would not be used in applying for an increase in OPA ceiling prices.

On November 8 the union filed a charge with the National Labor Relations Board, alleging that the corporation, after pleading financial inability to pay, refused to discuss its ability to pay and refused to disclose information essential to collective bargaining within the intent of section 8, subsection 5 of the National Labor Relations Act.

On November 9 the corporation agreed to let the United States conciliators sit in the negotiating meeting, but only as observers. The union proposed that the conciliators be permitted to participate fully in the negotiations. The union presented its reply to the corporation's November 7 brief. The proposal to work for an amendment of the Wages and Hours Act was rejected, likewise the conditional offer of an 8 to 10 percent wage adjustment linked to the increase in the cost of living. The corporation's chief negotiator, the vice president in charge of personnel, stated, "We say the ability to pay is not an economic factor in a wage negotiation."

On November 11 and 12 the UAW-CIO executive board received a report of negotiating efforts with General Motors and gave a strategy board authority to act under the previous membership vote authorizing strike action, if necessary.

On November 14 the corporation announced a 10-percent increase for salaried employees, except higher-paid officials, whose salaries and bonuses were to be reviewed in the light of the corporation's ability to pay and the value of their services to the corporation.

On November 15 the corporation presented a second reply brief, offering a flat 10-percent increase in wage rates, but in effect still tied to formulas for increasing OPA prices, in the union's judgment. Subsequently, in its letter of November 26, the corporation said that this offer was not contingent on how much of the resulting increase in costs would be allowed by Government authorities in the determination of the selling prices of our products. The union contended that this language in effect reserved the right to use the wage increase to get higher ceiling prices later.

On November 17 the union presented its second supplemental brief and reaffirmed its position that take-home pay must be maintained by a 30-percent increase in wage rates without increasing prices, and that General Motors could pay such higher rates without increasing prices.

On November 19, with the authority of a national conference of delegates from General Motors locals of the union, Vice President Reuther transmitted to the corporation an offer to submit the wage dispute to a three-man board of arbitration. This offer was signed by the union's international officers and the negotiating committee for the General Motors department of the union. It would have become effective upon its signature by corporation representatives. The offer proposed that the corporation and the union each name a member of the board and that they name a third member, who would be chairman; that the board's decisions would be final and binding upon both parties; that the board should have access to records of both the corporation and the union; that no wage increase should be recommended which would require a price increase; and that if the board found that, in addition to a 30-percent increase, the corporation could also afford a price decrease, it might advise such a decrease. The corporation was asked to reply within 24 hours.

The following day, November 20, with the national conference of delegates still in session, the corporation notified the union that the corporation's reply to the union's offer of arbitration would be made on or before November 23, the day after Thanksgiving. The union pointed out at the time that the corporation's note gave no ground for hope that the

corporation would accept even the principle of arbitration. In fact, the corporation's November 23 reply rejected both the proposed method and terms of arbitration and the principle itself. Upon receipt of the corporation's note, postponing reply for 3 days, the delegates' conference and later the union's strategy committee voted for a strike, which was announed that evening by the union's president, R. J. Thomas, and Vice President Reuther. At this point negotiations should have been reopened.

On the following day, November 21, the strike became effective without disorder or violence, as press and radio reports remarked.

On November 23 the corporation published its reply to the union's November 19 arbitration proposal, dismissing it as "so unsound, unfair, and unreasonable as to insure its rejection." It was, the corporation declared, "not an offer of arbitration, but a demand for abdication." Rejecting the offer, the corporation also, because of the strike, withdrew its offer of a 10-percent wage increase, which, it stated, "was not contingent on how much of the resulting increase in costs would be allowed by Government authorities in the determination of the selling prices of our products."

On November 25, the day after the corporation's rejection of arbitration was received and on the fourth day of the strike, the union wired the corporation to propose resumption of negotiating meetings at the earliest possible date.

The following day, November 26, the corporation refused to resume negotiations and the union thereupon filed a supplemental charge with the National Labor Relations Board. In its November 26 letter, the corporation told the union:

> Unless you are now prepared to modify your unreasonable wage demand, abandon your attempt to negotiate wages on the basis of our past profits, assumed future profits, and our selling prices, and are now prepared to discuss wage demands on their merits, we do not think that anything can be gained by further discussion of the wage issue with your union at this time.

In its November 27 supplemental charge that the corporation was in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, the union declared that the above-quoted statement "is a statement that the corporation will not discuss the wage issue further unless and until the union stands ready to abandon its right to bargain under the act."

Mr. President, all these matters could be treated very properly by negotiations. The union then said in its formal charge filed with the NLRB:

> It is well established National Labor Relations Board doctrine that, regardless of the cause of a strike, the fact of its existence in no way removes the legal obligation of an employer to engage in collective bargaining with the representatives of his employees. An act which has as its declared purpose the removal of a cause of strikes, in the form of refusal to bargain collectively, embodies an even greater obligation to engage in bargaining as a means of terminating strikes which occur as the result of such refusal.

On the same day, November 27, United States Chief of Conciliation Edgar Warren invited corporation and union representatives to meet with him in Washington, if necessary separately. The union accepted. General Motors President Wilson declined, stating that in his telephone conversation with Mr. Warren he (Wilson) had not agreed to come to Washington, that he did not plan to come to Washington on November 28 or at any time in the future. I am sorry Mr. Warren did not renew his offer to meet with him in Detroit.

On November 28 union representatives met with Mr. Warren and Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach. The Secretary of Labor later was quoted as saying that he would use all his power to persuade the corporation to resume negotiations. That is what I am hoping for.

On November 29 President Truman stated that he agreed with a resolution adopted by the OWMR advisory board, composed of representatives of management, labor, and agriculture, urging negotiation. Later that day General Motors President Wilson modified his early stand to the extent that he would go to Washington to confer with the President of the United States, but no one else.

On November 30 the corporation and the union representatives met in Detroit in a conference limited to a discussion of alleged illegal picketing. Although no progress was reported, Corporation Vice President Anderson stated on December 1 that at the next scheduled conference, on Wednesday, December 5, it might be possible to go on from a discussion of picketing to a discussion of other things, perhaps including wages. That was promising.

Simultaneously, the corporation proposed an arrangement with the union whereby production of parts for other car producers might be continued, thereby averting shut down of other companies against whom the union had not called a strike. On December 1 Union President R. J. Thomas accepted this proposal as "generous" and "welcome" and undertook to find out from other producers the parts for which they were dependent on uninterrupted General Motors production. Obviously, this may be a complicated matter to work out.

Mr. President, I have presented an outline of the steps by which this suspension of work in a hundred plants in 11 States has come about. I do not propose at this time to render a judgment on the merits of the union's position or the corporation's position. The time may come, and very quickly, when it will be the obvious duty of an appropriate committee of the Senate—the Senate Education and Labor Committee—to inquire thoroughly into the nature and causes and the possible solutions of this stoppage of employment and production, and to make findings and recommendations that will promote speedy and fair settlement. At the moment, the matter is in the hands of the Secretary of Labor and the President. If for any reason negotiation and settlement are much longer delayed it will become our duty, as I see it, to act. By that, I do not necessarily mean the formulation of another law. Industrial peace is not a matter of law alone. Basically, it is a matter of reasonableness, of being willing to confer, to negotiate, to accept conciliation, mediation, and voluntary arbitration of disputes. To last, industrial peace must be a fair peace—fair to labor, fair to management, fair to stockholders, and fair to the public.

At this time I propose to say no more, except to express the hope and the prayer that both the corporation and the union will accept and fully utilize every tool, device, and method of peaceful collective bargaining, to the end that a fair settlement may be speedily reached and production and employment resumed.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS IN THE EVENT OF STRIKES OR THREAT OF STRIKES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I make this request on condition that the Senator from Indiana will not lose the floor—a letter which bears upon the subject to which the Senator from New York has been speaking and making insertions in the RECORD. The letter comes from the president of one of the larger industrial companies in Connecticut. His company never has had any labor troubles, so far as I know, and the president of the company is an acknowledged liberal in that community.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 7, 1945.

President Truman has suggested a law which would provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards in the event of strikes or threatened strikes of national importance.

A suggestion from President Truman is entitled to the most careful and thorough consideration. However, I believe there is a very dangerous theory of determining wages being advocated by the CIO which would undoubtedly be injected into any hearings held by the boards. I feel that the suggestion by the President if enacted into law would seriously endanger our competitive system and the entire conduct of private enterprise.

The CIO, at present the most vociferous union organization in our country, has injected into the controversy over wages the question of "ability to pay" as a test of whether wage increases should be given. As an employer of labor this company knows, as does every other employer of labor in a competitive industry, that we must pay the going rate range in our area if we are to be able to retain and hire employees to work for us. If another employer is competing with us for employees, and has the ability to pay and does pay an amount greater than we pay in wages we are not going to be able to hire new employees, and over the long run we are not going to be able to keep our old employees. It would be absurd to think that General Motors could pay 30 percent more than Packard without taking away from Packard and the smaller companies the opportunity to obtain new help and retain old help over any extended period of time.

Furthermore, if a fact-finding body is going to get into the question of ability to pay they will have to study all the various ramifications of the company's business—whether the commissions allowed to distributors are

proper; whether the plans for future expansion for which reserves are set aside are reasonable; whether the amount left for stockholders is sufficient; and whether the amounts paid for salaries are fair. In fact, someone other than the managers of industry would then be in the position of trying to determine (after a few weeks of consideration) what that industry should do in regard to new machinery, new plants, managerial brains, and profits. The result would be that the directors chosen by the owners of the business, the stockholders, would no longer manage the business, but the fact-finding bodies or the unions would do it in their stead.

Mr. Murray and his unions claim the right to review a corporation's books to determine whether they have the ability to pay, which necessarily raises among many other questions those mentioned above. If we have come to the point where the unions are going to manage business and hold a veto power on what is or is not to be done, free enterprise has flown out the wondow, and we will have a socialistic economy, with the Government and its appointed boards determining what each company can and should do.

It is difficult enough for the executives of a company to determine a wise policy to be followed with relation to all of those questions. It would be impossible for any board to make a wise decision on these questions after a few days, or even a few weeks. The idea that within 20 days such a board could hold hearings and make a finding of facts that would be a sound one is absurd, but the fundamental difficulty, even though an intelligent decision could be made, is whether this country has come to the point where ability to pay is going to be the test of what wages are to be paid.

The appointment of fact-finding boards sounds so innocuous that I fear Congress and the people may be misled into doing a dangerous thing. Such boards certainly cannot substitute their opinion (arrived at in a few weeks) for that of managers who have devoted a lifetime to their jobs. The question which confuses the real fundamental issue at this time is the freezing of prices under the OPA, which makes it seem plausible to inject in wage questions "ability to pay," but price fixing is not a permanent part of our ordinary business economy.

In the railroad industry, where fact-finding boards have been used, the situation is quite different, for there rates and fares are controlled by the Government, and hence there is price fixing as far as the railroads are concerned. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the railroad is a public utility.

We certainly do not wish to have price fixing as a permanent part of our economic life, and have all prices controlled by the Government. To do so and inject into our economic life fact-finding boards which question the wisdom of the operation of business would turn our society into a totalitarian form of economy. Such a program would appear to be heading for a more extreme socialistic economy than is at present proposed for Great Britain.

It seems to me that this proposal is so dangerous that any legislation creating such boards is a long step toward the eventual control of business by the unions of employees.

Very truly yours.

LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry? It is necessary to ask several questions in order that this debate may have had some purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so for that purpose without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I make the point of order that when the Senator from Indiana has yielded, as he has, by unanimous consent, he has lost the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not press that point of order. There are certain things which should be done before we adjourn, and they can only be done by unanimous consent. We are at the end of the session. I hope technicalities will not be taken advantage of in order to prevent the Senate from concluding some matters which should be concluded before it adjourns. The Senator knows that if a quorum call is insisted upon and if thereafter a quorum is not developed, all the Senate can do is adjourn. Although the Senator from New Mexico is correct in his parliamentary position, I hope he will not insist on making the point of order at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, my thought was that if the point of order was sustained, I would address the Chair and would seek to obtain recognition in my own right. The Senator from Indiana addressed some remarks to me. Obviously, I cannot answer those remarks while he has the floor. I do not have in mind any purpose to prevent the taking of necessary action. Heretofore, I have always objected to having a Senator obtain the floor and attempt to farm out the time. I think such a procedure is entirely contrary to the rules and the spirit of the rules of the Senate.

However, under the circumstances I agree to withdraw my point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I simply wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry so that the record in regard to the debate may be straight. If the Senator from Indiana does suggest the absence of a quorum and if a quorum is not developed, then the Senate will have to adjourn, and the motion of the Senator from West Virginia will be dead. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate adjourns without taking action on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, his motion will be dead.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If a quorum call is had and if no quorum is developed and if thereupon an adjournment is taken, will my resolution remain on the calendar, as it is now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; and at the next session the motion of the Senator from West Virginia can be renewed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is made and if the presence of a quorum cannot be developed, the only possible action which the Senate can take in that event is to adjourn, is it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the understanding of the Chair, that is correct—with the exception of having the Senate order the Sergeant at Arms to request or require the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr BARKLEY. Of course, it would be possible to make some more-or-less ancillary motions with respect to having the Sergeant at Arms request the attendance of absent Senators, and so forth, so as to bring in Senators from the highways and byways. But except for such action, the only action which the Senate could take under those circumstances would be to adjourn; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be judge of The Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years, from June 2, 1936, vice Arthur J. Mellott, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 21, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana if he will yield so that, as in executive session, we

may take action on certain nominations which must be acted upon before the adjournment, or otherwise they will lapse and the President will have to submit the nominations during the next session?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield for that purpose, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the Senator to permit us, as in executive session, to have the nominations acted on by the Senate at this time—with the understanding, of course, that the Senator will not lose the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that any nominations which have come in may be called at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo P. McCann, to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto B. Roepke, to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the confirmations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

That completes the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a group of routine nominations and promotions in the diplomatic and foreign service has come to the Senate. They were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 19th instant, as shown at page 12344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. The nominations have not yet been acted upon by the Committee on Foreign Relations. If they are not acted upon by the Senate at this time, before the adjournment is taken, the President will either have to make recess appointments or he will have to send the same nominations to the Senate at the beginning of the next session.

Therefore, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that, without regard to the fact that the committee has not reported the nominations, they may be acted upon at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that, of course, the Senator from Kentucky has requested unanimous consent for the taking of action which we are really forced to take when a date is fixed for final adjournment, if the Senate is to perform its function in this respect. Under the circumstances, we must proceed by suspension of the rules by unanimous consent.

As I understand, all the nominations and promotions referred to are routine ones which I think we all appreciate would as a matter of course be reported with approval by the Committee on Foreign Relations, unless it decided not to do so as a result of the filing of charges against certain of the nominees. In the present situation, I feel that the only practical thing for the Senate to do is to agree to the request of the Senator from Kentucky and to act at this time on the nominations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. We face this situation at the end of every session. Under the circumstances, we are required to relax the rule somewhat. All the nominations are routine ones which would be reported en bloc by the committee. Therefore, no harm will be done by acting on them now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations will be discharged from the further consideration of the nominations.

Is there objection to their present consideration? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc and confirmed.

POSTMASTER AT SAND SPRINGS, OKLA.

Mr. HAYDEN. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the nomination of Clinton C. Evans to be postmaster at Sand Springs, Okla. The nomination is one which the Senator from Oklahoma desires to have confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, the nomination may be reported; and, without objection, it is considered and confirmed.

DEPORTATION OF WALTER BAER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to insert a matter in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I think one of the greatest strengths of the democratic form of government is its power to protect individuals from injustice. Whenever our democratic processes do not function to protect the rights of individuals from unjust governmental transgressions then democracy itself is in jeopardy.

Hence I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a case of great injustice which has behind it a history, and which apparently will become historic again. Some years ago the distinguished former Senator from Oregon, Mr. Charles McNary, raised his voice in the Senate of the United States for the purpose of preventing such a great injustice as is again being contemplated by the United States Department of Justice in regard to the deportation case of Walter Baer. I wish to have inserted in the RECORD certain material in connection with the case, at the present time, because it is a matter of great interest in the State of Oregon. Many members of the Oregon State Bar Association are concerned with it and have manifested to me, by letters and telegrams, their concern.

Briefly, Mr. President, the case is one in which Walter Baer, allegedly born in Germany, was brought to this country while a very small boy. He still believes that he was born in this country. Be that as it may, he has lived his entire life in the State of Oregon. He married an Oregon girl, and has three children. One of them is in the Army. Walter Baer himself worked as a ship-repair worker during the war. But in his early twenties he forged a couple of checks. He was found guilty. He was sentenced, as he should have been, and he served time. However, during the past 25 years his record has been one of law obedience and civic responsibility.

Because the record showed Mr. Baer to be an alien, some years ago the Department of Justice sought to deport him. Senator McNary introduced in the Senate a bill to prevent such a miscarriage of justice, and the deportation proceedings against Baer were dropped. The bill was also dropped. However, as of a recent date, the Department of Justice has again notified him to prepare himself for the next deportation party to Germany. I raise my voice, Mr. President, in protestation against such an unusual and cruel punishment. I feel that there is no justification for it, at least not on the basis of any record made known to the public by the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I invite attention of the Senate to a very excellent editorial on the subject which was published in a recent issue of the Oregonian.

I invite the attention of the Senate to two quotations from decisions of the United States Supreme Court, one of them having been written in that typically clear and fine language of Justice Douglas who said:

> Although deportation technically is not criminal punishment it may nevertheless visit as great a hardship as the deprivation of the right to pursue a vocation or calling. It may result in the loss of all that makes life worth living.

I read the following from a decision by Justice Murphy:

The impact of deportation upon the life of any alien is often as great if not greater than the imposition of a criminal sentence. A deported alien may lose his family, his friends, and his livelihood forever. Return to his native land may result in poverty, persecution, and even death. There is thus no justifiable reason for discarding the democratic and human tenets of our legal system and descending to the practices of despotism in dealing with deportation.

Imagine, Mr. President, sending Mr. Baer to Germany, a Germany which he does not know, because when a young man he committed an offense against our law which he has paid for with incarceration. For 25 years since his prison term he has been a law-abiding person.

I wish to make it clear that I hold no brief for the fact that Mr. Baer has not cleared up the question of his citizenship. I believe that aliens who live in this country and seek to take advantage of the economic opportunities afforded by living in America should proceed to become citizens of America. But I take it for granted that Mr. Baer's failure to become a citizen is because of the fact he has not been cleared of this criminal record made in his youth. I serve notice now, Mr. President, that I shall do all that lies within my power to impress upon the Department of Justice and, if necessary, upon the Congress of the United States, the importance of seeing to it that this type of deportation injustice which is being contemplated against Mr. Baer shall not come to pass.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred, and a news item pertaining to the case as published in a recent issue of the Oregonian, wherein the facts are set forth in greater detail than I have given them.

There being no objection, the editorial and the news item were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARDON FOR WALTER BAER

If there ever was a good reason for deporting Walter E. Baer to Germany (and the political turmoil surrounding the case 11 years ago raised a sincere doubt in the minds of many), the reason has been lost in the passage of time and the evidence of good citizenship of later years. The Immigration Bureau's order that he hold himself in readiness to join the next deportation party may be only routine, but it has the effect of persecution.

Walter Baer's contention that he was born in the United States is disputed by the Federal Government, but the evidence is clear that if he was born in Germany he must have been brought to the United States at an age which precluded memory of that country—a country now so devastated that to send anyone there is to impose a sentence worse than prison. The only known reason for deportation is two bad-check convictions in his youth, about 25 years ago, for which he served sentences.

Pronouncements of two justices of the United States Supreme Court have a bearing on the moral issues in this case. Justice Douglas said: "Although deportation technically is not criminal punishment it may nevertheless visit as great a hardship as the deprivation of the right to pursue a vocation or calling. * * * It may result in the loss of all that makes life worth living." Justice Murphy said: "The impact of deportation upon the life of any alien is often as great if not greater than the imposition of a criminal sentence. A deported alien may lose his family, his friends and his livelihood forever. Return to his native land may result in poverty, persecution, and even death. There is thus no justifiable reason for discarding the democratic and humane tenets of our legal system and descending to the practices of despotism in dealing with deportation."

Mr. Baer's wife and three children were born in Oregon. A son is serving in the Army of the United States. Mr. Baer is employed as an assistant chief engineer in the construction and repair of naval vessels. If the Governor, as requested by a group of lawyers, issues a full pardon for his early offenses the only known reason for his deportation will have been removed. We see no other course compatible with justice.

In the event of his pardon, it would be wise for Mr. Baer to accept the Government's evidence of his birth in Germany and to prove once and for all his affection for this country by applying for naturalized citizenship.

MANY ASK SNELL BAR EXCLUSION—LAWYERS PETITION IN BEHALF OF BAER; UNITED STATES CITES OLD CASE

One hundred and twenty Portland lawyers Thursday petitioned Gov. Earl Snell to pardon Walter E. Baer, civil engineer who in depression years was active in the promotion of a sewage-disposal project and who now again faces deportation to Germany because of offenses of 25 years ago for which he paid with terms in Oregon prison.

Only because of Baer's past record can the United States Department of Justice deport him to Germany, where it insists he was born, and separate him from his Oregon-born wife and three children, one of whom is in the Army, Irvin Goodman, his attorney, declared. Notice has been given Baer by V. W. Tomlinson, officer in charge of the immigration service here, to hold himself in readiness for the next deportation party to Germany.

CASE LONG DORMANT

"This has come out of a clear sky after the case has been dormant for years," Goodman said Thursday. "In the effort to prevent the deportation, 120 Portland lawyers, including several men who have just returned from overseas service, have asked the Governor to act. Baer will file immediately his formal petition for pardon."

Baer served terms in 1919 and 1921 on check charges. He previously had served a term in Idaho on a similar charge but this case was wiped out by a pardon. Goodman contended that the offenses were committed when Baer was a youth, that he has led the life of a good citizen since, that deportation is now cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the law of the land, and that the action outrages the public's sense of decency as evidenced by the widespread appeal that has been made in Baer's behalf over a period of years.

DEPORTATION DELAYED

Baer's deportation some time ago was held up by the action of the late Senator Charles L. McNary, who introduced a bill at the suggestion of a large group of Portland ministers and others to prevent such cases of hardship. After reaching Ellis Island, Baer was returned to Portland, where he has lived during the war and where he is now assistant chief engineer in the construction and repair of naval vessels.

In their petition, the lawyers declared that "the breaking up of Baer's home would be a grave violation of the principles of democracy. It would be a barbaric act the seriousness of which you could realize if only you, yourself, were to be forever removed from your own family. We urge you to immediately pardon Baer and forever end this matter."

Charges that "the immigration officials have maintained a secrecy about this case that is not in keeping with democratic principles" were made in a letter to Gov. Earl Snell by Irvin Goodman, attorney for Walter E. Baer, in asking the Governor to act to save him from exile from the country in which he grew to manhood, and lifetime separation from his family.

"Obviously," said the letter, "the fact that the offenses upon which the immigration authorities base their legal justification for deportation proceedings have been committed and fully expiated under Oregon law over a quarter century ago stamps any further belated infliction of punishment as 'cruel and unusual' according to the most elementary standards of American justice."

PEOPLE FAVORED PLAN

Goodman also declared that it is "a significant fact" that the arrest of Baer in deportation proceedings then started coincided with his activity in behalf of sewage disposal and his attack in public on Hitlerite Germany.

Baer came into the limelight in the days of the depression when there were many thousands of unemployed. Some of them stormed the city hall from time to time demanding governmental action to get them jobs and protesting against some of the relief efforts of the time. Backed by a large group of these unemployed, Baer proposed a project for sewage disposal which he contended could eventually pay for itself through sale of fertilizer. He also, in a rush just before election, prepared plans for such a project and on these sketches the council submitted a bond issue to the people, which was approved. The issue, however, was limited to revenue bonds and city officials contended the plans were not complete nor could such bonds be sold to finance the project. The matter went to the Supreme Court on various phases.

Following his arrest and the opening of deportation proceedings, the case attracted Nation-wide attention. Senator Charles L. McNary called it to the attention of the Senate in preparing a measure, advocated by Portland ministers, to stop deportations in such cases and to permit the wiping out of all such cases through the imposition of a sentence to be served in this country.

The case also was aired in national magazines and in newspapers. It was fought in the courts, but Baer finally lost because Gov. Charles H. Martin, to whom an appeal similar to that presented Thursday to Gov. Earl Snell, refused to intervene and wipe out the prison record which Baer had and on which the Federal authorities based their action.

The brief order to Baer from V. W. Tomlinson, officer in charge of the Immigration Service here, which again brings the matter to a head, said:

"Authority has been granted to join you to the next deportation party scheduled for sailing to Germany. At this time this office has no information as to when you will be required to surrender yourself, but it should be in the near future."

Goodman contended that the deportation procedure is of the character which Justices William O. Douglas and Frank Murphy of the United States Supreme Court have condemned. In his appeal to the governor, he said:

"1. Baer has lived in the United States since childhood and indeed, he himself believes he was born here. He knows no other country and to deport him to Germany at the age of 47 is to exile him to a land which is wholly alien to his being.

"2. Baer has never been convicted or accused of crime for the past 25 years, or since the check offenses of his youth.

"3. Deportation would separate him from his family, possibly forever, which would

be in itself an act of extreme cruelty. He lives here with his wife, children, and aged father. George, his son, age 19, is serving in the United States Army and is also a member of the DeMolay. His oldest daughter, Lois, 17, is a senior commerce high-school student, member of the Camp Fire Girls, president of the school science club, and staff member of its publication, The Blotter; his youngest child, Marlene, 14, is an eighth-grade pupil in Vestal school. Freda, his wife, and the children, all United States citizens, were born in Oregon while Baer, according to the contention of the immigration service, was brought here by his father as a child of 9 years."

"PENALTY LONG PAID

"4. The immigration officials have maintained a secrecy about this case that is not in keeping with democratic principles. When they arrested Baer on April 9, 1934, or over 11 years ago, they never told him then nor thereafter why they instituted the proceedings when the check offenses for which, at that time he had paid the penalty 14 years previously. Nor have these officials ever publicly announced why they seek to deport him. Yet it is a significant fact that Baer's arrest in 1934 coincided with his extensive sewage disposal activity to cleanse the Willamette River and create employment, as well as his public denunciation of Hitlerite Germany.

"5. Literally thousands of people have, during the long pendency of this case, urged the deportation proceedings be dropped. So, too, have many of our leading citizens, including the late Senator Charles McNary, as well as local and national publications.

"Baer is now employed here as an assistant chief engineer in the construction and repair of naval vessels. His fellow employees, and hundreds of other citizens have also signed petitions urging the pardon. As a matter of simple justice won't you, as these Portland attorneys urge, act now and thus put a stop to the continuance of a torment which has already been prolonged beyond all reason?"

SENDING OF MAIL AND PACKAGES TO GERMANY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield, with unanimous consent that I will not lose the floor, to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, immediately after the war closed a great many citizens wished to send mail and articles to relatives and friends in Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Poland. A few days ago several Senators, headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and myself filed a petition signed by 8,000 citizens from Michigan and other States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters I have received, one from Mr. and Mrs. K. T. Fezer, of New Jersey, and the other from Rev. Alois J. Sommerfeld, of Sykeston, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION, N. J., *December 18, 1945.*

Senator LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Let us congratulate you on your appeal to President Truman in behalf of the starving children and old folks of Germany and Austria. It was the first sign of light in an utterly dark night. Your appeal must be successful for the sake of our own country, who has a terrible responsibility in this matter. Just as the German people are suffering today for the violation of God's laws by their leaders, so our people will suffer for the same violations by our own leaders. If our praying to a common God and Father of all mankind has any meaning, He will not suffer our turning a deaf ear to the cries of starving children and old folks while sitting down at overflowing tables ourselves. Besides, it is not a question whether we can help or not but whether our Government has the right to keep its citizens from helping others, even if their conscience and heart tells them they must help.

Hoping that your appeal will be successful and thanking you again, we beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. K. T. FEZER.

ST. ELIZABETH'S CHURCH,
Sykeston, N. Dak., November 15, 1945.

The Honorable Senator W. LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Daily our papers bring us reports of conditions in Germany. They are not pleasant reports to us who have relations in that country. And they are not Nazis. They suffer with the guilty, and we are not able to help them, because our postal services are not open to many parts of Europe. Christmas is coming, a season of peace and happiness for us in the United States of America. Is there no chance for us of German descent to help ours over there and make them share of our abundance? The war is over, and the American spirit is one of charity and generosity. Please see that we can write to them, at least, and know if they are among the living. And thousands of others could ask you for the same thing.

With best wishes and thanks,

Very sincerely yours,

AL. J. SOMMERFELD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say that up to the present time nothing has been done in response to the petitions, although it was indicated there are plans to take action. We serve notice that if something is not done we plan to organize a Nation-wide movement in an effort to get action from the Department of State.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator withdraw his point of order in order that I may make a motion that the Senate do now adjourn?

Mr. CAPEHART. I withdraw the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the concurrent resolution heretofore adopted by the House and Senate providing for the adjournment today of the two Houses sine die, I now move that the Senate do adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die, the adjournment being under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 47.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, the Acting President pro tempore, under the authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, signed the following bills and joint resolutions, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District, No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chansior-Canfield Midway Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh.

H. R 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces;

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946 of the Navy's V-12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolution:

On December 21, 1945:

S. 405. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 862. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers in the town site of Ketchum, Idaho", approved July 11, 1940, so as to extend for 3 years the time for making application for benefits thereunder; and

S. 1366. An act to authorize the State of Tennessee to convey a railroad right-of-way through Montgomery Bell Park.

On December 28, 1945:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States", approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 715. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy;

S. 914. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the designation of freight forwarders as carriers of bonded merchandise; and

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

On December 31, 1945:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

THE TAX COURT

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio, to be judge of The Tax Court of the United States for the unexpired term of 12 years from June 2, 1936, vice Arthur J. Mellott.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 19), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Bernard C. Connelly	William E. Cole, Jr.
Jay Dixon Edwards	George E. Miller
Hector C. Adam, Jr.	Elim O'Shaughnessy
Maurice M Bernbaum	Charles O. Thompson

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Harry H. Bell	David L. Gamon
Donald C. Bergus	Thomas A. Goldman
Thomas D. Bowie	Marshall Green
Miss Lora C. Bryning	Walter C. Isenberg, Jr.
Robert E. Cashin	Spencer M. King
David P. Coffin	George T. Lister
Dwight Dickinson	Rupert A. Lloyd
Robert J. Dorr	Albert K. Ludy, Jr.
Donald A. Dumont	Hendrik van Oss
David I. Feber	Douglas W. Overton
William J. Ford	Henry C. Ramsey
Ralph A. Schweitzer	Harvey R. Wellman
Richard M. Service	George M. Widney
Sheldon B. Vance	Louis A. Wiesner

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Adrian R. Marron to be commodore, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Boston, Mass., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Robert N. S. Baker to be commodore, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Charleston, S. C., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Webster M. Thompson to be commodore, while serving as manager, Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Andrew I. McKee to be commodore, while serving as manager, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Lisle F. Small to be commodore, while serving as manager, Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

Joseph W. Fowler to be commodore, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Hunters Point, San Francisco, Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

George T. Paine to be commodore, while serving as commander, United States naval shipyards, Terminal Island (San Pedro), Calif., and to continue during any assignment which is commensurate with the rank of commodore, or until reporting for other permanent duty.

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

TO BE EXAMINERS IN CHIEF, BOARD OF APPEALS

Leo P. McCann
Otto B. Roepke

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Roberta D. Keirnes, Pierce.
Josephine McMurren, Weiser.

INDIANA

Daniel E. Haley, Hamlet.

LOUISIANA

Enolia T. Ordoyne, Larose.

MARYLAND

Bettie J. Porter, Ellerslie.

MISSISSIPPI

Lula M. Flippen, McCarley.

MISSOURI

Harvey H. Reynolds, Cairo.
Irvin P. Swift, Delta.
Christena Ramsey, Novelty.
Emma E. Farrell, Point Lookout.

MONTANA

James P. Waters, Manhattan.

NEW YORK

Edith M. McEwen, Colton.
Thompson B. Ward, Guilderland.
George D. Davison, Highview.
Josephine E. Morrison, Lake Pleasant.
Harry Burns, Williamstown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ellen J. Powell, Powers Lake.

OHIO

Charles N. Williams, Bartlett.
Elmer W. White, Carroll.
Joela P. Minnick, Grand Rapids.
Lorraine A. Franco, Lansing.

OKLAHOMA

Clinton C. Evans, Sand Springs.

OREGON

William W. Wooddy, Corvallis.
Hugh E. Watkins, Myrtle Point.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clifford G. Douthett, Cabot.
Jennie J. Rosini, Dunlevy.
George J. Schnur, East Butler.
Annie M. Riegle, Freeburg.
John J. Burchill, Smokerun.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer O. Bowyer, Dundon.
Hezekiah H. Pine, Scott Depot.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose temple is all space, the Lord and breath of things unseen, according to Thy name, so is Thy praise unto the ends of the earth. Thy right hand is full of righteousness; Thy name is clothed with immortal remembrance, to which the generations of men have come to light their torches of deathless hope. We would come thus with our prayers and dreams to the manger altar, as did the shepherds of old, and pay our homage to Him who walks the highways of the ages. In Him how beautiful are patience and long-suffering, and how unanswerable is the wonder of His love! Should the Star of Bethlehem cease to shine, what a black socket there would be in the sky of this weary world! O may the Christ be born in us, and formed in us, the light and hope of glory, our Lord Immanuel! Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348—An act for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 23 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Catherine Bode;

H. R. 2267. An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley;

H. R. 2487. An act for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton;

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 50. An act to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates;

S. 323. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gray;

S. 342. An act to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines;

S. 343. An act to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy;

S. 344. An act to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal;

S. 345. An act concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners;

S. 346. An act to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners;

S. 400. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Anderson;

S. 683. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually;

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke;

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States;

S. 1400. An act for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Charles L. Phillips;

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war;

S. 1551. An act relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson;

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blachard Erskine major general, United States Marine Corps, to the Office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites;

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1618. An act to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes;

S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 1649. An act to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.;

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution relative to the formation of an International Health Organization; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to preserve the status and perquisites of officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 4805) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes."

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 111, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, after "day", strike out down to and including "ceremonies", in line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill passed the House by unanimous consent?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And it went to the Senate. What is the amendment?

Mr. HOBBS. The amendment simply strikes out "inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in universities, colleges, schools, and churches or other appropriate places with appropriate ceremonies." It leaves in the merit and substance of the bill which is to declare January 5, 1946, his birthday, George Washington Carver Day, and authorizes and requests the President to have the flag displayed by those who care to.

Mr. MICHENER. It is only 1 day?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. In 1 year?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Not perpetually?

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have about 15 minutes on this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman that in that case the Chair will ask the gentleman from Alabama to withdraw his request.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object to the bill. I just thought if there is going to be some debate I would like to have time on another subject. But I can get time later.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INCREASING CAPACITY AND SECURITY OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4480) to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, strike out all after "1409)" over to and including "1947" in line 3, on page 2, and insert "He shall also make such study without drafting plans or sketches as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements. He shall report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the amendment? I understand that the Republican members of the committee are in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BLAND. The ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has authorized me to say that he is not opposed to it; in fact, I think he concurs in it.

Mr. MICHENER. Does he concur in it? The gentleman has raised a doubt as to whether the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] does concur in it.

Mr. BLAND. He has agreed to it and authorized me to consent to its being brought up at this time. An explanation of the amendment will show that it does not change substantially the resolution as it passed the House. This language was used in the bill as it passed the House:

And such additional investigation as he may deem necessary and to report to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President not later than December 31, 1947.

When that passed we thought that would be sufficient authority to give the Secretary of War sufficient authority to investigate also Tehuantepec, the Nicaraguan, and various other projects that have been proposed before the committee at various times, making no authorization for surveys or anything of the kind, but based upon information already acquired by the War Department. That language is stricken out, and this language was put in which may be more specific, but is not any fuller or more complete, I think, than the language we used.

He shall also make such study without drafting plans or sketches as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present canal with improvements. He shall report thereon to the Congress, through the Secretary of War and the President, not later than December 31, 1947.

I have also talked to representatives of the War Department that handles it, and they tell me they are agreeable to this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Who does the gentleman say is authorized to make this investigation; the Secretary of War?

Mr. BLAND. The Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Mr. RANKIN. I am speaking about reference to other canals. Did the gentleman say the Secretary of War?

Mr. BLAND. It will be under the Secretary of War, if I recall. I do not have the substance of the resolution, but it is the Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

Mr. RANKIN. Many Americans have held their breath, and many more have breathed a sigh of relief that the Japanese were too stupid to attack the Panama Canal at the time they attacked Pearl Harbor. It seems to me that the time has come when we should have a sea-level canal. The Panama Canal is 85 feet above sea level. One bomb dropped in one of those locks would have put the Canal out of commission for months, and one bomb dropped on the locks in the Chagres River would have put them out of commission for years. I am not opposing this, you understand. I think the Panama Canal at present is inadequate, but it seems to me that the time has come in this atomic age, and with the world generally wreaking with hatred and vengeance and threats from various sources, for us to construct a sea-level canal that we can protect at all times against attacks from the air.

Mr. BLAND. The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Secretary of War to investigate the possibilities of doing that very thing.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman recalls that the tidal range on the Pacific side is 15 feet at normal high water and about 2 feet on the Atlantic side. We do not want to dump the Pacific Ocean into the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. RANKIN. The authorities at Panama told me that the tide on the Pacific side was 18 feet and on the Atlantic side 18 inches. I realize there is that difference that would have to be overcome in some way, but I think it could easily be done if we had a sea-level canal.

Mr. BLAND. It is the purpose of this very resolution to make a study of that situation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not intend to object to the request of the gentleman, but since the point has been raised of the necessity for a sea-level canal near Panama, may I call the attenion of the gentleman to another situation in this country, that is, that one bomb dropped on the Soo locks at Sault Ste. Marie would absolutely have lost this war for us.

Mr. BLAND. That is not within the jurisdiction of my committee.

Mr. REED of New York. It is time that was investigated, too.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I was not advocating a sea-level canal at the Panama Canal, or on the Isthmus of Panama, because you would have to cut down 85 feet through those rocks, but I understand a survey has been made for a sea-level canal across Nicaragua.

Mr. REED of New York. I understand that.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not what I had in mind.

Mr. REED of New York. They made a survey there many years ago.

Mr. RANKIN. Just to show you the risk we ran this time, when I was down there in 1927 I protested to the authorities that we did not have an adequate air force. In 1937 I was in Hawaii and I protested then that we did not have an adequate air force in Hawaii. If they had knocked out one of those locks in the Panama Canal we would have had to go 13,000 miles farther to get around Cape Horn to get into the Pacific. It would have been a disaster that would probably have surpassed in importance the Pearl Harbor attack. If we are going to continue to spend money for this purpose, and I think we are, it seems to me we have reached the time when we need a sea-level canal that we can protect against such eventualities.

Mr. BLAND. This committee will make a report to the Congress for its decision.

Mr. REED of New York. If one bomb had dropped on the locks at Sault Ste. Marie you would not have built another battleship for this war. You would not have had the steel with which to do business in this war at all.

Mr. BLAND. That does not come within the jurisdiction of my committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I know it does not, but I am calling it to the attention of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, since we are all agreed that this ought to be done, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICERS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4489) an act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2, over to and including line 7 on page 2, and insert:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. For the purposes of this title, the term 'international organization' means a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any Act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation, and which shall have been designated by the President through appropriate Executive order as being entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided. The President shall be authorized, in the light of the functions performed by any such international organization, by appropriate Executive order to withhold or withdraw from any such organization or its officers or employees any of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided for in this title (including the amendments made by this title) or to condition or limit the enjoyment by any such organization or its officers or employees of any such privilege, exemption, or immunity. The President shall be authorized, if in his judgment such action should be justified by reason of the abuse by an international organization or its officers and employees of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities herein provided or for any other reason, at any time to revoke the designation of any international organization under this section, whereupon the international organization in question shall cease to be classed as an international organization for the purposes of this title."

Page 2, line 19, after "enjoy", insert "the same."

Page 2, line 20, after "process", insert "as is enjoyed by foreign governments."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "they" and insert "such organizations."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "year" and insert "years."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "or" and insert "of."

Page 5, line 20, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 5, line 24, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, strike out lines 1 and 2 and insert:

"'(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization.'"

Page 6, line 6, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, line 7, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, line 10, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 6, strike out lines 11 and 12 and insert:

"'(16) Service performed in the employ of an international organization.'"

Page 7, strike out lines 6 to 11, inclusive, and insert:

"'(18) International organization: The term "international organization" means a public international organization entitled to

enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act.'"

Page 7, line 15, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 7, line 16, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 7, line 19, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 7, line 21, after "organization" insert "entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act."

Page 7, line 1, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 8, line 10, strike out "subparagraph" and insert "paragraph."

Page 8, strike out all in line 15 after "Territories" down to and including "Government" in line 17.

Page 8, line 25, after "fingerprinting", insert "and."

Page 9, line 1, strike out "and selective training and service."

Page 9, strike out lines 17, 18, and 19, and insert "inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'and (7) a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization entitled to enjoy privileges, exemptions, and immunities as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act, or an alien officer or employee of such an international organization, and the family, attendants, servants, and employees of such a representative, officer, or employee.'"

Page 10, line 14, after "as", insert "a representative of a foreign government in or to an international organization or."

Page 10, line 15, strike out "officer" and insert "representative, officer."

Page 10, line 19, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, line 5, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, line 12, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, lines 17 and 18, strike out "immediate families residing with them" and insert "families, suites, and servants."

Page 11, line 18, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 11, line 23, strike out "act" and insert "title."

Page 12, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 10. This title may be cited as the 'International Organizations Immunities Act.'

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. Extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

"If a claim for credit or refund under the internal revenue laws relates to an overpayment on account of the deductibility by the taxpayer of a loss in respect of property considered destroyed or seized under section 127 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to war losses) for a taxable year beginning in 1941 or 1942, the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code shall in no event expire prior to December 31, 1946. In the case of such a claim filed on or before December 31, 1946, the amount of the credit or refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period provided in section 322 (b) (2) or (3) of such code, whichever is applicable, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the deductibility of the loss described in this section.

"SEC. 202. Contributions to pension trusts.

"(a) Deductions for the taxable year 1942 under prior income-tax acts: Section 23 (p) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the words 'January 1, 1943' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1942', and by striking out the words 'December 31, 1942' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1941.'

"(b) Effective date: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable as if it had been made as a part of section 162 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1942.

"SEC. 203. Petition to The Tax Court of the United States.

"(a) Time for filing petition: The second sentences of sections 272 (a) (1), 732 (a), 871 (a) (1), and 1012 (a) (1), respectively, of the Internal Revenue Code are amended by striking out the parenthetical expression appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(not counting Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday in the District of Columbia as the ninetieth day).'

"(b) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of September 8, 1945."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, certainly these are formidable-sounding amendments. The bill comes from the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], and other members of the committee on this side are present. I hope the amendments will be thoroughly explained to the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the amendments sound formidable, but the meaning is simple when you get below the surface.

The essence of the amendments, except the three amendments put on as tax riders to this bill, limit the scope of the bill as passed by the House last month. It will be recalled that I explained when I called the bill up in November that the emergency for this legislation grew out of the prospects that the headquarters for UNO will probably be in this country. We do not know whether it will be Boston, San Francisco, Chicago, or "Tuskeehoma."

There is every evidence that the headquarters will be here, and when these foreign employees come we want to be in position to extend them what might be called southern hospitality. In other words, this legislation is absolutely essential to carry out the agreements we have made and which other nations have already extended to similar organizations. The Senate made these restrictions. We thought the language of the bill limited these privileges to these international organizations that had been specifically sanctioned by the Congress. The Senate thought we ought to make that plain, and one amendment makes that provision: They do not get the benefits, these tax exemptions and other perquisites, unless the Congress has sanctioned the organization. The next amendment provides that if some organization starts functioning here and goes beyond the scope for which it was created, let us say starts into business over here, the President by Executive order can withdraw the privileges from the employees of that foreign organization.

Mr. RANKIN. Ought not that to be written into law? Why should we wait for the Executive? Should not that be written into law, that if they come here and engage in other business these privileges should cease?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. We have written it into law. Somebody has got to act in all law enforcement and we designate the President because he handles our foreign affairs under the Constitution; he acts for the Congress and the American people. It is written into this law and he is directed to withdraw from them these privileges if he finds they are violating the terms under which they were permitted to enter and to do business presumably for some international organization. It is a very hypothetical case, though, that representatives of Great Britain, for instance, who would be assigned to headquarters of the UNO would open up a shipping business in Boston or San Francisco. They just do not operate that way.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know. I saw in the papers the other day that the British Empire owns stock in General Motors, almost a controlling interest. I do not know whether that is true or not, but under the common law of England one corporation cannot own stock in another, and I do not believe the United States Government could own stock in a British corporation. Unless there is a great deal of hurry about this proposition——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Well, there is.

Mr. RANKIN. Why?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Simply because we are going to recess today, as the gentleman well knows, and we do not propose to come back until the 14th of January. In the meantime final action has got to be taken as to whether UNO will have its headquarters here or somewhere else. Everybody thinks it would be very fine to have the headquarters of this international organization in this country.

I communicated with the State Department today and was told that it was highly essential for us to complete action on this.

Here is a report that is unanimously presented by the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] reporting for that committee. These amendments were unanimously adopted by the Senate. They restrict what we have already voted for, and the vote in the House on our bill was unanimous.

Mr. RANKIN. I still contend that it should be written into the law that if they come here and then violate their exemptions and engage in other business here or engage in any kind of propaganda against this Government that they should automatically have these privileges withdrawn and be subjected to taxation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The law does take care of that as fully as we know how to put it in the law.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. The Congress has spoken. All that this does is to give the

President the power to enforce it when it becomes necessary.

Mr. RANKIN. It does not make it the law.

Mr. FOLGER. That is the gist of it, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely. It is provided that the President shall withdraw from such organization or its officers and employees their exemptions or immunities provided they do something they are not supposed to do. The situation is fully taken care of.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I wish to inquire if the gentleman or his committee has taken any testimony as to how many organizations now in existence outside of UNO would come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If UNRRA had to extend relief to us it would come under it. It also applies to certain foreign agencies of UNRRA. If the International Food and Agricultural Organization, which we have joined, should set up headquarters here, it would come under this. The only agency that we know of which would immediately function under this is UNO, but any international organization of which we are a member by action of the Congress and in which we participate, will come within the provisions of this act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There are quite a number of them already. This provides for additional organizations that may be formed?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I tried to explain that all of these amendments limited provisions that were unanimously passed by the House. It does not add any new organizations, it does not add any new powers. The language was deemed to be a little too broad in the items I have explained and the Senate limited them. I am asking that we accept the limitations adopted by the Senate. Those limitations, as I said, had the unanimous endorsement of the Senate committee, the Senate, the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the tax suggestions are approved by our committee and by our staff on internal revenue taxation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But it does provide for the creation of additional organizations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It does not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean for the recognition of such organizations?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It limits what we have already done. The original bill provided that when there is an international organization which we have joined by act of Congress, we should extend to them the privileges of immunity in general that we extend to the diplomatic corps. One thing we did in this bill that the Senate took out was this: We gave them freedom from State and local taxation. That was taken out by the Senate committee and I am asking the House to agree to that. It limits what we have undertaken to do. Another thing, it takes out the provision in our bill about selective service because that is covered by section 5 of our Selective Service Act.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I hope the gentleman will not feel a little overanxious and irritated by these questions. You see, there is no report printed, there is no report before us, and we do not have the opportunity to know what is contained in this report. I should like to ask another question. Is there any estimate in the gentleman's mind as to how many persons this will grant these extraordinary privileges to in this country? How many persons?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That question was asked last month when we had the bill before us and our answer was that we had no way of knowing how many persons, but we had no reason to believe that any foreign nation would send over here more persons than they needed to do the job, because they had to sustain them and pay them while they are here.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We went through that experience. It developed just before the war that Japan had 1 consul and 250 vice consuls with keen eyes, with keen minds, and with diplomatic immunity going about the people in this country and over in Hawaii. Who is going to be able to follow all of these organizations and all of these people with diplomatic immunities and find out where they are and what they are doing?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senate thought that our bill was not strict enough on that score, so it put this first amendment in that if they brought more people over here than they ought to bring over here and they got to doing something which we did not approve, the President would withdraw these privileges from them.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has only been a short time ago when the newspapers were full of reports that people came here without diplomatic immunity as visitors, and that they had engaged in business, and that their profits had amounted to $800,000,000, and escaped taxes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That was an entirely different category. They came over here not as representatives of their government engaged in an international organization of which we were members. They came over here as aliens on some kind of a temporary visa. Our tax laws did not reach them, and they participated, with a lot of others, in gambling on the stock market in New York, in which they made a good deal of money, I understand. But this bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They did not have diplomatic immunity?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. They did not have any kind of immunity.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yet they were able to accomplish this merely as aliens; that which they did accomplish. Now, will all of this group coming in here be immune?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I can say to my distinguished colleague that he has raised an entirely separate issue that is now being investigated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue as to whether these folks are taxable under existing law, and if not, whether legislation can be enacted to apply to them. The Ways and Means Committee expects to receive a report from the Bureau of Internal Revenue on this matter.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has this to do with it: They did not have the authority that will be granted to these maybe thousands and thousands of people going over this country, some of them friendly, and perhaps some of them otherwise, to pry into and go about things——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I just tried to explain to my colleague that this bill, if agreed to, would limit tax relief to the salaries paid by these organizations, and if they go into business they would not be exempt as to such income.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They would have to be caught first.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Well, do you not have to catch any violator first?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe that the gentleman said that the reason for urgency in connection with this bill was because the United Nations had accepted the invitation of this country to locate their international capital in the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. As I recall, he listed the invitation of Boston and Tuskahoma and a couple of other Johnny-come-lately invitations——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I did not mean to eliminate any great area like that which the gentleman represents.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure if the United States uses sagacity they will adopt the Black Hills suggestion. The bill also covers that?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought I heard something about limiting the number of persons who were to come over. Should there not also be something in the legislation which would limit the kind of people who should be permitted to come here and be immune from our laws? I make that inquiry because I have in my hand here a letter dated December 10 written from Detroit in which it says, among other things:

The enclosed is a statement by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, urging support for the General Motors strike.

It is signed by Carl Winter, chairman of the Michigan Communist Party. Now are you going to let all those fellows come over here from Russia or any other place and join up with Thomas,

who has asked Attlee to aid in the General Motors strike, and let those people go on and do anything they want to?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. No. I tried to explain that if they come over to aid in the General Motors strike, they lose their immunity, but I do not think that we could tell Russia that they could not bring Communists over here to represent them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think that those Communists should be permitted to come over here and take part in these strikes?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How are you going to stop it if this thing goes through?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Because we put in a provision that they lose their immunity if they do anything outside of the purposes of the organization that they represent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If and when the President makes a finding.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. That is right.

In conclusion I wish to summarize the substantive amendments as follows:

First. The benefits of the bill are extended only to those international organizations in which the United States participates with the sanction of Congress. That was our intention.

Second. The President is authorized in the light of functions performed by any particular international organization to withhold or withdraw from such organization, or its officers or employees, any of the privileges, exemptions, and immunities provided for in the title, or to condition or limit the enjoyment by any organization, or its officers or employees, of any of such privileges, exemptions or immunities. This will permit the adjustment or limitation of the privileges in the event that any international organization should engage, for example, in activities of a commercial nature. Provision is also made for withdrawal of the benefits of the title from organizations which abuse such benefits.

Third. The bill omits the provision of the House bill which provided that international organizations shall be entitled to the same exemptions and immunities from State and local taxes as is the United States Government. There is considerable doubt as to the authority of the Federal Government to extend such exemptions and immunities so far as State or local taxes are concerned.

Fourth. The House bill exempted from the provisions of selective training and service persons designated by foreign governments to serve as their representatives in or to international organizations, and the officers and employees of such organizations, and members of the immediate families of such representatives, officers, or employees residing with them, other than nationals of the United States. The Senate bill omits reference to selective training and service, since this matter, so far as aliens are concerned, is already provided for in section 5 of the Selective Service Act.

The Senate bill also adds a separate title providing certain tax amendments of an administrative nature. It was necessary to act on these amendments before December 31, 1945.

Fifth. The first tax amendment extends the time for filing claims for refund or credit with respect to war losses for the years 1941 and 1942. In a previous act we had extended this period to December 31, 1945, with respect to the year 1941. Since the whole war-loss matter is going to be studied by our committee and changes recommended it was deemed advisable to grant a further extension for both 1941 and 1942 through December 31, 1946.

Sixth. Another amendment corrects an error in the Revenue Act of 1942 with respect to pension trusts which omitted reference to the year 1942 and thereby created a hiatus in the statute. It is necessary to correct this situation now to prevent unnecessary paper work on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Seventh. The last amendment deals with the period for filing petitions with The Tax Court of the United States. A taxpayer at the present time must file his petition with The Tax Court within a period of 90 days. Where the ninetieth day falls on Sunday or a legal holiday such Sunday or legal holiday is not counted as the ninetieth day. Due to the fact that the Government does not now conduct business on Saturday, it is necessary to amend the statute so that where the ninetieth days falls on Saturday, Saturday will not be counted as the ninetieth day.

All of these tax amendments have the approval of the Treasury Department and the joint staff. The Tax Court of the United States is particularly interested in having the last amendment referred to adopted as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today for the Chair to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman outline, if he can, the expected program for the rest of the day?

Mr. RAMSPECK. There is no further business so far as I know to be transacted by the House except to pass the sine die adjournment resolution when it comes over from the Senate.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the Senate has passed the resolution fixing the 14th of January as the return date.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding that they have adopted it, and the only thing left now is the sine die resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean that cuts off special orders?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Not at all.

Mr. MICHENER. I certainly would object if I thought the gentleman from Michigan or anybody else wanted to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly the gentleman from Michigan would not want to speak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article from Life by Charles J. V. Murphy and in the other a letter by Mr. Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter from a friend in Austria and in the other some facts about the workings of UNRRA abroad.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the work of one of his committees.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of November 12 last.

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times in respect to the death of the outstanding economist, Dr. Edwin C. Kemmerer.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of the program of loans to foreign countries.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in Yank magazine giving a description of the benefits to be given by Canada to the Canadian GI's. It shows there are some things, I think, whereby we can improve on what we are doing for our own GI's.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee recently held hearings on a bill, H. R. 4982, which would authorize the Department of State to continue to carry on an international information program.

During the past week several stories and speculations have appeared in the press, both in Washington and New York, criticizing this program. Many of the facts and impressions in these stories are found to be incorrect when compared with the testimony by the Department of State before a committee of this House.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following article by Assistant Secretary of State Benton, which appeared in the New York Times on December 2, 1945, which has facts:

SELF-PORTRAIT—BY UNCLE SAM

THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS MAKING A NEW EFFORT TO GIVE THE WORLD A REALISTIC PICTURE OF AMERICA

(By William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State)

WASHINGTON.—Because we have risen to be one of the most powerful nations in the history of the world, we may reap envy, fear, and hate. We do not want such a harvest. Our national security is threatened by it. This was true before Hiroshima. It is even more true now.

The proposal for a State Department foreign information service, supplementing the Department's diplomatic activities, is a new idea for Americans in peacetime. In the critical years just before the war, and in the midst of the war itself, it became painfully clear that accurate, well-balanced information about the United States was urgently needed in many countries. Nelson Rockefeller discovered this in South America. The Office of War Information encountered it across the globe. Along with its "psychological warfare" activities directed at enemy countries, the OWI found that it was equally necessary to provide information about America to the people of Allied and neutral countries.

Is it any longer important to us in peacetime what the peoples of other countries think of the United States? Does it really matter what a New Zealand farmer, a Chinese peasant, a French businessman, or an Argentine school teacher knows about our life, our customs, our aspirations, our foreign policy?

Some Americans, contemplating our great power, would say no. Others—and I am among them—believe that foreign opinion about the United States may determine our future peace and security and the peace and security of the world.

We have committed ourselves to a policy of active patricipation in world affairs. We do not intend to forsake that policy. It will involve us in new problems, carrying the risk that our strength will be feared and our intentions misunderstood. The solution will not be less active participation. It can only be the active promotion of understanding.

Fear and misunderstanding of America will act against our own security because it may cost us friends and Allies in time of crisis. It will also act against the world's progress toward international security. The successful development of the United Nations Organization, upon which we are placing so much hope, is not something which will occur of itself. The United Nations Organization is simply an instrument. The value of that instrument will depend upon the spirit in which it is used. And that, in turn, will depend basically upon a better understanding of each other among the peoples of the world: the peoples are going to have a great deal to say about the policies which their governments will advocate in the Security Council and in the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization.

There was a time when foreign affairs were ruler-to-ruler relations, when the rulers dealt privately and secretly with one another through their ambassadors. Even when absolute rulers gave way to representative governments, the relations often continued to be secret and private through ambassadors. These government-to-government relationships prevailed until the First World War.

Since 1918 the relations between nations have constantly been broadened to include, not merely governments but also people. The peoples of the world are exercising an ever-larger influence upon decisions of foreign policy. This is as it should be. It means we must address ourselves to peoples as well as to their governments.

President Truman summarized the situation on August 31, when he declared that we must try to give the peoples of other countries "a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government." Pursuant to this declaration, the overseas program of the OWI and the information activities of its companion agency for Latin America, the Office of Inter-American Affairs, were transferred in September to the State Department. The Department is now developing an international information service for peacetime. This service will be on a much more modest scale than in wartime, though the need is at least as great, now that force of arms is no longer the one dominant factor in world affairs.

The enterprise is now organized temporarily as an Interim International Information Service. It is being carried forward in the midst of a process of liquidation. More than 3,000 OWI personnel in the overseas branch have been released since July 1. By January 1, 6,000 will have been laid off. By spring our outposts overseas will be only a fraction of their wartime strength.

The transition to a long-range program, on which we are now operating, has six main aspects:

First. As an immediate aftermath of the war emergency information, jobs remain to be done under military control in Germany, in Japan, and in parts of the world where American troops are awaiting transportation home. This is part of our occupation duty in Germany and the Pacific.

Second. The Overseas News and Features Bureau of OWI is down to one-sixth its former size. It maintains a news service in areas where there is no commercial service. Even in areas where an American commercial press service has an office the IIIS is supplying the full texts of speeches, acts of Congress, and official documents which otherwise would be sent overseas only in excerpts.

Third. We are operating short-wave radio programs beamed throughout the world. These are carried today in 18 languages, less than half as many languages as during the war. In parts of the world, such as the Balkans and eastern Europe, which have been cut off for years from normal contact with America, and in areas in southeastern Asia and China recently liberated from the Japanese, there is no other means of interpreting America. The radio "Voice of America," heard by millions during the war with indescribable hope, has not been silenced and should not be silenced.

Fourth. We are continuing to arrange for the distribution of documentary motion pictures protraying democratic processes and the American way of life. These will be prepared in various foreign languages. Some of them will be distributed abroad in theaters by the motion-picture industry. The others will reach nontheatrical audiences through our foreign-service establishments.

Fifth. The department is continuing the United States information libraries abroad, one of the most widely approved projects of OWI and OIAA. These will operate in connection with our embassies, legations, and consulates. In them American residents abroad and foreign readers find American histories, biographies, novels, technical works, periodicals, and official documents. Elmer Davis has told me he felt that nothing developed during the war so strongly warranted continuing support.

Sixth. Our large wartime exhibits have been curtailed, but we are maintaining smaller, less expensive photographic displays of American life. The Government owns a magnificent collection of millions of pictures, now being indexed and arranged in the Library of Congress.

The wartime spot-news operation (consisting of that news which would be considered useful by the discriminating newspaper editor) has been severely cut, so that IIIS now sends cut little spot news as such, except to Germany, Austria, and Japan. Such news—particularly that about the American scene—is sent by wireless for use by such German newspapers as have been licensed and approved by AMG. The German news service is also supplied in this way. This spot news is used by our radio stations in Germany. With Japan, spot news is sent by wireless from San Francisco.

The information (as distinguished from spot news) sent out by IIIS consists of a cross-section of editorial comment from the American press—texts of important speeches and documents, such as speeches of the President; full texts of bills before Congress and the most recent report of General Arnold; unsigned columns and signed columns from American newspapers explaining acts of the United States Government and attitudes of the American people in regard to economic, agricultural, social, and cultural subjects.

Some of this information is sent by wireless—operating on a 3-hour-a-day, 3-hour-a-night schedule. The wireless is monitored by 30 overseas outposts. Informational material sent by plane and ship consists of feature articles, film strips, exhibits, photostats, and photo offsets of stories as they appear in the American press.

IIIS short-wave involves a six-point program which:

1. Tells the world news in brief.

2. Gives American reaction to world news in American editorial and radio comment.

3. Employs statements of American official policy—Presidential statements, statements by Cabinet members and known leaders of all walks of American life.

4. Presents news of American internal delopments.

5. Gives news from the Far East and from the American zone of occupation in Germany.

6. Presents commentaries, radio features, and dramatizations depicting the American way of life and the development of American agriculture, science, education, and art.

The utilization of film strips has begun to diminish. These are being used by the IIIS, particularly in the Far East, to project what is going on in America. They cover a wide range of subjects—from our public schools to our industries. IIIS is at present using these film strips to show how we live; with emphasis upon our agriculture and our public-health projects.

These media have been especially useful because they have been able to reach large audiences. Film strips can be used many times without replacing them. They cost less than $2 a showing. In one instance 300 prints of a subject were shown to different audiences, with their accompanying lecture, at a cost of approximately $500. A film strip usually contains from 70 to 100 frames, with titles in both English and the language of the country in which it is to be shown.

With three exceptions, the OWI and OIAA magazines and booklets have ceased publication. The exceptions are two magazines for Germany, published in cooperation with the Army, and one for Russia, a fine, forthright illustrated magazine about the United States. Except for the Government's magazine America, American magazines are not available in Russian editions. "When America appears it is a great day in Moscow," Brooks Atkinson wirelessed the New York Times on October 26. "The portrait it gives of America is enormously exhilarating." In countries where United States magazines can circulate freely the department is cooperating fully with private American publishers in overseas distribution.

The long-range program of the Department, not yet drawn up in detail, will follow the general lines now evolving in the transition program. Private initiative and private facilities can do a very big part—indeed, an overwhelming proportion—of the job of disseminating abroad information about America. The more of it they will do, the better. The Government should not undertake to do what private press, radio, and motion-picture organizations do better, or what our tourists, salesmen, technicians, book publishers, play producers, and universities do regularly and well. The soundest procedure is for the State Department to determine, and to keep determining as conditions change, our information needs area by area, then to support and help private industry to do everything it can to meet these needs. The remainder of the job will devolve upon the Department.

In news distribution the Government will progressively retire from the field, which it moved into as a war necessity. My hope is that the Associated Press, the United Press, and International News Service, highly competitive organizations, will greatly expand their world coverage. Before very long governmental overseas news will be limited mainly to such background information as full texts of Presidential statements, acts of Congress, or reports like that of General Marshall, which have proved of great value to foreign editors, writers, and organizations, and which are essential to our embassies and missions abroad.

In short-wave radio the role of private enterprise is under study. This is a much more complex problem. There is no profit in short-wave radio. The Government must put up the money. Other Governments are using short-wave on an increasing scale. Technical efficiency grows from day to day. We cannot retire from the field. We have not yet determined how to operate it or who should own and control it.

The motion-picture industry's sales abroad, estimated at about $90,000,000 annually, are said to provide 30 to 40 percent of the industry's gross revenue. As every traveler knows, the people of other countries have gained their strongest impressions of us from the movies. These impressions have not always been full and fair. There is no thought by the State Department of "censoring" American films which are exported. It is in touch with the industry, which in wartime has shown a real desire to produce pictures for export which are broadly representative of American life. The Department may produce some inexpensive documentaries under contract for use abroad. Col. John Hay Whitney is advising with me and the Department in this area. He has had experience in Hollywood and served as head of Nelson Rockefeller's OIAA film division before entering the Army.

Exports of American books and magazines will be encouraged through our information libraries and through other means. Before the war hardly 3 percent of the output of American publishers was sold abroad.

To carry on all these activities three or four American information officers should presently be maintained by the State Department in each of the smaller countries, 10 to 20 in the larger countries, backed up by a compact and efficient service organization at home. Our future expenditures may be modest compared to the amounts reported being spent and under consideration by some other Governments. We need to open our own doors and minds, and invite a greater inflow of knowledge about other countries and peoples. International information must be a two-way traffic. We do not intend to take part in any sort of international "information race." Nor do we propose to depend on other nations to speak to the rest of the world on our behalf.

Neither do we intend to engage in "propaganda." We shall profit most by a frank portrayal of ourselves to the people of other countries, from Russia to the Argentine. We must be candid, truthful, and balanced. We must give the bad with the good, in a form complete enough to show, for instance, that, far from being a land of universal wealth and material ease, the United States has problems of poverty and maladjustment, and that we are well aware that our political democracy does not yet function perfectly.

Because the immediate and pressing problem is to recast the wartime information program to peacetime needs, I have here emphasized information. For the long pull what are loosely called "cultural interchanges" are even more important: the exchange with other countries of students, professors, scientists and technicians, of knowledge and of skills. That is also a part of the State Department's program, but it is another article. The President has said, "The nature of present-day foreign relations makes it essential for the United States to maintain informational activities abroad as an integral part of the conduct of our foreign policy."

We must not pin our faith on our power and our might, nor even on our righteous intentions, if we do not explain them. With the development of the atomic bomb and other terrifying weapons of destruction, we must place our small and inconspicuous wagers on these long-range, practical measures which hold some reasonable hope and promise that the world can learn to live in peace and understanding.

REVENUE ACT OF 1945

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that there is now available in the document room House Document No. 383, containing questions and answers relating to the Revenue Act of 1945. There are 70 copies there for each Member.

OUR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein a letter addressed to Congress by Mr. Louis J. Kehoe, of Washington, Iowa.

Mr. DE LACY (at the request of Mr. SAVAGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from Pic magazine entitled "Young Blood in Washington"; and in the other to include an article entitled "An Eye Witness of the Indonesian Situation."

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some material from the Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by John W. Owens appearing in the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a captain and a private in China on why we should take our marines out of China.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address to be made tonight by him and in another instance to extend his remarks and include an extract from a letter.

PROPOSED HEADQUARTERS FOR UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in the debate which just preceded my appearance here with reference to H. R. 4484, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] failed to mention the fact that the great city of New Orleans in Louisiana had been mentioned as being considered as the headquarters of the United Nations Organization. May I say that I hope this Organization will select this magnificent place for the site of the headquarters, because I am sure that anyone who has been in New Orleans will realize, on account of its climate, beauty, charm, hospitality, facilities, historical background, and many other advantages, including its geographical location, being close to the Latin-American countries, that it is the best place in the United States for the headquarters of this Organization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the American Lumberman.

A HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENT SEEKS ADVICE IN PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a high-school student of Guthrie Center, Iowa, who has asked me a question which I find rather difficult to answer to any degree of certainty just at this time. I hope that either General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service, or someone can give this ambitious young American a good and right answer to his question. Also I am sure there are millions of young Americans who would like to have Neil Rowley's question answered so they, too, can plan more securely for the future. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include his letter with my remarks. Even though the selective service law expires June 30, 1946, who can assure us the law will not again be renewed, at least if the present conditions of unrest in Europe and Asia are not settled in due time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. The letter is as follows:

GUTHRIE CENTER, IOWA,
December 10, 1945.

HON. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a student at Guthrie Center High School who will graduate May 1946. In March I will be 18. Since I was a small boy, I have had an ambition to become a doctor. In high school I have taken subjects to advance this career. I have science, Latin, mathematics, and English, to further this career.

Next year I would like to go to college and take premedics. After sending for college catalogs I've struck a rut. I've been advised by mother not to plan any farther until I know about the plans of the draft.

Certain of my teachers have told me that I could go to college, take ROTC and serve my term in the services after I get my degree. This seems like a favorable combination if it could be done. I have sought advice from several people but nobody seems to have definite information.

In my class of around 90 there are about 25 students hoping to go to college. Over half of these are boys. Several of them will be able to begin for a while, which they plan to do, while others will be unable to start at all because of age.

In the class room, we have had considerable discussion on this subject and have come to the conclusion that, since the peace has been signed, fellows of 18 should receive their training after their education, but before they're 25. It is known the Army gives an education but none of a professional nature.

At present I am stuck in my planning and would like an idea on how to plan ahead. And, if possible, how well can I plan on becoming a doctor to serve my country?

Sincerely yours,

NEIL ROWLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution extending the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, providing for an investigation of the Pearl Harbor attack.

JEWISH WAR VETS WOULD DENY BENEFITS OF GI BILL TO SERVICEMEN IN SOUTHERN STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from a letter from the Jewish War Veterans, and also a resolution adopted by them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a communication from the Jewish War Veterans, the second of its kind I have received in the last few weeks, includes a resolution demanding that the Federal Government deny the use of any funds appropriated for carrying out the GI bill of rights to any college or institution of learning which discriminates against any veteran because of race, color, creed, or country of origin.

In other words, this little group of self-appointed leaders who, in my opinion, are doing the Jewish race an irreparable injury, would deny the use of GI funds to every ex-serviceman in the Southern States, white or black. For they know we have separate schools for the two races in every State from Maryland to Texas.

It is most unfortunate that they would pass a resolution of this kind to deny the benefits of the GI bill to millions of the finest fighting men the world ever saw.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 49, which is now on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, agreed to December 20, 1945, is amended to read as follows:

"That the limit of time required, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, for the submission to the Senate and House of Representatives of the report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 15, 1946; and such resolution is hereby continued in full force and effect until such date."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain just why this is necessary? As I understand it, the two Republican members of that committee appointed from the House are favorable to the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. I fully explained the situation to the gentleman from Michigan a few moments ago. All Members of the House on the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee are in full accord with this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

MERRY CHRISTMAS TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on the part of my colleagues from Wisconsin, most of them having been here from 4 to 7 years, to extend to you, as the Speaker, our very best wishes for a Merry Christmas.

I wish to say personally that every year I am here the more I sympathize with the position you hold, and the higher the regard which the Members of this House from Wisconsin hold for you. If there is anyone who should have a Merry Christmas, it is the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PRICE OF CITRUS FRUITS

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER], was kind enough to call me up and say he was going to put some more citrus figures in the RECORD. I was unable to get here because, under the conditions of the session yesterday, the special orders were called earlier than had been anticipated. It was a coincidence that I was then listening to the Secretary of Agriculture speak before the National Press Club, as were other Members of the House and members of the Committee on Agriculture. It was also a coincidence that during that speech a question was asked him concerning present prices of citrus fruit, as to whether there had been inflation, as to whether there was anything unusual, or what the condition was, to all

of which he gave very definite and correct replies.

I have no thought of going into this matter in detail. I should like, when the House returns in January, to submit a statement to the entire House which will indicate exactly what has happened and furthermore, which I believe is more important, to indicate what attempt is being made by the OPA to use the situation today in its favor, for I am convinced that the OPA, especially its Administrator, Mr. Bowles, is very much more interested in the continuation of his agency than he is in present conditions in the citrus market.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I believe, in fairness to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from California should not feel that it was any attack upon his particular industry. As I understand, the gentleman from Wisconsin used citrus fruit only as an indication of the shadow of things to come in the whole general problem of what is going to happen to this country if we have a rise of all food prices.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have the same high regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has. The only thing I wish is that OPA would give him correct figures, and also that correct marketing interpretations would be drawn from them. For example, in the gentleman's speech yesterday he said:

> California oranges during the pre-November 19 period when the new crop was being marketed sold for an average price of $4.42 a box.

He concludes from that, because there was a rise last Tuesday to $6.34 a box in some sizes and markets, that this is uncontrolled inflation. First of all, there were no California new-crop oranges on the market at that time. That is simply a misstatement to the gentleman from Wisconsin, which he in turn put into the RECORD.

Second, I want to call attention to the statement that the price was $4.42 a box at that time, prior to November 19, which I have not been able to check but I will take for granted it is correct. It was about there, from $4.38 to perhaps $5—the ceiling was $5.60, and it is a normal thing that at that time of the year the prices should be down. With or without the ceiling they would have risen.

You must remember that the Department of Agriculture, and the citrus growers from all parts of the United States, asked that the ceilings be removed on October 1. That is when the ceiling should have been removed. Had it been removed at that time some of the present situation might have been avoided. With its usual delay, the OPA did not get around to removing ceilings until the 19th of November, which was just at a time when the demand was beginning to rise on all types of fruits and choice vegetables for the Christmas trade. It is a normal thing that it should rise. Second, I point out to you that in the hearing before Judge Collett, to which the gentleman from Wisconsin referred, he does not say but I think he should, that advertisements were exhibited from 100 cities in the United States, all of which indicated that the price of the average orange, to the housewife, was less since the ceiling prices had been removed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California, who comes from a citrus-producing district, and knows this subject thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to point out that there was another factor involved in the November 19 date; namely, it came before the new crop began to come on the market, which is now coming on the market, and one of the contentions of the people in the industry, and I think quite properly so, was that the new crop was going to be a very large one and that therefore the balance between supply and demand was inevitably going to adjust the difference.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a large crop. The date on which the OPA removed the ceilings was late. It came prior to the holidays, it came when we were having the car shortages, as the gentleman will remember, using all the cars possible for returning soldiers and for their supplies. Finally, we ran head-on into the present snow and storm conditions in the United States, but with all these things involved, I am pointing out that the hearts of the gentlemen who seem to be bleeding for the citrus industry or for the housewife who is presumably bothered about inflation, are not as a matter of fact bleeding for the housewives but for the people who may stay at the Waldorf or the Ritz, and such places, where the choice fruit is being bought. My heart does not bleed very much for those buyers, because the taking away of the ceiling price so that these few choice sizes may go above the ceiling, as indicated, makes it possible for all the rest of the citrus crop, which is 80 percent of the crop, to go below the ceiling price, whereas otherwise the ceiling would have to hold them all up, little and big.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, as the gentleman pointed out, the average price was not inflated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The present schedule of prices, without ceilings in effect, reflect much more accurately the real value of the different sizes and grades of fruit than was the case before?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that the small sizes which have been in such preponderance and which in some instances have not been able to be disposed of at all through the channels of distribution in the past will be able to make the market, under the circumstances, and will sell at somewhat less than they did before?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think they are selling under the old ceiling now in most markets, an analysis of the market shows that, and certainly they will sell, as soon as they come in, as the gentleman says they will.

Finally, I want to point out that these high inflationary prices which the gentleman from Wisconsin yesterday pointed out amount to 2 cents per box of oranges, which means 2 cents for 220 oranges. In one instance he showed an increase of 98 cents for 220 oranges or more. That is not inflation, in my opinion, especially when anyone in the room experienced in marketing knows this is a seasonal rise, which will drop in another week or so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Members of the House who are acquainted with the California people are quite well aware of the fact that this price is not due to any effort on their part nor to any inclination on their part to profiteer, but is due to natural laws; but while we are on that subject of prices I wonder if the gentleman will yield to the Member from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to explain to some of us who are interested in eggs just how it is or why it is that the price of eggs is now 70 cents a dozen, as fixed under OPA regulations, yet the Department of Agriculture, another branch of the Government, is calling for the killing of I do not know how many hens, 100,000 or 100,000,000. It does not seem to me that we are going to get a lower price and hold down the cost of living and hold down the cost of eggs when the Government asks us to kill off these hens.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are getting a little off the subject, but if the gentleman wishes, I would like to point out that we had a session in the Committee on Agriculture on the subject of poultry and eggs, as the result of which a subcommittee pointed out to Mr. Bowles that the figures he provides to the Members of Congress are not to be relied upon. Mr. Bowles has since then sent to me a further statement, which he has asked me to put in the RECORD. I shall be glad to do that, but I am waiting until after the first of the year, because I am compelled to point out that in Mr. Bowles' "correcting statement" he again misuses the figures by using only those which involve storage poultry and not fresh poultry, which his own experts at the meeting said was in surplus.

I now yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The only reason I am asking to yield is to answer the gentleman from Michigan's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the only reason I asked the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] to answer the question is because I know of his ability and his love for the OPA and how he always appears as an advocate of its policy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Please do not take up my time to praise the OPA on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was not praising the OPA. I am praising the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. He deserves it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank my colleague very much. I am sure I understand why the gentleman from Michigan wanted me to answer the question. We can discuss that some other time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, put it on the record.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Oh, no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is not a top military secret?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. We will do that after awhile. But I would like to say this, that the retail price of eggs is in my judgment way out of line with the price received by the producer of eggs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why kill the hens?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Just a moment. I do not agree with killing hens. I think we ought to go ahead and produce eggs, and if we have more than the American market can absorb at a fair price, I think there are plenty of people in the world that need them very badly right now. If you do that, it will be necessary, to be fair with the egg producers and the poultrymen, to make certain that they have a fair support price for their commodity.

I would like to point out further that insofar as the consumers complain about the high price of eggs, that the main thing they ought to be interested in is the possibility of narrowing the spread between what the farmers get and what they pay, rather than complaining, as they many times do, about the farmer getting too much, which he is not.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would it not be nice if the OPA and the other regulatory bodies would let us know a little more in advance what the prices are going to be so that we can have eggs and chickens?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe that would help a great deal.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have not read a great deal of the propaganda that has been published in the papers about the rise in the prices of citrus fruit, but from the testimony here today I come to the conclusion that the final result of the elimination of price control is a lower price in the aggregate for citrus fruits.

Mr. PHILLIPS. For the average housewise; not perhaps for the high-priced hotels in New York and Chicago.

Mr. BUFFETT. Of course, what we are interested in is the price to the ultimate consumer, the housewife, who represents the average consumer in this country.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is true.

Mr. BUFFETT. If that is correct, let me ask the gentleman one further question. Does he know of any greater disservice to the American people than for those in the employ of this Government to mislead the American people through propaganda, relating to our finances and inflation, by telling them that the prices went wild and got out of control, and all that sort of hog wash, when a natural situation will correct it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. When I came here, I remember hearing of somebody who said that he would rather be right than be President. After being here 3 years, I have come to the conclusion that there are more people who would rather retain their jobs than be right.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Last week I attended a meeting in Judge Collet's office, where the citrus industry was represented, and very definite information was brought out that 90 percent of the citrus fruit was selling below the ceiling price, and I believe 10 percent above, and that was Florida grapefruit.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Indian River grapefruit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And that was being purchased by the large hotels and large restaurants principally in the city of New York.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And that there will be 30,000,000 more boxes of oranges this year than we had last year. So it is a case of supply and demand, and the price naturally will come down if we will permit the free flow of the citrus fruits onto the market.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no question but that the removal of the price ceilings will eventually be beneficial.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to come back to the egg business.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would rather stick with citrus fruits, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. This is a statement that should be made at this time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. You cannot get orange juice out of eggs.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is, that the egg producers of the Eastern States, and the splendid egg producers of the State of California have, through their own ingenuity, and I am not criticizing them, been able to figure out a formula—a much nicer word than cartel—so that they have an advantage in the market places. They have been able to do that, and the people in the Midwest who produce eggs have not been able to meet that up to this time. That is reflected somewhat in the attitude of the OPA and these other agencies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I did not realize that we had any great advantage, except the sunshine, over Wisconsin eggs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering if the gentleman from California is not of the same opinion I am that the citrus situation has been used by OPA to perpetuate itself. I mean it is being used as one of the arguments why OPA should be continued.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is not a very pleasant thing to say, but I think the gentleman is entirely right that if this did not fit into the OPA's self-perpetuation program you would not hear very much about citrus right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman said he wanted to stick to citrus fruit. He said, too, if I remember, that you would not get very much orange juice out of eggs. You are getting quite a lot of lemon juice out of this OPA situation, I should think.

I only wanted to caution the gentleman that if the OPA follows the same procedure with reference to your citrus fruits that it has with the egg situation, you want to watch them or they will be cutting down your trees out there in order to hold down the price.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We have to watch the OPA all the time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the Republican Food Study Committee.

Mr. JENKINS. I recognize in the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] one of the great experts in this House on citrus fruits.

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; the gentleman could have gotten recognition without that compliment.

Mr. JENKINS. Yesterday I made a speech on the same subject. I should like the gentleman, because of his superior knowledge on that subject, to exhaust this citrus proposition, because it is almost a scandal.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Before the gentleman came in I said that I did not want to take the time of the House today, but that I have daily reports from the markets right up to the most recent that are obtainable, and I will present them to the House as soon as we get back in January, because I think this propaganda campaign of the OPA should be exposed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman said eggs had nothing to do with orange juice.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They come with the same meal; that is the most important connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are both very vital and they both are full of vitamins. I should like to point to the superiority of Massachusetts eggs. The eggs produced in my own district are very good.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If that is an invitation for me to come up and try the Massachusetts eggs, I should be very glad to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will, and will stay a very long time. May I say that we feel the OPA has been very difficult in the whole kerosene and oil situation, which has become bad, because we cannot cook the eggs and have to depend on orange juice.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentlewoman's point is very well taken. Let no one here misunderstand me. It was necessary that we have certain price controls in time of war. I think all of us are agreed on that. What we would like to have had, which would be too long to discuss here, is the type of control so well described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in his earlier report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems manifestly unfair that we in the New England States should have to pay one-half a cent more for kerosene and fuel oil than they do in some other sections of the country and also much more than is paid abroad.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman if he is having the difficulty we are experiencing in my State with reference to securing proteins for feed in the poultry industry and also in the dairy industry. Dairymen write and wire me almost every day that they are just at their wits' end to find protein feeds, and they are going to have to close down. I assume that is true in California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a separate subject.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman was talking about eggs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is no less serious a subject, but we have gotten a little bit off citrus.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentleman from Washington want to mention citrus, eggs, or kerosene?

Mr. SAVAGE. I know the California citrus is good and I know the Massachusetts eggs are all right, but if anyone wants apples or salmon, come out to the State of Washington.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the report has just come over the wire of the death of General Patton, which I know will throw a sad blanket on this final day of this session of the Congress.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY HOUSING NEEDED FOR RETURNING VETERANS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the discussion we had the other day concerning the question of temporary housing for veterans, at which time it was remarked there is a bottleneck in the handling of returning vets on the Pacific coast, I would like to include in my remarks in the RECORD an article published in the Los Angeles Times which was also published in the Los Angeles Examiner, showing there are some 5,400 veterans who arrived at San Pedro Harbor from the Pacific who were unable to be housed on shore and were put back on board the ships they came over on across the Pacific. There are some 10,000 additional men due to arrive soon which will add to the problem.

I am just emphasizing this to prove the necessity of the 100,000 temporary units which we provided for the other day and to prove the further necessity of additional units which we will certainly have to make appropriations for in the near future. It is deplorable that these men who have come from the battle fronts in the Pacific find it impossible to find a place to live within the United States when they arrive here.

The newspaper article is as follows:

SNARL KEEPS RETURNEES ABOARD SHIPS—PACIFIC VETERANS ARRIVING TOO FAST—10,000 DUE TODAY

Piling up like a log jam, servicemen returning from the Pacific pose a serious transportation problem that yesterday became even more critical.

Nearly 5,400 veterans of the Pacific, war weary and champing at the bit to get home, were forced to remain aboard their ships at Los Angeles Harbor yesterday because staging areas were too crowded to handle them.

And there are approximately 10,000 more expected to arrive aboard 20 ships that are scheduled to steam into the harbor today.

The servicemen who languished in the harbor yesterday were aboard the U. S. S. *General Howze* and the U. S. S. *Olmstead*. They held their noses and booed when the delay was announced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an explanation and a copy of the medical service bill which passed the Senate yesterday and which is on its way to the White House, much to my pleasure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include, first, an editorial from today's Daily News on Stand By MacArthur, and, second, a news article entitled "Why Mac's Popular With Jap People."

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therewith certain excerpts.

ROBERT RAMSPECK

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately because of weather conditions and other matters, I could not be present on the day when the exercises were held in commemoration of the services of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. He rendered distinguished service for many years as a ranking member on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. His seat has been on my right for many years. Much of the success, if we have achieved success, and I hope we have, has been due to the gentleman from Georgia. His patience and intelligent knowledge of matters has helped all of us very much and they have helped me more than I can say. He has been very helpful to me and to the committee. He is and has been my personal friend through all of his years of service on the committee, and my burdens have been materially lightened because of his assistance.

For the committee as a whole I can voice our great regret at his departure. We wish him well in all of his undertakings. He has borne heavy responsibilities with remarkable ease and his adjustment of his many tasks to expeditious handling attest his outstanding ability as an executive and promise success in the broad field of business which he now enters.

All of his comrades love him and this House without him will not seem the same. I lose a valued friend, the House loses a wise and sound counselor and adviser, and every Member of the House loses a comrade of great charm.

To him, I extend my best wishes for all the days that are to come, and for him I hope they may be many.

GERALD D. MORGAN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel we ought not permit the House to close its session today without an expression from

some of its members on the services of Mr. Gerald D. Morgan, of the Office of the Legislative Counsel, who will leave us at the close of the year to go into private practice. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is particularly indebted to him for his aid and help. The ship-sales bill was only one of the many bills on which he has rendered service to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

As an evidence of the regard which this committee had for him I include a copy of a resolution which we spread upon the minutes of the committee and sent him:

Committee Resolution 6

Whereas Gerald D. Morgan, Office of Legislative Counsel, assisted the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in its work in preparing and reporting the ship-sales bill (H. R. 3603), and in considering the bills (H. R. 4486 and H. R. 1425), which culminated in H. R. 3603; and

Whereas the work of this committee absorbed the time, attention, and study of the committee for 37 days and 41 sessions, on all of which days Gerald Morgan was present, assisting in the deliberations of the committee, and in addition to that time Mr. Morgan spent much time and gave much valuable assistance by personal interviews with the chairman and other members of the committee, and by his untiring patience, faithful diligence, and intelligent research contributed materially to the work of the committee in reaching a report on the bill and in securing its final passage in the House; and

Whereas the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries desires to express, though inadequately, its appreciation of the great service rendered to it by Mr. Morgan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries unanimously spread on its minutes this expression of its gratitude for the services of Gerald Morgan and its thanks for the work so effectively, intelligently, and patiently performed by Mr. Morgan, and (2) the committee extends to Gerald Morgan its thanks for the fidelity, patience, intelligence, and ability with which he has assisted the committee in its labors, and (3) that a copy of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to Mr. Morgan by the clerk of the committee.

OCTOBER 26, 1945.

As chairman of that committee, I do not know how I could have gotten along without him. Not only did he attend the committee meetings night and day and work with us in the committee room, but when I was temporarily indisposed he came from his office to help me and gave of his private time, night and day, in aiding me to solve some of the problems involved in that measure, reviewing with me the evidence, and discussing with me the points at issue in our considerations before the committee.

He has been of valuable service to every committee which he has attended. Without any disparagement of the other members of the Office of Legislative Counsel, I really do not know what I could have done without Jerry Morgan.

God speed him in his departure from this House. May he have success throughout his life, which he certainly will have if he conducts his law practice as faithfully as he has his service here. He will and cannot do otherwise. From the bottom of a deeply grateful heart I can only say God bless him.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to add my word to what the gentleman from Virginia has said about Jerry Morgan. He certainly will be missed in the drafting service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from statements and certain letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning there came to me from a constituent a letter from the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party. It reads as follows:

LAWYERS BUILDING, DETROIT,
December 10, 1945.

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed is a statement by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, urging support for the General Motors strike. You may find this of interest in your efforts to consolidate the ranks of labor in this present situation.

With best regards,
Fraternally yours,
CARL WINTER,
Chairman, Michigan Communist Party.

With that came a statement entitled "Labor Must Rally Reserves, Unite on Strategy To Win GM Fight—Foster." "From the Daily Worker, Monday, December 3, 1945."

Among other things, that statement has a caption on the second page: "No illusions on Truman."

Then follows this:

The second major thing that organized labor could do to help the GM strikers is to bring strong pressure to bear against the Truman administration looking toward a favorable settlement of the General Motors strike. There must be no illusions as to President Truman's position.

This was written on December 3, and before the President announced, as he did yesterday, that his Fact-Finding Board should take into consideration the question of profits, and I assume, later at least, the question of prices, which to my mind means in the end regimentation.

I continue to read:

In view of the many serious concessions made by the President to the great monopolists, both in their imperialistic foreign program and their wage-cutting domestic policies, it would be folly to expect that he of his own volition will adopt a line of real pressure to force the corporations to concede the workers' major demands.

I will refer later to claims made by General Motors, and claims made by the bargaining representatives of UAW-CIO; also a statement as to wages in the steel mills.

Then this statement from Foster continues:

Unfortunately in many sections of the country union leadership on this fact is not yet clear. There is a dangerous tendency to depend upon the President. Labor on the contrary must realize that it can compel favorable Government action only if it brings all its political strength upon the respective Representatives and Senators and upon the entire administration.

That being interpreted as I understand it means that if we do not do what the Communist Party wants we will not be here next year if they can help it.

Then the statement contains this paragraph:

The split in the labor movement is a great handicap to the workers in the present general wage movement. This is true despite the broad AFL rank and file support for the GM strike. At the head of the AFL and the mines unions, and to a certain extent of some railroad unions, are reactionaries of the type of Green, Woll, Hutcheson, Lewis, Dubinsky, etc., who, far from wishing to adopt a joint wage strategy with the CIO unions, would be glad to see these organizations defeated or even destroyed by the employers.

That letter from the head of the Michigan Communist Party comes from Detroit, where you remember that in the General Motors strike at the present time in violation of the State law the pickets are keeping clerical employees, office workers, even the office workers who want to go in to make out the pay checks, out of the factories; where you recall in the sit-down strikes there was a policy of lawlessness and of violence instigated by the Communists.

The Communists were condemned way back in 1925 by Lewis. They have been condemned time and time again by Green, and yet today they are one of the moving forces behind the CIO in the General Motors strike.

Labor disputes and strikes throughout the country carry the seeds of class consciousness and worse, of industrial strife, of mob violence, of lawlessness, which, if they come to full fruition, will bring us unemployment and depression when we should have prosperity, peace, and happiness for all.

There are no reliable, up-to-date figures available in either the Labor Department, or any other department of the Government, giving the number of strikers.

It is extremely difficult to make an accurate estimate from the news reports because the details of the picture change so rapidly from day to day. From the over-all situation, as reported by the press, it is apparent that 175,000 of the regular General Motors employees are out on strike; an additional 30,000 to 50,000 Ford employees have been on strike for some time. There are other strikes throughout the country. It is safe to say there are more than 300,000 employees on strike.

The figures which have been given do not include all of those who will be missing pay checks because of the strikes.

When General Motors or any other large corporation closes because of a strike, there are hundreds of thousands of others indirectly affected by the shutdown. Employees in supplier plants, those making radios, electrical equipment, generators, half a dozen or more items which go into an automobile or a truck, are automatically thrown out of work.

Throughout the country there are several thousand automobile dealers who are without new cars. As a result, mechanics and many others will feel the loss of a pay check or a sale.

When the workers in the General Motors factories do not receive their pay checks, then the sales of the butcher, the baker, drop off—businessmen all down the line sustain a loss.

The GM strike has lasted a little over 4 weeks. According to the union, 175,000 strikers lost in wages $7,910,000 a week, at the rate of $45.20 per striker per week, or a total of $31,640,000, figuring a 40-hour week at an average pay rate of $1.13 per hour.

The corporation contends that, if the strikers had continued on the job they would, with overtime, have averaged $51.22 a week. Accepting the union's figures, the 4-week strike has cost the employees more than 13 times what the 175,000 workers would have gained if the demand for a 30-percent increase in hourly pay had been granted in full.

If this strike should run 16 weeks workers will lose in wages more than they can gain in a full year of 40-hour weeks, if the 30-percent increase is granted in full. But, after all, that is their business. They have the right to strike and if they wish to do so and to take the loss, neither you nor I have a legal right to complain.

The union claims that GM has made a profit which would justify a 30-percent wage increase without increasing the price of its cars and it insists that the workers are entitled to the increase because of the increased cost of living.

GM in a paid ad states that the average hourly paid worker during the last year of the war, working 45.6 hours per week, earned $56.93 per week and that the union has now turned down a proposal which would give the average GM worker $63.44 per week, or $6.51 more for the same number of hours' work per week.

I am not expressing any opinion as to the merits of this or any other labor dispute, for, like millions of other Americans, I have no adequate knowledge of the facts.

We all know that the loss of the purchasing power of $7,910,000 does not help the businessman, nor does it buy groceries for the families of the strikers.

Every thinking American with the welfare of his country at heart must have given serious consideration to what may happen if the steel workers go on strike.

Their union insists that the companies with which they deal, and those companies employ 95 percent of the workers in the steel industry, can well afford to grant a wage increase of $2 a day, while the companies insist that if any such increase is granted the price of steel must go up.

OPA so far has refused to permit any increase in steel prices. The workers have voted to authorize a strike to be called at 12:01 on January 14, 1946, if their demands are not met. If this strike takes place and continues for any appreciable time, more than 2,000,000 workers will be idle, the industries of this country will be paralyzed.

It does not need an expert to convince the average citizen that, if the fires in the steel mills go out, industry and business throughout this country will be strangled, will cease to operate.

The administration has ordered a large additional tonnage of steel sent abroad. There are very few industries in the country who are not dependent upon steel in some form. It is not an exaggeration to say that if the GM strike continues, or if the steel workers go on strike, there are very few pocketbooks in the hands of American citizens which will not shrink.

Our industrial system is so vast, is so tied together, is so interdependent that a major part of it cannot be cut off without affecting the whole. Shut down the steel mills and you have stopped the heart of America's industry. End the flow of steel and you have drained the industrial lifeblood from the Nation's economic arteries, production and full employment ends, unemployment and a depression follow.

In spite of the rather gloomy possibilities of the situation which has been outlined, neither the administration nor the Congress has done anything to lessen the causes of labor disputes. Administration activities encouraged such disputes, delayed the solution of others.

Recently, President Truman, acting sincerely as we all believe, sent to Congress a message calling for the establishment of a fact-finding board, which was to make investigation of the facts out of which an industrial dispute arose, make public its findings and recommendations in the hope that, if the public had confidence in the board, public opinion swinging behind one or the other of the disputants would force a just settlement.

Congressional legislative counsel attempted to put the President's recommendation into effect. Unfortunately, in drafting the bill it gave to the proposed fact-finding committee the search-and-seizure power forbidden by the Constitution. Under that power any employee of the board could examine at any time or place the confidential files and records of the union, of the employer, and neither union nor employer will willingly submit to that procedure, no doubt for the reason that business and union secrets, methods, and plans for the future might be disclosed to competitors.

Yesterday, the President stated that the question of profits should be considered by the fact-finding board when making recommendations for the settlement of a dispute.

To this, the corporations strenuously object, saying that no outsider has the right to determine how much of their gross income or of the net profit should be set aside for research, for extension, for rehabilitation of their plants, for advertising, or for a half dozen other items.

It is the contention of the public generally, as I get it, that, if the corporations are making an excessive profit, after a fair adequate wage has been paid to the workers, then the surplus should be taken by the Government through taxation; that the Government itself has, may I put it, an increased cost of living; that it is in the red and that it must have additional revenue if it is to continue to function.

There is no indication so far that, if the fact-finding board learns that the company is losing money, as Ford claims to be at the rate of some $30,000,000 per year, a lesser wage will be acceptable to the workers.

The President will have extreme difficulty in getting through Congress, in the face of union and management opposition, legislation giving any board authority to act as snoopers or as over-all arbitrators of company profits or union wages.

Regimentation, and that is what the President's plan would mean in the end, is bitterly opposed by union leaders, who claim it will bring what they term involuntary servitude.

Management sees in it Government's supervision of their business; an attempt to place either union leaders or Government officials in control of private business.

Profits are not the answer in a wage dispute and the unions, if they thought the proposition through, would be the first to admit it. If there were no profits, no union bargaining agent would be willing to admit that a worker should have a less than subsistence wage. Such a proposition would be unthinkable, for the worker, like the business, who cannot make both ends meet, would starve to death or go on public relief.

The Washington News of this noon calls attention to the fallacy of the theory that profits are a controlling factor in the wage picture. That editorial is as follows:

ABILITY TO PAY

On the subject of industry's ability to pay, about which President Truman had something to say yesterday, it would be short-sighted and perhaps fatal not to look at the industrial picture as a whole. It is not merely a matter of General Motors or Ford or any other concern of conspicuous success and solvency.

Ours is not just a profit system. It is a profit-and-loss system. If all business operated automatically at a profit, the problem would be comparatively easy. But it's not that simple unfortunately.

The hard fact is that more businesses go broke than succeed.

Here are some figures from the record:

Nearly one-third of new business enterprises fail in their first year. Another 14 or 15 percent fail in their second year. And

very nearly 70 percent are gone by the end of 5 years.

At the beginning of this century there were 1,174,000 independent businesses in this country. By the end of 1940 the number had increased to 2,156,000. To achieve this net gain of less than 1,000,000, a total of 16,000,000 new business enterprises had been established—an average of 400,000 a year. Which shows the high failure rate.

Without torturing the subject statistically it is obvious that when we talk about ability to pay we must consider all the industrial story—not just a part of it. We must observe the graveyard as well as those who still breathe and live and have their being. We must remember the haberdasher who went broke along with the merchant who got rich.

Lacking such a view of the entire scene we are out of focus. And we may fall on our faces.

The Senate committee to which the bill, drawn in answer to the President's message, was referred, stuck it in a pigeonhole until after the holidays.

The House Labor Committee acting upon the suggestions of labor leaders, Green, Lewis, and Murray, by a vote of 10 to 7, turned down a motion supported by Republicans to hold hearings, consider the President's recommendation, attempt to improve it and report out forthwith what it considered to be remedial labor legislation. Blocked by Democratic votes influenced by labor leaders, the committee then voted unanimously to continue hearings upon reconvening in January.

We all know that for its enforcement law depends upon public opinion. We know the overwhelming majority of our people believe in justice and fair play.

The NLRA is the basic so-called labor legislation. It was passed at a time when labor was at a disadvantage—employers almost all-powerful. It prohibited certain practices by employers. It imposed penalties upon them. It compelled them to abide by the contract it made with a union. It contained no prohibition whatever against labor unions, their officers or their employees. It imposed no penalties upon unions or union members for the violation of the contracts they sought and willingly entered into.

Under the provisions of the NLRA, neither the employer nor the individual member of the union is able to obtain "equal justice under law," which is the legend engraved in marble over the portal of the United States Supreme Court in Washington.

Until the NLRA and one or two other laws are amended so as to place employees and employers on an equal footing with labor unions, labor organizers, and labor politicians, the disputes will continue—may increase. The public, as a whole, will suffer.

I have offered several amendments to this law which if adopted would go a long way toward imposing equal responsibility upon both parties to a labor dispute.

As to strikes vitally affecting the public health and welfare; that is, strikes in public utilities, the corporations responsible for those services cannot shut down, order a lockout; if they did they would lose their franchise. Unions should not be permitted arbitrarily to shut off the transportation, the water supply, the lights, the electricity of any community.

Into every contract between a company and a union furnishing transportation, light, heat, or power, or any other necessary public service, there should be written a provision that neither the company nor the employee could end the services without giving at least a 30-day notice of intention so to do. Every picket line which, by force or violence, prevented would-be employees who sought to restore such public service by entering its plant, should be outlawed.

The interest of employees and employers should be protected, but the interest of the general public is superior, must come first, and laws to bring that end must be enacted and enforced.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We have read in the press time and time again articles to the effect that Michigan has an antipicketing law. Is that correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; it is not an antipicketing law. The law to which I think you refer is section 17 of Act 176 of the Public Acts of 1939, which provides:

SEC. 17. It shall be unlawful for any employee or other person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force or attempt to force any person to become or remain a member of a labor organization, or for any employee or person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force or attempt to force any person to refrain from engaging in employment. Violation of this section shall be a misdemeanor and punishable as such.

We do not bar picketing in Michigan at all; it is just the violence and the blockading of the factory gates.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has that act been passed upon by the high court of Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. So far as I know, it has never come for consideration before the Michigan Supreme Court. There is no question as to its validity. It has not, however, always been enforced. For example, the other day the pickets permitted some of the clerical workers and some of the management officials who were inside the plant and who had been imprisoned there for 15 hours to leave. They said, "You can go home, but if you go home you cannot go back in." In another case there was a picket line around the gates and there was a conference between the captain of the pickets and the captain of the police—this was at Flint—and it was agreed—now, note that—it was agreed that clerical workers could go into the factory if they would go around the picket line. That action on the part of the pickets was a violation of law. The picket line would not move out of the way and would not let them in, but the employees could go around to the back door and get in that way or they could go around the picket line and get into the plant. The workers said if that is the way it is, we will go home.

My point is that the Communist Party, as we all know, carries on through a program of violence. There is no question about that. They use force. They destroyed hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property in preceding strikes. Now, they will soon be at it again because the other day Reuther said, in answer to a question, that the UAW-CIO had not thrown all of their forces into the strike—that they would throw in their "panzer" divisions later. He did not go on to explain, but we all have a thorough idea of what he meant. Here you have an official of the Communist Party, the chairman of the Michigan Communist Party, coming along and telling everybody to get in behind this strike. No doubt but he wants them to follow the usual communistic procedure.

I was hoping, before we laid it aside, that the Labor Committee would take up the President's suggestion. When the question came up in the Labor Committee whether to meet on the following Monday—this was on Saturday a week ago—with three other Republicans I voted to meet again on Monday to consider the President's bill to see if we could not bring out some sort of legislation which would aid in settling the strikes, benefiting the people as a whole, for after all, while the right of the employers and the employees must be protected and preserved, the one great right that must be protected is the right of the public.

I do not advocate the outlawing of strikes in all instances, but as I stated before the Labor Committee, when you come to a situation involving a public utility furnishing transportation either of goods, or passengers, or if there is involved messages or communications or a public-service corporation furnishing light, power, or water to a community, in my judgment we must have some legislation which will prohibit the employees from going on strike. We all know that a corporation engaged in that sort of enterprise cannot quit. If it did it would lose its franchise. Yet in the Labor Committee, when the President's proposition came down providing for a 30-day cooling-off period while negotiations were pending, before that committee came John L. Lewis, then came William Green, comparatively mild and conciliatory in his attitude, apparently reasonable; then came Phil Murray.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, each and every one of those gentlemen made the statement that if we compelled even these public-service-corporation employees to wait before going on strike, that

meant involuntary servitude. That is silly.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. On this President's proposition, the gentleman says he voted to continue the hearings on the following Monday?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Until a decision has been made by the gentleman's committee on that bill. What is the gentleman's opinion as to whether or not if the President's bill were adopted it would help the situation in Michigan and in other parts of the country?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In my judgment, we should have a fact-finding board that can be made effective without the power of subpena. I realize, as does everyone, that the effect of the findings depends to a large extent on the character of the men on the Board and their fairness. If we get a fair report as to a situation in Michigan, for instance, the law-abiding citizens of Michigan will be influenced to a very large degree by the statement of that Board; and public opinion will have a tremendous effect on the disputants. But findings from any board will not have any effect on the Communist Party or upon the Communist Party members. They do not care about settlement, they do not want settlement; they want trouble.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Does the gentleman believe if the President's program is submitted and becomes law that it would be helpful and bring about better feelings and better conditions between management and labor in the solution of this problem?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says "the President's program." I cannot go along with his program.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I mean as submitted in his message before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think an unbiased board made up of citizens in whom the public had confidence would be of help, but I would not go along, nor will management or labor, if I interpret their testimony right, go along with the interpretation now placed upon that plan with the additions which have been made to it. None of them will go along with the proposition to let any committee go into the books of the union or the books of the corporation, and employers will not agree that profits are to be used to pay wages when profits are needed to meet competition or necessary expansion or to induce new investment of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions after the adjournment of the present session of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 47.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 21, 1945, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resolution (S. Con. Res. 48), which was read by the Clerk:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 469) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] as a committee to wait upon the President.

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE LATE GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, less than an hour ago I conferred with Speaker Rayburn, and it was agreed that later in the day we would send a message to Gen. George S. Patton expressing the hopes of the House for his speedy recovery. Since that time I have learned that General Patton has passed away.

He will go down in history as the outstanding military leader developed in this war; a great military genius, a patriot, a man of courage and vision, who never sent a soldier where he was not willing to go himself.

He has been maligned and abused by the "smear bund" here in Washington, and throughout the country. That I may expose some day, but I will not take the time to do it at this hour.

When I found what was going on, and realized the reason for these unjust attacks on this great military leader, I took the floor and, in my humble way, helped to drive those scavengers to cover.

General Patton came to see me when he was in Washington. I am the only Member of either House that he called on. He said, "I came to thank you for defending me on the floor of the House. When I was engaged in the defense of my country on the battlefield, I could not defend myself." I said, "General, you do not owe me anything compared with what I owe you, because in my humble judgment if it had not been for your genius, your courage, your vision, your inspiration, your boldness, your leadership, we would probably have lost a million more men than we did lose in this conflict." I said to him, "I have watched your career ever since you were in training in Louisiana, through the north African campaign, where you whipped Rommel for the first time. To me you have manifested the qualities of genius displayed by Stonewall Jackson and Nathan Bedford Forrest." He said, "I simply took the tactics of Forrest and Jackson and applied them to mechanized warfare."

That is an answer that will go down in history alongside of that of Forrest when he answered General Morgan's question as to how he won the Battle of Murfreesboro. If he had been a West Pointer he might have said, "I moved by interior lines and hit the enemy at his weakest points." But Forrest was not an educated man. He simply said, "I took the short cut and got there first with the most men."

In these attacks on General Patton he was accused, among other things, of slapping a soldier. Probably I ought not to relate what he told me, but I am sure he would have told you the same thing. He said, "I was going through a hospital where about 350 of my men were shot to pieces, some with their arms shot off, some with their eyes shot out, some with their faces shot to pieces, or their legs shot off." He said, "I am more or less a sentimental human being. When I came out I saw this fellow sitting on a box crying. I thought he was shot. I laid my hand on his shoulder, and I said, 'What happened to you?' He said, 'Nothing; I just can't take it.' I just lifted him up and said, 'Do not be yellow. Get out and get back into the ranks.' " He said, "I did not slap him. I had my gloves in my hand and I waved them in his face this way." He said, "That was all I said." I referred to the doctors and nurses running in, and he said there was not a word of truth in that report. He said the fellow went back to his place in the ranks, as he had told him to do.

It was only when a certain change in commanders in one of the armies in continental Europe was suggested that the smear bund, under the inspiration of an individual here in Washington, spread that campaign of smear and slander against General Patton in order to keep him from being placed in another command in the place of a general whose command seemed to be "bogging down."

I could refer to many instances of his courage and daring. Probably none would exemplify his character more than the time he led his troops across the Sure River. The ground was frozen and covered with snow. It was necessary to get across that river. German snipers were shooting at everything they could see. I said, "General, your swimming that river was a rather daring feat." "Oh," he said, "I did not swim that river." I said, "Keep your mouth shut; everybody thinks you did." He said, "I waded it. They had submerged what we called a rubber foot walk, and I knew we had to get across. I could not tell my men to go in that river unless I was willing to go myself. I said to the man next in command, 'I am going across there.' He said, 'You will do nothing of the kind. You will not live to get half way across.' I said, 'Yes; and you are going with me.' " Which he did.

So he started across, and the water came up to his chin. Everybody looking on thought he was swimming, and he might just as well have been swimming, because he was in that icy water up to his neck. The German snipers were shooting at him all the time. As it happened, none of them hit him or his companion.

When he came back there was not a man in his command who was not willing to follow him across where he gained a foothold which helped in the drive that finally brought the war to a victorious conclusion. They charged here that General Patton made a drive and lost a large number of men trying to save his son-in-law, Colonel Waters. General Patton did not even know that Colonel Waters was in that prison. At this point, let me say that he would have done the same thing no matter who was there. He went to rescue those men and did it; and as it happened Colonel Waters was one of them.

I want to say a word about Colonel Waters while I am at it. He has one of the finest war records I have ever read. Some day I hope to put it in the RECORD to let you know that he was not depending upon his relationship to General Patton for his position in this war. He is one of the outstanding heroes of the entire conflict.

Thomas B. Aldrich once said:

Somewhere—in desolate wind-swept space—
In twilight-land—in no-man's land—
Two hurrying shapes met face to face,
And bade each other stand.
"And who are you?" cried one agape,
Shuddering in the gloaming light.
"I know not," said the second shape,
"I only died last night."

General Patton passed away today. But he is entering that great galaxy of men of genius in the military history of mankind such as Stonewall Jackson, Nathan Bedford Forrest, Napoleon, Hannibal, and Caesar, into which august company he will be properly admitted and will easily take his place as one of the greatest of them all.

Shakespeare said:

Let fame, that all hunt after in their lives,
Live register'd upon our brazen tombs,
And then grace us in the disgrace of death;
When, spite of cormorant devouring time,
Th' endeavour of this present breath may buy
That honour which shall bate his scythe's keen edge,
And make us heirs of all eternity.

While General Patton was making the drive to save his men and to win the war, regardless of criticism at home, he was making himself the heir of all eternity and writing his name high upon the scroll of fame to become an immortal hero to the children of this and future generations.

He was a gentleman of the highest type, and a patriot whose life was devoted to the welfare of his country.

He was a soldier who placed duty above all other earthly considerations.

He was a military genius of the highest rank and an American who loved his country with a passionate devotion that knew no bounds.

He was a man, take him for all in all,
I shall not look upon his like again.

MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MRS. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since you and I conferred, Gen. George S. Patton has passed away. I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker send a message of condolence on the part of the House to Mrs. Patton.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will comply with that request, without objection.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I speak of the passing of Gen. George Patton, an old and valued personal friend from my childhood days. He was courageous from the time he was a boy; a man who disciplined himself from the time he was young; a man who, as a boy, always wanted to be a great soldier. He disciplined his body. He disciplined his mind, in order that he might be a leader of men, an officer who could physically and mentally lead his men through all sorts of dangers, through every battle; a man who could lead his men to victory.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago last September I saw General Patton at his headquarters. I did not expect to see him, but I was told he had asked to see me. I did not feel he would have time to see or talk to anyone. Other officers were living in comfortable quarters in an old house, where there were fireplaces. General Patton was living in a shack on wheels. I can see him now, a strong and virile figure running down the steps of that shack to bid me welcome. It was not because I was on old friend that he wanted to see

me, but because he wanted to discuss with me certain things, certain types of equipment that he needed for his men in order to beat Hitler. So for 1 hour he told me how he thought supplies might be brought to the front, how supplies might be sent from this country to him and to those at the front who needed them so desperately. For weeks, Mr. Speaker, he had been running with a tremendous shortage of gasoline, of trucks, and jeeps, and tanks; and he described where he thought those tanks and jeeps were available and how they could be sent to aid his men. It seems sometimes, Mr. Speaker, as if he and his men were possessed of supernatural strength; they went so fast and won so many victories with so few supplies.

He had always one objective in mind and that was to win through with the smallest loss of our United States men. He was tough and rough, as you might think, but curiously gentle. I am going to tell you a story about him. I think it shows an innate gentleness that one likes to associate with strength and great fighting ability. He went to five different commands with another great general to award decorations. Every time it came his turn to speak he was so moved he could not express himself adequately. Because he knew what untold hardships they had suffered and how richly they deserved the award.

When I left he gave me a captured German dagger to bring back to his wife. He was ever gentle and thoughtful of her and his children. Their love was a great love and she as a woman was as gallant as he. It seems hard, Mr. Speaker, that General Patton should go now. We would like to know that he won his last battle. Yet I know he had a premonition that this would be his last war. And so, Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of the House, the general's boys and all fighting men will join me in our respects and farewell to our greatest fighting general. While it is his last war, may we also hope it will be the last this country will have to fight.

The SPEAKER. While we are waiting for the committee appointed to report to the President of the United States, I desire to say that I join with the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts in expressing my deep regret at the passing of a very great soldier and a very great man. He was the type of character that would have his ups and downs in life. He had his, but all in all his was a great, a grand, and a serviceable life, not only to his country but to humanity and the good people everywhere.

Before we receive the report of the committee to wait upon the President, may I say further that personally I deeply appreciate the words the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] stated earlier in the day. Such expressions as his and the kindly fashion in which I have been treated by the gentleman and all Members of the House, in these very arduous, these very onerous days, have made a position difficult enough in normal times, terribly difficult in times like those through which we have passed in the last 48 or 50 months, more tolerable, and, I may say, pleasant.

Some people like to say that the Congress has a session and does little, that it leaves much to be attended to on programs that have been proposed. I have been here a long time, I have seen long sessions and short sessions of Congress; I do not think the House of Representatives in any 3- or 4-month period in the almost 33 years of service I have had in this body, has done more, has passed more important and far-reaching legislation in that time than has the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress from September 5 until today. When you call the roll of those measures and those things accomplished, we have a right to be proud of ourselves.

I have never been the type or the character of man who did things, then went out and apologized for them. I am just not built that way. I defend the Congress of the United States at home and abroad, because the House of Representatives, this part of the Congress I have known so long and so well, is made up of men and women of high character and good ability. As you separate and go to your homes, I hope that you may have a happy holiday. You deserve it, each and every one of you, because you have worked hard in the interest of things that will bring peace and make a better country for all of us in which to live.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join the committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and ask him if he had any further communication to make to the Congress, has performed that duty.

The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress, but that he wishes the Members a Merry Christmas.

THE LATE GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that he has sent the following telegram to Mrs. George S. Patton, Jr.:

DECEMBER 21, 1945.

MRS. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.,
Washington, D. C.:

As the representative of the entire membership of the House of Representatives and at their suggestion I send you our deepest sympathy in the loss of your distinguished husband General Patton. His life was big and useful. His great career of service to his country assures that he will always be considered as an outstanding American. Again sympathy and regards.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 50. An act to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 323. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 342. An act to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 343. An act to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 344. An act to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 345. An act concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 346. An act to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 400. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 683. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 752. An act to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1288. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1400. An act for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Charles L. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1523. An act to modify the time limitations governing the award of certain military and naval decorations for acts performed during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1551. An act relating to the sale of Government-owned shotguns to officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1588. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blachard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the Office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1618. An act to exempt the Navy Department from statutory prohibitions against the employment of noncitizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1649. An act to authorize the construction of a new Federal office building at Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution relative to the formation of an international health organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to preserve the status and perquisites of officers of the United States Army detailed to duty in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the fire department;

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 576. An act to amend the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States" approved November 26, 1940, so as to eliminate the time limit within which incumbents of positions covered into the classified service pursuant to such act may be recommended for classification;

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to authorize an additional appropriation for the purpose of providing housing for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, the Chair declares the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces;

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER, under the authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, on January 4, 1946, signed the enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 90. An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House on January 2, 1946, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 90) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of George O'Hara."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 21, 1945:

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department; and

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

On December 22, 1945:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of Gordon T. Gorham and others;

H. R. 1481. An act for the relief of R. W. Wood;

H. R. 1793. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States court for the eastern district of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1976. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Gus Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albemarle Hospital; Dr. Z. D. Owens; Dr. W. W. Johnston; Evans Funeral Home; Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton; Duke Hospital; and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss.

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giselle Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington.

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer.

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the District of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe.

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States received by the Clerk of the House reported that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 19, 1945:

H. R. 2737. An act for the relief of the estate of Harry Leon Black.

On December 20, 1945:

H. R. 4129. An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

On December 21, 1945:

H. R. 608. An act to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States.

On December 28, 1945:

H. R. 207. An act for the relief of Edgar Kaigler;

H. R. 215. An act for the relief of Virginia Packard;

H. R. 915. An act for the relief of Fairview School District No. 90, Pratt County, Kans.;

H. R. 919. An act for the relief of Gladys Elvira Maurer;

H. R. 936. An act for the relief of John Nisselson, of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 1031. An act for the relief of Matthew Mattas;

H. R. 1234. An act for the relief of Percy Allen;

H. R. 1250. An act for the relief of Roy S. Councilman;

H. R. 1251. An act for the relief of the Irvine Co.;

H. R. 1348. An act for the relief of estate of Gordon T. Gorham, and others;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Lamb;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of W. F. Smothers;

H. R. 1836. An act for the relief of Viola Theriaque;

H. R. 1879. An act for the relief of Rev. Neal Deweese, Mrs. Minnie Deweese, Raymond Deweese, and the estate of Lon Thurman, deceased;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of the Ohio Brass Co.;

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Rastus L. Davis;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Harry Goldstein and Joseph Mallardi;

H. R. 2154. An act for the relief of John W. Magee and Florence V. Magee;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Charles W. Anderson, Roy Jefferds, and Guy Klockenkemper;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Henry P. King and G. B. Morgan, Sr.;

H. R. 2333. An act for the relief of Albemarle Hospital, Dr. Z. D. Owens, Dr. W. W. Johnston, Evans Funeral Home, Esther Pendleton, legal guardian of Lloyd Pendleton, Duke Hospital, and Ephriam Daniels;

H. R. 2401. An act for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad;

H. R. 2465. An act to amend section 20 of the Act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 2553. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2556. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy;

H. R. 2578. An act for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock;

H. R. 2644. An act for the relief of Eli Richmond;

H. R. 2666. An act for the relief of Oscar N. McLean;

H. R. 2746. An act for the relief of Annarae Weiss;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell and Charles J. Campbell;

H. R. 2965. An act to permit the inclusion of land occupied by Dibble General Hospital within the corporate limits of the city of Menlo Park, Calif.;

H. R. 3052. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Montague;

H. R. 3073. An act for the relief of Finck Cigar Co.;

H. R. 3124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisella Sante;

H. R. 3167. An act to amend section 112 of the Judicial Code to change the times for holding the terms of the District Court for the Eastern District of the State of Washington;

H. R. 3273. An act for the relief of Eric Fischer and Else Fischer;

H. R. 3277. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katie Sanders;

H. R. 3303. An act for the relief of A. M. Strauss;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Hugo Effinger, in behalf of his minor son, William L. Effinger;

H. R. 3725. An act for the relief of Miss Jacqueline Friedrich;

H. R. 3749. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3759. An act to provide the Navy with a system of laws for the settlement of claims uniform with that of the Army;

H. R. 3834. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eunice C. Hardage;

H. R. 3987. An act for the relief of Myrtle C. Radabaugh;

H. R. 3995. An act to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut;

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of M. R. Stone;

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Franklin P. Radcliffe;

H. R. 4480. An act to authorize an investigation of means of increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4587. An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize the Export-Import Bank of Washington to extend its operations to include the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 4780. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 4805. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4857. An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces;

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution designating January 5, 1946, as George Washington Carver Day;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution giving official recognition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States;

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V–12 program; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

On December 29, 1945:

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds;

H. R. 1236. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to quitclaim to Chanslor-Canfield Midway Oil Co. subsurface mineral and water rights in 211.36 acres of land in the county of Los Angeles, Calif.

H. R. 2321. An act for the relief of the Springfield Cooperative Bank;

H. R. 3574. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near eBan Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934; and

H. R. 4489. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to international organizations and to the officers and employees thereof, and for other purposes.

On January 3, 1946:

H. R. 4717. An act to establish a department of medicine and surgery in the Veterans' Administration.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had vetoed the following bills of the House on the dates indicated.

REDUCING CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

H. R. 4407. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 4407, "Reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes."

It is with sincere regret that I am unable to approve this legislation. In response to my communication of September 5, 1945, and in conformity with their own careful plans, the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate held extended hearings and gave mature consideration to the readjustment of executive programs and finances to the problems of the reconversion period. The Congress has acted expeditiously and considerately to develop the basis for the continuing peacetime operations of the Government. It has demonstrated a fine spirit of economy in reducing appropriations without complicating the delicate adjustment from wartime to peacetime functions, and without sacrificing the basic progress which has been made during the war years in the long-term development of Government activity.

So far as the basic purpose of this bill rescinding appropriations is concerned, I am in thorough agreement with the action of the Congress. Far from wishing to sacrifice the care and effort which have gone into its development, I shall by Executive action preserve the full values of these rescission provisions in the

exact terms which the Congress itself has approved. If these provisions stood alone I should gladly approve the bill. I have asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to place these rescission amounts in a reserve, nonexpendable status, and so to advise the departments and agencies concerned.

In addition to its effect on appropriations, however, the bill contains provisions which require our system of public employment offices—now unified in a single national system—to be broken up within 100 days, and transferred to operation as 51 separate State and territorial systems.

While I believe such a transfer should be made at the proper time, I am convinced that this bill requires that it be made at the wrong time, and in the wrong way. Such a dispersion and transfer at this time would immeasurably retard our reemployment program. And as the basis for Federal-State cooperation, in a fundamental program of national importance, the provisions of the bill dealing with the public-employment offices are unsound and unwise from any point of view.

So far as the timing of the transfer is concerned, the period designated by this bill—the next 100 days—is the most disadvantageous that could have been chosen. It will result in a disrupted and inefficient employment service at the very time when efficient operation is most vitally needed by veterans, workers, and employers.

Our local public employment offices are now, and will be during the next several months, in the midst of the peak work load in their history. This is because the offices are now engaged in counseling and placing millions of applicants who require individualized service. These applicants include able-bodied veterans seeking assistance in their readjustment to civilian life, handicapped veterans requiring even more time and guidance in finding the jobs most suitable for them, and unemployed war workers who are confronted by difficult readjustments because of substantial reductions in job opportunities at their wartime skills and wage rates.

At such a time any change in management and direction is necessarily disruptive to the service. A change which would replace our present single and unified management by 51 separate managements would be very harmful. Even with every effort by the States to promote a smooth transition, the transfer of some 23,000 employees to new conditions of employment, and the adjustment of operations to the requirements of 51 different State agencies, will inevitably cause confusion and delay.

In my reconversion message of September 6 to the Congress I pointed out our national responsibilities and problems in connection with reemployment during the reconversion period. During this period displaced war workers and the veterans who are returning to civilian life at the rate of more than a million per month will need, and have a right to expect from their National Government, an effective job-counseling and placement service. These problems and responsibilities cannot, in a period when millions of veterans and other workers are moving across State lines, be met adequately through 51 separate and independent public employment service systems, linked only by the necessarily remote and indirect influence of a Federal agency financing the State systems through grants-in-aid.

For these reasons, I now repeat my recommendation that the transfer of our public employment offices to State operation be postponed until June 1947. The administration is committed to returning the service to State operation, and that commitment will be carried through. But this is not the time.

Apart from the timing of the transfer, the provisions of H. R. 4407 which govern the basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of public employment offices do not assure that an adequate service will be available in all States.

The bill provides for the operation of public employment offices by the States under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act. Operating costs would be met entirely by the Federal Government. These provisions of the bill would remain in effect for only a few months—the balance of the current fiscal year.

The bill precludes the granting of funds to any State which is unable, or unwilling, to comply with the provisions of the bill or any requirement of the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the provisions of the bill.

A Federal-State cooperative program for a national system of public employment offices financed entirely by Federal funds must at least provide assurance as to two basic objectives: The Federal Government must be sure that the essential services are being provided through the States' employment offices, and it must know that the offices are being operated with reasonable efficiency. Under such a program, the Federal Government is not interested in prescribing minute or insignificant details concerning the State operation, but it does have a stake in the preservation of reasonable standards.

H. R. 4407 provides no effective protection for this national interest. If any State, for any reason, cannot or does not meet the minimum requirements, Federal grants cannot be made. But at the same time the Federal Government itself is precluded from continuing the operation of public employment office facilities in the State.

This means, in effect, that when there is a substantial failure to provide essential services or to meet minimum standards of efficiency, the Federal Government must choose between two alternatives which are both unsatisfactory. It must either acquiesce in the substandard operation—or, by withholding funds, it must deprive all of the State's employers, workers, and veterans of a service they need and to which they are entitled.

At a time of such acute emergency—when emloyment offices are needed to provide veterans with the services with which the Congress has required they be provided, and needed also to assist other unemployed workers in securing peacetime jobs—I cannot approve legislation which, under some conditions, may offer only a choice between a substantially substandard service or no service at all.

It seems clear to me that a matter of such grave importance as our public-employment system deserves not only permanent legislation, but legislation carefully and separately considered. Issues of such a difficult and vital nature should not be dealt with as riders to appropriation bills.

The fact is that our present legislation governing the operation of our cooperative Federal-State employment service system, enacted in 1933, needs thorough revision in the light of changed conditions. Several bills now pending before both Houses of Congress—H. R. 4437, S. 1456, and S. 1510—are designed to accomplish this. Enactment of such permanent legislation is essential before a transfer back to State operation can be achieved in an efficient and orderly manner.

Adequate and uniform standards of service must be maintained and proper security for the personnel of the organization itself must be provided in a permanent way, if it is to keep and attract the caliber of personnel able and eager to perform its important tasks.

Only in this way can we provide a sound and permanent basis for Federal-State cooperation in the maintenance of a postwar system of public employment offices which will meet the needs of veterans, employers, workers, and the Nation as a whole.

While I object to the specific measure which this bill proposes to carry out with respect to our employment service, I object even more strongly to the legislative method employed for its enactment. To attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill restricts the President's exercise of his functions and is contrary to good government.

In view of my past legislative experience, I realize the obligations of the President to the Congress as a coordinate branch of the Government. At the same time, I must be equally aware of the constitutional responsibility of the President to the people, and of the obligation of the Congress to help him discharge that responsibility.

The Constitution has placed upon the President the duty of considering bills for approval or disapproval. It has always been possible for the Congress to hamper the President's exercise of this duty by combining so many subjects into a single bill that he cannot disapprove an objectionable item without holding up necessary legislation.

Partly in order to prevent this practice, it has long been considered a fundamental principle that legislation on a

major issue of policy ought not be combined with an appropriation measure. The present bill directly violates that principle. I am obliged to withhold my approval to some very excellent legislation because of the objectionable practice which has been followed by attaching this rider which I cannot possibly approve.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 22, 1945.*

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

H. R. 1793. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1793, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

It appears that in 1942 the Army Air Forces desired to construct a hospital at the Army air base at Florence, S. C. Dr. John D. Smyser, who was the medical director and superintendent of Saunders Memorial Hospital, located in that city, offered to lease the hospital to the United States.

A series of negotiations took place between Dr. Smyser and representatives of the War Department, which resulted in the execution by Dr. Smyser of an option to lease the Saunders Memorial Hospital to the United States for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, subject to a right of termination by the Government at any time upon 30 days' notice. The War Department later reached the conclusion that it would be less expensive to construct a new hospital than to acquire and rehabilitate the Saunders Memorial Hospital, and declined to take up the option or to enter into a lease. No contract either to lease or purchase the premises was ever entered into by the Government.

It is asserted that in the meantime Dr. Smyser had made arrangements to turn over the hospital to the United States and had discontinued certain activities in the institution. The bill under consideration authorizes the board of trustees to file suit against the United States as though, contrary to fact, the option had been taken up and a contract had actually been entered into. If a contract had actually been entered into, no special legislation is needed to enable the claimant to file suit against the Government. On the other hand, to denominate a transaction a contract by legislative action when, in fact, no contract exists would give rise to an obligation on the part of the United States where actually there is no such obligation. The option taken by the United States created no obligation to enter into a lease or to purchase the property. No lease was actually made and no legal obligation arose on the Government toward the Saunders Memorial Hospital. The fact that the hospital authorities made premature preparations on the assumption that a lease would be made does not create either a legal or a moral obligation on the part of the Government to confer on the hospital the right to bring suit against the United States on the supposition that a contract had actually been made.

In view of the foregoing circumstances I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 29, 1945.*

EAGLE PACKET CO., INC.

H. R. 1976. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1976, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Eagle Packet Co., Inc.

The bill would vest the Court of Claims with jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Eagle Packet Co., St. Louis, Mo., against the United States, for damages sustained by the steamboat *Golden Eagle* and its cargo, in June 1941 when the vessel struck the submerged end of a dike in the Mississippi River, and was beached.

The record in this case establishes that about 9 o'clock on the night of June 14, 1941, the *Golden Eagle* was en route up the Mississippi River from Sheffield, Ala., to St. Louis, Mo.; that a short distance north of Chester, Ill., the vessel struck the submerged end of a dike, which was one of a series of dikes that had been constructed at that point by the War Department for the purpose of stabilization of the river channel in aid of navigation; that on the night of the accident a Government light which would ordinarily be at the end of one of the lower dikes for use as a range light in navigating this particular stretch of the river, had been moved landward, and that notice of this change in the position of the range light had been published by the United States Coast Guard for the information of river pilots. A Government board, convened to investigate the sinking of the *Golden Eagle*, after hearing witnesses, including testimony of the ship's master, concluded that the accident could have been avoided had the master been more attentive to his duties as pilot and had exercised reasonable care and skill in maintaining the course he had set.

The facts seemingly are not in dispute, nor do they present such difficulty as to warrant burdening the court with the duty of determining liability in this case. On the contrary, it would appear that the Government was diligent and timely in putting shipping interests on notice of the changed position of the range light, and that responsibility for the damage to the vessel rests solely upon the claimant's agent.

For these reasons, I feel that I cannot lend my approval to this measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 29, 1945.*

R. W. WOOD

H. R. 1481. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1481, "For the relief of R. W. Wood." It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $382.41 to R. W. Wood of 1811 D Street NE., Washington, D. C., in settlement of his claims against the United States "for salary not paid while under suspension at Army air base, Key Field, Miss., from January 21 to February 27, 1944, inclusive, while serving as associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction."

It appears that Mr. Wood was employed as an associate civil engineer and superintendent of construction at the Army air base, Key Field, Miss., at a salary of $3,200 per annum; that on October 23, 1943, he was suspended from duty without pay by the commanding officer at Key Field for a period not exceeding 90 days pending results of an investigation relative to charges preferred against him for the misappropriation of Government property; that upon the expiration of the 90-day suspension, on January 21, 1944, military authorities at the base extended the suspension; that on February 1, 1944, following advice from the district attorney that the case was closed, the suspension was terminated and Mr. Wood was restored to duty; that he thereafter tendered his resignation, which was accepted without prejudice, to take effect upon the termination of his accumulated annual leave, namely, on February 27, 1944; and that he was therefore in a leave-with-pay status, and was paid, for the period from February 1 to February 27, 1944. It furthers appears that extension of the suspension beyond January 21, 1944, was improper, and that it would be appropriate, therefore, to compensate Mr. Wood for the period January 22 to January 31, 1944, both inclusive, in the amount of $106.34, representing his base pay and overtime during that period.

The payment to Mr. Wood in the amount of $382.41, as proposed by the bill, includes, as stated in the bill, not only the period from January 21 to January 31, 1944, but also the period from February 1 to February 27, 1944, for which latter period Mr. Wood has already been paid. Approval of the bill would result, therefore, in a duplicate payment for that period.

I therefore feel obliged to withhold my approval of the bill, but I would not be opposed to the enactment of legislation which would compensate Mr. Wood for the period January 22 to January 31, 1944, both inclusive, in the amount of $106.34.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 29, 1945.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

882. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 282 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, a report of a committee was delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1201. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5100. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 with respect to the payment of certain benefits; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5101. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 6, 1945, Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5102. A bill to exempt from income tax certain payments made to seamen on account of their internment by the enemy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 5103. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, plywood, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5104. A bill to authorize the coinage of 10,000,000 silver dollars in commemoration of the victorious conclusion of World War II; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 5105. A bill to authorize the coinage of 10,000,000 silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Coinage, Weight, and Measures.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide an appropriation to assist the Virgin Islands in developing its tourist trade; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Hungarian National Assembly, eulogizing the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 5106. A bill for the relief of John Ritter Dunham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5107. A bill for the relief of M. Edmund Nicolas; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5108. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Shockley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5109. A bill for the relief of Lewis M. Burford; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Monnie L. Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred L. Bupp; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1436. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Peace Campaign, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to conditions in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.